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INTRODUCTION

Area of Study

Child psychologists, family sociologists, psychiatrists and others who have studied human development and family relationships tend to agree that the interpersonal environment of the home is a major determinant of an individual's personality development. Of all the social psychological factors of family relationships which influence the child, the parent-child relationship is probably the most important in its effect. For, it is the parents who first set conditions to which the child must adjust and it is they who furnish the rewards and punishment for guiding the child's early learning. Mullaby states that:

Since the child has no data for appraising himself or his performances except what he learns from the significant others, he tends to accept their judgments as to his worth and their valuation of his performances. Hence the self comes to be made up of reflected appraisals. One learns to appraise his own worth as it has been appraised by others ... (47, p. 25)

Kenkel (35), Mack (40) and Hawkes (28) all identify socialization of the child as a special function of the family. In order for the child to maximize his socialization experiences he needs to feel that he is an accepted member of the family group and valued as a unique individual. Yet, in Miller's and Swanson's (46) study of mothers in the Detroit area they found that many of the mothers responded that motherhood had been an unhappy rather than a happy experience.

Importance of Study

Social scientists for many years have been concerned with the process of socializing children. The relative ideas on the ideals of socialization
have changed over time. For example J. B. Watson was an advocator of the objective approach in the 1920's. His philosophy of the child in the family gave rise to this statement:

> There is a sensible way of treating children. Let your behavior always be objective and kindly, firm. Never hug and kiss them; never let them sit on your lap. If you must, kiss them once on the forehead when they say goodnight. Shake hands with them in the morning ... (67, p. 81-82)

The current ideals of socialization of the young appears to be achievement for every child. Federally financed programs like Operation Head Start are based on the assumption that much of the failure to achieve is a result of deprivation in social learning experiences and not a result of inherited inferiority. The assumptions of both the objective approach of the 1920's and the achievement-for-every-child emphasis of the mid-1960's is that the family is a primary determinant of the child's development. This assumption is explicitly expressed in the following quote taken from Scope and Methods of the Family Service Agency:

> The quality of family relationship has profound effects both positive and negative on the emotional development and the social adjustment of all members of the family. Positive experiences within a family provide the foundation for satisfactory personality development from birth to maturity. (21, p. 2)

Currently there are many research studies focusing on the child rather than the parent-child relations. An example is the emphasis on the study of the child's cognitive development using the laboratory experimental design.

Historically much of the research on children has been in the area of the abnormal and the disorganized. Much of what is known about the normal is based upon the studies of the abnormal with inferences being made to the normal human beings. Most studies of parent-child interaction have been
concerned with the effects of various forms of nonacceptance such as re-
jection, indulgence and overprotection. Thus, there is currently a need
for studies on normal family life.

The need for studying the total family relations is supported by

Ackerman who states:

It is essential to view the dominant modes of behavior in the
growing child as being shaped by the total psychological config-
uration of the family rather than by the child-parent relation-
ship in isolation. What is implied here is the need to define
parental role functioning and child-parent interaction in a
broader context of the psychosocial pattern of the family as a
whole. (1, p. 70)

The results of many clinical and statistical studies have indicated
that there is a close relationship between parents' feelings and behavior
toward their children and the adequacy of the children's social and emo-
tional adjustment. The results of many studies on juvenile delinquents
have shown the parent-child relationships to be an important determinant of
the child's delinquency.

Sullivan has suggested that the role of acceptance or non-acceptance
is important for the development and maintenance of the self. According
to Sullivan:

The self may be said to be made up of reflected appraisals. If
those were chiefly derogatory, as in the case of an unwanted
child who was never loved, of a child who has fallen into the
hands of foster parents who have no real interest in him as a
child; as I say, if the self dynamism is made up of experience
which is chiefly derogatory, then the self dynamism will itself be
chiefly derogatory. It will facilitate hostile, disparaging ap-
praisals of other people and it will entertain desparaging and
hostile appraisals of itself.

As I have said, the peculiarity exists that one can find in others
only that which is in the self. And so the unhappy child who
grows up without love will have a self dynamism which shows great
capacity for finding fault with others, and by the same token, with
himself. (62, p. 10)
Mead (43) and Freud (23) also describe the early social learning as being very important. Mead's (43) whole theory of the "self" is based on the assumption that the self is not initially there, but arises in the process of social experience. Freud (23) describes the process by which the super-ego develops and takes over the functions of the parental authority. He points out that an individual's ego becomes like another. Thus, Sullivan (62), Mead (43) and Freud (23) all support the idea that parental acceptance or nonacceptance contributes directly to the development of one's concept of self.

The need for insights into the determinants of parental acceptance is currently important because certain past patterns of child rearing are not present in the mid 1960's. Institutional controls and limits have given way to uncertainty and anxiety. The political, economic, and religious institutions now offer families various and conflicting ideologies which force decisions on parents that they can not verify from past experiences. Parents can no longer assume that their child will be an adult in the same type of world that exists during his childhood. A parent can no longer depend on the methods of child rearing that their parents used for ideas and information on present day child rearing. The type of personality needed by society has changed over time and will continue to change in the future as other aspects of the American society changes. For example Kenkel (34) has described the current American society as no longer needing the self denying, risk-taking pioneer that settled the frontier, but needing an individual that can get along in the complex bureaucratic structures of modern American society.
The Problem

Parental acceptance of children is assumed for this research to be one of the important factors of the parent-child relationship. Parental rejection, overprotection and overindulgence have shed considerable light on the role of parents in affecting the personality development of the child. However, few research studies have been concerned directly with factors related to parental acceptance.

Three concepts of parent-child relations which appear to exert an important influence upon parental acceptance will be focused upon in this research. The first concept affecting parental acceptance is the parent's personality, the second concept is the degree of the parent's marital adjustment and the third concept is the social environment of the parents.

Objectives and Hypotheses

The purpose of this research is to study the relationship of a parent's personality, marital adjustment and social environment with the parent's parental acceptance of his child.

The purposes of this thesis are reflected in the following objectives:

1. Establish a conceptual framework for studying the relationship of a parent's personality, marital adjustment and social environment with a parent's parental acceptance of his child.
2. To establish a rationale for empirical measures of the relevant concepts.
3. To test by statistical analysis the relationship of the empirical measures of the major concepts with the empirical measures of a parent's parental acceptance of his child.
At a general level the hypotheses to be tested are:

1. A parent's self attitudes will affect his parental acceptance of his child.

2. A parent's marital adjustment will affect his parental acceptance of his child.

3. A parent's social environment will affect his parental acceptance of his child.

Procedure

Subjects and source of data

The subjects of this research were 274 young Iowa farm couples with at least one child within the age group four years through nine years. These couples had all been interviewed for a total of four hours each in 1955 as subjects in the Iowa Farm and Home Development Study. The Farm and Home Development Study will be defined and the criteria for selection of the subjects for this research will be discussed in the Procedure and Method chapter. With an average of four hours of interviewing for each parent much data were available on each parent. In fact there were approximately 750 measures coded from the interviews. These measures on each parent included personality scores, goal agreement scores, social participation scores, sources of information on farming and homemaking and family and farm firm economic data. One of the strengths of the selection of these respondents for this study was the amount of varied data available about them. However, this was also a limitation because the amount of data did not always permit the use of the instruments with the most merits. For example it is the opinion of the author that most psychologists would have
chosen a personality test other than the Gordon Personal Profile if no restrictions were placed upon the testing time, administration complexity, scoring complexity or complexity of interpretation. However, with data sought on many variables the above factors were criteria of importance.

Methods of Presentation

The review of literature will not be presented as a separate chapter but will be integrated throughout the thesis where relevant. A conceptual framework for analysis will be discussed in the Conceptual Framework chapter and the general level hypotheses will be derived. The Conceptual Framework chapter will consider the relationship of the concepts of parent's personality, marital adjustment and social environment for parental acceptance. The rationale for the variables to measure the major concepts will be presented in the Procedure and Method chapter as well as the middle range and empirical hypotheses. This chapter will also contain a discussion of the methods chosen for analyzing the data. The results of the analysis will be presented in the Findings chapter and the discussion and limitations of the study will be presented in the Discussion chapter.
REVIEW OF LITERATURE

This chapter is included to communicate explicitly that the writer is aware of the role of a review of literature. A review of literature is necessary for any research. The literature review provides the functions of:

1. Determining what work, both theoretical and empirical, has been done before.
2. Helping delineate the areas of study.
3. Providing possible theoretical frameworks for design of the study.
4. Providing suggestions for measures of the concepts.

These functions are related to different sections of this thesis. The literature review has been integrated into the entire thesis. Relevant literature is cited throughout the thesis when it fulfills one or more of the above four functions. This procedure is similar to that used by Beal (8), Powers (53), Warland (66) and others.
CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

Introduction

In this chapter a conceptual framework\(^1\) for understanding and predicting human behavior will be presented. The conceptual framework presented is based on past empirical research, generalizations and theoretical propositions. From this general framework key concepts of human behavior will be derived for use in understanding and predicting a specific kind of human behavior. The specific kind of human behavior being studied is a parent's feeling and action in respect to his child's behavior.

An attempt will be made to define the relationship of the selected human behavior concepts with the parent's feeling and action in respect to his child's behavior. The dependent concept, parental child acceptance, will be discussed and the three general hypotheses presented. The independent concepts are defined and a discussion of their relationship to the dependent concept presented.

Although this research is not intended to be a comprehensive investigation of human behavior, the development of the conceptual framework nevertheless involves the perspective, concepts and research generalizations from various academic disciplines. The principal areas from which research generalizations and theoretical propositions will be integrated

---

\(^1\)This conceptual framework is one that might have been used by the research committee to study the relationships between the independent concepts and the dependent concept of parental acceptance. As nearly as could be determined the research committee did not overtly go through the rationale as it is presented in this chapter. Their decisions to include the items were based upon their best judgments in their respective areas of professional competency.
are sociology, social psychology, counseling psychology and child develop-
ment. Implicit in this approach is that no one discipline provides all of
the concepts and generalizations to properly account for the complex be-
havior involved in the dependent concept, parental acceptance.

Human Behavior in Perspective

Assumptions

There are many theoretical propositions, generalizations and empirical
findings on the subject of human behavior. The different assumptions of
these theoretical propositions, generalizations and empirical findings is
one of the major difficulties in organizing and integrating them. The
following general assumptions were made for the conceptualization of human
behavior in this research.

The initial assumption was that man must be studied at his own level.
Thus, a position of anti-reductionism was assumed. It was assumed that
human social psychological behavior cannot be derived from or inferred from
the study of non-human life.

Second, was the assumption that every individual enters life neither
social nor anti-social but rather asocial. The infant has potential for
social learning.

The third assumption was that most of adult behavior is learned be-
havior. This learning is made possible by symbolic communication. It is
assumed that an individual's behavior is largely determined by his past
learning experience and his current social psychological environment.

These three assumptions were used as major criteria for selection of
theoretical propositions, generalizations and empirical findings.
An overview of human behavior

In order to state theoretical propositions about a parent's feeling and action in respect to his child's behavior it is first necessary to discuss human behavior at the general level. The general purpose of the conceptual discussion of human behavior as set out in this section is to establish how an individual acquires the determinants for his actions.

An individual man is born with certain potentialities which have been biologically determined. These would include skin color, physical size and an intelligence parameter. Man is also born with predispositions for social learning. Man tends to use his intelligence for placing all the phenomena which he perceives into patterns of meaningful interrelationships. He is an organizing being. He organizes his perception of the world into patterns of cause and effect which to his are rationale. According to Krech et al.,

Each one of us, through the vagaries of chance and the determining influence of heredity and personal experience, develops a distinctive set of enduring dispositions to respond to other people in characteristic ways. (37, p. 103)

From this conception of human behavior can be derived the idea that in order to understand the why of man's behavior it is necessary to assess his organization and integration of past learning. Organization and integration of past learning are two of the primary aspects of the individual's personality or attitudes of himself.

Process of experiencing An individual through cognitive work constructs for himself his own meaningful world, and he classifies and orders within it a multitude of physical and social objects. Among the most significant of these objects are other people. In order to understand how
an individual feels and acts it is necessary to understand how he formulated his experience world about things and people.

An individual is able to perceive interrelationships because he has the ability to deal with abstractions. He can use symbolic stimuli which have an empirical reference in the object being perceived symbolically.

Man is unique in that he does not have to be in immediate sensory contact with phenomena in order to perceive and respond to them.

The responses of the individual to persons and things are shaped by the way they look to him. Man’s perception is a result of his cognitive processes. An individual does not respond directly to a stimulus. He responds not to the stimulus but to his perception and interpretation of it. He deals not only with his interpretation of reality but also with his perceptions and interpretation of possible alternatives. According to Krech et al. (37) the individual's perceptions are a product of: 1) his physical and social environment, 2) his needs and goals and 3) his past experience. According to Dalton,

What a man thinks or feels, how he talks or acts, even what he fantasies or dreams results from the kinds of experiences which he has had with other people throughout his life. (15, p. 1)

Stryker (61) has described the process of learning experiences as beginning at birth with an infant that is neither social nor antisocial but asocial. In Stryker's conceptual scheme the infant enters the world with certain physiological needs such as hunger. These physiological or primary needs are met by significant others in the infant's environment. As these needs are met the infant forms attitudes about the object meeting his needs. If he is fed warm milk to meet his primary need of hunger he develops a positive attitude toward warm milk and a negative attitude toward
cold milk. If he is fed cold milk from the beginning he develops a positive attitude toward cold milk and a negative attitude toward warm milk. The need for warm or cold milk is a derived need based on experiences.

During the process of socialization individuals acquire many derived needs. In the process of need gratification the individual develops attitudes toward the specific subjects and values about the general concepts. For example, the child in school forms an attitude about specific identifiable objects like a course or teacher. He forms a general value orientation about education which will determine the salency of education in his goal selection behavior. As the individual develops his attitudes and values he develops a perception of his expected role behavior. When the four year old asks, "Is this what nice boys do?", he is seeking clarification and reinforcement for his perceived role. From behavior patterns the individual develops a perceptual image of himself. This perceived image is the individual's attitudes of his self (56). The individual tends to organize his needs and goals around the self. For the individual responds not only to objects and persons in the outer environment but to his own body, his own thoughts, his own feelings. In so doing he develops cognitions about the self as a central and valued object. The individual develops important needs and goals which have to do with the enhancement and defense of the self.

**Motivational orientation** The process of experiencing leads to orientation to seek or avoid an object of past experience. Motivation deals with why an individual acts. Knowing an individual's motivation gives insights into why he chooses one action and rejects alternative
actions. The thoughts and actions of the individual reflect his needs and goals. The individual's needs determine his psychological motivation in directing and sustaining action toward a goal. The individual's thoughts as well as his actions reflect his attitudes which in turn reflect his goals and needs.

A goal is the aim, end or objective toward which an individual strives. Some goals may be broad, comprehensive and sought after over a long period of time and as a consequence are ever present. Other goals are specific, of short duration and recur frequently. Also, goals may be classified as tangible and intangible. Tangible goals have concrete characteristics; the course of action and the goals are easily discernible. Intangible goals may be comprehensive by the individual with an abstract quality and the individual's course of action is not clearly defined.

Goals are selected in the context of a situation. The context of a situation refers to the internal and external processes of the individual's family. The components of a situation are social, cultural and physical. Internal variables such as time, energy, money and so forth have an impact upon goals selected. External factors include the social environment of the family which is composed of the status of other families in close proximity and cultural factors in the society. Before goals are decided upon by the individual the situation is defined. The goals selected reflect the individual's definition of the situation.

**Social attitudes** The patterning of the judgments about past experiences forms an individual's attitude system. The individual's attitude system provides a set of tendencies to act in relation to stimuli
which he receives. An analysis of human behavior reveals that whenever man receives a stimulus he looks into his past experiences for help in interpretation. He asks himself how he reacted when he has faced similar problems in the past and evaluates the outcomes of those actions.

He considers alternative responses in terms of the goals he prefers. For example, the parent tends to reward behavior he believes to be desirable and to punish behavior he perceives to be undesirable. This process of choosing alternatives is the process of evaluation.

Each individual builds up his experience world by making judgments about each of his learning experiences. He evaluates them in terms of the relative satisfactions he sought and perceived that he gained. He judges them to be relatively good or bad. Man relates the past to the present interpretation by asking himself if he wants the same outcome for the future as in the past. Only after he has considered his relevant past experiences and his projection of the future does man act.

As man in his finite world is repeatedly forced to cope with the same object, the repeatedly evoked cognitions, feelings and response dispositions become organized into a unified and enduring system. This entire package of particular beliefs, feelings, and response tendencies is henceforth always there whenever the individual is confronted by the appropriate object. In other words he now has an attitude toward the object.

The Concept Attitude

Definition of an attitude

In the literature are many different definitions of attitudes. According to Secord and Backman,
The term attitude refers to certain regularities on the part of an individual in feelings, thoughts and predispositions to act toward some aspect of his environment. (60, p. 100)

Krech et al., defines attitudes as:

... enduring systems of positive or negative evaluations, emotional feelings, and pro or con action tendencies with respect to social objects. (37, p. 139)

The meaning of attitudes as used in this research is consistent with these definitions.

The concept value is not used in the theoretical conception of this research. Because of the frequent use of the concept value in theory and research the distinction between values and attitudes will be explicitly stated. According to Hall and Lindzey (27), values relates to broad goals but attitudes refer to specific objects. An example of this distinction would be: most parents value the idea that children should be reared in such a way so as to maximize their individual potentials. However, attitudes about specific child rearing practices vary widely between individual parents who hold this value.

Elements of attitudes

The elements of the individual's attitudes consist of his cognition or knowledge process, affection or feelings and action tendencies with respect to the various objects in his world of experience. In defining attitudes as systems the interrelatedness of the three attitude components or elements is emphasized. When incorporated in a system these three components become mutually interdependent.

The feeling elements consist of primarily positive or negative feelings. Attitudes may differ in the extent to which they involve such
effective elements. Some attitudes are quite irrational and involve little except this effective component. Political attitudes may be primarily of this character. Attitudes differ to the extent to which they involve knowledge. Some attitudes are highly intellectual. A person may take a particular position on a political issue because he has thought through the problem and after considering all the available evidence, decides the position he thinks is the most acceptable one. The word cognitive implies knowing. Hence, the cognitive element of an attitude is that aspect which is based on knowledge or derived from it in some way. The action element consists of the action tendencies. These are inferred from what the individual says he will do or what he actually does.

An individual can only have attitudes with respect to those objects which exist in his psychological world. The number of attitudes is finite. An individual does not have an attitude toward an object with which he has had no experience.

**Variation of attitude systems**

The components of attitudes may differ in valence, multiplexity and interconnectedness. Valence refers to the degree of favorability or unfavorability with respect to the object of the attitude. Multiplexity refers to the variation in the number and kind of the elements making up the components. The cognitive component of an attitude may include an exhaustive set of beliefs about the object. The feeling component may be a relatively simple and indifferencediated love for the object and the action tendency component may be multiplex in that the individual is prepared to take many and varied sorts of protective acts toward the object. There is
a general trend toward consistency among the components of attitudes in their valence and in their multiplexity. An individual's various attitudes may differ in the degree to which they are isolated from one another or are interconnected with one another. Few attitudes exist in a state of complete isolation. Most of them form clusters with other attitudes, but only rarely will all the attitudes of an individual exhibit such a high degree of interconnectedness that it can be said that the individual has a single ideology.

An accompanying result of the individual's evaluation of satisfactions derived from various experiences with an object may result in a positive attitude toward the object. The assimilation or development of an attitude does not result in a fixed attitude system. A continual evaluation of experiences reinforce or reorganize a hierarchy of satisfactions so that an attitude may be conceptualized as occupying a position of a continuum from positive to negative. An experience may either strengthen an attitude in its position on the continuum from negative to positive or the experience may cause the value to change positions. Not only do attitudes occupy a position on a continuum but attitudes occupy a position of priority of one to another with the salency constantly being evaluated by the individual.

Attitudes are developed through interaction with objects in the environment and have multiple origins. For example, the young child has not had the experience upon which to base judgments of what is good or bad. Lacking his own experiential frame of reference, he is susceptible to the attitudes of individuals who are significant in his life. Attitudes of the pre-school child are largely learned from his family. Attitudes of significant people in the individual's social environment are manifested
in his behavior.

After the child is exposed to and assimilates attitudes from significant persons in his environment, both external and internal actions operate to keep them relatively stable and to insure that behavior is kept compatible with them; to deviate from attitudes which the child has internalized causes him concern. There is a security in complying with attitudes and standards which he has internalized. Avoidance of guilt feelings, retaining belongingness and acceptance by the group are strong forces in the control of an individual's behavior and operate in maintaining attitudes.

**Saliency of attitudes**

The individual's attitude systems allow him to organize his alternatives into a more or less hierarchy on the basis of perceived future results. The saliency of individual attitudes varies. This position is supported by motivating theories which indicate that individual needs vary over time within individuals and from one individual to another. One such scheme is Maslow's (41) conceptual framework of motivation and psychological development as illustrated in Figure 1. Maslow's postulated hierarchy of needs from lower to higher order is as follows:

1. Physiological needs, e.g., hunger, thirst
2. Safety needs, e.g., security, order
3. Belongingness and love needs, e.g., affection, identification
4. Esteem needs, e.g., prestige, success
5. Need for self actualization, e.g., the desire for self-fulfillment.

According to Maslow a lower need must be adequately satisfied before the
Figure 1. Hierarchy of needs (37, p. 77)
next higher need can emerge in the development of the individual. Maslow has written:

> It is quite true that man lives by bread alone -- when there is no bread. But what happens to man's desires when there is plenty of bread, and when his belly is chronically filled? At once other and higher needs emerge, and these rather than physiological hunger dominate the organism. And when these in turn are satisfied, new and still higher needs emerge, and so on. (41, p. 394)

Once a person has moved from a lower level of needs, because of their adequate satisfaction, to a higher level, the lower level needs assume a less important role in the individual's total system of needs. They may become temporarily dominant again as a result of deprivation. After a person has passed through the various levels of psychological growth he possesses a personality structure in which the various needs form a hierarchical system. The lower needs in the hierarchy are no longer insistently salient. The individual is freed to realize his higher desires and potentialities and to think new thoughts. With this increased richness of his cognitive life his catalogue of needs increases in number and variety as he ascends the ladder of hierarchy from physiological to psychological needs. The needs of parents affect their interpersonal behavior. Based on Maslow's (41) conception the parent who has achieved the level of self actualization will be more likely to exhibit accepting behavior than the parent who has not yet had his third level needs, belonging and love, met.

**General Proposition**

As has been discussed in the prior sections of this chapter, each individual has a unique history of social learning. An individual's prior social learning and present social environment are the major determinants
of how he will feel and behave in the present.

Based upon the prior conception of human behavior the general proposition of this study can be stated: A parent's past social learning and present social environment are major determinants of a parent's feeling and action about his child.

**Parental Acceptance**

**Acceptance**

The need for acceptance has been discussed in many social psychological theories. The assumption in Festinger's (22) theory of social comparison is that an individual wants to be accepted so he seeks individuals like himself who will accept, share and support him. Erickson (20) makes the concept of trust the first important social learning resulting from parent-child interaction. He views acceptance as being very necessary in establishing a relationship of trust between parent and child. Rogers (55) in talking about the helping relationship in counseling views acceptance as a major factor. Tyler (65) lists acceptance as one of the three major elements needed by an individual for counseling. Jenkins (32) points out that the child who does not feel accepted becomes anxious, unhappy and confused about himself.

**Dimensions of parental acceptance**

Parental acceptance is assumed to be revealed in the feelings and behavior which a parent has toward, about, or with his child. It is important to realize that acceptance is only one part of the parent-child interaction. It is difficult to distinguish between the parts of parent-child
interaction. However, by studying the ways in which various aspects of parent-child behavior relate to each other, there is a better chance of gaining some perspective of acceptance. From a conceptual standpoint it is efficient to think in terms of the major dimensions of parent-child behavior. Examples of these dimensions are love versus hostility and control versus autonomy. This allows a description of types of parents to be reduced to a combination of two main dimensional concepts (9, 10).

The acceptance relationship between parent-child is related with the use of certain kinds of discipline behavior. In particular the use of praise and reason has been repeatedly found associated with warmth variables and the use of physical punishment with hostility variables (57, 58, 59).

The degree to which a parent demands and restricts the child is part of the parent's general values and attitude system. The parent's insistence on compliance to these demands and restrictions form a general dimension useful in viewing the parent's acceptance behavior. Sears et al., (59) found that the evidence implies that there is a strong tendency for parents who are strict or restrictive in one area to be so in other areas of child rearing.

**Developmental model**

The developmental model is used as the theoretical frame of reference to establish criteria for acceptance on the dimensions of parental behavior for this research. The developmentally orientated parent is assumed to be the ideal accepting parent.
Development concept

An early conceptualization of the developmental concept was made by Duvall (17) for studying the differential perception of parenthood. Duvall proposed a dichotomy of traditional versus developmental for studying parents. Her conception was based on mothers' verbatim responses to the question, "What are five things a good child does?" and "What are five things a good mother does?" (17, p. 110).

Duvall's (17) traditional conceptions of motherhood were ideas having to do with what a mother expects herself to do for her home and children, e.g., keeping house and making the child behave. Traditional ideas focus upon the child's behaving in ways that please adults, e.g., obeys, respects property and runs errands willingly. Traditional conceptions of both motherhood and childhood tend to be static and rigid. Specific behavioral expectancies tend to be consistent with childrearing patterns in the parent's family of procreation.

Duvall's (17) developmental conceptions of motherhood emphasize that a mother encourages her child to develop as a unique individual and views herself as a growing person. For example, she gives her child freedom to grow and shares with the child. Developmental conceptions of childhood center in the child being a happy, healthy, growing person, e.g., a child that is developing socially and enjoying the process of growing up. Developmental ideas are recognized as being dynamic, flexible and growth promoting. They emphasize encouraging development of the person rather than any specific form of discipline or type of behavior.

Duvall's (17) model was based on data from mothers. However, Elder (19) found similar contrasts in her research of traditional fathers versus
developmental fathers as they viewed parenthood and childhood. She found that developmental fathers were more interested in their child's maturation, believed more in parent guidance literature, attended more PTA meetings, were more apt to help in child rearing and were more apt to find parenthood enjoyable than were traditionally oriented parents.

The traditional point of view involves ordering and forbidding procedures. This point of view presumes that the child is less wise than the parent and that the parent should make many decisions for the child. On the other hand, the developmental point of view implies a relatively permissive atmosphere or the idea that the child should be allowed to evolve from his own potentialities. It is also held by the developmentalists that the child should be allowed to make his own mistakes and to develop into a unique and creative person. By the criteria of the traditional point of view an obedient and reserved child reflects credit on his parents. From the developmental point of view such a child is possibly the inhibited product of a repressive home.

Based upon the above discussion two generalizations can be derived. First, an accepting parent is one who regards his child as a person with feelings and respects the child's right and need to express these feelings. Second, an accepting parent is one who values the unique make-up of his child and does what he can to foster that uniqueness within the limits of healthy personal and social adjustment.

Factors Influencing Parental Acceptance

In the previous section of human behavior in perspective it was established that attitudes are a guide to action and serve as a predeterminal
frame of reference for an individual's perception of stimuli. From this general framework three major factors influencing parent's child acceptance may be derived. These factors are the parent's concept of self, parent's marital adjustment and parent's social environment.

**Parent's concept of self**

From the section, Human Behavior in Perspective, can be derived the postulate that the individual's attitudes are an important determinant of his feelings and actions. The term self is used in this research to identify the parent's attitudes about himself.

**Definition of self** As an individual grows toward maturity he develops a private world comprised of attitudes, values, perception and expectations which form a frame of reference reflecting his attitudes of himself or his personality. By use of his formed frame of reference an individual views himself and interprets the physical and social environment. The name for this private world varies. In this research it is called self.

According to Mead (43, p. 215) an individual becomes a self in the reflective sense when he can become an object to himself, and he becomes an object to himself by taking the attitudes of other individuals toward himself within a social environment or context of experience and behavior in which both he and they are involved. Taking the attitude of another individual toward himself, is taking the role of the other, so that he himself plays his role according to expectations. According to Mead:

These are personalities which they take, roles they play, and in so far control the development of their own personality ... In so far as the child does take the attitude of the other and allows that attitude of the other to determine the thing he is going to do with reference to a common end, he is becoming an organic
member of society. (44, p. 249)

In Mead's (43) opinion, a second stage in personality development is the development of a self in the fullest sense. It is not sufficient for an individual to become an object to himself. To accomplish full development of self, the individual organizes the attitudes of others towards himself and toward one another so that he has the attitude of the social group toward the various social situations which confront a social group at any given time. Only insofar as the individual takes the attitude of the organized social group to which he belongs towards the social activity or the activity in which it is engaged, does the individual develop a complete self (43, p. 231). The self concept is heavily infused with group membership. This interpretation emphasizes that the sense of self emerges during the course of growth and that it is of critical importance in understanding an individual. This interpretation views the emergence of self as a developmental process of growth, maturation and learning which begins in infancy and is controlled by the totality of the individual's growth experiences.

As Mead has pointed out, the development of the self attitude is possible because one consequence of being human is that a person becomes an object to himself. Man's possession of language and a superior intelligence over other animals makes it possible for him to think about himself and his perception of another person's image of him. Each individual has a set of cognitions and feelings toward himself. These are his self attitudes.

Mead defines the developed self as consisting of an "I" and "me". Mead distinguished the "I" and "me" as follows:
The 'I' is the response of the organism to the attitudes of the other; the 'me' is the organized set of attitudes of others which one himself assumes. The attitudes of others constitute the organized 'me' and then one reacts toward that as an 'I'. (43, p. 12)

An individual's various "me's" are seen by Mead not only as discreet objects but he may perceive all of them at once and in a hierarchy according to the degree of positive attitude he holds toward them. This perception of himself as a whole Mead called the "I" or "self-conception". The self-conception acquires a purely personal aspect once the individual establishes a relationship to himself. This definition of the self was accepted for this research. Rogers defines the concept of self as:

The self, that organized, consistent, conceptual gestalt composed of perceptions of the characteristics of the 'I' or 'me' to others and to various aspects of life, together with the value attached to these perceptions. (54, p. 184)

The self arises in the social process of interaction. Mead indicates that:

The self is something which has a development; it is not initially there at birth, but arises in the process of social experience and activity, that is, develops in the given individual as a result of his relations to that process as a whole and to other individuals within the process. (43, p. 212)

According to Mead (43) the infant does not distinguish between the self and non-self. Only as he interacts with objects and persons in interpersonal behavior events does he come to perceive of himself as an object separate and distinct from other objects and other persons.

Mead in his description of the processes involved in the development of self writes:

The self arises in conduct when the individual becomes a social object in experience to himself. This takes place when the individual assumes the attitude or uses the gesture which another individual would use and responds to it himself or tends
The individual's self is the mediator of experiences between the individual and the outside world of people and events. Although it is only one aspect of the total personality, it is an important element.

**Emergence of the self**  
Two important interpretations of the origins of the self are the psychoanalytic and the developmental point of view. The psychoanalytic concept emphasizes the unconscious aspects of an individual's inner world. This research is concerned with the developmental interpretation.

The most mature stage of development is the emergence of the self-other concept described by Mead (43). According to Mead when an individual is able to view himself as others view him, he can understand how others behave and how his own behavior may affect them. He becomes capable of transposing himself into the psychological frame of reference of another so that the other person's thinking, feeling, and acting are predictable. This process termed empathy, greatly enhances his capacity for social behavior. By becoming sensitive to the psychological frame of reference of others an individual can relate to others in an outgoing manner instead of using them to build up his own ego. As a result he becomes an understanding person.

**Elements of the self attitude**  
As has been discussed earlier in this chapter attitudes have three aspects. Thus, a person's attitudes toward himself has three aspects -- cognitive, affective and behavioral. The cognitive component represents the content of the self attitude illustrated by such thoughts as: I am intelligent, honest, sincere, ambitious,
tall, strong and overweight. The affective component represents one's feelings about oneself and is more difficult to illustrate because feelings toward oneself are usually not expressed in words. It would include a rather general feeling of self worth as well as evaluations of more specific cognitive aspects or other aspects of self attitudes. For example, a woman may dislike her nose which is slightly crooked. The behavioral component is the tendency to act toward oneself in various ways. For example, a person may behave in a self depreciating or self indulgent manner, or he may show oversensitivity to certain of his characteristics.

**Self concept and behavior**  An individual's capacity for developing self insights and for reacting realistically to stimuli, such as a child's behavior, seems to be affected by the level of self-acceptance he attains. The individual who has a positive self concept and a strong sense of self acceptance is not afraid to admit weaknesses or to incur the disapproval of others. He does not need to waste his energies protecting himself, hence has more energy available for creative purposes and for social interaction (49, 64).

An individual's self reference attitudes and feelings affect his interpersonal relationships for an individual is inclined to respond to others in a manner which reflects how he regards himself. The self-assured person can be other-directed in his dealings with people, because he does not have to use them to satisfy his own needs or to build his own ego. He can give of himself, put others at ease, and contribute to their security by his own lack of anxiety and defensive reactions.

Agryris' (2) study supports the view that the individual's self
concept has much to do with the individual's social success or failure. The self assured individual integrates well with other people and thus enhances his sense of security and self-identity. The person who has a low concept of himself avoids people, or displays such competitive, defensive, or dependent characteristics that people are repelled. Mendinnus and Curtis (45) found a relationship between the parent's self-acceptance and his child acceptance.

**General null hypothesis one** Based upon the prior conception of self attitudes the first major hypothesis of this study can be stated.

**General Null Hypothesis I.** There is no positive relationship between a parent's self attitudes and his parental acceptance of his child.

**Marital adjustment**

The second determinant, how an individual feels and behaves in regard to the response of another individual, is the variable of husband and wife relationship, or marital adjustment.

**Importance of interpersonal relations** The individual's self attitudes have been discussed as the individual's self perception. Closely associated with the individual's self attitudes is his perceived satisfaction and adjustment of his interpersonal relations with significant others in his environment.

It is assumed for this research that the most important significant other for a husband is his wife and the most significant other for the wife is her husband. Thus marital adjustment is an important dimension of the parent interpersonal relations. Interpersonal relations refer to how one
person thinks and feels about another person, how he perceives him and what he does to him, what he expects him to do or think and how he reacts to the actions of the other individual.

According to Secord and Backman,

Liking for other persons and their reciprocal feelings toward us are among the most important aspects of social life. Feelings of liking leads to increased association, and they shape the behavior of individuals in interaction. (60, p. 238)

**Role strain** Another conceptualization to support the importance of the interpersonal environment is that concerned with role strain. Role strain includes those situations in which an individual is confronted with conflicting or competing expectations and the individual experiences difficulty in meeting the role expectation.

According to Sears,

The resulting strain considered on the level of an individual involves experiencing conflicting tendencies to act and feelings of inadequacy, guilt, embarrassment and need frustration. On the level of social system, this strain is associated with interpersonal conflict and the failure of the system to maximize the achievement of its goals. On the level of the individual role strain may result from several conditions. First, an individual attribute may facilitate or interfere with the production of expected behavior. Second, role enactment may result in strain if the role expectations are incompatible with the individual's self concept. Third, he may have certain attitudes and needs that interfere with the enactment of a particular role. (58, p. 469)

**Need for social support** Newcomb (48) and Festinger (22) have proposed a theory that persons with similar attitudes are attracted to each other. Through long experience, an individual becomes dependent upon other persons for information about the environment. The individual needs support from others for his attitudes and beliefs. When an individual
encounters a person with attitudes contrary to his own a state of strain arises particularly if he likes the person. Festinger's (22) theory of social comparison and cognitive dissonance would support the need for similar attitudes between husband and wife.

**Marital adjustment and parental behavior**

Many research findings have implied that marital adjustment is an important consideration for the understanding and predicting of a parent's feeling and action behavior in regard to his child's behavior. Selected studies are presented in the following paragraphs.

Macfarlane (39) found that the marital adjustment of parents correlated more highly and consistently with behavior and personality difficulties than any other family variable. Baruch (6) found the following items concerning interparental relationship were significantly related to child adjustment: tension over sex, tension over ascendance-submission, tension over lack of consideration, lack of cooperation on the upbringing of the child, inability to talk over differences, tension over insufficient expression of affection, tension over friends, tension concerning work and tension over relatives. Symonds (63) found that in a group of rejecting parents more husbands or wives neglected their marital responsibilities and there was more evidence of marital unfaithfulness. There was evidence of a lack of full recognition by one partner of the other, a lack of mutual courtesy and thoughtfulness, and a presence of quarreling and irritability. Symonds interpreted these to be symptoms of unmet personality needs and thwartings in the marriage relationship.
General null hypothesis two  It seems plausible that a marriage partner whose personal needs are not being satisfied by his spouse may seek the satisfaction of those needs from the child in the form of over-protection or overindulgence. The lack of marital adjustment might be expressed in the form of resentment, irritability, and rejection of the child.

Based upon the prior conception of marital adjustment the second general hypothesis of this study can be stated.

General Null Hypothesis II. There is no positive relationship between a parents marital adjustment and his parental acceptance of his child.

Social environment

Within the third major determinant, parent's social environment, there are two subcategories. The first of these categories is the social economic class. The second category is reference groups. These two categories are not mutually exclusive for an individual's social economic class influences and an individual's reference groups. A number of specific studies relating social class to the child rearing attitudes and practices of the parents have been done by Sears et al., (59), Miller and Swanson (46) and McKinley (42). Kaplan has written that:

The most significant cultural influence on personality development is the social class structure of society. Membership in a given social class often determines the pattern of family life and the style of living which its members will adopt. The lower socio-economic classes in our society experience educational social and economic deprivations which have far reaching influences on their behavior and adjustment. (33, p. 115)

Social economic class  In general, studies of socio-economic factors and child rearing have dealt with parental behavior or parental attitudes. Hoffman and Lippitt (29) listed 18 studies since 1945 which
related social class to child rearing attitudes and practices of the parents. Kenkel (35) cited a bibliography listing over 275 items published prior to 1956 that have some bearing on socio-economic status and child rearing practices.

Socio-economic class is based on more than family wealth or income. According to Gardner socio-economic class is also a matter of tastes, values, beliefs and interests (25). Krech, et al., concluded from a study of social class classification by self-report that social class is a real group for the members of the class. They conclude that: "It is a group which is made up of people who do similar work and who have a similar set of beliefs, attitudes, and values" (37, p. 391). The two classes most studied are the middle class and the working class. The parental values of the working class center more on conformity to external restrictions (36). They are concerned with getting by and obtaining some security.

The parental values of middle class parents center more on self-direction. McKinley states that,

Since many of the parent's functions are in the nature of socialization through a manipulation of sanctions is the parent's access to sanctions of various kinds (resources) influenced by their status and does it in turn influence the resulting product returned to society, the socialized child? (42, p. 14)

Kohn (36) believes that it is this value orientation which leads middle class parents to seek out expert opinion. McKinley (42) differentiated between upper and lower middle class. He stated that upper middle class parents are career-oriented and consequently career and family life goals are fused. The lower middle class are concerned more with respectability, traditional morality and not so much with productivity.

Davis (16) and Kohn (36) have described American children in the
middle class family as being sheltered and closely supervised in comparison to the lower class. Middle class children are required to be in the house earlier at night and to work harder on their school lessons. Greater stress is placed on their individual achievement, habit of cleanliness, emotional restraint and the development of responsibility and self control. Middle class children are punished not only for what they do but also for their intentions and for the long range meaning of their behavior (16).

Thus, the family variable that has been most frequently related to the child directly and indirectly is social class. The most obvious revelance of social class as a determinant of parent behavior can be seen by a comparison of social classes. A consistent finding of the research relating social class to child rearing is that middle class mothers more often mention experts as their source of ideas about child rearing. Lower class mothers rely more on their own inclinations and their own upbringing. They also use their parents and friends more for information than do middle class mothers. The lower class is less exposed to changes in child rearing patterns while the middle class mother responds more to expert advice which is based on the prevailing scientific knowledge about child rearing.

Past social environment is more important as a dimension for viewing the effect of social environment on parent's child acceptance. The parent's past social environment influences his level of education and his attitude toward scientific knowledge.

Reference groups In discussing the role of a parent and its relationship to social reference groups Brim has written:

This role, like all roles in social interaction systems, is a set of regulated ways of behaving and of prescribed ends to be
achieved, which are consonant with the more general function ascribed to the social system of which the role is a part. Thus, the parent role, being part of the parent-child system, is regulated by rules about the aims to be sought and the appropriate behavior to reach these which are established by the members of society and in turn enforced by them ... The individual, in his role as the parent, seeks to discharge his responsibilities in a way which elicits approval from the group to which he belongs, or in any case, seeks to avoid their punishment. (13, p. 68)

Brim's (13) statement supports the importance and interrelatedness of the parent's social economic class and reference group.

There are three categories of reference groups. Those in which one participates, those one aspires to belong to, and those one aspires not to belong to. This research is concerned with the effect of reference group participation. The individual's degree of participation is assumed for this research to indicate the salency of the groups attitudes for a parent. The higher the degree of salency of the group, the more effect the attitude of the group members will have on the individual parent. It is assumed for this research that the effect of group participation will be to increase the parent child acceptance. This assumption is based upon the rationale that the ideal accepting parent is one who uses the most current social scientific concepts of child rearing. Researchers in the area of adoption of new ideas have found a significant correlation between adoption of new ideas and group participation (38).

**General null hypothesis three** Based upon the prior conception of parents social environment the third general hypothesis can be stated.

**General Null Hypothesis III.** There is no positive relationship between a parent's social environment and his parental acceptance of his child.
PROCEDURE AND METHOD

In the previous chapter a theoretical framework for studying human behavior was developed. Three major behavior determinants of parental acceptance were presented and three general hypotheses derived in relation to each determinant.

This chapter will consist of four sections. In the first section, the source and collection of data will be described. The second section is a description of the variables used to define operationally the theoretical concepts of the three major hypotheses. The third section will be a description of the methods of data analysis. The fourth section will be a discussion of the limitations of this research.

Source and Collection of Data for Study

Original source

Data for this study were taken from a longitudinal study\(^1\) of the

---

\(^1\)The study was undertaken jointly by the Cooperative Extension Service in Agriculture and Home Economics and the Iowa Agricultural Experiment Station in cooperation with the W. W. Kellogg Foundation from 1955-1960. The study was under the direction of the Interdisciplinary Committee for Research on Intensive Extension Programs. The committee was composed of:

- Dr. George Beal: Professor of Sociology; Extension Research, Chairman
- Dr. Glenn Hawkes: Professor and Head of Child Development
- Dr. Earl Heady: Professor or Agricultural Economics
- Dr. Margaret Liston: Professor and Head of Home Management
- Dr. Mary Lyle: Professor of Home Economics Education
- Mr. Carl Malone: Professor of Agricultural Economics; Extension Staff Consultant in Farm and Home Development

In addition, Mr. Norman Strand, Professor of Statistics, was the statistical consultant.

The statistical laboratory at Iowa State University collaborated with the committee in designing the survey and collected, processed and tabulated the data.
The basic objective of project 1278 was to provide data about the relative effectiveness of the Farm and Home Development educational approach when compared with the traditional Extension educational approach, that would allow Extension Administration a means of evaluating the role of Farm and Home Development in the overall Iowa Extension program.

**Research design**

All 99 Iowa counties were classified into one of four categories.

1. Counties which had a Farm and Home Development program already under way.

2. Counties which had no Farm and Home Development program but were ready to initiate such a program.

3. Counties which had no Farm and Home Development program and were not ready to initiate a Farm and Home Development program immediately, but had high probability for initiating one in the next four years.

4. Counties which had no Farm and Home Development programs and would probably not initiate an extensive Farm and Home Development program within the next four years.

Only categories two and four were used in the Farm and Home Development research design. The counties in category two were the potential for

---

Farm and Home Development is an organized effort on the part of the Cooperative Extension Service to teach the farm family to manage more effectively. If family members are to manage effectively, they must (1) have an understanding of their own goals; (2) have a reasonably adequate set of resources to manage; and (3) understand and be able to apply the process of management. (7, p. 1)
the treatment Farm and Home Development program counties. Those in category four were the potential for the control counties.

A second stratification was made on the type of farming area in Iowa. The survey was carried out in each of the five major types of farming areas into which Iowa is divided: Area 1, western livestock; Area 2, central cash grain; Area 3, northeastern dairy; Area 4, southern pasture; and Area 5, eastern livestock.

Beal in summarizing the sample stated:

Each of the potential treatment counties was paired with a potential control county. The counties were paired on the basis of soil types, type of farming, income and judged county staff competence. Distinct ethnic or other unique characteristics, such as urbanization, were also considered in pairing. From the resulting pairs, one pair was randomly selected in each of the five types of farming areas. Thus, at the county level, the sample was composed of five pairs of counties. One county was designated as the 'treatment' county and the other as the 'control' county. The Farm and Home Development program was to be initiated in the 'treatment' counties. (7, p. 8)

Farm families within each selected county were considered for the research sample if they met the following criteria:

1. The family included an operator and a homemaker who were husband and wife.

2. The operator was under 38 years of age.

3. The operator worked less than 100 days off the farm.

4. Gross income from sale of agricultural products totaled more than $1,200.

5. The operator was not in partnership with a person over 38 years of age.

6. The operator intended to operate a farm in the sample area during the next farming season.
Subjects

For the research of this thesis one additional criteria was added to those discussed above. All the parents used in the research of this thesis had to have at least one child within the age range of four years through nine years. This criteria reduced the original sample from 442 to 274. The number of parents for each category is presented in Table 1.

Table 1. Frequency of subjects by child age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age of child in years</th>
<th>Number of parents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>274</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This criterion was based on the rationale that the question measuring parental acceptance was constructed to measure parent's feeling and action to child behavior that could most likely be expected to occur during this age period. According to Hawkes \(^1\) both language development and type of parent child interaction would support the selection of an age range from

\(^1\)Dr. Glenn R. Hawkes, Associate Dean, Family and Consumer Sciences, University of California, Davis, California. Effect of age on parent child interaction. Private communication. 1966.
four years through nine years. For example, the question of, "How do you feel when your child says or does something hateful to you?" assumes a parent child interaction pattern expected to occur in the ages of four years through nine years. Ausubel lends support to the selection of the four year old for the lower age when he writes of the four year old:

Now for the first time he becomes intensely competitive in his play and desires to excel others. Everything that he has or can do is compared with the possessions and abilities of others, and the decision regarding relative superiority is invariably made in his favor. He is acutely resentful of the privileges accorded older siblings. His concern with power and prestige is also manifested by his preoccupation with possession, by interference with and teasing of other children and household pets, and by snatching of toys. With the growth of language his resistance assumes more verbal, subtle and symbolic forms. Threats, boasts, contentiousness, deceit, delaying and stalling tactics replace temper tantrums and open aggression. (3, p. 298)

The data were collected in the spring of 1956 by trained professional interviewers. The coding and tabulation of data were conducted by staff members of the Iowa State University Statistical Computation Center. The above discussion of the process of selection of the subjects has been presented to provide the reader with background for interpreting the degree of generalizations that they may wish to make about the findings.

The purpose of this research is not to provide a study of a random sample of Iowa parents with a child in this particular age group. The purpose of this research is to focus on the factors affecting parental acceptance with the limitations of this sample.

Operational Definitions

The three major independent concepts, parent's concept of self, parent's marital adjustment and parent's social environment were discussed at a general level in the Conceptual Framework chapter. Operational
definitions are now needed whereby the relationship of these theoretical
corcepts with the dependent concept, parental acceptance can be tested.
The movement from the general to the specific level is accomplished by
deductive logic.

According to Baldwin:

A scientific theory is a deductive system. It contains a set of
hypotheses, some of which may be logically deduced from the
others in the set. These hypotheses can be arranged in a sort
of hierarchical order. 1. There will be a set of highest-level
hypotheses, generally called assumptions and definitions, from
which all the rest of the set can be deduced ... 2. There will
be middle-level hypotheses that are deducible from the funda-
mental assumptions and are also the premises from which lowest-
level hypotheses are deduced ... 3. There will be lowest-level
hypotheses that are deducible from the rest of the system but
are not premises for further deductions. These are empirically
testable hypotheses or predictions if the system as a whole is
testable. (4, p. 8)

Thus, this section will deal with operational definitions whereby the gen-
eral hypotheses can be empirically tested. Restated the general hypotheses
are:

General Null Hypothesis I. There is no positive relationship between a
parent's self attitudes and his parental acceptance of his child.

General Null Hypothesis II. There is no positive relationship between a
parent's marital adjustment and his parental acceptance of his child.

General Null Hypothesis III. There is no positive relationship between a
parent's social environment and his parental acceptance of his child.

Concepts common to all three hypotheses

General concepts common to all three hypotheses are: parents, child,
and parental acceptance. Proceeding now to transform the general level
concepts in these general hypotheses into more precise terms for empirical
testing, the sample of parents was selected from the Iowa Agriculture and Home Economics Experiment Station Project No. 1278. The population from which the sample was selected and the method by which they were selected was described in the preceding section of this chapter, Source and Collection of Data for Study.

Parents in this study were married husbands and wives living together with at least one child in the age range four years through nine years. If a family had more than one child in the selected age range, the data was collected on the youngest child. In some cases this was the parents' only child. In other cases it was their only child in the age range.

The empirical measurement of parental acceptance was selected from the Porter Parental Acceptance Scale (51). In the following paragraphs the scale and the individually selected items will be discussed. However, the reader is referred to Porter's dissertation (51) for a complete discussion of the construction of the scale.

The purpose of the items in Porter's Scale is to measure how a parent feels and what he does when his child expresses negative feelings, and what the parent does when he discovers unique features or certain limitations which his child has (51).

For each of the situations described in a scale item, a scale was constructed by Porter which could represent ways of feeling and acting on the part of the parent. Listed below is the conceptual framework that Porter used to construct the responses for the dimension of the child's feeling and rights of expression.

I. An acceptant parent is one who regards his child as a person with feelings and respects the child's right and need to express these feelings. (51, p. 54)
Porter suggests five categories describing ways a parent may feel. These are listed below in order from low parental acceptance feelings to high parental acceptance feelings.

A. Ways of feeling.

1. Disturbed to the point of wanting to take punitive action.
2. Desire to block action or verbalization in kind but firm way.
3. Annoyance with child's behavior or verbalizations, but not to the extent described in No. 2.
4. Acceptance that this is part of growing up, but looking forward to the time when it will be over.
5. Pleasure because of child's security to freely express his emotions. (51, pp. 54, 55)

Listed below are the five categories of action a parent may take. These are listed in order from low parental acceptance action to high parental acceptance action.

B. Courses of action.

1. Strong will imposition.
2. Mild will imposition.
4. Verbal expression and/or action which shows understanding of child's feelings and behavior.
5. Acceptance of feelings, with support and guidance in the expression of them. (51, p. 55)

Porter's conceptual framework used to construct the responses for the dimension of the child's individual uniqueness is listed below.

II. An acceptant parent is one who values the unique make-up of his child and does what he can to foster that uniqueness within the limits of healthy personal and social adjustment. (51, p. 55)

Porter suggests five descriptive categories for ways a parent may feel and five ways a parent may act toward the child's expression of individual uniqueness. Listed below are the five ways a parent may feel toward a child's expression of individual uniqueness. These are listed in order
from low parental acceptance feelings to high parental acceptance feelings.

A. Ways of feeling.

1. Embarrassment or disappointment.
2. Desire or wish that he were different.
3. Recognition of uniqueness.
4. Desire to discover interests of child through mild participation in abilities, interests, etc.
5. Desire to help him make the most of his assets.

(51, p. 55)

Listed below are five ways a parent may act toward a child's expression of individual uniqueness. These are listed in order from low parental acceptance action to high parental acceptance action.

B. Courses of action.

1. Strong will imposition.
2. Mild will imposition; persuasion encouragement.
4. Mild support of abilities, interests, etc.
5. Strong support of, or interest in, his uniqueness.

(51, p. 55)

Porter used the following five criteria for selection of the items in the original scale.

1. The items must deal with significant aspects of parent's feeling for and relationship with his child.
2. The items should be sufficiently discriminating to prevent the overprotecting and indulgent parent from being classified as highly accepting.
3. The items should have a minimum of limitations by age of child; in other words they should apply to as wide an age range as possible.
4. The items should attempt to determine the true feelings and behavior patterns of a parent in regard to his acceptance of his child.
5. The items should secure, in so far as possible, that the parent will refer to his own child when responding to the items rather than children in general or to someone else's children. (50, p. 178)

The Interdisciplinary Committee selected three items from the Porter Parental Acceptance Scale. These three items are listed below as they
were used in the field interviewing schedule.

Question 1. Now we are interested in your ideas on raising children.

a. For example, there is the problem of what to say to a child who disagrees with you about something which you think is important. What do you usually say or do if 
   
   does this?

   1.________________________

       Oldest child

   2.________________________

       Youngest child
       over three

Here is a list of five things one may say or do. Which one of these comes closest to describing what you say or do if 
   
   disagrees with you.

   Number from card No: 1

   1.________________________

       Oldest child

   2.________________________

       Youngest child
       over three

Question 2. Suppose another problem arises that all parents are occasionally faced with. Suppose your child says angry and hateful things to you. How do you usually feel when 
   
   does this?

   1.________________________

       Oldest child

   2.________________________

       Youngest child
       over three

Here are five ways one may feel. Which one of these comes closest to describing how you feel when 
   
   says angry things to you?

   Number from card No: 2

   1.________________________

       Oldest child
2. ______  
Youngest child 
over three 

Question 3. No child is better than all of the other children of his age group at everything such as learning to walk, making friends, games, school work, and the like. Now when a child of yours is slower than other children at doing something, how do you usually feel?

1. ______________________________________________________

Here are five ways one might feel. Which one of these comes closest to describing how you feel when your child is slower at doing some things? (31, pp. 3, 4)

Trained field interviewers read the above questions to the parent. The parent was first asked for a non-structured response for the oldest and youngest child in that order. Then the parents were shown cards with the responses ordered as listed below and asked for a structured response for the oldest child and then for the youngest child.

The cards (31) used for the structured response for the above three questions are as follows:

Card No. 1

1. I tell the child that (he) (she) shouldn't disagree with me.
2. I make the child stop disagreeing with me.
3. I listen to the child's side of the disagreement and change my mind if I am wrong.
4. I tell the child that maybe we can do it (his) (her) way another time.
5. I explain that I am doing what is best for (him) (her).

Card No. 2

1. Annoyed
2. That I will be glad when (he) (she) is past this stage.
3. Pleased that (he) (she) feels free to express (himself) (herself).
4. Like punishing (him) (her).
5. Like telling (him) (her) not to talk that way to me.

Card No. 3
1. Realize that (he) (she) can't be best in everything.
2. Wish (he) (she) could do as well as other children.
3. Feel embarrassed.
4. Want to help (him) (her) find success in the things (he) (she) can do best.
5. Want to know more about the things (he) (she) can do well.

The first major methodological decision in using the data on parental acceptance was the question of whether to use the structured or non-structured responses or both. The structured responses were selected for studying the relationship of the selected factors with parental acceptance for two reasons. First, when a Pearson's correlation coefficient was computed to establish the relationship of the structured responses with the non-structured responses, the correlations were low. (See Table 2) The identification of the variables for Table 2 is as follows:

1. Question one: Father non-structured
2. Question one: Mother non-structured
3. Question one: Father structured
4. Question one: Mother structured
5. Question two: Father non-structured
6. Question two: Mother non-structured
7. Question two: Father structured  
8. Question two: Mother structured  
9. Question three: Father non-structured  
10. Question three: Mother non-structured  
11. Question three: Father structured  
12. Question three: Mother structured  

A possible explanation of the low correlations is that the parents' responses to the non-structured items were selected from many frameworks. However, in the case of the structured responses all parents were responding using the same set of five alternative responses. A second reason for choosing the structured responses over the non-structured is the difficulty in coding the non-structured responses. This difficulty may be illustrated by comparing Poulson's reported goal agreement score with an earlier coded goal agreement score for the subjects used in this research. Poulson's (52) goal agreement score correlated .44 with an earlier coded score for the same subjects. The subjects of this research were a portion of Poulson's subjects.

A second major methodological consideration was whether or not the scores could be combined into a total parental acceptance score for both parents. A Pearson correlation coefficient was computed to establish the relationship of the items. The results are reported in Table 2. The correlation coefficients are quite low and it appears that combining the scores would yield less insights than by using the scores as single scores.\(^1\)

Table 2. Correlation matrix of parental acceptance scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Correlation coefficient of .12 or above are significant at .05 level of probability.
The parental acceptance score was computed for each parent by weighting the items in a 1 to 5 range (51). The numerical value assigned to each item is as follows:

**Card No. 1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>I make the child stop disagreeing with me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>I tell the child that (he) (she) shouldn't disagree with me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>I explain that I am doing what is best for (him) (her).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>I tell the child that maybe we can do it (his) (her) way another time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>I listen to the child's side of the disagreement and change my mind if I am wrong.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Card No. 2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Like punishing (him) (her).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Like telling (him) (her) not to talk that way to me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Annoyed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>That I will be glad when (he) (she) is past this stage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Pleased that (he) (she) feels free to express (himself) (herself).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Card No. 3**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Feel embarrassed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Wish (he) (she) could do as well as other children.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Want to help (him) (her) find success in the things</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(he) (she) can do best.

4. Want to know more about the things (he) (she) can do well.

5. Realize that (he) (she) can't be best in everything.

The operational empirical measures of parental acceptances as used in this research are as follows:

1. Father's structured response as to his feelings and actions when his child disagrees with him on an important issue. (father's parental acceptance of disagreement score)

2. Mother's structured response as to her feelings and actions when her child disagrees with her on an important issue. (mother's parental acceptance of disagreement score)

3. Father's structured response as to his feelings and actions when his child says angry and hateful things to him. (father's parental acceptance of angry and hateful score)

4. Mother's structured response as to her feelings and actions when her child says angry and hateful things to her. (mother's parental acceptance of angry and hateful score)

5. Father's structured response as to his feelings when his child is slower at doing something than other children. (father's parental acceptance of child's slowness to learn score)

6. Mother's structured response as to her feelings when her child is slower at doing something than other children. (mother's parental acceptance of child's slowness to learn score)
Concepts not common to all those major hypotheses

General concepts which are different for each general hypothesis are: parent's self attitude, parent's marital adjustment and parent's social environment. Empirical operationalization for each of these general concepts will now be specified.

Parent's self attitude In the Conceptual Framework chapter the parent's self attitudes were discussed as being a major determinant of parental acceptance. Current methods of measuring personality are basically assessments of an individual's self attitudes. Most personality tests utilize the responses of an individual to statements or questions. The responses basically reflect the individual's attitudes derived from his self. Therefore, results from a personality test will be used as an assessment of the parent's self attitudes.

Based upon the above discussion of the operational measures of the parent's self attitude the first middle range hypothesis can be stated.

Middle Range Null Hypothesis 1. There is no positive relationship between the parent's personality and his parental acceptance concepts of anger and hatefulness, disagreement and slowness to learn.

The Gordon Personal Profile (26) was accepted as a measure of the major personality factors of parents for the purpose of this research. There are several possible methodological reasons for the Interdisciplinary Committee's selection of the Gordon Personality Profile. First, it is efficient and practical in terms of the time required for administering. It is self administering and an individual can be expected to complete the test in seven to fifteen minutes. Second, it is simple to score the
responses and the scores can be compared between individuals. Third, it is not necessary to make clinical interpretations of the scores obtained. Fourth, it was a practical test in terms of cost since copies were needed for 884 individuals located in 442 different households.

The Gordon Personal Profile (26) has a limited history of use. It is not a widely known test among researchers. Because it is not a widely known test it will be described in some detail in the following paragraphs. Because of its limited history of use the test manual will be used as a primary reference source. The test manual was written by Gordon and thus reflects his value judgments about the test.

The statement made for the instrument in the Gordon Personal Profile Manual is as follows:

The Gordon Personal Profile gives reliable measures of four aspects of personality which are especially significant in the daily functioning of the normal person -- Ascendancy (A), Responsibility (R), Emotional Stability (E), and Sociability (S). (26, p. 3)

The Gordon Personal Profile was developed using the force-choice technique and factor analysis. The test itself consists of 18 sets of four descriptive phrases. Each of the four factors -- Ascendancy (A), Responsibility (R), Emotional Stability (E), and Sociability (S) -- is represented by one of the phrases in each set of four phrases. Each set of four phrases includes two phrases that Gordon assumed to be of equally high preference and two items assumed to be of equally low average preference. That is, they are considered to be equally complimentary or uncomplimentary by the normal individual (26).

The test is based upon force-choice items. According to Gordon:

Each individual is asked to mark one item in each group as being
most like himself and one item as being least like himself. Thus, through the forced-choice technique, even individuals who are out to beat the test are forced to make what in effect are rankings within each set of four items, and cannot respond favorably to all items, as may be done in the conventional self-report inventory. For such individuals, the force-choice technique should produce higher validities than the inventory approach. Yet the conscientious respondent may still select appropriate complimentary or uncomplimentary alternatives by the forced-choice method.

In general, if two items have the same average preference values or are equally complimentary from the point of view of the group, individuals to whom one of the items is more applicable usually will tend to perceive that item as more complimentary. Thus, if an individual who is motivated to make only socially acceptable responses is forced to select one of the items as being most like himself, he will select the item that he perceives to be the more complimentary, which will tend to be the item that is more like himself. Conversely, if he is presented with two items that are equally uncomplimentary for the group and is forced to select one as least like himself, he will tend to perceive the item that is more like himself as the less uncomplimentary, and will thus tend to select the item that is least like himself as his "least" selection. (26, p. 1)

Three methods of describing the Gordon Personal Profile as used by Gordon in the manual will be presented in the following paragraphs. First there will be a general statement of the criteria given by Gordon (26) in the development of the items. Second there will be the presentation of the items with the most substantial correlations with the indicated factor. Third there will be summary statements, obtained by Gordon in developing the Gordon Personal Profile, from persons who knew the respondents well -- teachers, counselors, supervisors and personnel officers. These three methods of describing the Gordon Personal Profile will be used to describe the four dimensions measured. The four dimensions of an individual's self attitude as measured by the Gordon Personal Profile are ascendancy, responsibility, emotional stability and sociability.

Ascendancy is the tendency of an individual to take an active role in
group situations, to be self-assured and assertive in relationships with others and to tend to make independent decisions. The six highest correlative items with the ascendancy score are presented in Table 3 (26, p. 5).

Table 3. Correlations of ascendancy items with total ascendancy score

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Correlation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;takes the lead in group discussion&quot;</td>
<td>.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;able to make important decisions without help&quot;</td>
<td>.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;finds it easy to influence other people&quot;</td>
<td>.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;lacking in self-assurance&quot;</td>
<td>-.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;not too sure of own opinions&quot;</td>
<td>-.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;prefers to let others take the lead in group activity&quot;</td>
<td>-.71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A further definition of the factor was obtained by Gordon through interviews with persons who knew the individual. On ascendancy Gordon stated:

The highest scores on this scale were made by individuals whom their associates characterized most strongly as tending to take the lead in group discussion; being self-assured; willing to defend their own opinions; and exerting a strong positive influence on others. The lowest scores were made by individuals whom their associates nominated most frequently as preferring to follow; to agree rather than argue; to give in quite easily to others; and to be fairly readily influenced by others. (26, p. 5)

Responsibility is an indication that the individual takes task responsibility and is likely to stick to a job and get it done. A responsible individual is persevering and determined. A responsible individual is not flighty or irresponsible. The eight highest correlative items with
the responsibility score are presented in Table 4 (26, p. 5).

Table 4. Correlation of responsibility items with total responsibility score

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Correlation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;sees a job through despite difficulties&quot;</td>
<td>.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;thorough in any work undertaken&quot;</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;a persistent, steady worker&quot;</td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;a person who can be relied upon&quot;</td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;quite an unreliable person&quot;</td>
<td>-.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;doesn't take responsibilities seriously&quot;</td>
<td>-.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;lacks a sense of responsibility&quot;</td>
<td>-.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;cannot stick to the same task for long&quot;</td>
<td>-.80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A further definition of the factor was obtained by Gordon by inter­
views with persons who knew the individuals. According to Gordon:

Those individuals whom their associates nominated most frequently
as characteristically sticking to a job, once begun; being persist­
ent, steady workers; taking responsibilities seriously; and being
dependable, reliable, and trustworthy, made the highest scores on
this scale. Those whom their colleagues characterized most strong­
ly as being easily led astray from the task at hand; not taking
responsibilities seriously; not sticking to the same job for long;
and not being particularly dependable or reliable, made the lowest
scores. (26, p. 5)

Emotional stability is an indication that the individual is well-
balanced, stable and relatively free from anxiety and nervous tension.
Thus, less scores are associated with excessive anxiety, tension, hyper­
sensitivity, and nervousness. The correlation of four positive and four
negative items of the emotional stability items with the total score is
given in Table 5 (26, p. 5).

Table 5. Correlation of emotional stability items with total emotional stability score

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Correlation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;calm and easygoing in manner&quot;</td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;free from worry or care&quot;</td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;free from anxieties or tensions&quot;</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;finds it very easy to relax&quot;</td>
<td>.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;easily upset when things go wrong&quot;</td>
<td>-.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;tends to be a rather nervous person&quot;</td>
<td>-.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;acts somewhat jumpy and nervous&quot;</td>
<td>-.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;seems to have a worrying nature&quot;</td>
<td>-.89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A further definition of the factors was obtained by Gordon through interviews with persons who knew the individual. According to Gordon:

Individuals whom their colleagues most strongly characterized as rarely, if ever, getting upset; being free from any nervous tendencies; being very well-balanced emotionally; and being calm and collected in manner, made the highest scores on this scale. Individuals whom their colleagues most strongly characterize as tending to get upset very easily; being rather nervous; being not too well-balanced emotionally; and being somewhat inclined to worry, made the lowest scores on this scale. (26, p. 5)

Sociability is the tendency of an individual to like people and work effectively with people. Sociability indicates that an individual has an outgoing personality and several social relationships. The correlatives of four positive and four negative items of the sociability items with the total score is given in Table 6 (26, p. 6).
Table 6. Correlation of sociability items with total sociability score

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Correlation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;enjoys having lots of people around&quot;</td>
<td>.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;a good mixer socially&quot;</td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;finds it easy to make new acquaintances&quot;</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;finds it easy to be friendly with others&quot;</td>
<td>.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;limits acquaintances to a select few&quot;</td>
<td>-.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;lacks interest in joining group activities&quot;</td>
<td>-.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;uninterested in mixing socially with people&quot;</td>
<td>-.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;not interested in being with other people&quot;</td>
<td>-.84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A further definition of the factor was obtained by Gordon through interviews with persons who knew the individual. According to Gordon:

Individuals whom their colleagues most strongly characterize as thoroughly enjoying the company of people in general; usually eager to make new acquaintances; extremely fond of parties and social mixers; and enjoying just being with people, made the highest scores on this scale. Those most strongly characterized as not caring for the company of most people; not being particularly interested in meeting new people; and, at most, having a few select friends or acquaintances, made the lowest scores on this scale. (26, p. 6)

The Buros Fifth Mental Measurement Yearbook was reviewed for an evaluation of the instrument's reliability and validity. Fricke, the reviewer, states the following about the test: "Like almost all standardized tests, the profile has adequate reliability (media of 24 coefficients is about .85)" (24, p. 128). Fricke states the following about the validity of the test:

While Gordon has given some validity data and makes many references to completed studies the total impression is that adequate
validity has not been demonstrated. (24, p. 127)

This quote raises a serious question about the use of the Gordon Personal Profile. However, it should be noted that other possible alternative personality tests also received critical review in the Buros's Fifth Mental Measurements Yearbook. For example, Cronback when reviewing the California Psychological Inventory (CPI) summarized his review by stating:

"Gough is to be commended for pursuing his own contrary view skillfully but the usefulness of his instrument is still in question" (14, p. 37).

Validity is demonstrated by proving that the test measures what its author claims that it measures. It should also be noted that in the case of personality measures this is difficult to demonstrate.

Based upon the above discussion of the empirical measures of personality the empirical hypotheses can be stated.

Empirical Null Hypothesis 1. There is no positive relationship between father's ascendancy score and his parental acceptance of disagreement score.

Empirical Null Hypothesis 2. There is no positive relationship between father's ascendancy score and his parental acceptance of anger and hatefulness score.

Empirical Null Hypothesis 3. There is no positive relationship between father's ascendancy score and his parental acceptance of child's slowness to learn score.

Empirical Null Hypothesis 4. There is no positive relationship between mother's ascendancy score and her parental acceptance of disagreement score.

Empirical Null Hypothesis 5. There is no positive relationship
between mother's ascendency score and her parental acceptance of anger and hatefulness score.

**Empirical Null Hypothesis 6.** There is no positive relationship between mother's ascendency score and her parental acceptance of child's slowness to learn score.

**Empirical Null Hypothesis 7.** There is no positive relationship between father's responsibility score and his parental acceptance of disagreement score.

**Empirical Null Hypothesis 8.** There is no positive relationship between father's responsibility score and his parental acceptance of anger and hatefulness score.

**Empirical Null Hypothesis 9.** There is no positive relationship between father's responsibility score and his parental acceptance of child's slowness to learn score.

**Empirical Null Hypothesis 10.** There is no positive relationship between mother's responsibility score and her parental acceptance of disagreement score.

**Empirical Null Hypothesis 11.** There is no positive relationship between mother's responsibility score and her parental acceptance of anger and hatefulness score.

**Empirical Null Hypothesis 12.** There is no positive relationship between mother's responsibility score and her parental acceptance of child's slowness to learn score.

**Empirical Null Hypothesis 13.** There is no positive relationship between father's emotional stability score and his parental acceptance of disagreement score.
Empirical Null Hypothesis 14. There is no positive relationship between father's emotional stability score and his parental acceptance of anger and hatefulness score.

Empirical Null Hypothesis 15. There is no positive relationship between father's emotional stability score and his parental acceptance of child's slowness to learn score.

Empirical Null Hypothesis 16. There is no positive relationship between mother's emotional stability score and her parental acceptance of disagreement score.

Empirical Null Hypothesis 17. There is no positive relationship between mother's emotional stability score and her parental acceptance of anger and hatefulness score.

Empirical Null Hypothesis 18. There is no positive relationship between mother's emotional stability score and her parental acceptance of child's slowness to learn score.

Empirical Null Hypothesis 19. There is no positive relationship between father's sociability score and his parental acceptance of disagreement score.

Empirical Null Hypothesis 20. There is no positive relationship between father's sociability score and his parental acceptance of anger and hatefulness score.

Empirical Null Hypothesis 21. There is no positive relationship between father's sociability score and his parental acceptance of child's slowness to learn score.

Empirical Null Hypothesis 22. There is no positive relationship between mother's sociability score and her parental acceptance
of disagreement score.

Empirical Null Hypothesis 23. There is no positive relationship between mother's sociability score and her parental acceptance of anger and hatefulness score.

Empirical Null Hypothesis 24. There is no positive relationship between mother's sociability score and her parental acceptance of child's slowness to learn score.

Marital adjustment Similar education has been identified as an important factor for measuring marital adjustment. Similarity in education implies similar competencies for communication. Education is acquired through meaningful experiences. Similar education implies that the husband and wife have had similar experiences in certain general areas. Similar education from which similar experiences are derived should affect the alternatives known by the husband and wife.

Dissimilarity in education has been found to be a contributing factor in less satisfaction with companionship, less marital affection, and a higher percentage of disagreements. Blood and Wolfe (12, p. 164) found that even a one or two year difference in education created a marked decline in satisfaction with companionship. They write,

Where differences in education exist (as with religion), it is the wife with more interest who feels most deprived because the husband is unable to keep up with her. Wives who have been to school without their husbands regret his inadequacies .... Women who marry up provide their husbands with power and a feeling of superiority which he may appreciate, but power and companionship may be somewhat difficult to maintain in the same husband-wife relationship. (12, p. 164)

Educational differences may be a factor related to marital affection. Research has indicated that when the wife has an education of three or
more years more than her husband, satisfaction with love is less than when her education exceeds that of the husband by one or two years. Satisfaction with love is greatest when the education of both husband and wife are similar. When the education of the husband exceeds that of the wife, there is also diminished satisfaction with the love aspect of a marriage, but the relationship is not as strong as that between wife's educational superiority and satisfaction with love (12, p. 226).

Disagreements also rise with difference in education. According to Blood and Wolfe:

Quarrels over personal habits tend to occur in certain types of marital relationships. If the husband has had much more education than the wife, she seldom (11 per cent) mentions personality conflicts. However, as the balance of education shifts in the opposite direction, the percentage of disagreements rises steadily to a peak of 25 per cent when the wife had at least three or more years of schooling than the husband. (12, p. 246)

In summary, previous research has indicated that dissimilarity of education of marriage partners results in less satisfaction with companionship in the marriage, less marital affection and a greater number of marital disagreements. It is assumed that these characteristics of a marriage would contribute to low parental acceptance.

Based upon the above discussion of dissimilar educational level as an operational measure of possible marital conflict, middle range null hypothesis two can be stated.

**Middle Range Null Hypothesis 2.** There is no positive relationship between the parents' similar educational level and their parental acceptance concepts of anger and hatefulness, disagreement and slowness to learn.

There are many ways to empirically measure the education of subjects.
The most common method is the number of years of formal schooling completed. This was used as the basis of measuring the parent's education in this research project.

It is recognized that using formal education as a standard of similar education has its limitations. One limitation is that much education is informal and acquired through interaction with other individuals, from mass media and in various other ways. However, measurement of informal education is complicated, while years of education completed in the formal school system provides a measure of education that is readily available. It provides a means whereby the education of one person may be compared with that of another.

The empirical measure of the education of the father and mother was the answer given in years to the interviewer by the mother in response to the question, "How many years of formal education did (you) and (your husband) complete?" (7, p. 114). These responses were coded as follows:

1 - less than 8th grade
2 - completed 8th grade
3 - grades 9 - 11
4 - completed 12th grade
5 - 13 - 15
6 - 16 and over. (7, p. 14)

A similar educational score was computed by subtracting the father's level of education score (as coded above) from the mother's level of education score. The similar educational score is inversed when compared to the scores reported of the other variables in this research. If the resulting numerical value was negative it was changed to a positive value. The empirical hypotheses for difference in level of education and parental acceptance are stated below.
Empirical Null Hypothesis 25. There is no positive relationship between the similar formal educational score and father's parental acceptance of disagreement score.

Empirical Null Hypothesis 26. There is no positive relationship between the similar formal educational score and father's parental acceptance of anger and hatefulness score.

Empirical Null Hypothesis 27. There is no positive relationship between the similar formal educational score and father's parental acceptance of child's slowness to learn score.

Empirical Null Hypothesis 28. There is no positive relationship between the similar formal educational score and mother's parental acceptance of disagreement score.

Empirical Null Hypothesis 29. There is no positive relationship between the similar formal educational score and mother's parental acceptance of anger and hatefulness score.

Empirical Null Hypothesis 30. There is no positive relationship between the similar formal educational score and mother's parental acceptance of child's slowness to learn score.

Goal agreement and agreement on decision-making As was discussed in the Conceptual Framework chapter, parental acceptance is more likely to be lower when dissonance exists between parents. Dissonance theory assumes that for a mother and father to experience a state of consonance they need to have shared attitudes. According to Poulson:

Decision-making is a necessary process in performing management functions, and in joint husband-wife decision-making many of these functions pertain to family living. In the enactment of the process, communication takes place between the husband and
wife, opinions are shared, projections are made into the future, and past experiences are brought to bear in making decisions concerned with the present and future. A stage of concensus is arrived at, and a decision between the husband and wife is consumated. (52, p. 73)

A lack of agreement on goals and decision-making by husbands and wives is assumed for this research to be likely to produce dissonance.

Based upon the above discussion, middle range hypotheses three and four may be stated.

**Middle Range Null Hypothesis 3.** There is no positive relationship between the parents' agreement on goals and their parental acceptance concepts of anger and hatefulness, disagreement and slowness to learn.

**Middle Range Null Hypothesis 4.** There is no positive relationship between parents' agreement on decision-making and their parental acceptance concepts of anger and hatefulness, disagreement and slowness to learn.

As was discussed in the Conceptual Framework chapter a specific attitude is part of a general attitude system. Items were selected by the Interdisciplinary Committee, that they believed would yield a measure of the general attitude of agreement on decision-making and goals.

In order to obtain an empirical measure of goal agreement both husbands and wives were asked to list in order of priority the five goals they hoped to accomplish in the next five years. The subjects were asked to select the goals from the following list:

1. Improve the house and the fixed household equipment.
2. Improve the appearances of the farmstead.
3. Keep up to date on (farming, homemaking).
4. Improve the productivity of the farm itself.
5. Provide a good education for my children.
6. Be more active in church affairs.
7. Improve ability as a (wife, husband) and parent.
8. Make a considerable increase in ownership of property or additions to savings.
9. Travel and see more of my country.
10. Add to my movable home furnishings to make my home more comfortable or convenient.
11. Learn to be a better manager of money and time.
12. Learn to more fully appreciate music, art, and literature.
13. Gain and maintain the respect of my neighbors and other community members.
15. Improve the farm buildings and fixed farm equipment.

A goal agreement score was needed that would reflect the amount of agreement between the goals selected by the wife and those selected by the husband. The subjects had listed their goals in order of priority. It was felt that the priority of the goals listed was an important aspect of goal agreement. The following procedure was used to compute the goal agreement score:

1. Checking the mother's first five responses against father's first response only. Score 2 if first, second, or third response of mother matches first response of father. Score 1 if fourth or fifth response of mother matches first response of father. Score 0 in all other cases.

2. Check father's first five responses against mother's first
response only. Score 2 if first, second, or third response of father matches first response of mother. Score 1 if fourth or fifth response of father matches first response of mother. Score 0 in all other cases.

3. The mother's score and the father's score were added together to obtain a goal agreement score for the married pair.

It is assumed for this research that this combined score is a more adequate measure of goal agreement than the single score for either the husband or wife.

Based upon the above discussion of the empirical measure of agreement on goals score the following empirical hypotheses can be stated.

**Empirical Null Hypothesis 31.** There is no positive relationship between the parents' agreement on goals score and the father's parental acceptance of disagreement score.

**Empirical Null Hypothesis 32.** There is no positive relationship between the parents' agreement on goals score and the father's parental acceptance of anger and hatefulness score.

**Empirical Null Hypothesis 33.** There is no positive relationship between the parents' agreement on goals score and the father's parental acceptance of child's slowness to learn score.

**Empirical Null Hypothesis 34.** There is no positive relationship between the parents' agreement on goals score and the mother's parental acceptance of disagreement score.

**Empirical Null Hypothesis 35.** There is no positive relationship between the parents' agreement on goals score and the mother's parental acceptance of anger and hatefulness score.
Empirical Null Hypothesis 36. There is no positive relationship between the parents' agreement on goals score and the mother's parental acceptance of child's slowness to learn score.

An empirical measure for agreement on decision-making was obtained by asking the following eight questions: Who really makes the final decision on:

1. buying household needs such as an ironing board or iron
2. what is to be given to church or charity
3. disciplining the children
4. where to go on trips or holidays
5. where to go out socially
6. TV or radio programs
7. whom to vote for at a general election
8. buying a cultivator

Both the husband and wife responded separately to this question. For each question which was answered "together" a score of one was given and for any other answer a zero was given (7). The husband and wife scores were summed to yield a total agreement on decision-making score. Thus, the numerical range for the agreement on decision-making score was from zero to sixteen.

Using the above empirical score as a partial measure of agreement on decision-making the following six empirical hypotheses may be used as a partial test of the middle range null hypothesis four.

Empirical Null Hypothesis 37. There is no positive relationship between the parents' agreement on decision-making score and the father's parental acceptance of disagreement score.
Empirical Null Hypothesis 38. There is no positive relationship between the parents' agreement on decision-making score and the father's parental acceptance of anger and hatefulness score.

Empirical Null Hypothesis 39. There is no positive relationship between the parents' agreement on decision-making score and the father's parental acceptance of child's slowness to learn score.

Empirical Null Hypothesis 40. There is no positive relationship between the parents' agreement on decision-making score and the mother's parental acceptance of disagreement score.

Empirical Null Hypothesis 41. There is no positive relationship between the parents' agreement on decision-making score and the mother's parental acceptance of anger and hatefulness score.

Empirical Null Hypothesis 42. There is no positive relationship between the parents' agreement on decision-making score and the mother's parental acceptance of child's slowness to learn score.

An additional agreement on decision-making score was computed for the parents' agreement on who makes the decision in disciplining the children. This score was computed by taking the parents' response to the question, "Who really makes the final decision on disciplining the children?" (7, p. 147). The following criteria (7) were used to compute the numerical score:

1. A value of one if mother and father's response does not agree on how the decision is made.

2. A value of two if the parents agree that either the father or
mother decides.

3. A value of three if they agree that they make the decision together.

This additional partial measure of agreement on decision-making was used because of its relevance for parental acceptance. It is believed that parents are more likely to be accepting of a child when the discipline of the child is agreed upon and not a source of marital conflict. When the decision is a joint one there is probably a greater opportunity for communication between the spouses. It is assumed that this greater opportunity for communication could lead to a higher degree of decision-making agreement.

Based upon the above discussion of the empirical measure of parents' agreement on decision making in relation to disciplining children the following empirical hypotheses can be stated.

**Empirical Null Hypothesis 43.** There is no positive relationship between the parent's agreement on decision-making in disciplining children score and the father's parental acceptance of disagreement score.

**Empirical Null Hypothesis 44.** There is no positive relationship between the parents' agreement on decision-making in disciplining children score and the father's parental acceptance of anger and hatefulness score.

**Empirical Null Hypothesis 45.** There is no positive relationship between the parents' agreement on decision-making in disciplining children score and the father's parental acceptance of child's slowness to learn score.
Empirical Null Hypothesis 46. There is no positive relationship between the parents' agreement on decision-making in disciplining children score and the mother's parental acceptance of disagreement score.

Empirical Null Hypothesis 47. There is no positive relationship between the parents' agreement on decision-making of disciplining children score and the mother's parental acceptance of anger and hatefulness score.

Empirical Null Hypothesis 48. There is no positive relationship between the parents' agreement on decision making in disciplining children score and the mother's parental acceptance of child's slowness to learn score.

Social environment concept. The concept of parent's social environment will be operationalized by two sub-concepts, social class and reference groups for purposes of this research. This was discussed in the Conceptual Framework chapter. According to Sears et al., (59) the two aspects of a parent's social environment which affect their child rearing practices are educational level and socio-economic level. Because of the way in which the latter variable is measured, the two aspects are not mutually exclusive. The educational level influences the occupational level, the income level, and the associates one will have. The stimulation of associates from a particular socio-economic level perpetuates certain attitudes, values and interests (59). Researchers have tended to find a positive relationship of educational level or socio-economic level with child rearing attitudes and practices (11, 68, 57).
Schaefer and Bell (57), found in developing the Parental Attitude Research Instrument (PARI), that the attitude measures which were related to education indicated that mothers with higher education had the more usually approved attitudes toward child rearing. Baldwin (5) reported the bulk of democratic parents in his study had a college education. Zuckerman et al., (68) used the PARI with a clinic group of mothers and reported the less-educated, lower-class mothers had more authoritarian, controlling attitudes. Other variables were significantly related to parental attitudes, but the relationships seemed to be a function of the relation of these variables to the mother's education.

In comparing 198 middle class and 174 working class mothers, Sears et al., (59) found certain child rearing practices in which the mother's education appeared to be a more critical factor than socio-economic level. The better-educated mothers toilet trained later, gave children more responsibility, used reasoning and not rewards in training, were less inclined to insist that a boy must be masculine and a girl feminine, employed less pressure for neatness, and were more permissive of the child's dependency. That is, those better-educated mothers were cognizant of the developmental stages of childhood and more accepting of the child as he was.

In considering the effects of education on a parent's child acceptance the process of education should be reviewed. Education is a means of developing verbal skills whereby communication is facilitated. Shared meanings, experiences and understandings result from better communication. Blood and Wolfe write:

People who go to high school and college develop skills in
communication and habits of self-expression. Hence, it is easier for them to express affection as well as to communicate information and opinions. Love is, after all, a kind of opinion -- a very favorable opinion of another person. (12, p. 229)

Higher levels of education result in higher levels of ability in self-expression and communication.

Based upon the above discussion the fifth middle range null hypothesis can be stated.

**Middle Range Null Hypothesis 5.** There is no positive relationship between a parent's educational level and his parental acceptance concepts of anger and hatefulness, disagreement and slowness to learn.

The empirical measure of educational level was the number of years of formal schooling completed. The following six categories were used to measure the level of education for the father and the mother.

1 - less than 8th grade
2 - completed 8th grade
3 - grades 9 - 11
4 - completed 12th grade
5 - grades 13 - 15
6 - 16 and over

Based upon the above discussion of the empirical measure of the level of education the following empirical hypotheses can be stated.

**Empirical Null Hypothesis 49.** There is no positive relationship between the father's formal education score and his parental acceptance of agreement score.

**Empirical Null Hypothesis 50.** There is no positive relationship between the father's formal education score and his parental
acceptance of anger and hatefulness score.

**Empirical Null Hypothesis 51.** There is no positive relationship between the father's formal education score and his parental acceptance of child's slowness to learn score.

**Empirical Null Hypothesis 52.** There is no positive relationship between a mother's formal education score and her parental acceptance of disagreement score.

**Empirical Null Hypothesis 53.** There is no positive relationship between mother's formal education score and her parental acceptance of anger and hatefulness score.

**Empirical Null Hypothesis 54.** There is no positive relationship between mother's formal education score and her parental acceptance of child's slowness to learn score.

Net family income Sears, *et al.*, (59) found there were some differences in child training practices. Some of the trends seemed to be a function of socio economic class independent of differences in mothers' educational levels. Middle class mothers left their children more often with a sitter or maid, showed more warmth to children and admiration for husbands, and used less ridicule and more isolation in disciplining.

Miller and Swanson (46), Sears, *et al.*, (59) and McKinley (19) all concluded that the family income affects a parent's child rearing philosophy. These three studies all found a positive relationship between the family income and the parent's parental acceptance.

Based upon the above discussion the sixth middle range null hypothesis can be stated.

**Middle Range Null Hypothesis 6.** There is no positive relationship
between a parent's income and his parental acceptance concepts of anger and hatefulness, disagreement and slowness to learn.

The empirical measure of farm income was obtained by subtracting total farm expenses from total farm receipts. A net farm income was computed for each family in the sample, and was derived by adding together total farm receipts, plus other receipts (interest, gifts, investments) and housewife's income and then subtracting total expenses. One hundred thousand dollars was added to the total income to take care of minus net farm incomes. The families were categorized into seven groups with numerical ratings ranging from one to seven as listed below (30):

1 - 99,999 or less
2 - 100,000 - 101,499
3 - 101,500 - 102,499
4 - 102,500 - 103,499
5 - 103,500 - 104,499
6 - 104,500 - 107,999
7 - 108,000 and over

Based upon the above discussion of the empirical measure of net farm income the following empirical hypotheses can be stated.

**Empirical Null Hypothesis 55.** There is no positive relationship between the parents' net farm income score and father's parental acceptance of disagreement score.

**Empirical Null Hypothesis 56.** There is no positive relationship between the parents' net farm income score and father's parental acceptance of anger and hatefulness score.

**Empirical Null Hypothesis 57.** There is no positive relationship
between the parents' net farm income score and father's parental acceptance of child's slowness to learn score.

**Empirical Null Hypothesis 58.** There is no positive relationship between the parents' net farm income score and mother's parental acceptance of disagreement score.

**Empirical Null Hypothesis 59.** There is no positive relationship between the parents' net farm income score and mother's parental acceptance of anger and hatefulness score.

**Empirical Null Hypothesis 60.** There is no positive relationship between the parents' net farm income score and mother's parental acceptance of child's slowness to learn score.

**Social participation** A second subconcept used to measure social environment is a parent's reference groups. As was discussed in the Conceptual Framework chapter the individual's reference groups are an important part of an individual's social environment. The parent's reference group may affect his opinions and behavior in regard to child rearing.

There will be a tendency for a parent to practice those child rearing practices approved by his reference group. Methodologically it would be very difficult to gather adequate data on relevant reference groups. The first task would be to gather data to determine which various reference groups individuals and husbands-wives use regarding child rearing practices. Once these reference groups were determined the researcher would have to determine the child rearing practices of the specified reference groups. These types of data were not available in this study. However, a gross measure of social interaction with relevant others was available. It has been found that individuals tend to associate with others who have somewhat
similar values and goals through formal group participation. In adoption research it has been found that social participation is significantly related to the adoption of newly recommended practices in farming. Further, similar relations have been found in relation to the adoption of new home-making practices. Inferentially it may be concluded that social participation should also be related to the acceptance of recommended practices in child rearing. Fully recognizing the tenuity of the inference it is assumed in this study that social participation is a measure of the degree and type of reference group influence on an individual parent.

Based upon the above discussion the seventh middle range null hypothesis may be stated.

**Middle Range Null Hypothesis 7.** There is no positive relationship between a parent's social participation and his parental acceptance concepts of anger and hatefulness, disagreement and slowness to learn.

The empirical measure of the father's social participation was determined by scoring for each organization, the highest of the following numbers (30):

1 - if he didn't belong
2 - if he belongs and attends less than half the time or belongs only
3 - if he attends half or more
4 - if he is a committee member
5 - if he is an officer

The same procedure was used to compute the mother's social participation score. Based upon the above discussion of mother's and father's social participation scores the following empirical hypotheses can be stated.

**Empirical Null Hypothesis 61.** There is no positive relationship
between a father's social participation score and his parental acceptance of disagreement score.

**Empirical Null Hypothesis 62.** There is no positive relationship between a father's social participation score and his parental acceptance of anger and hatefulness score.

**Empirical Null Hypothesis 63.** There is no positive relationship between a father's social participation score and his parental acceptance of child's slowness to learn score.

**Empirical Null Hypothesis 64.** There is no positive relationship between a mother's social participation score and her parental acceptance of disagreement score.

**Empirical Null Hypothesis 65.** There is no positive relationship between a mother's social participation score and her parental acceptance of anger and hatefulness score.

**Empirical Null Hypothesis 66.** There is no positive relationship between a mother's social participation score and her parental acceptance of child's slowness to learn score.

**Methods of Data Analysis**

**Correlation coefficient**

The Pearson's zero order correlation analysis was selected to establish the relationship of each independent variable with each dependent variable. It is not the purpose of this research to establish the causality of parental acceptance. Rather this research is concerned with factors associated with parental acceptance.

The assumption is made that a linear relationship exists between
parental acceptance and certain selected variables. According to Edwards:

The coefficient of correlation is a measure of the degree of linear association between two variables. The coefficient may be positive or negative in sign and range in value from -1.00 to 1.00. A correlation coefficient may be computed whenever observations are paired .... (18, p. 77)

A perfect linear association between two variables indicates that as one variable increases or decreases the other variable also increases or decreases in an equal amount. It is assumed that both the independent and dependent variables are on a continuum.

The coefficient of correlation will be used to test the assumption that a linear relationship exists between parental acceptance scores and certain selected independent variables. The .05 level of probability was selected for the test of significance.

Regression analysis

Because of the dynamics of family interaction patterns, a regression analysis was carried out. The results of this analysis will be presented in the Additional Findings section of the Findings chapter. The regression analysis emphasizes the fact that both estimates and tests depend on the independent variables included in the regression. In any one regression the estimates and tests are correlated; the whole complex changes if independent variables are added or deleted. In this sense, statements made about the predictive value of a variable are not unique, they depend upon the other variables being used in the regression.
Limitations

Before proceeding to the discussion on the findings in the next chapter, the reader is cautioned on the limitations of this research. First, the sample was not a random sample of Iowa families of the child rearing stage in the family life cycle. The criteria for sampling and the further restrictions on the families used in this study are presented in this chapter, page 40.

Second, the items used to obtain the empirical numerical measures of the independent variables may not be the most adequate measures of these independent variables. As was discussed earlier in this chapter these data were obtained in a larger research project with a number of different objectives. In a number of cases the data were not obtained for the purposes for which they are used in this study. Because of the large number of research objectives and the danger of interviewee fatigue there was a limit to the depth of information that could be obtained for any specific area. An example of the degree of depth was the use of years of education completed as the measure of subjects education. It is possible that during the child-rearing stage of the family life cycle that significant differences exist in child-rearing information possessed by parents with the same number of years of formal education.

Third, the six dependent variables selected to measure parental acceptance may not be the most relevant variables for measuring parental acceptance.

The fourth point is in regard to data collection. The use of the field schedule with trained interviewers is a major method of social science data collection. However, in areas of complex human behavior such
as parental acceptance it is possible that the responses which a subject gives the interviewer may not be the same feelings and actions which actually exist between parent-child. Thus, the actual responses to the six dependent variables may not have been the actual parent's parental acceptance on these selected items.
FINDINGS

Introduction

This chapter is a report of the analysis of data testing the relationship of selected variables with parental acceptance. As was discussed in the Procedure and Methods chapter three items were selected as measures of parental acceptance. Both the mothers and fathers were asked to respond independently to the items. Therefore, there are a total of six parental acceptance scores, three for the mother and three for the father. These dependent variables are as follows:

1. Father's parental acceptance of disagreement score
2. Mother's parental acceptance of disagreement score
3. Father's parental acceptance of anger and hatefulness score
4. Mother's parental acceptance of anger and hatefulness score
5. Father's parental acceptance of child's slowness to learn score
6. Mother's parental acceptance of child's slowness to learn score

A coefficient of correlation was computed to determine whether or not a linear relationship existed between the parental acceptance scores and scores of the independent variables. The computed correlation coefficient and its test for significance at the .05 level of probability with 273\(^1\) degrees of freedom is listed immediately following each empirical null hypothesis. The following discussion will list the three general level hypotheses, seven middle level hypotheses, 66 empirical hypotheses and state if the empirical hypotheses support the respective middle and general level hypotheses.

\(^1\)Although 273 is reported here and in other places the correct degrees of freedom is 272. The r value needed to be significant at the .05 level remains the same.
Relationship of Selected Factors with Parental Acceptance

Parent's self attitude

General Null Hypothesis I. There is no positive relationship between a parent's self attitudes and his parental acceptance.

Middle Range Null Hypothesis 1. There is no positive relationship between a parent's personality and his parental acceptance concepts of disagreement, anger and hatefulness, and slowness to learn.

Empirical Null Hypothesis 1. There is no positive relationship between a father's ascendancy score and his parental acceptance of his child's disagreement score.

The computed correlation coefficient of father's ascendancy score with his parental acceptance of disagreement score yielded a coefficient of 0.143. An r value of 0.117 is needed to be significant at the .05 level of probability with 273 degrees of freedom. Therefore, the null hypothesis is refuted. These data do support the middle and general hypothesis.

Empirical Null Hypothesis 2. There is no positive relationship between father's ascendancy score and his parental acceptance of anger and hatefulness score.

The computed correlation coefficient of father's ascendancy score with his parental acceptance of anger and hatefulness score yielded a coefficient of 0.108. An r value of 0.117 is needed to be significant at the .05 level of probability with 273 degrees of freedom. Therefore, the null hypothesis is not refuted. These data do not support the middle and general hypotheses.

Empirical Null Hypothesis 3. There is no positive relationship
between father's ascendancy score and his parental acceptance of child's slowness to learn score.

The computed correlation coefficient of father's ascendancy score with his parental acceptance of child's slowness to learn score yielded a coefficient of -.020. An r value of .117 is needed to be significant at the .05 level of probability with 273 degrees of freedom. Therefore, the null hypothesis is not refuted. These data do not support the middle and general hypotheses.

**Empirical Null Hypothesis 4.** There is no positive relationship between mother's ascendancy score and her parental acceptance of disagreement score.

The computed correlation coefficient of mother's ascendancy score with her parental acceptance of disagreement score yielded a coefficient of .113. An r value of .117 is needed to be significant at the .05 level of probability with 273 degrees of freedom. Therefore, the null hypothesis is not refuted. These data do not support the middle and general hypotheses.

**Empirical Null Hypothesis 5.** There is no positive relationship between mother's ascendancy score and her parental acceptance of anger and hatefulness score.

The computed correlation coefficient of mother's ascendancy score with her parental acceptance of anger and hatefulness score yielded a coefficient of .112. An r value of .117 is needed to be significant at the .05 level of probability with 273 degrees of freedom. Therefore, the null hypothesis is not refuted. These data do not support the middle and general hypotheses.

**Empirical Null Hypothesis 6.** There is no positive relationship between mother's ascendancy score and her parental acceptance of
child's slowness to learn score.

The computed correlation coefficient of mother's ascendancy score with her parental acceptance of child's slowness to learn score yielded a coefficient of .064. An r value of .117 is needed to be significant at the .05 level of probability with 273 degrees of freedom. Therefore, the null hypothesis is not refuted. These data do not support the middle and general hypotheses.

**Empirical Null Hypothesis 7.** There is no positive relationship between father's responsibility score and his parental acceptance of disagreement score.

The computed correlation coefficient of father's responsibility score with his parental acceptance of disagreement score yielded a coefficient of .155. An r value of .117 is needed to be significant at the .05 level of probability with 273 degrees of freedom. Therefore, the null hypothesis is refuted. These data do support the middle and general hypotheses.

**Empirical Null Hypothesis 8.** There is no positive relationship between father's responsibility score and his parental acceptance of anger and hatefulness score.

The computed correlation coefficient of father's responsibility score with his parental acceptance of anger and hatefulness score yielded a coefficient of -.031. An r value of .117 is needed to be significant at the .05 level of probability with 273 degrees of freedom. Therefore, the null hypothesis is not refuted. These data do not support the middle and general hypotheses.

**Empirical Null Hypothesis 9.** There is no positive relationship between father's responsibility score and his parental acceptance
of child's slowness to learn score.

The computed correlation coefficient of father's responsibility score with his parental acceptance of child's slowness to learn score yielded a coefficient of -.121. An r value of .117 is needed to be significant at the .05 level of probability with 273 degrees of freedom. Therefore, the null hypothesis is not refuted. These data do not support the middle and general hypotheses.

**Empirical Null Hypothesis 10.** There is no positive relationship between mother's responsibility score and her parental acceptance of disagreement score.

The computed correlation coefficient of mother's responsibility score with her parental acceptance of disagreement score yielded a coefficient of .044. An r value of .117 is needed to be significant at the .05 level of probability with 273 degrees of freedom. Therefore, the null hypothesis is not refuted. These data do not support the middle and general hypotheses.

**Empirical Null Hypothesis 11.** There is no positive relationship between mother's responsibility score and her parental acceptance of anger and hatefulness score.

The computed correlation coefficient of mother's responsibility score with her parental acceptance of anger and hatefulness score yielded a coefficient of .112. An r value of .117 is needed to be significant at the .05 level of probability with 273 degrees of freedom. Therefore, the null hypothesis is not refuted. These data do not support the middle and general hypotheses.

**Empirical Null Hypothesis 12.** There is no positive relationship
between mother's responsibility score and her parental acceptance of child's slowness to learn score.

The computed correlation coefficient of mother's responsibility score with her parental acceptance of child's slowness to learn score yielded a coefficient of -0.048. An r value of 0.117 is needed to be significant at the .05 level of probability with 273 degrees of freedom. Therefore, the null hypothesis is not refuted. These data do not support the middle and general hypotheses.

*Empirical Null Hypothesis 13.* There is no positive relationship between father's emotional stability score and his parental acceptance of disagreement score.

The computed correlation coefficient of father's emotional stability score with his parental acceptance of disagreement score yielded a coefficient of 0.118. An r value of 0.117 is needed to be significant at the .05 level of probability with 273 degrees of freedom. Therefore, the null hypothesis is refuted. These data do support the middle and general hypotheses.

*Empirical Null Hypothesis 14.* There is no positive relationship between father's emotional stability score and his parental acceptance of anger and hatefulness score.

The computed correlation coefficient of father's emotional stability score with his parental acceptance of anger and hatefulness score yielded a coefficient of 0.022. An r value of 0.117 is needed to be significant at the .05 level of probability with 273 degrees of freedom. Therefore, the null hypothesis is not refuted. These data do not support the middle and general hypotheses.
Empirical Null Hypothesis 15. There is no positive relationship between father's emotional stability score and his parental acceptance of child's slowness to learn score.

The computed correlation coefficient of father's emotional stability score with his parental acceptance of child's slowness to learn score yielded a coefficient of -.010. An $r$ value of .117 is needed to be significant at the .05 level of probability with 273 degrees of freedom. Therefore, the null hypothesis is not refuted. These data do not support the middle and general hypotheses.

Empirical Null Hypothesis 16. There is no positive relationship between mother's emotional stability score and her parental acceptance of disagreement score.

The computed correlation coefficient of mother's emotional stability score with her parental acceptance of disagreement score yielded a coefficient of .068. An $r$ value of .117 is needed to be significant at the .05 level of probability with 273 degrees of freedom. Therefore, the null hypothesis is not refuted. These data do not support the middle and general hypotheses.

Empirical Null Hypothesis 17. There is no positive relationship between mother's emotional stability score and her parental acceptance of anger and hatefulness score.

The computed correlation coefficient of mother's emotional stability score with her parental acceptance of anger and hatefulness score yielded a coefficient of .009. An $r$ value of .117 is needed to be significant at the .05 level of probability with 273 degrees of freedom. Therefore, the null hypothesis is not refuted. These data do not support the middle and
general hypotheses.

**Empirical Null Hypothesis 18.** There is no positive relationship between mother's emotional stability score and her parental acceptance of child's slowness to learn score.

The computed correlation coefficient of mother's emotional stability score with her parental acceptance of child's slowness to learn score yielded a coefficient of -.035. An r value of .117 is needed to be significant at the .05 level of probability with 273 degrees of freedom. Therefore, the null hypothesis is not refuted. These data do not support the middle and general hypotheses.

**Empirical Null Hypothesis 19.** There is no positive relationship between father's sociability score and his parental acceptance of disagreement score.

The computed correlation coefficient of father's stability score with his parental acceptance of disagreement score yielded a coefficient of .122. An r value of .117 is needed to be significant at the .05 level of probability with 273 degrees of freedom. Therefore, the null hypothesis is refuted. These data do support the middle and general hypotheses.

**Empirical Null Hypothesis 20.** There is no positive relationship between father's sociability score and his parental acceptance of anger and hatefulness score.

The computed correlation coefficient of father's sociability score with his parental acceptance of anger and hatefulness score yielded a coefficient of .044. An r value of .117 is needed to be significant at the .05 level of probability with 273 degrees of freedom. Therefore, the null hypothesis is not refuted. These data do not support the middle and
general hypotheses.

**Empirical Null Hypothesis 21.** There is no positive relationship between father's sociability score and his parental acceptance of child's slowness to learn score.

The computed correlation coefficient of father's sociability score with his parental acceptance of child's slowness to learn score yielded a coefficient of -.051. An r value of .117 is needed to be significant at the .05 level of probability with 273 degrees of freedom. Therefore, the null hypothesis is not refuted. These data do not support the middle and general hypotheses.

**Empirical Null Hypothesis 22.** There is no positive relationship between mother's sociability score and her parental acceptance of disagreement score.

The computed correlation coefficient of mother's sociability score with her parental acceptance of disagreement score yielded a coefficient of .045. An r value of .117 is needed to be significant at the .05 level of probability with 273 degrees of freedom. Therefore, the null hypothesis is not refuted. These data do not support the middle and general hypotheses.

**Empirical Null Hypothesis 23.** There is no positive relationship between mother's sociability score and her parental acceptance of anger and hatefulness score.

The computed correlation coefficient of mother's sociability score with her parental acceptance of anger and hatefulness score yielded a coefficient of .024. An r value of .117 is needed to be significant at the .05 level of probability with 273 degrees of freedom. Therefore, the null
hypothesis is not refuted. These data do not support the middle and general hypotheses.

**Empirical Null Hypothesis 24.** There is no positive relationship between mother's sociability score and her parental acceptance of child's slowness to learn score.

The computed correlation coefficient of mother's sociability score with her parental acceptance of child's slowness to learn score yielded a coefficient of .101. An r value of .117 is needed to be significant at the .05 level of probability with 273 degrees of freedom. Therefore, the null hypothesis is not refuted. These data do not support the middle and general hypotheses.

**Marital adjustment**

**General Null Hypothesis II.** There is no positive relationship between the parent's marital adjustment and his parental acceptance.

Three variables have been identified for this research as possible indicators of marital adjustment. These variables are togetherness on decision-making, similarity of education, goal agreement and agreement on decision making regarding disciplining children.

**Similarity of education** As was discussed in the Conceptual Framework chapter, there could be a relationship between the similarity of husband's and wife's educational level and their parental acceptance. This similarity of education could mean that the couple had similar learning experiences. With similar past learning experiences the parents could have a greater degree of communication resulting in less marital conflict.

Following will be the middle range null hypothesis stating the
relationship of the concept of similar education with parental acceptance and the derived empirical hypotheses.

**Middle Range Null Hypothesis 2.** There is no positive relationship between parents' similar education and a parent's parental acceptance concepts of anger and hatefulness, disagreement and slowness to learn.

**Empirical Null Hypothesis 25.** There is no positive relationship between the similar educational score and father's parental acceptance of disagreement score.

The computed correlation coefficient of the similar educational score with the father's parental acceptance of disagreement score yielded a coefficient of .015. An r value of .117 is needed to be significant at the .05 level of probability with 273 degrees of freedom. Therefore, the null hypothesis is not refuted. These data do not support the middle and general hypotheses.

**Empirical Null Hypothesis 26.** There is no positive relationship between the similar educational score and father's parental acceptance of anger and hatefulness score.

The computed correlation coefficient of similar educational score with father's parental acceptance of anger and hatefulness score yielded a coefficient of .049. An r value of .117 is needed to be significant at the .05 level of probability with 273 degrees of freedom. Therefore, the null hypothesis is not refuted. These data do not support the middle and general hypotheses.

**Empirical Null Hypothesis 27.** There is no positive relationship between the similar educational score and father's parental acceptance of child's slowness to learn score.
The computed correlation coefficient of similar educational score with father's parental acceptance of child's slowness to learn score yielded a coefficient of .075. An r value of .117 is needed to be significant at the .05 level of probability with 273 degrees of freedom. Therefore, the null hypothesis is not refuted. These data do not support the middle and general hypotheses.

**Empirical Null Hypothesis 28.** There is no positive relationship between the similar educational score and mother's parental acceptance of disagreement score.

The computed correlation coefficient of similar educational score with mother's parental acceptance of disagreement score yielded a coefficient of .048. An r value of .117 is needed to be significant at the .05 level of probability with 273 degrees of freedom. Therefore, the null hypothesis is not refuted. These data do not support the middle and general hypotheses.

**Empirical Null Hypothesis 29.** There is no positive relationship between the similar education score and mother's parental acceptance of anger and hatefulness score.

The computed correlation coefficient of similar education score with mother's parental acceptance of anger and hatefulness score yielded a coefficient of .007. An r value of .117 is needed to be significant at the .05 level of probability with 273 degrees of freedom. Therefore, the null hypothesis is not refuted. These data do not support the middle and general hypotheses.

**Empirical Null Hypothesis 30.** There is no positive relationship between the similar educational score and another's parental
acceptance of child's slowness to learn score.

The computed correlation coefficient of similar educational score with mother's parental acceptance of child's slowness to learn score yielded a coefficient of .075. An r value of .117 is needed to be significant at the .05 level of probability with 273 degrees of freedom. Therefore, the null hypothesis is not refuted. These data do not support the middle and general hypotheses.

Goal agreement As was discussed in the Conceptual Framework chapter an individual's goals reflect his values and attitudes. Married partners who share similar attitudes and values are less likely to have marital conflict. Also, when husbands and wives have goal agreement there could be a greater amount of communication and cooperation. For example if the husband's goal is to raise a family of six and the wife's goal is to have no family there is a greater possibility for conflict than when both the husband and wife have a commonly agreed upon goal for family planning.

Following will be the middle range null hypothesis stating the relationship of the concept of agreement on goals with parental acceptance and the derived empirical hypotheses.

Middle Range Null Hypothesis 3. There is no positive relationship between parents' agreement on goals and a parent's acceptance concepts of disagreement, anger and hatefulness and slowness to learn.

Empirical Null Hypothesis 31. There is no positive relationship between the parents' agreement on goals score and the father's parental acceptance of disagreement score.

The computed correlation coefficient of the parents' agreement on
goals score with father's parental acceptance of disagreement score yielded a coefficient of .111. An r value of .117 is needed to be significant at the .05 level of probability with 273 degrees of freedom. Therefore, the null hypothesis is not refuted. These data do not support the middle and general hypotheses.

**Empirical Null Hypothesis 32.** There is no positive relationship between the parents' agreement on goals score and the father's parental acceptance of anger and hatefulness score.

The computed correlation coefficient of parents' agreement on goals score with father's acceptance of anger and hatefulness score yielded a coefficient of .045. An r value of .117 is needed to be significant at the .05 level of probability with 273 degrees of freedom. Therefore, the null hypothesis is not refuted. These data do not support the middle and general hypotheses.

**Empirical Null Hypothesis 33.** There is no positive relationship between the parents' agreement on goals score and the father's parental acceptance of child's slowness to learn score.

The computed correlation coefficient of parents' agreement of goals score with father's parental acceptance of child's slowness to learn score yielded a coefficient of -.041. An r value of .117 is needed to be significant at the .05 level of probability with 273 degrees of freedom. Therefore, the null hypothesis is not refuted. These data do not support the middle and general hypotheses.

**Empirical Null Hypothesis 34.** There is no positive relationship between the parents' agreement on goals score and the mother's parental acceptance of disagreement score.
The computed correlation coefficient of parents' agreement on goals score with mother's parental acceptance of disagreement score yielded a coefficient of -.107. An r value of .117 is needed to be significant at the .05 level of probability with 273 degrees of freedom. Therefore, the null hypothesis is not refuted. These data do not support the middle and general hypotheses.

**Empirical Null Hypothesis 35.** There is no positive relationship between the parents' agreement on goals score and the mother's parental acceptance of anger and hatefulness score.

The computed correlation coefficient of parents' agreement on goals score with the mother's parental acceptance of anger and hatefulness score yielded a coefficient of -.022. An r value of .117 is needed to be significant at the .05 level of probability with 273 degrees of freedom. Therefore, the null hypothesis is not refuted. These data do not support the middle and general hypotheses.

**Empirical Null Hypothesis 36.** There is no positive relationship between the parents' agreement on goals score and the mother's parental acceptance of child's slowness to learn score.

The computed correlation coefficient of parents' agreement on goals score with the mother's parental acceptance of child's slowness to learn score yielded a coefficient of -.134. An r value of .117 is needed to be significant at the .05 level of probability with 273 degrees of freedom. Therefore, the null hypothesis is not refuted. These data do not support the middle and general hypotheses.
Togetherness on decision-making  

Husbands and wives that make joint decisions could have more opportunity to communicate. An increased mutual understanding of factors involved in decision-making could result in a greater degree of marital adjustment.

Following will be the middle range null hypothesis stating the relationship of the concept of agreement on decision-making with parental acceptance and the derived empirical hypotheses.

Middle Range Null Hypothesis 4. There is no positive relationship between parents' agreement on decision making and a parent's acceptance concepts of disagreement, anger and hatefulness and slowness to learn.

Empirical Null Hypothesis 37. There is no positive relationship between the parents' agreement on decision-making score and the father's parental acceptance of disagreement score.

The computed correlation coefficient of parents' agreement on decision-making score with father's parental acceptance of disagreement score yielded a coefficient of .033. An r of .117 is needed to be significant at the .05 level of probability with 273 degrees of freedom. Therefore, the null hypothesis is not refuted. These data do not support the middle and general hypotheses.

Empirical Null Hypothesis 38. There is no positive relationship between the parents' agreement on decision-making score and the father's parental acceptance of anger and hatefulness score.

The computed correlation coefficient of parents' agreement on decision-making score with father's parental acceptance of anger and hatefulness score yielded a coefficient of .033. An r value of .117 is needed
to be significant at the .05 level of probability with 273 degrees of freedom. Therefore, the null hypothesis is not refuted. These data do not support the middle and general hypotheses.

**Empirical Null Hypothesis 39.** There is no positive relationship between the parents' agreement on decision-making score and the father's parental acceptance of child's slowness to learn score.

The computed correlation coefficient of parent's agreement of decision-making score with the father's parental acceptance of child's slowness to learn score yielded a coefficient of .016. An r value of .117 is needed to be significant at the .05 level of probability with 273 degrees of freedom. Therefore, the null hypothesis is not refuted. These data do not support the middle and general hypotheses.

**Empirical Null Hypothesis 40.** There is no positive relationship between the parents' agreement on decision-making score and the mother's parental acceptance of disagreement score.

The computed correlation coefficient of parents' agreement on decision-making score with the mother's parental acceptance of disagreement score yielded a coefficient of .102. An r value of .117 is needed to be significant at the .05 level of probability with 273 degrees of freedom. Therefore, the null hypothesis is not refuted. These data do not support the middle and general hypotheses.

**Empirical Null Hypothesis 41.** There is no positive relationship between the parents' agreement on decision-making score and the mother's parental acceptance of anger and hatefulness score.

The computed correlation coefficient of parents' agreement on
decision-making score with the mother's parental acceptance of anger and hatefulness score yielded a coefficient of -.015. An r value of .117 is needed to be significant at the .05 level of probability with 273 degrees of freedom. Therefore, the null hypothesis is not refuted. These data do not support the middle and general hypotheses.

**Empirical Null Hypothesis 42.** There is no positive relationship between the parents' agreement on decision-making score and the mother's parental acceptance of child's slowness to learn score.

The computed correlation coefficient of parents' agreement on decision-making score and the mother's parental acceptance of child's slowness to learn score yielded a coefficient of -.138. An r value of .117 is needed to be significant at the .05 level of probability with 273 degrees of freedom. Therefore, the null hypothesis is refuted. These data do support the middle and general hypotheses.

**Agreement on decision-making regarding disciplining children** Agreement on decision-making regarding discipline of children was one of the items used to obtain the general agreement on decision-making score. It was assumed that husbands and wives that make decisions together in disciplining children could have less conflict on this family function. When the children are not a source of possible conflict, the parents acceptance of them could be greater.

The empirical null hypotheses stating this relationship, the computed correlation coefficient and the test of significance are as follows:

**Empirical Null Hypothesis 43.** There is no positive relationship
between the parents' agreement on decision-making in disciplining children score and the father's parental acceptance of disagreement score.

The computed correlation coefficient of parents' agreement on decision-making in disciplining children score with the father's parental acceptance of disagreement score yielded a coefficient of .013. An r of .117 is needed to be significant at the .05 level of probability with 273 degrees of freedom. Therefore, the null hypothesis is not refuted. These data do not support the middle and general hypotheses.

_Empirical Null Hypothesis 44._ There is no positive relationship between the parents' agreement on decision-making in disciplining children score and the father's parental acceptance of anger and hatefulness score.

The computed correlation coefficient of parents' agreement on decision-making in disciplining children score with the father's parental acceptance of anger and hatefulness score yielded a coefficient of .016. An r value of .117 is needed to be significant at the .05 level of probability with 273 degrees of freedom. Therefore, the null hypothesis is not refuted. These data do not support the middle and general hypotheses.

_Empirical Null Hypothesis 45._ There is no positive relationship between the parents' agreement on decision-making in disciplining children score and the father's parental acceptance of child's slowness to learn score.

The computed correlation coefficient of parents' agreement on decision-making in disciplining children score with the father's parental acceptance of child's slowness to learn score yielded a coefficient of
-0.027. An r value of .117 is needed to be significant at the .05 level of probability with 273 degrees of freedom. Therefore, the null hypothesis is not refuted. These data do not support the middle and general hypotheses.

Empirical Null Hypothesis 46. There is no positive relationship between the parents' agreement on decision-making in disciplining children score and the mother's parental acceptance of disagreement score.

The computed correlation coefficient of parents' agreement of decision-making in disciplining children score with the mother's parental acceptance of disagreement score yielded a coefficient of .078. An r value of .117 is needed to be significant at the .05 level of probability with 273 degrees of freedom. Therefore, the null hypothesis is not refuted. These data do not support the middle and general hypotheses.

Empirical Null Hypothesis 47. There is no positive relationship between the parents' agreement on decision-making in disciplining children score and the mother's parental acceptance of anger and hatefulness score.

The computed correlation coefficient of parents' agreement of decision-making in disciplining children score with the mother's parental acceptance of anger and hatefulness score yielded a coefficient of -.017. An r value of .117 is needed to be significant at the .05 level of probability with 273 degrees of freedom. Therefore, the null hypothesis is not refuted. These data do not support the middle and general hypotheses.

Empirical Null Hypothesis 48. There is no positive relationship between the parents' agreement on decision making in
disciplining children score and the mother's parental acceptance of child's slowness to learn score.

The computed correlation coefficient of parents' agreement on decision-making in disciplining children score with the mother's parental acceptance of child's slowness to learn score yielded a coefficient of -.107. An r value of .117 is needed to be significant at the .05 level of probability with 273 degrees of freedom. Therefore, the null hypothesis is not refuted. These data do not support the middle and general hypotheses.

Social environment

In the Conceptual Framework chapter two sub-concepts of social environment were identified. The first of these was social class and the second was reference groups. The parents' social class could affect his access and use of scientific information. Scientific information on child rearing practices was the criteria used to score the parental acceptance items. Thus, a parent with more access to scientific information and more orientated to using it could be expected to score higher on the parental acceptance measures of this research. In the Procedure and Methods chapter education and net income were identified as dimensions of social class important for this research.

Education Education is a means of developing verbal skills whereby communication is facilitated. Parents with higher levels of education tend to have higher levels of ability in self-expression and communication. The ability to communicate is an important aspect of parent child relations. Parents with higher levels of education also tend to make more use of scientific information. The criteria used to develop the parental
acceptance scores for this research were based on scientific information.

Following will be the middle range null hypothesis stating the relationship of the concept of educational level with parental acceptance and the derived empirical hypotheses.

**Middle Range Null Hypothesis 5.** There is no positive relationship between a parent's educational level and his parental acceptance concepts of disagreement, anger and hatefulness and slowness to learn.

**Empirical Null Hypothesis 49.** There is no positive relationship between the father's educational level and his parental acceptance of disagreement score.

The computed correlation coefficient of father's educational level with his parental acceptance of disagreement score yielded a coefficient of .080. An r of .117 is needed to be significant at the .05 level of probability with 273 degrees of freedom. Therefore, the null hypothesis is not refuted. These data do not support the middle and general hypotheses.

**Net family income** Net family income is one indicator of the husband's and wife's ability to manage in general. Brim (13) has identified the parent's ability to be a good home manager as one of seven major criteria of a good parent. A good home manager is a parent who can perform the administrative procedures which make a home run smoothly. Children need to be fed, playtimes managed, toys purchased, baths given and housework completed.

Following will be the middle range null hypothesis stating the relationship of the concept net farm income with parental acceptance and the
derived empirical hypotheses.

**Middle Range Null Hypothesis 6.** There is no positive relationship between parents' net income and a parent's acceptance concept of disagreement, anger and hatefulness and slowness to learn.

**Empirical Null Hypothesis 55.** There is no relationship between the parents' net farm income and father's parental acceptance of disagreement score.

The computed correlation coefficient of net family income with father's parental acceptance of disagreement score yielded a coefficient of .110. An r of .117 is needed to be significant at the .05 level of probability with 273 degrees of freedom. Therefore, the null hypothesis is not refuted. These data do not support the middle and general hypotheses.

**Empirical Null Hypothesis 56.** There is no positive relationship between the parents' net farm income score and father's parental acceptance of anger and hatefulness score.

The computed correlation coefficient of parents' net farm income score with father's parental acceptance of anger and hatefulness score yielded a coefficient of -.002. An r value of .117 is needed to be significant at the .05 level of probability with 273 degrees of freedom. Therefore, the null hypothesis is not refuted. These data do not support the middle and general hypotheses.

**Empirical Null Hypothesis 57.** There is no positive relationship between the parents' net farm income score and father's parental acceptance of child's slowness to learn score.

The computed correlation coefficient of parents' net farm income score with father's parental acceptance of child's slowness to learn score
yielded a coefficient of -.021. An r value of .117 is needed to be significant at the .05 level of probability with 273 degrees of freedom. Therefore, the null hypothesis is not refuted. These data do not support the middle and general hypotheses.

**Empirical Null Hypothesis 58.** There is no positive relationship between the parents' net farm income score and mother's parental acceptance of disagreement score.

The computed correlation coefficient of parents' net farm income score with mother's parental acceptance of disagreement score yielded a coefficient of .047. An r value of .117 is needed to be significant at the .05 level of probability with 273 degrees of freedom. Therefore, the null hypothesis is not refuted. These data do not support the middle and general hypotheses.

**Empirical Null Hypothesis 59.** There is no positive relationship between the parents' net farm income score and mother's parental acceptance of anger and hatefulness score.

The computed correlation coefficient of parents' net farm income score with mother's parental acceptance of anger and hatefulness score yielded a coefficient of .041. An r value of .117 is needed to be significant at the .05 level of probability with 273 degrees of freedom. Therefore, the null hypothesis is not refuted. These data do not support the middle and general hypotheses.

**Empirical Null Hypothesis 60.** There is no positive relationship between the parents' net farm income score and mother's parental acceptance of child's slowness to learn score.

The computed correlation coefficient of parents' net farm income score
with mother's parental acceptance of child's slowness to learn score yielded a coefficient of .028. An r value of .117 is needed to be significant at the .05 level of probability with 273 degrees of freedom. Therefore, the null hypothesis is not refuted. These data do not support the middle and general hypotheses.

Social participation The amount of social participation is one aspect of a parent's social environment. Interaction with other individuals is an important reference criteria for an individual's evaluation of his own behavior. One of the processes of diffusion of scientific information is through social participation of the individual.

Following will be the middle range null hypothesis stating the relationship of the concept of social participation with parental acceptance and the derived empirical hypotheses.

Middle Range Null Hypothesis 7. There is no relationship between the parent's social participation score and his parental acceptance concept of disagreement, anger and hatefulness and slowness to learn.

Empirical Null Hypothesis 61. There is no positive relationship between a father's social participation score and his parental acceptance of disagreement score.

The computed correlation coefficient of father's social participation score with his parental acceptance of disagreement score yielded a coefficient of .072. An r value of .117 is needed to be significant at the .05 level of probability with 273 degrees of freedom. Therefore, the null hypothesis is not refuted. These data do not support the middle and general hypotheses.
Empirical Null Hypothesis 62. There is no positive relationship between a father's social participation score and his parental acceptance of anger and hatefulness score.

The computed correlation coefficient of father's social participation score with his parental acceptance of anger and hatefulness score yielded a coefficient of .055. An r value of .117 is needed to be significant at the .05 level of probability with 273 degrees of freedom. Therefore, the null hypothesis is not refuted. These data do not support the middle and general hypotheses.

Empirical Null Hypothesis 63. There is no positive relationship between a father's social participation score and his parental acceptance of child's slowness to learn score.

The computed correlation coefficient of father's social participation score with his parental acceptance of child's slowness to learn score yielded a coefficient of .037. An r value of .117 is needed to be significant at the .05 level of probability with 273 degrees of freedom. Therefore, the null hypothesis is not refuted. These data do not support the middle and general hypotheses.

Empirical Null Hypothesis 64. There is no positive relationship between a mother's social participation score and her parental acceptance of disagreement score.

The computed correlation coefficient of mother's social participation score with her parental acceptance of disagreement score yielded a coefficient of .083. An r value of .117 is needed to be significant at the .05 level of probability with 273 degrees of freedom. Therefore, the null hypothesis is not refuted. These data do not support the middle and
Empirical Null Hypothesis 65. There is no positive relationship between a mother's social participation score and her parental acceptance of anger and hatefulness score.

The computed correlation coefficient of mother's social participation score with her parental acceptance of anger and hatefulness score yielded a coefficient of .031. An r value of .117 is needed to be significant at the .05 level of probability with 273 degrees of freedom. Therefore, the null hypothesis is not refuted. These data do not support the middle and general hypotheses.

Empirical Null Hypothesis 66. There is no positive relationship between a mother's social participation score and her parental acceptance of child's slowness to learn score.

The computed correlation coefficient of mother's social participation score with her parental acceptance of child's slowness to learn score yielded a coefficient of -.021. An r value of .117 is needed to be significant at the .05 level of probability with 273 degrees of freedom. Therefore, the null hypothesis is not refuted. These data do not support the middle and general hypotheses.

Relationships of Findings to Middle and General Level Concepts

Parent's self attitudes

The concept parent's personality was derived from the more general concept of parent's self attitudes. This was the only middle range concept derived from parent's self attitudes. As was discussed in the Procedure and Method chapter, there were four measures of personality and three
measures of parent's parental acceptance. Therefore, there were 12 empirical hypotheses testing the relationships between father's personality scores and his parental acceptance scores and 12 empirical hypotheses testing the relationship between mother's personality and her parental acceptance scores. Four of the 12 empirical hypotheses pertaining to father's parental acceptance were positively significant at the .05 level of probability. The significant relationships were as follows:

1. Father's ascendancy score with his parental acceptance of disagreement score.
2. Father's responsibility score with his parental acceptance of disagreement score.
3. Father's emotional stability score with his parental acceptance of disagreement score.
4. Father's sociability score with his parental acceptance of disagreement score.

Hence, four of the father's personality factors were significantly related to the father's parental acceptance of disagreement score. There were no positively significant relationships between any of the father's personality factors and his parental acceptance of anger and hatefulness score or acceptance of slowness to learn score. Although a positive relationship was hypothesized there was a significant negative correlation of father's responsibility score with his parental acceptance of child's slowness to learn score.

None of the 12 empirical hypothesized relationships of mother's parental acceptance variables with mother's personality scores were significant at the .05 level of probability.
In summary, there were empirical supports to refute four of the 24 empirical null hypotheses stating the relationship between personality and the dependent concept, parental acceptance.

**Marital adjustment**

Four middle range concepts were derived from the general concept marital adjustment. These were similar parents' education, parents' agreement on goals, parents' agreement on decision-making and parents agreement on decision-making in disciplining children. Therefore, there were a total of six empirical hypotheses for each middle range concept or a total of 24 empirical hypotheses relating to the concept marital adjustment.

There were no positive significant relationships between the parents' empirical scores for these concepts and their parental acceptance score.

There were two negative significant relationships at the .05 level of probability between mother's empirical scores for the sub-concepts of marital adjustment and her parental acceptance scores when a positive relationship had been hypothesized. The two relationships were as follows:

1. Parents' agreement on decision-making and mother's parental acceptance of child's slowness to learn score.
2. Parents' agreement on goals score and mother's parental acceptance of child's slowness to learn score.

**Social environment**

Two major sub-concepts were derived from the general concept, social environment. These were social class and reference groups.

A parent's educational level and the parents' net farm income were selected as middle range concepts for measuring social class. The parent's
social participation score was selected as a measure of reference group influence on parental acceptance.

There were no significant relationships between the empirical scores measuring the three middle range concepts derived from social environment and the parent's parental acceptance scores. There was no evidence for refuting any of the 18 hypothesized relationships of social environment scores with parental acceptance scores.

Additional Findings

A regression analysis was selected as an additional analysis in order to determine the contribution for each of the independent variables with each dependent variable. The results of the regression analysis are reported in Table 9. A b value and the computed test for significance, t value is reported for each independent variable.¹

The 17 independent variables used in the regression analysis are the same variables as those used in the correlation analysis. The 17 variables are listed in 7. The X numbers will be used to identify the variables in Table 7.

The six dependent variables used in the regression analysis are the same variables as those used in the correlation analysis. The six variables are listed in Table 8. The Y numbers will be used to identify the variables in Table 9.

The significant findings of the regression analysis will be presented in the following paragraphs for each of the six dependent variables. This

¹Throughout this dissertation b will be used to mean partial regression coefficient and t will be used to mean the computed t value of a t test.
Table 7. Independent variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable number</th>
<th>Variable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X₁</td>
<td>Father's ascendancy score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X₂</td>
<td>Father's responsibility score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X₃</td>
<td>Father's emotional stability score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X₄</td>
<td>Father's sociability score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X₅</td>
<td>Mother's ascendancy score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X₆</td>
<td>Mother's responsibility score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X₇</td>
<td>Mother's emotional stability score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X₈</td>
<td>Mother's sociability score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X₉</td>
<td>Parents' agreement on decision-making score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X₁₀</td>
<td>Parents' agreement on goals score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X₁₁</td>
<td>Parents' net farm income score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X₁₂</td>
<td>Father's formal education score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X₁₃</td>
<td>Mother's formal education score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X₁₄</td>
<td>Father's social participation score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X₁₅</td>
<td>Mother's social participation score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X₁₆</td>
<td>Parents' similar formal education score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X₁₇</td>
<td>Parents' agreement on decision-making in disciplining children</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The method of presentation is used because each regression of the 17 independent variables regressed on a dependent variable is an independent analysis. The computed partial regression coefficients will be reported for the regression analyses which are significant at the .05 level of probability. The computed t used to test each partial regression coefficient will also
Table 8. Dependent variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable number</th>
<th>Variables</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Y₁</td>
<td>Father's parental acceptance of disagreement score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y₂</td>
<td>Mother's parental acceptance of disagreement score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y₃</td>
<td>Father's parental acceptance of anger and hatefulness score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y₄</td>
<td>Mother's parental acceptance of anger and hatefulness score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y₅</td>
<td>Father's parental acceptance of child's slowness to learn score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y₆</td>
<td>Mother's parental acceptance of child's slowness to learn score</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

be reported. For a t value to be significant at the .05 level it must be 1.97 or greater (18, p. 361). The $R^2$ representing the amount of variance of each dependent variable explained by all the independent variables when regressed on the dependent variable will be reported. The computed F used to test the significance of $R^2$ will also be reported. An F value of 1.99 or greater is needed to be significant at the .05 level of probability (18, p. 365).

Father's parental acceptance of disagreement score

There were no significant partial regression coefficients obtained when the 17 independent variables were regressed on the dependent variable of father's parental acceptance of disagreement score.

The overall $R^2$ was .09 for all of the 17 independent variables regressed on the dependent variable, father's parental acceptance of disagreement score. The computed F of 1.42 is not significant at the .05 level of probability.
Table 9. Results of multiple regression analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
<th>$Y_1$ b's</th>
<th>$Y_2$ b's</th>
<th>$Y_3$ b's</th>
<th>$Y_4$ b's</th>
<th>$Y_5$ b's</th>
<th>$Y_6$ b's</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>t</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$X_1$</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-1.90</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-1.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$X_2$</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.40</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$X_3$</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$X_4$</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$X_5$</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>1.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$X_6$</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>-.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$X_7$</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-1.02</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$X_8$</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-1.52</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$X_9$</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>-.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$X_{10}$</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-1.65</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-1.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$X_{11}$</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>-.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$X_{12}$</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>-2.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$X_{13}$</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.50</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$X_{14}$</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>1.61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are 256 degrees of freedom and 1.97 is significant at the .05 level of probability.
Table 9 (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent variables</th>
<th>$Y_1$ b's t</th>
<th>$Y_2$ b's t</th>
<th>$Y_3$ b's t</th>
<th>$Y_4$ b's t</th>
<th>$Y_5$ b's t</th>
<th>$Y_6$ b's t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$X_{15}$</td>
<td>-.01 -.58</td>
<td>-.02 -1.04</td>
<td>-.00 -.15</td>
<td>-.02 -1.10</td>
<td>.00 .08</td>
<td>-.03 -2.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$X_{16}$</td>
<td>.02 .23</td>
<td>.04 .33</td>
<td>.09 -1.00</td>
<td>.11 1.14</td>
<td>.22 1.92</td>
<td>.03 .34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$X_{17}$</td>
<td>-.00 -.04</td>
<td>.02 .27</td>
<td>.00 .05</td>
<td>-.03 -.36</td>
<td>.12 1.45</td>
<td>-.09 -1.46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Father's parental acceptance of anger and hatefulness score

One of the 17 partial regression coefficients was significant when the independent variables were regressed on the dependent variable, father's parental acceptance of anger and hatefulness score. The value of the partial regression coefficient for father's formal education score in the analysis with father's parental acceptance of anger and hatefulness score as the dependent variable was -.18. The t value was -2.05.

The overall $R^2$ was .07 for all of the 17 independent variables regressed on the dependent variable, father's parental acceptance of anger and hatefulness score. The computed $F$ of 1.23 is not significant at the .05 level of probability.

Father's parental acceptance of child's slowness to learn

Two of the 17 partial regression coefficients were significant when the independent variables were regressed on the dependent variable, father's parental acceptance of child's slowness to learn score. The value of the partial regression coefficient for father's ascendancy score in the analysis with father's parental acceptance of child's slowness to learn score as the dependent variable was .06 and the t value was 2.23. The value of the partial regression coefficient of mother's formal education score in the analysis with father's parental acceptance of child's slowness to learn score as the dependent variable was -.23. The t value was -2.01. The overall $R^2$ was .10 for all of the 17 independent variables regressed on the dependent variable, father's acceptance of child's slowness to learn score. The computed $F$ of 1.33 is not significant at the .05 level of probability.
Mother's parental acceptance of disagreement

One of the 17 partial regression coefficients was significant when the independent variables were regressed on the dependent variable, mother's parental acceptance of disagreement score. The value of the partial regression coefficient for mother's ascendancy score in the analysis with mother's parental acceptance of disagreement score as the dependent variable was .06. The t value was 2.50.

The overall $R^2$ was .06 for all of the 17 independent variables regressed on the dependent variable, mother's parental acceptance of disagreement score. The computed F of .87 is not significant at the .05 level of probability.

Mother's parental acceptance of anger and hatefulness

Two of the 17 partial regression coefficients were significant when the independent variables were regressed on the dependent variable, mother's parental acceptance of anger and hatefulness score. The value of the partial regression coefficient for father's responsibility score in the analysis with mother's parental acceptance of child's anger and hatefulness score as the dependent variable was -.04. The t value was -2.60. The value of the partial regression coefficient for parents' agreement on decision-making score in the analysis with mother's parental acceptance of anger and hatefulness score as the dependent variable was -.03. The t value was -1.98.

The overall $R^2$ was .07 for all of the 17 independent variables regressed on the dependent variable, mother's acceptance of anger and hatefulness score. The computed F of 1.13 is not significant at the .05 level.
Mother's parental acceptance of child's slowness to learn

Four of the 17 partial regression coefficients were significant when the independent variables were regressed on the dependent variable, mother's parental acceptance of child's slowness to learn. The value of the partial regression coefficient for father's emotion stability score in the analysis with mother's parental acceptance of child's slowness to learn score as the dependent variable was -.03. The t value was -2.38. The value of the partial regression coefficient for the parents' agreement on goals score in the analysis with mother's parental acceptance of child's slowness to learn score as the dependent variable was -.03. The t value was -2.23. The value of the partial regression coefficient for parents' agreement on decision-making score in the analysis with mother's parental acceptance of child's slowness to learn score as the dependent variable was -.07. The t value was -2.01. The value of the partial regression coefficient for mother's social participation score in the analysis with mother's parental acceptance of child's slowness to learn score as the dependent variable was -.03. The t value was -2.08.

The overall $R^2$ was .09 for all of the 17 independent variables regressed on the dependent variable, mother's acceptance of child's slowness to learn score. The computed $F$ of 1.46 is not significant at the .05 level of probability.
DISCUSSION

Discussion of Correlation Findings

Three major concepts were derived from the Conceptual Framework chapter as being related to parental acceptance. These concepts were self attitudes, marital adjustment and social environment. The discussion of the correlation findings will be presented for each of the three major concepts of parent's self attitudes, marital adjustment and social environment.

Parents' self attitudes

It was reported in the Findings chapter that of the 12 empirical measures derived from father's self attitudes four were significantly related to the empirical measures of parent's parental acceptance. All four were related to the father's parental acceptance of disagreement score. These were: the father's ascendancy score, responsibility score, emotional stability score and sociability score. None of the father's personality scores were significantly related to his parental acceptance of anger and hatefulness scores. It could be concluded from these findings that a father's personality appears to be less likely to influence his parental acceptance of anger and hatefulness than his parental acceptance of disagreement or slowness to learn.

A significant negative relationship was found between the father's responsibility score and his parental acceptance of child's slowness to learn score.

None of the 12 empirical scores for mothers were positively related to mother's parental acceptance scores. It could be concluded from these data that the variation in the personality of the father is perhaps a more
important factor for parental acceptance than is the variation in the personality of the mother.

**Marital adjustment**

The second general concept of the study was marital adjustment. Four sub-concepts were derived from marital adjustment. These were similar parents' education, parents' agreement on goals, parents agreement on decision-making and parents agreement on decision-making in disciplining children.

There were no significant relationships between the father's empirical scores for these sub-concepts of marital adjustment and his parental acceptance scores. It could be concluded that for this research data marital adjustment did not affect the father's parental acceptance.

There were two negative significant relationships between the mother's sub-concepts of marital adjustment and parental acceptance reported in the Findings chapter. A positive relationship was hypothesized. These were parents' agreement on decision-making with mother's parental acceptance of child's slowness to learn score and parents' agreement of goals score with mother's parental acceptance of child's slowness to learn score. It is possible that some variable may be intervening between these dependent variables and independent variables. At the .05 level five out of 100 times the results can be attributed to chance.

**Social environment**

The two sub-concepts of social class and reference group were derived from the general concepts of social environment. There were no significant relationships between the empirical measure of these sub-concepts and the
empirical measures of parental acceptance for either the mothers or fathers.

Conclusion

From these data it could be concluded that the parent's personality appears to be the most important of the three major concepts of this research for determining parental acceptance. Specifically, it could be concluded from these data that the personality of the father may be more often related with parental acceptance than is the mother's personality. There were no positive significant relationships between the empirical scores of parental acceptance and the empirical scores used as measures of the concepts marital adjustment and social environment. Thus, four of the 66 hypotheses were positive significantly related to parental acceptance scores.

Discussion of Partial Regression Findings

A complete reporting for all the significant b values determined by a t test were reported in the Findings chapter. The discussion of this section will focus upon conclusions which can be drawn from the significant findings.

Father's parental acceptance and the independent variables

None of the 17 independent variables were significant when regressed on the father's parental acceptance of disagreement score. The computed partial regression coefficient for father's formal education was the only significant regression coefficient when the 17 variables were regressed on father's parental acceptance of anger and hatefulness score. The partial correlation coefficients for father's ascendancy score and mother's formal
education score were significant when the 17 independent variables were re­gressed on father's parental acceptance of child's slowness to learn score.

Mother's parental acceptance and the independent variables

The partial correlation coefficient for mother's ascendancy was the one significant coefficient obtained when the 17 independent variables were regressed on mother's parental acceptance of disagreement score. The two partial correlation coefficients for father's responsibility score and parents' agreement on decision-making were the two significant coefficients obtained when the 17 independent variables were regressed on mother's parental acceptance of anger and hatefulness score. Four partial regression coefficients were significant when the 17 independent variables were regressed on mother's parental acceptance of child's slowness to learn. These variables were: father's emotional stability score, parents' agreement on decision-making, parents' agreement on goals and mother's social participation score.

Possible Reasons for Findings

The following discussion will focus on possible reasons that may have resulted in the lack of significant relationships between the dependent concept, parental acceptance, and the selected independent concepts.

One possible reason for the lack of empirical support of the hypothe­sized relationship was the fact that the subjects of this research were similar in many ways. All of the parents were married and living together. All of the fathers were 38 years of age or younger. All of the fathers were in the occupation of farming in the State of Iowa with gross sales from agricultural products totaling more than $1,200. All of the fathers
worked less than 100 days off of the farm. All of the parents had at least one child in the age range of four through nine years. Further, 63 percent had a child age four or five years (see Table 10). The subjects had similar sized families, were of similar age, had a similar number of years of formal schooling and similar income (see Tables 10, 11, 12, 13 and 14).

Table 10. Age of children

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Frequency of families</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 11. Size of family

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of children</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>274</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A second major reason for the lack of significant relations was the operational measures used. Of the three major concepts -- parent's self attitudes, marital adjustment and social environment -- the most direct
### Table 12. Age of parents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Frequency for fathers</th>
<th>Frequency for mothers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23 and below</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 - 26</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 - 29</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 - 32</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33 - 35</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 and over</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>274</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 13. Parent's educational level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years of education completed</th>
<th>Frequency for fathers</th>
<th>Frequency for mothers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 - 7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 - 11</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 - 15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 and over</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>274</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 14. Parent's income

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Frequency of families</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 - 18</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 - $1,499</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1,500 - $2,499</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$2,500 - $3,499</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$3,500 - $4,499</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$4,500 - $7,999</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$8,000 and over</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>274</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
measurement was of the parent's self attitude. The other two major concepts were measured by sub-concepts inferred as measures of social environment and marital adjustment.

The sub-concepts used to measure marital adjustment did not measure marital adjustment per se. The interviewer did not ask the mothers and fathers of this research direct questions pertaining to marital adjustment. Therefore, this research relied upon measures which were indicators of possible marital adjustment, not direct measurements of marital adjustment. It is difficult to gather the data on such sub-concepts as goals and agreement on decision-making. The methods used in this research may not have adequately measured either agreement goals or agreement on decision-making. The limitations of using number of years of formal education as the measure of educational level has been discussed in the Procedure and Method chapter.

The general concept of social environment is a very general concept. The sub-concepts of social class and reference groups certainly are not the only sub-concepts involved in the parent's social environment. Further, procedures and methods of measurement are difficult to establish for measuring these sub-concepts. As was discussed in the Procedure and Method chapter, the measurement of relevance of a parent's reference groups for child rearing by measuring a parent's social participation in all groups is only a generally inferred measure.

A third possible reason for the lack of results could be the operational measures of parental acceptance. As was reported in the Procedure and Method chapter, three items were selected from the Porter Parental Acceptance Scale. The criteria for deciding to use these selected items rather than all 32 items was to reduce the interviewing time needed to collect
data on child rearing. The reliability and validity of these three items, when used alone, has not been established.

A fourth possibility is that the conceptual framework was not correct nor adequate.

Suggestions for Further Research

First, this research points for the need of depth measures when studying homogeneous samples. The more general measures may not be precise enough for the concepts selected for study.

Second, this research points toward the need for observation data to aid in establishing the validity of data obtained by field schedules. This research is dependent upon the assumption that the parent's response to the field schedule reflected their actual feelings and actions when interacting with their child.

Third, this research reflects on the complexity of parent-child interaction and the need for better methods of studying possible intervening variables. An example would be: what effect does the approval or disapproval of the parent's child rearing patterns by significant others have upon the parent's parental acceptance?

Fourth, it has been concluded from this research that the interaction of mothers' and fathers' personality factors are related to parental acceptance. Further, research is needed that will contribute to the understanding of the interaction of mother and father variables upon parental acceptance.

Fifth, many of the conceptual frameworks and generalizations of the family are at a very general level. An example is the generalization that
years of the parent's formal education and child rearing knowledge are related. This research has indicated that there is a need for a conceptual framework from which more precise variables can be derived for studying parental acceptance.
SUMMARY

In the current American society there is an awareness that the family is a major factor in determining what the child will learn. Socialization of the child has been identified as a special function of the family by family sociologists and child developmentalists. A major contemporary goal in the socialization process is an opportunity for each child to maximize his potential for achievement. Current federal programs such as Head Start assumes that each child given the opportunity can achieve within limits. Studies have indicated that the parent-child relationship is an important factor for the child's achievement and emotional adjustment. For the child to maximize his learning experiences he needs to feel that he is an accepted member of his family. A parent's parental acceptance of his child is assumed for this research to be one of the most important factors of the parent-child relationship. Few research studies have been concerned directly with variables related with parental acceptance.

An overview of human behavior was conceptualized based mainly upon symbolic interaction theory and development theory. This conceptual framework assumes that man's social behavior is a result of his social learning. From the conceptual framework three general level independent concepts were identified as possible determinants of a parent's parental acceptance. These concepts were: parent's self attitude, parent's marital adjustment and parent's social environment. The three general hypotheses expressing the relation of these concepts to parental acceptance were as follows:

General Null Hypothesis One: A parent's self attitudes will have no positive relationship with his parental acceptance of his child.

General Null Hypothesis Two: A parent's marital adjustment will have
no positive relationship with his parental acceptance of his child.

General Null Hypothesis Three: A parent's social environment will have no positive relationship with his parental acceptance of his child.

The data for this research were obtained under Project No. 1278 of the Iowa Agriculture and Home Economics Experiment Station. The subjects were 274 Iowa young farm families with at least one child in the age range of four through nine years of age. These farm families were not a random sample of young Iowa families.

A parent's parental acceptance was measured by three items selected from the Porter Parental Acceptance Scale (51). The purpose of the selected items was to measure how a parent feels and what he does when his child expresses negative feelings, or when he discovers unique features or certain limitations which his child has (51).

Personality assessment instruments were identified as measures of the parent's self attitudes. The Gordon Personal Profile (26) was accepted as a measure of personality for this research. An empirical measure was obtained for each parent on the following factors of the Gordon Personal Profile, ascendancy, responsibility, emotionality and sociability.

The four sub-concepts of similar education, goal agreement, agreement on decision-making and agreement on decision-making in disciplining children were assumed to be measures of marital adjustment. From the major concept, social environment, were derived the two sub-concepts of social class and reference groups. Social class was empirically measured by the parent's education and the parent's net farm income. Reference group influence was measured by social participation of both the mothers and fathers.

Four limitations of this study were identified. These were: first,
the sample was not a random sample of Iowa families; second, the items selected to empirically measure the independent variables may not have been the best measures of the concepts. They may have lacked a preciseness of measurement. Third, the six dependent variables may not have been the best measures of parental acceptance. Fourth, the data were obtained by interviews which assumed that what the parents said was in fact what they did in the case of parent-child relations.

A Pearson correlation coefficient was computed to establish the relationship of the dependent variables measuring parental acceptance with the independent variables. The .05 level of probability was selected to determine if the level was significant. For the fathers four significant positive relationships were found. These were all personality measures. These significant relationships between the parent's personality measures and parental acceptance are as follows:

1. Father's ascendancy score with his parental acceptance of disagreement score.
2. Father's responsibility score with his parental acceptance of disagreement score.
3. Father's emotional stability score with his parental acceptance of disagreement score.
4. Father's sociability score with his parental acceptance of disagreement score.

There were no significant relationships between parents' parental acceptance scores and the scores measuring the independent concepts of marital adjustment or social environment. Although a positive relationship has been hypothesized, the following two relationships were negative and significant.

1. Parents' agreement on decision-making and mother's parental
acceptance of child's slowness to learn score.

2. Parents' agreement on goals score and mother's parental acceptance of child's slowness to learn score.

It could be concluded from the correlation analysis that more of the variables derived from the general concept of the parent's self attitudes were significantly related to the parent's parental acceptance scores than were the variables derived from the general concepts of marital adjustment and social environment. Further, it could be concluded that the father's variables derived from the general concept of self attitudes were perhaps more positively related with his parental acceptance than were the variables derived from the mother's self attitudes.

A partial regression analysis was computed as an additional analysis. Regressing the 17 independent variables as a separate analysis for each of the six dependent variables gave a possible 102 significant regression coefficients. The following ten coefficients were significant at the .05 level of probability:

1. Father's ascendancy score and father's parental acceptance of child's slowness to learn score.

2. Mother's formal education score and father's parental acceptance of child's slowness to learn score.

3. Father's responsibility score and mother's parental acceptance of anger and hatefulness score.

4. Parents' agreement on decision-making score and mother's parental acceptance of anger and hatefulness score.

5. Father's emotional stability score and mother's parental acceptance of child's slowness to learn score.
6. Parents' agreement on decision-making score and mother's parental acceptance of child's slowness to learn score.

7. Parents' agreement on goals score and mother's parental acceptance of child's slowness to learn score.

8. Mother's social participation score and mother's parental acceptance of child's slowness to learn score.

9. Father's formal education score and father's parental acceptance of anger and hatefulness score.

10. Mother's ascendancy score and mother's parental acceptance of disagreement score.

This research has indicated a need for research instruments that will yield more precision of measurement for parental acceptance and related determinant concepts. The largest $R^2$ of the 17 independent variables regressed on the dependent variables was .10. Using these 17 variables which represent major areas of previously identified determinants of parental acceptance the above $R^2$ only explains .10 percent of the variation in the dependent variable. Further research might focus on the complexity of the processes involved in parental acceptance and the need for studying possible intervening variables. Further research will need to employ new conceptual frameworks that will make possible more precise analysis of the processes involved in parental acceptance.
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