

California State University, San Bernardino

CSUSB ScholarWorks

Theses Digitization Project

John M. Pfau Library

1980

Behavioral correlates of parental attitudes expressed by child care staff in a residential treatment program for emotionally disturbed children

Sheryl Schechinger

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarworks.lib.csusb.edu/etd-project>



Part of the [Child Psychology Commons](#), and the [Psychiatric and Mental Health Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Schechinger, Sheryl, "Behavioral correlates of parental attitudes expressed by child care staff in a residential treatment program for emotionally disturbed children" (1980). *Theses Digitization Project*. 183. <https://scholarworks.lib.csusb.edu/etd-project/183>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the John M. Pfau Library at CSUSB ScholarWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in Theses Digitization Project by an authorized administrator of CSUSB ScholarWorks. For more information, please contact scholarworks@csusb.edu.

BEHAVIORAL CORRELATES OF PARENTAL ATTITUDES EXPRESSED
BY CHILD CARE STAFF IN A RESIDENTIAL TREATMENT
PROGRAM FOR EMOTIONALLY DISTURBED CHILDREN

A Thesis

Presented to the

Faculty of

California State College

San Bernardino, California

by

Sheryl Schechinger

 Approved by:


Chairperson

12-20-80

Date





Behavioral Correlates of Parental Attitudes Expressed

By Child Care Staff in a Residential Treatment

Program for Problem Adolescents

Sheryl A. Schechinger

California State College, San Bernardino

Running Head: Parental Attitudes

ABSTRACT

Staff-child relations of thirty-two child care workers in four residential treatment homes for problem children were assessed by the Structured Family Interaction Test (SFIT) and by the Maryland Parent Attitude Survey (MPAS). The SFIT consisted of a taped group discussion of ten hypothetical situations by a group which contained one staff member and two adolescents. Thirteen behavioral measures were calculated. Based on the SFIT the parental attitudes of staff were also rated on Rorbaugh rating scales. Results indicated that there is a significant positive relationship between behavioral measures of dominance from the SFIT and Disciplinarian and Protective attitudes from the MPAS. However, workers who endorsed rejecting parental attitudes were low on Dominance and Conflict. Additionally, high ratings of Warmth and Permissiveness on the Rorbaugh were negatively related to Indulgent attitudes. The reverse was true for ratings of Hostility. Anxious Emotional Involvement on the Rorbaugh was negatively related to Indulgent and Rejecting parental attitudes. Sex, race, and length of employment differences were found on behavioral measures of conflict. Results indicate that parental attitudes in a child care worker population have a significant relationship to behavior.

Table of Contents

Introduction..... 1

Method

 Subjects..... 14

 Procedure..... 14

Results..... 19

Discussion..... 31

Appendix..... 37

References..... 50

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1.	Correlations of Composite Behavioral Measures with Parental Attitudes.....	20
Table 2.	Correlations of Behavioral Measures of Dominance with Parental Attitudes.....	21
Table 3.	Correlations of Behavioral Measures of Conflict with Parental Attitudes.....	23
Table 4.	Correlations of Behavioral Measures of Protectiveness with Parental Attitudes.....	24
Table 5.	Correlations of Observer Ratings with Parental Attitudes.	25
Table 6.	Race and Sex Differences on The Structured Family Interaction Test.....	27
Table 7.	Length of Employment and Child/No Child Differences on The Structured Family Interaction Test.....	29
Table 8.	Demographic Differences on Composite Behavioral Measures of The Structured Family Interaction Test.....	30

Behavioral Correlates of Parental Attitudes Expressed

By Child Care Staff in a Residential Treatment

Program for Emotionally Disturbed Children

Over 193,539 children are being treated in residential treatment programs in the United States in 1972 (AACRC, 1972). Despite the widespread use of such facilities, research on the process and outcome of treatment is inadequate. A review of the literature reveals that the field lacks both concept consensus and definitive research results. Most research has consisted of descriptions of specific centers or the characteristics of children and programs. Global studies of treatment effectiveness have yielded conflicting and ambiguous results. Maluccio and Marlow (1972), in a review of the literature on residential treatment, calls for filling the gap in research on the process of treatment. Davids (1973) suggests that instead of attempting to determine if residential care is therapeutic for children it is more useful to investigate the components of a therapeutic environment.

Since it has become almost axiomatic in treating disturbed children that the experiences of the child in his immediate environment and his relationships with staff determine his treatment success (Carducci, 1962; Grossbard, 1960; Simon, 1956), one method of studying therapeutic processes is to investigate staff-child relationships in a residential treatment home. Research by Gilmour-Barrett (1974) supports the relevancy of such an approach. She found that the predominant managerial system in a residential treatment home has a crucial effect on the quality of child care. This is largely through

its influence on the quality of child care workers' motivation for their work and the character of the relationship between the worker and the child. Other research supports this finding (Raynes, Pratt, Roses, 1977; Tizard, Cooperman, Tizard, 1972).

Parental role-therapeutic dimensions. Mayer (1960) sees the purpose of residential treatment as temporarily neutralizing the influence of the child's parents and placing the child under the care of substitute parents who can provide the accepting, supportive and controlling atmosphere needed by the child. Other researchers agree that the essential character of residential treatment is an assumption of the parental role and the providing of adult-child relationships that are conducive to emotional growth (Beedell, 1970; Diggle, 1970; Gershenson, 1956; Hirschbach, 1976; Maier, 1955; Matsushima, 1964; Trieschman, Whittaker, Brentro, 1969.) Researchers have held that the crucial therapeutic growth of the child is facilitated by identification with the substitute parent (Bettelheim, 1966; Rosen, 1963; Simon, 1956). This identification depends on adult-child relationships that are characterized by love, security and need gratification. Children are felt to improve at a faster rate depending on the depths and strengths of their love relationships with adults.

Because residential treatment staff assume the role of surrogate parent, consistency of values and relationships is considered essential to a child's development of a sense of security. Erikson (1964) has stressed that the transition from one developmental period to the next is facilitated by the parent's continuity and predictability which becomes transformed in the child into a sense of inner security.

When parents have not provided security and consistency, the residential staff will theoretically substitute those values. (Mendelbaum, 1962).

Mayer (1958) sees the relationship between the child and the worker as varying between two dimensions. First is providing empathy, understanding and support. Second is the dimension of controlling behavior and expectation of appropriate behavior. These two dimensions of staff-child interaction are strikingly similar to dimensions of parental behavior studied by Schaefer (1965) and others (Roe, 1957; Loevinger, 1961).

Child care worker in residential treatment. The person who spends the most time with the child in a residential treatment program is the child care worker. This is also the person who undertakes most of the parenting functions. Many researchers have stressed the pivotal role of such workers (Bettelheim, 1966; Hirschbach, 1976; Mayer, 1965; Matsushima, 1964). Although the child care worker's role is accepted as crucial to a therapeutic environment, its dimensions are undefined. There are at least six fundamental roles that child care workers in group homes perform. The child care worker has to be a homemaker, surrogate parent, successful model coping with daily stress, member of a treatment team, teacher of social behavior, and manager of work, finances, and recreation (Hirschbach, 1975). In reality, the role the worker assumes as parent substitute is often an interplay of the worker's personal expectations of such a role and the institution's expectations (Mayer, 1965). Because of the requirements to respond instantly to crises, the child care worker cannot be con-

fined to a prescriptive outline. Additionally, except for a few basic practices such as permission of parents to visit, punishment, religious practices and others, there are few general rules. Mayer stresses that a vast quantity of rules, which interfere with the spontaneous interaction between staff and child, carries the danger of undermining and dehumanizing the therapeutic relationship in a treatment home which is the essence of a treatment program.

Carducci (1962) has explained the situation facing child care workers in this manner:

Most child care workers come to the institution with no initial training. The children test and the adults must respond. Each worker comes with his own ideas of child rearing and discipline conditioned by his own past experience. The cottage may become a separate community in itself, run by the individual philosophy of the workers built in response to the necessity of the moment. Because of the supervisors involvement in administration of a multitude of daily situations he has little time for first hand observations and is dependent on the cottage parent's reports for his knowledge of what is happening within the group. (p. 213)

In order to preserve his/her position, the worker must overtly comply with at least some of the prescribed institutional policies. Beyond this s/he is often on his own with performance determined by his/her own ideas and other pressures (Trieschman et al. 1971). Because of the gulf between the formal policies of many institutions and the daily experiences of the child care staff, formal policies may exert relatively little influence on the actual staff-child interaction. Beedell (1970) and others (Matsushima, 1964; Mayer, 1960; Trieschman et al. 1969) agree that, regardless of formal policy, there is always a great deal of leeway available to the child care worker in interaction with the children. Furthermore, child care

workers may act against the treatment plan and see themselves as good parents or saviors aligned with the child against the institution (Mayer, 1960). The child care worker may resist the low status and powerlessness of his/her position by providing a defective program of child care and by using the therapist's advice very limitedly (Matsushima, 1964). When child care workers are not integrated into the decision making process and are not totally responsible for the decisions that affect a child, they may interact with the children in ways that are bad for both: for example, defensive or punitive actions, cold indifference or emotional distance. Additionally, staff members may enjoy and encourage the children's rebellion (Bettelheim, 1966).

Mayer (1960) recognizes that child care workers are in a very difficult position.

They are asked to bring order into a child's life without really having the capacity and authority to organize it. They are asked to give love to the child and at the same time maintain distance. They are asked to bring values into the child's life without being certain what values are sought. (p. 277)

Consistency in values and relationships is considered essential to a child's therapeutic success and to the development of a sense of security. The time has passed, however, when one couple takes care of a dozen or more children for lengthy periods of time. Three, four or five workers may now have the responsibility. There is also the problem of frequent changes of personnel. In the past only about 26% of child care workers remained at their jobs at psychiatric inpatient facilities for over a year (AACRC, 1972). With frequent changes in personnel and many different staff members assuming the parenting role, there is a danger that the child in residential treatment will be

exposed to a bewildering and possibly contradictory array of values and expectations. Additionally, research by Buehler, Patterson & Furness (1966) indicates that staff in residential treatment are often inconsistent in the distribution of rewards and punishments and may alternately reward and punish the same act.

Unlike the traditional therapeutic encounter, there is little research providing guidelines for relationships in a residential treatment environment. One recent study by Payson (1974) indicates that an important relationship exists between the personality variables of the child care worker and that worker's child care practices. Workers judged most effective by their supervisors were less dogmatic, showed more capacity for intimate contact and unconditionality of regard, were more acceptant of aggression and showed more self-acceptance than their peers. However, research on the therapeutic effect of worker characteristics is sparse and fraught with difficulties, such as controlling for between institution differences and determining if the children assigned to each worker have equivalent problems. In view of the research by Mayer (1965) and others (Bettelheim, 1974; Rosen, 1963; Trieschman et al. 1969) that child care workers come to the institution with preconceived attitudes and values one influence on interaction is the worker's parental role attitudes.

The influence of the child care workers' parental role values and attitudes can be understood much in the way Gildea, Glidewell and Kantor (1961) explained parent-child interaction. There are certain pivotal points where the child's behavior violates the parent's expectations. To deal with this problem, the parent must choose from

whatever set of alternatives his/her experience can generate. A parent, for example, can give attention to the inner life of the child or deal only with external behavior. The parent may exert greater or lesser control and look for causes or solutions. Not only do the parental attitudes affect how the worker solves a recognized problem, but they also influence what is defined as a problem. Trieschman et al. (1969) agrees that the definition of mental illness, especially with children, rests on a tenuous assumption of common agreement on what behaviors are emotionally and socially healthy.

Investigating parental attitudes. Various methods have been devised to assess parental attitudes. The raw data of anthropologists have been pooled in an attempt to correlate attitudes and child-rearing practices with the personality traits of adults (Whiting & Child, 1953). Laboratory observation of parent-child interaction has frequently been used (Escalona & Heider, 1958; Farina, 1960; Farina & Dunham, 1963; Schulman, 1962). Structured interviews have been used (Sears, Maccoby & Levin, 1957; Lidz & Lidz, 1949) as have ratings by psychologists (Lorr & Jenkins, 1953; Becker, 1964). By far the most common approach is to administer a paper and pencil attitude survey to either parents (Loevinger, 1961; Winder, 1962) or children (Schaefer, 1965; Renson, Schaefer & Levy, 1968). Two of the most widely used parent attitude instruments are the Parent Attitude Research Instrument (PARI) devised by Schaefer and Bell (1958) and the Shoben Parent-Child Survey (1949).

Based on the voluminous research conducted in the area of parental attitudes, certain difficulties in research design have emerged when parental attitudes are related to personality development. The PARI

and the Shoben Parent-Child Survey have been found to have serious confounding of results by response and acquiescence sets. Becker (1965), in a research review of the PARI, concluded that measures of authoritarian attitudes reflected in most of the subscales of the PARI are strongly influenced by an acquiescence-response set and by the educational level of the respondent. Pumroy (1954) found similar problems with response sets using the Shoben Parent-Child Survey.

Bell (1958) has summarized the difficulties encountered in relating parental attitudes to a child's personality functioning. He found that it is difficult to assert that obtained differences between parental attitudes measured after the development of children reflect factors operating at the time children were developing. Secondly, attitudes can be influenced by social context such that different measured attitudes can be elicited from the same subjects in different social situations and an attitude can be changed by differences in relationships between the respondent and the questioner. Third, respondents may be unable to answer questions in a way that is indicative of their spontaneous day-to-day behavior. Fourth, parents can react quite differently to various children in the same family irregardless of expressed attitudes. Fifth, it has been found that similar overprotective attitudes are endorsed by mothers of children with a variety of physical or emotional disorders (Bell, 1964). There seems to be certain reactive attitudes that develop from the context of caring for an identified problem child. Such attitudes, identified in research with the parents of schizophrenic children (Mark, 1953) have been assumed to cause or contribute to the problem behavior

rather than be a reaction to such behavior.

Cluster of parental attitudes and personality functioning.

Certain types of parental behavior and attitudes have tended to cluster into definable units across research studies. Schaefer (1958) has held that there are two fundamental dimensions of parental behavior: autonomy-control and love-rejection. Roe (1957) theorized similar dimensions of neglecting-overprotecting and demanding and a second dimension of rejecting-loving. Raskin (1971) using a factor analysis of children's reports of parental behavior, found three major factors: acceptance, psychological control, and firm control-lax control. Others have also identified these dimensions in various contexts and with various populations (Becker, 1964; Lorr & Jenkins, 1953; Lovinger, 1961; Milton, 1958; Renson, Schaefer & Levy, 1968; Roe & Siegelman, 1963; Symonds, 1939). Certain associations have been found between dimensions of parental behavior and behavior of offspring. Numerous research studies have indicated that parents of disturbed children tend to be more rejecting than parents of normal children (Duncan, 1971; Mussen, Congen & Kagen, 1963; Ridberg, 1967; Schulman, 1962). Such results have been found across measuring instruments including observed play (Schulman, 1962), parental reports of parental attitudes (Winder, 1962), children's reports of parental attitudes (Schaefer, 1965) and interview techniques (Eron, 1961). Peterson (1959, 1961) found that strict, cold, aggressive and harsh attitudes were related to a variety of personality and conduct problems in children as well as to childhood autism.

When parental hostility is joined with the use of physical

punishment as a method of control, children tend to engage in more aggressive behavior than their peers (Becker, 1962; Eron, 1961; Volenski, 1963). Fearfulness in sons has also been related to punitive parenting patterns (Cohen, 1973) as has the use by adolescent boys of fantasy denial (Kovacs, 1958). A strict home environment also decreases the tendency for children to expect gratification in social relations (Wyer, 1965) and seems to be negatively related to measures of creativity and originality in children and positively related to academic performance (Nicholas, 1964). The use of high punitiveness and high use of physical punishment in fathers, when combined with attitudes of low self-esteem and high ambivalence in mothers, has been associated with four categories of social deviancy in boys - i.e. aggression, dependency, withdrawal and depression (Winder, 1962). Thus, certain parental attitudes of punitiveness, high discipline, low self-esteem and ambivalence have been shown to negatively affect a child's development.

Freeman (1955) found that mothers of schizophrenics tended to hold possessive attitudes toward child rearing. Attitudes also tended to be clustered in the areas of self-sacrificing martyrdom, subtle domination and overprotectiveness. They also expected unquestioning conformity with parents' wishes. Mark (1953) found that mothers of schizophrenic sons tended to be either overly devoted or detached. Parental attitudes of repressive overcontrol are paramount throughout the literature investigating parental attitudes in families of emotionally disturbed children (Duncan, 1971). Furthermore, it has been discovered that inhibited, neurotic children as opposed to

aggressive or delinquent children tend to come from families where excessive control has been exercised in their upbringing (Rosenthal, Ni, Finkelstein & Berkowits, 1962; Ridberg, 1967). Girls seem to fare worst when over-protected while boys seem to have more problems when there is a lack of support or discipline (Bronfenbrenner, 1960).

Problem children frequently come from homes marked by conflict (Ackerly, 1933; Bonney, 1941; MacDonald, 1938). Gerber (1976) concluded that there is greater conflict between parents of disturbed children than between parents of normal children in overall acceptance or rejection of the child. She also found that parents of disturbed children were discrepant in their perception of the child's looks, manner of expressing feelings and in intelligence.

Extensive research has investigated the relationship of parental attitudes to the personality functioning of children. Certain consistent and persistent associations of parental attitudes of harshness, rejection, over-control and conflict and a child's emotional and behavioral difficulties appear throughout the literature. Sears, Maccoby and Levin (1957) hold that since any given behavior is the product of many influences, it would be impossible to obtain high correlations between single child-rearing dimensions and measures of child behavior. The persistent relationships that appear across research methods and populations, however, substantiate the existence of a relationship between attitudes toward child rearing and a child's ability to cope emotionally and intellectually.

Research on the therapeutic process in residential treatment programs has largely ignored the role of the child care worker as

parent surrogate. It is that very role, however, that is often considered crucial to a child's therapeutic success. Since the dimensions of the parenting role are often determined by the attitudes and values of the individual worker, it appears that an investigation of a worker's parental attitudes is in order. The central question becomes whether the attitudes of a child care worker as measured by a parental attitude survey have a relationship to behavioral measures of his interaction with children under his care.

To address the question, the Maryland Parent Attitude Survey (MPAS) by Pumroy (1966) was given to child care workers in four residential treatment homes for problem adolescents. Pumroy designed the MPAS to control for social desirability in a manner similar to the method used in the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule (1954). Other widely used instruments such as the PARI and the Parent Attitude Scale do not control for response sets of subjects. The four major scales of the MPAS are disciplinarian, indulgent, protective and rejecting. The workers also participated in a structured group--the Structured Family Interaction Test (SFIT) developed by Farina (1960). The SFIT has been found useful in differentiating family interaction patterns and parental attitudes with parents of delinquent and normal adolescents (Duncan, 1971; Hetherington, 1971) and with families of schizophrenics (Farina, 1960). The SFIT yields ten behavioral measures of dominance and conflict. Trained raters assessed parental attitudes from the taped discussion using a rating scale by Rorbaugh (1966). The scales include: (a) Warmth, (b) Hostility, (c) Positiveness of Expectations, (d) Permissiveness/Restrictiveness, (e) Anxious Emotional Involvement, and

(f) Type of Discipline.

Past research on the relationship of parental attitudes to a child's behavior have found consistent results. Parental attitudes of dominance, overcontrol, overprotectiveness and rejection were found with the parents of problem adolescents. Therefore, based on past research in the area of parental attitudes the following relationships were anticipated:

(1) Workers who scored high on the disciplinarian scale of the MPAS would score high on dominance as measured by the SFIT. They would also score high on the discipline and restrictiveness scales of the Rorbaugh measure. (2) Workers who score high on the indulgent scale of the MPAS would score high on the Rorbaugh scales of warmth and permissiveness. They would score low on discipline, anxious emotional involvement, negative expectations, and hostility. Dominance scores on the SFIT would also be low. (3) Workers who scored high on the protectiveness scale of the MPAS would also score high on the Rorbaugh scales of restrictiveness, anxious emotional involvement and negative expectations. They would also score high on the behavioral indicators of protectiveness and on the dominance scale of the SFIT. (4) Workers who score high on the rejecting scale of the MPAS would score high on conflict on the SFIT and would also score high on the Rorbaugh scales of hostility, negative expectations and restrictiveness.

METHOD

Subjects. The subjects were thirty-two child care workers from four private, state contracted residential treatment homes for problem adolescents. The children were referred (1) for being legally classified as delinquent, (2) by a mental health professional due to moderately severe emotional difficulties, or (3) by parents or guardians because of the child's unmanageable behavior. All the homes mixed children with different referral backgrounds. Half the workers were male and half were female. They were all volunteers. All the subjects had worked in the institution for at least six months. It has been found that workers tend to form similar methods of working with children as a function of length of time in an institution (Trieschman et al., 1969). Therefore, this time period requirement was used.

Procedure. Introductory remarks explained the purpose of the research and the tape recording. Each staff member was initially seen individually and privately presented with the ten problem situations from the SFIT. They were asked to give his/her personal opinion on how the problem should be solved. The ten situations from the SFIT were:

1. Your daughter/son comes home from school on a Friday and tells you that s/he has a date to go to the movies that evening. You learn that her/his date is with someone s/he knows you do not approve of.
2. You ask your daughter/son to pick up her/his room. S/he mumbles something and goes right on watching television.
3. You ask your daughter/son what time s/he came in last night. S/he tells you midnight, but you had been up until one in the morning, so you know this is not true.
4. Glancing into your bedroom, you notice your daughter/son taking money from your purse/wallet.

5. Your daughter/son is having a party at your house and tells you that one party s/he went to was ruined because the parents stayed around all the time. S/he is hinting that s/he doesn't want you in the way.

6. Your daughter/son comes home after going to town. Glancing into her/his room, you see her/him take a new sweater out from where s/he had hidden it under her/his coat.

7. Your daughter/son comes home after an evening out with a group of teenagers who have a reputation of being wild, and with whom s/he has been spending a great deal of time recently.

8. You told your daughter/son to be home by midnight. It is now two in the morning when you hear her/him at the door.

9. The school authorities call you in the evening when you and your daughter/son are at home. They tell you that s/he has been skipping school.

10. You and your husband/wife are going to a party at a friend's house. You tell your daughter/son that s/he will have to stay home and watch the younger kids. S/he becomes very upset and says that s/he was going to go to a show with her/his friends, and that you just don't want her/him to have any fun.

After this initial interview, the worker was told that each situation would be the topic of a group discussion among him/herself and two adolescents from his/her institution. S/He was also told that the study was to determine possible parental solutions to the problems and the adolescent's perceptions of parental attitudes. After each staff member gave his/her individual response to the problem situation, the worker was brought together with two adolescents from his/her treatment home and the group was asked to reach a mutually agreeable solution to handling the problems. The discussion of each situation continued until all members of the group said the terminating signal, "agree". If the final solution was not clear, the interviewer asked

what the final solution was. If the discussion became unduly lengthy, he also reminded the group of the time limit. The interviewer did not participate in the discussion in any way. Additionally, the interviewer was careful not to make eye contact with any member of the group when she completed reading a situation, so that a participant did not feel obligated to speak first. After the group discussion, each member of the group was asked to complete the Maryland Parent Attitude Survey.

Based on this taped group discussion thirteen behavioral measures were calculated for each participant. They are listed below. The first ten measures were previously used to study the relationship of parental values to delinquency (Hetherington, 1971), interactions between parents (Farina, 1960; Hetherington, 1967), and interactions between parents and child (Farina & Holzberg, 1968). The first six were assumed to measure dominance and the next four were assumed to measure conflict. Additionally, the last three measurements were added to measure protectiveness.

1. Speaks first: the number of times each staff member spoke first in the ten interaction situations.
2. Speaks last: the number of times the staff member made the final comment in the discussion when the statements were not simply indicating acceptance of a position initially taken by another group member.
3. Percentage of total words spoken: word counts were made and the percentage of the total number of words spoken was calculated for each worker.
4. Passive acceptance: The number of times the staff member passively accepted the solution of another

without elaboration was calculated.

5. Ratio of unsuccessful to total attempted interruptions:

A successful interruption was scored if the adolescent stopped speaking for at least two seconds and the worker was able to express at least a complete phrase or was able to change the direction of the conversation. An unsuccessful interruption occurred if the adolescent did not stop for at least two seconds and the worker was unable to express a complete thought or redirect the conversation.

6. Yielding: The number of times the worker shifted from his initial individual solution to the final joint solution.

7. Simultaneous speech: the number of occasions the staff member spoke at the same time as a child for longer than five seconds.

8. Disagreements and aggressions: this included the number of times the worker disagreed or aggressed against a group member in the interview. It included contradictions, sarcasm or any reaction of shock to proposed solution.

9. The number of times the group was unable to reach final agreement about the way a situation should be handled.

10. Interruptions: the total number of times a worker interrupted a child.

11. The number of times a staff member asked an opinion of a specific child.

12. The number of times a staff member elaborated on a child's opinion or indicated approval of a child's opinions.

13. The number of times a staff member defended a child's opinions or person.

Based on these measures a composite score for dominance, conflict and protectiveness was calculated.

Scoring Procedure. A trained rater listened to the taped interviews and independently rated the thirteen behavioral measures from the SFIT into composite scores for conflict, dominance and protectiveness. Since direct behavioral measures have extremely high interjudge reliabilities, only one rater was used to evaluate them. Two raters also listened to the taped interviews to judge parental attitudes of the workers. Rorbaugh's (1966) six point rating scales were used to rate these attitudes. (See Appendix B). Interjudge reliability was .76. After each rater completed the scoring of an interview, a third person reviewed the ratings, met with the raters and resolved any discrepancies that were present. The raters were blind to the results of the MPAS.

RESULTS

Parent Attitudes. The parental attitudes expressed on the MPAS were correlated by a Pearson Product Moment correlation to composite behavioral measures of dominance, conflict and protectiveness from the SFIT. They were also correlated to ratings of parental attitudes based on the Rorbaugh scale. Various significant relations were found between MPAS endorsed parental attitudes and both behavioral measures and Rorbaugh ratings.

Disciplinarian Scale. Those workers who endorsed Disciplinarian parental attitudes were high on composite behavioral measures of dominance. ($r = .33, p < .03$). This can be seen in Table 1.

Insert Table 1

When individual behavioral measures that comprise scales are considered, various consistencies in responding become apparent. See Table 2.

Insert Table 2

The behavioral measure "speaking first" had a negative relationship with disciplinarian attitudes ($r = -.35, p < .02$) while a "high" percentage of words spoken" had a positive correlation with disciplinarian attitudes ($r = .24, p < .08$). "Inability to reach a solution" was also negatively related to disciplinarian attitudes ($r = -.24, p < .08$), while behavioral measures of protectiveness were not consistently related to disciplinarian attitudes. This can be seen in Table 3 and 4.

Table 1

Correlations of Composite Behavioral Measures
With Parental Attitudes

<u>Parental Attitudes</u>	<u>Behavioral Measures</u>		
	<u>Dominance</u>	<u>Conflict</u>	<u>Protectiveness</u>
Disciplinarian	.33 p<.03	-.01 p<.46	.29 p<.13
Protective	.37 p<.01	.15 p<.20	.08 p<.32
Indulgent	.21 p<.11	.18 p<.16	-.009 p<.48
Rejecting	-.26 p<.07	-.42 p<.008	-.02 p<.44

Table 2
Correlations of Behavioral Measures
of Dominance With Parental Attitudes

Parental Attitudes	<u>Behavioral Measures</u>					
	Speaks First	Speaks Last	Words Spoken	Passive* Accept	Unsuccessful* Interruptions	Yield*
Disciplinarian	-.35 p<.02	-.16 p<.17	.24 p<.08	-.19 p<.14	.009 p<.47	-.05 p<.38
Protective	.25 p<.07	.32 p<.03	.43 p<.007	-.09 p<.30	.06 p<.36	.30 p<.04
Indulgent	.27 p<.06	-.06 p<.35	-.005 p<.48	.14 p<.21	.12 p<.24	.04 p<.39
Rejecting	-.14 p<.21	-.06 p<.36	-.16 p<.18	.04 p<.39	-.21 p<.11	-.35 p<.02

*The numbers entered into the dominance measure in the reverse direction

Insert Table 3 and 4

Observers using the Rorbaugh scale rated those workers who endorsed Disciplinary attitudes as less warm ($\underline{r} = .29, p < .05$) and as having negative expectations for the children's behavior. ($\underline{r} = .30, p < .04$). See Table 5.

Insert Table 5

Ratings on "Permissiveness" were also negatively related to Disciplinary attitudes ($\underline{r} = -.35, p < .02$).

Protective Scale. Those workers who endorsed Protective parental attitudes were high on composite behavioral measures of dominance from the SFIT. ($\underline{r} = .37, p < .01$).

On individual behavioral measures from the SFIT, high Protective workers were high on "speaking first" in the discussion ($\underline{r} = .25, p < .07$) and on "speaking last" ($\underline{r} = .32, p < .03$). They were also high on the "percentage of words spoken" ($\underline{r} = .43, p < .007$) and on refusal to yield to a group decision ($\underline{r} = .30, p < .04$). These high MPAS Protective workers were not rated by the observers in any consistent direction.

Indulgent Scale. There were no significant relationships between high scores on the MPAS Indulgent scale and SFIT behavioral measures of dominance, conflict and protectiveness. However, observers rated high MPAS Indulgent workers as high on Warmth ($\underline{r} = .39, p < .01$), Positive Expectations ($\underline{r} = -.40, p < .01$) and Permissiveness ($\underline{r} = .37, p < .01$). Indulgent endorsing workers were also rated as less anxious in their dealings with the children ($\underline{r} = -.28, p < .05$) and as less hostile ($\underline{r} = -.27, p < .06$). These workers were seen as less likely to use power assertion in their discipline ($\underline{r} = -.39, p < .01$).

Rejecting Scale. Workers who advocated rejecting parental attitudes

Table 3
Correlations of Behavioral Measures
of Conflict With Parental Attitudes

Parental Attitudes	<u>Behavioral Measures</u>			
	Simultaneous Speech	Disagree Aggress	No Solution	Interrupt
Disciplinarian	.05 p<.37	.13 p<.22	-.24 p<.08	.01 p<.46
Protective	.04 p<.39	.20 p<.12	-.01 p<.47	.09 p<.29
Indulgent	.10 p<.29	-.04 p<.40	-.19 p<.14	.05 p<.37
Rejecting	-.28 p<.05	-.36 p<.02	-.09 p<.30	-.25 p<.07

Table 4
Correlations of Behavioral Measures of
Protectiveness With Parental Attitudes

<u>Parental Attitudes</u>	<u>Behavioral Measures</u>		
	<u>Asks Opinion</u>	<u>Elaborates</u>	<u>Defends</u>
Disciplinarian	-.11 p<.26	.09 p<.29	-.22 p<.10
Protective	.11 p<.25	.11 p<.26	.04 p<.39
Indulgent	.03 p<.42	.02 p<.44	-.09 p<.31
Rejecting	.06 p<.36	-.04 p<.39	-.20 p<.12

Table 5
Correlations of Observer Ratings
With Parental Attitudes

<u>Observer Ratings</u>	<u>Parental Attitudes</u>			
	<u>Disciplinarian</u>	<u>Protective</u>	<u>Indulgent</u>	<u>Rejecting</u>
*Warmth	.29 p<.05	.04 p<.40	-.39 p<.01	-.51 p<.02
*Positiveness of Expectations	.30 p<.04	.05 p<.38	-.40 p<.01	.05 p<.38
Anxious Emotional Involvement	.17 p<.17	-.22 p<.11	-.28 p<.05	-.24 p<.28
Hostility	.15 p<.20	.19 p<.13	-.27 p<.06	-.19 p<.14
Permissiveness Restrictiveness	-.35 p<.02	-.18 p<.15	.37 p<.01	.24 p<.08
Type of Discipline	.2185 p<.11	.16 p<.18	-.39 p<.01	-.05 p<.39

*High scores are in opposite direction from scale name

on the SFIT were rated low on composite behavioral measures of dominance ($r = .26, p < .07$) and conflict ($r = -.42, p < .0008$) when individual behavioral measures are considered, "yielding to the group decision" was negatively related to MPAS Rejecting parental attitudes ($r = -.35, p < .02$) as was "simultaneous speech" ($r = -.28, p < .05$), "disagreements and aggressions" ($r = -.36, p < .02$), and the "number of interruptions" ($r = -.25, p < .07$). Observers rated high MPAS Rejecting scale scores as warm ($r = -.51, p < .02$) and permissive ($r = .24, p < .08$).

Demographic Differences. A t test was computed between the scores of black and white workers to determine important response differences. The means of the two groups on the behavioral measures is on Table 6.

Insert Table 6

There were significant differences on seven of the 26 possible comparisons. On the composite conflict score, caucasian workers were significantly higher ($p < .01$). Consistent with the composite score are the individual conflict measures. The caucasian worker was significantly higher on "inability to reach a decision" ($p < .004$) and on "number of interruptions" ($p < .000$). However, s/he was also more likely to yield to the group decisions ($p < .01$) and had more successful interruptions than his/her black counterpart ($p < .01$). The caucasian worker was less likely to passively accept a group decision ($p < .08$) and more likely to defend a child's opinion ($p < .01$).

Male-female differences in responding were also compared. There were five significant differences out of 26 possible comparisons.

The male worker was less likely to passively accept the group opinion

Table 6
Race and Sex Differences
on the Structured Family Interaction Test

<u>Behavioral Measures</u>	<u>Demographic Variables</u>			
	<u>Male</u>	<u>Female</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>
Speaks First	5.4	6.6	6.8	6.1
Speaks Last	5.0	5.5	5.5	5.3
% of Words Spoken	5.0	5.1	5.2	5.0
Passive Acceptance	9.2	8.4*	8.0	9.0
Unsuccessful to Total Interruptions	2.2	1.9	.54	2.7**
Yielding	8.4	9.4***	9.4	9.1**
Simultaneous Speech	.42	1.8**	.72	1.9
Disagreements/ Agressions	2.7	3.3	1.6	4.0
No solution	.28	.68	.18	.80***
Interruptions	.42	1.3*	.18	1.6***
Asks Opinion	1.4	3.0	2.4	2.8
Elaborates	5.4	4.6*	3.5	5.5
Defends	1.7	2.2	.81	2.8**

* p < .05

** p < .01

*** p < .001

without comment ($p < .03$) but more frequently elaborated on a child's opinion ($p < .04$). The female worker engaged in more simultaneous speech ($p < .004$), interruptions ($p < .02$) and was less likely to yield her opinion ($p < .000$).

Long term workers (over one year) were compared with short term workers (more than three months but less than a year). See Table 7.

Insert Table 7

The short term worker was more likely to "passively accept" ($p < .001$). S/He was more likely to reach a consensual opinion ($p < .01$). However, s/he was higher in overall conflict scores ($p < .06$). These comparisons are found in Table 7 and 8.

Insert Table 8

Workers with children of their own were compared with workers who had no children. There were significant differences. The "parent" worker was higher on "passive acceptance" ($p < .001$) and "successful interruptions" ($p < .00$), but less high on the number of "disagreements and aggressions" ($p < .01$) and interruptions ($p < .01$). He was also seen as warmer on the Rorbaugh scales ($p < .04$) and low on the Rejection scale of the MPAS ($p < .07$).

Table 7

Length of Employment and Child/No Child Differences
on the Structured Family Interaction Test

<u>Behavioral Measures</u>	<u>Demographic Variables</u>			
	<u>Long Term</u>	<u>Short Term</u>	<u>Child</u>	<u>No Child</u>
Speaks First	5.9	7.1	8.3	5.5
Speaks Last	5.0	6.2	5.0	5.6
% of Words Spoken	4.6	5.9	5.0	5.1
Passive Acceptance	8.3	9.2***	7.7	9.0**
Unsuccessful to Total Interruptions	1.9	2.1	.20	2.8***
Yielding	9.3	9.0***	9.4	9.1
Simultaneous Speech	1.4	1.5	1.2	1.6
Disagreements/Aggressions	3.3	2.9	1.6	3.9**
No Solution	.76	.27**	.40	.68
Interruptions	.95	1.5	.60	1.4**
Asks Opinion	2.6	2.8	2.4	2.8
Elaborates	4.6	5.2	3.6	5.4
Defends	2.0	2.4	1.8	2.3

*p<.05

**p<.01

***p<.001

Table 8

Demographic Differences on Composite Behavioral Measures
of the Structured Family Interaction Test

<u>Demographic Variables</u>	<u>Composite Behavioral Measures</u>		
	<u>Dominance</u>	<u>Conflict</u>	<u>Protectiveness</u>
Male	35.4	4.2	8.5
Female	37.2	8.1	9.6
Black	35.6	3.2	6.8
White	37.4	9.3**	10.7
Long Term	35.2	6.8	8.8
Short Term	39.9	8.1	10.5
Child	35.8	5.6	7.8
No Child	37.3	8.0	10.13

*p < .05

**p < .01

***p < .001

DISCUSSION

Extensive research has related parental attitudes to the personality development of children. This research indicates that parental attitudes of punitiveness, rejection, over-control and rigid discipline can have detrimental effects. In view of the parental role assumed by child care workers in residential treatment, it is crucial to determine if the attitudes toward parenting a worker professes affects his behavior with his/her charges. The results of this study show that a worker's parental attitudes affect worker-child interaction in predictable ways.

Disciplinarian Attitudes. Past research in the area of parental attitudes provided the hypothesis that workers who scored high on the Disciplinarian scale of the MPAS would score high on behavioral measures of dominance on the SFIT. Workers were also expected to score high on the Disciplinarian and Restrictiveness scales of the Rorbaugh. These relationships were substantiated. This is a crucial finding in view of the research reviewed by Duncan (1971). Duncan concluded that a parental attitude of restrictive overcontrol is found throughout the literature in families of emotionally disturbed children.

A certain behavior pattern that goes with high Disciplinarian child rearing attitudes emerged when individual attitude correlates were considered. In the child care worker's interactions with his/her charges, s/he tended to dominate conversations and insure task completion. S/He was not concerned with fostering autonomy or defending a child's opinion. The high Disciplinarian worker was rated by observers as

emotionally neutral in reactions to the children and as having predominately negative expectations for the child's behavior.

Protectiveness Attitudes. It may appear puzzling that a significant negative relationship existed between Disciplinary attitudes and "speaking first" in an interaction. However, when this relationship was seen in conjunction with the significant positive relationship between Protective parental attitudes on the MPAS and "speaking first" and "speaking last" in an interaction, then the behavior became clearer. "Speaking first" and "speaking last" do not assess dominance but measure attempts to protect or control the child. The MPAS Protective scale stressed controlling the child's autonomy and allowing little independent action. For example, the item "Parents should watch their children all the time to keep them from being hurt" is endorsed on the Protective scale of the MPAS. The protective measures on the SFIT-"asking opinions", "elaborating on an opinion", and "defending an opinion"-stressed less the direct control of behavior than the items on the MPAS Protective scale. They did not consistently relate to the MPAS Protectiveness scale. Therefore, the initial hypothesis of a positive relationship between the MPAS Protectiveness scale and behavioral protectiveness measures on the SFIT was not confirmed. No relationships were found between protective control on the MPAS and Rorbaugh ratings of Restrictiveness.

Indulgent Attitudes. Indulgent attitudes by workers on the MPAS had a clearer relationship to overt behavior. Workers who scored high on Indulgent attitudes were judged by the raters to be warm, permissive individuals who showed a relaxed, calm, easy interaction with

adolescents in their group home. The raters judged them as having significantly higher expectations for the child's behavior and as more likely to emphasize internalization of controls and values in their discipline approach. These results confirmed the initial hypothesis of a positive relationship between the MPAS Indulgence scale and the Rorbaugh ratings of Warmth and Permissiveness. The predicted negative relationship between Indulgence on the MPAS and the Rorbaugh ratings of Anxious Emotional Involvement, Negative Expectations, and Hostility was also confirmed. SFIT dominance scores were low for high Indulgent workers as was predicted.

Rejecting Attitudes. Those workers who were high on Rejection on the MPAS were low on composite measures of dominance and conflict on the SFIT. They were likely to yield to group opinion and unlikely to engage in simultaneous speech, interrupt or disagree during the discussion. They were rated on the Rorbaugh as relaxed and matter of fact in their parenting approach. These puzzling relationships were clarified when the items endorsed in the MPAS were investigated. The MPAS Rejecting scale stressed the separation of the adult from the parenting role rather than rejection of the child. Items that had to be endorsed were "Children should not interfere with their parents' night out" or "Most parents are relieved when their children finally go to sleep". Thus, the MPAS Rejection scale was largely measuring a relaxed, possibly even uninvolved, approach to child rearing. The lack of relation between MPAS Rejection and ratings of hostility or coldness on the Rorbaugh underscore the limited definition that can be applied to the MPAS Rejecting scale. Consequently, the initial hypothesis that the MPAS Rejecting scale was

positively related to conflict on the SFIT and to the Rorbaugh scales of Hostility, Negative Expectations and Restrictiveness was not confirmed.

Demographic Differences. The caucasian female worker who had been in the residential home less than one year was most likely to have conflict with the adolescents. She was less likely to yield her position once stated. Short term workers engaged in more conflict than veteran workers. The long term worker was more likely to engage in such passive behaviors as accepting others' opinions or not reaching a solution. Workers who already had children of their own showed warmer, more positive and less conflict ridden relationships with the adolescents. They were less likely to advocate separation and independence from the parental role. This indicates that being a parent may be a useful consideration in choosing workers. Behavioral measures as a whole were more likely to indicate demographic differences than were observer's ratings or self-endorsed attitudes.

IMPLICATIONS

The use of parental attitude surveys, including the position that they are too inconclusive to be of much value (Becker, 1965), has been controversial. However, this study, which used the MPAS, indicated that important relationships between parental Disciplinarian, Protective, Indulgent and Rejecting attitudes and behavior exist in a child care worker population. This research supported the belief that parental attitude scales are useful instruments in predicting behavior in a certain type of adult-child interaction. It affirms the premise that a child care worker's beliefs about parenting in general affect his/her specific behavior in dealing with the children under his/her care.

However, it has not been determined if the child care workers' attitudes and corresponding behavior differences have an effect on treatment. This could be determined by using the MPAS to differentiate high and low scorers on the four attitude scales. The treatment effects of the corresponding attitude differences could thus be determined. It also has not yet been determined if the child views the worker's behavior in ways consistent with the worker's perception. This is especially crucial in view of the research by Schaefer (1965) that indicates the child's behavior may be more a function of the individual child's perception of parental attitudes than of the parent's professed attitudes.

The MPAS has proved to be a useful instrument in predicting behavior associated with parental attitudes. Thus, a residential treatment home in searching for optimal worker-environment match could focus on the worker's professed attitudes on the MPAS to screen for target worker characteristics. An institution that stressed control and discipline may prefer a worker with compatible high discipline attitudes toward parenting. However, an institution that stressed nurturance and support may prefer a worker who advocates more indulgent parental attitudes. Additionally, institutions may prefer differing worker behavior as a function of the population served. An institution that primarily serves repeat juvenile felony offenders may prefer a different parenting approach than an institution that serves status offenders. Certain parental attitude correlates may not be advocated by any institution. Past research on the effect of parental attitudes has indicated that attitudes of punitiveness, rejection and overcontrol are related to the formation of behavioral problems in children. An

institution dedicated to treatment must certainly determine the effect of workers supporting such attitudes.

The majority of behaviors which differentiated workers in this study involved negative behaviors -- that is, conflict measures and dominance measures. The measures that were assumed to be more concerned with the child's individuality -- that is, "asking opinions", "defending a child's opinion" or "elaborating" on a child's opinion -- were less successful in differentiating attitudes. In view of the demonstrated relationship in this study between attitudes and behavior, a useful approach in research is to determine attitudes that predict given desired behaviors in child care workers. Payson (1975) explored the personality characteristics related to counseling effectiveness in a child care worker population. He found that demographic data and results from a relationship inventory were useful predictors of specified target behaviors, as were certain scales from the California Psychological Inventory. Specifically, he found that worker characteristics of self-acceptance, self-actualization, capacity for intimate contact, empathy and feeling reactivity were predictive of high effectiveness ratings by program supervisors. An attitude survey that differentiates child care workers along predetermined desired behaviors is recommended. Such an attitude survey would be useful in further research on the therapeutic properties of residential treatment. The worker's characteristics could be held constant by screening them with such an instrument while other factors in residential care are varied.

The MPAS was useful in separating groups that differentiated on Disciplinary, Indulgent, and Protective attitudes. The results were

in the predicted directions based on past research on these attitudes. However, the Rejecting scale on the MPAS was not clearly consistent with past studies. For example, according to Roe (1957), interpersonal warmth should be negatively related with rejection. However, this research indicated no relationship between the MPAS Rejection scale and warmth. Therefore, the Rejection scale of the MPAS cannot be equated with past research results on the effects of parental attitudes of rejection without careful qualification.

A crucial role in therapeutic residential treatment has long been attributed to the child care worker. However, the dimensions of that role and the characteristics of the worker-child interaction have received little research attention. This study indicated that investigating the worker's attitudes toward childrearing offers a promising avenue of research.

Appendix A

Maryland Parent Attitude Survey

by

Donald K. Pumroy

Directions: This survey is concerned with parents' attitudes toward child rearing. At first, you will probably find it difficult; but as you proceed it will go more rapidly.

Below are presented 95 pairs of statements on attitudes toward child rearing. Your task is to choose ONE of the pair (A or B) that MOST represents your attitude, and place a circle around the letter (A or B) that proceeds that statement. Thus:

- (A) Parents should like their children.
- (B) Parents frequently find children a burden.

Note that in some cases it will seem that both represent the way you feel: while, on other occasions, neither represents your point of view. In both cases, however, you are to choose the one that MOST represents your point of view. As this is sometimes difficult to do, the best way to proceed is to put down your first reaction. Please pick one from each of the pairs.

1. A. Parents know what is good for their children.
B. A good leather strap makes children respect parents.
2. A. Parents should give some explanations for rules and restrictions.
B. Children should never be allowed to break a rule without being punished.
3. A. Parents do much for their children with no thanks in return.
B. Children should have tasks that they do without being reminded.
4. A. Parents should sacrifice everything for their children.
B. Children should obey their parents.
5. A. Children should follow the rules their parents put down.
B. Children should not interfere with their parents' night out.
6. A. Parents should watch their children all the time to keep them from getting hurt.
B. Children who always obey grow up to be the best adults.

7. A. Children should never be allowed to talk back to their parents.
B. Parents should accompany their children to the places they want to go.
8. A. Children should learn to keep their place.
B. Children should be required to consult their parents before making any important decisions.
9. A. Quiet, well behaved children will develop into the best type of grown-up.
B. Parents should pick up their child's toys if he doesn't want to do it himself.
10. A. Parents should do things for their children.
B. A child's life should be as pleasant as possible.
11. A. Watching television keeps children out of the way.
B. Children should never be allowed to talk back to their parents.
12. A. Personal untidiness is a revolt against authority so parents should take the matter in hand.
B. A good child always asks permission before he does anything so he doesn't get into trouble.
13. A. Sometimes children make a parent so mad they see red.
B. Parents should do things for their children.
14. A. Children should be taught to follow the rules of the game.
B. A child's life should be as pleasant as possible.
15. A. Parents should cater to their children's appetites.
B. Many parents wonder if parenthood is worthwhile.
16. A. A child's life should be as pleasant as possible.
B. Sometimes children make their parents so mad they see red.
17. A. Children should not tell anyone their problems except their parents.
B. Children should play whenever they feel like in the house.
18. A. A good form of discipline is to deprive a child of the things that he really wants.
B. Children should do what they are told without arguing.
19. A. Children should be taken to and from school to make sure there are no accidents.
B. Children who always obey grow up to be the best adults.
20. A. Many parents wonder if parenthood is worthwhile.
B. Children should be required to consult their parents before making any decisions.

21. A. If a child doesn't like a particular food, he should be made to eat it.
B. Children should have lots of gifts and toys.
22. A. Children should play whenever they feel like in the house.
B. Good children are generally those who keep out of their parents way.
23. A. Children never volunteer to do anything around the house.
B. Parents should pick up their child's toys if he doesn't want to do it himself.
24. A. Good children are generally those who keep out of their parents' way.
B. Children should not be allowed to play in the living room.
25. A. Modern children talk back to their parents too much.
B. Children should be required to consult their parents before making any decisions.
26. A. Parents should make it their business to know everything their children are thinking.
B. Children never volunteer to do any work around the house.
27. A. Children should come immediately when their parents call.
B. Parents should give surprise parties for their children.
28. A. Good parents overlook their children's shortcomings.
B. Watching television keeps children out of the way.
29. A. Parents should watch their children all the time to keep them from getting hurt.
B. A child should never be forced to do anything he doesn't want to do.
30. A. Television keeps children out of the way.
B. The most important thing to teach children is discipline.
31. A. Children should do what they are told without arguing.
B. Parents know how much a child needs to eat to stay healthy.
32. A. Television keeps children out of the way.
B. A child needs someone to make judgments for him.
33. A. Modern children talk back to their parents too much.
B. Parents should amuse their children if no playmates are around to amuse them.
34. A. Good children are generally those who keep out of their parents' way.
B. Parents should pick up their child's toys if he doesn't want to do it himself.

35. A. Parents should see to it that their children do not learn bad habits from others.
B. Good parents lavish their children with warmth and affection.
36. A. Parents shouldn't let their children tie them down.
B. Modern children talk back to their parents too much.
37. A. Children who destroy any property should be severely punished.
B. Children cannot make judgments very well for themselves.
38. A. Most parents are relieved when their children finally go to sleep.
B. Parents should hide dangerous objects from their children.
39. A. Children should not be allowed to play in the living room.
B. Children should play whenever they feel like in the house.
40. A. Parents should give surprise parties for their children.
B. Most parents are relieved when their children finally go to sleep.
41. A. Children should be taken to and from school to make sure there are no accidents.
B. Parents should clean up after their children.
42. A. Children are best when they are asleep.
B. Personal untidiness is a revolt against authority so parents should take the matter in hand.
43. A. The earlier the child is toilet trained the better.
B. A child needs someone to make judgements for him.
44. A. Watching television keeps children out of the way.
B. Parents should accompany their children to the places they go.
45. A. The earlier the child is toilet trained the better.
B. Good parents overlook their children's shortcomings.
46. A. Parents should clean up after their children.
B. Children need their natural meanness taken out of them.
47. A. Parents should give surprise parties for their children.
B. Children need their natural meanness taken out of them.
48. A. Most parents are relieved when their children finally go to sleep.
B. Children should come immediately when their parents call.
49. A. Children who lie should always be spanked.
B. Children should be required to consult their parents before making any decisions.

50. A. Sometimes children just seem mean.
B. Parents should see to it that their children do not learn bad habits from others.
51. A. Punishment should be fair and fit the crime.
B. Parents should feel great love for their children.
52. A. Parents should buy the best things for their children.
B. Children are best when they are asleep.
53. A. Children should be required to consult their parents before making any decisions.
B. Parents should cater to their children's appetites.
54. A. Parents should have time for outside activities.
B. Punishment should be fair and fit the crime.
55. A. Children should not be allowed to play in the living room.
B. Children should not tell anyone their problems except their parents.
56. A. It seems that children get great pleasure out of disobeying their elders.
B. Parents should watch their children all the time to keep them from getting hurt.
57. A. Personal untidiness is a revolt against authority so parents should take the matter in hand.
B. Parents should buy the best things for their children.
58. A. Children should learn to keep their place.
B. Good parents overlook their children's shortcomings.
59. A. Parents should accompany their children to the places that they want to go.
B. Good parents overlook their children's shortcomings.
60. A. Children do many things just to torment their parents.
B. Parents should insist that everyone of their commands be obeyed.
61. A. Children should come immediately when their parents call.
B. Parents should hide dangerous objects from their children.
62. A. Children do many things just to torment a parent.
B. Children should be protected from upsetting experiences.
63. A. Children who lie should always be spanked.
B. Parents should cater to their children's appetites.
64. A. A child should never be forced to do anything he doesn't want to do.

- B. It seems that children get great pleasure out of disobeying their elders.
65. A. Parents should keep a night light on for their children.
B. Parents live again in their children.
66. A. Sometimes children make parents so mad they see red.
B. Children should be taught to follow the rules of the game.
67. A. Parents should insist that everyone of their commands be obeyed.
B. Children should be protected from upsetting experiences.
68. A. Good children are generally those who keep out of their parents way.
B. Children should not tell anyone their problems except their parents.
69. A. Children who destroy property should be severely punished.
B. Children's meals should always be ready for them when they come home from play or school.
70. A. Parents should frequently surprise their children with gifts.
B. A good form of discipline is to deprive children of things they really want.
71. A. Children should depend on their parents.
B. Parents should amuse their children if no playmates are around to amuse them.
72. A. Many parents wonder if parenthood is worthwhile.
B. Children who lie should always be spanked.
73. A. Quiet, well behaved children will develop into the best type of grownup.
B. Children never volunteer to do anything around the house.
74. A. Children need their natural meanness taken out of them.
B. Children should be taken to and from school to be sure that there are no accidents.
75. A. Children should never be allowed to talk back to their parents.
B. Good parents overlook their children's shortcomings.
76. A. Parents should give their children all that they can afford.
B. Television keeps children out of the way.
77. A. Children cannot make judgments very well for themselves.
B. Children's meals should always be ready for them when they come home from play or school.
78. A. Sometimes children are inconvenient.

- B. Children should be reprimanded for breaking things.
79. A. If children misbehave they should be punished.
B. Parents should see to it that their children do not learn bad habits from others.
80. A. Children are often in one's way around the house.
B. Children seven years old are too young to spend summers away from home.
81. A. Children should do what they are told without arguing.
B. Parents should frequently surprise their children with gifts.
82. A. Parents should feel great love for their children.
B. Parents should have time for outside activities.
83. A. A child needs someone to make judgments for him.
B. Good parents overlook their children's shortcomings.
84. A. Parents should make it their business to know everything their children are thinking.
B. Quiet, well behaved children will develop into the best type of grownup.
85. A. Children who destroy any property should be severely punished.
B. A good child always asks permission before he does anything so that he does not get into trouble.
86. A. A good form of discipline is to deprive a child of things that he really wants.
B. Parents know how much a child needs to eat to stay healthy.
87. A. The most important thing to teach a child is discipline.
B. Parents should give their children all that they can afford.
88. A. Parents should amuse their children if no playmates are around to amuse them.
B. Parents shouldn't let children down.
89. A. Parents know how much a child needs to eat to stay healthy.
B. Parents should frequently surprise their children with gifts.
90. A. Sometimes children just seem mean.
B. If children misbehave they should be punished.
91. A. Children should be taught to follow the rules of the game.
B. Parents should do things for their children.
92. A. Parents shouldn't let their children tie them down.
B. Children should depend on their parents.
93. A. Children who always obey grow up to be the best adults.

- B. Parents should clean up after their children.
94. A. Children's meals should always be ready for them when they come home from play or school.
- B. Children do many things just to torment a parent.
95. A. A good child always asks permission before he does anything, so that he doesn't get into trouble.
- B. Parents should buy the best things for their children.

Appendix B

Rorbaugh Attitude Scales

Warmth

In part, Becker (1964, p. 174) defines parental warmth with variables such as: accepting, affectionate, approving, understanding, child-centered, frequent use of explanations, positive responses to dependency behavior, high use of praise. A warm parent is concerned and interested in his (her) child, and is empathic and understanding of the child's point of view. The parent's enjoyment of the child as a person is evident. The response to the child is more apt to be in terms of child's benefit (to teach him right, to be sure he is well or healthy) rather than because of the parent's self-orientation, comfort, ego-gratification, etc. Part of the overall attitude will come through in the ways the parent addresses the child in the immediate situation.

This scale is focusing on the amount of warmth, and assumes that warmth may be independent of hostility. For each situation, rate as seems most fitting for the whole situation--it will often be a weighted balance of maximum and minimum warmth shown.

1. Very warm. Parent clearly proud of son, concerned with and enjoying of the child as a person, understanding and empathic.
2. Quite warm. A lesser degree of 1, often the rating will fall slightly as a slightly less empathic approach will emerge, or the child's feelings are not so important.
3. Moderately warm. The parent loves the child, and expresses warmth toward him, but there is nothing outstanding in degree or expression. Is not ashamed of child, but doesn't express any particular pride, except in somewhat rare or hypothetical terms.
4. Luke-warm. Parent probably loves the child, but no special empathy toward him. May be casual but shows lack of empathy and an emotional distance.
5. Neutral. Little expression of warmth, may speak somewhat detachedly, in some cases even coldly. May not understand much of what child is doing or thinking, and may or may not be concerned about this. At quite a distance from the child emotionally.

Positiveness of Expectations

This scale is primarily to determine the quality of expectations

which are communicated to the child in regard to his behavior. Positive expectations are apt to be voiced in such ways as "_____ is always very dependable, so with him it would be all right." "We're always very proud of _____." "_____ is a bright kid, he always does good work." Negative expectations might be stated as "Well, we'd check that (good grade) for sure!" "_____ is apt to go fooling around and not paying any attention, so it would be better if he didn't try it." "You can't expect boys of his age to do that, so we'd watch it pretty close." "Boys will be boys, you know, and they just will get into trouble." The actual reality of the situation is irrelevant to this scale-- it is the expectation that counts.

1. Primarily positive expectations. Most of the expectations expressed or implied are positive.
2. More positive than negative, but some of both. Positive statements may be qualified or expressed so mildly or doubtfully that the result is somewhat mixed.
3. About 50-50. Expectations seem intermediate, or positive and negative are equally expressed.
4. More negative than positive, but some of both. The overall quality is that one can't expect too much of the child, but some positive is expected. (e.g., "Of course we know he can do it, but he usually doesn't want to work that hard.")
5. Primarily negative expectations. The child is not really expected to achieve or behave well. Naughtiness is expected, failure to live up to regulations is expected, achievement is not expected. Doesn't necessarily imply hostility, just doesn't expect child to behave in the positive ways, and is not surprised when he doesn't.

Anxious Emotional Involvement

Overall, this scale focuses on the degree of anxiety which the parent centers on the child, including what are usually termed over-solicitousness, overprotectiveness, and overinvolvement. Following Becker (1964, p. 174), anxious emotional involvement is reflected in "high emotionality in relation to (the) child, babying, protectiveness, and solicitousness for the child's welfare." The parent is anxious and over-involved with the child and demonstrated high child rearing anxiety. He is apt to use warnings of danger either as a reflection of overconcern about the child and the dangers in the world for the child, or as a means of controlling the child.

This scale is "basically concerned with the intensity of emotional response and involvement with the child, whether warm, hostile, or anxious, but emphasizing anxiousness." (Becker, 1964, p. 174) An involved or over-anxious quality must be present for a warm or hostile response to be rated higher on this scale.

High anxiety is also reflected in the parent's being easily hurt by the child, easily made defensive by or in regard to the child, and a tendency to see the child as endangered by others or outside forces, as vulnerable and in need of protection.

The low end of the scale is in the direction of calmness and matter-of-factness. Such a parent is not easily upset over and about the child, and is not easily worried or concerned about the child.

1. Little or no anxious emotional involvement. Parent is calm and unruffled by most of child's behavior, unless a real emergency comes up. Handles child matter-of-factly.
2. Some tendency to be anxious in relation to the child, though still quite mildly so. May express doubts about relatively minor aspects of own child-rearing behaviors, but not as though this was really much of a worry. A trifle over-protective, oversolicitous, or over-reactive in relation to the child.
3. Some specific focus on the child as a worry. Sometimes unsure in the face of child's behavior, but not to the point of not continuing to try to do something. May express some serious doubt about specific policies, although in general is not particularly worried. At this stage, some anxiety is clear in relation to child, but it is not strong or pervasive.
4. Considerable doubts and worries about child and own role in relation to child. Is hurt by the child's behavior, although may try to hide this in part. Leaps quickly to the child's defense, but in a manner that implies a view of the child as in need of protection. Becomes very worried if loses track of child. May (or may not) express considerable helplessness in regard to control of child.
5. Quite strongly emotionally involved in an anxious way with the child. The intensity (overly) and unease of the relationship is quite clear. Is quite worried and anxious in relationship to child. May quickly speak for the child, putting words into child's mouth before he can say anything. May be anxiously condescending, and "fluttering" in relation to the child.

Hostility

This scale is meant to measure any hostility which may be present, whether toward the child, the other parent, the experimenter, or the world in general. The hostility may be a personality trait, such as a generalized tendency to react angrily or sarcastically, or it may be situation specific.

1. No hostility detectable.
2. Abruptness, slight harshness of mode of expression, mild indications of annoyance or irritation.

3. Covert indications of hostility. Sarcastic in tone, harsh in tone, or an undercurrent of annoyance or mild anger. Quite mild at this point.
4. Marked covert hostility or anger, or mild anger expressed in the actual situation.
5. Clearly angry or hostile, expressed at the moment. May be clear in tone, or more likely both in tone and words.

Permissive - Restrictive

This scale measures the degree to which the parents restrict or do not restrict the freedom of action of the child, and the degree to which they attempt to structure the child's world and activities. This would thus entail both limiting range of action (keeping the child close to home, for instance) and the degree to which they want to know all of the details of what he does (and regulate them) whether or not that range is extended. The effectiveness of this control is here irrelevant, the point is the extent to which the parents attempt to be restrictive or grant autonomy.

1. Very restrictive. Restrictive in most situations. Little disobedience tolerated. Many restrictions and strict enforcement of demands in a wide variety of areas, including manners, neatness, orderliness, care of household furniture, noise, and aggression. Wants to know what child is doing; and structures most activities quite carefully. Child not allowed outside of fairly narrow range in terms of distance from home, ideas, and behavior.
2. Moderately restrictive. Provides considerable structure and control in many situations, but range is greater, and child is allowed to structure many aspects of situations for himself. Parent structures many situations, but not in great detail. May only provide general outline. Expect some disobedience, and moderate enforcement of neatness, noise, aggression, etc., particularly when not at home.
3. Medium. Sometimes restrictive, sometimes permissive. Allows autonomy in moderate degree, but structures more important areas (important to the parent) and usually knows fairly well where the child is. More flexible to child's own structuring of many situations. Moderate enforcement.
4. Moderately permissive. More often permissive than restrictive. Will be permissive if feels can, allows considerable autonomy of movement, leeway in obedience, aggression, manners, orderliness. Relatively little structure of situations within the acceptable range of behaviors and movement.
5. Very permissive. Most decisions left up to child. Little restriction on range of movement, much leeway of obedience, much tolerance of messiness and aggression.

Type of Discipline

Induction (love-oriented, psychological) techniques, versus Sensitization (power-assertive, physical) techniques.

At the low end of this scale fall discipline procedures oriented toward the production of guilt and internalized behavior controls not dependent on the actual presence of authority figures. At the high end fall disciplinary practices related to an externally oriented fear of consequences rather than fear of violating value standards. The induction techniques would include: insisting on restitution or apology, asking why he did it, reasoning and explanation of why it was wrong and not punishing if the child recognizes it was wrong and accepts the responsibility, expression of hurt and disappointment. The emphasis is on the child's taking responsibility for behaving according to inner standards based on fear of parental disapproval, as well as reinforcing tendencies of the child to either approve or disapprove of himself whether or not parents are present. In positive situations, the parent rewards the child by the pleasure of the parent and an emphasis on the intrinsic value of the behavior of the child.

Sensitization techniques include power assertive techniques, such as physical punishment, yelling at him, losing of parental temper, denying a privilege or sending to room as a fixed punishment rather than until the child is ready to behave. Parental reaction to misbehavior aimed at inhibiting the misbehavior, often containing an immediacy of response lacking in the induction techniques, and emphasizing the discomfort (often physical) to the child in the immediate situation when he is caught rather than the wrong or irresponsible nature of the action. In positive situations there is a dependence upon physical or material rewards rather than pleasure of parent or child.

1. Primarily use of induction techniques.
2. More induction than sensitization, but usually some of both.
3. About 50-50. Can't really classify. Mixed approaches.
4. More sensitization than induction, but usually some of both. Milder forms of sensitization.
5. Primarily sensitization techniques.

References

- Ackerly, S. Rebellion and its relation to delinquency and neurosis in 60 adolescents. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 1933, 3, 147-160.
- American Association for Children's Residential Centers. From Chaos to order. New York: Child Welfare League, 1972.
- Armentrout, J.A. Parental child rearing attitudes and preadolescents' problem behaviors. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1971, 37, 278-285.
- Ausubel, S.P., Balthazar, E., Rosenthal, I., Blackman, L., Schpoont, S., & Welkowitz, J. Perceived parent attitudes as determinants of children's ego structure. Child Development, 1954, 25, 173-183.
- Becker, W.C. Consequences of different kinds of parental discipline. In M.L. Hoffman & L.W. Hoffman (Eds.), Review of Child Development Research (vol. 1). New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1964, 169-208.
- Becker, W.C., & Krug, R.S. The parent attitude research instrument - a research review. Child Development, 1965, 36 (2), 329-365.
- Becker, W., Peterson, D.R., Luria, Z., Shoemaker, D.J., & Hellmer, L.A. Relations of factors derived from parent interview ratings to behavior problems of five-year olds. Child Development, 1962, 33, 509-535.
- Beedell, C. Residential life with children. New York: Humanities Press, 1970.
- Bell, R.Q. Retrospective attitude studies of parent-child relations. Child Development, 1958, 29(3), 323-337.
- Bell, R.Q. The effect on the family of a limitation in coping ability in the child: a research approach and a finding. Merrill-Palmer Quarterly, 1964, 10, 129-142.
- Berwald, J. Cottage parents in a treatment institution. Child Welfare, 1960, 39(10), 7-10.
- Bettelheim, B. Love is not enough. Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press, 1950.
- Bettelheim, B. The role of residential treatment for children: Symposium, 1954; 8: staff development in a treatment institution. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry. 1954, 25, 705-719.

- Bettelheim, B. Training the child-care worker in a residential center. The American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 1966, 36, 694-711.
- Bettelheim, B. Home for the heart. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, Inc., 1974.
- Bettelheim, B., & Sylvester, E. A therapeutic milieu. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 1948, 18, 191-206.
- Berwald, J.F. Cottage parents in a treatment institution. Child Welfare, 1960, 39(10), 7-10.
- Block, J. Personality characteristics associated with fathers' attitudes toward child rearing. Child Development, 1955, 26(1), 411-418.
- Bonney, M.B. Parents as the makers of social deviants. Social Forces, 1941, 20, 77.
- Bronfenbrenner, U. Some familial antecedents of responsibility and leadership in adolescents. In Petrullo, L. and Bass, B.M. Studies in leadership, 1960.
- Buehler, R.E., Patterson, G.R., & Furness, J.M. The reinforcement of behavior in institutional settings. Behavior Research and Therapy, 1966, 4, 157-167.
- Carducci, D.J. A possible solution to the training and orienting of child care workers. Child Welfare, 1962, 41(5), 212-216.
- Cohen, H. The importance of father's and mother's attitudes as related to fears of school-age boys. Dissertation Abstracts International, 1973, 34, 2924B.
- Cox, S. Intrafamily comparison of loving-rejecting child rearing practices. Child Development, 1970, 41(2), 437-448.
- Davids, A. Issues in abnormal psychology. Belmont, Ca: Wadsworth, 1973.
- Dennis, M. The relationship between perceived parental attitudes toward the daughter during childhood and subsequent tendency toward emotional disorders in the daughter. Dissertation Abstracts International, 1973, 34, 2932B.
- Diggles, M.W. The child care counselor: new therapist in children's institutions. Child Welfare, 1970, 49, 509-513.
- Duncan, P. Parental attitudes and interactions in delinquency. Child Development, 1971, 42, 1751-1765.
- Edwards, A.L. Manual for the Edwards personal preference schedule, 1954, New York: Psychological Corporation.

- Erikson, E.H. Childhood and Society. New York: Norton, 1964.
- Eron, L.D., Banta, T.J., Walder, L.O., & Lanlicht, J.H. Comparison of data obtained from mothers and fathers on childrearing practices and their relation to child aggression. Child Development, 1961, 32, 457-472.
- Farina, A. Patterns of role dominance and conflict in parents of schizophrenic patients. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1960, 61, 31-38.
- Farina, A., & Holzberg, J.D. Interaction patterns of parents and hospitalized sons diagnosed as schizophrenic. Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 1968, 73, 114-118.
- Farina, A., Storrs, C., & Dunham, R. Measurement of family relationships and their effects. Archives of General Psychiatry, 1963, 9, 64-73.
- Franklin, M. Human relations in the institutional treatment of mal-adjusted and delinquent children. The Howard Journal, 1955, 9(2), 123-126.
- Freeman, R. Maternal attitudes in schizophrenia. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1955, 50, 45-52.
- Frenkle-Brunswik, E. The authoritarian personality. In R. Christie & Marie Jahoda (Eds.), Studies in the scope and method of 'The authoritarian personality'. Glencoe: Free Press, 1954.
- Gerber, G. Conflicts in values and attitudes between parents of symptomatic and normal children. Psychological Reports, 1976, 38, 91-98.
- Gershenson, C. Residential treatment of children: research problems and possibilities. Social Service Review, 1956, 30, 268-275.
- Gildea, M.C.L., Glidewell, J.C., & Kantor, M.B. Maternal attitudes and general adjustment in school children. In J.C. Glidewell (Ed.), Parental attitudes and child behavior. Springfield, Ill.: Thomas, 1961, 42-89.
- Gilmour-Barrett, K. Managerial systems and interpersonal treatment processes in residential centres for disturbed youth. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Waterloo, Canada, 1974). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1975, 35, 2428-B.
- Golfarb, W., Mintz, I., & Stroock, K. A time to heal. New York: International Universities Press, 1969.
- Grossbard, H. Cottage parents - what they have to be, know and do. New York: Child Welfare League of America, 1960.

- Hart, I. Maternal child-rearing practices and authoritarian ideology. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1957, 55, 232-237.
- Heilbrun, A., Harrell, S., & Gillard, B. Perceived child-rearing attitudes of fathers and cognitive control in daughters. The Journal of Genetic Psychology, 1967, 111.
- Henry, J. The culture of interpersonal relations in a therapeutic institution for emotionally disturbed children. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 1957, 27, 725-733.
- Herschel, A., Grossbard, H. Professional issues in the institutional treatment of delinquent children. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 1949, 19, 279-294.
- Hetherington, E.M., & Frankie, G. Effects of parental dominance, warmth, and conflict on imitation in children. Journal of Personality & Social Psychology, 1967, 6, 119-125.
- Hetherington, E.M., Stouwie, R.J. & Ridberg, E.R. Patterns of family interaction and child-rearing attitudes related to three dimensions of juvenile delinquency. Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 1971, 78(2), 160-176.
- Hirschbach, E. Memo to child care workers on their role in group homes. Child Welfare, 1976, 55(10), 681-689.
- Hurley, J. Readings in the psychology of parent-child relations. New York: Wiley, 1967.
- Hyman, G. Development of self-awareness of child care staff. Training for child care staff. New York: Child Welfare League of America, 1963.
- Kovacs, A.L. Some antecedents of denial in fantasy as a defense against anger. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Department of Psychology. The University of Michigan, 1958.
- Leton, D. A study of the validity of parent attitude measurement. Child Development, 1958, 29(4), 515-520.
- Lidz, R., & Lidz, T. The family environment of schizophrenic patients. American Journal of Psychiatry, 1949, 106, 332-345.
- Loevinger, J., & Sweet, R. Construction of a test of mother's attitudes. In J.C. Glidewell (Ed.), Parental attitudes and child behavior. Springfield, Ill: Thomas, 1961.
- Lorr, M., & Jenkins, R.L. Three factors in parent behavior. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1953, 17, 306-308.
- MacDonald, M.W. Criminally aggressive behavior in passive effeminate

- boys. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 1938, 8, 70-78.
- Maier, H. The role of psychotherapy in residential treatment. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 1955, 25(4), 692-699.
- Maier, H., Hilgeman, L., Shugart, G., & Loomis, E. The role of residential treatment for children: Symposium, 1954: Supervision of child care workers in a residential treatment service. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 1954, 25, 699-704.
- Maluccio, A., & Marlow, W. Residential treatment of emotionally disturbed children: a review of the literature. Social Service Review, 1972, 46(2), 230-251.
- Mandelbaum, A. Parent-child separation: its significance to parents. Social Work, 1962, 7(4), 26-35.
- Mark, J.C. The attitudes of the mothers of male schizophrenics toward child behavior. The Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1953, 48(2), 185-189.
- Matsushima, J. Communication and cottage parent supervision in a residential treatment center. Child Welfare, 1964, 43(10), 529-533.
- Mayer, M. The parental figure in residential treatment. Social Service Review, 1960, 34(4), 273-285.
- Mayer, M. Differential education and inservice training for child care workers. Child Welfare, 1965, 44(5), 252-261.
- McCord, W., McCord, J., & Howard, A. Familial correlates of aggression in nondelinquent male children. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1961, 62, 79-93.
- Milton, G.A. A factor analytic study of child-rearing behaviors. Child Development, 1958, 29(3), 381-392.
- Mussen, Congen, & Kagen, Child development and personality. New York: Harper & Row, 1963.
- Nicholas. Parental attitudes of mothers of intelligent adolescents and creativity of their children. Child Development, 1964, 35, 1041-1049.
- Payson, S.L. A study of personality variables of institutional child care personnel and their relationship to child caring practices (Doctoral dissertation, University of Main, 1974). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1975, 36, 136A. (University Microfilms No. 75-12, 423)
- Peterson, D., Becker, W.C., Shoemaker, D.J., Luria, Z., & Hellmer,

- L.A., Child behavior problems and parental attitudes, Child Development, 1961, 32, 151-162.
- Peterson, D., Becker, W., Hellmer, L.A., Shoemaker, D.J., & Quay, H.C. Parental attitudes and child adjustment. Child Development, 1959, 30, 119-130.
- Pumroy, D.K. The effects of intermittent reinforcement on resistance to extinction and emotional behavior in preschool children. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Washington, Seattle, Wash., 1954.
- Pumroy, D.K. Maryland parent attitude survey: a research instrument with social desirability controlled. The Journal of Psychology, 1966, 64, 73-78.
- Raskin, A., Boothe, H., Reatig, N., & Schulterbrandt, J. Factor analyses of normal and depressed patients memories of parental behavior. Psychological Reports, 1971, 29, 871-879.
- Raynes, N., Pratt, M., & Roses, S. Aides' involvement in decision-making and the quality of care in institutional settings. American Journal of Mental Deficiency, 1977, 81(6).
- Read, K. Parents' expressed attitudes and children's behavior. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1945, 9(2), 97-100.
- Renson, G.J., Schaffer, E.S., & Levy, B.I. Cross-national validity of a spherical conceptual model for parent behavior. Child Development, 1968, 39, 1229-1235.
- Ridberg, E.H. Family interaction patterns in families containing a neurotic delinquent or normal adolescent boy. Unpublished master's thesis, University of Wisconsin, 1967.
- Roe, A. Early determinants of vocational choice. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1957, 4, 212-217.
- Rorbaugh, P. Family interaction patterns in normal families containing an aggressive, withdrawn, or sociable boy. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Wisconsin, 1966.
- Rosen, J. Personality factors in the reactions of child care workers to emotionally disturbed children. Psychiatry, 1963, 26, 257-265.
- Rosenthal, M.J., Ni, E., Finkelstein, M., & Berkwits, G. Father-child relationships and children's problems. Archives of Genetic Psychiatry, 1962, 7(5), 360-373.
- Schafer, C.E. An exploratory study of basic attitudes and philosophies of child care staff. Devereaux Schools Forum, 1974, 9(1), 21-26.
- Schafer, E.S. A circumplex model for material behavior. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1959, 59, 226-235.

- Schaefer, E.S. Children's reports of parental behavior: an inventory. Child Development, 1965, 36, 413-424.
- Schaefer, E.S., & Bell, R.Q. Development of a parental attitude research instrument. Child Development, 1958, 29, 339-361.
- Schulman, R., Shoemaker, D.J., & Moelis, I. Laboratory measurement of parental behavior. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1962, 26(2), 109-114.
- Sears, R.R., Maccoby, E., & Levin, H. Patterns of child rearing. Evanston, Ill.: Row, Peterson, 1957.
- Serot, N.M., & Teevan, R. Perception of the parent-child relationship and its relation to child adjustment. Child Development, 1961, 32, 373-378.
- Shoben, J.R. The assessment of parental attitudes in relation to child adjustment. Genetic Psychology Monographs, 1949, 39, 101-148.
- Silver, H. Residential treatment of emotionally disturbed children: an evaluation of 15 years experience. Journal of Jewish Communal Service, 1961, 38, 199-202.
- Simon, A. Residential treatment of children unanswered questions. Social Service Review, 1956, 30, 260-267.
- Stone, F.B., & Howley, V., Children's behavior problems and parental attitudes. The Journal of Genetic Psychology, 1965, 107, 281-287.
- Studd, E. Therapeutic factors in group living. Child Welfare, 1956, 35.
- Symonds, P.M. The psychology of parent-child relations. New York: Appleton-Century, 1939.
- Szurek, S.A. Dynamics of staff interaction in hospital psychiatric treatment of children. The American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 1947, 17, 652-664.
- Tizard, B., Cooperman, D., Joseph, A., & Tizard, J. Environmental effects on language development: a study of young children in long-stay residential nurseries. Child Development, 1972, 43, 337-358.
- Tod, R.J. Papers on residential work: disturbed children. London: Longmans, Green & Co., 1968.
- Trieschman, A.E., Whittaker, J.K., & Brentro, L.K. The other 23 hours: child care work with emotionally disturbed children in a therapeutic milieu. Chicago: Aldine, 1969.

- Volenski, L.T. Parental attitudes and children's social behavior. Dissertations Abstract International, 1973, 33(8-B), 3966.
- Wasserman, S., & Gitlin, P.A. A child care training experience revisited. Child Welfare, 1965, 44, 35-40.
- Winder, C.L., & Rau, L. Parental attitudes associated with social deviance in preadolescent boys. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1962, 64(6), 418-424.
- Yarrow, M. Problems of methods in parent-child research. Child Development, 1963, 34, 215-226.
- Zuckerman, M., Barrett, B., & Braigiel, R. The parental attitudes of parents of child guidance cases: comparisons with normals, investigations of socioeconomic and family constellation factors, and relations to parents' reactions to the clinics. Child Development, 1960, 31, 401-417.
- Zuckerman, M., Oltean, M. Some relationships between maternal attitude factors and authoritarianism, personality needs, psychopathology, and self-acceptance. Child Development, 1959, 30, 27-36.
- Zuckerman, M., Oltean, M., & Monashkin, I. The parental attitudes of mothers of schizophrenics. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1958, 22(4), 307-310.