

Coercive Discipline and Mothers' Perceptions
of Parental Control

By

Jill E. Simpson

A Thesis

Submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies
in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
for the Degree of

Master of Science

Department of Family Studies

University of Manitoba

Winnipeg, Manitoba, Canada

(c) Jill E. Simpson, 1996



National Library
of Canada

Acquisitions and
Bibliographic Services Branch

395 Wellington Street
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 0N4

Bibliothèque nationale
du Canada

Direction des acquisitions et
des services bibliographiques

395, rue Wellington
Ottawa (Ontario)
K1A 0N4

Your file *Votre référence*

Our file *Notre référence*

The author has granted an irrevocable non-exclusive licence allowing the National Library of Canada to reproduce, loan, distribute or sell copies of his/her thesis by any means and in any form or format, making this thesis available to interested persons.

The author retains ownership of the copyright in his/her thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without his/her permission.

L'auteur a accordé une licence irrévocable et non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque nationale du Canada de reproduire, prêter, distribuer ou vendre des copies de sa thèse de quelque manière et sous quelque forme que ce soit pour mettre des exemplaires de cette thèse à la disposition des personnes intéressées.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur qui protège sa thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

ISBN 0-612-16296-6

Canada

Name Gill E. Simpson

Dissertation Abstracts International and Masters Abstracts International are arranged by broad, general subject categories. Please select the one subject which most nearly describes the content of your dissertation or thesis. Enter the corresponding four-digit code in the spaces provided.

~~Course Description and Mother's Report~~ **Developmental Psychology**
 SUBJECT TERM
Developmental Psychology
Control

0620
 SUBJECT CODE

UMI

Subject Categories

THE HUMANITIES AND SOCIAL SCIENCES

COMMUNICATIONS AND THE ARTS

- Architecture 0729
- Art History 0377
- Cinema 0900
- Dance 0378
- Design and Decorative Arts 0389
- Fine Arts 0357
- Information Science 0723
- Journalism 0391
- Landscape Architecture 0390
- Library Science 0399
- Mass Communications 0708
- Music 0413
- Speech Communication 0459
- Theater 0465

EDUCATION

- General 0515
- Administration 0514
- Adult and Continuing 0516
- Agricultural 0517
- Art 0273
- Bilingual and Multicultural 0282
- Business 0688
- Community College 0275
- Curriculum and Instruction 0727
- Early Childhood 0518
- Elementary 0524
- Educational Psychology 0525
- Finance 0277
- Guidance and Counseling 0519
- Health 0680
- Higher 0745
- History of 0520
- Home Economics 0278
- Industrial 0521
- Language and Literature 0279
- Mathematics 0280
- Music 0522
- Philosophy of 0998

- Physical 0523
- Reading 0535
- Religious 0527
- Sciences 0714
- Secondary 0533
- Social Sciences 0534
- Sociology of 0340
- Special 0529
- Teacher Training 0530
- Technology 0710
- Tests and Measurements 0288
- Vocational 0747

LANGUAGE, LITERATURE AND LINGUISTICS

- Language 0679
 - General 0289
 - Ancient 0290
 - Linguistics 0290
 - Modern 0291
 - Rhetoric and Composition 0681
- Literature 0401
 - General 0294
 - Classical 0294
 - Comparative 0295
 - Medieval 0297
 - Modern 0298
 - African 0316
 - American 0591
 - Asian 0305
 - Canadian (English) 0352
 - Canadian (French) 0355
 - Caribbean 0360
 - English 0593
 - Germanic 0311
 - Latin American 0312
 - Middle Eastern 0315
 - Romance 0313
 - Slavic and East European 0314

PHILOSOPHY, RELIGION AND THEOLOGY

- Philosophy 0422
- Religion 0318
 - General 0318
 - Biblical Studies 0321
 - Clergy 0319
 - History of 0320
 - Philosophy of 0322
- Theology 0469

SOCIAL SCIENCES

- American Studies 0323
- Anthropology 0324
 - Archaeology 0324
 - Cultural 0326
 - Physical 0327
- Business Administration 0310
 - General 0310
 - Accounting 0272
 - Banking 0770
 - Management 0454
 - Marketing 0338
- Canadian Studies 0385
- Economics 0501
 - General 0501
 - Agricultural 0503
 - Commerce-Business 0505
 - Finance 0508
 - History 0509
 - Labor 0510
 - Theory 0511
- Folklore 0358
- Geography 0366
- Gerontology 0351
- History 0578
 - General 0578
 - Ancient 0579

- Medieval 0581
- Modern 0582
- Church 0330
- Black 0328
- African 0331
- Asia, Australia and Oceania 0332
- Canadian 0334
- European 0335
- Latin American 0336
- Middle Eastern 0333
- United States 0337
- History of Science 0585
- Law 0398
- Political Science 0615
 - General 0615
 - International Law and Relations 0616
 - Public Administration 0617
- Recreation 0814
- Social Work 0452
- Sociology 0626
 - General 0626
 - Criminology and Penology 0627
 - Demography 0938
 - Ethnic and Racial Studies 0631
 - Individual and Family Studies 0628
 - Industrial and Labor Relations 0629
 - Public and Social Welfare 0630
 - Social Structure and Development 0700
 - Theory and Methods 0344
- Transportation 0709
- Urban and Regional Planning 0999
- Women's Studies 0453

THE SCIENCES AND ENGINEERING

BIOLOGICAL SCIENCES

- Agriculture 0473
 - General 0473
 - Agronomy 0285
 - Animal Culture and Nutrition 0475
 - Animal Pathology 0476
 - Fisheries and Aquaculture 0792
 - Food Science and Technology 0359
 - Forestry and Wildlife 0478
 - Plant Culture 0479
 - Plant Pathology 0480
 - Range Management 0777
 - Soil Science 0481
 - Wood Technology 0746
- Biology 0306
 - General 0306
 - Anatomy 0287
 - Animal Physiology 0433
 - Biostatistics 0308
 - Botany 0309
 - Cell 0379
 - Ecology 0329
 - Entomology 0353
 - Genetics 0369
 - Limnology 0793
 - Microbiology 0410
 - Molecular 0307
 - Neuroscience 0317
 - Oceanography 0416
 - Plant Physiology 0817
 - Veterinary Science 0778
 - Zoology 0472
- Biophysics 0786
 - General 0786
 - Medical 0760

- Geodesy 0370
- Geology 0372
- Geophysics 0373
- Hydrology 0388
- Mineralogy 0411
- Paleobotany 0345
- Paleoecology 0426
- Paleontology 0418
- Paleozoology 0985
- Palynology 0427
- Physical Geography 0368
- Physical Oceanography 0415

HEALTH AND ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCES

- Environmental Sciences 0768
- Health Sciences 0566
 - General 0566
 - Audiology 0300
 - Dentistry 0567
 - Education 0350
 - Administration, Health Care 0769
 - Human Development 0758
 - Immunology 0982
 - Medicine and Surgery 0564
 - Mental Health 0347
 - Nursing 0569
 - Nutrition 0570
 - Obstetrics and Gynecology 0380
 - Occupational Health and Safety 0354
 - Oncology 0992
 - Ophthalmology 0381
 - Pathology 0571
 - Pharmacology 0419
 - Pharmacy 0572
 - Public Health 0573
 - Radiology 0574
 - Recreation 0575
 - Rehabilitation and Therapy 0382

- Speech Pathology 0460
- Toxicology 0383
- Home Economics 0386

PHYSICAL SCIENCES

- Pure Sciences 0485
 - Chemistry 0485
 - General 0485
 - Agricultural 0749
 - Analytical 0486
 - Biochemistry 0487
 - Inorganic 0488
 - Nuclear 0738
 - Organic 0490
 - Pharmaceutical 0491
 - Physical 0494
 - Polymer 0495
 - Radiation 0754
- Mathematics 0405
- Physics 0605
 - General 0605
 - Acoustics 0986
 - Astronomy and Astrophysics 0606
 - Atmospheric Science 0608
 - Atomic 0748
 - Condensed Matter 0611
 - Electricity and Magnetism 0607
 - Elementary Particles and High Energy 0798
 - Fluid and Plasma 0759
 - Molecular 0609
 - Nuclear 0610
 - Optics 0752
 - Radiation 0756
- Statistics 0463
- Applied Sciences 0346
 - Applied Mechanics 0346
 - Computer Science 0984

- Engineering 0537
 - General 0537
 - Aerospace 0538
 - Agricultural 0539
 - Automotive 0540
 - Biomedical 0541
 - Chemical 0542
 - Civil 0543
 - Electronics and Electrical 0544
 - Environmental 0775
 - Industrial 0546
 - Marine and Ocean 0547
 - Materials Science 0794
 - Mechanical 0548
 - Metallurgy 0743
 - Mining 0551
 - Nuclear 0552
 - Packaging 0549
 - Patroleum 0765
 - Sanitary and Municipal 0554
 - System Science 0790
- Geotechnology 0428
- Operations Research 0796
- Plastics Technology 0795
- Textile Technology 0994

PSYCHOLOGY

- General 0621
- Behavioral 0384
- Clinical 0622
- Cognitive 0633
- Developmental 0620
- Experimental 0623
- Industrial 0624
- Personality 0625
- Physiological 0989
- Psychobiology 0349
- Psychometrics 0632
- Social 0451

EARTH SCIENCES

- Biogeochemistry 0425
- Geochemistry 0996

THE UNIVERSITY OF MANITOBA
FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES
COPYRIGHT PERMISSION

COERCIVE DISCIPLINE AND MOTHERS' PERCEPTIONS
OF PARENTAL CONTROL

BY

JILL E. SIMPSON

A Thesis/Practicum submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies of the University of Manitoba in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

MASTER OF SCIENCE

Jill E. Simpson © 1996

Permission has been granted to the LIBRARY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF MANITOBA to lend or sell copies of this thesis/practicum, to the NATIONAL LIBRARY OF CANADA to microfilm this thesis/practicum and to lend or sell copies of the film, and to UNIVERSITY MICROFILMS INC. to publish an abstract of this thesis/practicum.

This reproduction or copy of this thesis has been made available by authority of the copyright owner solely for the purpose of private study and research, and may only be reproduced and copied as permitted by copyright laws or with express written authorization from the copyright owner.

I hereby declare that I am the sole author of this thesis.

I authorize the University of Manitoba to lend this thesis to other institutions or individuals for the purpose of scholarly research.

Jill E. Simpson

I further authorize the University of Manitoba to reproduce this thesis by photocopying or by other means, in total or in part, at the request of other institutions or individuals for the purpose of scholarly research.

Jill E. Simpson

Table of Contents

v

	Page
Abstract.....	x
Acknowledgements.....	xi
Introduction.....	1
Parental Control and its Effect on Development.....	3
Research from a unidirectional perspective	4
Research from a transactional perspective.....	9
Constructs of Perceived Control.....	11
Contingency	13
Competence	13
Causal attributions	15
A differentiated model.....	16
The Effect of Perceived Control on	
Parental Control.....	17
The effect on affective arousal	22
The effect on problem-solving	25
The effect on parental behaviour	27
How perceived control affects parental	
control	30
Attachment Representations and Perceived Parental	
Control.....	32
Caregiving schemas.....	35

Representations of early attachments	38
Attachment representations and parenting behaviour.....	41
Attachment representations and perceived parental control.....	46
Hypothesis and Predictions.....	52
Method.....	55
Sample.....	55
Procedure.....	56
Assessment of Perceived Parental Control.....	59
Assessment of Attachment Representations.....	64
Assessment of Coercive Discipline.....	67
Child Rearing Practices Report	67
Parenting Dimensions Inventory	68
Parental Responses to Misbehavior	69
Attitude Toward Spanking	70
Composite index of coercive discipline	71
Assessment of Child Problem Behaviours	72
Preschool Socioaffective Profile	73
Child Behaviour Checklist for Ages 2-3	75
Aggregate index of child problem behaviors.....	76

Results	77
Preliminary Analyses.....	78
Perceived parental control.....	78
Attachment representations.....	81
Coercive discipline.....	81
Child problem behaviours.....	82
Intercorrelations among the variables.....	83
Main Analyses.....	85
Prediction 1: Relation between Perceived Parental Control and Coercive Discipline....	86
Prediction 2: Relations between Attachment Representations and Perceived Parental Control.....	89
Prediction 3: Mediating Role of Perceived Parental Control.....	90
Discussion.....	90
References.....	102
Appendices.....	119
Appendix 1. Demographic Characteristics	
Appendix 2. Parent Attribution Test	
Appendix 3. Mother-Father-Peer Scale	

- Appendix 4. Child Rearing Practices Report
- Appendix 5. Parenting Dimensions Inventory
- Appendix 6. Parental Responses to Misbehaviour
- Appendix 7. Attitude Toward Spanking
- Appendix 8. Composite Index of Reported Use of
Coercive Discipline
- Appendix 9. Preschool Socioaffective Profile
- Appendix 10. Child Behaviour Checklist for Ages 2-3

List of Tables

<u>Table</u>	Page
1. Sample Characteristics.....	57
2. Study Variables and Measures.....	60
3. Descriptive Statistics for the Variables.....	79
4. Intercorrelations Among the Variables.....	84
5. Hierarchical Regression Analysis Predicting Coercive Discipline.....	87
6. Hierarchical Regression Analysis Predicting Perceived Parental Control.....	91

Abstract

This study tested the hypothesis that mothers' use of coercive discipline is related to their perceptions of parental control, and that these perceptions are influenced, in turn, by both the nature of their child's behaviour and their feelings about the quality of their early attachment relationships. The sample was comprised of 107 mothers, each with a three-year-old-daughter. Mothers were administered measures of perceived parental control, perceived quality of childhood relationships with mothers and fathers, and parenting attitudes and practices. Children's problem behaviours were assessed by fathers and nursery school teachers. Mothers' reported use of coercive discipline could not be predicted from their perceptions of parental control. Nor were their perceptions of parental control influenced by the nature of their child's behaviour. Interestingly, mothers' perceptions of the quality of their childhood relationship with their fathers, but not their mothers, was found to be significantly related to perceived parental control. Several interpretations of the findings were considered and suggestions were made for further research.

Acknowledgements

I am grateful for the opportunity to thank all those who have supported me in the fulfillment of my academic dream. To my thesis advisor, Dr. Rosemary Mills, I would like to express a special thank you for your words of encouragement and unending guidance and support which helped me continue on the journey to achieving my goal. To my thesis advisor, Dr. Rosemary Mills, and my committee members, Dr. Mary Warmbrod and Dr. Shiva Halli, I thank you sincerely for your guidance and dedication which helped me produce a quality piece of work.

Thank you to my fellow graduate students, whose insight helped guide me through the challenges of completing a graduate program.

To my parents, Gerald and Hilda Fleming, you have blessed me with the belief that I can achieve any goal I desire, and when my belief in myself sometimes faltered you were always there to strengthen it with words of love and encouragement. You have both been my greatest inspiration and I love you very much.

To my husband, Ken, your belief in me and love for me has been a source of strength and encouragement through the

process of achieving this dream. Thank you for encouraging me through the difficult times and rejoicing with, and for me, during the accomplishments.

Introduction

The question of what constitutes good parenting has long been a central focus in the study of child development. There is a general consensus that, in North American society at least, the most effective parenting style for socializing children is one in which love is combined with firm but flexible control. Relatively little is known, however, about the factors that determine whether parents use this type of control rather than some other, less optimal type of control.

One of the avenues that has been explored focuses on parents' concepts of relationships in general, and the parent-child relationship specifically. These concepts, termed "relational schemas," are comprised of images of the self, the other, and the self and other in relationship. They are thought to form the basis of specific beliefs and perceptions that guide parenting. One such belief concerns the extent to which parents believe they have the ability to control the interactions they have with their children, i.e., the amount of power parents believe themselves to have in situations of conflict with their children relative to the amount of power they attribute to their child. Human beings are believed to be innately motivated to influence

their environment, the goal of which is a feeling of "efficacy" (White, 1959). This feeling contributes to a sense of competence or control, which in turn guides future behaviour. This "effectance" motivation may apply just as much to relationships as it does to other domains of behaviour. Indeed, there is some evidence to suggest that, when parents are interacting with a child who resists compliance or is withdrawn and unresponsive, their beliefs about their ability to control the child's behaviour have an effect on the way they interact with the child. Further, parents seem to interact more effectively when they perceive themselves as able to control the child. The more parents believe this, the more likely they are to assert control in a firm yet flexible manner, and the less they believe this the more likely they are to use coercion to obtain control.

Where do beliefs about parental control come from? It has been suggested that, beginning with their first attachment relationships, people begin to form beliefs about relationships, including expectations about the predictability and responsiveness of the social world and about the effectiveness of the self in eliciting desired responses from others. These attachment representations are

generalized to other relationships, and can be modified by the experiences that occur in these other relationships. Thus, parents bring with them into the parent-child relationship certain control beliefs which were acquired through their earlier relationships and will be further modified by their experiences in the parent-child relationship itself. These beliefs, in turn, influence the way they attempt to control their children's behaviour. While this idea seems to provide a plausible explanation of why some parents assert control in a more optimal way than other parents, there have not yet been any studies in which attachment representations, perceived control, and parenting behaviour have been assessed together. As a result, there is as yet no empirical evidence that attachment representations play a role in parental control and that their effects are mediated by perceived parental control. The present study was designed to address this question.

Parental Control and its Effect on Development

In the initial stages of research on socialization, parental influence was assumed to be a one-way process in which children are passively moulded by their parents. Styles of influence were characterized in terms of certain

dimensions or patterns of behaviour. More recently, parental influence has been conceptualized in a more transactional way, as a dynamic process in which parent and child both actively influence the other over the course of their interactions, with the behaviour of each one emerging from the quality of the transactions that occur between them. Despite this change from unidirectional to transactional conceptions of parental influence, the research has been remarkably consistent in indicating that firm but flexible parental control is associated with positive developmental outcomes in children, while control which is either too coercive or too lax is associated with less positive outcomes (e.g., Baumrind, 1967, 1971; Maccoby & Martin, 1983).

Research from a unidirectional perspective. Early studies of parenting were aimed at identifying basic dimensions of parenting (e.g., Baldwin, 1955; Becker, 1964; Schaefer, 1959; Schaefer & Bayley, 1963; Sears, Maccoby, & Levin, 1957). Various approaches were used. Schaefer (1959) did a series of factor analyses, which indicated that parenting behaviours could be categorized into two bipolar dimensions, one labelled "love-hostility" and the other

labelled "autonomy-control." The love-hostility dimension was defined at the "love" end by characteristics such as positive evaluation of the child, egalitarianism, and expression of affection, and at the "hostility" end by characteristics such as ignoring, perceiving the child as a burden, rejection, punitiveness, use of fear, and strictness. The autonomy-control dimension was defined at the "autonomy" end by granting autonomy, and at the "control" end by characteristics such as excessive contact, intrusiveness, and fostering dependency. The two factors were independent, suggesting that how a parent is characterized on one dimension does not predict how they would be characterized on the other dimension. For example, a parent who was accepting (at the "love" end of the love-hostility dimension) could be at any place along the autonomy-control dimension. In a detailed, longitudinal study investigating the relationship between these dimensions of parenting and child behaviour, Schaefer and Bayley (1963) found that, in young children, maternal warmth and guidance were positively correlated with prosocial behaviours such as friendliness, cooperativeness, and attentiveness. In later childhood, maternal hostility and

control were found to be positively correlated with antisocial behaviours such as aggression in boys and discontentment, gloominess, and defiance in girls. Thus, there was some evidence that these two basic dimensions of parenting could be used to predict developmental outcomes in children.

Later, these dimensions were further differentiated. Baumrind (1967, 1971; Baumrind & Black, 1967) found evidence to suggest that the control-autonomy dimension encompasses both control and "maturity demands" (expectations), and that the love-hostility dimension encompasses both nurturance and communication. Parenting styles reflecting different configurations of these four dimensions were related to child characteristics. Parents who were warm, loving, supportive and who encouraged their children to communicate with them, while also imposing sanctions and demanding mature behaviour ("authoritative" parents), had children who were socially responsible and independent. Parents who relied heavily on power-assertive discipline, who discouraged their children from expressing disagreement, and who provided little warmth ("authoritarian" parents), had sons and daughters who were discontented, withdrawn and

distrustful. Sons of authoritarian parents were also found to be defiant and aggressive, but this was not the case for daughters. Parents who imposed little or no sanctions, made relatively few and then only weak demands for mature behaviour, paid little attention to training for independence and self-reliance, and who were warm ("permissive" parents) had children who tended to lack impulse control, self-reliance, and social responsibility.

In the next phase of research the focus was on specific discipline techniques and their effects on child behaviour. Researchers focusing on the effectiveness of different socialization techniques in promoting children's internalization of social norms and values found that power assertive strategies are the least effective techniques (e.g., Grusec & Goodnow, 1994). In one of the early studies illustrating this, Grusec, Kuczynski, Rushton, and Simutis (1978) found that children who were provided with a self-attributional explanation (e.g., "You shared because you like to help others") for their decision to donate a portion of game winnings to assist poor children showed more internalized sharing than children who had been instructed that they must share their winnings. That is, unlike

children who were made to share, those made to feel as though they shared because of their kind nature continued to donate winnings from subsequent games played in the absence of the adult two weeks later. The self-attributional explanation appeared to instill in the children the belief that sharing was something they enjoyed doing and which they believed was right, leading to internalized behaviour that manifested itself in the absence of adult surveillance. Being commanded to share, on the other hand, appeared to promote external attributions which interfered with internalization.

In summary, regardless of the approach taken to the study of parental control, it appears that the best developmental outcomes are associated with firm but flexible control, i.e., a parenting style in which the parent is warm, establishes clear guidelines but allows the child autonomy within those boundaries, and clearly communicates expectations and the reasons behind them (e.g., Baldwin, 1955; Baumrind, 1971; Sears, Maccoby & Levin, 1957). Deviations from this pattern of firm yet flexible control, whether they take the form of undercontrol or overcontrol, seem to be associated with poor developmental outcomes

(e.g., Baumrind, 1967, 1971; Maccoby & Martin, 1983).

Research from a transactional perspective. More recently, conceptions of parental control have been predicated on a transactional view of the parent-child relationship. As views of children have shifted, the recognition that children are active and spontaneous beings has led to greater awareness of the influence children have on their parents' behaviour as a result of such factors as their temperamental characteristics (e.g., Bell, 1968; Bell & Harper, 1977; Kochanska, 1995), their stage of development (Clifford, 1959; McNally, Eisenberg, & Harris, 1991; Roberts, Block, & Block, 1984), and the nature of their behaviour (e.g., Grusec & Kuczynski, 1980; Grusec, Dix, & Mills, 1982). More broadly, the "relationships" perspective in social and developmental psychology has brought recognition of the fact that parental control is a two-way process between partners in a relationship that changes over time. The observable tip of the relationship is the chain of actions and reactions that occur between parent and child, and its underlying substance is the thoughts and feelings that motivate actions and reactions.

This change in perspective has been accompanied by a

shift in the study of parental control, from a focus on the effectiveness of disciplinary methods in themselves to an attempt to understand how the parent's actions are influenced by the parent's interpretation and evaluation of the child's actions and how the effectiveness of these actions may be influenced by the child's interpretation and evaluation of the parent's actions (e.g., Grusec & Goodnow, 1994; Kochanska, 1991). Kochanska (1991), for example, has suggested that different types of parental control will be effective for children of different temperaments. In one study (Kochanska, 1995), gentle discipline deemphasizing power predicted internalization in temperamentally fearful children, while a secure attachment and a positive, mutually cooperative mother-child relationship was associated with internalization in temperamentally "fearless" children. Children who are temperamentally anxious may readily experience discomfort in response to actual or potential wrongdoing, and thus, minimal parental pressure may be sufficient to promote internalization in such children. Children who are not prone to anxiety may not be influenced by such subtle, psychological parental discipline. With these children, an increase in parental power may result in

high anxiety, but this may interfere with internalization; for such children, the most effective mechanisms of internalization may be ones which capitalize on the warmth of the parent-child relationship. When parents are consistently available, supportive, sensitive, responsive, and empathic, children are cooperative, compliant, and eager to internalize parental demands and values.

Along with these efforts to understand how children's response styles may mediate their responses to their parents' behaviour, attempts are also being made to uncover some of the perceptions and cognitions that mediate parents' responses to their children's behaviour and which may account for their styles of control. In particular, the perceptions and beliefs parents have about their ability to effectively control their children's behaviour appear to have a great deal to do with their approach to discipline. A number of theorists have suggested that control beliefs play an important role in all domains of human behaviour.

Constructs of Perceived Control

Theoretical conceptions about perceived control are rooted in the basic premise that people need to experience themselves as interacting effectively with the environment

and hence as competent in producing desired and preventing undesired events. In a classic paper arguing that "effectance" or competence is a primary motivation, White (1959) posited that human beings are intrinsically motivated to create effects on their environment, the goal of which is a "feeling of efficacy" (p. 323). These experiences contribute to a sense of competence or control, which motivates the individual to master the environment.

Various constructs of perceived control have been put forward. All have in common the assumption that the perception of control is an adaptive belief that promotes competence by motivating active problem-solving and accommodation to circumstances. The adaptive response, even in seemingly uncontrollable circumstances, is to maintain a belief in control; this motivates striving and increases the probability of effective action. Constructs have differed, however, in the degree to which they differentiate between different aspects of perceived control. Perceived control may encompass beliefs about the contingency between actions and their outcomes, the individual's competence to select and/or perform effective actions, and the causes of outcomes.

Contingency. The notion of efficacy expectations was developed in a social learning theory framework. In an early formulation, it was posited that people have perceptions of the contingency between their actions and the outcomes of their actions, and that these "action-outcome expectancies" vary in the perceived "locus of control" (Rotter, 1966; 1990). Individual differences in perceived locus of control were assumed to vary along a bipolar internal-external dimension. When people interpret events as being contingent on their own behaviour or characteristics, they are said to have a belief in internal control; when they interpret events as noncontingent, i.e., as occurring independently of their behaviour, they are said to believe in some type of external control (e.g., luck, chance, fate, powerful others).

Competence. In a later formulation, Bandura (1977) distinguished between response-outcome and outcome-consequence expectancies. He suggested that beliefs about the effectiveness of actions in producing outcomes will have no effect on behaviour unless the individual also believes that he or she have the ability to successfully execute the action required to produce the outcome. These "efficacy

expectations" affect the motivation to act. According to Bandura, people develop domain-specific beliefs about their efficacy, which guide their behaviour by determining what they try to achieve and how much effort they put into their performance in a particular situation. When people believe in their efficacy, they focus their attention on the task and engage in problem-solving until they find the effective response. They draw upon their previous experiences and their observations of others, and search until they find solutions to their problems. For example, the mother who believes herself to be an effective parent will think of alternative ways to soothe her child when cuddling does not help. It may occur to her, for example, that her child is hungry, and so she may give her child a bottle. If this has the desired effect, her belief that she is an effective caregiver will be confirmed. When people believe that they are ineffective and unable to perform well, they focus on their inability and become emotionally aroused. This interferes with effective performance which, in turn, confirms their belief that they are ineffective. Thus, for example, a mother who perceives herself as an ineffective parent, may abandon attempts to soothe her crying infant

when cuddling fails, and her belief that she is ineffective may be confirmed.

Causal attributions. From the perspective of attribution theory, perceived control can be viewed as causal attributions that can be arrayed along a number of dimensions. Attribution theorists begin with the premise that people need to explain the causes of events, and they postulate that the inferences people make about these causes play an important role in their behaviour by influencing their affective reactions and expectations. Weiner (1980, 1985), for example, postulated that when negative events occur, people make causal inferences on several different dimensions: the locus of causation (whether an event is caused by internal vs. external factors), the stability of the cause (the degree to which the cause is enduring vs. changeable), and the controllability of the cause (the extent to which the individual can vs. cannot control the cause). These inferences affect emotion and behaviour. Individuals, for example, who believe that their failure at a task was caused by an internal, uncontrollable, and stable cause will experience negative self-directed emotions (shame and/or guilt) and hopelessness (low expectancy). These

emotions and expectancies guide the individual's future behaviour. For example, a mother who ascribes her child's difficulty in toilet training to her own lack of competence as a parent (an internal, stable, and uncontrollable cause) may experience guilt, low self-esteem, and a sense of hopelessness about her ability to train her child.

In a synthesis of expectancy and attribution constructs, Seligman and Abramson (Abramson, Seligman, & Teasdale, 1978; Seligman, 1975) posited that when people repeatedly experience aversive events as noncontingent, they learn that no effective response exists. This is a generalized expectancy, referred to as "learned helplessness," that has disruptive effects on motivation, cognition, and behaviour. The attributions people make about the causes of their noncontingent experiences vary along the dimensions of stability, globality, and internality; these attributions determine the chronicity of the effects, their generality, and the extent to which self-esteem is affected. Individuals who believe that outcomes are noncontingent on their responses will react in ineffective ways such as with passivity and depression.

A differentiated model. In an attempt to integrate

these various frameworks and further differentiate the construct of perceived control, Skinner (1995) has suggested that three independent sets of generalized expectancies can be defined: the ability of the self to produce desired or prevent undesired events (control beliefs, e.g., "I can be an effective parent"), the extent to which certain causes are sufficient for the production of outcomes (strategy beliefs, e.g., "To be an effective parent, I have to be a good communicator"), and the extent to which the self possesses or has access to certain causes (capacity beliefs, e.g., "I can be a good communicator"). In this model, a distinction is made between beliefs about the self (capacity) and beliefs about causes (strategy). An individual's beliefs about control encompass beliefs about the multiple causes that produce outcomes, and these beliefs are quite independent of the individual's belief about his or her capacity to have access to these causes. These beliefs affect motivation and coping.

The Effect of Perceived Control on Parental Control

Although constructs of perceived control are becoming more differentiated, in the domain of parenting the research on perceived control has been guided by an attributional

perspective focusing on the dimensions of internality and controllability.

Much of what is known about perceived parental control and its effects on the way parents respond to their children derives from the work of Bugental and her colleagues (e.g., Bugental, 1992). She has argued, from a transactional perspective on the parent-child relationship, that individuals in any kind of mutually interdependent relationship will be concerned with the extent to which events in the relationship are controlled by the self, controlled by the other, or controlled jointly by self and other. To the extent that an individual believes that he or she has relatively low control, i.e., low control attributed to self relative to high control attributed to the other, he or she is more likely to be affectively reactive to the behaviour of others; these reactions have certain effects on the way the individual interacts with others.

From this perspective, perceived parental control is defined in relational terms, as the amount of power parents believe they have in situations of conflict with their child, relative to the amount of power they attribute to their child. The parent-child relationship is an authority

relationship; as such, the parent typically has more power than the child. The parent not only has more resources available for exerting influence, but also exercises this power more intentionally and purposefully than the child, particularly in the beginning. Normatively, then, parents with high perceived control will perceive themselves as having somewhat more control than their child does over parent-child interactions. Parents with low perceived control likely will feel that they have less control than their child. These perceptions will affect the way parents respond to their child.

To assess perceived parental control, Bugental developed the Parent Attribution Test (PAT). In this test, respondents are asked to indicate the importance of a number of potential causes of failure in a hypothetical caregiving situation. The potential causes are of four types: controllable by the self (e.g., caregiving motivation), uncontrollable by the self (e.g., mood or illness), controllable by the child (e.g., low effort or unpleasant disposition), and uncontrollable by the child (illness or fatigue). Perceived control is scored by combining respondents' ratings of all four types of causes.

Individuals with high perceived control would believe that interactional failures are influenced by controllable rather than uncontrollable factors (e.g., caregiving strategies, resistiveness or stubbornness), with their own control being somewhat greater than that of their child. Individuals with low perceived control would attribute low control to themselves and high control to their child, i.e., they would believe that interactional failures are influenced more by uncontrollable than controllable factors in themselves (e.g., illness more than desire to influence) and more by controllable than uncontrollable factors in their child (e.g., low effort or stubbornness more than illness or fatigue).

In an initial study of perceived control, Bugental and Shennum (1984) trained children to behave in a responsive or unresponsive manner, or selected them on the basis of these characteristics, and then had them interact with mothers to whom they were not related. Mothers who had low perceived control over caregiving outcomes, as assessed by the PAT, were more likely than other mothers to respond in a dysfunctional way to children who were unresponsive (e.g., who were slow to comply or were noncompliant to

conversational overtures or requests); with responsive children, they responded normally. With unresponsive children, mothers with low perceived control had a tendency to speak in a tone of voice that betrayed negative affect and to behave in an ingratiating way. This response style of negative affect combined with low self-assertion was suggestive of "learned helplessness."

The findings of this study seem to show that adults' perceptions of control affect the way they respond to children, and suggest that these responses vary depending on characteristics of the child. Adults with low perceived control responded in different ways to responsive and unresponsive children, and behaved more negatively toward unresponsive children, whereas adults with high perceived control responded in the same way to both types of children. The fact that the adults were unrelated to the children suggests that it was the perceptions of their own control rather than the relationship or shared history of experience with the child that accounts for the different quality of the responses made by low perceived control adults to responsive and unresponsive children. Other studies by Bugental and her colleagues provide some insight into the

way in which low perceived control affects caregivers' responses to unresponsive child behaviours.

The effect on affective arousal. Bugental, Blue, Cortez, Fleck, Kopeikin, Lewis, and Lyon (1993) found that, when exposed to unresponsive child behaviour, adults with low perceived control showed greater physiological arousal (increased heart rate and skin conductance) than did adults with high perceived control. In this study, subjects (women) believed that they were teaching a child a computer game via remote control; no actual interaction occurred. Depictions of the child's behaviour were computer-generated, and were of two types: responsive and unresponsive. In the responsive condition, the child's behaviour improved during the computer games. In the unresponsive condition, the child's behaviour showed decrements, which would give the impression that the child had the ability to perform the task but became careless and indifferent to the adult's instructions. Afterwards, the women gave a running commentary of their thoughts as they watched video replays of themselves; the affective valence of their thoughts was coded as negative, positive, or ambivalent.

Adults with low perceived control were significantly

more likely than adults with high perceived control to show increases in heart rate level and electrodermal activity during interactions involving unresponsive child behaviour, and to engage in negative thinking about these interactions. In response to responsive child behaviour, on the other hand, adults with low perceived control showed minimal levels of arousal and little negative thinking. Adults with high perceived control showed intermediate arousal levels in response to both responsive and unresponsive child behaviour. These findings seem to suggest that low perceived control has differential effects on affective arousal depending on the nature of the child's behaviour.

In another study, Bugental and Cortez (1988) had undergraduate women view videotapes of children with whom they were expecting to interact; some of the children were responsive (e.g., participated in conversation with an adult) and some were unresponsive (e.g., gave slow or no response at all to adult conversational overtures). Before, during, and after viewing, continuous readings were made of their heart rate, skin temperature, and skin conductance. Anticipated interaction with an unresponsive child tended to induce anxious arousal rather than positive interest or

attention, especially in women who scored low on perceived control. Again, preexisting beliefs moderated women's reactions to unresponsive children. Even in the anticipation of interaction with unresponsive children, women who perceived themselves as unable to control unresponsive child behaviour became anxious.

The finding that adults with low perceived control experience physiological arousal and negative affect during or even in anticipation of interaction with difficult children was interpreted by Bugental and her colleagues as an indication of physiological mobilization for defensive engagement with the environment, i.e., a stress response.

In another study (Bugental, Blue, & Cruzcosa, 1989; Bugental, Blue, & Lewis, 1990), mothers were observed interacting individually with each of two children, after which they rated the child on the degree to which the child was pleasant vs. annoying, friendly vs. unfriendly, cooperative vs. uncooperative, easy vs. difficult, and mature vs. dependent. The mothers were receiving counselling at a child abuse agency either because they had abused one or more of their children or because they were fearful of doing so. The mothers were observed interacting

briefly with each of their two children, one of whom they considered difficult and the other easy. A second group of mothers in the study was selected from the community; like the other group of mothers, they were observed interacting briefly with each member of the sibling pair, neither of whom they had met before.

Among the related mothers, those with low perceived control manifested more dysphoric affect (more sadness, less happiness) and more annoyance toward their children than those with high perceived control; how easy or difficult the child was made no difference. Among the unrelated mothers, low perceived control was associated with more dysphoric affect and annoyance, but primarily toward the difficult child and increasingly so as they became familiar with the child. Thus, mothers with low perceived control manifested more negative affect than those with high perceived control. The child's behaviour was an important moderating factor, but this was evident only with the unrelated mothers.

Other studies provide some insight into the effect of low perceived control on information processing in interactions with difficult children.

The effect on problem-solving. Bugental, Cortez, and

Lyon (1990; cited in, Bugental, 1992) found that perceived control influenced problem-solving ability. Forty mothers of school-aged children were shown a picture depicting a family-related problem and a second picture depicting a caregiving solution. They were then asked to tell a story about events that led up to the problem and events that led up to the solution. Individuals with low perceived control were found to generate more possible causes for the problem, in less time, than those with high perceived control; they did not differ in their description of events leading to the solution. When presented with a problem belonging to the child alone rather than a problem between parent and child, there were no differences in problem-focused thinking between mothers with high and those with low perceived control. These findings suggest that mothers with low perceived parental control, compared to those with high perceived parental control, may have ready access to problem-focused ideation related specifically to caregiving. Low perceived control mothers may, in other words, tend to think more negatively and pessimistically than other mothers. One result of this negative thinking may be the selection of ineffective strategies for influencing their

children's behaviour.

This conclusion is also supported by the literature on stress and coping, which provides evidence that coping depends on the extent to which individuals think they can do something to change the situation (Lazarus, 1993). An optimistic outlook seems to be associated with the use of problem-focused coping, i.e., engagement in problem-solving and reliance on social support, while pessimism is associated with emotion-focused coping, i.e., preoccupation or denial of the problem, and disengagement from the environment.

The effect on parental behaviour. At the behavioural level, individuals with low perceived control have been found to respond to "difficult" children in a response style of negative affect combined with low self-assertion, suggestive of "learned helplessness." Bugental and Shennum (1984), for example, found that women with low perceived control behaved in an ingratiating way with unresponsive children, e.g., they delivered positive statements in a relatively weak voice, their vocal intonation as a whole was somewhat unpleasant, and their smiles were exaggerated. In a similar study of difficult children at risk for physical

abuse, Bugental, Kopeikin, and Lazowski (1991) found that low perceived control women produced "unfelt" smiles at a more frequent rate during interactions with difficult children than with easy children; for high perceived control women, no differences were found. Unfelt smiles were smiles unaccompanied by eye involvement (appearance of crow's feet) or accompanied by facial actions indicative of negative affect (e.g., raising of their inner brows). It was suggested that this pattern of behaviour may be confusing to children because it contains conflicting messages of reassurance and disapproval.

Interestingly, it also appeared that children may perceive the sense of powerlessness felt by low perceived control adults. The ingratiating behaviour of low perceived control adults seemed to be noticeable to children, as evidenced by the fact that children were slower to respond during conversations (Bugental & Shennum, 1984) and showed more gaze aversion (Bugental, Kopeikin, & Lazowski, 1991) when they were interacting with low perceived control adults (women) than when they were interacting with high perceived control adults. Their responses may further reinforce perceptions of low perceived control in adults with low

perceived control.

Another type of behaviour associated with low perceived control may be the use of coercive types of control.

Bugental, Blue, and Cruzcosa (1989) found that mothers with low perceived control were more likely to be physically coercive than mothers with high perceived control, particularly with a difficult child. Physical coercion included spanking, pushing, slapping, punching, beating, and kicking; not surprisingly, mothers with an abuse history tended to use the more severe forms of physical coercion. The findings are consistent with studies indicating that abusive parents tend to have an external locus of perceived control (Ellis & Milner, 1981; Larrance & Twentyman, 1983), and suggest that low perceived control may be associated with coercive parenting behaviour, particularly when interacting with a difficult child.

To summarize, the findings of Bugental and her colleagues suggest that parents' beliefs about their ability to control their child influence their affective reactions, their problem-solving abilities, and their behavioural responses in parent-child interaction. When parents have low perceived control, they perceive "difficult"

parent-child interactions as threatening their sense of control. This interferes with their ability to think of constructive solutions to parent-child conflicts, and increases the likelihood that they will behave in inconsistent and coercive ways.

How perceived parental control affects parental control. How do perceptions of parental control influence parents' methods of control? The research of Bugental and her colleagues suggests that parents with high perceived control attribute unsuccessful caregiving outcomes to internal factors and factors that they can control, while those with low perceived control attribute them to external factors and factors that they cannot control. These attributions appear to be related to their affective reactions, their information processing, and their behaviour in interactions with children. To the extent that they attribute low control to themselves and high control to the child, they will respond negatively to difficult child behaviour.

The studies conducted by Bugental and her colleagues suggest that perceptions of control are embedded in a relational schema, i.e., a type of cognitive generalization

that serves to organize thoughts, feelings, and responses in interpersonal interactions. Adults with high perceived control will perceive themselves as being able to effectively influence caregiving outcomes and hence will not feel threatened by negative child behaviour, will engage in solution-oriented thinking, and will have positive expectations about what is likely to occur; consequently, they are able to engage in problem-solving unimpaired and hence are likely to respond to their child in a sensitive manner, using firm but flexible control. In contrast, low perceived control may reflect a "threat-oriented" schema in which it is believed that the child has more control than the adult. When faced with an ambiguous or challenging situation, adults with low perceived control will feel threatened, will experience negative emotions about the child, and will engage in pessimistic or problem-focused thinking about what is likely to occur; this will interfere with effective problem-solving and increase the likelihood of choosing ineffective strategies for controlling the child, such as coercion. Coercive behaviour may be a highly probable consequence of the negative affect associated with low perceived control, especially when taken in conjunction

with the established link between negative emotions and power assertive discipline (Dix & Lochman, 1990; Dix, Ruble, & Zambarano, 1989). If, as the findings also suggest, children seem to detect the feelings of powerlessness in adults with low perceived control (Bugental et al., 1991; Bugental & Shennum, 1984), a transactional process may occur in which the child's unresponsiveness further reinforces the parent's perceptions of low control, in turn strengthening the parent's tendency to behave in a coercive way.

As the research of Bugental and her colleagues suggests, then, parents' perceptions of their ability to parent effectively depend on both the history of experiences that they have with their child and on the generalized beliefs or schemas that guide their behaviour and which existed before the parent-child relationship began. Where do these schemas come from? It has been suggested that they may derive from representations of early attachment relationships (Bugental, 1992; Grusec, Hastings, & Mammone, 1994; Skinner, 1995). The importance of these representations is discussed below.

Attachment Representations and Perceived Parental Control

A relational schema is a cognitive generalization about

relationships formed from past experience (Baldwin, 1992). Relational schemas are comprised of three elements: an image of the self, an image of the other, and a script of the expected pattern of interaction between self and other. Each individual in a relationship is aware of his or her internal states during social interactions, infers something about the internal states of the other, and has a script of their expected interaction. Thus, an interpersonal schema includes expectations about the thoughts, feelings, and goals of both the self and the other and the interactions that will occur between them.

Using the notions of "conjoint schematicity" and "conjoint priming," Baldwin (1992) suggests how the three elements of relational schemas interact. If a person considers the self to be submissive, for example, he or she also should possess interpersonal scripts representing patterns of submissive-relevant interactions (e.g., "someone tells me what to do, and I do it"), as well as a schema for the other person in the interaction as domineering. This idea of conjoint schematicity implies that conjoint priming will occur, that is, if one element of a relational schema is primed, the other two elements should be accessible as

well. Reminding an individual of his or her occupational role (i.e., self-schema) as a doctor, for example, might momentarily lead the individual to see the person with whom he or she is interacting in terms of potential diagnostic categories (other schema) and to converse with the individual in a supportive fashion (interpersonal script).

There is an abundance of research suggesting that cognitive structures play an influential role in social cognition (e.g., Cantor, Mischel, & Schwartz, 1982; Sagar & Schofield, 1980). It is known, for example, that schemas lead individuals to interpret ambiguous information in a way that is consistent with their expectations (e.g., Bargh & Pietromonaco, 1982; Srull & Wyer, 1979), and to fill in gaps in information with "default" or expected values, i.e., by applying their expectations (e.g., Andersen & Cole, 1990; Rogers, Rogers, & Kuiper, 1979). Such influences can interfere with the development of new relationships by leading to a "false-alarm" effect, whereby personality attributes of a significant other are falsely applied to an individual who shares some of the attributes (Andersen & Cole, 1990). The nature of a schema is also such that it results in the explaining away of information that conflicts

with expectations (e.g., Kulik, Sledge, & Mahler, 1986; Swann & Ely, 1984; Swann & Read, 1981). As a result, for example, schemas can make therapeutic interventions difficult to accomplish.

As the research of Bugental and her colleagues suggests, beliefs about perceived parental control appear to function like a relational schema. Indeed, they may form a specific kind of relational schema, namely, a schema about caregiving relationships. This suggestion is developed further in the next section.

Caregiving schemas. Like other types of relational schemas, caregiving schemas are comprised of beliefs about the self, the other, and the self-other relationship. George and Solomon (1989) suggest that the "self" component includes beliefs about the self as a willing, able, and effective caregiver, while the "other" component includes corresponding beliefs about the child as an individual who wants and deserves care, is able to signal what is needed, and responds to care. Thus, caregiving representations are comprised of beliefs about the self and the other along three dimensions: willingness, ability, and effectiveness. The dimension of willingness encompasses beliefs

about one's willingness to provide care for the child, the child's willingness to accept care, and the child's entitlement to care (i.e., how deserving of care the child is). The dimension of ability encompasses beliefs about one's ability to read and understand the child's needs and the ability of the child to clearly indicate those needs. The dimension of effectiveness encompasses beliefs about the effectiveness of one's caregiving strategies and the child's ability to appropriately respond to these strategies. Being a secure base for one's child, i.e., a sensitive-responsive caregiver, requires a positive evaluation of both the self and the child on all three dimensions.

It can be argued, then, that beliefs about perceived parental control are an important aspect of caregiving schemas. According to George and Solomon (1989), and as the research of Bugental and her colleagues suggests, caregivers who believe in their ability to effectively influence their children's behaviour are more likely to be sensitive-responsive caregivers. Caregivers with high perceived control believe that they have the ability to effectively influence caregiving outcomes and as such would not perceive their child's behaviour as a deliberate attempt to sabotage

their control. Such individuals would perceive their child as a willing recipient of their care and therefore put forward the effort required to change the child's behaviour, even in the face of unresponsiveness, secure in the knowledge that they can influence the behaviour. Caregivers who believe that they do not have the ability to effectively influence their child's behaviour are more likely to be insensitive caregivers. Caregivers with low perceived control would perceive their child's difficult behaviour as a deliberate attempt to sabotage their shaky sense of control. Such caregivers believe that they are unable to influence the behaviour of their child, as the child is unwilling to accept their guidance; as a result, they experience negative affect which may, in turn, lead to coercive strategies or a desire to flee the situation.

As noted earlier, relational schemas represent regularities in patterns of interpersonal relating. They are generalizations drawn from past experience. As such, caregiving schemas may be derived from parents' representations of their attachment relationships with parents, particularly their constructions of the quality of these relationships in childhood.

Representations of early attachments. Bowlby

(1969/1980) used the term "internal working model" to refer to the mental representations of the attachment relationship between child and caregiver. These representations develop from patterns of interaction between the caregiver and the child. Through these patterns of interaction, the child develops expectations concerning the caregiver's availability and responsiveness, and complementary beliefs about self-worth and competence, which become organized into mental representations of the "self," the "caregiver," and their relationship. If the caregiver consistently acknowledges and responds to the child's need for comfort, protection, and exploration, the child will develop an internal representation of the caregiver as being available and dependable. The representation of the caregiver, in turn, leads to the development of complementary beliefs about the self. If the caregiver is available and responsive, the child will tend to view him or herself in a complementary way, i.e., as a valued person who is worthy of attention and care.

These beliefs about the caregiver, the self, and their relationship are cognitive generalizations, i.e.,

abstractions from past events. Their function is to help predict the caregiver's behaviour and guide responses to that behaviour. Thus, they influence the interpretation and appraisal of interactions with the caregiver, and help to determine responses to the caregiver. Children whose caregivers are sensitive and responsive will develop an internal working model of trustfulness, i.e., a belief that they will be protected and supported in times of need and that the world is a comfortable, predictable place. Such "secure" children expect that they will be supported and protected, and will behave accordingly. In the "Strange Situation" paradigm used to assess the quality of attachment in infancy (Ainsworth, Blehar, Waters, & Wall, 1978), "secure" children behave accordingly, i.e., they show mild protest during the mother's departure, seek the mother when she returns, and show inhibited exploration specifically during separation from the mother. An infant who expects to be rebuffed by the caregiver (presumably because the parent has consistently been rejecting in the past), will block awareness of attachment needs and the anger associated with these unmet needs. In the Strange Situation, this appears to be the strategy used by infants who fail to become

distressed upon the departure of the mother and avoid the mother upon her return. This pattern of behaviour is referred to as an "avoidant" attachment pattern. When the infant is apprehensive but not entirely certain about being rebuffed (presumably because the parent sometimes has been comforting), the infant feels ambivalent about the parent and becomes preoccupied with seeking the parent's love and approval. In the Strange Situation, this is the defensive coping style of "ambivalent" infants, who alternately cling to and push away the mother when she returns following her departure.

Because they are abstractions of past events, these internal working models tend to generalize to other relationships and tend to resist major changes in response to new information. As a result, the internal representations of relationships that form in early childhood tend to be carried forward and to guide behaviour in other relationships. Indeed, there is an extensive literature suggesting that attachment representations formed in infancy may influence the quality of children's peer relationships in early and middle childhood (e.g., Easterbrooks & Lamb, 1979; Lieberman, 1977; Pastor, 1981)

and the quality of romantic relationships in adulthood (e.g., Feeney & Noller, 1990; Hazen & Shaver, 1987; Kobak & Hazen, 1991). Indeed, these representations may influence all caregiving relationships in adulthood, including the parent-child relationship. Thus, it seems reasonable to view parental beliefs as reflections of the relational schemas that parents bring with them to the parent-child relationship (Grusec, Hastings, & Mammone, 1994).

In the next section, research is described examining the influence of mothers' attachment representations on their responses to caregiving situations.

Attachment representations and parenting behaviour.

There is some evidence to suggest that parents' attachment representations may be related to certain aspects of their behaviour as parents. Research has shown that the quality of mothers' attachment representations corresponds in coherent ways to the quality of their infants' attachments (e.g., Main, Kaplan & Cassidy, 1985; Posada, Waters, Crowell, & Keng-Ling, 1995). To assess mothers' attachment representations, George, Kaplan, and Main (1985) developed a semi-structured interview, known as the Adult Attachment Interview, in which mothers are asked to give five words or

phrases to describe their childhood relationship with each parent and to support each word or phrase with a memory. They are also asked what they did when they were upset, whether their parents ever threatened them, why they thought their parents behaved as they did, how they reacted to the death of important persons and what, if any, impact they thought their childhood parent-child relationship had on their present personality. Mothers were classified on the basis of the quality of their representations. Those classified as "secure" described their childhood relationships and experiences in a coherent manner. They conveyed a sense of valuing relationships and acknowledged the effects of their relationships on their personality. They also gave balanced descriptions of their own role in relationship difficulties and a tolerance of imperfection in themselves and their attachment figures. While their actual experience may have been negative or positive, their current state of mind with respect to this experience was open and coherent. Mothers classified as "preoccupied" with early attachment experiences appeared confused, unobjective, and mentally entangled in their descriptions, often appearing passive, fearful, or angry and conflicted. Mothers

classified as "dismissing" appeared to devalue the importance and impact of attachment relationships on their own lives, while making an implicit claim to strength, normality, and independence.

These attachment representations were found to mirror the patterns of attachment Ainsworth and her colleagues had found in infants (Main, Kaplan, & Cassidy, 1985). Mothers classified as Secure tended to have secure infants, those classified as Dismissing tended to have insecure-avoidant infants, and those classified as Preoccupied tended to have insecure-ambivalent infants. While mothers' responsiveness to their infants was not directly assessed, the findings indirectly suggest that mothers' representations of their early attachment relationships may be related to the quality of their parenting behaviour.

In a more direct demonstration of the influence that current representations of early attachment experiences may have on the quality of caregiving, Crowell and Feldman (1988) observed 64 mother-child dyads while they were engaged in problem-solving tasks. The mothers' behaviour during these sessions was rated on supportive presence (being calm and enthusiastic, focusing the child on the task

and fostering the child's sense of accomplishment) and the quality of assistance (helping the child understand the task and giving few hints to assist in completion of the task). Following the laboratory sessions, mothers were asked to complete the Adult Attachment Interview as a means of assessing their current mental representations of their childhood attachment relationships. Mothers classified as Secure were warm and supportive and gave helpful, concise directions to their children during difficult tasks. Mothers classified as Dismissing had a task-focused style characterized by coolness and remoteness and were less emotionally supportive or helpful. This behaviour corresponded to their descriptions of being pushed toward independence during childhood. Mothers classified as Preoccupied were also less supportive of their children, and gave instructions in such a confusing manner that the children often appeared overwhelmed. This inconsistent style of parenting corresponded to reports of their own parents' behaviour. These findings indicate that mothers' internal working models of attachment relationships are reflected in the quality of their caregiving as adults and that their parenting behaviour mirrors these

representations.

In a study of the relationship between caregivers' recollections of early attachment experiences, parenting behaviour, and child behaviour, Cohn, Cowan, Cowan, and Pearson (1992) found that caregivers' recollections of their early attachment relationships were related to their responsiveness toward their children during structured learning tasks. Dismissing and Preoccupied parents were less warm and provided their children with less structure (limit setting, maturity demands, communicating clearly about the task) than Secure parents during learning tasks. Thus, it appears that parents' recollections of their early attachment relationships influence their sensitivity and responsiveness toward their children.

Biringen (1990) also found that current representations of early attachment relationships are related to maternal responsiveness. She found that mothers' recollections of having been accepted by their own parents, as measured by the Mother-Father-Peer Scale (Epstein, 1983), were associated with appropriate and flexible responsiveness to infant behaviour, while recollections of rejection were associated with inharmonious interactions characterized by

awkward or abrupt handling, physical restraint, and hitting. These findings suggest that current constructions of parental acceptance vs. rejection in childhood are related to parental sensitivity vs. insensitivity.

It appears, then, that caregivers differ from one another in their representations of their early attachment relationships and that these representations are related to the way in which they respond to the needs of their children. Other studies suggest that perceived parental control may derive from these representations of early attachment relationships.

Attachment representations and perceived parental control. It was suggested above that internal working models of attachment may affect feelings of self-worth and competence. Bowlby (1969/1980) proposed that children build representational models of the self that are complementary to the beliefs they have about their attachment figures. A child whose parents are available and supportive will construct a representational model of self as able to cope and also as worthy of love and support. Conversely, a child whose parents are consistently lacking in responsiveness, who threaten abandonment or who actually abandon the child,

will tend to build a representational model of self as unworthy and unloveable. As such, internal representations of relationships appear to influence sense of self-worth and competency, with the sense of self being derived largely from experiences with others and what they convey about how the self is perceived. This notion that the sense of self is largely derived from inferences about others' perceptions has roots in symbolic interactionism (Cooley, 1902; Mead, 1934). Cooley (1902), for example, referred to the self derived in this way as the "looking-glass self." There is some evidence, albeit modest, that self-perceptions may be formed in this way (e.g., Shrauger & Schoeneman, 1979). Evidence that early attachments play a special role in this process is provided by Epstein (1983), who found that adults' reports of mother and father acceptance in childhood are more highly correlated with a sense of loveworthiness in adulthood than with any other of a wide range of personality variables. This finding suggests that adults' current constructions of their childhood attachments may reflect more than just their personality traits or current adjustment (but see Fox, 1995).

If global feelings of self-worth are related to felt

parental acceptance in childhood, then it seems reasonable to suggest that perceptions of parental control will also be related to felt parental acceptance. There has been very little examination, however, of the relations between perceived parental control and attachment representations. In a study which provides some indirect evidence, Ricks (1985) predicted that mothers' self-esteem and their memories of childhood would be related to the quality of mother-infant attachment. The participants in this study were twenty-eight mother-infant pairs living in stable middle-class families. The quality of mother-infant attachment was assessed when the infants were one year of age. Following this assessment, mothers' attachment representations and self-esteem were assessed. Representations of early attachment relationships were assessed using the Mother-Father-Peer Scale (Epstein, 1983). This is a self-report questionnaire that measures recollections of acceptance vs. rejection by mothers, fathers, and peers during childhood, and recollections of autonomy vs. overprotection by mothers and fathers. Mothers of securely attached infants had higher self-esteem and were more likely to report having been accepted and having been

encouraged to be self-reliant than were mothers of insecurely attached infants; that is, the more mothers tended to construe their early attachments as secure, the higher their self-esteem. These findings indicate that the quality of mothers' attachment representations is related to their level of self-esteem. Mothers who construe their early attachment relationships as having provided them with a feeling of acceptance and sense of autonomy, are more likely to have high self-esteem.

Ricks (1985) examined general sense of self-worth, and did not include a measure of perceived competence in the parenting domain. Thus, these findings do not establish a direct link between attachment representations and perceived parental control. However, there is one study in which this relation has been examined directly. Grusec, Hastings, and Mammone (1994) studied 94 parents (20 fathers and 74 mothers), each of whom had a child between the ages of 4 and 7. Twenty-seven of the children had been exposed to some form of maltreatment, and sixty-seven formed a control group matched for family income and education. The Adult Attachment Interview was used to assess parents' current mental representations of their childhood attachment

relationships; parents were classified as being either Preoccupied, Dismissive, or Secure. Bugental's Parent Attribution Test was used to assess parents' perceptions of parental control; perceived control over unsuccessful caregiving outcomes was scored by subtracting perceptions of child control from those of adult control. To assess parents' cognitions during challenging interactions with their children, parents were videotaped while persuading their children to clean up at the end of a play session. Later, parents were asked to observe a segment of the tape and to identify a time when things were not going well and they thought the child was behaving badly. The parents were then given a list of ten thoughts that parents sometimes have and were asked to check off those that had come to mind. Half the items were negative (e.g., "I can't take it much longer").

The results were as follows: Preoccupied parents reported themselves to have the most control over failure and Dismissive parents the least control, while Secure parents fell in between. The findings also revealed that Preoccupied parents endorsed the most negative thoughts, presumably a reflection of their high degree of rumination

over difficulties, and Dismissive parents the fewest negative thoughts, presumably in keeping with a desire to present themselves as self-confident and assured. Secure parents were intermediate, presumably in keeping with the fact that they are less "threat-oriented."

It is not entirely clear from these findings whether parents' constructions of their early attachment relationships are related to their perceived control over childrearing interactions. Parents who construed their early attachment relationships as secure seemed to perceive themselves as having control over caregiving outcomes. While some of the parents whose current constructions of their early attachments were marked by insecurity had reduced perceptions of control in the parenting domain (Dismissive parents), others were very high in perceived control (Preoccupied parents). It is difficult to interpret these findings in the absence of information about the children's characteristics which, as was suggested above, may contribute to parents' perceptions of their control over childrearing interactions. From a transactional perspective on parent-child interaction, child characteristics will moderate the relation between attachment representations and

perceived parental control, and need to be taken into account in studies of this relation. Perceived control may be highest when parents have "secure" representations (i.e., perceive parents as having been accepting and as having recognized one's autonomy) and easy or responsive children, and lowest when they have "insecure" representations (i.e., perceive parents as having been rejecting and as having not recognized one's autonomy) and difficult or unresponsive children.

Hypothesis and Predictions

The present study was designed to determine whether mothers' recollections of their early attachment experiences were related to the type of control they favour, and whether this relation was mediated by perceived parental control. On the basis of the foregoing review, it was hypothesized that the reported use of coercive discipline is determined by a parent's sense of parental control which, in turn, is influenced by both the child's behaviour and the parent's current representations of early attachment experiences. This hypothesis was suggested by attachment theory; by the findings described above linking the quality of attachment representations with self-esteem (Ricks, 1985), perceived

parental control (Grusec, Hastings, & Mammone, 1994), and patterns of parenting (e.g., Crowell & Feldman, 1988); and by the findings linking adults' perceptions of control with patterns of interaction with difficult or unresponsive children (e.g., Bugental, 1992).

The influence of the attachment representations that parents have of both their mothers and fathers needs to be studied. Although there is evidence that fathers play an important role in their children's development (e.g., Parke, 1995), very little is known about the differential impact that mothers and fathers may have on children's development. On the one hand, attachment theory suggests that internal working models derive from both parental relationships (Bowlby, 1980; Ainsworth et al., 1978). On the other hand, in the little research that exists, stronger effects have been found for mothers than for fathers (Carnelly, Pietromonaco, & Jaffe, 1994; Cobb & Barthelomew, 1996; Rothbaum, Schneider-Rosen, Pott, & Beatty, 1995; Rothbaum & Weisz, 1994). This difference has been attributed to the fact that mothers are the primary caregivers and hence the primary influence on children. With girls, it may also be due to the closer identification that develops with the

same-sex parent. Even so, the moderating effect of fathers may be considerable. Consequently, the role of both maternal and paternal attachment representations was examined.

Three predictions were derived from the hypothesis:

1. Low perceived parental control will be associated with the reported use of coercive discipline in mothers, particularly those with children whose behaviour is difficult or unresponsive. In keeping with the findings of Bugental, Blue, and Cruzcosa (1989), mothers with low perceived control were expected to report being more coercive (i.e., were in favour of harsh forms of control involving physical, verbal, and/or psychological force) than mothers with high perceived control, especially if they had a child with many problem behaviours.
2. Mothers' recollections of more secure childhood relationships (i.e., in which parents are perceived as having accepted them and encouraged their autonomy) will be associated with higher perceived parental control. Mothers' attachment representations of both mothers and fathers were explored.
3. Perceived parental control will mediate the relation

between recollections of childhood attachment relationships and reported use of coercive vs. noncoercive discipline.

The hypothesis was concerned with mothers only, as it is not known whether coercive discipline and perceived parental control have the same predictors in mothers and fathers. Because the theory and research suggesting the hypothesis are based primarily on mothers, the hypothesis may apply only to mothers. Thus, it was decided to determine first whether the hypothesis applied to mothers.

The study was done with a sample of mothers who participated in a larger study of child and family factors involved in the development of socioemotional adjustment in preschool-age girls. As this study was of girls only, the hypothesis was tested specifically in the context of the mother-daughter relationship.

Method

Sample

The sample is comprised of 107 mothers, each with a three-year-old girl. They were recruited through the Manitoba Health Services Commission (MHSC), with the exception of 10 recruited through word-of-mouth. A random sample of 600 two-parent families residing in Winnipeg, each

with a daughter between 38 and 45 months of age, was obtained from the MHSC. Each of these families was sent a letter describing the study. In order to obtain a measure of child adjustment from a source outside the family, only families whose daughter was attending daycare or nursery school were invited to participate. To obtain as broad a sample as possible and to encourage the participation of fathers, families were paid one hundred dollars for their participation.

In order to describe the demographic characteristics of the sample, information was gathered about mothers' age, level of education, employment status, religious affiliation, and family income (see Appendix 1). A summary of these characteristics is given in Table 1. Most of the mothers were in their thirties and had a high school or university education. Almost half were employed full-time, and most had family incomes above \$50,000.

Procedure

In the larger study from which the data were drawn, each family (mother, father, and 3-year-old daughter) visited the Child Development Centre of the Department of Family Studies. During their visit, the child and parents

Table 1

Sample Characteristics (N = 107)

Characteristics	<u>Mothers</u> (%)	<u>Fathers</u> (%)	<u>Family</u> (%)
<u>Age of mothers</u>			
20-29 years	13.7	6.8	---
30-39 years	83.3	80.6	---
40-49 years	2.9	11.7	---
59-59 years	0.0	1.0	---
<u>Level of Education</u>			
8 yrs./less	0.0	0.0	---
9 to 12 years	33.3	41.7	---
13 to 16 years	47.1	39.8	---
over 16 years	19.6	18.4	---
<u>Employment status</u>			
40 hrs./more	19.6	76.5	---
25 to 39 hours	24.5	19.6	---
15 to 24 hours	18.6	2.0	---
1 to 14 hours	12.7	0.0	---
Unemployed	24.5	2.0	---
<u>Religious affiliation</u>			
Catholic	19.6	16.7	---
Jewish	6.9	6.9	---

(table continues)

Characteristics	<u>Mothers</u>	<u>Fathers</u>	<u>Family</u>
	(%)	(%)	(%)
United	27.5	18.6	---
Anglican	6.9	8.8	---
Mennonite	2.9	2.9	---
Other	20.6	18.6	---
None	15.7	27.5	---
<u>Family Income</u>			
20-29,999	----	----	2.0
30-39,999	----	----	6.9
40-49,999	----	----	16.7
50-59,999	----	----	38.2
60-69,999	----	----	17.6
70,000+	----	----	18.6

were videotaped. As well, each parent completed the Child Rearing Practices Report, which was one of the measures used in the present study. At the conclusion of the visit, the parents were given two identical sets of questionnaires which they were asked to complete at home, within one week if possible, and return by mail in a stamped return envelope. The parents were asked to work on the questionnaires separately in order to ensure that their answers reflected their personal views. Mothers' responses to several of these questionnaires were analyzed in the present study. The questionnaires and the variables measured by them are shown in Table 2.

Assessment of Perceived Parental Control

Mothers' perceptions of parental control were assessed using the Parent Attribution Test (PAT; Bugental & Shennum, 1984; see Appendix 2). The PAT was developed to assess parental beliefs about the balance of control between parent and child. Respondents are presented with two brief scenarios describing caregiving situations, one a success ("suppose you took care of a neighbour's child one afternoon, and the two of you had a really good time together") and one a failure ("suppose you took care of a

Table 2

Study Variables and Measures

Variables	Measures
Perceived Parental Control	PAT
Attachment Representations	MFP
Use of Coercive Discipline	CRPR
	PDI
	PRM
	ATS
Child Problem Behaviours	PSP
	CBCL/2-3

Note. PAT = Parent Attribution Test; MFP = Mother-Father-Peer Scale; CRPR = Child Rearing Practices Report; PDI = Parenting Dimensions Inventory; PRM = Parental Responses to Misbehaviour; ATS = Attitudes Toward Spanking; PSP = Preschool Socioaffective Profile; CBCL/2-3 = Child Behaviour Checklist for Ages 2-3.

neighbour's child one afternoon, and the two of you did not get along well"). Each scenario is followed by 26 possible reasons for the outcome (e.g., "how unlucky you were in having everything just work out wrong", "how pleasant a disposition the child had"). Respondents are asked to assess the importance of each reason as a possible cause of the outcome by rating its importance on a 7-point scale ranging from 1 ("not at all important") to 7 ("very important").

The PAT was developed from a pool of possible causes initially generated on the basis of spontaneous attributions made by a sample of mothers. Multidimensional scaling and factor analyses revealed two major dimensions, one labelled locus (caregiver vs. child) and the other controllability (controllable causes vs. uncontrollable causes) (Bugental, Blue & Cruzcosa, 1989). It was further determined that perceived causes of caregiving failure (but not success) could be reduced to four factors of three items each. These factors were labelled High Adult Control Over Failure (ACF-high, items referring to little enjoyment of children, use of wrong approach, not getting along with children in general; Cronbach's alpha = .69), Low Adult Control Over

Failure (ACF-low, items referring to bad mood, illness, generally bad day; $\alpha = .78$), High Child Control Over Failure (CCF-high, items referring to disposition, resistiveness, lack of effort; $\alpha = .69$), and Low Child Control Over Failure (CCF-low, generally bad day, negative immediate circumstances, hunger; $\alpha = .51$). With the exception of CCF-low, the scales appeared to have a moderate degree of internal consistency and test-retest reliability (Bugental et al., 1989).

The PAT has some face validity as a measure of perceived control over caregiving interactions. There is also some evidence that the responses to the failure scenario (i.e., "suppose you took care of a neighbour's child one afternoon and the two of you did not get along") discriminate between subject groups in a predictable way. Compared to nonabusive parents, abusive parents attributed relatively low control over caregiving failures to themselves and relatively high control to the child; no difference was found for success attributions (Bugental et al., 1989). As well, as reported above, there is evidence that the failure scenario predicts mothers' attachment representations (Grusec, Hastings, & Mammone, 1994) and

their reactions in caregiving situations (e.g., Bugental et al., 1989; Bugental et al., 1990; Bugental et al., 1993).

Because the failure scenario has better psychometric properties than the success scenario, the failure scenario was used to index perceived parental control in the present study. There are two methods of scoring, one which involves assigning respondents to categories (e.g., low perceived control respondents would be above the median on CCF and below the median on ACF), and one which involves creating a continuous variable. The latter method was used in the present study. In this method, Perceived Parental Control (PPC) is scored by computing two composite scores and subtracting one from the other (Grusec, Hastings, & Mammone, 1994). First, a composite ACF score is computed by averaging six items concerned with adult control, three describing high control (e.g., "whether you used the wrong approach for this child") and three (reverse-scored) describing low control (e.g., "what kind of mood you were in that day"); scores range from 1 to 7, with higher scores reflecting greater perceived adult control.

Next, a composite score is computed by averaging six items concerned with the child's control, three describing

high control (e.g., "how unpleasant a disposition the child had") and three (reverse-scored) describing low control (e.g., "whether the child was tired or not feeling well"); scores range from 1 to 7, with higher scores reflecting greater perceived child control.

Next, to create a continuous variable indexing PPC, the composite CCF score is subtracted from the composite ACF score. This score can range from -6 to +6, with low scores reflecting the belief that caregiving failures are due to low caregiver control and high child control, high scores reflecting a belief that caregiving failures are due to high caregiver control and low child control, and intermediate scores reflecting the perception of a relative balance of control.

Assessment of Attachment Representations

Mothers' current constructions of their childhood attachments to their parents were assessed using the Mother-Father-Peer Scale (MFP; Epstein, 1983; see Appendix 3), a self-report measure which evaluates two dimensions of childhood experiences with parents and peers. The scale consists of 70 items. With reference to each of their parents separately, respondents rate their agreement (1 =

strongly disagree; 5 = strongly agree) with each of a series of statements describing their experience of their parents during childhood. The Acceptance vs. Rejection subscale consists of 10 items concerned with the extent to which the parents communicated love, acceptance, and appreciation of the child, as opposed to viewing the child as undesirable, a burden, a nuisance, and a source of unhappiness or disappointment; the Independence-Encouragement vs. Overprotection subscale consists of 13 items concerned with the degree to which parents accepted and encouraged the child's independence, self-reliance, and the development of social and other skills versus the degree to which they overprotected the child, worried about the child's health and safety, and failed to help the child learn to function independently; an additional Parent Idealization scale consists of 7 items concerned with the degree to which the parent is idealized. The Peer Interaction Scale consists of 10 items concerned with whether peers accepted, liked, respected, or admired the child and wanted to be friends with him or her versus disliked, teased, disrespected, or avoided the child and would not pick him or her for their teams. The subscales for mother, father, and peers have

acceptable test-retest reliability (ranging from .82 to .93), as assessed with male and female college students, and reasonable external validity as evidenced by significant positive correlations with self-esteem and ego strength, and significant negative correlations with neuroticism. The psychometric properties of the Parent Idealization subscale have not been evaluated; high scores on this subscale may indicate defensiveness, but young adults who show high acceptance of cultural norms also obtain high scores on this subscale.

The subscales for mothers and fathers were analyzed in the present study. The Acceptance vs. Rejection subscale for each parent is scored by summing the ratings for the 10 items in this subscale to create a total acceptance score; these scores can range from 10 to 50, with higher scores indicating greater felt acceptance by the parent. The Independence-Encouragement vs. Overprotection subscale for each parent is scored by summing the 13 ratings in this subscale to create a total encouraged-independence score; these scores can range from 13 to 65, with higher scores indicating greater felt encouragement of independence by the parent. An overall index of the quality of Mothers'

Recollections of Their Mothers (MRM) was computed by standardizing the subscale scores and summing them. An index of the quality of Mothers' Recollections of Their Fathers (MRF) was computed in the same way.

Assessment of Coercive Discipline

Mothers' reported use of coercive discipline was assessed by creating a composite index comprised of items drawn from four measures.

Child Rearing Practices Report. The Child Rearing Practices Report (CRPR; Block, 1965/1991; see Appendix 4) consists of 91 socialization-relevant statements phrased in the active voice and stating precise descriptions of childrearing attitudes, values, behaviours, and goals (e.g., "I threaten punishment more often than I actually give it"). It is administered in a Q-sort format with a forced-choice procedure, which minimizes response bias. Each statement appears on a separate card. Parents are asked to sort the cards into 7 groups of 13 cards each, and to put the groups into seven envelopes labelled from "least descriptive" of the parent's beliefs to "most descriptive."

The CRPR has adequate test-retest reliability (across one year the average correlation for the individual items is

.71 with a range of .38 to .85) and stability across time (correlations across a nine-year interval were significant for 73% of the items for mothers and 56% of the items for fathers) (Block, 1965/1991; Roberts, Block, & Block, 1984). There is also some evidence that it has construct validity, as assessed by the degree of correspondence between CRPR self-descriptions on item clusters and observed parental behaviour (Block, 1965/1991; Dekovic, Janssens, & Gerris, 1991; Kochanska, Kuczynski, & Radke-Yarrow, 1989), and for its predictive validity, as assessed by the relation between CRPR scores on item clusters and the psychological functioning of children between three and seven years of age (Block, Block, & Morrison, 1981).

The items are scored from 1 ("least descriptive") to 7 ("most descriptive") according to the envelope in which they are placed. In the present study, selected items were used to assess coercive discipline, as described later.

Parenting Dimensions Inventory. The Parenting Dimensions Inventory (PDI; Slater & Power, 1987; see Appendix 5) is a 54-item self-report instrument that assesses nine dimensions of parenting. Three scales assess parental support or warmth (Nurturance, Responsiveness to

Child Input, and Nonrestrictive Attitude), three assess parental control (Type of Control, Amount of Control, and Maturity Demands), and three assess parental structure (Consistency, Organization, and Involvement). The items were drawn from existing instruments with known psychometric properties or were generated by the authors. Confirmatory factor analyses were performed to determine whether each scale tapped only one parenting dimension; items that loaded on more than one factor were dropped. The resulting scales are internally consistent (Cronbach's alpha's range from .54 to .79). Predictive validity has also been established, as evidenced by the fact that the PDI is a significant predictor of children's behaviour problems. Although the PDI was originally developed with parents of school-age children, with the exception of several scales (Maturity Demands, Nonrestrictive Attitude, Organization, and Amount of Control), there is evidence of its validity and reliability with parents of preschool-age children (Power, Kobayashi-Winata, & Kelley, 1992). In the present study, selected items were used to assess coercive discipline, as described later.

Parental Response to Misbehavior. This is a

questionnaire which lists nine discipline techniques (reason, distract, negotiate, threaten, use time-out, spank, ignore, withdraw privileges, yell in anger) in response to common child misbehaviors (PRM; Holden & Zambarano, 1992; see Appendix 6). Parents report on a 7-point scale how frequently they use each technique in an average week (0 = never; 6 = nine or more times a week). Evidence that the techniques load on separate factors in a predictable way suggests that the PRM has good construct validity (Kochanska, 1995). In the present study, selected items were used to assess coercive discipline, as described later.

Attitudes Toward Spanking. In this questionnaire, parents rate on a 7-point scale their agreement with 10 statements about their use of and views on spanking (1 = strongly disagree; 7 = strongly agree) (ATS; Holden & Zambarano, 1992; see Appendix 7). In previous studies using this measure, alpha's ranged from .89 to .94; test-retest reliability was .76 (Holden & Zambarano, 1992; Kochanska, 1995). The ATS is scored by summing the ratings of the 10 statements; the resulting score can range from 10 to 70, with higher scores indicating stronger belief in the use of spanking.

Composite index of coercive discipline. For the purpose of this study, coercive discipline was defined as the reported use of harsh forms of control involving physical force, verbal force and/or psychological harm. To assess mothers' reported use of this type of discipline, a composite index, labelled Coercive Discipline (see Appendix, 8), was computed using items selected from the four assessment instruments described above. Coercive Discipline (CD) was defined as the extent to which mothers reported that they use each of the following types of coercion: physical discipline (four items, one from each of the four measures), yelling (two items, one from the PDI and one from the PRM), threatening (two items, one from the CRPR and one from the PRM), using isolation (two items, one from the CRPR and one from the PRM), and/or using guilt/shame-induction (four items, all from the CRPR). The items were selected on the basis of their face validity as indices of each type of coercion. The more coercive a mother is, the more likely she is to report using one or more of the coercive behaviors that define the construct. Indeed, some of the items included in the index (spanking, threatening, and yelling items from the PRM, and the total ATS score) have been found

to be strongly interrelated (Kochanska, 1995).

To compute the index, physical discipline, yelling, threatening, isolation, and guilt/shame-induction were computed by standardizing and summing the items within them. Next, each of the resultant five scores was standardized. These five scores were then summed to create the composite index, Coercive Discipline. The internal consistency of these five indices was assessed by computing Cronbach's alpha's. For physical discipline, yelling, threatening, isolation, and guilt/shame induction, the coefficients were .81, .68, .40, .52, and .32, respectively. As would be expected given these generally low coefficients, the internal consistency among the five forms of coercive discipline was also low, .53. This suggests that the index was not a highly reliable measure of mothers' reported use of coercive discipline. The results of analyses using this index must be treated with caution.

Assessment of Child Problem Behaviours

Difficult or unresponsive child behaviour was defined as problem behaviour of either an internalizing or externalizing nature. Difficult or unresponsive child behaviour was assessed by using teachers' and fathers'

ratings of children's problem behaviours. The two sets of ratings were aggregated to create a composite index of child problem behaviours.

Preschool Socioaffective Profile. Day care or nursery school teachers (two when possible) who were familiar with the child were asked to complete independently the short form of the Preschool Socioaffective Profile (PSP; LaFreniere, Dumas, Capuano, Coutu, & Giuliani, 1993; LaFreniere, Dumas, Capuano, & Dubeau, 1992; see Appendix 9). When ratings could be obtained from two teachers, the ratings of the two teachers were averaged. The PSP assesses the socioemotional functioning of preschool children between two and six years of age. Teachers rate the frequency of a variety of emotional and social behaviors on a 6-point scale (1 = sometimes; 6 = always).

The PSP yields scores on three factors: internalizing behaviour, externalizing behaviour, and social competence. The short form of the scale, which consists of 30 items, has documented reliability across several samples (internal consistency indicated by Cronbach's alpha's ranging from .77 to .92, inter-rater indicated by correlations ranging from .78 to .91, and test-retest indicated by correlations

ranging from .78 to .86 over two weeks). For each factor, correlations of about .90 have been found between the scale scores obtained with the short and long forms. These factors (long form) have been concurrently validated by substantial correlations with the teacher-rating form of the Child Behaviour Checklist for 6-11-year-olds (Achenbach & Edelbrock, 1983): .53 (girls) and .63 (boys) for internalizing behaviour and .66 (girls) and .64 (boys) for externalizing behaviour, and by the ability of the three factors to differentiate a clinical sample from a normative sample (LaFreniere et al., 1992). Construct validity has been demonstrated by coherent relations between scores on the three factors and indices of peer interaction (LaFreniere et al., 1992).

The internalizing and externalizing factors were analyzed in the present study. The short form of the internalizing factor is comprised of ten items describing anxious, isolated, and depressed behaviours (neutral expression; tired; worries; timid; sad; inhibited; inactive; remains apart; doesn't talk; goes unnoticed); the factor loadings range from .49 to .70. The short form of the externalizing factor is comprised of ten items describing

angry, aggressive, and oppositional behaviors (easily frustrated; angry when interrupted; irritable; screams easily; forces others; hits, bites, or kicks; gets into conflicts; hits teacher; opposes teacher; defiant); the factor loadings range from .58 to .84. Teachers' assessments of child problem behaviours were indexed by summing the internalizing and externalizing factor scores.

Child Behaviour Checklist for Ages 2-3. This parent-report measure was completed independently by mothers and fathers, using the version for two-to-three-year-olds (CBCL/2-3; Achenbach, 1992; Achenbach, Edelbrock, & Howell, 1987; see Appendix 10). In order to have an assessment of child behaviour from someone other than the mother, only fathers' assessments of the problem behaviour were used. The CBCL consists of 99 items describing problematic behaviours, each of which is rated on a three-point scale from 0 (not true as far as you know) to 2 (very true or often true). The CBCL assesses a wide range of socioemotional difficulties, including both specific syndromes as well as the more broad-band internalizing-externalizing groupings. The CBCL/2-3 has good reliability (test-retest correlations of .87 for internalizing and .84

for externalizing, inter-parent agreement at age three averaging .60) and good construct, discriminant, and predictive validity. Construct validity has been demonstrated by correlations ranging from .56 to .77 between the CBCL/2-3 and the Richman Behaviour Checklist; discriminant validity is indicated by differentiation between demographically matched referred and nonreferred children; and predictive validity is suggested by substantial predictive relations between the CBCL/2-3 at age three and CBCL/4-16 at ages four, five, and six. Parents' assessments of child problem behaviours were indexed by summing the internalizing and externalizing factor scores.

Aggregate index of child problem behaviours. To examine the consistency among the ratings of teachers, fathers, and mothers, correlations were computed. There was a moderately strong correlation between fathers' and teachers' ratings $r(72) = .35, p < .01$, and between mothers' and teachers' ratings $r(72) = .31, p < .01$. Fathers' and mothers' ratings were quite strongly correlated, $r(72) = .47, p < .001$. Thus, fathers appeared to be in as much agreement with teachers as were mothers. To create the aggregate index, fathers' and teachers' scores were

standardized, and the two standardized scores were summed.

Results

The purpose of the present study was to test the hypothesis that mothers' reported use of coercive discipline is determined by their sense of parental control, and that this, in turn, is influenced by both their child's behaviour and their current representations of early attachment relationships. Three predictions were derived from the hypothesis. Firstly, it was expected that low perceived parental control would be associated with the reported use of coercive discipline in mothers, particularly those with children whose behaviour is difficult or unresponsive. Secondly, it was expected that mothers' recollections of secure childhood relationships (i.e., parents are perceived as having accepted them and encouraged their autonomy) would be associated with higher perceived parental control. Finally, it was expected that perceived parental control would mediate the relation between the felt security of childhood relationships and the reported use of coercive discipline.

Preliminary Analyses

Before testing these predictions, the study variables were examined to assess their distributional properties and the appropriateness of the planned regression analyses. The descriptive statistics for all of the variables in their original form, and tests of skewness and kurtosis for the aggregate indices, are shown in Table 3.

Perceived parental control. As described earlier, this variable was created by computing two scores (Adult Control over Failure and Child Control over Failure) and subtracting the second from the first. Descriptive statistics for the adult-control and child-control scores, and for the Perceived Parental Control (PPC) score computed from them, are shown in Table 3. As the table shows, there was little variation in the scores. While Adult Control Over Failure and Child Control Over Failure could range from 1 to 7, they were relatively restricted in range, especially in the case of Child Control Over Failure. As a result, PPC also had a somewhat restricted range. Mothers were fairly homogeneous, generally perceiving themselves as having more control than their children. When examined for normality using the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test, it was found that the distribution

Table 3

Descriptive Statistics for the Variables

Variables	<u>M</u> (<u>SD</u>)	Range	Skewness (SE ^a)	Kurtosis (SE)
Perceived Parental Control				
Adult Control	4.08 (.6)	2.50 - 5.67		
Child Control	3.74 (.5)	2.33 - 4.83		
PPC	0.31 (.8)	-1.00 - 2.67	.14 (.3)	.12 (.5)
Attachment Representations				
Mother	86.14 (14.9)	43 - 110	-.68 (.3)	.21 (.5)
Father	85.36 (17.1)	37 - 111	-.87 (.3)	.16 (.5)
Coercive Discipline				
Physical	-0.02 (3.2)	-3.79 - 9.96		
PDI	8.24 (3.7)	6.00 - 22.00		
ATS	28.63 (13.4)	10.00 - 59.00		
PRM	0.75 (.7)	0.00 - 3.00		
CRPR#14	1.74 (1.1)	1.00 - 6.00		
Yelling	-0.02 (1.8)	-3.10 - 4.09		
PDI	14.05 (5.9)	6.00 - 30.00		
PRM	2.51 (1.5)	0.00 - 6.00		
Threatening	-0.01 (1.6)	-2.69 - 4.14		
CRPR#50	4.37 (1.7)	1.00 - 7.00		
PRM	2.51 (1.5)	0.00 - 6.00		

(table continues)

Variables	<u>M</u> (<u>SD</u>)	Range	Skewness (SE ^a)	Kurtosis (SE)
Isolation	-0.04(1.6)	-4.62 - 3.80		
PRM	2.50(1.4)	0.00 - 6.00		
CRPR#7	5.16(1.5)	1.00 - 7.00		
Guilt/Shame	9.41(3.2)	4.00 - 21.00		
CRPR#64	1.73(1.2)	1.00 - 7.00		
CRPR#65	1.92(1.4)	1.00 - 7.00		
CRPR#66	2.29(1.4)	1.00 - 7.00		
CRPR#73	3.42(1.7)	1.00 - 7.00		
Composite	0.09(2.98)	-4.89 - 8.35	.54(.3)	-.09(.5)
Child Problem Behaviours				
Teachers	34.69(9.1)	20.00 - 59.00		
Fathers	20.38(10.7)	0.00 - 53.00		
Aggregate	-0.01(.9)	-1.86 - 2.70	1.03(.5)	1.24(.5)

Note. Sample size for the study variables ranged from 91 - 107, with the exception of teachers' ratings of child problems (n = 85).

^aSE = standard error.

of the PPC scores differed somewhat from normal but not significantly, $D(91) = .07$, $p > .20$.

Attachment representations. Descriptive statistics for the variables indexing mothers' attachment representations of their mothers (MRM) and fathers (MRF) are shown in Table 3. As the table shows, mothers as a group tended to perceive their mothers and fathers positively. The mean for MRM ($M = 86.14$) was closer to the high than the low end of the range (23 to 115) with only a moderate amount of variance in scores ($SD = 14.94$). Similarly, the mean for MRF ($M = 85.36$) was closer to the high than the low end of the range (23 to 115) with only a moderate amount of variance in scores ($SD = 17.11$). Examination of the variables revealed that the distribution of the MRM scores differed somewhat from normal but not significantly, $D(91) = .07$, $p > .20$. The distribution of the MRF scores deviated moderately from normal $D(91) = .11$, $p < .01$. A square-root transformation was done to improve the normality of the distribution, $D(101) = .06$, $p > .20$. The descriptive statistics presented in Table 3, however, were computed with the untransformed scores.

Coercive discipline. Coercive discipline (CD) was

operationally defined as the reported use of any or all of the following five forms of coercion: physical discipline (4 items), yelling (2 items), threatening (2 items), use of isolation (2 items), and guilt/shame induction (4 items). Descriptive statistics for the individual items, the subtypes, and the overall composite score are given in Table 3. As the table shows, mothers reported little use of coercive discipline. The mean for CD ($M = .09$) was closer to the low than to the high end of the range (-4.89 to 8.35). The distribution of CD scores was normal, $D(96) = .07$, $p > .20$.

Child problem behaviours. Descriptive statistics for the teacher, father, and aggregate child problem behaviour scores are shown in Table 3. As the statistics show, children were perceived as having relatively few behaviour problems. Indeed, the scores were very positively skewed, with most of the scores near the low end of the distribution. Attempts to transform the data failed to normalize the distribution. Given the form of the distribution, it was decided for purposes of the regression analyses to dichotomize the variable (Tabachnick & Fidell, 1989). This was done by classifying children above the

median as having "many" problems (coded 2) and those below the median as having "few" problems (coded 1).

Intercorrelations among the variables. To examine the zero-order correlations among the variables, a series of correlations was computed. The results are shown in Table 4. Because the data were ordinal, and regression analysis requires at least interval data, the correlations were computed twice, once using a method for ordinal data (Spearman rank-order correlation) and once using a method for interval data (Pearson product-moment correlation). Nonsignificant differences between the results of the two methods would suggest that the ordinal data were functionally equivalent to interval data and hence could be subjected to regression analysis. There were no significant differences, with z scores ranging from .00 to .52, all ns.

As expected, there was a significant positive correlation between Coercive Discipline (CD) and Child Behaviour Problems (CPROB) ($r = .18, p < .05$). Contrary to expectations, mothers' perceptions of control (PPC) were not significantly related to their reported use of coercive discipline. They were, however, related to their attachment representations, at least of fathers (MRF) ($r = .18, p <$

Table 4

Intercorrelations Among the Variables

Variables	PPC	MRM	MRF	CD	CPROB
PPC	---	.07	.18*	-.05	-.11
MRM		---	.50***	-.33***	-.17*
MRF			---	.04	.03
CD				---	.18*

Note 1. Sample size for the study variables ranged from 96 to 107, due to missing values for some variables.

Note 2. PPC = Perceived Parental Control; MRM = Mothers' Recollections of Their Mothers; MRF = Mothers' Recollections of Their Fathers; CD = Coercive Discipline; CPROB = Child Problem Behaviours.

* $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$; *** $p < .001$.

.05). Attachment representations of mothers (MRM) were significantly correlated with CD ($r = -.33$, $p < .001$) and CPROB ($r = -.17$, $p < .05$), but not with PPC. As well, a significant correlation was found between MRM and MRF, $r = .50$, $p < .001$.

Main Analyses

The three predictions were tested using regression analysis. Regression analysis assumes that a linear relationship exists between the independent and dependent variables and that the errors are independent, with constant variance and normally distributed with a mean of 0. For each analysis, these assumptions were checked by plotting the standardized residuals against the independent variables, constructing a histogram of the Studentized residuals, and looking for outliers. There were no violations of the assumptions, as evidenced by random variation of the points about the line originating from the mean of the residuals (indicating linearity, independence, and homoscedasticity), approximately normal distribution of the residuals (indicating normality), and an absence of extreme scores.

Prediction 1: Relation between Perceived Parental Control and Coercive Discipline. It was expected that low perceived control would be associated with coercive discipline, particularly in mothers whose children were difficult or unresponsive. To test this prediction, a hierarchical (forced entry) regression analysis was computed to predict Coercive Discipline (CD). Child Problem Behaviours (CPROB) was entered in step one (1 = few problems; 2 = many problems), followed by mothers' Perceived Parental Control (PPC) in step two, and the product of the two variables (CPROB x PPC) in step three. The results are shown in Table 5. As table 5 shows, mothers' perceptions of parental control were not significantly related to coercive discipline.

Additional analyses were done to explore the possibility that mothers at the extreme ends of the distribution (high and low) in perceived parental control differed qualitatively in some way, such that the relation with coercive discipline was obscured. Some of the previous research hints at this possibility. In particular, Grusec, Hastings, and Mammone (1994), using the continuous variable scoring method, found that perceived parental control was

Table 5

Hierarchical Regression Analysis Predicting Coercive Discipline (N=106)

<u>V</u> ariables	<u>B</u>	<u>SE B</u>	<u>Beta</u>	<u>R² Change</u>	<u>F</u>
Step 1					
CPROB	.85	.54	.15	.02	2.49
Step 2					
PPC	-.26	.28	-.09	.01	0.88
Step 3					
CPROB x PPC	-.07	.56	-.04	.00	0.02

Note 1. CPROB = Child Problem Behaviours (1 = few problems; 2 = many problems); PPC = Perceived Parental Control.

Note 2. R² = .03, ns.

related to attachment representations in an unexpected manner; while some of the parents whose current constructions of their early attachments were marked by insecurity had reduced perceptions of control in the parenting domain, others were relatively high in perceived control. As well, Bugental has noted that the categorical method of scoring, in which subjects are categorized as high or low in perceived control, yields better results, i.e., stronger relations between perceived parental control and other variables (Bugental, 1994).

To explore the possibility that mothers with extremely high or low perceived control differ in kind, not just degree, the sample was divided into three groups: mothers with low perceived control (PPC score below the 33.3rd percentile) ($n = 32$), mothers with high perceived control (PPC score above the 66.7th percentile) ($n = 33$), and mothers perceiving a relative balance of control (PPC score above the 33.3rd and below the 66.7th percentile) ($n = 26$). Mothers with low perceived control reported the most coercion ($M = .44$, $SD = 3.18$), those with high perceived control reported the least ($M = -.07$, $SD = 2.89$), and those

with intermediate perceptions of control fell in between ($M = .06$, $SD = 3.14$). While the means differed in the predicted direction, a one-way factorial analysis of variance indicated that perceived control (high, intermediate, low) had a nonsignificant effect on reported coercion, $F(2, 88) = .24$, ns.

Prediction 2: Relations between Attachment Representations and Perceived Parental Control. It was expected that mothers' recollections of secure attachment relationships (i.e, in which parents are perceived as having accepted them and encouraged their autonomy) would be associated with higher perceived control. To test this prediction, a hierarchical regression analysis was computed to predict mothers' Perceived Parental Control (PPC). Child Problem Behaviours (CPROB) were entered in step one (1 = few; 2 = many) as a covariate, followed by Mothers' Recollections of Their Mothers (MRM) in step two, and Mothers' Recollections of Their Fathers (MRF) in step three. A hierarchical method of regression was used, as the purpose of the analysis was to determine whether mothers' representations of their mothers added to the variance in perceived control over and above the effect of their

children's behaviour (the covariate), whether their representations of their fathers added any further predictive power, and whether representations of their mothers and fathers had any interactive effect.

The results of the analysis are shown in Table 6. As the table shows, MRM was not significantly related to PPC (R^2 change = .00), but MRF was (R^2 change = .05, $p < .02$). The more mothers felt that their fathers had accepted them and encouraged their autonomy, the higher their perceived parental control. The joint effect of MRM and MRF was nonsignificant.

Prediction 3: Mediating Role of Perceived Parental Control. It was predicted that perceived parental control would mediate the relation between the felt security of childhood and coercive discipline. However, because the test of Prediction 1 indicated that the relationship between perceived parental control and reported use of coercive discipline was nonsignificant, no analysis of mediation was warranted.

Discussion

The purpose of this study was to determine whether mothers' recollections of their early attachment

Table 6

Regression Analysis Predicting Perceived Parental Control in Mothers

(N=106)

Variables	<u>B</u>	<u>SE B</u>	Beta	<u>R²</u> Change	<u>F</u>
Step 1					
CPROB (covariate)	-.15	.15	-.09	.01	0.94
Step 2					
MRM	-.03	.08	.04	.00	0.16
Step 3					
MRF	.21	.09	.26	.05	5.66*
Step 4					
MRM x MRF	-.10	.07	-.13	.02	1.83

Note 1. CPROB = Child Problem Behaviours (1 = few; 2 = many problems);

MRM = Mothers' Recollections of Their Mothers; MRF = Mothers'

Recollections of their Fathers.

Note 2. $R^2 = .08$, $p < .08$.

* $p < .02$.

relationships with their parents are related to the type of control they use, and whether this relationship is mediated by perceived parental control. It was hypothesized that a parent's use of coercive discipline is determined by the parent's sense of parental control, and that this, in turn, is influenced by both the child's behaviour and the parent's current representations of early attachment relationships. On the basis of this hypothesis, it was predicted that low perceived parental control would be associated with reported use of coercive discipline in mothers, particularly those with children whose behaviour is difficult or unresponsive; that mothers' recollections of secure attachment relationships would be associated with higher perceived parental control; and that perceived parental control would mediate the relation between the perceived quality of childhood relationships and mothers' reported use of coercive discipline.

The first prediction was made on the basis of a study by Bugental, Blue, and Cruzcosa (1989). Consistent with their finding that mothers with low perceived control were more likely to be physically coercive than mothers with high perceived control, particularly with a difficult child, it

was expected that mothers with low perceived control would report using more coercive discipline than mothers with high perceived control, especially if they had a child whose behaviour was difficult or unresponsive. No such relationship was found, however.

There may be several possible explanations for the discrepancy between the present findings and those of Bugental, Blue, and Cruzcosa (1989). One is related to the psychometric properties of the measure of coercive discipline used in the present study. As noted earlier, the measure lacked internal consistency and hence cannot be considered either reliable or valid. Given the generally questionable validity of self-report measures of childrearing attitudes and practices (Holden & Edwards, 1989), it would seem important to include an observational measure of coercion in future studies.

Another reason for the failure to find a relationship between perceived control and coercive discipline may lie in the type of parents studied. The mothers in the present study reported little use of coercive discipline, and generally perceived themselves as having control. Thus, the correlation between perceived parental control and coercive

discipline may have been attenuated by floor and ceiling effects and restricted range. Perhaps it is only when perceived control is very low that it tends to be associated with coercive discipline. In the only other study that has been done examining the relationship between perceived control and coercive discipline (Bugental, Blue, & Cruzcosa, 1989), the sample was comprised of mothers who were receiving counselling at a child abuse agency either because they had abused one or more of their children or were fearful of doing so. Low perceived control may lead to more coercive discipline only in high risk groups such as this. In normative groups, low perceived control may be associated with greater directiveness rather than coercion.

It is also possible that low perceived control leads to coercive discipline only under certain conditions. One moderating factor included in the present study was the nature of the child's behaviour. While there was no evidence for a moderating effect of the child, this may be because the children were generally perceived as having few difficulties. Other moderating factors undoubtedly need to be examined in order to identify conditions under which low perceived control may increase the likelihood of coercive

discipline. The presence of stress, for example, may be important. The mothers in Bugental et al.'s (1989) study may have been under considerable stress. Thus, it is possible that a relationship exists between perceived parental control and coercive discipline but only under certain conditions.

In other studies by Bugental and her colleagues (e.g., Bugental & Cortez, 1988; Bugental, Blue, & Cruzcosa, 1989; Bugental, Blue, & Lewis, 1990) low perceived parental control was found to be related to variables that might be expected to increase the likelihood of coercive discipline. Bugental and her colleagues have found that perceptions of control influence affective reactions, problem-solving abilities, and behavioural responses in parent-child interaction. Adults with low perceived control, even those from nonclinical groups, appear to perceive "difficult" or "unresponsive" child behaviour as threatening to their sense of control. These individuals have been found to experience physiological arousal and negative affect even in anticipation of interacting with difficult children, they have difficulty thinking of constructive solutions to adult-child conflict, and they respond to difficult children in an

ingratiating manner. All of these factors might be expected to increase the likelihood of using coercive discipline. As such, the hypothesis remains plausible and warrants further research using a more valid assessment of coercive discipline, including a broader assessment of parental coercion, comparing different types of mothers, and taking into account other possible moderating factors.

The second prediction was partially confirmed. It was expected that mothers' recollections of having been accepted and encouraged to be independent by their parents would be associated with higher perceived parental control. Consistent with this prediction, mothers' recollections of attachment relationships were found to be related to their perceptions of parental control; however, only with respect to their perceptions of their fathers. This finding is somewhat surprising, as in the little research that exists, stronger effects have been found for mothers than for fathers (e.g., Rothbaum, Schneider-Rosen, Pott, & Beatty, 1995; Rothbaum & Weisz, 1994), presumably because mothers are the primary influence. While it should not be surprising to find that fathers have some effect, given the view that representations of self and others derive from

both parental relationships (Bowlby, 1980), it is somewhat surprising to find an effect for fathers but not mothers.

As such, the meaning of this finding is open to speculation. Interestingly, there is some consistency between the findings of the present study and a recent study of fathers' influence on women's relational schemas (Dresner & Grolnick, 1996). In this study, women who perceived their fathers as having been accepting of them and as having encouraged their independence (assessed using the Mother-Father-Peer Scale) were more capable of intimacy (more able to be close to another while maintaining respect for their own and the other's autonomy). Their perceptions of their mothers, on the other hand, were not related to their capacity for intimacy. It was suggested, from a psychoanalytic perspective, that fathers may play an important role in promoting their children's individuation from the mother; individuation entails clear boundaries and hence provides the basis for a strong capacity for intimacy.

Other research suggests that fathers may play a special role in promoting the development of emotion regulation skills; such skills may, in turn, lead to a sense of control over events. In a study of the relationship between parent-

child interaction styles and peer competence, MacDonald and Parke (1984) found that girls whose teachers rated them as popular had emotionally expressive fathers (i.e., fathers who elicited high levels of positive affect and relied on questions more than directives). Interestingly, Isley, O'Neil, and Parke (1994; cited in, Parke, 1995) found that fathers' level of affect and control predicted children's peer competence both concurrently and one year later after controlling for maternal effects. Moreover, Boyum and Parke (1995) found a negative correlation between fathers' negative affect expressions, including anger, disgust, and anxiety, and their kindergarten children's sociometric status. In this study, no significant correlations were found for mothers. These findings suggest that fathers' emotional expressiveness may have a strong influence on their children's development of social competence.

Parke (e.g., Parke, 1995) suggests that interaction with an emotionally expressive parent who at the same time gives opportunities to regulate the tempo and pace of the interaction teaches the child how to send and recognize emotional signals during social interactions. Indeed, children who are skilled at this appear to be more socially

competent, including less controlling and more willing to adapt to the activities of their peers (e.g., Denham, McKinley, Couchoud, & Holt, 1990). According to Parke (1995), fathers tend to be very playful in their style of interaction, and hence provide the kind of affect-arousing play that promotes the learning of emotional communication skills. It is possible, therefore, that they exert a strong influence on their children's development of emotional communication skills and social competence and, through this, their perceptions of control in interpersonal relationships. These findings suggest that fathers play an important role in the development of these perceptions.

While fathers appear to play an important role in these perceptions there is no unequivocal evidence to suggest that they play a more important role than mothers. Some studies indicate that mothers are more predictive of their daughters' relationship schemas and skills than fathers (Carnelly, Pietromonaco, & Jaffee, 1994; Cobb & Barthelomew, 1996). The findings may differ depending on the specific aspect of parental behaviour being examined. Clearly, more research is needed to elucidate the nature of the relation that might exist between women's attachment representations

of their mothers and fathers and their perceptions of control.

In summary, the findings of this study, while inconclusive, suggest several avenues that need to be pursued. The hypothesis was strongly suggested by attachment theory; by findings linking the quality of attachment representations to self-esteem (Ricks, 1985), perceived parental control (Grusec, Hastings, & Mammone, 1994), and patterns of parenting (e.g., Crowell & Feldman, 1988); and by findings linking adults' perceptions of control with patterns of information processing and behaviour that would be conducive to coercive discipline (e.g., Bugental, 1992). As suggested above, the lack of support for the hypothesis may be due to an inadequate measure of coercive discipline and the type of sample studied. As such, it remains plausible and should be tested further with a broader and more valid measure of parental coercion, different types of mothers should be compared, and other possible moderating factors should be examined. The counterintuitive finding that recollections of fathers had more predictive power than recollections of mothers also calls for more research on the influence that fathers may

have on their daughters' perceptions of control.

References

- Abramson, L. Y., Seligman, M. E. P., & Teasdale, J. (1978). Learned helplessness in humans: Critique and reformulation. Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 87, 49-74.
- Achenbach, T. M. (1992). Manual for the Child Behaviour Checklist/2-3 and 1992 Profile. Burlington, VT: University of Vermont Department of Psychiatry.
- Achenbach, T. M., & Edelbrock, C. S. (1978). The classification of child psychopathology: A review and analysis of empirical efforts. Psychological Bulletin, 85, 1275-1301.
- Achenbach, T. M., & Edelbrock, E. (1983). Manual for the Child Behaviour Checklist and Revised Child Behaviour Profile. Burlington, VT: T. M. Achenbach.
- Achenbach, T. M., Edelbrock, C., & Howell, C. T. (1987). Empirically based assessment of the behavioural/emotional problems of 2- and 3-year-old children. Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology, 15, 629-650.
- Achenbach, T. M., McConaughy, S. H., & Howell, C. T. (1987). Child/adolescent behavioural and emotional problems: Implications of cross-informant correlations for situational specificity. Psychological Bulletin, 101, 213-

232.

Aiken, L. S., & West, S. G. (1991). Multiple regression: Testing and interpreting interactions. Newbury Park: Sage.

Ainsworth, M. D. S., Blehar, M., Waters, E., & Wall, S. (1978). Patterns of attachment: A psychological study of the strange situation. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Andersen, S. M., & Cole, S. W. (1990). "Do I know you?": The role of significant others in general social perception. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 59, 384-399.

Baldwin, A. L. (1955). Behaviour and development in childhood. New York: Dryden Press.

Baldwin, M., W. (1992). Relational schemas and the processing of social information. Psychological Bulletin, 112, 461-484.

Bandura, A. (1977). Self-efficacy: Toward a unifying theory of behaviour change. Psychological Review, 84, 191-215.

Bargh, J. A., Bond, R. N., Lombardi, W. J., & Tota, M. E. (1986). The additive nature of chronic and temporary sources of construct accessibility. Journal of Personality

and Social Psychology, 50, 869-878.

Bargh, J. A., & Pietromonaco, P. (1982). Automatic information processing and social perceptions: The influence of trait information presented outside of conscious awareness on impression formation. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 43, 437-449.

Baron, R. M., & Kenny, D. A. (1986). The moderator-mediator variable distinction in social psychological research: Conceptual, strategic, and statistical considerations. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 51, 1173-1182.

Baumrind, D. (1967). Child care practices anteceding three patterns of preschool behaviour. Genetic Psychological Monographs, 75, 43-88.

Baumrind, D. (1971). Current patterns of parental authority. Developmental Psychology, 4, 103.

Baumrind, D., & Black, A. E. (1967). Socialization practices associated with dimensions of competence in preschool boys and girls. Child Development, 38, 291-327.

Becker, W. C., & Krug, R. S. (1964). A circumplex model for social behaviour in children. Child Development, 35, 371-396.

Bell, R. Q. (1968). A reinterpretation of the direction of effect. Psychological Review, 75, 81-95.

Bell, R. Q., & Harper, L. V. (Eds.), (1977). Child effects on adults. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Biringen, Z. (1990). Direct observation of maternal sensitivity and dyadic interactions in the home: Relations to maternal thinking. Developmental Psychology, 26, 278-284.

Block, J. H. (1965/1991). The child-rearing practices report (CRPR): A set of O items for the description of parental socialization attitudes and values. Unpublished manuscript, Berkeley, CA: University of California, Institute of Human Development.

Block, J. H., Block, J., & Morrison, A. (1981). Parental agreement-disagreement on the child-rearing orientations and gender-related personality correlates in children. Child Development, 52, 965-974.

Bowlby, J. (1969). Attachment and loss. Vol.1: Attachment. New York: Basic Books (2nd rev. ed., 1982).

Bowlby, J. (1980). Attachment and loss. Vol.3: Loss, sadness and depression. New York: Basic Books.

Boyum, L., & Parke, R. D. (1995). The role of family

emotional expressiveness in the development of children's social competence. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 57, 1-16.

Bugental, D. B., (1992). Affective and cognitive process within threat-oriented family systems. In I. Sigel, A. V. McGillicuddy-Delisi, & J. J. Goodnow (Eds.), Parental belief systems: The psychological consequences for children (2nd ed., pp. 219-248). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Bugental, D. B., (1994). Parent Attribution Test. Unpublished manuscript, Santa Barbara, CA: University of California.

Bugental, D., Blue, J., & Curzosa, M. (1989). Perceived control over caregiving outcomes: Implications for child abuse. Developmental Psychology, 25, 532-539.

Bugental, B. D., Blue, J., & Lewis, J. (1990). Caregiver beliefs and dysphoric affect directed to difficult children. Developmental Psychology, 26, 631- 638.

Bugental, D. B., Blue, J., Cortez, V., Fleck, K., Kopeikin, H., Lewis, J. C., & Lyon, J. (1993). Social cognitions as organizers of autonomic and affective responses to social challenge. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 64, 94-103.

Bugental, D. B., & Cortez, V. (1988). Physiological reactivity to responsive and unresponsive children - as modified by perceived control. Child Development, 59, 686-693.

Bugental, D. B., Kopeikin, H., & Lazowski, L. (1991). Children's responses to authentic versus polite smiles. In K. Rotenberg (Ed.), Children's interpersonal trust (pp. 58-79). New York: Springer-Verlag.

Bugental, D. B., & Shennum, W. A. (1984). Difficult children as elicitors and targets of adult communication patterns: An attributional-behavioral transactional analysis. Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development, 49(1, Serial No. 205).

Cantor, N., Mischel, W., & Schwartz, J. C. (1982). A prototype analysis of psychological situations. Cognitive Psychology, 14, 45-77.

Carnelley, K. B., Pietromonaco, P. R., & Jaffe, K. (1994). Depression, working models of others, and relationship functioning. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 66, 127-140.

Clifford, E. (1959). Discipline in the home: A controlled observational study of parenting practices.

Journal of Genetic Psychology, 95, 45-82.

Cobb, R. J., & Bartholomew, K. (1996). Childhood rejection, attachment representations, and depression. Unpublished manuscript, Burnaby: Simon Fraser University.

Cohn, D. A., Cowan, P. A., Cowan, C. P., & Pearson, J. (1992). Mothers' and fathers' working models of childhood attachment relationships, parenting styles, and child behaviour. Development and Psychopathology, 4, 417-431.

Cooley, C.H. (1902). Human nature and the social order. New York: Schocken.

Crowell, J. A., & Feldman, S. (1988). Mother's internal models of relationships and children's behavioral and developmental status: A study of mother-child interaction. Child Development, 59, 1273-1285.

Dekovic, M., Janssens, J. A. M., & Gerris, J. R. M. (1991). Factor structure and construct validity of the Block Child Rearing Practices Report (CRPR). Psychological Assessment: Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 3, 182-187.

Denham, S., McKinley, M., Couchoud, E. A., & Holt, R. (1990). Emotional and behavioural predictors of preschool peer ratings. Child Development, 61, 1145-1152.

Dix, T., & Lochman, J. E. (1990). Social cognition and negative reactions to children: A comparison of mothers of aggressive and nonaggressive boys. Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology, 9, 418-438.

Dix, T. H., Ruble, D. N., & Zambarano, R. J. (1989). Mothers' implicit theories of discipline: Child effects, parent effects, and the attribution process. Child Development, 60, 1373-1391.

Dresner, R., & Grolnick, W. S. (1996). Constructions of early parenting, intimacy and autonomy in young women. Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, (13), 25-39.

Easterbrooks, M. A., & Lamb, M. E. (1979). The relationship between quality of infant-mother attachment and infant competence in initial encounters with peers. Child Development, 50, 380-387.

Ellis, R. H., & Milner, J. S. (1981). Child abuse and locus of control. Psychological Reports, 48, 507-510.

Epstein, S. (1983). Mother-Father-Peer Scale. Unpublished manuscript, Amherst, MA: University of Massachusetts.

Feeney, J. A., & Noller, P. (1990). Attachment style as a predictor of adult romantic relationships. Journal of

Personality and Social Psychology, 58, 281-291.

Fox, N. A. (1995). Of the way we were: Adult memories about attachment experiences and their role in determining infant-parent relationships: A commentary on van Ijzendoorn. Psychological Bulletin, 117, 404-410.

George, C., Kaplan, N., & Main, M. (1985). Adult Attachment Interview (AAI). Unpublished manuscript, Berkley: University of California.

George, C., & Solomon, J. (1989). Internal working models of caregiving and security of attachment at age six. Infant Mental Health Journal, 10, 222-237.

Grusec, J. E., Dix, T., & Mills, R. (1982). The effects of type, severity, and victim of children's transgressions on maternal discipline. Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science, 14, 276-289.

Grusec, J., E., & Goodnow, J., J. (1994). Impact of parental discipline methods on the child's internalization of values: A reconceptualization of the current points of view. Developmental Psychology, 30, 4-19.

Grusec, J. E., Hastings, P., & Mammone, N. (1994). Parenting cognitions and relationship schema. In J. G. Smetana (Ed.), Beliefs about parenting: Origins and

developmental implications (pp. 5-19). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Grusec, J. E., & Kuczynski, L. (1980). Direction of effect in socialization: A comparison of the parent versus the child's behaviour as determinants of disciplinary techniques. Developmental Psychology, 16, 1-9.

Grusec, J., E., Kuczynski, L., Rushton, J., P., & Simutis, Z., M. (1978). Modelling, direct instruction, and attributions: Effects on discipline. Developmental Psychology, 14, 51-57.

Hazan, C., & Shaver, P. (1987). Romantic love conceptualized as an attachment process. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 52, 511-524.

Holden, G. W., & Edwards, L. A. (1989). Parental attitudes toward child rearing: Instruments, issues, and implications. Psychological Bulletin, 106, 29-58.

Holden, G. W., & Zambarano, R. J. (1992). Passing the rod: Similarities between parents and their young children in orientations toward physical punishment. In I. E. Sigel, A. V. McGillicuddy-DeLisi, & J. J. Goodnow (Eds.), Parental belief systems: The psychological consequences of children (2nd ed., pp. 143-172). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Kobak, R. R., & Havan, C. (1991). Attachment in marriage: Effects of security and accuracy of working models. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 60, 861-869.

Kochanska, G. (1991). Socialization and temperament in the development of guilt and conscience. Child Development, 62, 1379-1392.

Kochanska, G. (1995). Children's temperament, mother's discipline, and security of attachment: Multiple pathways to emerging internalization. Child Development, 66, 597-615.

Kochanska, G., Kuczynski, L., & Radke-Yarrow, M. (1989). Correspondence between mothers' self-reported and observed child-rearing practices. Child Development, 60, 56-63.

Kulik, J. A., Sledge, P., & Mahler, H. I. M. (1986). Self-confirmatory attribution, egocentrism, and the perpetuation of self-beliefs. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 50, 587-594.

LaFreniere, P. J., Dumas, J. E., Capuano, F., Coutu, D., & Giuliani, L. (March, 1993). The Revised Preschool Socio-affective Profile. Paper presented at the Biennial Meeting of the Society for Research in Child Development, New

Orleans.

LaFreniere, P. J., Dumas, J. E., Capuano, F., & Dubeau, D. (1992). The development and validation of the Preschool Socioaffective Profile. Psychological Assessment: Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 4, 442-450.

Larrance, D. T., & Twentyman, C. T. (1983). Maternal attributions and child abuse. Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 92, 449-457.

Lazarus, R. S. (1993). From psychological stress to the emotions: A history of changing outlooks. Annual Review of Psychology, 44, 1-21.

Lieberman, A. F. (1977). Preschoolers' competence with a peer: Relations with attachment and peer experience. Child Development, 48, 1277-1287.

Maccoby, E. E., & Martin, J. A. (1983). Socialization in the context of the family: Parent-child interaction. In P. H. Mussen (Series Ed.) & E. M. Hetherington (Vol. Ed.), Handbook of child psychology. Vol 4: Socialization, personality, and social development (4th ed., pp. 1-101).

New York: Wiley.

MacDonald, K., & Parke, R. D. (1984). Bridging the gap: Parent-child play interaction and peer interactive

competence. Child Development, 55, 1265-1277.

Main, M., Kaplan, N., & Cassidy, J. (1985). Security in infancy, childhood, and adulthood: A move to the level of representation. Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development, 50(1-2, Serial No. 209).

McNally, S., Eisenberg, N., & Harris, J. D. (1991). Consistency and change in maternal child-rearing practices and values: A longitudinal study. Child Development, 62, 190-198.

Mead, G. H. (1934). Mind, self, and society. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Parke, R. D. (1995). Fathers and families. In M. H. Bornstein (Ed.), Handbook of parenting. Vol. 3: Status and social conditions of parenting (pp. 27-63). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Pastor, D., L. (1981). The quality of mother-infant attachment and its relationship to toddlers' initial sociability with peers. Developmental Psychology, 17, 326-335.

Posada, G., Waters, E., Crowell, J., & Keng-Ling, L. (1995). Is it easier to use a secure mother as a secure base? Attachment Q-sort correlates of the adult attachment

interview. In E. Waters, B. Vaughn, G. Posada & K. Kondo-Ikemura (Eds.), *Caregiving, cultural, and cognitive perspectives on secure-base behaviour and working models*. Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development, 60.

Power, T. G., Kobayashi-Winata, H., & Kelley, M. L. (1992). Childrearing patterns in Japan and the United States: A cluster analytic study. International Journal of Behavioral Development, 15, 185-205.

Ricks, M. (1985). The social transmission of parental behaviour: Attachment across generations. In I. Bretherton & E. Waters (Eds.), *Growing points of attachment theory and research*. Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development, 50(1-2, Serial No. 209).

Roberts, G. C., Block, J. H., & Block, J. (1984). Continuity and change in parents' child-rearing practices. Child Development, 55, 586-597.

Rogers, T. B., Rogers, P. J., & Kuiper, N. A. (1979). Evidence for the self as a cognitive prototype: The "false alarm effect." Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 5, 53-56.

Rothbaum, F., Schneider-Rosen, K., Pott, M., & Beatty,

M. (1995). Early parent-child relationships and later problem behaviour: A longitudinal study. Merrill-Palmer Quarterly, 41, 133-151.

Rothbaum, F., & Weisz, J. R. (1994). Parental caregiving and child externalizing behaviour in nonclinical samples: A meta-analysis. Psychological Bulletin, 116, 55-74.

Rotter, J.B. (1966). Generalized expectancies for internal versus external control of reinforcement. Psychological Monographs, 80(1, Whole No. 609).

Rotter, J.B. (1990). Internal versus external control of reinforcement: A case history of a variable. American Psychologist, 45, 489-493.

Sagar, H.A., & Schofield, J.W. (1980). Racial and behavioral cues in black and white children's perceptions of ambiguously aggressive acts. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 39, 590-598.

Schaefer, E. S. (1959). A circumplex model for maternal behaviour. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 59, 226-235.

Schaefer, E. S., & Bayley, N. (1963). Maternal behaviour, child behaviour, and their intercorrelations from

infancy to adolescence. Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development, 28(3, Serial No. 87).

Sears, R. R., Maccoby, E., & Levin, H. (1957). Patterns of child rearing. Evanston, Il: Row, Peterson.

Seligman, M. E. P. (1975). Helplessness: On depression, development, and death. San Francisco: Freeman.

Shrauger, J. S., & Schoeneman, T. J. (1979). Symbolic interactionist view of self-concept: Through the looking glass darkly. Psychological Bulletin, 86, 549-573.

Skinner, E. A. (1995). Perceived control, motivation, & coping. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Slater, M. A., & Power, T. G. (1987). Multidimensional assessment of parenting in single-parent families. Advances in Family Intervention, Assessment and Theory, 4, 197-228.

Srull, T. K., & Wyer, R. S. (1979). The role of category accessibility in the interpretation of information about persons: Some determinants and implications. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 37, 1660-1662.

Swann, W. B., Jr., & Ely, R. J. (1984). A battle of wills: Self-verification verses behavioral confirmation. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 46, 1287-1302.

verification processes: How we sustain our self-conceptions. Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 17, 351-372.

Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (1989). Cleaning up your act: Screening data prior to analysis. In J. Rothman, & E. MacElree (Eds.), Using multivariate statistics (2nd ed.). United Kingdom : Harper Collins Inc.

Weiner, B. (1980). A cognitive (attribution)-emotion-action model of motivated behaviour: An analysis of judgements of help-giving. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 39, 186-200.

Weiner, B. (1985). An attributional theory of achievement orientation and emotion. Psychological Review, 92, 548-573.

White, R. W. (1959). Motivation reconsidered: The concept of competence. Psychological Review, 66, 297-333.

10. How long have you lived in Canada? (check one):
- Less than 1 year ₁
- 1 to 5 years ₂
- 5 to 10 years ₃
- More than 10 years ₄
- All my life ₅
11. Other than Canadian, to what ethnic or cultural group do you yourself belong? (Please fill in your response):
- _____ ethnic or cultural group
12. Which activities do you participate in as a member of your ethnic or cultural group? (Check the ones you participate in):
- Eating special foods ₁
- Special in-home ceremonies ₂
- Ethnic volunteer organizations ₃
- Other (specify:). ₄
- None. ₅
13. What is your religious affiliation, if any? (Check one:)
- Roman Catholic ₁
- Jewish. ₂
- Protestant (United) ₃
- Protestant (Anglican) ₄
- Mennonite ₅
- Other (specify:). ₆
- None. ₇
14. To what degree would you say religion has an influence on your life? (Check one:)
- Very strong influence. ₁
- Somewhat strong influence ₂
- Very little influence ₃
- No influence. ₄
15. What is your marital status? (check one):
- Cohabiting. ₁ For how long? ____ yrs.
- Married ₂ For how long? ____ yrs.
16. If married, is this your first marriage? ₁ second? ₂ third? ₃ (check one)
17. So that we can describe the group of families participating in this study, please indicate your income for the past year (that is, total income before taxes) of all members of the family residing in your household, by checking one of these income categories:
- Under \$10,000 ₁
- \$10,001 to \$20,000 ₂
- \$20,001 to \$30,000 ₃

- \$30,001 to \$40,000 []₄
 \$40,001 to \$60,000 []₅
 \$60,001 to \$75,000 []₆
 Over \$75,000 []₇

18. Answer the question below by circling one of the numbers, as follows:

1 = Never 2 = Sometimes 3 = Often 4 = Very Often

During the last six months, how frequently did your family:

- 1) Cut back on social activities and
 entertainment? 1 2 3 4
- 2) Postpone major household
 purchases? 1 2 3 4
- 3) Postpone clothing
 purchases? 1 2 3 4
- 4) Change transportation patterns
 to save money? 1 2 3 4
- 5) Change food shopping or eating habits
 to save money? 1 2 3 4
- 6) Cut back on charitable
 contributions? 1 2 3 4
- 7) Reduce household utility
 use? 1 2 3 4
- 8) Sell some
 possessions? 1 2 3 4
- 9) Take additional employment to
 help meet expenses? 1 2 3 4

19. Which of the following best describes what has happened to your family income during the past six months? (check one):

- Has increased very much []₁
 Has increased somewhat []₂
 Has remained the same []₃
 Has decreased somewhat []₄
 Has decreased very much []₅

20. Which of the following best describes your family financially at this time? (check one):

- No problems []₁
 Minor problems. []₂
 Major problems. []₃
 Extreme problems []₄

Appendix 2
Parent Attribution Test

In this section, we want to know how important you believe different factors might be as potential causes of successful and unsuccessful interaction with children. We are interested in discovering the way people think about children -- there are no right or wrong answers.

Example: If you were teaching a child an outdoor game and he or she caught on very quickly, how important do you believe these possible causes would be?

- | | not at all
important | very
important |
|---|-----------------------------|-------------------|
| a. how good he or she is in sports in general | ---- ---- ---- ---- ---- | |
| | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 | |
| | (Circle one of the numbers) | |
| b. how good a teacher you are | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 | |
| | (Circle one of the numbers) | |
| c. how easy the game is | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 | |
| | (Circle one of the numbers) | |

Answer the following questions by making ratings in the same way as shown above.

1. **Suppose you took care of a neighbour's child one afternoon, and the two of you had a really good time together. How important do you believe the following factors would be as possible reasons for such an experience?**

- | | not at all
important | very
important |
|--|-------------------------|-------------------|
| a. whether or not this was a "good day" for the child, e.g., whether there was a TV show s/he particularly wanted to see (or some other special thing to do) | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 | |
| b. how interested you were in being with the child that day | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 | |
| c. how well you get along with children in general | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 | |
| d. how lucky you were in just having everything work out well | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 | |
| e. how much the child enjoys being with adults | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 | |
| f. how pleasant a disposition the child had | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 | |
| g. how well the neighbour had set things up for you in advance | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 | |

		not at all			very			
		important			important			
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
h.	whether the child was rested	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
i.	how much you enjoy being with children	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
j.	how good a mood you were in that day	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
k.	whether the child's surroundings contained interesting things for the child to see or do	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
l.	the extent to which the child was alert and responsive to you	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
m.	how much special effort you made to get along with the child	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
n.	how accepting you were of the child's behaviour	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
o.	how generally understanding you are of children	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
p.	how imaginative you are as a person	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
q.	how well-behaved the child was	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
r.	the extent to which you treated the child with respect	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
s.	how well-organized you are as a person	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
t.	how much the child enjoyed the activities that were available	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
u.	how much you encouraged the child in things they were trying to do	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
v.	how self-confident you were	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
w.	how much affection you demonstrated for the child	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
x.	how much the child liked you	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
y.	how compatible your interests were with those of the child	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
z.	how responsive you were to the child	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
aa.	how well you understood this particular child	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
bb.	how good a mood the child was in on that day	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
cc.	how pleasant or friendly the child was	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

The next question asks about bad experiences with children. Reasons for good interactions are not necessarily the same as those for unsuccessful ones. So please think about this situation without regard for the way you answered the first question.

2. Suppose you took care of a neighbour's child one afternoon, and the two of you did not get along well. How important do you believe the following factors would be as possible reasons for such an experience?

	not at all				very		
	important				important		
a. how unlucky you were in having everything just work out wrong	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
b. how unpleasant a disposition the child had	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
c. whether the child was tired or not feeling too well	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
d. whether or not you really enjoy children that much	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
e. whether the child doesn't like other people taking care of him/her	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
f. whether or not this was a bad day for the child, e.g., whether there was nothing good on TV, whether it was raining and s/he couldn't go outside	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
g. the extent to which your neighbour failed to set things up for you	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
h. how much your mind was preoccupied with other things that day and you didn't give your full attention	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
i. whether you used the wrong approach for this child	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
j. the extent to which the child was stubborn and resisted your efforts	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
k. how you get along with children in general	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
l. how unsuited the physical environment was for a child, e.g., not enough to do	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
m. what kind of mood you were in that day	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
n. insufficient experience with children of this age	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

	not at all				very		
	important				important		
o.	whether you were tired on that particular day						
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
p.	the extent to which the child failed to pay attention to you						
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
q.	how hungry the child was						
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
r.	your lack of understanding about what can be expected of children at this particular age						
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
s.	the kind of child he or she was						
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
t.	how little effort the child made to take interest in what you said or did						
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
u.	the extent to which you were not feeling well on that day						
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
v.	not having enough time with the child						
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
w.	the extent to which the child acted upset (e.g., threw a tantrum) because the parents left						
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
x.	how bad a mood the child was in on that day						
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
y.	the extent to which you expected too much from the child						
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
z.	whether or not this was a bad day for you in general						
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
aa.	how much you disliked this particular child						
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
bb.	your way of doing things (e.g., how strict you are) didn't suit this particular child						
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
cc.	how unpleasant or unfriendly the child was						
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Appendix 3
Mother-Father-Peer Scale

The following section contains a series of statements. Please indicate the extent to which the statements describe your childhood relationship with the people indicated. Answer by writing a number in the space to the right, using the following scale:

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly Disagree with Statement	Somewhat Disagree with Statement	Uncertain about Statement	Somewhat Agree with Statement	Strongly Agree with Statement

WHEN I WAS A CHILD, MY MOTHER (or mother substitute):

- 1) encouraged me to make my own decisions. _____
- 2) helped me learn to be independent. _____
- 3) felt she had to fight my battles for me when I had a disagreement with a teacher or a friend. _____
- 4) was close to a perfect parent. _____
- 5) was overprotective of me. _____
- 6) encouraged me to do things for myself. _____
- 7) encouraged me to try things my way. _____
- 8) had not a single fault that I can think of. _____
- 9) did not let me do things that other kids my age were allowed to do. _____
- 10) sometimes disapproved of specific things I did, but never gave me the impression that she disliked me as a person. _____
- 11) enjoyed being with me. _____
- 12) was an ideal person in every way. _____
- 13) was someone I found very difficult to please. _____
- 14) usually supported me when I wanted to do new and exciting things. _____
- 15) worried too much that I would hurt myself or get sick. _____
- 16) was never angry with me. _____
- 17) was often rude to me. _____
- 18) rarely did things with me. _____
- 19) didn't like to have me around the house. _____
- 20) and I never disagreed. _____
- 21) would often do things for me that I could do for myself. _____
- 22) let me handle my own money. _____
- 23) could always be depended upon when I really needed her help and trust. _____
- 24) gave me the best upbringing anyone could ever have. _____
- 25) did not want me to grow up. _____
- 26) tried to make me feel better when I was unhappy. _____
- 27) encouraged me to express my own opinion. _____
- 28) never disappointed me. _____
- 29) made me feel that I was a burden to her. _____
- 30) gave me the feeling that she liked me as I was; she didn't feel she had to make me over into someone else. _____

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly Disagree with Statement	Somewhat Disagree with Statement	Uncertain about Statement	Somewhat Agree with Statement	Strongly Agree with Statement

WHEN I WAS A CHILD, MY FATHER (or father substitute):

- 31) encouraged me to make my own decisions. _____
- 32) helped me learn to be independent. _____
- 33) felt he had to fight my battles for me when I had a disagreement
with a teacher or a friend. _____
- 34) was close to a perfect parent. _____
- 35) was overprotective of me. _____
- 36) encouraged me to do things for myself. _____
- 37) encouraged me to try things my way. _____
- 38) had not a single fault that I can think of. _____
- 39) did not let me do things that other kids my age were allowed to do. _____
- 40) sometimes disapproved of specific things I did, but never gave me
the impression that he disliked me as a person. _____
- 41) enjoyed being with me. _____
- 42) was an ideal person in every way. _____
- 43) was someone I found very difficult to please. _____
- 44) usually supported me when I wanted to do new and exciting things. _____
- 45) worried too much that I would hurt myself or get sick. _____
- 46) was never angry with me. _____
- 47) was often rude to me. _____
- 48) rarely did things with me. _____
- 49) didn't like to have me around the house. _____
- 50) and I never disagreed. _____
- 51) would often do things for me that I could do for myself. _____
- 52) let me handle my own money. _____
- 53) could always be depended upon when I really needed his help and
trust. _____
- 54) gave me the best upbringing anyone could ever have. _____
- 55) did not want me to grow up. _____
- 56) tried to make me feel better when I was unhappy. _____
- 57) encouraged me to express my own opinion. _____
- 58) never disappointed me. _____
- 59) made me feel that I was a burden to him. _____
- 60) gave me the feeling that he liked me as I was; he didn't feel he
had to make me over into someone else. _____

WHEN I WAS A CHILD, OTHER CHILDREN:

- 61) liked to play with me. _____
- 62) were always criticizing me. _____
- 63) often shared things with me. _____
- 64) often picked on me and teased me. _____
- 65) were usually friendly with me. _____
- 66) would usually stick up for me. _____
- 67) liked to ask me to go along with them. _____

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly Disagree with Statement	Somewhat Disagree with Statement	Uncertain about Statement	Somewhat Agree with Statement	Strongly Agree with Statement

- 68) wouldn't listen when I tried to say something. _____
69) were often unfair to me. _____
70) would often try to hurt my feelings. _____

Child Rearing Practices ReportInstructions for Sorting

In trying to gain more understanding of young children, we would like to know what is important to you as a parent and what kinds of methods you use in raising your child - in particular, the child with whom you are participating in this study. You are asked to indicate your opinions by sorting through a special set of cards that contain statements about bringing up children.

We would ask that you do the task independently of other family members, as we are interested in your personal beliefs and ideas. After you have completed the task on your own, then you may find it interesting to discuss the sort, but please don't change your sort after this discussion. It is very important that we find out your child rearing attitudes and practices.

The Cards and Envelopes

Each set or deck contains 91 cards. Each card contains a sentence having to do with child rearing. Some of these sentences will be true or descriptive of your attitudes and behaviour in relation to your child. Some sentences will be untrue or un-descriptive of your feelings and behaviour toward this child. By sorting these cards according to the instructions below, you will be able to show how descriptive or un-descriptive each of these sentences are for you.

Together with the cards you have received 7 envelopes, with the following labels:

7. These cards are most descriptive.
6. These cards are quite descriptive.
5. These cards are fairly descriptive.
4. These cards are neither descriptive nor un-descriptive.
3. These cards are fairly un-descriptive.
2. These cards are quite un-descriptive.
1. These cards are most un-descriptive.

Your task is to choose 13 cards that fit into each of these categories and to put them into their proper envelopes.

How to Sort the Cards (you may wish to check off each step as completed)

- ___ 1. Take the cards and shuffle them a bit first.
- ___ 2. Find a large cleared surface, like a kitchen table or desk, and spread out the envelopes in a row, going from 7 to 1 (Most Descriptive to Most Un-descriptive):

7 6 5 4 3 2 1

- ___ 3. Now take the shuffled deck of cards, and read each sentence carefully. Then make three piles of cards: one pile containing cards that are generally true or descriptive; one pile that you're not certain about, and one pile of cards that are generally not true or descriptive.

It doesn't make any difference how many cards you put in each of the three piles at this time, since you'll probably have to do some switching around later. But you may find it helpful if each pile contains about the same number of cards.

Now your cards and envelopes look like this:

7 - 6	5 - 4	3 - 2 - 1	- envelopes
"Descriptive"	"Not Sure"	"Undescriptive"	- cards
Cards	Cards	Cards	

4. Now, take the pile of descriptive cards and pick out the 13 cards that are most descriptive of your behaviour with your child. Put these cards on top of envelope #7.
 5. Next, from the cards that remain, pick out 13 cards that you think are quite descriptive of your behaviour and put these on top of envelope #6. (If you run out of cards from your "descriptive" pile, you'll have to add some of the more descriptive cards from your "Not Sure" pile.)
 6. Now, begin at the other end. Take the pile of "Undescriptive" cards and pick out the 13 cards that are most undescriptive of you. Put these on top of envelope #1.
 7. Then pick out the 13 cards which are quite undescriptive and put them on envelope #2. (Again, you may have to "borrow" from your "Not Sure" pile to make the necessary 13 cards for envelope #2.)
 8. You should now have 39 cards left over. These are now to be sorted into three new piles with 13 cards in each: 13 cards that are fairly descriptive of you (to be put on envelope #5); 13 cards that are neither descriptive nor undescriptive (to be put on envelope #4); and 13 cards that are fairly undescriptive (to be put on envelope #3.)
- You may find it hard, as others have, to put the same number of cards in each pile but we must ask you to follow these directions exactly, even if you feel limited by them.
9. Now, as a last step, look over your sort to see if there are any changes you want to make. When the cards seem to belong where you have put them, double-check to be sure you have 13 cards in each pile. Then put each pile in the proper envelope and tuck in the flap.

Thank you!

Items (one per card)

1. I respect my child's opinion and encourage (him) (her) to express them.
2. I encourage my child always to do (his) (her) best.
3. I put the wishes of my mate before the wishes of my child.
4. I help my child when (he) (she) is being teased by friends.
5. I often feel angry with my child.
6. If my child gets into trouble, I expect (him) (her) to handle the problem mostly by (himself) (herself).
7. I punish my child by putting (him) (her) off somewhere by (himself) (herself) for a while.
8. I watch closely what my child eats and when (he) (she) eats.
9. I don't think young children of different sexes should be allowed to see each other naked.
10. I wish my spouse were more interested in our children.
11. I feel a child should be given comfort and understanding when (he) (she) is scared or upset.
12. I try to keep my child away from children of families who have different ideas or values from our own.
13. I try to stop my child from playing rough games or doing things where (he) (she) might get hurt.
14. I believe physical punishment to be the best way of disciplining.
15. I believe that a child should be seen and not heard.
16. I sometimes forget the promises I have made to my child.
17. I think it is good practice for a child to perform in front of others.
18. I express affection by hugging, kissing, and holding my child.
19. I find some of my greatest satisfactions in my child.
20. I prefer that my child not try things if there is a chance (he) (she) will fail.
21. I encourage my child to wonder and think about life.
22. I usually take into account my preferences in making plans for the family.
23. I wish my child did not have to grow up so fast.
24. I feel a child should have time to think, daydream, and even loaf sometimes.
25. I find it difficult to punish my child.
26. I let my child make many decisions for (himself) (herself).
27. I do not allow my child to say bad things about (his) (her) teachers.
28. I worry about the bad and sad things that can happen to a child as (he) (she) grows up.
29. I teach my child that in one way or another punishment will find (him) (her) when (he) (she) is bad.
30. I do not blame my child for whatever happens if others ask for trouble.
31. I do not allow my child to get angry with me.
32. I feel my child is a bit of a disappointment to me.
33. I expect a great deal of my child.
34. I am easy going and relaxed with my child.
35. I give up some of my own interests because of my child.
36. I tend to spoil my child.
37. I have never caught my child lying.
38. I talk it over and reason with my child when (he) (she) misbehaves.
39. I trust my child to behave as (he) (she) should, even when I am not with (him) (her).
40. I joke and play with my child.
41. I give my child a good many duties and family responsibilities.
42. My child and I have warm, intimate times together.
43. I have strict, well-established rules for my child.
44. I think one has to let a child take many chances as (he) (she) grows up and tries new things.
45. I encourage my child to be curious, to explore and question things.
46. I sometimes talk about supernatural forces and beings in explaining things to my child.
47. I expect my child to be grateful and appreciate all the advantages (he) (she) has.
48. I sometimes feel that I am too involved with my child.
49. I believe in toilet training a child as soon as possible.
50. I threaten punishment more often than I actually give it.
51. I believe in praising a child when (he) (she) is good and think it gets better results than punishing (him) (her) when (he) (she) is bad.

52. I make sure my child knows that I appreciate what (he) (she) tries or accomplishes.
53. I encourage my child to talk about (his) (her) troubles.
54. I believe children should not have secrets from their parents.
55. I teach my child to keep control of (his) (her) feelings at all times.
56. I try to keep my child from fighting.
57. I dread answering my child's questions about sex.
58. When I am angry with my child, I let (him) (her) know it.
59. I think a child should be encouraged to do things better than others.
60. I punish my child by taking away a privilege (he) (she) otherwise would have had.
61. I give my child extra privileges when (he) (she) behaves well.
62. I enjoy having the house full of children.
63. I believe that too much affection and tenderness can harm or weaken a child.
64. I believe that scolding and criticism makes my child improve.
65. I believe my child should be aware of how much I sacrifice for (him) (her).
66. I sometimes tease and make fun of my child.
67. I teach my child that (he) (she) is responsible for what happens to (him) (her).
68. I worry about the health of my child.
69. There is a good deal of conflict between my child and me.
70. I do not allow my child to question my decisions.
71. I feel that it is good for a child to play competitive games.
72. I like to have some time for myself, away from my child.
73. I let my child know how ashamed and disappointed I am when (he) (she) misbehaves.
74. I want my child to make a good impression on others.
75. I want my child to be independent of me.
76. I make sure I know where my child is and what (he) (she) is doing.
77. I find it interesting and educational to be with my child for long periods.
78. I think a child should be weaned from the breast or bottle as soon as possible.
79. I instruct my child not to get dirty while (he) (she) is playing.
80. I don't go out if I have to leave my child with a stranger.
81. I think jealousy and quarrelling between brothers and sisters should be punished.
82. I think children must learn early not to cry.
83. I control my child by warning (him) (her) about the bad things that can happen to (him) (her).
84. I think it is best if the mother, rather than the father, is the one with the most authority over the children.
85. I don't want my child to be looked upon as different from others.
86. I don't think children should be given sexual information before they can understand everything.
87. I believe it is very important for a child to play outside and get plenty of fresh air.
88. I get pleasure from seeing my child eating well and enjoying (his) (her) food.
89. I don't allow my child to tease or play tricks on others.
90. I think it is wrong to insist that young boys and girls have different kinds of toys and play different sorts of games.
91. I believe it is unwise to let children play a lot by themselves without supervision from grown-ups.

The questions in this section were developed to learn about how parents think and what they do with regard to their children. Different parents will answer these questions differently. Please read and answer each item according to your personal views or behaviour. Even if an answer does not exactly reflect your own opinion or behaviour, please choose the response that is closest.

1. The following statements represent matters of interest and concern to some parents. Not all parents feel the same way about them. Circle the number which most closely applies to you and the child with whom you are participating in this study, using the scale below:

	1	2	3	4	5	6
Not at all Descriptive of Me	Slightly Descriptive of Me	Somewhat Descriptive of Me	Fairly Descriptive of Me	Quite Descriptive of Me	Highly Descriptive of Me	
1. I encourage my child to talk about his/her troubles.						1 2 3 4 5 6
2. I always follow through on discipline for my child, no matter how long it takes.						1 2 3 4 5 6
3. Sometimes it is so long between the occurrence of a misbehaviour and an opportunity for me to deal with it that I just let it go.						1 2 3 4 5 6
4. I do not allow my child to get angry with me.						1 2 3 4 5 6
5. There are times I just don't have the energy to make my child behave as he/she should.						1 2 3 4 5 6
6. My child can often talk me into letting him/her off easier than I had intended.						1 2 3 4 5 6
7. My child convinces me to change my mind after I have refused a request.						1 2 3 4 5 6
8. I think a child should be encouraged to do things better than others.						1 2 3 4 5 6
9. My child and I have warm intimate moments together.						1 2 3 4 5 6
10. I encourage my child to be curious, to explore, and to question things.						1 2 3 4 5 6
11. I find it interesting and educational to be with my child for long periods.						1 2 3 4 5 6
12. I don't think children should be given sexual information.						1 2 3 4 5 6
13. I believe that a child should be seen and not heard.						1 2 3 4 5 6
14. I believe that parents who start a child talking about his/her worries don't realize that sometimes it is better to leave well enough alone.						1 2 3 4 5 6
15. I encourage my child to express his/her opinions.						1 2 3 4 5 6
16. I make sure my child knows that I appreciate what he/she tries to accomplish.						1 2 3 4 5 6
17. I let my child know how ashamed and disappointed I am when he/she misbehaves.						1 2 3 4 5 6
18. I believe in toilet training a child as soon as possible.						1 2 3 4 5 6
19. I believe that most children change their minds so frequently that it is hard to take their opinions seriously.						1 2 3 4 5 6

- 3. Help child with a play activity (e.g., painting). _____
- 4. Comfort when he/she is upset. _____
- 5. Explain something to child. _____
- 6. Discipline child. _____

4. For each of the following statements, circle the number which indicates how often the statement is true of your family.

Never	Once in a While	Sometimes	Frequently	Most of the Time	Always
1	2	3	4	5	6

- 1. We have a regular dinner schedule each week. 1 2 3 4 5 6
- 2. Our house is clean and orderly. 1 2 3 4 5 6
- 3. Our family is organized and "together." 1 2 3 4 5 6
- 4. We get everything done around the house that needs to be done. 1 2 3 4 5 6

5. Listed below are several situations which frequently occur in childhood. You may or may not have had these experiences with your child. Imagine that each has just occurred and rate how likely it is that you would do each of the responses listed below the situation.

1. Your child has gone outside without picking up his/her toys as you requested.

- | | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|---|---|---|------------------------|
| | <u>Very
Unlikely</u> | | | | <u>Very
Likely</u> |
| a. Let situation go. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| b. Take away a privilege (e.g., no TV tonight). | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| c. Assign an additional chore. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| d. Take away something material (e.g., no dessert tonight). | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| e. Send to room. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| f. Physical punishment. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| g. Reason with child. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| h. Ground child. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| i. Yell at child. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| List and circle anything else you might do: | | | | | |
| Other _____ | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Other _____ | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

2. After arguing over toys, your child strikes a playmate.

- | | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|---|---|---|------------------------|
| | <u>Very
Unlikely</u> | | | | <u>Very
Likely</u> |
| a. Let situation go. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| b. Take away a privilege (e.g., no TV tonight). | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

- c. Assign an additional chore. 1 2 3 4 5
- d. Take away something material (e.g., no dessert tonight). 1 2 3 4 5
- e. Send to room. 1 2 3 4 5
- f. Physical punishment. 1 2 3 4 5
- g. Reason with child. 1 2 3 4 5
- h. Ground child. 1 2 3 4 5
- i. Yell at child. 1 2 3 4 5

List and circle anything else you might do:

- Other _____ 1 2 3 4 5
- Other _____ 1 2 3 4 5

3. Your child becomes sassy while you discipline him/her.

- | | <u>Very Unlikely</u> | | | | <u>Very Likely</u> |
|---|----------------------|---|---|---|--------------------|
| a. Let situation go. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| b. Take away a privilege (e.g., no TV tonight). | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| c. Assign an additional chore. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| d. Take away something material (e.g., no dessert tonight). | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

- | | <u>Very Unlikely</u> | | | | <u>Very Likely</u> |
|-------------------------|----------------------|---|---|---|--------------------|
| e. Send to room. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| f. Physical punishment. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| g. Reason with child. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| h. Ground child. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| i. Yell at child. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

List and circle anything else you might do:

- Other _____ 1 2 3 4 5
- Other _____ 1 2 3 4 5

4. You receive a note from your child's teacher that your child has been disruptive at school/daycare.

- | | <u>Very Unlikely</u> | | | | <u>Very Likely</u> |
|---|----------------------|---|---|---|--------------------|
| a. Let situation go. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| b. Take away a privilege (e.g., no TV tonight). | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| c. Assign an additional chore. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| d. Take away something material (e.g., no (dessert tonight)). | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| e. Send to room. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| f. Physical punishment. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| g. Reason with child. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| h. Ground child. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| i. Yell at child. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

List and circle anything else you might do:

Other _____	1	2	3	4	5
Other _____	1	2	3	4	5

5. You catch your child lying about something he/she has done that you would not approve of.

	<u>Very Unlikely</u>				<u>Very Likely</u>
a. Let situation go.	1	2	3	4	5
b. Take away a privilege (e.g., no TV tonight).	1	2	3	4	5
c. Assign an additional chore.	1	2	3	4	5
d. Take away something material (e.g., no dessert tonight).	1	2	3	4	5
e. Send to room.	1	2	3	4	5
f. Physical punishment.	1	2	3	4	5
g. Reason with child.	1	2	3	4	5
h. Ground child.	1	2	3	4	5
i. Yell at child.	1	2	3	4	5

List and circle anything else you might do:

Other _____	1	2	3	4	5
Other _____	1	2	3	4	5

6. You see your child playing at a busy street which you have forbidden him/her to go near for safety reasons.

	<u>Very Unlikely</u>				<u>Very Likely</u>
a. Let situation go.	1	2	3	4	5
b. Take away a privilege (e.g., no TV tonight).	1	2	3	4	5
c. Assign an additional chore.	1	2	3	4	5
d. Take away something material (e.g., no dessert tonight).	1	2	3	4	5
e. Send to room.	1	2	3	4	5
f. Physical punishment.	1	2	3	4	5
g. Reason with child.	1	2	3	4	5
h. Ground child.	1	2	3	4	5
i. Yell at child.	1	2	3	4	5

List and circle anything else you might do:

Other _____	1	2	3	4	5
Other _____	1	2	3	4	5

Appendix 6
Parental Responses to Misbehavior

Now please tell us what you do in reaction to common child misbehaviours. Please indicate how frequently you use each of the following responses in an average week, by circling one of the choices given below the response.

1. Reason (explain about rules or consequences of the child's behaviour):

Less than	1-2 times	3-4 times	5-6 times	7-8 times	9 or more times
Never	once/week	a week	a week	a week	a week

2. Distract, divert to acceptable activity:

Less than	1-2 times	3-4 times	5-6 times	7-8 times	9 or more times
Never	once/week	a week	a week	a week	a week

3. Negotiate with my child:

Less than	1-2 times	3-4 times	5-6 times	7-8 times	9 or more times
Never	once/week	a week	a week	a week	a week

4. Threaten my child:

Less than	1-2 times	3-4 times	5-6 times	7-8 times	9 or more times
Never	once/week	a week	a week	a week	a week

5. Use time-out: social or physical isolation (e.g., send child to room):

Less than	1-2 times	3-4 times	5-6 times	7-8 times	9 or more times
Never	once/week	a week	a week	a week	a week

6. Spank or slap:

Less than	1-2 times	3-4 times	5-6 times	7-8 times	9 or more times
Never	once/week	a week	a week	a week	a week

7. Ignore or give no reaction to my child's misbehaviour:

Less than	1-2 times	3-4 times	5-6 times	7-8 times	9 or more times
Never	once/week	a week	a week	a week	a week

8. Withdraw privileges:

Less than	1-2 times	3-4 times	5-6 times	7-8 times	9 or more times
Never	once/week	a week	a week	a week	a week

9. Yell in anger:

Less than	1-2 times	3-4 times	5-6 times	7-8 times	9 or more times
Never	once/week	a week	a week	a week	a week

Appendix 7
Attitude Toward Spanking

Now please tell us how you feel about spanking your child. Some parents believe spanking is not a good technique, but others feel that sometimes it may do some good. Using the rating scale below, rate how much you currently agree or disagree with each statement about spanking or slapping your child. (The word spank will be used, but you can also think of slaps, swats, etc.).

Strongly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Agree Nor Disagree	Neither Slightly Agree	Moderately Agree	Strongly Agree
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

- | | |
|---|---------------|
| 1. Spanking is a <u>normal part</u> of my parenting. | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 |
| 2. Sometimes a spank is the <u>best way</u> to get my child to listen. | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 |
| 3. A spank is <u>not</u> an effective method to change my child's behaviour for the long term. | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 |
| 4. Spanking is <u>never necessary</u> to instill proper moral and social conduct in my child. | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 |
| 5. Sometimes, the <u>only way</u> to get my child to behave is with a spank. | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 |
| 6. One of the best ways for my child to learn "no" is to spank him/her after disobedience. | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 |
| 7. If my child is spanked for a misbehaviour, s/he should always be spanked for that misbehaviour. | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 |
| 8. When all is said and done, spanking is <u>harmful</u> for my child. | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 |
| 9. I believe it is the <u>parents' right</u> to spank their children if they think it is necessary. | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 |
| 10. Overall, I believe spanking is a <u>bad</u> disciplinary technique. | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 |

Use of Physical Discipline (four items)

1. From the PDI: likelihood of responding to six disciplinary situations by using physical punishment. Scores on this item are derived from mothers' responses to six vignettes describing disciplinary situations. Following each vignette is a list of nine possible disciplinary responses; parents rate the likelihood that they would do each of the listed responses. Mothers' ratings of the likelihood that they would use "physical punishment" are summed across the six vignettes. (See Appendix 6)
2. Total score on Attitudes Toward Spanking questionnaire. (See Appendix 8)
3. "Spank or slap" item from the Parental Response to Misbehavior questionnaire. (See Appendix 7)
4. Item 14 from the Child Rearing Practices Report: "I believe physical punishment to be the best way of disciplining." (See Appendix 5)

Yell (two items)

1. From the PDI: likelihood of responding to six disciplinary situations by yelling at the child. Scores on this item are derived from mothers' responses to six vignettes describing disciplinary situations. Following each vignette is a list of nine possible disciplinary responses; parents rate the likelihood that they would do each of the listed responses. Mothers' ratings of the likelihood that they would "yell at child" are summed across the six vignettes. (See Appendix 6)
2. "Yell in anger" item from the Parental Response to Misbehavior questionnaire. (See Appendix 7)

Threaten (two items)

1. Item 50 from the Child Rearing Practices Report: "I threaten punishment more often than I actually give it." (See Appendix 5)
2. "Threaten my child" item from the Parental Response to Misbehavior questionnaire. (See Appendix 7)

Use Isolation (two items)

1. "Use time-out" item from the Parental Response to Misbehavior questionnaire. (See Appendix 7)
2. Item 7 from the Child Rearing Practices Report: "I punish my child by putting (him) (her) off somewhere by (himself) (herself) for a while." (See Appendix 5)

Use of Guilt - or Shame-Induction (four items)

1. Item 64 from the Child Rearing Practices Report: "I believe that scolding and criticism makes my child improve." (See Appendix 5)
2. Item 65 from the Child Rearing Practices Report: "I believe my child should be aware of how much I sacrifice for (him) (her)." (See Appendix 5)
3. Item 66 from the Child Rearing Practices Report: "I sometimes tease and make fun of my child." (See Appendix 5)
4. Item 73 from the Child Rearing Practices Report: "I let my child know how ashamed and disappointed I am when (he) (she) misbehaves." (See Appendix 5)

Here is a list of statements that concern a child's emotional state. Please circle the number that reflects the frequency of the behaviour that you observe for the child according to the following continuum: The behaviour occurs **NEVER** (1), **SOMETIMES** (2 or 3), **OFTEN** (4 or 5) or **ALWAYS** (6). For those exceptional cases that are impossible to evaluate, please circle **CE** (**CANNOT EVALUATE**).

	1	2	3	4	5	6	CE
	NEVER	SOMETIMES		OFTEN		ALWAYS	CANNOT EVALUATE
1. Maintains neutral facial expression (doesn't smile or laugh)	1	2	3	4	5	6	CE
2. Tired	1	2	3	4	5	6	CE
3. Easily frustrated	1	2	3	4	5	6	CE
4. Gets angry when interrupted	1	2	3	4	5	6	CE
5. Irritable, gets mad easily	1	2	3	4	5	6	CE
6. Worries	1	2	3	4	5	6	CE
7. Takes pleasure in own accomplishments	1	2	3	4	5	6	CE
8. Timid, afraid (e.g., avoids new situations)	1	2	3	4	5	6	CE
9. Sad, unhappy or depressed	1	2	3	4	5	6	CE
10. Inhibited or uneasy in the group	1	2	3	4	5	6	CE
11. Screams or yells easily	1	2	3	4	5	6	CE

Here is a list of behaviours that you may observe while the child is playing with peers. Please circle the number that reflects the frequency of the behaviour that you observe, according to the following continuum. The behaviour occurs **NEVER** (1), **SOMETIMES** (2 or 3), **OFTEN** (4 or 5) or **ALWAYS** (6). For those exceptional cases that are impossible to evaluate, please circle **CE** (**CANNOT EVALUATE**).

12. Forces other children to do things they don't want to do	1	2	3	4	5	6	CE
13. Inactive, watches the other children play	1	2	3	4	5	6	CE
14. Negotiates solutions to conflicts with other children	1	2	3	4	5	6	CE
15. Remains apart, isolated from the group	1	2	3	4	5	6	CE
16. Takes other children and their point of view into account	1	2	3	4	5	6	CE
17. Hits, bites or kicks other children	1	2	3	4	5	6	CE
18. Cooperates with other children in group activities	1	2	3	4	5	6	CE
19. Gets into conflicts with other children	1	2	3	4	5	6	CE
20. Comforts or assists another child in difficulty	1	2	3	4	5	6	CE
21. Takes care of toys	1	2	3	4	5	6	CE
22. Doesn't talk or interact during group activities	1	2	3	4	5	6	CE
23. Attentive towards younger children	1	2	3	4	5	6	CE
24. Goes unnoticed in a group	1	2	3	4	5	6	CE
25. Works easily in a group	1	2	3	4	5	6	CE

Here is a list of behaviours that you may observe while the child is interacting with adults (teachers, parent, etc.). Please circle the number that reflects the frequency of the behaviour that you observe, according to the following continuum: **NEVER** (1), **SOMETIMES** (2 or 3), **OFTEN** (4 or 5) or **ALWAYS** (6). For those exceptional cases that are impossible to evaluate, please circle **CE** (**CANNOT EVALUATE**).

26. Hits teacher or destroys things when angry with teacher	1	2	3	4	5	6	CE
27. Helps with everyday tasks (e.g., distributes snacks)	1	2	3	4	5	6	CE
28. Accepts compromises when reasons are given	1	2	3	4	5	6	CE

29. Opposed the teacher's suggestions	1	2	3	4	5	6	CE
30. Defiant when reprimanded	1	2	3	4	5	6	CE

Appendix 10
Child Behavior Checklist/2-3

This section will take you about 10 minutes to complete. It contains a list of items that describe children. For each item that describes your child now or within the past 2 months, please circle the 2 if the item is very true or often true of your child. Circle the 1 if the item is somewhat or sometimes true of your child. If the item is not true of your child, circle the 0. Answer the items to reflect your view of your child's behaviour. Please answer all the items as well as you can, even if some do not seem to apply to your child.

0 = not true (as far as you know)

1 = somewhat or sometimes true

2 = very true or often true

1.	Aches or pains (without medical cause)	0	1	2
2.	Acts too young for age	0	1	2
3.	Afraid to try new things	0	1	2
4.	Avoids looking others in the eye	0	1	2
5.	Can't concentrate, can't pay attention for long	0	1	2
6.	Can't sit still or restless	0	1	2
7.	Can't stand having things out of place	0	1	2
8.	Can't stand waiting; wants everything now	0	1	2
9.	Chews on things that aren't edible	0	1	2
10.	Clings to adults or too dependent	0	1	2
11.	Constantly seeks help	0	1	2
12.	Constipated, doesn't move bowels	0	1	2
13.	Cries a lot	0	1	2
14.	Cruel to animals	0	1	2
15.	Defiant	0	1	2
16.	Demands must be met immediately	0	1	2
17.	Destroys her/his own things	0	1	2
18.	Destroys things belonging to his/her family or other children	0	1	2
19.	Diarrhea or loose bowels when not sick	0	1	2
20.	Disobedient	0	1	2
21.	Disturbed by any change in routine	0	1	2
22.	Doesn't want to sleep alone	0	1	2
23.	Doesn't answer when people talk to her/him	0	1	2
24.	Doesn't eat well (describe): _____	0	1	2
25.	Doesn't get along with other children	0	1	2
26.	Doesn't know how to have fun, acts like a little adult	0	1	2
27.	Doesn't seem to feel guilty after misbehaving	0	1	2
28.	Doesn't want to go out of home	0	1	2
29.	Easily frustrated	0	1	2
30.	Easily jealous	0	1	2
31.	Eats or drinks things that are not food - don't include sweets (describe): _____	0	1	2
32.	Fears certain animals, situations, or places (describe): _____	0	1	2
33.	Feelings are easily hurt	0	1	2
34.	Gets hurt a lot, accident-prone	0	1	2
35.	Gets in many fights	0	1	2
36.	Gets into everything	0	1	2
37.	Gets too upset when separated from parents	0	1	2

0 = not true (as far as you know)

1 = somewhat or sometimes true

2 = very true or often true

38.	Has trouble getting to sleep	0	1	2
39.	Headaches (without medical cause)	0	1	2
40.	Hits others	0	1	2
41.	Holds his/her breath	0	1	2
42.	Hurts animals or people without meaning to	0	1	2
43.	Looks unhappy without good reason	0	1	2
44.	Angry moods	0	1	2
45.	Nausea, feels sick (without medical cause)	0	1	2
46.	Nervous movements or twitching (describe): _____	0	1	2
47.	Nervous, highstrung, or tense	0	1	2
48.	Nightmares	0	1	2
49.	Overeating	0	1	2
50.	Overtired	0	1	2
51.	Overweight	0	1	2
52.	Painful bowel movements	0	1	2
53.	Physically attacks people	0	1	2
54.	Picks nose, skin, or other parts of body (describe): _____	0	1	2
55.	Plays with own sex parts too much	0	1	2
56.	Poorly coordinated or clumsy	0	1	2
57.	Problems with eyes without medical cause (describe): _____	0	1	2
58.	Punishment doesn't change her/his behaviour	0	1	2
59.	Quickly shifts from one activity to another	0	1	2
60.	Rashes or other skin problems (without medical cause)	0	1	2
61.	Refuses to eat	0	1	2
62.	Refuses to play active games	0	1	2
63.	Repeatedly rocks head or body	0	1	2
64.	Resists going to bed at night	0	1	2
65.	Resists toilet training (describe): _____	0	1	2
66.	Screams a lot	0	1	2
67.	Seems unresponsive to affection	0	1	2
68.	Self-conscious or easily embarrassed	0	1	2
69.	Selfish or won't share	0	1	2
70.	Shows little affection toward people	0	1	2
71.	Shows little interest in things around him/her	0	1	2
72.	Shows too little fear of getting hurt	0	1	2
73.	Shy or timid	0	1	2
74.	Sleeps less than most children during day and/or night (describe): _____	0	1	2
75.	Smears or plays with bowel movements	0	1	2
76.	Speech problem (describe): _____	0	1	2
77.	Stares into space or seems preoccupied	0	1	2
78.	Stomachaches or cramps (without medical cause)	0	1	2
79.	Stores up things s/he doesn't need (describe): _____	0	1	2
80.	Strange behaviour (describe): _____	0	1	2
81.	Stubborn, sullen, or irritable	0	1	2
82.	Sudden changes in mood or feelings	0	1	2
83.	Sulks a lot	0	1	2

0 = not true (as far as you know)

1 = somewhat or sometimes true

2 = very true or often true

84.	Talks or cries out in sleep	0	1	2
85.	Temper tantrums or hot temper	0	1	2
86.	Too concerned with neatness or cleanliness	0	1	2
87.	Too fearful or anxious	0	1	2
88.	Uncooperative	0	1	2
89.	Underactive, slow moving, or lacks energy	0	1	2
90.	Unhappy, sad, or depressed	0	1	2
91.	Unusually loud	0	1	2
92.	Upset by new people or situations (describe): _____	0	1	2
93.	Vomiting, throwing up (without medical cause)	0	1	2
94.	Wakes up often at night	0	1	2
95.	Wanders away from home	0	1	2
96.	Wants a lot of attention	0	1	2
97.	Whining	0	1	2
98.	Withdrawn, doesn't get involved with others	0	1	2
99.	Worrying	0	1	2
100.	Please write in any problems your child has that were not listed above:			
	_____	0	1	2
	_____	0	1	2
	_____	0	1	2

PLEASE BE SURE YOU HAVE ANSWERED ALL ITEMS