The present investigation was designed to test two major hypotheses and five sub-hypotheses. The two major hypotheses were:

1. Parental models influence the shaping of children's responses to frustration, and
2. There is a positive relation between parental consistency in responses to frustration and children's imitation of parental responses.

Three sub-hypotheses derived from major Hypothesis I were:

a. Children exposed to parental models who display aggressive frustration reactions, will react in an aggressive manner to frustrative stimuli,

b. Children exposed to parental models who display dependency frustration reactions, will react in a dependent manner to frustrative stimuli,

c. Children exposed to parental models who display withdrawal frustration reactions, will react in a withdrawal manner to frustrative stimuli.

Two sub-hypotheses derived from major Hypotheses II
were; (a) Parental consistency in response to frustration will lead to greater parental imitation than will parental inconsistency, and (b) Parental inconsistency in response to frustration will lead to boys' imitation of fathers and girls' imitation of mothers.

Subjects were 57 boys and girls drawn from a population of eight to ten year old children, from middle class families, and unbroken homes. The design for the study was the static-group comparison design for correlational studies.

In testing the hypotheses for this study four major activities were undertaken; (1) obtaining participants for the study; (2) obtaining parents responses to frustration stimuli; (3) determining parental consistency in responses to frustration and classifying families into consistent or inconsistent groups, and (4) determining frustration reactions of children.

A measure of parental consistency in response to frustration was obtained by determining agreement between parents' responses to items in a projective-type instrument depicting frustration situations. A measure of the children's imitation of parental behavior was obtained by determining extent to which children's responses to frustration situations agreed with parental responses to frustration.

To determine influence of parental models in shaping children's responses to frustration, comparison was made of frustration-response scores of children from families in which parents were
aggressive, dependent and withdrawal with children from families in which parents were non-aggressive, non-dependent and non-withdrawal. Analysis of data confirmed the hypothesis that children imitate parental responses to frustration.

To determine influence of consistency between parents in response to frustration on children's imitation of parental responses, comparisons were made of frustration responses of children from parent-consistent and parent-inconsistent families in each of three conditions; aggression, dependency and withdrawal. Analysis of data partially supported the major hypothesis. Significant difference was not found between consistent and inconsistent groups in the aggressive condition. Significant differences were found between the consistent and inconsistent groups in dependent and withdrawal conditions.

Data supported two interpretations for negative findings concerning the influence of parental consistency on imitation of parental responses: (1) Consistency of one parent in response to frustration across situations was a more significant variable influencing children's imitation of parental models than consistency between parents; and (2) In consistent and inconsistent groups children imitated only the like-sexed parent.

Data in this investigation supported the hypothesis that in event of inconsistency between parents, boys imitate fathers and girls mothers.
It was concluded within limits of the data in the present investigation that parental models exert a significant influence in determining children's responses to frustration and in general boys tend to imitate fathers and girls, mothers. It is suggested that among several parental antecedents of imitative behavior, the combined effect of parental consistency across situations and consistency between parents in response to frustration was a significant variable influencing children's imitation of parental responses.
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THE RELATION BETWEEN PARENTAL CONSISTENCY IN RESPONSES TO FRUSTRATION AND CHILDREN'S IMITATION OF PARENTAL RESPONSES

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was twofold: (1) to determine the influence of parental models on children's reactions to frustration and (2) to determine the relationship between parental consistency in response to frustration and children's imitation of parental responses.

Statement of the Problem

Research literature (Dollard et al., 1939) and informal observation have suggested that western cultures have spawned high frustrating societies. There is also research evidence available (Lawson, 1965) to suggest that people react to frustration in various ways, some of which may be detrimental to both the individual and society.

The process of socialization involves frequent frustrations incident to the acquisition of social habits. According to Dollard et al. (1939):
Frustration is, indeed regularly used as a means of forcing the organism that enters a society to develop complex modes of response which ultimately prove gratifying. . . . the continual modifications of behavior expected from them, the arbitrary demands (from their point of view) made by the adults and the frequency with which established instrumental acts and goal-responses must be abandoned. By definition, such interference with established response-sequences is frustrating. (p. 57)

An area which has been the focus of considerable attention in relation to the responses to frustration has been the school. Attending school involves a radical change of habits. The familiar setting, objects and behavior patterns in the home must be abandoned for a considerable part of the day. It has been observed that the school environment to some subgroups constitutes an environment of frustration stimuli. Children from minority groups find the middle-class school a frustrating, frightening place; and that both their responses to the school situation and factors in the situation elicit responses that tend to be misunderstood by school personnel. Studies of disadvantaged children strongly suggest that a communication problem exists between school personnel and children from backgrounds differing from the cultural mainstream of American society.

The school environment has been a source of frustration not only to the lower class or disadvantaged children but also to the middle class children. Aside from the usual frustrations arising from lack of teacher-pupil communication due to inadequate understanding on the part of the teacher of the child's family background, the middle class child of the twentieth century is faced with new
frustrations. For example, with increasing number of lower class children attending middle class schools and integration of formerly all-white schools in middle class neighborhoods, the middle class child is suddenly called upon to make an adjustment to a social environment unfamiliar to him.

Although it has been noted that this is a problem, not only in the generally widespread and increased manifestation of aggressive stimuli, but also in the increased evidence of conflict between teachers and pupils relating to frustration responses of some children to the school environment, attempts to cope with the problem have left questions unresolved.

A basic question to be answered concerns the manner in which the young children learn ways of responding to frustrating stimuli. Finding an answer to this question would provide some basis for helping teachers acquire an understanding of some of the behavior patterns of their pupils, and would serve as a foundation from which to design experimental studies concerned with teaching ways of responding to frustration.

This research was concerned with determining how children acquire behavior repertoires for responding to frustrating stimuli. The study investigated the influence of parents on children's acquisition of ways of responding to frustration.
Background of the Problem

Since the time of Freud, there has been much theoretical and experimental work centered on various behavioral reactions to frustration. Studies for the most part have been concerned with (1) reactions to frustration and (2) origin of frustration reactions.

Reactions to Frustration

Traditionally, frustration has been viewed as eliciting inappropriate behavior. The psychoanalysts (Freud, 1925; Hartmann, Kris and Lowenstein, 1949) viewed frustration as a stimulus for the release of an aggressive instinct. Freud (1925) regarded the tendency to seek pleasure and avoid pain as the basic mechanism of mental functioning. Frustration occurred whenever there was interference with pleasure seeking or pain avoiding behavior. Aggression was the "primordial reaction" to such frustration and was thought of as being directed toward those persons or objects perceived as the source of frustration. If aggression toward the frustrating agent was blocked, aggressive responses were displaced toward another object.

Following the early psychoanalytic theories, a number of independent theories of frustration began to appear, all of which seemed to stress the behavioral effects of frustration. Due to the
clinical origins of the term frustration, it is not surprising that the early theories stressed various socially inappropriate or maladaptive responses that could result from this psychological state.

Rosenzweig (1938) outlined three characteristic patterns of reaction to frustration; extrapunitive, impunitive and intrapunitive. An extrapunitive reaction referred to a hostile attack on the external world of people and things; an impunitive reaction was characterized by attempts to deny the existence of the unpleasant emotional state and the intrapunitive reaction alluded to tendencies to blame or punish oneself.

Early learning theorists (Dollard et al. 1939) formulated the frustration-aggression hypothesis and made the assumption that aggression was the inevitable consequence of frustration. This theory later was modified (Sears 1941, Miller 1941) to mean that aggression was a naturally dominant reaction to frustration, but that learning experiences could produce nonaggressive reactions to frustration.

In addition to the frustration-aggression hypothesis, Freud had suggested the notion that frustration would cause an individual to revert to modes of action that characterized behavior at an earlier developmental stage. This hypothesis known as the frustration-regression hypothesis was formulated in more objective terms by Barker, Dembo and Lewin (1941), who demonstrated that nursery
school children regressed when frustrated. In their study, they found that constructiveness of the subjects play, assumed to increase with age, decreased from free play to frustration sessions.

Another clinically maladaptive frustration reaction described by Maier (1949) was the response fixation. Maier contended that when an organism was sufficiently frustrated, he lost his problem solving capacities and instead adapted a rigid or persistent pattern of responding, which Maier termed fixation.

Some frustration theories and studies have not focused on a specific response pattern. Child and Waterhouse (1952) argued that when goal directed behavior was in some way interfered with, the standard concept of frustration, motivation was changed, and also other responses were likely to occur. The effect of the motivational change could only be predicted by knowing a great deal about the alternative behaviors possible for a given subject as well as the subjects' past history. There was no one mode of reaction to frustration.

The social learning theorists considered frustration a nonspecific arousal which could elicit a variety of reactions depending on a person's social learning experiences (Bandura and Walters, 1963).
Origin of Frustration Reactions

Studies have tended to point to three primary factors relating to the origin of frustration reactions: (1) personality correlates of frustration reactions, (2) the relation of reinforcement factors to the shaping of frustration reactions and (3) the role of imitation and identification in the origin of frustration reactions.

1. Personality Correlates of Frustration. Some psychologists have studied the personality correlates of frustration reactions and have demonstrated individual differences in frustration reactions.

Block and Martin (1956) tested the hypothesis that "ego control" capacity in children measured independently is predictive of individual differences in behavior following frustration. In an experiment similar to the frustration-regression experiment of Barker, Dembo and Lewin (1941), they compared children who were rated as "over-controllers" and "under-controllers". The specific hypotheses that were tested and supported were (1) undercontrolling children would evidence greater decrement in their level of play constructiveness following frustration and (2) would make direct attacks on the frustrating barriers to a greater extent than overcontrolling children.

Otis and McCandless (1955) conducted a study with preschool children with two of Lerner's blocking models. Despite repeated frustrations, the subjects varied markedly in their expressions of
dominant-aggressive and compliant-submissive responses. The variations were significantly related to two needs, power-dominance and love-affection on which the subjects were rated by the teachers. Children with a high need for power were high on aggression during frustration and increased their scores over a series of eight trials. The submission scores of these subjects were low during frustration and decreased rapidly. Children low in power dominance were low in aggression. Strong need for love-affection was associated with frequent submission and infrequent aggression in play.

2. Reinforcement factors. Other studies have demonstrated the influence of reinforcement in the form of punishment or reward to the formation of frustration reactions.

Lesser's (1957) TAT investigations revealed that frequently punished children generally inhibit their aggressiveness in social situations and are more likely to match the behavior of others and be influenced by the social reinforcers they dispense.

Sears' (1961) follow-up of children surveyed by him and his collaborators several years earlier (Sears et al. 1957) demonstrated the inhibitory effects of punishment. There was a negative correlation between maternal punishment at age five and the children's score of anti-social aggression obtained when they were 12 years old. The more severely mothers punished aggression in early childhood, the less the youngsters engaged in anti-social aggression.
Some of the studies have further pointed out that the inhibition of aggression will depend on the type of punishment or disciplinary measures used by parents. Allinsmith (p. 315-336 in Miller and Swanson, 1960) demonstrated that seventh and eighth grade boys with weak internal controls against socially disapproved behavior, in this case aggression, tended to have parents who favored corporal punishment, a lower class orientation in enforcing demands. The parents of children exhibiting habitually strong inhibitions against aggression, in contrast were more likely to have employed psychological discipline in which they attempted to make children feel guilty or ashamed of moral transgressions.

Keister and Updegraff (1937) demonstrated that aggressiveness and other destructive behaviors could be reduced on a frustrating puzzle problem by providing young children with responses that could lead to problem solving (reward).

Davitz (1952) in a study with seven to nine year old children demonstrated the inadequacy of the frustration-aggression hypothesis and the importance of direct training in the shaping of frustration reactions. He first observed children in a free play situation and recorded their responses. One group of subjects was then given training sessions with aggressive games and another given practice and reward for constructive cooperative tasks. The children were then shown a movie and a candy bar given to them at the end of the
first reel. Frustration was induced by stopping the second reel at a climactic point and simultaneously depriving the subjects of the candy. Following the interruption of the film, the children were observed in a free play situation and their responses recorded. Children who had been trained to behave aggressively in competitive games responded more aggressively to frustration than groups trained in constructive games. Similarly, children who had received training in constructiveness responded more constructively to frustration than children who had been trained in aggression.

Bandura and Walters (1959) found that mothers of aggressive boys were somewhat more permissive for aggression directed toward themselves than were mothers of nonaggressive boys. In another publication Bandura and Walters (1963) state that the effects of parental permissiveness are not independent of the consequences that follow the performance of the permitted act. Presumably parents who permit and reward aggression will develop aggressive habits in their children. (p. 131)

Evidence is also available to demonstrate the effect of reinforcement factors on the development of another dominant frustration reaction, namely dependency. It has been generally assumed that adult nurturance is a crucial factor in the establishing of dependency in children.

Sears, Maccoby and Levin (1957) found that mothers who were affectionately demonstrative and responded positively to their
children's dependent behavior, described their children as high in dependency.

Bandura and Walters (1959) found that mothers and fathers of nonaggressive high-dependent adolescent boys were both warmer and more affectionately demonstrative than the parents of low dependent group. In another study Bandura (1960) found that parents who were warm and affectionate rewarded dependency and had spent a good deal of time caring for their sons, had children who tended to display high dependency behavior.

Another source of evidence that maternal permissiveness for and reward of dependency increases children's dependency behavior, was provided by Heathers (1953). Six to twelve year old children were blind-folded and then requested to walk along a narrow unstable plank. As the child stood on the starting end of the plank, the experimenter touched the back of the child's hand and waited for him to accept or reject the implied offer of help. Parent training measures previously obtained were compared to the child's performance. The analysis indicated that children who accepted the experimenter's hand on the initial trial tended to have child centered parents who encouraged their children's dependency on others.

Some evidence is also available to demonstrate the inhibitory effects of a negative reinforcement such as punishment on dependency behavior. Bandura's (1960) study investigating the childrearing
antecedents of aggressive and inhibited behavior revealed that punishment for dependency resulted in a marked decrease in dependency responses.

In another study by Nelsen, cited in Bandura and Walters (1963) the author investigated the effects of both reward and punishment of dependency on the incidence of children's dependent responses in subsequent social-interaction situation. During training half the children were shown approval for dependency, while the remaining children received mild rebukes for acting in a dependent manner. Pretest to posttest changes indicated that reward for dependency resulted in an increase in dependency responses toward the rewarding agent while punishment for dependency resulted in a decrease of such responses.

3. **Role of Imitation in Learning of Frustration Reactions.** The social learning theorists explained the origin of frustration reactions in terms of identification and imitative learning. They demonstrated that a particular individual's reactions to frustration is a product of his social learning experiences.

The social learning theorists asserted that while operant conditioning procedures suggested by Skinner (1953) and direct reinforcement of reactions to frustration explained how an individual modifies his habitual reactions, these reinforcement theories do not provide insight as to the genesis of the child's frustration reactions.
It was held that reinforcement through reward and punishment could modify frustration reactions but the frustration reactions had to occur before they could be modified through reinforcement. According to the social learning theorists observed differences in the choice and patterning of frustration reactions could to a large extent be attributed to children's observation and imitation of parent and other adult models. Bandura (1962) stated:

During the course of development, children are provided with ample opportunity to observe and learn through imitation, the characteristic mode of dealing with frustrations exhibited by adult models in a variety of situations. Such repeated exposure might serve to establish for the child a hierarchy of frustration reactions corresponding to the behavioral responses provided by the model. Consequently, when the child encounters frustrative stimuli, he would be predisposed to behave in an imitative rather than a random trial and error fashion. (p. 228)

The social learning theorists rather than denying the role of reinforcement factors in the development of frustration reactions, implied that the effect of reinforcement was secondary, namely modifying reactions after they had been established by imitation. There is evidence available to support the joint influence of reinforcement and modeling. Parents who encourage and reward dependency also serve as nurturant models for their children. Hartup and Keller (1960) found that nursery school children who sought help and affection relatively often tended also to give frequent
attentive, affectionate, protective and reassuring responses in their interactions with their peers.

The present study is based on the conceptual framework of the social learning theory approach to frustration and behavioral reactions to frustration, that there are a wide variety of frustration reactions and that children learn the various behavioral reactions to frustration through an observation of adult models. Within this framework, the study aimed at testing more systematically the influence of parental models in determining children's frustration reactions and the relationship between parental consistency in responses to frustration and children's imitation of parental responses.
CHAPTER II

RATIONALE

This study derives from a frame of reference defined by (1) theories of identification (2) theories of imitation (3) empirical research on identification and imitation.

Theories of Identification

All identification theories generally have agreed upon the fact that identification takes place only when there is some relationship between subject and model, or the identifier and the identificand.

Freud (1925) postulated two types of identification - anaclitic and defensive or aggressive identification. He stated that the former occurs as a result of a dependency relationship with a caretaking adult who mediates the child's need gratifications. Aggressive identification occurs as a resolution of the Oedipus complex in boys. Fear of the punitive castrating father induces the child to reduce anxiety over punishment. Relating to this earlier psychoanalytic hypothesis are Anna Freud's "identification with the aggressor", Mowrer's "defensive identification" and Sanford's "identification proper". In proceeding from the earlier psychoanalytic hypothesis, all three theories postulated that the threat of the same sex parent
motivated the child to identify with him by accepting the standard of the parents both in order to please them and obtain gratification by reducing anxiety.

Freud traditionally has been credited with initiating the concept of identification and specifying its importance to behavioral development based on his clinical observations. However, his analysis of the conditions under which the process developed in infancy were incomplete and his hypotheses have not been conducive to empirical investigation. The main reasons have been Freud's stress of the unconscious nature of the id, and his use of terms such as incorporation and introjection which are not readily transalatable into learning theory terminology. Freud's theory was reformulated to facilitate behavioral research, particularly by the learning theorists (Symonds 1946, Mowrer 1950, and Sears 1957) who explained the process of identification on the basic principles of learning such as reward and punishment and the mechanism of secondary reinforcement. Similarity of child to parent on a common measure has been used as an index of identification.

Mowrer (1950) distinguished between two mechanisms of identification, developmental and defensive, analogous to Freud's anaclitic and aggressive identification. Developmental identification refers to behavior powered mainly by biologically given drives such as fear of the loss of love in the anaclitic sense and defensive
identification refers to socially inflicted discomforts such as "castration fear" or simply "fear of punishment." Though he distinguished between the two, Mowrer focused on developmental identification both in his theoretical discussion and empirical research. He suggested that this form of identification occurs because a caretaking adult, usually the mother, gratifies the child's biological and social needs. Thus the mother's attributes take on secondary reward value. The child reinforces himself by producing behavior similar to that of the caretaking adult's rewarding behavior. This imitation by the child pleases the adult who in turn reinforces it.

Sanford (1955) pointed out that Mowrer's distinction between developmental and defensive identification was superficial and did not really exist since the latter form of identification like the former was impelled by the fear of loss of love. In place of Mowrer's defensive identification, Sanford proposed introjection. He argued that

...the process by which figures of the environment become models for response readiness in the deeper layers of personality is not defensive identification but introjection...the distinctive feature of the crisis in introjection is frustration in love or a real or imagined threat of such a loss. (p. 112)

Sanford considered reinforcement by reward and punishment to be the basis of the child adopting parental characteristics.
Sears (1957) brought the concept of identification within the learning theory framework, even though his theory reflected elements of the classical psychoanalytic theory. Sears contended that learning by identification is different from all other kinds of learning in that it does not involve specific training or reinforcement through overt rewards. The overt actions or the product of the process of identification can take the form of qualities, roles and demands or standards of conduct. Sears presented three stages that form the developmental sequence in the origin of identification. First, the child develops a dependency drive for which the mother's affectionate nature is the appropriate environmental event. Second, he imitates the mother. Third, his imitation provides sufficient gratification so that it becomes habitual and takes on the characteristics of a secondary motivational system for which "acting like the mother is the goal response." In brief, the actions learned by the child by imitation are those which the parent performs in gratifying the child's dependency needs. In a later publication, Sears et al. (1965) summarized the implication as follows.

The relevance of this imitation to identification theory is that the child by performing acts which, in the mother's behavior repertoire have become secondary rewards or reinforcers for the child, now has a mechanism by which he can reward himself. By imitating his mother, he can provide a substitute for her when she begins withdrawing affectionate interaction and nurturance from him. (p. 4)
Sears concurred with Mowrer in placing emphasis on a dependent parent-child relationship and regarding nurturant interaction as a necessary precondition of identification. Sears (1957) extended Mowrer's proposal to include among the acquired forms of self-reward the whole class of imitated maternal behaviors, such as gestures, postures, task performances, and expressions of feelings; and ultimately, as the child's cognitive capacities develop and he begins to perceive and absorb belief systems, values and ideological positions, he imitates these aspects of his available models also.

Parsons (1955) while acknowledging the inherent value in the psychoanalytic theory of identification, went a step further in relating elements of the family social structure to the identification process. He asserted that the psychoanalytic theory lacks a "systematic analysis of the structure of social relationships as systems in which the process of socialization takes place." (p. 104)

Parsons purported that the content of identification consists of three stages. First, the child identifies with the reciprocal role relationship. The next stage is the "love dependency" in which the mother's nurturance and affection become rewarding. In the first two stages there is no differentiation between parents in terms of sex-role, and the child can be motivated to do whatever please his father or mother. At this stage he internalizes more of the parents
overt behavior. At the third or oedipal stage, differential reinforce-
ment between sexes takes place. The reciprocal role pattern is 
more abstract and the child's identification not so much with the 
parents overt or actual behavior but with what they consider appro-
priate; the internalization of subtle and symbolic patterns. Parsons 
then stated his conception of identification.

Identification should designate the process of internali-
zation of any common collective 'we categorization' and 
with it the common values of requisite collectivity. In 
this meaning of the term in the oedipal phase of develop-
ment, a child undergoes not one but three new identifi-
cations. Two of them are common to members of both 
sexes, namely, internalization of familial 'we category' 
and of the sibling category 'we children.' The third by 
sex differs for children of each sex, in this sense the 
boy identifies with the father and the girl with the mother. 
It should also be noted that in none of these three senses 
does identification mean the internalization of a con-
crete role type. (p. 93-94)

Kagan (1958) believed that the various behavioral phenomena 
which have been labelled as "identification" differed in their mani-
fest properties and motivations. He identified four classes of be-
havior which have generally been described as related to the pro-
cess of identification, because they all lead to similarities in be-
havior between a subject and a model. He distinguished:

1. imitation learning which is similar to what Dollard 
and Miller called "matched-dependent" or "copying-
behavior";

2. prohibition learning which referred to the adoption 
and practice of the prohibitions of parents and parent 
substitutes;
3. identification with the aggressor referred to the adoption of behaviors which are similar to those of an aggressive or threatening model; and

4. vicarious affective experience.

Kagan also pointed out that identification has been used in three different senses to refer to (1) the process of identification, (2) individual differences in the content of behaviors, motives and attitudes and (3) the differential effect of various models that are used in the identification process.

After an analysis of some of the foremost theories of identification, Bonfenbrenner (1960) arrived at a threefold classification of phenomena to which the term identification has been applied:

1. identification as behavior where the emphasis is on overt behavior;

2. identification as motive where the emphasis is on disposition to act like another;

3. identification as process, which deals primarily with the psychological forces that impel the child to emulate the model; a mechanism through which behavior and motives are learned.

In reference to the third point, he distinguished four processes:

(1) anaclitic identification, (2) aggressive identification, (3) identification resulting from conventional reward and punishment without reliance on frustration and (4) identification resulting from perception of parent as exercising mastery over the environment. (p. 38)
Theories of Imitation

Some theorists have made only passing reference to identification and considered the mechanism in terms of imitation or modeling behavior. One of the most widely accepted theories has been that of Miller and Dollard (1941) which was based on the reinforcement of direct reward from the social environment in inducing the subject to behave like the model in responses to similar cues. According to this theory, the necessary conditions for learning through imitation include a motivated subject who is positively reinforced for matching the correct responses of a model during a series of initially random, trial and error responses. The theory of Miller and Dollard is challenged by Bandura and Walters (1963) on the basis that it does not account for the occurrence of imitative behavior in which the observer does not perform the model's responses during the acquisition process and for which reinforcers are not delivered either to the models or the observer.

Mowrer (1960) proposed the feedback theory of imitation. According to this theory, if certain responses have been repeatedly positively reinforced, stimuli associated with these responses acquire secondary rewarding properties. The individual is predisposed to perform the behavior for positive feedback. On the other hand, if the responses have been negatively reinforced, the
stimuli associated with such responses tend to arouse anxiety and thereby inhibit the occurrence of negatively valenced behavior.

According to the social learning theorists (Bandura and Walters, 1963) behavior is influenced by models even when there are no response-generated cues with negative or positive valence. Providing data from an experiment to support this notion, the authors suggest that the acquisition of imitative responses result primarily from the contiguity of sensory events, whereas, only the performance of imitatively learned responses is influenced by response consequences to the model or the observer. The theorists believe also that

... since eliciting and maintaining of imitative behavior are highly dependent on the response consequences to the model, an adequate social learning theory must also take into account the role of vicarious reinforcement through which the behavior of an observer is modified on account of the reinforcement administered to a model. (p. 4)

All theories of identification and imitation ultimately seem to point to the factor that various behavioral products of identification and imitation have three common aspects (a) they develop early in life, (b) they seem to occur spontaneously and (c) they become firmly established. Sears et al. (1965) suggest

... the operation of some intermediary process which, early in life, enables the child to learn without the parents having to teach and which creates a self-reinforcing mechanism that competes effectively in some instances with external sources of reinforcement." (p. 2)
Studie on Identification and Imitation

Studies on identification and imitation have taken on a variety of directions. These studies have been concerned with (1) parental identification (Sears et al., 1957, 1965; Mussen and Distler, 1959, 1960; Payne and Mussen, 1956; Mussen, 1961; Mussen and Rutherford, 1963; Emmerich, 1960). (2) Sex role identification (Lynn, 1959; Gray, 1959; Hartley, 1960) and (3) transmission of novel responses through imitation (Bandura, 1962; Hicks, 1965; Rosekrans, 1967).

The theoretical and empirical investigations on identification and imitation have further pointed to (1) the significant role of parents in the development of identification and imitation and (2) the influence of antecedent factors other than the mere presence or availability of adult models on identification and imitation.

1. Role of Parents on Imitative Learning

Psychoanalytic and learning theories and the studies on identification and imitation based on those theories have pointed to the significance of parents in the shaping of their children's behavior. For example, Bandura and Walters (1963) suggested that since the most potent models for the young child are those who are nurturant and who control resources, the qualities of the caretaker largely
determined those of the child. In most instances the caretakers are parents.

In the frame of reference of studies on parental identification and imitation, parents are seen as the most obvious models for the child to imitate because of the close and continuous contact and because of the significance of the parental role in the child's life.

Rosekrans (1967) who investigated the effects of perceived similarity to a social model on imitation, found that high perceived similarity to model appeared to facilitate acquisition of imitative responses as well as performance. If it is assumed that children generally perceive themselves as more similar to their parents than any other social model, then it can be further assumed on the basis of the study by Rosekrans, that parental models should be imitated more than any other social models.

Madsen (1965) demonstrated that modeling behavior of preschool children is significantly related to familiarity of models. Since parents are probably the most familiar models for children, it was assumed that parental behavior should have a considerable influence on their children's behavior.

2. Antecedent factors of Identification and Imitation

Evidence has suggested that the occurrence, strength and nature of imitative learning is contingent on certain antecedent factors. Stoke (1950) presented a comprehensive list of determinants
of identification. He emphasized importance of the familiarity of the model when he listed as one of the determinants of identification "the degree of acquaintance which the identifier had with the person with whom identification is attempted." (p. 166) Other antecedent factors considered directly or indirectly in identification studies are parent-child relations and parent personality factors (Payne and Mussen, 1956; Mussen and Distler, 1959, 1960; Mussen, 1961; Mussen and Rutherford, 1963). Factors considered in studies of imitation are reinforcement factors (Bandura and McDonald, 1963), power of models (Bandura, Ross and Ross, 1963; Madsen, 1965; Mischel and Grusec, 1966), and prestige of models (Lippit, Polansky and Rosen, 1952). Differences between sex of model and sex of child also have been found to influence imitative behavior (Bandura, Ross and Ross, 1961, 1963, and Rosenblith, 1959, 1961).

The large number of studies on children's identification with or imitation of parents do provide empirical support for the assumption that the behavior of children is related to their observation and learning of parental responses. However, there has been no direct research dealing with the systematic study of children's imitation of parental responses to frustration. Studies by Bandura, Ross and Ross (1961) and Revelle (1963) provide evidence for the modeling of frustration reactions. However, these studies were done under laboratory conditions using models that were not so familiar to the
children. From such a design imitative learning could be considered to have been acquired at the moment of testing rather than a generalized response occurring as a result of past learning. Some evidence for the transmission of aggressive responses from parents to children is found in studies by Bandura and Walters (1959) and Sears et al. (1957, 1965). These studies demonstrated clearly the existence of modeling behavior and suggest the need for research to determine the effect of more significant and permanent models in the shaping of frustration reactions.

Most of the studies on identification and imitation have included parents or other social models of one sex, rather than studying children's responses in relation to both parents or models of both sexes. In the present study, the precondition of imitation to be tested is parental consistency, namely the extent to which father and mother agree in their responses to frustration stimuli. It is assumed that if both parents agree in their behavioral responses the child's imitation of one parent is reinforced by similar behavior in the other parent. Some direct and indirect support for this assumption is found in research. McCord and McCord (1958) who examined the influence of parental role models on criminality found that children imitated their father's criminality when the mothers also were socially deviant. Helper (1955) found that a tendency for high school boys to assume similarity with their fathers was
related to mother's approval of the father as a model for the child.

The present study aimed at investigating not only the kind of similarity that exists between parents and their children in responses to frustration, but also the combined effect of a contingent factor, parental consistency that could be responsible for such modeling. The study also attempted to answer the question "after which parent will the child model his behavior in the event of inconsistency between fathers and mothers in their responses to frustration?"
CHAPTER III

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

A review of the literature on identification and imitation reveals that a large number of the studies on parental identification or imitation have placed emphasis on the formulation and testing of hypothesis concerning sex-role identification. However, imitative learning is not limited to sex-linked behavior or occupational roles. This has been demonstrated by several studies on identification and imitative learning (Bandura, 1962; Bandura and Walters, 1959; Sears et al., 1957; Rosenblith, 1959; Johnson and Szurek, 1952; Eisenberg, 1957; Revelle, 1963). Children observe all classes of behavior, a commonly observed one being the individual's reaction to stress and frustration in daily life. Studies providing evidence on children's imitation of adult frustration reactions can be grouped into two classes (1) experimental studies which have focused on transmission of novel responses and imitation of social models other than parents and (2) field studies which provide indirect evidence for children's imitation of parental responses to frustration.
Children's Imitation of Frustration Reactions of Adult Social Models

Direct support for the view that frustration reactions are transmitted through imitation of adult models is provided by several experimental studies on imitation.

Bandura and his associates (1962) conducted a series of experiments on the transmission of aggressive influences. In one study (Bandura, Ross, and Ross 1961), one group of nursery school children were exposed to an aggressive model who exhibited relatively novel forms of physical and verbal aggression toward a large inflated plastic doll. A second group observed the same model behave in a very subdued and inhibited manner. Following exposure to models, all children were mildly frustrated. They were then given a period of free play with no model present and their responses observed for amount of imitative and nonimitative aggression. Children who observed aggressive models exhibited about twice as much aggression as children in the nonaggressive or control group.

Mussen and Rutherford (1961) showed some subjects an aggressive cartoon, others a nonaggressive cartoon and no cartoon to a control group. Then all the subjects were asked about their desire to pop an inflated balloon. The subjects who had seen the aggressive cartoon were more willing to express aggressive impulses than were subjects in the other two groups.
In these two studies, the models were not necessarily responding to frustration stimuli, but the evidence is presented to show that when a child has observed aggression as a dominant response to emotional arousal in a specific situation and has learned this reaction, there will be high probability of his displaying aggressive reactions to frustration.

In another study Kobasigawa (1965) provided evidence that a frustrative motivational state may be aroused in a child who is not directly thwarted himself but is observing the thwarting of another individual. The investigator had first grade children observe an adult performer play a marble board game. Following blocking or nonblocking of the adult performer's marble placing efforts, a buzzer was sounded and the observing child was asked to depress a plunger to turn it off. The child's plunger pressing response was greater following thwarting of the adult performer than following nonthwarting. Though this is not evidence of direct modeling, imitative behavior of a sort can be considered to have taken place especially if vicarious involvement can be considered an index to identification as suggested by Kagan (1958, 1964).

A more systematic investigation of the role of modeling in determining reactions to frustration was conducted by Revelle (1963). In this experiment, preadolescents were administered alternatively three different sets of pictorial stimuli each of which
depicted a person in a frustrative or stressful situation along with three modes of response to each frustration situation, namely aggression, withdrawal and dependency. With different groups of subjects the model consistently chose aggressive, dependent or withdrawal solutions. The frequency with which the children matched the frustration responses of their respective models was obtained. As a generalization of modeling effects following the exposure session, the children were provided with additional frustration situations and their choice of aggressive, dependent and withdrawal reactions was obtained. Children who were exposed to aggressive models chose aggressive frustration reactions significantly more than children in the other groups.

Children's Imitation of Parental Frustration Reactions

If frustration reactions form such a significant part of our behavioral repertoire and if they are transmitted through the modeling process, then parents as significant models should be transmitting to their offspring their own emotional responses to frustration stimuli.

It has been pointed out that parental modeling effects can contravene the effects of direct training especially when it concerns the discipling of children. Such an interesting possibility has been suggested by Bandura and Walters (1963) who stated;
When a parent punishes a child physically for having struck a neighbor's child, the intended outcome of the training is that the child should refrain from hitting others. Concurrently with the intentional training, however, the parent is providing a model for the very behavior he is attempting to inhibit in the child. Consequently, when the child is thwarted in subsequent social interactions, he is more rather than less likely to respond in a physically aggressive manner. (p. 69)

There has been no direct research dealing with the systematic study of children's imitation of parental responses to frustration. However, some indirect evidence is available concerning the role of parental models in the development of such behavioral reactions.

Specific evidence concerning the role of modeling in the development of anti-social aggression is presented in a study by McCord and McCord (1958) who investigated the influence of parental models on criminality. The investigators found that there was a greater imitation of father's criminality when the mother also was socially deviant and when parental discipline was erratic, or when parents were rejecting. Since such disciplinary measures may include examples of hostile and aggressive behavior, the study provided evidence to suggest the influence of models on the origin of criminality.

In another study Bandura (1960) demonstrated that various forms of aggressive behavior frequently displayed by middle class parents in their disciplinary procedures and personal interactions may be transmitted to their children. Two groups of aggressive and
inhibited boys were compared with their parents on a number of scales of aggression. The boys high in aggression had parents who expressed indirect hostility and responded aggressively when instigated. On the other hand, the boys low in aggression had mothers who were inhibited in aggression. In addition, an interesting finding was that within the families of the inhibited boys, those boys who were high in aggression had fathers who expressed indirect hostility toward their wives.

There are some studies demonstrating the relationship between parental punitiveness and aggressive behavior. Sears et al. (1953) obtained a positive correlation between maternal punitiveness for aggression and incidence of boys aggressive behavior in nursery school. This finding was confirmed in a later study (Sears et al., 1957) where they found a similar relationship for girls. However, in the follow-up sample Sears (1961) reported nonsignificant relationship between parental punitiveness for aggression at age five and the expression of antisocial aggression at age 12. Berkowitz (1962) interpreted the differences in the studies done by Sears at two different periods, in terms of the differences in the anticipation of punishment. The severely punished children in the latter study (Sears, 1961) were somewhat older than the similarly treated youngsters in the earlier investigation (Sears et al., 1957). The older group conceivably could have come to accept punishment for
aggression in most situations while the younger children might not have generalized their anticipations of punishment. "Aggressive tendencies are not eliminated in either group however; punishment tends to suppress rather than eliminate the disapproved tendencies." (Berkowitz, 1962 p. 289)

Bandura and Walters (1959) reported that aggressive boys whose parents used punitive methods of discipline, displayed little direct aggression toward their parents but were highly aggressive in their interactions with peers and adults outside the home.

Similarly, Eron (1963) and his colleagues found that third grade children whose parents when interviewed indicated that they severely punished their children's aggression usually displayed a greater amount of aggression in school than did children of less punitive parents.

Levin and Sears (1956) used ratings of mothers' interviews to obtain measure of the punitiveness of parents and the degree of identification with the same sex parent as shown by their preschool children. Strongly identified boys showed significantly more aggression than weakly identified boys, especially when the fathers were the agents of frustration. Differences between strongly and weakly identified girls came only when mothers were severely punitive whereas severity of fathers' punishment had little influence on the boys aggression.
Most of the experimental studies on modeling behavior have considered only aggressive behavior as the dependent variable. However, there is some research evidence to suggest that all kinds of responses can be acquired through an observation of social models. For example, the Revelle study (1963) investigated the modeling of three classes of behavior. Levin and Baldwin (1959) studying pride and shame in children, found that children who were shy and inhibited had parents who were inhibited in their social interactions. The 1960 study by Bandura comparing inhibited and aggressive boys with their parents also provided support for their hypothesis that children model themselves after their parents in regard to dependency behavior.

These studies and others (Blake, 1958; Rosenblith, 1959; Eisenberg, 1957) have provided clear evidence that children readily imitate adult models. Bandura et al. (1961) Hartup (1964) and Revelle (1963) have demonstrated further that imitative behavior is not situation specific and will generalize across situations both in the presence and absence of models. Clearest evidence of the generalization of response across situations was provided by Miller and Dollard (1941). On the basis of an experiment demonstrating the result, the authors concluded that "imitation of a given response . . . learned in one situation . . . will generalize to new and somewhat similar situations." (p. 131)
On the basis of the above considerations the present study aimed at investigating more systematically, the influence of parental models in determining their children's responses to frustration reactions and the relationship between parental consistency in responses to frustration and children's imitation of parental responses.

Assumptions

Six assumptions were derived from the theoretical and empirical considerations concerning imitation and the development of frustration reactions.

1. It was assumed that children observe and learn all classes of adult behavior. Of these a significant area was reaction to frustration. It was assumed that children's responses to frustration are shaped through observation and imitation of parental responses.

2. It was assumed that frustration can elicit a wide variety of reactions depending on the subject's social learning experiences.

3. It was assumed that parents and children's responses to test stimuli, are indicative of their typical reactions to frustrations.

4. It was assumed that the nature and strength of the child's imitation is related to certain antecedent parental factors. One factor of significance was the consistency relationship between his parents' behavior.
5. It was assumed that lack of parental consistency in responses to frustration creates a conflicting situation for the child.

6. It was assumed on the basis of sex role identification studies that parental inconsistency will lead to boys imitation of father and girls imitation of mother.

_Hypotheses Tested in the Study_

Two major hypotheses and supporting sub-hypotheses derived from the set of assumptions were tested to determine the extent to which children acquire and pattern behavioral repertoires for responding to frustrative stimuli.

_Hypothesis I_

It was hypothesized that parental models influence the shaping of children's responses to frustration.

_Sub Hypotheses._

a. Children exposed to parents who respond aggressively to frustration, will react in an aggressive manner to frustrative stimuli.

b. Children exposed to parents displaying dependency reactions to frustration, will display dependency behavior in their reactions to frustrative stimuli.

c. Children exposed to parents displaying withdrawal frustration reactions, will display withdrawal behavior in their reactions to frustrative stimuli.
Hypothesis II

It was hypothesized that there is a positive relationship between parental consistency in response to frustration and children's imitation of parental responses.

Sub Hypotheses.

a. Parental consistency in frustration reactions will lead to greater parental imitation by children than parental inconsistency.

b. Parental inconsistency in frustration reactions will lead to the boys imitation of fathers and girls imitation of mothers in responses to frustration.

Definitions

Central to development of this study was consideration of three basic concepts (1) response consistency, (2) imitation-identification process, and (3) frustration.

Response Consistency

Response consistency was defined by agreement and non-agreement of responses of father and mother in a family unit.

1. Parental consistency was defined as the extent to which fathers and mothers agreed in their responses to similar frustration situations. Parental consistency was considered to exist when 70 percent
or more of the responses between parents were similar.

2. Parental inconsistency was defined as the extent to which fathers and mothers disagreed in their responses to similar frustration situations. Parents were considered to be inconsistent when less then 70 percent of the responses between parents were similar.

Imitation-Identification Process

A great controversy has centered around the definition of the two concepts imitation and identification. Some authors consider the two concepts as encompassing quite different phenomena. Others conceive of identification as having wider implications with imitation encompassing one aspect of identification. Still others use the term imitation alternatively with identification or synonymously.

Freud (1948) defined identification as the "endeavour to mold a person's ego after one that has been taken as the model." (p. 63) Freud (1925) made a distinction between primary and secondary identification. In general he treated identification as process, the interplay of internal and external forces which induce the child to accept parental behavior and characteristics. Later, he also considered the process of identification, the resulting similarity in the characteristics of parent and child. Though Freud spoke of identification as involving imitation, he later asserted that it was the ideal standards reflecting motives and aspirations that the child identifies with rather than actual behavior.
Learning theorists such as Sears, Maccoby and Levin (1957) defined identification as "whatever process that occurs when the child adopts the method of role practice i.e. posing as though he were occupying another person's role." (p. 370)

Parsons (1951) contrasted imitation and identification in terms of specificity and generality of learning. In the "social system" he made the following distinction.

The two major mechanisms for the learning of patterns from social objects are imitation which assures only that alter provides a model for the specific pattern learned without being an object of generalized cathetic attachment, and identification which implies that alter is the object of such an attachment and therefore serves as a model not only with respect to a specific pattern in a specific context of learning but also a model in a generalized sense not merely for specific patterns. (p. 211)

Lazowick (1955) distinguished the two on the basis that identification is matching behavior that is generalized and meaningful, while imitation involves highly specific acts.

Mowrer (1950) defined identification as matching behavior occurring in the presence of the model, whereas, imitation involves the emulation of the behavior characteristics of the model in the latter's absence.

Emmerich (1959) distinguished between identification and imitation on a somewhat similar basis as Mowrer. According to him, the notion of imitation ordinarily connotes spatio-temporal
proximity between the acts of the imitator and model. Identification was defined in terms of similarity to a symbolic representation of the model rather than imitation of the model's ongoing behavior.

Imitation first was integrated into the behavior theory framework with the publication of "Social Learning and Imitation" by Miller and Dollard (1941). They used three phrases to indicate the mechanism of imitation, "same behavior", "copying behavior" and "matched-dependent behavior". They have defined copying behavior as

... behavior in which one person learns to model his behavior on that of another. ... The copier is aware that his behavior falls within the band of tolerance as a match for the model act. (p. 92)

The authors referred to identification only briefly in their discussion of copying behavior. They stated that

... it is possible that a more detailed analysis would show that the mechanisms involved in copying are also involved in that aspect of character or superego formation which the Freudians have described as identification. (p. 164)

Bandura and Walters (1963) seemed to use the terms synonymously and explicitly stated the reason for such usage both in their theoretical discussion and empirical research. According to the authors both concepts "encompass the same behavioral phenomena, namely the tendency to reproduce the actions, attitudes, or emotional responses exhibited by real life or symbolic models." (p. 89)
In the present study imitation and identification were considered as representing the same behavioral phenomenon, the patterning of the behavior of one person, the subject, after that of another, the model.

**Frustration**

When it is said that a person is frustrated, it could mean a definition of observed behavior. But as Lawson (1965) states,

> the definition of frustration is not simply a definition in terms of independent and dependent variables. There is a strong implication that when an organism is frustrated, some very important things are happening inside the organism, especially in terms of the organism's feelings. (p. 6)

The psychoanalysts who were the original psychologists concerned with frustration and its effects, considered this concept in terms of inner feelings. According to the behaviorist, however, the status of the inner feelings of persons other than oneself is an inference, based on the observations of overt behavior and knowledge of external events preceding that behavior. Ultimately the real problem is one of identifying the observable antecedents and behavioral consequents and formulating generalizations about the relationships of these events (Lawson, 1965).

Establishing an operational definition of frustration has been as problematic as imitation or identification. The reason being, a
variety of operations have been used in inducing a "condition of frustration" in experimental studies. Bandura and Walters (1963) regarded all operations or conditions that prevent or delay reinforcement as frustration. "Since prevention or omission of reinforcement is equivalent to indefinitely prolonged or indefinite delay, frustration may be simply defined as delay of reinforcement." (p. 116)

Dollard et al. (1939) defined frustration as "interference with the occurrence of an instigated goal response at the proper time in the behavior sequence." (p. 7)

In the present study, a similar definition was used. Frustration was defined as the thwarting or blocking of a person's dominant motives, needs, goals or purposes.

Three responses to frustration were identified for the study: aggression, dependency, and withdrawal.

1. **Aggression** was defined as "a sequence of behavior the goal response to which is injury of the person toward whom it is directed." (Dollard et al. 1939, p. 9) Any physical or verbal injury to an individual or object.

Example
Johnny is trying to draw a picture of a horse.
He tries and tries but the picture does not look right.
Johnny grabs the picture, tears, it and throws it in the waste basket.

2. **Dependency** was defined as the "a class of responses
capable of eliciting positive attending and ministering from others,"
(Bandura and Walters, 1963, p. 139) i.e. the tendency to seek help
from others in making decision or solving problems.

Example  Unable to draw the picture himself, Johnny asks
his older brother to draw it for him.

3. **Withdrawal** was defined as the pattern of behavior intro-
duced by persistent frustration in which the person removes himself
from the realm of conflict physically or psychologically.

Example  Johnny leaves his drawing and starts playing
a game.

**Limitations**

Findings in this study have been qualified by three limitations.

1. Parental reactions to frustrations obtained in the
present study was through their answers to symbolic
material depicting frustrations. The answers thus
were projective in nature. An ideal thing would
have been to get their actual responses to real frus-
trations. This could have been done only by observ-
ing parents and children in a naturalistic setting
when they were actually experiencing frustration.
This seemed to be neither feasible nor possible.

2. Another limitation was the limiting of response
choices to three, from which the subject had to
make the selection. It acknowledged that there
are a wide variety of frustration reactions. The
three responses were included on the assumption
that they are more or less similar in terms of
social desirability.

3. The sample for the study was drawn from a select-
ed population, middle class, eight to ten year old
children, from San Luis Obispo, California. The sample was not drawn randomly and the number of subjects was small. Only children of parents who had agreed to participate in the first phase of the study served as subjects.
CHAPTER IV

METHOD AND PROCEDURE

Research Design

The design for the present study was the "static-group comparison" design described by Campbell and Stanley (1963) in which "a group which has experienced X is compared with one which has not for the purpose of establishing the effect of X." (p. 182) In the static group design, there is no formal means of certifying that the two groups would have been equivalent had it not been for X, so the factor needing control is selection. In the present study, selection was controlled through a definition of the population characteristics.

To test the influence of parental responses to frustration situations on children's development of behavior repertoires for their reactions to frustration, a comparison was made between children from families in which both parents reacted to frustration in the same way, with children from families in which there was disagreement between parents in their reactions to frustration.
Independent and Dependent Variables

In the investigation, the independent variable was parental consistency in response to frustration, measured by determining agreement of aggression, dependency and withdrawal responses of father and mother in each family unit to test stimuli depicting frustration. The dependent variable was children's imitation of parental responses to frustration as determined by the extent to which children's aggression, dependency and withdrawal responses to frustration agreed with parental responses.

Population and Sample

The population for this study consisted of eight to ten year old boys and girls, from grades three and four, in four public schools in San Luis Obispo, California, who met the following criteria: middle-socio-economic class, from families unbroken by divorce or death. Social class was controlled because of the demonstrated relationship between social class and parental behavior (Davis, 1946; Kohn, 1959; Miller and Swanson, 1960; Bonfenbrenner, 1958, 1961) Eight to ten year old children were selected because they appeared old enough to be able to understand the instructions in the test instrument administered to them and yet young enough for parental influences to affect their behavior.
Fifty-seven children constituted the sample for this study. These subjects were children of the parents who participated in the first phase of the study.

Procedures

In testing the hypotheses for this study four major activities were undertaken: (1) obtaining participants for the study; (2) obtaining parents responses to frustration stimuli; (3) determining parental consistency in responses to frustration and classifying families into consistent or inconsistent groups and (4) determining frustration reactions of children.

Obtaining participants for the study

In obtaining the subjects, a letter was sent to the Superintendent of the San Luis Obispo School System (Appendix A-1) explaining the purpose of the project and requesting permission for participation in the study of eight and ten year old children from the local elementary schools. A list of names and addresses of the parents of third and fourth grade children was obtained from the school principals. Two hundred families meeting the population criteria were contacted both by letter (Appendix A-2) and telephone. A self-addressed post card was enclosed with the letter to obtain parents' reply and also indicating the date, time and place for the
administration of an inventory to determine parents' responses to test stimuli. A follow-up phone call was made three days after the letters were mailed. Approximately 30 percent of the parents to whom the letters were sent, participated in the study and only the children of those parents served as subjects in the study. It is assumed that the group was representative of the population.

Obtaining parents' responses to frustration stimuli

To obtain a measure of parents' responses to frustration and the consistency between parents in their responses, data were gathered on the parents' responses to pictorial stimuli depicting frustration situations and reactions. The data gathering instrument used in the present study was the Family Situation Inventory, a projective instrument designed to determine adults and children's responses to familial frustration situations. A detailed description of the instrument is included in Appendix B. In administering the inventory, pictorial plates depicting frustration situations and the three alternative reactions were projected on the screen by means of an opaque projector. The visual cues were supplemented by standard verbal descriptions of the frustration situations and reactions. After viewing each situation, and the accompanying reactions the subjects' task was to identify which one of the three reactions the character in the scene would make to the particular situation.
It was assumed that the individual in making a choice of the pictorial character's reaction, would in essence be revealing his own behavioral reaction to the situation. Some supporting evidence for this assumption is provided by Maccoby and Wilson (1957) that in viewing a film, the viewer identifies with the character, especially if there is a similarity between the viewer and character in major social characteristics such as age, sex and race.

Initially, the 57 sets of parents who had agreed to participate in the study, were administered the adult version (Appendix C) of the Family Situation Inventory. The adult version of the inventory consisted of ten male and ten female items, each of which depicted a frustrating situation and provided three possible responses—aggression, dependency, withdrawal. Both parents responded to 20 items, since the inventory was administered to both parents simultaneously. However, only male items were scored for fathers and female items for mothers. The rationale for administering the instrument to the combined group of fathers and mothers at one time, rather than administering it to the two groups independently on two separate occasions, was because in the latter case, if the fathers, for example, took the test first, there was the chance of their discussing the test with their spouses prior to the latter group taking the test. This might introduce a bias in the female responses.
The instrument was administered to the parents in four groups to determine parental reactions to frustration. The test was administered in the school building, in a classroom under standardized conditions. Each set of frustration situations and alternative reactions was projected on the screen by an assistant for the parents to view. The parents were provided with test booklets containing written descriptions of the situations and reactions. As each picture plate was projected on the screen, the investigator read aloud the written descriptions. After viewing each plate, the parents were allowed about 30 seconds to indicate which one of the three reactions would be the most immediate reaction of the person in the scene to the situation. The parents recorded their response choices on an answer sheet provided with the test booklet. A trial situation was presented to the parents prior to the administration of the actual instrument, to be assured that the directions for taking the test were understood by the parents.

Determining consistency between parents and classifying families into consistent and inconsistent groups

A total score of aggression, dependency and withdrawal response choices was obtained for each parent. To determine consistency between parents, product-moment correlations were computed. Those families in which there was agreement \( r > .76 \), in their responses to the frustration situations, were considered as being consistent and those families in which there was low agreement
(r < .76) were considered as being inconsistent in their responses to frustration. The correlation level of r \geq .76 was selected because for product-moment correlation this figure is significant at the .01 level.

After correlations were obtained, families were classified into two major groups, consistent and inconsistent, with four subgroups under consistent as follows:

1. **Consistent** -- in which there was agreement between father and mother in their response choices to frustrative stimuli.
   a. **Consistent Aggressive** - in which there was agreement between parents in their response choices, with both parents having a predominance of aggression scores.
   b. **Consistent Dependent** - in which there was agreement between parents in their response choices, with both parents having a predominance of dependency scores.
   c. **Consistent Withdrawal** - in which there was agreement between parents in their response choices, with both parents having a predominance of withdrawal scores.
   d. **Consistent Mixed** - in which there was agreement between parents in their response choices, with neither parent having predominance of scores in any one of the three categories.

2. **Inconsistent** -- in which there was disagreement between parents in their response choices to frustration situations, each parent having a predominance of scores in one of the three dimensions, e.g. father aggressive and mother dependent.
In each of the groups an individual was labelled aggressive, dependent or withdrawing if 60 percent or more \( p \leq .07 \) of his responses was in one of the three directions. For example, if the response choice of a parent to six out of ten situations was aggression, he was labelled "aggressive".

**Determining Children's Responses to Frustration Situations**

To obtain a measure of the children's responses to frustration, arrangement for a definite date, place and time to administer the inventory, was made with the school principals and classroom teachers of the children. The children were administered the child version (Appendix D) of the Family Situation Inventory. Because of convenience to the school schedule, as in the case of the parents, the child version of the instrument was administered to the combined group of boys and girls, with only the male items scored for boys and the female items for girls. The other reason for the combined administration was to keep the adult version and the child version of the instrument uniform.

The procedure for administration of the instrument to the children was exactly the same as that for the parents. A practice item was presented, following which the ten male and the ten female situations were administered. A total score of aggression, dependency and withdrawal responses was obtained for each child.
The children were then grouped into the two major groups, consistent (aggression, dependency, withdrawal and mixed) and inconsistent to set up the data for statistical analysis. The grouping was done on the basis of the parents' consistency scores irrespective of the child's score.

**Data Analysis**

Means and standard deviations for scores on the inventory were computed for the consistent and inconsistent groups, and the mean scores for the two groups were compared by means of t-test.

In testing hypothesis number I, that there is a positive relation between parental responses to frustration and children's imitation of these responses, means and standard deviations were computed for the imitation scores of children in each of the three categories; aggression, dependency and withdrawal. Then the mean scores were compared by means of a t-test. For example, the mean aggression score of children from families in which at least one parent was aggressive was compared with the mean aggression scores of children from families in which neither parent was aggressive.

In testing hypothesis number II that there is a positive relation between parental consistency in response to frustration and children imitation of parental responses, mean scores on the inventory were computed by treatment group. A comparison was made of means
for the consistent groups and the inconsistent group for each of three conditions, aggression, dependency and withdrawal. The data from the consistent "mixed" group were not used in testing this hypothesis since "mixed" was not one of the categories in the test instrument.

To test the null hypothesis that there is no difference in mean scores between the consistent and the inconsistent groups, the t-test was used in comparing the means of aggression scores of boys from families in which both parents were aggressive with the mean aggression score of boys from families in which only the father was aggressive. A comparison was also made of the mean dependency score of girls from families in which both parents were dependent with the mean score of girls from families in which only the mother was dependent.

The t-test was also used to compare the difference in means between the aggression, dependency and withdrawal scores of the consistent groups in each of these categories with the mean of the aggression, dependency and withdrawal scores of the consistent "mixed" group, to test the null hypothesis that there is no difference in imitative behavior between the consistent groups in each of the three categories and the consistent mixed group.

In testing sub-hypothesis II-b, that in the event of inconsistency between parents, boys will imitate their fathers and girls their mothers, the data were treated by using a nonparametric statistic
the median test. A nonparametric test was selected because of the small sample size. The median test permitted the comparison of groups in 12 ways, four in each category. The possibilities are illustrated in the distribution of frequencies shown in Table I.

**TABLE I. Frequencies by sex for family type conditions in inconsistent families.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family type</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Boys</td>
<td>Girls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father aggressive</td>
<td>7*</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother aggressive</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father dependent</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother dependent</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father withdrawal</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother withdrawal</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Numbers in cells indicate number of cases.

However, due to the small number of cases in some of the cells, only the following three comparisons were possible: (a) comparison of the aggression scores of boys from families in which father was
aggressive with the aggression scores of girls from families in which father was aggressive; (b) comparison of the dependency scores of girls from families in which the mother was dependent with the dependency scores of boys from families in which the mother was dependent; (c) comparison of the withdrawal scores of boys from families in which the father displayed withdrawal frustration reactions with the withdrawal scores of boys from families in which mother displayed withdrawal frustration reactions. The comparisons were tested by the Fisher Exact Probability method. It has been suggested (Siegel, 1956) that when \( n_1 + n_2 \) is larger than 40 and no cell has an expected frequency of less than five, \( \chi^2 \) corrected for continuity should be used. But when \( n_1 + n_2 \) is less than 20 and the smallest expected frequency is less than five then the Fisher Exact Probability test should be used. In the present investigation the latter was the appropriate method.
CHAPTER V

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The purpose of this investigation was to test two major hypotheses: (1) Parental models influence the shaping of children's responses to frustration and (2) There is a positive relationship between parental consistency in responses to frustration and children imitation of parental responses.

In the study three sub-hypotheses derived from major hypothesis I were tested (a) Children exposed to parents who respond aggressively to frustration stimuli, will react in an aggressive manner to frustrative stimuli. (b) Children exposed to parents who display dependency frustration reactions, will react in a dependent manner to frustrative stimuli. (c) Children exposed to parents who display withdrawal frustration reactions, will react in a withdrawal manner to frustrative stimuli. Two sub-hypotheses derived from major hypothesis II were tested. (a) Parental consistency in responses to frustration stimuli will lead to greater imitation by children than will parental inconsistency. (b) Parental inconsistency in responses to frustration, will lead to boys imitation of fathers and girls imitation of their mothers.
Results

Parental Imitation of Frustration Reactions

In testing hypothesis number one that parental models influence children's responses to frustration, means and standard deviations were computed for the two groups in each category, aggressive and non-aggressive, dependent and non-dependent, with drawal and non-withdrawal. The mean scores for the two groups were compared by means of the t-test. The results appear in Tables II, III, IV.

TABLE II. Comparison of imitative behavior of children exposed to families in which one or both parents display aggressive reactions to frustration with those in which neither parent displays aggressive reactions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family type</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aggressive</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5.19</td>
<td>8.07</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>10.92</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-aggressive</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>9.25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE III. Comparison of imitative behavior of children exposed to families in which one or both parents display dependency reactions to frustration with those in which neither parent display dependency reactions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family type</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dependent</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>4.73</td>
<td>9.81</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>4.55</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-dependent</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>9.41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE IV. Comparison of imitative behavior of children exposed to families in which one or both parents display withdrawal reactions to frustration with those in which neither parent displays withdrawal reactions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family Type</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>$\bar{X}$</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Withdrawal</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5.24</td>
<td>8.82</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>5.80</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-withdrawal</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>9.73</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It can be seen from the results in Tables II, III, and IV that there was a significant difference in mean scores between the two groups in all three categories, thus confirming the hypothesis that children imitate parental models in their responses to frustration.

Parental Consistency in Responses to Frustration and Children's Imitation of Parental Responses.

One hypothesis central to the study was the relation between parental consistency in responses to frustration and children's imitation of parental responses. A comparison was made of scores of subjects in each of the parent consistent groups with the parent inconsistent group. Means and standard deviations were computed for the consistent and inconsistent groups in the three categories, aggressive, dependency and withdrawal and the mean scores compared by means of a t-test. The results are shown in Tables V, VI and VII.
TABLE V. Comparison of means of aggression scores of subjects from parental-consistent families with those from parental inconsistent families.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family Type</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>$\bar{X}$</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consistent</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.33</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(aggressive)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inconsistent</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4.73</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1.96</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE VI. Comparison of means of dependency scores of subjects from parental consistent families with subjects from parental inconsistent families.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family Type</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>$\bar{X}$</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consistent</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.33</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(dependent)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inconsistent</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2.38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE VII. Comparison of means of withdrawal scores of subjects from parental consistent families with subjects from parental inconsistent families.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family Type</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>$\bar{X}$</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consistent</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6.44</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(withdrawal)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inconsistent</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2.73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The results of the analysis presented in Tables V, VI and VII indicate that no difference occurred between the comparison of means of the aggression scores, but significant differences (p < .05) occurred between the two groups in the comparison of withdrawal and dependency scores.

An examination of the raw scores in the data of the consistent and inconsistent groups revealed that there were as many high scores in the inconsistent group as in the consistent group. In order to account for the lack of significant differences in mean scores between the consistent and inconsistent group in the aggression category (Table V) and to provide support for the interpretation that consistency across situations was an uncontrolled variable affecting imitative behavior, the t-test was again used to compare the differences in mean scores between the consistent group in each of the three categories and the consistent mixed group.

Another interpretation was that perhaps both in the consistent and inconsistent groups, the child was imitating only one parent, the like sexed parent. To provide support for this interpretation and additional support for the effect of consistency across situations on children's imitation of parental responses two more t-tests were performed comparing (1) the difference in means between the aggressive scores of boys from families in which both parents were aggressive with the mean aggression score of boys from families
in which only the father was aggressive and (2) the difference in
means in the dependency scores of girls from families in which both
parents were dependent with dependency scores of girls from fami-
lies in which only the mother was dependent. The results are shown
in Tables VIII, IX, X, XI and XII.

TABLE VIII. Comparison of means of aggression scores of subjects
from consistent aggressive families with subjects
from consistent mixed families.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family Type</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consistent (aggressive)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.33</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consistent (mixed)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>7.11</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE IX. Comparison of means of dependency scores of subjects
from consistent dependent families with subjects
from consistent mixed families.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family Type</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consistent (dependent)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.33</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consistent (mixed)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE X. Comparison of means of withdrawal scores of subjects from consistent withdrawal families with subjects from consistent mixed families.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family Type</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>$\bar{X}$</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consistent</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6.44</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(withdrawal)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consistent</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(mixed)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE XI. Comparison of means of aggression scores of boys from consistent aggressive families with boys from inconsistent (father-aggressive) families.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family Type</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>$\bar{X}$</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consistent</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.20</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father-aggressive</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5.78</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE XII. Comparison of means of dependency scores of girls from consistent dependent families with girls from inconsistent (mother-dependent) families.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family Type</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>$\bar{X}$</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consistent</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.25</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother-dependent</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5.75</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results in Tables XIII, IX and X reveal that there is a significant difference between the consistent group in each of the
three categories and the consistent mixed group, thus failing to support the influence of consistency between parents on children's imitative behavior. The results of Tables XI and XII reveal that there is no difference in means between the consistent and inconsistent groups in the aggression scores of boys and the dependency scores of girls, when only one parent, the like-sexed parent was taken into consideration in the inconsistent group. These results provided some support for the interpretation that in each group, the child was imitating only one parent, the like sexed parent, and that it was consistency across situations that was a significant variable, in determining children's imitation of parental responses to frustration.

Parental Inconsistency in Responses to Frustration and Children's Imitation of Parental Responses

To test the hypothesis that in the event of parental inconsistency boys will imitate their fathers and girls their mothers, the data were treated by the median test. Three separate analyses were conducted comparing scores of (1) boys from families where father was aggressive with girls from father-aggressive families, (2) boys from families where mother was dependent with girls from mother-dependent families, (3) boys from father-withdrawal families with boys from mother-withdrawal families.
To test the significance of differences between the two samples in each case, the Fisher Exact Probability test was conducted. The results reported in Tables XIII, XIV and XV reveal that the differences in all three comparisons were significant. The significance of the observed set of values were determined directly by reference to Table I in Siegel (1956).

**TABLE XIII.** Median test comparing imitative behavior of boys from father-aggressive families with girls from father-aggressive families.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family Type</th>
<th>Girls</th>
<th>Boys</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scores above median</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scores below median</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

median = 5 \( p = < .05^* \)

**TABLE XIV.** Median test comparing imitative behavior of girls from mother dependent homes with boys from mother dependent homes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family Type</th>
<th>Boys</th>
<th>Girls</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scores above median</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scores below median</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

median = 5 \( p = < .01 \)

* Probabilities were determined from Table I in Siegel, Non Parametric Statistics, McGraw Hill, 1956.
TABLE XV. Median test comparing imitative behavior of boys from father withdrawal families with boys from mother withdrawal families.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>father withdrawal</th>
<th>mother withdrawal</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scores above median</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scores below median</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

median = 4  \( p < .05 \)

Discussion

The present investigation has provided additional support to previous findings that children learn through imitation of parental models. In addition it has provided support for some of the theoretical speculations and research findings on sex-role identification (Lynn, 1959) and like-sex imitation (Bandura, Ross and Ross, 1961; Hartup, 1964; Sears et al., 1965).

In general the results of the study confirmed the major hypothesis that parental models influence children's responses to frustration, but the hypothesis that there is a positive relation between parental consistency in responses to frustration and children's imitation of parental responses was only partially supported.
Parental Consistency in Responses to Frustration and Children's Imitation of Parental Responses

Significant differences were obtained between the consistent and inconsistent groups in the comparison of dependency and withdrawal scores, but not in the aggression scores of the two groups. This made the results somewhat suspect and necessitated a re-examination of the data. An examination of the raw scores in all three categories revealed that some of the raw scores in the inconsistent group were almost as high as the consistent group.

Initially, it was expected that if the father, for example, was aggressive and the mother also was aggressive, then the boys imitation of his father's aggressiveness would be reinforced by the mother's aggression while, if in both groups parental imitation could take place, in the consistent group it should be greater because of the combined influence of both parents. Some direct and indirect support for this assumption is found in research. McCord and McCord (1958) who examined the influence of parent role models on criminality found that children imitated their father's criminality when the mothers also were socially deviant. Helper
(1955) found that a tendency for high school boys to assume similarity with their fathers was related to mother's approval of the father as a model for the child. However, some of the data in the present study indicates that reinforcement from both parents did not make a difference in aggression scores.

This led to the speculation that perhaps in both consistent and inconsistent groups the child was imitating only one parent. This assumption seems to imply that imitation of one parent precludes the imitation of the other. If interpreted on the basis of identification theory, such an assumption cannot be justified by appeal to research findings and theory. (Brodbeck, 1954, p. 233, and Kagan, 1958, p. 304) "When measured independently and correlated (as they rarely are) paternal and maternal identification are strongly correlated." (Slater, 1961, p. 119) However, Slater was referring to the correlation between maternal and paternal identification, if they occur consecutively rather than simultaneously. If the speculation is stated as the child imitating one parent more than the other, it would not preclude the imitation of the other.

A further speculation was that perhaps it was not consistency between parents but consistency within a parent across situations that would be the more significant variable. This speculation seems
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to be consistent with some of the theories on schedules of reinforce-
ment (Ferster and Skinner, 1950) where it has been demonstrated
that generally speaking, continuous reinforcement results in the
more rapid acquisition of responses than intermittent reinforcement.
The subjects from consistent aggressive, dependent and withdrawal
groups came from families where there was not only consistency
between parents but consistency across situations in each parent's
responses. In the inconsistent group, even through there was lack
of consistency between parents, there was probably consistency
across situations in some of the individual parent's reactions. The
data presented in Tables XIII, IX, X, XI and XII provide support
for both these interpretations.

The data presented supports the interpretation that it is
probably the combined effect of consistency across situations in one
parent's responses and consistency between parents that is the
influential factor, rather than consistency between parents alone.

In view of the fact that the results of findings in the dependency
and withdrawal scores between consistent and inconsistent group
were positive and the negative findings were only in the aggression
scores, the influence of parental consistency cannot be completely
discarded. Rather, the discrepancy in the data of the three analyses
could possibly be explained on the basis of the following arguments:
(a) Since the mean of the inconsistent aggressive group (4.73) was
greater than the mean of the inconsistent dependent (4.12) and inconsistent withdrawal group (4.50), it is assumed that there were more children of parents consistent across situations in the inconsistent aggressive group than in the other two groups. Results of data reported earlier support the assumption that consistency across situations is related to imitation. (b) In a comparison of the consistent and inconsistent, sex factor was not controlled within the two treatment groups. The differential influence of parent's sex on the child's behavior also became apparent in the testing of sub-hypothesis IIb, that in the event of inconsistency boys imitate fathers and girls imitate their mothers where in a comparison of boys and girls from the parental inconsistent group it was found that boys tended to imitate their fathers and girls their mothers.

**Sex Differences in Children's Imitative Behavior**

The present investigation which confirmed the hypothesis that generally girls tended to imitate their mothers and boys their fathers, seems consistent with the findings of other studies. For example, Hartup (1964) found that same-sex imitation moderately was generalized across situations but opposite sex imitation was not.

There have been contradictory findings about whether a same-sex model or an opposite sex model is imitated more. One
of the reasons for this is that most of the studies of imitation and identification included as models only parents of one sex. However, there is some theoretical and research evidence to support the occurrence of like sex imitation especially for boys. Lynn (1959), after interpreting the finding of a number of studies, concludes that (1) with increasing age, males become relatively more identified with the masculine role and females relatively less identified with the feminine role. (2) Males tend to identify with a cultural stereotype of the masculine role, whereas females tend to identify with aspects of their own mother's role. Sears et al. (1965) on the basis of intercorrelations among various child behaviors concluded that children of both sexes initially adopt feminine maternal ways of behaving, and the mechanisms involved may include a modeling process or direct tuition. But, after the age of four, the boy develops a "cognitive map" of the male role and begins to shape his own behavior toward that role.

Evidence for sex-typing in modeling behavior counts largely of observations obtained of parallel behaviors in parents and children. Bandura and Walters (1963) have shown that such parallels occur in many behavior qualities, including aggression, dependency, withdrawal, autism and guilt. The parallels reported in most instances are between parents and children of the same sex. Sears et al. (1965) raised the questions of "What the social and other
conditions may be that are conducive to imitation of the same-sexed parent," other than the fact that the father is more appropriately the model for the boy and the mother for the girl. The authors answer this question by providing research evidence to suggest that certain parental antecedent conditions e.g. warmth and nurturance, power of the model, may be the determinants of same-sex imitation. Evidence is available, (Sears, 1953), to show that opposite-sex identification takes place in situations when the above antecedent conditions are absent in the same sex parent and present in the opposite sex parent. However, investigation of these antecedent conditions was beyond the scope of the present investigation.

Another finding relative to the last hypothesis was that most of the subjects with a predominance of aggressive responses to frustrative stimuli were boys and subjects with predominantly dependent responses were girls. Both boys and girls imitated withdrawal responses. These sex differences can be explained on the basis that aggression is a more commonly a masculine trait and dependency a feminine trait. These findings are consistent with those of Sears et al. (1965) who found from their studies that "aggression appears to be more highly integrated (more nearly a unitary) trait in boys than in girls." (p. 166) Dependency seems to be acceptable or even desired in girls. The authors also found that the boys aggression is significantly related to the father and the girls (insignificantly) to the mothers.
CHAPTER VI

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The present investigation focused on two major hypotheses (1) parental models influence shaping children's responses to frustration; and (2) there is a positive relationship between parental consistency in response to frustration and children's imitation of parental responses. Three sub-hypotheses derived from hypothesis I were tested: (a) Children who are exposed to parental models who display aggressive frustration reactions, will react in an aggressive manner to frustrative stimuli. (b) Children who are exposed to parental models who display dependency frustration reactions, will react in a dependent manner to frustrative stimuli. (c) Children who are exposed to parental models who display withdrawal frustration reactions, will react in a withdrawal manner to frustrative stimuli. Two sub-hypothesis derived from hypothesis II were tested: (a) Parental consistency in responses to frustration will lead to greater imitation of parental behavior than will parental inconsistency. (b) Parental inconsistency in frustration reactions will lead to boys imitation of fathers and girls imitation of mothers.

The population for the study was eight to ten year old children, from middle socio-economic class, from families unbroken by
divorce or death, and from public schools in San Luis Obispo, California. The sample for the study was 57 boys and girls who met the population criteria. The subjects were classified into the parental consistent and parental inconsistent groups on the basis of their parents' responses to the adult form of the Family Situation Inventory, a projective instrument which consisted of pictorial stimuli depicting frustration situations and three alternative reactions to each situation. The instrument was designed to determine adult's and children's responses to frustrative stimuli. The children from families in which there was high agreement \((r \geq .76)\) between father and mother in their responses to frustrative stimuli, represented the consistent group. The children from families in which there was low agreement \((r < .76)\) between father and mother in their responses to frustrative stimuli, represented the inconsistent group. Within the consistent group there were four sub-groups. (1) Families in which both parents had a predominance of aggression scores. (2) Families in which both parents had a predominance of dependency scores. (3) Families in which both parents had a predominance of withdrawal scores. (4) Families in which there was agreement between parents, with neither parent having a predominance of aggression, dependent or withdrawal scores. The families were considered aggressive, dependent or withdrawing if six or more of each parent's ten responses was in one of the three directions \((p < .07)\).
A measure of the children's imitation of parental behavior was obtained by determining the extent to which children's responses to frustration situations agreed with parents responses to frustration situations.

To determine the influence of parental models in shaping children's responses to frustrations, means and standard deviations for the two groups in each of the three conditions, aggressive and non-aggressive, dependent and non-dependent and withdrawal and non-withdrawal were compared by means of a t-test. The analysis of the data confirmed the hypothesis that children imitate parental responses to frustration.

In order to interpret the influence of consistency between parents in responses to frustration on the imitative behavior of children, t-tests were performed comparing the differences in means between the consistent and inconsistent groups in each of the three conditions; aggression, dependency and withdrawal. Significant differences in imitation were found between the consistent and inconsistent groups in the dependent and withdrawal conditions but not in the aggressive condition. Thus the hypothesis on the influence of parental consistency in responses to frustration on imitative behavior of children was only partially supported.

The negative findings concerning parental consistency on imitative behavior were explained on the basis of two interpretations;
(1) Consistency of one parent across situations was a more significant factor influencing children's imitation of frustration responses than consistency between parents, and (2) In both consistent and inconsistent groups the children were imitating only one parent, the like-sexed parent. Data presented supported these interpretations, and the hypothesis on the influence of parental consistency in responses to frustration on children's imitation was rejected.

The final hypothesis tested was that in the event of inconsistency between parents in their responses, boys will imitate fathers and girls mothers. Using the median test, comparisons were made between (a) boys and girls from father aggressive homes (b) boys and girls from mother-dependent homes (c) boys from father withdrawal families and boys from mother withdrawal families.

It was concluded within the limits of the data in the present investigation, that parental models exert a significant influence in determining children's responses to frustration situations and in general boys tend to imitate their fathers and girls their mothers. It is suggested that among the several parental antecedents of imitative behavior, the combined effect of parental consistency across situations and between parents in response to frustration was a significant variable influencing imitation of parental behavior.

The present investigation has implications for parents and teachers in understanding how children develop behavior repertories
for handling stress situations. The study focussed on middle class children. It is suggested that it would be worthwhile to investigate the influence of parental models in other socio-economic groups in the shaping of their children's responses to frustration.
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APPENDICES
APPENDIX A

LETTERS
Dr. Ronald E. Notley  
Superintendent of Schools  
San Luis Obispo, California

The School of Education at Oregon State University is conducting a project aimed at improving teacher-pupil relationship in the elementary school. One of the ways in which it is hoped the teacher can effectively communicate with the children is by having some understanding of the homes from which the pupils come. In order to find out some of the important factors that our beginning teachers need to know, we are trying to identify situations that take place in homes in different communities.

We have obtained information on home situations in several communities in Oregon. We now are interested in finding out from a group of parents and their eight to ten year old children the typical reactions to such situations. We have met with parents and children in several communities to obtain their ideas on the situations and reactions. We are interested in having the fourth grade pupils in the San Luis Obispo area and their parents participate in this project by giving their ideas as to whether or not these situations and reactions are typical in their community.

In the inventory task parents and pupils will be shown photographs of situations, using the opaque projector. The task will take approximately thirty minutes for parents and thirty minutes for pupils. In each session (one for parents and one for pupils) twenty picture cards will be projected onto a screen. Each picture card is an 8 1/2 x 11 inch mat with four still pictures on it, as shown in the following illustration:

```
   ---
  1 ---
  ---
  A  B  C
```

On each picture card photograph 1 (2, 3, ... ) will be a picture of a situation involving children or parents. Photographs A, B, and C will depict three possible reactions to the situation shown on the
card, which people might make under conditions illustrated in the situation photograph. Under each photograph a brief narrative description of the situation is given. At the same time that the picture card is projected the administrator, will read aloud the description of the situation and the three possible reactions. The parents and pupils to whom the picture cards are being shown will be asked to indicate which of the reactions they think the persons in the situation would be most likely to make. They will indicate their choices of reactions by checking one of the letters, A, B, or C on a separate answer sheet which will be provided. We are enclosing narrative descriptions of the picture cards. We also are enclosing sample answer sheet.

We do not anticipate that the project will require staff time from teachers in your district. We will plan to make all arrangements for showing the picture cards, reading the descriptive information and collecting the answer sheets. We will be pleased to forward a copy of the findings when we have gathered all the data and have made the data analysis. I hope this information will suffice to describe the project to you. I have asked Renuka Raghavan, who started this project in Oregon, to contact you. She is now on the staff at California Polytechnic College. She will answer any further questions that you may have.

We request permission to carry out the plans for this study in the San Luis Obispo School District. Upon receiving formal authorization for doing the study, we will contact parents directly and will send a letter explaining details of the project. We will be happy to adjust our plan in any way possible to satisfy suggestions you may wish to make concerning arrangements, or other items. Thank you very much for your consideration and attention.

T. Antoinette Ryan
Director, Research Coordinating Unit

Enclosures Family Situation Inventory
FSI answer sheet

cc Renuka Raghavan, California State Polytechnic College
Assistant Professor
Dear Parents:

The School of Education at Oregon State University is interested in improving teacher-pupil relationships in the elementary school. One of the ways in which it is hoped the teacher can effectively communicate with the children is by having some understanding of the homes from which the children come. In order to find out some of the important factors that our beginning teachers need to know, we are trying to identify situations and reactions that parents and children in different communities consider typical.

The project consists of two parts. In the first part, we attempt to determine the situations that parents think are most typical in their community. In the second part, we are interested in identifying situations that children think are most typical in their community.

Following the suggestion of Dr. Notley, Superintendent of San Luis Obispo Public Schools, and Mr. Hopkins, Principal of the Teach School, my staff will be at the Teach Elementary School on Thursday, January 19, between 7:30 and 8:15 p.m. to give parents a chance to participate in the first part of the project. The task will take approximately 45 minutes. The task assignment will include situations involving fathers and mothers in the home.

One of my staff, Miss Renuka Raghavan, who is now on the faculty at California State Polytechnic College, will be contacting you by phone in a few days. Please fill in the enclosed form and return it in the enclosed stamped self-addressed envelop to Miss R. Raghavan, Dept. of Home Economics, California State Polytechnic College, San Luis Obispo, California, by Monday, January 16, 1967. If you have any questions please call Miss Raghavan at 546-2220 or 546-2229 between 8 a.m. and 5 p.m.

Thank you for your cooperation.

T. Antionette Ryan
Associate Professor
Director, Research Coordinating Unit
Enc. Stamped self-addressed envelop
Mail-in form
FAMILY SITUATION INVENTORY

Purpose

The Family Situation Inventory is a projective instrument designed to determine adults and eight to ten year old children's responses to frustrative stimuli. The inventory was created primarily for use with "normal" (non-psychiatrically disturbed) subjects.

Description of the Inventory

The inventory has two forms, the adult form for use with adults and the child form for use with children eight to ten years of age. Each form consists of both interpersonal and noninterpersonal situations that adults and children encounter in their daily lives. The adult form depicts male and female adults in frustration situations. The former, ten situations in number are labelled "male model items" and the latter also ten situations in number are labelled "female model items". Similarly, the child form depicting eight to ten year old boys and girls in frustration situations, consists of ten male and ten female situations labelled "male child items" and "female child items" respectively.

For each of the situations there are three alternative reactions; aggression, dependency and withdrawal. While it is acknowledged
that frustration may elicit a variety of reactions, these three are included because it is assumed that they are more or less similar in terms of social desirability. For example, if constructive task-oriented behavior was included, there might be a tendency for most subjects to select this response even though it may not be their typical mode of reaction; simply because of social desirability.

The other reason for including these three reactions is because literature and observation have indicated that these three are the more dominant reactions to frustration. The situations and reactions are described verbally and in written form. They are presented in the form of photographs 3" X 2" in size. Each set of four photographs consisting of a situation and three alternative reactions are pasted on a card 8 1/2 " X 11" as shown in the samples in the following page.

On each card, 1, 2, 3, ... there is a picture of a situation involving parents or children. Photographs A, B, C on the bottom of the card depict three possible reactions to the situation illustrated on the top of the card. In order to control for position effects, the order of arrangement for the three alternative reactions is varied randomly across situations.
Mr. Smith is making an important phone call. The people in the next room are making so much noise that he can't hear.

He asks his wife to tell the people to be quiet.

He says to the people, "Will you please be quiet. I can't hear a word!"

He hangs up and decides to call later when it is quiet.
Jim and John are playing baseball. They decide to take turns pitching and batting. Jim will not give up the bat to let John have his turn batting.

A  John starts to fight with Jim. He takes the bat from him by force.

B  John complains to his mother. He asks her to tell Jim to let him have his turn.

C  John tells Jim, "I don't feel like playing anymore." John walks away.
Construction

Derivation of Items

Descriptions of frustration situations to be included in the inventory were obtained from two sources: (1) an instrument developed by Revelle (1963); and (2) from parents and children other than those participating in the study, but who met the same population criteria as the subjects in the study.

A form letter was sent to about 50 families. The letter briefly stated the purpose of the project and requested the parents and their eight to ten year old children to describe at least one interpersonal and one noninterpersonal frustration situation that they had encountered in their daily lives. It was suggested in the letter that the adult interpersonal frustration situation involve only adults, i.e. both the agent of frustration and the subject being frustrated should be adults. e.g. "Mr. S. is doing some desk work and is trying hard to concentrate. Mrs. S. keeps calling him to come and help her." Similarly, it was suggested that the child interpersonal frustration situation should involve only children, i.e. both the agent of frustration and the subject being frustrated should be children. e.g. "Gayle and Irene promised to take turns pushing each other on the swing. Gayle pushes Irene first. When Irene has had her turn, she tells Gayle
she does not feel like playing anymore." Examples were also given of noninterpersonal situations.

It was suggested that the adult interpersonal situations not involve any children and the child interpersonal situation any adults, because it was felt that this might introduce an uncontrollable variable (age difference) and influence subject's response to the situation. Societal and familial values exert some influence in controlling an individual's reactions, thus bringing about differential behavior toward different age groups. For example, it has been suggested by Brim (1960), Bandura (1963) and Maccoby (1961) that children are less likely to respond aggressively when parents are the source of frustration than when siblings are responsible for the frustration.

Approximately 75 percent of the families responded to the letters. The total number of situations obtained were 45 adult situations and 40 child situations. These situations were evaluated by the investigator and two graduate students in Child Development, in terms of the definition of frustration used in the study. "Frustration involves the thwarting or blocking of a person's dominant motives, needs, desires or purposes." Situations which did not meet the above criterion definition were eliminated. The remaining situations along with the six child situations and five adult situations derived from the Revelle instrument totalled 35 child situations and 48 adult situations.
The situations were rated by a group of children and parents on the basis of two criteria; (1) whether the situations were frustrating or not frustrating; and (2) whether they were typical or not typical.

Ten boys and ten girls from Albany, Oregon, rated the "child male items" and "child female items" on a two-point scale, frustrating and non-frustrating. The situations that were rated by over 70 percent \( (p < .17) \) were selected. These situations were 26 in number.

The same group of children were asked to rate 34 adult situations on a two-point scale: (1) if they had seen it occur in their family and (2) if they had not seen it occur in the family. The purpose was to determine whether the situations were typical or not typical. Only 12 of the 34 situations were rated by ten or more children as typical. It was assumed that the rating of some of the situations as not typical could be due to the unclear wording in some of the situations described. Situations that were rated by at least eight to thirteen of the children as typical were revised. These situations and those rated by over 13 of the children as typical were submitted along with ten new situations for rating by 30 fourth grade children, ten boys and 14 girls ranging in age from eight to ten years from Sweet Home, Oregon. The situations rated by 62 percent
(p ≤ .15) of children as typical were selected for further rating by a group of parents.

A group of 15 adult males and 15 adult females from Lebanon, Oregon, rated the adult situations. A form letter was sent to the parents, describing the purpose of the project and requesting their cooperation. A selected list of 22 adult situations was sent to the parents with directions for rating. The rating was based on two criteria: (1) typical or nontypical (2) frustrating or nonfrustrating. The situations rated by over 66.6 percent (p = .15) as typical and frustrating were selected. The probabilities were determined from the binomial tables (Harvard Computation Laboratory, 1955) using the general binomial formula \( (p + q)^n = (1/2 + 1/2)^n \).

The next step was to establish the validity of the three reactions to each situation. Initially, the alternative reactions to each adult and child situation were developed by the investigator and two graduate students in Child Development. The three reactions to each situation were submitted for rating by a group of graduate students in psychology at Oregon State University. The raters were asked to identify each of the reactions on whether it represented aggression, dependency or withdrawal. To control for position effects, the reactions were varied randomly across situations. The raters were given definitions of the three terms along with directions for rating.
Twenty-five adults, male and female, rated the adult items and another group of 20 adults rated the child items. The ratings were checked for agreement with the investigator's rating and the definitions of the three reactions. In the adult items, of the 25 adults who responded to each of the adult items, there were only three disagreements, two in one situation and the third in another. The agreement was also high in the ratings of the child items. Of the 20 adults who responded to each item there were only two disagreements in two different situations. Referring to the binomial tables, applying the general binomial formula \((p + q)^n = (1/3 + 2/3)^n\), the probability of such high agreement by chance alone was zero. The almost perfect agreement between the ratings of the adults and the investigator's rating indicated that a high degree of validity of the reactions could be assumed.

After the situations and reactions were obtained, they were photographed. The adult situations were enacted by two senior students majoring in drama at Oregon State University. The child situations were enacted by four children, two boys and two girls eight to ten years of age from Albany, Oregon.

**Final Test Form**

The final test form of the Family Situation Inventory consisted of ten male models items, ten female model items, ten male child items
and ten female child items. Each item included one situation and three alternative reactions. The situations and the reactions were presented pictorially and in verbal and written form.

**Pretesting**

A pretest of both the adult and child items was conducted. The purpose of the pretest was to establish the base rates of the three reactions to each of the frustration situations. If the base rates of the three reactions were unequal for any episode, the reactions were to be modified. For example, if an item yielded predominantly aggressive choices and relatively low withdrawal and dependent choices, the pictorial cues and written definitions were to be modified to increase the possibility of withdrawal and dependent choices.

Thirty adult males and 30 adult females responded to the male and female adult items. Twenty-four boys and 21 girls responded to the male and female child items. Their total aggression, dependency and withdrawal responses to each item was obtained and the chi square "goodness of fit" test was performed to determine if the actual frequencies of the three responses to each item was in agreement with the expected frequency of the three responses to each item. The results are shown in Tables I, II, III and IV.
TABLE I. Chi square test comparing difference between actual and expected frequency of aggression, dependency and withdrawal response choices to adult male items.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Situation Number</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
<th>Significance Level .05</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>n. s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>n. s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>n. s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>n. s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>n. s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>n. s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>n. s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>n. s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>n. s.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE II. Chi square test comparing difference between actual and expected frequency of aggression, dependency and withdrawal response choices to adult female items.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Situation Number</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
<th>Significance Level .05</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>n. s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>n. s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>n. s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>n. s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>n. s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>n. s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>n. s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>n. s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>n. s.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE III. Chi square test comparing difference between actual and expected frequency of aggression, dependency and withdrawal response choices to child male items.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Situation Number</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
<th>Significance Level .05</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>n. s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>n. s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>n. s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>n. s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>n. s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>n. s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>n. s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>n. s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>n. s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>n. s.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE IV. Chi square test comparing difference between actual and expected frequency of aggression, dependency and withdrawal response choices to child female items.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Situation Number</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
<th>Significance Level .05</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>n. s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>n. s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>n. s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>n. s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>n. s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>n. s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>n. s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>n. s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>n. s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>n. s.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The chi square values for each set of male and female adult items and each set of male and female child items were non-significant. Thus no modification of items in the adult or child form of the inventory was necessary.

**Administration**

The Family Situation Inventory is simple to administer. It can be administered individually or in large groups. There is some research evidence (Beal, 1964) to indicate that testing by administration to each subject individually and obtaining their oral responses and administration to the group as a whole with their written responses obtained, elicit similar results. Beal (1964) in a comparison of oral and written responses to a classroom simulation test found that the two methods of test procedure elicited comparable data. In the present study, group administration and obtaining of written responses seemed more practical as more than one person could be administered the test at the same time.

The situations and three possible reactions to each situation are printed in a five-page reusable booklet. Complete directions are printed on a separate sheet. Answers are recorded on a specially prepared answer sheet.

In giving the FSI to a large group, the answer sheet is slipped inside each booklet prior to the time of administration. The subjects
are asked to fill in name, sex, marital status, occupation, city and date on the directions sheet and the answer sheet. When the booklets and pencils have been distributed, the subjects are asked to read the directions on the direction sheet silently as the examiner reads them aloud. After reading the directions, the examiner may ask if there are any questions. Answers to the questions should be consistent with the directions. It may be explained that the choices are limited but that they should be made. They are to choose in all cases, one of the three possible reactions which they believe to be the most immediate reaction of the pictorial character.

It requires about 20-30 minutes to complete the Family Situation Inventory. The 20 picture cards are projected on the screen by means of an opaque projector. Each card with the four pictures on it will be on the screen for one minute, and the subjects are given 30 seconds to record their answer. At the same time that the picture card is presented, the examiner reads aloud the description of the situation and three alternative reactions. The subject is asked to read the descriptions silently as the examiner reads them aloud. Before administering the actual test situations, the subjects are asked to respond to a trial situation. The purpose for the trial situation is to get some assurance that the directions for taking the inventory are understood.
Choices are recorded on the answer sheet provided with the test booklet. The subjects are asked to indicate which one of the three possible reactions they think the character in the scene would make to the situation. On the right hand side of the answer sheet, the numbers of the situation are listed. Next to each number, the letters of the three reactions are listed. The reactions are lettered rather than labelled "aggression," "dependency" and "withdrawal"; because it is assumed that the labels might influence the response choice of the subject.

Validity and Reliability

Validity

The validity of an instrument is frequently defined as "the extent to which the test or inventory actually measures what it purports to measure." The determination of the validity of an inventory would require the correlation between scores on the inventory and some pure criterion measure. Such pure criterion measures are difficult to obtain. For example, in the present case, the pure criterion measure would be subjecting the parents and children to frustration situations and observing their actual reactions. This seemed neither feasible nor possible. As a result, correlation of response to the inventory with teacher rating for children and self-rating for the adults were substituted for the pure criterion measure.
A group of 15 girls and 18 boys, eight to ten years of age, were classified as aggressive, dependent or withdrawal on the basis of their responses to the child form of the Family Situation Inventory. If over 60 percent \( (p < .07) \) of their responses were in any one of the three categories, they were classified into that category. The children's classroom teacher who did not have any knowledge of the children's performance on the test, was asked to classify each child (Appendix B, page 110) into one of the three categories, aggression, dependent and withdrawal on the basis of her observations of his immediate reaction to frustration situations. The child's classification based on test performance was compared with the teacher's classification of him.

Similarly a group of 32 adults, 17 males and 15 females were classified as aggressive, dependent or withdrawal on the basis of their response choices to the adult form of the Family Situation Inventory. If over 60 percent of their responses were in one of the three categories they were classified into that category. Three weeks after the administration of the inventory, the same adults were asked to rate themselves (Appendix B, page 111) on one of the three categories as representative of their most immediate reaction to frustration situations.

The validity test was conducted to determine the probability of attaining the number of agreements between test performance and
teacher rating for children or test performance and self-rating for adults by chance alone. The agreement and disagreement between test performance and teacher or self rating was treated as a binomial distribution, with a probability of agreement in each individual case equal to one-third and the probability of disagreement equal to two-thirds. The general binomial formula \((p + q)^n\) (Mendenhall, 1967) was applied to the data giving the probability of \((1/3 + 2/3)^n\). Substituting the actual number of agreements and disagreements the probabilities of agreement by chance alone were as follows for the four sets of items.

- **Adult Male Items**
  \[(1/3 + 2/3)^{17} = (10 + 7)^{17} \quad p < .027\]

- **Adult Female Items**
  \[(1/3 + 2/3)^{15} = (9 + 6)^{15} \quad p < .031\]

- **Child Male Items**
  \[(1/3 + 2/3)^{18} = (10 + 8)^{18} \quad p < .043\]

- **Child Female Items**
  \[(1/3 + 2/3)^{15} = (8 + 7)^{15} \quad p < .088\]

The probabilities were determined from the binomial tables (Harvard Computation Laboratory, 1955) using the general binomial formula.
### TEACHER-RATING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Child</th>
<th>School</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Grade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Directions:** (Read these directions)

There are many reactions to frustration. However, research literature has indicated that aggression, dependency and withdrawal are three of the more dominant reactions.

If given only these three choices in rating this child on the basis of your observations, in meeting a conflict or frustrating situation does he generally react immediately by being aggressive, dependent or withdrawing?

**Definitions:**
- **Aggression** - Any kind of physical or verbal injury i.e. hitting or any physical attack or swearing, using harsh words etc.
- **Dependency** - Asking or seeking the help of another person.
- **Withdrawal** - Escaping, leaving or ignoring the situation.

Select one of the three categories given below which most aptly describes this child's behavior on the basis of the definitions given above. Mark and X next to the category selected.

Aggression .......... Dependency .......... Withdrawal ..........
SELF-RATING

Name ........................................ Date .........................

Address ................................. Marital Status (check one)

City ........................................ Single, .... Married, ....

Widowed ....... Divorced ........

Directions: (Read these directions)

These are many reactions to frustration. However, research literature and informal observation have indicated that aggression, dependency and withdrawal are three of the more dominant reactions.

If given only these three choices in rating yourself in meeting a conflict or frustration situation, do you generally react immediately by being aggressive, dependent or withdrawing?

Definitions: Aggression - Any kind of physical or verbal injury i.e. hitting or any kind of physical attack or swearing, using harsh words etc.

Dependency - Asking or seeking the help of another person.

Withdrawal - Escaping, leaving or ignoring the situation.

Select one of the three categories given below which most aptly describes your behavior on the basis of the definitions given above.

Mark an X next to the category selected.

Aggression ............ Dependency ............ Withdrawal ............
Reliability

The Family Situation Inventory measures behavioral reactions that are not perfectly constant but could vary according to mood, traumatic experience, etc. Though internal consistency would have been an adequate method for testing reliability, this was not possible due to the small number of situations. So the repeat technique or the test-retest reliability was used.

A group of 27 children and 45 adults were administered the child and adult versions of the Family Situation Inventory. After a two-week interval the same test was administered to the same group of subjects. A total agreement score was obtained for each individual based on the frequency of items in which there was agreement in their response choices from pretest to post test. For example, if in seven of the ten situations, an individual had made the same response choice from pretest to post test, his total agreement score was seven. The probabilities of agreement by each individual for the ten situations were determined from the binomial tables (Harvard Computation Laboratory, 1955) using the general binomial formula \( (p + q)^n = (1/3 + 2/3)^n \). The probabilities for the adult male and female items and the child male and female items are listed as follows in Tables V, VI, VII, VIII.
TABLE V. Reliability of adult male items by probabilities of agreement of responses from pretest to post test (two week interval).

Number of situations = 10  Number of subjects = 25

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adult Male</th>
<th>Agreement*</th>
<th>p&lt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.0034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.0034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.0196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.0196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.0034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.0196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.0196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>.0003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.0034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.0034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.0034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.0765</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.0196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.0034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.0196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.0196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>.0003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.0034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.0176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.0176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>.00002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.0034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.0176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>.0003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.0765</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* 10 possible
TABLE VI. Reliability of adult female items by probabilities of agreement of responses from pretest to post-test (two week interval).

Number of situations = 10  Number of subjects = 20

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adult female</th>
<th>Agreement</th>
<th>p &lt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>.00002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>.00002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>.0003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.0196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.0196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.0034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.0034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.0196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.0034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.0034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.0034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>.0003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>.0003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>.0003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.0196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>.0003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>.0003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.0034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.0034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.0196</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE VII. Reliability of child male items by probabilities of agreement of responses from pretest to post test (two week interval).

Number of situations = 10 Number of subjects = 15

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Child</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Agreements</th>
<th>p &lt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.0196</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.0196</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.0765</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.0196</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.0196</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.0034</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.0034</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.0196</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>.0003</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.0034</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.0196</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.0034</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.0765</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.0034</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>.00002</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE VIII. Reliability of child female items by probabilities of agreement of responses from pretest to post test (two week interval).
Number of situations = 10  Number of subjects = 12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Child Female</th>
<th>Agreements</th>
<th>p &lt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.0034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.0196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.0765</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.0034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.0196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.0034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.0765</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.0196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.0034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.0196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>.0003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.0196</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Limitations

In discussing the limitations of the "Security-Insecurity Inventory" developed by Maslow (1952), the author makes the opening statement.

All such tests are limited in their usefulness by the fact that their purpose is usually clearly seen by the one who fills them out. He may or may not choose to tell the truth i.e. to give personally or socially undesirable answers.

It is possible that a limitation of this nature could be attributed to the Family Situation Inventory.

The main limitations of the inventory are the small number of adult and child situations. A second limitation is that response choices to each situation are limited to only three in number.
APPENDIX C

FAMILY SITUATION INVENTORY
ADULT FORM
FAMILY SITUATION INVENTORY
OREGON STATE UNIVERSITY

DO NOT OPEN THE BOOKLET OR TURN THE PAGE UNTIL YOU ARE TOLD TO DO SO. FILL IN THE BLANKS BELOW. PLEASE WRITE PLAINLY, OR PRINT.

Name . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . Date . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .
Address . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . Marital Status (Check one)
City . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . Married . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .
Approx. Population . . . . . Occupation . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .

Married . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . Widowed . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .
Divorced . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .

Directions: (Read these directions)

This is an inventory to determine typical situations likely to occur in households of different-sized communities. The inventory consists of descriptions of 20 situations. Beside each situation there are three possible reactions which might be made by people under conditions described. The situations are numbered 1, 2, 3 and so forth. The three possible reactions are labeled A, B, C. You will be seeing 20 picture cards on the screen depicting the situations and the possible reactions. Each card will have four photographs on it. Under each photograph there will be a written description of the picture. The photograph in the center, on the top of the card, is marked with a number. This photograph shows a situation which might occur in a typical family. The three pictures on the bottom of the card, are marked with the letters A, B, C. These photographs show three possible ways in which people might act under circumstances described in the picture on the top of the card.

You are to read the descriptions of each situation and the descriptions of the three possible reactions that people might make. You are to decide which of the three reactions would most likely be the most immediate reaction of the person in the picture to the situation. Indicate your answer by making a check mark (✓) next to the letter corresponding to the reactions you have selected.

Remove the answer sheet from inside the booklet. Fill in the blanks on the top of the page. Here is a sample item.

1. Mrs. Smith is busy cooking dinner in the kitchen. The telephone in the hallway keeps ringing.
A. She asks her husband, who is busy doing something, to answer the phone.

B. She puts the spoon down on the stove and says, "Why do people always have to call at dinner time?"

C. She shuts the door between the kitchen and the hallway.

Which of the three reactions would Mrs. Smith be most likely to make as an immediate response? On your answer sheet, check one of the three letters next to "practice".

This inventory will have 20 items just like the one you have completed. Read each item carefully and decide which of the three possible responses would be most likely to be the immediate reactions of the person in the situation. Check the letter corresponding to the reaction you have selected. Mark your answer clearly. You should check only one answer for each item. Do not leave any blank. Be sure that you are marking the answer for the situation described. Each card will be on the screen for one minute. You will have 30 seconds to mark your answer. You will be allowed 20 minutes after the examiner tells you to start. No questions will be answered by the examiner after the inventory starts.
FAMILY SITUATION INVENTORY
OREGON STATE UNIVERSITY

1. Mrs. Smith has ordered an item from the store. When the package arrives, she finds that it is not what she ordered.
   
   A. She calls the manager and complains to him, "Would you see to it that a replacement is sent to me at once.
   
   B. She asks her husband to go to the store and talk to the manager.
   
   C. She puts the item away thinking that she will take it to the store later.

2. Mrs. Smith shut the door when she left the house. On her return she finds that she has left the house keys inside.
   
   A. She shakes, pushes and pulls the doorknob, trying to get the door open.
   
   B. She decides to wait at the neighbor's house until her husband returns home.
   
   C. She calls her husband from the neighbor's house and asks him to come and open the door.

3. Mrs. Smith asked Mr. Smith to do the grocery shopping. When he returns she finds that he has forgotten to bring two items that she needs for dinner.
   
   A. She decides to cook something else.
   
   B. She telephones the neighbor and asks to borrow the items she needs.
   
   C. She tells Mr. Smith, "Can't I depend on you to do such a simple task right?"
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4. Mrs. Smith is ready to go out. Her last pair of nylons has a run.

A. She throws the nylons on the floor and says, "It never fails!"

B. She asks her husband, who is reading a book, to get another pair from the store.

C. She decides not to go out.

5. Mrs. Smith goes to the grocery store to buy some groceries for dinner. She looks all over the store for rice. She can't find it.

A. She asks an attendant in the grocery store, to find the rice for her.

B. She compains to the store manager, "It is impossible to find things in this store."

C. She busy potatoes instead of rice.

6. Mr. and Mrs. Smith go shopping downtown. Mrs. Smith, who is driving, finds a parking place between two cars. The cars are parked so close that she cannot get in the space.

A. Mrs. Smith says, "People who park like this should get a ticket!"

B. Mrs. Smith asks her husband to park the car.

C. Mrs. Smith says, "I can't be bothered with this. I am going to find another parking place."

7. Mr. and Mrs. Smith have planned to go out. Their baby sitter calls half an hour before they are to leave and says, "I cannot come this evening."

A. Mrs. Smith tells the baby sitter, "The least you could have done was to call earlier!"

B. Mrs. Smith decides to stay home.
C. Mrs. Smith calls her neighbor and asks if she will baby-sit.

8. Mrs. Smith is watching an interesting program on television. The telephone keeps ringing.

A. Mrs. Smith says, "Oh! That phone. Why can't I watch television peacefully for once!"

B. She asks her son, who is busy doing something, to answer the phone.

C. She turns off the television and goes to the bedroom.

9. Mrs. Smith is trying to make an important phone call. She has a part line. Everytime she lifts the phone to call, someone is on the line.

A. Mrs. Smith decides to make the call later in the day.

B. Mrs. Smith says, "Would you mind getting off the line? This is a party line!"

C. Mrs. Smith goes to the neighbor's house, and asks if she could use their phone.

10. Mrs. Smith has put a load of clothes in the washing machine. The washer suddenly stops in the middle of a load. She has two more loads to wash.

A. She decides to leave the clothes as they are and do some other chores.

B. She slams the lid of the washer and says, "This washer is not worth the money!"

C. She calls her husband and asks him to fix the washer.
11. Mr. Smith has just sat down to dinner. The telephone keeps ringing.

A. Mr. Smith says, "Can't I even eat peacefully. Why do people have to call at dinner time?"

B. He asks his wife, who is busy in the kitchen, to answer the phone.

C. He lets the phone ring, and starts to eat.

12. Mr. Smith wants to go out. He gets in the car but the car will not start.

A. He gets out of the car and bangs the door shut.

B. He decides to stay home and read a book.

C. He asks his neighbor if he can use his car.

13. Mr. Smith is watching an interesting program on television. There is a lot of disturbance and the picture is not clear.

A. Mr Smith calls his neighbor and asks if he can watch the TV program at his place.

B. He turns off the television and reads the newspaper.

C. He pounds on the television, trying to stop the disturbance and make the picture clear.

14. Mr. Smith is making an important phone call. The people in the next room are making so much noise that he can't hear.

A. He asks his wife to tell the people to be quiet.

B. He says to the people, "Will you please be quiet. I can't hear a word!"

C. He hangs up and decides to call later when it is quiet.
15. Mr. Smith is mowing the lawn. All of a sudden the lawnmower stops and he cannot get it started again.

A. He goes to the neighbor and asks to borrow his lawnmower.

B. He decides to mow the lawn another day and goes in the house.

C. He kicks the mower with his foot, trying to loosen the blades.

16. Mr. Smith has to go out. He cannot find an ironed shirt in the closet.

A. He takes an unironed shirt to his wife and asks her, "How come this shirt is not yet ironed?"

B. He decides to wear the same shirt that he had on all day.

C. He asks his daughter, who is busy helping her mother in the kitchen, to iron a shirt for him.

17. Mr. Smith is very particular about arriving places on time. Mrs. Smith is not ready.

A. He says to Mrs. Smith, "If you don't get ready in time, we won't go to the party!"

B. He asks his daughter to help her mother get dressed.

C. Mr. Smith gives up and sits in the living room.

18. Mr. Smith has come home from work tired and hungry. He finds that dinner is not ready because Mrs. Smith has been out and has just returned.

A. He says to Mrs. Smith, "It is past six o'clock. Why isn't dinner ready?"

B. He sits and reads the newspaper while waiting for dinner.

C. He asks his daughter to make him a sandwich.
19. Mr. Smith is waiting to get gas in his car. The service station attendant keeps talking to the driver of another car. Mr. Smith is in a hurry.
   * A. He goes to another gas station.
   B. He calls to the attendant and says, "Will you come and fill gas in my car? I am in a hurry!"
   C. He asks another attendant, who is working on a car, to help him.

20. Mr. Smith is busy doing something and is trying to concentrate. Mrs. Smith keeps calling him asking him to come and help her.
   A. He says to his wife, "Will you quit calling me? Can't you see I am busy?"
   B. Mr. Smith asks his son to go and help his mother.
   C. Mr. Smith shuts the door to the room so he can't hear her.
FAMILY SITUATION INVENTORY
ANSWER SHEET

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SITUATION</th>
<th>REACTIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Practice</td>
<td>A . . . . . B . . . . . C . . . . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>A . . . . . B . . . . . C . . . . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>A . . . . . B . . . . . C . . . . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>A . . . . . B . . . . . C . . . . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>A . . . . . B . . . . . C . . . . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>A . . . . . B . . . . . C . . . . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>A . . . . . B . . . . . C . . . . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>A . . . . . B . . . . . C . . . . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>A . . . . . B . . . . . C . . . . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>A . . . . . B . . . . . C . . . . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>A . . . . . B . . . . . C . . . . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>A . . . . . B . . . . . C . . . . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>A . . . . . B . . . . . C . . . . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>A . . . . . B . . . . . C . . . . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>A . . . . . B . . . . . C . . . . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>A . . . . . B . . . . . C . . . . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>A . . . . . B . . . . . C . . . . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>A . . . . . B . . . . . C . . . . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>A . . . . . B . . . . . C . . . . .</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX D

FAMILY SITUATION INVENTORY
CHILD FORM
FAMILY SITUATION INVENTORY
OREGON STATE UNIVERSITY

DO NOT OPEN THE BOOKLET OR TURN THE PAGE UNTIL YOU ARE TOLD TO DO SO. FILL IN THE BLANKS BELOW. PLEASE WRITE PLAINLY OR PRINT.

Name ............................ Age ............................
Address ............................ Date ............................
City ............................

Directions: (Read these directions)

We are going to show you some picture cards. Each card will have four photographs on it. Under each photograph there will be a written description of the picture. The photograph in the center, on the top of the card, is marked with a number. This photograph shows a situation which might occur in a typical family. The three pictures on the bottom of the card, are marked with the letters A, B, C. These photographs show three possible ways in which people might act under circumstances described in the picture on the top of the card. You are going to see several pictures. I will read to you the descriptions of each of the pictures you will see. You may read the descriptions as I read them aloud.

Remove the answer sheet from inside the booklet. Fill in the blanks on the top of the page. On the answer sheet you will find numbers of each situation. Next to each number there are the letters of the reactions A, B, C. After looking at the pictures, select the letter in front of the picture which you think describes the way in which the person in the picture would be most likely to act. Indicate your answer by making a check mark next to the letter you have selected.

Now we will have a practice situation.

Jim is sawing a board to make a boat. Everytime he starts to saw, the board breaks.

A. He asks his father who is ready to go out, to help him saw the board.
B. He decides to build the boat later.

C. He throws the board down and stomps on it.

In this practice situation, if you think Jim will ask his father to help him, check letter A. If you think he will decide to build the boat later, check letter B. If you think Jim will throw the board and stomp on it, check letter C. Put the check mark on your answer sheet next to "practice".

We will have 20 items just like the one you have completed. Read each situation and reaction carefully. You should check only one answer for each item. Mark your answer clearly. Do not leave any blank. Be sure that you are marking the answer for the situation described. For example, after you see item number one, on your answer sheet check one of the three letters next to number one. After you see item number two check one of the three letters next to number two and so on. Each card will be on the screen for one minute. You will have three seconds to mark your answer. No questions will be answered after the inventory starts.
1. Jim is trying to do his homework. His sister is playing her transistor radio so loudly that Jim cannot concentrate.

   A. Jim yells at his sister, "Will you turn off that stupid music!"

   B. Jim asks his father, who is busy doing something to tell his sister to turn off the radio.

   C. He decides to do his homework later.

2. John receives a brand new bicycle for a birthday present. His friend borrow it the same day and breaks it.

   A. John puts the bicycle in the garage and starts to cry.

   B. John hits his friend and yells at him, "That will teach you to be more careful with my bike!"

   C. John complains to his father and asks him to repair the bike.

3. John and Jim are playing marbles. Several times John finds Jim cheating.

   A. John yells at Jim, "If you are not going to play fair, I will not play with you."

   B. John asks his father to tell Jim not to cheat.

   C. John decides not to play and walks away.

4. Jim and his brother share the same bedroom. Jim is trying to read a book. His brother keeps bothering him by asking silly questions.

   A. Jim calls to his father and asks him to tell his brother not to bother him.
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B. Jim yells at his brother, "If you don't shut up, I am going to hit you!"

C. Jim decides to read in the living room.

5. Jim and John are playing baseball. They decide to take turns pitching and batting. Jim will not give up the bat to let John have his turn batting.

A. John starts to fight with Jim. He takes the bat from him by force.

B. John complains to his mother. He asks her to tell Jim to let him have his turn.

C. John tells Jim, "I don't feel like playing anymore!" John walks away.

6. John goes to get his new space toy out of the drawer. The drawer is stuck. He can't get it open.

A. He asks his mother, who is busy knitting, to open the drawer for him.

B. He pulls, pushes, and hits the drawer trying to get it open.

C. He says, "I guess I'll go and ride my bike."

7. Jim is trying to put up a tent. His younger brother is helping him. They are starting when his brother leaves.

A. Jim yells at this brother, "You come right back or else I am not going to let you sleep in my tent.

B. Jim asks his father, who is busy mowing the lawn, to help him put up the tent.

C. Jim leaves the tent and decides to do something else.
8. John wants to go to school early. He goes to the garage to get his bike, but finds that it has a flat tire.

A. He goes to his brother, hits him, and says, "That will teach you not to use my bike!"

B. John asks his father, who is busy doing something, to give him a ride to school.

C. John decides to walk to school.

9. At school Nancy continually uses Jim's eraser without asking for it, and she does not return it.

A. Jim decides to use a pencil which has an eraser attached to it.

B. Jim goes to the teacher and asks her to tell Nancy not to use his eraser.

C. Jim grabs the eraser from Nancy and yells at her, "You better get your own eraser!"

10. Jim and John are each building something different with an erector set. John is short of wheels. He finds that Jim has most of the wheels. Jim does not give John any wheels.

A. John pushes Jim aside and takes all the wheels away from him.

B. John asks his mother, who is busy in the kitchen, to tell Jim to give him a few extra wheels.

C. John decides to build something else which will not require so many wheels.

11. Nancy and Karen promised to take turns pushing each other on the swing. Nancy pushes Karen first. When Karen has had her turn, she tells Nancy she does not feel like playing anymore.
A. Nancy goes off by herself to play on the jungle gym.

B. Nancy calls to a friend, who is on the playground, to give the swing a push and get her started.

C. Nancy yells at Karen, "You are a liar for not keeping your promise!"

12. Karen is doing her homework. Her brother is playing his transistor radio so loudly that she cannot concentrate.

A. She yells at her brother, "Turn off that terrible music!"

B. She complains to her father and asks him to tell her brother to stop the music.

C. She decides to do her homework after her brother goes out.

13. Karen is drawing a picture of a horse. No matter how much she tries, the legs do not look right.

A. She asks her older sister, who is hurrying to her swimming lesson, to show her how to draw the legs.

B. She crumples up the picture and throws it in the fireplace.

C. She decides to read a book instead of drawing.

14. It is Nancy's turn to take care of the library books. She puts them in order on the shelf. Jim comes along and starts to mess up the books.

A. Nancy asks the teacher, who is busy grading papers, to tell Jim to stop messing up the books.

B. Nancy tells Jim, "You better stay away from the books if you can't use them right.

C. Nancy decides to wait until recess to straighten up the books.
15. Karen is playing a game with Nancy. Several times she catches Nancy cheating. Nancy cheats even after Karen has warned her not to cheat.

A. Karen upsets the game and yells at Nancy, "You are a cheater! I will never play with you again!"

B. Karen asks her mother, who is busy reading, to tell Nancy not to cheat.

C. Karen leaves, telling Nancy she does not feel like playing anymore.

16. At school Nancy continually used Karen's eraser without asking and she does not return it. Karen wants to use the eraser and she cannot find it.

A. Karen decides to use another pencil which has an eraser attached to it.

B. Karen goes to the teacher and asks her to tell Nancy not to use her eraser.

C. Karen grabs her eraser from Nancy and yells at her, "You better get your own eraser!"

17. Nancy wants to bake a cake. She is ready to start. She finds that there is not enough sugar.

A. She bangs the lid of the container and pushes it back.

B. She asks her brother, who is playing outside, to go to the store for sugar.

C. She decides to bake something which requires less sugar.

18. Karen is playing house with some older girls. Karen wants to have her turn being "mother" but the others will not let her.

A. Karen asks her mother to talk to the other girls.
B. Karen yells at the girls, "You are mean and bossy! I am not going to be the baby."

C. Karen leaves and decides to play by herself.

19. Nancy is learning to knit. She is knitting a scarf for her father. She knits eight inches, when she finds that she has dropped a few stitches on the way and has a hole in that place.

A. She rips off the scarf and dumps the yarn on the chair.

B. She asks her mother to pick up the dropped stitches.

C. She decides to sew something for her father.

20. Karen has been waiting in line for a long time to check a book out of the library. Just as she is about to be helped by the librarian, Nancy and John step in front of her.

A. Karen steps in front of Nancy and John and says to them, "I was here first. You wait your turn."

B. Karen asks the librarian, "Please will you have your helper get the book for me?"

C. Karen decides to leave and come back some other time for her book.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SITUATION</th>
<th>REACTIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>A . . .</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>