

FAMILY SIZE AND PERCEPTIONS OF
PARENT-CHILD COMMUNICATIONS

A THESIS
SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF SCIENCE
IN THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF THE
TEXAS WOMAN'S UNIVERSITY
COLLEGE OF NUTRITION, TEXTILES,
AND HUMAN DEVELOPMENT

BY
MARYLN JOY HAIR, B.S.

DENTON, TEXAS

MAY 1981

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The contribution of numerous persons made this study possible. Sincere appreciation is extended to:

Dr. Deanna Tate, committee chairperson, for professional and personal assistance, friendship, and expectations beyond the responsibilities of the profession;

Drs. Glen Jennings and Janet Malone for their professional assistance and service as committee members, and Dr. Charles Sweatt for his assistance in data analysis;

Sharon Murphy, Verda Chism, Pat Jones, Diana Everett and Diana Mason for assistance in typing;

Lloyd McConnell, Jr. for assistance in duplicating and Cherryl Fikes for managing the final processes;

Alan Hair, my husband, for his continuing encouragement, assistance, and love;

Merlene and Bill Hair, Trueman and Dorothy Joy, and Walter and Mattie Rue Oden for cooperation, encouragement, and support during my graduate studies;

June and Kristel Hair, my daughters, Tye, Dusty, Dennis, and David Hair, my sons, for their cooperation, sacrifices, and love throughout my graduate studies;

and numerous other friends, colleagues, and family members who encouraged and supported my efforts.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iii
TABLE OF CONTENTS	iv
LIST OF TABLES	vii
Chapter	
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Statement of the Problem	3
Definition of Terms	3
Hypotheses	4
Delimitations	5
Limitations	5
Assumptions	6
Summary	6
II. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	8
Communication	8
Interpersonal Communication	8
Marital Communication	9
Parent-Child Communication	9
Parental Communication as related to the Child's Self-Concept	10
Sibling Communication	12
Family Communication in Disturbed Families	12
Family Size	13

Related to Intellectual Development	17
Related to Personal Adjustment	20
Related to Childrearing	22
Related to Distrubed Families	23
Summary	24
III. METHODOLOGY	25
Introduction	25
Respondents	25
Instrument	26
Procedure	28
Analysis of the Data	30
Summary	31
IV. RESULTS	32
Description of Respondents	32
Non-Respondent Follow-Up	38
Data Analysis	38
Summary	41
V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS	43
Summary	43
Conclusion and Discussion	44
Recommendations for Further Study	46
APPENDICES	
Appendix A: Parent-Child Communication Inventory (Parent Form)	49

Appendix B: Parent-Child Communication Inventory (Child Form)	57
Appendix C: Cover Letter	64
Appendix D: Consent Form	66
Appendix E: Letter to Bienvenu	67
REFERENCES	68
REFERENCE NOTES	75

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Number of Children and Frequency Categorized by Family Size	33
2. Sex of Family Members Categorized by Family Size	34
3. Age of Family Members Categorized by Family Size	35
4. Ethnic Group and Social Class of Family Members Categorized by Family Size	36
5. T-test Comparison of PCCI Scores Reported by Family Sizes	39

CHAPTER I

Introduction

Family communication has been regarded as an indicator of the level of family interaction for decades. Recent studies of disturbed and normal families continue to support this relationship. Disturbed interactions are caused in part by faulty communication (Doane, 1978; Ferreira & Winter, 1968).

In order to measure the interaction level of family members by family size a measurement of the level of communication can be used. Bossard (1953) states two sociological laws which say "that an arithmetic increase in the number of persons in the group is accompanied by a markedly increasing acceleration in the number of relationships within the group" (p. 117-118). The level of perceived parent-child communication differing by family size is interesting.

Family communication has been studied in a variety of ways. The studies include abnormality, inter-generation, authority structures, and self-concept as variables. Ferreira & Winter (1968) demonstrated that "abnormal families do communicate less, and this quantitative disturbance in communication seems to be a very important link in a whole chain of interaction events" (p. 274). Inter-generation communication has been measured by inventories developed by

Bienvenu (1969) and Loeffler, Berdie, and Roth (1969). The relationship between authority structures of autocratic--authoritarian, permissive, and sentiment--has been studied by Earle (1967). He concluded from the data that "a person's positive sentiment to another is linked--in the mind of the perceiver--with frequent communication between them regardless of the authority structure" (p. 282). How the self-concept is affected by communication has been studied by Bienvenu and McClain (1970) and Miller (1972). A positive relationship seems to exist between the adolescent's self-esteem and his perceived level of communication with his parents. Miller confirmed a relationship between maternal descriptiveness in negative situations and the child's self-esteem.

Family size has been a variable in studies related to school readiness (Scarth, 1973), adolescent adjustment (Nye, 1951 and Templeton, 1962), personality development (Hawkes, Burchinal, & Gardner, 1958), IQ (McCall & Johnson, 1972), and school adjustment problems (Searcy-Miller & Cowen, 1977). "Family group size is only one of a multitude of variables which have been neglected in family interaction research" (Young, 1977, p. 6358-B). There seems to be a paucity in the literature which examines only the parent-child (family) communication and family size.

Statement of the Problem

Previous studies have been inconclusive about the relationship of family size and the level of parent-child communication. It has been an accepted idea that group size affects the level of communication, but the relationship of communication to family size has not been brought to the author's attention. This information is a valuable extension of the family communication literature because it investigates the influence of family size and perceived communication.

The present study was designed to determine if there is a measurable difference in perceived communication based on family size. Parent-child dyads answered the 40 item Parent-Child Communication Inventory (PCCI) developed by Bienvenu (Note, 1. See Appendix A & B).

Definition of Terms

To facilitate precise communication, the following terms are defined as they were used in this study.

Intact family. Father, mother, and a child/ren living in the same home.

Large family. A family with three or more children living in the same home as determined by self report. The Statistical Abstract of the United States states the average size of family is 3.3 persons (U.S. Bureau of Census, 1979, p.44).

Small family. A family with one or two children living in the same home as determined by self report. (See Census citation above)

Human communication. "Any messages or information passing between the members of a group of two or more" (Bienvenu, 1969, p. 117).

Parent-child dyad. One parent and one child 11-years-old or older living in the intact family. The child's age is expected to provide a reading level of sixth grade.

Hypotheses

The hypotheses examined in this study:

1. On examination of the scores from the PCCI, there will be no significant difference at the .05 level between the large family parent scores (LFPS) and the small family parent scores (SFPS). (PARENT)
2. On examination of the scores from the PCCI, there will be no significant difference at the .05 level between the large family child scores (LFCS) and the small family child scores (SFCS). (CHILD)
3. On examination of the scores from the PCCI, there will be no significant difference at the .05 level between the large family parent-child dyad

scores (LFDS) and the small family parent-child dyad scores (SFDS). (COMPOSITE)

Delimitations

The respondents were residents of the area served by the Odessa, Texas, City Directory. Parents and an 11-year-old or older child were asked to respond to either the child or the parent form of Bienvenu's Parent-Child Communication Inventory. The reading level required by the PCCI is sixth grade. The 11-year-old or older child is expected to read at this level. However, the child who is 11 years old chronologically may be reading at a lower level. Only communication factors surveyed by Bienvenu's Parent-Child Communication Inventory (PCCI) were measured.

Limitations

The thirty-five parent-child dyads who met the studies' qualifications and returned inventories do not reflect families with more than four children or families in the highest and lowest social classes. Families from the Mexican American ethnic group were represented at a lower percentage than the percentage they represent in the Odessa area. The instrument being only in English may have been a barrier to possible participants who were dominant in another language. The findings in this study cannot be generalized to parent-child dyads outside the Odessa, Texas area.

Assumptions

The offer of free ice cream as an incentive to return the inventory may have influenced the return of the inventories. This influence was not evaluated.

The parent-child dyads who chose not to return the inventories may have different levels of communication than the parent-child dyads who chose to return the inventories. This non-respondent influence may have affected the results. Evaluation of this effect was not made.

Summary

The present study examined the level of perceived parent-child communication and family size. Limited literature has been found which addresses this variable in family communication.

Other factors have been studied such as abnormality (Ferreira & Winter, 1968), inter-generation (Bienvenu, 1969); Loeffler, Berdie, & Roth, 1969) authority structures (Earle, 1967), and self-concept (Bienvenu & McClain, 1970; Miller, 1972). The review of literature which follows will give additional details in these areas.

The respondents were parent-child dyads from intact families differing in family size and living in Odessa, Texas. Dyads answered the 40 item Parent-Child Communication Inventory (PCCI) developed by Millard J. Bienvenu. The scores of

the PCCI were compared to see if there was a significant difference at the .05 level.

CHAPTER II

Review of Literature

The literature related to measuring parent-child communication includes topics of interpersonal communication, marital communication, parent-child communication, sibling communication, and communication in disturbed families. Family size has been studied as a factor in intellectual development, adjustment, home life, child-rearing, and disturbed families.

Communication

Interpersonal communication. Bienvenu (1971) developed a 50 item Interpersonal Communication Inventory to be used in counseling, teaching, and research. The inventory measures patterns, characteristics, and styles of communication. He based the development of this inventory on previous research he had done in marital communication, parent-child communication, intragroup communication, and group therapy.

In 1976, Bienvenu and Steward used the Interpersonal Communication Inventory to analyze dimensions of interpersonal communication through a factor analysis. These dimensions were self-disclosure, awareness, attention, evaluation and acceptance of feedback, self-expression,

coping with feelings, dominance, clarity, avoidance, handling differences, and perceived acceptance.

Marital communication. Navran (1967) found a positive correlation between the capacity to communicate and marital adjustment. By administering the Locke Marital Relationship Inventory, he identified 25 couples enjoying good relationships and 25 couples in an unhappy relationship. These 50 couples were administered the Locke-Sabagh-Thomas Primary Communication Inventory to provide a score for correlating to marital adjustment.

Bienvenu (1970) developed the Marital Communication Inventory. One hundred seventy-two married couples in a pilot study revealed contrasts in patterns and degrees of communication at a significant level. There is an increasing amount of research which indicates a positive relationship between marital adjustment and marital communication (Navran, 1967 & Bienvenu, 1970).

Parent-child communication. Good listening habits, freedom of expression, understanding, and acceptance have been identified as desirable in communication between parents and adolescents (Bienvenu, 1969). Loeffler, Berdie, and Roth (1969) developed four inventories to evaluate and to develop ways of accelerating satisfactory inter-generation communication. They concluded that increased use of

declarative statements by the parent and an increase in listening could change both the motive and content of the communication.

Parental communication as related to the child's self-concept. The Parent-Adolescent Communication Inventory and the Self-Esteem Checklist (SEC) were used to compare perceived parent-adolescent communication and self-esteem (Bienvenu & McClain, 1970). These two variables were found to be positively related.

Miller (1972) investigated the effect of parental verbalization on the self-concept of 200 lower class, inner city, black and middle class, suburban, white children in the eighth grade. The results for the inner city children suggested that the more descriptive a mother is in negative situations, the greater the child's self-esteem. The different life situations of two groups may be the cause of the different maternal verbal patterns, and therefore, a difference in the child's self-concept.

In the examination of parents' preferred communication style and locus of control of preschool children, the results indicated that the mothers' preference is for nondirective socratic communication in child management, but not in teaching situations (Johnson, 1980). This socratic communication (asking the child a question designed to generate a

complex verbal reply) was related to internal locus of control in children. The locus of control was measured by the Stanford Preschool Internal-External Scale. The actual behavior of the children was not evaluated in this study.

In 1967, Earle administered questionnaires to 8,770 junior and senior high students from North Carolina and Ohio to study the correlation of the adolescent's perceived closeness to the parent and the adolescent's perceived communication with the parent. The factors of parental authority structures--authoritarian, democratic, and equalitarian--were also related to communication and closeness. The data does not support the view that equalitarian and democratic authority structures seem to maximize the perceived closeness of communication between the adolescent and parent. This study was focused on reported perceived communication and sentiment, instead of actual communication. Results of this study do not negate that perceived strong illegitimate authority and low communication negatively relate to the parent-child sentiment.

Empathic communication is regarded as important in parent-child interaction (Guerney, Stover, & DeMeritt, 1968; Stover, Guerney, & O'Connell, 1971). Stover, et al (1971) delineated a previous measurement of empathy to allow

subscales of Acceptance, Allowing Self-Direction, and Involvement. This measurement was validated by correlating it at a .85 level with a previously developed measure of empathy (Guerney, et al, 1968).

Sibling communication. Sibling communication was one of the four areas tapped by questionnaires developed to define a sibling system (Younglich, 1964). The population in this study consisted of 100 volunteers which were college students recalling childhood experiences. Younglich and Schiessel (1966) constructed a scale to measure sibling relationships in a more systemic way. This scale indicated a pattern in decision making, affection, and communication.

Family communication in disturbed families. Ferreira and Winter (1968) in a study of information exchange in normal and abnormal families demonstrated that abnormal families communicate less. In this study abnormal was defined as schizophrenia-producing, delinquency-producing, and maladjusted. A review of fifty-seven direct observational studies which compared family interaction in disturbed (schizophrenic) and normal families was evaluated by Jacob (1975). In this review, Jacob revealed that communication clarity was one of the four major interactional domains. Nine studies of normal families indicated higher attention and communication adequacy than schizophrenic families.

Doane (1978) examined family interaction literature since Jacob's review and included studies of deviant communication studies which were not observational. Doane concluded that communication deviance is a promising measure to be used in high-risk research and in predicting offspring diagnosis of psychopathic parents.

Communication is present in many forms: interpersonal, marital, parent-child, and sibling. Several inventories have been developed to measure these types of communications. Pathological and disturbed families often can be identified by their deviance in communications.

Family size

Family size will be discussed as it relates to family interaction and the development of the child. Intellectual development, adjustment, home life, childrearing, and disturbed families were studies with family size as a factor.

As any group gets larger the function within the group changes. Bossard (1953) stated two sociological laws which describe the change in relationships as the size of a group increases. The two laws say "that an arithmetic increase in the number of persons in the group is accompanied by a markedly increasing acceleration in the number of relationships within the group" (p. 117-118). He also explains the

interactive space index which considers the amount of floor space in a home. This index calculates the pressure of physical nearness of interacting people. Several variables can influence the amount of family stresses, even in small living space. "They are the sex, age, marital status, and occupation of the family members, and the stages of development of the family cycle" (Bossard, 1953, p. 120).

In 1956, Bossard and Boll investigated the large family system to see the importance of the large family in child development and personality development. They also described the large family system. The subjects were 100 families each with six or more children living in 23 states.

The first step in the study was to collect the history of growing up in a large family written by 15 persons. This was analyzed and formed into a series of questions and topics. Twenty-five persons who had been reared in a large family answered this series. An outline consisting of Part I Base Data and Part II Topics for Written or Verbal Interviews was constructed and utilized throughout the study. Complete outlines were secured from at least one child in each of the hundred families. From these accounts of growing up in large families several things were concluded:

1. The large family is not as a rule a planned family in the sense that the term is used in the current literature.

2. Parenthood in the large family tends to be extensive rather than intensive.
3. Large family living makes for an early acceptance of the realities of life.
4. Inherent in every fact and impression that one gets from the study of the large family is its emphasis upon the group rather than the individual.
5. Group existence and awareness make for group functioning, and this in turn calls for organization and leadership.
6. With large family living go emphases on qualities of behavior which are group essentials.
7. Whenever any considerable number of people function together, rules of conduct and procedure become necessary, and, as a rule, the greater the number of persons in the group, the more numerous and stringent the rules.
8. Ten children born in the same family are not going to behave alike, any more than they are going to look alike.
9. It is our hypothesis that the larger the family group, that is, the more persons that are living together in a family, the more family consensus tends to develop, the stronger its hold upon

individual members becomes, and the stronger the position of the father as its directive symbol becomes.

10. Other things being equal, the large family system makes for a certain balance and sanity in child rearing. Our material tends to show that having many children makes for an extended accumulation of parental experience, which in turn results in a certain detached and objective attitude toward child problems.
11. To grow up in a large family is to come to terms with life.
12. As a system, the large family seems not to perpetuate itself. (Bossard & Boll, 1956, p. 310-320).

Many of Bossard and Boll's conclusions are supported by Nye, Carlson, and Garrett (1970) in a review of literature on the relationships and attitudes. They identified eight limited propositions and condensed them into four broad propositions.

- I. The larger the family, the more likely it is to be characterized by authoritarian parental practices.
- II. The larger the family (social class constant), the more likely the family will be characterized by father domination.

- III. The larger the family, the less likely that it be characterized by a predominance of positive affect.
- IV. The larger the family, the more likely that the role playing of the parents is characterized by severe stress. (pp. 216-218)

Related to intellectual development. The effect of family size on intellectual and cognitive development has been investigated by McCall and Johnson (1972), Strumpfer (1973), Walberg and Majoribands (1976), Schaefer (1977), and Shelly (1977). The influence of family size, family density, and socio-economic status on school readiness has been investigated by Scarth (1973).

McCall and Johnson (1972) tested hypotheses relating family size and birth order to IQ with 1430 students grade 2 through 12. He indicated that IQ is independent of family size and birth order. Strumpfer (1973) also failed to find a significant relationship between achievement motivation and family constellation factors of size, density, and sex-ordinal position in a study of 158 male and 160 female university students.

Walberg and Majoribanks (1976) reviewed 12 models which investigated the family environment and cognitive development. Cognitive development measures are mainly limited to standardized tests of verbal-educational ability.

Family size was a variable in four of the 12 models. In Model 1, the larger sibsize and the lower ability of the children were correlated. Socio-economic status and family size were compared to declining intelligence in Model 3. This was only an inference based on facts that parents of lower SES groups marry earlier and bear more children closer together. This inference is not reliable because there was no control for the number of barren adults. When subject controls are used for this factor it was found that adults with the highest IQ have the highest average fertility rates. Therefore, the number of children produced by the lower SES does not lower the average IQ.

Model 4 studies show an increase in the IQ over several years. The reduced family size during this time period may have allowed parental intellectual stimulation to be divided between fewer children.

Model 5 relates SES and sibsize interaction. In one study review for Model 5, profession-managerial homes and family size was not related to IQ. However in families with fathers in unskilled occupations, there was an estimated 40 IQ points difference in 11-year-old only child and 11-year-olds from six children families.

The amount of parental attention received by each child decreases as the number of children in the

family increases, in such a way that with each additional child the successive decrements in shared attention become smaller. (Walberg & Majoribanks, 1976, p. 532)

This review of studies indicates that SES, time, and nationality may be related to the size of family and measured IQ.

In 1977, Schaefer designed a study of the effects of birth order and family size on the scores of the Vocabulary and Block Designs, subtest of the WISC-P. Juveniles who were awaiting court hearings and between the ages of 11-15 were selected as the 100 subjects. Performance on the Vocabulary subtest was significantly related to family size, but the performance on Block Design subtest was not related.

Preschool-aged children in compensatory education programs were subjects in a study to assess the impact of an intellectual environment on a child's cognitive and language abilities (Shelly, 1977). A multivariate family configuration model was developed from the confluence theory. The configuration included number of siblings, birth order, number of adults, spacing between births, and the teacher effect. Results supported that the multivariate family configuration model demonstrated sufficient influence on cognitive and language abilities.

School readiness was studied by Scarth (1973) to investigate the influence of family size and density, maternal attitude (especially concerning the fostering of dependency and amount of intrusiveness), socio-economic status, and maternal education level. Subjects were 193 mother-child pairs. The children were measured for readiness with the Metropolitan Readiness Test and the Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test. The Parent Attitude Research Instrument and school records were used to calculate the Index of Family Size and Density and the Hollingshead Two Factor Index of Social Position. From this sample, children from larger, closely spaced families, and who had mothers who were intrusive, who fostered dependency, and who were from lower socio-economic and educational levels were at a lower level of school readiness.

Related to personal adjustment. Adolescent-parent adjustment (Nye, 1951), marital adjustment (Christensen & Philbrick, 1952), child adjustment (Hawkes, Burchinal & Gardner, 1958), and childrens' school adjustment (Searcy-Miller & Cowen, 1977) have been studied with the variable of family size.

Nye (1951) in a study of adolescent adjustment and socio-economic levels did not find a significant difference of parent adolescent adjustment in high and low socio-economic levels, which could be explained by small, medium,

or large family size. There was a significant difference between adjustment in medium and large families.

Christensen and Philbrick (1952) concluded from a study of 346 married couples at Purdue University that marital adjustment does not decrease as family size increases. When the couple is able to control the number of children to the level desired, the marital adjustment does increase.

Adjustment of children in large, medium, and small families was investigated by Hawkes, Burchinal, and Gardner (1958). Two hundred fifty-six students in the fifth grade in Ohio, Kansas, Iowa, and Wisconsin were administered the Rogers Test of Personality Adjustment. The size of the family ranged from two to eleven children. Children from small families were indicated to have better adjustment than children from large families, but it was not statistically significant.

Small versus large families were studied as a variable in school adjustment problems of children by Searcy-Miller and Cowen (1977). Subjects were 133 primary grade, small family children (two children) and 126 large family children (5 or more children) who had been referred to a school mental health program. Childrens' classroom adjustment was determined by two teacher rating scales, Acting-out, Moody, Learning Problem (AML), a quick screening device for detecting school maladjustment, and a Teacher Referral Form

developed by Clarfield (1974). Large family children had significantly more serious learning problems than small family children. However, small family children scored higher on aggression and acting-out problems. Neither group was significantly different in overall adjustment.

Related to childrearing. Thirty intact Mexican-American families who had a preschool son were subjects of an exploratory study to examine childrearing feelings and behaviors of that culture (Johnson, 1975). The influence of family size was one of the five classifications of variables compared to the parents' scores on the Parent As A Teacher Inventory (PAAT). Data did not indicate a significant effect of family size on the PAAT Inventory scores in the Creativity, Frustration, Play, or Teaching-Learning subscales. On the Control subscale, small family parents expressed significantly less need for control than large family parents.

Templeton (1962) reported a study investigating the influence of family size on teenagers' attitudes, behavior and perception of home life. Questionnaires were administered to 10,000 junior and senior high school students during 1957, 1958, and 1959, by the Sociology Department of Washington State University. The questionnaire measured social participation, dating, superior school grades,

home chores, work for pay, amount of free time, delinquency, self-perceptions of leadership, type of work preferred, plans to attend college, personal problems, parents' encouragement of decision-making, parental protectiveness, democracy scale, cooperation scale, affection scale, and fairness of discipline scale. As family size increased the following factors were indicated by this study: (a) social participation decreased, (b) frequency of dating decreased, (c) school grades became lower, (d) girls had increased home chores, (e) boys did more working for pay, (f) girls had less free time, (g) students considered themselves less as leaders, (h) fewer students planned to go to college, (i) encouragement by parents for children to make their own decisions decreased, (j) protectiveness increased, (k) democracy in family decreased, (l) cooperation in family decreased, (m) fairness of discipline decreased.

Related to disturbed families. Young (1977) studied the interaction of three-person families and four-person families in both normal and disturbed families. The subjects were 20 disturbed and normal three-person families, and 20 disturbed and normal four-person families. The families discussed hypothetical family problem situations from a questionnaire on which they had previously indicated their individual solutions. The family task was to come to a

consensus. The domains of the family analyzed from the recorded discussion were power, activity, and support. Strikingly different patterns of activity, support, and power were confirmed as the family group sizes increased in normal and disturbed families. Increases in group size by normal families increased verbal activity and increased supportive behavior, but decreased task efficiency. Disturbed families decreased in verbal activity and increased in antagonistic, nonsupportive behavior as size increased. According to Young (1977), family group size is one of the structural and methodological variables of family interaction which needs further investigation.

Summary

Many types of communication which relate to communication in the family have been studied. These include interpersonal, marital, parent-child, and sibling communication. Studies of disturbed families indicate that they communicate less and less adequately than normal families.

Family size has been a factor in many studies. The effect of family size on intellectual development, adjustment, home life, child rearing, and disturbed families are a few. Family size is indicated in many of these studies to have a significant effect. There seems to be a paucity of studies comparing perceived parent-child communication and family size.

CHAPTER III

Methodology

Introduction

A review of literature has revealed a need for a study of perceived parent-child communications and family size. The following procedures were used to collect data on this topic.

Respondents

Five hundred residences were randomly selected from the Odessa, Texas, City Directory. The City Directory is organized like the residential section of the telephone directory except it gives additional information, such as the wife's first name, the number of people living at the residence, and the husband's place of work. The number of people living at a residence was used as an indication that a family lived at the residence.

Demographic questions were used to determine if the parent and child were part of an intact family and if the child is between 11 and 18 years old. Identification of small families (one or two children) and large families (three or more children) was also determined by these demographic questions. Additional questions were asked to determine the respondent's age, sex, socio-economic status, and ethnic

group. Socio-economic status was calculated by the Hollingshead Two-Factor Analysis of Social Position (Haug, 1971). Haug (1973) suggested that averaging the educational level of the husband and wife, and the job titles of the husband and wife to determine the social class of the family. Hollingshead described the seven levels of social class as follows:

1. Higher Executives, Proprietors of Large Sized Businesses, and Lesser Professionals.
2. Business Managers, Proprietors of Medium Sized Businesses, and Lesser Professionals.
3. Administrative Personnel, Small Independent Businesses, and Minor Professionals.
4. Clerical and Sales Workers, Technicians, and Owners of Little Businesses.
5. Skilled Manual Employees.
6. Machine Operators and Semiskilled Employees.
7. Unskilled Employees.

(Haug, 1971, p. 551)

The demographic questions on the PCCI forms only measured social classes one through five.

Instrument

The Bienvenu Parent-Child Communication inventory was used to measure the level of communication (see Appendices A & B). The inventory is composed of two separate forms, the

Parent Form and the Child Form. Written permission was obtained to print the inventories with additional demographic questions typed on the last page (see Appendix E). The following information is from A Guide to Accompany the Parent Child Communication Inventory.

The questions on both forms are counterparts of each other thereby facilitating a convenient and effective cross-check on the communication perceptions of both child and parent. The Child Form is best suited for youngsters with at least a sixth grade reading level whereas the Parent Form is suitable for parents with children from elementary school.

The scoring procedure is the same for the Child Form and the Parent Form. The three possible responses, "Yes", "Sometimes", and "No", are scored from zero to three with a favorable response (one indicative of good parent-child communication) given the higher score. In some instances the "Yes" response may be favorable, in others unfavorable, depending on the wording of the item. It should be noted that "Sometimes" response when indicative of a favorable attitude or answer is given a weight of two whereas when suggesting an unfavorable attitude a weight of one. The possible range of scores to be earned on the inventory is from zero to 120. The higher the

total score, the higher the level of parent-child communication.

[In order to establish the content validity,] the PCCI was administered to 240 subjects in an eighth grade junior high school. Approximately fifty-five percent were white and forty-five percent black. They were nearly evenly divided between the sexes. The classes selected for the study possessed the reading level necessary to understand the questions on the inventory which was administered during one class period.

The Chi-square test was then used in an item analysis to determine those items showing a significant difference (in number of favorable and unfavorable responses) between the upper and lower quantities of the inventory. Thirty-five out of 40 items in the inventory were found to be significantly discriminating between the upper and lower quartiles ($p < .01$). (Bienvenu, Note 2, pp. 1, 3, 5, & 6)

Procedure

The steps which were followed in collecting data:

1. Assigned a number to names listed in the Odessa, Texas, City Directory which indicated that three or more people lived at a residence.

2. Randomly selected 500 names.
3. Sent by third-class mail the 500 names a cover letter explaining the study (see Appendix C), a consent form (see Appendix D), the Parent Form of PCCI (see Appendix A), the Child Form of PCCI (see Appendix B), a small stamped return envelope for the release form, and a large stamped return envelope for the two inventories.
4. Made final arrangements for each completed inventory to be redeemed for a single dip ice cream cone at the Baskin-Robbins 31 Ice Cream Store, 2618-A North Grandview.
5. Sent by first-class mail the non-respondent names a cover letter, another set of PCCI forms, a release form, and return envelopes. This mailing was made three weeks after the first deadline for return.
6. Searched most recently published telephone book for correct addresses for returns because of incorrect addresses. Mailed forms to correct addresses which were found.
7. Requested the PCCI child form or consent card from parent-child dyads who returned partial sets.
8. Conducted telephone follow-up. Twenty-five names were randomly selected from the original 500 names so the calculated return rate could be determined.

Analysis of the Data

The t-test is designed to test whether the difference between the two means is a chance difference. "[It] determines the probability of [the] observed difference appearing, if, in fact, the null hypothesis of no difference is true" (Wiersma, 1969, p. 81).

The t-test procedure for independent samples was used. Subjects were randomly selected from a normal population distribution. Homogeneity of variance was expected. Less than 30 data items were in each sample group. Groups were of unequal size. The two samples were tested for equality of variances. The variances were assumed to be equal. The alpha level of .05 was used to determine the significance of the results obtained. The following scores were compared:

1. The PCCI scores from the large family parents were compared to the PCCI scores from the small family parents. (PARENT)
2. The PCCI scores from the large family children were compared to the PCCI scores from the small family children. (CHILD)
3. The composite PCCI scores from the large family parent-child dyads were compared to the composite PCCI scores from the small family parent-child dyad. (COMPOSITE)

Summary

Parent-child dyads from intact families completed the Parent-Child Communication Inventory (PCCI) developed by Millard J. Bienvenu (see Appendices A & B). Scores from the Parent Form and the Child Form were analyzed by the t-test in order to determine if there was a significant (.05 level) difference in the level of communication between:

1. Parents of large families and parents of small families.
2. Children of large families and children of small families.
3. Parent-child dyads of large families and parent-child dyads of small families.

CHAPTER IV

Results

The major problem of this study was to measure the difference in perceived parent-child communication according to family size. The Parent-child Communication Inventory (PCCI) developed by Bienvenu (Note 2) was sent to 500 randomly selected residences in Odessa, Texas. The analysis of the results is presented in the following order: (a) description of respondents, (b) discussion of non-respondents, (c) discussion of data collected.

Description of respondents

Thirty-five parent-child dyads meeting the study criteria from large and small families completed the Parent-Child Communication Inventory developed by Millard J. Bienvenu. Demographic information collected included (a) the parent's age and sex, (b) the child's age and sex, (c) the ethnic background, (d) the socio-economic status.

Five hundred inventories were sent by third-class mail to randomly chosen residences in the Odessa City Directory that indicated three or more people lived at the address. A second mailing by first-class mail was made to those that did not return the inventories. Fifty-two parent-child dyads returned the inventories. Thirty-five parent-child dyad inventories met the study's requirements of representing

an intact family with a child between the ages of 11 and 18 years old. Of the thirty-five usable inventories, thirteen were from large families (three or more children) and twenty-two were from small families.

Table 1
Number of Children and Frequency
Categorized by Family Size

Number of Children	Large (N=13) Frequency	Small (N=22) Frequency
One Child	--	9
Two Children	--	14
Three Children	11	--
Four Children	1	--

Table 1 presents the reported number of children in the respondent families. The most frequent family size was two children. Families with three children were the next most frequent family size. There was not a large range of difference in the small and large family.

Table 2 presents information on the sex of the family members categorized by family size. The majority of the small and large family parents were female with six out of 35 being male. The female was also in the majority of the

child respondents with 55% in small families and 57% in large families. However, there were 45% males in the small families and 43% in the large families which approaches being half of the child respondents.

Table 2

Sex of Family Members Categorized by Family Size

Category	Large (N=13)		Small (N=22)	
	<u>Male</u>	<u>Female</u>	<u>Male</u>	<u>Female</u>
	Number	Number	Number	Number
Parent ^a	2	11	4	16
Child	5	8	10	12

^a Two parents did not mark sex.

The age of family members categorized by family size is presented in Table 3. The highest percentage of the small family parents was in the 40-49 age range. A majority of the large family parents was in the 30-39 age range. The age of children responding from small families was evenly distributed among the 11 to 18 year age range. The single exception was the absence of a 12 year old. The age range of large family children was evenly distributed except for the absence of a 13 year old and a higher percentage (23%) of 12 year olds.

Table 3

Age of Family Members Categorized by Family Size

Category	<u>Large (N=13)</u>		<u>Small (N=22)</u>	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Parent Age				
Under 20	0	0.0	0	0.0
20-29	0	0.0	0	0.0
30-39	8	62.0	9	41.0
40-49	5	38.0	11	50.0
Over 50	0	<u>0.0</u>	2	<u>9.0</u>
		100		100
Child Age				
11	1	7.6	4	18.2
12	3	23.0	0	0.0
13	0	0.0	3	13.6
14	2	15.3	4	18.2
15	2	15.3	3	13.6
16	2	15.3	4	18.2
17	1	7.6	3	13.6
18	2	<u>15.3</u>	1	<u>4.5</u>
		99.4		99.9

Note. Less than 100% is a result of rounding off.

Table 4 presents the ethnic groups of family members categorized by family size. The percentage of ethnic groups living in Odessa was a projected figure made by the Odessa Chamber of Commerce for 1978 from the 1970 census figures (U.S. Bureau of Census, 1970). Some discrepancies occurred between the Odessa ethnic percentages and the respondent percentages. There were 88.6% of White American families reported which is 7.6% higher than the 1978 projected ethnic percentages for Odessa. The Mexican American group was represented by 2.8% of the respondents while the Odessa population is 13.6% Mexican American. This is 10.8% lower than the 1978 projected ethnic percentage for Mexican Americans in Odessa. The Black American group was represented by 8.6% of the respondent families which is 3.2% higher than the 1978 projected ethnic percentages for Odessa.

Social class of family members categorized by family size is presented in Table 4. Most of the families were in the third social class, which Hollingshead indicated as administrative personnel, small independent businesses, and minor professionals. The second and fourth social classes were equally represented with nine in each class. One family was calculated in the fifth social class. It is interesting to note that this approximates a bell curve.

Table 4

Ethnic Group and Social Class
of Family Members Categorized by Family Size

Ethnic Group	<u>Large (N=13)</u>		<u>Small (N=20)</u>		<u>Total</u>		<u>Odessa^b</u>	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
White American	13	100	18	82	31	88.6	31	81.0
Mexican American	0	0	1	5	1	2.8	1	13.6
Black American	0	0	3	13	3	8.6	3	5.4
		100		100		100		100
Social Classa								
1	1	7	0	0	1	2.8	1	--
2	4	31	5	23	9	25.7	9	--
3	4	31	11	50	15	42.8	15	--
4	4	31	5	23	9	25.7	9	--
5	0	0	1	4	1	2.8	1	--
		100		100		99.8		

Note. Less than 100% is a result of rounding off.

aDetermined by Hollingshead Two Factor Index of Social Position.

bOdessa Chamber of Commerce.

Non-respondent follow-up

Of the 500 questionnaires sent out by third-class mail four inventories came back because of incorrect addresses. The first-class mailing inventories resulted in fifty-eight questionnaires returned because of incorrect addresses.

Since the percentage of return seemed to be low, twenty-five names were randomly selected from the original 500 randomized names for the follow-up procedure. Results indicated that 13 (52%) were not contactable (not home, incorrect address, phone number, or no phone), six (24%) did not have a child between the ages of 11 and 18, three (12%) returned a usable inventory, one (4%) returned the inventory after being phoned, and two (8%) did not want to participate. If these percentages were applied to the 500 randomly selected names, the fifty-two returned inventories would represent 41% calculated return rate. The thirty-five usable inventories represent 28% of the sample. Telephone follow-up of all non-respondents was determined to be impractical, since it could be expected to yield only an additional 4% usable inventories.

Data Analysis

The t-test procedure for independent samples was used. Subjects were chosen from a normal population distribution. Less than 30 data items were in each sample group. The two

samples were tested for equality of variance. The variances for the two populations were assumed to be equal. Table 5, lists the number of data items, the variance, the standard deviation, the mean, and t statistic for each grouping.

Table 5
T-test Comparison of PCCI Scores
Reported by Family Size

Statistic	Parent		Child		Composite	
	Large	Small	Large	Small	Large	Small
N	13	22	13	22	13	22
Variance	352.56	285.05	626.14	642.21	1680.10	1584.68
Standard						
Deviation	18.78	16.88	25.02	25.34	40.99	39.81
Mean	94.69	98.00	89.85	86.73	184.54	184.73
t statistic	.54		.35		.01	

The following hypotheses were tested:

Hypothesis 1. There will be no significant difference at the .05 level between the large family parent (LFP) dyad scores and the small family parent (SFP) dyad scores.
(PARENT) The t statistic of the LFP and the SFP is .54.
The rejected limit at .05 level of significance is 2.04.
The null hypothesis that the LFP mean and the SFP mean were

equal was accepted. The difference in means was not significant and could have been caused by chance rather than family size.

Hypothesis 2. There will be no significant difference at the .05 level between the large family child scores (LFCS) and the small family child scores (SFCS). (CHILD) The t statistic of the LFCS and the SFCS is .35. The rejection limit at .05 level of significance is 2.04. The null hypothesis that the LFCS and the SFCS means were equal was accepted. The difference in means was not significant and could have been caused by chance rather than family size.

Hypothesis 3. There will be no significant differences at the .05 level between the large family parent-child dyad scores (LFDS) and small family parent-child dyads scores (SFDS). (COMPOSITE) The t statistic of the LFDS and SFDS is .01. The rejection limit at .05 level of significance is 2.04. The null hypothesis that the LFDS mean and the SFDS mean were equal was accepted. The difference in the means was not significant and could have been caused by chance rather than family-size.

The rejection limit at the .05 level of significance was 2.04. The null hypothesis that the two means were equal was accepted for the parent, child, and composite groups.

This study indicates that no significant difference exists in the perceived parent-child communication and family size.

Summary

The major problem of this study was to investigate the difference in perceived parent-child communication and family size. The Parent-Child Communication Inventory (PCCI) developed by Bienvenu was used to measure communication level. The respondents were randomly selected parent-child dyads living in Odessa, Texas. The majority of parent respondents were females, between the ages of 30 and 49 years old, White Americans, and in social class two, three or four. The majority of the child respondents were females evenly distributed between the ages of 11 and 18 and White American.

A t-test for independent samples was used to test for significance at the .05 level. The following scores were compared:

1. The PCCI scores from the large family parents were compared to the PCCI scores from the small family parents. (PARENT)
2. The PCCI scores from the large family children were compared to the PCCI scores from the small family children. (CHILD)

3. The composite PCCI scores from the large family parent-child dyads were compared to the composite PCCI scores from the small family parent-child dyads. (COMPOSITE)

There was no significant difference at the .05 level in any of the scores.

CHAPTER V

Summary, Conclusions, Recommendations

Summary

The purpose of this study was to determine if a difference exists in perceived parent-child communication and family size. The subjects were 35 parent-child dyads who had been randomly selected from intact families living in Odessa, Texas.

The subjects were asked to respond to either a 40-item parent or child form of the Parent-Child Communication Inventory (PCCI). Subjects were asked to rate the questions of communication as Yes (usually), No (seldom), or Sometimes. The inventories were mailed to 500 randomly selected residences in Odessa, Texas twice. A follow-up procedure was conducted by phoning 25 randomly selected names from the original 500 selected residences. The actual total calculated rate from the follow-up procedure was 41%.

The t-test for independent samples was used to compare parent scores from large and small families, child scores from large and small families, and parent-child composite scores from large and small families. There was no significant difference in the compared scores at the .05 significance level.

Conclusion and Discussion

This study indicates that no significant difference exists in the perceived parent-child communication and family size. Several factors in the study which may have influenced the results are (a) the small difference in the size of large and small families, (b) the low percentage of respondents from the Mexican-American culture, (c) the low percentage of fathers who responded, (d) the reluctance to participate in a scholarly study, and (e) the structure of the PCCI which actually measured only a one-to-one relationship. In addition, the child form of the PCCI did not provide a place to indicate which parent the child had in mind while answering the inventory.

The typical large family in this study had three children with only one exception. Compared to the size of the small family with one or two children, little difference exists. If the large family size had been operationally defined as having five or more children, a more significant difference may have been seen in the measured communication scores. The selection of the sample could have been stratified into two groups, one group with three or four persons indicated living at a residence and the other group with five or more persons indicated as living at a residence. This would have possibly increased the number

of large family respondents and increased the range between the small and large family. The large family parent, because of parenting demands, may have been unresponsive as a result of the lack of time.

The percentage of respondents from the Mexican American culture was low. This may have been caused by a language barrier since many of this culture do not read English. If the inventory had been translated to Spanish, more Mexican American families might have responded. Also, the perceived threat of participating in a scholarly study was probably greater for this culture.

The low percentage of fathers responding may have influenced the results of the large families. Nye, Carlson, and Garrett (1970) indicate that the larger the family the more the father dominates and the more likely the parents are to use authoritarian methods.

Since Odessa, Texas is served by only one upper level university, the population is not frequently requested to participate in graduate research. Therefore, there is more likely to be a lack of understanding about the risks of being a participant and a threat of personal privacy being invaded.

The design for collecting data from a parent and a child may have influenced the PCCI scores. The actual

communication measured was the one-to-one communication between one parent and one child in either a large or small family. It is likely, that the child which had more adequate communication with the responding parent selected to fill out the child inventory. Would a significant difference be measured if all the children in the family and both parents filled out reciprocal inventories?

Since the child form of the PCCI did not provide a place for the child to indicate which parent was in the child's mind while answering the communication questions, the child could have switched back and forth in answering the questions pertaining mother or father. On the other hand, the parent form did direct the parent to answer the form pertaining to only one child.

Recommendations for further study

Future studies in the area of perceived parent-child communication and family size should be fruitful. Many factors which influence the parent-child communication need to be measured.

Additional information would be provided by comparing the demographic information and the PCCI scores of the parent and child. For example, the social class as related to the PCCI scores might indicate a difference in the parent-child communication in different social classes.

Whether a same-sex child and parent or opposite-sex child and parent indicate a higher PCCI score could be measured by comparing the sex of the parent responding and the sex of the child responding. Whether the age of the parent affects the perception of the communication might be indicated by comparing the parent's age with the PCCI score and the PCCI child score. Also, the effect of the child's age on the perception of communication might be indicated by comparing the child's age and the PCCI parent score and the PCCI child score.

Since many families with more than three children have been formed by blending two families, it would be interesting to study the perceived parent-child communication among these family members. This would add to the literature on step-parents and step-children.

How would using intact groups such as school children and their parents influence the measured communication difference between large and small families? What would be the effect of training the parent and child in communication skills? The PCCI could also be used to test similar questions beyond the scope of this research. This study adds to the literature investigating family group size as one of the influences on parent-child communication. However, many other facets relating family group size and family communication remain to be investigated by future research.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

PARENT-CHILD COMMUNICATION INVENTORY

(Parent Form)

This questionnaire is to better understand how you and your child talk and communicate. We want to look at the good points in your relationship and also where you may be having problems. You will find it both interesting and helpful to make this study.

DIRECTIONS

1. Answer the questions only as they pertain to your child

_____.

(name)

(Some of the questions may seem to fit a child a little older or younger than yours and the word "child" in the questions may feel a bit awkward if he/she is a little older).

2. There are no right or wrong answers. The most helpful answer to each question is your indication of the way you feel at the moment.
3. Do not consult with anyone while completing this inventory. What's important now is the way you see things between you and your child.
4. Please answer each question without taking too much time and answer each question according to the way you feel right now, not the way you usually feel or felt last week.

5. USE THE FOLLOWING EXAMPLES FOR PRACTICE. Put a check (✓) in one of the three blanks on the right to show how the question applies to you and to your ways of communicating with your child.

	YES	NO	SOME-
	Usually	Seldom	TIMES
Do you listen to your child's side of things?	_____	_____	_____
Does your child let you know when he/she is worried about something?	_____	_____	_____

The YES column is to be used when the question can be answered as happening most of the time or usually. The NO column is to be used when the question can be answered as seldom or never. The SOMETIMES column should be marked when you cannot answer YES or NO. USE THIS COLUMN AS LITTLE AS POSSIBLE.

6. Read each question carefully and mark your personal answer to it. Be sure to answer every question.

Copyright 1974 Millard J. Bienvenu, Sr. All rights reserved.
Reprinted by permission.

	YES	NO	SOME-
	Usually	Seldom	TIMES
1. Is family conversation pleasant at meal times?	_____	_____	_____
2. Do you wait until your child is through talking before "having your say?"	_____	_____	_____
3. Do you pretend you are listening to your child when actually you've tuned him/her out?	_____	_____	_____
4. Does your child feel you "preach" too much?	_____	_____	_____
5. Does your family have a good time?	_____	_____	_____
6. Do you respect your child's opinions?	_____	_____	_____
7. Do you laugh at or make fun of your child?	_____	_____	_____
8. Do you wish your child were a differenct kind of person?	_____	_____	_____
9. Do you ever say that your child is bad?	_____	_____	_____
10. Does your family talk things over with each other?	_____	_____	_____

	YES	NO	SOME-
	Usually	Seldom	TIMES
11. Does your child discuss personal problems with you?	_____	_____	_____
12. Do you tend to complain and nag about your child's faults?	_____	_____	_____
13. Do you tend to talk down to your child?	_____	_____	_____
14. Do you encourage your child to talk about himself/her-self?	_____	_____	_____
15. Do you feel your child is going to amount to something?	_____	_____	_____
16. Is it hard for you to say nice things to your child?	_____	_____	_____
17. Do you think you understand your child?	_____	_____	_____
18. Does your child talk about sex with you?	_____	_____	_____
19. Is it hard for you to trust your child?	_____	_____	_____
20. Do you understand how your child really feels and thinks?	_____	_____	_____

	YES	NO	SOME-
	Usually	Seldom	TIMES
21. Do you say nice things to your child?	_____	_____	_____
22. Do you have confidence in your child's abilities?	_____	_____	_____
23. Do you pretty much say to your child what is on your mind?	_____	_____	_____
24. Does your child ask your reasons for decisions you make concerning him/her?	_____	_____	_____
25. Do you allow your child to say what he/she believes about things?	_____	_____	_____
26. Do you get very upset if your child disagrees with you?	_____	_____	_____
27. Do you consider your child's ideas in making family decisions?	_____	_____	_____
28. Do you tend to criticize your child a lot?	_____	_____	_____
29. Do you really try to see your child's side of things?	_____	_____	_____

	YES	NO	SOME-
	Usually	Seldom	TIMES
30. Do you say one thing but mean another?	_____	_____	_____
31. Can you tell when your child is unhappy or troubled about something?	_____	_____	_____
32. Is your child afraid to disagree with you?	_____	_____	_____
33. Is your tone of voice irritating to your child?	_____	_____	_____
34. Do you try to make your child feel better when he/she is "down in the dumps"?	_____	_____	_____
35. Does your child have a tendency to keep to himself/herself at home?	_____	_____	_____
36. Does your child really try to understand your side of things?	_____	_____	_____
37. Does your child avoid discussing personal problems with you?	_____	_____	_____
38. Does your child tell you what bothers or upsets him/her?	_____	_____	_____

YES	NO	SOME-
Usually	Seldom	TIMES

39. Do you explain your reasons
for not letting your child
do something? _____

40. At home, does your child
find it hard to talk to
you? _____

(CIRCLE ANY QUESTION THAT WAS NOT CLEAR AND TURN TO OTHER SIDE)

Please fill in completely:

1. Age: _____ Under 20 _____ 20-29 _____ 30-39
 _____ 40-49 _____ Over 50

2. Married: _____ Yes _____ No 3. Sex _____ M _____ F

4. Number of children living in the home with you _____

5. Years of school finished by wife:

_____ Less than high school	_____ 2 years college
_____ High school or equivalent	_____ 3-4 years college
_____ Some college	_____ Beyond Bachelor's Degree

6. Years of school finished by husband:

_____ Less than high school	_____ 2 years college
_____ High school or equivalent	_____ 3-4 years college
_____ Some college	_____ Beyond Bachelor's Degree

7. What is the husband's job title?

8. What is the wife's job title?

9. Ethnic group: Check one.

<input type="checkbox"/> Mexican American	<input type="checkbox"/> White American
<input type="checkbox"/> Black American	<input type="checkbox"/> Other

ALL INFORMATION WILL BE KEPT STRICTLY CONFIDENTIAL.

APPENDIX B

PARENT-CHILD COMMUNICATION INVENTORY

(Child Form)

This questionnaire is to better understand how you and your parents talk and communicate so that we can better understand you as a person. We want to look at the good points in your relationships and also where you may be having problems. You will find it both interesting and helpful to make this study.

DIRECTIONS

1. This is not a test. There are no right or wrong answers to it. The most helpful answer to each question is your indication of the way you feel at the moment.
2. Do not put your name on this questionnaire. We want you to be as frank as possible. You can not receive a grade because all of the answers are considered right answers for you.
3. Please answer each question without taking too much time. Answer each question according to the way you feel right now, not the way you usually feel or may have felt last week.
4. Use the following examples for practice. Put a check (✓) in one of the three blanks on the right to show how the question applies to you and to your ways of communicating with your parents.

	YES	NO	SOME-
	Usually	Seldom	TIMES

Do your parents listen to your
side of things?

Do you let your parents know
when you are worried about
something?

5. "The YES column is to be used when the question can be answered as happening most of the time or usually. The NO column is to be used when the question can be answered seldom or never. The SOMETIMES column should be marked when you cannot answer YES or NO. USE THIS COLUMN AS LITTLE AS POSSIBLE."
6. Read each question carefully and mark your personal answer to it. Be sure to answer every question.
- Copyright 1974 Millard J. Bienvenu, Sr. All rights reserved.
Reprinted by permission.

	YES	NO	SOME-
	Usually	Seldom	TIMES
1. Is family conversation pleasant at meal time?	_____	_____	_____
2. Do your parents wait until you are through talking before "having their say"?	_____	_____	_____
3. Do you pretend you are listening to your parents when actually you've tuned them out?	_____	_____	_____
4. Do you feel your parents "preach" too much to you?	_____	_____	_____
5. Does your family have a good time?	_____	_____	_____
6. Are your opinions respected by your parents?	_____	_____	_____
7. Are you laughed at or made fun of by either of your parents?	_____	_____	_____
8. Do you feel either of your parents wishes you were a different kind of person?	_____	_____	_____
9. Do either of your parents say that you are bad?	_____	_____	_____

	YES	NO	SOME-
	Usually	Seldom	TIMES
10. Does your family talk things over with each other?	_____	_____	_____
11. Do you discuss personal problems with either of your parents?	_____	_____	_____
12. Do your parents tend to pick on you about your faults?	_____	_____	_____
13. Do your parents seem to talk to you as if you were much younger than you actually are?	_____	_____	_____
14. Do your parents encourage you to talk about yourself?	_____	_____	_____
15. Do your parents feel you are going to amount to something?	_____	_____	_____
16. Is it hard for your parents to say nice things about you?	_____	_____	_____
17. Do your parents seem to understand you?	_____	_____	_____
18. Do you talk about sex with either of your parents?	_____	_____	_____

	YES	NO	SOME-
	Usually	Seldom	TIMES
19. Is it hard for your parents to trust you?	_____	_____	_____
20. Do either of your parents really understand how you feel and think about things?	_____	_____	_____
21. Do your parents say nice things to you?	_____	_____	_____
22. Do they have confidence in your abilities?	_____	_____	_____
23. Do your parents say pretty much what is on their minds?	_____	_____	_____
24. Do you ask your parents reasons for decisions they make concerning you?	_____	_____	_____
25. Are you allowed to say what you believe about things?	_____	_____	_____
26. Do your parents get very upset if you disagree with them?	_____	_____	_____

	YES	NO	SOME-
	Usually	Seldom	TIMES
27. Do they consider your ideas in making family decisions?	_____	_____	_____
28. Do they tend to criticize you a lot?	_____	_____	_____
29. Do your parents really try to see your side of things?	_____	_____	_____
30. Do your parents say one thing but mean another?	_____	_____	_____
31. Can your parents tell when you are unhappy or troubled over something?	_____	_____	_____
32. Are you afraid to disagree with your parents?	_____	_____	_____
33. Is the tone of voice of either of your parents irritating?	_____	_____	_____
34. Do your parents try to make you feel better when you are "down in the dumps"?	_____	_____	_____
35. Do you have a tendency to keep to yourself at home?	_____	_____	_____

	YES	NO	SOME-
	Usually	Seldom	TIMES
36. Do you really try to understand your parents' side of things?	_____	_____	_____
37. Do you avoid discussing personal problems with either of your parents?	_____	_____	_____
38. Do you tell your parents what bothers or upsets you?	_____	_____	_____
39. Do they explain their reasons for not letting you do something?	_____	_____	_____
40. At home, do you find it hard to talk to your parents?	_____	_____	_____
(CIRCLE ANY QUESTION THAT WAS NOT CLEAR AND TURN TO OTHER SIDE)			
1. Age: _____ years			
2. Sex _____ M _____ F			
3. Number of brothers and sisters living in the home with you _____.			
4. Ethnic group:			
_____ Mexican American	_____ White American		
_____ Black American	_____ Other _____		

APPENDIX C
COVER LETTER

July 8, 1980

Dear Odessa Parent and Children,

Parents are concerned about how to talk with their children. Children are concerned about how to talk with their parents. In order to gain insight into parent-child communication, a study of how parents and children communicate in large and small families is being performed. You have been chosen to participate. This study is being performed as part of a Master's Degree in Child Development at Texas Woman's University. In order to improve parent-child communication, studies of this type are necessary. All information you give will be confidential and will be used for statistical purposes.

To participate:

1. Sign the consent form for yourself and for you child. Return it in the small stamped envelope.
2. Answer the Parent Inventory completely.
3. Have your 11-year-old or older child living with you answer the Child Inventory completely.

4. Send the two completed inventories in the large stamped envelope, or redeem each inventory for a single dip of ice cream at only the 2618 Grandview Baskin Robbins.

If you have any questions, feel free to contact me.

Thank you for your time.

Your fellow Odessan,

Maryln Hair
Child Development Instructor
Odessa College

APPENDIX D

CONSENT FORM

I hereby give my permission for Maryln Hair to use the data from the Parent-Child Communication Inventories in the study of communication in large and small families. I understand that the data gathered will be confidential and used only for statistical purposes. I have read the cover letter by Maryln Hair, which explains the procedure of this study. I understand that no risk is involved in completing the enclosed questionnaires. My child and I will gain insight into better communications by considering the items on the inventories. I understand that NO medical service or compensation is provided to subjects by Texas Woman's University as a result of injury from participation in research. An offer to answer all of my questions regarding the study has been made. I understand that I may terminate my participation in the study at any time.

In addition, I give my permission for my child to participate.

Parent's signature

Date

APPENDIX E

May 23, 1980

Millard J. Bienvenu, Sr. Ph.D.
Counselor and Communication Consultant
710 Watson Drive
Natchitoches, Louisiana 71457

Dear Dr. Bienvenu:

A thesis study to compare the level of communication in large and small families is being developed. Your Parent-Child Communication Inventory is being proposed as the instrument. The study is a partial requirement for a Master's Degree in Child Development at Texas Woman's University.

Additional demographic information is required. Will you grant permission to print sufficient questionnaires to survey 500 parent-child dyads with the additional demographic information at the end? A sample copy has been included for your review.

Please notify me concerning the status of your permission.

Thank you for your consideration in this matter.

Sincerely yours,

Maryln Hair

REFERENCES

REFERENCES

- Bienvenu, M. J. Measurement of parent-adolescent communication. Family Coordinator, April 1969, 117-121.
- Bienvenu, M. J. Measurement of marital communication. Family Coordinator, January 1970, 26-31.
- Bienvenu, M. J. An interpersonal communication inventory, Journal of Communication, 1971, 21, 381-388.
- Bienvenu, M. J. & McClain, S. Parent-adolescent communication and self-esteem. Journal of Home Economics, 1970, 62 (5), 344-345.
- Bienvenu, M. J. & Steward, D. W. Dimensions of interpersonal communication. Journal of Psychology, 1976, 93, 105-111.
- Bossard, J. H. S. Parent and child: Studies in family behavior. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1953.
- Bossard, J. H. S. & Boll, E. S. The large family system: An original study in the sociology of family behavior. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1956.
- Clarfield, S. P. The development of a teacher referral form for identifying early school maladaptation. American Journal of Community Psychology, 1974, 1, 199-210.
- Christensen, H. T. & Philbrick, R. E. Family size as a factor in marital adjustments of college couples. American Sociological Review, 1952, 17, 306-312.

- Doane, J. A. Family interaction and communication deviance in disturbed and normal families: A review of research. Family Process, September 1978, 17, 357-376.
- Earle, J. R. Parent-child communication, sentiment, and authority. Sociological Inquiry, 1967, 37, 275-282.
- Ferreira, A. J. & Winter, W. D. Information exchange and silence in normal and abnormal families. Family Process, 1968, 7, 251-276.
- Guerney, B., Stover, L. & De Merritt, S. A measurement of empathy in parent-child interaction. Journal of Genetic Psychology, 1968, 112, 49-55.
- Haug, M. R. & Sussman, M. B. The indiscriminate state of social class measurement. Social Forces, June 1971, 49(4), 549-563.
- Haug, M. R. Social class measurement and women's occupational roles. Social Forces, September 1973, 52, 86-98.
- Hawkes, G. R., Burchinal, L., & Gardner, B. Size of family and adjustment of children. Marriage and Family Living, February 1958, 20, 65-68.
- Jacob, T. Family interaction in disturbed and normal families: A methodological and substantive review. Psychological Bulletin, 1975, 82(1), 33-65.

- Johnson, A. S. An assessment of Mexican-American parent child rearing feeling and behaviors. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Arizona State University, 1975.
- Johnson, J. E. Parents' preferred communication style and locus of control of preschool children. Home Economics Research Journal, March 1980, 8(4), 269-273.
- Loeffler, D., Berdie, R. F., & Roth, J. Content and process of inter-generation communication. The Family Coordinator, October 1969, 345-352.
- McCall, J. N. & Johnson, O. G. The independence of intelligence from family size and birth order. Journal of Genetic Psychology, 1972, 121, 207-213.
- Miller, T. W. Cultural dimensions related to parental verbalization and self-concept in the child. Journal of Social Psychology, 1972, 87, 153-154.
- Navran, L. Communication and adjustment in marriage. Family Process, 1967, 6(2), 173-184.
- Nye, I. Adolescent-parent adjustment--socio-economic level as a variable. American Sociological Review, 1951, 16, 341-349.
- Nye, I. F., Carlson, J., & Garrett, G. Family size, interaction, affect and stress. Journal of Marriage and Family, May 1970, 33, 216-226.

- Scarth, L. L. Influence of certain environmental variables on the school readiness of kindergarten children (Doctoral dissertation, University of Georgia, 1972) Dissertation Abstracts International, 1973, 33(7)A, 3168A. (University Microfilms No. 72-34, 144).
- Schaefer, W. M. Factors associated with intellectual development birth order and family size effects for a select population (Doctoral dissertation, Loyola University of Chicago, 1977). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1977, 38(4)A, 2009A-2010A. (University Microfilms No. 77-22,351).
- Searcy-Miller, M. L. & Cowen, E. L. School adjustment problems of children from small vs. large families. Journal of Community Psychology, 1977, 5, 319-324.
- Shelly, M. H. The relationship between family configuration and cognitive and language abilities of preschool-aged children. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Michigan, 1977). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1977, 38(3)A, 1310A (Abstract). (University Microfilms No. 77-18, 116).
- Stover, L., Guernsey, B. G., & O'Connell, M. Measurement of acceptance, allowing self-direction, involvement and empathy in adult-child interaction. Journal of Psychology, 1971, 77, 261-269.

- Stumpfer, D. J. W. Failure to find relationships between family constellation and achievement motivation. Journal of Psychology, 1973, 85, 29-36.
- Templeton, J. A. The influence of family size on some aspects of teenagers' attitudes, behavior and perceptions of home life. Family Life Coordinator, July 1962, 51-57.
- U. S. Bureau of Census, The statistical abstract of the United States 1979 (100th ed.). Washington, D.C., 1979.
- U. S. Bureau of Census, Block statistic Odessa, Texas urbanized area. U. S. Government Printing Office, Code no. 8C(3)-239, 1970.
- Walberg, H. J. & Marjoribanks, K. Family environment and cognitive development: Twelve analytic models. Review of Educational Research, Fall 1976, 46(4), 527-551.
- Wiersma, W. Research methods in education. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippercott Company, 1969.
- Young, C. D. Interaction patterns in normal and emotionally disturbed families as a function of family group size. (Doctoral dissertation, Washington University, 1976). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1977, 37(12)B 6358-B (University Microfilms No. 77-12, 489).
- Younglich, A. Exploration in sociological study of sibling systems. Family Life Coordinator, October 1964, 13(4), 91-94.

Younglich, A. & Schiessel D. Constructing a sibling systems measurement device. Family Life Coordinator, July 1966, 107-111.