

THE INTERRELATIONSHIP OF PERCEIVED PARENTAL BEHAVIOR,
PEER VERSUS ADULT ORIENTATION,
AND MORALITY IN EARLY ADOLESCENCE

by

Keith Frederick Mauthe

B.A., Valparaiso University, 1971

A THESIS SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF
THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF
MASTER OF ARTS

in the Department

of

Psychology



KEITH FREDERICK MAUTHE 1973

SIMON FRASER UNIVERSITY

June 1973

All rights reserved. This thesis may not be reproduced in whole or in part, by photocopy or other means, without permission of the author.

APPROVAL

Name: Keith Frederick Mauthe

Degree: Master of Arts

Title of Thesis: The Interrelationship of Perceived Parental Behavior, Peer Versus Adult Orientation, and Morality in Early Adolescence

Examining Committee:

Chairman: Jean E. Koepke

Elinor W. Ames
Senior Supervisor

James E. Marcia

Rowland M. Lorimer
External Examiner
Assistant Professor
Behavior Science Foundation
Simon Fraser University, Burnaby, B.C.

Date Approved: June 11, 1973

ABSTRACT

Peer versus adult orientation has been studied by Bronfenbrenner (1966) who presented subjects with hypothetical conflict situations in which peers were advocating deviance from adult approved standards of behavior. In a study comparing American and Soviet preadolescents' responses to these situations, it was found that American subjects were more likely than Soviet subjects to follow their peers and engage in socially disapproved or deviant behavior. However, Bronfenbrenner's conflict situations confounded the variable of peer versus adult orientation with the variable of morality, since each conflict situation presented peers as encouraging socially disapproved or deviant behavior in opposition to adult approved or conventional behavior. The present study devised a new instrument, the Conflict Situations Questionnaire (CSQ), with which it was possible to derive separate measures of peer versus adult orientation and morality. This was done by depicting adults as suggesting the conventionally good response while peers suggested the conventionally bad or deviant response in half the situations. In the other half of the situations, adults were depicted as suggesting the conventionally bad response while peers suggested the conventionally good response. The two measures obtained were then related to perceived parental behavior as measured by the Children's Report of Parental Behavior Inventory (CRPBI), subjects' reported participation in organized activities, and subjects' conduct as rated by school counsellors and the school vice-principal. The subjects were 62 grade 8 girls, 57 grade 8 boys, 55 grade 10 girls, and 57 grade 10 boys from a junior secondary school in Burnaby, British Columbia. The conventionally good alternative on the CSQ was chosen significantly more often by grade 8 subjects than by grade 10 subjects and by girls than by boys. On the peer versus adult

dimension, girls were significantly more likely than boys to choose the peer alternative. All subjects, particularly girls, were more responsive to influence from peers than from adults when responding to the morality dimension of the CSQ. The subjects' responses to the CRPBI were factor analyzed and it was found that subjects perceived each parent along the dimensions of Psychological Control versus Psychological Autonomy, Rejection versus Acceptance, and Firm Control versus Lax Control, the same three dimensions found in previous research using the instrument. It was also found that subjects perceived both parents as similar in their behavior. Correlations between the CSQ and other measures revealed that the dimension of morality was negatively related to perceiving both parents as using psychological control, positively related to perceiving the mother as accepting, perceiving both parents as using firm control, subjects reporting high participation in organized activities, and subjects being rated as having good conduct. The latter correlation provides construct validity for the morality dimension of the CSQ. Choosing the adult alternative on the CSQ was related to perceiving both the mother and the father as using firm control. Multiple correlations revealed that the morality dimension and the peer-adult dimension of the CSQ both make a significant contribution to the prediction of the use of rejection and firm control by each parent while morality alone contributed significantly to the prediction of the use of psychological control by each parent. The relations between scores on the CSQ and subjects' perception of parental behavior, as revealed by the CRPBI, were discussed and found to be in general agreement with previous studies investigating the relationship of perceived parental behavior to responses to the Dilemmas Test (Bronfenbrenner, 1966; Devereux, 1970).

Table of Contents

Approval	ii
Abstract	iii
List of Tables	vi
List of Appendices	ix
Acknowledgements	x
Introduction	1
A General View of Psychological Development During Early Adolescence	2
The Measurement of Pressure From Peers Versus Adults	6
Age Differences in Peer Versus Adult Orientation and Morality	13
Sex Differences in Peer Versus Adult Orientation and Morality	14
Perceived Parental Behavior and Morality	16
Perceived Parental Behavior and Peer Versus Adult Orientation	18
The Measurement of Perceived Parental Behavior: The Children's Report of Parental Behavior Inventory (CRPBI)	19
The Factor Structure of the CRPBI	22
The Modified Form of the CRPBI: Replication of Factor Structure	23
The Modified Form of the CRPBI: Discrimination Between Groups	26
A Replication of the Factor Structure of the Modified Form of the CRPBI with Two Independent Samples	27
The Choice of the Modified Form of the CRPBI for the Thesis	28
Method	28
Procedure	33
Results	34
Discussion	47
References	57
Tables	60
Appendices	90

List of Tables

Table 1.	Factor Loadings For the Three Rotated Factors of the Children's Report of Parental Behavior Inventory (CRPBI)	60
Table 2.	Mean and Range of Ages For Each Grade-Sex Group	61
Table 3.	Means and Ranges of Counsellors' and Vice-Principal's Conduct Ratings, and Correlations Between Their Ratings For Each Grade-Sex Group	62
Table 4.	The Percentage of Variance Accounted For By The Three Rotated Factors of the Children's Report of Parental Behavior Inventory (CRPBI)	63
Table 5.	Factor Loadings For The Three Rotated Factors of the Children's Report of Parental Behavior Inventory (CRPBI)	64
Table 6.	Factor Loadings For The Three Rotated Factors of the Children's Report of Parental Behavior Inventory (CRPBI)	65
Table 7.	A Survey of the Items of the CSQ	66
Table 8.	The Internal Consistency Reliability of the Items of the Two Dimensions of the CSQ	68
Table 9.	Means and Standard Deviations of Groups On the Peer-Adult Dimension of the CSQ	69
Table 10.	Differences Between Groups Compared On the Peer-Adult Dimension of the CSQ	69
Table 11.	Means and Standard Deviations of Groups On the Conventionally Good-Conventionally Bad Dimension of the CSQ	70
Table 12.	Differences Between Groups Compared On the Conventionally Good-Conventionally Bad Dimension of the CSQ	70
Table 13.	Differences Between Subsets of the Morality Dimension of the CSQ For All Subjects, Girls, Boys, Grade 8, Grade 10, and Individual Grade-Sex Groups	71
Table 14.	Means and Standard Deviations of Groups On the Measure of Participation in Organized Activities	72
Table 15.	Differences Between Groups Compared On the Measure of Participation in Organized Activities	72
Table 16.	Means and Standard Deviations of Groups On Conduct Ratings	73

Table 17.	Differences Between Groups Compared On Conduct Ratings	73
Table 18.	Multiple Correlations Using Peer Versus Adult Orientation and Morality as Predictors and Each of the Other Variables as the Criterion	74
Table 19.	Correlations Among the Dimensions of the CSQ, Participation in Organized Activities, and Conduct	75
Table 20.	Means and Standard Deviations of Groups On the Perceived Use of Psychological Control by the Mother	77
Table 21.	Differences Between Groups Compared On the Perceived Use of Psychological Control by the Mother	77
Table 22.	Means and Standard Deviations of Groups On the Perceived Use of Psychological Control by the Father	78
Table 23.	Differences Between Groups Compared On the Perceived Use of Psychological Control by the Father	78
Table 24.	Means and Standard Deviations of Groups On the Perceived Use of Rejection by the Mother	79
Table 25.	Differences Between Groups Compared On the Perceived Use of Rejection by the Mother	79
Table 26.	Means and Standard Deviations of Groups On the Perceived Use of Rejection by the Father	80
Table 27.	Differences Between Groups Compared On the Perceived Use of Rejection by the Father	80
Table 28.	Means and Standard Deviations of Groups On the Perceived Use of Firm Control by the Mother	81
Table 29.	Differences Between Groups Compared On the Perceived Use of Firm Control by the Mother	81
Table 30.	Means and Standard Deviations of Groups On the Perceived Use of Firm Control by the Father	82
Table 31.	Differences Between Groups Compared On the Perceived Use of Firm Control by the Father	82
Table 32.	Differences Between the Perceived Use of Psychological Control by Father and Mother for Each Grade-Sex Group	83

Table 33.	Differences Between the Perceived Use of Rejection by Father and Mother For Each Grade-Sex Group	84
Table 34.	Differences Between the Perceived Use of Firm Control by Father and Mother For Each Grade-Sex Group	85
Table 35.	Correlations Between the Perceived Behavior of the Mother and the Perceived Behavior of the Father On the Three Dimensions of the CRPBI	86
Table 36.	Correlations Among the Three Dimensions of the CRPBI for Mother and Father, the Two Dimensions of the CSQ, Participation in Organized Activities, and Conduct	88

List of Appendices

Appendix A: The Conflict Situations Questionnaire (CSQ)	90
Appendix B: Participation In Organized Activities	96
Appendix C: Conduct Rating Scale	97
Appendix D: The Children's Report of Parental Behavior Inventory (CRPBI)	98
Appendix E: Scoring Sheet For The Child's Report of Parent Behavior Inventory	109

Acknowledgements

My sincere thanks goes to Dr. Elinor W. Ames, my academic advisor, for her time, her ideas, and her thoughtful suggestions throughout this thesis research project. I would also like to thank Dr. James E. Marcia for discussion and ideas, and Dr. Rowland M. Lorimer for serving on my thesis examination committee.

A special thanks goes to Mr. Warn, vice-principal at Burnaby Heights Junior Secondary School, for his effort in arranging the data collection, and to guidance counsellors, Miss Wiebe, Mr. Gagey, and Mr. Brown, for their assistance and cooperation in collecting the data for this thesis.

I am also grateful to Ms. Pat McArthur for the typing and proof-reading of this thesis.

Introduction

This thesis is concerned with developing an instrument with which to measure morality independently of peer versus adult orientation as measured by the Dilemmas Test used by Bronfenbrenner (1966) and reported by Devereux (1970). Both the measure of morality, which measures the extent to which a subject will either adhere to conventionally good standards of behavior or deviate from them, and the measure of peer versus adult orientation will then be related to subjects' age, sex, and perceived parental behavior.

The items of the Dilemmas Test presented subjects with hypothetical conflict situations in which peers were encouraging actions which went against adult-approved or socially acceptable standards of conduct. The instrument confounded the variable of peer versus adult orientation with the variable of morality since the conflict situations always presented peers as encouraging socially disapproved or deviant behavior. Studies using the Dilemmas Test have interpreted subjects' scores on a dimension of peer versus adult orientation and have related the scores to other variables such as peer group experience, age, sex, and perceived parental behavior of subjects.

In this thesis, a new measure, the Conflict Situations Questionnaire (CSQ), is used to derive separate measures of peer versus adult orientation and morality. This is done by depicting adults as suggesting the conventionally good response while peers suggest the conventionally bad or deviant response in half the situations. In the other half of the situations, adults are depicted as suggesting the conventionally bad response while peers suggest the conventionally good response. Then each measure is related to subjects' age, sex, and perceived parental behavior in order to see how the results compare with those of Bronfenbrenner (1966) and Devereux (1970) using the Dilemmas Test.

The major aspects of psychological development during the period of early adolescence are briefly discussed below, since the subjects of this study are in that period of development.

A General View of Psychological Development
During Early Adolescence

Early adolescence, from the ages of twelve to sixteen, is a period of tremendous psychological growth and change. In the first place, the self comes to be seen as unique, but not well defined in personal or social terms. Secondly, the adolescent's present and future roles are a cause of concern at this time. Thirdly, the adolescent displays a growing need for autonomy and independence separate from the values and expectations learned from parents during childhood socialization. Fourthly, the adolescent may come to identify with and conform to peer group norms as a result of questioning and abandoning parental values.

The questioning of the values of society instilled by parents and the search for an integrated self that can relate on its own terms in a meaningful way to society occur for the first time during adolescence. During this period, cognitive functioning becomes more sophisticated and social interaction with others outside the home and immediate neighbourhood increases. Early adolescence is a time when there is great potential for growth and change in the areas of ego-identity development (Erikson, 1963), cognitive development (Piaget & Inhelder, 1958), and moral development (Kohlberg, 1963; Piaget, 1932). The common characteristic defining all three areas of development during early adolescence is that the individual comes to see a greater number of possible ways of dealing with and constructing his personal and social reality.

Firstly, with respect to cognitive development during early adolescence, Piaget and Inhelder (1958) have discovered that the child moves out of the stage of concrete operations and into the stage of formal operations at about the age of twelve. The stage of formal operations is characterized by deductive reasoning, hypothesis testing, and "thinking about thinking". The adolescent is capable of considering a number of alternatives, questioning them, and deciding on the most valid (Piaget & Inhelder, 1958).

Secondly, that the adolescent considers alternative roles, values, and life-styles is discussed in the psychosocial theory of ego development proposed by Erikson (1963). The theory is made up of eight stages which span the entire life-cycle. Each stage is associated with a specific period in life and a psychosocial crisis that is encountered at this time. The outcome of each crisis is dependent upon the extent to which previous crisis have been resolved and the nature of the expectations and support of significant others in the social environment. The psychosocial crisis of adolescence is concerned with the formation of a personal identity. In early adolescence, there is a questioning of all that the individual has become up until now and a questioning of the roles which society expects the adolescent to fill as one's future occupation and personal ideology become issues of concern.

Thirdly, moral development, also, has often been theoretically explained as a function of the child's ability to see situations from a number of different perspectives. Both Piaget (1932) and Kohlberg (1963) have devised theories of moral development and have emphasized the role that peer group experience plays in the development of this ability. The development of moral judgment in children was studied by Piaget (1932). He found that as the child grows older and moral development progresses, the possibility of

conflict between the sense of justice and adult authority increases. The desire for equality of treatment in certain situations comes to be seen as opposing the fact that there is authority. The heteronomous individual who respects authority without question may either obey the adult authority without seeing the inequality in a situation or may recognize the inequality but obey the adult authority at the cost of justice anyway. The autonomous individual, on the other hand, may simply put justice before obedience in a situation where an unjust command is given or may consider the circumstances of a situation, such as the relationship with the other individual and the possibility of mutual cooperation, before deciding whether to follow the command or not.

Kohlberg (1963) also devised a cognitive theory of moral development, based on the work of Piaget, showing the progression through a fixed sequence of six stages. The theory points out that moral development is more than simply internalizing adults' standards of behavior, since the quality of responses to moral dilemmas changes as a function of chronological age and the accompanying changes in cognitive functioning that provide insight into one's actions and alter one's view of the external world (Kohlberg, 1964). Stages 1 and 2 of Kohlberg's theory are considered "pre-moral", since consideration for others is lacking at this level of moral development. Decisions and actions are carried out for the purpose of either avoiding punishment or gaining personal satisfaction. The next level of moral development described by Kohlberg is the "conventional level" and includes stages 3 and 4. There is a conscious effort to be loyal and maintain and justify the values of one's society and the actions of its members. The final level of moral development is the "principled" level where values are upheld and decisions made apart from authorities, the social group or one's

identification with a given society. Universal principles are applied that are not bound to the society that one is living in. Most children by the age of ten have developed beyond the first two stages and during preadolescence the conventional level of moral reasoning is dominant (Kohlberg, 1964).

Adolescents may be found at any of the six stages of moral reasoning, although there is a tendency to move away from conventional modes and towards autonomous moral principles at this time (Kohlberg & Gilligan, 1971). By the age of sixteen, stage 5 is fairly common whereas stage 6 is still little used.

The views of both Piaget and Kohlberg have been largely theoretical and have been based on little empirical evidence. As reported by Johnson (1962), empirical studies based on Piaget's theory of moral development have confirmed that adult constraint is related to the development of moral judgment, but have not confirmed that peer group experience is related to this development. The reason for this may be that the child is involved in a number of different kinds of activities with peers, such as gang activities, organized activities, or activities with single friends. Also, the child has different motivations for being involved with peers. The parent-child relationship may determine the type of peer activity and experience that the child has. There may be a satisfactory relationship with parents and interaction with peers may result from parents providing an opportunity for the child to have experiences outside the home (Kohlberg, 1969). On the other hand, when parents are either excessively permissive or excessively rejecting the child may be driven to the peer group (Devereux, 1970), or when parents encourage the acceptance of peer standards (Hollander & Marcia, 1970), this may occur.

In summary, growth in the areas of cognitive, moral, and ego-identity

development during early adolescence is concerned with coming to see the alternative possibilities in a situation. Some theorists suggest that peer group experience aids this growth. Empirical studies, however, do not show that peer group experience is highly related to growth in the area of moral development. It is suggested that little relationship is found because there are various kinds of peer group experience and a number of motivations for becoming involved with peers. In particular, the parent-child relationship may be an important factor in determining peer group experience.

The Measurement of Pressure From Peers Versus Adults

In a research program at Cornell University, pressure from peers versus adults in preadolescence has been studied and its relation to peer-group experience, moral development, and perceived parental behavior investigated (Bronfenbrenner, 1966; Devereux, 1970). The instrument used to measure responsiveness to pressure from peers versus adults, the Dilemmas Test, was employed by Bronfenbrenner (1966) in a study which was based on an interest in "...investigating the differential impact of adults and peers on the behavior and personality development of children in different cultural contexts (Bronfenbrenner, 1966, p.1)."

The Dilemmas Test was composed of thirty hypothetical conflict situations each depicting a real-life situation in which peers were urging the subject to engage in deviant behavior while adults were urging the subject to follow adult-approved standards of conduct. The subject was asked to what extent he would go along either with peers or with adults in each situation.

Each response was scored on a scale from -3 to +3. Negative scores were given for going along with peers and positive scores were given for going along with adults. The choices given were "absolutely certain" (-3),

"fairly certain" (-2), and "I guess so" (-1) to go along with peers and "absolutely certain" (+3), "fairly certain" (+2), and "I guess so" (+1) to go along with adults. Only one response was made to each item.

The conflict situations were presented to the subjects in the manner of the example below taken from Bronfenbrenner (1966).

The Hallowe'en Prank

Suppose you are out with your friends on Hallowe'en night. They want to soap some windows. Your parents have told you that it is wrong to hurt other people's property. What would you really do?

REFUSE TO GO ALONG WITH MY FRIENDS

GO ALONG WITH MY FRIENDS

REFUSE TO GO ALONG WITH MY FRIENDS			GO ALONG WITH MY FRIENDS		
absolutely certain	fairly certain	I guess so	I guess so	fairly certain	absolutely certain

The scale direction was reversed for half the items in order to control for a positional response set and the instrument was administered to 158 sixth grade subjects in six American classrooms and 188 fifth grade subjects in six Soviet classrooms. The average age of the subjects was twelve years. Responses were made under three conditions: 1) a "neutral" condition where the subjects were told that only the investigators would see the responses; 2) an "adult" condition where the subjects were told that responses would be shown to parents and teachers at a special meeting; and 3) a "peer" condition where the subjects were told that responses would be seen by their classmates. Each of the three conditions had ten conflict situations and scores for each subject could range from -30 (extreme peer-orientation) to +30 (extreme adult-orientation).

The following significant differences were found when groups were compared on responses to the Dilemmas Test: 1) Soviet subjects of both sexes went along with the behavior urged by adults to a significantly greater

extent than American subjects. (The mean score for Soviet boys, in the "neutral" condition, was 13 and the mean score for Soviet girls was 16. In contrast, the mean scores for American boys and girls were 1 and 3.5 respectively which indicates that the American subjects were nearly as ready to go along with peers and deviate as they were to go along with the socially approved standards of adults); 2) boys, in both the American and Soviet groups, were significantly more oriented toward their peers and inclined to engage in socially disapproved behavior than girls; 3) in both cultures, the subjects gave more socially approved responses under the "adult" condition than under the "peer" condition; 4) the Soviet subjects showed a significantly greater shift toward socially approved standards than the American subjects when moving from the "neutral" to the "adult" condition; 5) when moving from the "neutral" to the "peer" condition, the American subjects showed deviance from socially approved standards whereas Soviet subjects adhered even more strongly to socially approved standards.

Bronfenbrenner interpreted the findings as evidence that, for Soviet subjects, pressure from peers operates in the same direction as pressure from adults. On the other hand, the American peer group was seen as relatively autonomous and as having values which opposed those of the adult society. Although Bronfenbrenner has no data to show that responses made on the Dilemmas Test will remain stable throughout adolescence, he has demonstrated that the instrument can be used to find significant differences in behavior orientation between boys and girls in two different cultures under a number of social conditions. The finding that the Soviet subjects were more adult-oriented than American subjects is given support by field observations of Soviet children reported by Bronfenbrenner (1962). The fact that Soviet

children were found to be well-behaved and not likely to violate rules is in agreement with the findings using the Dilemmas Test.

An adaption of the Bronfenbrenner instrument was used by Hollander and Marcia (1970) in a study which investigated the extent to which peer-oriented children had parents who encouraged acceptance of peer standards and were, therefore, peer-oriented themselves. The subjects for the study were two fifth grade classes composed of 30 boys and 22 girls ages eleven and twelve. Peer-orientation was measured by a "dilemmas questionnaire" consisting of six hypothetical situations. Three of the items required that the subject choose between peer values and his own. The other three items required a choice between peer and parental values. Items were scored from 1 to 6 in the direction of peers. Both a peer- versus self-orientation score and a peer- versus parent-orientation score were obtained and, by adding the two, a total peer-orientation score was calculated for each subject. Parents' peer-orientation was measured by an interview and by direct questions. It was found that the correlation between parents' peer-orientation and the total peer-orientation score for subjects was .61. As in the Bronfenbrenner study, boys were found to be significantly more peer-oriented than girls. When subjects rated subjects of the same sex on sociometric scales, it was found that those children who chose self over peers were perceived as the least conforming by their classmates. Subjects rated as "doing what grown-ups think is right," a measure of obedience to authority, were highest for parent-oriented subjects whose parents were not peer-oriented.

A criticism of both the Bronfenbrenner study and the study by Hollander and Marcia is that the items of the Dilemmas Test always depict peers as encouraging socially disapproved or deviant behavior while adults are always

depicted as encouraging socially approved or conventionally good behavior. The test can be criticized on the grounds that during early adolescence pressure to deviate does not necessarily always come from peers and pressure to follow conventionally good standards of behavior does not necessarily always come from adults. Furthermore, it cannot be determined whether correlations of this test with other measures are due to peer versus adult orientation or morality.

Brittain (1963), working independently of Bronfenbrenner, and Hollander and Marcia, investigated peer- versus adult-orientation in adolescent girls from the ninth, tenth, and eleventh grades. The instrument used by Brittain consisted of twelve items requiring subjects to choose between peer and adult expectations. The Cross-Pressures Test (CPT) had two identical forms (A and B) whose only difference was that the expectations of peers and adults were reversed from one form to the other. As Brittain pointed out, the items of the CPT present the subject with two dilemmas simultaneously. It was necessary to respond to pressure from peers versus adults and it was also necessary to respond to the content of a situation, e.g. deciding which boy-friend to go steady with. It was hypothesized that the subjects' choices, either peer or adults, would depend upon the content of the situation. The hypothesis was further clarified by individually interviewing 42 subjects from the ninth and tenth grades. Three items were more closely associated with choosing the peer alternative. These items involved issues such as status within the peer group and identification with it. Seven other items were more closely associated with choosing the adult alternative and were involved with issues such as the adolescent's future plans and school achievement. Brittain interpreted the findings as evidence that the subjects perceived peers as

competent in giving advice with respect to certain areas where a decision was required while parents were perceived as more competent in other areas.

The CPT was shown to be a useful instrument in investigating the responses of adolescents to pressure from peers versus adults. Brittain went beyond the work of Bronfenbrenner (1966) and Hollander and Marcia (1970) by pointing out that there was another dimension in the study of peer- versus adult-orientation. Brittain found that the content of a given conflict situation was an important determinant in choosing either the peer or adult alternative.

The most recent version of the Dilemmas Test has been described by Devereux (1970). The instrument presents subjects with twenty-four hypothetical situations in which peers are encouraging deviance from socially acceptable standards of conduct. Six of the items pit peers against parents, and subjects must choose whether to go along with or resist pressure from peers who are encouraging behavior which displeases parents, but which has not been forbidden by parents. These items are not concerned with "moral" issues and include such things as seeing a movie with friends that parents would rather not have the subject see, and wearing old sneakers that parents would rather not have the subject wear. Six other items in the Dilemmas Test do involve moral issues such as lying about one's age to get into the show for less money and stealing fruit from an orchard. Subjects are asked to indicate to what extent they would tell their peers not to do the behavior described, to what extent they would go along if peers decided to do this behavior, and to what extent they would tell on their peers if an adult asked who was involved in the misbehavior. Six more items in the instrument measure to what extent subjects would either do what they themselves want to do or go

along with peers who are encouraging some personally less desirable behavior or activity. Examples of this type of item are going to a camp where something of interest to the subject is offered versus going to another camp with friends where this same activity is not offered, and reading an interesting book by oneself versus going to someone's house with friends. Finally, six items involve subjects choosing to what extent they would either spend time with or stick up for a single friend as opposed to going along with peers who are not concerned about the single friend.

Subjects' responses to the items of the Dilemmas Test are interpreted by Devereux (1970) as indicating to what extent subjects are either peer-oriented or adult-oriented. Subjects who are found to be peer-oriented are also referred to by Devereux as "peer conforming", "peer conformist", "yielding to peer pressure toward deviance", and "deviating from adult-approved standards of conduct, adult-sponsored moral values". On the other hand, adult-oriented subjects are referred to as "adult conforming", "adult conformist", "conforming to adult standards, adult moral values, adult-sponsored moral values, internalized moral standards, internalized adult values", and "resisting peer pressure toward deviance". A careful look at the Dilemmas Test reveals that not all items pit pressure from peers directly against pressure from adults, nor are all the items concerned with moral issues. When interpreting the results of studies using the Dilemmas Test, peer versus adult orientation and morality have been confused. Moreover, no precise or consistent set of terms has been used by Devereux (1970). In order to measure whether subjects are "peer-oriented" or "peer conforming" in some general sense, it would seem to be necessary to measure their responses to situations in which peers are encouraging socially approved behavior, as well as

situations in which peers are encouraging deviance.

A review of the literature relating morality and peer versus adult orientation to the variables of age, sex, and perceived parental behavior is given below.

Age Differences in Peer Versus Adult Orientation and Morality

The correlation between age and adult-orientation as measured by the Dilemmas Test was consistently found to be negative (Devereux et al., 1962; Devereux et al., 1969). Greater involvement with peers as children grow older could mean that older subjects are less able to resist peer pressure to deviate. Also, older subjects have had more experience away from the home and, therefore, would not subscribe to parental values to as great an extent as younger subjects who have had limited experience with peers (Devereux, 1970).

Devereux's results agree with those of Bowerman and Kinch (1959), who interviewed 686 students from the fourth through tenth grades to determine the extent of family versus peer orientation of subjects. The criteria used to determine a subject's orientation were: 1) the extent to which the subject identified with one group or the other; 2) the group with which the subject preferred to associate; and 3) the group which the subject thought of as having norms and values most like his own. It was found that family orientation decreased and peer orientation increased between the fourth and tenth grades. 87% of the fourth graders were family-oriented, 42% of the eighth graders, 45% of the ninth graders, and 32% of the tenth graders. On the other hand, 6% of the fourth graders were peer-oriented, 40% of the eighth graders, 33% of the ninth graders, and 48% of the tenth graders. This study points out that as subjects become older they identify less with parental values, prefer to associate with parents less, and also identify

less with parents themselves.

As reported, moral development advances toward more general and autonomous standards of conduct as the child becomes older (Kohlberg, 1963; Piaget, 1932). On the other hand, using the Dilemmas Test it has been found that older subjects are less likely to go along with adults and adhere to socially acceptable or conventional moral values (Devereux, 1970). Kohlberg and Kramer (1969) report that in early adolescence there may be a regression in moral development to the preconventional level. Whether going along with peers and deviating from conventional moral values represents moral regression or the use of autonomous standards has not been determined.

Sex Differences in Peer Versus Adult Orientation and Morality

In all studies reported by Devereux (1970), girls scored significantly more adult-oriented than boys on the Dilemmas Test.

Douvan (1960) reported findings from a study investigating sex differences in character development in a large sample of boys and girls between the ages of fourteen and sixteen. It was found that girls were more likely than boys to identify with and respect parental control and regulation. Boys, on the other hand, tended to view parental rules as external and in opposition to their own standards. On a projective measure involving parents setting limits for the child, 25% of the boys responded by questioning the parental restriction whereas only 4% of the girls responded in this way. One-third of the girls supported the parental restriction whereas hardly any of the boys did this. These findings demonstrated that boys were in opposition to parental rules whereas girls accepted and often reinforced parental standards. Douvan suggested that adolescent boys are actively struggling with the issue of control as they move toward the establishment of

autonomous, personal standards of conduct. Adolescent girls, on the other hand, "...are relatively uninvolved in this struggle and maintain a compliant-dependent relationship with their parents (Douvan, 1960, p. 206)".

In a study investigating familial antecedents of responsibility and leadership in early adolescence, Bronfenbrenner (1961) found that these qualities could be kept from developing in girls and boys as a consequence of the different childrearing practices used with the two sexes. Parental rejection and neglect hindered the development of responsibility and leadership in both sexes. For boys, too little support and authority from parents had a negative effect on the subject's being seen as a leader by his teacher and peers and being seen as dependable or responsible. On the other hand, girls who were given too much parental affection and control failed to develop leadership and responsibility. From these findings, Bronfenbrenner concluded that male adolescents are more often undersocialized by parents whereas female adolescents are more often oversocialized. The effect of such treatment by parents is to produce an individual who lacks responsibility and leadership.

In conclusion, both Bronfenbrenner (1961) and Douvan (1960) found that adolescent boys were encouraged to develop apart from external control imposed by parents whereas adolescent girls were not encouraged to develop independent standards of behavior. The effect of such differential treatment was to undersocialize boys by providing too little affection and control and to oversocialize girls by providing too much affection and control.

Not all studies investigating sex differences in peer versus adult orientation and morality are in agreement with the findings reported above. For example, some studies report that girls are more peer-oriented than boys and more willing to conform to peer group pressure. This may reflect a

greater need for social approval in girls than in boys (Hartup, 1970). When moral decisions are required, as in responding to the Dilemmas Test, girls are more willing than boys to respond to pressure from adults and adhere to conventional standards of conduct (Bronfenbrenner, 1966; Devereux, 1970). It may be that girls respond to pressure from both peers and adults in order to gain social approval. As may often be the case, gaining social approval from adults requires adherence to morally conventional standards.

Perceived Parental Behavior and Morality

Bronfenbrenner has concluded that, "...the internalization of moral standards is a function of the degree and ratio of parental affection and discipline (Bronfenbrenner, 1962, p. 558)". Internalization is maximized when both affection and discipline are high. If parents employ power-assertion techniques, i.e. physical discipline, without affection, the child will come to respond only to external control motivated by the fear of punishment. Furthermore, when affection and discipline are both low or when one outweighs the other, moral standards are weak. The results reported by Hoffman (1963) are in basic agreement with this. He has reported that warmth and affection shown toward the child promote identification with parents and their values. Discipline techniques that appeal to the child's needs for affection, self-esteem, and concern for others lead to an internalized moral orientation. Power-assertion techniques, on the other hand, lead to a moral orientation based on a fear of external detection and punishment.

Hoffman and Saltzstein (1967) classified seventh grade subjects as having either an external or an internal moral orientation. The internalized subjects were further differentiated into "humanistic-flexible" or "conventional-rigid". In general, the internalized subjects reported that parents

were more permissive in their discipline and employed physical discipline less often than the external group. The mothers of the internalized group were seen as more affectionate and using discipline techniques that indicated the painful consequences of the child's actions for the parent. The internalized subjects gave consistently more guilt responses on a story completion measure than the externally controlled subjects. The discipline techniques used by the parents of the internalized subjects seemed to appeal to the child's personal and social motives, whereas the techniques used by the parents of the externally controlled subjects instilled fear of authority and threat of punishment in the child.

Internalized subjects who were classified as "humanistic-flexible" considered human need and the entire situation before making a moral judgment or decision. The parents of these subjects showed their disappointment in the child when disciplining, thus pointing out that the child was capable of living up to an ideal. The child was also told to what extent his actions would hurt parents and others. In this way, empathy was aroused in the child. This type of psychological discipline was called "induction". The overall effect of using induction was to produce a child who used a positive approach in making moral decisions. On the other hand, internalized subjects who were classified as "conventional-rigid" generally ignored the situation when making a moral judgment and strictly adhered to conventional authority. The type of discipline technique most often employed by the parents of the conventional-rigid subjects was "love withdrawal". The parent either rejected the child without explanation when disciplining or used "ego-attack" techniques such as shame and scorn.

The work of Hoffman (1963) and Hoffman and Saltzstein (1967) relating

perceived parental behavior to morality has shown that high parental affection and low parental power-assertion are both related to internalization of standards of conduct. Parental use of "induction" was related to advanced moral judgment, whereas "love withdrawal" was related to less advanced moral judgment.

Perceived Parental Behavior and Peer Versus Adult Orientation

Devereux (1970) reports several studies from a research program at Cornell University which attempted to relate perceived parental behavior to peer versus adult orientation in subjects from the fifth through tenth grades from several cultural and socioeconomic backgrounds. Perceived parental behavior was measured by subjects' responses to a ten-item parental behavior inventory developed from a longer instrument consisting of one hundred items. The instrument yielded three general factors describing parental behavior - support, control, and punishment. In all samples studied, subjects who were adult-oriented reported parents as being more supporting, more controlling, and less punishing than did peer-oriented subjects. Reported participation with groups of peers in gang activities related negatively to resisting pressure from peers to deviate.

In addition, the Dilemmas Test was administered under a neutral condition where subjects were told only the researchers would see the responses, under a peer condition where subjects were told that their classmates would see the responses, and under an adult condition where subjects were told that their parents would see the responses. It was found that both boys and girls skewed their responses toward the peer end of the Dilemmas Test under the peer condition and toward the adult end under the adult condition. When the responses of individual subjects were looked at, it was

found that the largest amount of shifting toward the adult end under the adult condition occurred in those subjects who reported more association with mother, and more support from both parents, and less punishment from both parents. On the other hand, those subjects who made the largest shifts toward the peer end under the peer condition reported high involvement with gangs of peers and little association with mothers. For this group, parents were reported as low in support and either extremely high or extremely low in discipline (Devereux, 1970).

In reviewing the areas of peer versus adult orientation and morality, it was found that the relation of morality to the variables of age, sex, and perceived parental behavior is highly similar to that between the same variables and peer versus adult orientation. For example, older subjects were found to be less willing to adhere to conventionally good standards of morality and were less adult-oriented than younger subjects. Also, girls were found to be more willing to adhere to conventionally good standards and were more adult-oriented than boys. Finally, the perceived use of affection and control by parents was related to adherence to conventionally good standards and being adult-oriented. In most of the studies reviewed, adult-orientation was confused with conventionally good morality and peer-orientation was confused with deviance from conventionally good morality. For this reason, the present research is concerned with investigating the separate contributions of both peer versus adult orientation and morality as they each relate to subjects' age, sex, and perceived parental behavior.

The Measurement of Perceived Parental Behavior:
The Children's Report of Parental Behavior Inventory (CRPBI)

The early work done by E.S. Schaefer and his colleagues on the measurement of children's reports of parental behavior investigated the

hypothesis that, "A child's perception of his parents' behavior may be more related to his adjustment than is the actual behavior of his parents (Schaefer, 1965a, p. 413)". Schaefer was concerned about the fact that most previous studies in the area of children's perceptions of their parents' behavior had not attempted to measure discrete components of parental behavior and had failed to differentiate maternal from paternal behavior.

The concepts of parental behavior that were chosen by Schaefer were determined by factor analyzing psychologists' ratings of parental behavior. Two orthogonal dimensions were discovered. These dimensions were Love vs Hostility and Autonomy vs Control (Schaefer, 1959). Twenty-six scales were associated with the dimensions and combinations of the dimensions. For example, the scales Extreme Autonomy and Lax Discipline were associated with the Autonomy end of the Autonomy vs Control dimension, whereas Childcenteredness and Possessiveness were the scales associated with a combination of Love and Control. Ten items for each of the Twenty-six scales describing similar, specific, and observable parental behavior were chosen from twenty items by three psychologists. The criteria used to select the final ten items were clarity of the behavioral description, relevance of the item to the associated scale, applicability of the item to both father and mother, and high predicted item variance (Schaefer, 1965a).

The instrument, known as the Children's Report of Parental Behavior Inventory (CRPBI), was administered by Schaefer (1965a) to 85 boys and 80 girls in a suburban parochial school and to 81 delinquent boys living in an institution. The non-delinquent sample ranged in age from 12 to 14 years and the delinquent sample from 12 to 18 years. Each group completed separate forms for father and mother. The items were identical for both parents, except for the necessary changes in pronoun gender. The subjects indicated

whether an item was "Like", "Somewhat Like", or "Not Like" the behavior of the parent. Analyzing the responses of all subjects together, Schaefer found that the median internal consistency reliabilities of groups of scales used to determine the dimensions of the CRPBI were: for Love, .84; for Hostility, .78; for Autonomy, .69; and for Control, .66. Schaefer concluded from the results that, "The attempt to develop homogeneous measures for relatively specific components of parental behavior was rather successful (Schaefer, 1965a, p. 416)".

Using the data from the same study, Schaefer demonstrated the scale validity of the CRPBI by showing that the scales of the instrument could discriminate between criterion groups. The delinquent and non-delinquent groups were not matched for age, socioeconomic status, or adjustment status and, therefore, Schaefer points out that the results of the analysis cannot be interpreted as evidence of stable difference between the groups. The analysis did reveal, however, that of the 52 possible differences between groups (26 for mothers and 26 for fathers) 26 were significant beyond the .05 level and 14 were significant beyond the .01 level.

The data from the non-delinquent subjects were used by Droppleman and Schaefer (1963) to demonstrate that a separate analysis of maternal and paternal behavior is necessary in order to show differences in criterion groups and also to show on which specific scales mothers and fathers are perceived as different. In the sample of 85 boys and 80 girls, significant differences were found in 11 of the 26 scales for girls and in 8 of the 26 scales for boys. In a second sample of 36 boys and 34 girls, significant differences were found in 3 of 6 clusters of scales for both boys and girls. The results revealed mothers as more loving and affectionate and less ignoring and neglecting than fathers (Droppleman and Schaefer, 1963).

The Factor Structure of the CRPBI

Schaefer (1965b) administered the CRPBI to two samples of Army men. One group was made up of 154 personnel at an Army hospital and the other group was made up of 108 patients and personnel at the same hospital. All subjects were adult males and were instructed to describe their parents' behavior when the subjects were 16 years of age. The data from these two groups, along with the data from the previous samples of delinquent and non-delinquent subjects were analyzed in order to determine the factor structure of the CRPBI and also to determine if reports of parental behavior would replicate the structure of parental behavior derived from psychologists' ratings.

All subjects reported maternal and paternal behavior separately. Four correlation matrices (one for the delinquent sample, one for the non-delinquent sample, and one for each sample of Army men) were factor analyzed using the principal components method and three factors were rotated to simple structure using the Varimax criterion. The three factors accounted for an average of 66 percent of the total variance and were very similar from sample to sample when "coefficients of congruence" were computed (Harman, 1960). Schaefer found that the scales designed to measure Love vs Hostility loaded highly on the first factor. Positive Evaluation, Sharing, Expression of Affection, Emotional Support, and Equalitarian Treatment were the scales on the positive end of the dimension and Ignoring, Neglect, and Rejection were on the negative end. This dimension of the CRPBI was labelled Acceptance vs Rejection. The second dimension, which was labelled Psychological Autonomy vs Psychological Control, was associated with scales measuring Intrusiveness, Parental Direction, and Control Through Guilt. Possessiveness, Protectiveness, Nagging, and Negative Evaluation, which loaded highly on the Acceptance vs

Rejection dimension, all loaded highly on this dimension. Strictness and Punishment, scales associated with the third dimension, loaded highly on this factor as well. The third dimension which was defined by the Lax Discipline, Extreme Autonomy, Punishment, and Strictness scales, was labelled Firm Control vs Lax Control.

Based on the results of the factor analysis, Schaefer (1965b) was able to recommend to other researchers how certain scales might be combined to form more economical scales to investigate children's reports of parental behavior. For example, by plotting the factor loadings of scales with high loadings on the Acceptance vs Rejection and the Psychological Autonomy vs Psychological Control together, it was found that the Neglect, Rejection and Ignoring scales formed a configuration which could more economically be labelled Hostile Detachment. This new scale, composed of items from each of the former scales, could be included on the CRPBI form in future studies. Encouraging Sociability and Encouraging Individual Thinking combined to form the new scale Acceptance of Individuation. Emotional Support, Sharing, Expression of Affection, and Positive Evaluation formed Loving Involvement, while Nagging, Negative Evaluation, and Irritability formed Hostile Involvement. Although Schaefer did not actually plot the factor loadings of scales with high loadings on the Psychological Autonomy vs Psychological Control and Firm Control vs Lax Control dimensions, he did hypothesize which scales would form configurations. The more economical scales were labelled Enforcement, Inconsistent Discipline, and Control Through Withdrawal of Relations.

The Modified Form of the CRPBI: Replication of Factor Structure

Edward and Shirin Schludermann (1970) carried out a study, using a revised version of the CRPBI, that was designed to replicate the findings of

the Schaefer studies. The study had two major objectives. First of all, it was the aim of the researchers to, "test the generalizability of the CRPBI factor structure for different independent samples (Schludermann & Schludermann, 1970, p. 239)". Generalizability would imply that perceived parental behavior could be described in a more economical manner by calculating and reporting factor scores rather than scale scores when using the CRPBI for research purposes. The other objective of the study was to administer a shortened version of the CRPBI which consisted of 18 scales with 6 scales composed of 8 items each and 12 scales composed of 5 items each. The new instrument consisted of 108 items which were identical for each parent. Validation of the shortened form would provide the same information that Schaefer obtained in less time.

The 18 scales of the revised form were selected according to the criteria of high scale reliability, variability, and applicability to parental behavior. Items with the highest item-reliability were chosen for each scale. The researchers also eliminated items which were not relevant to ethnic, social, and religious minority groups, since the modified form was to be administered to Hutterite children in a cross-cultural study. The overall effect of modifying the CRPBI was to shorten, simplify, and make more easily readable Schaefer's original form. The Schludermanns also included scales which closely resemble, in label and content, the combined and more economical scales suggested by Schaefer (1965b). For example, Acceptance of Individuation, Hostile Detachment, Enforcement, and Inconsistent Discipline have been included in the modified form. Also, Loving Involvement has become Positive Involvement, Hostile Involvement has become Hostile Control, and Control Through Withdrawal of Relations has become Withdrawal of Relations. The complete modified form of the CRPBI and the

items associated with each of the 18 scales are found in Appendices D and E.

The replicability of the factor structure of the CRPBI was tested by the Schludermanns (1970) who administered the modified form to two independent samples of first year college students, ranging in age from 18 to 22 years. The first sample consisted of 149 males and 145 females and the second sample consisted of 168 males and 230 females. The data were factor analyzed separately for each group and separate analyses were done for male and female respondents as well as for mother's and father's forms. Items were scored 3, 2, 1 for statements that were "Like", "Somewhat Like", and "Not Like" parental behavior respectively. Each of the eight correlation matrices of 18 x 18 scale scores was factor analyzed by the principal axes method and was rotated orthogonally according to the Varimax criteria. An eigenvalue of 1.0 was used as the cut-off point to decide the number of factors to be rotated. All three eigenvalues above 1.0 were greater than 2.0. Three factors emerged from the analyses of all eight matrices and accounted for 66 to 72 percent of the total variance.

The factors were quite similar in structure to those found by Schaefer (1965b) and the labels used by him were retained. The three factors were Acceptance vs Rejection, Psychological Control vs Psychological Atunomy, and Firm Control vs Lax Control.

An overall factor analysis of the pooled data was done since the factor matrices were so much alike. The composite factor structure was similar to the separate analyses and the labels used to describe the three dimensions remained the same. Coefficients of factorial similarity were calculated within- and between-groups. It was found that the coefficients of similarity between the Acceptance vs Rejection and Firm Control vs Lax Control dimensions were insignificant and, therefore, the factors could be considered

to be independent of one another, whereas some moderately significant coefficients of similarity between the Psychological Control vs Psychological Autonomy dimension and the other two factors indicated moderate overlap of that factor with the others. Also, it was found by calculating between-groups coefficients of similarity that male and female subgroups displayed significantly high coefficients of similarity on each of the three factors. This finding can be taken as evidence that males and females perceived parental behavior along the same three basic dimensions.

In summary, the Schludermanns (1970) successfully replicated the factor structure found with Schaefer's original CRPBI across parents' forms, sex groups, and independent samples using a modified version of the instrument which was shortened and simplified. The researchers concluded that, based on their findings, the more economical factor scores, rather than scale scores, could be used when describing children's report of parental behavior.

The Modified Form of the CRPBI: Discrimination Between Groups

In a study designed to investigate how the childrearing practices in the Hutterite communal society influence the adolescent's perception of parental behavior, the Schludermanns (1971) demonstrated the ability of the modified form of the CRPBI to replicate the factor structure of previous studies with the modified instrument and of studies using the original form (Schaefer, 1965b). The subjects for the study were 71 boys and 111 girls, aged 13 to 15 years, from twenty Hutterite colonies in rural Manitoba. The data for father's and mother's forms and for boys and girls were pooled together and factor analyzed according to the previous procedure used by the Schludermanns (1970). It was found that the Hutterite adolescents described their parents along the same three dimensions as subjects of previous studies had. This finding illustrated the usefulness of the modified form of the

CRPBI as a tool in cross-cultural studies. Between-group and within-group comparisons of factor scores, using t tests, revealed significant differences in how mothers and fathers were perceived differently by both boys and girls in Hutterite communal society. The findings of the study demonstrate the ability of the CRPBI to discriminate between groups of respondents.

A Replication of the Factor Structure of the Modified Form of the CRPBI with Two Independent Samples

In the Summer of 1972, a study was conducted by the author which employed the modified form of the CRPBI. The subjects for the study were 202 boys and girls from the fifth to the eighth grade in two public schools located in neighbouring villages in Southwestern Ontario. There were 112 subjects from one school and 90 subjects from the other school. The data from boys and girls on mother's and father's forms were pooled together since previous studies demonstrated that the factor structure for both sexes on both parents' forms was the same (Schludermann & Schludermann, 1970; 1971). The correlation matrix of 18 x 18 scale scores was factor analyzed by the principle components method with an eigenvalue of 1.0 as the cut-off criterion. All eigenvalues above the cut-off point were also above 2.0. The three factors that were found were rotated to simple structure according to the Varimax criterion and accounted for 72 percent of the total variance. The results, which replicated the basic factor structure of previous studies using the instrument, are presented in Table 1 along with the results of the studies done by the Schludermanns (1970, 1971). From these findings, it can be seen that independent samples of subjects consistently perceive their parents along the same three basic dimensions of Acceptance vs Rejection, Psychological Control vs Psychological Autonomy, and Firm Control vs Lax Control.

The Choice of the Modified Form of the CRPBI For the Thesis

The CRPBI is an instrument that measures subjects' perception of parental behavior. Since the purpose of the thesis is to investigate how peer versus adult orientation and morality relate to the perception of parent behavior during early adolescence, it is most appropriate to get the information concerning parental behavior from the subjects themselves rather than from observation of parents or reports from parents. 'Also, the CRPBI has been shown to consistently yield three basic underlying dimensions along which subjects, regardless of age, sex, socioeconomic status, or cultural background, perceive their parents. Finally, the modified form of the CRPBI is shorter, simpler, and gives the same information as the original form. The three factor scores which are generated for each subject on each of the parent's forms can be used to investigate sex differences and grade differences among groups of subjects, as well as to relate perceived parental behavior to peer versus adult orientation and morality.

Method

Subjects.- The subjects for the study were 231 students from Burnaby Heights Junior Secondary School in Burnaby, British Columbia. There were 62 grade 8 girls, 57 grade 8 boys, 55 grade 10 girls, and 57 grade 10 boys. The subjects ranged in age from 12 to 17 years and were from a variety of ethnic, racial, and socioeconomic backgrounds. Table 2 gives the mean and range of ages for each grade-sex group. All subjects were in a "general" or "academic" program at school with the exception of two grade 8 girls and thirteen grade 8 boys who were in an "occupational" program.

The Conflict Situations Questionnaire (CSQ)

A questionnaire composed of twenty hypothetical conflict situations

was devised by the author for use in the study and was based on the Dilemmas Test used by Bronfenbrenner (1966) and reported by Devereux (1970). The conflict situations presented real-life events, and subjects indicated to what extent they would go along either with peers or adults in the situation described. Half of the conflict situations described peers as doing or encouraging behavior which was conventionally bad or deviant while adults were doing or encouraging behavior which was conventionally good. The other half of the items on the CSQ described adults as doing or encouraging behavior which was conventionally bad while peers were doing or encouraging behavior which was conventionally good.

Subjects were presented alternately with the two types of conflict situations. The left-right position of the response alternatives was alternated within each type of situation on the response sheet. In this way, conflict situations of the same type did not follow one another directly and any positional response set was controlled for. A complete form of the CSQ and instructions are given in Appendix A.

Scoring the CSQ

Subjects indicated "absolutely certain", "fairly certain", or "maybe" they would go along with either peers or adults in each situation. One score was calculated for each subject on the peer-adult dimension and another score was calculated on an independent conventionally good-conventionally bad dimension. Scores on each conflict situation could range from 1 to 6 and the responses were scored, from low to high, in the direction of peers for the first dimension and in the direction of conventionally good for the second dimension. For example, a response of absolutely certain to go along with adults scored 1 on the peer-adult dimension while a response of absolutely certain to go along with peers scored 6. A response of absolutely certain

to choose the conventionally bad alternative scored 1 on the morality dimension while a response of absolutely certain to choose the conventionally good alternative scored 6. Scores on each dimension could range from 20 to 120 for each subject.

A subject scoring at or near the extreme on one dimension could not score at or near the extreme on the other dimension because of the construction of the test. For example, a subject who always chose the peer alternative would of necessity choose the conventionally good alternative half the time and the conventionally bad alternative half the time.

The items of the CSQ are based on the results of a pilot study which is discussed below.

The CSQ Pilot Study

A pilot study was conducted to determine the appropriateness of the items of the Conflict Situations Questionnaire (CSQ). The subjects for the study were 60 seventh-grade girls and boys from Aubrey Elementary School in Burnaby, British Columbia. The subjects were given the standard instructions for the CSQ and responded in a single group in their regular classroom. After completing the CSQ, the subjects were randomly assigned to groups of three or four and joined the author in the school library. A discussion of the items of the CSQ followed and each session lasted approximately twenty minutes. The major questions discussed were: 1) Does this situation make sense to you? 2) Is this situation something that is realistic to you and, therefore, could happen in your life? 3) Is this the way your parents or other adults you know might act in this situation? 4) Is this the way your friends might act in this situation? Based on the comments and suggestions of the subjects, two of the items were reworded,

and three situations were altered so as to meet the criteria of making sense, being realistic, and being what peers or adults would conceivably do in each situation.

Although the purpose of the pilot study was to establish appropriate items for the CSQ, the results of the subjects' responses are interesting in their own right. It was found that the subjects were extremely oriented toward choosing the conventionally good alternative no matter if it was adults or peers who encouraged it. This finding was illustrated by the fact that only six of the sixty subjects scored on the conventionally bad end of the dimension, i.e. below 70. Twenty-nine subjects scored 90 or above on this dimension. Scores on the morality dimension ranged from 55 to 112. The mean score on this dimension was 87.95. As for the peer-adult dimension, the subjects were nearly evenly divided with twenty-five scoring toward the peer end and thirty-five scoring toward the adult end. Scores on this dimension ranged from 46 to 87, a smaller range than for the morality dimension. The mean score on this dimension was 69.00.

Reported Participation in Organized Activities

Subjects reported any groups, clubs, or activities that they were involved in at school, in the church, or in the community with peers and with adults. The response sheet used to measure participation in organized activities is given in Appendix B. Only "organized" activities were included in the scoring, and activities such as meeting with friends in the neighbourhood or jamming with a rock and roll band were not counted when reported by subjects.

Activities reported with peers and activities reported with adults were looked at separately and it was found that there was a high correlation between the two measures. Also, both measures correlated in a similar

manner with the other measures of the study. It was also found that subjects reported few activities involving adults. For the above reasons, it was decided to combine reported activities with peers and with adults to yield an overall organized activities score for each subject.

Conduct

The general conduct of each of 102 subjects was rated by each subject's guidance counsellor and the school vice-principal. 16 grade 8 girls, 29 grade 8 boys, 21 grade 10 girls, and 36 grade 10 boys were rated. One counsellor rated both groups of girls, another counsellor rated grade 8 boys, and a third counsellor rated grade 10 boys. The vice-principal rated all subjects. The rating scale used in the study is given in Appendix C.

Table 3 presents the mean and range of counsellors' and vice-principal's conduct ratings for each grade-sex group, and the correlations between their ratings. The agreement between counsellors' and vice-principal's ratings was poor and it was decided to average together the two ratings for each subject to yield an overall measure of conduct. A possible explanation for the low correlations between counsellors' and vice-principal's ratings is that the vice-principal, who used a much smaller range of scores to rate subjects' conduct, did not know the subjects as well as the counsellors did. The vice-principal used a larger range of scores to rate boys than girls and this suggests that he knew the boys (good and bad) better than he knew the girls.

The Children's Report of Parental Behavior Inventory (CRPBI)

The modified form of the CRPBI (Schludermann & Schludermann, 1970) was used. It consisted of 108 items describing the behavior of the mother and an identical 108 items describing the behavior of the father. A complete

form of the CRPBI and instructions are given in Appendix D.

All 231 subjects responded to the mother's form of the CRPBI, but only 199 subjects responded to the father's form. Subjects did not respond to the father's form when the father was deceased, not living at home, or not known well enough by the subject.

Scoring of the CRPBI

Each subject indicated whether the behavior described was "Like", "Somewhat Like", or "Not Like" the behavior of the parent. Responses were scored 3, 2, 1 respectively and scores on items that formed a scale of the CRPBI were added together to yield a scale score. The CRPBI had eighteen scales. Six scales have 8 items each and twelve scales have 5 items each. The scores on the scales with 8 items were multiplied by $5/4$ and the scores on the scales with 5 items were multiplied by 2 in order to yield a total of eighteen scale scores that could range from 10 to 30 for each subject. A scoring sheet for the CRPBI showing the 18 scales and items making up each scale is given in Appendix E.

Procedure

The data collection occurred during December of 1972 and January of 1973. Regularly scheduled school guidance periods were used so that subjects could complete the CSQ, the CRPBI, and reported participation in organized activities. Since each class lasted one hour and ten minutes, there was sufficient time to complete the data collection in a single period. Three classes of grade 8 girls, two classes of grade 8 boys, two classes of grade 10 girls, and three classes of grade 10 boys responded. The classes were chosen because they were scheduled at a time that was convenient for both the author and the guidance counsellors.

Subjects were first asked to give their age, grade, and sex at the top of the sheet used to measure participation in organized activities. Before each measurement was obtained, verbal instructions were given and any questions which the subjects had were answered. While subjects were completing the forms, the author circulated throughout the classroom to assist subjects and insure that they were finished within the allotted time.

Subjects did not give their names before responding. However, each subject was assigned an identification number which appeared on all forms completed by the subject. A separate sheet of paper was passed around the classroom after all forms were completed and were being collected. Each subject printed his or her name beside the number on the sheet which corresponded to the subject's identification number.

It was necessary to have the names of subjects in order for counsellors and the vice-principal to rate subjects' conduct. Three weeks were allowed for counsellors and the vice-principal to complete the ratings of conduct.

Results

The Factor Structure of the CRPBI

Subjects' scores on the eighteen scales of the CRPBI from mother's forms, father's forms, and mother's and father's forms taken together were transformed into three 18 x 18 correlation matrices. A component analysis was done on each of the three correlation matrices. In each case, the number of factors selected for rotation was determined by using the criterion of eigenvalues greater than 1.0 (all eigenvalues were above 2.0). An orthogonal rotation was executed using the Varimax criterion. Table 4 indicates the percentage of variance accounted for by each factor and the total percentage of variance accounted for in the three analyses.

As shown in Table 5 the factor structure of the three analyses was highly similar, and almost identical factor loadings were produced. Considering only those scales with loadings above $\pm .40$ on a factor, the three factors of the CRPBI may be described as follows:

a) Psychological Control versus Psychological Autonomy - The parent who is perceived by the child as using psychological control is both possessive and intrusive, and displays emotionality, especially hostility, in dealing with the child. The parent appeals to the child to do what is expected out of love for the parent and love is withdrawn when the child displeases the parent. The child is reminded of misbehavior long after it is over. Also, the parent tends to be inconsistent in disciplining.

b) Rejection versus Acceptance - The parent who is perceived by the child as rejecting is not comforting or supporting of the child in any way. The parent is likely to be irritated by what the child does. There is little interest taken by the parent in the activities of the child. The parent is not seen as possessive nor is the parent seen as accepting of individuation.

c) Firm Control versus Lax Control - The parent who uses firm control is seen by the child as having specific rules of behavior that are enforced by checking that the child has adhered to parental standards. The child is not let off easily when a rule is broken. Finally, limits are set for the child's behavior and extreme autonomy is not granted by the parent.

The factor structure of the CRPBI was found to be highly similar to the factor structure found by other researchers using the instrument (Schludermann & Schludermann, 1970; 1971) as shown in Table 6.

From the factor analysis of the pooled data from father's and mother's forms, factor scores were generated for each subject on each of the three factors describing each parent.

A Survey of the Items of the CSQ

A survey of the items of the CSQ was conducted in order to determine if the situations described did indeed depict conventionally good versus conventionally bad behavior. A questionnaire was administered to forty adults from a number of occupational backgrounds including housewife, nurse, teacher, salesman, librarian, and mill worker. Subjects were asked to indicate whether the content of each situation used in the CSQ was either "good" or "bad" according to the way that the subject thought most people in Canadian Society feel about it today. The items were worded in such a way that a response of "bad" was required in order to verify the assumptions made when the CSQ was devised. As Table 7 indicates, the percentage of subjects responding "bad", as expected, was quite high. Sixteen of the twenty items were responded to as "bad" by over 80% of the subjects. The lowest percentage of subjects responding "bad" was 68% to two of the twenty items.

A significant chi square value (chi square=9.4, $p < .01$) was found when the number of subjects in the survey responding "bad" to those items in which peers were encouraging deviant behavior while adults were encouraging conventionally good behavior (the odd numbered items in Table 7) was looked at in comparison to the number of subjects making the same response to those items in which adults were encouraging deviant behavior while peers were encouraging conventionally good behavior (the even numbered items in Table 7). More "bad" responses were given for those items in which peers were deviating than for those in which adults were deviating. This finding suggests that the subjects of the survey felt stronger about the moral issues involved in the former items than in the latter items.

The Internal Consistency Reliability of the
Items of the Two Dimensions of the CSQ

The reliability of the two dimensions of the CSQ was determined by measuring the internal consistency of each dimension as indexed by the "alpha" coefficient. Table 8 gives the "alpha" coefficients for each dimension of the CSQ when looking at responses to items for all subjects, girls, boys, grade 8 subjects, grade 10 subjects, and each of the four grade-sex groups. The "alphas" ranged from .14 to .40 for the peer-adult dimension and from .73 to .81 for the morality dimension. In general, the items used to measure the morality dimension provide a relatively reliable measure of morality, whereas the items used to measure the peer-adult dimension provide a relatively unreliable measure of peer versus adult orientation. Also, the measure of morality has been found to be a more stable measure than the measure of peer versus adult orientation, i.e. another sample of subjects would be found to respond in a similar way to the items of the morality dimension, whereas this would not occur to as great an extent when responding to the items of the peer-adult dimension.

Group Differences on the CSQ

The means and standard deviations for grade-sex groups on the peer-adult dimension of the CSQ are presented in Table 9. Individual t tests* were used to compare groups on this dimension and, as Table 10 indicates, the only significant difference found was that girls were more peer oriented than boys ($p < .05$). This finding was not true for the grade 8 or grade 10 groups taken separately.

Table 11 gives the means and standard deviations for grade-sex groups on the conventionally good-conventionally bad dimension of the CSQ. Individual t tests revealed that significant differences were found between all groups

* All t tests reported in this thesis are two-tailed.

compared on the dimension of morality (see Table 12). Overall, girls scored significantly higher on the conventionally good end of the dimension than boys ($p < .001$) and this same result was found in separate analyses of grade 8 subjects ($p < .01$) and grade 10 subjects ($p < .05$). It was also found that grade 8 subjects scored significantly higher than grade 10 subjects ($p < .001$) and this was found in separate analyses of girls ($p < .001$) and boys ($p < .001$).

Differences Between Subsets of the Morality
Dimension of the CSQ

The items of the CSQ were divided into two subsets in order to determine if responding to either peers or adults made the greater contribution to subjects' scores on the morality dimension of the CSQ. One subset included the ten items depicting peers as doing or encouraging conventionally bad behavior while adults are doing or encouraging conventionally good behavior. The other subset included the ten items depicting adults as doing or encouraging conventionally bad behavior while peers are doing or encouraging conventionally good behavior.

Means and standard deviations of each of the subsets of items for all subjects, girls overall, boys overall, grade 8 subjects overall, grade 10 subjects overall, and the four individual grade-sex groups are given in Table 13. For groups of subjects, scores on the two subsets of items were compared using t tests of correlated samples. As shown in Table 13, all subjects taken together were found to be significantly more responsive to peers than to adults when responding to the morality dimension of the CSQ ($p < .001$). In other words, subjects chose to go along with peers to a significantly greater extent than adults when told by each to adhere to conventionally good standards of conduct and also when told to deviate from them. This finding was also true for girls overall ($p < .001$),

for grade 8 subjects overall ($p < .05$), and grade 10 subjects overall ($p < .001$). When individual grade-sex groups were looked at, this finding was true for grade 8 girls ($p < .01$), grade 10 girls ($p < .001$), and grade 10 boys ($p < .05$). The results show that all subjects, especially girls, are "peer oriented" in the sense that they are more responsive to pressure from peers than adults when responding to the morality dimension of the CSQ.

Group Differences on Participation in Organized Activities and Conduct

The means and standard deviations for grade-sex groups reported participation in organized activities are given in Table 14. As Table 15 shows, there were no significant differences found between groups on the measure of reported participation in organized activities. All groups reported approximately the same amount of involvement in organized activities.

Table 16 presents the means and standard deviations for grade-sex groups' conduct scores. A comparison between groups revealed that grade 8 subjects had significantly higher conduct scores than grade 10 subjects ($p < .05$) when rated by school counsellors and vice-principal. This finding was not true of boys' and girls' groups compared separately (see Table 17). There were no significant sex differences found in conduct.

Multiple Correlational Analyses

Multiple correlational analyses were performed using the variables of peer versus adult orientation and morality as predictors and each of the other variables, in turn, as the criterion variable. As shown in Table 18, the morality variable contributed significantly to the prediction of activities ($p < .01$), the use of psychological control by the mother ($p < .001$), the use of rejection by the mother ($p < .001$), the use of firm control by the mother ($p < .001$), the use of psychological control by the father ($p < .001$),

the use of rejection by the father ($p < .001$), the use of firm control by the father ($p < .001$), and conduct ($p < .001$). The variable of peer versus adult orientation contributed significantly to the prediction of the use of rejection by the mother ($p < .001$), the use of firm control by the mother ($p < .001$), the use of rejection by the father ($p < .01$), and the use of firm control by the father ($p < .001$). These findings are in agreement with the results found using individual correlations between variables which are presented below. The only exception is that the use of rejection by the mother and the father are not found to be significantly related to the peer versus adult orientation variable when investigated by means of individual correlations.

Correlations Among the Dimensions of the CSQ
Participation in Organized Activities, and Conduct

Table 19 presents the correlations among scores on the two dimensions of the CSQ, participation in organized activities, and conduct for all subjects taken together and for the separate grade-sex groups. No significant correlations were found between scores on the peer-adult dimension of the CSQ and either organized activities scores or conduct scores. Choosing the conventionally good alternative on the CSQ was related to high participation in organized activities for all grade 10 subjects ($r = .23$, $p < .05$) and for grade 10 girls separately ($r = .30$, $p < .05$).

Being rated as having good conduct by counsellors and vice-principal was related to choosing the conventionally good alternative for all subjects ($r = .38$, $p < .01$), for all girls ($r = .41$, $p < .05$), for all boys ($r = .41$, $p < .01$), and for all grade 10 subjects ($r = .48$, $p < .01$). The only individual grade-sex group for whom this finding was true was grade 10 boys ($r = .61$, $p < .01$). Also, having a good conduct score was related to being involved in relatively many organized activities for all subjects ($r = .25$, $p < .05$), for all boys ($r = .26$,

$p < .05$), and for all grade 10 subjects ($r = .29$, $p < .05$), although this was not true for any individual grade-sex group.

Group Differences in Factor Scores of the CRPBI

Means and standard deviations for grade-sex groups on the three factor scores describing each parent are presented in Tables 20, 22, 24, 26, 28 and 30. Differences between groups on the three factor scores for each parent were investigated by means of individual t tests. There were no significant differences found in the way in which groups perceived either the mother or the father in their use of psychological control (see Tables 21 and 23).

Overall, as shown in Table 25, grade 10 subjects perceived mothers as significantly more rejecting than did grade 8 subjects ($p < .01$). When the sexes were looked at separately, this finding was significant only for girls ($p < .05$). Grade 10 subjects also perceived the father as more rejecting than did grade 8 subjects ($p < .01$) as shown in Table 27. When the sexes were looked at separately, this finding was true only for girls ($p < .01$).

As shown in Table 29, grade 8 subjects perceived the mother as using more firm control than did grade 10 subjects ($p < .05$) and, looking at the sexes separately, this finding was significant for boys ($p < .01$) but not for girls. Table 31 indicates that grade 8 boys perceived the father as using significantly more firm control than did grade 10 boys ($p < .05$), although this was not significant for any other groups compared.

Group Differences Between the Perceived Behavior of the Mother and the Father on the Three Dimensions of the CRPBI

For groups of subjects, factor scores for mothers and fathers were compared on each of the three dimensions of the CRPBI by employing t tests of correlated samples. As shown in Tables 32, 33 and 34, the only significant findings were that grade 8 girls perceived the father as more rejecting than

the mother ($p < .01$) and as using more firm control than the mother ($p < .05$). Mothers and fathers were perceived as highly similar in their behavior along the three dimensions of the CRPBI.

Correlations Between the Perceived Behavior of the Mother and the Perceived Behavior of the Father on the Three Dimensions of the CRPBI

Correlations among the three dimensions of the CRPBI for both mothers' and fathers' reported behavior are presented in Table 35. The most consistent finding was that perception of the behavior of one parent on each of the three dimensions of the CRPBI was significantly related to perception of the behavior of the other parent on the same dimension. For all subjects, the correlation between reported use of psychological control by the mother and psychological control by the father was $.50$ ($p < .01$). The correlation between reported use of rejection by both parents was $.39$ ($p < .01$). The correlation between reported use of firm control by both parents was $.56$ ($p < .01$). For girls, boys, grade 8 subjects, and grade 10 subjects, all correlations between the perception of mother's and father's behavior were significant at the $.01$ level or better. For the four grade-sex groups, 10 out of 12 correlations between the perception of mother's and father's behavior on the three dimensions of the CRPBI were significant at the $.05$ level or better (see Table 35).

Correlations Among the Three Dimensions of the CRPBI and the Two Dimensions of the CSQ

As indicated in Table 36, perceiving the mother as using psychological control was negatively related to choosing the conventionally good alternative on the CSQ for grade 10 subjects overall ($r = -.37$, $p < .01$). This was true for each sex separately ($r = -.34$, $p < .05$, for girls; $r = -.39$, $p < .01$, for boys). Perceiving the father as using psychological control was negatively related

to choosing the conventionally good alternative for grade 10 subjects overall ($r = -.27$, $p < .01$) and for grade 10 boys separately ($r = -.37$, $p < .05$). There were no significant relations found between perception of parental psychological control and subjects' scores on the peer-adult dimension of the CSQ.

For all subjects, perceiving the mother as rejecting was negatively related to choosing the conventionally good alternative on the CSQ ($r = -.24$, $p < .01$). This finding was also true for boys ($r = -.28$, $p < .05$) and grade 10 subjects overall ($r = -.21$, $p < .05$). Perceiving the father as rejecting was negatively related to choosing the conventionally good alternative for girls overall ($r = -.27$, $p < .01$) and for grade 10 girls separately ($r = -.31$, $p < .05$). There were no significant relations found between perception of parental rejection and the peer-adult dimension.

The perceived use of firm control by both the mother and the father was positively related to choosing the conventionally good alternative on the CSQ for all subjects ($r = .33$, $p < .01$, for mother; $r = .28$, $p < .01$, for father), for girls overall ($r = .24$, $p < .05$, for mother; $r = .24$, $p < .05$, for father), for boys overall ($r = .43$, $p < .01$, for mother; $r = .35$, $p < .01$, for father), for grade 8 subjects overall ($r = .27$, $p < .01$, for mother; $r = .25$, $p < .05$, for father), for grade 10 subjects overall ($r = .29$, $p < .01$, for mother; $r = .27$, $p < .01$, for father), for grade 8 boys ($r = .44$, $p < .01$, for mother; $r = .34$, $p < .05$, for father), and for grade 10 boys separately ($r = .29$, $p < .05$, for mother; $r = .28$, $p < .05$, for father). The perceived use of firm control by the mother was negatively related to choosing the peer alternative for all subjects ($r = -.32$, $p < .01$), for girls overall ($r = -.40$, $p < .01$), for boys overall ($r = -.25$, $p < .05$), for grade 8 subjects overall ($r = -.34$, $p < .01$), for grade 10 subjects overall ($r = -.27$, $p < .01$), for grade 8 girls ($r = -.36$, $p < .01$), for grade 8 boys ($r = -.32$,

$p < .05$) and for grade 10 girls separately ($r = -.43$, $p < .01$). Perceiving the father as using firm control was negatively related to choosing the peer alternative for grade 8 subjects overall ($r = -.22$, $p < .05$) and for grade 8 girls separately ($r = -.29$, $p < .05$).

Correlations Among the Three Dimensions of the CRPBI
Participation in Organized Activities, and Conduct

Table 36 shows the correlations among the dimensions of the CRPBI, participation in organized activities, and conduct. For all subjects, perceiving the mother as using psychological control was related to high participation in organized activities ($r = .25$, $p < .01$). This finding was also true for boys overall ($r = .33$, $p < .01$), for grade 8 subjects overall ($r = .30$, $p < .01$), for grade 10 subjects overall ($r = .22$, $p < .05$), for grade 8 boys ($r = .37$, $p < .01$), and for grade 10 boys separately ($r = .32$, $p < .05$).

Perceiving the father as rejecting was negatively related to high participation in organized activities for all subjects ($r = -.24$, $p < .01$), for girls overall ($r = -.45$, $p < .01$), for grade 8 subjects overall ($r = -.31$, $p < .01$), for grade 10 subjects overall ($r = -.23$, $p < .05$), for grade 8 girls ($r = -.53$, $p < .01$), and grade 10 girls separately ($r = -.41$, $p < .01$). Perceiving the mother as rejecting was negatively related to high participation in organized activities for grade 8 subjects overall ($r = -.26$, $p < .01$) and grade 8 girls separately ($r = -.43$, $p < .05$). Perceiving the mother as rejecting was negatively related to having a good conduct score for all subjects ($r = -.24$, $p < .01$), for girls overall ($r = -.37$, $p < .05$), and for grade 8 girls separately ($r = -.43$, $p < .01$).

The perceived use of firm control by neither parent was related to participation in organized activities or conduct.

Summary of Results

- 1) A survey of the items of the CSQ revealed that the situations described did indeed depict "conventionally good" versus "conventionally bad" behavior.
- 2) In the survey, more "bad" responses were given to those items in which peers were deviating from conventionally good standards of conduct than for those in which adults were deviating.
- 3) The items used to measure the morality dimension of the CSQ provided a relatively reliable measure of morality, whereas the items used to measure the peer-adult dimension provided a relatively unreliable measure of peer versus adult orientation.
- 4) Girls were significantly more peer-oriented than boys, as measured by the CSQ, although this was not true of each grade separately.
- 5) Girls were significantly more likely than boys and grade 8 subjects were significantly more likely than grade 10 subjects to choose the conventionally good response on the CSQ. These findings were true when individual grade-sex groups were compared.
- 6) All subjects, especially girls, were "peer-oriented" in the sense that they were more responsive to pressure from peers than from adults when responding to the morality dimension of the CSQ.
- 7) No significant differences were found between groups on the measure of reported participation in organized activities.
- 8) Grade 8 subjects had significantly higher conduct scores than grade 10 subjects, although this finding was not true when the sexes were compared separately.
- 9) When peer versus adult orientation and morality were used as predictors and each of the other variables, in turn, was used as the criterion in

multiple correlational analyses, the findings were generally in agreement with results found using individual correlations.

10) Neither participation in organized activities nor conduct was related to subjects' scores on the peer-adult dimension of the CSQ.

11) Choosing the conventionally good alternative on the CSQ was positively related to having a good conduct score for all subjects.

12) Choosing the conventionally good alternative was positively related to high participation in organized activities for grade 10 subjects only.

13) For all subjects, having a good conduct score was positively related to high participation in organized activities.

14) Subjects perceived parents along the same three dimensions of Psychological Control versus Psychological Autonomy, Rejection versus Acceptance, and Firm Control versus Lax Control as other researchers have found using the CRPBI.

15) Both mothers and fathers were perceived by grade 10 subjects as more rejecting and using less firm control than by grade 8 subjects.

16) When individual grade-sex groups' perception of mothers and fathers was compared, the only significant findings were that grade 8 girls perceived the father as more rejecting and using more firm control than the mother.

17) Perception of the behavior of one parent on each of the dimensions of the CRPBI was positively related to perception of the behavior of the other parent on the same dimension.

18) The perceived use of psychological control by both the mother and the father was negatively related to choosing the conventionally good alternative on the CSQ for grade 10 subjects overall.

19) The perceived use of rejection by the mother was negatively related to choosing the conventionally good alternative for all subjects. This was also

true for girls overall in the case of the father.

20) Perceiving both the mother and the father as using firm control was positively related to choosing the conventionally good alternative for all subjects. The perceived use of firm control by the mother was negatively related to choosing the peer alternative. This was also true for grade 8 subjects overall in the case of the father.

21) For all subjects, perceiving the mother as using psychological control was positively related to high participation in organized activities.

22) Perceiving the mother as rejecting was negatively related to having a good conduct score for all subjects.

23) The perceived use of rejection by both the mother and the father was negatively related to high participation in organized activities for grade 8 subjects overall. This was also true for all subjects in the case of the father.

24) The perceived use of firm control by neither parent was significantly related to participation in organized activities or conduct.

Discussion

At least two alternatives to the Dilemmas Test (Bronfenbrenner, 1966; Devereux, 1970) have been proposed. Neither of these alternatives is the same as the Conflict Situations Questionnaire (CSQ) which was devised for the present study. Hartup (1970) has suggested that the Dilemmas Test be modified so as to pit approved peer and adult norms against each other or disapproved peer and adult norms against each other. Such an instrument would focus on peer versus adult orientation and, as has been shown in this study, the dimension of morality appears to be an important variable as well when responding to hypothetical conflict situations. The dimension of morality,

i.e. adhering to conventionally good values versus deviating from them, would not be measured by this instrument. Another approach to the study of pressure from peers versus adults during adolescence has been used by Brittain (1963) who devised the Cross-Pressures Test (CPT). By reversing the expectations of peers and adults in the items of the CPT from one form of the instrument to the other, it was possible to measure the response of subjects to pressure from peers versus adults separately from their response to the content of the situation. It was found that the content of a given situation was an important determinant of whether the adolescent will go along with peers or adults when pressure from each conflicts. Brittain thus pointed out that peer versus adult was not the only dimension along which subjects responded to conflict situations. The instrument could not provide a separate measure of morality, however, since only two of the twelve items of the CPT were concerned with moral issues.

The CSQ was devised in an attempt to yield separate measures of peer versus adult orientation and morality when subjects respond to hypothetical conflict situations. While the structure of the CSQ itself insured that there could never be a strong correlation between its two dimensions, it did not insure that the two dimensions of the instrument were entirely unrelated. When subjects' responses to the morality dimension of the CSQ were divided into two subsets of items, i.e. those items where peers were encouraging conventionally bad behavior while adults were encouraging conventionally good behavior and those items where adults were encouraging conventionally bad behavior and peers were encouraging conventionally good behavior, it was found that subjects were "peer-oriented" in the sense that they chose to go

along with peers to a significantly greater extent than adults when told by each to adhere to conventionally good standards of conduct and also when told to deviate from them. Girls, especially, were "peer-oriented" and were more responsive to pressure from peers than adults when responding to the morality dimension of the CSQ.

Results of the multiple correlational analyses show that both the measure of peer versus adult orientation and the measure of morality significantly contribute to the prediction of the variables of perceived parental behavior measured by the CRPBI. In particular, the morality dimension of the CSQ contributes significantly to the prediction of each dimension of the CRPBI for each parent and the peer-adult dimension contributes significantly to mother's and father's use of both psychological control and rejection. These findings are in agreement with the results found when individual correlations were used to investigate the relations between the two dimensions of the CSQ and the three dimensions of the CRPBI. The only exception is that in individual correlations the peer-adult dimension is related only to perceiving each of the parents as using firm control.

Also, the separate measures of peer versus adult orientation and morality were found to be related to the dimensions of Psychological Control, Rejection, and Firm Control as measured by the CRPBI in the same direction as findings relating responses on the Dilemmas Test to similar dimensions of perceived parental behavior. In general, it was found that the perceived use of psychological control by each of the parents was negatively related to choosing the conventionally good alternative on the CSQ. The CRPBI dimension of psychological control measured parental use of emotionality, especially hostility, in dealing with the child. This dimension measured the extent to

which the parent withdraws love when disciplining and reminds the child of misbehavior long after it is over. Devereux et al. (1962) found that American preadolescents were significantly more likely than West German preadolescents to yield to pressure from peers to deviate. It was also found, in agreement with the findings of the present study, that the American subjects reported parents as using significantly more psychological pressure and criticism, such as deprivation of privileges and expressive rejection, than did the West German subjects.

Perceiving each of the parents as rejecting was negatively related to choosing the conventionally good alternative on the CSQ. In studies reported by Devereux (1970) relating parental behavior to subjects' responses on the Dilemmas Test, no rejection factor was used, but a support factor was used which was described by such scales as parental nurturance and instrumental companionship. The negative end of this dimension is highly similar to rejection as measured by the CRPBI. Devereux (1970) reported that subjects who were adult-oriented, as measured by the Dilemmas Test, reported parents as being more supporting than did subjects who indicated that they would go along with peers and participate in deviant behavior. Perceiving parents as rejecting, or non-supporting, was related to going along with peers and participating in deviant behavior as measured by the Dilemmas Test, and to not going along with the conventionally good alternative as measured by the CSQ. Reporting parental behavior along the dimension of Rejection versus Acceptance was not significantly related to subjects' scores on the peer-adult dimension of the CSQ when individual correlations were computed, but this dimension made a significant contribution to the prediction of the Rejection versus Acceptance dimension of the CRPBI for each of the parents when multiple

correlations were performed.

The perceived use of firm control by both parents was positively related to choosing the conventionally good alternative on the CSQ. Devereux (1970) found that the perceived use of control by parents was consistently related to choosing the adult alternative on the Dilemmas Test. Devereux's control factor is highly similar to the firm control factor of the CRPBI, since both describe parents as having specific rules and expecting the child to adhere to them. Perceiving parents as using (firm) control was related to being adult-oriented and going along with conventionally good standards as measured by the Dilemmas Test, and to choosing the conventionally good alternative as measured by the CSQ.

It was also found, however, that the perceived use of firm control by each of the parents was related to choosing the adult alternative on the CSQ. This finding was the only significant finding relating the peer-adult dimension of the CSQ to the three dimensions of perceived parental behavior measured by the CRPBI when individual correlations were looked at. This finding suggests that Devereux may be correct in his assertion that adult orientation bears some relation to perceived parental control.

In summary, the present study reveals that the use of acceptance and firm control by each of the parents is related to choosing both the conventionally good and adult alternatives on the CSQ. The use of psychological control by each of the parents is related to choosing the conventionally bad alternative on the CSQ but is not related to the peer-adult dimension of the instrument. Furthermore, when the similarities between the dimensions of the CRPBI and the factors of parental behavior reported by Devereux (1970) are taken into account, the findings relating perceived parental behavior to

subjects' responses on the Dilemmas Test are found to be in general agreement with findings relating perceived parental behavior to both dimensions of the CSQ.

Studies using the Dilemmas Test have revealed that younger subjects are significantly more likely than older subjects to yield to pressure from adults and adhere to conventionally good standards of conduct (Devereux, 1970). On the CSQ, there were no grade differences found between groups' responses on the peer-adult dimension, but grade 8 subjects scored significantly higher than grade 10 subjects on the conventionally good end of the morality dimension. This finding was true in separate analyses of both girls and boys. Also, the results of the pilot study reported earlier show that the seventh-grade subjects were slightly more oriented toward choosing the conventionally good alternative on the CSQ than the eighth-grade subjects. The findings relating subjects' age to the morality dimension of the CSQ, when the dimensions of peer versus adult orientation and morality are separated, are in agreement with findings relating subjects' age to responses on the Dilemmas Test.

It has been found consistently that girls are more willing than boys to go along with adult-approved behavior and adhere to conventionally good standards of conduct (Bronfenbrenner, 1966; Devereux, 1970; Hollander & Marcia, 1970). In contrast, the present study finds girls to be more peer-oriented than boys. This finding is true when investigating responses to the peer-adult dimension of the CSQ itself and when looking at responses to the subsets of the items of the morality dimension of the CSQ. This finding agrees with the widespread view that girls are more influenced by peers than are boys (Hartup, 1970). At the same time, however, it was found that girls

scored significantly higher than boys on the conventionally good end of the morality dimension of the CSQ. This result was found in separate comparisons of grade 8 subjects and grade 10 subjects. It appears that girls' responses, on the Dilemmas Test, probably represent a compromise between the opposing pulls of peer orientation and orientation toward conventionally good morality. The fact that girls were found to be significantly more peer-oriented than boys in the present study disagrees with the results of studies using the Dilemmas Test.

The results of the present study relating participation in activities with peers to the morality dimension of the CSQ are also in disagreement with results reported by Devereux (1970) relating activities with peers to responses to the Dilemmas Test. Studies using the Dilemmas Test have revealed that subjects' involvement with groups of peers in "gang" activities is positively related to yielding to peer pressure to deviate from conventionally good standards of conduct. It has been concluded that spending time with groups of peers is associated with willingness to yield to peer pressure to deviate from socially acceptable standards of conduct. The present study, in contrast, found that participation with peers in "organized" activities was positively related to choosing the conventionally good alternative on the CSQ. Involvement with peers is not necessarily associated with deviance or conventionally bad behavior. Any relations found between responding to hypothetical conflict situations and peer group experience depends upon the type of activity with peers being measured, i.e. whether "organized" or "gang" activities.

Having a good conduct rating was also related to choosing the conventionally good alternative on the CSQ, a finding that seems to provide

some construct validity for the morality dimension of the CSQ. Furthermore, grade 8 subjects in the present study were found to have both a higher score on the morality dimension and a better conduct rating than grade 10 subjects.

In addition, high participation in organized activities and good conduct were found to be significantly related to one another. It appears that subjects who are seen as well-behaved by counsellors and vice-principal also are involved in relatively many organized activities. It may be that subjects who are regarded favorably by parents and teachers are encouraged to participate in activities, such as girl guides and school clubs, that are sanctioned by adults. Hollander and Marcia (1970) found that subjects who were rated by their classmates as "doing what grown-ups think is right" were also found to be adult-oriented and willing to adhere to conventional standards of behavior. These subjects would quite likely receive good conduct ratings from counsellors and school administrators, and might be encouraged to become involved in organized activities by adults. Neither the measure of participation in organized activities nor the measure of conduct was related to the peer-adult dimension of the CSQ.

When peer versus adult orientation and morality was measured separately, it was found that there was a wider distribution of scores on the morality dimension than on the peer-adult dimension of the CSQ. Furthermore, the morality dimension of the CSQ was found to relate to more variables than the peer-adult dimension in the present study. The findings of the present study suggest, however, that both peer versus adult orientation and morality relate independently to the other measures.

The present study should not be looked at as a replication of the studies using the Dilemmas Test. The items of the CSQ are different than the

items of the Dilemmas Test in construction and content. Also, most of the studies using the Dilemmas Test have employed sixth-grade subjects whereas the present study has used eighth- and tenth-grade subjects.

With regard to the items of the CSQ, the measure of internal consistency reliability has revealed that the items used to measure the morality dimension provide a relatively reliable measure of morality, whereas the items used to measure the peer-adult dimension provide a relatively unreliable measure of peer versus adult orientation. Caution should be taken in interpreting the results found when the measure of peer versus adult orientation is related to the other measures of the study. This measure can also be said to lack stability in the sense that another sample of subjects would likely not respond to the items of the peer-adult dimension in the same way as the subjects in the present study.

In future studies using the CSQ, the instrument should be revised on the basis of the findings of the present study. Moral issues of equal strength should appear in those items in which peers are encouraging deviant behavior and in those items in which adults are encouraging deviant behavior. As was learned from the survey of the items of the CSQ, those items in which peers were encouraging deviance involved stronger moral issues than those items in which adults were encouraging deviance. This finding may offer some explanation for the "peer-orientation" of subjects found in the analyses of subsets of items of the morality dimension of the CSQ. The survey was done after the data collection had been completed and, therefore, information learned from the survey could not be used in revising the instrument. Furthermore, the items of the CSQ used to measure peer versus adult orientation should be revised in an attempt to improve the reliability of

this measure when applied to samples of subjects in future studies.

The relative contribution of pressure from peers versus adults and conventionally good versus conventionally bad morality, and subjects' motivation for responding to the items of the CSQ the way they did cannot be measured in the present study. Subjects do not appear to be blindly following either peers or adults. Whether they are merely blindly conforming to or rejecting conventionally good adult standards of conduct or have developed autonomous standards of their own could only be answered by questioning subjects as to their reasons for their responses to the items of the CSQ and then classifying subjects according to Kohlberg's criteria for stages of moral development.

In conclusion, the Conflict Situations Questionnaire was devised to yield separate measures of peer versus adult orientation and morality. It was found, however, that the two measures were somewhat related in that all subjects, especially girls, were more responsive to pressure from peers than adults when responding to the morality dimension of the CSQ. The findings relating the dimensions of the CSQ to the dimensions of the CRPBI were found to agree in substance and in direction with findings relating the Dilemmas Test to measures of perceived parental behavior. In addition, however, there were several results which could not have been obtained had peer versus adult orientation and morality not been measured separately. Contrary to what has been found in studies using the Dilemmas Test, the present study found that 1) girls were more peer-oriented than boys and 2) participation with peers in "organized" activities was positively related to choosing the conventionally good response on the CSQ.

References

- Bowerman, C.E. & Kinch, J.W. Changes in family and peer orientation of children between the fourth and tenth grades. Social Forces, 1959, 37, 206-211.
- Brittain, C.V. Adolescent choices and parent-peer cross-pressures. American Sociological Review, 1963, 28, 385-391.
- Bronfenbrenner, U. Some familial antecedents of responsibility and leadership in adolescents. In L. Petrullo & B.M. Bass (Eds.), Leadership and interpersonal behavior. New York: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston, 1961.
- Bronfenbrenner, U. Soviet methods of character education: Some implications for research. American Psychologist, 1962, 17, 550-564.
- Bronfenbrenner, U. Response to pressure from peers versus adults among Soviet and American school children. Cornell Soviet Studies Reprint, no. 16, 1966.
- Devereux, E.C. The role of peer-group experience in moral development. In J.P. Hill (Ed.) Minnesota symposia on child psychology. Vol. 4. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1970.
- Devereux, E.C., Bronfenbrenner, U., & Rodgers, R.R. Child rearing in England and the United States: A cross-national comparison. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 1969, 31, 257-270.
- Devereux, E.C., Bronfenbrenner, U., and Suci, G. Patterns of parent behaviour in the United States of America and the Federal Republic of Germany: A cross-national comparison. International Social Science Journal, 1962, 14, 488-506.
- Douvan, E. Sex differences in adolescent character processes. Merrill-Palmer Quarterly, 1960, 6, 203-211.
- Douvan, E. & Adelson, J. The adolescent experience. New York: Wiley, 1966.
- Douvan, E. & Gold, M. Modal patterns in American adolescence. In M.L. Hoffman & L.W. Hoffman (Eds.), Review of child development research. Vol. 2. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1966.
- Droppleman, L.F. & Schaefer, E.S. Boys' and girls' reports of maternal and paternal behavior. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1963, 67, 648-654.
- Erikson, E.H. Childhood and Society. New York: Norton, 1963.
- Harman, H.H. Modern Factor Analysis. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1960.

- Hartup, W.W. Peer interaction and social organization. In P.H. Mussen (Ed.), Carmichael's manual of child psychology. Vol. 2. New York: Wiley, 1970.
- Hoffman, M.L. Childrearing practices and moral development: Generalizations from empirical research. Child Development, 1963, 34, 295-318.
- Hoffman, M.L. Moral development. In P.H. Mussen (Ed.), Carmichael's manual of child psychology. Vol. 2. New York: Wiley, 1970.
- Hoffman, M.L. & Saltzstein, H.D. Parent discipline and the child's moral development. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1967, 5, 45-57.
- Hollander, E.P. and Marcia, J.E. Parental determinants of peer-orientation and self-orientation among preadolescents. Developmental Psychology, 1970, 4, 292-302.
- Johnson, R.C. A study of children's moral judgments. Child Development, 1962, 33, 327-354.
- Kohlberg, L. The development of children's orientations toward a moral order: I Sequence in the development of moral thought. Vita humana, 1963, 6, 11-33.
- Kohlberg, L. Development of moral character and ideology. In M.L. Hoffman & L.W. Hoffman (Eds.), Review of child development research. Vol. 1. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1964.
- Kohlberg, L. Stage and sequence: The cognitive-developmental approach to socialization. In D.A. Goslin (Ed.), Handbook of socialization theory and research. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1969.
- Kohlberg, L. & Gilligan, C. The adolescent as a philosopher: The discovery of the self in a postconventional world. Daedalus, Fall 1971, 1051-1086.
- Kohlberg, L. & Kramer, R. Continuities and discontinuities in childhood and adult moral development. Human development, 1969, 12, 93-120.
- Piaget, J. The moral judgment of the child. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1932.
- Schaefer, E.S. A circumplex model for maternal behavior. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1959, 59, 226-235.
- Schaefer, E.S. Children's reports of parental behavior: An inventory. Child Development, 1965, 36, 413-424. (a)
- Schaefer, E.S. A configurational analysis of children's reports of parent behavior. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1965, 29, 552-557. (b)

Schludermann, E. & Schludermann, S. Replicability of factors in Children's Report of Parent Behavior (CRPBI). Journal of Psychology, 1970, 76, 239-249.

Schludermann, S. & Schludermann, E. Adolescent perception of parent behavior (CRPBI) in Hutterite communal society. Journal of Psychology, 1971, 79, 29-39.

TABLE 1

Factor Loadings For the Three Rotated Factors of the
Children's Report of Parental Behavior Inventory (CRPBI)

Scale	Psychological Control	Rejection	Firm Control
1. Acceptance	-.03	-.18 ^{b,c}	-.01
2. Childcenteredness	.22	-.86	-.01
3. Possessiveness	.56 ^{a,c}	-.51 ^{a,b,c}	-.06
4. Rejection	.35 ^b	.80 ^{a,b,c}	.15 ^c
5. Control	.71 ^{a,b,c}	.20 ^a	-.10
6. Enforcement	.62	.45	-.05 ^b
7. Positive Involvement	.18 ^{a,b,c}	-.88 ^a	-.02 ^b
8. Intrusiveness	.73	-.14 ^{a,b,c}	-.06
9. Control Through Guilt	.63 ^{a,b,c}	-.20	.10
10. Hostile Control	.60 ^{a,b,c}	.49	.43
11. Inconsistent Discipline	.13 ^{a,b,c}	.17 ^a	.89 ^a
12. Nonenforcement	-.12 ^{b,c}	.01	.96 ^{a,c}
13. Acceptance of Individuation	-.11	-.45	.80 ^{a,b,c}
14. Lax Discipline	-.15	-.13 ^{a,b,c}	.94 ^a
15. Instilling Persistent Anxiety	.33 ^b	.10 ^c	.84 ^{a,b,c}
16. Hostile Detachment	.03 ^b	.28 ^b	.93 ^a
17. Withdrawal of Relations	.11 ^{b,c}	.18 ^b	.93 ^{a,c}
18. Extreme Autonomy	-.07 ^{b,c}	-.03	.95 ^{a,b,c}

Note: Scales loading highly on a factor (above $\pm .40$): a-Mauthe; b-Schludermann & Schludermann (1970); c-Schludermann & Schludermann (1971).

TABLE 2

Mean and Range of Ages For Each Grade-Sex Group

Groups	Mean	Range
Grade 8 Girls	13.4 years	12 years to 15 years
Grade 8 Boys	13.4 years	12 years to 15 years
Grade 10 Girls	15.5 years	14 years to 17 years
Grade 10 Boys	15.3 years	15 years to 17 years

TABLE 3
Means and Ranges of Counsellors' and
Vice-Principal's Conduct Ratings,
and Correlations Between Their Ratings For Each Grade-Sex Group

Groups	Counsellors' Ratings		Vice-Principal's Ratings		Correlation
	Mean	Range	Mean	Range	
Grade 8 Girls	.44	-5 to +6	1.50	-1 to +3	.12
Grade 8 Boys	2.00	-4 to +7	1.00	-5 to +5	.54
Grade 10 Girls	.05	-5 to +6	.05	-3 to +3	.49
Grade 10 Boys	1.20	-3 to +7	.36	-5 to +5	.60

TABLE 4

The Percentage of Variance Accounted For By The Three Rotated Factors
of the Children's Report of Parental Behavior Inventory (CRPBI)

Analysis	Psychological Control	Rejection	Firm Control	Total
MOTHER'S FORM	29%	17%	10%	56%
FATHER'S FORM	33%	17%	10%	60%
MOTHER'S AND FATHER'S FORM	31%	17%	11%	59%

TABLE 5
 Factor Loadings For The Three Rotated Factors of the
 Children's Report of Parental Behavior Inventory (CRPBI)

Scale	Psychological Control			Rejection			Firm Control		
	MO	FA	MO & FA	MO	FA	MO & FA	MO	FA	MO & FA
1. Acceptance	-.14	-.12	-.13	-.84	-.88	-.86	.03	-.14	-.07
2. Childcenteredness	.01	.06	.03	-.80	-.82	-.82	-.04	-.17	-.11
3. Possessiveness	.47	.49	.48	-.47	-.55	-.51	.01	.14	.07
4. Rejection	.68	.67	.67	.54	.55	.56	.01	.12	.08
5. Control	.48	.37	.40	-.13	.10	.02	.61	.69	.67
6. Enforcement	.42	.45	.41	.10	.26	.22	.52	.59	.57
7. Positive Involvement	-.03	-.00	-.02	-.85	-.87	-.87	.12	-.03	.04
8. Intrusiveness	.58	.54	.56	-.15	-.20	-.18	.35	.35	.35
9. Control Through Guilt	.67	.73	.69	-.12	-.21	-.18	.10	.05	.06
10. Hostile Control	.79	.77	.78	.25	.27	.26	.23	.32	.28
11. Inconsistent Discipline	.51	.52	.52	.13	.03	.07	-.23	-.25	-.24
12. Nonenforcement	.14	.03	.09	.05	.01	.04	-.70	-.69	-.68
13. Acceptance of Individuation	-.24	-.23	-.23	-.65	-.69	-.68	-.14	-.21	-.18
14. Lax Discipline	-.03	.01	.00	-.22	-.37	-.31	-.73	-.68	-.71
15. Instilling Persistent Anxiety	.68	.73	.70	.21	.15	.18	.19	.28	.24
16. Hostile Detachment	.59	.60	.59	.60	.62	.62	-.08	.03	-.01
17. Withdrawal of Relations	.66	.65	.65	.18	.12	.16	-.06	.06	.02
18. Extreme Autonomy	-.05	-.07	-.05	.08	-.05	.02	-.62	-.64	-.62

Note: MO is Mother; FA is Father.

TABLE 6

Factor Loadings For The Three Rotated Factors of the
Children's Report of Parental Behavior Inventory (CRPBI)

Scale	Psychological Control	Rejection'	Firm Control
1. Acceptance	-.13	-.86b,c,d	-.07
2. Childcenteredness	.03	-.82a,b,c,d	-.11
3. Possessiveness	.48a,c,d	-.51a,b,c,d	.07
4. Rejection	.67b,d	.56a,d	.08c
5. Control	.40a,b,c,d	.02	.67b,d
6. Enforcement	.41a,b,c,d	.22a	.57b,d
7. Positive Involvement	-.02	.87a,b,c,d	.04
8. Intrusiveness	.56a,b,c,d	-.18	.35
9. Control Through Guilt	.69a,b,c,d	-.18	.06
10. Hostile Control	.78a,b,c,d	.26a	.28a
11. Inconsistent Discipline	.52b,c,d	.07	-.24a,c
12. Nonenforcement	.09	.04	-.68a,b,c,d
13. Acceptance of Individuation	-.23	-.68a,b,c,d	-.18a
14. Lax Discipline	.00	-.31c	-.71a,b,c,d
15. Instilling Persistent Anxiety	.70b,d	.18	.24a
16. Hostile Detachment	.59b,c,d	.62b,d	-.01a,c
17. Withdrawal of Relations	.65b,c,d	.16	.02a,c
18. Extreme Autonomy	-.05	.02	-.62a,b,c,d

Note: Scales loading highly on a factor (above $\pm .40$): a-Mauthe;
b-Schludermann & Schludermann (1970); c-Schludermann & Schludermann
(1971); d-present findings.

TABLE 7
A Survey of the Items of the CSQ

Item	"good"	"bad"	% "bad"
1. Cheating on a quiz in school by not telling the teacher that the answers were found	7	33	83
2. Keeping \$50 found in a wallet on the sidewalk	7	33	83
3. Taking gloves from a department store without paying for them	0	40	100
4. Picking flowers from a neighbour's yard without asking	1	39	98
5. Taking pills from someone who says they will make you feel good	1	39	98
6. Selling tickets to an important hockey game for a dollar more than they're worth	13	27	68
7. Tipping over garbage cans and tearing down cardboard signs in the neighbourhood	0	40	100
8. Refusing to help a friend solve an important personal problem	12	28	70
9. Not telephoning someone even though an hour later than planned	3	37	93
10. Refusing some people who ask you to help repair a damaged community centre	1	39	98
11. Refusing to include a person of another race in a community activity	0	40	100
12. Taking supplies home from the office or school without anyone knowing	5	35	88

TABLE 7 (Cont'd.)

Item	"good"	"bad"	% "bad"
13. A child disobeying a parent by going sailing without an adult present	1	39	98
14. A student getting help with a homework assignment when the student is expected to do it on his (her) own	9	31	78
15. Throwing an aluminum can in a ditch when finished with it	2	38	95
16. Not reporting a neighbour who treats his dog cruelly to the Humane Society	2	38	95
17. A child going swimming instead of cleaning out the basement as expected by parents	3	37	93
18. Not going on a walkathon that raises money for a good cause	7	33	83
19. Lying about one's age to get into the show for less money	13	27	68
20. A student buying answers to homework problems	0	40	100

TABLE 8

The Internal Consistency Reliability of the Items
of the Two Dimensions of the CSQ

Groups	"Alpha" For Peer-Adult Items	"Alpha" For Morality Items
All Subjects	.26	.81
Grade 8 Girls	.40	.73
Grade 8 Boys	.37	.78
Grade 10 Girls	.25	.79
Grade 10 Boys	.14	.80
Girls	.30	.79
Boys	.23	.81
Grade 8	.38	.77
Grade 10	.19	.80

TABLE 9

Means and Standard Deviations of Groups
On the Peer-Adult Dimension of the CSQ

Groups	N	Mean	SD
Grade 8 Girls	62	72.97	8.13
Grade 8 Boys	57	70.86	8.90
Grade 10 Girls	55	74.96	7.58
Grade 10 Boys	57	72.39	8.16
Girls	117	74.00	8.10
Boys	114	71.60	8.54
Grade 8	119	71.98	8.76
Grade 10	112	73.66	8.07

TABLE 10

Differences Between Groups Compared
On the Peer-Adult Dimension of the CSQ

Groups Compared	t
Grade 8 Girls versus Grade 8 Boys	1.3530
Grade 8 Girls versus Grade 10 Girls	-1.3664
Grade 8 Boys versus Grade 10 Boys	1.7292
Grade 10 Girls versus Grade 10 Boys	-0.9582
Girls versus Boys	2.2004*
Grade 8 versus Grade 10	-1.5151

*p < .05
**p < .01
***p < .001

TABLE 11

Means and Standard Deviations of Groups

On the Conventionally Good-Conventionally Bad Dimension of the CSQ

Groups	N	Mean	SD
Grade 8 Girls	62	88.06	11.48
Grade 8 Boys	57	81.35	14.21
Grade 10 Girls	55	76.98	13.10
Grade 10 Boys	57	70.28	15.41
Girls	117	82.85	13.83
Boys	114	75.81	15.53
Grade 8	119	84.85	13.19
Grade 10	112	73.47	14.93

TABLE 12

Differences Between Groups Compared

On the Conventionally Good-Conventionally Bad Dimension of the CSQ

Groups Compared	t
Grade 8 Girls versus Grade 8 Boys	2.8465**
Grade 8 Girls versus Grade 10 Girls	4.8847***
Grade 8 Boys versus Grade 10 Boys	2.4804*
Grade 10 Girls versus Grade 10 Boys	3.9939***
Girls versus Boys	3.6546***
Grade 8 versus Grade 10	6.1550***

*p < .05

**p < .01

***p < .001

TABLE 13

Differences Between Subsets^a of the Morality Dimension of the CSQ For All Subjects, Girls, Boys, Grade 8, Grade 10, and Individual Grade-Sex Groups

Group	N	Peer Bad/Adult Good			Adult Bad/Peer Good		t
		M	SD	M	SD		
All Subjects	231	38.42	9.35	40.93	8.06	-4.5755***	
Grade 8 Girls	62	42.61	7.59	45.39	6.14	-2.9508**	
Grade 8 Boys	57	40.65	9.57	40.79	7.29	-0.3276	
Grade 10 Girls	55	36.04	8.76	40.76	7.25	-4.4879***	
Grade 10 Boys	57	33.91	8.74	36.37	8.70	-2.1891*	
Girls	117	39.52	8.80	43.21	7.07	-5.1536***	
Boys	114	37.28	9.77	38.58	8.33	-1.6256	
Grade 8	119	41.67	8.65	43.18	7.10	-2.0377*	
Grade 10	112	34.96	8.81	38.53	8.32	-4.5559***	

*p<.05
 **p<.01
 ***p<.001

a-One subset of the morality dimension of the CSQ includes the ten items depicting peers as doing or encouraging conventionally bad behavior while adults are doing or encouraging conventionally good behavior. The other subset includes the ten items that depict adults as doing or encouraging conventionally bad behavior while peers are doing or encouraging conventionally good behavior.

TABLE 14

Means and Standard Deviations of Groups On the Measure of
Participation in Organized Activities

Groups	N	Mean	SD
Grade 8 Girls	62	2.26	2.25
Grade 8 Boys	57	2.58	2.56
Grade 10 Girls	55	2.60	2.33
Grade 10 Boys	57	2.95	3.15
Girls	117	2.42	2.29
Boys	114	2.76	2.87
Grade 8	119	2.41	2.40
Grade 10	112	2.78	2.78

TABLE 15

Differences Between Groups Compared On the Measure of
Participation in Organized Activities

Groups Compared	t
Grade 8 Girls versus Grade 8 Boys	-.7189
Grade 8 Girls versus Grade 10 Girls	-.7971
Grade 8 Boys versus Grade 10 Boys	-.6624
Grade 10 Girls versus Grade 10 Boys	-.6865
Girls versus Boys	-1.0053
Grade 8 versus Grade 10	-1.0638

*p<.05

**p<.01

***p<.001

TABLE 16

Means and Standard Deviations of Groups On Conduct Ratings

Groups	N	Mean	SD
Grade 8 Girls	16	.97	1.9
Grade 8 Boys	29	1.5	2.3
Grade 10 Girls	21	.05	1.9
Grade 10 Boys	36	.78	2.4
Girls	37	.45	1.9
Boys	65	1.1	2.4
Grade 8	45	1.3	2.2
Grade 10	57	.51	2.3

TABLE 17

Differences Between Groups Compared On Conduct Ratings

Groups Compared	t
Grade 8 Girls versus Grade 8 Boys	-.7862
Grade 8 Girls versus Grade 10 Girls	1.4593
Grade 8 Boys versus Grade 10 Boys	-1.1937
Grade 10 Girls versus Grade 10 Boys	1.2269
Girls versus Boys	-1.4170
Grade 8 versus Grade 10	1.9678*

*p < .05
 **p < .01
 ***p < .001

TABLE 18

Multiple Correlations Using Peer Versus Adult Orientation and
Morality as Predictors and
Each of the Other Variables as the Criterion

N	Criterion	Predictor	r	t
231	Activities	Peer-Adult Morality	.1558 2.7140	ns p-.01
231	MO PC	Peer-Adult Morality	1.454 5.713	ns p-.001
231	MO RE	Peer-Adult Morality	3.613 7.053	p-.001 p-.001
231	MO FC	Peer-Adult Morality	9.186 9.431	p-.001 p-.001
199	FA PC	Peer-Adult Morality	.9930 5.238	ns p-.001
199	FA RE	Peer-Adult Morality	2.563 3.843	p-.01 p-.001
199	FA FC	Peer-Adult Morality	2.583 8.502	p-.001 p-.001
102	Conduct	Peer-Adult Morality	.8878 13.00	ns p-.001

TABLE 19

Correlations Among the Dimensions of the CSQ, Participation in Organized Activities, and Conduct

	All Subjects				Grade 8 Girls				Grade 8 Boys				Grade 10 Girls				Grade 10 Boys			
	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
1. Peer-Adult Dimension of CSQ	1.0	.19	-.02	-.03	1.0	-.28	-.06	.19	1.0	-.35	-.03	-.19	1.0	-.22	-.09	-.03	1.0	-.00	.07	.13
2. Morality Dimension of CSQ	1.0	.09	.38**		1.0	.17	.44		1.0	-.12	-.02		1.0	.30*	.28		1.0	.22	.61**	
3. Participation in Organized Activities	1.0	.25*			1.0	.08			1.0	.22			1.0	.09			1.0	.30		
4. Conduct	1.0				1.0				1.0				1.0				1.0			

*p<.05
**p<.01

TABLE 19 (Cont'd.)

	Girls				Boys				Grade 8				Grade 10			
	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
1. Peer-Adult Dimension of CSQ	1.0	.27	.07	.06	1.0	.20	.03	.05	1.0	.27	.05	.10	1.0	.06	.01	.08
2. Morality Dimension of CSQ	1.0	.19	.41*		1.0	.05	.41**		1.0	.01	.11		1.0	.23*	.48**	
3. Participation in Organized Activities	1.0	.13			1.0	.26*			1.0	.19			1.0	.29*		
4. Conduct			1.0			1.0				1.0				1.0		

*p < .05

**p < .01

TABLE 20

Means and Standard Deviations of Groups On the Perceived Use
of Psychological Control by the Mother

Groups	N	Mean	SD
Grade 8 Girls	62	-.11	.86
Grade 8 Boys	57	.13	.78
Grade 10 Girls	55	-.05	.94
Grade 10 Boys	57	.05	1.02
Girls	117	-.07	.90
Boys	114	.10	.91
Grade 8	119	.01	.83
Grade 10	112	.02	.98

TABLE 21

Differences Between Groups Compared On the Perceived Use
of Psychological Control by the Mother

Groups Compared	t
Grade 8 Girls versus Grade 8 Boys	-1.5925
Grade 8 Girls versus Grade 10 Girls	-.3612
Grade 8 Boys versus Grade 10 Boys	-.5402
Grade 10 Girls versus Grade 10 Boys	.4714
Girls versus Boys	-1.4333
Grade 8 versus Grade 10	-.0839

*p<.05

**p<.01

***p<.001

TABLE 22

Means and Standard Deviations of Groups On the Perceived Use
of Psychological Control by the Father

Groups	N	Mean	SD
Grade 8 Girls	56	-.20	.80
Grade 8 Boys	49	.13	.92
Grade 10 Girls	46	.02	1.07
Grade 10 Boys	48	.03	1.09
Girls	102	-.10	.94
Boys	97	.08	1.01
Grade 8	105	-.04	.87
Grade 10	94	.03	1.08

TABLE 23

Differences Between Groups Compared On the Perceived Use
of Psychological Control by the Father

Groups Compared	t
Grade 8 Girls versus Grade 8 Boys	-1.9689
Grade 8 Girls versus Grade 10 Girls	-1.1891
Grade 10 Girls versus Grade 10 Boys	-.0449
Grade 8 Boys versus Grade 10 Boys	.4892
Girls versus Boys	-1.3034
Grade 8 versus Grade 10	-.5068

*p<.05

**p<.01

***p<.001

TABLE 24

Means and Standard Deviations of Groups On the Perceived Use
of Rejection by the Mother

Groups	N	Mean	SD
Grade 8 Girls	62	-.38	.92
Grade 8 Boys	57	-.17	.82
Grade 10 Girls	55	.04	.89
Grade 10 Boys	57	-.01	.80
Girls	117	-.19	.93
Boys	114	-.08	.81
Grade 8	119	-.28	.88
Grade 10	112	.02	.85

TABLE 25

Differences Between Groups Compared On the Perceived Use
of Rejection by the Mother

Groups Compared	t
Grade 8 Girls versus Grade 8 Boys	-1.3125
Grade 8 Girls versus Grade 10 Girls	-2.5074*
Grade 8 Boys versus Grade 10 Boys	.3136
Grade 10 Girls versus Grade 10 Boys	-1.0568
Girls versus Boys	-.9615
Grade 8 versus Grade 10	-2.6362**

*p<.05
**p<.01
***p<.001

TABLE 26

Means and Standard Deviations of Groups On the Perceived Use
of Rejection by the Father

Groups	N	Mean	SD
Grade 8 Girls	56	-.23	1.02
Grade 8 Boys	49	.002	.96
Grade 10 Girls	46	.39	1.11
Grade 10 Boys	48	.34	.84
Girls	102	.16	1.08
Boys	97	.17	.92
Grade 8	105	-.01	.99
Grade 10	94	.37	.98

TABLE 27

Differences Between Groups Compared On the Perceived Use
of Rejection by the Father

Groups Compared	t
Grade 8 Girls versus Grade 8 Boys	-1.1964
Grade 8 Girls versus Grade 10 Girls	-2.9397**
Grade 10 Girls versus Grade 10 Boys	.2472
Grade 8 Boys versus Grade 10 Boys	-1.8459
Girls versus Boys	-.0702
Grade 8 versus Grade 10	-2.7220**

*p<.05
**p<.01
***p<.001

TABLE 28

Means and Standard Deviations of Groups On the Perceived Use
of Firm Control by the Mother

Groups	N	Mean	SD
Grade 8 Girls	62	-.02	.87
Grade 8 Boys	57	.11	.81
Grade 10 Girls	55	-.19	.79
Grade 10 Boys	57	-.38	.74
Girls	117	-.10	.91
Boys	114	-.14	.81
Grade 8	119	.04	.84
Grade 10	112	-.29	.85

TABLE 29

Differences Between Groups Compared On the Perceived Use
of Firm Control by the Mother

Groups Compared	t
Grade 8 Girls versus Grade 8 Boys	-.8430
Grade 8 Girls versus Grade 10 Girls	1.1038
Grade 8 Boys versus Grade 10 Boys	1.3176
Grade 10 Girls versus Grade 10 Boys	3.3793**
Girls versus Boys	.3539
Grade 8 versus Grade 10	2.9729**

*p<.05

**p<.01

***p<.001

TABLE 30

Means and Standard Deviations of Groups On the Perceived Use
of Firm Control by the Father

Groups	N	Mean	SD
Grade 8 Girls	56	.17	.99
Grade 8 Boys	49	.29	.81
Grade 10 Girls	46	.09	1.02
Grade 10 Boys	48	-.03	.78
Girls	102	.14	1.00
Boys	97	.13	.81
Grade 8	105	.23	.91
Grade 10	94	.03	.90

TABLE 31

Differences Between Groups Compared On the Perceived Use
of Firm Control by the Father

Groups Compared	t
Grade 8 Girls versus Grade 8 Boys	-.6749
Grade 8 Girls versus Grade 10 Girls	.4014
Grade 10 Girls versus Grade 10 Boys	.6430
Grade 8 Boys versus Grade 10 Boys	1.9838*
Girls versus Boys	.0773
Grade 8 versus Grade 10	1.5600

*p < .05

**p < .01

***p < .001

TABLE 32

Differences Between the Perceived Use of Psychological Control
by Father and Mother For Each Grade-Sex Group

Groups	t
Grade 8 Girls	-.3283
Grade 8 Boys	-1.1505
Grade 10 Girls	.0496
Grade 10 Boys	-.0520

*p<.05
**p<.01
***p<.001

TABLE 33

Differences Between the Perceived Use of Rejection
by Father and Mother For Each Grade-Sex Group

Groups	t
Grade 8 Girls	2.7309**
Grade 8 Boys	.5820
Grade 10 Girls	-.8720
Grade 10 Boys	1.1428

*p<.05
**p<.01
***p<.001

TABLE 34

Differences Between the Perceived Use of Firm Control
by Father and Mother For Each Grade-Sex Group

Groups	t
Grade 8 Girls	2.5925*
Grade 8 Boys	-.2525
Grade 10 Girls	-.4549
Grade 10 Boys	.0289

*p<.05
**p<.01
***p<.001

TABLE 35

Correlations Between the Perceived Behavior of the Mother and the Perceived Behavior of the Father
On the Three Dimensions of the CRPBI

	Grade 8 Girls						Grade 8 Boys						Grade 10 Girls						Grade 10 Boys											
	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6						
1. MO-PC	.50**																													
2. FA-PC	.47**																													
3. MO-RE	.39**						.27						.68**						.46**						.32*					
4. FA-RE	.28																													
5. MO-FC	.56**						.72**						.65**						.36*						.46**					
6. FA-FC	.58**																													

*p < .05 Note: MO-PC is Use of Psychological Control by the Mother; FA-PC is Use of Psychological Control by the Father; MO-RE is Use of Rejection by the Mother; FA-RE is Use of Rejection by the Father; MO-FC is Use of Firm Control by the Mother; FA-FC is Use of Firm Control by the Father.

TABLE 35 (Cont'd.)

	Girls						Boys						Grade 8						Grade 10					
	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6
1. MO-PC	.37**						.61**						.57**						.44**					
2. FA-PC																								
3. MO-RE	.38**						.40**						.44**						.29**					
4. FA-RE																								
5. MO-FC	.55**						.58**						.69**						.40**					
6. FA-FC																								

*p < .05

**p < .01

TABLE 36

Correlations Among the Three Dimensions of the CRPBI for Mother and Father, the Two Dimensions of the CSQ, Participation in Organized Activities, and Conduct

	Grade 8 Girls				Grade 8 Boys				Grade 10 Girls				Grade 10 Boys							
	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4				
1. MO-PC	-.01	-.17	.25**	-.06	-.17	.05	.22	-.11	-.17	.12	.37**	-.02	.24	-.34*	.07	.05	.09	-.39**	.32**	-.18
2. FA-PC	.00	-.16	.10	-.15	-.07	-.10	.16	-.33	-.22	.14	.19	-.35	.27	-.17	-.08	-.33	.06	-.37*	.12	-.05
3. MO-RE	.15	-.24*	-.07	-.24*	.15	-.06	-.28*	-.43*	.19	-.26	-.26	-.22	.19	-.17	-.01	-.23	.07	-.26	.15	-.18
4. FA-RE	.11	-.14	-.24**	.04	.00	-.12	-.53**	-.25	.23	-.09	-.09	-.06	.21	-.31*	-.41**	.30	-.10	.17	-.06	.23
5. MO-FC	-.32**	.33**	-.02	.06	-.36**	.15	.12	-.25	-.32*	.44**	.05	.13	-.43**	.27	-.10	.29	-.13	.29**	-.06	-.04
6. FA-FC	-.13	.28**	.03	.18	-.29*	.23	.14	-.10	-.10	.34*	-.16	.06	-.03	.27	.17	.18	.00	.28**	-.02	.27

*p<.05 Note: 1 is Peer-Adult Dimension of the CSQ; 2 is Morality Dimension of the CSQ; 3 is Participation in Organized Activities; 4 is Conduct

**p<.01

TABLE 36 (Cont'd.)

	Girls				Boys				Grade 8				Grade 10			
	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
1. MO-PC	.03	-.16	.15	-.01	-.03	-.15	.33**	-.10	-.18	.04	.30**	-.02	.15	-.37**	.22*-.11	
2. FA-PC	.12	-.17	.03	-.31	-.08	-.12	.14	-.10	-.18	-.02	.19	-.26	.16	-.27**	.03	-.14
3. MO-RE	.19	-.19	-.13	-.37*	.14	-.28*	-.03	-.23	.15	-.18	-.26**	-.25	.13	-.21*	.08	-.16
4. FA-RE	.11	-.27**	-.45**	.03	.11	-.03	-.05	.05	.11	-.10	-.31**	-.11	.07	-.06	-.23*	.24
5. MO-FC	-.40**	.24*	.00	.01	-.25*	.43**	-.03	.09	-.34**	.27**	.09	.01	-.27**	.29**	-.08	.02
6. FA-FC	-.17	.24*	.15	.13	-.09	.35**	-.10	.23	-.22*	.25*	.01	.01	-.01	.27**	.06	.23

*p<.05

**p<.01

Appendix A

The Conflict Situations Questionnaire (CSQ)

Place yourself in the following situations and respond accordingly. Under each item there are six choices lettered a. to f. Mark with an X what you think you would do in each situation. Mark each item only once. Do not tell what you think is right or wrong, but tell what you would really do.

1) You and your friends find the answers to a quiz you are going to have in the classroom tomorrow. Your friends say that you can do better on the quiz by not saying anything to the teacher. Your teacher has told you that it is wrong to cheat on quizzes. What would you really do?

Go Along With Your Friends
And Cheat On The Quiz

Agree With The Teacher's View And Tell
The Teacher That The Answers Were Found

<u>a.</u>	<u>b.</u>	<u>c.</u>	<u>d.</u>	<u>e.</u>	<u>f.</u>
absolutely certain	fairly certain	maybe	maybe	fairly certain	absolutely certain

2) You have found a wallet containing \$50 on the sidewalk on your way home from school and your friends say that you should take it to the police. You take it home and your parents say that it is O.K. to keep it. What would you really do?

Do As Your Parents Say
And Keep The Money

Do As Your Friends Say And
Give The Wallet To The Police

<u>a.</u>	<u>b.</u>	<u>c.</u>	<u>d.</u>	<u>e.</u>	<u>f.</u>
absolutely certain	fairly certain	maybe	maybe	fairly certain	absolutely certain

3) Your friends are in a department store and are planning to take some gloves. They want you to help them do it. You know that your parents do not approve of stealing things. What would you really do?

Do What Your Parents Want And
Not Help Take The Gloves

Help Your Friends
Take The Gloves

<u>a.</u>	<u>b.</u>	<u>c.</u>	<u>d.</u>	<u>e.</u>	<u>f.</u>
absolutely certain	fairly certain	maybe	maybe	fairly certain	absolutely certain

8) You have a friend who has an important personal problem and would like your advice in solving it. Your parents have told you not to get involved in other people's personal affairs. What would you really do?

Help Your Friend
Solve The Problem

Do What Your Parents Want And
Not Help Solve The Problem

a. absolutely certain
b. fairly certain
c. maybe

d. maybe
e. fairly certain
f. absolutely certain

9) Your parents have told you to be home from roller-skating at a particular time. Your friends want you to get a hamburger with them after skating, and this will make you an hour late. There is no telephone available to call your parents. What would you really do?

Get A Hamburger With Your
Friends After Skating

Go Straight Home
After Skating

a. absolutely certain
b. fairly certain
c. maybe

d. maybe
e. fairly certain
f. absolutely certain

10) You have some friends down the street who have damaged the local community centre and must fix it up so that they won't get reported to the police. They want you to help them at the community centre, but your parents have told you not to have anything to do with them. What would you really do?

Do What Your Parents Say And
Not Help Your Friends

Help Your Friends At
The Community Centre

a. absolutely certain
b. fairly certain
c. maybe

d. maybe
e. fairly certain
f. absolutely certain

11) You are in charge of setting up a display for your school's open-house. Some of your friends say not to include a student of another race, but your teacher has said that all students are eligible to participate. What would you really do?

Go Along With The Teacher And
Include The Student Of Another Race

Go Along With Your Friends
And Not Include The Student

a. absolutely certain
b. fairly certain
c. maybe

d. maybe
e. fairly certain
f. absolutely certain

12) Your father has brought home supplies from the office before for his own use and sees nothing wrong with your bringing home extra pens supplied by your school. Your friends say that if you do this some of the other students may not get a pen and so you shouldn't do it. What would you really do?

Agree With Your Friends And
Not Take The Extra Pens Home

Agree With Your Father And
Take The Extra Pens Home

a.
absolutely
certain

b.
fairly
certain

c.
maybe

d.
maybe

e.
fairly
certain

f.
absolutely
certain

13) Some friends want you to go out with them in their family sail boat. Your parents have told you not to go sailing without an adult present. What would you really do?

Go Out In The Sail Boat
With Your Friends

Do What Your Parents Want And
Not Go Sailing With Your Friends

a.
absolutely
certain

b.
fairly
certain

c.
maybe

d.
maybe

e.
fairly
certain

f.
absolutely
certain

14) You haven't done your homework assignment which is due the next day. Your parents offer to do it for you, but you know your friends have done their assignments on their own and expect you to do the same. What would you really do?

Let Your Parents Do
Your Homework

Do Your Homework On Your Own
Like Your Friends Expect

a.
absolutely
certain

b.
fairly
certain

c.
maybe

d.
maybe

e.
fairly
certain

f.
absolutely
certain

15) You and your friends are drinking pop from aluminum cans and your friends throw their cans in a ditch and suggest you do the same. You know that your mother is concerned about the environment and would give your can to a special collection group, if you gave it to her. What would you really do?

Take the Can
To Your Mother

Throw The Can In The Ditch
Like Your Friends Do

a.
absolutely
certain

b.
fairly
certain

c.
maybe

d.
maybe

e.
fairly
certain

f.
absolutely
certain

16) There is a man in your neighbourhood who treats his dog cruelly and your friends say that you should report him to the Humane Society. Your parents tell you to forget it and not report the man. What would you really do?

Do As Your Friends Say And
Report The Man To The Humane Society

Do As Your Parents Say And
Not Report The Man

a.
absolutely
certain

b.
fairly
certain

c.
maybe

d.
maybe

e.
fairly
certain

f.
absolutely
certain

17) Your parents have gone shopping and have left you to clean out the basement. Your friends come along and want you to go swimming right away, but you haven't finished cleaning out the basement yet and you won't have time to finish it and go swimming too. What would you really do?

Go Swimming With
Your Friends

Stay And Clean Out The Basement
For Your Parents

a.
absolutely
certain

b.
fairly
certain

c.
maybe

d.
maybe

e.
fairly
certain

f.
absolutely
certain

18) Your friends are expecting you to go on a walkathon with them to help raise money for a good cause. Your parents have told you that they think it is a waste of time and recommend that you not go. What would you really do?

Do As Your Parents Recommend
And Not Go On The Walkathon

Go On The Walkathon
With Your Friends

a.
absolutely
certain

b.
fairly
certain

c.
maybe

d.
maybe

e.
fairly
certain

f.
absolutely
certain

19) Your friends are going to lie about their age so that they can get into the show for less money and they want you to do the same. You know that your parents want you to be honest in a situation like this. What would you really do?

Do What Your Parents Want
And Not Lie About Your Age

Do Like Your Friends and
Lie About Your Age

a.
absolutely
certain

b.
fairly
certain

c.
maybe

d.
maybe

e.
fairly
certain

f.
absolutely
certain

20) You tell your parents that someone has offered to sell you answers to math homework problems. Your parents say that you should buy the answers, but your friends say that you should not cheat in this way. What would you really do?

Go Along With Your Friends And
Not Buy The Answers

Do What Your Parents Say
And Buy The Answers

a.
absolutely
certain

b.
fairly
certain

c.
maybe

d.
maybe

e.
fairly
certain

f.
absolutely
certain

Appendix B

Participation In Organized Activities

- 1) Check all groups, clubs or organizations that you belong to in your school, church or community that meet regularly and involve activities with your friends and other people your own age.

community centre	___	intra-mural sports	___
scouts, guides	___	young people (church)	___
Y.M.C.A.	___	other	_____
Y.W.C.A.	___	other	_____
bowling (team)	___	other	_____
swimming (team)	___	other	_____
hockey (team)	___	other	_____

- 2) Check any activities that you participate in where most of the other people involved are adults.

music lessons	___	other	_____
choir	___	other	_____
band	___	other	_____

Appendix C

Conduct Rating Scale

Instructions

The following conduct rating scale should be completed without discussion with other teachers and counsellors. The number on the sheet corresponds to the number on the accompanying sheet with each student's name beside it. There is one rating sheet for each student. Please rate each student only once on the scale. Reference may be made to school records if this will help in your rating of the student.

+7...+6...+5...+4...+3...+2...+1...0...-1...-2...-3...-4...-5...-6...-7

Good

Average

bad

Appendix D

The Children's Report of Parental Behavior Inventory (CRPBI)

Instructions

As children grow up to be teenagers and young adults, they learn more and more about their parents and how their parents are bringing up or have brought up their children. Children, as they grow older, can well describe some of their experiences with their mothers and fathers in the family setting. This questionnaire is an opportunity to describe some of these experiences. Please read each statement on the following pages and circle the answer that most closely describes the way each of your parents acts towards you. The first 108 items describe the mother and the next 108 items describe the father. BE SURE TO MARK EACH ANSWER FOR EACH PARENT.

- If you think the statement is Like your parent, circle L.
If you think the statement is Somewhat Like your parent, circle SL.
If you think the statement is Not Like your parent, circle NL.

FORM FOR MOTHER

	<u>Like</u>	<u>Some- what Like</u>	<u>Not Like</u>
1. Makes me feel better after talking over my worries with her.	L	SL	NL
2. Isn't very patient with me.	L	SL	NL
3. Sees to it that I know exactly what I may or may not do.	L	SL	NL
4. Wants to know exactly where I am and what I am doing.	L	SL	NL
5. Soon forgets a rule she has made.	L	SL	NNL
6. Is easy with me.	L	SL	NL
7. Doesn't talk with me very much.	L	SL	NL
8. Will not talk to me when I displease her.	L	SL	NL
9. Is very strict with me.	L	SL	NL
10. Feels hurt when I don't follow advice.	L	SL	NL

- | | | | |
|--|---|----|----|
| 11. Is always telling me how I should behave. | L | SL | NL |
| 12. Usually doesn't find out about my misbehavior. | L | SL | NL |
| 13. Spends very little time with me. | L | SL | NL |
| 14. Almost always speaks to me in a warm and friendly voice. | L | SL | NL |
| 15. Is always thinking of things that will please me. | L | SL | NL |
| 16. Believes in having a lot of rules and sticking to them. | L | SL | NL |
| 17. Tells me how much she loves me. | L | SL | NL |
| 18. Is always checking on what I've been doing at school or at play. | L | SL | NL |
| 19. Punishes me for doing something one day, but ignores it the next. | L | SL | NL |
| 20. Allows me to tell her if I think my ideas are better than hers. | L | SL | NL |
| 21. Lets me off easy when I do something wrong. | L | SL | NL |
| 22. Sometimes when she disapproves, doesn't say anything but is cold and distant for awhile. | L | SL | NL |
| 23. Forgets to help me when I need it. | L | SL | NL |
| 24. Sticks to a rule instead of allowing a lot of exceptions. | L | SL | NL |
| 25. Tells me exactly how to do my work. | L | SL | NL |
| 26. Doesn't pay much attention to my misbehavior. | L | SL | NL |
| 27. Likes me to choose my own way of doing things. | L | SL | NL |
| 28. If I break a promise, doesn't trust me again for a long time. | L | SL | NL |
| 29. Doesn't seem to think of me very often. | L | SL | NL |
| 30. Doesn't tell me what time to be home when I go out. | L | SL | NL |
| 31. Gives me a lot of care and attention. | L | SL | NL |
| 32. Believes that all my bad behavior should be punished in some way. | L | SL | NL |

- | | | | |
|---|---|----|----|
| 33. Asks me to tell everything that happens when I'm away from home. | L | SL | NL |
| 34. Doesn't forget quickly the things I do wrong. | L | SL | NL |
| 35. Wants me to tell her about it if I don't like the way she treats me. | L | SL | NL |
| 36. Worries about me when I'm away. | L | SL | NL |
| 37. Gives hard punishments. | L | SL | NL |
| 38. Believes in showing her love for me. | L | SL | NL |
| 39. Feels hurt by the things I do. | L | SL | NL |
| 40. Lets me help to decide how to do things we're working on. | L | SL | NL |
| 41. Says some day I'll be punished for my bad behavior. | L | SL | NL |
| 42. Gives me as much freedom as I want. | L | SL | NL |
| 43. Smiles at me very often. | L | SL | NL |
| 44. Is always getting after me. | L | SL | NL |
| 45. Keeps a careful check on me to see that I have the right kind of friends. | L | SL | NL |
| 46. Depends upon her mood whether a rule is enforced or not. | L | SL | NL |
| 47. Excuses my bad conduct. | L | SL | NL |
| 48. Doesn't show that she loves me. | L | SL | NL |
| 49. Is less friendly with me if I don't see things her way. | L | SL | NL |
| 50. Is able to make me feel better when I am upset. | L | SL | NL |
| 51. Becomes very involved in my life. | L | SL | NL |
| 52. Almost always complains about what I do. | L | SL | NL |
| 53. Always listens to my ideas and opinions. | L | SL | NL |
| 54. Would like to be able to tell me what to do all the time. | L | SL | NL |
| 55. Doesn't check up to see whether I have done what she told me. | L | SL | NL |
| 56. Thinks and talks about my misbehavior long after it's over. | L | SL | NL |

- | | | | |
|---|---|----|----|
| 57. Doesn't share my activities with me. | L | SL | NL |
| 58. Lets me go any place I please without asking. | L | SL | NL |
| 59. Enjoys doing things with me. | L | SL | NL |
| 60. Makes me feel like the most important person in her life. | L | SL | NL |
| 61. Gets cross and angry about little things I do. | L | SL | NL |
| 62. Only keeps rules when it suits her. | L | SL | NL |
| 63. Really wants me to tell her just how I feel about things. | L | SL | NL |
| 64. Will avoid looking at me when I've disappointed her. | L | SL | NL |
| 65. Usually makes me the center of her attention at home. | L | SL | NL |
| 66. Often praises me. | L | SL | NL |
| 67. Says if I loved her, I'd do what she wants me to do. | L | SL | NL |
| 68. Seldom insists that I do anything. | L | SL | NL |
| 69. Tries to understand how I see things. | L | SL | NL |
| 70. Complains that I get on her nerves. | L | SL | NL |
| 71. Doesn't work with me. | L | SL | NL |
| 72. Insists that I must do exactly what I'm told. | L | SL | NL |
| 73. Asks other people what I do away from home. | L | SL | NL |
| 74. Loses her temper with me when I don't help around the house. | L | SL | NL |
| 75. Does not insist I obey if I complain or protest. | L | SL | NL |
| 76. Cheers me up when I am sad. | L | SL | NL |
| 77. Sees to it that I obey when she tells me something. | L | SL | NL |
| 78. Tells me of all the things she has done for me. | L | SL | NL |
| 79. Wants to control whatever I do. | L | SL | NL |
| 80. Does not bother to enforce rules. | L | SL | NL |
| 81. Thinks that any misbehavior is serious and will have future consequences. | L | SL | NL |

- | | | | |
|---|---|-----|----|
| 82. Is always finding fault with me. | L | SL | NL |
| 83. Often speaks of the good things I do. | L | SL | NL |
| 84. Makes her whole life centre about her children. | L | SL | NL |
| 85. Doesn't seem to know what I need or want. | L | SL | NL |
| 86. Is happy to see me when I come home from school or play. | L | SL | NL |
| 87. Gives me the choice of what to do whenever possible. | L | SL | NL |
| 88. If I've hurt her feelings, stops talking to me until I please her again. | L | SL | NL |
| 89. Worries that I can't take care of myself unless she is around. | L | SL | NL |
| 90. Hugged and kissed me goodnight when I was small. | L | SL | NL |
| 91. Says if I really cared for her, I would not do things that cause her worry. | L | SL | NL |
| 92. Is always trying to change me. | L | SL | NL |
| 93. Is easy to talk to. | L | SL | NL |
| 94. Wishes I were a different kind of person. | L | SL | NL |
| 95. Lets me go out any evening I want. | L | SL | NL |
| 96. Seems proud of the things I do. | L | SL | NL |
| 97. Spends almost all of her free time with her children. | L | SL | NL |
| 98. When I have certain jobs to do she does not allow me to do anything else until they are done. | L | SL | NL |
| 99. Is very interested in what I am learning in school. | L | SL | NL |
| 100. Doesn't like the way I act at home. | L | SL | NL |
| 101. Changes her mind to make things easier for herself. | L | SL | NL |
| 102. Can be talked into things easily. | L | SL | NL |
| 103. Wishes I would stay at home where she could take care of me. | L | SL | NL |
| 104. Makes me feel I'm not loved. | L | SL. | NL |
| 105. Has more rules than I can remember, so is often punishing me. | L | SL | NL |

- | | | | |
|---|---|----|----|
| 106. Says I make her happy. | L | SL | NL |
| 107. Will talk to me again and again about anything bad I do. | L | SL | NL |
| 108. Lets me do anything I like to do. | L | SL | NL |

FORM FOR FATHER

		Some- what Like	Not Like	Like
1. Makes me feel better after talking over my worries with him.	L	SL	NL	
2. Isn't very patient with me.	L	SL	NL	
3. Sees to it that I know exactly what I may or may not do.,	L	SL	NL	
4. Wants to know exactly where I am and what I am doing.	L	SL	NL	
5. Soon forgets a rule he has made.	L	SL	NL	
6. Is easy with me.	L	SL	NL	
7. Doesn't talk with me very much.	L	SL	NL	
8. Will not talk to me when I displease him.	L	SL	NL	
9. Is very strict with me.	L	SL	NL	
10. Feels hurt when I don't follow advice.	L	SL	NL	
11. Is always telling me how I should behave.	L	SL	NL	
12. Usually doesn't find out about my misbehavior.	L	SL	NL	
13. Spends very little time with me.	L	SL	NL	
14. Almost always speaks to me with a warm and friendly voice.	L	SL	NL	
15. Is always thinking of things that will please me.	L	SL	NL	
16. Believes in having a lot rules and sticking to them.	L	SL	NL	
17. Tells me how much he loves me.	L	SL	NL	
18. Is always checking on what I've been doing at school or at play.	L	SL	NL	
19. Punishes me for something one day, but ignores me for doing it the next.	L	SL	NL	
20. Allows me to tell him if I think my ideas are better than his.	L	SL	NL	
21. Lets me off easy when I do something wrong.	L	SL	NL	
22. Sometimes when he disapproves, doesn't say anything but is cold and distant for awhile.	L	SL	NL	

- | | | | |
|---|---|----|----|
| 23. Forgets to help me when I need it. | L | SL | NL |
| 24. Sticks to a rule instead of allowing a lot of exceptions. | L | SL | NL |
| 25. Tells me exactly how to do my work. | L | SL | NL |
| 26. Doesn't pay much attention to my misbehavior. | L | SL | NL |
| 27. Likes me to choose my own way of doing things. | L | SL | NL |
| 28. If I break a promise, doesn't trust me again for a long time. | L | SL | NL |
| 29. Doesn't seem to think of me very often. | L | SL | NL |
| 30. Doesn't tell me what time to be home when I go out. | L | SL | NL |
| 31. Gives me a lot of care and attention. | L | SL | NL |
| 32. Believes that all my bad behavior should be punished in some way. | L | SL | NL |
| 33. Asks me to tell everything that happens when I'm away from home. | L | SL | NL |
| 34. Doesn't forget very quickly the things I do wrong. | L | SL | NL |
| 35. Wants me to tell him about it if I don't like the way he treats me. | L | SL | NL |
| 36. Worries about me when I'm away. | L | SL | NL |
| 37. Gives hard punishment. | L | SL | NL |
| 38. Believes in showing his love for me. | L | SL | NL |
| 39. Feels hurt by the things I do. | L | SL | NL |
| 40. Lets me help to decide how to do things we're working on. | L | SL | NL |
| 41. Says some day I'll be punished for my bad behavior. | L | SL | NL |
| 42. Gives me as much freedom as I want. | L | SL | NL |
| 43. Smiles at me very often. | L | SL | NL |
| 44. Is always getting after me. | L | SL | NL |
| 45. Keeps a careful check on me to see that I have the right kind of friends. | L | SL | NL |
| 46. Depends upon his mood whether a rule is enforced or not. | L | SL | NL |

- | | | | |
|---|---|----|----|
| 47. Excuses my bad conduct. | L | SL | NL |
| 48. Doesn't show that he loves me. | L | SL | NL |
| 49. Is less friendly with me if I don't see things his way. | L | SL | NL |
| 50. Is able to make me feel better when I am upset. | L | SL | NL |
| 51. Becomes very involved in my life. | L | SL | NL |
| 52. Almost always complains about what I do. | L | SL | NL |
| 53. Always listens to my ideas and opinions. | L | SL | NL |
| 54. Would like to be able to tell me what to do all the time. | L | SL | NL |
| 55. Doesn't check up to see if I've done what he has told me. | L | SL | NL |
| 56. Thinks and talks about my misbehavior long after it's over. | L | SL | NL |
| 57. Doesn't share many activities with me. | L | SL | NL |
| 58. Lets me go any place I please without asking. | L | SL | NL |
| 59. Enjoys doing things with me. | L | SL | NL |
| 60. Makes me feel like the most important person in his life. | L | SL | NL |
| 61. Gets cross and angry about little things I do. | L | SL | NL |
| 62. Only keeps rules when it suits him. | L | SL | NL |
| 63. Really wants me to tell him just how I feel about things. | L | SL | NL |
| 64. Will avoid looking at me when I've disappointed him. | L | SL | NL |
| 65. Usually makes me the centre of his attention at home. | L | SL | NL |
| 66. Often praises me. | L | SL | NL |
| 67. Says if I loved him, I'd do what he wants me to do. | L | SL | NL |
| 68. Seldom insists that I do anything. | L | SL | NL |
| 69. Tries to understand how I see things. | L | SL | NL |
| 70. Complains that I get on his nerves. | L | SL | NL |
| 71. Doesn't work with me. | L | SL | NL |
| 72. Insists that I must do exactly what I'm told. | L | SL | NL |

- | | | | |
|--|---|----|----|
| 73. Asks other people what I do away from home. | L | SL | NL |
| 74. Loses his temper when I don't help around the house. | L | SL | NL |
| 75. Does not insist I obey if I complain or protest. | L | SL | NL |
| 76. Cheers me up when I am sad. | L | SL | NL |
| 77. Sees to it that I obey when he tells me something. | L | SL | NL |
| 78. Tells me of all the things he has done for me. | L | SL | NL |
| 79. Wants to control whatever I do. | L | SL | NL |
| 80. Does not bother to enforce rules. | L | SL | NL |
| 81. Thinks that any misbehavior is very serious and will have future consequences. | L | SL | NL |
| 82. Is always finding fault with me. | L | SL | NL |
| 83. Often speaks of the good things I do. | L | SL | NL |
| 84. Makes his whole life centre about his children. | L | SL | NL |
| 85. Doesn't seem to know what I need or want. | L | SL | NL |
| 86. Is happy to see me when I come home from school or play. | L | SL | NL |
| 87. Gives me the choice of what to do whenever possible. | L | SL | NL |
| 88. If I've hurt his feelings, stops talking to me until I please him again. | L | SL | NL |
| 89. Worries that I can't take care of myself unless he is around. | L | SL | NL |
| 90. Hugged or kissed me goodnight when I was small. | L | SL | NL |
| 91. Says if I really cared for him, I would not do things that cause him to worry. | L | SL | NL |
| 92. Is always trying to change me. | L | SL | NL |
| 93. Is easy to talk to. | L | SL | NL |
| 94. Wishes I were a different kind of person. | L | SL | NL |
| 95. Lets me go out any evening I want. | L | SL | NL |
| 96. Seems proud of the things I do. | L | SL | NL |

- | | | | |
|--|---|----|----|
| 97. Spends almost all of his free time with his children. | L | SL | NL |
| 98. When I have certain jobs to do he does not allow me to do anything else until they are done. | L | SL | NL |
| 99. Is very interested in what I am learning at school. | L | SL | NL |
| 100. Doesn't like the way I act at home. | L | SL | NL |
| 101. Changes his mind to make things easier for himself. | L | SL | NL |
| 102. Can be talked into things easily. | L | SL | NL |
| 103. Wishes I would stay at home where he could take care of me. | L | SL | NL |
| 104. Makes me feel I'm not loved. | L | SL | NL |
| 105. Has more rules than I can remember, so is often punishing me. | L | SL | NL |
| 106. Says I make him happy. | L | SL | NL |
| 107. Will talk to me again and again about anything bad I do. | L | SL | NL |
| 108. Lets me do anything I like to do. | L | SL | NL |

Appendix E

SCORING SHEET FOR THE CHILD'S REPORT OF PARENT BEHAVIOR INVENTORY

Scores for Father _____
 Mother _____

Name: _____
 Subject No: _____
 Subject's Age: _____
 Sex: M or F _____

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	Total	
1 Acceptance		14			43	50	59		76	83	96									x 5/4
2 Childcenteredness		15	31				60			84	97									x 2
3 Possessiveness				36		51	65				89								103	x 2
4 Rejection			23		44	52	61		71	85									104	x 5/4
5 Control		16	32						72		98									x 2
6 Enforcement	9		24	37					77										105	x 2
7 Positive Involvement		17		38		53				86	90	99							106	x 5/4
8 Intrusiveness		18		33	45				73											x 2
9 Control through Guilt	10			39					67	78										x 2
10 Hostile Control		11	25	34		54			74	79	100									x 5/4
11 Inconsistent Discipline		19			46		62				101									x 2
12 Nonenforcement		12	26			55			68	80										x 2
13 Acceptance of Individuation		20	27	35	40		63	69		87	93									x 5/4
14 Lax Discipline		21			47				75		102									x 2
15 Instilling Persistent Anxiety			28	41		56				81									107	x 2
16 Hostile Detachment	7	13	29		48	57		70	82	94										x 5/4
17 Withdrawal of Relations		22			49		64			88										x 2
18 Extreme Autonomy			30	42		58				95									108	x 2