THE INFLUENCE OF DOMESTIC VIOLENCE, PSYCHOLOGICAL PROBLEMS, AND MATERNAL PARENTING STYLE UPON INTERPERSONAL PROBLEM-SOLVING ABILITY IN EARLY CHILDHOOD

By

CAROL ANN TERSHAK

Bachelor of Arts
St. Louis University
St. Louis, Missouri
1967

Master of Rehabilitation Counseling
Bowling Green State University
Bowling Green, Ohio
1975

Submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate College
of the Oklahoma State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the Degree of
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY
July, 1982

THE INFLUENCE OF DOMESTIC VIOLENCE, PSYCHOLOGICAL PROBLEMS, AND MATERNAL PARENTING STYLE UPON INTERPERSONAL PROBLEM-SOLVING ABILITY IN EARLY CHILDHOOD

Thesis Approved:

Dicki Green
Thesis Adviser

Larry T. Brown

Frances Everett

Larry M. Dorsett

Norman N. Durham
Dean of the Graduate College

PREFACE

This study attempts to investigate the effects of wife-battering on young children. The primary objective is to assess the interpersonal problem-solving ability of children of battered women to children of non-battered women. Four matched groups, which further classify children by presence/absence of psychological problems, are used in the statistical analyses. The maternal parenting style is also assessed in relationship to the child's problem-solving ability.

I am extremely grateful to my adviser, Dr. Vicki Green, for her time, stimulation, and enduring support throughout this investigation. I am also grateful to the other committee members, Dr. Larry Brown, Dr. Frances Everett, and Dr. Larry Perkins, for their insight, wit, and invaluable assistance. These four individuals made the initial task seem possible, and the final manuscript more readable.

Additionally, I would like to thank my family for their toleration and support, and for giving me the time to pursue this research. My husband, Andrew, and our children, Andy and Susanne, encouraged me, watched over me, nurtured me, and provided me with the necessary distractions. I will always be grateful for all of this.

Appreciation is also extended to the Psychology Department for research funds that were available for part of this study. Special thanks is also offered to my research assistant, Cheryl Treat, who helped me in the preliminary stages of this study.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

In the past ten years physically abusive patterns of family interaction have received increasing public and professional attention. The focus of this attention has generally centered on the observable results of actual physical abuse within the husband-wife dyad (Martin, 1976; Straus, 1977-1978; Walker, 1979), and/or within parent-child interactions (Gil, 1977; Helfer & Kempe, 1976; Wooden, 1976). Only passing acknowledgment has been given to individuals who are observers of physical abuse between other family members but who have not been physically abused themselves. Notably, there is some indication that children who are observers of parental abuse are directly affected by what they observe, and that in the future they may incorporate violent interaction patterns into their own lives.

Researchers who have studied domestic violence within adult relationships point to the significance of such an environment upon children who observe such violence. Wallerstein and Kelly (1980) studied 60 recently divorced couples. They found that where physical violence occurred between the parents (and this occurred in approximately half of the cases), children were usually not shielded and often witnessed the fighting. Even in those families where abuse occurred once or rarely, it was long and vividly remembered by the frightened child. Carlson (1977) suggested that children growing up in violent homes--those who only observe

violent and aggressive behavior--are far more likely to learn such patterns of behavior and to use them when frustrated than are children who do not observe domestic violence in their homes. In support of her thesis she explored the background of over 260 battered women. She found that one-third of the recipients of domestic violence and one-half of the assailants in her study had observed violence between their parents. Other researchers have also related previous observation of domestic violence to adult experience of domestic violence (Eekelaar & Sanford, 1978; Martin, 1978; Steinmetz, 1977). In support of such explanations is the research of social learning theorists that has addressed the issue of the impact of adult role models on children's development and socialization. An expanded presentation of this theoretical position can be found in Bandura's writing (e.g., 1969).

Evidence indicates the high risk of social maladjustment for children who have been exposed to marital violence. However, not all children who are reared in homes where domestic violence occurs are socially maladjusted. Rutter (1978) found that children of violent environments who had a good relationship with one parent were much less likely to develop socially maladaptive behaviors than children in similar homes who did not have a good relationship with either parent. Rutter does not define the elements of this good parent-child relationship, but it is evident that he considers it to be non-authoritarian, and most specifically, one in which the modeling effects of the violent, punitive environment are not evident. Anthony (1975) and Garmezy (1976) have singled out social competence as an important trait of children who survive violent, high-risk environments.

Shure and Spivack (1978) have studied the components of social competence in children and the relationship of parenting techniques to such components. They found that the child's ability to generate multiple solutions to interpersonal problems and his/her ability to assess the consequences of such actions were related to his/her social adjustment. Additionally they demonstrated that the child's ability to generate multiple solutions to interpersonal problems as well as the kind of solutions generated were related to the mother's parenting style. Children of mothers who emphasized open communication in the relationship between parent and child were less likely to be inhibited or totally aggressive in their interpersonal relationships than children of mothers who relied on physical punishment and/or abrupt commands.

The present study compared the interpersonal problem-solving ability of children of battered women to the problem-solving ability of children who had not been exposed to physically abusive modeling behavior. In order to assess how vulnerable the child was in his/her environment, half of the subjects tested exhibited psychiatric/psychological symptoms, half did not. The current parenting style of the mother was also assessed. It was presumed that a procedure of this type, that could identify the relationship of a child's deficit in social competence with witnessing domestic violence and parenting styles, would provide the necessary data to generate a more effective mental health program for battered women and their children. The need for such data has been discussed in the literature (Fontana, 1973; Walker, 1979).

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Domestic Violence

Although family violence is an ancient problem, it is only recently that society has been willing to publicly admit that the family could conceal physical abuse (Steinmetz, 1974; Straus, 1974, 1977-1978). In the United States, it is estimated that at least 1.8 million women are physically abused each year by their husbands (Project Share, 1980). Some researchers, including pyschologist Lenore Walker (1979), have estimated that as many as 50 percent of all women will be battering victims at some point in their lives. Research by Straus, Gelles, and Steinmetz (1980) documents that domestic battering occurs among adults of all socio-economic and ethnic minority groups, and among persons with varying educational levels.

Several studies have revealed the existence in Western society of conflicting expectations with regard to the family and physical abuse (Fleming, 1979; Gelles, 1974; Steinmetz, 1977). On the one hand, the family is a unit that society looks to for love, gentleness, and solidarity. On the other hand, society gives family members the clear right to use physical force and restraint--for example, the physical punishment of children. Stark and McEvoy (1970) documented evidence of societal approval for spouses to hit each other. Flynn (1976) confirmed

their findings in a midwestern community. He found that while some community members viewed the problem of spouse abuse as wrong, they also viewed it as being strictly a family matter. Professionals often failed to report cases of spouse abuse, even though required to do so by law. Police officers often viewed themselves as being powerless and were cautious in making an arrest unless they witnessed the event. Attorneys disagreed about alternatives open to victims. Walker (1979) discusses this societal permissiveness and disagreement regarding the problem of domestic violence. She theorizes that such permissiveness/disagreement is undoubtedly related to society's apparent ignorance of denial of the problem historically.

Not only have people ignored wife beating, but they have felt comfortable poking fun at it. Party jokes such as, "Are you beating her again, Jim?" demonstrate this attitude of tolerance. A recent media trend has also been detected purveying images of abused women for purposes of entertainment (London, 1977-1978). Pascal (1977) relates this media trend to traditional sex role stereotypes as well as to society's tendency toward avoidance concerning the problem of female/wife abuse. He suggests that such kinds of socially condoned tactics imply that abuse of women is traditional, acceptable, and funny. He and other researchers (Walker, 1979; USDHHS, 1980) agree that national statistics of domestic violence have been too overwhelming to ignore and poke fun at though.

While providing help for battered women has become an increasing national priority, researchers (Frieze, Knoble, Washburn & Zomnir, 1980) point out that little is being done for their non-battered children. Yet, common sense dictates, and research supports the observation, that the family unit becomes terribly distorted when physical violence enters

into the relationship (Roy, 1977; Steinmetz, 1978; Walters, 1975). Researchers have found that children in homes allowing spouse abuse are vulnerable to future patterns of disturbed interpersonal relationships (Davidson, 1978; Gayford, 1975; Gelles, 1974; Hammond, 1977; Walker, 1979). Hilberman and Munson (1977-1978) and Steinmetz (1978) concluded that this vulnerability is the case whether the children themselves are the victims of abuse or only the observers of parental violence. In their observation the cycle of family violence is complete when the sons and daughters of violent parents report violence in their own relationships.

The scope of this generational problem becomes obvious when one reflects on the scenario of how many children have the opportunity to witness wife beating. Based on a National Crime Survey sample, Gaquin (1977) reported that most occurrences of wife battering take place at night in the victim's home when there is a high likelihood that the children will also be present. Hammond (1977) found that most abused women do have children. A common pattern for these women is to have children immediately after marriage. Erin Pizzey (1974), founder of the world's first refuge for battered wives in London, England, studied both abused women and their children. She found that men often beat their wives in the presence of their children. Additionally, these abusive husbands use threats of further beatings to keep both their wives and their children from reporting the abuse.

A study conducted by the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (1980) concluded that there is ample evidence that living in a home where the father batters the mother is an insidious form of child abuse, even when the child is not physically abused. Additionally,

statistics show that many of these children are physically or sexually abused. In Walker's (1979) sample, approximately one-third of the wife batterers also beat their children. Additionally, these men were suspected of seductive sexual behavior toward their daughters. In approximately another third of the cases, battered women beat their children. In Hilberman and Munson's (1977-1978) sample (women who had suffered repeated or serious injury as the result of assaults by their husbands or cohabiters) one-third of the children experienced physical or sexual abuse. This abuse was inflicted by the father in the majority of cases. In Pfout's (1978) sample approximately one-third of the children were physically abused. However, in this study the children were more often abused by the mother.

Childhood Vulnerability and Invulnerability

Reviewing the literature on domestic violence and its impact on children naturally leads to a detailed exploration of childhood emotional development and individual differences. A notion underlying Erikson's (1963) theory of emotional/personality development is that each stage of childhood sets a unique and permanent stamp on future personality. In acknowledgment of this theoretical perspective, Wolff (1969) uses clinical experiences and developmental research to illustrate that the experiences of childhood are not lost. He believes that when such experiences are overwhelmingly stressful, arrest of personality occurs and a pattern of repetitive maladaptive behavior may be set in motion, preventing individuals from ever achieving full potentialities in adult life.

Many researchers have stressed that the experiences of childhood most noticeably stressful to children of battered women fall into two

categories: traumatic, based on the emotional trauma involved in being present during physical abuse; and environmental, based on the unstable or poor living conditions, and on the possible separation from parents due to injury or incarceration. While the traumatic and environmental stressors may be the same for children, especially those in the same family, not all children are vulnerable to such stressors. Two factors would appear to influence the child's adaptation given such stressors: (1) the stage of development in which the child first experiences the stressors, and (2) the individual characteristics and individual temperament of the child (Pines, 1979).

Rutter (1978) states that children in discordant homes are more likely to develop normally: (1) if they have adaptive temperamental characteristics which make them easy to get along with, (2) if they maintain a good relationship with one parent, (3) if family circumstances change for the better, and (4) if there are compensating good experiences outside the family, such as good teacher and peer relationships at school. Rutter contends that even without such ameliorating factors, intervention can facilitate normal development. Anthony (1974) examined the survival skills of children in high-risk environments. He emphasizes that a child's coping ability cannot be judged only by his/her performance. Rather, the survival of traumatic environments depends on what Anthony refers to as inner competence--the ability to evaluate, organize, and retain the mass of incoming data and to create a coherent, comprehensive frame of reference with which the child can analyze problems and direct future performance.

Researchers have also focused upon the relationship of vulnerability to the variable of gender. Fleming (1979) found that children who witness

wife beatings tend to identify with the parent of the same sex and model the same behavior. This finding was supported by Roy (1977) with data gathered from abused mothers. In these data, mothers reported that their children were beginning to develop perceptions of "acceptable" sex-role behaviors as a result of being in a home where domestic violence was exhibited. More specifically, boys and girls seemed to learn that physical abuse is a control exercised by men over women, and that violence is a way to "win" a disagreement. Thus males are aggressive and females are passive. Roy emphasizes that the more passive forms of behavior are particularly common among girls. Carlson (1977) indicated that boys who observe violence in their homes are far more likely to learn aggressive patterns of behavior and to use them when frustrated than are boys who did not observe such violence in their homes. Carlson used a case anecdote to illustrate her statement. She had worked with a 14-year-old boy who persistently defended his mother against the father's physical attacks. The parents subsequently separated and the home situation improved. However, during the following year the boy would respond by attacking his mother physically whenever the mother disciplined the boy verbally. In Fleming's (1979) study of women's shelters young girls in such settings tended to be passive, easily giving up their toys and generally displaying victim mentalities, while the boys often had terrible tempers and violent tantrums. It was also noted that the children had stopped listening to their mothers, or to any female staff. Fleming surmised that such behavior was related to the father's behavior of devaluing all women.

Not only does one see aggression or passivity in children of violent homes but one sees other forms of disturbance. Hilberman and Munson

(1977-1978) uncovered some of the other disturbances exhibited as attempts for coping in these situations. In their study, young children displayed intense fear of and resistance to going to bed at night, and were highly anxious about dying. Older male children were easily frustrated and female children were likely to become withdrawn, clinging, and anxious.

Obviously children from homes where domestic violence is exhibited can often be identified by their maladaptive behaviors. One of the most critical "global" maladaptations to be observed is the children's inability to function interpersonally. Children reared in homes where domestic violence occurs are likely to be lacking in social competence, whether it be flawed with aggressiveness, extreme passivity, or other maladaptive interpersonal tactics. The only published research that focuses upon interpersonal competence in children was completed by Shure and Spivack (1978). These researchers used a population of "normal" inner-city four- and five-year-olds to identify those children who were the social survivors of such a stressfully poor environment. They found that (1) social adjustment was related to a set of mediating skills encompassing the child's ability to think through and solve interpersonal problems, and (2) these skills could be acquired by the child if the parent were taught appropriate parenting tactics.

Of added importance, Shure and Spivack found that children who were exposed to interpersonal cognitive problem-solving training in their home or school setting improved their behavior in other environments, also. They suggested that it is reasonable to assume that when children learn how to problem solve interpersonally rather than are taught specific solutions to specific problems, they are able to utilize this

problem-solving skill in a variety of circumstances or environments. Correlated with successful problem-solving for the impulsive child is an increased ability to cope with frustration. Additionally, inhibited children exhibit less need to retreat from confrontations with others.

Thus, in their assessment of the actual responses that children gave to an interpersonal problem, Shure and Spivack found that the generation of multiple responses to a problem correlated more strongly to adjustment than being able to just verbalize the "best" solution. Both the best-adjusted children and the poorly-adjusted children thought of forceful ways to settle interpersonal conflicts. However, the best adjusted children could also think of more nonforceful ways. This assessment of forceful and nonforceful responses is delineated in the scoring procedures provided for Shure and Spivack's (1974) Preschool Interpersonal Problem Solving (PIPS) Test Manual.

Shure and Spivack also found that the child's interpersonal problem-solving skills were related to the mother's parenting style; good interpersonal problem-solving skills were related to a non-authoritative, communicative parental style. An objective measure of the mother's parenting style is available that differentiates role performance between authoritative and permissive mothers (Johnsen, 1965).

Hypotheses

The purposes of this study were (1) to measure the interpersonal problem-solving ability of adjusted and maladjusted four- to six-year-old children from varying environments, having been exposed to, or not exposed to domestic violence; and (2) to assess the parenting style exhibited by the children's mothers. Given that children who witness

spouse abuse are in highly vulnerable environments and may often model the interpersonal behavior they observe and thus are at high risk of maladjustment, given that four- to five-year-olds are at a stage of development where they are very vulnerable to stressors and parental tactics, and given findings from Shure and Spivack that a child's adjustment is related to his/her interpersonal competence, the following hypotheses will be tested:

1. Children who have witnessed wife beating will differ in their problem solving ability from children who have not witnessed wife beating. More specifically, in comparison to children who have not witnessed wife beating, they will generate fewer solutions to interpersonal problem stories.

2. Compared to children of battered mothers who have not been referred for psychiatric assistance, children of battered mothers who have been referred for psychiatric assistance will generate fewer solutions to interpersonal problem stories.

3. Compared to children of non-battered mothers who have not been referred for psychiatric assistance, children of non-battered mothers who have been referred for psychiatric assistance will generate fewer solutions to interpersonal problem stories.

Given that witnessing of wife beating may have differential effects on males and females, the following hypothesis will be tested:

4. Male children of battered mothers will generate more forceful responses to interpersonal problem stories than female children of battered mothers.

Given Shure and Spivack's finding that mothers influence the problem-

solving behavior of their children, the following hypothesis will be tested:

5. Mothers of the group of children who are least able to generate solutions to the problems will score on Johnsen's Parental Permissiveness Scales (JPPS) as being authoritarian; mothers of the group of children who are best able to generate solutions to the problems will score permissive on the JPPS.

CHAPTER III

METHOD

Subjects

Forty children, ages 4 to 5, served as subjects. All children were currently being reared by a single female parent and had not experienced physical abuse. The children were recruited for this study, primarily, through a network of professionals working with domestic violence and female issues. The affiliations of these individuals included social service agencies, hospitals, domestic violence services, psychiatric facilities, public and private preschool and daycare centers, churches of different denominations, and college and university services.

The children were divided equally into four groups. The groups were as follows:

1. The first group, Battered Mom Psychological Problems (BMPsyP), consisted of 10 children who had experienced living in a household with wife battering and who had been referred for psychiatric/psychological evaluation and therapy subsequent to, but not specifically related to the domestic violence.

2. The second group, Battered Mom Well Adjusted (BMWA), consisted of 10 children who had experienced living in a household with wife battering and who had never been referred for psychiatric/psychological treatment, and whose score on the Child Behavior Rating Scale (CBRS) indicated good adjustment, and where the investigator concurred with

this evaluation as a result of observation during testing and subsequent family interactions.

3. The third group, Non-Battered Mom Psychological Problems (N-BMPsyP), consisted of 10 children who had never witnessed wife battering in their families but who had been referred for psychiatric/psychological evaluation and therapy.

4. The fourth group, Non-Battered Mom Well Adjusted (N-BMWA), consisted of 10 children who had never witnessed wife battering in their families and had never been referred for psychiatric/psychological treatment, whose score on the CBRS indicated good adjustment, and where the investigator concurred with this evaluation as a result of observation during testing and subsequent family interaction.

Subjects were matched across these four groups on the following variables: gender, ethnic status, stage of cognitive functioning, and general level of socioeconomic status. Matching on the basis of these variables dictated, to a large extent, subject selection after the first pool of subjects was tested. The demographics pertaining to the first 10 to 15 subjects tested provided information relevant to further subject recruitment. This information was forwarded to the referral sources who assisted in recruiting subsequent matched subjects. In all instances, the referral sources provided the initial information pertaining to screening for SES, single parent status, child gender, and ethnic status. The demographic questionnaire was used later to confirm this information.

Instruments Used for Categorizing Subjects

The Conflict Tactics Scales (CTS)

The CTS (Straus, 1979) are designed to measure interpersonal

conflict tactics, the means used to resolve conflicts of interests. Three different tactics are measured: (1) reasoning, the use of rational discussion and argument; (2) verbal aggression, the use of verbal and symbolic means of hurting--such as insults or threats; and (3) violence, the actual use of physical force. (Refer to Appendix A for a copy of the CTS.) The administration of the CTS involves asking the respondents how they were treated when they had a disagreement with their spouse, and how they have treated their children in disagreements. Though all three scales are given to the parental subjects, the violence scale (composed of items k through r) was the only scale scored for this study. Any response on the last five items of the violence index (considered the severe violence index) was used to confirm battered women status and to screen out child abusers.

The internal consistency reliability of the violence index is .87 for husband-to-wife violence and .83 for mother-to-child violence (Straus, 1980). Straus states that the violence items have a degree of "face" or content validity since they all describe acts of actual physical force being used by one family member on another.

The Child Behavior Rating Scale (CBRS)

The CBRS measures the child's level of behavior and personality adjustment. This instrument was developed by Cassel (1962) and is an objective assessment of children from preschool through third grade. It consists of 78 brief statements to be rated by someone familiar with the child (such as parent and/or teacher) on a scale of six values ranging from "Yes" to "No." (Refer to Appendix B for a copy of the CBRS.) The

CBRS provides a profile of the child's adjustment in five different areas (self, home, social, school, and physical) along with a single score to indicate total adjustment. This score is labeled the Personality Total Adjustment Score (PTAS). Using a table provided by Cassel, the PTAS is converted into a t-score on the basis of the normative data for the group of typical children. If this t-score is above 40, the child is considered well adjusted; if this t-score is below 40, the child is considered maladjusted in some way. The PTAS was used to determine whether children would be categorized as well adjusted. It is consistent practice to obtain a CBRS rating from both the child's parent and teacher. In the present study the majority of children were not enrolled in a school setting; thus, ratings were obtained from mothers only.

The CBRS has a construct validity index of .481 with the Vineland Social Maturity Scales. Additionally, a comparison of scores on the CBRS between 200 typical children and 200 maladjusted children produced significant statistical differences (Cassel, 1962). A split-half reliability coefficient of .873 was obtained when comparing odd-even items for 800 typical children, and .589 for 200 maladjusted children.

Demographic Questionnaire

The demographic questionnaire, prepared by the researcher, was designed primarily to elicit responses for matching children across groups. The questions are similar to those Straus (1980) used in his family violence studies. (Refer to Appendix C for a copy of the demographic questionnaire.) Responses to questions 1-5 and question 9 were matched for subjects across groups. Questions 6, 7, 8, and 10 provided information on the mothers that could be used in a post hoc fashion.

Piaget Tasks

Three of Piaget's tasks, as presented by Ginsburg and Opper (1969), were utilized to assess the stage of cognitive functioning of the child for purposes of matching across groups. The age-relevant stages encompass the child's ability to construct orderings or relationships, and then the ability to manipulate such relationships in various ways. The first stage assessed, preoperational (divided into early and late), occurs roughly during the years 2 to 7. The second stage assessed, concrete operations, occurs roughly from the years 7 to 11. The stages and the specific tasks used to assess functioning within each stage are as follows: (1) Early Preoperational--an ordering of sticks; (2) Late Preoperational--a one-to-one correspondence of sticks and paper dolls; and (3) Concrete-Operational--conservation of equivalence when sticks are pushed together and dolls remain. (Refer to Appendix D for a full description and scoring for each task.)

Instruments Yielding Dependent Measures

The Preschool Interpersonal Problems Solving Test (PIPS)

The PIPS, developed by Shure and Spivack (1974) measures the child's ability to conceptualize alternate solutions to real-life interpersonal problem situations with peers and mothers. (Refer to Appendix E for a copy of the PIPS score sheet.) In the peer component of the PIPS, the tester shows the child subject three pictures, two of children and one of a toy. A dialogue is presented by the test manual that essentially asks the child to solve the problem of one of the children wanting the

toy the other has. Throughout the peer component of the PIPS, the goal is to elicit as many different solutions to this problem as the child can generate. Pictures of children and toys are switched to maintain the subject's interest. To the child subject, each new set of pictures represents a new story. Actually, the procedure is elicting different solutions to what is really the same problem--getting to play with a toy that another child has. A minimum of seven toys are shown, but if seven different relevant solutions are given, the procedure continues until the child can no longer generate solutions. Including repetitions and irrelevant responses, the subject is allowed four attempts per set of cards to find a new solution. The mother-problem story follows the same format, measuring solutions to the problem of a child wanting to avert mother's anger after having broken something valuable to her.

The score obtained represents the total number of solutions the child generates. The PIPS produces a score for peer-problems, a score for mother-problems, and a total score (a summation of the first two scores). Shure and Spivack (1978) have found the peer-problem score and the mother-problem score to be highly correlated at a significance level of $p < .01$. Test-retest reliability obtained on 57 randomly selected youngsters was .72. Shure and Spivack claim validity for the PIPS based on tests showing that the PIPS discriminates between children who differ in their degree of exhibited behavioral adjustment and the fact that these findings are not accounted for by general verbal ability or IQ.

Johnsen's Parental Permissiveness Scales (JPPS)

The JPPS measures mothers' perceptions of their own parenting styles.

(Refer to Appendix F for a copy of the JPPS.) Developed by Johnsen (1965) these scales allow comparison between the mother's concept of what a parent should do, her tolerance for different types of childhood behaviors, and her action toward these behaviors. Response categories for each item move from complete permissiveness (encouragement) to absolute restriction and punishment for the behavior. The JPPS is comprised of three scales: one, the role concept scale, was not used. The remaining two, the tolerance and action scales, were scored separately and then totaled. These two measures combined yield scores ranging from 0-15 with permissive mothers' scores being in the 0-7 range and authoritarian mothers' scores being in the 8-15 range.

Reliability of the scores was determined by the test-retest method; the reliability coefficients were as follows: role concept scales, .73; tolerance scales, .82; action scales, .55 (Johnson, 1976). The author relies on face validity for these scores.

Procedure

All data collection was accomplished in the children's homes and proceeded in the following manner: the mother and child were first introduced to the investigator. The parent was then provided with an introductory statement and a parental consent form. (Refer to Appendix G for the introductory statement and the consent form.) After the consent form was signed and returned to the investigator, testing began. A packet containing the demographic questionnaire and rating forms (CBRS and JPPS) was given to the mother for completion. The child was then taken to a separate room by the investigator. Following establishment of rapport, each child was administered the PIPS and then the Piaget

tasks. The total testing time with the child and mother working simultaneously varied from half an hour to one hour. Normally, testing with the child was completed prior to the mother's completion of forms. This allowed the investigator time for free play with the child and the opportunity for further behavioral observation.

After all testing and forms were completed, the investigator provided feedback to the parent with the child present. The parent was also given the opportunity to ask further questions regarding the study. At the completion of both testing and feedback, the child was given a small toy and a package of candy for participation, and the mother was given five dollars for her time and participation.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

For purposes of comparison to other samples, the following is a summary of the demographic and control variables. (Descriptive demographic data are summarized by group in Table I.)

All of the children who participated in this study performed cognitively at the early preoperational level, as assessed by Piagetian tasks. All subject pairs were white, U.S. citizens, and residents of a metropolitan area. All of the mothers who participated in this study had, at least, a high school education: 7.5 percent had completed additional training beyond high school, 27.5 percent had some college, 5 percent had a college degree, and 10 percent had graduate degrees. Twenty percent of the mothers had an income over $10,000 and under $20,000; the remainder had incomes below $10,000. The number of children in each family varied from one to three, with 40 percent of the mothers having three children, 42.5 percent having two children, and 17.5 percent having one child. Religious preference varied in five different classifications, with no unusual sects mentioned: 45 percent stated a preference for Protestant, with no denomination listed; 17.5 percent listed Baptist, 5 percent listed Episcopal, 12.5 percent listed Methodist, and 20 percent listed Roman Catholic.

The two independent variables (domestic violence, psychiatric/psychological problems) were used as potential predictors of preschool

TABLE I

SUMMARY OF DESCRIPTIVE DEMOGRAPHIC DATA

	Number of Children in Family			Educational Level of Mother					Financial Level		Religious Preference				
	1	2	3	High School	Training Beyond High School	Some College	College Degree	Graduate Degree	Under $10,000	Over $10,000-Under $20,000	Protestant--No Denomination Given	Protestant--Baptist	Protestant--Episcopal	Protestant--Methodist	Roman Catholic
	n/%	n/%	n/%	n/%	n/%	n/%	n/%	n/%	n/%	n/%	n/%	n/%	n/%	n/%	n/%
BMPsyP (n = 10)	1/ 2.5	5/ 12.5	4/ 10.0	6/ 15.0		2/ 5.0	2/ 5.0		8/ 20.0	2/ 5.0	6/ 15.0	4/ 10.0			
BMWA (n = 10)	1/ 2.5	4/ 10.0	5/ 12.5	5/ 12.5	2/ 5.0	1/ 2.5		2/ 5.0	8/ 20.0	2/ 5.0	2/ 5.0	3/ 7.5		2/ 5.0	3/ 7.5
N-BMPsyP (n = 10)		5/ 12.5	5/ 12.5	8/ 20.0	1/ 2.5	1/ 2.5			8/ 20.0	2/ 5.0	7/ 17.5				3/ 7.5
N-BMWA (n = 10)	5/ 12.5	3/ 7.5	2/ 5.0	1/ 2.5		7/ 17.5		2/ 5.0	8/ 20.0	2/ 5.0	3/ 7.5		2/ 5.0	3/ 7.5	2/ 5.0
Total	7/ 17.5	17/ 42.5	16/ 40.0	20/ 50.0	3/ 7.5	11/ 27.5	2/ 5.0	4/ 10.0	32/ 80.0	8/ 20.0	18/ 45.0	7/ 17.5	2/ 5.0	5/ 12.5	8/ 20.0

children's interpersonal problem solving ability (PIPS) and maternal parents' childrearing style (JPPS). An assessment of gender differences of the children was also involved in the study analyses.

Hypotheses 1, 2, and 3: a 2X2 (domestic violence X psychiatric/psychological problem) complete factorial ANOVA of the dependent variable of PIPS total score yielded the following results: the main effect for psychiatric/psychological problems was significant; neither the main effect for witnessing domestic violence nor the interaction effect was significant. Table II presents the summary table for the ANOVA. Table III summarizes means and standard deviations for the four groups in the study.

A two-sample dependent t-test was conducted comparing the PIPS scores of adjusted and majadjusted children of battered women. The two groups were found to be significantly different, $t(9) = 3.48$, $p < .01$. A two sample dependent t-test was also conducted comparing the PIPS scores of adjusted and maladjusted children of non-battered women. These two groups were also found to be significantly different, $t(9) = 4.20$, $p < .01$. The results indicate that children with psychiatric/psychological problems, of both battered and non-battered mothers, generate fewer solutions to interpersonal problems than children who do not have such problems. Based on these findings, hypothesis 1 (that children who had witnessed wife beating would generate fewer solutions for interpersonal problems than children who had not witnessed wife beating) was rejected. Based on these findings, hypothesis 2 (that children of battered mothers who had been referred for psychiatric/psychological problems would generate fewer solutions than children of battered mothers who had not been referred for problems) was not rejected. Additionally, hypothesis 3

TABLE II

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE SUMMARY TABLE FOR DEPENDENT VARIABLE OF PIPS TOTAL SCORE AS A FUNCTION OF DOMESTIC VIOLENCE AND PSYCHIATRIC/ PSYCHOLOGICAL PROBLEMS

Source	Sum of Squares	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Squares	F Ratio
Domestic Violence	11.025	1	11.025	3.06
Psychiatric/Psychological Problems	75.625	1	75.625	20.99*
Interaction	.625	1	.625	.17
Error	129.702	36	3.603	
Total		39		

*$p < .001$.

TABLE III

MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS FOR PIPS TOTAL SCORES FOR CHILDREN IN ALL GROUPS

	Battered Mother X (S.D.)		Non-Battered Mother X (S.D.)	
Psychiatric/Psychological Problems (N = 20)	3.2	(2.04)	4.0	(1.25)
Well Adjusted (N = 20)	5.7	(2.11)	7.0	(2.05)

(that children of non-battered women who had been referred for psychiatric/psychological problems would generate fewer solutions than children of non-battered women who had not been referred for problems) was not rejected.

Hypothesis 4: a two sample dependent t-test was conducted comparing the PIPS scores for force solutions of male children of battered women to those of female children of battered women (note 1). The two groups were found to be significantly different, $t(9) = 3.35$, $p < .01$. Refer to Table IV for a summary of means and standard deviations. Hypothesis 4 was not rejected; male children of battered women were found to generate more forceful responses (based on PIPS scoring) to interpersonal problem stories than female children of battered women.

Related to this hypothesis, post-hoc analyses were conducted with the dependent variable of PIPS force scores. First, a two sample dependent t-test was conducted comparing the PIPS scores for force solutions of male children of non-battered women to those of female children of non-battered women. The two groups were not found to be significantly different, $t(9) = 1.96$, $p < .05$. Refer to Table V for a summary of means and standard deviations. Second, a 2X2 (domestic violence X psychiatric/psychological problem) complete factorial ANOVA of the dependent variable of PIPS force scores for all children did not produce any significant main or interaction effects. Table VI presents the summary table for this ANOVA. So, while force solutions of children of battered mothers could be significantly discriminated by gender of child, this same type of discrimination could not be made based on whether the child did or did not display psychiatric/psychological problems. Third, a 2X2 (domestic violence X psychiatric/psychological problem) complete factorial

TABLE IV

MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS FOR PIPS FORCE SCORES FOR MALE AND FEMALE CHILDREN OF BATTERED WOMEN

	Males (N = 10) X (S.D.)	Females (N = 10) X (S.D.)
PIPS Force Scores	1.10 (1.18)	.10 (.32)

TABLE V

MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS FOR PIPS FORCE SCORES FOR MALE AND FEMALE CHILDREN OF NON-BATTERED WOMEN

	Males (N = 10) X (S.D.)	Females (N = 10) X (S.D.)
PIPS Force Scores	1.00 (1.05)	.40 (.52)

TABLE VI

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE SUMMARY TABLE FOR DEPENDENT VARIABLE OF PIPS FORCE SCORES AS A FUNCTION OF DOMESTIC VIOLENCE AND PSYCHIATRIC/ PSYCHOLOGICAL PROBLEMS

Source	Sum of Squares	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Squares	F Ratio
Domestic Violence	.100	1	.100	.18
Psychiatric/Psychological Problems	.400	1	.400	.72
Interaction	0	1	0	0
Error	20.100	36	.558	
Total		39		

TABLE VII

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE SUMMARY TABLE FOR DEPENDENT VARIABLE OF PIPS FORCE SCORES FOR MALES AS A FUNCTION OF DOMESTIC VIOLENCE AND PSYCHIATRIC/PSYCHOLOGICAL PROBLEMS

Source	Squares	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Squares	F Ratio
Domestic Violence	.050	1	.050	.10
Psychiatric/Psychological Problems	1.250	1	1.250	2.41
Interaction	.050	1	.050	.10
Error	8.300	16	.519	
Total		19		

ANOVA of all male PIPS force scores also did not yield any main or interaction effects. Table VII (page 28) presents the summary table for this ANOVA. Thus gender differences in force scores were not found in any grouping analyzed other than the children of battered mothers.

In order to assess gender influences upon total PIPS scores, a 2X2X2 complete factorial ANOVA of the independent variable of PIPS was completed for all subjects. Besides repeating a previous analysis (Table II), this analysis yielded the following additional results: neither the main effect for gender, nor the interaction effects utilizing gender were significant. Table VIII presents the summary table for this ANOVA. Thus there were no indications that gender, as an independent variable, affects the overall PIPS score. Further, there were no indications of a significant interaction between gender and either of the other two independent variables.

Hypothesis 5: a two-sample dependent t-test was conducted comparing the JPPS (Johnsen's Parental Permissiveness Scales) scores of the mothers of the group of children scoring highest on the PIPS (N-BMWA Group) to the mothers of the group of children scoring lowest of the PIPS (BMPsyP Group). Using 10 JPPS scores (two scores are duplications because there were 8 mothers for 10 children) for each group, the two groups were found to be significantly different, $t(9) = 2.39$, $p < .05$ (note 2). Refer to Table IX for a summary of means and standard deviations. Hypothesis 5 was not rejected; mothers of the group of children with the lowest PIPS scores were found to be more authoritarian in their parenting scores (JPPS) than the mothers of the group of children with the highest PIPS scores.

TABLE VIII

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE SUMMARY TABLE FOR DEPENDENT VARIABLE OF PIPS SCORES AS A FUNCTION OF GENDER, DOMESTIC VIOLENCE, AND PSYCHIATRIC/PSYCHOLOGICAL PROBLEMS

Source	Sum of Squares	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Squares	F Ratio
Gender	9.025	1	9.025	2.75
Domestic Violence	11.025	1	11.025	3.35
Psychiatric/Psychological Problems	75.625	1	75.625	23.00*
Gender X Domestic Violence	13.225	1	13.225	4.02
Gender X Psychiatric/Psychological Problems	.225	1	.225	.07
Domestic Violence X Psychiatric/Psychological Problems	.625	1	.625	.19
Gender X Domestic Violence X Psychiatric/Psychological Problems	2.025	1	2.025	.62
Error	105.200	32	3.288	
Total		39		

*$p < .001$.

TABLE IX

MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS FOR JPPS SCORES FOR MOTHERS IN ALL GROUPS

Group	JPPS Scores X (S.D.)
BMPsyP (N = 10)	9.4 (1.96)
BMWA (N = 10)	8.0 (1.33)
N-BMPsyP (N = 10)	7.9 (2.08)
N-BMWA (N = 10)	7.8 (1.14)

TABLE X

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE SUMMARY TABLE FOR DEPENDENT VARIABLE OF JPPS SCORES AS A FUNCTION OF DOMESTIC VIOLENCE AND CHILDREN'S PROBLEMS

Source	Squares	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Squares	F Ratio
Domestic Violence	7.225	1	7.225	2.58
Children's Problems	5.625	1	5.625	2.00
Interaction	4.225	1	4.225	1.51
Error	100.900	36	2.803	
Total		39		

A 2X2 (domestic violence X psychiatric/psychological problems of children) complete factorial ANOVA of the dependent variable of JPPS scores for all mothers did not produce any significant main or interaction effect. Table X (page 31) presents the summary table for this ANOVA.

CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION

The primary question studied was whether the interpersonal problem solving ability of children who had witnessed wife abuse would be different from children who had not witnessed such abuse. There was no evidence obtained in this study to indicate that there was a significant difference between these two groups of children. Evidence that children of battered women who displayed psychiatric/psychological symptoms demonstrated interpersonal difficulties similar to those of other children with problems who had not been exposed to domestic violence was found. However, the evidence pointed to the individual psychological problems, and not the violent environment, as the factor in the interpersonal difficulties. This pattern, of restricted ability in solving interpersonal problems, mirrors the findings of Shure and Spivack (1978), who found that deficiencies in alternate-solution thinking was a powerful predictor of problems in four- and five-year-old children.

High-risk studies (Worland, Janes & Anthony, 1980) have indicated that it is difficult to accurately assess the total risk to which a child is exposed. This phenomenon could possibly provide an explanation for the present findings relating to the child's observation of domestic violence. Research indicates that even children in the highest risk settings are not equally susceptible to the same disturbances. Researchers in the area attribute the "good" adjustment of some children in high risk

environment to a factor they term vulnerability. However, they provide no clear objective method for assessing this vulnerability. Consequently, in this study there was no way to assess the child's vulnerability.

Another possible explanation for the discrepancy between the study's primary question and its findings might be attributed to one of the demographic variables peculiar to this sample. All of the children in the Battered Mom groups no longer lived in environments where they observed domestic violence. They had been absent from such home environments for time periods ranging from three months to about two years. (This information was not obtained in any systematic manner, but rather through casual conversation.) None of the mothers gave any indication to the investigator of further battering incidents after the initial separation. Furthermore, the mother's resolve to remain separated from the batterer seemed firm in all cases. Two relevant pieces of information are important here. Though children between the ages of six months and four years of age are considered extremely susceptible to the impact of family discord (Rutter, 1972), a steady relationship with one parent may ameliorate the impact of the discord. Additionally, it has been observed that toddlers and young children have the recuperative ability to form new relationships and fresh attachments after brief separations from even a primary caretaker (Robertson & Robertson, 1971). Thus, the influence of attachments formed with battering fathers may be modified by positive attachments to non-abusive mothers or other significant adults.

Rutter (1978) indicates that if family circumstances change for the better, and if there are compensating good social experiences outside the family, children are more likely to develop normally than if they remained in the atmosphere of discord. In this study, all of the mothers

gave evidence of some social support system, either family or close friends. The children, also, had social contacts through this support system. In addition, all mothers showed some element of independence, though some mothers were more independent and goal-oriented than others.

What is crucial here then is that this sample, in all likelihood, varies dramatically from a sample of children who might presently be residing in a domestic violence shelter or still living in the discordant home. The fact that the main hypothesis regarding the effects of observing domestic violence was not substantiated does not necessarily need to be negatively interpreted. This evidence could suggest an aura of optimism for breaking the cycle of violence. The main finding of this study could be interpreted as supporting the domestic violence literature (USDHHS, 1980) that maintains if life changes are made while the children are still young, the damage of domestic violence can be reversed.

Another question posed was whether the male children of battered mothers would give more interpersonal solutions involving the use of force than female children of battered mothers. Evidence was obtained supporting this hypothesis. A significant difference was not found in the number of forceful solutions for any other possible combination of groups within this study. Thus, this finding cannot be interpreted only in light of information available regarding traditional sex role socialization. This finding offers support to researchers (especially Walker, 1979, and Pagelow, 1978) who theorize that role modeling probably contributes heavily to the continuing cycle of violence.

Bandura (1972) indicates that the presence of an aggressive model increases a child's propensity for acting aggressively. Thus, if a child identifies with the parent of the same sex, and that parent displays

aggressive behavior in situations of interpersonal conflict, the child may do the same. There are indications that this modeling effect does not change over time. Owens and Straus (1975) found that adult approval of interpersonal violence is highly related to experiencing, observing or committing violence as a child. While correlations on this phenomenon are similar for different socioeconomic groups in their study, the control for sex differences revealed that there was consistently less of a realtionship between exposure to violence and interpersonal violence approval for women than there was for men. It is surmised that if the female has witnessed her mother as the recipient of this violence, it is likely that she is highly threatened by violence.

The final question focused upon was whether the mothers of the group of children who scored lowest on the PIPS would be more authoritarian in the parenting approach than the mothers of the group of children who scored the highest. The findings on the JPPS (Johnsen's Parental Permissiveness Scales) gave evidence to support this assumption. However, an additional analysis of all scores indicated that the mothers' JPPS scores were not related to either of the independent variables. Obviously, the effect is only significant for those who parent in an extreme authoritarian or permissive fashion. While it is not necessarily assumed that an authoritarian parenting style precludes stimulation of a child's ability to cognitively seek alternatives and generate decisions, it is generally accepted that an authoritarian approach is more restrictive by nature than is a permissive parenting approach. Investigators (Sears, Maccoby & Levin, 1975; Hoffman, 1970) have concluded from previous studies that physical punishment and verbal coercion may lead to inhibited, impulsive, or aggressive behavior. More non-restrictive parent-child

interactions were found, by these investigators, to encourage reasoning and the search for alternatives.

A possible explanation for the JPPS finding that relates only to extremes may reside in the inherent problems of an objective instrument that purports to measure qualitative responses. The attempt to classify parental behavior and attitudes by a limited number of responses to a variety of single items may be simply inadequate when trying to categorize such highly complex variables as permissive and authoritarian parenting styles. The author (Johnsen, 1965) acknowledges this hazard. Additionally, permissive and authoritarian childrearing practices are by no means the only dimensions of parenting. Present understanding of the mechanisms affecting parent-child interactions remains limited.

While the assessment of parenting style offered only limited differential information, some differences in families seemed apparent from observation. Generally, the families with well adjusted children seemed somewhat more consistent, positive, and predictable, especially in the interactions of individual family members. Also, the mothers in these families tended to express more goal and/or career orientation, along with an awareness of the consequences of their actions. In the families where the children displayed some maladjustment, the daily routine and interpersonal interactions of family members seemed to oscillate more. The mothers of these families tended to display behaviors of two extremes. Either they seemed totally overwhelmed by their circumstances, or extremely opinionated and verbally aggressive. These mothers, also, expressed more financial and emotional dependency on adult male support. Given these observations, one might speculate that the mother's

independence is a more critical variable in these single-parent families than parenting styles.

Though this study did not provide any precise data on differences between children who have witnessed domestic violence and those who have not, some of the present findings and the limitation of the present study would indicate that further research is needed. It is necessary to clarify the psychological impact of domestic violence, and to sort out the various parental, environmental, and temperamental variables that might alter the impact of such an environment. Future research might be more productive with a less rigidly defined sample. More specifically, future research should encompass the following:

1. Sample a broader age range of children.

2. Assess the mother's ability to function independently.

3. Assess the stability of the child's prior home, despite the presence of domestic violence.

4. Assess time elapsed since the child was exposed to domestic violence.

5. Assess the age of the child during exposure to domestic violence, and cumulative length of time of such exposure.

Additionally, it would be essential to evaluate children who continue to live in an atmosphere of domestic violence.

The results of this study should not be taken to indicate that service providers should not attend to children who have witnessed spouse abuse. Most likely, the evaluation of such children has not been refined sufficiently to detect the discriminating differences that would indicate the exact nature of the psychological nature of this type of environment.

REFERENCE NOTES

[1]The PIPS scoring technique makes it feasible to classify each solution into one of sixteen different categories (see Appendix F for PIPS scoresheet). Four of the categories--(1) force-grab, (2) physical attack on a person, (3) damage to property, and (4) command--are considered force categories.

[2]Child researchers disagree over how to statistically assess a parent-child comparison in which one parent is related to more than one child. Since this study focused on the child, it seemed logical to duplicate the JPPS scores for those mothers whose parenting style influenced more than one child.

REFERENCES

Anthony, E. J. Children at risk from divorce: A review. In E. J. Anthony and C. Koupernik (Eds.), The Child in his family: Children at psychiatric risk (Vol. 3). New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1974.

Anthony, E. J. (Ed.). Exploration in child psychiatry. Baltimore: Plenum Press, 1975.

Bandura, A. Social-learning theory of identificatory processes. In D. A. Goslin (Ed.), Handbook of socialization theory and research. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1969.

Bandura, A. The role of modeling processes in personality development. In C. S. Lavatelli and F. Stendler (Ed.), Readings in child behavior and development. New York: Harcourt Brace Javanovich, 1972.

Carlson, B. E. Battered women and their assailants. Social Work, 1977, 22, 455-460.

Cassel, R. N. The child behavior rating scale manual. Los Angeles: Western Psychological Services, 1962.

Davidson, T. Conjugal crime: Understanding and changing the wifebeating pattern. New York: Hawthorn Books, Inc., 1978.

Eekelaar, J. M., & Sanford, N. K. (Eds.). Family Violence. Toronto: Butterworths, 1978.

Erikson, E. H. Childhood and society (2nd ed.). New York: Norton, 1963.

Fleming, J. B. Stopping wife abuse. New York: Anchor Books, 1979.

Flynn, J. P. Recent findings related to wife abuse. Social Casework, 1976, 58, 13-20.

Fontana, V. J. Somewhere a child is crying. New York: The New American Library, Inc., 1973.

Frieze, I. H., Knoble, J., Washburn, C., & Zomnir, G. Characteristics of battered women and their marriages. Unpublished NIMH report, University of Pittsburg, 1980.

Gaquin, D. A. Spouse abuse: Data from the national crime survey. Victimology: An International Journal, 1977-78, 2, 632-643.

Garmezy, N. Vulnerable and invulnerable children: Theory, research and intervention. Master Lecture on Developmental Psychology. New York: American Psychological Association, 1976.

Gayford, J. J. Battered wives. Medicine, Science, and the Law, 1975, 15, 237-245.

Gelles, R. J. The violent home. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications, 1974.

Gil, D. H. Child abuse: Levels of manifestation, causal dimensions and primary prevention. Victimology: An International Journal, 1977-78, 2, 186-194.

Ginsburg, H., & Opper, S. Piaget's theory of intellectual development: An introduction. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1969.

Hammond, N. Domestic assault: A report on family violence in Michigan. Lansing: Michigan Women's Commission, 1977.

Helfer, E., & Kempe, C. H. (Eds.). Child abuse and neglect: The family and the community. Cambridge: Ballinger, 1976.

Hilberman, E., & Munson, K. Sixty battered women. Victimology: An International Journal, 1977-78, 2, 460-470.

Hoffman, M. L. Moral development. In P. H. Mussen (Ed.), Carmichael's manual of child psychiatry (Vol. 2). New York: Wiley, 1970.

Johnsen, K. P. Methodological notes on research in child rearing. Merrill-Palmer Quarterly, 1965, 11, 345-358.

Johnson, O. G. Tests and measurements in child development: Handbook II (Vols. 1 & 2). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1976.

London, J. Images of violence against women. Victimology: An International Journal, 1977-78, 2, 510-524.

Martin, D. Battered wives. San Francisco: Glide Publications, 1976.

Martin, J. P. (Ed.). Violence and the family. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1978.

Owens, D. J., & Straus, M. A. The social structure of violence in childhood and approval of violence as an adult. Aggressive Behavior, 1975, 1, 193-211.

Pagelow, M. D. Secondary battering: Breaking the cycle of domestic violence. Paper presented at the meeting of the Sociologists for Women Section of the American Sociological Association, Chicago, Illinois, September, 1977.

Pascal, H. J. Secret scandal: Battered wives. Canfield, Ohio: Alba House, 1977.

Pfouts, J. H. Violent families: Coping responses of abused wives. Child Welfare, 1978, 57, 12-23.

Pines, M. Superkids. Psychology Today, 1979, 12, 53-63.

Pizzey, E. Scream quietly or the neighbors will hear. Short Hills, N.J.: Ridley Enslow, 1974.

Project Share. Rockville, Md.: Department of Health and Human Services, 1980.

Robertson, J., & Robertson, J. Young children in brief separations: A fresh look. Psychoanalytic Study of the Child, 1971, 26, 264-315.

Roy, M. Battered women: A psychosociological study of domestic violence. Florence, Ky.: Van Nostrand Reinhold Co., 1977.

Rutter, M. Maternal deprivation reassessed. Harmondsworth, Middlesex, England: Penquin, 1972.

Rutter, M. Early sources of security and competence. In J. Bruner & A. Garton (Eds.), Human growth and development. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1978.

Sears, R. R., Maccoby, E. E., & Levin, H. Patterns of child rearing. New York: Harper & Row, 1957.

Shure, M. B., & Spivack, G. The preschool interpersonal problem-solving test manual. Philadelphia: Hahnemann Medical College and Hospital, 1974.

Shure, M. B., & Spivack, G. Problem-solving techniques in childrearing. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1978.

Stark, R., & McEvoy, J., III. Middle class violence. Psychology Today, 1970, 4, 52-65.

Steinmetz, S. K. Resource booklet for families in crisis. Wilmington, Dela.: Governor's Commission on the Status of Women, 1978.

Steinmetz, S. K. The use of force for resolving family conflict: The training ground for abuse. The Family Coordinator, 1977, 26, 19-26.

Steinmetz, S. K. Violence between family members. Marriage and Family Review, 1978, 1, 1-16.

Steinmetz, S. K., & Straus, M. A. (Eds.). Violence in the family. New York: Dodd, Mead, 1974.

Straus, M. A. Leveling, civility, and violence in the family. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 1974, 36, 13-29.

Straus, M. A. Wife beating: How common and why? Victimology: An International Journal, 1977-78, 2, 443-458.

Straus, M. A., Gelles, R., & Steinmetz, S. K. Behind closed doors. New York: Anchor Press, 1980.

U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. A monograph on services to battered women. (DHHS Publication No. OHDS 79-05708.) Washington, D.C., 1980.

Walker, L. E. The battered woman. New York: Harper and Row, 1979.

Wallerstein, J. S., & Kelly, J. B. Surviving the breakup. New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1980.

Wolff, S. Children under stress. London: The Penguin Press, 1969.

Wooden, K. Weeping in the playtime of others. New York: McGraw Hill, 1976.

Worland, J., Janes, C., & Anthony, E. J. St. Louis risk research project: Experimental studies. St. Louis: Harry Edison Child Development Research Center, 1980.

APPENDIX A

THE CONFLICT TACTICS SCALES

No matter how well a couple gets along, there are times when they disagree on major decisions, get annoyed about something the other person does, or just have spats or fights because they are in a bad mood or tired or for some other reason. They also use many different ways of trying to settle their differences. Below is a list of some things that you or your ex-husband/partner might have done when you had a dispute. Circle the numbers that fit you and your ex-spouse.

	Ever Happened			
	You		Partner	
	Yes	No	Yes	No
a. Discussed the issue calmly	1	2	1	2
b. Got information to back up (your/his) side of things	1	2	1	2
c. Brought in or tried to bring in someone to help settle things	1	2	1	2
d. Insulted or swore at the other one	1	2	1	2
e. Sulked and/or refused to talk about it	1	2	1	2
f. Stomped out of the room or house (or yard)	1	2	1	2
g. Cried	1	2	1	2
h. Did or said something to spite the other one	1	2	1	2
i. Threatened to hit or throw something at the other one	1	2	1	2
j. Threw or smashed or hit or kicked something	1	2	1	2
k. Threw something at the other one	1	2	1	2
l. Pushed, grabbed, or shoved the other one	1	2	1	2
m. Slapped the other one	1	2	1	2
n. Kicked, bit, or hit with a fist	1	2	1	2
o. Hit or tried to hit with something	1	2	1	2
p. Beat up the other one	1	2	1	2
q. Threatened with a knife or gun	1	2	1	2
r. Used a knife or gun	1	2	1	2

Parents may use many different ways of trying to settle differences between them and their children. Below is a list of some things you might have done when you had a dispute with your child. Circle the numbers that fit what you have ever done with the child who is participating in this study when the two of you have had a disagreement.

	Ever Happened You	
	Yes	No
a. Discussed the issue calmly	1	2
b. Got information to back up your side of things	1	2
c. Brought in or tried to bring in someone to help settle things	1	2
d. Insulted or swore at the other one	1	2
e. Sulked and/or refused to talk about it	1	2
f. Stomped out of the room or house (or yard)	1	2
g. Cried	1	2
h. Did or said something to spite the other one	1	2
i. Threatened to hit or throw something at the other one	1	2
j. Threw or smashed or hit or kicked something	1	2
k. Threw something at the other one	1	2
l. Pushed, grabbed, or shoved the other one	1	2
m. Slapped or spanked the other one	1	2
n. Kicked, bit, or hit with a fist	1	2
o. Hit with something hard	1	2
p. Beat up the other one	1	2
q. Threatened with a knife or gun	1	2
r. Used a knife or gun	1	2

APPENDIX B

THE CHILD BEHAVIOR RATING SCALE

The Child Behavior Rating Scale

By

Russell N. Cassel, Ed.D.

Published By

WPS WESTERN PSYCHOLOGICAL SERVICES
PUBLISHERS AND DISTRIBUTORS
12031 WILSHIRE BOULEVARD
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90025
A DIVISION OF MANSON WESTERN CORPORATION

Name				School
Address				Grade
Birthdate	Age	Boy	Girl	Rated By:
Date				Position of Rater:

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS

This rating scale is designed to assess the personality adjustment of primary grade school children who do not have sufficient reading skill to complete the group type of psychological tests. The ratings are to be accomplished by the teacher and/or parents. The person rating the child should read each item on the scale carefully, and then place a check mark (✓) in the appropriate place where he believes the particular child belongs for the specific item involved. If the item is "yes" for the child, put a check mark on the "yes". If the item is "no", put a check mark on the "no". If the answer is somewhere in between the yes and no, put a check mark on the four point scale indicating where the item is most true. Study the example.

Example: Mary is prettier than Lois.

yes		✓			no

C.B.R.S. Profile (2000 Typical Pupils)

T-Score	Self-Adjustment	Home-Adjustment	Social-Adjustment	School-Adjustment	Physical-Adjustment	Personality Tot. Adjust.
80	120	120	120	72	36	552
75	119	119	119	71	36	547
70	118	118	118	70	35	542
65	117	117	117	68	34	536
60	112	112	112	65	33	513
55	105	105	105	62	32	483
50	99	98	99	59	30	452
45	92	91	92	56	29	421
40	85	84	85	53	27	390
35	78	77	78	50	26	360
30	72	70	72	46	24	329
25	65	62	65	43	22	298
20	58	55	58	40	21	267
Weighted Scores						
Weight Values	2	2	0	1	0	P.T.A.S.
Personality Total Adjustment Score		+		+		=

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

W-37A

The Child Behavior Rating Scale

Self Adjustment	Scale Values 1	2	3	4	5	6
1. Often prefers to be alone.	yes					no
2. Often seems unhappy or depressed.	yes					no
3. Often cries, and with little or no reason.	yes					no
4. Feelings are often easily hurt.	yes					no
5. Often appears to feel unwanted or disliked.	yes					no
6. Often seems to have little self confidence.	yes					no
7. Often sulks when unable to get own way.	yes					no
8. Often daydreams and "mind" tends to wander.	yes					no
9. Often giggles even when nothing is funny.	yes					no
10. Often makes alibis or excuses for mistakes.	yes					no
11. Personal values often not accepted by others.	yes					no
12. Often is slovenly and unkempt in appearance.	yes					no
13. Often talks dirty, swears, or uses foul words.	yes					no
14. Often bites nails or sucks thumbs and fingers.	yes					no
15. Often tends to be on the go and can't relax.	yes					no
16. Often is very nervous and excited about things.	yes					no
17. Often has trouble controlling temper.	yes					no
18. Often is not very tactful with others.	yes					no
19. Often does things which later regrets having done.	yes					no
20. Often behavior goes in cycles of good and bad.	yes					no
NUMBER CHECKS						TOTAL WEIGHTED SCORE
WEIGHTED VALUES						

Home Adjustment						
21. Often expresses strong dislike for home and family.	yes					no
22. Sometimes talks about running away from home.	yes					no
23. Often fears parents when something is wrong.	yes					no
24. Doesn't get along well with one or both parents.	yes					no
25. Parents often find fault with child's conduct.	yes					no
26. Parents often are too strict about minor matters.	yes					no
27. Parents often use corporal punishment (whipping).	yes					no

	Scale Values					
	1	2	3	4	5	6
28. There is evidence of parental neglect in home.	yes					no
29. Parents have little confidence in child.	yes					no
30. Parents often do not trust child.	yes					no
31. Parents sometimes play favorites among children.	yes					no
32. Parents make unfavorable comparisons of child.	yes					no
33. There is evidence of over-dominance by parents (do too much of child's thinking).	yes					no
34. There is evidence of over-indulgence by parents (do too much that child should be doing).	yes					no
35. There is evidence of excessive bad habits in home.	yes					no
36. Immediate family is broken (death, divorce, etc.).	yes					no
37. There is evidence of constant quarreling in home.	yes					no
38. Family lives in multiple family dwelling.	yes					no
39. Family lives in racially mixed neighborhood.	yes					no
40. Parents have little or no religious affiliations.	yes					no
NUMBER CHECKS						TOTAL WEIGHTED SCORE
WEIGHTED VALUES						

Social Adjustment

41. Often is aggressive and hostile towards others.	yes					no
42. Often gets into physical fights with others.	yes					no
43. Often is a poor sport and a poor looser.	yes					no
44. Often plays mean tricks on others.	yes					no
45. Often has trouble making friends.	yes					no
46. Often has trouble keeping friends.	yes					no
47. Often is not very popular with boys own age.	yes					no
48. Often is not very popular with girls own age.	yes					no
49. Often lacks status and feels insecure with friends.	yes					no
50. Often doesn't carry on a pleasant conversation.	yes					no
51. Often plays with children younger than self.	yes					no
52. Often plays with children older than self.	yes					no
53. Often has bad and unacceptable manners.	yes					no
54. Often tries to be a "show-off" among friends.	yes					no
55. Often tends to have "stage fright" before a group.	yes					no

	Scale Values						
	1	2	3	4	5	6	
56. Often has difficulty finding things to do with self.	yes					no	
57. Often tends to be very selfish and self-centered.	yes					no	
58. Often is not a very good listener in conversation.	yes					no	
59. Often is dishonest and not very trustworthy.	yes					no	
60. Often does not attend Sunday school or church.	yes					no	
NUMBER CHECKS							TOTAL WEIGHTED SCORE
WEIGHTED VALUES							

School Adjustment

61. Often expresses a strong dislike for school.	yes					no	
62. Often is very sleepy or restless in school.	yes					no	
63. Often has difficulty expressing self in words.	yes					no	
64. Often seems afraid to speak-out in class.	yes					no	
65. Often has difficulty keeping "mind" on school work.	yes					no	
66. Often distracts other students in school program.	yes					no	
67. Often has difficulty doing school work.	yes					no	
68. Takes little or no part in co-curricular activities.	yes					no	
69. Gets along poorly with one or more teachers.	yes					no	
70. Parents often "nag" child about school work.	yes					no	
71. Seldom works hard or long on school assignments.	yes					no	
72. Quality of school work varies from day-to-day.	yes					no	
NUMBER CHECKS							TOTAL WEIGHTED SCORE
WEIGHTED VALUES							

Physical Adjustment

73. Generally is in rather poor health.	yes					no	
74. Has poor muscular control and coordination.	yes					no	
75. Teeth are often unclean; and is unkempt.	yes					no	
76. Often doesn't have much energy or "pep".	yes					no	
77. There is evidence of perceptual malfunctioning.	yes					no	
78. Has uncorrected poor vision or poor hearing.	yes					no	
NUMBER CHECKS							TOTAL WEIGHTED SCORE
WEIGHTED VALUES							

APPENDIX C

DEMOGRAPHIC QUESTIONNAIRE

Demographic Questionnaire

This information is designed to gather background information about the child who is participating in this study, and about your present family structure.

Please fill in answers or check appropriate responses for the following statements. All of your answers will be confidential.

Characteristics of Child

1. Present Age: ___
2. Gender: Female __ Male __
3. Type of home is from:
   - Rural (living in a town under 15,000) __
   - Urban (between 15,000 and 100,000) __
   - Metropolitan (over 100,000) __
4. Ethnic background:
   - Afro American (Black) __
   - Asian American __
   - Caucasian (White) __
   - Hispanic __
   - Native American __
   - Other __
5. U.S. Citizen: Yes __ No __

Characteristics of Family

6. How many children do you have? _____
   What are their ages? _____
   Do they all live with you? _____
7. What is your current marital status?
   Single __ Married __ Divorced __
   Widowed __ Living Together __

8. What is the highest grade or year you completed in school?

Some grade school	___
Completed grade school (8th grade)	___
Some high school	___
Completed high school	___
Completed high school and also had other training but not college (technical, nursing, business, etc.)	___
Some college	___
Completed college	___
Some graduate work	___
Graduate degree	___

9. For research purposes, we need to know which of these groups your total family income before taxes for 1980 was in. Please include your own income and that of all members of you immediate family who are living with you, and any other sources of income you may have. (Include welfare payments, child support, alimony, social security, income from stocks, etc.)

___ None
___ Less than $5,000
___ $5,000-$9,999
___ $10,000-$14,999
___ $15,000-$19,999
___ $20,000-$24,999
___ $25,000-$29,999
___ $30,000-$34,999
___ $35,000-$39,999
___ $40,000 and over

10. What is your religious preference?

Roman Catholic	___
Protestant	___
(If checked, what denomination)	_____
Jewish	___
None	___

APPENDIX D

PIAGET TASKS

Piaget Tasks

Task one is concerned with the ability to construct an order of a collection of ten sticks which differ only in size. The shortest of the sticks (about 9 cm. in length) is called A, the next larger B, and on through J, the largest (about 16 cm. in length). A differs from B by about .8 cm., and this is also true of B and C, etc. The child is presented with the sticks in a randomly organized array and asked to select the smallest of the lot. After this is done, the instruction is given: "Now try to put first the smallest, then one a little bigger, then another a little bigger, all the way to the biggest stick." Scoring: the child in stage one-early cannot form a systematic ordering of the ten sticks, although sometimes he/she can order a few of them.

Task two scoring: Presented with the same problem, children in stage one-late generally succeed in constructing the ordinal arrangement of sticks, so that A < B < C < D < E < F < G < H < I < J. But the child does not build the orderings without difficulty. The child is then presented with ten paperdolls, A^1-J^1, also randomly arranged, which are to be ordered in size. The paperdolls are larger than the sticks, and the difference between adjacent peperdolls is larger than between pairs of sticks. The child is told that the dolls are going for a walk, and that each of them must have the proper sticks to take along. The intention of the instructions is to get the child to produce an ordering of the dolls and of the sticks, and to make each member of one ordering correspond to the appropriate member of the other ordering. Thus, doll A^1 should have stick A, doll B^1 should have stick B, and so on. Children in stage one-late should be able to produce a one-to-one correspondence of dolls and sticks, though it will be done in a trial-and-error fashion.

Task three scoring: Presented with the same problem children in stage two can construct the orderings quite easily. His/her ordering is guided by an overall plan. The child usually begins with the smallest (or sometimes with the largest), then the next to smallest, and so forth, in sequence until the ordering is complete for the sticks and the paperdolls. Next the sticks are placed very close together by the examiner. However, their order is preserved. The child is then asked which stick "goes with" which doll. The child in stage two performs this task quite easily.

APPENDIX E

PRESCHOOL INTERPERSONAL PROBLEMS SOLVING TEST SCORESHEET

SCORESHEETS

FROM

PRESCHOOL INTERPERSONAL PROBLEM SOLVING

(PIPS) TEST: MANUAL

Myrna B. Shure, Ph.D., and George Spivack, Ph.D.

Department of Mental Health Sciences

Hahnemann Community Mental Health/

Mental Retardation Center

Hahnemann Medical College and Hospital

PIPS Preliminary Score Sheet

PEER PROBLEM: I

	Relevant Non-Force Solution Categories													Relevant Force Solution Categories				No-Solutions						
Name	Ask	Say 'Please'	Loan	Fair-Share-Turns	Trade-Bribe	Authority Intervention	Trick	Finagle	Manipulate Affect	Get Mad	Wait	Plan For Future		Force-Grab	Physical Attack (Person)	Damage to Property	Command	Related Goal	Substitute Goal	Irrelevant	Enumerations	Repetitions (Relevant) [a]	Non-Relevant Repeat [b]	

[a] Repetitions = Exact + Similar (Relevant)

[b] Repetitions = Exact + Similar (Non-Relevant) + Repeat of Same Substitute Goal.

PIPS Preliminary Score Sheet

Mother Problem: II

Name	Solution Categories-Relevant												No-Solutions Irrelevant				
	Replace	Repair	Authority-Aid	Truth-Apology	Blame Other-Lie-Deny	Don't Be Mad	Manipulate Affect	Finangle	Hide	Hide-It	Clean Up			Enumerations	Repetitions Relevant	Irrelevant Repeat	

PIPS Summary Sheet

Name	Peer Problem								Mother Problem					Totals[a]					
					Verbal						Verbal					Verbal			
	Forceful Solutions	Non-Forceful Solutions	Total Peer Solutions	Categories	No-Solution (Related + Substitute + Irrelevant)	Enumerations	All Repetitions		Solutions	Categories	No-Solutions (Irrelevant)	Enumerations	All Repetitions		Solutions	Categories	All No-Solutions	Enumerations	All Repetitions	Total Verbal (PIPS TALK)[b]

[a] Peer + Mother Problems

[b] No-Solutions + Enumerations + Repetitions = PIPS Talk

PIPS Final Score Sheet

Name	PIPS Score Relevant Solutions (Peer * + Mother	Categories (Peer * + Mother	Relevancy Ratio (Peer + Mother)	Force Ratio (peer)	PIPS Talk (Total Verbal) (Peer + Mother)

* Relevant = Non-Force + Force

SAMPLE PIPS FINAL SCORE SHEET

Name	PIPS Score Relevant Solutions (Peer + Mother)	Relevant Solution Categories (Peer + Mother)	Relevancy Ratio (Peer + Mother)	Force Ratio (Peer)	PIPS Talk (Total Verbal) (Peer + Mother)
Johnny S.	9	9	.45[a]	.40[c]	27[e]
Bobby R.	8	5	.50[b]	.20[d]	23[f]

a) $\frac{9}{9 + 11}$ b) $\frac{8}{8 + 8}$ } $\frac{\text{Relevant}}{\text{Relevant + No-Solution}}$

c) $\frac{2}{2 + 3}$ d) $\frac{1}{1 + 4}$ } $\frac{\text{Force}}{\text{Force + Relevant Non-Force}}$

e) $11 + 3 + 13$ / $8 + 0 + 15$ } No-Solutions + Enumerations + All Repetitions

Note: The above are calculated from the PIPS Summary Sheet.

APPENDIX F

JOHNSEN'S PARENTAL PERMISSIVENESS SCALES

Johnsen's Parental Permissiveness Scales

Kathryn P. Johnsen.

These scales measure the parent's concept of what a parent should do, tolerance for behavior representing general areas, and the action usually taken in response to specific behaviors. Starred items are reverse scored. Listed below are the item numbers in their scale order.

Section A: Concept Scales

Aggression	Obedience	Sex
# 3	#14	# 8
# 9	# 5	#11
#15	# 2	# 6
# 1*	#10*	# 4*
# 7*	#12*	#13*

Section B: Biographical Material (not included)

Section C: Tolerance Scales

Aggression	Obedience	Sex
#47	#46	#37
#40	#39	#42
#34	#36	#44

Section D: Action Scales

Aggression	Obedience	Sex
#50	#49	#51
#57	#55	#56
#53	#52	#54

Section E is a duplication of the items in Section A for use if a comparison is desired between the parent's response and the perception of the respondent's own parent's attitudes.

Mothers differ widely in their ideas about how children should be reared. We are interested in your opinions, and your ways of handling your children. There are no correct answers to any of the statements or questions, except in the sense that your answers correctly reflect your feelings and actions.

We are asking you, then, to complete this questionnaire. We would also like you to answer the questions as you read through the first time. Please do not read clear through then go back. We need your answer the first time you read it.

* * * SECTION A * * *

Please read the following statements and circle the response which most nearly reflects your feelings about the statement. The abbreviations used are:

SA - Strongly agree with the statement. MD - Mildly disagree with the statement.
MA - Mildly agree with the statement. SD - Strongly disagree with the statement.

1. A mother should teach her children that anger should not be expressed toward their mother.
   SA MA MD SD
2. A school-age child should be allowed to question his mother's judgment, when he disagrees with her.
   SA MA MD SD
3. A mother should encourage her children to express their angry feelings, even toward herself.
   SA MA MD SD
4. A mother should teach her children that their curiosity about sex should not be satisfied in play with other children.
   SA MA MD SD
5. A mother should be able to let her school-age child act on his own judgment, though she may disagree with his decisions.
   SA MA MD SD
6. A child should be allowed to satisfy his curiosity about the opposite sex.
   SA MA MD SD
7. A mother should teach her children that it is wrong to be angry at their mothers.
   SA MA MD SD
8. A mother should encourage her children's curiosity about sex.
   SA MA MD SD
9. A mother should be able to let her children be angry at her, and express this anger in some way.
   SA MA MD SD
10. A school-age child should be expected to do as he is told without argument.
    SA MA MD SD
11. A mother should help her children satisfy their curiosity about sex in some way.
    SA MA MD SD

12. A mother should let her school-age child know that there is no excuse for disobedience.
SA MA MD SD

13. A mother should teach her children that it is wrong to be curious about sex.
SA MA MD SD

14. A mother should encourage her school-age child to make the most of his own decisions.
SA MA MD SD

15. A child should be allowed to be angry at his mother occasionally, and show it without fear of punishment.
SA MA MD SD

* * * SECTION C * * *

We are interested in some of the behavior which you allow in your children. Please check the statement which most nearly describes your actions in the particular type of behavior presented. If you have not experienced the behavior, please check what you probably would allow and note you have not experienced it. Put your check on the line immediately following the number. (For example, 6. ___ none, etc.)

34. Sometimes a child will get angry at his mother and hit her or kick her. How much of this do you allow in your children?
/__/ 1.__as much as they like, I encourage them to express their feelings in this manner, if they are angry at me.
/__/ 2.__quite a bit, I will not usually stop it, unless it continues for some time.
/__/ 3.__some, I will allow occasional slaps or kicks, without comment.
/__/ 4.__some, I will allow occasional slaps or kicks, but discourage it from continuing.
/__/ 5.__very little, I will rarely allow this, and only if there is a very good reason.
/__/ 6.__none, I will not allow it.

35. Until what age do you allow this _____

36. Most mothers tell their school-age children to do things like hang up their clothes, straighten their room, stop what they are doing, or something like this. Many times the children will wait awhile before doing it, or will not do it at all. How much of this do you allow in your children?
1.__as much as they like, I encourage them not to obey, if there is a good reason.
2.__quite a bit, I do not usually expect obedience.
3.__some, I will wait awhile, or tell them several times, and sometimes allow them not to do it.
4.__some, I will wait awhile, or tell them several times, but expect them to do it eventually.
5.__very little, I will occasionally tell them more than once, or wait a few minutes, but usually expect immediate obedience.
6.__none, I expect them to obey immediately.

37. How much have you allowed your children to run about the house without their clothes on?
/__/ 1.__as much as they like, I encourage this in the house around the family.
/__/ 2.__quite a bit, I allow them to play unclothed while getting dressed or undressed, if they wish.
/__/ 3.__some, I allow them to go to and from the bathroom, etc., unclothed, without comment.
/__/ 4.__some, I allow them to go to and from the bathroom etc., unclothed, but attempt to discourage it.
/__/ 5.__very little, I try to avoid this.
/__/ 6.__none, I will not allow it.

38. Until what age do you allow this? _____

39. School-age children will sometimes argue with their mother's decision or command, and try to get her to change her mind. How much of this do you allow?

/__/ 1. as much as they like, I encourage this and often change my decision after hearing their comments.
/__/ 2. quite a bit, I usually allow this and sometimes change my decision.
/__/ 3. some, I allow a few comments or questions, and occasionally change my decision.
/__/ 4. some, I allow a few comments or questions, but will not usually change my decision.
/__/ 5. very little, I will occasionally allow this, but will not change the decision once it is made.
/__/ 6. none, I will not allow it.

40. Mothers tell us that their children sometimes shout angry things at them, call them names, etc. How much of this do you allow your children to do?

/__/ 1. as much as they like, I encourage them to do this when they feel like it.
/__/ 2. quite a bit, I usually allow this, as long as it doesn't continue for a long time.
/__/ 3. some, I occasionally allow a few words without comment.
/__/ 4. some, I occasionally allow a few words but discourage it from continuing.
/__/ 5. very little, I rarely allow any of this, and only if there is a very good reason.
/__/ 6. none, I will not allow it.

41. Until what age do you allow this? _____

42. We sometimes hear mothers talking about their children's habit of playing with themselves (fondling their genitals). How much of this do you allow?

/__/ 1. as much as they like, I encourage them to do this when they feel like it.
/__/ 2. quite a bit, I do not usually attempt to stop it, except in public.
/__/ 3. some, I will occasionally allow this without comment.
/__/ 4. some, I will occasionally allow this, but discourage it from continuing.
/__/ 5. very little, I rarely allow this without comment.
/__/ 6. none, I will not allow it.

43. Until what age do you allow this? _____

44. Many mothers report that their young children and their playmates will take off their pants, look at each other, giggle, etc., at times. How much of this do you allow your children to do?

/__/ 1. as much as they like, I encourage them to play this way if they wish.
/__/ 2. quite a bit, I do not usually attempt to stop it unless it continues for some time.
/__/ 3. some, I occasionally allow this, without comment.
/__/ 4. some, I occasionally allow this, but discourage it from continuing.
/__/ 5. very little, I try to avoid this.
/__/ 6. none, I will not allow it.

45. Until what age do you allow this? _____

46. Some mothers feel that their school-age children (7-11) should be allowed to decide things for themselves, such as, what to wear, how to spend their money, what they do with their toys, who they play with, where they play, etc., others do not. How do you handle this with your children?

___/__ 1.__I encourage them to decide these things for themselves.
___/__ 2.__I usually allow them to make their own decisions, as long as it does not involve their own safety.
___/__ 3.__I allow them to make some of their own decisions by themselves.
___/__ 4.__I allow them to make some of their own decisions from among approved choices.
___/__ 5.__I occasionally let them choose between two or three approved alternatives.
___/__ 6.__I seldom let them decide things like this.

47. How much do you allow your child to throw his things around his room, or the yard, etc., when he is angry at you?

___/__ 1.__as much as they like, I encourage them to do this if they are angry at me.
___/__ 2.__quite a bit, I will usually allow this unless it continues for some time.
___/__ 3.__some, I occasionally allow a little of this without comment.
___/__ 4.__some, I occasionally allow a little of this, but discourage it from continuing.
___/__ 5.__very little, I rarely allow this, and only if there is a very good reason.
___/__ 6.__none, I will not allow it.

48. Until what age do you allow this? _____

* * * SECTION D * * *

Next we have a series of situations, which are not too uncommon in homes with children. You have, possibly, not encountered these situations exactly as they are presented, but you probably have had some experiences not too different from these. Please, as you read these, think about your own reactions when you have faced similar situations, then check the action which most nearly agrees with what you do. We have used a boy or girl, specifically, in most of the situations, merely for convenience. The behavior applies equally well to both sexes. Remember, you think of your own children, and what you are most likely to do.

(your check goes on the line, for example; 1. ✓ smile, etc.)

49. You are ready to serve dinner and your grade-school son has not come in, though you are sure he has heard you call several times. When he finally comes, he tells you that he had to finish something he was doing, but he came as soon as he could. What would you be most likely to do?

___/__ 1.__smile at him, letting him know you understand.
___/__ 2.__say nothing, even though this happens quite often.
___/__ 3.__say nothing unless this has been happening frequently, then express disapproval.
___/__ 4.__explain why he shouldn't do this.
___/__ 5.__express emphatic disapproval.
___/__ 6.__punish or threaten punishment.

50. You have refused to let your daughter go to a friend's house. She has become extremely angry, stormed into her room, and begun throwing her toys, her books, and various things around the room. What would you be most likely to do?

/__/ 1. __smile at her, letting her know you understand how she feels.
/__/ 2. __say nothing <u>even though</u> she has done this several times before.
/__/ 3. __say nothing <u>unless</u> this has happened several times before, then express disapproval.
/__/ 4. __explain to her why she shouldn't do this.
/__/ 5. __express emphatic disapproval.
/__/ 6. __punish or threaten punishment.

51. You have just discovered your young son and a group of little boys with their clothes off. They are dancing around, pointing at each other, and laughing. What are you most likely to do?

/__/ 1. __smile at them and let them continue.
/__/ 2. __do nothing, unless it has been happening too frequently, <u>then distract their attention</u>.
/__/ 3. __do nothing, unless it has been happening too frequently, then <u>express disapproval</u>.
/__/ 4. __explain to them why they shouldn't do this.
/__/ 5. __express emphatic disapproval of this behavior.
/__/ 6. __punish or threaten punishment.

52. Your grade-school son took the money he had been urged to save to the drugstore. He spent it all for candy and several little toys. You were trying to explain to him that he should not have spent it all in this way, when he said: "It's my money, can't I spend my own money the way I want?" What are you most likely to do?

/__/ 1. __smile at him, apologize and agree that he should be able to spend it as he wishes.
/__/ 2. __say nothing, <u>even though</u> he has done this several times before.
/__/ 3. __say nothing, <u>unless</u> he has done this several times before, then express disapproval.
/__/ 4. __explain to him why he should not have spent it all in this way.
/__/ 5. __express emphatic disapproval.
/__/ 6. __punish or threaten to punish him.

53. You have just had to bring your child in the house from play. She did not want to come, and it has made her angry. Suddenly she rushes at you, slapping and trying to kick you. What are you most likely to do?

/__/ 1. __smile at her, letting her know you understand.
/__/ 2. __do nothing, unless this continues for some time, <u>then attempt to distract her attention</u>.
/__/ 3. __do nothing, unless this continues for some time, <u>then express disapproval</u>.
/__/ 4. __explain why she shouldn't act this way.
/__/ 5. __express emphatic disapproval.
/__/ 6. __punish or threaten punishment.

54. You have just discovered your pre-school daughter playing with a little boy of the same age. They have their pants off, are investigating each other, and talking about the differences in their bodies. What are you most likely to do?

/__/ 1. __smile at them, letting them continue.
/__/ 2. __do nothing unless it continues, then attempt to distract them.
/__/ 3. __do nothing unless it continues, then express disapproval.
/__/ 4. __explain why they shouldn't play this way.
/__/ 5. __express emphatic disapproval.
/__/ 6. __punish or threaten punishment.

55. You had given your daughter a job to do before she turned on T.V. It was nearing time for her favorite show, and she was far from through. She asked if she could turn it on anyway, and you said "No." She began to argue with you, and finally said that if you would let her watch, she would finish immediately afterwards, and next time not waste so much time doing the job. What are you most likely to do?

/__/ 1. __smile at her, praise her suggestion, let her watch.
/__/ 2. __agree with her suggestion, probably let her watch.
/__/ 3. __caution her that she had better keep her word, probably let her watch.
/__/ 4. __explain why she should not do this, probably not let her watch.
/__/ 5. __express emphatic disapproval, not let her watch.
/__/ 6. __punish or threaten punishment.

56. You have just found your son lying awake sometime after he had been sent to bed. His hand was inside his pajama pants, and you asked him what he was doing. He said just rubbing himself, it felt good. What would you be most likely to do?

/__/ 1. __smile at him and agree that it feels good.
/__/ 2. __say nothing, unless this has been happening too frequently, then attempt to distract him.
/__/ 3. __say nothing, unless this has been happening too frequently, then express disapproval.
/__/ 4. __explain to him why he shouldn't do this.
/__/ 5. __express emphatic disapproval.
/__/ 6. __punish or threaten punishment.

57. Your son has asked you to buy him a baseball mitt. You have refused, suggesting he save his money and buy it himself. He begins to yell and shout at you that you are mean, he hates you, he'll never get enough money, you never give him anything, etc. What are you most likely to do?

/__/ 1. __smile at him, letting him know you understand how he feels.
/__/ 2. __say nothing, unless it continues, then attempt to distract him.
/__/ 3. __say nothing, unless it continues, then express disapproval.
/__/ 4. __explain to him why he shouldn't act this way.
/__/ 5. __express emphatic disapproval.
/__/ 6. __punish or threaten punishment.

* * * NOTICE * * *

NOW, if you look back over the two sections, you have just completed, you will notice boxes preceding each of the numbers, designating the responses. Will you please go back through Sections C and D (the two you have just finished) and place a check in the box preceding the statement which most nearly describes the actions of your mother toward you when you were a child. This is an important aspect of our study, please do not overlook it. It is essential that your answers be on the line, and your mother's in the box. Please look carefully to see that your answers are checked in this way.

* * * SECTION E * * *

We would like to have you read the following statements, then circle the response which most nearly represents your mother's feelings about the statement, when you were a child. Remember, answer these the way you think your mother would have, as you think back over things she said to you, and the way she handled you as a child.

58. A child should be allowed to be angry at his mother occasionally, and show it, without fear of punishment.
SA MA MD SD

59. A mother should encourage her school-age child to make most of his own decisions.
SA MA MD SD

60. A mother should teach her children that it is wrong to be curious about sex.
SA MA MD SD

61. A mother should let her school-age child know that there is no excuse for disobedience.
SA MA MD SD

62. A mother should help her children satisfy their curiosity about sex in some way.
SA MA MD SD

63. A school-age child should be expected to do as he is told without argument.
SA MA MD SD

64. A mother should be able to let her children be angry at her, and express their anger in some way.
SA MA MD SD

65. A mother should encourage her children's curiosity about sex.
SA MA MD SD

66. A mother should teach her children that it is wrong to be angry at their mother.
SA MA MD SD

67. A child should be allowed to satisfy his curiosity about the opposite sex.
SA MA MD SD

68. A mother should be able to let her school-age child act on his own judgment, though she may disagree with his decision.
SA MA MD SD

69. A mother should teach her children that their curiosity about sex should not be satisfied in play with other children.
SA MA MD SD

70. A mother should encourage her children to express their angry feelings, even toward herself.
SA MA MD SD

71. A school-age child should be allowed to question his mother's judgment, when he disagrees with her.
SA MA MD SD

72. A mother should teach her children that anger should not be expressed toward their mother.
SA MA MD SD

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *

Thank you very much for your time and your cooperation. If you are sure you have answered all the questions, will you please put this form in the envelope provided for it, and mail it back to us. Please be sure to check the back of the sheets, to be sure you haven't overlooked a page. Your promptness is greatly appreciated.

APPENDIX G

INTRODUCTORY STATEMENT AND CONSENT FORM

Introduction for Participants in

Child Research Project

We are in the process of conducting a study on children and their responses to interpersonal problems and we are asking for the assistance of you and your child in this project. Your participation in this study will help us to better understand the interpersonal problem-solving techniques available to children. Additionally, it will help us to gain information on variables that might facilitate this process. If you agree to participate in this study, you will be asked to give some general background and parenting information, and to complete a form that gives us your impression of your child's behavior. Your total participation in this study should take approximately one hour. In exchange for your participation, you will be given $5.00.

If your child agrees to participate in this study, several questionnaires will be used to assess his/her general behavioral and cognitive functioning, and his/her ability to solve interpersonal problems. Total testing time for your child will require approximately one hour. Short breaks will be taken if necessary. This testing is not stressful and is usually viewed by the child as a pleasant game. A small toy and a package of candy will be given to the child for participation in this project.

The information we obtain will be kept in strict confidence. At no time will any participant's identity be revealed. Questionnaires will be identified by numbers only, and the final analysis of data will focus on participants as members of a larger group. This information will ultimately be used for purposes of mental health prevention techniques.

Carol Tershak
Doctoral Student
Psychology Department
Oklahoma State University

Vicki Green, Ph.D.
Research Adviser
Psychology Department
Oklahoma State University

If you would like a copy of the final results of this study, please give your name and address to Carol Tershak so that these data can be sent to you after completion of the study.

CONSENT FORM

I have read the introduction for the study on children's problem-solving techniques and I hereby voluntarily consent for _____ _____ to participate in this study. I understand that I can also refuse to participate or withdraw my child from this study at any time, if I wish.

Parent's Signature _____

Date _____

Witness _____

VITA[2]

Carol Ann Tershak

Candidate for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

Thesis: THE INFLUENCE OF DOMESTIC VIOLENCE, PSYCHOLOGICAL PROBLEMS, AND MATERNAL PARENTING STYLE UPON INTERPERSONAL PROBLEM-SOLVING ABILITY IN EARLY CHILDHOOD

Major Field: Psychology

Biographical:

Personal Data: Born in St. Louis, Missouri, December 22, 1941, the daughter of Agnes and George Peters. Married to Andrew Tershak, March 27, 1967. Mother of one son, Andrew Paul, and one daughter, Susanne Lara.

Education: Graduated from Incarnate Word Academy, St. Louis, Missouri, in May, 1959; attended Incarnate Word College, San Antonio, Texas, 1959-1960; attended St. Francis College, Joliet, Illinois, 1962-1964; attended Marillac College, St. Louis, Missouri, 1964-1966; received the Bachelor of Arts degree in Sociology from St. Louis University in 1967; received the Master of Rehabilitation Counseling degree from Bowling Green State University in 1975; completed requirements for the Doctor of Philosophy degree at Oklahoma State University in July, 1982.

Professional Experience: Staff therapist, Alcoholic Rehabilitation Center, Evansville, Indiana, 1975-1976; staff therapist, Family and Children's Services, Evansville, Indiana, 1976-1977; graduate research assistant, Department of Family Relations and Child Development, Oklahoma State University, 1977-1978; graduate teaching assistant, Department of Psychology, Oklahoma State University, 1978-1981; practicum placement as staff psychologist at Psychological Services Center, Oklahoma State University, 1978-1981; practicum placement as staff psychologist at Children's Medical Center, Tulsa, Oklahoma, 1981; clinical internship at The Child Guidance Clinic, Washington University School of Medicine, St. Louis, Missouri, 1981-1982.

Professional Organization: Member of the American Psychological Association.