CHILDREARING AND HELPING

BEHAVIORS IN YOUNG CHILDREN

by
Anne Heineman Batory

Dissertation submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate School
of the University of Maryland in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the of
Doctor of Philosophy
1984

APPROVAL SHEET

Title of Dissertation: Childrearing And Helping
                              Behaviors In Young Children

Name of Candidate: Anne Heineman Batory
                             Doctor of Philosophy, 1984

Dissertation and Abstract Approved: _Robert F. Marcus_____

                              Robert Marcus, Ph.D.
                              Associate Professor
                              Department of Human Development

Date Approved: _July 10, 1984_____

ABSTRACT

Title of Dissertation: Childrearing and Helping Behaviors
                          in Young Children

Anne Heineman Batory, Doctor of Philosophy, 1984

Dissertation directed by: Robert Marcus, Ph.D.
                          Associate Professor
                          Department of Human Development

The purpose of this study was to investigate the parental social-
ization practices which may be associated with helping behaviors in
young children. Symbolic interaction theory and the identification/
internalization approach postulate that parental support, discipline
style, and focus on responsibility are influential in the socialization
process. The research was designed to explore both the simple
association between each parental variable and the children's helping
behaviors and the effective patterning of these parental influences.
The sample for the study consisted of 53 children (22 boys; 31 girls)
and their parents. The volunteer families were middle class, mostly
two-parent, and affiliated with a college sponsored preschool. The
parents completed a Parent Interview Questionnaire which consisted of a
measure of parental support (Parental Acceptance - Rejection
Questionnaire), discipline style (Hoffman discipline measure), and
focus on responsibility (constructed for the study). The naturally
occurring behaviors of the children were observed in their preschool
and instances of aiding, comforting, sociability, and other behaviors
were coded. The findings indicate that there is an association between

parental focus on responsibility in the home and young children's helping behaviors. The findings concerning the relationship of parental support and discipline style to children's helping behaviors were more tentative. There was no evidence of a predictive or interactive influence of the parenting variables on young children's helping behaviors. The results were discussed in relation to theoretical predictions and previous research.

DEDICATION

This research is affectionately dedicated to my family and the families who shared information for the pursuit of knowledge.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Every research effort is the product of the contributions of many persons. I appreciate the helpful efforts of all who have contributed to my education and personal development.

I am particularly grateful to Robert Marcus and the participants on my dissertation committee.

Robert Marcus has been a most understanding and helpful advisor. I appreciate very much his continued patience, interest, and assistance during the long process of this research. As a mentor, he has guided my thinking and enriched my search for knowledge.

I thank Charles Johnson who introduced me to the field of quantitative analysis and encouraged me to experience the lure of statistics.

I am grateful to Bonnie Tyler for giving me the opportunity to develop my knowledge and sensitivity toward parents. Both in and out of class, Bonnie has been a patient listener, warm supporter, and helpful advisor.

I appreciate the warm support and encouragement of Joann Hunt and Nathan Fox. Their helpful comments and advice have strengthened my work.

Each participant on the committee has responded with helpful consultation and encouragement. I appreciate their efforts and thank them all.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS
(continued)

LIST OF TABLES

INTRODUCTION

Background and Rationale

The development of positive social behaviors in young children is of major interest in the field of socialization. The term, socialization, refers to the process by which individuals acquire the behaviors and attitudes which enable them to participate within family, other groups, and society (Inkeles, 1969). Helping a child move from total dependency and self absorption to independency and concern for others seems to be a central goal of early socialization. According to Krebs (1970) and Rushton (1976), the study of prosocial behavioral development can lead to insights into understanding the very core of socialization processes in general.

Prosocial, or positive social behavior, refers to behavior that benefits or aids another person. Helping behavior is one of a cluster of behaviors (eg. helping, donating, rescuing, cooperating, resisting temptation) that has been employed to operationalize the concept of prosocial behavior. Helping behavior can be defined as an act which alleviates distress in another person or facilitates another's work or play activity (Marcus & Leiserson, 1978). Although there is debate concerning the origin of prosocial tendencies (eg. the genetic control of altruism, Wilson, 1975; the socialization control of aggression, Ardrey, 1962), it is contended that most children have the potential for

helping behavior and that socialization influences the development and nurturance of prosocial capabilities.

As shall be seen in Chapter II, symbolic interaction theory and the identification/internalization approach both emphasize the crucial importance of the early parent-child relationship for the development of prosocial orientations in the child. According to symbolic interaction theorists, a child develops self definition through social interactions with significant others. The support and affection of parents for a child and their attitudes and behavior toward the child help the child to develop a meaningful sense of self. It is through the socialization interactions that a child forms an inner self, a core, which represents his or her most valued and salient attitudes toward self (Mead, 1934; Stryker, 1972). If the parents, through their childrearing patterns, communicate to the child that he or she is worthy of love, competent and capable of responding to self and others, and responsible in decisions and behavior, perhaps the child will develop a core self which reflects these prosocial orientations.

The identification/internalization approach is a derivation of psychoanalytic and social learning conceptualizations (Staub, 1979). According to Sears (1957), identification occurs when the child is dependent on a model. Since the parents, especially the mother, satisfy the child's biological needs, the parental actions become reinforcing. The child adopts many of the parent's attributes because they become self-reinforcing. Sears believes that parental support and nonpunitive discipline strengthen the child's motivation to identify. Internalization, which is the acceptance of parental and reference group moral values as one's own, can result from the identification process.

The child adopts the values of the parents and control comes from within the child's own self. The parents transmit these values, both explicit and implicit through their behavior toward the child. Hoffman (1970) states that the content of the socialization experience, the support and discipline patterns, influence the strength and nature of internalization. It is believed that a child who is reared within an environment which is supportive, responsive to the child's developing inner control and understanding, and concerned about responsibility for others will facilitate the child's development of positive moral values and prosocial behaviors.

A review of symbolic interaction theory and the identification/ internalization approach will suggest that there are three dimensions of parental characteristics with significant influence in the socialization process. These are: the level of parental support; the type of parental discipline; and the parents' emphasis on responsibility for the young child. The empirical literature review will demonstrate that there is some support for the theoretical contentions. It will be noted, however, that not only is there limited support in the area of parental emphasis on responsibility but that there is substantial empirical neglect of a possible interactive relationship for the parental dimensions.

Purpose of the Study

The present study is an investigation of the parental socialization practices that are associated with helping behaviors in young children. The parental practices upon which this study focuses are support, discipline, and responsibility assignment. These three dimensions have been postulated by symbolic interaction theory and the identification/

3

internalization approach as being most influential in the socialization process. Each parental dimension is investigated for its simple association with the child's helping behaviors. In addition, an attempt is made to explore the interrelatedness of these parental characteristics in order to gain an understanding of how the parental dimensions are patterned.

The purpose of this investigation is to formulate answers to the following questions:

1. Is there a relationship between the parents' level of support and young children's helping behaviors?

2. Is there a relationship between parental discipline style and young children's helping behaviors?

3. Is there a relationship between young children's responsibility in the home and their helping behaviors?

4. What are the interrelationships among parental childrearing behaviors?

5. Is there an interaction between the parents' level of support and the parents' discipline style which influences the young child's helping behaviors?

Conceptual Definitions

At this point, it would be helpful to explain the meanings of the terms used in this study. Therefore, a list of the important concepts and their definitions follow:

Child Concepts

Prosocial behaviors--child behavior that benefits or aids another person (Bar-Tal, Raviv, & Goldberg, 1982).

Helping behavior--child behavior that attempts to alleviate the needs of another. Helping behavior can consist of aiding (alleviating nonemotional needs of others), or comforting (alleviating emotional distress in others). This definition is adapted from the research of Eisenberg-Berg (Eisenberg-Berg, Cameron, Tryon, & Dodez, 1981; Eisenberg-Berg & Hand, 1979: Eisenberg-Berg & Lennon, 1980). Both types of helping behavior require that the child recognizes some need in another, responds to these needs, and either facilitates another's goals or assists in nurturing another emotionally (Marcus, Note 4).

Parental concepts

Discipline techniques--the typical manner in which the parent trains or responds to the child's behaviors. There are three styles of discipline: Power assertion (the parent uses or threatens physical punishment or restraint); Love withdrawal (the parent uses non physical anger expression and disapproval of the child); Induction (the parent uses reasoning to communicate information concerning consequences of the child's behavior for others). This definition is from Hoffman (1963, 1970, 1975b).

Support--the typical frequencies of warm and affectionate behaviors from the parent to the child (Rohner, 1976, 1980).

Responsibility assignment--the typical level of parental expectation or encouragement of home task assistance by the child (Whiting, Child, & Lambert, 1966).

Research Hypotheses

The theoretical perspectives of symbolic interaction theory and the identification/internalization approach suggests certain directionality

in the association between the parental concepts and children's helping
behaviors. Therefore, the following hypotheses are tested in this
study:

> <u>Hypothesis 1</u>. Parental support is associated with helping
> behaviors in young children.
>
> <u>Hypothesis 2</u>. Parental use of induction discipline is associated
> with helping behaviors in young children.
>
> <u>Hypothesis 3</u>. Parental emphasis on young children's responsibility
> in the home is associated with their helping
> behaviors.
>
> <u>Hypothesis 4</u>. Parental support, inductive discipline style, and
> responsibility emphasis influence young children's
> helping behaviors.
>
> <u>Hypothesis 5</u>. Parents who practice a discipline style using
> induction and nonpower within a supportive
> relationship have young children with helping
> behaviors.

Significance of the Study

The present study investigates the socialization practices that
contribute to helping behaviors in young children. It is believed that
such a study has implications both for an understanding of socialization
processes in general, and for educational direction in enhancing
prosocial behavioral development. According to Staub (Note 6)

> The socialization practices that contribute to a prosocial
> orientation are also likely to contribute to the development
> of positive self concept and self esteem by the child; to the
> willingness to live by social rules...and to the capacity and

6

tendency to interact with other people in a positive manner,

which contributes to harmony in a social group. (p. 55)

These possible contributions form the very essence of the goals of early socialization. In addition, if some understanding of the parent-child interaction patterns which influence a prosocial behavior is gained, then this information could be a contribution for the area of parent education. There is a belief (eg. Sears, Maccoby, & Levin, 1957) that many parents have prosocial type goals for their children but are unaware of the parent behaviors that are associated with the desirable outcome. This study should give some meaningful information concerning the influence of certain parental practices.

In a more specific sense, the present research is significant because there appears to be a research gap concerning the flow and interrelatedness of the antecedents for children's prosocial behaviors. This research is designed to explore both the simple association between each parental characteristic and the child's helping behavior and the effective patterning of these parental influences.

Concluding Remarks

Chapter I has given an introduction to the background and rationale for the present study. The purpose, conceptual definitions, research hypotheses, and significance of the study were discussed. Chapter II will detail and amplify the theoretical framework and empirical literature upon which the research rationale is based.

CHAPTER II

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK AND LITERATURE REVIEW

This chapter will explore selected empirical research concerning parental socialization practices associated with prosocial behaviors in young children. It is believed that the studies can best be approached from a multiple conceptual framework perspective (Broderick, 1971). Thus, the symbolic interactional framework and the identification/ internalization approach will be employed for this understanding.

Symbolic Interaction Theory

Human behavior is behavior in interaction and that interaction is patterned by the social structure within which it takes place. Symbolic interactionism is the analysis of human interplay, roles, definitions of situations, and social acts. It is concerned with individual percep- tions and individual definitions. According to Schvaneveldt (1966), the interactional theory views the family as a "unity of interacting person- alities." The primary emphasis of this theory is upon internal processes. Personal relationships are viewed in terms of roles, status relations, communication, socialization, and personality development.

One of the assumptive underpinnings of this theory is that infants are born asocial. Prosocial or antisocial tendencies are developed and are not inherent. These tendencies are part of the self and situational definitions which are shaped in interaction with significant others (Stryker, 1972). In early childhood, these significant others are the

parents or primary caregivers. Another important assumption within the symbolic interactional approach is that a person is an actor as well as a reactor. The child's self develops in areas in which he or she feels a sense of competency or control over the situation. Socialization is not a static but rather a dynamic concept in which the transactions between child and parents are influenced by all the actors in the situation (Rollins & Thomas, 1979). The self is conceptualized to be composed of identity sets, each identity being an internalized person category. The child's self identity is developed and validated in social interactions with parents (Stryker, 1972).

The parents inculcate their values and their definitions of situations to the child through their socializing actions. Rollins and Thomas (1979) report that parent-child interactions concerning control and discipline situations and support-affection relationships are crucial in influencing childhood socialization. Parents choose particular patterns based upon their goals for the outcome of the socialization experience. The discipline and support patterns a parent employs teaches the child the parental values implicit in the control or support practice and how to perceive the situation and him or herself (Inkeles, 1969).

Thus, the symbolic interactional approach emphasizes parental goals and parental behavior in influencing the outcome of childhood sociali-zation. The theory lends support to the prediction that prosocial behavior in young children is influenced by the goals and behaviors that parents employ. When parents, through their socialization behaviors, teach their child that he or she is a competent person who should be

concerned about and responsive to another's needs, the child may exhibit prosocial behaviors.

Identification/Internalization Approach

The identification/internalization approach is derived from concepts in both psychoanalytic theory and learning theory (Staub, 1979). The identification notion postulates that the child learns to be like the parents in attitude, values, and behavior through a process of role practice. The child is assumed to practice aspects of the parents' characteristics that bring parental approval and, thus, a continuance of parental affection and support (Sears, Maccoby, & Levin, 1957; Sears, Rau, & Alpert, 1965). The internalization notion postulates that the family prohibitions and mandates are adopted by the child and control comes from within the self. Thus, certain behaviors are intrinsically rather than extrinsically motivated (Hoffman, 1970; Hoffman, 1975). Aronfreed (1970) emphasizes the importance of this internalization concept for socialization research when he stated that the consequences of socialization are that "children become capable of their own internalized control over their behavior" (p. 104).

Like symbolic interactionalism, the human infant is viewed as basically asocial. The baby's innate needs are gradually modified through parental interaction with the child. The primary drives become the more social secondary drives such as dependency. Dependency needs, in turn, lead the child to satisfaction through the process of identification with the parents and internalization of their views and behaviors. Also complimentary to symbolic interaction theory is the approach's emphasis on parental socialization practices as important antecedents of child behavior. However, the identification/internali-

10

zation approach appears to place more stress on the unidirectional flow from parent to child.

The parents are viewed as the locus of power and controller of resources in the parent-child relationship. According to Sears (Sears et al., 1957; Sears et al., 1965), parental attributes become reinforcing to the child because they are associated with the gratification of the earlier primary drives. When the parents begin to demand some independency from the child, he or she adopts the parents' attributes. The child desires to be like the parent because this likeness is both gratifying in itself and is usually rewarded by the parents.

Certain corollaries of this process are important in influencing prosocial behavioral development. First of all, children tend to identify and internalize both the intended and unintended parental characteristics. This would appear to predict that parental attitudes are as important as their behavior (Sears et al., 1957; Sears et al., 1965). Secondly, the higher the quality of affection and support, the more the child tends to identify and internalize (Hoffman, 1970; 1975b; Sears et al., 1957; Sears et al., 1965). This contention predicts that children will tend to adopt the values and behaviors of supportive, affectionate parents. The last corollary is that love-oriented as opposed to object-oriented discipline methods will enhance children's positive behaviors (Hoffman, 1970, 1975b; Sears et al., 1957; Sears et al., 1965). Hoffman (1970) further theorizes that love-oriented discipline is of two types: love withdrawal and induction and that it is induction discipline that is most influential in the internalization process.

Both the symbolic interaction and identification/internalization approach assume that children learn moral standards and behaviors by learning from examples, adopting the characteristics of socializers, or forming self perceptions based upon their perceptions from interaction with others. Parents are considered the most influential socializers and parental attitudes and behaviors are seen as important in both frameworks.

Review of Empirical Literature

In recent years, many studies have been performed to investigate children's prosocial behaviors (reviews include Bryan & London, 1970; Eisenberg-Berg, in press; Grusec, in press; Krebs, 1970; Mussen & Eisenberg-Berg, 1977; Rushton, 1976; Staub, 1978, 1979). Most of these studies are in the area of personal and social variables such as the relationship between positive social behavior and moods and affects (eg. Barnett, King, & Howard, 1979; Kenrick, Baumann, & Cialdini, 1979), peer acceptance (eg. Ladd & Oden, 1979), attribution (eg. Grusec & Redler, 1980), developmental trends (eg. Yarrow & Waxler, 1976), moral reasoning (eg. Eisenberg-Berg, Note 2), and empathy (eg. Marcus, Telleen, & Roke, 1979). Although these studies are an important resource in understanding prosocial behavior, they are not really relevant for the objectives of this study and will not be discussed in this review. The emphasis of this paper is on the relationship between parents and their children. Therefore, only studies which investigate parental socialization are included in this discussion. Parental support, parental discipline, parental emphasis on responsibility, and patterns of parental behaviors are each reviewed in separate sections.

Parental Support

The quality of parental support is theorized to be one socialization antecedent of children's prosocial orientation and behaviors. It is believed that an affectionate relationship between parents and their children is crucial for identification and internalization (Hoffman, 1970; Sears et al., 1957). From the perspective of symbolic interaction theory, a supportive parent-child relationship facilitates a child's sense of competency by virtue of its responsiveness to the child's needs and actions (Rollins & Thomas, 1979). According to Staub (1975a), an affectionate parent-child relationship is probably the most important experience for the development of a tendency to behave prosocially. Staub enumerates four reasons why nurturance would be important. He feels that a supportive relationship allows the child to feel safe and secure and that this security leads to a reduction of self concern. Secondly, a supportive relationship in the home creates a positive view of people. The child learns to like and trust others first at home, then, outside of the home. Also, the positive emotional environment can facilitate learning. And, lastly, Staub feels that a supportive relationship is an important source of parental identification for the child.

Research findings from a variety of naturalistic studies do suggest that a supportive parental relationship is associated with children's tendencies to behave prosocially. In a series of studies on the antecedents of moral development, Hoffman and his associates have found a consistent relationship between parental affection and moral behavior in children. An early study conducted by Hoffman (1963) demonstrated that parental acceptance of the child, as measured by the amount of

pleasurable mother-child interaction recorded in a 24-hour time span, was related to nursery school children's positive affective orientation (rho = .53, $p < .01$). Positive affective orientation was defined as the initiation of friendly social acts. The relationship between parental acceptance and the child's consideration for others was, however, not significant.

In a second study (Hoffman & Saltzstein, 1967), assessments of parental affection were obtained from both the parents and their children. These children were all seventh grade students. The affection score, obtained from a self-report weighted rating scale, was tested for its relationship with several child behaviors. Of interest to this discussion were the child variables of peer ratings for consideration of other children and the child's conscious identification with a parent. Hoffman's results indicate the importance of maternal affection for middle class boys ($p < .05$). Middle class girls were influenced by their perception of maternal affection ($p < .05$) and lower class boys were influenced by their perception of both maternal and paternal affection ($p < .05$).

The third Hoffman study to be discussed here was conducted with fifth graders (Hoffman, 1975b). Using the same parental support measure and peer reputational measure as was used in the previous study (Hoffman & Saltzstein, 1967), Hoffman found a significant relationship for maternal affection for the son's altruistic behavior ($r = .29$, $p < .05$). The relationship between child behavior and maternal affection for daughters and paternal affection for boys and girls did not reach significance in this study.

The study by Rutherford and Mussen (1968) also investigated the hypothesis that prosocial behaviors are acquired by means of parental identification. On the basis of a generosity test (giving away candies) two groups of white, middle class, preschool boys were formed. One group was high in generosity and the other group was low in generosity. The boys were rated by their teachers and evaluated in a situational test of competitiveness. Additionally, each boy engaged in a projective doll playing situation designed to elicit the child's attitudes and perceptions of both parents. Results indicated that high generous boys saw their fathers as warmer and more nurturant than low generous boys ($p < .05$).

Mussen, Harris, Rutherford, and Keasey (1970) studied the relationships among maternal childrearing, children's self-esteem, and altruism among preadolescents. The mothers were requested to respond to Q-sorts concerning their childrearing practices and the children were assessed by means of peer reputation questionnaires and the Prisoner's Dilemma situational test. Mussen and his associates found a positive relationship between situational altruism and maternal nurturance for boys ($r = .42$, $p < .02$) and a negative relationship for girls ($r = -.37$, $p < .05$). There was no relationship between maternal support and reputational altruism for either sex.

Feshback (1974) investigated the relationship between childrearing factors and both positive and negative behaviors in 48 six and eight year old children. Feshback employed the Block Q-sort to quantify the parental practices. She found that both maternal and paternal affection was related to sons' positive behaviors ($r = .56$, $p < .01$ and $r = .70$,

15

$p < .01$, respectively) but the relationship was not significant for daughters.

A more recent study by Roke (1979; Roke & Marcus, Note 5) hypothesized that parental nurturance is associated with cooperativeness in young children. Parental support was operationalized with the Hoffman (1967, 1975b) affection measure. The findings for these preschoolers indicate that maternal support is related to girls' cooperative behavior ($r = .55$, $p < .03$). However, maternal affection was unrelated to boys' cooperativeness and paternal affection was not significantly related to either daughters' or sons' cooperativeness.

The research of Bryant and Crockenberg (1980) was concerned with the contributions of mothers and sisters in facilitating prosocial behavior in children. The study compares maternal behavior toward female children of different ages with sisters' prosocial behavior toward each other in a semi-naturalistic, game-playing context. Of interest here is the authors' finding that maternal sensitive responding was related to child comforting and sharing ($r = .45$, $p < .001$).

Discussion

Several points must be considered before reaching a generalization concerning the association between parental support and prosocial behavior. First of all, the variable of parental support has been given a variety of different labels in the literature (eg. "affection," "nurturance"). However, the conceptual meaning of these labels are quite similar (Rollins & Thomas, 1979). Secondly, limitations of measurement plague this area. Many of the reviewed studies utilize support instruments which do not have reliability and validity data reports. Another problem is that there are contradictions in the

16

findings. Hoffman found significant maternal support influences for both boys and girls. Mussen and his associates found maternal support was related to boys' altruism but was negative for girls' behaviors. Feshback found a positive association between sons' positive behaviors and nurturance from both parents. Both Roke and Bryant and Crockenberg found the mother to daughter influence significant whereas Rutherford and Mussen found the father to son relationship significant.

In all of the studies the definitions and measures of prosocial behavior differ greatly, and in two of the Hoffman studies and the Mussen study the subjects were much older than in the other investigations. Also, the Rutherford and Mussen research used a very different measure of parental support than the other studies and used only males as the subjects. Beyond these probable explanations of differences are the possibilities of non-independence of data when measures are from the same source (as in parts of the Hoffman and Saltzstein study and in the Rutherford and Mussen study) and possible constriction of the range in one or more of the measures.

Having noted these cautions, the empirical literature generally supports the theoretical proposition that prosocial behavior is influenced by parental support. However, further exploration of these variables is needed.

Parental Discipline

Another parental socialization practice which has been given attention in the empirical literature is parental discipline styles. Sears (1957, 1965) predicts that parental employment of love-oriented techniques (love withdrawal and induction) as opposed to object-oriented or power assertive patterns should increase the child's identification

17

with parents. Hoffman (1970) agrees that nonpower assertive discipline is most effective for prosocial behavioral development. However, Hoffman suggested that the reasoning with the child which is involved in induction techniques is more influential in positive outcomes than the love withdrawal technique. He also made the distinction between two types of induction. One, called induction regarding parents, refers to the practice of reasoning with the child by referring to the consequences of the child's actions for the parents. In the second type, called induction regarding others, the consequences of the child's actions for other people are emphasized. These induction patterns are theorized to influence the child's internalization.

Symbolic interactionism basically supports the identification/internalization postulates. As noted previously, symbolic interactionism emphasizes the importance of competency outcome interactions for the self development of the child. A discipline style that focuses upon reasoning and information-giving would facilitate competency perceptions on the part of the child. This view of self as competent would presumably influence behavior in a prosocial direction (Rollins & Thomas, 1979).

Empirical data offers partial support for these speculations. Parental discipline styles do, in fact, influence child behavior. In the Hoffman studies, discussed in the parental support review, parental discipline influence was extensively investigated. In the study with preschoolers, Hoffman (1963) predicted that induction techniques would relate positively with the child's consideration for other persons. The parent data was obtained from in-depth interviews with mothers concerning the details of her interactions with the child during the

twenty-four hours previous to the interview. The findings supported this hypothesis (r = .75, $p <$ .01). Hoffman was surprised, however, by the findings concerning the use of reasoning within a generally power-assertive disciplinary style. Here, the child's consideration for others was negatively related to reasoning (r = -.68, $p <$ .05). This finding led Hoffman to conclude that a high power-assertive context alters the effects of induction "in a manner dysfunctional for the development of an internalized moral orientation" (p. 584).

In the second study, the considerateness and degree of identification of seventh graders was related to parental discipline techniques. The parents were asked to imagine six situations (eg. the child being careless and destroying something of value, or seeing the child make fun of another child). Following each situation, the parents were asked to indicate their first, second, and third most frequently used discipline technique from a list of fourteen practices. The listed practices represented the three main categories of power-assertion, love withdrawal, and induction. For girls, the frequent use of maternal power assertion was negatively associated with consideration and identification ($p <$ .05). Love withdrawal was associated with low identification ($p <$ .05). Induction was positively related to girls' consideration of others ($p <$ .01). The findings were very different, however, for the boys. Maternal power-assertion was, unexpectedly, positively related to considerate reputation ($p <$ .05) while induction was only associated with the boys' identification ($p <$ .05). The researchers offered the explanation that their measure of consideration was not an adequate one for the boys since preadolescent males, in

contrast with females, would place a low value on helping others (Hoffman & Saltzstein, 1967).

In yet another study using peer reputation as a measure of prosocial behavior, Hoffman (1975b) studied parental discipline styles as an antecedent of fifth graders' altruism. The discipline measure was a modification of the situational measure used in the previous research (Hoffman & Saltzstein, 1967). The parents were presented with three situations in which a child harmed another person (eg. by kicking a friend's toy house apart, by making fun of another child). Hoffman was interested in what he termed "victim-centered" techniques. He felt that induction centering on reparation or apology to the victim would influence prosocial behavior. The results indicated that maternal induction related positively with sons' altruistic behavior ($r = .50$, $p < .01$), and paternal induction with daughters' altruism ($r = .53$, $p < .01$).

Two investigations which used the Block Q-sort to quantify child-rearing practices had very different results. Mussen found a relationship between maternal reasoning discipline and daughters' altruism ($r = .49$, $p < .01$) but no relationship for sons (Mussen, Harris, Rutherford, & Keasey, 1970). However, Feshback found that there was a positive association between maternal induction and boys' positive behaviors ($r = .41$, $p < .05$). She found no relationship for the female children (Feshback, 1974).

Recently, Roke (1979) reported contradictory findings for the influence of induction on children's cooperative behavior. Using a situational measure that coded parental reasoning categories into person-oriented (feelings and needs of people) and position-status

20

factors (eg. "all children should..."), he presented parents with parent-child situations involving such conflicts as the child not wanting to go to school or the child picking a neighbor's flowers. Maternal induction did not relate significantly with either boys' or girls' cooperativeness. Paternal induction, on the other hand, was negatively associated with boys' cooperativeness ($r = -.71$, $p < .05$).

Discussion

Roke and Marcus (Note 5) suggest that the non relationships were found because of the young age of their subjects. They also cite Staub's (1978) argument that boys react oppositionally to verbal communications because of the male socialization experience. However, Hoffman (1963) did find a positive maternal induction influence for both sons and daughters with very young children. One obvious area of difference between the two studies is in the instrument used for collecting parental discipline data. Conceptually and operationally, the measures were different. Also, the children's prosocial behavioral measurement was similar in conceptual meaning, but different in instrumentation. Beyond these reasons, it is important to note that Hoffman's study was reported sixteen years prior to Roke's research when, presumably, male socialization experiences were even more rigid. Roke's disciplinary measure, on the other hand, did have reported reliability and validity data whereas Hoffman's measure did not.

Although the Mussen et al. and Feshback studies used the same parental practices instrument, their quantification of prosocial behavior differed substantially and their samples were different in age.

Hoffman and others (eg. Mussen & Eisenberg-Berg, 1977) conclude that induction has a powerful influence on prosocial behaviors. However,

according to Staub (1979), parental discipline is not an isolated

practice and it is important to review studies that investigate parental

patterns that include both differential levels of parental support and

varying discipline styles.

Parental Emphasis on Responsibility

Parental emphasis on responsibility is a third possible socializa-

tion influence on children's prosocial behavior. Staub (1978) has

proposed that children's involvement with responsible activities leads

to a sense of personal responsibility toward others. He feels that such

a prosocial orientation toward others is an important influence on

prosocial behavior.

It seems logical from a symbolic-interaction perspective that

children who are allowed early and consistent practice in helping others

gain feelings of efficacy and ability. Thus, if the child is allowed to

define the self as a competent helper, he or she may be motivated to

continue helping others. This is also consistent from the

identification/internalization approach. If the parents encourage

helping behaviors, the child will seek to secure parental approval

through helpful acts. Eventually, through role practice, helpful

behavior will become intrinsically motivated and part of the child's own

definition of self.

Unfortunately, there is very little empirical research in this

area. The first study linking childhood responsibility to prosocial

behavior was reported by Bathurst (1933). He studied sympathy and

resistance among 73 children aged 18 to 76 months. He found that the

possession of a pet increased sympathy, decreased resistance, and had a

greater effect upon both resistance and sympathy than reported environmental conditions.

More influential research in this area was performed by the anthropological team of Whiting and Whiting (1973, 1975). Observation and interview data was collected on the social behavior of 134 children in six communities: Tarong, Taira, Khalapur, Orchard Town, Juxtlahuaca, and Nyansengo. Essentially, the researchers found that cultures which rank highest in nurturant behaviors by the children were those cultures in which the females were major economic contributors, extended family lived together, and children were responsible for helping with younger siblings and doing family chores. The relationship between responsibility for family work and infant care and altruism was strong ($\underline{r}$ = .94, $\underline{p}$ < .01 and $\underline{r}$ = .82, $\underline{p}$ < .01, respectively).

Additionally, the Whitings found that intra-cultural analysis maintained the relationship between altruism and responsibility. Children who performed domestic chores or economic tasks were rated as more nurturant ($\underline{p}$ < .05) and children who tended younger children were also more nurturant ($\underline{p}$ < .05).

The Whitings' conclusion regarding nurturance responsibility and altruism is supported by the findings in research on Israeli kindergarten age children. Bitzman, Yinon, Mivtzari, & Shavit (1978) examined the altruistic behavior of children in age-heterogeneous and age-homogeneous school settings. Their measures of altruism were both direct (donation behaviors) and indirect (story completions). The authors found that age-heterogeneous children contributed more pretzels (χ^2 = 8.81, $\underline{p}$ < .01) and chose a helping alternative more often for the two stories (χ^2 = 4.02, $\underline{p}$ < .05 and χ^2 = 8.44, $\underline{p}$ < .01). Bitzman and

his associates felt that their results supported the contention that children in mixed aged social groupings have had more opportunities to experience being helped by older children and helping younger children and that this experience is related to altruism.

In the study of honesty and altruism among preadolescents reported earlier, Mussen and his colleagues conclude that maternal emphasis on the acceptance of person responsibility and high achievement is related to altruism. However, the definition of responsibility was in terms of self-control as opposed to helpful acts (Mussen, Harris, Rutherford, & Keasey, 1970).

There is research that supports the notion that parental encouragement of helping facilitates helpful acts by children. Rheingold (1982) explored children's helping in home type tasks in the laboratory. A total of 80 children ranging in age from 18 to 30 months of age were observed in a simulated home environment with either their mothers or fathers and in some cases, an unfamiliar adult. The parents were asked to complete nine common home tasks such as folding laundry, making beds, and picking up books. All of the children participated in helping their parents with the tasks and 86% of the children helped an unfamiliar adult. Most of these children helped on several of the tasks. In addition, the children exhibited behaviors which showed that they were aware of the goals of the tasks. Rheingold suggests that very young children are able to help and should be provided with opportunities for spontaneous helping.

Grusec (in press) studied children's helping behaviors in the home by training mothers to record the helping behaviors of their children and the reactions of those around them. The sample included 22 four

year olds and 16 seven year olds from middle-class families. Of particular relevance to this discussion was the finding that there was a relationship between the younger children's number of offers to help and parental acceptance of these offerings. The more accepting the parents were of the child's helpfulness, the more helpful was the child (neither statistic nor p level reported). Also, there was a strong relationship between spontaneous helping and offered helping ($p < .01$). Grusec reasons that children who are allowed practice in helpful actions gain feelings of efficacy and ability.

The laboratory studies of Staub (1970, 1975b) generally support the notion that responsibility focusing or responsible activities enhance helpful behaviors. The 1970 study investigated the effects of indirect responsibility focusing. Eighty-four kindergarten and first-grade children participated in the study. In one of the treatment groups, the children, who were alone in the experimental room, were told that they were "in charge" and were "to take care of things." The first graders in this distress-responsibility group made more attempts to help a child whom they believed to be in distress in an adjoining room than children who heard the distress sounds but were not "in charge" ($t = 3.0$, $p < .01$). The kindergarten children did not show a treatment effect for responding to distress sounds but the distress-responsibility kindergarteners did deny more frequently than the other group that they heard the distress sounds ($x^2 = 3.6$, $p < .10$). Staub felt that this denial may have been due to fear of disapproval for nonaction.

The Staub and Fotta research (cited in Staub, 1975b) explored the effect of induction combined with responsible activities on prosocial behaviors of fifth- and sixth-grade children. The responsible action

treatment groups spent time making puzzles for children in the hospital, whereas the neutral groups were told stories and drew pictures. Each of these groups were further divided into groups that received induction (experimenter talking about the positive consequences of helping activity) and no induction. The combined effect of induction and responsible activities was significant ($\underline{F}$ = 5.7, $\underline{p} <$ .02) but the effect was mainly the result of the girls' prosocial behavior (sex effect, $\underline{F}$ = 4.89, $\underline{p} <$ .02). For boys, both induction and responsible activities increased the intention to make more puzzles but the interaction was not significant.

Staub concludes that assigning children responsibility for activities that enhance other persons' welfare facilitates the children's development of prosocial behavior.

Discussion

Although the evidence is not substantial, the empirical studies do support the theoretical contentions concerning parental emphasis on responsibility and helpful behavior by young children.

The Staub studies support the notion that being responsible, and to a lesser extent, engaging in responsible activities, enhance subsequent prosocial behavior.

The Rheingold (1982) study demonstrates that even very young children can help with household tasks and the Grusec (in press) study shows that parental encouragement of helping behavior is associated with increased levels of helping. The Whiting and Whiting (1973, 1975) and, to a lesser extent, the Bathurst (1933) research demonstrates that there is a relationship between home responsibility and prosocial behaviors in young children. Specifically, the ethnographic study shows that both

across cultures and within cultures, the opportunity and encouragement of early helpful behavior is associated with nurturance and altruism in the young child.

Patterns of Parental Behaviors

Most of the previously reviewed studies have focused upon the parental behaviors of support, discipline, and responsibility in isolation from each other. In the real world, children are exposed to various discipline styles and responsibility levels from parents within a range of supportive parent-child relationships. In theory, there may be important additive or multiplicative relationships among the parent influences.

For instance, factor analytic research on parent behaviors have developed conceptualizations about parental childrearing. By analyzing maternal behavior correlations, Schaefer (1959) developed a two dimensional model for mothers' behaviors. He labeled the reference axes love versus hostility and autonomy versus control. Schaefer utilized this circumplex model to describe the intercorrelations between child behavior and maternal behavior (Schaefer & Bayley, 1963).

Becker (1964) developed an alternative model which incorporates three parental dimensions. Becker's warmth versus hostility factor is similar to Schaefer's love versus hostility dimension. However, the factor analyses of Becker subdivided Schaefer's autonomy versus control factor into a restrictiveness versus permissiveness dimension and an anxious-emotional involvement versus a calm-detachment dimension.

These conceputalizations do provide a framework for analyzing parental behaviors. They also provide a perspective for studying parental behaviors as a pattern of childrearing interactions. Both

Schaefer and Becker have found that parental behaviors on one dimension are correlated with parental behaviors on another dimension. It seems necessary to view parental behavior as a pattern rather than as isolated techniques. There are, in fact, several research reports which view parental behavior in a differential pattern fashion.

In an early study, Baumrind (1967) categorized a sample of 110 three and and four year old preschoolers on the basis of their behaviors in school. The groups are as follows: Group I--energetic-friendly (n=13); Group II--conflicted-irritable (n=11); Group III--impulsive-aggressive (n=8). The study focus was not on helping or other prosocial behaviors but several behavioral items are relevant for this review. Group I children were rated higher on "helps other children adapt" than children in either Group II ($p < .01$) or Group III ($p < .01$). These Group I children were also rated higher on "other children seek his help" than Group II ($p < .01$) and Group III ($p < .01$) children and on "nurturant" than either Group II ($p < .05$) or Group III ($p < .05$).

Parental behavior was assessed through home and structured observations and through interviews. Group I children's parents used a pattern of childrearing which included high control, high independence training, reasoning in their discipline, and nurturance in their interactions with their child.

Baumrind (1971) conducted another study with preschoolers in which the parents were categorized into one of seven parental patterns and scores for child behaviors were treated as dependent variables. Again, the parental characteristics were gathered from home visit observations and interviews and the child data were based upon observations in their

nursery schools. Of interest was Baumrind's finding that Pattern II
parents (authoritative, not nonconforming) had sons who were signifi-
cantly higher in such behaviors as "nurturant toward other children,"
"helps other children carry out their plans," and "understands other
children's positions in interaction" ($p < .01$ for the cluster). These
parents were firm enforcers and encouragers of independence and
individuality. Baumrind also reported that assignment of household
duties to children was one part of the pattern of childrearing employed
by the parents of the friendly and sociable children.

Another study, whose findings are in harmony with Baumrind's
results is the longitudinal investigation by Brody and Axelrad (1978).
These researchers were interested in the relationship between parental
care and children's psychological development. The parental data was
obtained through interview and observation and the children were
observed both at home and in school and were given a battery of psycho-
logical tests. Parents were categorized as adequate (Group A) and less
adequate (Group B). Exact behavioral criteria were not clearly stated
in the report but categorization appears to have been based upon ratings
of maternal sensitivity to the child, and later, empathy, control,
efficiency, and the consistency of these behaviors in interaction with
the child. Brody and Axelrad report that adequate mothers were married
to adequate fathers and inadequate persons formed couple units. The
findings, in terms of prosocial development, were as follows: At age
four, Group B children rarely or never responded to the needs of other
children ($\chi^2 = 5.72$) and showed poor social judgment ($\chi^2 = 4.11$). At
six years of age, Group B children showed poor social awareness ($\chi^2 =
6.641$), rarely or never responded to the needs or peers ($\chi^2 = 12.2$),

showed poor social judgment (χ^2 = 4.981), and low awareness of appropriate social behaviors (χ^2 = 7.546). Group B children were rated in terms of their comparison to Group A children.

The Baumrind (1967, 1971) and Brody and Axelrad (1978) studies support the contention that induction type discipline influences prosocial type behaviors, but they do not give clear data regarding support in parent-child relationships. Also, Staub (1979) suggests a methodological weakness in the Baumrind studies. The parent behavior clusters that were used for analysis were derived from both interviews and observer reports combined. Baumrind did not report the degree of agreement in parental and observer reports of parental behaviors. Finally, neither the Baumrind nor the Brody and Axelrad studies were focused on prosocial behaviors.

There is one report in the prosocial literature which provides information concerning maternal childrearing patterns. Zahn-Waxler, Radke-Yarrow, and King (1979) investigated maternal socialization behaviors and children's prosocial initiations toward victims of distress. The subjects were 1½-2½ years of age (n=16). Parent data was obtained from home observations (the mothers were rated on empathic caregiving). In order to overcome some of the measurement problems inherent in research with very young children, the mothers were trained to observe their children and record detailed descriptions of behavioral sequences. These maternal reports served as the data source for both maternal response techniques and the child's behaviors.

The findings were as follows: mothers who were high in affective explanations (eg. stating principles) had children who intervened when they were the cause of the distress (t = 4.77, $p <$ .001); maternal

affective explanations were also associated with greater altruism on the part of the child when he or she witnessed distress ($\underline{t}$ = 2.6, $\underline{p} <$ .05). These results lend more support to induction influence as a disciplinary style. Of further importance, though, is the fact that Zahn-Waxler and her associates reported the intercorrelations of maternal techniques. Empathic caregiving, as a parental support variable, was significantly interrelated with affective explanations ($\underline{r}$ = .7, $\underline{p} <$ .01).

It is unfortunate that most of the previously reviewed studies did not report the relationships among the parental measures. Parent behavior does occur within a context of childrearing. The Schaefer (1959, 1963) and Becker (1964) models demonstrate the conceptual utility of a pattern perspective. However, further research is needed in which both the bivariate and multivariate contributions of the parent variables are investigated.

Conclusion

Both symbolic interactionism and the identification/internalization approach predict that parental childrearing patterns which include induction type discipline within a highly supportive parent-child relationship will be associated with children's prosocial behaviors. The theories also suggest that the parents' emphasis on early responsibility may influence children's helping behaviors.

The empirical literature gives support to the influence of induction and somewhat less corroboration for the influence of parental support. Very limited research exists in the area of parental emphasis on responsibility.

The argument has been made that there is a need to further analyze the influence of parental support level, parental discipline style, and

parental emphasis on responsibility, both as single variables and in their interrelated context. The present research is designed to use both bivariate and multivariate perspectives in order to provide some indications concerning the patterning of parental socialization influences. The following chapter will describe the methodology of the proposed research.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

Chapter I has introduced the research problem and presented the purpose, conceptual definitions, research hypotheses, and the significance of the study. Chapter II reviewed the theoretical and empirical literature and elaborated upon the rationale for the present research. This chapter will describe the subjects, procedures, research instruments, operational definitions of terms, data analysis, and limitations of the study.

Subjects

Participating families were recruited from two college affiliated preschools in Columbia and Luzerne Counties, Northeastern Pennsylvania. The parents received a letter from the researcher which explained the investigation and requested the family's participation (See Appendix A).

The acceptance rates at the two preschools were 45% and 50% respectively. A total of 57 families completed the parental questionnaires.

Four children were omitted from analysis due to inconsistent attendance. The observed sample contained 53 children, 22 boys and 31 girls. Their ages ranged from 31 through 77 months, with a mean age of 57.4 months. There were 8 only children, 21 first-born children, and 24 later-born children.

The families were Caucasian and middle-class. Eleven of the families were single-parent and 42 were two-parent families.

Research Procedures

A request was made to the directors of two college affiliated preschools to contact their registered families. A letter from this investigator was given to each family by the respective directors. This letter described the proposed research and requested the family's participation (see Appendix A). The directors explained to the families that the researcher would be present the following week to answer parent or child questions and distribute the parent questionnaires.

The families who agreed to participate were given an envelope which contained an information sheet describing the research and a consent form to be completed by the parents (see Appendix B). The envelope also contained the Parent Interview Questionnaire (see Appendix C). This questionnaire consisted of the parental support, parental discipline, parental emphasis on responsibility, and social desirability response measures described in the instrumentation section in this chapter. Single parent families were given one questionnaire and two questionnaires were presented to the two-parent families.

The researcher answered parental questions and thanked the families for their participation.

Observation Procedure

Each child in the study was observed during free-play periods. Both the observation routine and coding of behavior is based upon Eisenberg-Berg and Hand (1979).

Each observation period included 10 minutes of observation per child and each child was observed 6 times, for a total of 60 minutes for each child.

The observers consisted of a primary observer (the investigator) and a secondary observer naive to the hypotheses of the study. The secondary observer was utilized for reliability checking. Observation training was carried out prior to the formal data collection. Both observers trained and practiced the observation procedure in the preschools from which the sample was recruited. The variable definitions and coding instructions were discussed and then a randomly selected sample of 10 children from each preschool was observed by both observers for a total of 10 minutes per child. Interrater reliability was computed as percent of exact agreement between observers using the formula:

$$\frac{\text{total number of agreements}}{\text{total number of agreements} \quad \text{plus} \quad \text{total number of disagreements}}$$

Initial interrater reliability was .92 and .84 at preschools A and B respectively. Reliability checks were performed weekly during the data collection phase of the research. Overall interrater reliability was .87 for a total of 530 one-minute intervals.

The children's helping and sociability behavior was coded into one of the following categories:

1. Aiding - the child attempts to alleviate another's nonemotional needs through verbal or motor behavior (eg. secures a game piece for another, helps with a task).

2. Comforting - the child attempts to alleviate another's emotional distress (eg. puts arm around crying child, gets the teacher to help a hurt child).

35

3. Sociability - the child has positive social interactions with others (eg. playing together, greetings, sharing).

The children's negative and neutral behaviors were placed into the category of "other."

Furthermore, the effectiveness of the observed aiding or comforting behavior was rated according to the following categories:

1. Effective - the helping behavior has taken place (eg. in the case of aiding, the recipient wanted and accepted the game piece or completed the task more efficiently; in the case of comforting, the recipient stopped crying or the teacher helped the hurt child).

2. Ineffective - the behavior is not helping behavior. The action has not helped another attain a goal or relieved the needs of another.

Each observed behavior variable was coded as to its circumstances and the recipient of the behavior. The definitions for these categories are the following:

Circumstances

1. Self-initiation - the child spontaneously initiates the prosocial or social act.

2. Compliance - the child is responding to a request from another.

3. Questionable - the circumstance cannot be determined.

Recipient

1. Peer - any child in the school area

2. Adult - any teacher or other adult person in the
   school area.

Observers noted the occurrence of each behavior category and the circumstances and recipient of each behavior. In addition, the sex of the peer recipient was recorded (see Appendix D).

Instrumentation

In this section each research tool used with the parents will be described and the reliability and validity information will be reported.

Parental Support

Parental support was assessed by administering the Parental Acceptance-Rejection Questionnaire-Adult Version (PARQ) to each parent in the sample. The PARQ was developed by Rohner (1976) and is designed to measure the warmth factor in the parent-child relationship.

The PARQ consists of 60 items which measure such dimensions as parental warmth/affection, parental aggression/hostility, parental neglect/indifference, and parental rejection (undifferentiated). The parents were requested to determine if each statement concerning a parent-child relationship was basically true or untrue in their relationship with their child. If the statement was basically true, the parents were asked to indicate if the item is almost always true or sometimes true. If the statement was basically untrue, the parents were requested to determine if the item was rarely true or almost never true. Responses were coded on a 4 point scale with maximum score indicating maximum quantity of that scale.

Extensive analysis of the validity and reliability of the PARQ was conducted (Rohner, 1980). Concurrent validity was studied by correlating the PARQ with two validated instruments (Schafer's Child's Report of Parent Behavior Inventory-CRPBI and Bronfenbrenner's Parental Behavior Questionnaire-BPB). The reported coefficients ranged from .90 to .81 (all correlations were $p < .001$). Internal consistency ranged from .95 to .86 ($p < .001$ for all correlations). The convergent and discriminant validity of the PARQ was also assessed using the CRPBI and BPB. The correlations reported were significant at the $p < .001$ level for the PARQ scales.

Parental Discipline

The discipline measure was provided by Mark Barnett of Kansas State University. He adapted the Hoffman measure (Hoffman, 1975b; Hoffman & Saltzstein, 1967) for use in a research study on empathy development in young children (Barnett, King, Howard, & Dino, 1980).

Parents were presented with three hypothetical child behavior situations and were requested to indicate the likelihood of their response with each of eight common parental practices. The practices were classified into power assertive, love withdrawal, and induction type discipline. Parental responses were coded on a 5 point scale and parents received a score for the frequency of use of each discipline style.

The research tool has been used by Hoffman (1975b) with results which support the discipline stance of the internalization theoretical approach. This is an indication of construct validity. The internal consistency was assessed in a study of reputational helping in preschoolers with the result that the three scales of power assertive,

love withdrawal, and induction had alpha coefficients of .91, .72, and .89 respectively with an overall alpha of .76 (Batory, Note 1).

Parental Emphasis on Responsibility

The instrument for quantifying parental emphasis on responsibility was constructed from information suggested by Rheingold (1982) and Whiting, Child, and Lambert (1966).

The questionnaire consists of 9 questions concerning children's helping behaviors with household chores, pets, and younger siblings. Items are scored from 1 (almost never) to 4 (almost always).

A sample of 40 parents with preschool age children was recruited from a babysitting cooperative in the College Park area of Maryland. The test was administered to these parents in April of 1982 and again in May of 1982. The coefficient of stability was .99 and the internal consistency of the instrument was .95 and .95 respectively for the two administrations of the test.

Parental Social Desirability Response

The Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale was included in the parent questionnaire as an attempt to quantify the role of demand characteristics (Crowne & Marlowe, 1960). The scale was developed to measure non-test relevant response determinants. The scale consists of behavioral statements which are culturally sanctioned but improbable of occurrence.

The parents were requested to decide if each item in turn was true or false as it pertained to them. Responses of TRUE to items 2, 4, 16, 17, 24, 25, 26, and 33 were summed and added to the sum of responses of FALSE to items 6, 11, 15, 19, 28, 30, and 32. The resulting total was the social desirability response score.

Crowne and Marlowe (1960) reported an internal consistency coefficient of .88 and test-retest reliability of .89 for the scale.

Parental Demographics

Background information concerning the parental status (mother or father), occupation, time spent with the child, age of the child, and number and age of other children in the home was requested in a simple fill-in format.

Teacher Ratings

A brief scale was developed for completion by the preschool teachers (see Appendix E). The teachers were requested to complete a rating scale based upon their observations of parental behaviors. The teachers were asked about parental affection (hugging or saying nice things to the child), interest (attending meetings, asking questions concerning their child), and concern (appropriate clothing, health care, picking the child up on time).

The teachers were given the rating scales after all child observations were completed. The scale was expected to give an additional, independent source of information on parent behaviors.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

Chapters I and II presented the research problems, research hypotheses, theoretical framework, and empirical review. Chapter III reported the methods by which the study was implemented. This chapter will present the statistical analyses performed and the data collected.

Children's helping behavior data consists of measurements derived from time-sampled naturalistic observations. Observations were made of aiding and comforting behaviors (see Appendix D).

Parental variables consist of the parents' scores on various instruments in the Parent Interview Questionnaire. The support instrument produced scores on the variables of warmth, aggression, neglect, and rejection. The discipline measure resulted in scores on power assertion, love withdrawal, induction re self, and induction re others. The responsibility instrument measured the parents' perception of their children's chore behavior, the parents' encouragement and expectation of chore behavior on the part of the children, the children's responsibility toward a family pet, the children's responsibility behavior toward a younger sibling, and the parents' encouragement and expectation of sibling care. The social desirability scale measured the role of demand characteristics. Data concerning sample demographics were also collected (see Appendix C).

In addition to the self-report measurements, ratings on parent behaviors were made by the preschool teachers.

Preliminary Analysis

Child Data

The mean scores and standard deviations for the observational helping categories are presented in Table 1. The children displayed infrequent incidences of helping behavior during the observational period (i.e. a mean of 0.12 helping acts per minute).

An examination of Table 1 reveals that the helping behavior data have large standard deviations relative to the means. The data appear to have rather flat distributions without strong centralization.

The helping behaviors of the children are related to their observed sociability. Effective sociability, defined as positive social interactions with others, is significantly related to aiding behavior (r = .46, p < .001). This result is influenced by the sex variable. For girls, the correlation is r = .61 (p < .001), whereas for boys, the relationship is not significant (r = .20). Comforting behavior is not significantly related to effective sociability when the total sample is analyzed. When the sex variable is considered, however, comforting behavior is associated with boys' sociability (r = .41, p < .05) but not girls' sociability (r = .03).

Other child variables are also found to have an association with aiding behavior. For the sample as a whole, child age and having a family pet are both related to aiding behavior (r = .30, p < .01, and r = -.24, p < .05, respectively). When sex is considered, the aiding behavior of girls is positively related to child age (r =.43, p < .01), and negatively related to having a family pet (r = -.41, p < .01) and having a single parent (r = -.39, p < .05). For boys, the variable of birth order is related to their aiding behavior (r = .39, p < .05).

Table 1

Observational Categories:
Means and Standard Deviations
for Total Observation
(60 minutes per child)

Category[a]	$\underline{M}$	$\underline{SD}$
Effective Aiding	6.89	4.08
Effective Aiding with boys. . . .	1.60	2.40
Effective Aiding with girls . . .	3.23	3.51
Effective Aiding with adults. . .	2.25	2.01
Spontaneous Aiding.	2.98	2.93
Compliant Aiding.	3.89	2.54
Effective Comforting	.40	.91
Effective Comforting with boys. .	.20	.56
Effective Comforting with girls .	.30	.77
Effective Comforting with adults.	.00	.00
Spontaneous Comforting.	.38	.88
Compliant Comforting.	.02	.14
Effective Sociability.	40.32	12.45
Other Behaviors.	26.00	13.00

[a] $\underline{n}$ = 53

Later born males score higher aiding observations than first born boys. Comforting behavior is not significantly associated with these variables.

An analysis of sex differences reveals insignificant differences in observed helping scores for boys and girls (t = -.30, N.S., for aiding, and t = -.29, N.S., for comforting). Further analyses of the observation categories finds insignificant differences in the mean observation scores of boys and girls for all categories except effective aiding of girls and effective comforting of girls. Girls are more likely to effectively aid (t = -2.55, p < .01 and effectively comfort (t = -2.40, p < .05) their female peers than are boys.

Stability of Child Behaviors

The observed child behaviors of aiding and comforting were analyzed for stability in each preschool using an application of Cronbach's generalizability coefficient (Marcus, Johnson, and Roke, Note 3).

A two-way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) with one observation per cell was applied to aiding scores and comforting scores matrices. Data for School A consisted of 38 x 6 subject by occasion matrices. Data for School B consisted of 15 x 6 subject by occasion matrices. Variance components were estimated from the ANOVA mean squares using the Cornfield-Tukey algorithm. These variance components provided the data for determining the generalizability coefficients for aiding and comforting behaviors in each preschool.

As shown in Table 2, the stability of aiding behavior is relatively high. In School A, the children's variance component is 37% of the total variance and the generalizability coefficient is .79. In School B, the children are more heterogeneous in aiding behavior as indicated

Table 2

Estimated Variance Components, Score Components,
and Generalizability Coefficients for Aiding and
Comforting Scores of Six Occasions Per Subject

	School A[a]			School B[b]		
Source:	Variance Component	Proportional Size	Score Component	Variance Component	Proportional Size	Score Component
			Aiding			
Subjects	.381	.37	.381	5.560	.945	5.560
Occasions	.049	.05		.020	.003	
Residual	.594	.58	.099	.306	.052	.051
Estimated Score Variance			.480			5.611
Generalizability Coefficient			.79			.99
			Comforting			
Subjects	.008	.10	.008	.048	.26	.048
Occasions	.001	.01		.003	.02	
Residual	.073	.89	.012	.130	.72	.022
Estimated Score Variance			.020			.070
Generalizability Coefficient			.40			.69

[a] $\underline{n}$ = 38

[b] $\underline{n}$ = 15

by the subject variance component representing 94% of the total variance. The generalizability coefficient is .99.

The stability of comforting behaviors reflects the problems inherent in naturalistic observation of a low occurence behavior. In School A, the children's variance component is 10% of the total variance and the generalizability coefficient is .40. Again, the children in School B are more heterogeneous. These subjects' variance component is 26% of the total variance for comforting behavior with a generalizability coefficient of .69. Occasions variance components contribute very little to total variability in either preschool. For aiding behavior, the occasions variance proportional size is .05 in School A and .003 in School B. Occasions variance represents .01 and .02 of the variance in comforting behavior for Schools A and B respectively.

Parent Data

The means and standard deviations of the parenting variables are shown in Table 3. An examination of the data reveals a constriction of data range for many of the variables. For example, although the possible range of scores on the parental warmth variable was 20 to 80, the actual range is 67 to 80 for mothers and 54 to 80 for fathers.

In order to ascertain the possible influence of demand characteristics, correlation analyses are performed on the relationship between social desirability response and the parenting variables. Social desirability response is defined as the parent's score on the Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale. For mothers, social desirability response scores relate in a significant and negative direction with the support measures ($r = -.27$, $p < .05$, for warmth;

Table 3

Means and Standard Deviations
for Parenting Variables

Category		N	M	SD
Maternal				
Support	Warmth	52	75.62	4.07
	Aggression	52	26.88	5.26
	Neglect	52	21.75	4.62
	Rejection	52	15.75	3.32
Discipline	Power Assertion	52	13.08	3.83
	Love Withdrawal	52	9.79	3.79
	Induction re Self	52	20.27	5.24
	Induction re Others	52	26.94	3.24
Responsibility	Chore Behavior	52	3.02	.58
	Encouragement of Chores	52	3.17	.51
	Expectation of Chores	52	2.65	.91
	Pet Responsibility	27	2.52	1.22
	Sibling Responsibility Behavior	26	3.15	.54
	Encouragement of Sibling Responsibility	26	3.12	.71
	Expectation of Sibling Responsibility	26	2.54	.95
Socio-Economic Status		21	63.71	11.16
Number of Hours		52	58.78	17.41

Table 3 (continued)

Category		N	M	SD
Paternal				
Support	Warmth	41	73.02	6.04
	Aggression	41	25.61	4.99
	Neglect	41	22.80	4.73
	Rejection	41	15.54	2.75
Discipline	Power Assertion	41	15.83	4.66
	Love Withdrawal	41	11.80	3.90
	Induction re Self	41	21.68	4.62
	Induction re Others	41	25.55	3.37
Responsibility	Chore Behavior	41	2.90	.67
	Encouragement of Chores	41	3.03	.53
	Expectation of Chores	41	2.63	.77
	Pet Responsibility	22	2.68	1.04
	Sibling Responsibility Behavior	22	3.14	.64
	Encouragement of Sibling Responsibility	22	3.32	.48
	Expectation of Sibling Responsibility	22	2.55	.86
Socio-Economic Status		41	68.20	20.99
Number of Hours		41	31.65	18.53

Note Possible range of scores for each variable were:
Warmth = 20 to 80, Aggression = 15 to 60, Neglect = 15 to 60,
Rejection = 10 to 40, Discipline Scales = 5 to 30,
Responsibility Scales = 1 to 4, Socio-Economic Status = 1 to 96,
and Number of Hours = 0 to 99.

48

$\underline{r} = -.48$, $\underline{p} < .001$, for aggresion and neglect; and $\underline{r} = -.51$, $\underline{p} < .001$, for rejection). Social desirability response is also related to maternal love withdrawal discipline ($\underline{r} = -.27$, $\underline{p} < .05$) and pet responsibility ($\underline{r} = .34$, $\underline{p} < .05$). For fathers, social desirability response scores are associated with two support measures ($\underline{r} = -.47$, $\underline{p} < .001$, for warmth and $\underline{r} = -.40$, $\underline{p} < .01$, for neglect). Paternal induction re others and encouragement of chores are also significantly related to social desirability response ($\underline{r} = .33$, $\underline{p} < .05$ and $\underline{r} = .34$, $\underline{p} < .05$, respectively).

<u>Analyses of Hypotheses</u>

<u>Hypothesis 1 Results</u>

The first hypothesis states that parental support is associated with helping behaviors in young children.

The correlations between children's helping behavior observations and maternal variables are presented in Table 4. Table 5 shows the correlations between children's helping behavior observations and paternal variables.

For mothers, the correlations between each of the four support scales and children's aiding and comforting are small and non-significant. Small and non-significant correlations also result from the analyses of fathers' support scores and children's helping behaviors.

The analysis was continued separately for girls and for boys. For girls, the correlations between their helping behaviors and both the maternal and paternal support variables are small and non-significant. However, for boys, there are some significant results. The correlation

49

Table 4

Correlations Between Children's Helping Behavior
Observations and Maternal Variables

Maternal Variable Category		Total (n=52)		Girls (n=31)		Boys (n=21)	
		A	C	A	C	A	C
Support	Warmth	.08	-.09	.19	.08	-.18	-.40*
	Aggression	.05	.09	.14	.07	-.07	.14
	Neglect	-.04	.01	.01	.02	-.12	.02
	Rejection	.04	-.01	.14	.01	-.16	-.01
Discipline	Power Assertion	.23*	.22*	.27	.19	.16	.27
	Love Withdrawal	.23*	.03	.36*	.08	-.10	-.06
	Induction re Self	.21	.08	.22	.01	.21	.17
	Induction re Others	-.06	-.06	.03	.10	-.25	-.29
Responsibility	Chore Behavior	.09	.01	.00	.02	.24	-.04
	Encouragement of Chores	.09	-.12	-.05	-.09	.37*	-.17
	Expectation of Chores	.24*	.08	.18	.02	.38*	.15
	Pet Responsibility	.26^a	.10^a	.21^e	-.27^e	.39^f	.57^{f*}
	Sibling Responsibility Behavior	.11^b	-.13^b	.03^d	-.05^d	.19^g	-.76^{g**}
	Encouragement of Sibling Responsibility	.18^b	-.26^b	.15^d	-.22^d	.19^g	-.76^{g**}
	Expectation of Sibling Responsibility	.08^b	-.12^b	.31^d	-.20^d	-.48^g	.54^g
Socio-Economic Status		.29^c	.14^c	.36^f	-.06^f	.19^g	.47^g
Number of Hours		-.11	-.20	-.07	-.09	-.20	-.36

Note: A refers to Children's Aiding Behavior.
C refers to Children's Comforting Behavior.

^{a} n = 27, ^{b} n = 26, ^{c} n = 21, ^{d} n = 18, ^{e} n = 14, ^{f} n = 13, ^{g} n = 8,
* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$.

Table 5

Correlations Between Children's Helping Behavior
Observations and Paternal Variables

Paternal Variable Category		Total (n = 41)		Girls (n = 23)		Boys (n = 18)	
		A	C	A	C	A	C
Support	Warmth	.04	.17	.13	-.11	.01	.39*
	Aggression	.15	.06	.14	.16	.12	-.02*
	Neglect	-.04	-.21	-.02	-.00	-.07	-.40*
	Rejection	-.06	-.16	-.04	.05	-.12	-.39*
Discipline	Power Assertion	.00	.02	.18	.19	-.30	-.26
	Love Withdrawal	.05	.09	.31	.34*	-.40*	-.32
	Induction re Self	-.29*	-.03	-.07	.29	-.52**	-.35
	Induction re Others	-.10	.05	-.09	.13	-.07	-.05
Responsibility	Chore Behavior	.23	.01	.35*	.20	.07	-.27
	Encouragement of Chores	.02	-.09	.06	-.14	.01	.00
	Expectation of Chores	.09	-.18	.40*	-.11	-.36	-.26
	Pet Responsibility	-.07^a	.08^a	-.07^c	-.30^c	-.15^c	.52^{c*}
	Sibling Responsibility Behavior	-.31^a	-.57^{a**}	-.49^{b*}	-.64^{b**}	.46^d	-.14^d
	Encouragement of Sibling Responsibility	-.35^{a*}	-.04^a	-.66^{b**}	-.11^b	.46^d	-.14^d
	Expectation of Sibling Responsibility	-.13^a	.02^a	-.34^b	.05^b	.33^d	.11^d
Socio-Economic Status		.15	-.06	.26	-.11	-.14	.05
Number of Hours		-.18	.04	-.21	.09	-.10	-.05

Note: A refers to Children's Aiding Behavior.
C refers to Children's Comforting Behavior.

^{a} n = 22, ^{b} n = 14, ^{c} n = 11, ^{d} n = 8, * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$

between maternal warmth and sons' comforting is $r = -.40$ ($p < .05$). Paternal warmth correlates $r = .39$ ($p < .05$), paternal neglect correlates $r = -.40$ ($p < .05$), and paternal rejection correlates $r = -.39$ ($p < .05$) with boys' comforting behaviors. Correlations are non-significant between both maternal and paternal support variables and boys' aiding behaviors.

Partial correlation analyses were used to statistically control the influence of several parent and child variables on the correlation results with the hypothesized associations. The parental control variables used in this and in subsequent partial correlation analyses were as follows: parental social desirability response, as measured by the parents' scores on the Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale; parental socio-economic status, as quantified by Duncan's Socioeconomic Index (Duncan, 1961), and the number of hours the parent spent with his or her child, as reported by the parent. The child control variables were as follows: the sociability of the child, which was measured by the preschool observation; the child's age; the child's sex; the child's birth order; the number of siblings in the family; and the number of parents in the family. These last five variables were coded from information provided by the parents.

The relationship between maternal warmth and sons' comforting remains significant after controlling for social desirability response, maternal socio-economic status, the child's age, birth order, sibling number, and parent number. However, the relationship between maternal warmth and sons' comforting reduced to a non-significant But still negative correlation after controlling for the number of hours the mothers spent with their boys ($r = -.23$, N.S.) and the sociability of the sons ($r = -.28$, N.S.).

The relationship between paternal warmth, neglect, and rejection and boys' comforting remains significant after controlling for the fathers' socio-economic status, the number of hours the fathers spent with their sons, the sociability, age, birth order, sibling number, and parent number of the boys. However, the relationship between the paternal support variables and sons' comforting is reduced to non-significant correlations after controlling for paternal social desirability response (r = .25, for warmth; r = -.31, for neglect; and r = -.31, for rejection).

The combined influence of mothers' and fathers' support level on children's helping behaviors was examined using a one-way analyses of variance procedure. For this and for subsequent joint influence analyses, the two-parent families were divided into three groups based upon the parents' scores on the quantifying instruments. One group consisted of parents who, as a couple, scored high on the parent variable of interest (above or equal to the median). One group consisted of parents who both scored low on the parent variable (less than the median). The third group consisted of couples who were not consistent with each other. Membership criteria in this group consisted of one parent scoring high and one parent scoring low on the parent variable. The number of parent dyads in each group for the support variables were as follows: 12 High, 6 Low, 18 Inconsistent (Warmth); 17 High, 11 Low, 12 Inconsistent (neglect); and 17 High, 17 Low, 6 Inconsistent (rejection).

The analysis of variance for the parental support variables are not significant for parental warmth, neglect, and rejection. These F ratios are parental warmth, $F(2,33)$ = .14 (aiding) and $F(2,33)$ = .28

(comforting); parental neglect, $F(2,37)$ = .05 (aiding) and $F(2,37)$ = .75 (comforting); and parental rejection, $F(2,37)$ = .79 (aiding) and $F(2,37)$ = .64 (comforting).

Analysis of variance on the helping scores of children whose parents were grouped according to their scores on the aggression scale of the support instrument indicates significant differences for aiding behavior ($F(2,37)$ = 3.42, $p < .05$). The Scheffé procedure for post hoc analysis reveals that children whose parents were both above the median in aggression scores score significantly higher in their aiding behaviors ($p < .05$). Children whose parents were either inconsistent (one parent high and one parent low) or both low in aggression scores do not exhibit significant group differences. The analysis of variance using parental aggression as a grouping variable is not significant for comforting behaviors ($F(2,37)$ = .09).

The hypothesis concerning a positive relationship between parental support and helping behaviors in young children finds quite limited support in this research. The hypothesis is not supported for daughters. For sons, maternal warmth is negatively related to comforting behaviors. Fathers' warmth, neglect, and rejection are related to boys' comforting behaviors in the expected direction. Parental support is not related to boys' aiding behaviors.

Hypothesis 2 Results

The second hypothesis states that parental use of induction discipline is associated with helping behaviors in young children. As shown in Table 4, maternal induction re self correlates r = .21 (N.S.) with aiding behaviors and r = .08 (N.S.) with comforting behaviors. Mothers induction re others correlates in a negative direction with both

categories of helping behaviors ($r = -.06$, N.S. and $r = -.06$, N.S., respectively). Table 5 reveals that paternal induction re self correlates $r = -.29$ ($p < .05$) for aiding behaviors and $r = -.03$ (N.S.) for comforting behaviors. Fathers' induction re others results in non-significant correlations for both aiding and comforting behaviors ($r = -.10$, N.S. and $r = .05$, N.S., respectively). When the correlation analysis is performed for each sex separately, paternal induction re self is related in a negative direction to boys' aiding behaviors ($r = -.52$, $p < .01$).

Partial correlation analyses were performed to control for the influence of several parent and child variables. Children's aiding behaviors are significantly related to maternal induction re self after controlling for the child's age ($r = .24$, $p < .05$) and the number of siblings in the family ($r = .23$, $p < .05$). The negative relationship between aiding and paternal induction re self remains significant after controlling for social desirability response, paternal socio-economic status, the numbers of hours the fathers spent with their children, the children's sex, birth order, sibling number, and number of parents. The use of child age as a control variable reduces the correlation between aiding and paternal induction re self to a non-significant r value ($r = -.21$, N.S.) However, when analyzed on the basis of the sex of the child, the negative relationship between sons' aiding and fathers' use of induction re self discipline remains significant after controlling for all the previously mentioned parent and child variables.

Analysis of variance performed on the joint influence of mothers' and fathers' induction re self variable indicates non-significant differences for aiding behaviors ($F(2,36) = .39$) and for comforting

behaviors ($F(2,36) = .53$). Parental induction re others group differences are also non-significant ($F(2,36) = 2.36$ for aiding, and $F(2,36) = .55$ for comforting). The number of parent dyads for this analysis were 12 High, 19 Low, 8 Inconsistent (induction re self) and 15 High, 15 Low, 9 Inconsistent (induction re others).

The hypothesis that predicts a positive relationship between parental use of induction discipline and helping behaviors is not supported by this study. In fact, the results show a relationship between other discipline techniques and helping behaviors. For mothers, power assertion correlates $r = .23$ ($p < .05$) with aiding behaviors and $r = .22$ ($p < .05$) for comforting behaviors. Maternal love withdrawal correlates $r = .23$ ($p < .05$) for aiding behaviors and $r = .03$ (N.S.) for comforting. The total sample correlation analysis results in non-significant correlation coefficients for both paternal power assertion and love withdrawal with children's helping behaviors.

When analyzed on the basis of sex, the relationships found to be significant are maternal love withdrawal and girls' aiding behaviors ($r = .36$, $p < .05$), paternal love withdrawal and girls' comforting behaviors ($r = .34$, $p < .05$), and paternal love withdrawal and boy's aiding behaviors ($r = -.40$, $p < .05$).

These relationships between non induction discipline techniques and helping behaviors remain significant after controlling for parental social desirability response, socio-economic status, number of hours spent with the children, children's ages, sociability, number of siblings, sex, birth order, and number of parents.

Analysis of variance reveals non-significant F ratios for group differences when investigating the combined influence of mothers' and

fathers' power assertion and love withdrawal discipline variables. The number of parent dyads were 16 High, 17 Low, 6 Inconsistent (power assertion) and 16 High, 16 Low, and 7 Inconsistent (love withdrawal). The F ratios for power assertion are $F(2,36) = .47$ for aiding and $F(2,36) = 1.48$ for comforting. For the love withdrawal variable, the F ratios are $F(2,36) = .21$ for aiding and $F(2,36) = .09$ for comforting.

Hypothesis 2 is, generally, not supported by the results of this research.

Hypothesis 3 Results

The third hypothesis states that parental emphasis on young children's responsibility in the home is associated with their helping behaviors. The results of the correlation analysis of this hypothesis are presented in Table 4 (Mothers) and Table 5 (Fathers).

In the category of chores, maternal perception of children's chore behavior and mothers' encouragement of chores are not related to children's helping behaviors ($r = .09$ and $r = .09$ for aiding, and $r = .01$ and $r = -.12$ for comforting, respectively). Maternal expectation of chores is associated with aiding behaviors ($r = .24$, $p < .05$), but not comforting behaviors ($r = .08$, N.S.). Mothers' perception of pet responsibility, sibling responsibility behavior, encouragement of sibling responsibility, and expectation of sibling responsibility are not significantly related to either aiding or comforting behaviors. Correlations for paternal responsibility variables are not significant when analyzed with total sample helping behaviors data with the exceptions of fathers' perceptions of sibling responsibility behavior and fathers' encouragement of sibling responsibility ($r = -.57$, $p < .01$, for comforting and $r = -.35$, $p < .05$, for aiding, respectively).

57

Further correlation analyses on the basis of sex of the child were performed. For girls, none of the maternal responsibility variables are related to their aiding and comforting behaviors. However, some of the paternal responsibility variables did attain significant correlation coefficients. Girls' aiding behaviors are associated with fathers' perception of daughters' chore behavior (r = .35, $p < .05$), fathers' expectation of chores (r = .40, $p < .05$), fathers' perception of daughters' sibling responsibility behavior (r = .-49, $p < .05$), and fathers' encouragement of daughters' sibling responsibility (r = -.66, $p < .01$). Girls' comforting behaviors are associated with fathers' perception of daughters' sibling responsibility (r = -.64, $p < .01$).

For boys, there is a relationship between their aiding behavior scores and maternal encouragement of chores (r = .37, $p < .05$) and expectation of chores (r = .38, $p < .05$). Boys' comforting scores are related to maternal perception of sons' pet responsibility (r = .57, $p < .05$), maternal perception of sons' sibling responsibility behavior (r = -.76, $p < .01$), and maternal encouragment of sons' sibling responsibility (r = -.76, $p < .01$). The fathers' perceptions of sons' pet responsibility is the only paternal responsibility variable to reach a significant correlation coefficient when paired with boys' helping behaviors (r = .52, $p < .05$ for comforting).

Partial correlation analyses were performed to test the influence of several parent and child variables on the hypothesized relationships between children's helping behaviors and parental emphasis on responsibility. For the total sample analysis, maternal expectation of chores and paternal encouragement of sibling responsibility remain significantly related to aiding behavior and paternal perception of

sibling responsibility behavior remains significantly related to comforting behavior after controlling for parental social desirability response, socio-economic status, number of hours spent with children, child's sociability, age, sex, birth order, number of siblings, and number of parents. Maternal perception of children's chore behavior and pet responsibility attains a significant correlation with aiding behavior after controlling for child age (r = .24, $p <$ .05 and r = .37, $p <$ .05, respectively). For fathers, the relationship between aiding and paternal perception of children's chore behavior is significant after controlling for child age (r = .26, $p <$ .05) and number of hours the fathers spent with their children (r = .26, $p <$.05). Fathers' perception of sibling responsibility behavior is significantly related to aiding after controlling for birth order (r = -.40, $p <$ .05).

When analyzed on the basis of the sex of the child, none of the maternal responsibility variables are related to girls' helping behaviors after controlling for the previously mentioned variables. The observed sociability of the girls, when used as a control variable, reduces the correlation coefficients between girls' aiding behaviors and paternal perception of daughters' chore behavior (r = .21), fathers' expectation of chores (r = .32) and fathers' perception of sibling responsibility behavior (r = -.27) to non-significant levels. The fathers' encouragement of sibling responsibility remains significantly and negatively related to girls' aiding after the control analyses. And, the relationship between girls' comforting and fathers' perception of sibling responsibility behavior also remains significant.

The partial correlation analyses do not reveal any significant reductions in the correlation coefficients for the previously reported significant relationships between boys' helping behaviors and both maternal and paternal responsibility variables. Boys' aiding behaviors are associated with maternal expectation of sons' sibling responsibility ($r = -.83$, $p < .01$) after controlling for boys' sociability and maternal perception of sons' pet responsibility ($r = .55$, $p < .05$) after controlling for child age. Boys' aiding behavior is also associated with paternal expectation of chores after controlling for boys' birth order ($r = -.48$, $p < .05$).

Analysis of variance was performed to examine the combined influence of mothers' and fathers' focus on responsibility. The number of parent dyads in each group analyzed for the joint influence of parents' responsibility emphasis were as follows: 20 High, 12 Low, 8 Inconsistent (chore behavior); 15 High, 16 Low, 9 Inconsistent (encouragement of chores); 34 High, 4 Low, 2 Inconsistent (expectation of chores); 8 High, 5 Low, 7 Inconsistent (pet responsibility); 3 High, 4 Low, 15 Inconsistent (sibling responsibility behavior); 9 High, 9 Low, 4 Inconsistent (encouragement of sibling responsibility) and 9 High, 9 Low, 4 Inconsistent (expectation of sibling responsibility) Group differenced are non-significant for parental perception of chore behavior ($F(2,37) = .37$ for aiding and $F(2,37) = 1.02$ for comforting), parental encouragement of chores ($F(2,37) = 2.40$ for aiding and $F(2,37) = .003$ for comforting), parental perception of children's pet responsibility ($F(2,17) = .50$ for aiding and $F(2,17) = .11$ for comforting), parental perception of sibling responsibility ($F(2,19) = .76$ for aiding and $F(2,19) = .48$ for comforting), parental encouragement

of sibling responsibility ($F_{(2,19)}$ = .59 for aiding and $F_{(2,19)}$ = 1.24 for comforting and parental expectation of sibling responsibility ($F_{(2,19)}$ = .59 for aiding and $F_{(2,19)}$ = .24 for comforting).

Analysis of variance on the aiding scores of children whose parents were both high in expectation of chores, both low in expection of chores, or one parent high and one parent low in expectation of chores indicates significant differences for aiding behavior ($F_{(2,37)}$ = 4.1, $p < .05$). The Sheffé procedure for post hoc analysis reveals that children whose parents were inconsistent with each other in expectation of chores (one parent high and one parent low) score significantly higher on the aiding measurement ($p < .05$). Children whose parents are either both high or both low in expectation of chores are not significantly different from each other in terms of their aiding scores. Analysis of variance using parental expectation of chores as a grouping variable is not significant for comforting behaviors ($F_{(2,37)}$ = .41).

Hypothesis 3 finds qualified support in this study. Paternal emphasis on chore responsibility is positively related to girls' aiding behaviors. However, fathers' emphasis on sibling responsibility is negatively related to girls' helping behaviors. Fathers' perception of pet responsibility for boys is related to their sons' comforting scores. Mothers' emphasis on responsibility is not related to girls' helping behaviors but is associated with boys' observed helping. There are positive relationships between boys' aiding behaviors and their mothers' encouragement and expectation of chores and between boys' comforting behaviors and their mothers' perceptions of pet responsibility. Negative relationships appear between boys' comforting behaviors and

mothers' perception of sons' sibling responsibility and their encouragement of boys' sibling responsibility.

Hypothesis 4 Results

The fourth hypothesis states that parental support, inductive discipline style, and responsibility emphasis influence young children's helping behaviors. Hypothesis 4 was analyzed using hierarchial multiple regression analysis. Since the influence of parental support and induction on positive social behaviors was basically supported by empirical research (see Chapter II), these variables were entered first in the regression equation. Parental responsibility, having a more limited base of empirical support, was entered last in the regression equation. Parental support was quantified by creating a variable consisting of reverse parental warmth scores, and the neglect, aggression, and rejection scores. Parental induction consisted of parents' induction re self and induction re others scores. Parental responsibility consisted of the parents' scores on actual, encouraged, and expected chore behavior on the part of their children. Table 6 contains the summary table for the multiple regression analysis

The analysis was performed both with the combined parental scores and separately for mothers and fathers. As shown in Table 6, the F ratios for parents, mothers, and fathers are not significant when support, induction, and responsibility are used as the predictor variables and children's aiding behavior is the dependent variable. Non-significant results are also obtained when children's comforting behavior is the dependent variable.

Hypothesis 4 is not supported by the data in this research.

Table 6

Summary Table for Multiple
Regression Analysis

	Aiding					

Parents	Multiple R	R Squared	F	R^2 Change	F Change	DF
Total Support	.07	.00	.14	.00	.14	(1,33)
Induction	.11	.01	.21	.01	.28	(2,32)
Responsibility	.35	.12	1.4	.11	3.84*	(3,31)
Girls Support	.16	.03	.53	.03	.53	(1,20)
Induction	.16	.03	.25	.00	.00	(2,19)
Responsibility	.27	.07	.48	.05	.95	(3,18)
Boys Support	.23	.05	.60	.05	.60	(1,11)
Induction	.37	.14	.79	.09	.99	(2,10)
Responsibility	.69	.48	2.78	.34	5.97*	(3,9)
Mothers						
Total Support	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	(1,49)
Induction	.13	.02	.44	.02	.88	(2,48)
Responsibility	.28	.08	1.28	.06	2.93	(3,47)
Girls Support	.03	.00	.02	.00	.02	(1,29)
Induction	.18	.03	.51	.03	1.00	(2,28)
Responsibility	.20	.04	.36	.00	.09	(3,27)

Table 6 (continued)

Aiding

		Multiple R	R Squared	F	R^2 Change	FChange	DF
Boys	Support	.04	.00	.03	.00	.03	(1,18)
	Induction	.06	.00	.03	.00	.04	(2,17)
	Responsibility	.50	.25	1.78	.25	5.26*	(3,16)
Fathers							
Total	Support	.01	.00	.01	.00	.01	(1,35)
	Induction	.21	.04	.80	.04	1.60	(2,34)
	Responsibility	.32	.10	1.25	.06	2.10	(3,33)
Girls	Support	.02	.00	.01	.00	.01	(1,20)
	Induction	.06	.00	.04	.00	.07	(2,19)
	Responsibility	.48	.23	1.77	.22	5.10*	(3,18)
Boys	Support	.03	.00	.00	.00	.01	(1,13)
	Induction	.39	.15	1.10	.15	2.19	(2,12)
	Responsibility	.45	.20	.93	.04	.65	(3,11)

Table 6 (continued)

Comforting

	Multiple $\underline{R}$	$\underline{R}$ Squared	$\underline{F}$	$\underline{R}^2$Change	FChange	$\underline{DF}$
Parents						
Total Support	.04	.00	.06	.00	.06	(1,33)
Induction	.10	.01	.16	.01	.26	(2,32)
Responsibility	.15	.02	.24	.01	.40	(3,31)
Girls Support	.10	.01	.22	.01	.22	(1,20)
Induction	.26	.07	.70	.06	1.17	(2,19)
Responsibility	.28	.08	.49	.01	.15	(3,18)
Boys Support	.23	.05	.60	.05	.60	(1,11)
Induction	.37	.14	.78	.08	.96	(2,10)
Responsibility	.38	.15	.51	.01	.11	(3,9)
Mothers						
Total Support	.07	.01	.25	.01	.25	(1,49)
Induction	.09	.01	.18	.00	.12	(2,48)
Responsibility	.09	.01	.13	.00	.02	(3,47)

Table 6 (continued)

Comforting

		Multiple R	R Squared	F	R^2Change	FChange	DF
Girls	Support	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	(1,29)
	Induction	.06	.00	.05	.00	.10	(2,28)
	Responsibility	.08	.01	.05	.00	.06	(3,27)
Boys	Support	.17	.03	.57	.03	.57	(1,18)
	Induction	.18	.03	.28	.00	.02	(2,17)
	Responsibility	.20	.04	.23	.01	.16	(3,16)
Fathers							
Total	Support	.14	.02	.72	.02	.72	(1,35)
	Induction	.14	.02	.35	.00	.00	(2,34)
	Responsibility	.22	.05	.53	.03	.91	(3,33)
Girls	Support	.15	.02	.45	.02	.45	(1,20)
	Induction	.33	.11	1.14	.08	1.81	(2,19)
	Responsibility	.33	.11	.73	.00	.01	(3,18)
Boys	Support	.38	.15	2.24	.15	2.23	(1,13)
	Induction	.59	.35	3.20	.20	3.71	(2,12)
	Responsibility	.66	.43	2.77	.08	1.60	(3,11)

* $p < .05$

Hypothesis 5 Results

The final hypothesis states that parents who practice a discipline style using induction and nonpower within a supportive relationship have young children with helping behaviors. This hypothesis predicts that parents who combine a discipline style which is highly inductive and low on power assertion with a highly supportive parent/child relationship have children who score higher on helping behavior observations. Multiple regression was used as the method of analysis of interaction. The discipline style variable consisted of the induction and reverse power assertion scores and the support variable consisted of reverse warmth scores and the aggression, neglect, and rejection scores.

The analysis of this hypothesis tested the independent variables for their interaction effect produced in combination with each other. As shown in Table 7, interaction effects for the total population are not significant. Further analysis by the sex of the child again produced non-significant interaction results.

Since the interaction effects were not significant, main effects were analyzed. Main effects for the total population are also not significant. When analyzed by the sex of the child, the fathers' discipline style has a significant effect on boys' comforting behaviors ($\underline{F}(2,13) = 3.52$, $\underline{p} < .05$). Other parent/child effects are not significant.

Hypothesis 5 is not supported by the data in this study.

Table 7

Summary Table for Multiple Regression
Analysis of Interaction

Aiding

Mothers	Multiple $\underline{R}$	$\underline{R}$ Squared	$\underline{F}$	R^2 Change	$\underline{F}$ Change	Sig $\underline{F}$ Change	$\underline{DF}$
Total	.36	.13	1.7	.04	2.23	.14	(3,47)
Girls	.37	.14	1.02	.02	.64	.43	(3,27)
Boys	.37	.14	.60	.07	1.22	.29	(3,16)
Fathers							
Total	.35	.12	1.15	.04	1.29	.27	(3,34)
Girls	.27	.07	.32	.04	.65	.43	(3,18)
Boys	.59	.35	1.47	.01	.12	.74	(3,12)

Comforting

Mothers							
Total	.23	.05	.66	.00	.19	.66	(3,47)
Girls	.20	.04	.29	.00	.00	.99	(3,27)
Boys	.35	.12	.53	.04	.69	.42	(3,16)
Fathers							
Total	.23	.05	.46	.03	1.04	.32	(3,34)
Girls	.38	.14	.72	.01	.18	.68	(3,18)
Boys	.72	.52	3.00	.06	1.24	.29	(3,12)

68

<u>Additional Analyses</u>

<u>Parental Intercorrelations</u>

The intercorrelations of the parenting variables are presented in Table 8. These data provide an overview of the interrelationships within each parenting dimension and an indication of how the parenting variables are patterned.

For mothers, the support variables of warmth, aggression, neglect, and rejection are significantly interrelated in the expected directions ($p < .01$) with the exception of warmth and rejection ($r = -.18$, N.S.). The maternal discipline techniques, on the other hand, are not intercorrelated. Maternal power assertion and love withdrawal are the only discipline techniques which achieved a significant correlation coefficient ($r = .47$, $p < .001$). An examination of the maternal responsibility dimension reveals mixed results. Ten of the possible 21 correlation coefficients reach significance.

There are some interesting interrelationships between the maternal parenting dimensions. Warmth, which is negatively related to boys' comforting behavior, is positively related to maternal induction re others, perception and encouragement of chore behavior, perception of sibling responsibility behavior, and the number of hours the mother spent with her child. Maternal warmth is negatively related to mothers' expectation of chore behavior and expectation of sibling responsibility behavior. The maternal discipline technique of power assertion and love withdrawal are related to the maternal support variables of aggression, neglect, and rejection. Mothers' use of induction re self is associated with several of the responsibility variables.

TABLE 8

Intercorrelations of Parental Variables

Maternal

Maternal	SUPPORT				DISCIPLINE							RESPONSIBILITY				Socio-Economic Status	Number of Hours
	Warmth	Aggression	Neglect	Rejection	Power Assertion	Love Withdrawal	Induction re Self	Induction re Others	Chore Behavior	Encouragement of Chores	Expectation of Chores	Pet Responsibility	Sibling Responsibility Behavior	Encouragement of Sibling Responsibility	Expectation of Sibling Responsibility		
Support																	
Aggression	-.5557 (52) p=.005																
Neglect	-.5619 (52) p=.000	.5769 (52) p=.000															
Rejection	-.1830 (52) p=.097	.6058 (52) p=.000	.6224 (52) p=.000														
Discipline																	
Power Assertion	-.0182 (52) p=.449	.4797 (52) p=.000	.2567 (52) p=.033	.4658 (52) p=.000													
Love Withdrawal	.0637 (52) p=.312	.4399 (52) p=.001	.2569 (52) p=.033	.4702 (52) p=.000	.5659 (52) p=.000												
Induction re Self	.1722 (52) p=.111	-.0571 (52) p=.344	-.1015 (52) p=.237	-.1628 (52) p=.124	.1687 (52) p=.116	.1827 (52) p=.097											
Induction re Others	.3117 (52) p=.012	-.0047 (52) p=.366	-.2324 (52) p=.049	-.0560 (52) p=.347	.0461 (52) p=.373	.0373 (52) p=.396	.1173 (52) p=.204										
Responsibility																	
Chore Behavior	.3289 (52) p=.009	-.1930 (52) p=.085	-.3584 (52) p=.005	-.2023 (52) p=.075	-.0061 (52) p=.400	.1096 (52) p=.220	.4195 (52) p=.001	.1068 (52) p=.167									
Encouragement of Chores	.2290 (52) p=.052	-.1467 (27) p=.233	-.0543 (27) p=.294	-.2920 (27) p=.022	-.1165 (52) p=.205	.0697 (52) p=.212	.404 (52) p=.001	.0685 (27) p=.266	.6654 (52) p=.000								
Expectation of Chores	.0444 (52) p=.378	.0008 (52) p=.498	.1383 (52) p=.164	-.0947 (52) p=.252	-.1504 (52) p=.144	-.2450 (52) p=.040	-.0048 (52) p=.487	-.1672 (52) p=.118	-.0246 (52) p=.431	.5017 (27) p=.004							
Pet Responsibility	-.254 (27) p=.099	-.1038 (26) p=.307	-.1793 (26) p=.190	-.1187 (26) p=.282	-.197 (27) p=.159	-.3210 (27) p=.051	.2941 (27) p=.021	.1279 (27) p=.262	.2446 (27) p=.106	.4638 (26) p=.008	.3629 (27) p=.031						
Sibling Responsibility Behavior	.2963 (26) p=.099	.0781 (26) p=.352	-.2500 (26) p=.040	-.1616 (26) p=.215	.1190 (26) p=.265	.2926 (26) p=.024	-.0523 (26) p=.400	.2364 (26) p=.122	.4098 (26) p=.019	.6204 (26) p=.000	-.4686 (26) p=.006	-.0403 (15) p=.443					
Encouragement of Sibling Responsibility	.2402 (26) p=.119	-.1200 (26) p=.275	.0644 (26) p=.377	-.1616 (26) p=.215	-.1293 (26) p=.265	.0959 (26) p=.321	-.0492 (26) p=.406	.1582 (26) p=.220	.3220 (26) p=.054	-.1453 (26) p=.239	-.1304 (26) p=.263	.2092 (15) p=.227	-.0019 (26) p=.477				
Expectation of Sibling Responsibility	-.2928 (26) p=.024	.0644 (26) p=.377	.0009 (26) p=.498	-.1616 (26) p=.215	-.2373 (26) p=.122	-.1697 (26) p=.204	-.0036 (26) p=.435	.0032 (26) p=.494	-.1812 (26) p=.188	-.2441 (21) p=.076	.3416 (26) p=.044	.1303 (15) p=.322	-.1725 (26) p=.316	.3787 (26) p=.028			
Socio-Economic Status	-.0692 (21) p=.383	.0406 (21) p=.431	.1466 (21) p=.263	.0549 (21) p=.407	.0811 (21) p=.363	.0718 (21) p=.367	-.2227 (21) p=.166	-.1198 (21) p=.303	-.2856 (21) p=.105	-.2441 (21) p=.076	.0295 (21) p=.450	-.4914 (9) p=.090	-.2241 (21) p=.076	-.1281 (10) p=.362	.3122 (10) p=.190		
Number of Hours	.2763 (50) p=.026	-.0607 (50) p=.289	-.2104 (50) p=.071	-.0009 (50) p=.498	-.1922 (50) p=.091	-.0715 (50) p=.311	-.1105 (50) p=.222	.1724 (50) p=.116	-.0393 (50) p=.293	.1662 (50) p=.124	-.0980 (50) p=.249	-.0897 (26) p=.331	.0900 (25) p=.334	.0162 (25) p=.359	-.2546 (25) p=.110	.1796 (16) p=.074	

Note. Correlation coefficient / (number of cases) / significance level

TABLE 8 (Continued)

Paternal

	SUPPORT				DISCIPLINE				RESPONSIBILITY							Socio-Economic Status
Paternal	Warmth	Aggression	Neglect	Rejection	Power Assertion	Love Withdrawal	Induction re Self	Induction re Others	Chore Behavior	Encouragement of Chores	Expectation of Chores	Pet Responsibility	Sibling Responsibility Behavior	Encouragement of Sibling Responsibility	Expectation of Sibling Responsibility	
Support Warmth																
Aggression	-.3659 (41) p=.009															
Neglect	-.6936 (41) p=.000	.5646 (41) p=.000														
Rejection	-.4363 (41) p=.002	.4777 (41) p=.001	.5411 (41) p=.000													
Discipline Power Assertion	.2035 (40) p=.104	.0333 (40) p=.407	-.0340 (40) p=.418	.0246 (40) p=.440												
Love Withdrawal	.0767 (40) p=.319	-.0041 (40) p=.490	.1499 (40) p=.178	.1974 (40) p=.111	.2671 (40) p=.048											
Induction re Self	.2708 (40) p=.045	-.0496 (40) p=.381	-.1089 (40) p=.252	-.0419 (40) p=.399	.2817 (40) p=.039	.3300 (40) p=.019										
Induction re Others	.5006 (40) p=.000	-.1121 (40) p=.245	-.2558 (40) p=.056	-.0895 (40) p=.291	.1122 (40) p=.245	.1877 (40) p=.123	.6351 (40) p=.000									
Responsibility Chore Behavior	.1676 (40) p=.151	.2067 (40) p=.100	.1314 (40) p=.209	.1577 (40) p=.166	.0491 (39) p=.383	.2856 (39) p=.039	.0139 (39) p=.467	.0988 (39) p=.275								
Encouragement of Chores	.2234 (40) p=.019	-.1015 (40) p=.019	-.0084 (40) p=.178	-.2528 (40) p=.204	.0907 (39) p=.148	.2200 (39) p=.089	.1769 (39) p=.141	.2587 (39) p=.056	.3670 (40) p=.010							
Expectation of Chores	-.0597 (40) p=.357	-.0299 (40) p=.019	-.1498 (40) p=.209	-.1344 (40) p=.204	-.1717 (39) p=.148	.1016 (40) p=.269	.0059 (39) p=.486	-.2112 (39) p=.098	.0247 (40) p=.440	-.1015 (40) p=.267						
Pet Responsibility	.3893 (22) p=.037	-.0269 (22) p=.453	-.1700 (22) p=.224	-.1569 (22) p=.243	-.4112 (22) p=.029	-.2495 (22) p=.131	.1049 (22) p=.321	.2446 (22) p=.136	-.2165 (22) p=.164	.1482 (22) p=.255	.0708 (22) p=.377					
Sibling Responsibility Behavior	-.1793 (22) p=.212	.0055 (22) p=.490	.3100 (22) p=.080	.2264 (22) p=.155	-.1135 (22) p=.308	-.1813 (22) p=.210	-.3002 (22) p=.087	-.1555 (22) p=.245	-.1881 (22) p=.201	.1117 (22) p=.310	-.1650 (22) p=.232	.4494 (12) p=.011				
Encouragement of Sibling Responsibility	-.2049 (22) p=.181	-.0568 (22) p=.401	.2090 (22) p=.177	.0744 (22) p=.155	-.1924 (22) p=.195	-.154 (22) p=.205	-.2014 (22) p=.184	-.1108 (22) p=.312	-.3453 (22) p=.058	-.2288 (22) p=.153	-.1107 (22) p=.312	.5468 (12) p=.032	.6510 (22) p=.001			
Expectation of Sibling Responsibility	.0552 (22) p=.404	-.0957 (22) p=.336	-.2988 (22) p=.088	.1588 (22) p=.240	.0235 (22) p=.459	-.4011 (22) p=.032	-.2565 (22) p=.125	-.3179 (22) p=.075	-.0738 (22) p=.372	-.0526 (22) p=.408	.2596 (22) p=.122	-.1055 (12) p=.372	.2051 (22) p=.180	.2540 (22) p=.127		
Socio-Economic Status	.0994 (40) p=.271	.0833 (40) p=.305	-.3256 (40) p=.020	-.2780 (40) p=.041	.0759 (39) p=.323	-.2878 (39) p=.038	-.0400 (39) p=.404	-.0664 (39) p=.344	.0204 (39) p=.451	-.0197 (39) p=.453	.3382 (39) p=.018	.2066 (21) p=.182	-.3134 (22) p=.078	-.4257 (22) p=.024	.451 (22) p=.019	
Number of Hours	.2414 (40) p=.067	-.1582 (40) p=.165	-.1595 (40) p=.163	-.0454 (40) p=.388	.0057 (39) p=.486	.1737 (39) p=.001	.1970 (39) p=.114	.2504 (39) p=.062	.1292 (39) p=.216	.2790 (39) p=.043	-.2880 (39) p=.038	-.2787 (21) p=.111	-.1024 (22) p=.325	.0159 (22) p=.472	-.4137 (22) p=.028	-.4115 (40) p=.004

Note: Correlation coefficient/(number of cases)/significance level

71

TABLE 8 (Continued)

Maternal

Note: Correlation coefficient/(number of cases)/significance level

Paternal		SUPPORT				DISCIPLINE				RESPONSIBILITY							Socio-Economic Status	Number of Hours
		Warmth	Aggression	Neglect	Rejection	Power Assertion	Love Withdrawal	Induction re Self	Induction re Others	Chore Behavior	Encouragement of Chores	Expectation of Chores	Pet Responsibility	Sibling Responsibility Behavior	Encouragement of Sibling Responsibility	Expectation of Sibling Responsibility		
Support	Warmth	.2446 (40) p=.064	-.2787 (40) p=.041	-.4440 (40) p=.002	-.3387 (39) p=.016	-.2287 (40) p=.078	-.1860 (40) p=.125	.1913 (40) p=.118	-.0084 (40) p=.460	.0418 (40) p=.399	.0034 (40) p=.492	-.0030 (40) p=.426	.0846 (22) p=.354	-.2963 (22) p=.099	-.3720 (39) p=.044	-.3357 (39) p=.063	.0921 (21) p=.346	.0972 (39) p=.278
	Aggression	-.3209 (40) p=.022	.5071 (40) p=.000	.5066 (40) p=.000	.4599 (40) p=.001	.2245 (40) p=.073	.2298 (40) p=.077	-.0025 (40) p=.494	.0414 (40) p=.400	-.0660 (40) p=.338	.0279 (40) p=.432	.2645 (40) p=.050	-.0025 (22) p=.460	.0577 (22) p=.399	-.0636 (22) p=.256	.2615 (22) p=.120	.2170 (16) p=.210	-.1886 (39) p=.125
	Neglect	-.1533 (40) p=.172	.2823 (40) p=.039	.3852 (40) p=.007	.4499 (40) p=.002	.0799 (40) p=.312	.2017 (40) p=.106	-.1927 (40) p=.117	-.0262 (40) p=.436	.0786 (40) p=.315	.1874 (40) p=.123	.0066 (40) p=.411	-.1051 (22) p=.321	.5376 (22) p=.005	.5219 (22) p=.006	.1590 (22) p=.240	-.3047 (16) p=.125	-.1398 (39) p=.198
	Rejection	-.4713 (40) p=.001	.3493 (40) p=.014	.4690 (40) p=.002	.3517 (40) p=.013	.0798 (40) p=.312	.0413 (40) p=.400	-.2602 (40) p=.052	-.3016 (40) p=.029	-.2794 (40) p=.040	-.0903 (40) p=.290	.1870 (40) p=.124	-.2270 (22) p=.144	-.0905 (22) p=.361	.0000 (22) p=.500	.2770 (22) p=.106	-.2166 (16) p=.210	-.2874 (39) p=.038
Discipline	Power Assertion	-.0143 (39) p=.465	-.0828 (39) p=.308	.1161 (39) p=.241	.1225 (39) p=.227	.0441 (39) p=.395	.0744 (39) p=.326	-.1758 (39) p=.142	.0073 (39) p=.482	-.2252 (39) p=.075	-.4471 (39) p=.002	.0759 (39) p=.323	-.3596 (22) p=.050	-.1098 (22) p=.313	-.3214 (22) p=.072	.0042 (22) p=.493	.5320 (15) p=.021	.0229 (38) p=.429
	Love Withdrawal	.0999 (39) p=.273	-.0061 (39) p=.414	-.0155 (39) p=.463	.2284 (38) p=.081	.2657 (39) p=.051	.1825 (39) p=.133	-.1038 (39) p=.265	.0099 (39) p=.476	.1175 (39) p=.238	.0411 (39) p=.402	-.1203 (39) p=.233	.1773 (22) p=.215	.2206 (22) p=.162	-.0668 (22) p=.350	-.3253 (22) p=.070	-.4417 (15) p=.050	-.1754 (38) p=.146
	Induction re Self	.2174 (39) p=.092	-.2135 (39) p=.096	-.2486 (39) p=.063	-.2670 (39) p=.050	-.1782 (39) p=.139	-.2783 (39) p=.043	.2376 (39) p=.073	.2898 (39) p=.037	.2207 (39) p=.023	.1931 (39) p=.119	.0437 (39) p=.396	.0063 (22) p=.485	-.1649 (22) p=.232	-.2165 (22) p=.167	-.0189 (22) p=.467	.0273 (15) p=.461	.1068 (38) p=.258
	Induction re Others	.2505 (39) p=.062	-.3155 (39) p=.025	-.5452 (39) p=.000	-.3850 (39) p=.008	-.2636 (39) p=.052	-.3189 (39) p=.024	.1167 (39) p=.186	.3205 (39) p=.023	.2004 (39) p=.032	.2024 (39) p=.108	.1732 (39) p=.146	.2121 (22) p=.172	-.2890 (22) p=.096	-.2717 (22) p=.111	-.2110 (22) p=.079	-.1997 (15) p=.238	.0971 (38) p=.281
Responsibility	Chore Behavior	.2486 (40) p=.061	-.2807 (40) p=.040	-.2383 (40) p=.072	-.1734 (39) p=.142	.1127 (40) p=.244	.0632 (40) p=.349	.0098 (40) p=.476	.0734 (40) p=.326	.0467 (40) p=.387	.1046 (40) p=.260	-.1659 (40) p=.153	-.1282 (22) p=.288	-.0904 (22) p=.345	-.2018 (22) p=.184	-.2310 (22) p=.150	-.2606 (16) p=.165	.0717 (39) p=.332
	Encouragement of Chores	.3668 (40) p=.010	-.1574 (40) p=.166	-.3188 (22) p=.022	-.0535 (22) p=.371	-.1355 (40) p=.202	.1574 (40) p=.166	-.0648 (40) p=.346	.0472 (40) p=.386	.1752 (40) p=.140	.1962 (40) p=.113	-.1851 (40) p=.126	-.1328 (22) p=.278	-.0201 (22) p=.465	-.1199 (22) p=.298	-.2078 (22) p=.177	-.0357 (16) p=.448	.2669 (39) p=.049
	Expectation of Chores	-.1150 (40) p=.240	.0992 (40) p=.271	.4506 (40) p=.002	.2252 (40) p=.081	.1244 (40) p=.222	.0685 (40) p=.337	.0740 (40) p=.325	-.0600 (40) p=.356	-.2544 (40) p=.012	-.2706 (40) p=.046	.0171 (40) p=.458	-.0652 (22) p=.387	-.4185 (22) p=.026	-.4672 (22) p=.014	.0061 (22) p=.489	.4125 (16) p=.056	-.3400 (40) p=.017
	Pet Responsibility	.0099 (22) p=.482	.1243 (22) p=.291	-.2117 (22) p=.172	-.1919 (22) p=.195	-.2287 (22) p=.153	-.0979 (22) p=.332	.3480 (22) p=.056	.1595 (22) p=.239	-.0426 (22) p=.425	.2074 (21) p=.177	-.0598 (21) p=.379	.3220 (20) p=.082	.4436 (12) p=.074	.6145 (12) p=.017	.0166 (12) p=.477	-.0433 (21) p=.459	.1022 (21) p=.330
	Sibling Responsibility Behavior	-.1685 (22) p=.227	.0152 (22) p=.291	-.1397 (22) p=.268	.0099 (22) p=.483	.1023 (22) p=.325	.2246 (22) p=.157	-.1537 (22) p=.247	-.1078 (22) p=.317	.1706 (22) p=.224	.2016 (22) p=.186	.0186 (22) p=.467	.2239 (13) p=.231	.3443 (22) p=.058	.3237 (22) p=.071	-.0176 (22) p=.469	-.4280 (22) p=.145	-.0476 (22) p=.417
	Encouragement of Sibling Responsibility	-.1351 (22) p=.274	-.0593 (22) p=.397	-.1657 (22) p=.231	-.0664 (22) p=.384	.1394 (22) p=.268	.0586 (22) p=.398	.1464 (22) p=.258	.0057 (22) p=.490	.2289 (22) p=.153	.3194 (22) p=.074	-.1250 (22) p=.290	.1977 (13) p=.259	.3647 (22) p=.048	.2895 (22) p=.096	-.1941 (22) p=.193	-.4280 (8) p=.145	-.3023 (22) p=.066
	Expectation of Sibling Responsibility	.2474 (22) p=.140	.0067 (22) p=.488	.1696 (22) p=.225	-.2051 (22) p=.180	-.0058 (22) p=.437	-.0295 (22) p=.448	-.0928 (22) p=.341	-.4600 (22) p=.016	-.5087 (22) p=.008	-.2722 (22) p=.110	.4273 (22) p=.025	-.5562 (13) p=.024	-.2612 (22) p=.120	-.0904 (22) p=.361	.1789 (22) p=.213	.6134 (8) p=.053	-.2911 (22) p=.094
Socio-Economic Status		.1341 (40) p=.205	-.0433 (40) p=.395	.1193 (40) p=.232	-.1283 (40) p=.215	-.1247 (40) p=.222	.0492 (40) p=.381	.1816 (40) p=.131	-.0609 (40) p=.354	-.2658 (40) p=.049	-.2417 (40) p=.066	.0962 (40) p=.277	-.2589 (13) p=.122	-.2694 (22) p=.113	-.1091 (22) p=.314	.3020 (22) p=.066	.4848 (16) p=.028	-.2994 (39) p=.100
Number of Hours		.0798 (39) p=.315	.0842 (39) p=.305	-.1871 (39) p=.127	.1281 (39) p=.218	.1808 (39) p=.135	.1489 (39) p=.183	.0848 (39) p=.304	.0243 (39) p=.442	.3727 (39) p=.010	.3165 (39) p=.025	-.3518 (39) p=.014	.2752 (21) p=.114	.0027 (22) p=.325	-.2536 (22) p=.127	-.5612 (22) p=.003	-.1594 (16) p=.278	.1385 (38) p=.203

For fathers, the support variables are intercorrelated in the expected directions ($p <$ .01). Paternal power assertion, love withdrawal, and induction re self are interrelated ($p <$ .05). Fathers' induction re others, however, is only associated with induction re self (r = .63, $p <$ .001). An examination of the paternal responsibility dimension reveals limited interrelationships. Four of the possible 21 correlation coefficients reach significance.

The paternal dimension interrelationships are also interesting. Fathers' warmth, which is related in a positive direction to boys' comforting is also associated with the induction variables in the discipline dimension and the responsibility variables of paternal encouragement of chore behavior and pet responsibility behavior. The fathers' socio-economic status is positively related to the paternal variables of warmth, expectation of chore behavior, and encouragement and expectation of sibling responsibility behavior. Paternal socio-economic status is negatively related to fathers' neglect, rejection, power assertion, and number of hours spent with their children.

An examination of the intercorrelations of the maternal and the paternal parenting variables reveals some interesting data. The mothers' and fathers' support variables of aggression, neglect, and rejection are interrelated ($p <$ .05). Maternal and paternal warmth, however, has a correlation coefficient of .24 (N.S.). The discipline variables of power assertion, love withdrawal, and induction re self are not related for mothers and fathers. However, their induction re others variables do reach a significant correlation (r = .32, $p <$ .05). The responsibility measures for mothers and fathers are not related to

each other nor are the number of hours the parents spent with their children.

Among the significant intercorrelations in the parenting data, several are of interest. Fathers' neglect appears to be related to mothers' perception and encouragement of sibling responsibility. These maternal variables are negatively related to boys' comforting. Fathers' expectation of chore behavior is positively associated with mothers' neglect and negatively associated with mothers' perception and encouragement of both chore and sibling responsibility behavior. Mothers' perception and expectation of chore behavior, which are associated with girls' aiding behavior, are also related to the number of hours the fathers' spent with their children.

Child Variables

An examination of the relationships between other child variables and the parenting variables is presented below.

Child age. The age of the child is negatively related to maternal perception of chore behavior ($r = -.39$, $p < .01$) and maternal encouragement of chores ($r = -.26$, $p < .05$). As the age of the child went up, the mothers' perception and encouragement of chores went down. Child age is also associated with paternal induction re self ($r = -.33$, $p < .01$), fathers' expectation of sibling responsibility ($r = .51$, $p < .01$), and the number of hours fathers report spending with their children ($r = -.39$, $p < .01$). Further analysis examined the correlations between child age and the parent variables separately for boys and girls. The age of the boys is negatively related to their mothers' perceptions of chore behavior ($r = -.52$, $p < .01$) and pet responsibility ($r = -.58$, $p < .01$).

The boys' age is also negatively associated with their fathers' induction re others ($r = -.43$, $p < .01$), encouragement of chores ($r = -.43$, $p < .01$), and number of hours the fathers report spending with their sons ($r = -.58$, $p < .01$). However, the older the boys were the more the fathers expected them to assume responsibility for their younger siblings ($r = .88$, $p < .01$). There are no significant correlations between the age of girls and the parenting variables.

Birth order. The birth position of the child in the family is related to three maternal variables and one paternal variable when the total sample is examined. Birth order is associated with mothers' neglect ($r = .27$, $p < .05$), rejection ($r = .27$, $p < .05$), and expectation of chores ($r = .30$, $p < .01$), and with fathers' expectation of chores ($r = .36$, $p < .01$). An analysis by sex reveals an association between the order of daughters' births and maternal warmth ($r = .32$, $p < .05$), expectation of chores ($r = .39$, $p < .01$), and perception of girls' sibling responsibility ($r = -.49$, $p < .01$). Girls' birth order and fathers' expectation of chores are also related ($r = .49$, $p < .01$). For boys, birth order is related to maternal perception of sons' sibling responsibility ($r = .76$, $p < .01$), their encouragement of sons' sibling responsibility ($r = -.76$, $p < .01$) and the number of hours mothers reported spending with their boys ($r = -.53$, $p < .01$). Boys' birth order is also related to fathers' perception of their sibling responsibility ($r = .99$, $p < .001$) and fathers' expectation of their sibling responsibility ($r = .99$, $p < .001$).

Number of siblings. The number of siblings in the family is related to maternal expectation of chore behavior ($r = .32$, $p < .01$). This variable is not related to other maternal nor any of the paternal

parenting variables for the sample as a whole. However, for girls, the number of siblings is negatively associated with maternal perception of sibling responsibility ($r = -.47$, $p < .05$) and positively related to the number of maternal hours spent with their daughters ($r = .32$, $p < .05$). For boys, the number of siblings is negatively related to maternal warmth ($r = -.41$, $p < .05$) and positively related to mothers' perception of sons' chore behavior ($r = .38$, $p < .05$). The number of siblings in boys' families is also related to paternal power assertion ($r = .58$, $p < .01$), and fathers' perception and encouragement of sibling responsibility ($r = .65$, $p < .01$ and $r = .65$, $p < .01$, respectively).

Number of parents. The number of parents in the children's homes is related to a number of maternal variables. Parent number is associated with maternal induction re self ($r = -.31$, $p < .01$), perception of chore behavior ($r = -.32$, $p < .01$), encouragement of chores ($r = -.31$, $p < .01$), perception of pet responsibility ($r = -.44$, $p < .01$), encouragement of sibling responsibility ($r = -.39$, $p < .05$), and expectation of sibling responsibility ($r = -.33$, $p < .05$). When the correlations are examined by sex of the child, the number of parents in girls' homes is related to mothers' induction re self ($r = -.34$, $p < .05$), encouragement of chores ($r = -.43$, $p < .05$), perception of pet responsibility ($r = -.63$, $p < .01$), encouragement of sibling responsibility ($r = -.41$, $p < .05$), and expectation of sibling responsibility ($r = -.48$, $p < .05$). The number of parents in boys' homes is related to maternal perception of sons' chore behavior ($r = -.38$, $p < .05$). Single parent mothers appear to score higher on these measures of child rearing behaviors.

<u>Sociability</u>. The children's observed sociability is associated with maternal induction re self (r = .25, $p <$ .05), and paternal warmth and perception of pet responsibility (r = .25, $p <$ .05 and r = .46, $p <$ .01, respectively). Girls' sociability is positively related to maternal warmth (r = .36, $p <$ .05), and negatively related to paternal perception and encouragement of sibling responsibility (r = -.52, $p <$ .05 and r = -.53, $p <$ .05, respectively). The sociability of boys is negatively associated with their mothers' warmth (r = -.51, $p <$ .01), and positively related to maternal aggression (r = .42, $p <$ .05) and expectation of sibling responsibility (r = .65, $p <$ .05). The sociability of boys is also related to their fathers' perception of pet responsibility (r = .80, $p <$ .01).

Teacher Data

The correlations between preschool teachers' ratings of parental affection, interest, and concern and parental self-report variable categories and presented in Table 9 (Maternal) and Table 10 (Paternal). Teachers' ratings of maternal affection are significantly related to maternal neglect and rejection (r = -.26, $p <$ .05 and r = -.23, $p <$ .05, respectively). These affection ratings are also significantly related to several of the responsibility categories but none of the discipline categories. Preschool teachers' perceptions of maternal interest are not related to any of the support categories but are related to love withdrawal (r = -.23, $p <$ .05) and several of the responsibility categories. Teachers' ratings of mothers' concern are associated with maternal rejection (r = -.29, $p <$ .01), induction re self (r = .38, $p <$ .01), and, again, several of the responsibility categories. In fact, all three of the teachers' ratings categories are associated with

77

Table 9

Correlations Between Teachers' Ratings
and Material Variables

Maternal Variable	Teachers' Rating Category		
	(n = 52)		
Category	Affection	Interest	Concern
Support			
Warmth	.12	−.07	.13
Aggression	−.19	−.06	−.11
Neglect	−.26*	−.17	−.22
Rejection	−.23*	−.17	−.29**
Discipline			
Power Assertion	−.15	−.14	−.07
Love Withdrawal	−.10	−.23*	−.00
Induction re Self	.13	.21	.38**
Induction re Others	.09	−.12	.01
Responsibility			
Chore Behavior	.49***	.37**	.49***
Encouragement of Chores	.39**	.15	.29*
Expectation of Chores	−.02	.29*	.22
Pet Responsibility	.44[a]**	.35[a]*	.35[a]*
Sibling Responsibility Behavior	.12[b]	−.32[b]*	−.32[b]*
Encouragement of Sibling Responsibility	.07[b]	−.26[b]	−.25[b]

(continued)

Table 9 (continued)

Maternal Variable	Teachers' Rating Category		
	($\underline{n}$ = 52)		
Category	Affection	Interest	Concern
Expectation of Sibling			
Responsibility	$-.10^b$	$-.10^b$	$-.10^b$
Socio-Economic Status	$.04^c$	$-.03^c$	$-.03^c$
Number of Hours	.19	.07	.10

$^a\underline{n}$ = 27

$^b\underline{n}$ = 26

$^c\underline{n}$ = 21

 *$\underline{p}$ < .05

 **$\underline{p}$ < .01

***$\underline{p}$ < .001

Table 10

Correlations Between Teachers' Ratings and Paternal Variables

| Paternal Variable | Teachers' Rating Category ($n = 39$) | | |
Category	Affection	Interest	Concern
Support			
Warmth	−.16	−.19	−.19
Aggression	−.05	.02	.02
Neglect	.13	.14	.14
Rejection	−.06	−.03	−.03
Discipline			
Power Assertion	−.19	−.19	−.19
Love Withdrawal	.15	.15	.15
Induction re Self	.20	.21	.21
Induction re Others	.20	.20	.20
Responsibility			
Chore Behavior	−.02	−.07	−.07
Encouragement of Chores	.05	−.02	−.02
Expectation of Chores	−.05	−.08	−.08
Pet Responsibility	−.08[a]	−.08[a]	−.08[a]
Sibling Responsibility			
Behavior	−.25[a]	−.25[a]	−.25[a]

Table 10 (continued)

Teachers' Rating Category

($\underline{n}$ = 39)

	Affection	Interest	Concern
Encouragement of Sibling Responsibility	$.12^a$	$.12^a$	$.12^a$
Expectation of Sibling Responsibility	$-.41^a$*	$-.40^a$*	$-.40^a$*
Socio-Economic Status	$-.32$*	$-.28$*	$-.28$*
Number of Hours	$.27$*	$.24$	$.24$

[a] $\underline{n}$ = 20

*$\underline{p}$ < .05

81

maternal perception of childrens' chore behaviors (r = .49, p < .001; r = .37, p < .01; and r = .49, p < .001, respectively) and pet responsibility (r = .44, p < .01; r = .35, p < .05, and r = .35, p < .05, respectively).

Preschool teachers' perceptions of fathers' affection, interest, and concern are not significantly related to paternal support or discipline categories. All three teacher categories are negatively associated with paternal expectation of sibling responsibility (r = -.40, p < .05 for affection, interest, and concern) and paternal socio-economic status (r = -.32, p < .05, affection; r = -.28, p < .05, interest, r = -.28, p < .05, concern). The fathers' reports of their number of hours spent with their children are associated with teachers' ratings of affection (r = .27, p < .05).

Correlation analyses of the preschool teachers' perceptions of parental affection, interest, and concern with the children's observed helping behaviors reveal very low, insignificant correlations between the variables.

CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION

Chapters I, II, and III, presented the research problems,
theoretical framework, research hypotheses, empirical review, and
research methods. Chapter IV presented the results of the data
analyses. This chapter will provide a discussion of the implications of
the research and an integration of the research results within the
theoretical framework.

Children's Helping Behavior

The data in the present study support the belief that children in a
preschool environment help each other although infrequently. In
previous research, helping has been shown to be a relatively infrequent
behavior. A review of the research (Marcus, Note 4) shows that studies
of aiding type behaviors report a range of .008 to .16 behaviors per
minute. Studies of comforting type behaviors report a range of less
than .00 to .09 behaviors per minute. The present study reports similar
observational averages (.11 per minute for aiding and .01 per minute for
comforting).

Consistent with previous research on younger children, there are no
overall differences between boys and girls in their helping behaviors
(Eisenberg-Berg & Hand, 1979; Krebs, 1970). There are, however, several
child characteristics which appear to be related to children's helping.
Eisenberg-Berg and Hand (1979) found that helping behavior in nursery
school children was related to their sociability. The current study

replicates that finding. Girls' aiding and boys' comforting appear to be related to their observed sociability with their peers. Children who exhibit a tendency to interact positively with their peers may be more self confident in their interpersonal skills and/or more aware of the needs of others and, thus, will engage in helpful activities. There is also the possibility that sociable children have received positive feedback for helping or have more opportunities to be helpful.

Other variables related to girls' aiding are age, having two parents, and not having a family pet. Although previous research has reported age related increases in prosocial behaviors (Bryan & London, 1970; Krebs, 1970), helping behaviors have not shown this trend (Eisenberg-Berg & Hand, 1979). The range of child ages is limited in the present study and further research on helping behavior with a wider range of age groups seems indicated. The fact that having a single parent family appears to increase the likelihood of girls' aiding may be related to the possibility that more opportunities to experience necessary and relevent aiding exist in a single parent home. The possible interpretations of the relationship between pet ownership and aiding are mentioned in the discussion of parental focus on responsibility. Briefly, it may be possible that young girls are expected to be caring and nurturant toward their pets and this expectation, based upon gender rather than interests or competencies, may have a negative influence on the girls' aiding behaviors.

Birth order is the only child characteristic related to boys' aiding. Perhaps boys who have older siblings have experienced receiving aid and this experience increases their likelihood of giving aid to peers. The strength of the relationship is low and analysis of variance

does not indicate significant differences in the aiding scores of boys who were first-born, later-born, or only children.

Thus, young children do engage in helping behaviors and these behaviors are related to certain child characteristics. Young children's helping behaviors are also related to several factors within the parent-child relationship. The findings concerning parental support, discipline, emphasis on responsibility, and patterns of parental behavior will be discussed below.

Parental Support

It was believed that parental support would foster the development of helping behavior. Parental support does have a significant simple association with the preschool boys' comforting behaviors. Young boys' comforting behaviors are positively correlated with fathers' warmth and negatively correlated with fathers' neglect and rejection. Mothers' warmth, on the other hand, is negatively related to the boys' comforting behaviors. These relationships between parental support and comforting behaviors do not hold in the case of girls nor is parental support related to aiding behaviors in either sex.

The results concerning fathers and sons are consistent with the findings of Rutherford and Mussen (1968) and Feshback (1974). These two studies found significant relationships between paternal warmth and young boys' prosocial behavior. However, the results concerning mothers and sons are inconsistent with reviewed empirical research. Previous studies have found either a positive relationship between mothers' support and sons' prosocial behavior (Hoffman & Saltzstein, 1967; Hoffman, 1975; Mussen et at., 1970; Feshback, 1974), or an absence of association between mothers' support and sons' prosocial behavior

(Hoffman, 1963; Roke, 1979; Rutherford & Mussen, 1968). The research
which found positive relationships were completed with older, school-age
children. The studies of Hoffman (1963) and Roke (1979) were concerned
with preschool children and both studies utilized the Hoffman affection
measure. The Rutherford and Mussen (1968) research used a projective
technique to assess maternal nurturance. Perhaps the fact that the
Parental Acceptance-Rejection Questionnaire was used in the present
study to quantify support is the source of the differences in empirical
findings.

The results concerning parents and daughters is consistent with the
research of Hoffman (1963, 1975b) and Feshback (1974). Other studies
have shown a negative correlation for mothers and daughters (Mussen et
al., 1970) or a positive relationship (Hoffman & Saltzstein, 1967; Roke,
1979).

In theory, a supportive parent-child relationship would create an
atmosphere which would enhance a child's sense of competency,
self-worth, and security. Within the nurturant climate, a child would
feel more positive toward other persons and freer to experiment, learn,
and grow. Also, several authors have mentioned the association between
parental support and the child's identification with the parents
(Hoffman, 1970; Sears et al., 1957; Staub, 1975a, 1979).

Parental support is not shown to have a relationship with girls'
aiding or comforting nor with boys' aiding. Staub (1979) has suggested
that insignificant relationships between support and prosocial behaviors
may be a function of the source of the support measure. Staub feels
that support measures derived from parental reports do not completely
reflect the children's subjective reality of the support. According to

symbolic interaction theory, it would be this perception of support that would be crucial in fostering the development of a prosocial orientation.

Although parental support is associated with boys' comforting behaviors, the introduction of other variables reduces these associations. The correlation between boys' comforting and fathers' support is not significant after adjusting for the effects of the fathers' social desirability response. Paternal social desirability response is not itself, related to the helping behaviors. The negative correlation between boys' comforting and mothers' warmth remains negative but not significant after controlling for the number of hours the mothers reported spending with their sons or the boys' sociability. Maternal number of hours is related to maternal warmth but is not related to the helping behaviors. Boys' sociability is negatively associated with maternal warmth and positively related to their comforting behaviors.

Thus, the simple associations between parental support and sons' comforting behaviors appear to be a function of spurious correlation. It is also important to note that a multiple regression analysis revealed low, nonsignificant multiple R s for the overall relationship between the parental support variables and the children's aiding and comforting behaviors. These results demonstrate the complexity of the parent-child relationship and the need for caution when interpreting simple associations or inferring directionality within the interactive process.

Parental Discipline

Parental use of induction type discipline was believed to be associated with helping behavior in young children. Fathers' induction re self did have a significant, but negative, relationship with preschool boys' aiding behaviors. Fathers' induction is neither related to boys' comforting nor girls' aiding or comforting behaviors. Maternal induction re self is significant for children's aiding behaviors only after removing the effects of child age or number of siblings in the family. Mother's induction techniques are not associated with children's comforting behaviors.

Other discipline techniques are found to be related to children's helping behaviors. Mothers' power assertion is positively related to both aiding and comforting for the total sample. Both mothers' and fathers' love withdrawal is related to girls' helping behaviors. Boys' aiding behaviors are negatively associated with their fathers' love withdrawal.

These results are consistent with the findings of Roke (1979) who found that fathers' use of reasoning type discipline was negatively related to sons' cooperation. The results concerning parental love withdrawal discipline and girls' helping behaviors is consistent with the research of Sears (1957, 1965). Other studies have identified the significance of maternal induction for daughters' prosocial behavior (Hoffman, 1963; Hoffman & Saltzstein, 1967, Mussen et al., 1970), or sons' prosocial behavior (Hoffman, 1963, 1975b: Feshback, 1974). With the exception of the Hoffman (1963) research, these studies were conducted with older children.

Hoffman's study with preschool age children did not find a significant relationship between induction and children's consideration for others until the effects of power assertion within the mother-child relationship were controlled. Hoffman felt that maternal power assertiveness influenced the emotional context of child rearing and effected the childrens' reactions to other discipline techniques. This contextual effect is not evidenced in the present study. When parental power assertion is removed from the relationship between induction and children's helping behaviors, the non significant relationships remain non significant. The negative correlation between fathers induction re self and boys' aiding is lowered but still significant ($r = -.46$, $p < .05$).

One possible interpretation of these results is suggested by Staub (1978). He feels that psychological reactance may be activated, especially in boys, when verbal statements are made concerning appropriate, expected behavior. Staub states that children's oppositional tendencies are created by their desire to retain freedom of choice. Boys, in particular, may resent influences which they perceive as threats to their freedom because they are subject to less control generally than girls and because they are taught to value independence. Parental induction or love-withdrawal techniques may contain messages that the desired behaviors are obligatory especially since the language of the reasoning or love withdrawal is in terms a young child can understand. Thus, the boys in this study may have been influenced by the activation of an oppositional tendency.

The study also supports the argument of Roke and Marcus (Note 5) that age may be a factor in induction influences. Removing the effect

of child age from the relationship between mothers' induction re self and childrens' aiding increases the strength of the correlation to a significant level. Also, although the child age variable is not significantly associated with parental induction for girls, there is a negative relationship between fathers' induction and sons' age. Perhaps, fathers are effected by the oppositional tendency in boys and, consequently, decrease their use of reasoning type discipline. Since the range of children's ages is small in this study, any interpretation must be made with caution. If, indeed, fathers do decrease their use of induction the decrease may be temporary. There is also the possibility, suggested by Mussen and Eisenberg-Berg (1977), that children are influenced by repeated exposures to inductive discipline. The children in the current study may not have had the opportunity, because of their age, to experience repeated inductive discipline over an extended period of time. As a qualification of the findings in the discipline dimension it is important to note that multiple regression analysis of the overall relationship between children's helping behaviors and parental discipline reveals nonsignificant associations (MR = .33, aiding and .27, comforting, for mothers and MR = .36, aiding and .14, comforting, for fathers).

Parental Emphasis on Responsibility

It was expected that parental focus on young children's responsibility in the home would be associated with their helping behaviors. Interesting cross-sex parent-child correlations are found. Maternal responsibility focus is not associated with either of the girls' helping behavior measures. However, boys do appear to be influenced by their mothers' emphasis on responsibility. Maternal

90

encouragement and expectation of chores are related to sons' aiding and mothers' perception of their sons' pet responsibility is related to boys' comforting. Mothers' perception of sons' pet responsibility is related to boys' comforting. Mothers' perception of sons' pet responsibility is also related to boys' aiding after removing the masking effects of boys' age on the relationship. Mothers' perception and encouragement of sibling responsibility are negatively related to boys' comforting. Maternal expectation of sibling responsibility is negatively associated with boys' aiding after removing the effects of the sons' sociability.

Fathers, on the other hand, appear at first to have more influence with their responsibility focus on the helping behaviors of their daughters and less with their sons. For boys, paternal perception of pet responsibility is associated with their comforting. Fathers' expectation of chores is associated with boys' aiding behaviors after removing the effects of birth order. Girls' aiding is positively related to paternal perception and expectation of chore behavior and negatively related to fathers' perception of sibling responsibility behavior. But these associations are reduced to non significant levels after removing the effects of girls' sociability on the relationships. Fathers' perception of sibling responsibility behavior is negatively related to girls' comforting and fathers' encouragement of sibling responsibility is negatively related to girls' aiding behaviors.

The results concerning pet responsibility are consistent with the findings of Bathurst (1933) in the case of boys. Boys' comforting behaviors are related to both their mothers' and fathers' perceptions of their responsibility toward the pet. Parental perceptions of pet

responsibility are not related to girls' helping behaviors. Since there are no significant differences between boys and girls in parental perception of pet responsibility, the results indicate that pet responsibility may have positive effects on boys' helping behaviors and non significant effects on girls' helping behaviors. Perhaps, the physical tasks of caring for a pet helps a boy to gain practice and skill in an acceptable nurturant role or, perhaps, boys who exhibit predispositions toward comforting are given more responsibility toward their pets. On the other hand, girls may be stereotyped as care givers by their parents and this subtle neglect of their interests may influence the nature of the role relationship with their pets and the consequent influence of this relationship on their behavior with peers. In fact, although parental perceptions of pet responsibility are not significantly related to girls' helping behaviors, having a family pet in the home is negatively associated with girls' aiding behaviors. There is the possibility that boys who are responsible with their pets are rewarded with praise and acceptance whereas girls may just be expected to be responsible and are not rewarded with praise nor further acceptance.

Maternal encouragement and expectation of chores are related to boys' aiding behaviors and are not associated with girls' helping behaviors. Fathers' perception and expection of chores are related to girls' aiding behaviors. But these associations between paternal focus on chore responsibility and girls' aiding are not significant after removing the effects of girls' sociability on the relationships. Fathers' expectation of chores is also related to boys' aiding after removing the effects of birth order. These results concerning parental

focus on chore responsibility and boys' aiding behaviors are consistent with the cross-cultural research of Whiting and Whiting (1973, 1975) who found that responsibility for family tasks was related to children's altruism.

The question arises concerning why the focus on chore responsibility is significant for boys and not for girls. Maternal perceptions of chore behavior are higher for daughters than for sons ($\underline{t}$(50) = 2.18, $\underline{p} < .05$). Although mothers' encouragement and expectation of chores and fathers' perception, encouragement, and expectation of chores are higher for girls than for boys, the differences between boys and girls are not significant in these parental focus on chore responsibility variables. Again, it is suggested that subtle stereotyping of gender appropriate behaviors may influence the children's definition of the responsibility situation. Boys who were encouraged or expected to help with family chores may have been enabled to feel competent and skilled at this role. Or, perhaps, boys with a predisposition to be helpful were given more encouragement and expectations to be helpful at home. According to Staub (1978), participation in responsible tasks may enhance the development of a personal responsibility toward others. Parents who encouraged and expected their sons to help with chores may have enhanced the boys' definitions of self as a capable helper. However, girls may have felt the subtle attitude of chore helping as an obligatory female appropriate behavior. This may have weakened the influence of task responsibility on their helping behaviors toward their peers. If girls receive parental encouragement and expectations for chore responsibility because they are girls, they may not develop a personal sense of responsibility

toward others. Their interactions with their parents may help them to define themselves as girls who should help rather than as helpful persons.

The above discussion concerning the influence of parental chore responsibility must be interpreted cautiously. Multiple regression analysis reveals that the overall relationship between parental chore responsibility and children's helping behaviors do not reach significance. However, when these responsibility variables are added to a prediction equation after entering the parental support and discipline variables, the subsequent increase in the variance accounted for is significant for mothers and boys and fathers and girls (see Table 6).

The negative relationships between sibling responsibility measures and helping behaviors are surprising. Whiting and Whiting (1973, 1975) found that sibling care was related to altruism both within and across cultures. Boys' comforting behavior is negatively related to their mothers' perception and encouragement of sibling responsibility. There are no differences between boys and girls in the parental focus on sibling responsibility variables. Perhaps the discussions concerning parental discipline and boys' prosocial behaviors are relevant in this situation. Staub (1978) argues that reactance may be created in boys when parental induction is used. Staub feels that since boys are subject to less control than girls they may learn to disregard parental messages. Also, there is a social expectation that boys should be taught independence and they may resent certain influences which diminish their freedom. Perhaps, when boys are encouraged to care for younger siblings by their mothers, an oppositional tendency is developed which is negatively associated with their helpfulness toward peers.

Because of gender appropriate stereotyping, pet responsibility and parental focus on chore responsibility may enhance boys' development of a sense of self which transcends gender stereotypes. But responsibility toward younger siblings may be too inconsistent with the male socialization experience. Rather than enhancing a development of personal responsibility toward others, sibling responsibility may encourage the development of behavior which is less helpful toward others and more stereotypically male. It is interesting from the identification/internalization perspectives that maternal perception and encouragement of sibling responsibility are associated with paternal neglect. Boys who may be attempting to gain approval from their same-sex parent may feel that the fathers' behaviors toward them are the appropriate models of male behaviors and this may develop or reinforce the oppositional behavior toward helping peers. These possible tendencies may diminish or change as the boys develop in years and experience.

This argument may also be applied in some aspects to girls. The girls' comforting behaviors are negatively related to their fathers' perceptions of their sibling responsibility. Girls' aiding behavior is associated in negative directions with fathers' perception and encouragement of sibling responsibility. Perhaps, when fathers focus on sibling responsibility with their young daughters, the girls find this focus consistent with the female socialization experience. However, one must remember that these girls are young in age. The paternal focus on responsibility toward siblings may be narrow in perspective and influence the girls' behaviors with siblings and not other peers. The girls may, possibly, be building experience and competence in their

nurturance abilities which has not yet developed to a level in which they would feel comfortable risking offers of help to non-siblings. There is also the possibility that fathers perceive and encourage sibling responsibility with their daughters because they are girls and not because of any interest in such concerns on the part of the daughters. Such paternal behavior may give rise to oppositional behavior when the girls are in the school environment. It may be relevant to note that although paternal perception and encouragement of sibling responsibility are not related to the maternal parenting variables, fathers' encouragement of sibling responsibility is negatively associated with the fathers' socio-economic status. Lower socio-economic status males may hold more traditional views on gender appropriate role behaviors for their daughters.

The fact that the children in this study are preschool age may also be relevant in discussing the focus on sibling responsibility findings. Staub's (1970) research, which investigated the effects of indirect responsibility focusing, found that placing a child in charge had an effect on first graders helpful responses. The younger, kindergarten age children did not respond more readily when they were placed in charge and, in fact, denied more frequently that they were aware of the need for help.

As children develop more maturity and feelings of connectedness with others outside of their family, the experiences derived from sibling responsibility focus may have a less negative or, perhaps, a positive association with their helping responses. Additional research is need to clarify this issue.

Patterns of Parental Behaviors

Parental support, inductive discipline style, and responsibility emphasis were expected to influence young children's helping behaviors. Also, it was believed that parents who practiced a discipline style using induction and nonpower within a supportive relationship would have young children with helping behaviors. The findings do not support either the predictive or interactive hypotheses.

In attempting to account for the lack of support for these hypotheses, it appears probable that the nature of the parent-child data decreased the possibility of significant findings. The children's helping behaviors are highly variable and quite infrequent. The parental data are constricted in range for many of the variables. In addition, the simple associations, when significant, explain little of the variance in the observed helping behaviors.

The factor analytic research on parent behaviors by Schaefer (1959) and Becker (1964) found that parental behaviors can be conceptualized along dimensions of behavior and that these dimensions are intercorrelated with each other. The parental support variables are significantly interrelated for both mothers and fathers in this research effort. The discipline variables are intercorrelated for fathers whereas the responsibility variables evidence more interrelationships for mothers than for fathers. The mothers' and to a more limited extent, the fathers' support, discipline, and responsibility dimensions are intercorrelated. These data are evidence of maternal and paternal configurations of rearing. For instance, there is a relationship between parental warmth and induction discipline. This pattern is consistent with the findings of Zahn-Waxler, Radke-Yarrow, and King

(1979) who reported a similar relationship between maternal reasoning and empathic caregiving.

The relationships between mothers' and fathers' parenting variables are more limited. The only parenting variables which are significantly correlated with each other are maternal and paternal aggression, neglect, rejection, and induction re others. Mothers' warmth is not related to fathers' warmth and, other than the induction re others variable, mothers' discipline variables are not related to fathers' discipline variables. Parental responsibility variables are, similarly, not related. Obviously, the parents in this study are individuals whose childrearing behaviors, according to their reports about their parenting behaviors, are not clearly related to the childrearing behaviors of their spouse.

An examination of the interrelationships among the parenting variables leads to some interesting conjectures. For instance, the mothers' perception and encouragement of sibling responsibility are related to fathers' neglect. Perhaps the fathers' neglect stimulates a need in these mothers for more help with the care of younger children. Or, perhaps, the children of neglecting fathers are more helpful with their younger siblings in order to gain nurturance from the siblings or approval from the mothers. Another interesting set of relationships exists between fathers' rejection and mothers' induction re others, perception of chores, and number of hours spent with her child. Perhaps the time the mothers spend with their children, reasoning with them, and doing family chores together are resented by some fathers and they then reject the children. Or perhaps, the mothers spend more time with the children to compensate for paternal rejection. The children of

rejecting fathers may demand more of the mothers' time, spend time helping with chores, and are receptive to the mothers' induction. These possibilities are, of course, conjectures.

One of the purposes of this research was to investigate the possibility that additive or multiplicative relationships among the parenting variables influence helping behaviors in young children. Given the results from this study, clear conclusions regarding these hypotheses cannot be given. The results do not support the theoretical contentions.

Implications

One major outcome of successful socialization is the acquisition of behaviors and attitudes which enable a person to live harmoniously within his or her society. The research described in this paper enhances our understanding of parental socialization processes. Several authors have expressed concern regarding empirical research based upon a simplified view of parenting (Bell & Harper, 1977; Staub, 1975a, 1979). Parental socialization seems not to be a unidirectional inculcation from a power source to a waiting agent. This research supports the notion that parental socialization is a complex, transactional flow. Simple associations do not give a clear picture of the dynamics involved in parenting. Present in any parent-child interaction is the history and patterning of the parental rearing techniques and the individual characteristics of both the parents and the child. According to Bell and Harper (1977), child behavior influences parental patterns of responses and children do have the ability to modify adult behavior. Staub (1979) feels that such child

characteristics as temperament and activity level mediate the effect of the parental behaviors. The examination of parental socialization based upon this differential and transactional perspective would require far more creative research methodology than was employed in this study.

However, the present research extends empirical knowledge in its attempt to go beyond the testing of simple associations. Using several child and parent variables as controls eliminates spurious correlation and leads to the discovery of possible intervening relationships and associations masked by suppressor relationships. Although the contended predictive and interactive patterns were not supported by this study, future research using improved methodology may yet support these hypotheses.

Although the current study does not provide a clear understanding of the nature of parental socialization patterns in the promotion of helping behaviors in young children, certain implications do seem indicated. For instance, although the study results do not provide direct evidence for the importance of parental support, these results seem to be more a function of the research methodology than a reflection of the reality of the parent-child relationship. Parental support, per se, may not have a direct influence on children's helping behavior. However, the nature and quality of the supportive atmosphere may influence both the parent-child interactions and the content and influence of these transactions. The study results do indicate that various aspects of parental discipline and focus on responsibility are associated with young children's helping behaviors.

According to Staub (1979), a parent can be warm and affectionate without also being sensitive and responsive to the child's feelings and

needs. Perhaps it is this sensitivity or responsiveness to the individuality of the child which influences or mediates the effectiveness of the childrearing techniques. For instance, a parent who is generally warm and affectionate may not be perceived by the child as supportive unless the parent combines the nurturance with some sensitivity to the child's emotional and physical needs and responds to variations in these needs. In addition, the influence of various discipline techniques may depend upon the parent's sensitivity to the child's psychological state and receptiveness to the potential learning situations. Also, it is possible that variations in children's perceptions and generalizations within responsibility situations are effected by parental sensitivity to the children's needs or interests when focusing on responsibility in the home.

Parents and other socializers can improve their responsiveness with children. Studies of handicapped infants have demonstrated that parents can be taught to interpret ambiguous cues and learn to respond to their child's individual needs (Fraiberg, 1974). Parents, as well as children, can develop more positive feelings regarding each other when parents learn a repertoire of effective methods of discipline and apply these methods differentially and with sensitivity to their children. According to Staub (1979), when parents of disruptive children learn effective, reasonable methods of discipline, there are changes both in the behavior of the children and in the affective nature of the parent-child relationship.

The influence of parental focus on responsibility may also be effected by the context of the situation and the individual characteristics of the family members. As mentioned previously, one

possible explanation for the study results showing that pet and chore responsibility are related to boys' helping behaviors and are not related to girls' helping behaviors may be associated with subtle gender stereotyping. The parents of young boys who perceive their sons to be responsible and encourage them to participate in pet and chore responsibility may exhibit mild control and investment in the responsibility situation. They do not require that a young boy be responsible because he is a boy and, thus, may attribute his responsible efforts to an individual characteristic of the child. This may help the boy to evaluate the situation in a manner which might lead to an internal attribution for his behavior and his definition of self as competent helper may be enhanced. On the other hand, the parents of girls may have a larger investment in the responsibility situation and exert stronger control. The parents may feel that responsible activity is appropriate behavior for girls rather than an individual asset. This subtle stereotyping may influence the girls' definition of the situation and dilute the parental influence on self definition. Parents can become aware of the possibility of subtle stereotyping in their behavior and may be helped to examine their attitudes, interactions, and behaviors in order to provide both daughters and sons with responsible learning opportunities which are sensitive and responsive to the children's interests and skills.

The results concerning the negative relationships between sibling responsibility and young children's helping behavior would seem to imply, at first, that such responsibility may lower the levels of helping behavior at least temporarily. However, information concerning parental motives and methods of getting the child to accept

responsibility were not gathered. It seems advisable that these contextual factors be examined along with the long term effects of sibling responsibility.

It has been suggested that children be given the opportunity to engage in responsible activities both in the home and in other areas of their environment (Staub, 1979). The results of the present study imply that such opportunities should take into account the child's age and interests and, perhaps, the attitudes, motives, and control methods of the supervising socializer.

Conclusions

Young children do participate in helping behavior and this behavior is significantly related to several variables within the parent-child relationship. The research results show support, although quite limited, for the theoretical contentions that parental support, discipline, and focus on responsibility are associated with helping behaviors in young children. The results also reveal some unexpected directionality in these associations and several predictions based upon the theoretical framework are not supported.

The results of the research do not clearly support the prediction that parental support is associated with helping behaviors in young children. The data provide qualified support for the contention that parental use of induction discipline is associated with preschoolers' helping behaviors. The data also provide partial support for the hypothesis that parental focus on young children's responsibility in the home is associated with their helping behaviors. However, there is no evidence in the results which support the contended predictive or

interactive influence of the parenting variables on young children's helping behaviors.

Although the findings were statistically significant, the results explained small amounts of the variance in the children's helping behavior scores. One limitation was the range on the parent measures. The restricted range may be associated with the fact that the parents in this sample were middle-class and affiliated with a college environment. The families were also volunteers who responded to a request for help with a research project. It is not known to what extent these limitations effected the study results.

Other limitations which should be noted concern the data measures. The discipline measure, for example, requested parents to respond to hypothetical discipline situations concerning transgressions by their child. Parental discipline, or control, permeates the familial structure and the salient aspects of the discipline may not have been measured. The responsibility instrument provided data on parental perception, encouragement, and expectation of various types of responsibility assignments for children. However, it did not measure parental motives or methods of getting child to accept responsibilities. These motives and methods may have influenced the child's perception of the situation and the consequences of the assignments on helping behaviors with peers. Also, the parental support measure provided information based upon the parents' reports of their behavior. There were no measures of the children's perception of parental support. The teacher ratings, an independent source of information on parent behaviors, gave only partial support for the reliability of the parental measures.

Two final limitations were the restricted age range in the sample of children and the lack of information concerning individual characteristics of the children. As previously discussed, several parent-child interaction variables may have required an extended history to influence observed behavior. In addition, it was not possible to examine possible child effects on parent behavior or differential influence of parenting without extended information on children's congenital and personality characteristics.

It is suggested that future research emphasize both the patterning of parent-child interaction and the influence of person variables when investigating the relationship between childrearing and children's helping behaviors.

APPENDIX A

Anne Heineman Batory

Home: 66 North Lehigh Street
          Shavertown, Pennsylvania 18708

B.S.C.:   Department of Psychology
          Old Science Hall
          Bloomsburg State College
          Bloomsburg, Pennsylvania 17815

Dear Parents:

    This letter is a request for your help and participation in a
research project concerning parenting and preschool children.

    Although there are a lot of opinions about parenting, there really
isn't much information from parents themselves as to how they think,
feel, and behave. That is why I am asking for your help.

    If you agree to help with the study, you will be requested to
complete a consent form and a questionnaire concerning your parenting
behaviors. There are two questionnaires in this envelope. If your
family is a single-parent family, please complete one questionnaire. If
there are two parents, I am requesting a questionnaire from each parent
to be completed separately. The questionnaire takes about 15 minutes to
complete. When completed, the questionnaire(s) and consent form may be
sealed in the envelope and deposited in a locked box at the Bloomsburg
State College Child Care Center. The box will be labeled PARENTING
RESEARCH PROJECT.

    I am also requesting your persmission to observe your child while
he or she is playing at the center. I would not have any contact with
your child and would only be observing your child's play behaviors.

    If you would like additional information before agreeing to
participate, please leave your name and telephone number in the box at
the B.S.C. Child Care Center and I will contact you as soon as possible.

    Your decision to participate in this study is completely voluntary.
Be assured that all information is strictly confidential and will be
used for research purposes only.

    Thank you for your time and attention. If you have any questions
at all, please feel free to contact me at anytime.

                                    Sincerely,

                                    Anne Heineman Batory
                                    Adjunct, Department of
                                       Psychology

107

Anne Heineman Batory
66 North Lehigh Street
Shavertown, Pennsylvania 18708

Dear Parents:

This letter is a request for your help and participation in a research project concerning parenting and preschool children.

Although there are a lot of opinions about parenting, there really isn't much information from parents themselves as to how they think, feel, and behave. That is why I am asking for your help.

If you agree to help with the study, you will be requested to complete a consent form and a questionnaire concerning your parenting behaviors. There are two questionnaires in this envelope. If your family is a single-parent family, please complete one questionnaire. If there are two parents, I am requesting a questionnaire from each parent to be complete separately. The questionnaire takes about 15 minutes to complete. When completed, the questionnaire(s) and consent form may be sealed in the envelope and deposited in a locked box at Mercy Center. The box will be labeled PARENTING RESEARCH PROJECT.

I am also requesting your permission to observe your child while he or she is playing at the center. I would not have any contact with your child and would only be observing your child's play behaviors.

If you would like additional information before agreeing to participate, please leave your name and telephone number in the box at Mercy Center and I will contact you as soon as possible.

Your decision to participate in this study is completely voluntary. Be assured that all information is strictly confidential and will be used for research purposes only.

Thank you for your time and attention. If you have any question at all, please feel free to contact me at anytime.

Sincerely,

Anne Heineman Batory
Department of Psychology
Bloomsburg State College

APPENDIX B

INFORMATION SHEET

Study Title: Parenting Preschool Children

Investigator: Anne Heineman Batory
               6 North Lehigh Street   Department of Psychology
               Shavertown, PA 18708   Old Science Hall
               696-4424   Bloomsburg State College
                                            Bloomsburg, PA 17815
                                            389-4471

Department: Institute for Child Study/Department of Human Development
               The University of Maryland at College Park

In this parenting research I will be trying to find out something about how parents behave in their rearing of preschool children. I am also interested in the everyday behaviors of preschool children.

I have requested that you complete a questionnaire that asks questions concerning your parenting behavior. I am also requesting your permission to observe your child at play in the Bloomsburg State College Child Care Center.

Your decision to participate in this study is completely voluntary and you may withdraw at any time. Be assured that all information is strictly confidential and will be used for research purposes only. Any identifying information will be destroyed at the end of the study.

Please feel free to ask any questions you may have concerning the study.

Thank you for your help.

Please sign the Consent Form and enclose it with your completed questionnaire in the envelope. Please place the sealed envelope in the PARENTING RESEARCH PROJECT box in the B.S.C Child Care Center.

INFORMATION SHEET

Study Title: Parenting Preschool Children

Investigator: Anne Heineman Batory
                 66 North Lehigh Street   Department of Psychology
                 Shavertown, PA 18708   Old Science Hall
                 1-717-696-4424   Bloomsburg State College
                                                 Bloomsburg, PA 17815
                                                 389-4471

Research
Department: Institute for Child Study/Department of Human
                Development, The University of Maryland at College Park

In this parenting research I will be trying to find out something
about how parents behave in their rearing of preschool children. I am
also interested in the everyday behaviors of preschool children.

I have requested that you complete a questionnaire that asks
questions concerning your parenting behavior. I am also requesting your
permission to observe your child at play in Mercy Center.

Your decision to participate in this study is completely voluntary
and you may withdraw at any time. Be assured that all information is
strictly confidential and will be used for research purposes only. Any
identifying information will be destroyed at the end of the study.

Please feel free to ask any questions you may have concerning the
study.

Thank you for your help.

Please sign the Consent Form and enclose it with your completed
questionnaire in the envelope. Please place the sealed envelope in the
PARENTING RESEARCH PROJECT box in Mercy Center.

Please keep this information sheet so that you can contact me if
any questions arise.

CONSENT FORM

I have requested that each parent complete a questionnaire that asks questions concerning parenting behaviors. I have also requested your permission to observe your child at play in the Bloomsburg State College Campus Child Care Center

_____

I fully understand the project in which I am being asked to participate. I have had a chance to ask questions. I understand that I may ask questions at any time during the study.

I understand that I am participating in this activity of my own free will and that I am free to withdraw from the project at any time.

This is to certify that I agree to participate in this research under the direction of Anne Heineman Batory.

_____   _____

Child's Name   Signature of Parent

                                     _____

                                     Date

CONSENT FORM

I have requested that each parent complete a questionnaire that aks questions concerning parenting behaviors. I have also requested your permission to observe your child at play in Mercy Center.

_____

I fully understand the project in which I am being asked to participate. I have had a chance to ask questions. I understand that I may ask questions at any time during the study.

I understand that I am participating in this activity of my own free will and that I am free to withdraw from the project at any time.

This is to certify that I agree to participate in this research under the direction of Anne Heineman Batory.

_____   _____
Child's Name   Signature of Parent

                                       _____
                                       Date

APPENDIX C

PARENT INTERVIEW

This questionnaire has been designed to explore parents' attitudes and behaviors. There are no right or wrong answers to these questions, so please answer every one as honestly as you possibly can. Your responses are completely confidential; no names will be used in reporting the results of the study. There are 5 sections to the questionnaire.

Thank you in advance for your assistance.

If you would like a summary of the results of this study, when it is completed, please fill in the following information:

NAME: _____

ADDRESS: _____

_____

_____

Section 1

P A R Q

The following pages contain a number of statements describing the way different parents act toward their children. Please read each statement carefully and think how well it describes the way you treat your child. Please work quickly; give your first impression and move on to the next item.

Four lines are drawn after each sentence. If the statement is <u>basically</u> true about the way you treat your child then ask yourself, "Is it almost <u>always</u> true?" or, "Is it only <u>sometimes</u> true?' If you think you almost always treat your child that way, put an <u>X</u> on the line ALMOST ALWAYS TRUE: if the statement is sometimes true about the way you treat your child, then mark SOMETIMES TRUE. If you feel the statement is <u>basically</u> untrue about the way you treat your child then ask yourself, "Is it <u>rarely</u> true?" or "Is it almost <u>never</u> true?" If it is rarely true about the way you treat your child put an <u>X</u> on the line RARELY TRUE; if you feel the statement is almost never true then mark ALMOST NEVER TRUE.

Remember, there is no right or wrong answer to any question so be as frank as you can. Respond to each statement the way you feel you really are rather than the way you might like to be. For example, if you almost always hug and kiss your child when he/she is good, you should mark the item as follows:

	TRUE OF ME		NOT TRUE OF ME	
	Almost Always True	Sometimes True	Rarely True	Almost Never True
I hug and kiss my child when he/she is good	X	_____	_____	_____

116

	TRUE OF ME		NOT TRUE OF ME	
	Almost Always True	Sometimes True	Rarely True	Almost Never True
1. I say nice things about my child	___	___	___	___
2. I nag or scold my child when he/she is bad.	___	___	___	___
3. I ignore my child.	___	___	___	___
4. I wonder if I really love my child.	___	___	___	___
5. I discuss general daily routines with my child and listen to what he/she has to say.	___	___	___	___
6. I complain about my child to others when he/she does not listen to me.	___	___	___	___
7. I take an active interest in my child.	___	___	___	___
8. I encourage my child to bring friends home, and I try to make things pleasant for them.	___	___	___	___
9. I make fun of my child.	___	___	___	___
10. I ignore my child as long as he/she does not do anything to disturb me.	___	___	___	___
11. I yell at my child when I am angry.	___	___	___	___
12. I make it easy for my child to confide in me.	___	___	___	___
13. I am harsh with my child.	___	___	___	___
14. I enjoy having my child around me.	___	___	___	___

	TRUE OF ME		NOT TRUE OF ME	
	Almost Always True	Sometimes True	Rarely True	Almost Never True
15. I make my child feel proud when he/she does well.	____	____	____	____
16. I hit my child even when he/she may not deserve it.	____	____	____	____
17. I forget things I am supposed to do for my child.	____	____	____	____
18. My child is a burden for me.	____	____	____	____
19. I praise my child to others.	____	____	____	____
20. I punish my child when I am angry.	____	____	____	____
21. I make sure my child has the right kind of food to eat.	____	____	____	____
22. I talk to my child in a warm and affectionate way.	____	____	____	____
23. I am impatient with my child.	____	____	____	____
24. I am too busy to answer my child's questions.	____	____	____	____
25. I resent my child.	____	____	____	____
26. I praise my child when he/she deserves it.	____	____	____	____
27. I am irritable with my child.	____	____	____	____
28. I am concerned who my child's friends are.	____	____	____	____
29. I take real interest in my child's affairs.	____	____	____	____

	TRUE OF ME		NOT TRUE OF ME	
	Almost Always True	Sometimes True	Rarely True	Almost Never True
30. I say unkind things to my child.	___	___	___	___
31. I ignore my child when he/she asks for help.	___	___	___	___
32. I am unsympathetic to my child when he/she is having trouble.	___	___	___	___
33. I make my child feel wanted and needed.	___	___	___	___
34. I tell my child that he/she gets on my nerves.	___	___	___	___
35. I pay of lot of attention to my child.	___	___	___	___
36. I tell my child how proud I am of him/her when he/she is good.	___	___	___	___
37. I hurt my child's feelings.	___	___	___	___
38. I forget events that my child thinks I should remember.	___	___	___	___
39. When my child misbehaves, I make him/her feel I don't love him/her anymore.	___	___	___	___
40. I make my child feel what he does is important.	___	___	___	___
41. When my child does something wrong, I threaten or frighten him/her.	___	___	___	___
42. I like to spend time with my child.	___	___	___	___
43. I try to help my child when he/she is scared or upset.	___	___	___	___

	TRUE OF ME		NOT TRUE OF ME	
	Almost Always True	Sometimes True	Rarely True	Almost Never True
44. When my child misbehaves, I shame him/her in front of his/her playmates.	____	____	____	____
45. I avoid my child's company.	____	____	____	____
46. I complain about my child.	____	____	____	____
47. I respect my child's point of view, and encourage him/her to express it.	____	____	____	____
48. I compare my child unfavorably with other children.	____	____	____	____
49. When I make plans, I take my child into consideration.	____	____	____	____
50. I let my child do things he/she thinks are important, even if it is inconvenient for me.	____	____	____	____
51. When my child misbehaves, I compare him/her unfavorably with other children.	____	____	____	____
52. I leave my child to someone else's care (e.g. a neighbor or relative.)	____	____	____	____
53. I let my child know he is not wanted.	____	____	____	____
54. I am interested in the things my child does.	____	____	____	____
55. I try to make my child feel better when he/she is hurt or sick.	____	____	____	____
56. I tell my child I am ashamed of him/her when he/she misbehaves.	____	____	____	____

	TRUE OF ME		NOT TRUE OF ME	
	Almost Always True	Sometimes True	Rarely True	Almost Never True
57. I let my child know I love him/her.	____	____	____	____
58. I treat my child gently and kindly.	____	____	____	____
59. When my child misbehaves, I make him/her feel ashamed or guilty.	____	____	____	____
60. I try to make my child happy.	____	____	____	____

PERSONAL REACTION INVENTORY

Section 2

Listed below are a number of statements concerning personal attitudes and traits. Please read each item and decide whether the statement is TRUE or FALSE as it pertains to you personally. Then place a check in the TRUE or FLASE column.

TRUE   FALSE

1. Before voting, I thoroughly investigate the qualifications of all the candidates.

2. I never hesitate to go out of my way to help someone in trouble.

3. It is sometimes hard for me to go on with my work if I am not encouraged.

4. I have never intensely disliked anyone.

5. On occasion, I have doubts about my ability to succeed in life.

6. I sometimes feel resentful when I don't get my way.

7. I am always careful about my manner of dress.

8. My table manners at home are as good as when I eat out in a restaurant.

9. If I could get into a movie without paying and be sure I was not seen I would probably do it.

10. On a few occasions, I have given up doing something because I thought too little of my ability.

TRUE	FALSE

11. I like to gossip at times.

12. There have been times when I felt like rebelling against people in authority even though I knew they were right.

13. No matter who I'm talking to, I'm always a good listener.

14. I can remember "playing sick" to get out of something.

15. There have been occasions when I took advantage of someone.

16. I'm always willing to admit it when I make a mistake.

17. I always try to practice what I preach.

18. I don't find it particularly difficult to get along with loud mouthed, obnoxious people.

19. I sometimes try to get even rather than forgive and forget.

20. When I don't know something I don't at all mind admitting it.

21. I am always courteous, even to people who are disagreeable.

22. At times I have really insisted on having things my own way.

23. There have been occasions when I felt like smashing things.

24. I would never think of letting someone else be punished for my wrong-doings.

TRUE	FALSE

25. I never resent being asked to return a favor.

26. I have never been irked when people expressed ideas very different from my own.

27. I never make a long trip without checking the safety of my car.

28. There have been times when I was quite jealous of the good fortune of others.

29. I have almost never felt the urge to tell someone off.

30. I am sometimes irritated by people who ask favors of me.

31. I have never felt that I was punished without cause.

32. I sometimes think when people have a mistfortune they only got what they deserved.

33. I have never deliberately said something that hurt someone's feelings.

Section 3

The following nine questions concern activities in the home. Please read each question and then indicate your answer by placing an X on one of the four lines that best describes your answer.

	Almost Always	Sometimes	Rarely	Almost Never
1. When you are doing chores around the home (eg. dusting, picking up, setting the table, folding laundry, etc.), does your child help you?	_____	_____	_____	_____
2. When you are doing chores around the home (eg. dusting, picking up, setting the table, folding laundry, etc.), do you encourage your child to help you?	_____	_____	_____	_____
3. When there are chores that need to be done around the home (eg. dusting, picking up, setting the table, folding laundry, etc.) is your child expected to do one or more chores?	_____	_____	_____	_____

4. Does your family have a Pet?

   _____ Yes   _____ No

   If you answered No to question 4, please go to question 6.

| 5. If your family owns a pet, is your child expected to participate in the care of the pet (eg. exercise, feeding, cleaning, etc.)? | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |

6. Does your child have a younger brother or sister?

   _____ Yes   _____ No

   If you answered No to question 6, please go to next section.

	Almost Always	Sometimes	Rarely	Almost Never
7. If there is a younger brother or sister in the home, does your child help with the care of this child (eg. watching, entertaining, etc.)?	———	———	———	———
8. Do you encourage your child to help with the care of his or her younger brother or sister (eg. watching, entertaining, etc.)?	———	———	———	———
9. Is your child expected to help with the care of his or her younger brother or sister (eg. watching, entertaining, etc.)?	———	———	———	———

Section 4

<u>Instructions</u>: For the following three hypothetical situations please
indicate how likely it would be for you to respond with
each of the practices listed.

Situation 1: Your child and a friend are each building a house of blocks. The friend says, "My house is nicer than yours. Yours doesn't even look like a real house." Your child gets mad and kicks the friend's house apart, whereupon the friend starts to cry and runs away.

1. Spank or threaten to spank your child.

Never	Unlikely	Somewhat likely	Very likely	Extremely likely
1	2	3	4	5

2. Indicate to your child that you dislike him(her) when he(she) doesn't play nicely with friends.

Never	Unlikely	Somewhat likely	Very likely	Extremely likely
1	2	3	4	5

3. Indicate to your child that it makes you feel hurt or disappointed when he(she) does thing like that.

Never	Unlikely	Somewhat likely	Very likely	Extremely likely
1	2	3	4	5

4. Indicate to your child that it makes the friend feel sad when he(she) does things like that.

Never	Unlikely	Somewhat likely	Very likely	Extremely likely
1	2	3	4	5

5. Take away or threaten to take away some object or privilege from your child.

Never	Unlikely	Somewhat likely	Very likely	Extremely likely
1	2	3	4	5

6. Indicate to your child that if he(she) doesn't play nicely with friends, then he(she) shouldn't expect you to be nice to him(her).

Never	Unlikely	Somewhat likely	Very likely	Extremely likely
1	2	3	4	5

7. Encourage your child to think about how you feel when you see him(her) do things like that.

Never	Unlikely	Somewhat likely	Very likely	Extremely likely
1	2	3	4	5

8. Encourage your child to think about how the friend feels when he(she) does things like that.

Never	Unlikely	Somewhat likely	Very likely	Extremely likely
1	2	3	4	5

Situation 2:   You see your child making fun of another child, and the
               child walks away dejectedly.

1. Indicate to your child that such behavior makes others unhappy.

Never	Unlikely	Somewhat likely	Very likely	Extremely likely
1	2	3	4	5

2. Indicate to your child that it concerns you when he(she) treats
   others unkindly.

Never	Unlikely	Somewhat likely	Very likely	Extremely likely
1	2	3	4	5

3. Indicate to your child that you don't love him(her) as much when
   he(she) makes fun of others.

Never	Unlikely	Somewhat likely	Very likely	Extremely likely
1	2	3	4	5

4. Spank or threaten to spank your child.

Never	Unlikely	Somewhat likely	Very likely	Extremely likely
1	2	3	4	5

5. Encourage your child to think about how his(her) teasing hurts the
   other person's feelings.

Never	Unlikely	Somewhat likely	Very likely	Extremely likely
1	2	3	4	5

6. Encourage your child to think about how you feel when you see
   him(her) make fun of others.

Never	Unlikely	Somewhat likely	Very likely	Extremely likely
1	2	3	4	5

7. Give your child a disgusted look and/or refuse to give him(her) any
   attention.

Never	Unlikely	Somewhat likely	Very likely	Extremely likely
1	2	3	4	5

8. Take away or threaten to take away some object or privilege from
   your child.

Never	Unlikely	Somewhat likely	Very likely	Extremely likely
1	2	3	4	5

Situation 3: Your child is playing with one of his(her) toys. You see your child refuse to share the toy with a playmate who doesn't have any toys. The playmate gets upset and goes home.

1. More or less openly withdraw your love from the child by ignoring him(her).

Never	Unlikely	Somewhat likely	Very likely	Extremely likely
1	2	3	4	5

2. Encourage your child to think about how you feel when he(she) doesn't share with others.

Never	Unlikely	Somewhat likely	Very likely	Extremely likely
1	2	3	4	5

3. Take away or threaten to take away some object or privilege from your child.

Never	Unlikely	Somewhat likely	Very likely	Extremely likely
1	2	3	4	5

4. Encourage your child to think about how his(her) selfishness can make others unhappy.

Never	Unlikely	Somewhat likely	Very likely	Extremely likely
1	2	3	4	5

5. Spank or threaten to spank your child.

Never	Unlikely	Somewhat likely	Very likely	Extremely likely
1	2	3	4	5

6. Indicate to your child that it bothers you when he(she) doesn't share with others.

Never	Unlikely	Somewhat likely	Very likely	Extremely likely
1	2	3	4	5

7. Indicate to your child that you don't like him(her) as much when he(she) doesn't share.

Never	Unlikely	Somewhat likely	Very likely	Extremely likely
1	2	3	4	5

8. Indicate to your child that not sharing (being selfish) makes others unhappy.

Never	Unlikely	Somewhat likely	Very likely	Extremely likely
1	2	3	4	5

Background Information

Please answer the following questions:

1. What is your relationship to the child?

   (a) Mother   (b) Father   (c) Other_____

2. What is your occupation?

   _____

3. What are the approximate number of hours you spend with your awake
   preschool child during an average week?_____

4. What is the birth date of your preschool child?_____

5. Please list the oldest to youngest children in the family by sex
   and date of birth (please do not list by name).

   <u>Sex Of Child</u>   <u>Birthdate</u> (month and year)

Thank You Very Much For Your Help!

APPENDIX D

Behavior Categories

Behavior variable	Definition
Aiding	The child attempts to alleviate the nonemotional needs of another (eg. gives information, secures a game piece for another, helps another with some task).
Comforting	The child attempts to alleviate the emotional distress of another (eg. puts arm around crying child, speaks soothing words to a child in distress, gets the teachers to help a hurt child).
Sociability	The child exhibits positive social interactions with others (eg. greetings, playing together, sharing, exchanging information to express group solidarity).
Other	The child exhibits negative or neutral behaviors (eg. hitting, aggressive shouting, ignoring).

Effectiveness of Aiding or Comforting Behavior	Definition
Effective	Helping behavior has taken place (eg. in the case of aiding, the recipient is pleased with the information, wanted and accepted the game piece, or the task is completed more efficiently; in the case of comforting, the recipient stopped crying, is pleased and accepted the soothing words, or the teacher helped the hurt child.)
Ineffective	Behavior is not helping behavior. The action has not helped another attain a goal or relieved the needs of another.

Circumstances	Definition
Self-initiation	The child spontaneously initiates the prosocial act.
Compliance	The child responds to a request from another.
Questionable	Undetermined self-initiation or compliance.

Recipient	Definition
Peer	Any child in the school area.
Adult	Any teacher or other adult person in the school area.

Instructions for Observations

<u>Before you begin:</u>

Write in observer's name, the date of the observation, the child's code (refer to code list). Then note the starting time of the observation.

Each interval must be timed at 1 minute with a 30 second break between intervals.

Each observation lasts a total of 15 minutes; 10 minutes for observation intervals and 5 minutes for breaks.

On the coding sheet, indicate for each interval the occurrence of each behavior category with sequential numbers, the effectiveness of each aiding or comforting behavior identified by number, the circumstances surrounding each behavior identified by number, and the recipient of each behavior identified by number. If a peer is the recipient of a behavior, note the sex of that peer. Do not indicate multiples of a behavior category within one interval of observation.

<u>Example:</u>

During Interval 1, Child BB spontaneously comforts a male peer who accepts the soothing and then sets the snack table after a request by the teacher. The teacher accepts the aid. During Interval 2, Child BB offers a name for the block group after the teacher requests suggestions. Then Child BB notices that a female peer who has built a bridge is looking for a toy car and he gets it for her and she accepts it.

These two intervals would be coded as follows:

Observation Coding Sheet

Observer: **AHB**   Date: **04/03**

Child: **BB**   Start Time: **11:00 a.m.**

Free Play: (Inside)   Outside   End Time: **11:15 a.m.**

Intervals

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Behavior										
Aiding.......	2	2								
Comforting...	1									
Sociability..		1								
Other.......										
Effectiveness										
Effective....	1,2	1,2								
Ineffective..										
Circumstances										
Self-initiation...	1	2								
Compliance...	2	1								
Questionable.										
Recipient										
Peer.........	1M	2F								
Adult.......	2	1								

Observation Coding Sheet

Observer: _____   Date: _____

Child: _____   Start Time: _____

Free Play: Inside   Outside   End Time: _____

Intervals

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

Behavior

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Aiding.......										
Comforting...										
Sociability..										
Other.......										

Effectiveness

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Effective....										
Ineffective..										

Circumstances

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Self-initiation...										
Compliance...										
Questionable.										

Recipient

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Peer........										
Adult........										

APPENDIX E

TEACHER RATING SCALE

This scale was developed to provide independent information for the Parenting Research Project. Previous studies have shown that teacher observations are very valuable sources of information. Absolute confidentiality will be maintained. Parent names are included for your references when completing this scale. Please remove the list of parent names before returning the scale to the researcher.

Your cooperation is greatly appreciated.

TEACHER SCALE

On the basis of what you have observed over the last two weeks, please complete the following questions:

	Hugs Or Says Nice Things To The Child (e.g. a pat on the shoulder, "I missed you", etc.)			Picks The Child Up On Time			Shows An Active Interest In The Child (e.g. attends meetings, asks questions concerning the child, etc.)			Shows An Active Concern For The Child (e.g. appropriate clothing, health care, etc.)		
The parents of:	YES	NO	NOT KNOWN	YES	NO	NOT KNOWN	YES	NO	NOT KNOWN	YES	NO	NOT KNOWN
Mother:												
Father:												

141

REFERENCE NOTES

1. Batory, A. H. Childrearing and helping behaviors in preschool children. Paper presented at the Human Development Colloquium, University of Maryland, College Park, May 1981.

2. Eisenberg-Berg, N. Prosocial moral reasoning: Its development and implications. Paper presented in the symposium "Development of Prosocial Behavior and Cognitions" at the American Psychological Association, Montreal, 1980.

3. Marcus, R., Johnson, C., & Roke, E. Application of the "generalizability coefficient" to the study of the stabiliy of cooperative behavior of young children. Unpublished manuscript, 1981.

4. Marcus, R. Naturalistic observation of cooperation, helping, and sharing and their associations with empathy and affect. Paper presented at the conference on "Aggression and altruism: Social and biological origins," Society for Research in Child Development and the Child Development Foundation, Bethesda, Maryland, April 1982.

5. Roke, E., & Marcus, R. Parent variables in young children's cooperative behavior. Paper presented at the Southeastern Conference on Human Development, Alexandria, Virginia, April 1980.

6. Staub, E. The development of prosocial behavior: Directions for future research and applications to education. Paper presented at Moral Citizenship/Education Conference, Philadelphia, June 1976.

REFERENCES

Ardrey, R. *The territorial imperative*. New York: Antheneum, 1966.

Aronfreed, J. The socialization of altruistic and sympathetic behavior: Some theoretical and experimental analyses. In J. Macaulay & L. Berkowitz (Eds.), *Altruism and helping behavior*. New York: Academic Press, 1970.

Barnett, M., King, L., & Howard, J. Inducing affect about self or other: effects on generosity in children. *Developmental Psychology*, 1979, 15, 164–167.

Barnett, M., King, L., Howard, J., & Dino, G. Empathy in young children: Relation to parents' empathy, affection, and emphasis on the feelings of others. *Developmental Psychology*, 1980, 16, 243–244.

Bar-Tal, D., Raviv, A., & Goldberg, M. Helping behavior among preschool children: An observational study. *Child Development*, 1982, 53, 396–402.

Bathurst, J. A study of sympathy and resistance (negativism) among children. *Psychological Bulletin*, 1933, 30, 625–626.

Baumrind, D. Child care practices anteceding three patterns of preschool behavior. *Genetic Psychological Monographs*, 1967, 75, 43–88.

Baumrind, D. Current patterns of parental authority. *Developmental Psychology*, 1971, 4, 1–101.

Becker, W. Consequences of different kinds of parental discipline. In L. Hoffman & M. Hoffman (Eds.), *Reviews of child development research*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1964.

Bell, R., & Harper, L. *Child effects on adults*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1977.

Bitzman, A., Yinon, Y., Mivtzari, E., & Shavit, R. Effects of the age structure of the kindergarten on altruistic behavior. *Journal of School Psychology*, 1978, 16, 154–160.

Broderick, C. Beyond the five conceptual frameworks: A decade of development of family theory. In C. Broderick (Ed.), *A decade of family research and action*. Minneapolis, Minn.: National Council on Family Relations, 1971.

Brody, S., & Axelrad, S. _Mothers, fathers, and children: Explorations in the formation of character in the first seven years._ New York: International Universities Press, 1978.

Bryan, J. & London, P. Altruistic behavior by children. _Psychological Bulletin_, 1970, _73_, 200–211.

Bryant, B., & Crockenberg, S. Correlates and dimensions of prosocial behavior: A study of female siblings with their mothers. _Child Development_, 1980, _51_, 529–544.

Crowne, D., & Marlowe, D. A new scale of social desirability independent of psychopathology. _Journal of Consulting Psychology_, 1960, _24_, 349–354.

Duncan, O. A socioeconomic index for all occupations. In A. J. Reiss (Ed.), _Occupations and social status._ New York: The Free Press of Glencoe, 1961.

Eisenberg-Berg, N. _The development of prosocial behavior._ New York: Academic Press, in press.

Eisenberg-Berg, N., Cameron, E., Tryon, K., & Dodez, R. Socialization of prosocial behavior in the preschool classroom. _Developmental Psychology_, 1981, _17_, 773–782.

Eisenberg-Berg, N., & Hand, M. The relationship of preschoolers' reasoning about prosocial moral conflicts to prosocial behavior. _Child Development_, 1979, _50_, 356–363.

Eisenberg-Berg, N., & Lennon, R. Altruism and the assessment of empathy in the preschool years. _Child Development_, 1980, _51_, 552–557.

Feshback, N. The relationship of child-rearing factors to children's aggression, empathy, and related positive and negative behaviors. In J. DeWit & W. Hartup (Eds.), _Determinants and origins of aggressive behavior._ The Hauge, Netherlands: Mouton, 1974.

Fraiberg, S. Blind infants and their mothers: An examination of the sign system. In M. Lewis & L. Rosenblum (Eds.), _The effect of the infant on its caregiver._ New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1974.

Grusec, J. The socialization of altruism. In N. Eisenberg-Berg (Ed.), _The development of prosocial behavior._ New York: Academic Press, in press.

Grusec, J., & Redler, E. Attribution, reinforcement, and altruism: A developmental analysis. _Developmental Psychology_, 1980, _16_, 525–534.

Hoffman, M. Parent discipline and the child's consideration for others. _Child Development_, 1963, _34_, 573–588.

Hoffman, M. Moral development. In P. Mussen (Ed.), Carmichael's manual of child psychology (Vol. 2, 3rd ed.) New York: John Wiley, 1970.

Hoffman, M. Moral internalization, parental power, and the nature of parent-child interaction. Developmental Psychology, 1975, 11, 228-239. (a)

Hoffman, M. Altruistic behavior and the parent-child relationship. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1975, 31 937-943. (b)

Hoffman, M. & Saltzstein, H. Parent discipline and the child's development. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1967, 5, 45-57.

Inkeles, A. Social structure and socialization. In D. Goslin (Ed.) Handbook of socialization theory and research. Chicago: McNally, 1969.

Kenrick, D., Baumann, D., & Cialdini, R. A step in the socialization of altruism as hedonism: Effects of negative mood on children's generosity under public and private conditions. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1979, 37, 747-755.

Krebs, D. Altruism--An examination of the concept and a review of the literature. Psychological Bulletin, 1970, 73, 258-302.

Ladd, G. & Oden, S. The relationship between peer acceptance and children's ideas about helpfulness. Child Development, 1979, 50, 402-408.

Marcus, R., & Leiserson, M. Encouraging helping behavior. Young Children, 1978, 24-34.

Marcus, R., Telleen, S., & Roke, E. Relation between cooperation and empathy in young children. Developmental Psychology, 1979, 15, 346-347.

Mead, G. Mind, self, and society. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1934.

Mussen, P., & Eisenberg-Berg, N. Roots of caring, sharing, and helping. San Francisco: W. H. Freeman, 1977.

Mussen, P., Harris, S., Rutherford, E., & Keasey, C. Honesty and altruism among preadolescents. Developmental Psychology, 1970, 3, 169-194.

Rheingold, H. Little children's participation in the work of adults, a nascent prosocial behavior. Child Development, 1982, 53. 114-125.

Rohner, R. Parental acceptance-rejection questionnaire (PARQ): Adult. Test manual. Washington, D.C.: Boys Town Center for the Study of Youth Development, 1976.

Rohner, R. _Handbook for the study of parental acceptance and rejection._ Storrs: The University of Connecticut, 1980.

Roke, E. Parental correlates of cooperative behavior in young children. Ph.D. Dissertation, 1979, University of Maryland.

Rollins, B., & Thomas, D. Parental support, power, and control techniques in the socialization of children. In W. Barr, R. Hill, F. Nye, & I. Reiss (Eds.), _Contemporary theories about the family: Research-based theories_ (Vol. 1). New York: The Free Press, 1979.

Rushton, J. P. Socialization and the altruistic behavior of children. _Psychological Bulletin_, 1976, _83_, 898-913.

Rutherford, E., & Mussen, P. Generosity in nursery school boys. _Child Development_, 1968, _39_, 755-765.

Schaefer, E. A circumplex model for maternal behavior. _Journal of Abnormal Social Psychology_, 1959, _59_, 226-235.

Schaefer, E. & Bayley, N. Maternal behavior, child behavior, and their intercorrelations from infancy through adolescence. _Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development_, 1963, _28_ (3).

Schvaneveldt, J. The interactional framework in the study of the family. In F. Nye & F. Berardo (Eds.), _Emerging conceptual frameworks in family analysis._ New York: Macmillan, 1966.

Sears, R. Identification as a form of behavioral development. In D. Harris (Ed.), _The concept of development._ Minneapolis: The University of Minnesota Press, 1957.

Sears, R., Maccoby, E., & Levin, H. _Patterns of child rearing._ Evanston, Illinois: Row, Peterson, 1957.

Sears, R., Rau, L., & Alpert, R. _Identification and child rearing._ Stanford, California: Stanford University Press, 1965.

Staub, E. A child in distress: The effects of focusing responsibility on children on their attempts to help. _Developmental Psychology_, 1970, _2_, 152-154.

Staub, E. _The development of prosocial behavior in children._ Morristown, New Jersey: Silver Burdett Company, 1975. (a)

Staub, E. To rear a prosocial child: Reasoning, learning by doing, and learning by teaching others. In D. De Palma & J. Folley (Eds.), _Moral development: Current theory and research._ Hillsdale, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum, 1975. (b)

Staub, E. _Positive social behavior and morality: Volume 1, social and personal influences._ New York: Academic Press, 1978.

Staub, E. Positive social behavior and morality: Volume 2, socialization and development. New York: Academic Press, 1979.

Stryker, S. Symbolic interaction theory: A review and some suggestions for comparative family research. Journal of Comparative Family Studies, 1972, 3, 17-32.

Wilson, E. Sociobiology--The new synthesis. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1975.

Whiting, J., Child, I, & Lambert, W. Field guide for the study of socialization. B. Whiting (Ed.), Six Cultures Series (Vol. 1). New York: John Wiley, 1966.

Whiting, B., & Whiting, J. Children of six cultures. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1975.

Whiting, J., & Whiting, B. Altruistic and egoistic behavior in six cultures. In L. Nader & T. Maretzki (Eds.), Cultural illness and health: Essays in human adaptation. D. H. Maybury-Lewis (Ed.). Anthropological studies, No. 9. Washington, D.C.: American Anthropological Association, 1973.

Yarrow, M. R., & Waxler, C. Z. Dimensions and correlates of prosocial behavior in young children. Child Development, 1976, 47, 118-125.

Zahn-Waxler, C., Radke-Yarrow, M., & King, R. Child rearing and children's prosocial initiations toward victims of distress. Child Development, 1979, 50, 319-330.

CURRICULUM VITAE

Name: Anne Heineman Batory.

Permanent address: 11 Circle Drive
                    Dallas, Pennsylvania 18612.

Degree and date to be conferred: Ph.D., 1984.

Date of birth: August 3, 1946.

Place of birth: New York City, New York.

Secondary education: Saint John Villa Academy
                      New York, New York, 1964.

Collegiate institutions attended	Dates	Degree	Date of Degree
Wilkes College	09/64–06/68	B.A.	1968
University of Maryland	08/73–06/75	M.S.W.	1975
University of Maryland	07/78–1984	Ph.D.	1984

Major: Human Development.

Professional positions held:

        Bloomsburg University of Pennsylvania
        Bloomsburg, Pennsylvania 17815.
        Adjunct faculty position (08/82–present).

        Model Neighborhood Area Comprehensive Community
            Mental Health Center
        Capitol Heights, Maryland.
        Clinical Consultant (10/77–09/79).
        Coordinator of Children and Youth Services (05/75–10/77).

Saint Pius School
Norfolk, Virginia.
Teacher (09/69-06/70).

Willowbrook State School
New York, New York.
Special Education Teacher (06/68-08/69).