Utah State University

DigitalCommons@USU

All Graduate Theses and Dissertations

Graduate Studies

5-1979

Effects of Perceived Child Rearing Practices on Moral Character

Melody T. Beutler
Utah State University

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.usu.edu/etd

Part of the Social and Behavioral Sciences Commons

Recommended Citation

Utah State University
MERRILL-CAZIER LIBRARY

EFFECTS OF PERCEIVED CHILD REARING PRACTICES

ON MORAL CHARACTER

by

Melody T. Beutler

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree

of

MASTER OF SCIENCE

in

Home Economics and Consumer Education

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to express my sincere appreciation to Dr. Larry Jensen for his time and assistance throughout the completion of this paper. His direction and guidance have made this study possible. I would also like to thank Mrs. Marie Krueger, my advisor, for her encouragement and willingness to help at all times.

Another thank you to Dr. Eldon Drake and Dr. Glen Jenson for their helpfulness and time.

A final thank you to my husband, Brent, our son, Barry, and our parents, Arlene Taylor and Perry and LuJuana Beutler, for their support and encouragement.

Melody J. Beutler

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

ABSTRACT

Effects of Perceived Child Rearing Practices

on Moral Character

by

Melody T. Beutler, Master of Science

Utah State University, 1977

Major Professor: Marie Krueger

Department: Home Economics and Consumer Education

The purpose of this study was to determine the relationship be-
tween perceived child rearing practices and the moral character or
pro-social behavior of students in their late teens and early twenties.

A questionnaire was administered to forty-eight students to test
their moral character which was the dependent variable on the following
traits: ambitious, broadminded, capable, cheerful, clean, courageous,
forgiving, helpful, honest, imaginative, independent, intellectual,
logical, loving, obedient, polite, responsible and self-controlled.
The child rearing practices used by the mothers and fathers were also
tested as the independent predictor variables according to the fol-
lowing terms: autonomy, coercion, companionship, guilt, inconsistency,
love withdrawal, over protection, physical affection, positive reason-
ing, and support.

A similar questionnaire was also sent to the parents of these
students asking the mother and father to rate their student's moral
character and also how they feel they raised their son or daughter.

The results indicate fathers influence their daughter's moral

character as much as do mothers. However, using the above moral character variables and child rearing practices variables, fathers only slightly influence their sons and mothers have no significant influence over their sons.

Parental child rearing techniques influencing the females the most are: low amounts of physical affection and autonomy from both parents, low amounts of support from the mother, and low amounts of guilt from the father. Also, high amounts of companionship and inconsistency from both parents are strong influences on moral character high ratings.

Those child rearing techniques promoting high moral character in males are low amounts of over protection and high amounts of love withdrawal from fathers.

It also appears the way children perceive their parents rearing them is in most cases not the way parents feel they raised their children. Also, the way children view their own character traits is not the same way the parents view it in most cases.

(53 pages)

INTRODUCTION

Many researchers do not agree upon the same definition of moral character. After consideration of various definitions of morality, the researcher decided upon an operational definition that was believed to be compatible with most definitions, but also specific enough to be measureable. To do this the following operational definition was used: moral character is a word used to describe an individual's practice and open endorcement of basic pro-social values, restricted to those which imply right or wrong. Where the right or wrong mentioned can be very extensive, the following humanistic moral traits were selected: broadminded, forgiving, helpful, loving, and polite; along with the following conventional moral traits: courageous, honest, obedient, responsible, and self-controlled. In order to understand this, we compared these moral values combined with the following pro-social values classified as positive non-moral traits: ambitious, capable, cheerful, clean, imaginative, intellectual, and logical. Even though they are positive social traits, they do not have an implication upon a right or wrong dimension.

After considerable research on the socialization of morality, the parent-child interaction continues to be regarded as one of the most critical, yet elusive causation variables. Reviews in this area of research generally point out the need of more research, the necessity for more complex designs, and for studying the combined effects of multiple independent variables on separate dependent variables

(Hoffman, 1970; Saltzstein, 1976; Mussen & Eisenberg-berg, 1977).

Mussen and Eisenberg-berg (1977) state:

> Clearly, these child rearing practices are not independent of achievement even though for research purposes they are generally examined one at a time. . . . There is an urgent need to explore the human relationships among these practices and to determine the effects of combinations of patterns of disciplinary tactics on children's pro-social behavior . . . today there are no systematic data, consequently, no adequate answers to these questions. (pp. 99-100)

One partial explanation for some of the inconsistency reported in the reviews is that accurate effects of parental discipline cannot be adequately assessed when the child is young. Induction or reason oriented discipline techniques have been associated with general internalization which increases as the child grows older (Aronfreed, 1961; Hoffman & Saltzstein, 1960; Grusec & Mischel, 1966). It has been reported (Jensen & Buhanan, 1974) that power oriented techniques decrease in effectiveness with older children. If this is so, then the research on parental discipline and moral behavior using young subjects will more likely find more positive associations with power oriented types of discipline, but the opposite would be true when studying older children. It is the researcher's opinion that socialization outcomes should be measured at older ages because, conceptually, the critical socialization outcome is adult behavior, not child behavior. In addition, considerable variation, fluctuations, and reversals in moral behavior would be expected during the young formative years. Most of the research reported in the literature has been done only with correlating young childrens' behavior and parental disciplinary techniques.

Another confounding factor is the choice of dependent variables,

A study illustrating this difficulty is the study by Mussen, Ruther-
ford, Harris, and Keasey (1970). These researchers found different
parental predictors for different indicators or measures of morality.
The differences reported by these researchers also interacted with
sex. Thus, it was found that the type of discipline depended upon
sex of child and type of morality studied. One theoritical implica-
tion of this finding is that researchers are beginning to believe
there are different types of morality (e.g. Saltzstein & Hoffman,
1975). Hogan (1973) has proposed five dimensions of morality: em-
pathy, autonomy, ethical attitudes, moral knowledge, and socializa-
tion.

Hoffman and Saltzstein (1976) identify a humanistic morality
which is oriented towards a more personal feeling for others and a
conventional morality which is more rule and justice oriented. For
research purposes, two basic directions are implied by these concep-
tualizations of multiple types. First, move away from a unitary
approach in studying morality, to a simultaneous inclusion of several
dependent variables representing the various dimensions of morality.
Second, researchers could be advised to avoid studying only a single
trait or dimension in order to avoid idiosyncratic findings. Instead,
they could use more general measures that are composed of several sub-
factors. The latter approach was selected for this study as general
parent-child predictors were sought that would not be specifically re-
lated to a single specific trait; a more general dependent variable
was desired.

Most studies have reported significant correlations only between

the mother's discipline and the children's behavior (Mussen, Ruther-
ford, Harris, & Keasey, 1970; Hoffman, 1963; Hoffman & Saltzstein,
1967; Dlugokinshi & Firestone, 1974). However, it does appear the
father's role is one that cannot continue to be neglected and thus
should be included.

There are certain methodological procedures which could clarify
and produce more powerful effects. First, the dependent variables
are often assessed in a single observation on a relatively isolated
laboratory test. In this research peer ratings are believed to be
a more useful measure. Peer impressions generally are based on ob-
servations over many days and across many specific issues. The
value of peer ratings has received a strong endorcement by Kane and
Lawler (1978) as they reviewed methods of peer assessment. They
state, "Overall, the data are rather encouraging with respect to
the reliability, validity, and freedom from bias of peer assessment
methods" (p. 583). Peer ratings to be used in this research are
believed to be more valid and reliable because of the amount of time
and intimacy between the peers used as subjects.

In addition, and assuming a phenomenalogical framework, it may
be that at an older age the determinates of one's morality might be
influenced more by the perception of parental discipline techniques
than by the actual behavior of the parents. It may be that a
stronger association will be found between perceptions of parental
behavior that between the parents rating of their own behavior. Re-
lated to this is another concern derived from perceptual theory.
Does parental discipline influence a person's outlook about his own
and others morality? It is possible the parental discipline indi-

rectly influenced moral behavior by causing a child to see the world
differently. If this is the case, it would be expected the ratings
the subject would assign others on specific moral attributes would
be related to the parental antecedents, these two may indirectly
influence the way others respond to the subject. Therefore, it is
predicted there will be a relationship between perceived parental
discipline techniques and the typical rating a person will receive;
these two perceptions combine as antecedents for moral behaviors
which almost always have a social component, (e.g. kindness, altru-
ism, sharing, etc.).

In terms of antecedents and causuality there has been a con-
siderable discussion about the child's effects on adult's child
rearing behaviors (Bell, 1968; Scarr, 1965; Yarrow, Waxler, &
Scott, 1971; Bell, 1974). It is concluded that, while meaningful,
the conceptualization of parental behaviors primarily influencing
the child and not the reverse is a more logical and realistic
causitive sequence (see Hoffman, 1975; Saltzstein, 1976).

Purpose and Objective

The preceeding discussion has enumerated ways in which the re-
lationship between child rearing and moral behavior can be better
researched. This research was designed to incorporate these improve-
ments in the following wasy: First, instead of using young children
as subjects, older adolescents were employed to minimize bias against
induction type discipline which is believed to be less effective with
young children. Second, ratings by peers who shared common living
quarters were used to insure familiarity and across situation

generality. Third, a parent measure using perceived parent-child interactions was employed, which according to the phenomenalogical theory just discussed should help identify predictors. Fourth, a composite of moral traits are used rather than focus on a single dimension of morality.

In this study the composite scores are based on Rokeach's value dimensions (Rokeach, 1973). The values have logically subdivided into three classifications; two correspond with Saltzstein and Hoffman's conventional and humanistic morality and the third is categorized as positive non-moral social traits. Fifth, because of the complex interactions expected among the parental antecedent variables, a multiple regression analysis is employed rather than relying on simple correlations as is commonly reported in the literature. Sixth, because the parental effects on moral behavior may be altered through changes produced in an offspring's outlook about moral characteristics of others, an analysis will be on the rating a subject has about his peers. Seventh, another intervening variable may be a child's perception of himself as a moral agent. Thus, self ratings on morality will also be analyzed. Eighth, both mother and father scores will be used as predictors and be analyzed separately.

It is believed that by implementing the preceeding considerations the present research enables the researcher to more accurately identify and interpret data about parental variables as antecedents to moral behavior.

METHOD

Subjects

Forty-eight students were selected from cooking facility residential dorms at Utah State University. Four living units of each sex with six to a unit participated. Students residing in these units were primarily white, caucasian, middle class, and in their late teens and early twenties. All 24 of the females and 20 of the 24 males completed the questionnaire. Questionnaires were also sent to the parents of these students.

Measures

The parental behavior was assessed using an adaptation of an instrument developed by Rollins at Brigham Young University (1978). The Rollins Child Rearing Scale was developed by administering a large pool of items to subjects and having them rate their parents on each item. Using a factor analysis, Rollins identified ten basic factors that describe child rearing practices. The ten factors are:

1) Autonomy: Letting the child do as s/he pleases and giving the child as much freedom as s/he wants.

2) Coercion: Finding fault with, complaining about, getting after, and being impatient with the child.

3) Companionship: Sharing activities as parent and child; also talking together.

4) Guilt: Telling the child how much the parent has suffered for them; telling the child of all s/he has done for that child.

5) Inconsistency: Insisting the child follow a rule one day, and ignoring it the next.

6) Love Withdrawal: The parent will not have anything to do with the child when the child upsets him or her until the child finds a way to make up.

7) Over Protection: Telling the child exactly when to be back when s/he went out; always wanting to know who phoned the child and what was said.

8) Physical Affection: The parent shows and tells of his or her love for the child.

9) Positive Reasoning: Parents explain how good s/he feels when the child does something s/he likes.

10) Support: The parent trusts the child as a family member. The parent makes the child feel s/he is there if needed.

The original Rollins Scale contained 78 items representing the ten basic factors. Forty were selected for use in this research, four from each of the ten basic factors, using only items having the highest ratings. There were only two factor ratings under .50. Acceptable reliability and validity data have been reported by Rollins (Rollins, 1978; Peterson, 1978).

The moral character of each subject was assessed using an adaptation of an instrument developed by Milton Rokeach (1973). His instrument was designed for a respondent to make a hierarchal arrangement of 18 values. Rokeach's test-retest reliabilities after seven weeks were reported in the .70's. For this research rather than arrange the values in terms of importance, subjects were asked to rate themselves and each of their roommates as being very much like, somewhat like, or

not like me and my roommates. All 18 values were used. They are: ambitious, broadminded, capable, cheerful, clean, courageous, forgiving, helpful, honest, imaginative, independent, intellectual, logical, loving, obedient, polite, responsible and self-controlled.

The researcher divided the 18 values into three categories (humanistic morality, based on orientation towards people; conventional morality, based on orientation towards rules and established behavioral norms; and a third called positive non-moral social traits) to assist in the computer analysis of the data. Those considered to be logically related to the humanistic morality were broadminded, forgiving, helpful, loving, and polite. Those considered to be logically related to a conventional morality were courageous, honest, obedient, responsible, and self controlled. The positive non-moral social traits were ambitious, capable, cheerful, clean, imaginative, independent, intellectual, and logical.

The reliability of these measures was established using a test-retest procedure. Seven subjects were contacted after a two month interval and asked to complete the test.

Reliability

The test-retest reliabilities on ratings given to self were; $r = .46$ ($p < .1$, $n = 7$) for the humanistic scores, $r = .78$ ($p < .05$, $n = 7$) for the conventional scores, and $r = .75$ ($p < .05$, $n = 7$) for the positive non-moral scores. These were regarded as adequate considering the small number ($n = 7$) of cases used to establish the reliabilities.

Research Design

The test was administered simultaneously to each of the six room-
mates in the living unit by the principle investigator after scheduling
an appointment. Students were asked to rate themselves and each of
their roommates using the Rokeach Value Inventory and then describe
how their mother and father raised them using the abridged Rollins
Child Rearing Scale.

The parents of these students were also sent a similar questionnaire.
The mother and father were separately asked to describe how they raised
that particular child using the abridged Rollins Child Rearing Scale,
they were also asked to rate their child's character using the Rokeach
Value Inventory.

DATA ANALYSIS

The students' data were analyzed using a multiple regression analysis to compare all the variables against each other. The predictor independent variables included the perceived parental child rearing scores on each of the ten factors. The dependent variables were the subjects' ratings of self combined with those of his or her roommates on that subject.

Because of computer limitations the number of predictor variables should not exceed twenty-five percent of the sample size. Therefore, it was not possible to use more than five predictor scores in a single regression analysis. The following criteria were then used to select the first set of five predictor variables: A preliminary regression analysis was performed and variables were selected from the tables of simple and partial correlation co-efficients. The scores having the highest correlations with a single dependent variable were computed by combining all ten values. Those selected by this method were the same for the mothers as for the fathers. The researcher independently selected five variables employing a logical reasoning procedure to identify high power parental approaches as compared with low power discipline approaches. This was done prior to looking at the correlations referred to above. The researcher found the same grouping occurred when using either of the two different procedures. The group with the highest initial correlations and also logically considered to be more positive and low powered parental techniques were: support, positive reasoning, autonomy, physical affection, and companionship. The scores with the lower correlation with the composite dependent

variable and also considered to be more negative and high powered were: guilt, coercion, over protection, inconsistency, and love withdrawal. The two sets of five were then used separately.

The dependent variables included composite scores derived from the peer ratings received by the subject on each of the 18 Rokeach moral behaviors. The first variable step was the average rating received from the roommates plus the rating given to one's self. The second variable step was the average of the peer ratings given to each of the roommates by the subject. The third variable step was the rating given by the subjects to themselves. The basic three ratings were then used to compute the following scores which were analyzed as dependent variables: (Refer to explanation of the three types of morality on page nine.)

1. Self Rating on Humanistic Morality.

2. Self Rating on Conventional Morality.

3. Self Rating on Positive Non-Moral Social Traits.

4. Ratings Received on Humanistic Morality.

5. Ratings Received on Conventional Morality.

6. Ratings Received on Positive Non-Moral Social Traits.

7. Ratings Given on Humanistic Morality.

8. Ratings Given on Conventional Morality.

9. Ratings Given on Positive Non-Moral Social Traits.

In summary, the preceding nine dependent variables were analyzed separately in each of the following regression analyses:

1. Fathers with sons using low power predictors.

2. Fathers with sons using high power predictors.

3. Fathers with daughters using low power predictors.

4. Fathers with daughters using high power predictors.

5. Mothers with sons using low power predictors.

6. Mothers with sons using high power predictors.

7. Mothers with daughters using low power predictors.

8. Mothers with daughters using high power predictors.

The multiple regressions were analyzed as described. Only those having a significant F ratio for the full regression model are reported. As a general rule even with a significant F for the full model, if less than five percent of the variance is accounted for by an additional variable, it was not reported. In some cases there was a variable that contributes significantly to the model, but which has a non-significant Beta weight. In these cases the variable is reported and discussed because the variable contributes to the overall regression and significantly contributes to the variance accounted for when used with the other variables.

There were no significant predictors of males humanistic and conventional moral scores received from their peer ratings. Table 1 presents significant perceived parental behaviors as predictors of the humanistic, conventional and non-moral scores. (Refer to Table 1) Also, note there are no significant regressions using the mother scores as predictors for the males.

For the females there are significant regressions for both mother and father scores as predictors. As indicated by the data in Table 1, males with high scores in non-moral values perceive their fathers as being low in over protection and high in love withdrawal. There are no significant correlations between the son's and their mother's scores.

The self ratings were not consistent and had fewer significant and interpretable findings and are reported only in Appendix A. The scores based on ratings received were believed to be similar except they should have even higher reliabilities because the scores are based on an average of usually six ratings.

For the female's humanistic morality scores there are four mother low power variables each contributing more than a .05 increase to the overall regression analysis for a total of 44 % of the variance. Low scores for mothers in affection, support, and autonomy combined with high scores in companionship predict a high humanistic morality. More clearly, this means mothers who show little physical affection and support, and do not give much freedom; but show much companionship towards their daughters rear daughters with a high personal feeling for others.

Affection from the father and the giving of autonomy by the father to the daughter are negatively associated with a humanistic morality as it was for the mother. This means fathers as well as mothers who do not show much physical affection and do not allow much freedom raise daughters who have a humanistic morality. There were no significant high power predictors for female's humanistic scores.

Inconsistency on the part of both the mother and father was most strongly associated with high conventional morality scores. For fathers the inconsistency score alone was not significant, but when combined with a negatively correlated guilt score, the low guilt and high inconsistency predicted conventional morality. A positive love withdrawal score also added .06 more predictability. Thus, high female conventional morality is correlated with a mother's high incon-

Table 1

Received Ratings

Variable	F For Full Regression Model	DF	Proba-bility	Signif-icant Beta	F Ratio of Beta	Proba-bility	Multiple R	RSG Change	Simple R
Female Humanistic Morality (Mean = 2.44 SD = .25) with Mother's Low Power Scores									
Physical Affection	3.51	1/21	.10	⁻.47	4.44	.05	⁻.38	.14	⁻.38
Autonomy	3.77	2/21	.05	⁻.30	2.52	N.S.	.52	.13	⁻.38
Companionship	4.00	3/19	.05	.46	5.45	.01	.62	.11	.27
Support	3.57	4/18	.05	⁻.38	2.50	N.S.	.67	.06	⁻.27
Female Humanistic Morality (Mean = 2.44 SD = .25) with Father's Low Power Scores									
Autonomy	2.92	1/22	N.S.	⁻.44	4.28	N.S.	.34	.12	⁻.34
Physical Affection	3.51	2/21	.05	⁻.42	2.92	N.S.	.50	.13	⁻.25
Female Conventional Morality (Mean = 2.52 SD = .21) with Mother's High Power Scores									
Inconsistency	4.54	1/21	.05	.32	1.34	N.S.	.42	.18	.42
Female Conventional Morality (Mean = 2.42 SD = .21) with Father's High Power Scores									
Inconsistency	2.43	1/22	N.S.	.38	3.07	N.S.	.32	.10	.32
Guilt	3.79	2/21	.05	⁻.43	3.02	N.S.	.51	.17	⁻.29
Love Withdrawal	3.16	3/20	.04	.28	1.76	N.S.	.57	.06	.19

Table 1 (Continued)

Variable	F For Full Regression Model	DF	Proba-bility	Signif-icant Beta	F Ratio of Beta	Proba-bility	Multiple R	RSG Change	Simple R
Female Positive Non-Morality (Mean = 2.40 SD = .16) with Mother's Low Power Scores									
Companionship	9.22	1/21	.01	.82	5.61	.05	.55	.31	.55
Female Positive Non-Morality (Mean = 2.40 SD = .16) with Father's Low Power Scores									
Companionship	5.45	1/22	.05	.57	5.59	.05	.45	.20	.45
Physical Affection	5.35	2/21	.05	⁻.39	2.91	N.S.	.58	.14	⁻.22
Male Positive Non-Morality (Mean = 2.53 SD = .27) with Father's High Power Scores									
Over Protection	4.45	1/16	.10	⁻.61	4.59	.15	.47	.22	⁻.47
Love Withdrawal	4.05	2/15	.05	.34	1.09	N.S.	.59	.13	.15

sistency and a father's high inconsistency when they also use love withdrawal and do not promote guilt feelings.

Companionship was the strongest variable for each parent with female positive non-moral scores. For fathers, however, the negatively associated physical affection score is also significant. Thus high companionship from the mother and high companionship combined with low physical affection from the father predicts a high conventional morality score for their daughter.

All female scores can be predicted using both mother and father scores, but for males there were no significant correlations with mother scores in any of the areas and only one with the father.

The males had a high positive non-morality score when their fathers showed very little over protection and much love withdrawal.

For the female conventional morality scores there were high power parental predictors, but no low power parental scores. This supports the fact that parents use low power techniques such as autonomy, companionship, physical affection, positive reasoning, and support to influence humanistic morality (oriented towards a personal feeling towards others) and positive non-morality. Also, parents use high power techniques such as coercion, guilt, inconsistency, love withdrawal, and over protection to influence conventional morality (rule and justice oriented).

Once again, those traits considered to be logically related to the humanistic morality were broadminded, forgiving, helpful, loving, and polite. Those considered to be logically related to the conventional morality were courageous, honest, obedient, responsible, and self-controlled. Those related to the positive non-moral social traits were

ambitious, capable, cheerful, clean, imaginative, independent, intellectual, and logical.

Companionship was the most consistently useful low power variable and inconsistency was the strongest high power variable.

The parent data were compared against the student data using Pearson correlation coefficients, because only a simple correlation was needed. All of the 18 character ratings given by the subject to self were compared against how their parent rated their character. Also, the students' rating of the ten parental child rearing scores were compared against the parent ratings of how they felt they raised their child.

The only significant correlations between subjects character ratings of themselves and the way their parents rated them were females' and mothers' ratings of broadminded, clean, honest, independent, polite, and self-controlled. There were three correlations between fathers and their daughters: loving, polite, and self-controlled. There were no significant correlations with mothers and their sons, and only two with fathers and their sons: courageous and intellectual. When all of the scores of both sexes were combined mothers and their children rated similar in five areas: ambitious, clean, imaginative, independent, and polite. When all scores were combined fathers and their children rated similar in three areas: ambitious, polite, and self-controlled. This supports the idea that mothers understand how their children feel about themselves better than do fathers. However, the sample size used was 14 females' parents and 10 males' parents, giving a total of 24 which may not be enough to draw conclusions (Refer to Table 2 for these correlations).

Table 2

Significance of Correlations Between Subjects' Character Ratings of Themselves
and Their Parents' Ratings of Them

Character Traits	Females N = 14		Males N = 10		Females and Males N = 24	
	Mothers	Fathers	Mothers	Fathers	Mothers	Fathers
Ambitious	.060	.268	.120	.071	*.019	*.050
Broadminded	*.039	.109	.486	.486	.101	.117
Capable	.331	.494	.545	.312	.287	.878
Cheerful	.519	.183	1.000	.779	.657	.219
Clean	*.053	.948	.137	.115	*.017	.207
Courageous	.513	.494	.286	*.035	.440	.762
Forgiving	.384	.636	.545	.807	.442	.951
Helpful	.704	.321	.645	.545	.862	.582
Honest	*.051	----	----	----	.083	----
Imaginative	.151	.818	.093	.163	*.018	.189
Independent	*.003	.109	.896	.653	*.004	.102
Intellectual	.334	.461	.062	*.015	.092	.093
Logical	.400	.611	.486	.645	.920	.974
Loving	1.000	*.025	.259	.153	.324	.007
Obedient	----	.511	.312	.060	.703	.092
Polite	*.002	*.042	.083	.077	*.005	*.005
Responsible	.337	.271	.545	.545	.813	.165
Self-Controlled	*.311	*.051	.779	.060	.185	*.008

Numbers less than .05 are significant at the .05 level and marked*

19

When correlating the subjects' perceptions of how their parents raised them and their parents' perceptions of how they raised their children, it again appears that parents understand more closely how their daughters feel than their sons. Also, when both sexes are considered, mothers understand more accurately how their children feel than do the fathers. Mothers and their daughters agreed on the amount of physical affection, love withdrawal, and over protection given. Fathers and their daughters agreed on the amount of support, physical affection, and companionship given. There was no significant correlation between the sons and either of the parents.

When all the scores of both sexes were combined, mothers agreed with their children on the way they were raised in four areas: physical affection, inconsistency, love withdrawal, and over protection. Fathers agreed with their children in only two areas: support and physical affection. The sample size for this portion was again small with 15 parents of females and nine parents of males, giving a total of 24 (Refer to Table 3 for these correlations).

Table 3

Significance of Correlations Between Subjects' Perceptions of How Their Parents
Raised Them and Their Parents Perceptions of How They Raised Their Children

Child Rearing Practices	Females N = 15		Males N = 9		Females and Males N = 24	
	Mothers	Fathers	Mothers	Fathers	Mothers	Fathers
Support	.790	*.001	.861	.886	.797	*.001
Positive Reasoning	.071	.128	.373	.511	.437	.548
Physical Affection	*.016	*.008	.533	.171	*.041	*.001
Guilt	.570	.641	.632	.172	.943	.640
Inconsistency	.217	.571	.270	.925	*.045	.609
Autonomy	.738	.549	.351	.432	.720	.231
Love Withdrawal	*.023	.317	.972	.616	*.026	.985
Over Protection	*.038	.363	.190	.558	*.018	.338
Companionship	.500	*.001	.744	.859	.492	.060
Coercion	.552	.177	.952	.083	.314	.443

Numbers less than .05 are significant at the .05 level and are marked*

DISCUSSION

It is possible to arrive at a number of general conclusions after studying the data. First, in both conventional and humanistic morality, males are not as predictable using the present variables as are females. In only one area was it possible to obtain significant multiple regressions and that was for boys with their fathers on the positive non-moral social attributes; where low levels of over protection and the use of love withdrawal predicted more positive scores. However, predictability and contributing variables were found for both mother and father scores for females.

To account for the increased predictability of humanistic moral scores for females as opposed to males, two possibilities emerge. First, it may be that the family plays a more significant role in the moral socialization of females. Second, there exists a numerical difference in the data that did not permit adequate meaningful analysis of the male data as there were one-sixth less as many males as females who completed the questionnaire. Inspection of the means and standard deviations show very little difference between the male and female scores with no ceiling effects present in the dependent variables. Another explanation may be other more significant variables which contribute to the variance of boy scores to a greater extent than they do with the females.

It is the latter view that is considered a better explanation. It is believed the variables will still likely be in one or more aspects of the parent-child interaction. Because of the relative success of identifying variables associated with female morality scores and not

with males, the remainder of this discussion will be primarily directed towards an understanding of the data obtained for the females.

Several of the predictions were supported. It appears the fathers contribute as much to the total variance of the female scores as did mothers. It also appears for the humanistic and conventional morality scores the effect of the father operated in a similar manner as did the mother.

Physical affection was negatively correlated with humanistic low power morality scores and inconsistency was positively correlated with conventional high power morality scores. This is contradictory to previous research. Boyce and Jensen (1976) suggest the frequent use of physical affection leads to an increase in empathy and humanistic morality. Whereas, in this research, the use of affection was negatively correlated.

The description of conventional morality and logic would argue that a rule oriented person would be more likely to have encountered a rigid and consistent structure of discipline in the home. This description would lead to a negative correlation between perceived inconsistency in the child rearing practices of the parent and a conventional morality score. However, the findings for conventional moralities were not in line with this correlation. The findings show a positive correlation between high inconsistency and conventional morality; which means females would have regarded both mothers and fathers as being inconsistent in their child-rearing practices. This is not compatible with both the logic and description of conventional morality; i.e. a focus on rules and order. However, it appears that inconsistency on the part of the father is only useful when it is

combined with love withdrawal. When considering the negative correla-
tion of father's using guilt with conventional morality and also exam-
ining the items used to form the guilt score, the researcher is led to
conclude guilt may cause a person to react in the opposite direction.
The frequent use of guilt by a parent may cause a child to avoid rules
which when broken cause him to be uncomfortable. The rules in compli-
ance with a conventional morality may only appeal to children whose
parents did not frequently use guilt, hence the negative correlation
between guilt and a conventional morality. An example of a guilt item
is: I told him/her how much I had suffered for him/her. The use of
inconsistency and love withdrawal when behavior does not meet the
approval of the parent does seem to produce a high conventional moral-
ity. It may be that youth rebel against the combined effects of love
withdrawal and inconsistency. To avoid this unpleasant situation,
they produce an orderly and predictable life.

The data on conventional morality for both the mother's and
father's scores does support the prediction that high power is asso-
ciated only with conventional elements in morality and not with the
more general positive non-moral values or with the humanistic morality.

In terms of social significance, the finding that companionship
was the single and exceptionally strong predictor of the non-moral
scores is important. Apparently the friendship relation between either
a father or mother and the female child is extremely effective for
the socialization of behavior. The items of companionship imply ·sharing
activities, talking together, and enjoying being together.

However, combined with father's companionship for the female non-
morality scores was a negative relationship with physical affection.

Apparently a father as a companion need not be physically affectionate in order to be effective. It may be the female child feels more comfortable with a non-affectionate father and is more influenced when the relationship is more platonic and less familiar.

The most unexpected and difficult to explain finding is a negative relationship between affection and the humanistic and non-moral scores. This negative correlation was found only for the female's scores and can be related to Hoffman's (1975) findings. He found maternal affection was associated with pro-social types of behavior for males, but was not related for females. While nurturance usually discussed in the literature is more encompassing than physical affection, the quote by Mussen and Eisenberg-Berg (1977) points out the complexity of understanding even nurturance. They state:

> We cannot draw any difinitive conclusions about the impact of parental nurturance per se on children's pro-social behavior. Perhaps the simplest and most straightforward conclusion is that simply giving a child warmth, support, and affection (even in fairly large doses) does not ensure that the child will become altruistic, kind, considerate, or generous. (p. 92)

Because of the strong negative relationship with physical affection found for both parents on the humanistic score and also for fathers on the non-moral score, an explanation is felt necessary for this unusual finding. Perhaps a deficit motivational model can be used to explain the finding. If, as is most commonly reported in child development literature, affection is a basic need of the human, then failure to receive adequate affection disposes a person to seek warmth in other ways. If physical affection is necessary, then a deprivation of this should increase their motivation to receive affection from others. A person desiring affection from others may be willing to

engage in loving actions to receive warmth from peers; and accordingly
be rated higher. On the other hand, it may be that relationships
which have a great deal of warmth in terms of mutual understanding,
shared feelings, and the comunication of genuine caring do not re-
quire as much touching.

Thus, two explanations have been presented. A deficit model that
humanistic morality is motivated by a desire to regain warmth and
affection from others; or the presence of warmth and caringness in
a family context is often associated with low amounts of physical
affection. The deficit model has more support when examining the se-
quence of variables in the humanistic morality. For example, there
is a negative relationship between affection and also with autonomy
and support. Apparently females with this humanistic morality have
lived in a family context which while having ample companionship is
characterized by a non-supportive non-affectionate mother who does
not give autonomy. It could be that such a child would then seek
a life style and behavior which valued loving and reciprocated those
elements found in a humanistic loving-caring-for type of morality.
This would be similar to the often referred to reactance or adolescent
rebellion. The subjects were also in their late adolescent years.
This is an age group which typically reacts against what was perceived
to be parental inadequacies. There may be a desire to establish a
life style that over compensates for elements lacking in their past.
It is of interest that low amounts of autonomy, freedom, were corre-
lated with the humanistic morality for both the father and mother
scores.

While the humanistic morality is generally seen as a higher or more sophisticated level of motivation, the family variables producing these behaviors may not be as commendable. It could be that experience with low level affection and restrictions upon autonomy, which might be viewed as lack of trust, cause a person to value the elements of freedom, sympathy, caring for hurt feelings, and empathy for the victim which motivates the loving compassionate humanistic morality. This conclusion is viewed very tentatively as it contradicts a more optomistic and positive view of the origin, the humanistic morality (see: Boyce & Jensen, 1978; Jensen, 1978).

SUMMARY

To summarize the findings, it appears those parental child rearing techniques promoting a humanistic morality (characteristic of being broadminded, forgiving, helpful, loving, and polite) in females are low amounts of physical affection and autonomy from both parents and high amounts of companionship and low amounts of support from the mother.

Those parental child rearing techniques promoting a conventional morality (characteristic of being courageous, honest, obedient, responsible, and self-controlled) in females are high amounts of inconsistency from both parents, and low amounts of guilt and high amounts of love withdrawal from the father.

Those parental child rearing techniques promoting positive non-moral social traits (characteristic of being ambitious, capable, cheerful, clean, imaginative, independent, intellectual, and logical) in females are high amounts of companionship from both parents and low amounts of physical affection from fathers.

Those child rearing techniques promoting positive non-moral social traits in males are low amounts of over protection and high amounts of love withdrawal from the father.

When all of the student scores were combined, the amount of physical affection given by the parents was viewed the same by both parents and children. Fathers and their children agree to the amount of support being given. Mothers and their children view the amount of inconsistency, love withdrawal, and over protection given to be the same.

Parents and children do not agree in most of the areas as to how

the children were raised. It would be interesting to correlate the way the parents perceive they raised their children with the moral character of the children. This correlation is not done at this time because of lack of funds and time.

With all of the scores combined, mothers and their children agree to the child's traits in the following areas: ambitious, clean, imaginative, independent, and polite. Fathers and their children a-gree upon the following traits: ambitious, polite, and self-con-trolled. This data supports the idea that mothers understand how their children feel more accurately than do the fathers.

RECOMMENDATIONS

A few recommendations toward further research in this area
follow:

1. Include other variables of child rearing and moral charac-
teristics in a questionnaire, as there were not many significant cor-
relations with the males.

2. Identify an age category for the child rearing questionnaire.

3. Questions on child rearing may need to be changed to identify
different aspects of the ten areas. For example: instead of using
physical affection, other types of affection such as a warm feeling
may be used.

4. The group tested was a limited sample in that many of the
subjects were probably freshmen or sophomores in college. Probably
a majority of them were religious as the dorms they lived in were
owned by The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-Day-Saints two years
previous.

5. It might be well to use off campus housing residents as sub-
jects, non-college students, or even older subjects.

6. More subjects may have also changed the findings.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

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

Bell, R. Q. A reinterpretation of the d'rection of effects in studies of socialization. Psychological Review, 1968, 75, 81-95.

Bell, R. Q. Control of parent or care taker behavior by offspring period. Developmental Psychology, 1974, 4, 63-74, 763-772.

Boyce, P. and Jensen, L. Moral Reasoning: a philosophical and psychological integration. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1978.

Dlugokinski, E., and Firestone, I. F. Other centeredness and susceptibility to charitable appeals: effects of perceived discipline. Developmental Psychology, 1974, 10, 21-28.

Grusec, J. E. and Mischel, K. Model's characteristics as determinants of social learning. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1966, 4, 211-215.

Hoffman, Martin L. Parent discipline and the child's consideration of others. Child Development, 1963, 34, 573-588.

Hoffman, Martin L. Conscience, personality, and socialization techniques. Human Development, 1970, 13, 90-126.

Hoffman Martin L. Altruistic behav or in the parent-child relationship. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1975, 31 937-943.

Hoffman, Martin L. Moral internalization, peer power in the nature of peer-child interaction. Developmental Psychology, 1975, 2, 2, 228-239.

Hoffman, M. L. and Saltzstein, H. D. Parent practices and the development of children's moral orientations. In W. E. Mart n (Chm.), Parent Behav or and Children's Personality Development: Current Project Research. Symposium presented at annual meeting of the Amer can Psychological Associat on, Chicago, September 1, 1960.

Hoffman, M. L. and Saltzstein, H. D. Parent discipline and the child's moral development. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1977, pp. 45-57.

Hogan, R. Moral conduct and moral character: psyhological perspective. Psychological Bulletin. 1973, 79, 4, 217-232.

Jensen, Larry. That's not fair. Provo: Brigham Young University Press, 1978.

Jensen, L. and Buhanan, K. Resistance to temptation following three types of notivational instruction among four, six, and eight year old female children. Journal of Genetic Psychology, 1974, 125, 51-59.

Kane, J. and Lawler, E. Methods of peer assessment. Psychological Bulletin, May, 1978, 85, 3, 555-586.

Mussen, Paul and Eisenberg-Berg, Nancy. Roots of caring, sharing. and helping: the development of prosocial behavior in children. San Francisco: W. H. Freeman and Company, 1977.

Mussen, P., Rutherford, E., Harris, S., and Keasey, C. B. Honesty and altruism among preadolescents. Developmental Psychology, 1970, 3, 169-194.

Peterson, G. W. Nature and antecedents of adolescents conformity. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Brigham Young University, 1978.

Rokeach, Milton. The nature of human values. New York: The Free Press, 1973.

Rollins, Boyd. Test to measure parental behavior. Unpublished Manuscript, Brigham Young University, 1978.

Saltzstein, H. D. and Hoffman. M. Social influence and moral development: a perspective on the role of parents and peers. In Thomas Lickona, Moral development and behavior theory, research. and social issues, (Ed.), New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1976, pp. 253-265.

Scarr, S. The inheritance of sociability. American Psychologist, 1965, 20, 524. (Abstract).

Yarrow, M. R., Waxler, C. Z., and Scott, P. M. Child effects on adult behavior. Developmental Psychology, 1971, 5, 300-311.

APPENDIXES

Appendix A

Table 4

Self Ratings

Variable	F For Full Regression Model	DF	Proba- bility	Signif- icant Beta	F Ratio of Beta	Proba- bility	Multiple R	RSG Change	Simple R
	Male Positive Non-Morality with Father's Low Power Scores								
Positive Reasoning	4.44	1/16	.05	⁻.27	1.00	N.S.	.47	.22	⁻.47
Support	3.51	2/15	N.S.	.79	7.27	.01	.56	.10	.08
Companionship	5.16	3/14	.05	⁻.72	1.00	N.S.	.72	.10	⁻.43
Physical Affection	3.67	4/13	.05	⁻.12	.145	N.S.	.73	.21	⁻.27
	Male Positive Non-Morality with Father's High Power Scores								
Over Protection	6.28	1/16	.05	⁻.63	6.43	.05	.53	.28	⁻.53
Love Withdrawal	6.36	2/15	.01	.50	3.13	N.S.	.68	.17	.17
Inconsistency	4.21	3/14	.05	.38	1.34	N.S.	.69	.02	.19
Guilt	3.45	4/13	.05	⁻.33	1.01	N.S.	.72	.14	⁻.17
	Male Conventional Morality with Father's High Power Scores								
Over Protection	7.85	1/16	.05	⁻.62	5.61	.05	.57	.33	⁻.57
Love Withdrawal	4.38	2/15	.05	.44	2.10	N.S.	.61	.04	⁻.15

34

Table 4 (Continued)

Variable	F For Full Regression Model	DF	Proba-bility	Signif-icant Beta	F Ratio of Beta	Proba-bility	Multiple R	RSG Change	Simple R
Coercion	3.68	3/14	.05	⁻.36	1.41	N.S.	.66	.07	⁻.20
	Female Humanistic Morality with Mother's High Power Scores								
Inconsistency	4.74	1/21	.05	.65	5.91	.05	.43	.18	.43
	Female Conventional Morality with Mother's High Power Scores								
Inconsistency	6.04	2/21	.01	.58	5.41	.05	.61	.22	.38
Coercion	4.18	3/19	.05	.27	.82	N.S.	.63	.02	⁻.13
Love Withdrawal	3.20	4.18	.05	⁻.18	.42	N.S.	.64	.02	.17
	Female Humanistic Morality with Father's High Power Scores								
Inconsistency	12.09	1/22	.01	.68	12.84	.01	.60	.35	.60
Coercion	7.09	2/21	.01	.36	2.90	N.S.	.63	.05	.19
Guilt	5.63	3/20	.01	⁻.27	1.59	N.S.	.68	.05	.11
Over Protection	4.26	4/19	.05	⁻.13	.53	N.S.	.69	.01	.17
Love Withdrawal	3.24	5/18	.05	.03	.03	N.S.	.69	.00	.20

Table 4 (Continued)

Variable	F For Full Regression Model	DF	Proba-bility	Signif-icant Beta	F Ratio of Beta	Proba-bility	Multiple R	RSG Change	Simple R
	Female Positive Non-Morality with Father's Low Power Scores								
Companionship	8.09	1/22	.01	.52	5.54	.05	.52	.27	.52
Autonomy	6.02	2/21	.01	.36	3.92	.05	.60	.10	.22
Physical Affection	4.93	3/20	.05	.31	2.13	N.S.	.65	.06	.31
Support	3.69	4/19	.05	¯.22	.68	N.S.	.66	.01	.25
Positive Reasoning	2.99	5/18	.05	.17	.55	N.S.	.67	.02	.36

Appendix B

As part of my Masters Degree requirements I am asking you to help
by participating in this study. Please rate yourself and each of your
roommates on each of the 18 areas listed in Part I. Please also rate
your parents on the parent description scale which comprises the sec-
ond part of the questionnaire. These ratings will be held confiden-
tial, will not be disclosed to anyone and will be used for statistical
and research purposes only.

You should be able to complete this form within 30 minutes. If you
are not sure about an answer, mark what seems to be most correct. Since
this is used for research only, an exact answer is not always required;
but you should answer each question. Thank you for your willingness to
help.

Begin now by turning the page, please be sure to write the correct
name at the top of each page.

After you have filled out this questionnaire would you be willing
to retake this questionnaire again during the month of January or Feb-
ruary. (I need to evaluate the test reliability over a period of time)?
If so, please sign your first name and last initial. _____

PART I

On this page and the five that follow is a personality rating form.
Please quickly fill out this page for yourself and each of the fol-
lowing for your roommates. Write your first name and last initial
on this page and do the same for each of your roommates on the pages
that follow.

Circle the number most like_____

(Your Name and Last Initial)

Very Much Like Me	Somewhat Like Me	Not Like Me	
3	2	1	AMBITIOUS, Hard-working, Aspiring
3	2	1	BROADMINDED, Open-minded
3	2	1	CAPABLE, Competent, Effective
3	2	1	CHEERFUL, Lighthearted, Joyful
3	2	1	CLEAN, Neat, Tidy
3	2	1	COURAGEOUS, Standing up for your beliefs
3	2	1	FORGIVING, Willing to pardon others
3	2	1	HELPFUL, Working for the welfare of others
3	2	1	HONEST, Sincere, Truthful
3	2	1	IMAGINATIVE, Daring, Creative
3	2	1	INDEPENDENT, Self-Reliant, Self-Sufficient
3	2	1	INTELLECTUAL, Intelligent, Reflective
3	2	1	LOGICAL, Consistent, Rational
3	2	1	LOVING, Affectionate, Tender
3	2	1	OBEDIENT, Dutiful, Respectful
3	2	1	POLITE, Courteous, Well-Mannered
3	2	1	RESPONSIBLE, Dependable, Reliable
3	2	1	SELF-CONTROLLED, Restrained, Self-Disciplined

Circle the number that is most like _____
<div align="right">(Roommate's Name and Last Initial)</div>

Very Much Like Him/Her	Somewhat Like Him/Her	Not Like Him/Her	
3	2	1	AMBITIOUS, Hard-working, Aspiring
3	2	1	BROADMINDED, Open-minded
3	2	1	CAPABLE, Competent, Effective
3	2	1	CHEERFUL, Lighthearted, Joyful
3	2	1	CLEAN, Neat, Tidy
3	2	1	COURAGEOUS, Standing up for your beliefs
3	2	1	FORGIVING, Willing to pardon others
3	2	1	HELPFUL, Working for the welfare of others
3	2	1	HONEST, Sincere, Truthful
3	2	1	IMAGINATIVE, Daring, Creative
3	2	1	INDEPENDENT, Self-reliant, Self-sufficient
3	2	1	INTELLECTUAL, Intelligent, Reflective
3	2	1	LOGICAL, Consistent, Rational
3	2	1	LOVING, Affectionate, Tender
3	2	1	OBEDIENT, Dutiful, Respectful
3	2	1	POLITE, Courteous, Well-Mannered
3	2	1	RESPONSIBLE, Dependable, Reliable
3	2	1	SELF-CONTROLLED, Restrained, Self-disciplined

PART II

Circle the answer which best describes how your mother and father
have treated you. Please rate each on a scale of 1-5.

    1 . . . . . Never
    2 . . . . . Hardly Ever
    3 . . . . . Sometimes
    4 . . . . . Fairly Often
    5 . . . . . Very Often

Mother	Father		
1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1.	Over the past several years s/he trusted me as a family member.
1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	2.	Over the past several years s/he has felt affection for me and I was certain of it.
1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	3.	Over the past several years s/he made me feel they were there if I needed them.
1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	4.	Over the past several years s/he gave me a sense of security when I was with them.
1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	5.	S/he explained to me how good they felt when I did something they liked.
1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	6.	S/he told me how much they loved me.
1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	7.	S/he told me how much they had suffered for me.
1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	8.	S/he told me someday I would be punished for my bad behavior.
1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	9.	S/he insisted I follow a rule one day and then didn't care whether or not I followed the same rule the next day.
1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	10.	S/he usually let me do anything I wanted to do.
1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	11.	S/he allowed me to be out on my own as often as I pleased.
1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	12.	S/he hugged and kissed me often.
1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	13.	S/he told me how good others felt when I did what was right.
1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	14.	S/he told me how good I should have felt when I did what was right.
1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	15.	S/he wouldn't have anything to do with me when I upset them until I found a way to make up.
1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	16.	S/he hugged or kissed me goodnight.
1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	17.	S/he told me of all they had done for me.
1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	18.	S/he told me exactly when to be back when I went out.

Mother	Father		
1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	19.	S/he only kept rules when it suited them.
1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	20.	S/he almost always wanted to know who phoned me or talked to me and what they said.
1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	21.	S/he believed in showing their love for me.
1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	22.	S/he would not talk to me when I displeased them.
1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	23.	S/he wished I would have stayed closer around home where they could have taken better care of me.
1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	24.	S/he avoided looking at me when I had disappointed them.
1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	25.	S/he shared many activities with me.
1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	26.	S/he was always finding fault with me.
1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	27.	S/he often complained about what I did.
1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	28.	S/he seemed to enjoy doing things with me.
1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	29.	S/he let me go out with friends about anytime I wanted
1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	30.	S/he punished me for doing somethings one day, but ignored it the next.
1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	31.	S/he frequently changed the rules I was supposed to follow.
1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	32.	S/he gave me as much freedom as I wanted.
1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	33.	S/he talked with me often.
1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	34.	S/he was always getting after me.
1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	35.	S/he was not very patient with me.
1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	36.	S/he stopped talking to me if I hurt their feelings until I made them happy again.
1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	37.	S/he liked to talk to me and be with me much of the time.
1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	38.	S/he wanted to control whatever I did.
1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	39.	S/he told me that someday I would be sorry I wasn't a better child.
1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	40.	S/he explained to me that when I shared with other family members, they liked me for sharing.

Appendix C

As part of a special study being conducted at Utah State University, we are asking the parents of students who have already completed a similar test to fill out the following questionnaire. Please rate _____ on each of the 18 areas listed on page 1. Please also rate yourself as to how you raised the above child on pages 2 and 3. These ratings will be held confidential, will not be disclosed to anyone, and will be used for statistical and research purposes only.

We need a seperate rating from both father and mother. We are asking the father to fill out the green form and the mother to fill out the pink form. If for some reason your child's other parent is not able to complete this study, please indicate why with an X in the appropriate box.

☐ Not living together (Divorced or Separated)
☐ Decised
☐ Out of town for several days
☐ Other

You should be able to complete this form within 15 minutes. If you are not sure about an answer, mark what seems to be most correct. Since this is used for research only, an exact answer is not always required, but you should answer each question. Thank you for your willingness to help.

After completing this questionnaire, please enclose it in the self-stamped addressed envelope and return it to me. Thank you!

You may begin now by turning the page.

Sincerely,

Dr. Larry Jensen
Department of Family and Human Development, Utah State University

Page 1

On this page is a personality rating form. Please quickly rate your son/daughter by circling the number that is most like him/her.
Please be sure the father is filling out the green form and the mother is filling out the pink one. Thank you!

Very Much Like Him/Her	Somewhat Like Him/Her	Not Like Him/Her	
3	2	1	AMBITIOUS, Hard-working, Aspiring
3	2	1	BROADMINDED, Open-Minded
3	2	1	CAPABLE, Competent, Effective
3	2	1	CHEERFUL, Lighthearted, Joyful
3	2	1	CLEAN, Neat, Tidy
3	2	1	COURAGEOUS, Standing up for their Beliefs
3	2	1	FORGIVING, Willing to Pardon Others
3	2	1	HELPFUL, Working for Other's Welfare
3	2	1	HONEST, Sincere, Truthful
3	2	1	IMAGINATIVE, Daring, Creative
3	2	1	INDEPENDENT, Self-Reliant and Sufficient
3	2	1	INTELLECTUAL, Intelligent, Reflective
3	2	1	LOGICAL, Consistent, Rational
3	2	1	LOVING, Affectionate, Tender
3	2	1	OBEDIENT, Dutiful, Respectful
3	2	1	POLITE, Courteous, Well-Mannered
3	2	1	RESPONSIBLE, Dependable, Reliable
3	2	1	SELF-CONTROLLED, Restrained, Disciplined

Page 2

Circle the answer which best describes how as a mother or father you have raised your son/daughter. Please rate each on a scale of 1-5.

```
1 . . . . . Never
2 . . . . . Hardly Ever
3 . . . . . Sometimes
4 . . . . . Fairly Often
5 . . . . . Very Often
```

Father/Mother

1 2 3 4 5   1. Over the past several years I trusted him/her as a family member.

1 2 3 4 5   2. Over the past several years I have felt affection for him/her and he/she was certain of it.

1 2 3 4 5   3. Over the past several years I made him/her feel I was there if he/she needed me.

1 2 3 4 5   4. Over the past several years I gave him/her a sense of security when I was with this child.

1 2 3 4 5   5. I explained to him/her how good I felt when he/she did something I liked.

1 2 3 4 5   6. I told him/her how much I loved him/her.

1 2 3 4 5   7. I told him/her how much I had suffered for him/her.

1 2 3 4 5   8. I told him/her someday he/she would be punished for his/her bad behavior.

1 2 3 4 5   9. I insisted s/he follow a rule one day and then didn't care whether or not he/she followed the same rule the next day.

1 2 3 4 5   10. I usually let him/her do anything he/she wanted to do.

1 2 3 4 5   11. I allowed him/her to be out on their own as often as he/she pleased.

1 2 3 4 5   12. I hugged and kissed him/her often.

1 2 3 4 5   13. I told him/her how good others felt when he/she did what was right.

1 2 3 4 5   14. I told him/her how good they should have felt when he/she did what was right.

1 2 3 4 5   15. I wouldn't have anything to do with him/her when he/she upset me until he/she found a way to make up.

1 2 3 4 5   16. I hugged or kissed him/her goodnight.

Page 3

Father/Mother

1	2	3	4	5	17.	I told him/her of all I had done for him/her.
1	2	3	4	5	18.	I told him/her exactly when to be back when he/she went out.
1	2	3	4	5	19.	I only kept rules when it suited me.
1	2	3	4	5	20.	I almost always wanted to know who phoned him/her or talked with and what was said.
1	2	3	4	5	21.	I believed in showing my love for him/her.
1	2	3	4	5	22.	I would not talk to him/her when he/she displeased me.
1	2	3	4	5	23.	I wished he/she would have stayed closer around home where I could have taken better care of him/her.
1	2	3	4	5	24.	I avoided looking at him/her when he/she disappointed me.
1	2	3	4	5	25.	I shared many activities with him/her.
1	2	3	4	5	26.	I was always finding fault with him/her.
1	2	3	4	5	27.	I often complained about what he/she did.
1	2	3	4	5	28.	I seemed to enjoy doing things with him/her.
1	2	3	4	5	29.	I let him/her go out with friends about any time he/she wanted.
1	2	3	4	5	30.	I punished him/her for doing somethings one day, but ignored it the next.
1	2	3	4	5	31.	I frequently changed the rules s/he was supposed to follow.
1	2	3	4	5	32.	I gave him/her as much freedom as he/she wanted.
1	2	3	4	5	33.	I talked with him/her often.
1	2	3	4	5	34.	I was always getting after him/her.
1	2	3	4	5	35.	I was not very patient with him/her.
1	2	3	4	5	36.	I stopped talking to him/her if he/she hurt my feelings until he/she made me happy again.
1	2	3	4	5	37.	I liked to talk to and be with him/her much of the time.
1	2	3	4	5	38.	I wanted to control whatever s/he did.
1	2	3	4	5	39.	I told him/her someday he/she would be sorry for not being a better child.
1	2	3	4	5	40.	I explained that when he/she shared with other family members I liked him/her for sharing.

Appendix D

KEY TO PART II

1) Autonomy: Questions 10, 11, 29, 32.

2) Coercion: Questions 26, 27, 34, 35.

3) Companionship: Questions 25, 28, 33, 37.

4) Guilt: Questions 7, 8, 17, 39.

5) Inconsistency: Questions 9, 19, 30, 31.

6) Love Withdrawal: Questions 15, 22, 24, 36.

7) Over Protection: Questions 18, 20, 23, 38.

8) Physical Affection: Questions 6, 12, 16, 21.

9) Positive Reasoning: Questions 5, 13, 14, 40.

10) Support: Questions 1, 2, 3, 4.

VITA

Melody T. Beutler

Candidate for the Degree of

Master of Science

Thesis: Effects of Perceived Child Rearing Practices on Moral
Behavior

Major Field: Home Economics and Consumer Education

Biographical Information:

Personal Data: Born in Vernal, Utah, February 17, 1955.
Married Brent Beutler, June 11, 1976. One son,
Barry Charles.

Education: Attended elementary and secondary schools in
Vernal, Utah; graduated in 1973. Attended Snow College
in Ephraim, Utah; graduated in 1975 with Associate
Degree in Secretarial Science. Attended Utah State
University in Logan, Utah; graduated in 1977 with a
Bachelor of Science degree with a major in Home
Economics Education; graduated in 1979 with a Master
of Science degree in Home Economics and Consumer
Education.

Professional Experience: Extension Service 4-H Aid, summer
of 1976.