

A STUDY OF CONTROLLING AND ACCEPTING
BEHAVIOR OF MOTHERS IN TWO
SOCIAL CLASSES

By

BEVERLY MARIE RUSSELL PARKER
"

Bachelor of Science in Home Economics

Langston University

Langston, Oklahoma

1961

Submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate College
of the Oklahoma State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the Degree of
MASTER OF SCIENCE
July, 1977

Thesis
1977
P238s
cop.2



A STUDY OF CONTROLLING AND ACCEPTING
BEHAVIOR OF MOTHERS IN TWO
SOCIAL CLASSES

Thesis Approved:

Elizabeth Starkweather

Thesis Adviser
Frances Stromberg

John C. McCullen

Norman D. Durbin

Dean of the Graduate College

989219

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The writer wishes to express her appreciation to Dr. Elizabeth Starkweather, for her guidance and encouragement during all phases of this study; and for her enthusiasm, dedication, patience, and friendship. Thanks is expressed to Dr. Frances Stromberg and Dr. Judith Powell for their guidance and suggestions throughout my graduate study. Special thanks is expressed to Dr. John C. McCullers and Dr. Frances Stromberg for their critical reading of the manuscript.

Appreciation is expressed to Judy Ritter Kovacs for her assistance and friendship throughout this study, and particularly for her data gathering in interviews with the middle-class mothers.

Thanks is expressed to the administrators of the Head Start programs, the day care centers, and the nursery schools for their assistance; and special thanks is expressed to the mothers who participated in this research.

Appreciation is expressed to the writer's mother and deceased father, who helped to make this study possible.

My sincerest appreciation is expressed to my husband and daughters, Raymond, Crystal Marie, and Tonya Annette for the many personal sacrifices made.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Problem	1
Definitions	4
Purpose	5
II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE	6
Social Class Differences	6
The 1940's	6
The 1950's	8
The 1960's	12
The 1970's	14
Implications for Future Research	15
III. METHODS AND PROCEDURES	16
Subjects	16
Parent Questionnaires	17
Waring's Preferred Practices Questionnaire	18
Ostrander's Parent Behavior Questionnaire	18
Porter's Parental Acceptance Scale	19
Data Analysis	19
IV. RESULTS	21
Controlling Behavior and Accepting Behavior	21
Social Class Differences	22
Controlling Behavior	22
Accepting Behavior	27
Sex Differences	27
V. SUMMARY AND IMPLICATIONS	28
Implications for Future Research	30
A SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY	31

Chapter	Page
APPENDIXES	33
APPENDIX A - DESCRIPTIVE DATA AND QUESTIONNAIRE SCORES . .	34
APPENDIX B - PARENT QUESTIONNAIRES	37
APPENDIX C - SCORING INFORMATION	51

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
I. Distribution of Children by Age, Sex, and Social Class	17
II. Social Class Differences in Controlling Behavior As Measured by Part I, Waring's Preferred Practices Questionnaire	23
III. Social Class Differences in Controlling Behavior As Measured by Part II, Ostrander's Parent Behavior Questionnaire	24
IV. Social Class Differences in Controlling Behavior As Measured by Questionnaires, Parts I and II Combined	25
V. Social Class Differences in Accepting Behavior As Measured by Part III, Porter's Parental Acceptance Scale	26
VI. Descriptive Data and Questionnaire Scores of Middle-Class Mothers	35
VII. Descriptive Data and Questionnaire Scores of Lower-Class Mothers	36

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Problem

During the past few decades a great deal of research has been focused on parent-child relations. The belief has been that the child-rearing practices of parents are a major influence in the life of the young child, and that an increased understanding of the parent-child relationship would be a major contribution to the field of child development. The personality development of children and their behavior both are significantly influenced by the child-rearing practices of parents.

Studies of child-rearing practices in middle-class and lower-class families have shown specific social class differences and have shown marked changes in practices within each social class over the years. In the 1940's, middle-class mothers were described as restrictive and lower-class mothers were described as permissive in the training of their children. In the 1950's, a shift was noted; the middle-class mothers were more permissive and the lower-class mothers were more restrictive. Most of the research during these years was focused on the mothers' practices in special areas of child training, such as feeding, toilet training, aggressive behavior toward parents, sex behavior, and dependency.

The reported social-class differences in child-rearing practices have been widely accepted, and yet there is reason to believe that these differences should be interpreted with caution. Bronfenbrenner (1958) reviewed several studies that had been completed at that time and commented about the factors which might be taken into consideration in any interpretation of the findings. Major factors were the cultural backgrounds of the parents, the techniques of gathering data, and the advice of experts on child-rearing practices.

At Cornell University, from 1948-1955, studies of parent-child relations were conducted under the direction of Ethel B. Waring (1973). The focus of these studies was on the control and acceptance which mothers exhibited in their child-training practices. Waring believed that the combination of control and acceptance was crucial in the parent-child relationship. Most frequently the high-control mother was low in acceptance, and the low-control mother was high in acceptance; in reality, any combination of control and acceptance was possible and did exist.

One of the Cornell studies in particular, that of Thies (1951), was a study of the relationship between the degree of parental control and the behavior of young children. Findings from that study have relevance for the present research. Thies defined control as the influence exerted by the adult over the child toward the goal or expectations of the adult. The degree of adult control was defined as the ratio of adult and child participation in deciding what the child should do and in carrying out that decision. In line with this definition, the high-control adult is almost entirely responsible for making the decision and directing the child's behavior; and the low-control adult is

minimally responsible for making the decision and directing the child's behavior.

Thies (1951) found a significant relationship between parental control and children's behavior tendencies. The children of high-control mothers tended to be imitative, non-exploratory, and compliant with adults. She speculated that their urge to conform was greater than their desire for new experiences and that this was one of the reasons that these children did not wander away, for example. The children of low-control mothers had many ideas of their own, were exploratory, and were independent with adults. These children were imaginative, adventurous, curious, and questioning, always looking for new things to do and new ways to do them on their own. They apparently became so absorbed in their own ideas and in carrying out their activities that they just did not get around to complying with adult requests. Thies suggested that these children could, with wise guidance, learn to trust adults and thereby learn to comply when wise adults think it is necessary for them to comply.

In view of the earlier research findings, Ritter (1976) chose the controlling and accepting behavior of parents as the focus of a pilot study of the relationship between parent behavior and children's creativity. She searched for and examined a number of instruments (questionnaires and scales) which might be appropriate for use in a study of the influence of parent-child relations on creative learning and creative expression in early childhood. She found that questionnaires which attempt to measure attitudes are far less discriminating than those which measure parental behaviors. She also found that parents who are both high-controlling and high-accepting seem to have the more

creative children.

The findings of the pilot work done by Ritter (1976) provide the directions for the next steps in the O.S.U. creativity research. The relationship between the controlling and accepting behavior of parents and the creativity of their children should be examined more thoroughly: and inasmuch as social class differences in child-rearing practices are known to exist, the research should include middle-class and lower-class families.

At Oklahoma State University, creativity in early childhood has been the focus of one major research project. Primarily the emphasis has been on the development of research instruments which could be used with young children to measure the various aspects of creativity or the various characteristics related to creative expression. However, the ultimate goal has always been to study the forces in the parent-child relationship which encourage or hinder the development of creativity.

Definitions

The relationship between control and acceptance in parent-child relationships, the inseparability of the two, can be seen in the detailed definitions that have been provided by Waring (1973):

Control in social action involves persons in two roles, the active agent and the recipient of control. By control is meant any guiding, directing, or restraining influence upon the activity, thinking, or feeling of another. In controlling another person, one relates his interest and efforts with the other person in one of three directions:

1. Supplements or reinforces the activity, thinking, or feeling of another.
2. Opposes or conflicts with the activity, thinking, or feeling of another.
3. Is independent of or unrelated to the activity, thinking, or feeling of another.

Acceptance in social interaction involves a person's recognition of another as one who has needs and wishes. In accepting another, one's awareness of the other person is in one of three directions:

1. Awareness of another as a worthy equal whom one willingly aids in gaining his wishes.
2. Awareness of another as an opponent whom one deliberately thwarts or hinders in seeking fulfillment of his wishes.
3. Preoccupation of the self so as to be scarcely aware of another as a psychological entity in his field, and so does nothing either to help or hinder him in attaining his wishes (pp. 3-4).

Purpose

The purpose of this study was to examine social class differences in maternal control and acceptance. To achieve this purpose mothers from middle-class and lower-class families were asked to respond to questionnaires designed to measure controlling behavior and accepting behavior in the parent-child relationship. To the extent that this study contributes to our understanding of social class differences in controlling and accepting behavior, it will make a significant contribution to the total creativity research program at Oklahoma State University.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The purpose of this study was to examine social class differences in child-rearing practices with particular emphasis on the controlling and accepting behavior of mothers. The review of literature includes the research reports of social class differences in child-rearing practices over the past few decades.

Social Class Differences

During the past few decades a great deal of research has been focused on parent-child relations. Studies of child-rearing practices in middle-class and lower-class families have shown specific social class differences and have shown marked changes within each social class over the years.

The 1940's

In the 1940's, middle-class mothers were described as generally more restrictive than lower-class mothers. Their relationship with their children was oriented toward restraints and self-discipline, and they subjected their children to more frustrations than did lower-class mothers (Davis and Havighurst, 1946). In terms of control and acceptance, middle-class mothers were more controlling and lower-class mothers were more accepting. This seemed to be true in all areas of child

rearing.

In the area of infant feeding, lower-class children were breast fed on demand and were fed more frequently than were middle-class children. Also, lower-class children were weaned later than were middle-class children. Thumbsucking, which is a behavior frequently related to feeding experiences, occurred three times as often among the middle-class children (Davis and Havighurst, 1946).

In the area of toilet training, middle-class mothers were more controlling than lower-class mothers. Middle-class mothers started toilet training earlier than lower-class mothers; however, they were less severe in punishing their children during the training period (Davis and Havighurst, 1946). Findings about the completion of toilet training were conflicting. Davis and Havighurst (1946) reported that middle-class mothers completed toilet training earlier than lower-class mothers; however, Ericson (1946) reported that lower-class mothers completed bowel training earlier than middle-class mothers, and that the two groups completed bladder training at about the same time.

In the area of environmental exploration, that is, children's freedom away from home, middle-class mothers were more controlling than lower-class mothers. Middle-class children were expected to be in the house earlier at night than lower-class children, and they were not permitted to go to the movies alone at an early age, as were the lower-class children (Davis and Havighurst, 1946; Ericson, 1946).

Home responsibilities was another area investigated in the 1940's; and here again the middle-class mothers were more controlling. Middle-class children were expected to assume responsibilities in the home at an earlier age than were the lower-class children. Specifically,

middle-class girls were expected to do housework and sewing at an earlier age than lower-class girls (Davis and Havighurst, 1946).

With reference to disciplinary techniques, middle-class mothers seemed to be more accepting of their children than lower-class mothers. Middle-class mothers used reward and praise more frequently as a means of controlling their children, and they punished their children less severely than did lower-class mothers. In spite of this apparent leniency and acceptance, middle-class mothers were more restrictive and subjected their children to more frustrations than did the lower-class mothers (Davis and Havighurst, 1946).

In the area of achievement expectations, Davis and Havighurst (1946) found that middle-class mothers emphasized achievement more than lower-class mothers. Duvall (1946) found that middle-class mothers had expectations for their children which focused on general behavior and attitudes rather than on specific behaviors as was more typical of the lower-class mothers. Middle-class mothers expected their children to be eager to learn, to share, to love and confide in their parents, to be cooperative, and to be happy and healthy. Lower-class mothers were described as more traditional in their expectations. They expected their children to be neat and clean, to be obedient and respectful, and to please their parents.

The 1950's

In the 1950's, marked changes in the child-rearing practices of both social classes were evident. Middle-class mothers became more permissive and lower-class mothers became more restrictive in training their children (Bronfenbrenner, 1958). Middle-class mothers were more

attentive to their children's internal feelings, whereas, lower-class mothers showed greater concern about the overt behavior of their children (Kohn, 1959). Other researchers reported similar findings. Lower-class mothers were inclined to be rigid in their child-rearing practices (Klatskin, 1952), and were more severe in their training methods than were middle-class mothers (Maccoby and Gibbs, 1954). Middle-class mothers were reported as imposing fewer restrictive demands on their children, and as being warmer in their relationship with their children than were the lower-class mothers (Sears, Maccoby, and Levin, 1957). In terms of control and acceptance, in the 1950's the middle-class mothers seemed to be more accepting and the lower-class mothers seemed to be more controlling. This was the reverse of the findings reported in the 1940's.

In the area of infant feeding, social class differences were less distinct than they had been in the 1940's. Maccoby and Gibbs (1954) reported that upper-middle-class mothers breast fed their babies more than upper-lower-class mothers; however, Bronfenbrenner (1958) reported that lower-class mothers were more likely to breast feed their children than middle-class mothers. Researchers did agree on social class differences in the scheduling of feeding. Middle-class mothers scheduled their children more rigidly; whereas, lower-class mothers were more likely to follow a self-demand schedule (Maccoby and Gibbs, 1954; Sears, Maccoby, and Levin, 1957; Bronfenbrenner, 1958).

In the area of toilet training, there was general agreement among researchers that mothers in the two social classes showed marked changes in their training practices. Middle-class mothers shifted from high-control to leniency; and the reverse appeared to be true of the

lower-class mothers. Lower-class mothers tended to start toilet training somewhat later than middle-class mothers but they completed the training earlier. The lower-class mothers were more severe in their training; they punished, scolded, and shamed their children when they had toileting accidents; and they worried when their children were slow to gain sphincter control. Middle-class mothers appeared to be more lenient and they completed bowel and bladder training later than the lower-class mothers (Klatskin, 1952; Maccoby and Gibbs, 1954; White, 1957).

Training in the area of sex play was not reported in the 1940's; however, in the 1950's, definite class differences were noted. Middle-class mothers seemed to be more accepting and less controlling of their children's sex play than were lower-class mothers. Lower-class mothers punished their children for sex play and used various forms of pressure to prevent sex exploration. Middle-class mothers reacted to their children's sex play with less emotion than did the lower-class mothers. Rather than using physical punishment, they tended to separate children in order to control sex play, and they discouraged the more active forms of sex behavior (Maccoby and Gibbs, 1954; Sears, Maccoby, and Levin, 1957; Littman, Moore, and Pierce-Jones, 1957).

In the area of aggressive behavior toward parents, social class differences were also noted in the 1950's. In this area middle-class mothers were more permissive and less punitive than lower-class mothers. Middle-class mothers tended to permit and overlook this type of aggression, but this was not true of the lower-class mothers (Maccoby and Gibbs, 1954; Sears, Maccoby, and Levin, 1957; White, 1957).

In the area of environmental exploration or freedom away from

home, a change in the two social classes was reported between the 1940's and the 1950's. Middle-class mothers were less controlling than lower-class mothers, and they were less controlling than they had been in the 1940's. Middle-class mothers were less likely to check on their children's whereabouts while they were playing in their own neighborhood and they allowed their children more freedom in such activities as crossing streets (Maccoby and Gibbs, 1954; Sears, Maccoby, and Levin, 1957).

In the area of disciplinary techniques, researchers in the 1940's had reported that middle-class mothers controlled their children with rewards and praise more than the lower-class mothers. Similar class differences were reported in the 1950's. Middle-class mothers were more lenient in the way they disciplined their children and in the way they expressed disapproval of their children's behavior. Their disciplinary techniques were apt to be guilt provoking. They punished their children more often with isolation, scolding, and withdrawal of love. Lower-class mothers more often used negative and punitive techniques such as ridicule, deprivation of privileges, and physical punishment (Maccoby and Gibbs, 1954; Sears, Maccoby, and Levin, 1957; Bronfenbrenner, 1958). In general, middle-class mothers considered the child's intentions, when they punished for misbehavior; whereas, lower-class mothers considered the consequences of the child's misbehavior when they punished (Kohn, 1959).

In the area of achievement expectations, a major social class difference was related to school achievement. Middle-class mothers were not so concerned about immediate school achievement as lower-class mothers, but they had higher expectations for their children and

expected them to make more progress in school than did the lower-class mothers. Middle-class mothers also expected their children to learn to take care of themselves at an earlier age than was expected of lower-class children. However, as had been true in the 1940's, the expectations of the lower-class mothers were oriented toward maintaining order and obedience in the home; whereas, the middle-class mothers' expectations seemed to be based on more long range goals (Maccoby and Gibbs, 1954; Sears, Maccoby, and Levin, 1957; Bronfenbrenner, 1958).

Other reports of social class differences in the 1950's seem related to control and acceptance. Middle-class mothers were more responsive to their infants' cries than were lower-class mothers (White, 1957); and lower-class mothers were more irritated by their children's dependency behavior and rejected it with a punishing attitude (Sears, Maccoby, and Levin, 1957). These two findings suggest that middle-class mothers were more accepting of their children than lower-class mothers. Mothers in both classes tended to restrict their children where general messiness and noise were concerned; however, lower-class children were subjected to more stringent requirements about hanging up clothes, keeping the feet off the furniture, and being quiet around the house (Sears, Maccoby, and Levin, 1957). These findings suggest that lower-class mothers were more controlling than were middle-class mothers.

The 1960's

In the 1960's, middle-class mothers were described as more permissive than lower-class mothers. This was true in all areas of child training -- feeding, toilet training, aggression toward parents, and

sex play (Bayley and Schaefer, 1960). This was essentially the same social class difference that had been noted in the 1950's.

The disciplinary techniques which the mothers in the two classes used were also similar to those reported earlier. Middle-class mothers were less punitive and more frequently used love-oriented techniques of discipline, such as punishing by withdrawal of love. Lower-class mothers used more physical punishment to control their children (Bayley and Schaefer, 1960; Prothro, 1966).

Waters and Crandall (1964) reported a social class difference in the use of coercive child-rearing practices. Middle-class mothers were less controlling and less severe than lower-class mothers. Similar findings were reported by other researchers (Bayley and Schaefer, 1960; Zunich, 1961; Bee, Van Egeren, Streissguth, Nyman, and Leckie, 1969).

Several of the researchers in the 1960's described middle-class mothers as more accepting of their children than were lower-class mothers. This was evident in the social interaction between mother and child and in the warmth of their relationship (Bayley and Schaefer, 1960; Prothro, 1966). Lower-class mothers were less likely to play with their children, whereas middle-class mothers showed more interest in their children and spent more time with them (Zunich, 1961). Kogan and Wimberger (1969) also reported that lower-class mothers were more detached and spent less time in social interaction with their children than did middle-class mothers.

The picture of mother-child relations in the 1960's was similar to that in the 1950's. Middle-class mothers were less controlling and more accepting in their child-rearing practices than were lower-class mothers.

The 1970's

The pattern of mother-child relations described in the 1960's continued into the 1970's. Middle-class mothers were more permissive than lower-class mothers in all areas of child training. Middle-class mothers used more love-oriented disciplinary techniques, and lower-class mothers used more punishment (Schlieper, 1974; Hetherington and Parke, 1975).

In the area of achievement expectations, middle-class mothers placed greater demands on their children than did lower-class mothers. They expected high achievement and expected their children to have high academic goals (Hetherington and Parke, 1975).

Social interaction between mother and child continued to be different for the two classes. Middle-class mothers did less directing, criticizing, interfering and restricting than did lower-class mothers; and middle-class mothers had more verbal interaction with their children than did lower-class mothers (Schlieper, 1974; Hetherington and Parke, 1975; Zeglob and Forehand, 1975).

In general, in the 1970's, middle-class mothers continued to be less controlling and more accepting of their children than were lower-class mothers. The direction of this difference was the same as it had been since the 1950's; however, the differences seemed to be less marked. A few contradictions existed in the research findings or in the interpretation of the findings. For example, Hetherington and Parke (1975) described middle-class mothers as less restrictive and more permissive than lower-class mothers, and at the same time stated that middle-class mothers gave greater parental supervision and control.

Implications for Future Research

Throughout the research on child-rearing practices there are implications about the controlling behavior and the accepting behavior of the mothers in the two social classes even though there was no specific research effort to measure control and acceptance. Specific measurements of these two qualities in the parent-child relationship, with consideration of social class differences, is needed. Control and acceptance are inseparable, and various combinations of the two may exist in both social classes. With the increased understanding of control and acceptance that such research will provide, a study of the relation of young children's creativity to the controlling and accepting behavior of parents can be undertaken more effectively.

CHAPTER III

METHODS AND PROCEDURES

The purpose of this study was to examine social class differences in maternal control and acceptance. To achieve this purpose mothers from middle-class and lower-class families were asked to respond to questionnaires designed to measure controlling behavior and accepting behavior in the parent-child relationship. This chapter includes a description of the subjects who participated in the study, a description of the questionnaires, and a statement about the data analysis.

Subjects

The subjects in the present study were 60 mothers of four-year-old children. Thirty of these were middle-class, and 30 were lower-class. For purposes of this study, family income was used as a rough measure of social class. The middle-class mothers, most of whom were not employed, were from Stillwater, Oklahoma; and their children attended half-day nursery schools in the community. These nursery schools operated two to three days a week and required a tuition payment. The lower-class mothers were from Stillwater and Okmulgee, Oklahoma; and their children were enrolled in Head Start programs and day care centers which accepted only children from low-income families. Even though some data were gathered in a university community, only two student families were included in the low-income group of subjects. Another characteristic of

the two groups was that the middle-class families were predominantly white and the lower-class families were predominantly black. Distribution of the children by age, sex, and social class is presented in Table I.

TABLE I
DISTRIBUTION OF CHILDREN BY AGE,
SEX, AND SOCIAL CLASS

	N	<u>Age in Years and Months</u>	
		Median	Range
Middle-Class			
Boys	15	4:6	4:0 - 5:0
Girls	15	4:9	4:1 - 5:3
Total	30	4:7	4:0 - 5:3
Lower-Class			
Boys	11	4:9	4:4 - 5:3
Girls	19	4:9	4:3 - 5:5
Total	30	4:9	4:3 - 5:5

Parent Questionnaires

Questionnaires designed to measure control and acceptance in the parent-child relationship were examined by Ritter (1976). She found that those instruments designed to measure behaviors were more

discriminating than those designed to measure attitudes, and therefore, she recommended the following three questionnaires for use in the study of parental control and acceptance: Waring's Preferred Practices Questionnaire, Ostrander's Parent Behavior Questionnaire, and Porter's Parental Acceptance Scale. These three questionnaires were accepted for use in the present study.

The mothers who participated in this study were interviewed personally by the researcher and, with a few exceptions, completed the questionnaires in her presence. This offered an opportunity for clarification wherever needed. Copies of the questionnaires as given to the mothers are presented in Appendix B.

Waring's Preferred Practices Questionnaire

Waring's questionnaire on Preferred Practices requires parents to select child-rearing practices they prefer in given situations; for example, when the child sucks his thumb, when he plays with matches, or when he is quarrelsome. This questionnaire was designed to measure a parent's controlling behavior. No method of scoring was provided by Waring, and therefore, a suitable method was developed by Ritter (1976), and is the scoring method used in the present study. The scoring method is described in Appendix C.

Ostrander's Parent Behavior Questionnaire

Ostrander's Parent Behavior Questionnaire requires parents to select the child-rearing practices they actually use in handling their children in specific situations; for example, when the child does not share his toys, when he goes out to play in places where he has been

told not to go, or when he does not eat the food he is expected to eat. This questionnaire was designed to measure the controlling behavior of parents. In each situation the parent is asked to select from several possible responses those which he actually uses. The method of scoring, revised by Ritter (1976), is presented in Appendix C.

Porter's Parental Acceptance Scale

Porter's Parental Acceptance Scale requires the parent to respond with what he does when his child behaves in certain ways; for example, when the child kicks and knocks things about at home, when he acts silly and giggly, or when he prefers to do things with his friends rather than with his family. Five possible responses are presented for each situation and the parent is asked to check the one which indicates what he usually does when his child behaves in that way. The scoring, revised by Ritter (1976), is presented in Appendix C.

Data Analysis

The questionnaires provided three scores for each of the 60 mothers. These were two scores for controlling behavior and one score for accepting behavior. The relationship between the two scores for controlling behavior was determined by means of Spearman rank order correlation. These two scores were then converted into one score for controlling behavior which was used in an analysis of the relationship between controlling and accepting behavior. Spearman rank order correlation was also used for this analysis.

The Mann-Whitney U-test was used for all other analyses. Social class differences in controlling behavior and accepting behavior were

examined for all children and for boys and girls separately. The data were also analyzed to determine whether within each social class the mothers of boys were more or less controlling and accepting than the mothers of girls.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

In the present study the controlling behavior and accepting behavior of mothers in two social classes were examined. Thirty middle-class and 30 lower-class mothers of four-year-old children participated in the study. The questionnaires used in data gathering were (I) Waring's Preferred Practices Questionnaire, (II) Ostrander's Parent Behavior Questionnaire, and (III) Porter's Parental Acceptance Scale. Data were analyzed for the relationship between the two scores for controlling behavior, for the relationship between controlling and accepting behavior, for social class differences, and for sex differences within each social class. Descriptive data and questionnaire scores for individual mothers are presented in Tables VI and VII in Appendix A.

Controlling Behavior and Accepting Behavior

There was a high positive correlation between the two scores for controlling behavior derived from questionnaire Parts I and II ($\rho = +0.488$; $p < .001$). Mothers who scored high on Part I also scored high on Part II.

In view of the positive relationship between the two scores for controlling behavior, the two were converted into one score. For this conversion, each mother's II-score, which had a possible range of

16 - 48, was weighted so that it was comparable to her I-score, which had a possible range of 0 - 40. The formula for this conversion was as follows: $I\text{-Score} + (II\text{-Score} - 16)(1.24) = \text{Score I \& II}$.

There was a high negative correlation between the score for controlling behavior (Score I & II) and the score for accepting behavior (Score III) ($\rho = -0.719$; $p < .001$). Mothers who scored high in controlling behavior scored low in accepting behavior, and mothers who scored low in controlling behavior scored high in accepting behavior. This relationship between control and acceptance had been reported by Waring (1973) on the basis of her findings in the Purnell studies, 1948-1955.

Social Class Differences

Controlling Behavior

The Waring Preferred Practices Questionnaire (Part I) and Ostrander's Parent Behavior Questionnaire (Part II) both measure controlling behavior in the mother-child relationship. For each of these questionnaires a high score indicates controlling behavior. The distribution of scores and the findings from these two questionnaires are presented in Tables II, III, and IV. The Mann-Whitney \underline{U} -test was used in all analyses.

Inspection of Tables II, III, and IV reveals that lower-class mothers were significantly more controlling with their children than were middle-class mothers. (Part I: $\underline{U} = 51.5$; $p < .00003$. Part II: $\underline{U} = 268.5$; $p < .0037$. Parts I & II: $U = 68.7$; $p < .00003$). When the data were analyzed separately for boys and girls, the same significant

TABLE II
 SOCIAL CLASS DIFFERENCES IN CONTROLLING BEHAVIOR
 AS MEASURED BY PART I, WARING'S PREFERRED
 PRACTICES QUESTIONNAIRE

	Middle-Class	Lower-Class	Social Class U-Test
Mothers of Boys	(N = 15)	(N = 11)	
Median	10	25	$\underline{U} = 2.00$
Range	04 - 20	14 - 28	$\underline{p} < .002$
Mothers of Girls	(N = 15)	(N = 19)	
Median	12	24	$\underline{U} = 22.5$
Range	06 - 22	08 - 34	$\underline{p} < .002$
Sex \underline{U} -Test	$\underline{U} = 92$ n.s.	$\underline{U} = 93$ n.s.	
Total	(N = 30)	(N = 30)	
Median	11	24	$\underline{U} = 51.5$
Range	04 - 22	08 - 34	$\underline{p} < .00003$

TABLE III
 SOCIAL CLASS DIFFERENCES IN CONTROLLING BEHAVIOR
 AS MEASURED BY PART II, OSTRANDER'S
 PARENT BEHAVIOR QUESTIONNAIRE

	Middle-Class	Lower-Class	Social Class <u>U-Test</u>
Mothers of Boys	(N = 15)	(N = 11)	
Median	27.3	29.0	<u>U</u> = 52.5
Range	22.6 - 30.7	21.0 - 32.8	n.s.
Mothers of Girls	(N = 15)	(N = 19)	
Median	26.9	29.0	<u>U</u> = 81.5
Range	23.0 - 32.6	24.1 - 38.5	<u>p</u> < .05
Sex <u>U-Test</u>	<u>U</u> = 104 n.s.	<u>U</u> = 89.5 n.s.	
Total	(N = 30)	(N = 30)	
Median	27.2	29.0	<u>U</u> = 268.5
Range	22.6 - 32.6	21.0 - 38.5	<u>p</u> < .00003

TABLE IV
 SOCIAL CLASS DIFFERENCES IN CONTROLLING BEHAVIOR
 AS MEASURED BY QUESTIONNAIRES,
 PARTS I AND II COMBINED

	Middle-Class	Lower-Class	Social Class U-Test
Mothers of Boys	(N = 15)	(N = 11)	
Median	25.0	41.6	$\underline{U} = 12$
Range	14.8 - 34.2	20.2 - 47.0	$\underline{p} < .002$
Mothers of Girls	(N = 15)	(N = 19)	
Median	25.9	38.8	$\underline{U} = 24$
Range	18.3 - 34.5	22.3 - 61.3	$\underline{p} < .002$
Sex \underline{U} -Test	$\underline{U} = 98$ n.s.	$\underline{U} = 101$ n.s.	
Total	(N = 30)	(N = 30)	
Median	25.7	41.2	$\underline{U} = 68.7$
Range	14.8 - 34.5	20.2 - 61.3	$\underline{p} < .00003$

TABLE V
 SOCIAL CLASS DIFFERENCES IN ACCEPTING BEHAVIOR
 AS MEASURED BY PART III, PORTER'S
 PARENTAL ACCEPTANCE SCALE

	Middle-Class	Lower-Class	Social Class <u>U-Test</u>
Mothers of Boys	(N = 15)	(N = 11)	
Median	37	32	<u>U</u> = 21
Range	28 - 42	23 - 38	<u>p</u> < .002
Mothers of Girls	(N = 15)	(N = 19)	
Median	37	30	<u>U</u> = 45
Range	29 - 42	19 - 39	<u>p</u> < .002
Sex <u>U-Test</u>	<u>U</u> = 111 n.s.	<u>U</u> = 103 n.s.	
Total	(N = 30)	(N = 30)	
Median	37	30.5	<u>U</u> = 127.5
Range	28 - 42	19 - 39	<u>p</u> < .00003

class differences were evident. (Parts I & II: For boys, $\underline{U} = 12$; $\underline{p} < .002$. For girls, $\underline{U} = 24$; $\underline{p} < .002$). One exception was that the results of the Ostrander questionnaire showed no class difference in the controlling behavior of the mothers of boys.

Accepting Behavior

Porter's Parental Acceptance Scale (Part III) measures accepting behavior in the mother-child relationship. For this questionnaire a high score indicates accepting behavior. The distribution of scores and the findings from this questionnaire are presented in Table V. The Mann-Whitney U-test was used in all analyses.

Middle-class mothers were significantly more accepting in their relationship with their children than were lower-class mothers. (Part III: $\underline{U} = 127.5$; $\underline{p} < .00003$). When the data were analyzed for boys and girls separately, the same significant class differences were evident. (For boys, $\underline{U} = 21$; $\underline{p} < .002$. For girls, $\underline{U} = 45$; $\underline{p} < .002$).

Sex Differences

Data were also analyzed to determine whether, within each social class, the mothers of boys were more or less controlling and accepting than the mothers of girls. The Mann-Whitney U-test was used for these analyses. Within each social class, no significant differences were found in the responses of the mothers of boys and the mothers of girls. These data are presented in Tables II - V.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY AND IMPLICATIONS

The purpose of this study was to examine social class differences in child-rearing practices with particular emphasis on the controlling and accepting behavior of mothers. Sixty mothers of children approximately four years old participated in the study. Thirty of these were middle-class, and 30 were lower-class. The middle-class mothers were from Stillwater, Oklahoma; and their children attended half-day nursery schools in the community. The lower-class mothers were from Stillwater and Okmulgee, Oklahoma; and their children were enrolled in Head Start programs and day care centers which accepted only children from low-income families.

Each mother was asked to respond to three questionnaires which were designed to measure controlling behavior and accepting behavior in the parent-child relationship. The three questionnaires were Waring's Preferred Practices Questionnaire, Ostrander's Parent Behavior Questionnaire, and Porter's Parental Acceptance Scale. The mothers who participated in this study were interviewed personally by the researcher and, with a few exceptions, completed the questionnaires in her presence. This offered an opportunity for clarification wherever needed.

The questionnaires provided three scores for each of the 60 mothers. These were two scores for controlling behavior and one score for accepting behavior. The relationship between the two scores for

controlling behavior was determined by means of Spearman rank order correlation. These two scores were then converted into one score for controlling behavior which was used in an analysis of the relationship between controlling and accepting behavior. Spearman rank order correlation was also used for this analysis.

The Mann-Whitney U-test was used for all other analyses. Social class differences in controlling behavior and accepting behavior were examined for all children and for boys and girls separately. The data were also analyzed to determine whether within each social class the mothers of boys were more or less controlling and accepting than the mothers of girls.

The major findings of this research were as follows:

1. There was a significant positive correlation between the scores on the two questionnaires designed to measure controlling behavior.
2. There was a significant negative correlation between controlling behavior and accepting behavior of mothers in both social classes.
3. Lower-class mothers were significantly more controlling with their children than were middle-class mothers. This was true for boys and for girls.
4. Middle-class mothers were significantly more accepting in their relationship with their children than were lower-class mothers. This was true for boys and for girls.
5. Within each social class, there was no significant difference between the controlling behavior or the accepting behavior of the mothers of boys and the mothers of girls.

Implications for Future Research

The ultimate goal of the creativity research at Oklahoma State University has always been to study the forces in the parent-child relationship which encourage or hinder the development of creativity in young children. The present study has focused on the parent-child relationship and has contributed to our understanding of social class differences in controlling and accepting behavior. Social class differences do exist. Now these differences should be examined in relation to social class differences in young children's creativity, that is, their creative learning and creative expression. It is possible that the qualities in the parent-child relationship which contribute to children's creativity may be different in the two social classes.

A study much larger than the present research should be undertaken. A larger group of subjects from both social classes should participate in the study. Mothers and fathers should respond to the questionnaires, and children from more than one age group should be included in the creativity part of the research.

The questionnaires used in the present research were developed in the early 1950's and were somewhat limited or inadequate in content. A revision of these questionnaires should be undertaken with particular emphasis on the inclusion of all possible types of responses for each item to which the parents respond. For example, Waring (1973) has identified three directions which controlling behavior may take, each direction suggesting a difference in the accepting quality of the parent's behavior. A revision of the questionnaire which would make it possible to identify these qualities more accurately is needed.

A SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Bayley, N., and Schaefer, E. S. Relationships between socioeconomic variables and the behavior of mothers toward young children. Journal of Genetic Psychology, 1960, 96, 61-77.
- Bee, H. L., Van Egeren, L. F., Streissguth, A. P., Nyman, B. A., and Leckie, M. S. Social class differences in maternal teaching strategies and speech patterns. Developmental Psychology, 1969, 1, 726-734.
- Bronfenbrenner, U. Socialization and social class through time and space. In E. Maccoby, T. Newcomb, and E. Hartley (Ed.) Readings in Social Psychology. New York: Henry Holt, 1958.
- Davis, A., and Havighurst, R. Social class and color differences in child rearing. American Sociological Review, 1946, 11, 698-710.
- Duvall, E. M. Conceptions of parenthood. American Journal of Sociology, 1946, 52, 193-203.
- Ericson, M. Child rearing and social status. American Journal of Sociology, 1946, 52, 190-192.
- Hetherington, E. M., and Parke, R. D. Child Psychology. New York: McGraw Hill, 1975.
- Klatskin, E. H. Shifts in child care practices in three social classes under an infant care program of flexible methodology. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 1952, 22, 52-61
- Kogan, K. L., and Wimberger, H. Interaction patterns in disadvantaged families. Journal of Clinical Psychology, 1969, 25, 347-352.
- Kohn, M. L. Social class and paternal values. American Journal of Sociology, 1959, 44, 337-351.
- Kohn, M. L. Social class and the exercise of parental authority. American Sociological Review, 1959, 24, 352-366.
- Littman, R. A., Moore, R. A., and Pierce-Jones, J. Social class differences in class rearing: A third community for comparison with Chicago and Newton, Massachusetts. American Sociological Review, 1957, 22, 694-704.

- Maccoby, E. Methods of child rearing in two social classes. In W. Martin and C. Stendler (Ed.) Readings in Child Development. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, 1954.
- Ostrander, L. Practices of Suburban Mothers in Rearing Preschool Children. Unpublished master's thesis. Cornell University, 1950.
- Porter, B. M. The Relationship Between Marital Adjustment and Parental Acceptance of Children. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Cornell University, 1952.
- Prothro, E. T. Socialization and social class in a transitional society. Child Development, 1966, 37, 218-228.
- Ritter, J. G. The Relationship of Parental Control and Acceptance to Creativity in Early Childhood. Unpublished master's thesis. Oklahoma State University, 1976.
- Schlieper, A. Mother-child interaction observed at home. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 1974, 45, 468-472.
- Sears, R., Maccoby, E., and Levin, H. Patterns of Child Rearing. New York: Row Peterson, 1957.
- Thies, E. P. The Relationship Between the Degree of Parental Control and the Behavior of Nursery School Children. Unpublished master's thesis. Cornell University, 1951.
- Waring, E. B. Purnell Studies: 1948-1955. Unpublished manuscript. Cornell University, 1973.
- Waters, E., and Crandall, V. J. Social class and observed maternal behavior from 1940-1960. Child Development, 1964, 35, 1021-1032.
- White, M. S. Social class, child rearing practices, and child behavior. American Sociological Review, 1957, 22, 704-712.
- Zegiob, L. E. and Forehand, R. Maternal interaction behavior as a function of race, socioeconomic status, and sex of the child. Child Development, 1975, 46, 564-473.
- Zunich, M. A study of the relationships between child rearing attitudes and maternal behavior. Journal Experimental Education, 1961, 30, 231-341.

APPENDIXES

APPENDIX A

DESCRIPTIVE DATA AND QUESTIONNAIRE SCORES

TABLE VI
 DESCRIPTIVE DATA AND QUESTIONNAIRE SCORES
 OF MIDDLE-CLASS MOTHERS
 (N = 30)

Sex and Code No.	Age of Child	Mothers' Questionnaire Scores			
		I	II	III	I & II
F-2514	5:3	08	25.8	40	20.2
F-2507	5:1	14	26.1	37	26.5
F-2503	5:1	12	32.6	40	32.6
M-2498	5:0	10	26.7	37	23.3
F-2510	5:0	14	30.3	34	31.7
M-2500	5:0	12	26.2	40	24.7
M-2506	4:11	20	27.3	28	34.0
M-2504	4:11	06	25.5	40	17.8
F-2513	4:10	06	26.6	40	19.1
F-2520	4:9	12	23.0	42	20.7
M-2493	4:9	14	27.3	42	28.0
F-2495	4:9	08	25.3	39	19.5
F-2492	4:9	10	30.2	37	27.6
M-2515	4:7	18	27.5	39	32.3
M-2502	4:7	18	29.1	34	34.3
F-2508	4:6	12	27.2	35	25.9
F-2494	4:6	14	26.9	37	27.5
F-2516	4:6	22	26.1	38	34.5
M-2509	4:6	08	25.9	36	20.3
M-2511	4:5	12	27.6	36	26.4
M-2521	4:5	08	22.6	37	16.2
F-2499	4:5	18	28.7	39	30.7
F-2497	4:3	12	27.2	34	25.9
M-2496	4:3	08	30.7	38	26.2
M-2505	4:3	04	29.4	37	20.6
F-2518	4:3	10	28.0	36	24.9
M-2519	4:1	10	28.5	40	25.5
F-2512	4:1	08	24.3	29	18.3
M-2501	4:0	10	28.1	37	25.0
M-2517	4:0	06	23.1	37	14.8

TABLE VII
 DESCRIPTIVE DATA AND QUESTIONNAIRE SCORES
 OF LOWER-CLASS MOTHERS
 (N = 30)

Sex and Code No.	Age of Child	Mothers' Questionnaire Scores			
		I	II	III	I & II
F-2462	5:5	22	29.0	33	38.1
M-2463	5:3	26	29.3	33	42.5
F-2464	5:2	22	27.1	38	35.8
F-2465	5:2	14	27.1	37	27.8
M-2467	5:2	24	28.0	37	38.9
F-2466	5:0	24	35.0	30	47.6
M-2468	4:11	28	27.0	28	41.6
F-2469	4:11	30	28.0	33	44.9
F-2475	4:11	30	32.5	19	50.5
F-2470	4:10	20	24.1	36	30.0
F-2471	4:10	26	38.5	21	53.9
M-2472	4:9	26	29.0	33	42.1
F-2473	4:9	30	34.3	29	52.7
M-2474	4:9	26	30.4	25	43.9
M-2476	4:9	26	25.5	23	37.8
M-2477	4:9	26	32.8	27	46.8
F-2478	4:9	34	38.0	21	61.3
F-2479	4:8	20	28.2	31	35.1
F-2481	4:8	08	27.5	35	22.3
F-2490	4:8	22	32.0	30	41.8
F-2480	4:7	26	26.3	30	38.8
M-2484	4:7	14	21.0	38	20.2
F-2491	4:7	28	32.0	25	47.8
M-2482	4:5	20	28.0	32	34.9
F-2483	4:5	24	34.1	30	46.4
M-2485	4:4	20	32.7	28	40.7
M-2486	4:4	28	31.3	33	47.0
F-2487	4:4	19	31.1	36	37.7
F-2489	4:4	24	26.0	25	36.4
F-2488	4:3	16	24.7	34	26.8

APPENDIX B

PARENT QUESTIONNAIRES

PARENT BEHAVIOR QUESTIONNAIRE

Name: _____ Date: _____

Are you the father? _____ Or the mother? _____

Child about whom you will be thinking as you answer the questions:

Child's number in study: _____

Thank you for your cooperation.

PART I

Mrs. Smith and Mrs. Jones are both regarded by their neighbors as fine mothers. They both love their children, take good care of them, and hope they will grow up to be good citizens. Mrs. Smith's methods of dealing with her children differ from Mrs. Jones' in many ways. In some situations you may prefer Mrs. Smith's method. In other situations you may prefer Mrs. Jones'. Frequently you may think of other methods which work better for you. Nevertheless, in each of the following examples, you are asked to make a choice between the methods used by Mrs. Smith and those used by Mrs. Jones.

Indicate which method you prefer by drawing a circle around either a or b in the following examples:

-
1. a. Four-year-old Johnny Jones dislikes carrots. Mrs. Jones does not allow conversation about disliked food at the table and she expects Johnny to eat his carrots before he has dessert.
b. Four-year-old Sammy Smith dislikes carrots. Mrs. Smith encourages him to remind her to give him a small serving.
 2. a. When Johnny grabs a toy from little Janie, Mrs. Jones takes the toy away from both children.
b. When Sammy grabs a toy from little Susie, Mrs. Smith suggests that he return it to Susie and ask if he may play with it soon.
 3. a. When Mrs. Smith found Sammy playing with matches she explained that he couldn't play with them because he might get burned, but promised to allow him to light the dinner table candles.
b. When Mrs. Jones found Johnny playing with matches, she took them away and warned him not to touch them again.
 4. a. Mrs. Jones ignores her children when they say "I hate you" or "You are an old meanie".
b. Mrs. Smith does not allow her children to call her names.
 5. a. When two-year-old Janie Jones sucks her thumb, Mrs. Jones tells her to take her thumb out of her mouth.
b. When two-year-old Susie Smith sucks her thumb, Mrs. Smith tries to interest her in a toy.
 6. a. Mrs. Jones is toilet training her two-year-old Janie. She asks Janie if she has to go to the toilet but never insists if the child refuses.
b. Mrs. Smith is toilet training her two-year-old Susie. She insists that Susie use the toilet regularly.

7.
 - a. When Johnny has friends in to play, Mrs. Jones encourages them to plan their own games.
 - b. When Sammy has friends in to play, Mrs. Smith usually suggests games for them to play.
8.
 - a. Mrs. Smith does not allow her children to play anywhere outside their own yard unless they ask her first.
 - b. Mrs. Jones allows her children to play wherever they want to in the neighborhood.
9.
 - a. Once she has told her children what to do, Mrs. Smith allows no "back talk."
 - b. Even after she has told her children what to do, Mrs. Jones is willing to change her mind if the children have good reasons.
10.
 - a. One day four-year-old Sammy followed a stray dog down the road. Mrs. Smith missed him, but waited until he returned. When he returned in about an hour, Mrs. Smith listened to his excited story of his wanderings, and warned him to tell her next time before he left.
 - b. One day four-year-old Johnny followed a stray dog down the road. Mrs. Jones went after him, brought him home, and told him he couldn't go out of his yard for the rest of the day.
11.
 - a. When four-year-old Johnny Jones refused to put on his brown socks and insisted on wearing his new red ones, Mrs. Jones insisted that he wear the brown ones as she had planned.
 - b. When four-year-old Sammy Smith refused to put on his brown socks and insisted on wearing his new red ones, Mrs. Smith allowed him to wear the new red ones.
12.
 - a. Mrs. Smith tries to stay out of the children's quarrels and interferes only to protect a child from physical harm.
 - b. Mrs. Jones settles her children's quarrels as soon as they start and before they "really get going strong".
13.
 - a. One day Johnny came into the house and told his mother he had just been playing with a big black bear. Mrs. Jones explained that there were no bears around and told him he shouldn't make up stories.
 - b. One day Sammy came into the house and told his mother he had just been playing with a big black bear. Mrs. Smith encouraged him to tell her all about the bear.
14.
 - a. When Johnny goes to a birthday party, Mrs. Jones selects and buys the gift for him to take.
 - b. When Sammy goes to a birthday party, Mrs. Smith helps Sammy select and buy the gift he takes.

15.
 - a. Mrs. Smith asked Sammy to pick out several of his toys which he would like to give to a collection for poor children.
 - b. Mrs. Jones explained to Johnny that toys were being collected for poor children and he could give away the toys she had picked out.
16.
 - a. Mrs. Smith trains her children to pick up their toys as soon as they finish using them.
 - b. Mrs. Jones often allows her children to "save" a project which they want to use another day.
17.
 - a. When two-year-old Susie Smith plays with her food instead of eating, Mrs. Smith feeds her.
 - b. When two-year-old Janie Jones plays with her food instead of eating, Mrs. Jones asks her if she is finished and would like to leave the table.
18.
 - a. Four-year-old Johnny Jones is quite a "day dreamer". Mrs. Jones encourages him to talk about his dreams and to act them out.
 - b. Four-year-old Sammy Smith is quite a "day dreamer". Mrs. Smith objects to his daydreaming, and tries to discourage it.
19.
 - a. Mrs. Jones believes that children should help with household tasks, so each week she assigns some easy tasks and sees that the children do them.
 - b. Mrs. Smith believes that children should help with household tasks, so each week she and the children decide what these shall be but she permits them to "swap" tasks as they wish.
20.
 - a. Mrs. Smith insists that her children use their toys carefully and take good care of them.
 - b. Mrs. Jones allows her children to do with their toys as they please.

PART II

On the following pages there are eight situations in which you are asked what you would do if your child behaved in a certain way.

Ten possible responses are listed for each situation.

Place a check (✓) in the box in front of any practices you use.

Double check (✓✓) the ONE practice you use MOST often.

If there are other practices you use, you may add those.

Situation 1: When he doesn't eat what you want him to.

1. Coax - tell him how good it is - "Mother and Daddy like it."	6. Have him taste it.
2. Tell him he can't have dessert until he does.	7. Let him leave it.
3. Take the spoon in my hand and help him.	8. Insist - put it in his mouth.
4. Ignore - pay no attention.	9. Tell him to eat it, until he does.
5. Make him sit there until he eats it.	10. Substitute food he likes.
Other:	

Situation 2: When he won't go to bed when you want him to.

1. Just get him ready and put him there.	6. Read or tell a story.
2. Let him take something to bed with him.	7. Pick him up and carry him if he persists in refusing.
3. Let him stay up later.	8. Threaten to punish him if he doesn't.
4. Resort to spanking.	9. Go to bed with him or lie down with him.
5. Keep telling him to go or to quiet down.	10. Take him by the hand and take him to bed.
Other:	

Situation 3: When he won't share his playthings.

1. Take away the things they are quarreling about.	6. Let them work it out themselves.
2. Put him in a chair until he will.	7. Separate the children to play in different places.
3. Get him interested in something.	8. Threaten to put his toys away.
4. Tell him he ought to share.	9. Help him settle it with his playmates.
5. Punish him.	10. Make him give up or share.
Other:	

Situation 4: When he picks up bad words here and there.

1. Tell him it's bad, it isn't nice, it's very naughty.	6. Slap his mouth.
2. Tell him, "We don't talk that way," or "we can't use those words."	7. Explain that people won't like him if he talks that way.
3. Wash his mouth out.	8. Yell at him.
4. Tell him "cut it out."	9. Scold.
5. Ignore it, just let it go or even chuckle to myself.	10. Say, "I wouldn't say that word."
Other:	

Situation 5: When he goes out to play in places you have told him he cannot go.

1. Bring him back to the house.		6. Tie him up.
2. Spank him.		7. Frighten him - talk and talk about dangers.
3. Tell him why he shouldn't do it.		8. Tell him not to go again.
4. Threaten physical punishment.		9. Threaten to take away special treats.
5. Tell him over and over.		10. Scold.
Other:		

Situation 6: When he doesn't pick up his toys.

1. Tell him again firmly.		6. Make a game of it.
2. Ask him to help.		7. Spank.
3. Push them out of the way or threaten to do so.		8. Insist - make him know I mean it.
4. Just let it go, don't make an issue out of it.		9. Help him with it.
5. Threaten to punish him if he doesn't.		10. Tell him he can't have his dinner until he does pick them up.
Other:		

Situation 7: When he doesn't wash before dinner.

1. Remind him to wash.	6. Ask him if he has washed.
2. Wash his hands for him.	7. Tell him he can't have his dinner until he's washed.
3. Approve him for what he does.	8. Ignore it and pretend he has washed.
4. Go in and help him wash.	9. Explain that he must wash before doing other things.
5. Tell him again and see that he does it.	10. Tell him his hands are dirty.
Other:	

Situation 8: When he tells "stories" that aren't so because he thinks he'll be punished if he tells what really happened.

1. Tell him he won't get punished "nearly as much" if he tells the truth.	6. Tell him he won't get into trouble if he tells the truth.
2. Spank him if he lies "a little too much."	7. Tell him it isn't so - it's a lie.
3. Make him stay indoors to punish him.	8. Ask questions and try to make him understand.
4. Interest him in something else, sometimes play with him.	9. Put him to bed.
5. Put him in the corner.	10. Tell him he shouldn't.
Other:	

PART III

In each of the following 15 situations, you are asked to check (✓) the response which indicates WHAT YOU DO when your child behaves in a certain way. Please check only ONE response in each situation.

1. When my child is shouting and dancing with excitement at a time when I want peace and quiet, I:
 - Give him something quiet to do.
 - Tell him that I wish he would stop.
 - Make him be quiet.
 - Let him tell me about what excites him.
 - Send him somewhere else.

2. When my child is unable to do something which I think is important for him, I:
 - Tell him he must do better.
 - Help him make the most of the things which he can do.
 - Ask him to tell me more about the things which he can do.
 - Tell him that no one can do everything.
 - Encourage him to keep trying.

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

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

5. When my child kicks, hits or knocks his things about, I:
 - Make him quit.
 - Tell him it is all right to feel that way, but help him find other ways of expressing himself.
 - Tell him he shouldn't do such things.
 - Tell him I know how he feels.
 - Pay no attention to him.

6. When my child is not interested in some of the usual activities of his age group, I:
- Try to help him realize that it is important to be interested in the same things as others in his group.
 - Call his attention to the activities in which he is interested.
 - Tell him it's all right if he isn't interested in the same things.
 - See to it that he does the same things as others in his group.
 - Help him find ways of making the most of his interests.
7. When my child misbehaves while others in the group he is with are behaving well, I:
- See to it that he behaves as the others.
 - Tell him it is important to behave well when he is in a group.
 - Let him alone if he isn't disturbing the others too much.
 - Ask him to tell me what he would like to do.
 - Help him find some activity that he can enjoy and at the same time not disturb the group.
8. When my child disagrees with me about something which I think is important, I:
- Tell him he shouldn't disagree with me.
 - Make him quit.
 - Listen to his side of the problem and change my mind if I am wrong.
 - Tell him maybe we can do it his way another time.
 - Explain that I am doing what is best for him.
9. When my child says angry and hateful things about me to my face, I:
- Tell him it's all right to feel that way, but help him find other ways of expressing himself.
 - Tell him I know how he feels.
 - Pay no attention to him.
 - Tell him he shouldn't say such things to me.
 - Make him quit.
10. When my child shows a deep interest in something I don't think is important, I:
- Let him go ahead with his interest.
 - Ask him to tell me more about this interest.
 - Help him find ways to make the most of this interest.
 - Do everything I can to discourage his interest in it.
 - Try to interest him in more worthwhile things.

11. When my child acts silly and giggly, I:

- Tell him I know how he feels.
- Pay no attention to him.
- Tell him he shouldn't act that way.
- Make him quit.
- Tell him it is all right to feel that way, but help him find other ways of expressing himself.

12. When my child is faced with two or more choices and has to choose only one, I:

- Tell him which choice to make and why.
- Think it through with him.
- Point out the advantages and disadvantages of each, but let him decide for himself.
- Tell him that I am sure he can make a wise choice and help him foresee the consequences.
- Make the decision for him.

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

- Tell him he must try to do as well as the others.
- Encourage him to keep trying.
- Tell him that no one can do everything well.
- Call his attention to the things he does well.
- Help him make the most of the activities which he can do.

14. When my child makes decisions without consulting me, I:

- Punish him for not consulting me.
- Encourage him to make his own decisions if he can foresee the consequences.
- Allow him to make many of his own decisions.
- Suggest that we talk it over before he makes his decision.
- Tell him he must consult me first before making the decision.

15. When my child prefers to do things with his friends rather than with his family, I:

- Encourage him to do things with his friends.
- Accept this as part of growing up.
- Plan special activities so that he will want to be with us.
- Try to minimize his association with them.
- Make him stay with his family.

APPENDIX C

SCORING INFORMATION

SCORING INFORMATION

For the first questionnaire (Part I) a scoring method needed to be developed, and for the other two questionnaires (Parts II and III) the scoring method needed revision. This work was done by Ritter (1976) with the help of five judges. The judges were faculty members at Oklahoma State University and were all trained and experienced in child development.

PART I

WARING'S PREFERRED PRACTICES QUESTIONNAIRE

The judges checked the items in Part I as a highly-controlling parent would respond. There was complete agreement on all items. The high-control responses for each item were as follows:

1: a	6: b	11: a	16: a
2: a	7: b	12: b	17: a
3: b	8: a	13: a	18: b
4: b	9: a	14: a	19: a
5: a	10: b	15: b	20: a

High-control responses were used to score each mother's questionnaire. Two points were given for every high-control response for which certainty of the responses was indicated; and one point was given for every high-control response for which the mother indicated doubt or uncertainty. With this method of scoring, the range of possible scores was from zero to 40.

PART IIOSTRANDER'S PARENT BEHAVIOR QUESTIONNAIRE

Weightings for the possible responses listed in the Ostrander Questionnaire were developed by Ritter (1976) with the help of the five judges. Each judge was given a copy of the questionnaire and was asked to select the four most controlling responses and the four least controlling responses for each of the eight situations presented in the questionnaire. From the judges' responses, a weighting of one, two, or three was calculated for each response. Those responses which all five judges rated as least controlling were given a weighting of one, and those which they all rated as most controlling were given a weighting of three. All other responses were given a weighting of two. The mother's score for each situation was calculated by summing the weights of each item checked, dividing this sum by the number of items checked, and then adding the weights of the items double-checked as the behavior used most frequently. Each mother's total score for the Ostrander Questionnaire was the sum of the scores for the eight situations. The range of possible scores was from 16 to 48.

Weightings for the Items in the Ostrander QuestionnaireSituation 1

1: 2 6: 2
2: 3 7: 1
3: 2 8: 3
4: 1 9: 2
5: 3 10: 1

Situation 2

1: 2 6: 1
2: 1 7: 3
3: 1 8: 3
4: 3 9: 2
5: 2 10: 2

Situation 3

1: 2 6: 1
2: 3 7: 2
3: 1 8: 2
4: 2 9: 2
5: 3 10: 3

Situation 4

1: 2 6: 3
2: 1 7: 2
3: 3 8: 3
4: 2 9: 2
5: 1 10: 1

Situation 5

1: 2 6: 3
2: 3 7: 3
3: 1 8: 1
4: 2 9: 2
5: 1 10: 2

Situation 6

1: 2 6: 1
2: 1 7: 3
3: 2 8: 2
4: 1 9: 1
5: 3 10: 3

Situation 7

1: 2 6: 1
2: 3 7: 3
3: 1 8: 1
4: 2 9: 2
5: 2 10: 2

Situation 8

1: 2 6: 2
2: 2 7: 2
3: 2 8: 2
4: 1 9: 3
5: 3 10: 1

PART IIIPORTER'S PARENTAL ACCEPTANCE SCALE

Weightings for the responses listed in the Porter Questionnaire were developed by Ritter (1976) with the help of the five judges. Each judge was asked to rank the five possible responses for each item from one to five, with one representing low acceptance and five representing high acceptance. Inasmuch as five levels of acceptance were not clearly indicated by the five possible responses to each item, the judges' composite rankings were used as a basis for assigning weights of one to three to the responses. One judge and one researcher (not a judge) assigned these weights independently, compared their weightings, and then resolved any differences by discussing the items. Each mother's score for the scale was the sum of the weights assigned to the responses checked. The range of possible scores was from 15 to 45.

Weightings for Items in the Porter Parental Acceptance Scale

<u>S-1</u>	<u>S-2</u>	<u>S-3</u>	<u>S-4</u>	<u>S-5</u>	<u>S-6</u>	<u>S-7</u>	<u>S-8</u>
2	1	1	3	1	1	1	1
1	3	3	1	3	2	1	1
1	3	2	1	2	2	3	3
3	2	1	3	3	1	2	3
2	1	3	2	2	3	3	2
<u>S-9</u>	<u>S-10</u>	<u>S-11</u>	<u>S-12</u>	<u>S-13</u>	<u>S-14</u>	<u>S-15</u>	
3	3	3	2	1	1	3	
3	3	2	3	1	3	3	
2	3	1	3	2	3	2	
1	1	1	3	3	2	1	
1	2	3	1	3	1	1	

VITA²

Beverly Marie Russell Parker

Candidate for the Degree of

Master of Science

Thesis: A STUDY OF CONTROLLING AND ACCEPTING BEHAVIOR OF MOTHERS IN
TWO SOCIAL CLASSES

Major Field: Family Relations and Child Development

Biographical:

Personal Data: Born in Okmulgee, Oklahoma, May 7, 1938, the
daughter of Mr. and Mrs. B. H. Russell.

Education: Attended elementary school in Okmulgee, Oklahoma;
graduated from Dunbar High School, Okmulgee, Oklahoma, in
May, 1957. Received a Bachelor of Science degree in Home
Economics from Langston University, Langston, Oklahoma, in
May, 1961.

Professional Experience: Vocational Home Economics teacher at
Dunbar and Okmulgee Senior High Schools, Okmulgee, Oklahoma,
1961-1964 and 1972-1974; Elementary teacher, Hawthorne and
MacArthur Elementary Schools, Tulsa, Oklahoma, 1964-1970;
Team-teacher, Skyline Elementary School, Stillwater, Oklahoma,
1971-1972; Teacher, Langston Elementary School, Langston,
Oklahoma, 1975; Graduate Teaching Assistant, Department of
Family Relations and Child Development, Oklahoma State
University, 1976-1977.

Professional Organization: Omnicron Nu.