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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The problem. The object of this study is to test the hypothesis that there is a positive relationship between the degree to which parents "accept" their children and certain personal and social adjustment characteristics of the children. This problem is suggested by several considerations. Present research findings indicate certain home and family influences are related to various attitudinal and behavioral characteristics of children, but few of the studies have been concerned with parental acceptance per se.¹ Most of the studies have been concerned with pre-school children or children with types of behavioral difficulties. Few studies have been based

on any systematic sampling of some defined population of children or families. In addition, some writers have implied that there is a relationship between the degree to which a child is accepted by his parents or other "significant" persons and his personal and social characteristics although empirical evidence has been lacking. The need for a statistical investigation of the relationship between parental acceptance of children and the personal and social adjustment characteristics of the children for a fairly large sample of "typical" families seemed timely.

In the following section a brief theoretical outline is presented as a basis for testing the relationship between parental acceptance of children and adjustment characteristics of the children.

Theoretical framework. Ideas and concepts used in this outline are drawn from many sources and it is impossible


to document each indebtedness. Special mention is given in a few instances where it is obvious that particular acknowledgment is necessary. Because of the general acceptance and use of the contributions of Cooley, Lewin, Lecky and Mead or psychoanalytic writers as Freud, Adler, Sullivan, Horney and Fromm toward our understanding of personality development, specific references to the works of these writers have been omitted.

An overview of the theoretical framework which follows might be useful in identifying and organizing the concepts used in this discussion. It seemed that the child's concept of himself might be particularly useful for assuming a theoretical relationship between parental acceptance and a child's personality adjustment patterns. The degree to which a child has experienced a sense of well being during his development is used to describe the process of learning whereby the child acquires his conception of himself. Certain elements of social learning theory are employed to describe this learning process. Finally, the theoretical outline is applied to the problem in this investigation.

One of the basic postulates of the thinking of men
as different as Erickson\textsuperscript{3} and Rogers\textsuperscript{4} is that individuals possess a growth and developmental potential. Rogers' postulate of the "self actualization principle" as a universal principle of growth or Erikson's discussion of "inner laws of development" offers a useful point of departure for analysis of the infant's or child's development. It has been well established that the human organism exhibits observable and fairly predictable patterns of physiological and psychological growth and development. Research over the past several decades in the field of child development has resulted in the establishment of a very clear picture of the physiological growth and development patterns of infants and children. Psychological and psychoanalytic research have clarified the idiosyncratic, but none the less predictable pattern of individuals' psychological development.\textsuperscript{5}


\textsuperscript{4}Carl Rogers, Client Centered Therapy (Houghton Mifflin Co., 1951), pp. 467-490.

\textsuperscript{5}In this discussion growth is thought of primarily as increase in size of the organism or its parts. Development is used to indicate an increase in some skill as language development or complexity of function as perceptual differentiation.
If the child's growth or developmental needs are reasonably well satisfied, he may be said to experience a sense of "well being." However, if deprivation or thwarting is encountered by the child, he will experience tension or frustration which prevents him from acquiring a sense of well being. For the development of self identity, the child should experience a sense of well being during the various periods of his development. Self identity implies that a child or person has a fairly realistic appraisal of himself and the nature of his relations with others.

During the initial periods of life, the sense of well being is satisfied by meeting the child's organic needs. But as the infant develops, he begins to acquire feelings concerning his relation to the objects of his phenomenal field. Instead of encountering only organic needs, the child becomes capable of experiencing a variety of thwarting conditions some of which may be related to organic needs, but many of which are related to his affective relations with persons and things about him.

---

6This concept is used with essentially the same meaning as Snygg and Combs ascribe to their concept of the basic human need: "the preservation and enhancement of the phenomenal self." See D. Snygg and A. W. Combs, Individual Behavior (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1949), p. 58.
Henceforth the child's sense of well being becomes increasingly dependent upon the opportunity for him to express his growth and developmental potentialities and to receive positive reinforcements from his efforts to interact with those who care for him. It is generally accepted that the infant's or child's psycho-social development will not follow the normative pattern unless the infant or child has an opportunity for sufficient interaction with persons about him. There is even a question as to whether physical growth and development will proceed normally for the infant or child who is severely deprived of contact with a mother figure. In fact, it might be well to speak of children's development from infancy onward through life to their adulthood as "interactive development."

The child's development supplies him with a succession of potentialities which may be expressed in almost innumerable ways, depending on his learning experiences. Since the child is almost entirely dependent upon his parents for satisfaction of his organic needs for his psychological well being, the reactions they have to his attempts to maintain or enhance his well being are important cues to him. Some of the parents' reactions as perceived by the child reinforce his feeling of well
being. Other parental reactions threaten this feeling. Since the child values the status he is awarded by his parents, he tends to learn those patterns of behavior which reinforce his feeling of well being. He selects modes of relating himself to his parents which maintain or enhance his feeling of well being. By means of such a process the child's behavior becomes patterned.

As the child continues to grow and develop, he discovers that behavior patterns which were once appropriate and were rewarded by positive responses, now are no longer favorably considered by his parents. He continuously has to adapt his method of relating himself to his parents and siblings to modes of conduct expected of him by them. Therefore, his sense of well being is not static, but may change from one period of development to another. There is, however, a psychological continuity in the child's feelings of well being as reflected in his relationships with members of his family. The child translates these feelings of well being into a more or less stable set of attitudes toward himself. He sees himself as a distinct person and begins to incorporate into his ideas about himself the expectancies with which other persons, particularly his parents, have come to regard him. If the child has experienced a sense of well being throughout
earlier developmental periods, he should be able to achieve an adequately realistic and integrated concept of himself.

At this point it would be well to return to the variables selected for study - parental acceptance of children and the personal and social adjustment characteristics of children. Several observations concerning the association among these variables are possible in relation to the self concept theory outlined in this discussion. First, the parent who is able to "accept" his child is one who has an adequate and integrated concept of himself. He feels that he doesn't have to protect his child from making the mistakes that he has made. He sees his child as an autonomous individual with the necessity of developing a self of his own. Consequently he will let the child experiment to develop his own uniqueness within the limits, of course, of socially defined personal and social behavior. The parent who has not come to understand or accept himself will tend to protect his child or try to make him conform to some pattern which the parent thinks is desirable for reasons of the parent's lack of self identity. In the dimensions of the operational definition of acceptance given in the next chapter, he probably will not be a very accepting
parent.

Secondly, a child whose parents accept him has the opportunity to develop his own self concepts without undue restriction or coercion for development in a particular direction. He will be relatively free to test his various capacities and skills. The pre-adolescent will receive support from his parents in his attempts to develop his own autonomy apart from his family. He will feel free to develop peer group identifications and form social relations apart from his family. He can develop feelings of his own personal worth and enjoy his status achievements within a family in which the parents realize that his developing autonomy is one more step in the direction of a socially useful and self-accepting adult.

With this theoretical framework as a basis, it was postulated that data gathered from parents and their pre-adolescent children should demonstrate that there is a positive relationship between parental acceptance and the personal and social adjustment of children. Several scales used to measure these variables are described in the next chapter.
CHAPTER II
MEASURING INSTRUMENTS

Appropriate schedules for measuring the variables in this study were selected from existing scales. The Porter parental acceptance scale, apparently unique and the first of its kind, was used to measure the degree to which parents accept their children.\(^1\) The Rogers test of personality adjustment was chosen to measure the adjustment characteristics of the children.\(^2\)

Definitions of the variables measured by these scales and a brief description of each are given in this chapter.

Definition of parental acceptance. Definitions for parental acceptance have been advanced by Symonds\(^3\) and by Baldwin, Kalhorn, and Breese.\(^4\) However, Porter has


\(\text{\textsuperscript{2}}\)Carl R. Rogers, Measuring Personality Adjustment in Children, Nine to Thirteen Years of Age, Contribution to Education No. 456 (New York: Bureau of Publication, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1931).


\(\text{\textsuperscript{4}}\)A. L. Baldwin, J. Kalhorn, and F. N. Breese, "Patterns of Parent Behavior," Psychology Monographs, 1945, 58, p. 75.
pointed out that these definitions were too general, lacked in specificity and failed to discriminate between the truly accepting parent and the overprotecting or overindulgent parent. Therefore, Porter formulated the following operational definition:

Parental acceptance may be defined as feelings and behavior on the part of the parents which are characterized by unconditioned love for the child, a recognition of the child as a person with feelings who has a right and a need to express those feelings, a value for the unique make-up of the child and a recognition of the child's need to differentiate and separate himself from his parents in order that he may become an autonomous individual.

Nonacceptance . . . is considered to include rejection, indulgence, overprotection, and other forms of parental behavior which fail to provide the child with an assurance of being a worthy individual who is loved unconditionally and who is respected for his uniqueness and need to become an autonomous individual.

The parental acceptance scale. The parental acceptance scale was constructed on the basis of the four dimensions of the operational definition. Ten items were written for each dimension. Each item was repeated twice, asking first, how the parent feels in the situation, and second, what the parent does in the situation. For example,


6Ibid., p. 177.

7The methodology described here applies only to the last three dimensions of the operational definition. The
referring to the second dimension of acceptance which deals with the parents' regard for the child as a person with feelings and respect for the child's right and need to express these feelings, the following items illustrate the two-way expression of each item.

25. When my child says angry and hateful things about me to my face, it:
   1. Makes me feel like punishing him.
   2. Makes me feel like telling him not to talk that way to me.
   3. Makes me feel annoyed.
   4. Makes me feel that I will be glad when he is past this stage.
   5. Pleases me that he feels free to express himself.

35. When my child says angry and hateful things about me to my face, I:
   1. Make him quit.
   2. Tell him he shouldn't say such things to me.
   3. Pay no attention to him.

(Footnote 7, continued) first dimension, unconditional love, was treated in a different manner. See Appendix D, p. 85 for a copy of the schedule. The unconditional love dimension consists of the first ten items. It was assumed that the parents who unconditionally love their child would check "the same" for each item. If a check were placed in either the "a little less than usual" column or "a little more than usual" column, the love of a parent toward the child was conditioned somewhat by the circumstances described by the item. Checking the "much more than usual" or "much less than usual" columns for any items was taken to indicate an even greater amount of conditional love. In order to quantify the degree of unconditional love in accord with these assumptions Porter weighted the middle column 5 points, each of the adjacent columns 3 points, and each of the extreme columns 1 point. High score indicates unconditional love. See the scoring guide, Appendix E, p. 93.
4. Tell him I know how he feels.
5. Tell him it's all right to feel that way, but help him find other ways of expressing himself.

Parents responded by checking one of the five multiple choice responses. These responses were weighted in the conventional manner from one to five with one representing low acceptance and five representing high acceptance. Since the scale includes 40 items, the possible range of scores on the scale is from 40 to 200 points.

Reliability and validity of the acceptance scale. Porter found a split half reliability correlation for the acceptance scale equal to $r = .766$. Application of the Spearman-Brown formula raised this estimate of reliability to $r = .865$ ($N = 100, P < .01$). Split half reliability coefficients were obtained for the parental acceptance scale for each of the four state samples used in this study. The coefficients ranged from $r = .659$ to $r = .704$. Estimates of the reliability of the scale after application of the Spearman-Brown formula varied from $r = .794$ to $r = .826$ ($P < .01$).

Judges' ratings were used by Porter in establishing the validity of the scale. Five judges were given the items for which the responses were inter-mixed and were instructed to rank the responses from low to high acceptance. There was no instance in which there was not
agreement of at least three out of five judges. The greatest degree of disagreement was by a distance of two scale points and that occurred in only 18.7 percent of the responses. Porter summarizes his case for validity in the following manner:

While the validity of the parental acceptance scale could not be stated in quantitative terms, it rested its case on the following factors which may be regarded as an inferential basis for judging roughly the validity of the scale: the method used for selecting the test items and responses, the agreement of the judges as to the ranking of the responses of each item, and the methods used to eliminate factors which contribute to unreliability in tests.  

No further efforts were made in this study to test the validity of the acceptance scale.

Selection of a suitable measure of children's personal and social adjustment characteristics. Several methodological and theoretical considerations described in detail in methodological discussion in Chapter III, limited the selection of tests which might have been used to measure personal and social adjustment characteristics of the children. The sample design and contemplated field procedures for the study made it impossible to consider using any of the projective tests such as the Children's

Apperception Test, Thermatic Apperception Test or Rosenzweig Picture studies. Since only fifth grade children were going to be used as subjects, many of the personality tests including the Bell adjustment inventory, the Bernreuter personality inventory, the personal audit, the Mooney problem check list or the Thurstone temperament schedule could not be used. All of these inventories begin with the seventh or ninth grade level.

A review of several test bibliographies showed that two instruments could be considered adequate for measuring personal and social adjustment characteristics of fifth grade children. These were the California test of personality and the Rogers test of personality adjustment. The California test has been widely used and there is ample reliability and validity evidence available for it. Yet several weaknesses of this test have been

---


10 Rogers, op. cit.

11 L. D. Thorpe, W. Clark, and E. W. Tiegs, California Test of Personality Manual, 1953 Revision (Los Angeles, California: The California Test Bureau, 1953), pp. 4-9; Editorial Staff, Summary of Investigations, Number One, California Test of Personality (Los Angeles, California: California Test Bureau, 1949).
pointed out. Although the Rogers test is older than the California test it was examined for possible use. Adequate reliability and validity data were presented for the adjustment test. When the two tests were contrasted in terms of their method of obtaining responses from children, the Rogers appeared to possess several advantages over the California for the purposes of this study.

In responding to the California test, the children are limited to a yes or no response. In addition to being well disguised, the Rogers test, however, offers the child an opportunity to express feelings which come closer to those which he experiences than would be possible if he were limited to a yes or no response. The several indirect testing techniques used by Rogers permit the child, among other things, to compare himself with his peer group or to contrast his present self and ideal self feelings. These responses fit very well into the present day reference theory of behavior upon which this is based. Therefore, it was thought that the Rogers test would be the more appropriate instrument for the purposes of this study. In addition to the statistical evidence which can be cited for support of the use of the Rogers test and its structural

advantages over the California, there are also the favorable comments of clinicians who have used the Rogers test.\textsuperscript{13} With these considerations in mind, it was decided to use the Rogers test for measuring the personality characteristics of the children.

Definitions of children's adjustment characteristics. The decision to adopt the Rogers test also led to the definition of the types of children's adjustment characteristics that were studied. Four adjustment scores are obtained from the Rogers personality test.\textsuperscript{14} The first is called the personality inferiority score which indicates roughly the extent to which a child thinks himself to be physically or mentally inadequate - i.e., duller, weaker, less good looking, less capable than his competitors. The social maladjustment score is a measure of the child's group adjustment - the extent to which he is unhappy in his group contacts, poor at making friends and poor in the social skills. The degree of the child's conflict and maladjustment in his relations with his parents and siblings, such as jealousies, antagonisms, feelings of

\textsuperscript{13}For example, see C. M. Louttit, in Buros, The Nineteen Forty Yearbook, p. 94.

\textsuperscript{14}Rogers, op. cit., see Chapter IV, "Formation of Diagnostic Scores;" H. H. Remmers and N. L. Gare, Educational Measurement and Evaluation (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1943), see pp. 354-356 for a discussion and evaluation of the Rogers test.
being rejected and over-independence are indicated by the family relations score.

And finally the daydreaming score is designed to indicate the extent to which he indulges in fantasies and unrealistic thinking. The total score is interpreted as an indication of the seriousness of the child's maladjustment.

The Rogers test of personality adjustment. The items for the test were derived largely from interviewing schedules employed by clinical psychologists and psychiatrists in working with children. A slightly different and indirect testing technique is used for each of the six subtests of the adjustment test. The subtests contribute in varying degrees and with different items to each of the adjustment scores.15

The subjects used in developing the test were 52 "problem" children who had been referred to the Institute for Child Guidance in New York City. Each child was thoroughly known by several experts, usually a psychiatrist, psychologist and a social worker. Rogers developed a rating scale used by these people to rate each child inde-

---

15 For a copy of the test see Appendix D, p. 91. The scoring guide may be found in Appendix E, p. 94.
pendently for the several areas of adjustment. The combined rating on each child was taken as the nearest approximation to the true measure. These ratings were then compared with the child's responses to the test in order to arrive at a scoring system for the test.\textsuperscript{16} Reliability and validity of the Rogers test. Reliabilities of the test scores were determined for a sample of 43 children by a retest given after an interval of one month. Coefficients of reliability for the four scores ranged from .65 to .72 and the reliability of the total score was .72. In this study, fifty-one children were retested after a one week interval. Reliability coefficients for the four scores varied from .673 to .771 and the reliability of the total score was .708.

Correlations between the ratings of clinicians who knew the children and the children's test scores was one of the methods used by Rogers to estimate the validity of the test scores. He found that the correlations varied from .36 to .48 on the subtests. The validity coefficient for the total score was .48. While there was some degree of agreement between the test scores made by the children and the ratings given by the clinicians, this agreement

\textsuperscript{16}Rogers, \textit{op. cit.}, pp. 28-32.
was not very marked. Rogers therefore investigated the extent of agreement among the clinicians and found that their ratings of the children differed considerably for some cases. Rogers concluded that the test gave diagnostic scores which were as valid as ratings made by clinicians who knew the children. Two nonstatistical methods were employed by Rogers to check the validity of his test. Fourteen cases making the highest and those making the lowest score on the various dimensions of the test were carefully examined. Rogers states that it was clear that the high scores were made by seriously maladjusted children while low scores were those of fairly normal children. A further check on validity was made by means of a group use of the test. Fifty-four children in a small private school were given the test. The principal and teachers who knew the children and their families very well were asked to select the children whom they regarded as most maladjusted socially or who had the poorest estimate of their own abilities. "Problem" children were also selected from these classes by taking the top quartile of test scores for each sex. All of the six boys in the top quartile were also listed by the teachers and principal. In comparison for the girls, selection by the test did not coincide too well with those made by the school personnel.
Only three of the referred children were found in the top quartile.

Rogers' conclusions as to the validity of his test were:

Each of these studies as to validity is based on relatively small numbers. None of these taken alone has any great weight, and all statistical calculations have a rather large probability error, due to the small numbers. It is the cumulative evidence of the three different approaches which indicate the validity of the test. The fact that the results are fairly consistent throughout points to the conclusion that the test does roughly measure children's attitudes. The test scores were found to be a crude but reasonably accurate yardstick for measuring unhappiness and maladjustment in the youngsters studied.\textsuperscript{17}

\textbf{Limitations of the scales.} As a measure of parental attitudes, the acceptance scale suffers from all the sources of error usually associated with self ratings. In addition to the lack of empirical validation, several other possible limitations of the scale may be pointed out. The acceptance scale requires a considerable amount of reading and its use with individuals with less than a high school education is difficult. Although the majority of the parents finished the test in about twenty minutes, some respondents worked on it for over an hour. A few respondents claimed that for some items only a "professor at the

\textsuperscript{17}Ibid., p. 80.
college" could think of "answers" with only a hairline difference among them. It is possible that the ordering of the respondents on the acceptance scale was obvious for the sophisticated respondent. And finally, how discipline, love and guidance are offered by a parent is undoubtedly as important as what is offered, but the acceptance scale records only what the parent says he feels like or what he does. It does not get at how this is accomplished.

The Rogers test for measuring children's adjustment characteristics was selected despite its apparent weaknesses some of which are common to personality tests in general and some of which are peculiar to the Rogers test. Perhaps the single greatest weakness of the Rogers test lies in its method of development. The rating scale used by the clinicians, basic to the scoring and the validity of the scale, consisted of only twelve items. Further, the ratings were used to separate twenty children into three adjustment groups. As few as four children comprised the "adjusted" group while the largest number in any group was nine. On the basis of these small numbers weights were assigned to items on the test. Consequently, only a very rough scoring system was possible. Perhaps, it was for this reason that Rogers was careful throughout his report to de-emphasize the importance of the numerical
scores. In regard to this de-emphasis on scores, however, the statistical calculations presented as evidence of reliability and validity take on less significance.

One further limitation of the Rogers test should be raised. The test was developed during 1927 and 1928 and the results were published in 1931. By any standards, this is an old test. The reliability of the scores on the test found in this study were similar to those reported by Rogers, but whether the test is as valid an instrument for testing children today might be questioned. Our concepts of personality have undergone considerable change since the development of this test. Also, children's scoring patterns may be different today than several decades ago as a reflection of vast social changes which have occurred in the interval.
CHAPTER III
METHODOLOGY

The definition of the characteristics of a suitable sample of parents and children for testing the postulated relationship was the first methodological problem of this investigation. Once the criteria of a suitable class of families were established the universe of interest for this study could be defined and an appropriate sampling design developed.

The universe of interest. The criteria for the universe of families were suggested by several methodological and theoretical considerations. To facilitate sampling procedures and to gain some control over the measurement of the variables, the ages of the children were held constant by using the fifth grade level as the criterion for selection of children. This was done for several reasons. First, the child's skill in reading has progressed far enough that he is free of the mechanics of reading and can concentrate on the subject matter. Secondly, a child of this age has matured sufficiently to have developed facility in factual interpretation of relationships. And finally, for children of this age the pressures for conformity have not smothered their spontaneous responses to questions. Acceptance measurements of parents were also
controlled to the extent that each parent was asked to respond to the acceptance scale on the basis of his attitudes and behavior toward his fifth grade child. Using children of only one grade level also permitted development of a sample design by which suitable families were selected by means of identifying the parents of those children.

It also seemed essential to control several characteristics of the families. It was decided that both parents of the child must be living together with the child and that the family must consist of at least two children. For methodological reasons, the selection of families was limited to rural areas and small towns (2500 to 10,000 population by the 1950 Census). Four states, Iowa, Ohio, Kansas, and Wisconsin, were the primary areas of sample selection. The universe of interest for this study therefore included all "whole" rural and small town families in four states of the midwest which had at least two children one of whom was in the fifth grade during the 1954-55 school year.

The sample design. Since the most practical manner of selecting a sample of families from this universe appeared to lie in first selecting the children through fifth grade classes in schools, all school districts having fifth
grade classes were defined as possible sampling points in each state.\(^1\) Among the several possible sampling plans which might have been used to draw a sample of fifth grade classes in each of the four states, a stratified random sample design seemed most appropriate.\(^2\) With such a sample it is always desirable to "scatter" the sample points as much as possible, subject to time and cost limitations, and to keep the number of families at each sample point small. No precise calculations were made for the size of the sample at any point or on the number of sample points per state, but after consideration of time and cost estimates of the field work it was decided to have eight sample points per state with eight families selected at each of the sample points. Thus, the state samples consisted of sixty-four families and the total

\(^1\) Schools with less than twenty pupils in the fifth grade were combined into units with at least that number of children. An exception was made for one or two room schools which were not considered as possible sampling points. Time and cost factors seemed to indicate that any sample which contained such small units was impractical.

\(^2\) Appropriate general references for the procedures used and for estimation from this type of sample are: W. G. Cochran, *Sampling Techniques* (New York: J. Wiley and Sons, 1953); Morris H. Hanson, William N. Hurwitz, and William G. Madow, *Sample Survey Methods and Theory* (New York: J. Wiley and Sons, 1953).
sample included 256 families.

The eight sample points for each state sample were chosen from two population strata: (1) towns in the 2500 to 10,000 population range\(^3\) and (2) rural areas. A proportional allocation was made for the eight sample points in each state between these two strata based on the total populations of the strata to the population of the state. For example, two sample points were used to represent the urban strata and six were drawn for the rural strata for the Iowa sample.

The two urban points were selected by a probability method based on the sizes of the populations of all the cities in Iowa in this strata to the total population of the strata. Each city within the defined range of population was listed by its 1950 Census population. A cumulative population table was constructed based on these populations. Two numbers were then drawn at random (two cities were to be selected) between the lower limit (zero) and the upper limit (312,658) of the cumulative population distribution. If the number chosen was in the range of a given city's contribution to the size of the strata that city was selected.

\(^3\)Cities in this range which were parts of metropolitan areas were excluded from the urban strata.
In the second stage of sampling for the urban strata, the class of fifth grade children to be tested was selected within each of the primary sampling points. If there were only one elementary school with only one fifth grade class, the entire section was used. If there were two or more sections of fifth grade children, one section was chosen by the same probability method used in selecting the cities.

Sampling for the fifth grade classes in the rural strata required the use of several sampling units. Counties were first selected on the basis of their total population by the method described for the selection of the cities. Within each of the selected counties, a school or combination of schools was chosen by the same method. And finally, in only a few rural sample points it was necessary to select one class of fifth grade children from the several classes in the school.

In this manner, eight sampling points were drawn for each state sample. Selection of the eight sample points in each state established the primary conditions for the field work.

Field procedures. Once the sample points had been selected, arrangements were made with the school heads to administer the Rogers tests to the children in the fifth
grades of the schools. All the children in the classes completed the Rogers test under the direction of the writer. They also filled out a short information blank used to determine if their family met the criteria for inclusion in the universe of families defined for this study. A simple random selection of eight children and, hence, families was drawn from the list of children whose families met the criteria. Four alternate families were also drawn and were used when necessary in the exact order of their selection.

The writer called at the homes of the selected families to introduce himself and to explain the nature of the project - how the families were chosen and what kinds of information were desired. A time was agreed upon when it would be convenient for the father and mother to complete the parental acceptance scale and several other schedules not reported in this study. When no one was at home two call-backs were made or an attempt was made to reach the family by telephone. For those who weren't able to or who didn't want to cooperate, an alternate family was substituted. The fathers and mothers completed the Porter scale independently in the presence of the writer.

Field work was begun in Iowa in October, 1954 and completed in Ohio in May, 1955.
Outcome of sample selection. Not all of the originally selected families at many of the points were able or wished to cooperate in the study. Approximately 11 percent of the Iowa sample, 30 percent of the Ohio sample, 19 percent of the Kansas sample and 22 percent of the Wisconsin sample consisted of alternate families. A total of fifty-two families, approximately 20 percent of the total sample, was alternate families.

A variety of factors was responsible for the use of alternates. The father's work schedule accounted for approximately 43 percent of the cases in which alternates were used. This description covered various situations as when the father had two jobs, he worked out of town or he was working away from home during the period in which the writer was in the community. Refusals were the second largest source of reasons for using alternates; approximately 22 percent of the originally selected families were not used for this reason. Very close to refusals in the number of interviews not obtained were those instances where no one was home even after several call-backs. This category included about 19 percent of the "lost" families. Various other reasons for not obtaining an interview from an originally selected family accounted for the remaining 16 percent of the cases.
Because approximately 20 percent of the regional sample consisted of alternate families, there was a possibility that the final sample was biased in some of its dimensions. One definite way to check for any sample bias consists of comparing various sample characteristics with known population characteristics. For instance, the ages of the parents or the occupational distribution of the fathers of the sample from any state might have been compared with the distribution of that characteristic for the population of the state. Unfortunately, it was not possible to do this. The universe from which the sample was drawn was an existent and carefully defined universe, but one for which parameters were lacking. Census data were not relevant because the universe of this study included only complete families with two or more children living in areas with a population of less than 10,000. Therefore, it was not possible to test the representativeness of the sample for the universe from which it was drawn. Since approximately 80 percent of the sample consisted of originally selected families and since the remainder of the families in the sample were drawn in the same manner and from the same sampling points, it could probably be safely assumed that no appreciable bias existed in the sample.
Weighting the sample. It will be remembered that children and families appearing in the sample did not all have the same probability of being selected. Therefore, an unbiased estimate of any statistic for a state sample should have been calculated by summatlng properly weighted sample point data. But if it could be assumed that the sample was self weighting due to the manner in which it was drawn, the sixty-four cases for each state could simply have been combined and treated as a random sample and further calculations would have been greatly simplified.

Such an assumption, however, was unwarranted unless testing the data showed that undue bias was not introduced. In order to determine if the cases might simply have been combined or if the proper weights for each sample point should have been used in all calculations, statistics for several sample characteristics for each of the four states were calculated by each method, weighted and unweighted. The rationale for and the method used in weighting sample point data and the comparison of statistics calculated by each method are given in Appendix A.⁴

Only small and certainly nonsignificant differences resulted when the outcomes of the two methods were compared for two types of continuous and two types of

⁴See Appendix A, p. 69.
discrete data. On the basis of this comparison, it was assumed that for the purposes of the present analysis unweighted statistics would provide an adequate estimate of the association between the characteristics measured.
In addition to describing the sampling plan used in a study and the outcome of the sample selection, it is often desirable to consider some of the more important characteristics of the sample.

**Present community.** The type of community the family was living in at the time of the study was noted in terms of the three categories shown in Table 1. None of the families could have been in any category over 10,000 population by reason of the sample design. The largest number of families, approximately 51 percent, was living in a rural nonfarm location. Farm families comprised 30 percent of the sample. The smallest group, 18.8 percent of the sample, was living in a community between 2,500 and 10,000 population.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of community</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rural farm</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural nonfarm</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>51.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,500 - 10,000</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>18.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
the sample, came from cities in the 2500 to 10,000 population range.

Occupations of the fathers. The fathers' occupations were solicited in an open end fashion and were later placed in one of the conventional categories used for occupational classification. Professional occupations were defined as those involving considerable time spent in training and having high community prestige. Only three fathers in the sample, a surgeon, a minister and a lawyer, were so classified. Typical occupations included in the business and semi-professional category were accountants, large retail store managers, pharmacists, school teachers, executives and small retail business men. Occupations such as machinist, foreman and plumbers who ran their own shops were classified as skilled and small trades. Clerical jobs included store clerks of various kinds as well as relatively unskilled paper work jobs. Semi-skilled jobs included occupations such as carpenter, electrician and railroad jobs as brakeman. Farm and farm managers probably need no further explanation. Unskilled occupations included farm laborers and other jobs where it was apparent that no particular training or experience was necessary for the work. Many kinds of factory assembly jobs came under this category.
Table 2 shows that only 1.1 percent of the occupations of the fathers were classified as professional. The business and semi-professional, skilled and small trades, clerical and semi-skilled, each included 18.0 percent of the fathers in the sample. The largest single group was the farmers who comprised 27.3 percent of the fathers. Fathers who were unskilled workers made up 17.6 percent of the sample.

**Table 2. Occupations of the fathers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupations</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business and semi-professional</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>18.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skilled and small trades</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>18.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical and semi-skilled</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>18.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmers and farm managers</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>27.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unskilled</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>17.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>256</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Income of the families. The sample was divided into two groups, farm and nonfarm, on the basis of the fathers' occupations for consideration of the income levels of the families. Table 3 gives the number and percent of fathers
Table 3. Fathers' yearly incomes in farm and nonfarm occupations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yearly income</th>
<th>Farm</th>
<th></th>
<th>Nonfarm</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 2,000</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,000 - 3,999</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>45.6</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>49.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4,000 - 5,999</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>30.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6,000 - 7,999</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8,000 - 9,999</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 - 14,999</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15,000 - 19,999</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20,000 and over</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

reporting various levels of income. When both the father and mother worked, only the income of the father was recorded. Net income was used for farmers.

About 46 percent of the farmers reported net incomes within the $2,000 to $3,999 range and approximately 70 percent reported incomes in the $2,000 to $6,000 range. Only 8 percent of the farmers reported incomes of less than $2,000 and roughly 23 percent reported incomes over $6,000.
Like the farmers, about 50 percent of the nonfarmers reported incomes in the $2,000 to $3,999 range. When this percentage was combined with that of the next highest interval, the $4,000 to $5,999 range, slightly over 80 percent of the nonfarmers were accounted for. An additional 10 percent of the nonfarmers were in the $6,000 to $7,999 bracket. Only 4 percent were under $2,000 per year and about 5 percent were over $7,000.

Ages of the fathers and mothers. The ages of the fathers and mothers are given by intervals of five years in Table 4.

Table 4. Ages of the fathers and mothers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ages</th>
<th>Fathers</th>
<th>Mothers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 - 29</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 - 34</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>16.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 - 39</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>24.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 - 44</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>26.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 - 49</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>16.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 - 54</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 - 59</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 60</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The modal age group for the husbands was the 40 to 44 age range; for the wives it was just ten years younger, from 30 to 34. Over half of the husbands, about 60 percent, were over 40 years of age, while approximately the same percent of the wives were less than 40 years of age. The average age for the husbands was 41.7 and for the wives 38.3.

Educational levels of the fathers and mothers. The educational levels of the parents are reported in Table 5.

Table 5. Educational levels of fathers and mothers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educational level</th>
<th>Fathers Number</th>
<th>Fathers Percent</th>
<th>Mothers Number</th>
<th>Mothers Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>35.9</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>18.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school nongraduate</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>21.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school graduate</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>15.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College graduate</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post graduate</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Approximately 36 percent of the fathers and 18 percent of the mothers had less than a high school education; about 13 percent of the fathers and 22 percent of the mothers left high school prior to graduation; 30 percent of the fathers and 33 percent of the mothers were high school graduates; and approximately 21 percent of the fathers and 27 percent of the mothers had some training beyond high school. Within the last category, approximately 12 percent of the fathers were college graduates or had had some post graduate work while about 5 percent of the mothers had a similar educational attainment. It was interesting to note that almost twice as many mothers attended college as did fathers, but as would be expected fewer of the mothers graduated from college. It would appear that the upper educational levels, beyond high school, were over represented in the sample. This might be especially true for the mothers. Otherwise, the educational attainment for the fathers and mothers followed the expected pattern; more mothers than fathers had a high school educational level while fathers were more numerous at the elementary and college or graduate levels.

Number of years married. The number of years the couples had been married is indicated in Table 6. The data for the number of years the couples had been married were
Table 6. Number of years married

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of years</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7-9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-12</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>21.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13-15</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>25.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-18</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>19.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-21</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>13.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22-24</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 and over</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>256</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The numbers of years married were grouped by intervals of three years starting with the 7 to 9 year range and ending with 25 years and over.

Two couples, 0.7 percent, were married less than nine years. In these two cases the sample requirements for eligibility were violated by the writer. The fact that the children resulted from a former marriage of either the father or mother was not learned until after the interview had progressed a considerable way. In these two instances it was not possible to obtain alternate families for these sample points because of scheduling arrangements.

The largest group of couples by length of marriage was
in the 13 to 15 year range. The 10 to 12 and 16 to 18 year ranges showed similar percentages of couples, roughly 22 and 20 respectively. Taken together these three categories included approximately 68 percent of the couples. The average length of marriage was 16.6 years.

Sizes of the families. In order to have been considered eligible for inclusion in the sample, a family had to consist of both parents and at least two children, one of whom was in the fifth grade. Table 7 shows the number and percent of families of different sizes in the sample.

Table 7. Sizes of the families

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of children</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>25.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>23.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>23.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 or more*</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>256</td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Included in this category were eight families who had nine children and two who had eleven children.
Families with two, three, and four children showed very similar percentages. Taken together these three sizes accounted for almost three-fourths of the sample. The mean number of children per family was approximately four (actually 3.9).

Some characteristics of the children. Children in the fifth grade over thirteen were considered as ineligible since it was thought that their ability to comprehend and to respond accurately to the Rogers test would be limited by their apparent lack of academic achievement. Therefore, all the children in the sample were in the ten to twelve year old range. The number of boys and girls in the sample was almost evenly split; there were 129 boys and 127 girls. The ordinal positions of the children were noted in terms of three categories, youngest, middle or oldest child. Approximately the same number of children were in each of the three categories, about 38 percent of the children were in a middle position, 32 percent were the oldest and 30 percent were the youngest children in their families.
The relationship between the parents' acceptance scores and the children's adjustment scores was tested by four types of correlation analysis. Fathers' and mothers' acceptance scores were related separately to each of the children's adjustment scores. Two types of combined acceptance scores for the fathers and mothers were also correlated with the children's scores. The results of these analyses are reported in this chapter.

Relation of the fathers' and mothers' acceptance scores and the children's adjustment scores. The acceptance scale is weighted in such a manner that higher scores indicate greater acceptance of children, but higher scores on the various dimensions of the children's personality test indicate a greater degree of maladjustment. Therefore, if the hypothesis that there is a positive relationship between these characteristics is to be upheld, statistically significant negative correlation coefficients should be found.

Correlation coefficients for the association of fathers' and mothers' acceptance scores with the children's scores on each of the five adjustment tests are presented.
below. The correlations between the parents' acceptance scores and the children's personal inferiority scores for each state sample and for the total sample are given in Table 8.1

Table 8. Correlations for the fathers' and mothers' acceptance scores and the children's personal inferiority scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample areas*</th>
<th>Parents</th>
<th>Iowa</th>
<th>Ohio</th>
<th>Kansas</th>
<th>Wisconsin</th>
<th>Total sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fathers</td>
<td>-.104</td>
<td>.070</td>
<td>-.081</td>
<td>.046</td>
<td>-.011</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mothers</td>
<td>-.246</td>
<td>.055</td>
<td>-.268</td>
<td>-.034</td>
<td>-.120</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The number of pairs for each state coefficient was 64. The total sample coefficients were based on 256 pairs.

None of the correlations for the fathers' and children scores differed significantly from zero.2 Only one

1The total sample correlation coefficient gives the association between the characteristics for the total sample. Analysis of variance was computed to test for the significance of differences among the state sample means for parental acceptance and for each of the five adjustment scores. None of the F values for the differences among the state means was significant. Therefore, the data from the four state samples can be safely combined into one sample in order to obtain an overall estimate of association. See Appendix B, pp. 76-78, for tables of the mean scores and the analysis of variance computations.

2The 5 percent level of confidence for a correlation based on 64 cases may be taken at $r = .250$. For a correlation based on an N of 256 cases, the 5 percent level may be established at $r = .124$. 
of the correlations between the mothers' acceptance scores and the children's personal adjustment scores, that for Kansas, was significant \((r = -0.268, P < 0.05)\). This coefficient was negative or in the direction expected. The coefficient for the mothers' acceptance scores and children's personal adjustment scores for Iowa approached, but did not quite reach, the five percent level. The correlations for the total samples of mothers and fathers were both nonsignificant although the coefficient of the wives was quite close to the required value for the five percent level of confidence.

Correlation coefficients between the acceptance scores of the parents' and children's social maladjustment scores are shown in Table 9.

Table 9. Correlations for the fathers' and mothers' acceptance scores and the children's social maladjustment scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample areas*</th>
<th>Parents</th>
<th>Iowa</th>
<th>Ohio</th>
<th>Kansas</th>
<th>Wisconsin</th>
<th>Total sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fathers</td>
<td>-.249</td>
<td>-.205</td>
<td>.017</td>
<td>-.089</td>
<td>-.132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mothers</td>
<td>.177</td>
<td>-.045</td>
<td>.179</td>
<td>-.136</td>
<td>.047</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The number of pairs for each state coefficient was 64. The total sample coefficients were based on 256 pairs.
In this case, none of the coefficients for the relationship between the acceptance scores of the mothers and the social adjustment scores of the children differed significantly from zero. The value for Iowa ($r = -0.249$, $N = 64$) may be taken as significant just at the five percent level. The negative sign indicated that the direction of the relationship was in agreement with the assumed direction of the relationship. The correlation between the fathers' and children's scores for the total sample was significant ($r = -0.132$, $P < 0.05$) and the direction of association was in the expected direction.

Table 10 gives the correlations between the acceptance scores of the parents and the family relations scores of the children. Once again low and nonsignificant correlation coefficients were mainly evident.

Table 10. Correlations for the fathers' and mothers' acceptance scores and the children's family relations scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample areas*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total sample</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fathers</th>
<th>Iowa</th>
<th>Ohio</th>
<th>Kansas</th>
<th>Wisconsin</th>
<th>Total sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.026</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>-.026</td>
<td>.239</td>
<td>.046</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mothers</td>
<td>-.145</td>
<td>-.076</td>
<td>.055</td>
<td>.274</td>
<td>.029</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The number of pairs for each state coefficient was 64. The total sample coefficients were based on 256 pairs.
The only correlation which was significant at the five percent level occurred for the relationship between mothers and children in Wisconsin, but the direction of the relations was positive or in the opposite direction than was expected. The coefficient for the Wisconsin fathers approached significance but also from an opposite direction than was assumed. All the other values including the total correlations were very low and non-significant.

The relationship between the parents' acceptance scores and the children's daydreaming scores also followed the pattern reported in the previous analysis.

None of the correlations reported in Table 11 reached the five percent level of significance. The relationship between the fathers' acceptance scores and the children's

Table 11. Correlations for the fathers' and mothers' acceptance scores and the children's daydreaming scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample areas*</th>
<th>Parents</th>
<th>Iowa</th>
<th>Ohio</th>
<th>Kansas</th>
<th>Wisconsin</th>
<th>Total sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fathers</td>
<td>.056</td>
<td>.039</td>
<td>.242</td>
<td>-.043</td>
<td>.071</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mothers</td>
<td>-.144</td>
<td>-.033</td>
<td>.190</td>
<td>-.010</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The number of pairs for each state coefficient was 64. The total sample coefficients were based on 256 pairs.
day dreaming scores in Kansas approached the five percent level, but from the opposite direction than assumed.

Correlations between the acceptance scores of the fathers and mothers and the children's total scores are listed in Table 12. None of the correlation coefficients was significantly different from zero, nor did any of the coefficients even approach the five percent level of significance.

Table 12. Correlations for the fathers' and mothers' acceptance scores and the children's total scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample areas*</th>
<th>Parents Iowa</th>
<th>Ohio</th>
<th>Kansas</th>
<th>Wisconsin</th>
<th>Total sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fathers .173</td>
<td>.071</td>
<td>.035</td>
<td>.094</td>
<td>-.034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mothers .139</td>
<td>.063</td>
<td>.012</td>
<td>.046</td>
<td>-.043</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The number of pairs for each state coefficient was 64. The total sample coefficients were based on 256 pairs.

In general, the hypothesis that there is a positive relationship between the acceptance scores of the fathers and mothers with the adjustment scores of the children was found to be untenable. Fifty correlations were calculated and four were found to be significant \( P < .05 \). Four more of the correlation coefficients approached the five
percent level of significance, but one of the significant correlations and two of the correlations which approached significance indicated a pattern of association contrary to the expected direction. Only two of the correlations for the total sample were significant (P < .05), but these were so low (r = -.120 and r = -.132) that they can hardly warrant any interpretation.

Virtually no relationship was found between the acceptance scores of each parent and the children's adjustment scores, but the question might be asked, what relationship exists between the combined scores of the parents and the children's adjustment scores?

Relation of the differences between the parents' acceptance scores and children's adjustment scores. The differences between the parents' acceptance scores were correlated with each of the five children's scores on the assumption that for children whose parents showed different degrees of acceptance greater indications of maladjustment should be observed. Since the mothers had a higher mean score than fathers on the acceptance scale, fathers' scores were subtracted from the mothers' scores.

Differences between the acceptance scores of the fathers and mothers ranged from zero to 69 points. Approximately 37 percent of the differences were in the
zero to 10 point interval; about 28 percent of the cases were found in the 11 to 20 point difference interval and another 19 percent of the differences were between 21 and 30 points. The remaining 15 percent of the differences between the parents' acceptance scores were greater than 30 points.

The correlation coefficients between the differences in parents' acceptance scores and the children's five adjustment scores for the samples used in this study are given in Table 13.3 Since it was assumed that greater differences in parental acceptance scores would be associated with higher test scores for the children, the correlations, if in line with this reasoning, should be positive.

The values listed in the table are almost uniformly similar to the other nonsignificant coefficients reported in previous analyzes. Coefficients for twenty state cor-

---

3Since the correlation coefficients for the association between the parents' acceptance scores were known and since the relationships between the acceptance scores of each parent with the children's scores were also known, it was possible to make use of certain statistical relationships among the various relationships in order to determine the relationship between the differences in the parents' acceptance scores and the children's adjustment scores. See Appendix C, pp. 80-83, for the formula used for calculating the relationships of the differences between the parents' scores and the children's scores.
Table 13. Correlations for the differences between the parents' acceptance scores and the children's adjustment scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample areas*</th>
<th>Personal inferiority</th>
<th>Social maladjustment</th>
<th>Family relations</th>
<th>Day dreaming</th>
<th>Total score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>-.124</td>
<td>.323</td>
<td>-.094</td>
<td>-.146</td>
<td>.016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>-.016</td>
<td>.140</td>
<td>-.069</td>
<td>-.061</td>
<td>.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>-.156</td>
<td>.131</td>
<td>.065</td>
<td>-.026</td>
<td>-.035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>-.059</td>
<td>-.034</td>
<td>.025</td>
<td>.025</td>
<td>-.035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total sample</td>
<td>-.088</td>
<td>.139</td>
<td>-.015</td>
<td>-.052</td>
<td>-.011</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

♦ The number of pairs used for the analysis in each state was 64 and the number for the total sample was 256.

Relations were determined and only one, the differences between parental scores and the children's social maladjustment scores for Iowa, was significant (r = .323, N = 64, P = .01). Since the value of the correlation coefficient is positive the relationship is in the assumed direction. But the relationships of the differences between parents' scores to the social maladjustment scores in the other three state samples were all nonsignificant. Because the correlation was significant in only one of the four comparisons, the validity of generalizing from this relation-
ship is extremely doubtful even though the regional coefficient was significant \((r = .139, N = 256, P < .05)\).

**Relation of the sum of the parents' acceptance scores and the children's adjustment scores.** There was no association between the differences in parental acceptance and the children's adjustment scores, but it seemed that the relationship between the combined parent scores and the children's scores could be examined in another manner. It could be assumed that children whose parents are both highly accepting of them should show fewer indications of personal inferiority or difficulty in social and family relations than children whose parents show little acceptance of them. Since it has been found that no relationship existed between the difference in parental acceptance and the children's scores, there appeared to be no reason why the acceptance scores of the parents could not be summed to test for the relationship between total parental acceptance and children's adjustment scores.\(^4\)

If the correlations for the relationship between the

\(^4\)The correlation coefficients for the relationships between the sum of the parents' acceptance scores and the adjustment scores of the children were determined by use of a formula very similar to that used for the analysis of relationship between the differences in acceptance scores and the children's scores. See Appendix C, pp. 80-83.
summed parental acceptance scores and the children's adjustment scores are to support the hypothesis, the coefficients should be negative. The correlations of the summed parental scores with the adjustment scores of the children for each of the five test results are given in Table 14.

About half of the coefficients had a sign in agreement with the hypothesis. Only two of the values reached the level of significance. For Wisconsin, the relation between the sum of the parents' scores and the children's family relations scores \( r = .349 \) exceeded the one percent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample areas*</th>
<th>Adjustment scales</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Personal inferiority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>-.242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>.077</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>-.231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total sample</td>
<td>-.087</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The number of pairs used for the analysis in each state was 64 and the number for the total sample was 256.
level of significance. The relationship between the sum of the parents' scores and the children's day dreaming scores for the Kansas sample ($r = .278$) passed the five percent level of significance, but the signs of both of these correlations were contrary to the expected direction. Since none of the other correlations for these scales in the other states even approached significance, they were regarded as spurious results.

It should be pointed out that two of the values for the personal inferiority dimension tended to approach the five percent level of significance; the correlation coefficient for the Iowa sample was $r = -.242$ and the Kansas value was $r = -.231$. Both of these correlations were negative or in the direction expected, but the other two correlations on this scale were very low and consequently the total sample coefficient was nonsignificant.

There was no evidence to support the assumption that the combined acceptance scores of the parents were related positively to the adjustment scores of the children.

Discussion. Significant and conclusive findings are easier and perhaps more exciting to report than nonsignificant and inconclusive findings. The findings of this study are, with only a few exceptions, nonsignificant and in terms of the hypotheses which were tested, also inconclusive.
Two alternative conclusions might be drawn from the results of the analysis of the data: (1) no relationship exists between the degree to which parents accept their children and the personality adjustment of the children, or (2) the lack of association between the characteristics stems from inadequate measurement.

It seemed that the first conclusion could not be accepted. Certainly no significant relationship existed between the variables as defined and measured in this study, but there are fairly strong grounds for rejecting the conclusion that no relationship existed between the variables for the families in the sample. The accumulated findings of other studies are too great to be rejected on the basis of the findings of this study. Furthermore, this conclusion could be drawn from the analysis of the data only if the scales used in this study were highly reliable and valid and the measuring situation was controlled.

The circumstances under which the measurement occurred were standardized and controlled by the writer. Hence, it is felt that these factors did not affect the measurement of the relationship. It will be recalled that the reliability of the acceptance scale was approximately equal to .812, and the reliabilities of the scores of the Rogers
test of personality adjustment ranged from .07 to .77. These reliabilities are not high, but they may be taken as reaching at least minimum levels for personality tests.

The question of the validity of the tests is more difficult to summarize. The validity of the acceptance scale rested entirely on an inferential basis. Rogers made several empirical attempts to establish the validity of his test, but this is an old test and questions may be raised concerning its validity for present use. Our concepts of personality have undergone considerable change since about 1929 when Rogers devised his test. There has been considerable social change which may have affected children's responses to the test. Therefore, it could be argued that given minimal reliability and lack of well established validity of the scales, the two instruments taken in relationship to one another were too gross to permit measurement of the postulated relationship.

Of course, there is the possibility that parental acceptance, as one measure of parental behavior, is not as crucial to the parent-child interaction structure as was assumed. Consequently, one might expect to find low order and nonsignificant correlations for measures of the association between parental acceptance and children's personality characteristics. But if the accumulated findings
of other studies and the generally accepted theoretical formulations concerning the influence of parental attitudes upon children's personality development were generalized to the problem of this study, then some degree of association should have been found.

In view of the theoretical position outlined in the first chapter of this study, one further observation relative to the findings of this study should be made. Since no relationship was found between the degree to which parents accept their children and the adjustment characteristics of the children, the question might be asked: what relationship exists between the children's adjustment characteristics and their perception of their parents' acceptance of them? It could be argued that the low order and mainly nonsignificant correlation coefficients found in this study were due primarily to the failure to measure what was important from the children's points of view, that is, the children's perceptions of their relationships with their parents, members of their families and others. Phenomenological personality theory suggests that one might expect to find greater relationships between measures of children's adjustment characteristics and their perception of their parents' acceptance of them than for the relationships tested in this study.
Since the correlation coefficients found for the relationships tested in this study were almost entirely nonsignificant, retesting these relationships using the children's perceptions of parental acceptance in place of measures of parental acceptance would demonstrate whether or not it is possible to obtain statistically measurable relationships among the variables selected for investigation in this study.
CHAPTER VI
SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

In this study an attempt was made to determine what statistical relationship existed between the degree to which parents "accept" their children and certain personal and social personality characteristics of the children. A brief summary of the methodology used to test this hypothesis and the conclusions of the study are presented in this chapter. Some suggestions for further research are also considered.

Summary. The Porter parental acceptance scale and the Rogers test of personality adjustment for children were used to measure the variables studied. One score is derived from the acceptance scale while four subscores and a total score are obtained from the Rogers test. Measures of reliability and validity have been reported for both scales. No validity tests were performed for the scales as used in this study although the reliability coefficients of the scales determined for the samples of parents and children in the present study were very similar to those reported by the authors of the scales.

A stratified probability sample for this study was drawn from universe defined as including all essentially rural families in the midwest that were "whole" families
having two or more children with one of the children in the fifth grade during the 1954-55 school year. Rural areas and cities not over 10,000 in population were included as possible sample points. States actually sampled were Iowa, Ohio, Kansas and Wisconsin. Eight sampling points, divided proportionately between the urban and rural strata for each state, were drawn and eight families were selected randomly from fifth grade classes at each point. Thus the state samples included sixty-four families and the total sample included 256 families. Both parents in the selected families completed the parental acceptance scale at their homes in the presence of the writer. The Rogers test was completed by the fifth grade children in school under the direction of the writer. Approximately 80 percent of the originally selected families cooperated in the study. The remaining portion of the sample consisted of alternate families selected at random from the various sample points.

Because the families were not selected with the same probability, it was important to determine if weighted sample point data should be used in various calculations. Comparisons of statistics calculated by weighted and unweighted methods demonstrated that the results obtained by each method were essentially similar. Therefore, the
simpler or unweighted method was used in all calculations reported in this study.

To test the hypothesis that parents' acceptance scores and children's adjustment scores were positively associated, the acceptance scores of fathers and mothers were related separately with each of the children's five adjustment scores. The relationships between the children's five scores and two types of combined parents' scores were also determined. One hundred correlations were calculated for the four relationships between the parents' and children's scores for the state samples and the total sample. Whether the scores of each parent were related to the children's scores or whether both of the parents' acceptance scores (by difference and by sum) were related to the children's scores, the results were essentially similar: there was virtually no statistically significant association between the parents' and children's scores. Eight correlation coefficients were found to be significant, but three of these indicated an association opposite in direction from what had been expected. Only two of the significant correlations were found for total sample analyses and these were very low, \( r = .139 \) and \( r = -.132 \) (\( P < .05 \)).

Conclusions. The immediate conclusion which might be drawn from the analyses of the relationships between
parental acceptance and the personal and social adjustment of children is that no statistically significant relationship exists between these variables. This conclusion would certainly be true for the relationship as measured in this investigation and generalized to the universe of families from which the samples were drawn. But if the findings of other studies and commonly accepted theoretical formulations relative to personality development are generalized to the present problem, then some degree of association should have been found. Because the expected relationships were not found, an alternate conclusion for this study might be that the lack of association between parental acceptance and certain personal and social characteristics of children was principally due to inadequate measurement of the variables or failure to measure what is important from the child's point of view, that is, his perception of his parents acceptance of him. The tenability of the second conclusion can be established inferentially on the basis of the nonsignificant and inconclusive nature of the findings of this study and the accumulated findings of other studies which have demonstrated various parent-child relationships. Tentative acceptance of the alternate conclusion does suggest some directions for further research.
Suggestions for further research. Before adequate testing of the relationship between parental acceptance of children and certain personality characteristics of the children can be accomplished, some additional research must be directed toward improved measurement of the variables.

At the present time the validity of the parental acceptance scale rests mainly on the agreement of judges' ranking of the degree of acceptance indicated by each of the responses to the items on the scale. Whether or not the ranking of the judges corresponds to empirically established weights needs to be determined. Some index of parental acceptance derived from observation of the interaction of some sample of parents with their children needs to be related to the acceptance scores of the parents. Modifications of the techniques reported by Lafore,1 Merrill2 or Bales3 might be used for testing the validity of the acceptance scale. The validity of the scale might also be estimated by determining the relationship of


parents' scores on the acceptance scale with their scores on some other scale measuring parental attitudes toward children.\textsuperscript{4} Data gathered by the former method would permit not only testing the validity of the existing scale, but might also make it possible to perform a careful item analysis which could contribute to the development of a more discriminating scale for measuring parental acceptance of children.

The statistical results of this study and the experiences of the writer in administering and scoring the Rogers test led to the conclusion that a more adequate measure of children's personal and social adjustment characteristics needs to be devised. Even the widely used California test of personality adjustment is an old test. The recently published personality tests designed for use with preadolescent children are mainly projective devices. Some type of self administered nonprojective personality measure for children of this age level would be a contribution to the research and guidance fields.

Assuming that adequate measures for parental accept-

\textsuperscript{4}For one of the better tested scales for measuring other types of parents' attitudes toward children than acceptance, see Edward Shoben, "The Assessment of Parental Attitudes in Relation to Child Adjustment," \textit{Genetic Psychology Monographs}, 1949, 39, pp. 101-148.
ance and children's personality characteristics could be devised, further research could be undertaken to determine what factors are related to parental acceptance or associated with adequate response patterns for children. Statistical and case study methods might be employed to contribute to our understanding of the development of parental attitudes toward children, the techniques employed by parents in relation to their children and the corresponding personal and social characteristics displayed by children.

In the last chapter it was suggested that it would be desirable to measure the relationship between children's adjustment characteristics and their perception of parental acceptance. A schedule for measuring children's perception of parental acceptance probably could be developed by adapting portions of the Porter parental acceptance scale for use with children. If such a schedule and some measure of personal and social adjustment were completed by a sample of children, the relationship between the children's perception of parental acceptance and their adjustment characteristics could be determined. Results obtained from such an analysis could indicate whether or not it is possible to obtain statistically measurable relationships among the variables studied in this investigation.
One other suggestion for further research could be offered to help clarify the choice of alternative conclusions for this study. If another sample of parents were asked to complete the acceptance scale and their children completed both the Rogers test and the California test, then the relationships between the children's scores on each of the tests and the parents' acceptance scores could be determined. If one set of coefficients were higher than the other set, some evidence would be available for demonstrating the weakness of either the Rogers or California test for measuring this relationship. Should the results still be nonsignificant, at least it will have been demonstrated that the relationship investigated in this study is unmeasurable with existing instruments.
APPENDIXES
APPENDIX A
CALCULATION OF WEIGHTED STATISTICS

It will be remembered that the sample for each state was made up of subsamples of eight families drawn at random from eight sample points in each state. The sample points were selected by a proportional probability scheme using available measures of several preliminary sampling units. Because the preliminary units varied in size, the selections of the families in the sample occurred with unequal probabilities. Consequently, any unbiased statistics for the samples should have been calculated by using weighted sample point data. Such calculations would be very cumbersome and if it could be demonstrated that the sample was self weighting due to the manner in which it was drawn further calculations would be greatly simplified.

For this reason several statistics for the four state samples and for the total sample were calculated by using unweighted and weighted data to determine if further calculations should have been based on the weighted data or if the simpler unweighted method might be used.

In this Appendix, a brief description of the rationale for the calculation of weighted means and the comparison of several weighted and unweighted means and proportions is given.
Method of calculation. The necessary data for calculating the weighted mean for the father's acceptance scores for Iowa are presented in Table 15. Selection probabilities of the primary sampling units are defined as $P_i$. These were cities for the urban stratum and counties for rural stratum. The second column, $P_{ij}$, contains the selection probabilities of the secondary sampling units. In the cities these were classrooms while in the counties these were schools. For one of the rural schools it was necessary to use a third sampling unit represented by $P_{ijk}$ in the table. The expansion factor (E. F.) is defined in the following discussion. The number of eligible families at each of the points is indicated under the column headed as $E$ and finally, $\bar{X}$ is the mean of the scores for each of the sample points.

In order to simplify the discussion, only one sample point is taken to illustrate the method of calculation which was necessary to arrive at the weighted mean for that point. The Lake City sample point in Calhoun County is used because it included a tertiary sampling unit.

The sample point mean ($\bar{X}$) was multiplied by the number of eligibles ($E$) at the sample point, but this only represented a portion of the eligible fathers at that point so $P_{ijk}$ must be considered. The values of $P_{ij}$ and
Table 15. Calculation table for Iowa fathers' weighted mean Porter score

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample points</th>
<th>P_i</th>
<th>P_ij</th>
<th>P_ijk</th>
<th>( \bar{x} ) (Porter father)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shenandoah</td>
<td>.022</td>
<td>.327</td>
<td></td>
<td>137.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear Lake</td>
<td>.016</td>
<td>.245</td>
<td></td>
<td>256.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calhoun County*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake City</td>
<td>.012</td>
<td>.180</td>
<td>.448</td>
<td>1063.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lohrville</td>
<td>.012</td>
<td>.134</td>
<td></td>
<td>602.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dallas County</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>.101</td>
<td></td>
<td>774.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linn County</td>
<td>.019</td>
<td>.060</td>
<td></td>
<td>876.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O'Brien County</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td>.179</td>
<td></td>
<td>511.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palo Alto County</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>.232</td>
<td></td>
<td>486.73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Two sample points are given for Calhoun County because this county was drawn twice as a primary rural sampling point.

\( P_i \) must be used in the calculation in order to expand the value for the statistic at the sample point to its contribution of the estimate for the state mean. Now if \( P_i \) and \( P_{ij} \) and \( P_{ijk} \) represent the probabilities of selection of the sampling units, then in expanding a statistic based on the sample at a sample point to the state level, the reciprocals of these values should be taken together.
Column E. F., the expansion factor, in the table represents the values for the product of the reciprocals of the selection probabilities of each of the sample points. The product of the sample point mean and the number of eligibles at each sample point was multiplied by the E. F. to obtain a final product called \( \hat{Y} \). This product, \( \hat{Y} \), represented the value of the mean of a sample point expanded to its portion of the state mean, but this value had to be divided by some number equivalent to the number of persons upon which the expansion was based. This value defined as \( \hat{E} \) was obtained by the multiplication of E. F. times E.

The values of \( \hat{Y} \) and \( \hat{E} \) were obtained for each sample point and summated. The solution of the ratio of the \( \hat{Y} \) over the \( \hat{E} \) gave the weighted mean for the state.

These relationships are expressed by the following formula where:

\[
\Sigma Y = \Sigma [(E. \cdot P. )(E.) (\bar{X})] = 12740230.425 \\
\Sigma E = \Sigma [(E. \cdot P. )(E.)] = 35700.168
\]

and where the weighted mean was found by solving:

\[
\bar{X}_w = \frac{\Sigma \hat{Y}}{\Sigma \hat{E}}
\]

Using the data given in Table 15, the weighted mean for the fathers' acceptance scores was equal to:

\[
\bar{X}_w = \frac{\Sigma \hat{Y}}{\Sigma \hat{E}} = 133.13
\]
In a similar manner the weighted mean acceptance scores for the other three state samples and for the total sample of fathers were calculated. Weighted means for the children's social maladjustment scores and weighted proportions for two types of discrete data, proportion of fathers who were farmers and proportion of mothers who were high school graduates, were also calculated.

Unweighted means for the two types of continuous data and unweighted proportions for the two types of discrete data were calculated in the conventional manner.

Comparisons of weighted and unweighted means. Comparisons of the weighted and unweighted statistics for these four types of data for each state sample and for the total sample are given in Table 16. The symbol $X_w$ or $Y_w$ represents the weighted statistics and the symbol $X$ or $Y$ represents the unweighted statistics.

Examination of the statistics calculated by the weighted and unweighted methods showed that in most comparisons only very small and certainly nonsignificant differences occurred. Larger differences between the results of the two methods of calculation occurred for the discrete types of data but even those differences were not very large. Since the results of calculations based on unweighted data agreed very well with the results of
similar calculations using weighted data, the simpler or unweighted method was employed for the correlation analyses used to test the hypothesis for this investigation.
Table 16. Weighted and unweighted statistics for the state and total samples

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample areas*</th>
<th>Fathers' acceptance means</th>
<th>Children's social maladjustment means</th>
<th>Proportion of farmers</th>
<th>Proportion of mothers-high school graduates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\bar{X}_w$</td>
<td>$\bar{X}$</td>
<td>$\bar{X}_w$</td>
<td>$\bar{X}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>133.13</td>
<td>132.48</td>
<td>14.66</td>
<td>14.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>132.45</td>
<td>132.08</td>
<td>15.36</td>
<td>15.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>132.51</td>
<td>132.16</td>
<td>14.77</td>
<td>14.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>134.42</td>
<td>134.56</td>
<td>13.53</td>
<td>13.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total sample</td>
<td>132.53</td>
<td>132.82</td>
<td>14.94</td>
<td>14.80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The number for each state sample was 64 and for the total it was 256.
APPENDIX B

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE DIFFERENCES AMONG PARENTS' AND CHILDREN'S MEAN SCORES

In addition to obtaining the correlation coefficients for the association between parental acceptance and children's adjustment characteristics for each state sample, it was desirable to obtain an estimate of the association between the variables for the total sample of 256 parents and children. The data for the parents or the children from the four state samples could be combined into total samples only if there were no significant differences among the state sample means for the several variables. In order to determine if any significant differences were present among the state sample means, an analysis of variance was computed for the mean acceptance scores and the mean adjustment scores of the parents and children.

The analysis of the differences among the parental acceptance scores is presented first and a similar discussion for the children's scores is given in the following section.

Parental acceptance mean scores. The mean acceptance scores for the four state samples and for the total sample of fathers and mothers are given in Table 17.
Table 17. Means and standard deviations for fathers' and mothers' acceptance scores for the state and total samples

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample areas by parents*</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fathers</td>
<td>101-154</td>
<td>132.48</td>
<td>13.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mothers</td>
<td>102-174</td>
<td>136.67</td>
<td>15.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fathers</td>
<td>68-179</td>
<td>132.08</td>
<td>13.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mothers</td>
<td>107-171</td>
<td>139.38</td>
<td>17.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fathers</td>
<td>101-175</td>
<td>132.16</td>
<td>15.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mothers</td>
<td>96-173</td>
<td>137.02</td>
<td>17.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fathers</td>
<td>105-176</td>
<td>134.55</td>
<td>15.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mothers</td>
<td>101-174</td>
<td>140.42</td>
<td>15.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total sample</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fathers</td>
<td>68-179</td>
<td>132.82</td>
<td>15.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mothers</td>
<td>96-174</td>
<td>138.37</td>
<td>16.61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The sample for each state consisted of 128 parents divided equally between fathers and mothers.

It was obvious that only very small differences existed among the mean acceptance scores of either fathers or mothers. Nevertheless, an analysis of variance was computed separately for the means of the fathers and the means of the mothers. Computation tables have been omitted from this discussion because the differences among the means
were very small. The tables would add little to the presentation of the results of the analysis.

The F ratios for the differences among the fathers' and mothers' mean acceptance scores were equal to .348 and .764, respectively. Since both of these values were less than unity, both indicate that the differences among the acceptance mean scores for the samples of fathers and mothers from the four states could easily have occurred due to sampling variation. On the basis of these results, the four samples of parents were combined into total samples of fathers and mothers.

*Children's mean adjustment scores.* The mean adjustment scores for boys and girls for each state sample and for the total sample are given in Table 18. Once again it was quite obvious that only very small differences existed among the mean adjustment scores of boys or girls for any of the five areas of the Rogers test. It was not surprising that the results of the analysis showed that the differences among various mean scores were all nonsignificant. The F values for the significance of the differences among the five adjustment mean scores of boys or girls varied from .06 to .47. Since the observed differences among the five mean scores for both sexes were nonsignificant, the four state samples were combined into total samples of boys and girls.
Table 18. Children's mean adjustment scores by sex for the state and total samples

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample areas by sex of children</th>
<th>Means for the Rogers scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boys</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girls</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boys</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girls</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boys</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girls</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boys</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girls</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total sample</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boys</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girls</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis of variance demonstrated that the state samples of parents and children could be safely combined into total samples for tests of association between the characteristics measured in this investigation. The results of the correlation analysis using total samples of parents and children are given in Chapter V.
APPENDIX C

FORMULAE FOR CORRELATIONS USING DIFFERENCES AND SUMS OF SCORES

The correlation of the differences between the parents' acceptance scores and the children's adjustment scores could have been calculated by using the differences between the parents' scores in a correlation analysis with each of the children's scores. Similarly, the parents' scores could have been added together to determine the association of the sums of the parents' scores with the children's scores. Since the association between the fathers' and mothers' acceptance scores was already known and since the relationship of the fathers' and the mothers' acceptance scores taken separately with each of the children's scores was also previously determined, it was possible to calculate the correlation of the differences between and the sums of the parents' scores with each of the children's scores by the use of a formula which did not require determination of the differences or sums of the parents' scores.

The correlation of the differences between the parents' acceptance scores with any of the children's scores was determined by use of the following formula. Derivation of the formula is given at the end of this Appendix.
\[ r_{uz} = \frac{r_{yz}(Sy) - r_{xz}(Sx)}{\sqrt{S_x^2 + S_y^2 - 2r_{xy}(Sx)(Sy)}} \]

where \( x \) = fathers' acceptance scores
\( y \) = mothers' acceptance scores
\( z \) = children's adjustment scores

then \( u = y - x \)

\( S_x \) = the sample standard deviation of the fathers' scores
\( S_y \) = the sample standard deviation of the mothers' scores
\( r_{xz} \) = correlation of the fathers' and children's scores
\( r_{yz} \) = correlation of the mothers' and children's scores

and then \( r_{uz} \) equals the correlation of the differences between the parents' scores and the children's scores.

To determine the association between the sum of the parents' acceptance scores and that of the children's scores, the only changes in the formula given above involve changing the two minus signs to positive signs and substituting \( r_{wz} \) for \( r_{uz} \) where \( w \) represents the sum of the fathers' and mothers' scores \((x + y)\).

All the data necessary to calculate any correlations for the sums of parents' scores or the differences between the parents' scores with the children's scores except the
The correlation coefficients for the relationships between the fathers' and mothers' acceptance scores for the various samples are given in various tables in the text or preceding Appendix.

The correlation coefficients for the association between the parents' acceptance scores were:

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>.104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>.311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>.196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>.082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total sample</td>
<td>.189</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When the proper values were substituted for the symbols in these two formulae, the correlation coefficients reported in Tables 13 and 14 were found.

After making the appropriate substitutions in one of the standard correlation formulas, the correlation \( r_{u4} \) can be expressed as:

\[
r_{u4} = \frac{\sum (U - \bar{U})(z - \bar{z})}{\sqrt{\sum (U - \bar{U})^2 \sum (z - \bar{z})^2}}
\]

where \( \bar{U} \) is the mean of differences between the parents' acceptance scores given by \( Y - X \) and

\( \bar{z} \) is the mean of the children's scores.

By performing the indicated expansions and collecting the terms, the relationship \( r_{u4} \) may be expressed as equal
\[
\frac{[\sum YZ - \frac{(\sum Y)(\sum Z)}{n}] - [\sum XZ - \frac{(\sum X)(\sum Z)}{n}]}{\sqrt{\sum (z - \bar{z})^2 \left\{ \frac{\sum Y^2}{n} \frac{(\sum Y)^2}{n} + \frac{\sum X^2}{n} \frac{(\sum X)^2}{n} - 2 \frac{\sum XY}{n} \frac{(\sum X)(\sum Y)}{n} \right\}}}
\]

Since covariance \( \Sigma YZ - \frac{(\sum Y)(\sum Z)}{n} \) may be defined as \( r_{Ya}(S_y)(S_a)(n-1) \), we may rewrite the covariances as:

\[
\frac{(n-1)(S_a)[r_{Ya}(S_y) - r_{xa}(S_x)]}{\sqrt{(n-1)2S_a^2[S_y^2 + S_x^2 - 2r_{xy}(S_x)(S_y)]}}
\]

and by performing the indicated simplification, the formula given on the previous page is obtained.

\[
r_{ua} = \frac{r_{Ya}(S_y) - r_{xa}(S_x)}{\sqrt{S_y^2 + S_x^2 - 2r_{xy}(S_x)(S_y)}}
\]
APPENDIX D

SCHEDULES USED IN THIS STUDY
THE PORTER PARENTAL ACCEPTANCE SCALE

PARENT SCHEDULE III

1. Ages of children (to nearest birthday)
   Ages of boys __________;
   Ages of girls __________;

   Place a circle around the age of the one which you have been instructed to be thinking of while answering the questions about your child. BE SURE AND REFER ONLY TO THIS CHILD WHILE ANSWERING ALL THE QUESTIONS.

2. Is this child your: (circle one) Own child stepchild adopted child

INFORMATION ABOUT YOUR CHILD

Many parents say that their feeling of affection toward or for their child varies with his behavior and with circumstances. Will you please read each item carefully and place a check in the column which most nearly describes the degree of feeling of affection which you have for your child in that situation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree of Feeling of Affection</th>
<th>Much more than usual</th>
<th>A little more than usual</th>
<th>The same</th>
<th>A little less than usual</th>
<th>Much less than usual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Check One Column For Each Item Below</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. When he is obedient</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. When he is with me</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. When he misbehaves in front of special guests</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. When he expresses unsolicited affection. &quot;You're the nicest mommy (daddy) in the whole world.&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. When he is away from me</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. When he shows off in public</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. When he behaves according to my highest expectations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. When he expresses angry and hateful things to me</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. When he does things I have hoped he would not do</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. When we are doing things together</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Listed below are several statements describing things which children do and say. Following each statement are five responses which suggest ways of feeling or courses of action.

Read each statement carefully and then place a circle around the letter in front of the one response which most nearly describes the feeling you usually have or the course of action you most generally take when your child says or does these things.

It is possible that you may find a few statements which describe a type of behavior which you have not yet experienced with your child. In such cases, mark the response which most nearly describes how you think you would feel or what you think you would do.

Be sure that you answer every statement and mark only one response for each statement.

11. When my child is shouting and dancing with excitement at a time when I want peace and quiet, it:
   a. Makes me feel annoyed
   b. Makes me want to know more about what excites him
   c. Makes me feel like punishing him
   d. Makes me feel that I will be glad when he is past this stage
   e. Makes me feel like telling him to stop

12. When my child misbehaves while others in the group he is with are behaving well:
   a. See to it that he behaves as the others
   b. Tell him it is important to behave well when he is in a group
   c. Let him alone if he isn't disturbing the others too much
   d. Ask him to tell me what he would like to do
   e. Help him find some activity that he can enjoy and at the same time not disturb the group

13. When my child is unable to do something which I think is important for him, it:
   a. Makes me want to help him find success in the things he can do
   b. Makes me feel disappointed in him
   c. Makes me wish he could do it
   d. Makes me realize that he can't do everything
   e. Makes me want to know more about the things he can do

14. When my child seems to be more fond of someone else (teacher, friend, relative) than me, it:
   a. Makes me realize that he is growing up
   b. Pleases me to see his interest widening to other people
   c. Makes me feel resentful
   d. Makes me feel that he doesn't appreciate what I have done for him
   e. Makes me wish he liked me more

15. When my child is faced with two or more choices and has to choose only one, I:
   a. Tell him which choice to make and why
   b. Think it through with him
   c. Point out the advantages and disadvantages of each, but let him decide for himself
   d. Tell him that I am sure he can make a wise choice and help him foresee the consequences
   e. Make the decision for him
16. When my child makes decisions without consulting me, I:
   a. Punish him for not consulting me
   b. Encourage him to make his own decisions if he can foresee the consequences
   c. Allow him to make many of his own decisions
   d. Suggest that we talk it over before he makes his decision
   e. Tell him he must consult me first before making a decision

17. When my child kicks, hits or knocks his things about, it:
   a. Makes me feel like telling him to stop
   b. Makes me feel like punishing him
   c. Pleases me that he feels free to express himself
   d. Makes me feel that I will be glad when he is past this stage
   e. Makes me feel annoyed

18. When my child is not interested in some of the usual activities of his age group, it:
   a. Makes me realize that each child is different
   b. Makes me wish he were interested in the same activities
   c. Makes me feel disappointed in him
   d. Makes me want to help him find ways to make the most of his interests
   e. Makes me want to know more about the activities in which he is interested

19. When my child acts silly and giggly, I:
   a. Tell him I know how he feels
   b. Pay no attention to him
   c. Tell him he shouldn't act that way
   d. Make him quit
   e. Tell him it is alright to feel that way, but help him find other ways of expressing himself

20. When my child prefers to do things with his friends rather than with his family, I:
   a. Encourage him to do things with his friends
   b. Accept this as part of growing up
   c. Plan special activities so that he will want to be with his family
   d. Try to minimize his association with his friends
   e. Make him stay with his family

21. When my child disagrees with me about something which I think is important, it:
   a. Makes me feel like punishing him
   b. Pleases me that he feels free to express himself
   c. Makes me feel like persuading him that I am right
   d. Makes me realize he has ideas of his own
   e. Makes me feel annoyed

22. When my child misbehaves while others in the group he is with are behaving well, it:
   a. Makes me realize that he does not always behave as others in his group
   b. Makes me feel embarrassed
   c. Makes me want to help him find the best ways to express his feelings
   d. Makes me wish he would behave like the others
   e. Makes me want to know more about his feelings
23. When my child is shouting and dancing with excitement at a time when I want peace and quiet, I:
   a. Give him something quiet to do
   b. Tell him that I wish he would stop
   c. Make him be quiet
   d. Let him tell me about what excites him
   e. Send him somewhere else

24. When my child seems to be more fond of someone else (teacher, friend, relative) than me, I:
   a. Try to minimize his association with that person
   b. Let him have such associations when I think he is ready for them
   c. Do some special things for him to remind him of how nice I am
   d. Point out the weaknesses and faults of that other person
   e. Encourage him to create and maintain such associations

25. When my child says angry and hateful things about me to my face, it:
   a. Makes me feel annoyed
   b. Makes me feel that I will be glad when he is past this stage
   c. Pleases me that he feels free to express himself
   d. Makes me feel like punishing him
   e. Makes me feel like telling him not to talk that way to me

26. When my child shows a deep interest in something I don't think is important, I:
   a. Makes me realize he has interests of his own
   b. Makes me want to help him find ways to make the most of this interest
   c. Makes me feel disappointed in him
   d. Makes me want to know more about his interests
   e. Makes me wish he were more interested in the things I think are important for him

27. When my child is unable to do some things as well as others in his group, I:
   a. Tell him he must try to do as well as the others
   b. Encourage him to keep trying
   c. Tell him that no one can do everything well
   d. Call his attention to the things he does well
   e. Help him make the most of the activities which he can do

28. When my child wants to do something which I am sure will lead to disappointment for him, I:
   a. Occasionally let him carry such an activity to its conclusion
   b. Don't let him do it
   c. Advise him not to do it
   d. Help him with it in order to ease the disappointment
   e. Point out what is likely to happen

29. When my child acts silly and giggly, it:
   a. Makes me feel that I will be glad when he is past this stage
   b. Pleases me that he feels free to express himself
   c. Makes me feel like punishing him
   d. Makes me feel like telling him to stop
   e. Makes me feel annoyed
30. When my child is faced with two or more choices and has to choose only one, it:

a. Makes me feel that I should tell him which choice to make and why
b. Makes me feel that I should point out the advantages and disadvantages
c. Makes me hope that I have prepared him to choose wisely
d. Makes me want to encourage him to make his own choice
e. Makes me want to make the decision for him

31. When my child is unable to do something which I think is important for him I:

a. Tell him he must do better
b. Help him make the most of the things which he can do
c. Ask him to tell me more about the things which he can do
d. Tell him that no one can do everything
e. Encourage him to keep trying

32. When my child disagrees with me about something which I think is important, I:

a. Tell him he shouldn't disagree with me
b. Make him quit
c. Listen to his side of the problem and change my mind if I am wrong
d. Tell him maybe we can do it his way another time
e. Explain that I am doing what is best for him

33. When my child is unable to do some things as well as others in his group, it:

a. Makes me realize that he can't be best in everything
b. Makes me wish he could do as well
c. Makes me feel embarrassed
d. Makes me want to help him find success in the things he can do
e. Makes me want to know more about the things he can do well

34. When my child makes decisions without consulting me it:

a. Makes me hope that I have prepared him adequately to make his decisions
b. Makes me wish he would consult me
c. Makes me feel disturbed
d. Makes me want to restrict his freedom
e. Please me to see that as he grows he needs me less

35. When my child says angry and hateful things about me to my face, I:

a. Tell him it's all right to feel that way, but help him find other ways of expressing himself
b. Tell him I know how he feels
c. Pay no attention to him
d. Tell him he shouldn't say such things to me
e. Make him quit

36. When my child kicks, hits and knocks his things about, I:

a. Make him quit
b. Tell him it is all right to feel that way, but help him find other ways of expressing himself
c. Tell him he shouldn't do such things
d. Tell him I know how he feels
e. Pay no attention to him
37. When my child prefers to do things with his friends rather than with his family, it:

   a. Makes me wish he would spend more time with us
   b. Makes me feel resentful
   c. Please me to see his interests widening to other people
   d. Makes me feel he doesn't appreciate us
   e. Makes me realize that he is growing up

38. When my child wants to do something which I am sure will lead to disappointment for him, it:

   a. Makes me hope that I have prepared him to meet disappointment
   b. Makes me wish he didn't have to meet unpleasant experiences
   c. Makes me want to keep him from doing it
   d. Makes me realize that occasionally such an experience will be good for him
   e. Makes me want to postpone these experiences

39. When my child is not interested in some of the usual activities of his age group, I:

   a. Try to help him realize that it is important to be interested in the same things as others in his group.
   b. Call his attention to the activities in which he is interested
   c. Tell him it is all right if he isn't interested in the same things
   d. See to it that he does the same things as others in his group
   e. Help him find ways of making the most of his interests.

40. When my child shows a deep interest in something I don't think is important, I:

   a. Let him go ahead with his interest
   b. Ask him to tell me more about this interest
   c. Help him find ways to make the most of this interest
   d. Do everything I can to discourage his interest in it
   e. Try to interest him in more worthwhile things

THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR YOUR COOPERATION
The questions in this booklet are to help us find out what boys and girls think, and the things they wish for. There are no "right" or "wrong" answers. Each boy and girl will answer differently. Just try to put down what you really think, and really wish.

Name______________________________

Age_________ Race_________________

Grade in School______________________

Date_______________________________
NUMBER ONE

Suppose that just by wishing you could change yourself into any sort of person. Which of these people would you wish to be? Write a "1" in front of your first choice, a "2" in front of your second choice, and a "3" in front of your third choice:

(a) ______ a housewife  (b) ______ a teacher  (c) ______ a movie star
(d) ______ a stenographer  (e) ______ a storekeeper  (f) ______ a cowboy
(g) ______ a business man  (h) ______ a business woman  (i) ______ a princess
(j) ______ an inventor  (k) ______ a policeman  (l) ______ an aviator
(m) ______ a captain  (n) ______ a fireman  (o) ______ a poet
(p) ______ a detective  (q) ______ a doctor  (r) ______ a nurse
(s) ______ an engineer  (t) ______ an actress  (u) ______ a prizefighter
(v) ______ a king  (w) ______ a singer  (x) ______ a lawyer
(y) ______ a salesman  (z) ______ an artist

Is there any other sort of person you would very much like to be? If there is, write it here:

NUMBER TWO

Suppose you could have just three of the wishes below, which would you want to come true? Put a "1" in front of your biggest wish, a "2" in front of your second biggest wish, and a "3" in front of your third:

I would like
(a) ______ to be stronger than I am now.
(b) ______ to have the boys and girls like me better.
(c) ______ to get along better with my father and mother.
(d) ______ to be brighter than I am now.
(e) ______ to play games better.
(f) ______ to have a different father and mother.
(g) ______ to be a boy (if you are a girl).
(h) ______ to be a girl (if you are a boy).
(i) ______ to be bigger than I am now.
(j) ______ to have more money to spend.
(k) ______ to be grown up and get away from home.
(l) ______ to have more friends.
(m) ______ to be better looking.
(n) ______ to have my father and mother love me more.

NUMBER THREE

Suppose you were going away to live on a desert island, and could only take three people with you. Write here the names of the three people you would choose:

1. __________________________  3. __________________________

2. __________________________
Read the sentences below, and the questions that follow them. If the answer to a question is "yes", put a check mark (✓) on "yes". If the answer is "no", put a mark on "no". If the true answer is somewhere in between yes and no, put the mark where it will be most true. Study this sample until you know how to do it.

**SAMPLE:**
Harold can run faster than any boy in school.

- Am I just like him?.............. Yes No
- Do I wish to be just like him?.... Yes No

Do the sentences below the same way as you did the sample.

1. Peter is a big, strong boy who can beat any of the other boys in a fight.

   - Am I just like him?.............. Yes No
   - Do I wish to be just like him?.... Yes No

2. George likes to read. He has read all the books he can get about cowboys, Indians, and soldiers.

   - Am I just like him?.............. Yes No
   - Do I wish to be just like him?.... Yes No

3. Ed is the best ball player in school.

   - Am I just like him?.............. Yes No
   - Do I wish to be just like him?.... Yes No

4. Sam gets very good marks on all his school work.

   - Am I just like him?.............. Yes No
   - Do I wish to be just like him?.... Yes No

5. Allan has make-believe friends and a make-believe world which is much nicer than the real world. He sits and dreams of all sorts of make-believe adventures with these make-believe friends.

   - Am I just like him?.............. Yes No
   - Do I wish to be just like him?.... Yes No

6. Joe is a leader. All the fellows do what he tells them.

   - Am I just like him?.............. Yes No
   - Do I wish to be just like him?.... Yes No

7. Steven doesn't know how to play baseball, football, or basketball.

   - Am I just like him?.............. Yes No
   - Do I wish to be just like him?.... Yes No

8. Alfred always does just what his mother tells him to do.

   - Am I just like him?.............. Yes No
   - Do I wish to be just like him?.... Yes No

9. John is the most popular boy in school. Everybody likes him.

   - Am I just like him?.............. Yes No
   - Do I wish to be just like him?.... Yes No

10. Harry has more girl friends than any of the other fellows.

    - Am I just like him?.............. Yes No
    - Do I wish to be just like him?.... Yes No
<p>| | | | | | | | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Walt is pretty &quot;dumb&quot; in his school work.</td>
<td>Am I just like him?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Do I wish to be just like him?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Jack doesn't want to mind his father and mother. He knows he is old enough to decide things for himself.</td>
<td>Am I just like him?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Do I wish to be just like him?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Don has more spending money than the other boys.</td>
<td>Am I just like him?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Do I wish to be just like him?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Bob is the brightest boy in school.</td>
<td>Am I just like him?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Do I wish to be just like him?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>James likes to sit by himself and imagine things. He thinks it is much more fun than playing games.</td>
<td>Am I just like him?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Do I wish to be just like him?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Fred fights a good deal with his brother and sister, no matter how hard he tries not to.</td>
<td>Am I just like him?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Do I wish to be just like him?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Which of these boys would your mother like best? Write his name here</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Which of these boys would your father like best? Write his name here</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In the questions that follow, put a mark (✓) in front of the line that is the true answer, unless it tells you to do otherwise:

1. How well can you play ball?
   (a) ___ can't play ball at all.
   (b) ___ can play a little bit.
   (c) ___ can play pretty well.
   (d) ___ best player in my class.

2. How many friends would you like to have?
   (a) ___ none.
   (b) ___ one or two.
   (c) ___ a few good friends.
   (d) ___ many friends.
   (e) ___ hundreds of friends.

3. How strong are you?
   (a) ___ very weak.
   (b) ___ not very strong.
   (c) ___ strong.
   (d) ___ the strongest in my class.

4. When you are grown up, what sort of person do you want to be?
   (a) ___ I want to be a very great person and do great things that people will talk about.
   (b) ___ I want to be one of the leaders in whatever town I live in.
   (c) ___ I want to be a happy ordinary person, with a good job.
   (d) ___ I would rather not grow up.

5. Do you like to play games with the other boys and girls?
   (a) ___ I don't, because I can't play games very well.
   (b) ___ They don't want me to play with them, because I can't play games very well.
   (c) ___ I like to play games fairly well.
   (d) ___ I like it a great deal.
   (e) ___ I would rather play games than anything else I know.

6. (In this question put a "1" in front of your first choice, a "2" in front of your second choice, and a "3" in front of your third choice.)
   If you were going to the circus, would you rather go
   (a) ___ with your father?
   (b) ___ with your best friend?
   (c) ___ with a group of friends?
   (d) ___ with your mother?
   (e) ___ all alone?

7. Do you want to be a grown-up man or woman?
   (a) ___ I just can't wait to be grown up.
   (b) ___ I would like to be grown up.
   (c) ___ I don't want to be grown up. I would rather be just as I am.
   (d) ___ I would like best of all to be a few years younger than I am now.
8. How well do your father and mother like you?
   (a)______I am the one they like best of all.
   (b)______They like me second best.
   (c)______They like all my brothers and sisters better than they like me.
   (d)______They like me well enough, but not better than my brothers and
           sisters.

9. Which do you like best?
   (a)______to go off by yourself and play or read.
   (b)______to play with one or two others.
   (c)______to play with a whole crowd.

10. Do you like to have some one else tell you how to do things?
    (a)______I like it.
    (b)______I don't care.
    (c)______I would rather do things my own way.
    (d)______I hate to be told what to do.

11. How do you feel when your brother or sister is praised for something they have
    done?
    (a)______I feel proud of them.
    (b)______I wish I could do better than they have done.
    (c)______I don't like to have them praised.
    (d)______I hate to have them do better than I can do.
    (e)______I don't care.
    (f)______I don't have any brother or sister.

12. Are you good looking?
    (a)______I'm not at all good looking.
    (b)______I'm not very good looking.
    (c)______I'm as good looking as most boys and girls.
    (d)______People say that I'm very good looking.

13. Do other children play mean tricks on you?
    (a)______never.
    (b)______sometimes.
    (c)______very often.

14. Do you have any good friends?
    (a)______none at all.
    (b)______one or two.
    (c)______a few good friends.
    (d)______many friends.
    (e)______hundreds of them.

15. Do you like to get into rough games, wrestling matches, football games and
    things like that?
    (a)______I like them very much.
    (b)______I like them a little.
    (c)______I don't like them.
    (d)______I hate to have people push and pull me around.
16. Do people treat your brother (or sister) better than they treat you?
   (a)______ never.
   (b)______ sometimes.
   (c)______ often.
   (d)______ almost always.
   (e)______ I haven't any brother or sister.

17. Do you wear good clothes to school?
   (a)______ I don't have any nice clothes.
   (b)______ My clothes are nice enough.
   (c)______ I have very good clothes.

18. What do your father and mother want you to do when you are grown up?
   (a)______ They want me to be a very great person and do great things that people will talk about.
   (b)______ They want me to be one of the leaders in whatever town I live in.
   (c)______ They want me to be a happy, ordinary person with a good job.
   (d)______ They don't want me to grow up.

19. Do boys or girls like you best?
   (a)______ The boys like me better than the girls do.
   (b)______ The girls like me better than the boys do.
   (c)______ I am popular with both boys and girls.
   (d)______ I am not popular with either boys or girls.

20. When do you think one has the most fun in life?
   (a)______ When you are a young child.
   (b)______ When you are between 9 and 12 years old.
   (c)______ When you are between 12 and 25 years old.
   (d)______ After you are 25 years old.

21. Do you want people to like you?
   (a)______ I just can't stand it, if people don't like me.
   (b)______ I always try very hard to make people like me.
   (c)______ I don't care very much, but I'm glad when people like me.
   (d)______ I don't care a bit whether people like me or not.
NUMBKR SIX

Fill in enough of the squares below to show how many there are in your family. If you had one older brother and two younger sisters you would fill them out like the sample. Notice that you put the oldest person in the family first, then the next oldest, and so on. Don't forget to put yourself in. Cross out the extra squares:

**SAMPLE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>father</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>mother</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>brother</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>me</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sister</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sister</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**YOU FILL IN THIS ONE**

|             |   |
|             |   |
|             |   |
|             |   |
|             |   |
| Your best girl friend |   |
| Your best boy friend   |   |

Now go back and put a "1" in front of the person you love most, a "2" in front of the person you like next best, a "3" in front of the person you like next best, and so on through the whole list. Sometimes it is very hard to decide which person you love best, but do the best you can, and be sure that you put a number in front of each person except yourself. Don't forget the last two, your best boy friend, and best girl friend. Put a number in front of them, too, that will tell how much you like them.
APPENDIX E

SCORING GUIDES FOR THE SCHEDULES USED IN THIS STUDY
SCORING GUIDE FOR THE PARENTAL ACCEPTANCE SCALE

Responses to items 1 through 10 are scored with the following weights:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Much more than usual</th>
<th>A little more than usual</th>
<th>The same</th>
<th>A little less than usual</th>
<th>Much less than usual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Responses to items 11 through 40 are weighted as follows:

11. a. 3 16. a. 1 21. a. 1 26. a. 3 31. a. 1 36. a. 1
   c. 5  b. 5  b. 5  b. 5  b. 5  b. 5
   c. 1  c. 4  c. 2  c. 1  c. 4  c. 2
   d. 4  d. 3  d. 4  d. 4  d. 3  d. 4
   e. 2  e. 2  c. 3  e. 2  e. 2  e. 3

12. a. 1 17. a. 2 22. a. 3 27. a. 1 32. a. 2 37. a. 3
   b. 2  b. 1  b. 1  b. 2  b. 1  b. 1
   c. 3  c. 5  c. 5  c. 3  c. 5  c. 5
   d. 4  d. 4  d. 2  d. 4  d. 4  d. 2
   e. 5  e. 3  e. 4  e. 5  e. 3  e. 4

13. a. 5 18. a. 3 23. a. 4 28. a. 5 33. a. 3 38. a. 4
   b. 1  b. 2  b. 3  b. 1  b. 2  b. 3
   c. 2  c. 1  c. 1  c. 2  c. 1  c. 1
   d. 3  d. 5  d. 5  d. 3  d. 5  d. 5
   e. 4  e. 4  e. 2  e. 4  e. 4  e. 2

14. a. 4 19. a. 4 24. a. 2 29. a. 4 34. a. 4 39. a. 2
   b. 5  b. 4  b. 4  b. 5  b. 3  b. 4
   c. 1  c. 2  c. 3  c. 1  c. 2  c. 3
   d. 2  d. 1  d. 1  d. 2  d. 1  d. 1
   e. 3  e. 5  e. 5  e. 3  e. 5  e. 5

15. a. 2 20. a. 5 25. a. 3 30. a. 2 35. a. 5 40. a. 3
   b. 3  b. 4  b. 4  b. 3  b. 4  b. 4
   c. 4  c. 3  c. 5  c. 4  c. 3  c. 5
   d. 5  d. 2  d. 1  d. 5  d. 2  d. 1
   e. 1  e. 1  e. 2  e. 1  e. 1  e. 2
DIRECTIONS FOR SCORING

It cannot be said that the scoring of this test is a simple, clerical task. The scoring system cannot be a simple tabulation, because the test is constructed so that the child reveals more of himself than he knows. Frequently a response is significant only in comparison with another response, and the scoring must be based on the comparison, rather than on the response itself.

However, the scoring is a definite and objective score, and does not depend on the scorer's subjective judgment. If a few tests are carefully scored according to directions the scorer should be able to develop speed in the work. The four diagnostic scores necessitate going through the test four times, since this is much easier than keeping four things in mind while going through the test.

Personal Inferiority Score

Number One - Omit.

Number Two - Examine items a, d, i, m for boys; items a, d, i, m, g for girls.
   If choices 1 and 2, 1 and 3, or 1, 2, 3 are in this area, 4 points.
   If choice 1 alone, or choices 2 and 3, are in this area, 3 points.

Number Three - Omit.

Number Four - Add the number of double checks (✓) occurring at the extremes of questions--
   1, 2, 3, 6, 8, 9, 10, 13, 16 for boys
   1, 3, 4, 7, 8, 9, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17 for girls.
   Each double check counts, 1 point.
   Add the number of points of conflict*, in the direction noted, on these questions:--

   Boys          Girls
   1.             1.              Total number points conflict * points.
   4.             3.              divided by 3

Number Five - If these items are checked score as indicated.

1. d - 3 points  7. d - 1 point
2. e - 2 points  12. a, b, or d - 1 point
3. a, b, or d - 1 point  18. a or b - 2 points
4. a - 2 points  18. If the check on 18 is higher than
4. b - 1 point  the check on question 4, score 2
                  points additional.

The number of points of "conflict" or difference is illustrated in these diagrams.

A - 

B - 

Question A shows 5 points conflict in this direction(\). Question B shows 8 points conflict in this direction(/). The highest possible number on one question is 9.
Number Six - Omit.

The total number of points thus obtained, is the Personal Inferiority score.

Social Maladjustment Score

Number One - Omit

Number Two - Examine items b, e, j, l.

If choices 1, 2, and 3, are in this area, 4 points.

If choices 1, 2, or 3 are in this area, 3 points.

Number Three - If all three are members of the family (marked F), or if they are adults (Teacher, etc.),
or if they are imaginary persons (Hendrick Hudson, a Pet Lion, etc.)
or if they are left blank, 4 points

If 2 are as described above, 3 points.

If 1 is as described above, 2 points.

Number Four - Examine these questions.

3, 6, 9, 13, for boys.
5, 7, 9, 10, 16, for girls.

Count each one that has the left hand extreme double-checked (Y Y)
(Y Y) as - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - 1 point.

Examine the questions below. Each question which shows a conflict in the direction noted counts, 1 point.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Boys</th>
<th>Girls</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2./</td>
<td>7./</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3./</td>
<td>9./</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4./</td>
<td>10./</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5./</td>
<td>13./</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6./</td>
<td>15./</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number Five - If these items are checked, score as indicated.

1.a - 3 points 13.c - 2 points
1.b - 2 points 14.a or e - 3 points
1.d - 1 point 14. If the check on 14 is 2 or more
2.a - 2 points lines above the check on question
2.e - 1 point 2, score 3 points additional.
5.a or b - 2 points 15. Boys - b, c, or d - 1 point
6.e (whether marked 15. Girls - c or d - 1 point
1,2, or 3) 2 points 17.a - 2 points
9.a - 2 points 19. Boys, b or d - 2 points
9.e - 1 point Girls, a or d - 2 points
21.a - 2 points
Number Six

If subject crosses out or leaves blank friend of own sex while putting number beside friend of opposite sex, 2 points.
If subject crosses out both friends, or writes that he has none, 3 points.
If subject gives lower number to friend of opposite sex than to friend of own sex, 2 points.

The total number of points thus obtained is the Social Maladjustment Score.

Family Maladjustment Score.

Number One - Omit.
Number Two - Examine items c, f, n.
   If one of these items is marked, (either with 1, 2, or 3), 2 points
   If two of these items are marked, 4 points
Number Three - Omit.
Number Four -
   Question 8 (Boys) or 6 (Girls)
   If more than 3 points conflict / - 1 point
   Question 12
   If marked "No - No" - 1 point
   If more than 3 points conflict \ - 2 points
   Question 16 (Boys) or 15 (Girls)
   If subject has any sibs and marks "No - No" - 1 point
   If more than 5 points conflict \ - 2 points
   Question 17 (Boys) or 19 (Girls)
   Look back to the child who is named. Count the number of spaces from "Yes" to the subjects rating of himself.
   This number \ / 2 = points.

Number Five.
   6. If a or d is marked "1", 1 point. 16. a or c, 1 point.
   8. b or c, 2 points 16. d, 2 points.
   10. c or d, 2 points 18. a, 3 points.
   11. b or e, 1 point 18. b, 2 points.
   11. c or d, 2 points

Number Six.

If there are two or more sibs, and one of the sibs next to the subject is given the highest number in the family, 1 point.
If one of the friends is given a lower number than some member of the family, 2 points.
If parents are separated by two ratings (e.g. mother rated "1", father rated "3") - 2 points.
If parents are separated by more than two ratings, 4 points.
If parents receive highest numbers, 2 points.

The total number of points thus obtained is the Family Maladjustment Score.

*This is determined by looking at Number Six.
Daydreaming Score.

**Number One.**
If o, i, t, n or v are marked "1", 2 points
If any two of these are marked, 2 points

**Number Two and Three** - Omit.

**Number Four**
Question 5 (Boys) or 14 (Girls)
If self or ideal is rated more than 2 points from the right, 2 points
Question 15 (Boys) or 18 (Girls)
If self or ideal is rated more than 2 points from the right, 2 points

**Number Five** - If these items are checked, score as indicated.
4.d - 1 point
6.e (if marked 1, 2 or 3) - 2 points
7.d - 2 points
9.a - 3 points
20.a - 1 point

The total number of points thus obtained is the Daydreaming Score.
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