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Introduction

The standards that parents set for their children and the expectations they hold are an important consideration in studying family dynamics, development of a child's self-esteem, quality of parental care, emotional responses to required and desired behavior, and virtually any other aspect of the parent-child relationship. Parents maintain expectations of their child's physical, socio-emotional, and intellectual development. Children's self-concept, self-esteem, and general emotional well-being are all affected by their ability to fulfill parents' expectations. Failure to live up to a standard that is important to the parent could lead to psychological distress for the child and disruption in the family. Parental standards and their importance to the parent also affect the methods of discipline that they use in correcting children, which, in turn, can influence the child's development in a variety of ways (e.g. moral internalization).

Very general measures of parental "beliefs" have been developed. Development does not occur at general levels, however. Parents and children affect, react, and interact at the level of specific behaviors. An instrument to assess the specific expectations/standards of parents has not yet been developed. Such a measure would be useful for clinicians, therapists, and researchers alike in determining a particular parent's expectations, which could then be related to the child's functioning and psychological characteristics. It might also be
helpful to compare an individual parent’s standards with that of the majority of parents to determine where that parent falls within the population. Differences could than be detected, and perhaps unrealistically high expectations could be identified. Clinicians could eventually identify characteristic expectations of particular parenting styles.

The present study is an evaluation of a recently developed instrument to assess specific expectations that parents have of children. Preliminary evidence of the quality of this instrument will be presented.

Review of the Literature

Parental beliefs/expectations and models of parenting. Many theoreticians have proposed models of parental behavior and parental beliefs. Rubin and Mills (1992) propose that parental beliefs affect the child through their manifestations in the parent’s behavior. They suggest that promoting social competence and prosocial behavior in children is guided by the goals that a parent sets. The socialization goals of parents influence their behavior, but are accompanied by other mediating factors, such as individual personalities, qualities of the parent-child relationship, socio-ecological factors, etc. This information processing model asserts that parental beliefs are influenced by many factors, and these beliefs in turn influence parental behavior, which impacts child development. Murphey (1992) described a similar model in his review of the research on
parental beliefs. He adds that these beliefs are especially influenced when the parent's perception of the child is highly discrepant from his/her beliefs. It is also theorized that the best environment for children is one in which the parent's expectations match the competencies and ideas of the child (Goodnow, 1988). These expectancies are affected by a child's conduct, sex, and attractiveness (Adams and LaVoie, 1975). They also vary by social class, parenting experience, and culture (McGillicuddy-Delisi, 1992) and the performance of the child (Peet and Melson, 1991). McGillicuddy-Delisi identifies possible origins of beliefs as adoptions from the culture, reflections on a parent's experiences with the child, or rationales for one's behavior. These expectations may also be a result of a family's code: the paradigms, myths, stories, and rituals that transmit guidelines (Sameroff and Fiese, 1992).

Dix (1992) emphasizes the importance of goals and empathy in the parenting process. Parents attempt to achieve a goal by activating a plan to achieve them. They evaluate events in light of the goals, experiencing positive emotions if they are met and negative emotions if they are not. He asserts that these goals orient and organize a parent's cognitions. Parents' attributions and assessments of children's behavior are influenced by the desirability of the behavior, as well as by the goals of the parents (Dix, 1986, 1993). He also emphasizes the effect that these will have on the child's behavior, as well as reactions to the child's misconduct (Dix and Reinhold, 1991).
Parents' beliefs have an effect on the actions that they display with their children. In addition, parents' actions are often a reflection of their beliefs (Sigel, 1992). Grusec et al. (1993) asserted that a parent's behavior and his/her model of relationships are mediated by his/her cognitions. Abusing parents reported significantly less accurate developmental expectations than non-abusing parents (Kravitz and Driscoll, 1983). Specific violations of behavior expectations have also been reported as precursors to physical discipline (Holden et al., 1993). Holden et al. found that parents reported violations such as "inappropriate use of an object", "defiant disobedience", "physical aggression", etc. as precipitators of punishment.

Other models of parenting have addressed disagreement between parents and children. Goodnow (1992, 1993) proposes that parents express a position, the child notices and interprets the position, the child accepts or rejects the message, and finally a divergence is noticed and responded to. She asserts that a parent puts forth a range of alternatives, from optimal to unacceptable. The effects will be most noticeable if the child violates or disagrees with the alternatives from the "unacceptable" extreme end of the range.

Parental expectations have a profound effect on the behavior and development of children. Transmitting knowledge and expectations of the world elicits behavioral accommodation, and social expectancies regulate appraisals and emotions (Castanzo and Siegel, A., 1993). When differentiating between sex of the
child, parental beliefs about development are related to a child’s development (Peet and Melson, 1991).

Moretti and Higgins propose that a child’s emotional state and development are dependent upon self-evaluation. Using Higgin’s self-discrepancy theory (Higgins, 1987) as a model, they assert that children evaluate themselves through the use of standards and guides set by themselves and significant others. Children evaluate their actual-self (their perception of their attributes) using their ideal-self (their perception of the wishes from their parents) and their ought-self (their perception of the requirements set by parents). A difference between these self-state representations (actual-ought or actual-ideal) will result in negative affective states. Actual-ought discrepancies are often accompanied by the parent presenting negative outcomes, while actual-ideal discrepancies are accompanied by the parent withholding positive outcomes (Higgins, 1989). Dejection-based emotions will result from a persistent discrepancy between the actual and the ideal-self, and agitation-based emotions can result from ongoing discrepancies between the actual and the ought-self (Moretti & Higgins, 1990).

Measures of Parental Beliefs. Several instruments have been developed for assessment in the area of parenting and parental beliefs. The majority of these measures assess parents’ perceptions of the child rearing process, their expectations of specific behaviors at particular developmental milestones, and their general attitudes of parenting.
The Parenting Inventory: Young Children (Fox, 1992) was designed to "assess the behaviors and developmental expectations" of parents of one to four year old children. Results indicated that the measure reliably assessed expectation, discipline, and nurturing factors (Fox, 1992), and maintained a significant indication of validity (Bentley et al., 1992). "My child should be able to use the toilet without help" and "my child should be able to ride a tricycle" are two of the scale items that clustered in the expectations factor.

Other measures dealing with parental beliefs have focused on the ideas each parent has about being a parent. For example, Block's Child Rearing Practices Report (1965) was designed to measure the attitudes, values, and behaviors of child rearing practices (Dekovic et al., 1991). Dekovic et al. found that this instrument had reliable scales and support for construct validity, along with an ability to differentiate based on socio-economic status. Other similar measures have identified parental strictness scales in the assessment of different dimensions of parental-rearing practices (Ross et al., 1983).

A few measures assessing parental attitudes along with children’s behavior and personality, such as The Parental Attitude Scale, the Parental Attitude Research Instrument, and the Maryland Parent Attitude Survey, were developed in the early years of parental attitude research (Slough et al., 1978, Tolor, 1967). The Maternal Expectations, Attitudes and Belief Inventory assesses the beliefs and expectations of the behavior and
development of pre-school children and was shown to discriminate between parents of clinic-referred and non-clinic children (Rickard et al., 1984).

Holden and Edwards (1989) reviewed 83 parent child-rearing attitude questionnaires and identified five specific domains that were assessed: attitudes, behavioral intentions, beliefs, self-perceptions, and values. These authors also emphasized the lack of these measures' specific items, distinctions between constructs, and contextual information. Although beneficial, these instruments and studies did not capture the attributes proposed by models, such as that of Moretti and Higgins (1990b).

Measuring Ideal and Ought Expectations: Q methodology. Moretti and Higgins (1990b) define ought expectations as self-guides of the "duties and obligations that they believe someone holds for them". Ideal standards are "hopes or wishes that they believe someone else holds for them". The actual-self is represented by "the attributes they believe they actually possess". In order to measure these representations, one would have to find what parental expectations exist and how important these are to parents. Researchers could go about this by interviewing clinicians, interviewing parents, consulting the literature, or any means that assess a general agreement on how a child should or ideally would be. In operationalizing the self-discrepancy model, one would also have to measure perceptions of actual behavior. These assessments of representations could then be compared with each other to determine if discrepancies exist.
and the consequences of these. In order to assess the constructs proposed by Moretti and Higgins, one needs to establish an ideographic approach (Moretti and Higgins, 1990a). The subjective nature of a parent's expectations requires a measure that deals with individual cases or instances.

These assessments could be undertaken using techniques such as rating scales, interviews, questionnaires, etc. Each of these presents problems in assessing a domain such as parental expectations, however. For example, Holden and Edwards (1989) identified the problem of a Likert scale's social desirability and use of vague probability terms. Responses are unclearly defined and fail to address inter-individual ratings, as well as questioning an individual's ability to distinguish between different ratings. The data is subject to response sets, the tendency for any one subject to respond in a manner that is consistent for that individual (Block, 1961).

Q technique, presents a unique solution to the limitations of these traditional methods. Q methodology has become increasingly popular as its reputation has spread. Brown (1968) cited 600 references that referred to Q methodology. In 1977 Brown cited additional references adding to the variety of areas of application for Q sort methodology. The reference for Q technique currently exceeds 1500 citations. Q sort methods have been used in such domains as measuring parenting behaviors (Pease et al., 1989) and the definition of ego identity status (Mallory, 1989). The California Q-Set was developed as a personality
measure and has been accepted as a valid means for objectifying subjective data (Block, 1961). Q methodology has even been used to study politics and political opinion (Brown, 1986).

Q sort methodology was first introduced in 1935. William Stephenson and T.H. Thompson described it at relatively the same time, although Stephenson elaborated on the technique during the next fifty years.

According to Stephenson, Q methodology was developed within the context of the theory that our behavior is associated with "self-referent (emotional)" statements. These statements can then be used as a population, gathered to form a Q sample, and statistically analyzed (cf. "theory of concourse"). Sorters review their behavior in order to perform a Q sort. A Q sort is a self-expression of feeling about an individual’s behavior, thus providing a way for clinicians and researchers to study the subjective domain (Stephenson, 1987). In fact, he proposed that Q methodology solves the problem of induction in science. Subjective hypotheses are now given objective qualities, e.g. they are repeatable and can incorporate information from various observers on the same material (Stephenson, 1979). The self-reference of an individual’s subjectivity is maintained, and this method successfully capitalizes on the importance of studying individuals (McKeown and Thomas, 1988).

Block (1961) extends Stephenson’s proposal to observer-ratings. Observer evaluations are presented in a manner that allows for objective evaluation. The results are objectified by
limiting the evaluators to a common language. The method provides objective data for subjective domains.

Characteristics of Q sorting. The Q sort method is most commonly a forced-choice method. Evaluators sort Q items into a specified number of categories, each with a required number of items to be placed in each category (Block, 1961). Block summarizes the advantages of the forced Q sort method. This quality permits an assessment of equivalence of item meaning between subjects. More discriminations are required, thus reducing the effect of reporting very general things about an individual. The resulting data is reliable, provides additional information, and is presented in an accessible form.

The Q sort method produces data that is ipsative in nature. The scores are distributed around an individual’s mean rather than a population mean. This allows persons to be correlated across variables (Dawis, 1987). The variables are scaled relative to each other, with certain criteria and a subject as a frame of reference (Block, 1961). Though Hicks could not recommend using ipsative instruments in 1970, he acknowledged that using a purely ipsative test could be justified if it reduces, more conclusively than a normative form, a response bias that affects validity (Hicks, 1970), which is, in fact, the case.

Saville and Wilson (1991) demonstrated that ipsative data can be just as reliable and valid as normative data. In fact, ipsative scores were found to correlate more strongly with "true" scores than normative forms. These researchers reminded that each
form, normative or ipsative, has its own disadvantages. They found no evidence to suggest that strictly normative data should be used across situations.

*Description of the Q.* The Q sort consists of a number of statements that the subject sorts into a somewhat flattened quasi-normal distribution. Stephenson suggests that the sorter first look through all items to get a "general impression". The sorter then places these into categories on a continuum of significance to the subject (Stephenson, 1953). The resulting distribution will be characteristic of a normal curve and present a description characterizing the person being evaluated (Block, 1961).

*Advantages and Disadvantages of the Method.* Ozer (1993) describes five advantages of using the Q sort method. 1) Raters do not need to be trained. Anyone with an understanding of the language can accomplish a successful Q sort. 2) This method can include information from a range of sources. 3) This method controls rater error by minimizing response bias through equal distributions. Social desirability is also reduced since there are only a limited number of slots for desirable items. 4) Q sort methodology addresses the challenge of age appropriate instruments. The same Q sort has been used successfully with subjects at various ages in developmental psychological research. 5) This type of instrument provides opportunities for assessment of a variety of constructs, use for many other purposes, and analyses of the data. Ozer asserts that Q methodology reduces
error and bias through its requirement of careful judgments against an explicit standard.

Q sort data also reduces response sets and order effects (Block, 1961). The forced distribution "forces" raters to produce similar evaluation constructs. Block also emphasizes the elimination of inter- and intra-judge influences and the exhaustive coverage that results from an item sort. Q sort assessment requires only a small number of respondents (McKeown and Thomas, 1988).

Though Q technique is a substantial improvement over other assessment techniques, it is faced with minor limitations. Tenopyr (1988) cautions the use of construct interpretations from Q data. One reliable scale of an ipsative measure can artificially increase the reliability estimates of the entire measure. She suggests that this problem caused by scale interdependence could be limited by developing internal consistency estimates with items in normative form. Statistical data from Q sorts cannot be tested for significance in the usual way, and should not be used (Ozer, 1993). Instead, traditional empirical procedures need to be modified (e.g. using a modified analysis of variance) to accommodate data obtained from Q methodology (Neff and Cohen, 1967). Again, both ipsative and normative measures have their limitations, it is a matter of exchanging one bias for another (Saville and Willson, 1991). In the case of assessing an ideographic domain, such as parental expectations, Q sort methodology seems the appropriate choice.
The ESP and its development (Ferguson, 1990, Ferguson & Crowley, 1993). The Expectation Sort for Parents (ESP) was developed based on Moretti & Higgin's (1990b) application of self-discrepancy theory to parents and their children. It is a 70 item measure of parents' ideal, ought, and actual conceptions of their children. These items were developed through an extensive review of the literature, parental interviews, and professional psychologists. The resulting 70 items were distributed amongst thirteen subscales: antisocial behavior, self-control, sexual attitudes, athletic ability, physical attributes, physical hygiene, prosocial behavior, temperamental characteristics, peer interactions, social responsibility, honesty, respect for authority, and school performance (see Appendix A). These items were phrased negatively because parents are more aware of their standards if they are violated. These items containing expectations of parents can be distinguished as ideal or ought constructs and also compared with a parent's perception of the child's actual behavior.

The data obtained through this measure can be used to determine the expectations that parents have for their children (Ferguson et al., 1994a), as well as the relation between the expectations and the actual behavior. Discrepancy scores can then be calculated by correlating the ideals with the actuals, as well as the oughts with the actuals. This would determine any differences that might exist between parents' expectations and children's behavior. These scores could then be related to the
child’s emotional state (Ferguson et al., 1994b).

The Expectation Sort for Parents is administered over three sessions to parents of 5-12 year old children. Parents are given seventy items that contain descriptions of expectations. Each item has an ought, an ideal, and an actual version. The ideal and ought versions are worded negatively, and the parent has been trained as to how to interpret the phrasing. The parent first sorts out the ten that he/she feels do not apply to him/her.

The parent then selects thirty of the sixty items that he/she considers ought standards for the child. (The remaining thirty are sorted into a "Does not apply" group. The thirty ought items are then placed by the parent on a five-point forced normal distribution ranging from "I agree slightly that my child ought not..." to "I agree strongly that my child ought not..."

The parent’s next task is to sort the remaining thirty items (those that were categorized as "Does not apply" in the ought sort) on a five-point forced normal distribution that constitutes the ideal sort. These items are sorted in range from "I agree slightly that ideally my child would not..." to "I agree strongly that my child ideally would not..."

The thirty ought items and the thirty ideal items are then matched with the sixty corresponding actual items by the experimenter. The parent takes these sixty items that contain descriptions of a child’s actual behavior and sorts these on a forced five-point normal distribution ranging from "Not descriptive/not true of my child" to "Very descriptive/very true
Purpose

The purpose of this research was to present a preliminary evaluation of the ESP. In addition to evaluating the evidence for the theoretical constructs behind this measure and investigating how parents performed the sorts, this paper will provide preliminary evidence for the internal validity of the Expectation Sort for Parents. We were interested in seeing how a sample of parents would classify the items and how this relates to the constructs assessed by this measure. We wanted to see if parents could agree amongst themselves on particular items to provide support for the measure’s internal validity, see also Ferguson et al. (1994a). If a large percentage of parents would rate an item similarly, we would have evidence that this measure is assessing the phenomena it purports to measure. Parents should display variance between themselves on the ideal items, but not on the ought items. Ought items are theorized to be more agreed upon, representing common standards. A portion of support for the ESP’s validity lies in its ability to accurately tap the constructs of ideals and oughts. Our first research question was whether parents would show more variability sorting the ideal items than the ought items.

This study also investigated this measure’s ability to assess ideal and ought constructs by determining the categorization of the thirteen subscales through an inter-item
analysis. Theoretically, scales that represent domains such as societal standards and moral behavior should be considered ought standards. This research looked at this measure’s ability to discriminate between the categorization of these scales. If this instrument is actually assessing ideal and ought standards, then certain scales should have greater parental agreement as ought items, and others should be generally agreed upon as ideal scale items. Thus, this study’s second research question investigated whether ideal and ought standards were represented in the appropriate scales.

In addition, this paper will investigate the ESP’s ought and ideals compared with the actual sort. Moretti and Higgins (1990b) explained that expectations accompanied by strong affect, i.e. highly salient expectations, will encourage prosocial and obedient behavior in children. Thus, if the ESP is measuring the constructs that the author claims, highly salient ought items should be related to low actual scores, at least for the majority of parents. Ought items are phrased negatively and reflect standards such as "My child ought not steal", while the actual items are phrased as a presence of the behavior. Thus, a high score on the ought sort translates into a standard that must not be violated, and a corresponding low actual score is a report that the child actually does not engage in the behavior that he/she is not supposed to. Children normally will conform their behavior to the absolutely necessary standards of their parents. In fact, it is when this does not occur, that psychological
dysfunction occurs. This study's third research question deals with whether high ought items are related to low actual scores, as Moretti and Higgins proposed.

In answering these three questions, this research will be able to provide preliminary evidence for the validity of this instrument. If results are displayed as they are hypothesized by theories defining the constructs of ideals, oughts, and actuals; then the validity of the ESP would be preliminarily supported.

Method

Data that had been collected on 81 subjects at T. Ferguson's lab at Utah State University were used. These subjects (parents of 5-12 year old children) had been recruited throughout the community and had performed the ESP sort over three sessions as well as a battery of other measures.

SPSS was utilized to determine the response by subjects on a per-item basis. Different calculations were performed to determine the frequency of parental response. First, calculations were done to determine the frequency of rating an item as a high ought or a high ideal. (Ratings at the extreme ends of the curves provide more information about the parent's concept of an expectation. These items should be more salient to the parent and are considered most important to the parent (Block, 1961). Percentages of subjects were calculated for those who rated each item as a 4 or a 5. This was done by dividing the number of responses of this rating by the number of valid cases for that
item. This would enable the discovery of the most salient, and thus the more important, ideal and ought items.

Calculations were also performed to determine the distribution of parents' actual ratings of their children. The percentage of parents coding an item as a 4 or a 5 on the actual scale was calculated. The number of parents rating the item as a 4 or a 5 was divided by the total number of subjects. The percentage of parents rating an actual as low (1 or 2) was also figured. Similar calculations were done on the items most frequently sorted out. The items were arranged with their corresponding parental percentages in columns to provide a reference for determining parental agreement. The largest percentages were placed in descending order to determine the items with the greatest amount of parental agreement. These calculations, including some earlier versions using slightly different data, were also presented in Ferguson et al. (1994a).

This research additionally entailed determining how the thirteen subscales of the ESP compared with parental response. The percentages of parents coding an item as a high ideal and the percentage coding that item as a high ought were noted throughout the thirteen scales. For example, each item on the antisocial behavior scale was paired with the respective percentages of parental response. If an item was rated as a high ought by a greater percentage of the parents than those who rated it as a high ideal, the item was marked as an ought. The number of items within each scale containing a higher percentage of either high
oughts or high ideals was noted and compared. These percentages of parents served as an indicator of the general categorization of items based on their scale membership.

Percentages of parental agreement were used to compare the salient oughts with the high and low actuals. The percentage of parents rating an item as either a 4 or a 5 ought was compared with the percentage of parents coding the corresponding actual item as a 1, 2 or a 4, 5. These comparisons were accomplished by selecting highly salient ought items and determining the corresponding low actual percentages.

Results

This evaluation of the Expectation Sort for Parents resulted in encouraging preliminary results. Parental agreement was more varied for items coded as ideals. A much larger percentage of parents were able to agree upon the ought classification of an item (see also Ferguson et al., 1994a). For example the top five ought items (the items that the largest percentage of parents reported agreeing with strongly or very strongly) ranged in percentage of agreement from 43% to 63%, while the top five ideal items ranged from only 28% to 33% agreement. Item 41 resulted in the highest agreement for being a high ought standard, "My child ought not tell lies", and item 36 was the top ideal standard, "My child ideally would not have difficulty expressing himself/herself". The percentage of parental agreement for ought standards was consistently greater than that for ideal standards,
as hypothesized. (See tables 1-1, 1-2, and 1-3).

The ESP also produced results that showed the items of the thirteen subscales were coded as hypothesized. The antisocial behavior, social responsibility, and honesty subscales were all considered by parents to represent ought standards. More items in these scales were considered representations of salient ought standards rather than salient ideals. 73% of the items on the antisocial behavior scale were considered ought standards. 80% of the items on the social responsibility scale represented ought standards, and 100% of the items on the honesty scale were overwhelmingly coded as oughts. Though the prosocial behavior scale consisted of only 44% ought items, the large percentage of agreement on the specific ought items shows that this might be considered an ought scale with the use of a different calculation method. The rest of the scales contained a larger majority of ideal items. These percentages provide evidence that the ESP is actually measuring ideal and ought expectations that parents have for their children since the parents’ coding of these constructs are falling as theory dictates. (See table 2-1).

The comparison between salient ought standards and the actual ratings also provided some evidence that the Expectation Sort for Parents is measuring the appropriate phenomena. The ten most important ought items (6, 16, 17, 24, 26, 27, 41, 45, 55, 57) had corresponding parental agreement on low actuals ranging from 5% to 75%. Only one of these top ten items had less than 29% agreement as a low actual. In addition, actual items with the
greatest parental agreement with ratings of 1 or 2 were related to scales that had more agreed upon salient ought items. In fact, 82% of the "top" low actuals were from scales that had over 43% of its items coded by more parents as high oughts than high ideals. The fact that the overwhelming majority of highly salient ought items were accompanied by significantly agreed upon low actual scores adds additional credence to the quality of this instrument based on the Moretti and Higgins model. (See tables 3-1 and 3-2).

Conclusions and Discussion

These results have shown preliminary support for the validity of the Expectation Sort for Parents. Hypotheses were presented based on our knowledge of parental expectations and the self-discrepancy model and then compared with the information provided by this measure. The parental agreement that resulted provided the necessary evidence for considering this instrument a valid assessment of the ideal, ought, and actual self-representations proposed by Moretti and Higgins (1990b).

Further investigation of this instrument should include additional assessments of validity and reliability, along with factor analyses. Other research might also investigate the power of this instrument for additional populations.

The area of parental beliefs, ideas, and expectations has been shown to be in need of instruments that accurately assess these domains. Though further research is needed, this instrument
should prove to be a necessary and successful instrument in determining the expectations that parents have for their children.
**RESULTS**

### Table 1-1

**Parental Agreement on Ideals and Oughts**

(of parents coding item as 4 or 5 ideal(I) or ought(O)/number of valid cases=percent agreeing)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>O</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 1-2

**Top Oughts**

(Items with the greatest parental agreement)

- **Item 41**: "My child ought not tell lies" (63%)
- **Item 55**: "My child ought not shoplift" (62%)
- **Item 6**: "My child ought not play with matches or other potentially dangerous materials" (58%)
- **Item 57**: "My child ought not cheat in games or on school work" (47%)
- **Item 27**: "My child ought not fail to help another child who is in pain or distress" (41%)

### Table 1-3

**Top Ideals**

(Items with the greatest parental agreement)

- **Item 36**: "Ideally my child would not have difficulty expressing himself/herself" (33%)
- **Item 19**: "Ideally my child would not have few friends or playmates because of difficulty in getting along with others" (30%)
- **Item 70**: "Ideally my child would not act cold, unresponsive, or dislike affection" (29%)
- **Item 68**: "Ideally my child would not have difficulty seeing things from another’s point of view" (29%)
- **Item 52**: "Ideally my child would not anger easily, yell at or threaten others when upset" (29%)
### Table 1-4

Parental Agreement on Actual Sort  
[percentage coding item as 1 or 2(L), or 4 or 5(H)]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>L</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 1-5

**Low Actuals**  
(Items with highest percentage coding as a 1 or 2)

- **Item 55:** "Shoplift" (75%)  
- **Item 13:** "Touch or expose his/her 'private parts' in public" (72%)  
- **Item 16:** "Swear or use explicitly sexual or 'dirty language'" (71%)  
- **Item 39:** "Get in trouble at school" (69%)  
- **Item 17:** "Mistreat or tease animals or pets" (65%)  
- **Item 29:** "Run around the house or yard naked" (61%)  
- **Item 30:** "Refuse to play or associate with someone just because the person has a handicap or is from a minority group" (61%)  

### Table 1-6

**Top Actuals**  
(Items with highest percentage coding as a 4 or 5)

- **Item 34:** "Neglect or fail to do assigned household chores" (76%)  
- **Item 54:** "Be messy or fail to pick up after himself/herself" (70%)  
- **Item 31:** "Disrupt conversations" (67%)  
- **Item 63:** "Lose or misplace things" (64%)  
- **Item 26:** "Disobey or ignore parental requests" (61%)  
- **Item 15:** "Give up easily or fail to finish projects" (52%)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Agreement as Oughts</th>
<th>Agreement as Ideals</th>
<th>Percent of items coded: ideal (%) and ought (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ANTISOCIAL BEHAVIOR</strong></td>
<td>11,16,17,18,21,23,31,39,45,65,69</td>
<td>11,16,17,18,21,23,45,65</td>
<td>31,39,69</td>
<td>73 (ideal) and 27 (ought)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SELF-CONTROL</strong></td>
<td>15,25,32,44,52,59,62,67</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>all</td>
<td>100 (ideal) and 0 (ought)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SEXUAL ATTITUDES</strong></td>
<td>8,13,29,60</td>
<td>13,29</td>
<td>8,60</td>
<td>50 (ideal) and 50 (ought)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ATHLETIC ABILITY</strong></td>
<td>22,46</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>all</td>
<td>100 (ideal) and 0 (ought)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PHYSICAL ATTRIBUTES</strong></td>
<td>12,14,48</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>all</td>
<td>100 (ideal) and 0 (ought)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PHYSICAL HYGIENE</strong></td>
<td>4,40,54</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>40,54</td>
<td>33 (ideal) and 33 (ought)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1Items=Items included in the scale (see Appendix A).
   Agreement as Oughts=Items in which the percentage of parents who rated item as a high(4,5) ought was greater than those who rated it as a high(4,5) ideal.
   Agreement as Ideals=Items in which the percentage of parents who rated item as a high(4,5) ideal was greater than those who rated it as a high(4,5) ought.
   Percent of items coded as ideal and ought=Percent of "Agreement as Oughts" items within the scale, and percent of "Agreement as Ideals" items within the scale.
PROSOCIAL BEHAVIOR
  Items: 7, 27, 30, 35, 37, 38, 43, 64, 68
  Agreement as Oughts: 7, 27, 30, 68
  Agreement as Ideals: 35, 37, 38, 43, 64
  Percent of items coded: ideal (56%) and ought (44%)

TEMPERAMENTAL CHARACTERISTICS
  Items: 3, 20, 36, 49, 50, 58, 61, 70
  Agreement as Oughts: none
  Agreement as Ideals: all
  Percent of items coded: ideal (100%) and ought (0%)

PEER INTERACTIONS
  Items: 1, 5, 19, 28, 47, 51
  Agreement as Oughts: none
  Agreement as Ideals: all
  Percent of items coded: ideal (100%) and ought (0%)

SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY
  Items: 6, 9, 24, 42, 63
  Agreement as Oughts: 6, 9, 24, 42
  Agreement as Ideals: 63
  Percent of items coded: ideal (20%) and ought (80%)

HONESTY
  Items: 41, 55, 57
  Agreement as Oughts: all
  Agreement as Ideals: none
  Percent of items coded: ideal (0%) and ought (100%)

RESPECT FOR AUTHORITY
  Items: 26, 33, 34, 53, 56
  Agreement as Oughts: 26, 33
  Agreement as Ideals: 34, 53, 56
  Percent of items coded: ideal (60%) and ought (40%)

SCHOOL PERFORMANCE
  Items: 10, 66
  Agreement as Oughts: none
  Agreement as Ideals: all
  Percent of items coded: ideal (100%) and ought (0%)
Table 3-1
Relationship of Salient Ought Items to Actual Sort

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOP OUGHT ITEMS</th>
<th>CORRESPONDING PERCENTAGE CODING ACTUAL AS 1 OR 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3-2
Relationship of Low Actuals to Scales

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agreed Upon Low Actuals</th>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Scale Items(Ought)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Coded as 1 or 2 by the greatest % of parents)</td>
<td>Honest</td>
<td>(% of items on scale coded as high ought by more parents than as high ideal)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 55</td>
<td>Honesty</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 13</td>
<td>Sexual Attitudes</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 16</td>
<td>Antisocial Behavior</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 39</td>
<td>Antisocial Behavior</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 17</td>
<td>Antisocial Behavior</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 29</td>
<td>Sexual Attitudes</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 30</td>
<td>Prosocial Behavior</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 22</td>
<td>Athletic Ability</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 70</td>
<td>Temperamental Characteristics</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 11</td>
<td>Antisocial Behavior</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 57</td>
<td>Honesty</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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²These attachments are from "Precursors and Assessment of Guilt and Shame in Children" (Ferguson & Crowley, 1993).
APPENDIX A

EXPECTATION SORT FOR PARENTS
SCALE ITEMS
SCALE ITEMS
(Items phrased as for the Actual Sort)

ANTISOCIAL BEHAVIOR
11. Play mean tricks on others.
16. Swear or use explicitly sexual or dirty language.
17. Mistreat or tease animals or pets.
18. Break or ruin his/her toys or clothing.
23. Use or manipulate others.
31. Disrupt conversations.
45. Hit or kick others.
65. Call others names because of their appearance.
69. Behave in a rude, noisy, or distracting manner in public.

SELF-CONTROL
15. Give up easily or fail to finish projects.
25. Act younger than children the same age.
32. Have a short attention span or be easily distracted.
44. Cry, pout, or throw temper tantrums frequently.
52. Anger easily, yell at, or threaten others when upset.
59. Wet his or her pants or bed.
62. Throw things when angry.
67. Fidget, squirm, or fail to sit still, especially in public.

SEXUAL ATTITUDES
8. Play with toys usually associated with the opposite sex.
13. Touch or expose his/her "private parts" in public.
29. Run around the house or yard naked.
60. Want to dress in clothing usually associated with the opposite sex.

ATHLETIC ABILITY
22. Be sluggish, slow-moving, or have little zest for normal activities.
46. Be clumsy or have difficulty in sports or athletics.

PHYSICAL ATTRIBUTES
12. Be too heavy or too thin.
14. Have messy hair or improperly fastened clothing.
48. Have just an average looking or unattractive face.

PHYSICAL HYGIENE
4. Be sloppy with food.
40. Have a habit of nail biting, hair-twiddling, or nose-picking.
54. Be messy and fail to pick up after himself/herself.

PROSOCIAL BEHAVIOR
7. Tease, insult, or be rude to others.
27. Fail to help another child who is in pain or distress.
30. Refuse to play or associate with someone just because the person has a handicap or is from a minority group.
35. Say "I hate you" to parents or siblings.
37. Refuse to share or take turns.
38. Mimic or parrot others.
43. Fail to show appreciation for gifts or favors.
64. Stare at others, especially strangers.
68. Have difficulty seeing things from another’s point of view.
TEMPERAMENTAL CHARACTERISTICS
3. Be easily scared or frightened.
20. Be unusually shy.
36. Have difficulty expressing himself/herself.
49. Complain about everything; be fussy or difficult to please.
50. Act helpless, feeble, or physically weak.
58. Demand constant attention.
61. Avoid being with others or prefer to be left alone.
70. Cold, unresponsive, or dislike affection.

PEER INTERACTIONS
1. Be a show off or act conceited.
5. Be unwilling to participate in normal childhood events or activities.
19. Have few friends or playmates because of difficulties getting along with others.
28. Be a sore loser or a poor sport.
47. Attract teasing or be laughed at by others.
51. Act bossy or domineering with other children.

SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY
6. Play with matches or other potentially dangerous materials.
9. Reveal secrets or break promises.
24. Show disregard for the safety of others.
42. Be careless with or destructive of other’s property.
63. Lose or misplace things.

RESPECT FOR AUTHORITY
26. Disobey or ignore parental requests.
33. Run off or leave the home without permission.
34. Neglect or refuse to do assigned household chores.
53. Play or snoop in an area that is "off limits".
56. Discuss family "business" outside of the family.

SCHOOL PERFORMANCE
10. Be poorly motivated or work below potential.
66. Be a slow learner or often need lessons repeated.

HONESTY
41. Tell lies.
55. Shoplift.
57. Cheat in games or on school work.
1. I agree slightly that my child would IDEALLY NOT
2. I agree slightly more that my child would IDEALLY NOT
3. I agree moderately that my child would IDEALLY NOT
4. I agree strongly that my child would IDEALLY NOT
5. I agree very strongly that my child would IDEALLY NOT
1. I agree slightly that my child OUGHT NOT
2. I agree slightly more that my child OUGHT NOT
3. I agree moderately that my child OUGHT NOT
4. I agree strongly that my child OUGHT NOT
5. I agree very strongly that my child OUGHT NOT
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very true of my child</th>
<th>Somewhat true of my child</th>
<th>Moderately true of my child</th>
<th>Slightly true of my child</th>
<th>Almost not true of my child</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

*Note: The table contains a series of questions or statements, each with options for the rating scale.*
APPENDIX C

INSTRUCTIONS TO PARENTS
We would first like to express our sincerest of thanks to you for participating in this survey. Your cooperation is appreciated and will certainly contribute to our knowledge of parents' thoughts about their children. All of your answers will be kept completely confidential.
IMPORTANT!! While we all have ideas of what the perfect child and perfect parent should do, we also know that those "perfect" parents and children do not exist. Therefore, we are interested in "real" parents and kids and the way they think and feel. Please be honest in all of your answers.

If these instructions are not clear, please call the experimenter for more explanation. He/she is here to assist you.

YOU MAY BEGIN STEP 1 NOW!
STEP 1: IDEALS

PLEASE READ ALL OF THE INSTRUCTIONS FOR STEP 1 BEFORE BEGINNING!

As parents, we all have IDEALS for our children. These IDEALS refer to the wishes, hopes, and aspirations that we have for how our children are and how we would like them to behave. Stop now and ask yourself: "What wishes, hopes, and aspirations do I have for my child?" A few examples include:

IDEALLY my child would be nice looking.
IDEALLY my child would be talented at sports.

Try your own example of an IDEAL that you have for your child:

IDEALLY my child would ____________________ .

IDEALLY my child would be ____________________ .

We also have opinions about how our children would IDEALLY NOT BE. A few examples include:

IDEALLY my child would NOT be unattractive.
IDEALLY my child would NOT be clumsy at sports.

Try your own example of an IDEALLY NOT that you have for your child:

IDEALLY my child would NOT ____________________ .

IDEALLY my child would NOT be ____________________ .

You have a stack of 70 cards in front of you. Take the entire stack of cards and shuffle them (mix them up). Then read the first card. You must decide if this is:

(1) a card that you DO agree with. This card makes you think: "This does apply to my idea of what my child would do or be like IDEALLY." Place this card under the IDEALLY MY CHILD WOULD NOT nameboard in front of you.

(2) a card that you DON'T agree with. This card makes you think: "This does not apply to my view." Place this card under the DOES NOT APPLY nameboard in front of you. (Think of these as the "Top Ten" items that do not apply to the IDEALS that you have for your child.)

Make this decision with the remaining 69 cards in the stack. You are restricted to:

60 cards in the IDEALLY MY CHILD WOULD NOT pile, and
10 cards in the DOES NOT APPLY pile.

(Remember to only think of the IDEALS that you have for the child that is participating in this experiment with you, not any of your other children.)

When you have 60 cards in the IDEALLY MY CHILD WOULD NOT pile and 10 cards in the DOES NOT APPLY pile you have completed STEP 1. Call the experimenter.
IMPORTANT!! While we all have ideas of what the perfect child and perfect parent should do, we also know that those "perfect" parents and children do not exist. Therefore, we are interested in "real" parents and kids and the way they think and feel. Please be honest in all of your answers.

If these instructions are not clear, please call the experimenter for more explanation. He/she is here to assist you.

YOU MAY BEGIN STEP 2 NOW!
STEP 2: OUGHTS

PLEASE READ ALL OF THE INSTRUCTIONS FOR STEP 2 BEFORE BEGINNING!

When we think about the word OUGHT it has a very definite meaning for each of us. As parents, we all have certain rules, obligations, and duties that our children must meet. Stop now and ask yourself: "What rules, duties, and obligations should my child live up to?" A few examples include:

- My child OUGHT to keep a tidy bedroom.
- My child OUGHT to be fair with others.

Try your own example of an OUGHT that you have for your child:

My child OUGHT to ____________________.

My child OUGHT to be ____________________.

We also have opinions about how our children OUGHT NOT be or behave. A few examples include:

- My child OUGHT NOT lie.
- My child OUGHT NOT be messy.

Try your own example of an OUGHT NOT that you have for your child:

My child OUGHT NOT ____________________.

My child OUGHT NOT be ____________________.

You have a stack of 60 cards in front of you. Take the entire stack of cards and shuffle them (mix them up). Then read the first card. You must decide if this is:

(1) a card that you DO agree with. This card makes you think: "This does apply to my idea of how my child OUGHT NOT act or be." Place this card under the MY CHILD OUGHT NOT nameboard in front of you.

(Think of these as the "Top Thirty" items that your child OUGHT NOT do or be.)

(2) a card that you DON'T agree with. This card makes you think: "This does not apply to my view." Place this card under the DOES NOT APPLY nameboard in front of you.

Make this decision with the remaining 59 cards in the stack. You are restricted to:

- 30 cards in the MY CHILD OUGHT NOT pile, and
- 30 cards in the DOES NOT APPLY pile.

(Remember to only think of the OUGHT NOT'S that you have for the child that is participating in this experiment with you, not any of your other children.)

When you have 30 cards in the MY CHILD OUGHT NOT pile and 30 cards in the DOES NOT APPLY pile you have completed STEP 2. Call the experimenter.
STEP 3: RATING YOUR OUGHTS

PLEASE READ ALL OF THE INSTRUCTIONS FOR STEP 3 BEFORE BEGINNING!

As parents, we all have thought about how our child OUGHT NOT be or behave. A few examples include:

My child OUGHT NOT be rude to strangers.
My child OUGHT NOT behave violently.

Many behaviors OUGHT NOT occur, however, there are differences in the degree with which we believe that a behavior OUGHT NOT occur. For example, there is a difference between "My child OUGHT NOT be rude to strangers" and "My child OUGHT NOT behave violently."

The differences in degree include:
1) "I agree SLIGHTLY that my child OUGHT NOT..."
2) "I agree SLIGHTLY MORE that my child OUGHT NOT..."
3) "I agree MODERATELY that my child OUGHT NOT..."
4) "I agree STRONGLY that my child OUGHT NOT..."
5) "I agree VERY STRONGLY that my child OUGHT NOT..."

You have a stack of 30 cards in front of you. Take the entire stack of cards and shuffle them (mix them up). Then read the first card. You must decide the degree of your agreement with this card. Ask yourself, "To what degree do I agree that my child OUGHT NOT... (fill in the statement on each card)."

Express the extent of your agreement by placing the card in one of the blank spaces on the poster in front of you. Make this decision with the remaining 29 cards in the stack. You are restricted to one card per box on the poster. You cannot add more spaces. (Remember to only think of the OUGHT NOT'S that you have for the child that is participating in this experiment with you, not any of your other children.)

When you have one card in each box on the poster you have completed STEP 3. Call the experimenter.

IMPORTANT!! While we all have ideas of what the perfect child and perfect parent should do, we also know that those "perfect" parents and children do not exist. Therefore, we are interested in "real" parents and kids and the way they think and feel. Please be honest in all of your answers.

If these instructions are not clear, please call the experimenter for more explanation. He/she is here to assist you.

YOU MAY BEGIN STEP 3 NOW!
STEP 4: RATING YOUR IDEALS

PLEASE READ ALL OF THE INSTRUCTIONS FOR STEP 4 BEFORE BEGINNING!

As parents, we all have thought about how our child IDEALLY NOT be or behave. A few examples include:
- IDEALLY my child would NOT fail in school.
- IDEALLY my child would NOT be unattractive.

Many behaviors IDEALLY would NOT occur, however, there are differences in the degree with which we believe that a behavior IDEALLY would NOT occur. For example, there is a difference between "IDEALLY my child would NOT fail in school" and "IDEALLY my child would NOT be unattractive. The differences in degree include:
1) "I agree SLIGHTLY that IDEALLY my child would NOT..."
2) "I agree SLIGHTLY MORE that IDEALLY my child would NOT..."
3) "I agree MODERATELY that IDEALLY my child would NOT..."
4) "I agree STRONGLY that IDEALLY my child would NOT..."
5) "I agree VERY STRONGLY that IDEALLY my child would NOT...."

You have a stack of 30 cards in front of you. Take the entire stack of cards and shuffle them (mix them up). Then read the first card. You must decide the degree of your agreement with this card. Ask yourself, "To what degree do I agree that my child IDEALLY would NOT...(fill in the statement on each card)."

Express the extent of your agreement by placing the card in one of the blank spaces on the poster in front of you. Make this decision with the remaining 29 cards in the stack. You are restricted to one card per box on the poster. You cannot add more spaces. (Remember to only think of the IDEALLY NOT'S that you have for the child that is participating in this experiment with you, not any of your other children.)

When you have one card in each box on the poster you have completed STEP 4. Call the experimenter.

IMPORTANT!! While we all have ideas of what the perfect child and perfect parent should do, we also know that those "perfect" parents and children do not exist. Therefore, we are interested in "real" parents and kids and the way they think and feel. Please be honest in all of your answers.

If these instructions are not clear, please call the experimenter for more explanation. He/she is here to assist you.

YOU MAY BEGIN STEP 4 NOW!
STEP 5: WHAT MY CHILD IS LIKE

PLEASE READ ALL OF THE INSTRUCTIONS FOR STEP 5 BEFORE BEGINNING!

Now we would like you to consider what your child is like in real, everyday life. A few examples include:
   My child fails in school.
   My child is rude to strangers.

Your child has many and various behaviors, however, there are differences in the degree with which a particular behavior is descriptive or true of your child. For example, there may be a difference between "My child fails in school" and "My child is rude to strangers." The differences in degree include:
   1) "This behavior is not descriptive/true of my child."
   2) "This behavior is slightly descriptive/true of my child."
   3) "This behavior is moderately descriptive/true of my child."
   4) "This behavior is strongly descriptive/true of my child."
   5) "This behavior is very descriptive/true of my child."

You have a stack of 60 cards in front of you. Take the entire stack of cards and shuffle them (mix them up). Then read the first card. You must decide the degree of your agreement with this card. Ask yourself, "To what degree does my child ACTUALLY...(fill in the statement on each card)." Express the extent of your agreement by placing the card in one of the blank spaces on the poster in front of you. Make this decision with the remaining 59 cards in the stack. You are restricted to one card per box on the poster. You cannot add more spaces.

(Remember to only think of the ACTUAL behaviors of the child that is participating in this experiment with you, not any of your other children.)

When you have one card in each box on the poster you have completed STEP 5. Call the experimenter.

IMPORTANT!! While we all have ideas of what the perfect child and perfect parent should do, we also know that those "perfect" parents and children do not exist. Therefore, we are interested in "real" parents and kids and the way they think and feel. Please be honest in all of your answers.

If these instructions are not clear, please call the experimenter for more explanation. He/she is here to assist you.

YOU MAY BEGIN STEP 5 NOW!
APPENDIX D

PARENT PROTOCOL:
EXPERIMENTER INSTRUCTIONS

The Parent Protocol includes experimenter instructions for administration of the ESP, as well as administration of other measures within this test battery.
PARENT PROTOCOL
PARTICIPANT CONTACT

a.) Select a person from the participant file whose schedule coincides with yours.

b.) Call participant and arrange first session.

SAMPLE PHONE CALL: "Hello, _______. This is _____ from Utah State University. We are working on a research project and I understand that you called our office saying that you might be interested in participating. We are looking at how parents and children perceive everyday occurrences. We would need to meet with you and one of your children on three separate occasions. Each session will take approximately one hour. At the end of the third session you would be paid $20.00. Are you still interested in participating? (Ask for age and gender of child.) DO NOT, UNDER ANY CIRCUMSTANCES, TELL THEM WE ARE RESEARCHING GUILT AND SHAME!!"

c.) Mark appointment on scheduling calendar.

d.) Construct a file consisting of:

PARENT
1. Protocol (Parent & Child)
2. Guilt/Shame Data Record
3. Parent Consent Form
4. Family Information Survey
5. Personal Reaction Inventory
6. CBCL (Child Behavior Checklist)
7. Parents Q-Sort instructions
8. Q-Sort Recording Sheet
9. OUGHT Recording Sheet
10. IDEAL Recording Sheet
11. ACTUAL Recording Sheet
12. Q-Sort Coding Sheet
13. P-CARS Instruction Sheet
14. P-CARS (Positive)
15. P-CARS (Negative)
16. PDI (Psychiatric Diagnostic Interview) Record Sheet
17. 4 envelopes, 1 each marked: TOTAL, OUGHT, IDEAL, and ACTUAL

CHILD
18. Perceived Contingency Scale.
20. SCIC (Semistructured Clinical Interview for Children).
SESSION #1

1. Preparation
   a.) Arrive early so you can prepare the parent’s testing table with:
      1. "IDEALLY MY CHILD WOULD NOT..." and "DOES NOT APPLY" placards.
      2. Parent Q-Sort Instructions.
      3. TOTAL Cards (70 in envelope).
      4. Pen or pencil.
      5. Parent Consent Form.
   b.) Have participant file at a separate work area with the following items to be used during this session:
      1. Personal Reaction Inventory.
      2. CBCL (Child Behavior Checklist).
      3. Family Information Survey.
      4. OUGHT, IDEAL, and ACTUAL cards (70 in each envelope).
   c.) Refamiliarize yourself with the procedures for this session.

2. Participant Arrival
   a.) Welcome the participant and introduce yourself.
   b.) Immediately place testing sign on outside of door.
   c.) Spend a few minutes informally talking to the parent, try to make them feel comfortable.

3. Begin Testing
   a.) Have parent read and sign consent form.
   b.) Record last 4 digits of parent’s social security number on the top right corner of consent form.

   HONESTY STATEMENT!! Tell the parent that we are very interested in getting their personal reactions and feedback.
   Remind them that while we all have ideas of what the perfect child and perfect parent should do, we also know that those “perfect” parents and children do not exist. Therefore, we are interested in “real” parents and kids and the way they think and feel.

   c.) Briefly acquaint them with the parent Q-Sort instructions, the TOTAL stack of cards, and the placards.
   Assure the parent that you will be nearby and that they can feel free to call upon you if they have any questions during the session.
   d.) Have the parent begin the first phase of the Q-Sort.
   e.) While parent works on Q-Sort, write the I.D. number (last 4 digits of S.S. #) and the researcher’s initials on the upper right corner of every page in the participant’s file. Record these items on the envelopes containing the OUGHT, IDEAL, and ACTUAL cards as well.

4. Q-Sort (1st phase)
   a.) After the parent has placed 10 cards in front of the “DOES NOT APPLY” placard, take those cards and place them on the DOES NOT APPLY section of the Q-sort Recording Sheet.
   b.) Take the remaining cards and place them back in the TOTAL envelope.
HONESTY STATEMENT!! Remind the parent that while filling out the forms we need to have them give us an accurate representation of themselves and their child. Children and adults manage to do many things very well, but everyone struggles and has problems from time to time, that is normal. We are interested in the normal, everyday struggles and triumphs that exist in families.

c.) Ask the parent to complete the following instruments:

1. Personal Reaction Inventory.
2. CBCL (Child Behavior Checklist).
3. Family Information Survey.

d.) Record the item numbers of the 10 cards in the DOES NOT APPLY section of the recording sheet. Double check for accuracy.

e.) Remove those same item numbers from the:

1. OUGHT envelope and place them in the OUGHT discard envelope.
2. IDEAL envelope and place them in the IDEAL discard envelope.
3. ACTUAL envelope and place them in the ACTUAL discard envelope.

f.) When the parent finishes filling out the forms they will be ready to start the 2nd phase of the Q-sort.

5. Q-Sort (2nd Phase)

a.) Flip placards around to read, "MY CHILD OUGHT NOT..." and "DOES NOT APPLY".

b.) Give parent the cards from the OUGHT envelope and tell them to continue with the sort, following the instructions in front of them.

c.) After the parent has placed 30 cards in front of each placard they have completed their part of session one.

At this time you should thank the parent for their participation and schedule the next session. (Optimally sessions should be scheduled between three and seven days apart.) They are now free to go. You will need to write in appointment time, rooms needed, instruments needed, etc. on the scheduling chart.

d.) Once the parent leaves you should take the cards from in front of the "MY CHILD OUGHT NOT..." placard and place them back in the OUGHT envelope.

e.) Take the cards from in front of the "DOES NOT APPLY" placard and record (with a check mark) the item numbers on the Q-Sort recording sheet. Double-check for accuracy.

f.) Place those cards in the OUGHT discard envelope.

g.) Remove the IDEAL cards from the IDEAL envelope and match the IDEAL cards to the OUGHT "DOES NOT APPLY" item numbers. Double-check for accuracy.

h.) Place the IDEAL cards that match the OUGHT "DOES NOT APPLY" back into the IDEAL envelope and place the remaining 30 IDEAL cards in an IDEAL discard envelope.

6. Master Check List

a.) Enter participant information on the Master Sheet form. (Follow the information given on the sheet.

b.) Check off tasks accomplished during this session.
SESSION #2

1. Preparation

a.) Arrive early so you can prepare OUGHT and IDEAL bell charts by recording the participant's identification number and your initials in the upper right corner of the chart.

b.) Install the OUGHT bell chart in the small bell board.

c.) Prepare the parent's testing table with:
   1. OUGHT bell board.
   2. OUGHT cards (30 in envelope).
   3. Parent Q-Sort instructions for the 2nd session.

d.) Have participant file at a separate work area with the following items to be used during this session:
   1. Negative and positive P-CARS.
   2. OUGHT and IDEAL recording sheets.
   3. IDEAL cards.

e.) Refamiliarize yourself with the procedures for this session.

2. Participant Arrival

a.) Put testing sign on outside of the door.

b.) Welcome the parent and make them feel comfortable.

* HONESTY STATEMENT!! Tell the parent that, once again, we are very interested in getting their personal reactions and feedback. Remind them that while we all have ideas of what the perfect child and perfect parent should do, we also know that those "perfect" parents and children do not exist. Therefore, we are interested in "real" parents and kids and the way they think and feel.

c.) Direct the parent to begin by following the instructions for this session's Q-Sort.

3. Q-Sort (3rd Phase)

a.) When the parent has finished placing the OUGHT cards in the boxes on the bell chart, carefully, place the bell chart to the side. You will adhere the cards and record this information momentarily.

4. Negative P-CARS

a.) Give the parent the negative P-CARS with instructions to complete.

5. Q-Sort (3rd Phase Continued)

a.) You will now adhere the cards and record the item numbers off the parents OUGHT bell chart onto the OUGHT bell recording sheet in precisely the same order as the parent did. Double check for accuracy.

b.) Replace the OUGHT bell sheet with an IDEAL bell sheet in the bell board and wait for the parent to finish completing the negative P-CARS.
6. Q-Sort (4th Phase)

   a.) Give the parent the IDEAL bell chart with the 30 IDEAL cards and tell them to continue following the Q-Sort instructions.

   b.) When the parent has finished placing the IDEAL cards in the boxes on the IDEAL bell chart, carefully place the bell chart to the side. You will adhere the cards and record this information momentarily.

7. Positive P-CARS

   a.) Give the parent the positive P-CARS with instructions to complete.

8. Q-Sort (4th Phase Continued)

   a.) You will now adhere the cards and record the item numbers off the parents IDEAL bell chart onto the IDEAL bell recording sheet in precisely the same order as the parent did. Double check for accuracy.

   b.) When the parent completes the positive P-CARS they are finished for this session.

At this time you should thank the parent for their participation and schedule the last interview with them (between 3-7 days apart). They are now free to go. You will need to write in appointment time, rooms needed, instruments needed, etc. on the scheduling chart.

9. Master Check List

   Check off tasks accomplished during this session.

10. Payment Preparation

   If the parent is to be paid for participation you should make arrangements to pick up money before the next session. You are responsible for this money and the receipt that accounts for it! Follow payment (and documentation of that payment) procedures very carefully.
SESSION #3

1. Preparation

a.) Arrive early so you can prepare the parent’s testing table with:

1. ACTUAL bell sheet in bell board marked with subject’s identification number and the researcher’s initials.
2. ACTUAL cards (60 in envelope).
3. Parent Q-Sort instructions for the last session.

b.) Have participant file at a separate work area with the following items to be used during this session:

1. ACTUAL recording sheet.
2. Q-Sort coding chart.
3. PDI book and recording sheet.
4. Money and receipt (at the bottom of consent form) to be signed and dispensed at the end of the session.

2. Participant Arrival

a.) Place testing sign on the outside of the door.

b.) Greet parent and make them feel comfortable.

HONESTY STATEMENT!! One more time, tell the parent that we are very interested in getting their personal reactions and feedback. Remind them that while we all have ideas of what the perfect child and perfect parent should do, we also know that those “perfect” parents and children do not exist. Therefore, we are interested in “real” parents and kids and the way they think and feel.

c.) Direct them to begin by following the instructions for this session’s Q-Sort.

3. Q-Sort (5th Phase)

When the parent has finished placing the ACTUAL cards in the boxes on the ACTUAL bell chart, ask the parent to help you adhere the cards as the last portion of the session will consist of an interactive interview. (You will record the information from the bell chart later.)

4. PDI (Psychiatric Diagnostic Interview)

a.) Inform the parent that you will now ask them a number of questions and assure them that all answers will remain confidential.

b.) Ask the parent to answer the questions as honestly as they can, reflecting back throughout their entire life thus far.

c.) Begin asking the questions tabbed at the back of the book, working your way to the front of the book. (The order will be numbers 17, 15, 12, 11, 7, 5, 4, 3, & 2).

d.) When you are finished with the PDI, if the parent is to be compensated for their participation, have them SIGN THE RECEIPT, accepting the money for their participation. Give them their money.

At this time you should thank the parent for their participation, they are now free to leave.
5. **Q-Sort (5th Phase Continued)**

   a. You will record the item numbers from the parents ACTUAL bell chart onto the ACTUAL bell recording sheet in precisely the same order as the parent did. Double check for accuracy.

   b. Take the OUGHT, IDEAL, and ACTUAL bell recording sheets and transfer that information to the Q-Sort coding sheet. The instructions for doing this are given at the top of the sheet.

6. **Master Check List**

   Check off tasks accomplished during this session.

7. **Receipt**

   Make a copy of the consent/receipt form and place it in the receipt folder as soon as possible.

8. **Completed File**

   When file is completed, place it in the appropriate place so it can be coded.