

PARENTAL ATTITUDES AND HOW THEY RELATE
TO SIBLING RELATIONSHIPS

A DISSERTATION
SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR
THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY IN EARLY CHILDHOOD
EDUCATION IN THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF THE
TEXAS WOMAN'S UNIVERSITY

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION

BY

SHIRLEY COTHRAN BARRET, B.A., M.ED.

DENTON, TEXAS

AUGUST 1979

The Graduate School
Texas Woman's University

Denton, Texas

July 17, 1979

We hereby recommend that the dissertation prepared under
our supervision by Shirley Cothran Barret
entitled Parental Attitudes and how They Relate to
Sibling Relationships

be accepted as fulfilling this part of the requirements for the Degree of
Doctor of Philosophy.

Committee:

Sam Ed Brown

Chairman

Shirley Hollingsworth

J. R. [unclear]

Dolice R. Jager

Bobbie Hillman

John W. McFarland

[unclear]

Accepted:

Margaret J. Fucell

Dean of The Graduate School

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Few endeavors of any magnitude are the product of only one or two people. Instead, they are the result of the support and contributions of many people. I wish to express my appreciation to those who have been involved with this exploratory study.

No dissertation can be completed without the participation of committee members. My gratitude goes to Dr. Sam E. Brown, Dr. Patricia Fagan, Dr. Shirley Hollingsworth, Dr. Rodney Short, and Dr. Bobbie Wilborn.

My thanks also go to the 100 parents and 50 children who gave of their time and energy in completing the study's instruments. Without their participation, all efforts toward completion of this study would have been in vain.

Thank you all.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	iii
	LIST OF TABLES.	vi
Chapter		
I.	INTRODUCTION.	1
	Problem of the Study.	3
	Significance of the Problem	4
	Purpose of the Study.	7
	Statement of the Null Hypotheses.	9
	Definition of Terms	11
	Limitations	12
II.	REVIEW OF SELECTED LITERATURE	13
III.	METHODOLOGY	26
	Instruments	26
	Sample.	29
	Collection of the Data.	29
	Design of the Study	31
	Analysis of the Data.	32
IV.	RESULTS OF THE STUDY.	34
	Description of the Population	35
	Results of Intercorrelations and Canonical Correlations.	39
	Data Results from Multiple Regression	48
	Concluding Statements of the Null Hypotheses	53
	Summary	54
V.	SUMMARY, IMPLICATIONS OF THE FINDINGS, AND SUGGESTIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH	56
	Summary	56
	Findings and Conclusions Related to Hypothesis One	57
	Findings and Conclusions Related to Hypothesis Two	60

Findings and Conclusions Related to Hypothesis Three	61
Findings and Conclusions Related to Hypothesis Four.	63
Findings and Conclusions Related to Hypothesis Five.	64
Findings and Conclusions Related to Hypothesis Six	66
Conclusions of the Study.	67
Unanswered Questions.	67
Suggestions for Further Research.	68
REFERENCES.	71
REFERENCE NOTE.	77
APPENDICES	
A. Cover Letter to Parents and Family Information Form	78
B. Parent Attitude Survey.	81
C. Family Environment Scale.	94

LIST OF TABLES

Table

1.	Summary Data for Family Information Form	36
2.	Means and Standard Deviations for Family Environment Scale.	37
3.	Means and Standard Deviations for Parental Attitude Survey.	38
4.	Intercorrelations of the Parent Attitude Survey for Combined Parent Data	40
5.	Intercorrelations of the Parent Attitude Survey for Father Only Data	41
6.	Intercorrelations of the Parent Attitude Survey for Mother Only Data	42
7.	Intercorrelations of the Family Environment Scale.	44
8.	Canonical Correlations Using Means of Mothers and Fathers Scores on PAS	45
9.	Canonical Correlations Using Fathers Scores on Parent Attitude Survey.	46
10.	Canonical Correlations Using Mothers Scores on Parent Attitude Survey.	47
11.	Pearson Correlations of Family Environment Scales with Parent Attitude Survey Scales for Combined Parents Data.	50
12.	Pearson Correlations of Family Environment Scales with Parent Attitude Survey on Fathers Data.	51
13.	Pearson Correlations of Family Environment Scales with Parent Attitude Survey on Mothers Data.	52

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Sibling relationships are an often overlooked aspect of family interaction (Bank & Dahn, 1975). When a number of children live together, especially within the intimate framework of family life, they are bound to affect each other in many ways (Bossard & Boll, 1956b; Irish, 1964; Pfouts, 1976).

An estimated 80% of children growing up in the United States have siblings (Mussen, Conger, & Kagan, 1974), and this fact alone would seem to indicate a need for further research in sibling relationships. It would appear that this obviously important area of interaction would be saturated with research, but the opposite is true. Rather, little of substance is known about the influence of siblings on each other (Mussen et al., 1974; Perlman, 1967; Riskin & Faunce, 1972).

The little information available concerning sibling relationships and interactions may be antiquated in view of our culture's rapidly changing lifestyle. The literature reveals studies pertaining to sibling relations involved in large family systems, rural families, and self-sustaining

units (Bossard & Boll, 1956b), most of which may not as applicable to today's urban, mobile, and industrialized world as to earlier family patterns. Prior to World War II, studies of sibling rivalry, birth order, and kinship focused on the parent and child dynamics (Irish, 1964; Krout, 1939; Pfouts, 1976). Inquiry into the meaning that sibship possessed within the nuclear family was not the focus of attention (Irish, 1964). Most research seems to concern siblings and relationships with peers (Hartup, 1970), ordinal position (Sutton-Smith & Rosenberg, 1970), and middle-child syndrome (Minuchin & Montalvo, 1967; Pfouts, 1976).

Because parents influence the sibling interaction, it is important to examine parental attitudes as they relate to sibling relationships (Hollender, Duke, & Nowicki, 1973; Schachter, Shire, Feldman-Rotman, Marquis, & Campbell, 1976). Bonds between parent and child as well as those between siblings are strong (Graham, 1977; Perlman, 1967; Pfouts, 1976). As interest in the nuclear family as a unit grows, a need for additional research is indicated. Also, an expanded interest in small group therapy and methodology has been slowly maturing since World War II. As a result, family practitioners are becoming more cognizant of sibling interaction because of the systems approach (Minuchin, 1974; Pfouts, 1976) in counseling.

The intimate relationships within a family are interactive (Minuchin, 1974). From early childhood, brothers and sisters, affected by parental attitude influences, formulate attitudes toward themselves and toward each other. These attitudes depend on one's own behaviors and characterizations, on those of the other siblings, and on parental attitudes (Pfouts, 1976). Updated research in evaluating parental attitudes and how those attitudes affect sibling relationships can be useful to parents, siblings, educators, and psychologists.

Problem of the Study

With the ever increasing concern about changing roles of the family in our society and the complex dynamic roles of family members, attention has been focused more and more on learned behavior. Behavior that is learned by children from their parents often affects sibling relationships (Pfouts, 1976).

As psychologists and educators become more cognizant of the complexities of family relationships and the effects of these relationships on various family members, the sibling interaction factor becomes increasingly critical (Minuchin, 1974; Pfouts, 1976). While recognizing the significance of sibling interaction, research has not addressed the factors that affect this relevant and important aspect of the nuclear

family. In particular, the relationship between parental attitudes and sibling interactions have not been studied. This study has examined the relationship between specific attitudes of parents that directly relate to sibling interaction.

Significance of the Problem

Sibling interaction is an important but a frequently overlooked aspect of family functioning (Bank & Dahn, 1975). Much has been written concerning sibling rivalry as it relates to power struggles for parental love and acceptance. For instance, Adler's (1959) theory of individual psychology states that sibling's struggle for love of one or both parents is based on psychological position within the family constellation. In the 1930's, Levy (1936, 1937) discussed some of the hierarchical sibling struggles for parental love. Rabin's (1965) study of Kibbutz children supported the theory that children learn early in life to seek parental affection, and that sibling rivalry is a natural function (Adler, 1959). Dreikurs (1964), in an elaboration of Adler's theory, stated sibling rivalry was a result of each child's striving for attention and/or position with the parent(s).

A review of the literature revealed related research data concerning sibling relationships and the vertical dimension of parent-child relationships (Krout, 1939), but little

data were found concerning parental attitudes and how they affect sibling interactions. Bossard and Boll (1956b), in their book about large families, studied the motives and attitudes of mothers and fathers in relationship to parenthood. They found that the large family is usually planned for reasons of pride, values, religious beliefs, economic gain, or personal philosophies. Parents who were resentful, indifferent, or ashamed about parenthood became happy, proud, and pleased after a child's birth (Bossard & Boll, 1956b). They also emphasized facts concerning individual, family or husband/wife relationships. Couples who had similar attitudes toward parenthood produced more effective family interaction (Minuchin, 1974; Riskin & Faunce, 1972).

The past, present, and future are indivisibly related to one's current lifestyle (Greco, 1950). The parents' attitudes, the children's philosophy of the future, and the realities of the present are crucial in formulating relationships.

Another theory of sibling relationships (Caplow, 1968) is the theory of power relationships within families. This theory described conditions under which sibling coalitions were most likely to formulate: (a) solid parental coalition which discouraged child-parent coalition versus the other parent, (b) weaker parent and child(ren) versus dominant parent, and (c) equal parent power but absence of a strong

parental coalition inducing intense sibling rivalry (Caplow, 1968). Caplow's theory contained little experimental data, however, extensive and direct observations of sibling subsystems by Minuchin and Montalvo in 1967 and Salvador Minuchin in 1974 provided support for Caplow's theory. They found that malfunctioning of parental interaction brought about changes in sibling subsystems (Minuchin, 1974; Minuchin & Montalvo, 1967).

Thus, the literature indicated that sibling interaction is greatly influenced by parental attitudes. But there is also a limit to the parental influence over the sibship, where siblings exhibit and exchange power, service, and feelings with one another, which might be different to the parents' desires and expectations (Bank & Dahn, 1975). Chapin (1932) also recognized family interaction being affected by concealed and obvious structural patterns. Some of the factors he recognized were number of siblings, sex and age distribution, and parent patterns. Chapin stated the more subtle concealed factors were less investigated, and in order to achieve family equilibrium, the common reciprocating attitudes of each individual family member must be instigated (Chapin, 1932).

Parental attitudes do play an important role in sibling interaction. Tolman (1959) describes the influences of interactions among siblings as important supplements to the

parent-child relationships (Tolman, 1959). He has proposed that a person can be appropriately characterized:

in terms of the people who have been living with him the longest, most intimately, and most regularly, and by incidental losses of such people, i.e. primarily his parents and siblings. (Tolman, 1959, p. 199)

Because of the intimate enmeshing of family relations, many interactional patterns emerge. Research stated that some siblings' personality differences might be attributed to the divergent roles of sibship interaction and treatment by the parents (Sletto, 1934).

Most of the literature of sibling interaction since the 1930's has dealt with ordinal position, sex and ages of children, and size of families. It has even been said, "the attempt to explain sibling behavior in terms of nonpsychological factors such as birth order is thoroughly futile" (Krout, 1939, p. 4). Because of a lack of data and research, this exploratory study was an attempt to examine the relationship between parental attitudes and sibling interaction. These findings can help educators, parents, counselors, and families to better understand family functioning.

Purpose of the Study

Krout (1939), after a review of the existing literature, determined that past efforts to explain sibling interaction

in terms of nonpsychological factors have been fruitless. Others feel that past studies concerning sibling relationships have only attempted to explain the interactions in a broad sense without addressing the factors that truly affect this issue specifically (Bossard & Boll, 1956b; Chapin, 1932).

Some efforts have been made to examine the effects of parental attitudes on sibling interaction (Bank & Dahn, 1975; Caplow, 1968; Minuchin & Montalvo, 1967; Tolman, 1959). For the most part, however, the studies contained little experimental data. Most of the referenced authors agreed that more experimental data was needed in this area of the study.

Hereford (1963) identified five areas of parental attitudes. These five attitudes are categorized under the headings of Confidence of parents' role, Causation of child's behavior, Acceptance of the child's behavior and feelings, Understanding, and Trust. Moos (1974) has identified ten areas of sibling relationships which he labeled as Cohesion, Expressiveness, Conflict, Independence, Achievement Orientation, Intellectual-Cultural Orientation, Active-Recreational Orientation, Moral-Religious Emphasis, Organization, and Control.

Utilizing Hereford's (1963) and Moos' (1974) purported areas of attitudes and relationships, the purpose of this study was to identify the relationship between specific

parental attitudes and sibling relationships. Identification and correlation of these attitudes to specific sibling interactions should be of great value in understanding family relationships. After reviewing the existing literature, this exploratory study specifically addressed the following research questions:

1. Is there a relationship between selected parental attitudes and selected sibling relationships?
2. Do different parental attitudes in selected areas affect sibling relationships in selected areas?

Statement of the Null Hypotheses

To carry out the purpose of this study, the following null hypotheses were formulated:

1. No relationship exists between parents' attitudes on the scale of Confidence of parents' role and sibling relationships in the areas of (a) Cohesion, (b) Expressiveness, (c) Conflict, (d) Independence, (e) Achievement Orientation, (f) Intellectual-Cultural Orientation, (g) Active-Recreational Orientation, (h) Moral-Religious Emphasis, (i) Organization, and (j) Control as measured by the Parent Attitude Survey and the Family Environment Scale.
2. No relationship exists between parents' attitudes on the scale of Causation of child's behavior and sibling relationships in the areas of (a) Cohesion, (b) Expressiveness,

(c) Conflict, (d) Independence, (e) Achievement Orientation, (f) Intellectual-Cultural Orientation, (g) Active-Recreational Orientation, (h) Moral-Religious Emphasis, (i) Organization, and (j) Control as measured by the Parent Attitude Survey and Family Environment Scale.

3. No relationship exists between parents' attitudes on the scale of Acceptance of the child's behavior and feelings and sibling relationships in the areas of (a) Cohesion, (b) Expressiveness, (c) Conflict, (d) Independence, (e) Active-Recreational Orientation, (h) Moral-Religious Emphasis, (i) Organization, and (j) Control as measured by the Parent Attitude Survey and Family Environment Scale.

4. No relationship exists between parents' attitudes on the scale of Understanding and sibling relationships in the areas of (a) Cohesion, (b) Expressiveness, (c) Conflict, (d) Independence, (e) Achievement Orientation, (f) Intellectual-Cultural Orientation, (g) Active-Recreational Orientation, (h) Moral-Religious Emphasis, (i) Organization, and (j) Control as measured by the Parent Attitude Survey and the Family Environment Scale.

5. No relationship exists between parents' attitudes on the scale of Trust and sibling relationships in the areas of (a) Cohesion, (b) Expressiveness, (c) Conflict, (d) Independence, (e) Achievement Orientation, (f) Intellectual-Cultural Orientation, (g) Active-Recreational Orientation,

(h) Moral-Religious Emphasis, (i) Organization, and (j) Control as measured by the Parent Attitude Survey and the Family Environment Scale.

6. No relationship exists between attitudes held by parents and sibling interaction.

Definition of Terms

For the purpose of this study the following definitions were formulated:

1. Parental Attitudes - The personal position, disposition, and manners from which parents derive their child interaction patterns, as they relate psychologically and physically with their children in ongoing relationships. For this study, the operational definition was the score an individual received on the Parent Attitude Survey.

2. Sibling Relationship - Those children, performing essential and peripheral tasks of habitation together, and maintaining a psychological relationship and unity as it relates to kinship, individual development, and sibship. For this study, the operational definition was the score which an individual received on the Family Environment Scale.

3. Intact Family - Those homes where the mother and father are married and living with their children in the same household. The parents may be either the natural parents or a step-parent(s) who has been a member of that family for a minimum of three years.

Limitations

The following limitations were imposed on this study due to the design of the study:

1. This study was limited to intact families which was specified in definition of terms.

2. The subjects selected for this study were solicited from North Central Texas public school systems, which were the geographic boundaries.

3. When referring to parental attitudes, only the five parental attitudes as described in the Parent Attitude Survey, Confidence, Causation, Acceptance, Understanding, and Trust were used.

4. When referring to sibling relationships, only the ten sibling relationships as described in the Family Environment Scale, Cohesion, Expressiveness, Conflict, Independence, Achievement Orientation, Intellectual-Cultural Orientation, Active-Recreational Orientation, Moral-Religious Emphasis, Organization, and Control were used.

5. The subjects who were in this study were volunteers.

6. No attempt was made to control for socioeconomic level.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF SELECTED LITERATURE

There is a growing trend toward examining the total American family system that is affecting research. Irish (1964) considers the family as a "unity of interacting personalities" (p. 279); Minuchin (1974) views the family as a framework in which each person conceptualizes the circumstances and acts upon, as well as reacts to, those circumstances. Ackerman (1966) describes the family as a unique organization, that is the basic union of society. So, a definition is acquired of the family as a single unit which is an acceptable design for living (Mishler & Waxler, 1968).

Family interaction is a total pattern, and the relationship between any two people is colored by the unity of interacting personalities (Burgess, 1926). The family has been described as being extraordinarily sensitive to its members; the bonds of love and loyalty and the relations of mother, father and child are organized in varying ways depending upon the conditions (Ackerman, 1966). Thus, it can be said that individual and family relations are a result of an intimate interplay of processes of emotional joining and disjointing. The growth and effectiveness of a family is reflected

in its ability to integrate, harmonize and balance the numerous strains placed on family life (Ackerman, 1966; Minuchin, 1974).

Within that framework or design, there are several subsets of relationships about which research in the nuclear family can be organized: interactions between the two parents, between parents and children, and among the children. The vertical dimension between children and parents has been investigated (Irish, 1964; Krout, 1939; Rogers, 1969). Much research concerning child-rearing techniques and practices has been published (Biehler, 1976; Dreikurs, 1964; Minuchin, 1974; Rogers, 1969). The lateral dimension of parents has been widely explored in marital adjustment (Minuchin, 1974).

But, the horizontal dimension of sibling interaction has been given little heed (Irish, 1964). Even while educators, researchers, and psychologists have recognized the prominent significance of sibling relationships, the literature is sparse in addressing this relevant and important aspect of the modern family. At the same time, it is recognized that parental attitudes greatly affected children and their personalities (Cicirelli, 1978). Yet, these seemingly important acknowledgments concerning parental attitudes and their relationship to sibling interactions have been neglected in being merged together in useful and meaningful dialogue.

Sibship has been described and referred to in terms of sibling rivalry, which again turns to an individual vertical dimension of competition between children to attain love, attention, and favor of the parent(s) (Adler, 1959; Irish, 1964). The connotation of sibship has had pronounced negative overtures upon its interpretation. Bossard and Boll (1954) point out:

The role of siblings has been considered chiefly in the light of displacement and rivalry. It is rarely that one finds any but the negative aspects of sibling relationships, and warnings how to deal with them.

(p. 532)

Numerous research projects of Individual Psychology have been conducted, utilizing sibling position, number, and sex as variables in examining some particular influence upon personality development. Jones (1933) listed approximately 100 articles about birth order and its relation to other traits in individuals. Adler (1959) stated that sibling relationships are based on constructs of psychological position within the family. Altus (1966) found that first-born children were more achievement-oriented, while Becker, Lerner, and Carroll (1966) agreed that the first born is more cooperative, responsible, and conforming to social pressures.

A number of explanations have been proposed to account for this phenomenon of the first-born description, and yet,

these findings are trends, not steadfast rules. Biehler (1976) offered explanations of these trends which involved parents. Some of these were high-expectations from parents, parental tension and anxiety resulting in inconsistent child-rearing practices, or the child being driven to attain the undivided attention of his parents.

A frequent contributor to the statistical research literature concerning sibling relationships has been Helen Koch (1955a, 1955b, 1956). Her major research interests have been the effect of various family constellation factors, such as sex of child, sex of sibling, ordinal position of child in sibship, and differences in age on the personalities of children. She, more than many others, has studied personality traits within the realm of sibling relationships.

Most of these studies involving birth order, plus the innumerable ones that have not been mentioned, have focused on the relation of sib-position to personality traits. An attempt to crystalize the intervening interactions among the siblings has had little or no attention. Thus far, little empirical research has been conducted in this related field of sibling relationships (Irish, 1964; Perlman, 1967). Literature on effects of birth order alone may be misleading when applied to a specific family structure, for other factors are certainly vital for accurate interpretation (Cicirelli, 1978).

Examining relationships among siblings in other cultures, Murdock (1949) found the siblings bound to one another through child care, childhood games, and economic assistance. Thus, all were rendering reciprocal material services. Murdock (1949) and Irish (1964) went on to report that these types of anthropological studies had included complicated patterns that were still prevalent and present research problems; joint residences, adoption, and other polygamous marriage arrangements modified the intensity as well as extensity of sibling interaction. Consequently, inquiry into the meaning siblings have for one another, and their interactions within the nuclear family, have not been the primary focus in anthropological research.

It has been established that the bonds between parent(s) and child(ren) are strong within the nuclear family, and the ties between most siblings place only second to the former (Garigue, 1956; Irish, 1964; Mussen et al., 1963; Pfouts, 1976). To further emphasize the importance of sibship relations, Cumming and Schneider (1961) found that some sibling ties, during certain phases of the life cycle, become more meaningful than relationships with the spouses.

Irish (1964) found that within the nuclear family these siblings constituted an important sub-group. Further, Chapin (1932) found an obvious and concealed structural pattern that can be discerned in family interactions and the siblings'

sub-groups. The concealed structural patterns have been overshadowed by the more evident factors of parent interactions, number of siblings, sex, and age distribution (Hollender, Duke, & Nowicki, 1973; Pfouts, 1976). However, it was pointed out that the less evident patterns were also important:

The latent structural pattern is of a subtler nature. It is revealed in the separate member roles and in the pattern of equilibrium of the whole family group. It has to be inferred from the common reciprocating attitudes of the individual members of the family group. . . . The manifest structure of the sibling group may determine the latent structure of the member role. (Chapin, 1932, p. 204)

Differences in siblings' personalities might also be attributed to the divergent roles which are implicated in intrasibship interaction; these patterns are associated with the sibling position of the children, as well as to the varying treatments by the parents (Sletto, 1934). Krout (1939) has pointed out that, "siblings create an ever-changing milieu in the family. . . . A sibling is not a silent witness of a drama in which the parent and another child participates" (p. 4). All siblings, in fact, respond and react to the events and treatments of their siblings,

for those events and treatments also color their own attitudes and reactions.

Parents' treatments, reactions, and attitudes toward their children can have a positive or negative affect on their children (Kirkpatrick, 1966; Mussen et al., 1974). If insufficient attention, understanding, or indifference is portrayed by a parent(s), siblings may turn to one another for fortitude and parental substitution (Irish, 1964; Tolman, 1959). If this becomes the case, Tolman recognizes this interaction as an important socialization avenue for the siblings, for this is where understanding, cohesion, and emotional stability become nourished.

This contention of sibling interaction filling voids and supplying emotional and physical needs has also been hypothesized by others. Davis and Northway (1957) observed five pairs of siblings during a five year period. They supported their theory that each child used his sibling as a means of his own self-definition, while at the same time they strengthened their relationships. This is another indication of the influential power that sibships impose upon one another, both individually and collectively.

Interest concerning the large family and its interior workings has also been stimulated by investigators. Ellis and Beechley (1951) utilized information from 1000 child guidance case histories to examine the characteristics of

large families, and then that data was compared to medium and small sized families. Evidence was produced that the size of families could be an important facet in mental hygiene.

Other findings about large family systems have been brought to the foreground by Bossard and Boll (1956a), who addressed the contention that the family and its size limits the number of available role choices to a sibling. The siblings thus develop their role by selecting one of which has already been disposed by another sibling. It is realized, however, that within the structuring of large families, there is a greater complexity of roles, functions, and specializations, which conjoles the siblings to discipline each other more frequently, along with other necessary intro-family adjustments (Bossard & Sanger, 1952).

In 1952, a study by Nye scrutinized relations between parents and children of small families to selected variables; small families indicated better relations than larger families. This line of investigation was furthered by Hawkes, Burchinal, and Gardner (1958), whose study of 256 fifth-grade children, also precluded that the smaller family had more favorable relations to parents and siblings than did those from larger families. However, their data did not conclude that the larger family environment nurtured more favorable personality adjustment. A more appropriate variable to

reflect sibling substructure would be the amount of time of parental attention (Cicerilli, 1978).

It has become increasingly apparent that America's population is no longer a recluse. Instead, it is a modern industrialized, transient society which has affected the nuclear family unity (Biehler, 1976; Rogers, 1969). Sussman (1959) and Reiss (1962) pursued studies which confirmed the notion that the nuclear family is no longer isolated, and the frequency and attitudes of interaction is becoming less. Further, Reiss asserts:

The families of siblings with least contact with each other are those of two brothers, the only ones with the same last name - a residue of our now defunct patrilineal tradition. (p. 334)

And yet, there are theorists who purport that one of the basic doctrines of developmental psychology is the early familial environment of a child, especially the pervading attitudes of the parents and the emotional tone which has been established for the parent and child relationship (Serot & Teevan, 1961). It has already been supported through substantial clinical data that there is a correlation between parent-child relationships and the nature of children's personality or relative adjustment (Jackson, Klatskin & Wilkin, 1952; Martin, 1943; Strott, 1940).

It has been determined that the vertical dimension of the parent-child relationship has prominent effects in interactions (Irish, 1964; Krout, 1939; Rogers, 1969). It has also been determined that siblings have an important and lasting effect on each other's development (Adler, 1931; Schachter, 1959; Sutton-Smith & Rosenberg, 1969). When combining the vertical and horizontal dimensions, Sutton-Smith and Rosenberg (1970) had this to say in their discussion concerning sibling power effects:

With respect . . . in which we stressed the importance of considering sibling as well as parent influences, it can be said that some of the differences agreed upon by siblings in the present study appear to derive from parental sources, and that some appear to derive from what might be termed the character of the interaction.

(p. 53)

Sibling interaction, like parent-child interaction, is characterized by many facets. When siblings speak of each other, they speak of ambivalence, or solidarity and rivalry, of the desire to be equal and yet differentiated. It is also a primitive world of naked emotions, cruelty, and betrayal (Pfouts, 1976). Thus, the attitudes one holds toward one's self depend not only on personal behaviors and characteristics, but on those of his siblings as well (Davis & Northway, 1957; Pfouts, 1976).

These attitudes which are formulated by the influence of one's sibs are powerful (Bank & Dahn, 1975). Minuchin and Montalvo (1967) interviewed and treated large, fatherless poverty families in which parental disfunctioning gave power and substance to the sibling subsystem. It was found that siblings gave reflected self-appraisal, protection, socialization, and interpretation to one another.

In other studies, it was made clear that parents control and supervise sibling relationships, but there was a limit to the parental influence over the sibling system. It was the view of Bank and Dahn (1975) that siblings were not just the puppets of parental wishes, but that siblings exhibited power, expressed feelings, and reciprocated services to each other. Coalitions within those sibships were variable, with numerous affects in different situations, for siblings defined their own sets of rules as to how far each other may go. It was within this subsystem, the first social laboratory, that siblings experimented with peer relationships; the younger children transacted in areas of nurturance, security, and guidance, while the older children made contracts and contacts with the extrafamilial world (Minuchin, 1974). But each of those initial attempts and the later consequent efforts of socialization were primed by parental influences and attitudes (Mussen et al., 1963; Rogers, 1967).

The 1970's have seemed to be a period of struggle, during which changes have created a need for structures that have not yet appeared. Minuchin (1974) identified the changing world and described the family's function as such:

As the family, in a generic sense, changes and adapts to historical circumstances, so the individual family constantly adapts. The family is an open system in transformation. (p. 50)

An apparent concern for research regarding the degree of relationship between people has converged from several directions. Frequently, that research is concerned with describing the group situation, as is implied by the phrase social schemata, sometimes used to label the relationships concept (Kuethé, 1964). In allowing for the description of individuals and groups, the term interpersonal distance seemed appropriate, since it implied a common measurement operation, i.e., measuring physical distance (Altman & Lett, 1970). Hollender, Duke, and Nowicki (1973) added to the discussion that interpersonal distance appeared to be a function of individual predisposition, in addition to one's interpersonal environment.

Other developmental hypotheses, based on theory and research in the development of trust, contend that maternal affection was positively correlated with interpersonal closeness, especially for males (Erikson, 1950; Katz & Rotter, 1969).

These implications of parental relationships affecting the interpersonal distance between siblings and toward other people has been the subject of speculation, and is still clearly in need of further probing.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

This study was designed to better understand how parental attitudes relate to sibling relationships. The hypotheses concerned the relationships between selected parental attitudes and selected areas of sibling interaction. This chapter will describe the procedures used to gather the data for this exploratory study and will include a description of the instruments, selection of the sample, collection of the data, design of the study, and data analysis.

Instruments

The Hereford Parent Attitude Survey (PAS) (see Appendix B) is a seventy-seven item instrument that was used to measure parental attitudes in five areas: (a) Confidence in parent's role, which refers to the parent's concept of himself as a capable or inadequate parent, (b) Causation of the child's behavior, which is concerned with the interpretation a parent makes of his child's behavior, and the extent to which he involves himself as a causative factor, (c) Acceptance of the child's behavior and feelings, which measures the degree to which a parent is satisfied with his child and accepts the child's individuality, (d) Mutual Understanding,

which refers to the extent of interaction of ideas, thoughts, and feelings between parent and child, and (e) Mutual Trust, which measures the amount of confidence that parents and children have in each other (Hereford, 1963). Within each of the five scales there are fifteen items; two additional items are designated as set breakers to reduce the occurrence of habitually marking the undecided category (Johnson, 1976). Answers are marked Strongly Agree (A), Agree (a), Undecided (u), Disagree (d), and Strongly Disagree (D).

The split-half reliability computed for the five attitude scales ranged from .68 to .86 (Johnson, 1976). The split-half reliability coefficient for the Parent Attitude Survey was .80, which is satisfactorily accepted for attitude measures (Hereford, 1963). Interscale correlation coefficients ranged from .33 to .62, all positive. Hereford (1963) reported, "The correlation coefficients are high enough as to indicate that all scales measure related parent attitudes" (p. 57).

The Family Environment Scale (FES) (see Appendix C) was developed by Rudolph H. Moos, Ph.D. at the Social Ecology Laboratory of Stanford University. Its primary assessment is of the social climate of all types of families. The subscales ascertain relationship dimensions of (a) Cohension, which is the extent of familial concern and commitment, (b) Expressiveness, which is the open expression of feelings,

and (c) Conflict, which is the extent of anger and aggression. There are personal growth dimensions of (d) Independence, which is the extent of self-sufficiency and assertiveness, (e) Achievement Orientation, which is the extent of a competitive framework, (f) Intellectual-Cultural Orientation, which is the extent of concern about political, social, and intellectual activities, (g) Active-Recreational Orientation, which is the extent of familiar recreation, and (h) Moral-Religious Emphasis, which is the extent of family discussion about ethical and religious issues. Finally, the system maintenance dimensions evaluate (i) Organization, which measures the clarity and importance of family structure, rules, and responsibilities, and (j) Control, which assesses the extent the family is organized in a hierarchical manner (Moos, 1974).

Personal contact with Dr. Moos' staff at Stanford University verified the acceptance and reliability of the examiner's utilization of an adaptation of the FES to assess sibling interaction and social climate (Lemkey, Note 1). The FES adaptation consisted of rewording test terminology "family" to "brothers and sisters."

The internal consistencies of the FES were calculated using the Kuder-Richardson Formula 20, which were all in an acceptable range. The item-to-subscale correlations varied from a moderate .45 to a substantial .58. The test-retest

reliability was also acceptable varying from a low of .68 to a high of .86. Then, ten subscale scores were intercorrelated with an average being around .20, indicating that the subscales measured distinct and related aspects of family social environments. These intercorrelations accounted for less than 20% of the subscale variance (Moos, 1974).

Sample

The sample was composed of volunteer cooperating families who favorably responded to an initial request letter and family information form that was distributed through two North Central Texas public school systems. These families were intact families with at least two siblings living at home, one of whom was at least 12.0 years old. Because of the wording and complexities of the FES, an adolescent at least 12.0 years old was more likely to understand and complete the study's instrument. A sample size of 50 families was obtained.

Collection of the Data

Permission was requested and granted to send letters and family information forms (see Appendix A) to families who had children enrolled in two North Central Texas school districts. The letter explained the purpose of the study and solicited families who would be willing to be a part of the study. The information sheet asked for number and ages

of children, if both natural parents resided in the same household with the children, or if a step-parent(s) has lived in the same household a minimum of three years, father's occupation, mother's occupation, telephone number, and address. Those intact families who agree to participate in the study returned the letter and family information form to the school. The investigator collected those forms and letters.

Of the approximately 480 request letters and forms sent to the two school systems, 79 were returned. The first 50 families that responded, fit the selection criteria, and agreed to participate were the subjects for this study. Those families were asked to take the tests in groups at a centrally located building. For those families where either a parent or the 12.0 year old child could not come together, a survey and a stamped, addressed envelope was given to the parent who was present at the group administration. The appropriate instrument was then taken home to the person unable to attend. For those families where no representative could attend the group session, two PAS surveys, one FES scale, and a stamped, addressed envelope were delivered to the home. An explanation of the study and directions for the scale and surveys was offered to the families. After a waiting period of several days, a telephone call was made to each of the parents who were solicited to participate in the study. The telephone conversations were used to answer questions,

clarify any issue, and to insure completion of the scale and surveys.

At the group administration, one examiner explained the directions to the parents and the same examiner read the test aloud to the children. A monitor was with the children while the examiner was with the parents. The investigator acted as examiner.

Parents completed the Parent Attitude Survey. The children completed the Family Environment Scale. Approximate testing time, including the directions, was one-half hour. The inventories were scored and coded for automatic data processing.

Design of the Study

This study determined the relationship between five selected parental attitudes and ten selected dimensions of sibling interaction. These correlations came from families who favorably responded to an initial request letter and who were within the limitations of this study. The limitations were an intact family, no less than two siblings in each family, siblings attending a North Central Texas public school, and the sibling closest to age 12.0 years agreeing to complete the study's specified instrument.

The parents completed the Parent Attitude Survey (see Appendix B), and their two scores were combined to result in a single averaged score. Each parent score was also computed

individually. The sibling closest to age 12.0 years completed the Family Environment Scale (see Appendix C) to ascertain a sibling relationship score.

Two main analyses were done by canonical correlation and multiple regression. Canonical correlation was chosen because of its efficiency in correlating the data of five Parent Attitude Survey (PAS) attitudes to the ten Family Environment Scale (FES) relationship dimensions. Ten dependent variables of Cohesion, Expressiveness, Conflict, Independence, Achievement Orientation, Intellectual-Cultural Orientation, Active-Recreational Orientation, Moral-Religious Emphasis, Organization, and Control came from the Family Environment Scale. The Parent Attitude Survey and five selected parental components of Trust, Confidence, Acceptance, Causation, and Understanding served as independent variables. The canonical correlation analysis was performed to correlate the ten dimensions of the FES to the five components of the PAS, thus predicting sibling relationships by parental attitudes.

Analysis of the Data

The major concern of this study was to determine the relationship, if any, between parental attitudes and siblings' interaction. The program used for this study's canonical correlation was CANCECORR of the University of

Pittsburg Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS), which was performed at the computer center at Texas Woman's University in Denton, Texas. For the multiple regression analysis, the subprogram MULREG was utilized.

Canonical correlation analysis and multiple regression was used to analyze the data. For the purposes of the analysis, the members of the family were considered a single unit. Data analysis included interrelating the five independent variables of parental attitudes of the PAS, and interrelating the ten dependent variables of sibling relationship areas of the FES. In addition, the canonical correlation analysis also correlated the two interrelated areas, which predicted FES sibling relationships from the PAS attitudes.

The coefficient of determination, R^2 , was examined to determine the total proportion of variance in the dependent variables accounted for by the independent variables. An overall R^2 was attained and examined to ascertain its efficiency in predicting sibling interactions by parental attitudes. A chi-square test was used to determine if a given prediction was significant. A level of significance of .05 was used.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS OF THE STUDY

The primary purpose of this study was to identify the relationship between specific parental attitudes and sibling relationships. Parental attitudes were categorized into five areas based upon Hereford's (1963) Parental Attitude Survey (PAS). Those parental attitudes were Confidence, Acceptance, Causation, Understanding, and Trust. Sibling relationships were based upon Rudolph Moo's (1974) Family Environment Survey (FES) ten categories, representing Cohesion, Expression, Conflict, Independence, Achievement Orientation, Intellectual-Cultural Orientation, Active-Recreational Orientation, Moral-Religious Emphasis, Organization, and Control.

The PAS and the FES were employed to collect data from the two parents and their 12.0 year old child in each of the fifty families during the Spring of 1979.

Chapter VI is divided into four sections. The first section contains a description of the population used in the study. Section two addresses the intercorrelations for the PAS and FES, and also the results of the study's canonical correlation procedures. The third section of this chapter

presents data which resulted from the use of multiple regression. In the last section, the null hypotheses will be discussed.

Description of the Population

A total of 50 families were involved in this study. Both parents and one sibling in each family were the subjects for this study. Of the siblings surveyed, 26 were boys and 24 were girls. No attempt was made to control for socioeconomic variables. In 26 of these families, both parents worked outside the home.

Because the study was concerned with sibling relationships, it was necessary that each family include at least two siblings. The number of siblings in each household ranged from two to seven, with an average number of children per household being 2.78 children. The range in sibling age varied from 3 years to 31 years of age. Many of the siblings' ages clustered around the study's representative sibling who was 12 years old. Table 1 summarizes data that were gathered from the Family Information Form.

Those siblings chosen for this study were administered the Family Environment Scale, and parents completed the Parent Attitude Survey. Summary statistics are displayed in Tables 2 and 3, which include the means and standard deviations for the FES and PAS. Table 3 further reports the results on the PAS by sex of parent.

Table 1

Summary Data for Family
Information FormNumber of Natural Parents 47Number of families with a step-parent(s) living
in the household a minimum of three years 3

Range of number of children per household:

least 2most 7average 2.78

Range of siblings' ages:

youngest 3 yearsoldest 31 yearsaverage 10.35 yearsNumber of double-income families 26Number of single-income families 24

Sex of child who completed Family Environment Scale:

Girls 24Boys 26

Table 2

Means and Standard Deviations for
Family Environment Scale

Scale	Mean	Standard Deviation
Cohesion	6.62	1.99
Expression	3.60	1.67
Conflict	5.02	1.89
Independence	5.92	1.35
Achievement Orientation	6.24	1.51
Intellectual- Cultural Orientation	5.44	1.88
Active- Recreational Orientation	6.44	1.55
Moral-Religious Emphasis	6.32	1.81
Organization	5.46	2.14
Control	4.92	1.60

Table 3
Means and Standard Deviations for
Parental Attitude Survey

Scale	Fathers Only		Mothers Only		Means of Fathers and Mothers	
	\bar{X}	SD	\bar{X}	SD	\bar{X}	SD
Confidence	5.86	4.16	6.04	4.54	5.95	3.51
Acceptance	7.96	5.39	11.68	5.39	9.40	4.09
Causation	13.24	5.80	14.22	4.70	13.73	4.60
Understanding	13.36	4.83	16.78	5.06	14.87	3.85
Trust	12.04	6.39	14.22	5.16	13.33	4.70

Results of Intercorrelations and
Canonical Correlations

The program used for this study's canonical correlation was the CANCERR of the University of Pittsburg Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS), which was performed at the computer center at Texas Woman's University in Denton, Texas, during the Spring of 1979. Canonical correlation was used to determine the relationship between two sets of data with several independent variables and several dependent variables.

Eight of the ten intercorrelations for the Combined Parent data exceeded the .01 level of significance, while one attained significance at .05. Only the intercorrelation of Trust and Understanding failed to reach significance (see Table 4).

Interrelating the five PAS variables were also performed for the Mothers' scores and the Fathers' scores separately. Examining Fathers Only scores on Table 5 reveals four intercorrelations significant at the .01 level and five intercorrelations significant at the .05 level. Failing to reach a level of significance was the Trust and Understanding intercorrelation. Mothers Only scores on the PAS showed a different proportion of intercorrelations: 6 correlations reached significance at the .01 level and one correlation at the .05 level (see Table 6). Intercorrelations of Confidence

Table 4
 Intercorrelations of the Parent Attitude Survey
 for Combined Parent Data

	Confidence	Acceptance	Causation	Understanding	Trust
Confidence	1.000				
Acceptance	.485**	1.000			
Causation	.466**	.440**	1.000		
Understanding	.527**	.543**	.439**	1.000	
Trust	.430**	.454**	.337*	.148	1.000

*Significant $p \leq .05$ $r \geq .279$

**Significant $p \leq .01$ $r \geq .361$

Table 5
 Intercorrelations of the Parent Attitude
 Survey for Father Only Data

	Confidence	Acceptance	Causation	Understanding	Trust
Confidence	1.000				
Acceptance	.577**	1.000			
Causation	.321*	.570**	1.000		
Understanding	.474**	.358*	.328*	1.000	
Trust	.337*	.557**	.305*	.167	1.000

*Significant $p \leq .05$ $r \geq .279$

**Significant $p \leq .01$ $r \geq .361$

Table 6
 Intercorrelations of the Parent Attitude
 Survey for Mother Only Data

	Confidence	Acceptance	Causation	Understanding	Trust
Confidence	1.000				
Acceptance	.221	1.000			
Causation	.463**	.439**	1.000		
Understanding	.441**	.599**	.390**	1.000	
Trust	.169	.370**	.268	.339*	1.000

*Significant $p \leq .05$ $r \geq .279$

**Significant $p \leq .01$ $r \geq .361$

and Trust, Confidence and Acceptance, and Causation and Trust did not reach an acceptable significant level. However, Causation and Trust was approaching significance at the .05 level.

The ten variables from the FES were also intercorrelated (see Table 7). Of the 45 intercorrelations, 9 reached significance at the .01 level and 6 at the .05 level (see Table 7). The intercorrelations had a range from a low of $-.018$ to a high of $.624$.

The first canonical correlation employed the mean score for both parents on the five scales of the PAS as one set of variables (see Table 8). A chi-square was used to test the significance of the canonical correlations. No significant relationship was found. There were no combinations of variables on the PAS that correlated significantly with any combination of variables on the FES.

Since this first canonical correlation failed to find any significant relationship, canonical correlations were performed using the Fathers Only scores on the five scales of the PAS as one set of variables, and the 10 FES scales as the other (see Table 9). A canonical correlation was also performed using the five scales on the PAS for the Mothers Only data as one set of variables, and the 10 FES scales as the other variable (see Table 10). This was done since the scores on the mothers and fathers separately might have

Table 7

Intercorrelations of the Family Environment Scale

	C	Ex	Con	Ind	AO	ICO	ARO	ME	Org	Cont
Cohesion	1.000									
Expression	.082	1.000								
Conflict	-.376**	-.101	1.000							
Independence	.328*	.058	-.055	1.000						
Achievement Orientation	.370*	-.067	-.059	.210	1.000					
Intellectual- Cultural Orientation	..427**	.077	-.325*	.151	-.031	1.000				
Active- Recreational Orientation	.429**	.077	-.073	.425**	.224	.226	1.000			
Moral-Religious Emphasis	..406**	-.018	-.299*	.152	.270*	.282*	.166	1.000		
Organization	.624**	-.045	-.446**	.154	.218	.441**	.257	.224	1.000	
Control	.201	-.173	.177	.236	-.174	.236	-.174	..452**	.141	1.000

*Significant $p \leq .05$ $r \geq .279$

**Significant $p \leq .01$ $r \geq .361$

Table 8
 Canonical Correlations Using Means of Mothers
 and Fathers Scores on PAS

Canonical R	Eigenvalue	Chi-square	df	Significance
0.656	0.430	50.220	50	0.465
0.489	0.240	27.140	36	0.856
0.467	0.218	15.914	24	0.831
0.299	0.090	5.816	14	0.971
0.216	0.047	1.963	6	0.923

Table 9
 Canonical Correlations Using Fathers Scores
 on Parent Attitude Survey

Canonical R	Eigenvalue	Chi-square	df	Significance
0.617	0.381	40.488	50	0.829
0.451	0.203	20.844	36	0.979
0.335	0.112	11.517	24	0.985
0.332	0.110	6.637	14	0.948
0.210	0.044	1.854	6	0.933

Table 10
 Canonical Correlations Using Mothers
 Scores on Parent Attitude Survey

Canonical R	Eigenvalue	Chi-square	df	Significance
0.641	0.411	52.207	50	0.388
0.588	0.345	30.527	36	0.726
0.397	0.157	13.155	24	0.964
0.284	0.080	6.133	14	0.963
0.252	0.064	2.696	6	0.846

shown differences based on the sex of the parent that would have been obscured by combining that data. No significant relationship was found in either case.

Data Results from Multiple Regression

Multiple regression analyzes the relationship between a set of independent predictor variables with a single dependent or criterion variable. For the data in this study there were 45 multiple correlations possible for entry.

A systematic testing of the data was performed in the following manner: first, it was decided that each PAS variable would be used as the criterion, with the ten FES scales being the predictors. This procedure was accomplished using each of the five PAS scales for the Mothers Only, each of the five PAS scales for the Fathers Only, and each of the five for the Combined Parent scales.

The procedure was then maneuvered to name the FES scales as criterion with the PAS components serving as predictors. Having the FES as criterion, the data were analyzed for significant predictors among the five PAS variables for the Mothers Only scales, Fathers Only scales, and finally the five Combined Parents scores. The level that was used to determine significance was .05.

In only two of the multiple regressions did more than a single variable enter into the equation at a significant

level. For the Combined Parents scores on the PAS, the regression predicting Active-Recreational Orientation had variables, Confidence and Causation, entering at significant levels. These two variables had an \underline{R} of .28113, with $\underline{R}^2 = .15967$. This accounted for approximately 16% of the total variance.

As was mentioned earlier, the Fathers Only scales had no regressions in which more than one predictor variable entered the equation at the .05 level of significance. However, when the PAS scores were regressed on the Mothers Only data, the regression predicting Acceptance had variables, Expression and Independence, entering at significant levels. With these two variables in the equation, $\underline{R} = .48815$, and $\underline{R}^2 = .23829$. This accounted for 24% of the variance.

There were several other regressions with a single variable which entered at an acceptable level of significance. The categories of Mothers Only and Combined Parent scores each had two significant multiple correlations in which only a single predictor entered from the PAS or the FES. The Fathers Only category also had two significant correlations which contained a single predictor from the PAS or the FES. These corresponded to the significant zero-order correlations between the ten FES scores and the three sets of five PAS scores. These three sets of significant correlations are indicated in Tables 11, 12, and 13.

Table 11

Pearson Correlations of Family Environment Scales with Parent
Attitude Survey Scales for Combined Parents Data

Scale	Confidence	Acceptance	Causation	Understanding	Trust
Cohesion	.198	.197	-.0002	.138	.042
Expression	.134	-.231	-.054	-.130	.068
Conflict	-.066	.114	-.140	-.077	.071
Independence	.057	.209	-.068	.076	.004
Achievement Orientation	-.086	.123	-.048	-.031	-.102
Intellectual- Cultural Orientation	.236	.146	.190	.060	.041
Active- Recreational Orientation	.281*	.182	-.210	.210	-.034
Moral-Religious Emphasis	.088	-.085	.075	-.007	-.301*
Organization	.098	.059	.208	-.125	.044
Control	.025	-.166	.203	-.111	-.250

*Significant $p \leq .05$

Table 12

Pearson Correlations of Family Environment Scales with Parent
Attitude Survey on Fathers Data

Scale	Confidence	Acceptance	Causation	Understanding	Trust
Cohesion	.349*	.059	.073	.234	.019
Expression	.057	.062	.100	-.063	.141
Conflict	-.026	.062	-.190	-.144	.118
Independence	-.020	-.163	-.119	-.076	-.155
Achievement Orientation	-.072	-.142	-.046	-.186	-.101
Intellectual- Cultural Orientation	.123	.226	.162	.074	.029
Active- Recreational Orientation	.306*	-.008	-.089	.179	-.047
Moral-Religious Emphasis	.014	-.055	.128	.119	-.197
Organization	.166	.065	.101	.159	-.036
Control	-.008	.016	.246	-.057	-.127

51

*Significant $p \leq .05$

Table 13
 Pearson Correlations of Family Environment Scales with Parent
 Attitude Survey on Mothers Data

Scale	Confidence	Acceptance	Causation	Understanding	Trust
Cohesion	-.014	-.074	-.091	-.018	.066
Expression	.156	-.405*	-.231	-.045	.001
Conflict	-.079	.173	-.037	-.002	.048
Independence	.107	.248	.156	.194	.152
Achievement Orientation	-.067	.037	-.039	.090	-.224
Intellectual- Cultural Orientation	.252	.083	.169	.023	-.027
Active- Recreational Orientation	.154	.078	.125	.150	-.058
Moral-Religious Emphasis	.123	-.060	-.011	-.139	-.357*
Organization	.000	.008	-.069	.021	.087
Control	.045	-.123	.095	-.110	-.252

52

*Significant $p \leq .05$

Concluding Statements of the Null Hypotheses

In regard to retaining or rejecting the null hypotheses, several statements may be made. First, the multiple regression testing the first null hypothesis showed a significant relationship between the parental attitude of Confidence and the sibling relationship scale of Active-Recreational Orientation. No other relationship was found between the parental attitude, Confidence, and the other FES variables. Therefore, the first null hypothesis was rejected, since there was a significant relationship resulting between PAS Confidence and one scale of the FES.

Multiple regression testing the second null hypothesis between the parental attitude of Acceptance and the sibling relationship scales found no significant relationships. Therefore, the second null hypothesis was retained.

Multiple regression testing the third null hypothesis between the parental attitude of Causation and the sibling relationship scales found no significant relationships. Therefore, the third null hypothesis was retained.

Multiple regression testing the fourth null hypothesis between the parental attitude of Understanding and the sibling relationship scales found no significant relationships. Therefore, the fourth null hypothesis was retained.

Multiple regression testing the fifth null hypothesis showed a significant relationship between the parental

attitude of Trust and the sibling relationships scale of Moral-Religious Emphasis. Consequently, the fifth null hypothesis was rejected, due to this significant relationship between PAS Trust and one scale of the FES.

The sixth null hypothesis of no overall relationship between parental attitudes and sibling interaction was retained. This null hypothesis was tested by canonical correlation analysis.

As noted above, additional analyses were performed to determine whether significant canonical correlations existed between the 10 FES scales and the 5 PAS scales for the mothers and fathers individually. Multiple regressions were performed to determine whether some linear combination of variables could predict each individual variable at an acceptable level of significance. Little significant relationship was found.

Summary

In summarizing the results of this study, it was apparent that there were few significant relationships between parental attitudes and the interactions and relationships between siblings. Although there was some significance associated between particular parental attitudes and sibling relationships, the significance did not account for an overall global statement of a relationship between the two.

Therefore, any attention given to the significant relationships could well be based on chance, since there were only 2 significant relationships out of a possible 45. The parental attitudes which could affect sibling interaction are discussed below.

When the two parents' scores were combined, two PAS variables were significantly related with two single FES variables: Parental Confidence coupled with the FES description of Active-Recreational Orientation; Parental Trust related with Moral-Religious Emphasis. The sibling relationship scale of Active-Recreational Orientation was also significant with parental attitudes Confidence and Causation.

Individual analysis was performed on the scores of Mothers Only and Fathers Only. When the Mothers Only scores were analyzed there were three sets of significant findings. They were PAS Acceptance relating significantly with FES Expression and Independence. PAS Trust was significantly related to FES Moral-Religious Emphasis. And PAS Acceptance was significantly related with FES Expression.

When the Fathers Only scores were computed, two sets of significant relationships resulted. One was PAS Confidence significantly relating with FES Cohesion, and the other was PAS Confidence significantly relating to FES Active-Recreational Orientation.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, IMPLICATIONS OF THE FINDINGS, AND SUGGESTIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

Summary

A review of the literature on the subject of sibling relationships indicated that parental attitudes have an affect on the sibship. Bonds between family members are strong and each person within the familial bond affects each of the other members. The parents are family architects who define the tone and mood for family members.

This study was designed to determine the relationship between selected parent attitudes and selected sibling interactions. The Parent Attitude Survey (PAS) was administered to all parents in the study. The PAS measures parents' attitudes toward Confidence, Acceptance, Causation, Understanding, and Trust. The Family Environment Scale (FES) was administered to all children in the study. The FES measures siblings' relationships in the areas of Cohesion, Expressiveness, Conflict, Independence, Active-Recreational Orientation, Moral-Religious Emphasis, Organization, and Control.

Of the 480 request letters and family information forms sent to parents with children enrolled in two North Texas

public school systems, 79 were returned, constituting a return rate of approximately 16%. The first 50 families that met the limitations of the study and agreed to take the surveys and scales were the subjects for this study. Data were gathered during the Spring of 1979 from 50 sets of parents and their 12 year-old children. No regard was given to socioeconomic level. Double and single income families were included in this study.

The data were analyzed using the canonical correlation procedure. Because no significant relationships were found, multiple regression analyses were also applied to further assess relationships of the Mothers Only and Fathers Only and the Combined Parent PAS scores with the FES scales.

Findings and Conclusions Related to Hypothesis One

The first hypothesis stated: No relationship exists between parents' attitudes on the scale of Confidence in parents' role and sibling relationships in the areas of (a) Cohesion, (b) Expressiveness, (c) Conflict, (d) Independence, (e) Achievement Orientation, (f) Intellectual-Cultural Orientation, (g) Active-Recreational Orientation, (h) Moral-Religious Emphasis, (i) Organization, and (j) Control as measured by the Parent Attitude Survey and the Family Environment Scale.

A relationship of .281, significant at the .05 level, was found between the Combined Parent scores on the PAS Confidence subscale and the FES Active-Recreational Orientation subscale. Therefore, hypothesis one (g) was rejected and the remaining sub-hypotheses were retained.

The Confidence scale of the PAS is concerned with the parents' feelings of uncertainty as to what to do about problems encountered in the parenting role, implications that parenting requires suffering or sacrifice, and parents' feelings about the number of problems involved with parenting (Hereford, 1963).

Active-Recreational Orientation was intended by the FES author to measure the extent to which a group, in this case brothers and sisters, participated actively in various kinds of recreational and sporting activities (Moos, 1974).

The significant relationship appears to indicate that when parents feel confident about their parenting role, children tend to participate actively in various kinds of recreation and sporting activities.

These parents who perceived themselves as confident parents disagreed with items such as the following examples: It's hard to know what to do when a child is afraid of something that won't hurt him; and I feel I am faced with more problems than most parents.

It seems plausible to assume that parents who felt good about themselves would pass this positive feeling to their children. Siblings who were surrounded by satisfied feelings would be likely to actively join in various kinds of recreational and sporting activities among themselves. Sporting activities which include a competitive framework would not thwart sibling interaction but induce lively participation.

No significant relationship was found between the PAS Confidence subscale and the FES subscales of Cohesion, Expressiveness, and Conflict. These findings are in disagreement with research which indicates that a strong capable parental model favors familial support and open expression of feelings, and reduces conflictual interactions (Mussen et al., 1974; Sutton-Smith & Rosenberg, 1970).

No significant relationship was found between the PAS Confidence subscale and the FES personal growth dimensions, Independence, Achievement Orientation, Intellectual-Cultural Orientation, and Moral-Religious Emphasis. These dimensions were profiles of assertiveness, competitiveness, intellectual concern, and ethical values. These findings do not support previous research which gives data that support the theory that parents who perceive and live confident parenting roles will induce their children to be self-sufficient,

competitive, and assertive (Biehler, 1976; Sutton-Smith & Rosenberg, 1970).

No significant relationship was found between PAS Confidence subscale and the FES system maintenance dimensions, Organization and Control. Again, a discrepancy exists between these findings and other research which points out that parents' certainty in their parental roles does not reflect hierarchical confusion or role responsibilities (Minuchin, 1974).

Findings and Conclusions Related
to Hypothesis Two

The second hypothesis stated: No relationship exists between parents' attitudes on the scale of Acceptance of the child's behavior and feelings and sibling relationships in the areas of (a) Cohesion, (b) Expressiveness, (c) Conflict, (d) Independence, (e) Achievement Orientation, (f) Intellectual-Cultural Orientation, (g) Active-Recreational Orientation, (h) Moral-Religious Emphasis, (i) Organization, and (j) Control as measured by the Parent Attitude Survey and Family Environment Scale. There were no relationships significant at the .05 level and therefore hypothesis two was retained.

The PAS Acceptance scale measures parental reluctance to accept childhood behavior or normal developmental changes

in the child. The scale is concerned with parental acceptance or rejection of children's behavior and feelings (Hereford, 1963).

The findings of this study do not support research that identifies parental acceptance with a child's personal growth (Biehler, 1976; Mussen et al., 1974).

Findings and Conclusions Related
to Hypothesis Three

The third hypothesis stated: No relationship exists between parents' attitudes on the scale of Causation of child's behaviors and sibling relationships in the areas of (a) Cohesion, (b) Expressiveness, (c) Conflict, (d) Independence, (e) Achievement Orientation, (f) Intellectual-Cultural Orientation, (g) Active-Recreational Orientation, (h) Moral-Religious Emphasis, (i) Organization, and (j) Control as measured by the Parent Attitude Survey and Family Environment Scale. No relationships were significant at the .05 level and therefore hypothesis three was retained.

The findings of this study failed to support previous research. Hereford (1963) defined Causation as concern with the interpretation a parent makes of his child's behavior, and the extent to which he involves himself as a causative factor. The purpose of this measurement is to discern if parents distinguish between natural developmental

circumstances or induced developmental circumstances. Three selected items read: A child that comes from bad stock doesn't have much chance of amounting to anything; Some children are just naturally bad; and Why children behave the way they do is too much for anyone to figure out.

This scale indicates some very important and basic beliefs about parenthood and human behavior. Many parental decisions and reactions reflect a personal panorama as to how children should be reared, what decides the future of their children, and what decision would be best for all concerned.

Research states that comprehension of circumstances which were not caused by the parents could result in a stronger and more favorable relationship. And parents who can realistically assume responsibility for circumstances or aspects which result from their attitudes are making a tremendous contribution toward improved and stronger relationships among their family members (Minuchin, 1974).

By accepting one's child as he is, unconditionally, a parent's emotional oppression can be yielded. The child who feels that he has been accepted will feel better about himself. An improved or accepted self-image will most likely render good relationships in most of the FES personal growth dimensions, relationship dimensions, and the system maintenance dimensions. Parents who are not properly distinguishing between inherent and environmental causations will most likely have poor familial function patterns.

Because of the preceding research discussions, it would seem reasonable to query why these two instruments had no significant relationships. There is research to defend the premise of parental understanding of causation affecting siblings and their relationships (Biehler, 1976; Mussen et al., 1974; Sutton-Smith & Rosenberg, 1970).

Summary and Conclusions Related

To Hypothesis Four

The fourth hypothesis stated: No relationship exists between parents' attitudes on the scale of Understanding and sibling relationships in the areas of (a) Cohesion, (b) Expressiveness, (c) Conflict, (d) Independence, (e) Achievement Orientation, (f) Intellectual-Cultural Orientation, (g) Active-Recreational Orientation, (h) Moral-Religious Emphasis, (i) Organization, and (j) Control as measured by the Parent Attitude Survey and the Family Environment Scale. No relationships were obtained which were significant at the .05 level, and therefore hypothesis four was retained.

These findings were not in agreement with other research in this area. According to the PAS author, this scale is the communication or interaction variable, although it is not necessarily dependent on the amount of verbal exchange (Hereford, 1963). Minuchin (1974) emphasized the importance of good communication skills, and stated that this ability

forms an invisible web of complementary demands that regulate many family situations. The FES subscale of Moral-Religious Emphasis also deals with communication related to delving into, discussing, and debating issues which could enrich parent, child, and sibling relationships. A lack of parental initiative in this area widens the communication gap and spreads to other relationship dimensions (Mishler & Wasler, 1968).

FES Intellectual-Cultural Orientation also involves interaction and conversation. Political, cultural, and intellectual conversations would rarely be instigated in families if stimulating conversations were not emphasized and valued. With this type of insouciant family, cohesive relationships would not be as prominent, for there would be a lack of concern and commitment to one another (Murdock, 1949; Sutton-Smith & Rosenberg, 1970).

Summary and Conclusions Related to Hypothesis Five

The fifth hypothesis stated: No relationship exists between parents' attitudes on the scale of Trust and sibling relationships in the areas of (a) Cohesion, (b) Expressiveness, (c) Conflict, (d) Independence, (e) Achievement Orientation, (f) Intellectual-Cultural Orientation, (g) Active-Recreational Orientation, (h) Moral-Religious Emphasis,

(i) Organization, and (j) Control as measured by the Parent Attitude Survey and the Family Environment Scale.

A relationship of $-.031$, significant at the $.05$ level, was found between the Combined Parent scores on the PAS Trust subscale and the FES Moral-Religious Emphasis subscale. Therefore, hypothesis five (h) was rejected and the remaining sub-hypotheses were retained.

The PAS Trust scale deals with the amount of confidence that parents and children have in each other, which can be suspicion and deceit or mutual confidence and trust (Hereford, 1963).

Moral-Religious Emphasis measures the extent to which the family actively discusses and emphasizes ethical and religious issues and values (Moos, 1974).

Because this significant relationship is negative, the two variables are inversely related. For those parents who scored high on the PAS Trust subscale, their children tended to score low on the FES Moral-Religious Emphasis subscale; and for those parents who scored low on the PAS Trust subscale, their children tended to score high on the FES Moral-Religious Emphasis subscale. These findings are so inconsistent with previous research and theories found in the literature that no explanation from the data of this study seems possible.

Summary and Conclusions Related
to Hypothesis Six

The sixth null hypothesis stated: No relationship exists between attitudes held by parents and sibling interaction. The results of the data analysis indicated a retention of the sixth null hypothesis.

Evaluating the overall significant relationships between PAS parental attitudes and FES sibling relationships, scores obtained on these two instruments did not disprove the null hypothesis. Only two sub-hypotheses yielded significant relationships which does not warrant rejection of the hypothesis. However, a review of the literature did give credence to the theory that parental attitudes do affect sibling relations (Hollender et al., 1973; Pfouts, 1976).

There appear to be several reasons why significant relationships between parental attitudes and sibling relationships were not found in this study: (a) The instruments may measure unrelated constructs even though they use similar terminology; (b) The use of only one sibling in a family may have limited the sibling relationship perspective; and (c) The volunteer population may not have been fairly representative.

Conclusions of the Study

In synthesizing the results of this study, two significant relationships between the Parent Attitude Survey (PAS) and the Family Environment Scale (FES) of the Combined Parent data resulted.

PAS Confidence had a significant relationship with FES Active-Recreational Orientation. This implies that parents who were certain, competent, and satisfied in their parental roles had siblings who, together, actively engaged in recreational and sporting activities.

PAS Trust had a significant negative relationship with FES Moral-Religious Emphasis. This inverse relationship indicated that when parents were distrustful of their children, the siblings were interested in ethical and moral issues and emphasis. And when parents were trusting of their children, the siblings tended to be less interested in moral and ethical issues.

Unanswered Questions

In view of the findings of this study of sibling relations and parental attitudes, several questions remain unanswered:

1. How many statements in the literature were based on subjective feelings rather than empirical research?

2. Is the research data in the literature skewed toward the family social climate of emotionally and physically deprived children?

3. If parents become better acquainted with literature on the effects of parental attitudes, would they respond differently to the instrument used in this study?

4. Would a different parental attitude scale measuring the same variables correlate differently with the FES dimensions?

A better understanding of parental attitudes and sibling relationships is needed, and therefore further substantial research is warranted. This study has attempted only to identify parental attitude and sibling relationships within certain limitations.

Suggestions for Future Research

Information available concerning sibling relationships was sparse and antiquated. Although what has been published, both dated and current knowledge, is valuable; however, too often much of the literature focuses on extremely specific populations.

The research collected by Sutton-Smith and Rosenberg (1970) is of tremendous breadth and extremely valuable to education and psychology scholars. However, the data may be too technical or specific for parents' comprehension and

utilization in their own lifestyles. Recognizing the broad scope of available information concerning ordinal position, sex, and age in addition to parental attitudes, a need for general trends of parental attitudes and sibling interaction still exists. Only through scientifically substantive studies will a better understanding of parental attitudes and sibling relationships be added to the literature.

While there were limitations imposed and recognized in this study, quality control of a scientific approach was attempted in retaining or rejecting the study's hypothesis of sibling relationships. Even though few significant relationships resulted, this study represented an exploratory effort.

The findings of this study supported the need for better defined parental attitudes, and the extent, if any, to which those attitudes affect the sibship. These data suggested that overall parental attitudes do not affect sibling relationships. Inferred here was the need for further research, exploration, and refinement of terminology.

The limited relationships found between the two variables in question could indicate a need for better test procedures and instruments. A test solely for the purpose of assessing sibling relationships was not found; consequently, it was necessary to revise upon an existing scale which assessed the family social climate. This necessity of scale

revision raised the question as to whether the revision, or even the conditions, affected test outcomes. Inadequate scale measurement could have obscured the true relationships among siblings. With these suggested improvements in mind, more accurate results might have been attained.

As a result of this study, several modifications could be offered to any future extensions to this type of exploratory investigation:

1. A sample increase in the number of families would be helpful.
2. An instrument should be developed to evaluate sibling relationships.
3. Using the responses of all the siblings in a family might yield different results.

In conclusion, the study was undertaken in an exploratory manner. It attempted to examine the relationship between specific attitudes of parents that directly affect selected sibling interaction. It was the belief of the researcher that parental attitudes do greatly contribute to the quality and type of sibship. When reviewing related literature this belief was supported. Even though the results of this exploratory study provided limited significant results, the study directed itself to the question of whether parental attitudes do indeed affect sibling relationships.

REFERENCES

References

- Ackerman, N. W. Treating the troubled family. New York: Basic Books, Incorporated, 1966.
- Adler, A. What life should mean to you. Boston: Little Brown, 1931.
- Adler, A. Understanding human behavior. New York: Fawcett Publications, 1959.
- Altman, I., & Lett, E. E. The ecology of interpersonal relations: A classification system and conceptual model. In J. E. McGrath (Ed.), Social and psychological factors in stress. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1970.
- Altus, W. D. Birth order and its sequence. Science, 1966, 151, 44-49.
- Bank, S., & Kahn, M. Sisterhood-brotherhood is powerful: Sibling subsystems and family therapy. Family Process, September 1975, 14(3), 311-335.
- Becker, S. W., Lerner, M. J., & Carroll, J. Conformity as a function of birth order and type of group pressure: A verification. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1966, 3, 181-193.
- Biehler, R. F. Child development: An introduction. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1976.
- Bossard, J. H. S., & Boll, E. Security in the large family. Mental Hygiene, October 1954, 38, 532.
- Bossard, J. H. S., & Boll, E. Adjustment of siblings in large families. American Journal of Psychiatry, 1956, 112, 889-892. (a)
- Bossard, J. H. S., & Boll, E. The large family system. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1956. (b)
- Bossard, J. H. S., & Sanger, W. The large family system: A research report. American Sociological Review, February 1952, 17, 3-9.

- Burgess, E. W. The family as a unity of interacting personalities. The Family, March 1926, 3-9.
- Caplow, T. Two against one: Coalition in triads. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1968.
- Chapin, F. The experimental approach: The advantage of experimental sociology in the study of family group patterns. Social Forces, December 1932, 11, 204.
- Cicirelli, V. G. The relationship of sibling structure to intellectual abilities and achievement. Review of Educational Research, Summer 1978, 48, 365-379.
- Cumming, E., & Schneider, D. M. Sibling solidarity: A property of American kinship. American Anthropologist, June 1961, 63, 498-507.
- Davis, C., & Northway, M. L. Siblings--rivalry or relationship? Bulletin of the Institute for Child Study, Toronto, 1957, 19(3), 10-13.
- Dreikurs, R. Children: The challenge. New York: Duell, Sloan and Pearce, 1964.
- Ellis, A., & Beechley, R. M. A comparison of child guidance clinic patients coming from large, medium, and small families. Journal of Genetic Psychology, September 1951, 79, 131-144.
- Erikson, E. H. Childhood and society. New York: Norton, 1950.
- Essman, C. S. Sibling relations as socialization for parenthood. The Family Coordinator, July 1977, 26(3), 23-34.
- Ferguson, G. Statistical analysis in psychology and education. New York: McGraw-Hill Company, 1971.
- Garigue, P. French Canadian kinship and urban life. American Anthropologist, 1956, 58, 1090-1101.
- Graham, A. Sibling solidarity. Journal of Marriage and the Family, February 1977, 39(1), 177-184.
- Greco, M. C. Group life. New York: The Philosophical Library, 1950.

- Hartup, W. W. Peer interaction and social organization. In P. H. Mussen (Ed.), Carmichael's manual of child psychology. (3rd ed.) Vol. 2. New York: Wiley, 1970, 457-561.
- Hawkes, G. R. Burchinal, L., & Gardner, B. Size of family and adjustments of children. Marriage and Family Living, February 1958, 20, 65-68.
- Hereford, C. S. Changing parental attitude through group discussion. Austin, Texas: University of Texas Press, 1963.
- Hollender, J. W., Duke, P., & Nowicki, S. Interpersonal distance: Sibling structure and parental affection antecedents. The Journal of Genetic Psychology, 1973, 123, 35-45.
- Irish, D. Sibling interaction: A neglected aspect in family life research. Social Forces, March 1964, 42, 279-288.
- Jackson, E. B., Klatskin, E. H., & Wilkin, L. C. Early child development in relation to the degree of flexibility of maternal attitudes. Psychoanalytical Studies of Children, 1952, 7, 393-428.
- Johnson, O. G. Parental attitude survey. Tests and measurements in child development: Handbook II. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1976.
- Jones, H. E. Order of birth. In C. Murchinson (Ed.), Handbook of child psychology. Worcester, Massachusetts: Clark University Press, 1933.
- Katz, H. A., & Rotter, J. B. Interpersonal trust scores of college students and their parents. Child Development, 1969, 40, 657-661.
- Kirkpatrick, C. The family: A process and institution. New York: The Ronald Press Company, 1963.
- Koch, H. The relation of certain family constellation characteristics and the attitudes of children toward adults. Child Development, 1955, 26, 13-40. (a)
- Koch, H. Some personality correlates of sex, sibling position, and sex of siblings among five and six-year-old children. Genetic Psychology Monographs, 1955, 52, 3-50. (b)

- Koch, H. Attitudes of young children toward their peers as related to certain characteristics of their siblings. Psychological Monographs, 1956, 70 (Whole No. 426).
- Krout, M. H. Typical behavior patterns in twenty-six ordinal positions. Journal of Genetic Psychology, 1939, 55, 3-30.
- Kueth, J. L. Pervasive influence of social schemata. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1964, 68, 248-254.
- Levy, D. Hostility patterns in sibling rivalry experiments. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, April 1936, 6, 183-257.
- Levy, D. Studies in sibling rivalry. American Orthopsychiatry Association, 1937, 2. (Monograph)
- Martin, A. R. A study of parental attitudes and their influence upon personality development. Education, 1942-1943, 63, 597-608.
- Minuchin, S. Families and family therapy. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1974.
- Minuchin, S., & Montalvo, B. Families of the slums. New York: Basic Books, 1967.
- Mishler, E. G., & Wasler, N. E. Interaction in families. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Incorporated, 1968.
- Moos, R. H., Insel, P., & Humphrey, B. Family, work, and group environment scales. Palo Alto, California: Consulting Psychologists Press, Incorporated, 1974.
- Mussen, P. H., Conger, J. J., & Kagan, J. Child development (4th ed.). New York: Harper and Row, 1974.
- Murdock, G. P. Social structure. New York: Macmillan Company, 1949.
- Nye, F. I. Adolescent-parent adjustment: Age, sex, sibling number, broken homes, and employed mother as variables. Marriage and Family Living, November 1952, 14, 328.
- Perlman, H. H. A note on siblings. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, January 1967, 37, 148.

- Pfouts, J. H. The sibling relationship: A forgotten dimension. Social Work, 1976, 21(3), 200-203.
- Rabin, A. I. Growing up in the Kibbutz. New York: Springer, 1965.
- Reiss, P. J. The extended kinship system: Correlates of and attitudes on frequency of interaction. Marriage and Family Living, November 1962, 24, 333-339.
- Riskin, J., & Faunce, E. An evaluative review of family interaction research. Family Process, 1972, 11, 365-455.
- Rogers, D. Child psychology. Belmont, California: Brooks/Cole Publishing Company, 1969.
- Schachter, F. F., Shire, E., Feldman-Rotman, S., Marquis, R. E., & Campbell, S. Sibling deidentification. Developmental Psychology, September 1976, 12(5), 418-427.
- Schachter, S. The psychology of affiliation. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1959.
- Serot, N. M., & Teevan, R. C. Perception of the parent-child relationship and its relation to child adjustment. Child Development, 1961, 32, 373-378.
- Sletto, R. F. Sibling position and juvenile delinquency. American Journal of Sociology, March 1934, 39, 657-669.
- Strott, L. H. Parental attitudes of farm, town, and city parents in relation to certain personality adjustments in their children. Journal of Social Psychology, 1940, 10, 325-340.
- Sussman, M. B. The isolated nuclear family: Fact or fiction. Social Problems, Spring 1959, 6, 333-340.
- Sutton-Smith, B., & Rosenberg, B. Modeling and reactive components of sibling interaction. Minnesota Symposium of Child Psychology. Minnesota: University of Minnesota Press, 1969, 3, 131-152.
- Sutton-Smith, B., & Rosenberg, B. G. The sibling. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1970.
- Tolman, W. Family constellations as a basic personality determinant. Journal of Individual Psychology, November 1959, 15, 199.

Reference Note

1. Lemkey, S. Personal Communication, February 13, 1979.

APPENDIX A

COVER LETTER TO PARENTS AND
FAMILY INFORMATION FORM

April 1979

Dear Parents,

A study is being conducted to learn more about parent and children attitudes. If both of you are willing to participate in this study, please complete and return the enclosed form to your child's teacher.

If you agree to participate, you will be asked to complete a questionnaire, and your child will also be asked to complete a questionnaire. To complete these forms will take approximately thirty minutes of your time. All answers are confidential and will not be identified. Interest is in groups of answers, not individual responses.

If you respond favorably and are chosen to participate according to random selection, you will be notified by phone or by letter.

Sincerely,

Shirley C. Barret
Texas Woman's University
Doctoral Student

Enclosure

FAMILY INFORMATION FORM

1. Are both natural parents currently living together in same household? Yes No.

*2. Has the step-parent(s), living in the same household, been a member of the family for at least three years?
 Yes No.

3. Last name of family _____.

4. First name of father _____.

First name of mother _____.

Names, ages, and grade levels of children:

_____ Age _____ Grade _____.

5. Father's occupation _____.

6. Mother's occupation _____.

7. Telephone number _____.

8. Address _____.

*If applicable

APPENDIX B

PARENT ATTITUDE SURVEY

6. Most of the time giving advice to children is a waste of time because they either don't take it or don't need it. A a u d D
7. It is hard to let children go and visit people because they might misbehave when parents aren't around. A a u d D
8. Fewer people are doing a good job of child-rearing now than 30 years ago. A a u d D
9. With all a child hears at school and from friends, there's little a parent can do to influence him. A a u d D
10. If a little girl is a tomboy, her mother should try to get her interested in dolls and playing house.. . . . A a u d D
11. A child has a right to his own point of view and ought to be allowed to express it, just as parents express theirs A a u d D
12. If children are quiet for a while you should immediately find out why. A a u d D
13. It's a rare parent who can be even-tempered with the children all day A a u d D
14. Psychologists now know that what a child is born with determines the kind of person he becomes A a u d D
15. One reason that it is sad to see children grow up is because they need you more when they are babies A a u d D
16. The trouble with trying to understand children's problems is they usually just make up a lot of stories to keep you interested A a u d D
17. A mother has a right to know every thing going on in her child's life because her child is a part of her A a u d D

18. Most parents aren't sure what is the best way to bring up children. A a u d D
19. A child may learn to be a juvenile delinquent from playing games like cops and robbers and war too much. A a u d D
20. There is no reason why a child should not learn to keep his clothes clean very early in life A a u d D
21. If a parent sees that a child is right and the parent is wrong, they should admit it and try to do something about it A a u d D
22. A child should be allowed to try out what it can do at times without the parents watching A a u d D
23. It's hard to know what to do when a child is afraid of something that won't hurt him A a u d D
24. Most all children are just the same at birth; it's what happens to them afterwards that is important A a u d D
25. Playing with a baby too much should be avoided since it excites them and they won't sleep A a u d D
26. Children shouldn't be asked to do all the compromising without a chance to express their side of things A a u d D
27. Parents should make it their business to know everything their children are thinking. A a u d D
28. Raising children isn't as hard as most parents let on. A a u d D
29. There are many things that influence a young child that parents don't understand and can't do anything about. A a u d D

30. A child who wants too much affection may become a "softie" if it is given to him A a u d D
31. Family life would be happier if parents made children feel they were free to say what they think about anything A a u d D
32. Children must be told exactly what to do and how to do it or they will make mistakes. A a u d D
33. Parents sacrifice most of their own fun for their children A a u d D
34. Many times parents are punished for their sins through the bad behavior of their children. A a u d D
35. If you put too many restrictions on a child, you will stunt his personality. . . . A a u d D
36. Most children's fears are so unreasonable it only makes things worse to let the child talk about them A a u d D
37. It is hard to know when to let boys and girls pal together when they can't be seen. A a u d D
38. I feel I am faced with more problems than most parents. A a u d D
39. Most of the bad traits children have (like nervousness or bad temper) are inherited. A a u d D
40. A child who misbehaves should be made to feel guilty and ashamed of himself. . . . A a u d D
41. Family conferences, which include the children, don't usually accomplish much A a u d D
42. It's a parent's duty to make sure he knows a child's innermost thoughts A a u d D

43. It's hard to know whether to be playful rather than dignified with children. . . . A a u d D
44. A child that comes from bad stock doesn't have much chance of amounting to anything. . . . A a u d D
45. A child should be weaned away from the bottle or breast as soon as possible A a u d D
46. There's a lot of truth in the saying, "Children should be seen and not heard" A a u d D
47. If rules are not closely enforced, children will misbehave and get into trouble A a u d D
48. Children don't realize that it mainly takes suffering to be a good parent. . . . A a u d D
49. Some children are so naturally headstrong that a parent can't really do much about them. . . . A a u d D
50. One thing I cannot stand is a child's constantly wanting to be held. . . . A a u d D
51. A child's ideas should be seriously considered in making family decisions. . . . A a u d D
52. More parents should make it their job to know everything their child is doing. . . . A a u d D
53. Few parents have to face the problems I find with my children. . . . A a u d D
54. Why children behave the way they do is too much for anyone to figure out A a u d D
55. When a boy is cowardly, he should be forced to try things he is afraid of A a u d D
56. If you let children talk about their troubles they end up complaining even more. . . . A a u d D

57. An alert parent should try to learn all his child's thoughts A a u d D
58. It's hard to know when to make a rule and stick by it. A a u d D
59. Not even psychologists understand exactly why children act the way they do. A a u d D
60. Children should be toilet-trained at the earliest possible time. A a u d D
61. A child should always accept the decision of his parents. A a u d D
62. Children have a right to activities which do not include their parents A a u d D
63. A parent has to suffer much and say little A a u d D
64. If a child is born bad there's not much you can do about it A a u d D
65. There's no acceptable excuse for a child hitting another child. A a u d D
66. Children should have a share in making family decisions just as the grown-ups do A a u d D
67. Children who are not watched will get in trouble A a u d D
68. It's hard to know what healthy sex ideas are. A a u d D
69. A child is destined to be a certain kind of person no matter what the parents do A a u d D
70. It's a parent's right to refuse to put up with a child's annoyances A a u d D
71. Talking with a child about his fears most often makes the fear look more important that it is A a u d D

72. Children have no right to keep anything from their parents A a u d D
73. Raising children is a nerve-wrecking job. A a u d D
74. Some children are just naturally bad A a u d D
75. A child should be taught to avoid fighting no matter what happens. A a u d D
76. Children don't try to understand their parents. A a u d D
77. A child should never keep a secret from his parents A a u d D

PARENT ATTITUDE SURVEY SCORING KEY

CONFIDENCE SCALE

Item Number	Item Direction*
1**	-
3	-
8	-
13	-
18	-
23	-
28	+
33	-
38	-
43	-
48	-
53	-
58	-
63	-
68	-
73	-

*A plus sign indicates that agreement with the statement receives a positive score; a minus sign indicates that agreement with the statement receives a negative score. The extremes of this five-point scale are scored +2 or -2, depending on the item direction. Agree and Disagree choices are scored +1 or -1; Undecided is scored 0. The algebraic sum of the item scores in each area serves as the scale score for that area.

**Buffer item; not scored.

PARENT ATTITUDE SURVEY SCORING KEY

ACCEPTANCE SCALE

Item Number	Item Direction*
2**	-
10	-
15	-
20	-
25	-
30	-
35	+
40	-
45	-
50	-
55	-
60	-
65	-
70	-
75	-

*A plus sign indicates that agreement with the statement receives a positive score; a minus sign indicates that agreement with the statement receives a negative score. The extremes of this five-point scale are scored +2 or -2, depending on the item direction. Agree and Disagree choices are scored +1 or -1; Undecided is scored 0. The algebraic sum of the item scores in each area serves as the scale score for that area.

**Buffer item; not scored.

PARENT ATTITUDE SURVEY SCORING KEY

CAUSATION SCALE

Item Number	Item Direction*
4	-
9	-
14	-
19	-
24	+
29	-
34	-
39	-
44	-
49	-
54	-
59	-
64	-
69	-
74	-

*A plus sign indicates that agreement with the statement receives a positive score; a minus sign indicates that agreement with the statement receives a negative score. The extremes of this five-point scale are scored +2 or -2, depending on the item direction. Agree and Disagree choices are scored +1 or -1; Undecided is scored 0. The algebraic sum of the item scores in each area serves as the scale score for that area.

PARENT ATTITUDE SURVEY SCORING KEY

UNDERSTANDING SCALE

Item Number	Item Direction*
6	-
11	+
16	-
21	+
26	+
31	+
36	-
41	-
46	-
51	+
56	-
61	-
66	+
71	-
76	-

*A plus sign indicates that agreement with the statement receives a positive score; a minus sign indicates that agreement with the statement receives a negative score. The extremes of this five-point scale are scored +2 or -2, depending on the item direction. Agree and Disagree choices are scored +1 or -1; Undecided is scored 0. The algebraic sum of the item scores in each area serves as the scale score for that area.

PARENT ATTITUDE SURVEY SCORING KEY

TRUST SCALE

Item Number	Item Direction*
7	-
12	-
17	-
22	+
27	-
32	-
37	-
42	-
47	-
52	-
57	-
62	+
67	-
72	-
77	-

*A plus sign indicates that agreement with the statement receives a positive score; a minus sign indicates that agreement with the statement receives a negative score. The extremes of this five-point scale are scored +2 or -2, depending on the item direction. Agree and Disagree choices are scored +1 or -1; Undecided is scored 0. The algebraic sum of the item scores in each area serves as the scale score for that area.

APPENDIX C

FAMILY ENVIRONMENT SCALE

FAMILY ENVIRONMENT SCALE

Instructions

There are 90 statements in this scale. They are statements about brothers and sisters. You are to decide which of these statements are true of your brothers and sisters and which are false. Make all your marks on the separate answer sheets. If you think the statement is TRUE or mostly TRUE, make an X in the box labeled T (true). If you think the statement is FALSE or mostly FALSE of your brothers and sisters, make an X in the box labeled F (false).

You may feel that some of the statements are true for some brothers and sisters and false for others. Mark T if the statement is TRUE for most members. Mark F if the statement is FALSE for most members. If the members are evenly divided, decide what is the stronger overall impression and answer accordingly.

Remember, we would like to know what your brothers and sisters seem like to you. So do not try to figure out how other members see your family, but do give us your general impression of your family for each statement.

1. Brothers and sisters really help and support one another.
2. Brothers and sisters often keep their feelings to themselves.
3. We fight a lot.
4. We don't do things on our own very often.
5. We feel it is important to be the best at whatever you do.
6. We often talk about political and social problems.
7. We spend most weekends and evenings at home.
8. My brothers and sisters attend church, synagogue, or Sunday School fairly often.
9. Activities with my brothers and sisters are pretty carefully planned.
10. My brothers and sisters are rarely ordered around.

11. We often seem to be killing time at home.
12. We say anything we want to around home.
13. My brothers and sisters rarely become openly angry.
14. We are strongly encouraged to be independent.
15. Getting ahead in life is very important in our family.
16. We rarely go to lectures, plays or concerts.
17. Friends often come over for dinner or to visit.
18. We don't say prayers in our family.
19. We are generally very neat and orderly.
20. There are few rules that we have to follow.
21. We put a lot of energy into what we do at home.
22. It's hard to "blow off steam" at home without upsetting one of my brothers or sisters.
23. We get so angry that one of us throws things.
24. We think things out for ourselves.
25. How much money a person makes is not very important to us.
26. Learning about new and different things is very important to us.
27. Nobody in our family is active in sports, little league, bowling, etc.
28. We often talk about the religious meaning of Christmas, Passover, or other holidays.
29. It's often hard to find things when you need them in our household.
30. There is one brother or sister who makes most of the decisions.
31. There is a feeling of togetherness with our brothers and sisters.

32. We tell each other about our personal problems.
33. Brothers and sisters hardly ever lose their tempers.
34. We come and go as we want to.
35. We believe in competition and "may the best man win."
36. We are not that interested in cultural activities.
37. We often go to movies, sports events, camping, etc.
38. We don't believe in heaven or hell.
39. Being on time is very important to us.
40. There are set ways of doing things at home.
41. We rarely volunteer when something has to be done at home.
42. If we feel like doing something on the spur of the moment we often just pick up and go.
43. Brothers and sisters often criticize each other.
44. There is very little privacy with my brothers and sisters.
45. We always strive to do things just a little better the next time.
46. We rarely have intellectual discussions.
47. Every brother or sister has a hobby or two.
48. We have strict ideas about what is right and wrong.
49. We often change our minds.
50. There is a strong emphasis on following rules.
51. Brothers and sisters really back each other up.
52. Someone usually gets upset if you complain in our family.
53. Brothers and sisters sometimes hit each other.
54. Brothers and sisters almost always rely on themselves when a problem comes up.

55. Brothers and sisters rarely worry about job promotions, school grades, etc.
56. Someone plays a musical instrument.
57. We are not very involved in recreational activities outside work or school.
58. We believe that there are some things you just have to take on faith.
59. Brothers and sisters make sure their rooms are neat.
60. Brothers and sisters have an equal say in family decisions.
61. There is very little group spirit among brothers and sisters.
62. Money and paying bills is openly talked about in our family.
63. If there's a disagreement, we try hard to smooth things over and keep the peace.
64. Brothers and sisters strongly encourage each other to stand up for their rights.
65. In our family, we don't try that hard to succeed.
66. Brothers and sisters often go to the library.
67. Brothers and sisters sometimes attend courses or take lessons for some hobby or interest (outside of school).
68. Each person has different ideas about what is right and wrong.
69. Each person's duties are clearly defined in our family.
70. We can do whatever we want to in our family.
71. We really get along well with each other.
72. We are usually careful about what we say to each other.
73. Brothers and sisters often try to one-up or out-do each other.

74. It's hard to be by yourself without hurting someone's feelings.
75. "Work before play" is the rule in our family.
76. Watching T.V. is more important than reading to brothers and sisters.
77. Brothers and sisters go out a lot.
78. The Bible is a very important book in our home.
79. Money is not handled very carefully in our family.
80. Rules are pretty inflexible in our household.
81. There is plenty of time and attention for everyone in our family.
82. There are a lot of spontaneous discussions among brothers and sisters.
83. We believe you don't ever get anywhere by raising your voice.
84. We are not really encouraged to speak up for ourselves.
85. Brothers and sisters are often compared with others as to how well they are doing at work or school.
86. Brothers and sisters really like music, art and literature.
87. Our main form of entertainment is watching T.V. or listening to the radio.
88. We believe that if you sin you will be punished.
89. Dishes are usually done immediately after eating.
90. You can't get away with much in our family.

FAMILY ENVIRONMENT SCALE SCORING

The questions are scored by counting how many X's have been appropriately marked in the TRUE/FALSE column. The number of X's is then recorded for each category and converted to a standard score which determines category status.

Item Number	Item Answer
<u>Cohesion</u>	
1	T
11	F
21	T
31	T
41	F
51	T
61	F
71	T
81	T
<u>Expressiveness</u>	
2	F
12	T
22	F
32	T
42	T
52	F
62	T
72	F
82	T

Item Number	Item Answer
<u>Conflict</u>	
3	T
13	F
23	T
33	F
43	T
53	T
63	F
73	T
83	F
<u>Independence</u>	
4	F
14	T
24	T
34	T
44	F
54	T
64	T
74	F
84	F

Item Number	Item Answer
-------------	-------------

Achievement Orientation

5	T
15	T
25	F
35	T
45	T
55	F
65	F
75	T
85	T

Intellectual-Cultural Orientation

6	T
16	F
26	T
36	F
46	F
56	T
66	T
76	F
86	T

<u>Item Number</u>	<u>Item Answer</u>
<u>Active-Recreational Orientation</u>	
7	F
17	T
27	F
37	T
47	T
57	F
67	T
77	T
87	F
<u>Moral-Religious Emphasis</u>	
8	T
18	F
28	T
38	F
48	T
58	T
68	F
78	T
88	T

Item Number	Item Answer
<u>Organization</u>	
9	T
19	T
29	F
39	T
49	F
59	T
69	T
79	F
89	T
<u>Control</u>	
10	F
20	F
30	T
40	T
50	T
60	F
70	F
80	T
90	T