

Copyright is owned by the Author of the thesis. Permission is given for a copy to be downloaded by an individual for the purpose of research and private study only. The thesis may not be reproduced elsewhere without the permission of the Author.

PARENTAL ATTITUDES IN THE PLAY CENTRE

---

A thesis presented in partial fulfilment  
of the requirements for the degree of  
Master of Arts in Education  
at Massey University.

by

Barry E. Burdon.

January, 1971.

### Abstract

It is an expressed opinion of the New Zealand Play Centre Federation that parental involvement in the Play Centre will be effective in allowing husbands and wives to gain more understanding of their role as parents. If this were so it could be expected that there would be some modification of these parents' attitudes towards children and the family during the period of the association.

This study was planned to examine these expectations as it was considered that the Play Centre movement would benefit from some knowledge of the parental attitudes of its members and of the effectiveness of its programmes and as well whether sex differences were apparent in parental attitudes and their modification.

It was hypothesised that parental involvement would increase the accuracy of parents' understanding of Play Centre ideas and would help modify parental attitudes to become more like those of the Play Centre but that parents would neither achieve complete understanding nor completely accept Play Centre's point of view. It was also predicted that there would be sex differences in the perception and modification of parental attitudes.

A modified form of the Parental Attitude Research Instrument, renamed the Parent Attitude Survey Questionnaire, was administered to two groups of parents (both partners) who were matched so that a comparison of attitudes on a pre- and post-involvement basis could be made. The subjects were asked to respond to the PASQ first as though stating their own point of view and second as though stating the Play Centre's point of view. A group of Play Centre experts were asked to respond to the PASQ as though stating the Play Centre point of view, to give some measure of Play Centre attitudes.

The responses of 133 subjects (including the 76 subjects of the test group) to the 128 items of the PASQ were intercorrelated and factor analysed using the principal components solution rotated to normalized Varimax structure.

The ten factors were taken as the attitude factor scales. A second-order factor analysis revealed two factors, an authoritarian-restrictiveness scale and a democratic-permissiveness scale. Mean scores of the test and expert groups on the ten-factor-scales were compared using the t-Test of significant difference but these comparisons revealed little significant difference between group mean scores except between the attitudes of parents and of the Play Centre and between parents perception of Play Centre attitudes and the attitudes of the Play Centre.

In terms of the original problem this would seem to raise some doubts about the effectiveness of the Play Centre's parent education programme at least for this group, in that parents did not have a very accurate perception of the parental attitudes of the Play Centre, that there was not an appreciable shift in parental attitudes during the time of involvement in the Play Centre, that the parents' and the Play Centre's attitudes did differ significantly and that the anticipated differences in parental attitudes between husbands and wives who are differently involved in the Play Centre, were not apparent. Caution must be expressed however as to the generalization of these comments to the total Play Centre population in view of the limitations of the investigation, the small and specialized sample and the difficulty of measuring accurately parental attitudes.

Scores on four of the factor scales appeared reliable enough to give some indication of the parental attitudes of the total sample. In general these Play Centre parents were more permissive and democratic in their attitudes towards their pre-school-age children than the New Zealand literature would indicate.

Suggestions for more detailed research in this area are indicated by the findings of this preliminary investigation and include the refinement of an

instrument to measure parental attitudes, their relation to personality variables, marriage patterns and sex roles in marriage, and the accuracy of the transfer of Play Centre ideas and policy at a regional and local level.

Acknowledgement

My sincere thanks are extended to Professor C. G. N. Hill and Mr. D. McAlpine, Education Department, Massey University, for their initial suggestions, perceptive criticism and long range interest and encouragement:

to all those who are the Play Centre movement, and especially those mothers and fathers who gave their time to answer numerous questions:

to colleagues in Palmerston North, Melbourne and Adelaide whose questions were not always answered:

to Mr. David Bruce, A.C.E.R. who has similar problems:

to Professor S.B. Hammond, Psychology Department, Melbourne University whose computer skills and interest in family studies opened many doors and:

to Miss Di Swan, whose programming skills remain a closed door and:

to those who should be first but are always last, Judith, Michael, Rachel and Benjamin who are what this is all about.

Adelaide.

January, 1971.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
List of Tables.	v
Chapter:	
1. Introduction	1
1. The Problem and Purpose.	1
2. Basic Questions.	5
2. Background to the Problem.	8
1. The N.Z. Play Centre Movement.	8
2. Parent Education in the Play Centre Movement.	9
3. The Development of Attitudes and Attitude Change.	11
4. Child Rearing in New Zealand.	17
3. Hypotheses.	30
4. Procedures.	37
1. Definition of Terms.	37
2. Sample Description.	38
i. Selection of the Sample.	38
ii. Description of the Sample.	38
iii. Matching of Test Groups.	45
3. Instrumentation: Measurement of Parental Attitudes	49
4. Design and Data Collection.	52
5. Play Centre Attitudes.	55
6. Analysis of Data.	56
7. Factor Analysis.	58
i. Sample for Factor Analysis.	60
ii. Factor Analysis Procedures.	65
iii. Second Order Factor Analysis.	67

	Page
5. Presentation of Results.	
1. a. Factor Analysis Results.	75
b. Second Order Factor Analysis.	81
2. T-Test Comparisons of Factor-Scale Scores.	84
6. Discussion and Interpretation of Results.	113
1. Factor Analysis of Parental Attitudes.	113
2. T-Test Comparisons.	114
3. Parental Attitudes.	119
7. Conclusions and Implications.	123
1. General Conclusions & Implications.	123
2. Limitations to Conclusions.	126
3. Suggestions for Further Research.	128
Appendix.	130
Bibliography.	163

LIST OF TABLES

Table:	Page
1. Mean Age at Marriage of Test Groups and Nearest National Groups (in years).	41
2. Education Level of Test Groups by Number and Percentage.	42
3. Occupation Level of Test Groups by Number and Percentage.	43
4. Occupation Levels of Test and National Groups by Percentage (Male Only).	44
5. Matching of Test Groups - Wives.	47
6. Matching of Test Groups - Husbands.	48
7. Education Level of Factor Analysis Sample by Number and Percentage.	61
8. Occupation Level of Factor Analysis Sample by Number and Percentage.	62
9. Occupation Levels of the Total Factor Analysis Group and National Distribution (Male) By Percentage.	64
10. Reliability Coefficients of the Ten Rotated Factor-Scales	67
11. Correlation Matrix: Ten Rotated PASQ Factor-Scales.	68
12. Second Order Analysis: Unrotated Solution.	69
13. Second Order Analysis: Rotated Solution.	70
14. Perceived Play Centre Parental Attitudes of Mothers of Beginners and Mothers of Finishers.	86
15. Perceived Play Centre Parental Attitudes of Fathers of Beginners and Fathers of Finishers.	87
16. Parental Attitudes of Mothers of "Beginners" and Mothers of "Finishers".	88
17. Parental Attitudes of Fathers of "Beginners" and Fathers of "Finishers".	89
18. Parental and Perceived-Play Centre Attitudes of Mothers of Beginners.	91
19. Parental and Perceived-Play Centre Attitudes of Fathers of Beginners.	92

20.	Parental and Perceived-Play Centre Attitudes of Mothers of Finishers.	93
21.	Parental and Perceived-Play Centre Attitudes of Fathers of Finishers.	94
22.	Parental Attitudes of Mothers of Beginners and Play Centre Experts.	97
23.	Parental Attitudes of Fathers of Beginners and Play Centre Experts.	98
24.	Parental Attitudes of Mothers of Finishers and Play Centre Experts.	99
25.	Parental Attitudes of Fathers of Finishers and Play Centre Experts.	100
26.	Perceived Play Centre Parental Attitudes of Mothers of Beginners and Play Centre "Experts".	102
27.	Perceived Play Centre Parental Attitudes of Fathers of Beginners and Play Centre "Experts".	103
28.	Perceived Play Centre Parental Attitudes of Mothers of "Finishers" and Play Centre "Experts".	104
29.	Perceived Play Centre Parental Attitudes of Fathers of "Finishers" and Play Centre "Experts".	105
30.	Parental Attitudes of Mothers and Fathers of Beginners.	107
31.	Parental Attitudes of Mothers and Fathers of Finishers.	108
32.	Perceived Play Centre Parental Attitudes of Mothers and Fathers of Beginners.	110
33.	Perceived Play Centre Parental Attitudes of Mothers and Fathers of Finishers.	111
34.	Parent Attitude Mean Scale Scores, Beginners and Play Centre Experts, by 4 - 1 Weighting.	120

LIST OF APPENDICES

	Page
1. Item Scales Written for this Survey.	131
2. Parent Attitude Survey Questionnaire.	135
3. Information Sheet.	141
4. Family Relations Questionnaire.	142
5. Request for information, Play Centre experts.	144
6. Item Correlational Matrix of PASQ Item Scores.	145
7. 20 Principal Components - Unrotated.	146
8. 10 Factor Rotation.	147
9. Factor A. Authoritarian Attitudes.	148
10. Factor B. Realities of Parenthood.	150
11. Factor C. Maternal Ascendancy.	152
12. Factor D. Restrictive Attitudes.	154
13. Factor E. Discouraging Independence.	156
14. Factor F. Inadequacy of Verbal Communication.	158
15. Factor G. Irritability.	159
16. Factor H. Equalitarianism.	160
17. Factor I. Dissatisfaction in Homemaking Role.	161
18. Factor J. Respect for Individuality.	162

## Chapter 1 Introduction

### The Problem and Purpose of the Study.

This study was intended to examine the modification of parental attitudes in parents of children attending Play Centres in New Zealand. The New Zealand Play Centre Federation has as one of its major aims that of "Parent Education" or more specifically "To provide means through which parents may gain for themselves, more understanding of their role as parents".<sup>1</sup>

If husbands and wives do gain this greater understanding through their association with the Play Centre movement it is to be expected that there will be some modification of parental attitudes over the period of the association. Not only does the Play Centre state this general aim, but it also spells out an expectation that a change in attitude will result from parental association with the Play Centre.

"This kind of learning (by active association) the key to which is responsible involvement, not just looking on, is efficient in changing views. Parents with the relevant facts in perspective, are ready to learn. Fewer resistances to learning occur and greater perceptiveness grows."<sup>2</sup>

Executive officers and supervisors of some play centres and some "experts" involved in providing information and education courses for parents of Play Centre children (Beverley Morris,

A. Forrest, D. Garrett, I.W. Jenkin) have indicated in personal communication with the investigator that they feel there is often a modification of parental attitudes and a growth in understanding of children as a result of parental association with a play centre's parent education programme. Recently Geraldine McDonald<sup>3</sup> lists self reports from many of her sample of Play Centre mothers indicating a change in attitude towards children and child-rearing as a result of their involvement with play centre.

To date however there appears to have been no conclusive research conducted that examines either the parental attitudes of parents of children attending a play centre, or more significantly whether modification of parental attitude occurs in these parents in the time that they are associated with or involved in the activities of the Play Centre movement. In fact the Play Centre itself has called for research into this very aspect of its own programme.

"Avenues of research could be:— parents' attitudes before and after a period at play centre."<sup>4</sup>

The Play Centre movement has no definitive, officially stated attitudes towards the various aspects of childrearing although a number of Play Centre publications (Hill, Somerset and Grey,<sup>5</sup> Somerset,<sup>6</sup> Somerset and Grey,<sup>7</sup>) support a reasonably permissive, middle-of-the-road approach. The Play Centre avoids being prescriptive (Hill, Somerset and Grey,<sup>8</sup> Somerset and Grey<sup>9</sup>) preferring to provide the opportunities for parents to widen their experience, make their own judgements and thus form their own attitudes.

The Play Centre's parent education programme comprises both formal and informal aspects. Active participation is basic to the whole process and includes meeting other parents and talking with them, discussing children with others, working with and watching children. This the Play Centre considers will facilitate the kind of understanding that parents may need or will help parents to find out more about their own children.

"Every play session is a further stage in parent education"<sup>10</sup>

The formal aspect includes national and regional seminars, workshops, refresher and in-service courses, evening lectures, discussion groups, films, introductory talks and individual lecture sessions. Speakers are drawn from various sources including Universities, Teachers Colleges, the medical profession and active members of the Play Centre itself.

In his own contact with play centres and Play Centre personnel since 1967, the investigator had felt some concern about questions asked and statements made to him that indicate uncertainty and confusion in the minds of some parents about aspects of child-rearing purported to have been made as "Play Centre policy". The investigator's involvement in conducting some parent education sessions for play centres also served to stimulate questions about the effectiveness of these sessions in particular, and generally of the success of the Play Centre movements programmes of parent education.

It appeared that the New Zealand Play Centre movement had been involved in an extensive programme of parent education with its goal of acceptable attitudes before it but without

adequate knowledge of the attitudes that parents brought to play centre with their children nor an objective assessment of the effect that its parent education programme had on the parents who became involved.

It seemed then that it would be advantageous for the New Zealand Centre Federation to have some knowledge of the parental attitudes that parents bring to play centre and the extent to which these differ from the attitudes endorsed by the Play Centre itself.

It appeared necessary as well, that the Play Centre movement have some assessment of the effectiveness of its programme, that is an answer to the question, "do parents come to accept the parental attitudes of the Play Centre movement as a result of their involvement?" Another aspect of the general question of parental attitudes that needed to be assessed was the anticipated difference in parental attitudes between husbands and wives. Furthermore, in view of the frequently expressed concern about the lack of paternal involvement in Play Centre, there was also the need to investigate sex differences in the modification of parental attitudes (assuming of course that modification did occur).

For these reasons then the investigation was considered to be necessary and worthwhile. It was also hoped that the study would contribute a little to the current knowledge about parents and their children in New Zealand.

To consider the broad problem adequately it would have been necessary to sample the total population of both Play Centre and non-Play Centre parents, to investigate the attitudes in different social class groups, to study Maori-European and urban-rural samples, use control groups, and to sample attitudes in the same groups on a pre- and post-involvement basis. It would also have been necessary to assess the amount of involvement for different groups and analyse these in relation to the various parameters involved. This would have involved a study, the scope of which went beyond the limits of this exercise. It was decided to conduct this investigation as a preliminary survey of a more limited sample, to determine and compare the parental attitudes of two matched groups of parents (for both husbands and wives) of children attending play centres in the Palmerston North area. One group would comprise parents of children who had recently commenced play centre ("Beginners"), the other would be drawn from parents of children who had been attending a play centre for some time ("Finishers"). It was also planned to measure the accuracy of parents' perception of the Play Centre movement's attitudes in relation to the attitudes actually favoured by the play centre itself.

The problems can be stated in question form as follows:

1. What are the parental attitudes of two groups (Beginners and Finishers) of parents of Play Centre children?
2. What are the parental attitudes favoured by the Play Centre?

3. How well do parents perceive the parental attitudes of the Play Centre, i.e. are there differences in the perception of Play Centre attitudes by parents and the attitudes of the Play Centre movement itself - and in what areas?
4. What differences in Parental attitudes exist between Beginners and Finishers?
5. Does association with the Play Centre movement lead parents to a more complete acceptance of Play Centre's point of view?
6. Are there sex differences in these areas of parental attitudes?

Footnotes. Chapter 1.

1. G.L. Somerset (ed.) I Play and I Grow (Auckland: The New Zealand Play Centre Association, 1967), p.4.
2. C.G.N. Hill, G.L. Somerset and A. Grey. Living and Learning With Children (Wellington, Price: Milburn, 1965), p.144.
3. Geraldine McDonald. Title Unknown (Unpublished Master's Thesis, Department of Education, Victoria University, 1969), pp.311-312.
4. Joan Smith. "Our Directors of Training, What Are They Thinking About", Play Centre Journal, 15 (1969) p.3-4
5. Hill, Somerset and Grey, op.cit.
6. Somerset, op.cit.
7. G.L.Somerset and A. Grey. Belonging in the Family (Wellington The New Zealand Play Centre Federation, 1962).
8. Hill, Somerset and Grey, op.cit.p.xii.
9. Somerset and Grey, ibid.p.1.
10. Hill, Somerset and Grey, op.cit. p.138

## Chapter 2. Background to the Problem

### 1. The New Zealand Play Centre Movement.

The New Zealand Play Centre movement had its beginnings in the early 1940's when groups of mothers whose husbands were on active war service met together to enable their pre-school children to play with others in a supervised situation and so that the mothers themselves could enjoy the companionship. Mothers took their turn to assist the supervisor (usually a trained Kindergarten teacher) but later when Kindergartens initiated both morning and afternoon sessions this source of trained supervisors was no longer available. The New Zealand Play Centre Federation (formed 1948) initiated programmes of supervisor training by recruiting from its own members, as it recognised that the active involvement of parents was necessary in a programme of early childhood education. With this move too the Play Centre became actively involved in providing information about children and parenthood for its members; so began the Play Centre's involvement in "Parent Education". "The (then) Regional Councils of Adult Education (now University Extension Departments) assisted by organising and staffing lectures, discussions, day and weekend schools, films and general encouragement."<sup>1</sup> Play centres are now established in many parts of New Zealand and as at 14 February, 1969, a total of 484 play centres were being administered by eleven Play Centre Associations.<sup>2</sup>

The Department of Education provides some financial assistance and sets standards for accommodation, health, equipment and supervision. However a good deal of finance must still be raised by each centre to assist principally in the purchase of equipment and the payment of the

supervisor's salary. Play Centres do not usually have to own their own building, an advantage that favours their ready establishment especially in country districts and in suburban areas where there is a predominance of young families in new houses. However, in 1966 over 30 groups owned their own building.

## 2. Parent Education in the Play Centre Movement.

"Parent Education" as the term is used by the Play Centre movement appears to refer to more than is usually recognised as a formal process (however informally it may be conducted) and includes "the responsible involvement of parents in the total process of providing a pre-school service for their children".<sup>3</sup>

Play Centre is a cooperative enterprise; organised, supervised and maintained by a group of parents and as such provides opportunities for parents to work among children other than their own and to discuss with other parents their own experiences and the behaviour of their children. Mothers are required to assist the supervisors on a number of occasions and to attend a preliminary Introductory Discussion Course of at least three meetings. A new mother is also required to attend with her child for at least three sessions to help the child settle in. This also provides the opportunity for the parent to learn a little about Play Centre, its ideas, beliefs and methods, and to observe children at play. This meeting together then provides mothers with the opportunity to learn about and observe at first hand other children than their own, and how they behave and learn, and they discuss the children and the child-rearing techniques and attitudes that other parents preach and practise. It may mean that some parents

will rethink their own position, develop new attitudes and attempt to develop new practices and techniques.

A further type of change may be affected when it is the mothers turn to become "mother-help". In this situation the mother is "on show" - not that it is the supervisor's duty to be critical or make evaluative judgements, but the way in which she behaves with children and carries out her duties is likely to be observed and discussed by other members who may be present. The mother-help is usually aware of this and however much she may not agree with what is being done and with what she has to do she must act as she thinks the Play Centre would want her to. Play Centre would hope that in time these mothers would come to accept more of the ideas that it has to offer. As well, Play Centre would hope that, as parents experience the work and the activities themselves, as they listen, discuss and share experiences and ideas about child-rearing, they will take an interest in what children do and how they do it; and so will "—gain more understanding of their role as parents".<sup>4</sup>

This then is one aspect of the Play Centre's education programme - the informal education programme. The other aspect is more formal.

The basic aspects of the formal education programme comprises those activities organised by the Play Centre (local, zone or Association) such as parents' workshops, films and discussion, winter or Zone courses, Correspondence courses, leadership and supervisor-training courses, day or weekend schools and the like. The other aspect of the formal education programme are these courses run by Departments of University

Extension, Manual and Technical Classes, Polytechnic, the Health Department and other agencies. Assistance is also offered in the form of loans of books and films by the National Library Service and the National Film Library.

It can be seen then that there exists a variety of activities that the Play Centre considers to be a part of parent education. Because the term is used in this broadly inclusive manner in the Play Centre literature and could be confused with the more limited formal definition and because of the stress that the literature places on the value of this active involvement in the informal aspects<sup>5</sup>, it was decided to use the phrase "association with the Play Centre movement" rather than "parent education programme of the Play Centre movement" in much of the subsequent discussion.

### 3. The Development of Attitudes and Attitude Change.

The literature of the Play Centre movement appears to use for preference non-behavioural terms in discussing anticipated changes in parental relationships with children. It speaks of the gain in "understanding" of parental roles,<sup>6</sup> becoming "interested",<sup>7</sup> and of the kind of learning which is "efficient in changing views",<sup>8</sup> but is rather guarded about discussing actual parental behaviour with children. It would appear then that the Play Centre assumes that development of understanding and interest and changes in attitudes will be reflected in changes in parental behaviour.

Attitudes are acquired in a number of ways; by imitation and role playing, from emotional experiences and conditioning, from various kinds of informative experience, and by deliberate cultivation.<sup>9</sup>

It is feasible that each of these processes could operate to form attitudes in the Play Centre situation.

The observation of other parents interacting with children in the play sessions, and the discussions with other parents about children provides situations where behaviour and attitudes are open to imitation. The fact that many of these behaviour patterns and expressed attitudes are favoured or endorsed by a "significant other" i.e. the Play Centre collectively or by the supervisor acting as model, would facilitate acceptance by "new" mothers of some of these attitudes or behaviours. Further reinforcement may occur when the imitator as "mother-help" assumes and acts out the roles herself.

Bandura<sup>10</sup> has indicated that exposure to models has several effects including the opportunity to learn new response patterns (e.g. control techniques), the strengthening or weakening of inhibitions about engaging in the observed behaviour (e.g. working as mother-help and exercising non-authoritarian control techniques) and eliciting previously acquired but dormant responses (e.g. using a musical ability as a control technique). In the Play Centre situation then there are opportunities for the development of attitudes and behaviours through imitation and role play.

It would be difficult to separate the influence of group pressures on attitude formation from other influences. It is likely that the desire to conform would serve as a powerful motivating force in the development of attitudes and behaviours through imitation and role play. Garry and Kingsley comment on studies by Sherif and by Asch that demonstrate the susceptibility of the individual to group judgements.

"The more ambiguous the situation, the younger the subject, the less crucial the issue, and the greater the consensus of opinion, the greater the willingness of individuals to ignore their own perceptions and conform to the group judgement. The closer the issue to deep-seated beliefs or the presence of some support, the more individuals will stand by their own judgement."<sup>11</sup>

It would appear then that the parents in the Play Centre will be influenced by group pressures to the extent that they see these attitudes as appropriate for themselves in either the play centre or the home situation. An aspect of McDonald's research with Play Centre mothers lends some support to this proposition.<sup>12</sup> When asked in interview about the appropriateness of Play Centre ideas the majority (57 of 58 subjects) considered that Play Centre ideas were appropriate for Play Centre but only one third considered Play Centre ideas as appropriate for the home. It would appear that the acceptance of Play Centre ideas is situation and person specific and in this group at least that the development of new deep-seated attitudes could not be assumed for the majority of her sample. The Play Centre ideas were accepted only when they were seen as appropriate.

Emotional experiences may also influence attitude formation and the Play Centre not only provides the situation where this may occur (e.g. the formation of warm and emotionally satisfying experiences with children) but also stresses this situation in its handbook I Play and I Grow.<sup>13</sup>

In addition to the social and emotional influences, the acquisition of new knowledge can be effective in influencing the formation of attitudes.

There appears then to be a variety of situations and experiences in the structure, organisation and administration of play centres within which attitudes may develop. The differential development of any attitude as a result of informal involvement will be influenced by a variety of factors among which would seem to be age, previous experience and attitudes, degree of commitment to the play centre and the level of discrepancy between attitudes of the sender and the receiver.

In its extensive provision of information (the "formal" aspect of parent education mentioned above) and information services the Play Centre is again providing opportunities that may lead to the development or acquisition of attitudes. The provision of knowledge it is presumed will influence the development of what the individual believes about an object or situation and this in turn will influence the "feeling" or affective areas so that a new attitude becomes generalised. But what of the modification of already existing attitudes? In general the influences are the same; social, group and personality factors. It would appear that the question of attitude change is one of susceptibility to persuasion.<sup>14</sup> Krech, Crutchfield and Livson consider that the communicator and the message are of prime importance in considering persuasion and attitude change. They summarise the research in a series of propositions.

"1. The Communicator.

- (i) Communicators regarded by the audience as credible are more effective in inducing immediate change than are untrustworthy communicators.

- (ii) The advantage of communicators high in credibility over untrustworthy communicators tends to disappear over time. (This effect may result from the dissociation with the passage of time, of source from content. People tend to remember what is said without spontaneously thinking about who said it.)
- (iii) Communicators who are perceived as similar in their attitudes to the audience are more effective than communicators who are seen as dissimilar.

## 2. The Message.

- (i) The acceptance of attitudes opposed by the audience will be promoted if the message is so designed that it evokes minimal counter argument in the audience.
- (ii) The acceptance of attitudes opposed by the audience will be promoted if arguments containing material desirable to the audience are presented before undesirable material."<sup>15</sup>

Not all parents who enrol children at Play Centre hold similar parental attitudes. Susceptibility to change will depend then to some extent, on the degree of discrepancy between parent's attitudes and Play Centre attitudes as they are perceived by parents. It could be suggested in view of this summary of research that the more formal parent education programmes may be less effective in modifying parental attitudes than the Play Centre would acknowledge. However by stressing parental involvement in the day to day activities of the centres the Play Centre is strengthening the possibility that attitudes may be modified.

Bem suggests that the traditional view that attitudes cause behaviour needs rethinking. This he has done and proposed that under certain conditions, one of the most effective ways to change attitudes is to change behaviour. Bem suggests that Festinger's theory of cognitive dissonance lends support to his proposition.

"Festinger's theory postulates, among other things, that if an individual is induced to engage in behaviour that is inconsistent with his beliefs or attitudes, he will experience the discomfort of "cognitive dissonance" which will motivate him to seek a resolution of that inconsistency. One way he can do this is to convince himself that he actually believes in what he has done, that he actually holds the beliefs and attitudes implied by his behaviour. In other words, the inconsistency, or "dissonance" between an individual's beliefs or attitudes and his behaviour, will motivate belief or attitude change toward cognitive consistency."<sup>16</sup>

The involvement of mothers in play sessions and with groups of children presents situations in which some are forced to modify aspects of their behaviour to meet the expectations and requirements of the Play Centre movement. Repetition will strengthen these behaviours, increasing the dissonance and the possibility that attitudes will change to lessen the dissonance.

"the new behaviour provides a source from which (the parent) draws a new set of inferences about what he feels and believes"<sup>17</sup>

The Play Centre movement then appears to be on strong theoretical ground when it claims that its broad "parent education" programmes will modify attitudes and this brief consideration of the theory of attitude

change in relation to the practices of the Play Centre does nothing to lessen the expectation that association with the Play Centre movement will modify parental attitudes.

#### 4. Childrearing in New Zealand.

Until the late 1960's knowledge about the New Zealand family and more specifically about childrearing within the New Zealand family has been extremely limited. Strobant's comments to the Association for the Study of Childhood in 1958 highlights this deficiency.

"---we have little dependable knowledge about how and under what circumstance New Zealand children are influenced significantly by the decisions and actions of their elders."<sup>18</sup>

More recently there has been some effort to rectify this situation. Gilson<sup>19</sup> has outlined a demographic analysis of changes in the New Zealand family and in discussing some of the social influences and implications of the structural changes has stressed the isolated (from other generations) nature of many New Zealand families. McCreary also has commented on this and speculates that this

"---separation of generations (may have) produced an uncertainty in child care which is reflected in the invention of the Plunket Society and the growth of organisations concerned with teaching anxious mothers how to care for their young."<sup>20</sup>

Ephra Garrett takes up this theme in her discussion of the reflection of changes in society in family life. Because the openness of New Zealand society allows open choice this has created

"—burdens of decision making. Parents have to sort out the various ideas on child-rearing — they cannot bring up children in the way they themselves were brought up"<sup>21</sup>

Evidence presented by James and Jane Ritchie supports these previous comments

"—the nuclear family in New Zealand is very isolated and very much on its own and within that family the mother is even more isolated and even more on her own."<sup>22</sup>

It would appear then that within the New Zealand home it is the mother who has prime responsibility for bringing up the children. In 75% of the families studied by self reports of mothers in interview the Ritchies report that help from the father in taking care of small children was insignificant, and that not only was help not offered, it was not expected.<sup>23</sup> Laurence Brown's report lends some support to the findings of the Ritchies. On the basis of responses to a "Day at Home Questionnaire" by 246 urban and rural Form I and II boys and girls Brown concludes that

"the wife appears to be central figure in most family activities while the husband has his main role in child control and in activities outside the actual home".<sup>24</sup>

Brown's comparison with his 1959 results show that there has been a significant move towards parental cooperation in child care, he comments that, "—It seems that children act as a focus for joint activity in the family."<sup>25</sup> Expected differences however between "parents functions in urban and rural families has not been confirmed by these results."<sup>26</sup>

The somewhat conflicting evidence of the Ritchies and the Brown reports may perhaps be explained by differences in the samples and the method of data collection. Brown's data was collected from eleven to thirteen year old boys and girls and relates "only to those family functions which are apparent to children."<sup>27</sup> The Ritchies report data collected from wives only. This data was collected some years ago (1963) and in view of Brown's report of a move towards greater cooperativeness in parents functions from 1959 to 1970,<sup>28</sup> the Ritchies' data may be already dated. The high report by the Ritchies' sample of non-cooperative husbands may reflect a defensive reaction by mothers to the interview. For wives to admit accepting help from husbands would be a slight on their efficiency in their primary role as housewives and mothers. Therefore they tend to undervalue the cooperation of husbands.

The Ritchies' questions were directed towards parents and their very young children, Brown's sample families contained older children. The Ritchies comment that, the role of fathers in older families differs from their role in younger families<sup>29</sup> therefore any comparison of the results must be made with reservation. However the evidence does support the generally accepted picture that childrearing in New Zealand, at least in the child's early years, is predominantly a woman's domain. This has certain implications for expecting there to be sex differences in parental attitudes towards the pre-school child.

In her summary of changes in the New Zealand family, Ephra Garrett comments that

"—there has been a change from father dominated families to companionship families. There is a greater stress on companionship between husband and wife and a greater sharing of family responsibilities. But we do not know how widespread this is." <sup>30</sup>

Gilson suggests that opportunities for companionship and family interaction may be limited especially in the newer outlying suburbs because husbands spend much time away from home travelling to and from work, at work and undertaking —"overtime or secondary employment to cope with the financial demands of a young family."<sup>31</sup>

These comments then suggest that there is some basis for the general expectation that husbands' parental attitudes will differ from these of their wives.

As with other aspects of childrearing and the New Zealand family, knowledge of parental attitudes in New Zealand was limited until the circulation of the Ritchies' preliminary report<sup>32</sup> and the more detailed publication<sup>33</sup> of the results of their New Zealand replication of the Sears, Maccoby and Levin 1957 Boston study. In summary, the Ritchies comment on the expressed warmth of mother-child relations and the picture of devotion to the role of motherhood. However they comment less favourably on methods of control in that, for New Zealand mothers, "control by smacking is its chief characteristic."<sup>34</sup> They consider that mothers have discarded many useful reward techniques such as

"—praise [which] is thought to be inappropriate; tangible rewards [which] are castigated as bribery; holding up other children as positive and negative models [is] thought to be an anti-social technique; very few families use a credit-point

reward system; over half think isolation of the child cruel (or find it impossible to achieve); half regard reasoning as a waste of time. —Only punishment and threat of punishment and occasional praise [remains]. And it is Mum who punishes not Dad."<sup>35</sup>

On the basis of these comments it would be expected that New Zealand parents would express authoritarian attitudes towards control and towards any child behaviour that transgresses the limits set by the parents for their children.

Attitudes towards sex and aggression revealed by the Bitchies' work are more definite,

"—Social sex play, infantile masturbation and nakedness bring out the worst in New Zealand mothers. For the most part they don't tolerate these things; in a word they are still very prudish and interpret such activity in an adult context of meaning and try to stamp it out.

Aggression really upsets mothers. They seem unable to handle it, and —no wonder. They want their children to fight back but not show aggression."<sup>36</sup>

The Bitchies then have provided some research evidence which tends to support the not always popular comments of some overseas visitors (Ausubel, Bourne)<sup>37</sup> about the authoritarianism that underlies parental attitudes of many New Zealanders. McCreary<sup>38</sup> makes similar comment in almost the same words. It is expected that these restrictive attitudes will be present in a sample of parents new to Play Centre but it would be hoped that if the Play Centre experience modifies parental attitudes, then attitudes towards sex and aggression will be less restrictive in a

similar sample of parents who have been involved with Play Centre for a period of time.

The role and importance of the father in childrearing has received even less attention in New Zealand than that of mothers. This reflects a universal trend which Nash<sup>39</sup> has documented in an extensive survey of the childrearing assumptions of Western industrial society. Even the New Zealand Play Centre literature appears to reflect this trend. Although the Play Centre in its literature repeatedly stresses its importance as a family concern and the necessity for husbands to support their wives to take an active interest in their children, to complement their wives involvement and to become involved themselves as administrators and maintenance helpers, very little comment appears to be directed to wives that stresses the important role that fathers can play in the shaping of their children's future development. This understanding may develop and be considered in more detail in the formal education programmes but it is felt that even for newly involved mothers, the role of the father as a potent figure in childrearing in the family should be stressed. If this were done some realisation might begin to develop in mothers that childrearing is not entirely a female prerogative.

Thus, while the Play Centre speaks of parents in much of the literature it is generally acknowledged that the majority of those who become associated with Play Centre are the mothers of the children who attend. Some attempt is made to include fathers but very little opportunity is available for them to participate in the actual play sessions with children (where theoretically attitudes towards children may begin to

be modified). Attendance at formal parent education sessions is possible for many more fathers, though very few avail themselves of the opportunity to do so.<sup>40</sup>

It is the mothers who become involved in the various activities of the Play Centre. An introductory discussion course and a certain amount of mother helping is compulsory, many others are persuaded on to committees or to take some administrative responsibility (McDonald cites nearly 50% of her sample),<sup>41</sup> some attend evening courses, weekend workshops or seminars and a few complete the supervisors course.

Fathers of play centre attenders however, are generally less involved with play centre than mothers. The possibility of fathers helping in even a minimal fashion at normal play sessions is remote for most men are at work at this time (note the name "motherhelp"). Garrett comments that men very seldom attend workshops and courses<sup>42</sup> though more turn up for the annual "fathers' day" or the occasional working bee, and a number may be found on committees at various levels. It is reasonable to assume then that because fathers have less to do with Play Centre, there will be a sex difference in the acceptance of the parent attitudes of the Play Centre movement.

Dennis Garrett has proposed that parent education in the Play Centre may be little more than a "pious platitude". But having admitted that Play Centre does not involve both parents in parent education (his definition is more limited than that used in this study) Garrett considers that to modify the parental attitudes of fathers, Play Centre may not have to involve both parents. In relation to Play Centre he considers that there are four types of men; the actively sympathetic, the passively sympathetic, the indifferent and those who are hostile.

To educate husbands it is necessary for the Play Centre to educate their wives. Garrett comments

"Perhaps we have to accept realistically that if we do a good job of parent education with mothers where fathers are sympathetic to any degree, they will be educated at secondhand both by their wives and their children. If the father is merely indifferent some of it will rub off. If he is hostile, I suggest we acknowledge that it is beyond our competence to deal with the problem; and indeed we should tread warily lest we actually make things worse".<sup>43</sup>

Another aspect of the Play Centre and attitude change which Garrett considers and which is pertinent to this study is the comment that "the 'side-effect' satisfactions of pre-school involvement [becoming a good parent, making social contacts and intellectual and emotional satisfactions from using talents and abilities] are likely to be sufficient to make attitude change through parent education programmes relatively easy; the seeds fall on fertile ground. —not — that mother education ever achieves a 100% conversion. —To know the good (even if you accept it in theory) is not always to do it. But it is more likely for mothers than for fathers."<sup>44</sup>

In summary then the background to the problem can be stated as follows.

The New Zealand Play Centre movement aims at helping parents understand their children and their own role as parents. To facilitate this, parental involvement is required in all aspects of its organisation,

operation and administration, and as well, more formal parent education programmes are provided. There is a sound theoretical basis to support the expectation that both the formal and informal aspects of parent education will operate to induce a change in parental attitudes where they differ from those of the Play Centre. Knowledge of the New Zealand family and childrearing indicates that parents are anxious to learn about children, that there are sex differences in parental attitudes and behaviours and that generally New Zealanders are rather authoritarian and restrictive in their role as parents especially in relation to discipline, sexual behaviour and aggression. Comment on parent education in the Play Centre indicates that attitude change will be affected more readily in mothers, that fathers are less likely to become involved but that some fathers attitudes may be modified "secondhand", and finally that a 100 per cent acceptance of Play Centre attitudes even in mothers is an unrealistic aspiration.

A number of hypotheses are now proposed.

Footnotes. Chapter 2.

1. Somerset. I Play and I Grow, p.39
2. The New Zealand Play Centre Federation. Play Centre Journal (May, 1969), p.26.
3. Hill, Somerset and Grey. Living and Learning With Children, p.126
4. Somerset, op.cit.p.15.
5. Hill, Somerset and Grey, op.cit., Somerset op.cit.
6. Somerset, loc.cit.
7. Somerset, op.cit., p.23.
8. Hill, Somerset and Grey, op.cit. p.144.
9. Ralph Garry and Howard L. Kingsley. The Nature and Conditions of Learning (New Jersey, Prentice-Hall Inc., 1970), pp.484-510.
10. Albert Bandura. "Behavioural Modification Through Modelling Procedures" in Krasner L. and P. Ullman (eds.) Research in Behaviour and Modification (New York, Holt Rinehart and Winston, 1964).
11. Garry and Kingsley, op.cit. p.500.
12. Geraldine McDonald, Unpublished Thesis, op.cit. pp.293-294
13. Somerset, op.cit. pp. 14, 15, 23, 27.
14. Garry and Kingsley, op.cit. p.503
15. David Krech, Richard S. Crutchfield and Norman Livson. Elements of Psychology (New York: Knopf, 1970), pp.816-817.

16. Daryl J. Bem. Beliefs, Attitudes and Human Affairs (California: Brooks Cole, 1970), pp.54-55.
17. Bem. *ibid.* p.66.
18. R. Strobant. "Current Methods of Child Control" in Conformity and Individuality (Wellington, Association for the Study of Childhood, 1958) cited in Houston, S.(ed) Marriage and the Family in New Zealand (Wellington: Sweet and Maxwell, 1970), p.26.
19. Miriam Gilson. "The Changing New Zealand Family" in The New Zealand Family and Child Development (Wellington: Association for the Study of Childhood, 1969), pp.65-75,  
and  
\_\_\_\_\_ "The Changing New Zealand Family: A Demographic Analysis" in Houston, Stewart (ed) Marriage and the Family in New Zealand (Wellington, Sweet and Maxwell, 1970).
20. J. R. McCreary. "An Introduction to the New Zealand Family" in The New Zealand Family and Child Development (Wellington: Association for the Study of Childhood, 1969) pp.11-20.
21. Ephra M. Garrett. "Social Change in the New Zealand Family." Delta 5 (Palmerston North: Massey Education Society, 1969) pp. 53-58.
22. James E. Ritchie and Jane Ritchie. Patterns of Child Rearing in New Zealand: Some Preliminary Results (Hamilton: Waikato University 1966. Mimeo graphed Report), p.1.
23. Ritchie and Ritchie, *ibid.* p.2.
24. Laurence B. Brown "New Zealand Family Pattern: A Rural-Urban Comparison", in Houston, Stewart (ed.) Marriage and the Family in New Zealand

(Wellington: Sweet and Maxwell, 1970, p.84

25. Brown, *ibid.* p.83.

26. Brown, *ibid.* p.84.

27. Brown, *ibid.* p.83.

28. Brown, *ibid.*

29. James E. Ritchie and Jane Ritchie. Child Rearing Patterns in New Zealand (Wellington: Reed, 1970) p.27.

30. Ephra Garrett, *op.cit.*, p.56.

31. Gilson, The Changing New Zealand Family (1970), p.63

32. Ritchie and Ritchie, Child Rearing Patterns: Preliminary Results, (1966).

33. Ritchie and Ritchie, Child Rearing Patterns, 1970.

34. Ritchie and Ritchie, *ibid.* p.157.

35. Ritchie and Ritchie, *ibid.* p.157.

36. Ritchie and Ritchie, *op.cit.*, p.157.

37. David P. Ausubel. The Fern and the Tiki, Sydney: Angus and Robertson, 1960, and Harold Bourne "Authority and the New Zealander," The New Zealand Listener, (4th October, 1957) pp.4-5

38. McCreary, *op.cit.* p.20.

39. John Nash. "The Father in Contemporary Culture and Current Psychological Literature". Child Development 36 (1,1965), pp. 262-297

<sup>40</sup>Dennis Garrett. "Can we Communicate Both to Mothers and Fathers". (A Paper for the 12th Annual Pre-School Conference, Arabina June 1969a)

and

\_\_\_\_\_ "The Open Community" Play Centre  
Journal (15, 1969b), pp.16-18.

<sup>41</sup>McDonald, Unpublished Thesis, 1969 . . .

<sup>42</sup>D.Garrett (1969a) *op.cit.*

<sup>43</sup>D.Garrett, *op.cit.* p.6.

<sup>44</sup>D.Garrett, *ibid*, p.5.

### Chapter 3. Hypotheses

When parents come to a play centre for the first time it will be with a mixed degree of knowledge about what Play Centre stands for, about how it operates and of its position in regard to prescribed parental behaviour. One of the major assumptions made by the Play Centre is that it is effective in modifying parental attitudes. For this to happen parents must be able to perceive clearly what parental behaviours and attitudes the Play Centre does advocate. It has been indicated that Play Centre is reluctant to do this and avoids being prescriptive. It is conceivable then that some confusion will arise in parents' minds, especially when there are so many different agencies and individuals involved in the parent education programmes of the Play Centre movement.

As parents become more acquainted with Play Centre, as they have the opportunity to become involved, it would be expected that they will gain a more accurate perception of what Play Centre is about and of the parental attitudes sanctioned by the Play Centre through its literature, through individuals associated with providing information and parent education programmes or both. So, as perception becomes more accurate with length of association it will be expected that there will be a change in parents' perception of the parental attitudes endorsed by the Play Centre. The success of the Play Centre in presenting its own attitudes and standards clearly and attractively will in some degree be judged by the extent to which new members come to perceive accurately and comprehensively these attitudes and standards. These expectations are stated in Hypothesis one.

Hypothesis 1.

"Association with the Play Centre movement will increase the clarity of parents perception of the parental attitudes endorsed by the Play Centre".

The Mitchies have highlighted areas of parental attitudes that they consider are pathogenic and detrimental to the personality development of the growing child and have indicated also the high incidence of these behaviours and attitudes.<sup>1</sup>

It is likely then that many parents new to Play Centre will express these pathogenic attitudes.

The Play Centre movement does not endorse such attitudes, it is generally permissive and child centred and reflects these attitudes in its literature and in the operation of the play sessions. To be consistent it must also endorse these attitudes in its parent education programmes.

If the Play Centre is successful in bringing its members to a greater understanding of their role as parents by providing information about children and how they grow, learn and develop, then it will be expected that parents who have been associated with the Play Centre for some time will express parental attitudes that are closer to those of the Play Centre movement than are the parental attitudes of these parents who are new to Play Centre. This expectation is expressed in Hypothesis two.

Hypothesis 2.

"Association with the Play Centre Movement will change parental

attitudes in the direction of acceptance of these considered acceptable by the Play Centre Movement."

It was the opinion of the investigator that parents would not accept entirely or completely the attitudes of the Play Centre as they saw them. Geraldine McDonald's report of parents' reservations about the appropriateness of Play Centre ideas and attitudes for the home supported this opinion.<sup>2</sup> It was considered that parents would be somewhat less committed than the Play Centre position in their acceptance of new ideas and would see the Play Centre as being "theoretical" while they themselves were "practical" with their practicality winning out. It was expected that this difference would be expressed in all groups. This anticipated difference is stated as hypothesis three.

Hypothesis 3.

"Parental attitudes will differ from parents' perception of Play Centre attitudes."

It followed from the statements made in relation to the hypotheses considered so far that if parental attitudes were modified in the direction of Play Centre attitudes and if parents' perception of Play Centre attitudes became more accurate, then there would be a reduction in the difference between parental attitudes and parents' perception of Play Centre attitudes. It was indicated in the previous hypothesis that a significant difference would be expressed for all groups, however for this present hypothesis to be supported the differences between the Finishers scores would have to be less than the differences between the Beginners scores. The hypothesis is stated.

Hypothesis 4

"Association with the Play Centre movement will reduce the difference between parental attitudes and parents' perception of Play Centre Attitudes."

The Play Centre movement expresses generally permissive and child centred parental attitudes in its literature<sup>3</sup> and reflects these attitudes in the operation of its play sessions which allow the child personal freedom to select the play situations and playmates that appeal to him at the moment. Adults are present to assist the child rather than to impose their standards, and supervisors and mother-helpers are strictly forbidden to use any form of physical punishment. The child with the help of a friendly sympathetic adult is encouraged to discipline himself.

It has been noted already that Play Centre does not expect a 100% commitment to its ideas, some favourable movement is expected however. The expectation of a difference between parents' own parental attitudes and their perception of play centre's attitudes has been noted. Comment has been made that parents will attempt to maintain some distance between the two because of the layman's inherent suspicion of the theorist.

Comment has also been made (Hypothesis 1) about the apparent difficulty faced by parents in finding out what attitudes are endorsed by the Play Centre movement and the reasons behind this endorsement. Because of this confusion, and the defensiveness of many parents when confronted by the expert, it is expected that there will be a significant difference between the parental attitudes endorsed by the Play Centre on

the one hand and both parental attitudes and perception of Play Centre attitudes on the other. This expectation is stated in hypothesis five.

#### Hypothesis 5

"Parental attitudes and perception of Play Centre attitudes will differ significantly from those endorsed by the Play Centre movement."

Extensive comment and the result of research surveys overseas<sup>4</sup> and in New Zealand<sup>5</sup> indicates that there is a general expectation that there will be sex differences in parental attitudes. Traditionally the expectation would have been that fathers were more restrictive and authoritarian in their attitudes, however this is not the case today, in fact there is little agreement on an expectation of the father's attitudes.

However the lack of opportunity for fathers to be involved in the informal aspects of the Play Centre and their apparent reluctance to attend the more formal parent education programmes (preferring to babysit so that their wives can attend) means that they are almost completely cut off from contact with the information and attitude-giving facilities of the Play Centre. It could be possible for wives to influence their husbands as Garrett<sup>6</sup> suggests but it is not considered that this would be a sufficiently consistent influence for all husbands to reduce the possibility of sex differences as expressed in hypothesis six.

#### Hypothesis 6

"There will be sex differences in parental attitudes and in parents' perception of Play Centre attitudes."

The final hypothesis states the expected direction of the difference which is expressed in hypothesis six.

Hypothesis 7

"Parents' attitudes and perception of Play Centre attitudes of fathers will show greater divergence from play centre attitudes than will those of mothers."

Footnotes: Chapter 3.

1. Ritchie and Ritchie, Child Rearing in New Zealand, pp.146-158.
2. McDonald, Unpublished Thesis, 1969, pp.293-294.
3. Hill, Somerset and Grey; Somerset; Somerset and Grey.
4. Nash, "The Father in Contemporary Culture." 1965.
5. Ritchie and Ritchie, *op.cit.*  
Brown, "New Zealand Family Patterns": (1970)
6. D. Garrett, "Can We Communicate Both to Mothers and Fathers"  
1969a.

## Chapter 4. Procedures

### 1. Definition of Terms.

Parental attitudes were operationally defined as the patterns of attitudes towards specific aspects of child rearing and family life revealed by responses to the Parent Attitude Survey Questionnaire. In some cases the single word "attitudes" is used to refer to "parental attitudes". Perceived Play Centre attitudes were defined as parents' understanding of the parental attitudes of the Play Centre movement and defined operationally as parental attitudes revealed by responses to Form B of the PASQ (Parent Attitude Survey Questionnaire). Play Centre attitudes were defined as the parental attitudes endorsed by the Play Centre movement and defined operationally as the perceived parental attitudes revealed by responses of Experts to the P.A.S.Q. Experts are defined operationally as a small group comprising past or present executive members of the New Zealand Play Centre Federation, and University and Teachers College lecturers in education and psychology who were asked to respond to the P.A.S.Q. "as though stating the official Play Centre attitude."

The Beginners group was a group of 19 husband and wife couples whose oldest child had (at the time of the study) recently (in the previous six month period) begun to attend regular sessions at a Play Centre. The Finishers group was a group of 19 husband and wife couples whose oldest child was about to leave Play Centre to commence school at five years of age. Parent education was defined as any formal or informal attempt by the Play Centre "to provide means through which

parents may gain for themselves more understanding as the role as parents".<sup>1</sup>

The Play Centre movement or Play Centre refers collectively to the pre-school education programme and the people associated with this programme, operating under the auspices of the New Zealand Play Centre Federation (N.Z.P.C.F.) Association with the Play Centre movement was defined as any parental contact with the N.Z.P.C.F. or groups under its administration or control in relation to the regular attendance of a child at a Play Centre. It is used usually in relation to and discussion of the parent education programme offered by the Play Centre movement. A play centre (lower case initials) refers to a specific play group operating under the auspices of the N.Z.P.C.F.

The instruments and groups are described below in more detail and a copy of the PASQ is included in the appendix.

## 2. Sample Description.

### i. Selection of the Sample.

The sample was drawn from the parents of children attending Play Centres in and around Palmerston North. The study called for the selection of two particular group of parents described as Beginners and Finishers in the previous section (see "Definition of Terms", p.37).

Having obtained permission from the Management Committee of the Central Districts Play Centre Association, preliminary examination of the attendance registers of seven play centres in the Palmerston North area revealed an apparent total sample of 223 (112 Beginners and 111 Finishers) who satisfied these requirement. It was decided to include as many parents in the study as would participate. This would enable a pool of information to be available and would also

ensure that allowing for a reasonable sample mortality that the Beginners group would be sufficiently large to be retested in 18 to 24 months time (in a subsequent and independent follow-up study) when it became a Finishers group. This follow-up study was planned to examine changes in attitude in a particular group as a validation for this two group comparison.

Personal contact was established with as many people at Play Centres as possible to explain and discuss the study, through visits to play sessions and attendance at meetings, discussion groups and "Fathers' days".

The second step in the selection of the sample was made by mailing an introductory letter and an Acceptance to Participate Form with a stamped return envelope to the parents of the 223 children who appeared to fit the criteria indicated. Returns and follow up telephone reminders obtained agreement from 124 (55.6% of total) parent couples to participate in the survey. Of the remaining 99, some 51 declined by returning the Non-Acceptance form, 24 declined by telephone and 24 did not reply or could not be contacted. Of the 124 couples who agreed to participate 57 (46.6%) were Beginners and 67 (53.4%) were Finishers.

However a further reduction in the sample occurred during the period of the testing programme. Of the 124, only 79 (63.7% or 35.4% of the initial selection) actually participated in the study. Five of these 45 additional dropouts refused to participate when they read the contents of the PASQ, eight indicated in some way that they wished to withdraw, nine did not attend the testing sessions as arranged and 23 did not mail returns of the test battery after they had indicated a willingness to do the tests at home. It was realised that parents

had been requested to participate at a very busy time of the year (mid November to early December) and the national elections, pre-Christmas preparations and business and work commitments figured high in the reasons offered for non participation.

As indicated 79 families participated in the survey in some way although only 55 complete husband-wife couples were found within this total, the other couples (24) were represented either by the wife (21) or in some few (3) cases, by the husband.

Of these 55 husband-wife couples a further 17 were excluded from the comparison study because it was found that the present play centre attenders of these parents were not the eldest children in the family. There remained 38 husband-wife couples, 19 Beginners and 19 Finishers, much smaller groups than the initial survey and acceptance responses had suggested.

#### ii Description of the Sample.

The test sample showed a wide range of ages, occupational levels and educational backgrounds.

As would be expected the mean age of the Beginners group (Husbands 28.5 years, S.D. 4.6 years; Wives 26.4 years, S.D. 2.1 years) was lower than that of the Finishers group (Husbands 32.4 years S.D. 6.0 years; Wives 30.1 years, S.D. 7.0 years) for both husbands and wives. The difference in mean age between husbands and wives was 2.1 years for Beginners and 2.3 years for Finishers. This difference is smaller than the national figures for 1965 (3.0 years) reported by Gilson<sup>2</sup>. Mean age at marriage is shown (Table 1.) with the nearest national figures reported by Gilson<sup>3</sup> for comparison.

TABLE. 1.  
MEAN AGE AT MARRIAGE OF TEST GROUPS AND  
NEAREST NATIONAL GROUPS (IN YEARS)

	Husbands	Wives	Husbands	Wives
Test Groups	Beginners		Finishers	
	23.1	21.0	25.4	23.1
National Groups	1965		1960	
	25.2	22.2	26.1	22.9

In general both Beginners and Finishers were married at a younger age than the national sample, apart from the wives in the Finishers group and in this case the difference (0.2 years) is not significant. Beginners had been married an average of 5.4 years and Finishers an average of 7.1 years, suggesting an approximate marriage period of two years before the first child was born. The average number of children per family was 2.0 for Beginners and 2.8 for Finishers.

The educational level of the sample ranged from Form III at secondary school to Ph.D. level (see Table 2).

TABLE 2.  
EDUCATION LEVEL OF TEST GROUPS BY  
NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE

Education Level	Beginners				Finishers			
	Husbands		Wives		Husbands		Wives	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Tertiary (excluding Teachers College)	5	27.8	1	5.3	7	38.9	2	10.6
Senior Secondary (Form V, VI and Teachers College)	8	44.4	12	63.1	3	16.7	12	63.1
Junior Secondary (Form III & IV)	5	29.8	6	31.6	8	44.4	5	26.3
Totals.	18	100.0	19	100.0	18	100.0	19	100.0

(\* 1 subject not recorded)

A higher proportion of husbands than wives in both groups had completed tertiary level education though the relative numbers at other levels varied considerably. The husbands in the Beginners group in general have attained a higher educational level than the fathers of Finishers (29.8% of Beginners below senior secondary level as against 44.4% of Finishers). The relative levels for wives was more comparable across the two groups (31.6% and 26.3% respectively below the senior secondary level).

Occupational level using the Congalton-Havighurst Scale<sup>4</sup> is presented in Table 3. Occupation of wife was taken as occupation before marriage and of husbands as at the time of the survey.

TABLE 3.  
OCCUPATION LEVEL OF TEST GROUPS BY NUMBER  
AND PERCENTAGE

Occupation Level (Congalton-Havighurst)	Beginners				Finishers			
	Husbands		Wives		Husbands		Wives	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
1. Senior Professional and large business	1	5.5	-	-	-	-	-	-
2. Professional, Business & Senior Managerial	4	22.0	1	5.3	6	31.6	-	-
3. Minor Professional & Smaller Business	2	11.0	1	5.3	2	10.5	2	10.5
4. Semi Professional & Smaller Business & Clerical	5	28.0	7	36.8	5	26.3	9	47.4
5. Skilled Manual	1	5.5	4	21.0	-	-	6	31.6
6. Semi-skilled	3	17.0	5	26.3	6	31.6	2	10.5
7. Unskilled and Labouring	2	11.0	1	5.3	-	-	-	-
TOTAL	18	100.0	19	100.0	19	100.0	19	100.0

\* 1 subject not recorded

A comparison with the distribution of occupation levels for the total population (Table 4.) shows that the test sample is not representative of the national distribution. It should be noted that the national distribution figures were obtained from a different source<sup>5</sup> but were based on the Congalton-Havighurst scales. For comparison certain occupation levels of the Test Groups were combined to present a similar structure.

TABLE 4.  
OCCUPATION LEVELS OF TEST AND NATIONAL  
GROUPS BY PERCENTAGE (MALE ONLY)

Occupation Level	National	Beginners	Finishers
1. Professional (1 & 2)	8.7	27.5	31.6
2. Clerical/Farming (3 & 4)	43.8	39.0	36.8
3. Manual (5, 6, 7) *	47.5	33.5	31.6
TOTAL	100.0	100.0	100.0

\* Note: Numbers refer to listing on the Congalton-Havighurst scale p.43

In relation to the total population the lower proportion of husbands in the skilled, semi-skilled and unskilled occupations and the higher proportion of test group in the Professional group indicated that the test sample was far from representative.

A between group comparison of husband's occupation revealed a fairly balanced distribution, although this balance was not so apparent when comparing the pre-marriage occupations of the women in the sample.

In summary then the Finishers group, in relation to the Beginners was older; they married later in life, had more children and a greater number had Tertiary level education, but a higher proportion

especially of husbands, had only Junior secondary level education, while occupation level of the husbands in the two groups was more comparable.

Whereas the data indicate a reasonable level of comparability between test groups, it cannot be claimed that the groups were representative of a total sample of New Zealand parents or even of Play Centre parents from which the sample was selected. Self selection and other unknown factors accounted for both the initial decision to participate in the survey and subsequent withdrawal, and the data also indicates that the test groups are not representative of the national sample on a number of grounds including occupation, education, age, age at marriage and number of children per family. Data were not available that would provide some indication of the features of a representative sample of Play Centre parents. The test groups then were rather specific but in view of the lack of other data, the groups could give some indication about attitudes of Play Centre parents and the modification of parental attitudes after a period of association with Play Centre.

It has already been indicated that the present study was seen as a preliminary investigation of a much broader research area, especially in the modification of parental attitudes and the results obtained would undoubtedly influence the latter programme by providing questions, clues and hypotheses for further study.

### iii. Matching of Test Groups

While it would have been reasonably safe to assume that, in general, the parental intake to Play Centre in any one year would not

differ greatly from that of any other year, and not significantly over the two year period that this study considers, the small samples involved made it necessary to match the subjects closely to ensure that similar samples were in fact being compared.

Subjects were matched on the basis of educational level, occupation, and number of children as being significant factors influencing attitudes towards children and childrearing. Although it was not always possible to obtain perfect match, greater emphasis was placed on matching for educational and occupational level and occupation of subjects' father than on matching for number of children.

Details of the matching criteria and matching of subjects is presented below.

#### Matching Criteria

- a. Education level (Ed).  
Groupings as in Table 2 (3-point scale).
- b. Occupation Level (Occ).  
Groupings as in Table 3. (Congalton-Havighurst 7-point scale).
- c. Father's Occupation (Frs.Occ.)  
As for b. Occupation Level.
- d. Number of Children in Family (Chn)  
actual number reported.

TABLE 5.

Matching of Test Groups - Wives

<u>Subject N.</u>	<u>Beginners</u>				<u>Subject N</u>	<u>Finishers</u>			
	<u>Ratings</u>					<u>Ratings</u>			
	<u>Ed.</u>	<u>Occ.</u>	<u>Frs.Oc.</u>	<u>Chn</u>		<u>Ed.</u>	<u>Occ.</u>	<u>Frs. Oc.</u>	<u>Chn.</u>
106	1	3	4	2	230	1	3	3	2
112	2	2	2	4	214	1	2	3	4
118	2	4	3	1	234	2	3	3	2
120	2	4	3	2	212	2	3	3	3
110	2	4	3	2	232	2	3	5	4
102	2	4	4	2	210	2	3	6	2
130	2	4	4	2	206	2	4	4	2
132	2	4	4	2	202	2	4	4	3
114	2	4	4	2	228	2	4	5	2
124	2	5	5	2	226	2	4	5	1
128	2	5	6	3	224	2	5	5	3
116	2	6	4	2	208	2	4	6	2
134	2	6	4	2	238	2	5	2	2
136	2	6	6	2	218	2	6	5	4
122	3	4	5	2	220	3	3	6	4
126	3	4	7	2	222	3	5	3	2
138	3	6	7	1	204	3	5	x	3
108	3	6	5	1	236	3	5	6	3
104	3	6	4	2	216	3	6	x	1

x indicates information not available

TABLE 6.

Matching of Test Groups - Husbands

<u>Subject N.</u>	<u>Beginners</u>				<u>Subject N.</u>	<u>Finishers</u>				
	<u>Ratings</u>					<u>Ratings</u>				
	<u>Ed.</u>	<u>Occ.</u>	<u>Frs.</u>	<u>Occ.</u>	<u>Chn.</u>	<u>Ed.</u>	<u>Occ.</u>	<u>Frs.</u>	<u>Occ.</u>	<u>Chn.</u>
105	1	1	5	2	213	1	2	6	4	
111	1	2	1	4	231	1	2	3	4	
117	1	2	x	1	225	1	2	2	1	
119	1	2	4	2	233	1	2	3	2	
121	1	2	4	2	237	1	2	5	2	
125	2	3	x	2	229	1	2	3	2	
103	2	3	4	2	211	1	3	3	3	
129	2	4	3	2	207	2	4	4	2	
101	2	4	6	2	227	2	4	6	2	
113	2	4	2	2	223	2	3	2	3	
115	2	4	3	2	209	3	4	4	2	
107	2	4	5	1	205	3	4	x	2	
137	2	5	6	1	203	3	4	5	3	
131	2	6	6	2	201	3	6	6	3	
123	3	5	6	2	217	3	5	4	4	
127	3	6	3	3	221	3	6	4	2	
133	3	6	5	2	235	3	6	5	3	
135	3	7	x	2	215	3	6	x	1	
109	3	x	x	2	219	3	6	x	4	

x indicates information not available.

### 3. Instrumentation: Measurement of Parental Attitudes

A modified form of the Parent Attitude Research Instrument (PARI) developed by Earl S. Schaefer and Richard Q. Bell<sup>6</sup> was used to measure parental attitudes. The PARI-Form IV is a set of 23, five-item scales measuring parents attitudes towards childrearing and family life. It has been used extensively to measure these attitudes<sup>7</sup> and has been subject to comment (most thorough is that of Becker and Krug 1965)<sup>8</sup> and investigation, especially in a series of studies under the direction of Dr. Marvin Zuckerman.<sup>9</sup>

Becker and Krug<sup>10</sup> highlight some considered weaknesses of the PARI. Chief among these is that the test is strongly influenced by response sets, particularly an acquiescence response set on the authoritarian-control items which in fact comprise most of the test. Schaefer and Bell had stated most of the items in this direction in an attempt to gain maximum item discrimination. The test constructors were aware of the influence of an acquiescence response set but the work of Zuckerman and Norton and Zuckerman, Norton and Sprague<sup>11</sup> has clearly demonstrated the influence of response sets. The democratic-attitude factor in terms of content was the logical opposite pole of the authoritarian-control factor but the two were uncorrelated. Nichols<sup>12</sup> obtained similar results for fathers. Where parents could thus agree with democratic attitudes as well as those favouring authoritarian control the operation of an acquiescence-response set is strongly implied.

The influence of an acquiescence response set on responses to the PARI is acknowledged, however its influence in this present study should not negate the validity of the comparisons that will be presented.

The primary concern of this study was to examine differences between separate responses to the same questionnaire for specialised but heterogeneous samples. The heterogeneity of the two test groups and the fact that they had been matched on a number of factors gives some basis to the assumption that the acquiescence response set would be similar in the two groups.

Another response set that could have influenced scores on the PASQ was an extreme response set but after examining the evidence available the reviewers consent that

"We have no evidence to indicate that an extreme-response set poses a serious problem in interpreting PARI Scores"<sup>13</sup>

In the same critique Becker and Krug<sup>14</sup> conclude that the parental attitudes as measured by the PARI are not related to actual parental behaviour or to the prediction of parent-child interaction. However this present study was concerned with the influence of Play Centre on parental attitudes, rather than on behaviours so these criticisms do not invalidate the use of the PARI in its modified form, in the manner prescribed.

The PARI appears to be particularly sensitive to the effects of an educational programme<sup>15</sup> so that the validity for its use in this study has been established by previous success. It should be noted however that the education programme of the Play Centre differs from the type of programmes reported above (see above "The New Zealand Play Centre Movement") and that the samples involved also differ quite markedly from the sample of Play Centre parents involved in this study.

Modification of the original PARI for this research involved the deletion of five of the five item scales (numbers 3,5,6,15,23;) and the addition of eight, five-item scales (Appendix 1.) constructed by the investigator. The scales which have been deleted include "Seclusion of Mother" which would not appear appropriate for the mothers in this study who to be involved in Play Centre are of necessity freed from the seclusion of the home.

The "Martyrdom", "Dependency of the Mother", "Fear of Harming the Baby", and "Approval of Activity" scales were discarded because it was considered they would have been less likely to discriminate as well, or to provide the kind of information which could be gathered from the eight scales written for this study. These eight scales follow the Schaefer and Bell format in that the items are stated as attitudes in the "bad" (pathogenic) direction, contrary to the usually approved child-rearing opinions. The modified form of the PARI (entitled Parent Attitude Scale Questionnaire - PASQ) is presented in full in Appendix 2.

The scales "Marital Role" (5) and "Marital Decision Making" (15) were introduced to give additional information to that provided in the original "Marital Conflict" scale and to provide attitudinal data which would help differentiate "parallel" and "interactional" marriage patterns. It was envisaged that responses to items in these scales would relate to responses on the "Family-Relations Questionnaire".

The scale "Rejection of Family Life (Men)" (25) was introduced to measure the attitudes of husbands in relation to role acceptance in the family, and to parallel these measures in the similar scale "Rejecting the Homemaking Role" (13) for women. The scale comprises items from the Paternal Form of the PARI reported by Nichols (1962).

The other five scales were introduced to provide additional information on attitudes relating to control of behaviour, permissiveness in relation to sexual display and aggression, and discipline. These scales were labelled "Restricting Undressed Display" (3), "Restricting Aggressive Behaviour" (6), "Parental Ascendancy" (23), "Avoidance of Verbal Control of Behaviour" (24) and "Harsh Discipline" (26).

It was considered that the introduction of these eight five-item scales would strengthen both the information gathering and attitude measuring qualities of the original PASQ. In addition it was planned that these scales would provide a more adequate measure of parental attitudes towards the family, and towards control and discipline as they relate to the New Zealand situation and to provide a modest supplement to the recently published New Zealand material on child rearing.<sup>16</sup>

Subjects were asked to respond to the PASQ by stating their level of agreement (Strongly or Mildly Agree) or disagreement (Mildly or Strongly Disagree) with each item. Scores for each item were calculated by converting the item responses into score weights of 4 (Strongly Agree) 3 (Mildly Agree), 2 (Mildly Disagree) or 1 (Strongly Disagree).

During the testing programme it was discovered that two of the 130 items were duplicated, in one case in an incorrect scale. These two items were disregarded in all consequent calculations so that the PASQ consisted of 128 items not the 130 originally planned.

#### 4. Design and Data Collection.

To reduce the possibility of collusion between husband and wife and to standardise the procedures as much as possible, it was planned to have subjects respond to the questionnaires in the presence of the

investigator. This was also considered necessary in view of the findings of Bell, Hartup and Crewell<sup>17</sup> that indicated that when the PARI was administered by mail, more socially desirable responses were given than when the PARI was administered in groups under direct supervision. Data collection was carried out by prior arrangement at evening meetings at Palmerston North Teachers College or the local Play Centre, or in the subject's own home during a four week period in November-December 1969. The testing session was to be completed in a little over one hour although it was found that home visits often took much longer because of the more informal nature of the situation.

During the data collecting sessions the following procedures were adopted.

- i. Introduction. Self introduction: brief outline of the purpose of the study and the procedures to be followed.
- ii. P.A.S.Q. - Form A: This administration was designed to assess parental attitudes. (Administration see Appendix 2).
- iii. Information Sheets: (Appendix 3) These were available for subjects to complete as they finished the PASQ Form A. When all had handed in the PASQ the Family Relations Questionnaire was introduced.
- iv. Family Relations Questionnaire (F.R.Q.) This had been designed to gather information relating to parallel and interactional family patterns. It had been planned in the initial stages of the survey to relate parental attitudes to family patterns but this was abandoned because of the small size of the test samples.

The data were collected and will be used in a later analysis.

The F.R.Q. was administered at this stage as a distractor or an interference to inhibit subjects remembering responses<sup>18</sup> to the PASQ Form A. PASQ Form B was administered after completion of the F.R.Q. (Appendix 4)

v. PASQ Form B. At this stage another copy of the PASQ (labelled Form B) was handed to subjects. This had not been indicated previously in the testing session and subjects were asked to respond to this same questionnaire but "as you think the Play Centre would want you to respond." This procedure had been adopted by Brodbeck, Nogee and Di Mascio<sup>19</sup> in a study of parental discipline when they asked mothers to respond to a questionnaire in terms of what they actually did, then in terms of what they thought they should do (and finally in terms of what they thought their neighbours usually did).

It was considered that the unexpected nature of this request and the distraction of the F.R.Q. between administrations would inhibit subjects remembering their responses on Form A of the PASQ. Furthermore an administration in reversed sequence (Form B then Form A) may have provided greater motivation for subjects to remember their responses to Form B so that they would be seen to differ from the Play Centre's position in their own responses on Form A.

It was not always possible to arrange for subjects to be available at the times suggested so in some cases it was necessary to have subjects complete the test battery in their own home in an unsupervised situation. The majority of the test groups (78.9% Beginners and 84.2% Finishers) responded to the test battery in a supervised situation. It was considered that the responses of

the small number from the test groups who were unsupervised would not influence the grouped results significantly.

#### 5. Play Centre Attitudes.

As has been indicated the New Zealand Play Centre Federation has no definitively stated parental attitudes, however the literature of the Play Centre favours certain parental attitudes and behaviours.

It was considered that the most reliable measure of "Play Centre's parental attitudes" would be obtained by asking a number of Play Centre experts to respond to the PASQ as if they were expressing the generally accepted Play Centre position.

Precedent for this was established by Sir Cyril Burt.<sup>20</sup> In this study Burt was anxious to obtain the opinions of a wide sample of the population about desired reforms in education. He considered that the simplest way to do this was to sample the opinion of a few experts in the field for he considered that "the views of those having special knowledge or experience within a particular field (will) fluctuate less widely — and possess the further advantage of being more trustworthy on technical grounds."<sup>21</sup>

To this end a sample of eight experts who have been associated with the Play Centre or with providing education programmes for the Play Centre movement were selected. This sample included prominent past and present Dominion Executive members of the Play Centre Federation, and University Extension Department, Teachers College and University lecturers in Family Life, Child Development and Psychology. A copy of the PASQ was mailed to the selected members of this experts group with a letter (see Appendix 5) requesting them to respond as if they were

reflecting the generally accepted Play Centre attitudes. A 100% response was obtained.

#### 6. Analysis of Data.

The items of the PASQ were scored and weighted from 4 through 1 according to the rationale that had been previously established by Schaefer and Bell.<sup>22</sup> The five-item scales were calculated by summing the appropriate item scores. It had been planned to calculate mean and standard deviation scores of the 26 scales and to compare the scale scores as outlined below. However when the factor scales were computed the original 26 scales were discarded. Mean scores of the 10 factor-scales were compared as follows using the t-Test of significant difference.<sup>23</sup>

Beginners Form A - Finishers Form A

(Male and Female)

Beginners Form A - Beginners Form B

(Male and Female)

Finishers Form A - Finishers Form B

(Male and Female)

Beginners Form A - Experts

(Male and Female)

Finishers Form B - Experts

(Male and Female)

Mothers Form A - Fathers Form A

(Beginners and Finishers)

Beginners Form B - Experts

(Male and Female)

Finishers Form B - Experts

(Male and Female)

Beginners Form B - Finishers Form B

(Male and Female)

Mothers Form B - Fathers Form B

(Beginners and Finishers)

This would allow a detailed breakdown of the anticipated differences between groups.

In using the t-Test, "Assumption of Normality" has traditionally been emphasised, that is, it must be assumed that the samples studied have been drawn from populations that are normally distributed. This assumption cannot be made of the sample in this study. Another important assumption has been that of "homogeneity of Variance" - that is, that the variances within the groups are statistically the same; again this assumption cannot be made in this study.

More recently these two assumptions have been examined thoroughly by empirical methods.<sup>24</sup> Boneau violated a number of the assumptions underlying the use of the t-Test and found that these variations produced a minimal effect on the distribution of t ratio scores. He concludes,

"For a large number of different situations confronting the researcher, the use of the ordinary t-Test and its associated tables will result in probability statements which are accurate to a high degree, even though the assumptions of homogeneity of variance and normality of the underlying distributions are untenable."<sup>25</sup>

The t-Test of significant difference can thus be used with some confidence in this analysis.

#### 7. Factor Analysis.

It became apparent when scoring the PASQ scales and in trial t-Test calculations that the 5-item sub scales did not discriminate sufficiently and also that conceptually some of the sub scales were not viable factors in their own right. A methodological problem became apparent too in that data obtained were nominal rather than ordinal and that a stronger statistical basis was required for the composition of the scales before valid comparisons could be made. A phenomenological approach (i.e. having the items ranked and weighted by independent judges) was considered but rejected in favour of a factor analytic approach.

It must be stressed that this factor analysis was not planned for in the original study but arose only after the data had been collected and preliminary analysis of the data had begun. It was decided to abandon the sub scale groupings altogether, to correlate the scores on individual items, factor analyse this correlational matrix and treat any resultant factors as the new attitude scales.

Previous factor analyses of the PARI in its original form have been reported by Schaefer and Bell; Zuckerman, Ribback, Monashkin and Norton; and by Schaefer.<sup>26</sup> Schaefer and Bell<sup>27</sup> with a sample of 100 unmarried student nurses obtained five oblique factors named as "suppression and interpersonal distances", "hostile rejection of the homemaking role", "excessive demand for striving", "overpossessiveness"

and "harsh punitive control". The correlations were not reported. The factor analysis reported by Schaefer<sup>28</sup> indicated the presence of three factors. The sample of 100 wives was drawn from a relatively homogeneous group whereas that reported by Zuckerman et. al.<sup>29</sup> was based on a more heterogeneous sample of 413 mothers including some attending child guidance and childrens psychiatric clinics. In this latter report, three factors were also indicated. The three factors indicated in both studies were almost identical in the inclusion of PARI scales and were labelled by Schaefer "approval of maternal control of the child", and "approval of maternal expression of hostility" while the third included the three rapport scales. Zuckerman et. al. named their factors "authoritarian-control", "hostility rejection" and "democratic attitudes".

Most of the 23 scales in Form IV of the PARI had appreciable loadings on the authoritarian-control factor. Scales labelled rejection of the homemaking role, irritability and marital conflict were the main scales loading on hostility rejection while encouraging verbalisation, equalitarianism and comradeship and sharing loaded on democratic attitudes.

An additional factor analysis has been reported of an adaption of the PARI for fathers by Nichols<sup>30</sup>. Nichol's analysis of a revised form of 25 scales revealed a five factor structure. Three of these which focussed on authoritarian control, marital conflict and democratic attitudes were very similar to the three factors reported above for mothers. In addition Nichols obtained two more specific factors relating to punishment and firm discipline which in some cases shared scales with other factors.

Factor analysis research of the PARI has been reported on the basis of five factors for fathers and for five and three factors

for mothers. Only one factor analysis was conducted on responses by an heterogeneous sample but to date no factor analysis of the PARI has been reported outside of the United States or for a mixed sex heterogeneous sample.

i. Sample for Factor Analysis.

This sample comprised the 133 subjects for whom responses to the PASQ Form A were available. Subjects included <sup>the test group,</sup> the 19 husband-wife Finisher couples and two husband-wife Beginner couples that had been excluded from the test group because of the non- "First child attender" criterion (32 subjects) and 25 single responders comprising nine Beginners (eight wives and one husband) and sixteen Finishers (thirteen wives and three husbands). In all the sample comprised 133 subjects, 75 females and 58 males.

The sample was broader, in its range of background experiences and demographic features, than the test groups discussed above. Mean age for husbands was 32.66 years, and S.D. 6.6 years (almost the same as the mean age of husbands in the Finisher group i.e. 32.45, S.D. 6.05) and for wives 32.0 years, S.D. 4.45 years (almost two years older than the mean age of wives in the Finisher group.) Ages ranged from 22 to 50 years. The mean number of years married was 9.04 years (S.D. 4.38 years); longer than the test groups studied, while the average number of children was 3.0 (S.D. = 1.36) per family.

Parents education level is set out in Table 7 for comparison with Table 2. Education level ranges from Standard 6 in Primary to Ph.D. with a higher proportion of men than woman having completed Tertiary level.

TABLE 7

Education Level of Factor AnalysisSample by Number and Percentage

Education Level (See Table )	Male		Female		Total	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
Tertiary	18	32.5	6	8.0	24	18.3
Senior Secondary	16	28.9	42	56.0	58	44.3
Junior Secondary	20	36.0	26	34.7	46	35.1
Primary	2	3.6	1	1.3	3	2.3
TOTAL	56	100.0	75	100.0	131	100.0

Almost equal number of men were included at each of the three levels (excluding Primary) while over half of the women had reached senior secondary level. At almost all levels this sample fell part way between the attainment of the Beginners and the Finishers test groups.

Occupation levels of this sample is shown in Table 8.

TABLE 8

Occupation Level of Factor Analysis SampleBy Number and Percentage

Occupation Level (Congalton- Havighurst)	Male		Female		Total	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
1. Senior Professional and large business	1	1.7	-	-	1	0.8
2. Professional, business and senior managerial	13	22.4	3	4.0	16	12.0
3. Minor Professional & small business	5	8.6	6	8.0	11	8.2
4. Semi Professional Smaller business & Clerical	13	22.4	22	29.3	35	26.2
5. Skilled manual	9	15.5	22	29.3	31	23.2
6. Semi-skilled	15	25.9	18	24.0	33	25.0
7. Unskilled & Labouring	2	3.5	4	5.4	6	4.6
TOTAL	58	100.0	75	100.0	133	100.0

Over 50% of the total sample had listed occupations in categories 5, 6 or 7 (Male 44.9%, Female 58.7%) which is a higher proportion than for the test groups combined (Male 32.6%, Female 47.8%). It cannot be claimed then that the test groups are representative of the factor-analysis sample or vice versa. The test group sample would appear to be more selective than the factor analysis sample but

because of lack of adequate data no comment can be made on the relation of the factor analysis sample to the total Play Centre population.

A comparison of the occupation levels of males from the factor Analysis group with the national distribution of male occupation levels is not reported here because of the unequal sex distribution in the group and because many of the subjects included in the group were not related maritally (unlike the test groups where only married couples were considered and thus there existed a more valid basis for comparing male occupation levels as an index of socio economic status).

As a result of the consequent findings of the study that there was little significant difference between parental attitudes of males and females, it was decided to include at this point a comparison of the occupation levels of the total factor analysis sample with the national distribution of male occupation levels. (Table 9)

TABLE 9.

Occupation Levels of the Total Factor Analysis  
Group and National Distribution (Male) By Percentage

Occupation Level	National <sup>2.</sup> (Male) %	Factor Analysis (Total) %
1. Professional (1, 2) <sup>1.</sup>	8.7	12.8
2. Clerical/Farming (3, 4)	43.8	34.4
3. Manual (5, 6, 7)	47.5	52.8
TOTAL	100.0	100.0

Notes 1. Numbers refer to Congalton-Leighurst Scale (p.43).

2. After Vellekoop (1969 p.17) See also above p.44.

On this rather tentative basis of comparison it can be seen that the factor analysis sample is approaching representative status but contains a higher proportion of both professional and manual occupations than Vellekoop's figures indicate. It would be safer to conclude therefore that any generalisation to the National population on the basis of any results obtained should be rather tentative. However the study is concerned with the attitudes of a selective group within the national population, but even here as has already been indicated, it cannot be claimed that either the test

group or the factor analysis group is entirely representative of the Play Centre population.

ii. Factor Analysis Procedures.

The PASQ Form A responses were scored and weighted on an individual item basis (see p. 52) punched on to data cards and inter-correlated on the IBM 7044 computer at Melbourne University. The highest value of the correlations in each row of the matrix was used as the communality estimate. The 128 item correlational matrix is presented in Appendix 6. The matrix was factored using the principal components solution for 20 principal components (see Appendix 7) which accounted for 65.6% of total variance. These 20 unrotated factors had eigen values of 1.2 or greater. Additional principal components would have each added only small amounts to the total of explained variance. The unrotated factors were then rotated to normalised Varimax structure for 10 factors. These 10 factors had eigen values of 2.1 or greater and accounted for 50.6% of total explained variance.

A factor loading of  $\pm .33$  was taken as being significant and an examination on this basis accounted for 109 of the 128 items. Where items were loaded on two or more factors they were usually assigned on the basis of highest loading. Though in some few cases items were assigned to lower loaded factors where better conceptual sense was evident.

Nineteen of the items could not be assigned on this basis. Because of their relatively high eigen values (greater than 1.5) and because a number of these unaccounted items were loaded significantly on four of the unrotated factors, another rotation of the 20 principal components was performed, this time for 14 factors. However it was

more difficult to present a consistent conceptual basis for these fourteen factors (which at  $\pm .33$  factor loading still did not account for all 128 items) and which accounted for only another 7.1% of variance so this solution was not considered in favour of the ten factor rotation.

The 19 of the 128 items that were not included at the  $\pm .33$  loading were examined and placed in factors according to their highest factor loadings (which in no case fell below  $\pm .25$ ). The rotated solution is presented in Appendix 8. The ten factors, which will now be considered as the attitude scales for the PASQ, are set out with mean item scores and factor loadings in Appendices 9 - 18.

Internal consistency reliability coefficients (Kuder-Richardson) of these factor scales were calculated and are set out in Table 10. The formula used was Guilford's "Shorter Approximation to the K - R reliability coefficient"<sup>31</sup>

$$r_{tt} = \frac{n\sigma_k^2 - N(n-1)}{(n-1)\sigma_t^2}$$

where  $r_{tt}$  = Reliability Coefficient  
 $n$  = number of items in scale  
 $N$  = mean of total scores  
 $\sigma_t^2$  = total test variance

In calculating the formula  $n$  was multiplied by 4 because of the 4 - 1 weighting of responses.

TABLE 10.  
Reliability Coefficients of the Ten Rotated  
Factor-Scales

Factor	K-R Reliability Coefficient
A Authoritarian Attitudes	.86
B Realities of Parenthood	.76
C Maternal Ascendency	.79
D Restrictive Attitudes	.76
E Discouraging Independence	.72
F Inadequacy of Verbal Communication	.54
G Irritability	.51
H Equalitarianism	.50
I Dissatisfaction with Housewives Role	.63
J Respect for Individuality	.52

The reliability coefficients were not high, none reaching an acceptable level but Scales A to E seem moderately reliable. It should not be expected that Scales F - J would measure attitudes with any reliability.

### iii. Second Order Factor Analysis

The correlational matrix of the ten factors (Table 11) revealed certain relationships between factors.

TABLE 11.

Correlation Matrix : Ten Rotated PASQ Factor-Scales

Scale	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	Eigen	
A	.45	.24	.28	.51	.57	.21	.31	-.17	.28	-.31	2.52	
B		.30	-.05	-.02	.28	.09	.24	.28	.31	.08	.97	
C			.33	.37	.23	.32	.36	-.23	.24	-.34	.44	
D				.47	.47	.23	.26	-.30	.22	-.47	-.28	
E					.42	.13	.30	-.07	.14	-.26	-.23	
F						.21	.23	.08	.20	.05	-.18	
G							.25	-.05	.28	-.21	.16	
H								.23	.02	.33	-.15	
I									.22	-.11	-.05	
J										.33	.01	
											Sum Eigen Values	3.25
											Sum $H^2$	3.21

Note 1. Diagonal has been replaced by squared multiple correlational communalities.

2. Eigen Values reported in final column.

A positive relationship was noted between factors A, C, D, E and I: a positive relationship between H and J, a negative relationship between H and C, H and D and between J and each of A, C, D, and E. These relationships had been anticipated in view of previous factor analyses (see discussion above p. 59) so it was decided to perform a second order factor analysis to determine whether a basic underlying factor existed.

The established intercorrelations suggested that five or six factors may be present (i.e. (i) A, C, D, E, I; (ii) B; (iii) H and J, (iv) F, (v) G ) so a Principal Axis analysis to select six factors was performed on the 10-factor correlational matrix using squared multiple correlation communalities. The unrotated factors are presented in Table 12.

TABLE 12.

Second Order Analysis : Unrotated Solution

Scale	Factor						$H^2$
	1	2	3	4	5	6	
A	.70	.10	.20	-.10	-.04	-.25	.50
B	.21	.58	.13	-.17	.28	.09	.38
C	.54	-.14	-.34	-.23	-.05	.10	.32
D	.70	-.22	.06	-.20	-.03	.07	.54
E	.62	.14	.30	.20	-.10	.19	.41
F	.32	.20	-.34	.21	.21	-.04	.14
G	.50	.18	-.16	.02	-.08	-.10	.28
H	-.26	.50	-.01	-.06	-.19	-.14	.32
I	.38	.28	-.16	.17	-.17	.09	.22
J	-.50	.36	-.08	-.17	-.13	.14	.38
Sum $H^2$							3.49

Rotation to normal Varimax structure was performed for two factors (on the basis of factors for eigen values higher than .97). The two factor solution is presented in Table 13.

TABLE 13.

Second Order Analysis : Rotated Solution

Scale	Factors	
	I	II
A	.60	-.58
B	.54	.31
C	.32	-.46
D	.39	-.62
E	.56	-.30
F	.38	-.05
G	.49	-.19
H	.13	.55
I	.47	-.04
J	-.14	.60
Percentage Variance	Factor I = 18.63%	
	Factor II = 16.25%	
Total Variance	= 34.88%	

Footnotes: Chapter 4

<sup>1</sup>Somerset, I Play and I Grow, p.4.

<sup>2</sup>Gilson, "The Changing New Zealand Family", p.48.

<sup>3</sup>Gilson, *ibid*, p.49.

<sup>4</sup>Athol Congalton and Robert J. Havighurst. "Status Ranking of Occupations in New Zealand", Australian Journal of Psychology, 6(1954), p.10-15.

<sup>5</sup>Coro Vellekoop. "Streaming and Social Class", Delta 5. (Palmerston North, Massey Education Society, 1969) p.17.

<sup>6</sup>Carl S. Schaefer and Richard Q. Bell. "Development of a Parent Attitude Research Instrument", Child Development, 29 (1958), pp.339-361.

and

—————"Patterns of Attitudes Toward Child Rearing and the Family", Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology 54(1957), pp.391-395.

<sup>7</sup>Carl S. Schaefer and Betty R. Burgeon. "Reference on the Parental Attitude Research Instrument, 1957-1965," (National Institute of Mental Health, 1966, Mimeographed).

<sup>8</sup>Wesley C. Becker and Ronald S. Krug. "The Parent Attitude Research Instrument - A Research Review", Child Development, 36 (1965), pp.329-365.

<sup>9</sup>Marvin Zuckerman. "Reversed Scales to Control Acquiescence Response Set in the Parental Attitude Research Instrument", Child Development 3(1959), pp.523-532.

\_\_\_\_\_, Beatrice H. Barrett and Raymond Bragiel. "The Parental Attitudes of Parents of Child Guidance Cases: I Comparisons of Normals, Investigations of Socioeconomic and Family Constellation Factors and Relations of Parents Reactions to the Clinics," Child Development, 31 (1960) pp.401-417

\_\_\_\_\_ and James Norton. "Response Set Content Factors in the Californian F-Scale and the PARI", Journal of Social Psychology, 53 (1961) pp.199-210.

\_\_\_\_\_ James Norton and D. S. Sprague. "Acquiescence and Extreme Sets and Their Role in Tests of Authoritarianism", Psychiatric Research Reports, 10 (1958) pp.28-45.

\_\_\_\_\_ and Mary Oltean. "Some Relationships between Paternal Attitude Factors and Authoritarianism, Personality Needs, Psychotherapy and Self-Acceptance", Child Development 30 (1959) pp.27-36.

\_\_\_\_\_ Mary Oltean and Irwin Menashkin "The Parental Attitudes of Mothers of Schizophrenics", Journal of Consulting Psychology, 22 (1958) pp.307-310.

\_\_\_\_\_ Beatrice Barrett Ribback, Irwin Menashkin and James A. Norton Jr. "Normative Data and Factor Analysis on the Parental Attitude Research Instrument," Journal of Consulting Psychology 22, 3(1958), pp.165-171.

<sup>10</sup>•Becker and Krug, *ibid.*

<sup>11</sup>•Zuckerman and Norton, *ibid*; Zuckerman, Norton and Sprague, *ibid.*

<sup>12</sup>•Robert C. Nichols. "A Factor Analysis of Parent Attitudes of Fathers", Child Development, 33 (1962) pp. 791-802.

13. Becker and Krug, op.cit. pp.336-337.

14. Becker and Krug, op.cit.

15. Frank Castin. "Measuring Attitudinal Outcomes of Child Psychology with the Parental Attitude Research Instrument", Journal of Educational Research, 53 (1960), pp.289-294.

\_\_\_\_\_ "Attitudinal Outcomes of Child Psychology Courses Having Difference Orientations" Journal of Psychology 51 (1961) pp.113-119.

D. E. Freedheim and Wally Reichenberg-Hackett "An Experimental Investigation of Parent-Child Attitudes with the PARI Scales", Child Development, 30(1959), pp.353-361.

16. Stewart Houston (ed). Marriage and the Family in New Zealand (Wellington, Sweet and Maxwell, 1970).

James E. Ritchie and Jane Ritchie. Child Rearing Patterns in New Zealand (Wellington Reeds, 1970).

17. Richard Q Bell, W. W. Hartup and D. H. Crowell. "Mailed Versus Supervised Administration of a Projective Questionnaire", Journal of Consulting Psychology, 26 (1962), p290.

18. John P. DeCece. The Psychology of Learning and Instruction; Educational Psychology (Englewood Cliffs, N.J. Prentice-Hall Inc. 1968) pp.351-356.

19. Arthur J. Brodbeck, Philip Nogee and Arthur Di Mascio. "Two Types of Conformity: A Study of the Rieszman Typology Applied to Standards of Parental Discipline", Journal of Psychology, 41(1956), pp.23-45.

<sup>20</sup>•Sir Cyril Burt: "An Enquiry into Public Opinion Regarding Educational Reform," Occupational Psychology XVII, 1(4, 1943), pp. 157-167.

<sup>21</sup>•Burt, *ibid*, p.163 .

<sup>22</sup>•Schaefer and Bell (1958), *op.cit*.

<sup>23</sup>•George A. Ferguson. Statistical Analysis in Psychology and Education (New York, McGraw-Hill, 1966).

J. P. Guilford. Fundamental Statistics in Psychology and Education (New York, McGraw-Hill, 1956).

Fred N. Kerlinger. Foundations of Behavioural Research (New York, Holt Rinehart and Winston, 1970).

<sup>24</sup>•C. Boneau. "The Effects of Violations of Assumptions Underlying the t-test", Psychological Bulletin, LVII (1960), pp.49-64.

—————"A Note on Measurement Scales and Statistical Tests" American Psychologist, XVI (1961), pp.260-261.

<sup>25</sup>•Boneau (1960), *ibid*, p.62.

<sup>26</sup>•Schaefer and Bell (1957)*op.cit*.

Zuckerman et al (1958) *op.cit*.

Earl. S. Schaefer. "Converging Conceptual Models For Maternal Behaviour and For Child Behaviour" in J. C. Glidewell (ed.) Parental Attitudes and Child Behaviour (Springfield, Ill: Thomas, 1961).

<sup>27</sup>•Schaefer and Bell, *ibid*.

<sup>28</sup>•Schaefer, *ibid*.

<sup>29</sup>•Zuckerman et.al.*ibid*.

<sup>30</sup>•Nichols, *op.cit*.

<sup>31</sup>•Guilford, *op.cit*. p.455

## Chapter 5. Presentation of Results

The results of the ten rotation factor analysis are presented followed by the results of the group comparisons for these factor scales.

### 1. a. Factor Analysis Results.

Factor A consists of 25 items (Appendix 9.) relating to strict discipline (items 8, 34, 84, 110), physical punishment (items 26, 52, 77 and 128), domination (items 32, 56, 72, 81, 96, 98, 108) and loyalty and obedience of children to parents (items 11, 23, 37, 49, 86, 87, 99, 112, 113, 125). The factor appears to measure the extent to which parents believe in dominating their children, in imposing strict standards and expecting loyalty, esteem and unquestioning obedience and was labelled Authoritarian Attitudes. The factor includes four items from each of the five-item PASQ scales (scale numbers in parenthesis) Parental Ascendancy (23) and Harsh Discipline (26) which were written for this study and Strictness (8) and Deification (11) from the original PARI. The other items include two each from the scales Breaking the Will (4), Restricting Aggressive Behaviour (6), Excluding Outside Influences (10), Intrusiveness (20) and one from scale 22, Acceleration of Development. All of the latter are original PARI items apart from the two from Scale 6.

In the Zuckerman et.al.<sup>1</sup> factor analysis of the PARI scales 4, 8, 10, 11 and 20 were included in their factor A (Authoritarian-Control).

Factor B (Appendix 10.) has been labelled Realities of Parenthood because it contains items which recognise the value of warm parent-child and interpersonal relationships (21, 66, 73, 90)

but at the same time acknowledge the conflict that may arise because of this closeness (59,61). Also included in this factor are items relating to fighting (58, 64), strict training (60, 74), the inconveniences of parenthood (68, 85, 89) and need for the mother to take the lead in planning and organising round the home (57, 69, 71). The factor also contains two items concerned with the rejection of strict training (22 and 106). It is felt that moderate or even strong agreement with the attitudes expressed in these items is an expression of what may be termed "realistic" attitudes for many homes. Raising children does tie a mother down somewhat and it can be a nerve wracking job bringing up children. Parents can express more enlightened attitudes at the same time as they agree with items which tend to be more authoritarian or restrictive. A closer examination of these latter items however reveals that they are related to less anxiety-promoting aspects of parenthood. This supposition is supported by the lack of any significant difference on scores for this scale between test samples and the experts group who were expressing the usually more permissive Play Centre attitude.

Factor C (Appendix 11) has both negatively and positively loaded factor items from the PARI scale Ascendancy of the Mother, (scale 19) from two scales written for this study Marital Role (scale 5) and Rejection of Family Life - Men (scale 25) and three items from other scales. Two of the items which have a negative loading (78 and 97) indicate a rejection of children's role in the family situation and the three items (19, 95, 121) from scale 19 indicate an express desire for the mother to take the lead in family life. Items 51, 101, 127 are an expression of the loss of freedom felt by husbands in settling

down to family life especially as this may involve some loss of freedom of choice in relation to family life. Item 114 indicates some desire for children not to bother the mother while items 31 and 107 which have low positive loadings could indicate a begrudging deference to the will of the husband and the reluctant assignment to him of some tasks in family life. The negative loading on item 5 would seem to indicate that wives do not want their husbands to have too much to do with the new baby; mothers know what is best for baby - fathers shouldn't interfere. It could be argued however that the negative loading indicates a realisation that fathers do all they can for the new baby in this field and that the moderately high, i.e. Agree, score indicates this realisation. Even if this is so it may well be that fathers are doing as much as they are allowed to do.

Taking these aspects into consideration then this Factor scale (C) was named Maternal Ascendancy implying a fairly active effort on the part of the mother to ensure that in the home her word was final and that her wishes should be carried out.

Factor D (Appendix 12) is related to restrictive attitudes towards sexuality and verbal interaction. All but two of the items load negatively on this factor, however all loadings will be reversed so that we can discuss this factor scale in similar manner as the others, i.e. at the pathogenic end of the continuum. The strongest and most consistent loadings on this factor are on the complete scales Restricting Undressed Display (scale 3) and Suppression of Sexuality (scale 18), the former which was written for this study, in all ten items which include some of the highest factor loadings of the study (80 =  $-.72$ , 44 =  $-.67$ , 29 =  $-.61$ , 3 =  $-.59$ ).

The second group of items in this factor relate to restrictive attitudes towards verbal communication between parents and their children (16, 24, 27, 47, 100, 118, 126) and between parents themselves (15, 41, 67) and to the imposition of the parents point of view (4, 30, 124).

The inclusion of all PASQ items relating to attitudes towards sexual behaviour in children is a comment on the consistency of parental attitudes in this area. However the fact that these are linked in the same factor with attitudes that relate to other areas of family life indicates that there is an underlying attitude of restrictiveness per se, one that would show up across a broader spectrum of parental attitudes rather than in isolated behavioural areas. The factor was thus labelled Restrictive Attitudes.

It should be noted that all 5 items of scale 3, the three items from scale 15 and the three items from scale 24 were all written for this study.

Factor 5 (Appendix 13) comprises fourteen items relating primarily to the degree of extra-familial influences on children that parents will tolerate. Four of the items are from scale 2 Fostering Dependency relating to the shielding of children from difficult unfamiliar situations, three from scale 20 Intrusiveness, parents knowing what the child is thinking and two from scale 10, Excluding Outside Influences. These items are concerned with the efforts by parents to impose their point of view (above that of others) and of the child's dependence on his parents. Items 38 and 63 can also be explained on a similar conceptual basis. Items 45, 91 and 119 are a little more difficult to explain in that they relate to

husband-wife relations. However items 45 and 91 relate to a degree of maternal ascendancy while 119 appears to be a plea for fathers to join in and help out, or a reaction to the unremitting grind of closely supervising a child's actions. This factor has been labelled Discouraging Independence.

Items 45, 91 and 119 may also be seen to fit conceptually if this factor is seen as relating to dependence - independence. In each case a positive reply would indicate a reaction by the mother to actions of other family members independent of her control or influence.

Factor F (Appendix 14). Four of the seven items in this factor are from scale 7 Marital Conflict. An examination of these four along with the other three (42, 71 and 111) indicates that the underlying factor appears to be a reaction to the value of verbal communication. The items included would seem to indicate an attitude which could be expressed as, "it's no use talking out problems and conflicts, these things (bad behaviour, marital conflict, anger at children's behaviour) will happen anyway, no matter how much you try to avoid them". The factor was labelled Inadequacy of Verbal Communication.

Factor G, labelled Irritability (Appendix 15) contains six moderately loaded items which relate to attitudes indicating the inevitability of conflict occurring in the home. Items 9, 25, 50 and 76 fit readily into this category while items 54 and 92 are related to potential areas of irritability. They are almost a warning to parents to look to these areas so that conflict can be reduced. The

reverse of this factor could well be labelled "Maintaining Harmony" or "Avoiding Irritability".

Factor H (Appendix 16) labelled Equalitarianism consists of six items, three from scale 14 Equalitarianism expressing the attitude that children have rights and that these should be respected and notice taken of them. Item 1 from the scale Encouraging Verbalisation - fits well with these three as does item 10 which has a negative loading. Item 117 may seem out of place but is seen as an expression of equalitarianism between marriage partners - a logical extension of the concept of equalitarianism in parent-child relations.

It was expected that a greater number of items would load on this factor; at least 15 items in the PASQ are stated in a permissive, democratic direction. However these are distributed over five of the factors (B, C, D, H, J).

Factor I (Appendix 17) comprises eight items, seven of which are from PASQ scales 13 and 17 (four and three items respectively) with the eighth (item 35) from scale 9. All items express negative feelings about the role of being a housewife or mother (being stuck at home, stuck with children, husbands could be more thoughtful) scale 13 was named "Rejecting the Homemaking Role" after Schaefer and Bell's PARI scale name but it was felt that this is too strong a name for this factor scale. On consideration it appears to be an expression of dissatisfaction rather than rejection. It appears that parents are stating the reality of the situation - that this is so - that mothers are stuck at home but they just have to put up with it (at least until the kids grow up). The factor was thus labelled Dissatisfaction with the Housewives Role.

Factor J. (Appendix 18)

Four of the nine items of this scale are loaded in a positive direction, five in the negative. A consideration of the four positive items and a reversal of the negative items reveals a factor which expresses toleration and equality. Three of the reversed items (6, 12, 88) express toleration for children fighting, three of the positive items (53, 103, 123) express toleration for companionship and equalitarianism while others reject strong negative methods of training (102) and early training for walking (48). The ninth item (82) indicates that parents agree that fathers do spend as much time as they can with their children. The factor has thus been labelled Respect for Individuality. This respect is expressed in relation to the parents attitudes the child's individual progress in walking, his liability to transgress rules of "good behaviour" his rough-housing with others and his expression of his own ideas.

b. Second Order Factor Analysis.

While it was the results of the ten factor, factor analysis that were used as the basis for the measurement of parental attitudes, the results of the second order factor analysis are presented because they do indicate an underlying factor that relates to parental attitudes and attitudes towards children (Table 13).

Factor I is loaded significantly on all factor scales apart from H (0.13) and J (-0.14), while Factor II is loaded significantly on factor scales B (.31), H (.55) and J (.60), A (-.38), C (-.46), D (-.62) and E (-.30). Factor scales F, G, and I do not load significantly on Factor II.

It would appear that Factor I is an Authoritarian-Restrictiveness scale while Factor II is its reverse. Factor Scale B is shared ( $I = .54$ ,  $II = .31$ ) by both factors which is not unexpected in view of the inclusion of both authoritarian and permissive items in that scale (see below P.70). The loadings of factor-scales F, G and J while being significant and positive on Factor I are almost zero on Factor II. One possible interpretation is that these scales discriminate at the authoritarian end of the continuum only and that disagreement with the authoritarian attitudes expressed does not indicate a permissive outlook but rather one of neutrality. It is feasible that parents can avoid conflict and so lessen, but not remove entirely the chance of being irritable; that even if a couple do talk things over this will not eliminate all problems, that not being dissatisfied with the housewife's role does not make a woman satisfied with it. There appears to be in lay-terms a commonsense attitude that prevails and underlies many responses to items on the PASQ. This interpretation is supported by the t-Test analyses which show a lack of any significant difference between scores of different groups of parents and the Play Centre on these scales (see Tables 22-25).

Factor II (Democratic-Permissive Attitudes) has its highest loadings on scales D, H and J which express relatively permissive attitudes relating to sexuality and aggressive behaviour, to warmth and equality in personal relationships and to a high degree of verbal interaction. An anticipated significant polarity of loadings on Scale H and J (i.e. significant positive loading on Factor II and a significant negative loading on Factor I) was not shown by the second order factor analysis. This could indicate the presence

of an Acquiescence Response Set (see background discussion pp.49-50) but the fact that loadings on Factor I were nearer zero ( $H = .13$ ,  $J = -.14$ ) than significantly positive would indicate that the acquiescence in this study is much less of a problem than indicated by the Zuckerman<sup>2</sup> and Nichols<sup>3</sup> studies. Polarity was shown by this factor analysis for Factor Scales A, C, D and E and in view of the discussion could not be expected on Factor Scale B.

It would appear then that Factor Scales F, G, H, I and J for which no significant polarity was noted cannot be relied on to measure attitudes accurately, perhaps because they are susceptible to influence by an acquiescence response set. Another probable explanation for the inability of these Factor Scales to discriminate significantly is that they contain only a few (six to nine) items whereas Scales A, C, D and E, which do show polarity, contain from 12 to 25 items and would indicate a more reliable measure. This conclusion is supported by the Kuder-Richardson reliability coefficients for the scales (Table 10. p.(7)). Factor-Scales A to E rank from .86 to .72 (admittedly not highly reliable), then there was a drop to .63 for I, .54 for F, .52 for J, .51 for G and .50 for H at which point the low reliability coefficients call the discriminatory function of these scales (F to J) into doubt.

#### Summary

The second order factor analysis of the ten factor scale correlational matrix isolated two second order factors labelled **Authoritarian-Restrictive Attitudes and Democratic-Permissiveness.**

The former was loaded significantly on all but two (the permissive) factor-scales while the latter was loaded significantly on A, C, D, E, B, H and J. Factor-scale B was shared. Factors F, G and I did not show significant polarity in loading. The presence of an acquiescence response set was intimated and the discrimination reliability of factor scales B, H, J, F, G and I was called into doubt.

## 2. T-Test Comparisons of Factor-Scale Scores

The results of the t-tests of significant difference are presented as they relate to the hypotheses stated in Chapter 3.

For the initial hypothesis to be upheld there would need to be a significant difference (with Finishers scoring lower i.e. nearer to actual Play Centre attitudes, than Beginners on all scales except H and J where weighting was in the reversed direction) between scores of Beginners and Finishers on Form B of the PASQ. Form B asked parents to respond "as though the Play Centre would want you to" which would indicate parents perception of Play Centre attitudes. These scores are presented in Tables 14 for Mothers and 15 for Fathers. Although slight differences between mean scores on a number of scales were evident for both Mothers and Fathers, no significant differences in either direction were noted between the mean scores of Beginners and the mean scores of Finishers on these scales. In terms of this survey there was no apparent difference between parents who were new to Play Centre and those who had been associated with Play Centre for some time, in their understanding of Play Centre's parental attitudes.

The second hypothesis, designed to examine the effect of association with the Play Centre movement on parental attitudes would be upheld if a significant difference was noted between PASQ form A scores of Beginners on all scales except H and J where the weighting was in the reversed direction. These are presented in Tables 16 for mothers and 17 for fathers. Only very small differences were evident between mean scores on some scales and in no case do these differences approach significance in either direction at even the 0.10 level. There was no evidence then from the data to support the second hypothesis.

TABLE 14.

Perceived Play Centre Parental Attitudes of Mothers  
Of Beginners and Mothers of Finishers

Attitude Scale	Beginners M/SD	Finishers M/SD	Differences in Means ±	t (df = 31)	Sig.
A	M 52.63 SD 13.90	54.36 7.70	+ 1.73	0.38	N.S.
D	M 33.25 SD 6.27	34.71 7.17	+ 1.46	0.49	N.S.
E	M 34.51 SD 9.33	32.23 8.90	- 2.28	0.64	N.S.
C	M 26.50 SD 4.10	26.41 4.13	- 0.09	0.04	N.S.
I	M 22.38 SD 4.49	22.00 5.04	- 0.38	0.19	N.S.
H	M 19.13 SD 2.32	19.17 2.28	+ 0.04	0.04	N.S.
J	M 29.63 SD 3.37	29.64 3.05	+ 0.01	0.01	N.S.
B	M 49.94 SD 5.14	48.12 4.08	- 1.82	0.84	N.S.
F	M 17.69 SD 4.49	17.29 2.42	- 0.40	0.26	N.S.
G	M 13.75 SD 3.89	12.82 3.64	- 0.93	0.58	N.S.

N.S. = No Significant Difference.      t for df = 31 (two tailed)

± Signs indicate direction (higher/lower) of second measure in relation to the first.

TABLE 15

Perceived Play Centre Parental Attitudes of Fathers of  
Beginners and Fathers of Finishers

Attitude Scale	Beginners M/SD	Finishers M/SD	Differences in Means *	t (df = 26)	Sig.
A	M 55.75 SD 13.75	63.25 14.16	+ 8.50	1.62	N.S. (0.20)
D	M 36.07 SD 9.52	36.50 7.43	+ 0.43	0.11	N.S.
E	M 34.18 SD 8.74	37.00 6.00	+ 2.82	0.81	N.S.
C	M 25.38 SD 5.19	26.50 4.14	+ 1.12	0.49	N.S.
I	M 22.00 SD 4.62	23.75 4.65	+ 1.75	0.71	N.S.
H	M 18.63 SD 2.89	18.42 2.59	- 0.21	0.17	N.S.
J	M 28.13 SD 3.51	27.67 1.97	- 0.46	0.23	N.S.
B	M 47.88 SD 5.20	49.75 3.81	+ 1.87	0.96	N.S.
F	M 16.56 SD 3.85	17.75 3.95	+ 1.19	0.73	N.S.
G	M 13.00 SD 2.70	13.75 3.69	+ 0.75	0.47	N.S.

N.S. = No Significant Difference. t for df = 26 (two tailed)

\* Signs indicate direction (higher/lower) of second measure in relation to the first.

TABLE 16.  
Parental Attitudes of Mothers of "Beginners"  
and Mothers of "Finishers"

Attitude Scale	Beginners M/SD	Finishers M/SD	Differences in Means*	t df = 36	Sig.
A	M 56.21 SD 14.90	55.69 12.25	- 0.52	0.01	N.S.
D	M 34.63 SD 5.32	31.50 5.52	- 3.13	1.44	N.S. (0.20)
E	M 29.57 SD 7.04	28.11 7.44	- 1.46	0.54	N.S.
C.	M 25.00 SD 4.24	26.58 4.88	+ 1.58	0.88	N.S.
I	M 18.53 SD 4.39	19.00 4.65	+ 0.47	0.28	N.S.
H	M 19.53 SD 1.73	18.95 1.67	- 0.58	0.63	N.S.
J	M 30.17 SD 2.34	30.05 2.86	- 0.12	0.10	N.S.
B	M 49.16 SD 5.11	48.84 5.19	- 0.38	0.18	N.S.
F	M 19.16 SD 3.70	19.16 2.99	-	-	N.S.
G	M 14.11 SD 3.75	13.95 3.37	- 0.16	0.11	N.S.

N.S. = No significant difference      t for df = 36 (two tailed)

\* Signs indicate direction (higher/lower) of second measure in relation to the first.

TABLE 17.

Parental Attitudes of Fathers of "Beginners" and  
Fathers of "Finishers"

Attitude Scale	"Beginners" M/SD	"Finishers" M/SD	Differences in Means *	t df = 36	Sig.
A	M 61.74 SD 12.70	62.00 12.45	+ 0.26	.06	N.S.
D	M 36.36 SD 7.88	37.31 9.96	+ 0.95	.30	N.S.
E	M 29.42 SD 5.94	30.86 6.56	+ 1.44	.60	N.S.
C	M 26.26 SD 6.76	26.11 5.07	- 0.15	.07	N.S.
I	M 21.22 SD 3.05	22.47 3.30	+ 1.25	.69	N.S.
H	M 17.42 SD 2.44	18.63 2.03	+ 1.21	1.11	N.S.
J	M 28.44 SD 4.59	28.37 5.25	- 0.07	0.0	N.S.
B	M 49.21 SD 4.59	49.47 5.25	+ 0.26	0.14	N.S.
F	M 17.58 SD 3.81	18.05 3.64	+ 0.47	0.30	N.S.
G	M 14.11 SD 2.93	14.58 3.81	+ 0.47	0.30	N.S.

N.S. = No Significant Difference. t for df 36, (two tailed)

\* Signs indicate direction (higher/lower) of second measure in relation to the first.

The expectation of a difference between parents' admitted attitudes and their understanding of Play Centre attitudes was proposed in hypothesis three. It was expected that significant differences would exist between PASQ Form A and PASQ Form B scores for mothers and fathers in both test groups. The relevant data is shown in Tables 18 - 21.

In the Beginners group mean scores for mothers in Form B (see Table 18) did not differ significantly from mean scores on Form A apart from scores on Scale I (Dissatisfaction with Housewife's Role). In this case Form A score was significantly (0.05 level) lower than Form B scores indicating that mothers attitudes were less restrictive than those they thought were held by the Play Centre on this scale. Mean score difference was relatively high also on Scale E but was significant at only the 0.20 level. Although this level was not acceptable some measure of difference seemed to be indicated. Table 19 contains the data for fathers in the Beginner group. No significant differences between scores on Form A and Form B were noted although differences between scores on Scale A (0.20) and Scale E (0.10) respectively were obtained.

The scores of mothers of Finishers (Table 20) likewise indicated that their perception of Play Centre's attitudes differed little from their own admitted attitudes. No significant differences were evident though, but in some cases (Scales E, I and F) the differences approached significance (.10, .10 and .20 respectively). The scores for fathers in the Finishers group (Table 21) again did not indicate significant differences between responses on the two forms apart from Scale E (.05) when Form B scores were higher than Form A scores.

TABLE 18.  
Parental and Perceived-Play Centre Attitudes  
Of Mothers of Beginners

Attitude Scales	Parental M/SD	Perceived P.C. M/SD	Differences in Means ±	t df = 33	Sig.
A	M 56.21 SD 14.90	52.63 13.90	- 3.58	0.43	N.S.
D	M 34.63 SD 5.38	33.25 6.27	- 1.38	0.55	N.S.
E	M 29.57 SD 7.04	34.51 9.33	+ 4.94	1.60	N.S.
C	M 25.00 SD 4.24	26.50 4.10	+ 1.50	0.82	N.S.
I	M 18.53 SD 4.39	22.38 4.49	+ 3.85	2.15	0.05
H	M 19.53 SD 1.73	19.13 2.32	- 0.40	0.37	N.S.
J	M 30.17 SD 2.34	29.63 3.37	- 0.54	0.43	N.S.
B	M 49.16 SD 5.11	49.94 5.14	+ 0.78	0.33	N.S.
F	M 19.16 SD 3.70	17.69 4.49	- 1.47	0.92	N.S.
G	M 14.11 SD 3.78	13.75 3.89	- 0.36	0.23	N.S.

N.S. = No Significant Difference      t for df = 33 (two tailed)

± Signs indicate direction (Higher/lower) of second measure in relation to the first.

TABLE 19.

Parental and Perceived-Play Centre Attitudes  
Of Fathers of "Beginners"

Attitude Scales	Parental M/SD	Perceived P.C. M/SD	Differences in Means ±	t df = 33	Sig
A	M 61.74 SD 12.70	55.75 13.75	- 5.99	1.31	N.S. (0.20)
D	M 36.36 SD 7.88	36.07 9.52	- 0.29	0.08	N.S.
E	M 29.42 SD 5.94	34.18 8.74	+ 4.76	1.93	N.S. (0.10)
C	M 26.26 SD 6.76	25.38 5.19	- 0.88	0.37	N.S.
I	M 21.22 SD 3.05	22.00 4.62	+ 0.78	0.37	N.S.
H	M 17.42 SD 2.44	18.63 2.89	+ 1.21	1.04	N.S.
J	M 28.44 SD 2.98	28.13 3.51	- 0.31	0.18	N.S.
B	M 49.21 SD 4.59	47.88 5.20	- 1.33	0.68	N.S.
F	M 17.58 SD 3.81	16.56 3.85	- 1.02	0.65	N.S.
G	M 14.11 SD 2.93	13.00 2.70	- 1.11	0.45	N.S.

N.S. = No Significant Difference. t for df = 33 (two tailed).

\* Signs indicate direction (higher/lower) of second measure in relation to the first.

TABLE 20

Parental and Perceived-Play Centre Attitudes  
Of Mothers of Finishers

Attitude Scales	Parental M/SD	Perceived P.C. M/SD	Difference in Means *	t df = 34	Sig.
A	M 55.69 SD 12.25	54.36 7.70	- 1.33	0.32	N.S.
D	M 31.50 SD 5.52	34.71 7.17	+ 3.21	1.21	N.S.
E	M 28.11 SD 7.44	32.23 8.90	+ 4.12	1.88	N.S. (0.10)
C	M 26.58 SD 4.38	26.41 4.13	- 0.17	0.09	N.S.
I	M 19.00 SD 4.65	22.00 5.04	+ 3.00	1.74	N.S. (0.10)
H	M 18.95 SD 1.67	19.17 2.28	+ 0.22	0.22	N.S.
J	M 30.05 SD 2.86	29.64 3.05	- 0.41	0.32	N.S.
B	M 48.84 SD 5.19	48.12 4.08	- 0.72	0.36	N.S.
F	M 19.16 SD 2.99	17.29 2.42	- 1.87	1.37	N.S. (0.20)
G	M 13.95 SD 3.37	12.82 3.64	- 1.13	0.78	N.S.

N.S. = No Significant Difference. t for df = 34 (two tailed)

\* Signs indicate direction (higher/lower) of second measure in relation to the first.

TABLE 21

Parental and Perceived-Play Centre Attitudes  
of Fathers of Finishers

Attitude Scales	Parental M/SD	Perceived P.C. M/SD	Differences in Means *	t df = 29	Sig.
A	M 62.00 SD 12.45	63.25 14.16	+ 1.25	0.25	N.S.
D	M 37.31 SD 9.96	36.50 7.43	- 0.81	0.26	N.S.
E	M 30.86 SD 6.56	37.00 6.00	+ 6.14	2.29	0.05
C	M 26.11 SD 5.07	26.50 4.14	+ 0.39	0.18	N.S.
I	M 22.47 SD 3.30	23.75 4.65	+ 1.28	0.63	N.S.
H	M 18.63 SD 2.63	18.42 2.59	- 0.21	0.16	N.S.
J	M 28.37 SD 2.91	27.67 1.97	- 0.70	0.54	N.S.
B	M 49.47 SD 5.25	49.75 3.81	+ 0.28	0.14	N.S.
F	M 18.05 SD 3.64	17.75 3.95	- 0.30	0.19	N.S.
G	M 14.58 SD 3.81	13.75 3.69	- 0.83	0.49	N.S.

N.S. = No Significant Difference. t for df = 29 (two tailed)

\* Signs indicate direction (higher/lower) of second measure in relation to the first.

On no other scales did the difference even approach the level of significance. It must be concluded then that apart from the few exceptions noted (mainly for scales E and I) parents' perception of play centre attitudes differs very little from their own admitted attitudes. What this means will be discussed later. Hypothesis three is not supported by the data obtained.

Hypothesis four is concerned with the lessening of the divergence between parental attitudes and those that parents saw as being advocated by the Play Centre Movement. As has been noted very little difference existed between these scores so that the direction of movement of attitude was no longer relevant. It had been expected that there would be less difference between PASQ Form A and Form B scores for Finishers than Beginners because of marked reductions in scores on both Forms (reflecting increased knowledge about, and acceptance of Play Centre ideas). These expectations were not realised as has already been indicated in discussions of Tables 14 and 15 (Hypothesis 1) and Tables 16 and 17 (Hypothesis 2).

Analysis of data relating to hypothesis five can really be considered in two separate parts. They were included together in the hypothesis to examine the researcher's expectation that the attitudes of the Play Centre movement would not be accepted fully by the parents who became associated with the movement itself.

The relationships between parental attitudes and those of the Play Centre are set out in Tables 22-25.

In the Beginners group, mothers attitudes differed significantly from Play Centre on Scales A, D and I while differences also approached significance on scales E (.10) C (.20) and G (.20) (Table 22).

In all cases except I, mean scale scores of the mothers were higher than the mean scale scores of the Play Centre Experts which indicated that mothers were more authoritarian and restrictive in their parental attitudes than the Play Centre movement. On Scale I mothers mean score was lower than that of the "Experts". This will be discussed below.

The fathers in the Beginner group (see Table 23) differed significantly in parental attitudes from the Play Centre on Scales A (.001), D (.02) and E (.05) and the differences approached significance on scales C (.10), H(.10), I (.20) and G (.20). On these scales (except H and I) mean scores of fathers, were higher than mean scores of the Play Centre experts, indicating as for mothers, that fathers parental attitudes were less permissive and less democratic than those of the Play Centre Movement. A lower score for fathers on Scale H (Equality) also indicated a more authoritarian attitude because, as has been indicated, scales H and J were scored and weighted in the opposite direction so that a high score on these indicates more democratic attitudes rather than the authoritarian-restrictive attitudes indicated on the other scales. Scale I was the only scale on which fathers scored in a lower (less restrictive) direction.

TABLE 22.

Parental Attitudes of Mothers of Beginners and  
Play Centre Experts

Attitude Scales	Maternal Beginners	Experts M/SD	Differences in Means *	t df = 25	Sig.
A	M 56.21 SD 14.90	33.25 5.58	- 22.96	4.07	0.001
D	M 34.63 SD 5.38	25.75 2.63	- 8.88	3.66	0.01
E	M 29.57 SD 7.04	23.37 1.92	- 6.20	2.02	N.S. (0.10)
C	M 25.00 SD 4.24	21.87 2.03	- 3.13	1.60	N.S. (0.20)
I	M 18.53 SD 4.39	24.25 2.14	+ 5.72	2.75	0.02
H	M 19.53 SD 1.73	19.87 1.79	+ 0.34	0.31	N.S.
J	M 30.17 SD 2.34	30.00 2.24	- 0.17	0.76	N.S.
B	M 49.16 SD 5.11	48.25 2.99	- 0.91	0.37	N.S.
F.	M 19.16 SD 3.70	18.25 1.63	- 0.91	0.58	N.S.
G	M 14.11 SD 3.78	11.62 1.87	- 2.49	1.50	N.S. (0.20)

N.S. No Significant Difference. t for df = 25 (two tailed).

\* Signs indicate direction (higher/lower) of second measure in relation to the first.

TABLE 23.

Parental Attitudes of Fathers of Beginners and  
Play Centre Experts

Attitude Scale	Paternal Beginners M/SD	Experts M/SD	Differences in Means *	t df = 25	Sig.
A	N 61.74 SD 12.70	33.25 5.58	- 28.49	5.88	0.001
D	N 36.36 SD 7.88	25.75 2.63	- 10.61	2.71	0.02
E	N 29.42 SD 5.94	23.37 1.92	- 6.05	2.27	0.05
C	N 26.26 SD 6.76	21.87 2.03	- 4.39	1.74	N.S. (0.10)
I	N 21.22 SD 3.05	24.25 2.14	+ 3.03	1.67	N.S.
H	N 17.42 SD 2.44	19.87 1.79	+ 2.45	1.85	N.S. (0.10)
J	N 28.44 SD 2.98	30.00 2.24	+ 1.66	0.86	N.S.
B	M 49.21 SD 4.59	48.25 2.99	- 0.96	0.44	N.S.
F	M 17.58 SD 3.81	18.25 1.63	+ 0.67	0.40	N.S.
G	M 14.11 SD 2.93	11.62 1.87	- 2.49	1.54	N.S. (0.20)

N.S. No Significant Difference. t for df = 25 (two tailed).

\* Signs indicate direction (higher/lower) of second measure in relation to the first.

TABLE 24.

Parental Attitudes of Mothers of Finishers and  
Play Centre Experts

Attitude Scale	Maternal Finishers N/SD	Experts N/SD	Differences in Means *	t df = 25	Sig.
A	M 55.69 SD 12.25	33.25 5.58	-22.44	6.08	0.001
D	M 31.50 SD 5.52	25.75 2.63	- 5.75	2.66	0.01
E	M 28.11 SD 7.44	23.27 1.92	- 4.74	1.57	N.S. (0.20)
C	M 26.58 SD 4.38	21.87 2.03	- 4.71	2.26	0.05
I	M 19.00 SD 4.65	24.25 2.14	+ 5.25	2.52	0.02
H	M 18.95 SD 1.67	19.87 1.79	+ 0.92	0.30	N.S.
J	M 30.05 SD 2.86	30.00 2.24	- 0.05	0.04	N.S.
B	M 48.84 SD 5.19	48.25 2.99	- 0.59	0.25	N.S.
F	M 19.16 SD 2.99	18.25 1.63	- 0.91	0.51	N.S.
G	M 13.95 SD 3.37	11.62 1.87	- 2.33	1.53	N.S. (0.20)

N.S. = No Significant Difference. t for df = 25 (two tailed).

\* Signs indicate direction (higher/lower) of second measure in relation to first.

TABLE 25

Parental Attitudes of Fathers of Finishers and  
Play Centre Experts

Attitude Scale	Paternal Finishers M/SD	Experts M/SD	Differences in Means =	t df = 25	Sig.
A	M 62.00 SD 12.45	33.25 5.58	-28.75	5.77	0.001
D	M 37.31 SD 9.96	25.75 2.63	-11.56	4.87	0.001
E	M 30.86 SD 6.56	23.37 1.92	- 7.49	2.75	0.02
C	M 26.11 SD 5.07	21.87 2.03	- 4.24	1.94	N.S. 0.10
I	M 22.47 SD 3.30	24.25 2.14	+ 1.78	0.92	N.S.
H	M 18.63 SD 2.03	19.87 1.79	+ 1.24	0.38	N.S.
J	M 23.37 SD 2.91	30.00 2.24	+ 1.63	1.19	N.S.
B	M 49.47 SD 5.25	48.25 2.99	- 1.22	0.58	N.S.
F	M 18.05 SD 3.64	18.25 1.63	+ 0.20	0.11	N.S.
G	M 14.58 SD 3.81	11.62 1.87	- 2.96	1.52	N.S. 0.20

N.S. = No Significant Difference. t for df = 25 (two tailed)

= Signs indicate direction (higher/lower) of second measure in relation to the first.

As with Beginners, a similar pattern of differences emerged for the Finishers. Mothers differed from Play Centre Experts (Table 24) on Scales A (.001), D (.01), C (.05) and I (.02) and differences approached significance on Scales E (.20) and G (.20). The higher mean scale scores of mothers indicated again less permissive/democratic parental attitudes than those of the Play Centre movement. Again Scale I was the exception. As with mothers in the Beginners group no significant difference occurred on the "democratic" scales, H and J.

Fathers of the Finishers group differed from the Play Centre experts on scales A (.001), D (.001) and E (.02) (Table 25) and differences approached significance on Scales C (.10) and G (.20). No significant difference occurred for Scale I or for scales H and J. In the four group comparisons differences between mean scores for scale B were very small and never approached significance. The lack of significant difference between scores on Form A and Form B of the PASQ already noted (Tables 18 - 21) indicates that similar patterns of differences to those just discussed (Tables 22-25) would exist between PASQ Form B Factor scale scores and the PASQ factor scale scores of Play Centre experts.

In the Beginners group maternal perception of Play Centre attitudes differed significantly from the Play Centre (see Table 26) on scales A (.001), C (.05) D (.05) and E (.01). Fathers' perceptions (Table 27) differed significantly on A (.001), D (.01) and E (.001) and approached significance on scale C (.20). In all cases the scores were higher (more authoritarian) than those of Play Centre experts.

TABLE 26

Perceived Play Centre Parental Attitudes of  
Mothers of Beginners and Play Centre "Experts"

Attitudes Scales	Maternal Beginners M/SD	Experts M/SD	Differences in Means $\pm$	t df = 22	Sig.
A	M 52.63 SD 13.90	33.25 5.58	-19.38	3.80	0.001
D	M 33.25 SD 6.27	25.75 2.63	- 7.50	2.42	0.05
E	M 34.51 SD 9.33	23.37 1.92	-11.14	2.91	0.01
C	M 26.50 SD 4.10	21.87 2.03	- 4.63	2.31	0.05
I	M 22.38 SD 4.49	24.25 2.14	+ 1.87	1.02	N.S.
H	M 19.13 SD 2.32	19.87 1.79	+ 0.74	0.56	N.S.
J	M 29.63 SD 3.37	30.00 2.24	+ 0.37	0.23	N.S.
B	M 49.94 SD 5.14	48.25 2.99	- 1.67	0.64	N.S.
F	M 17.69 SD 4.49	18.25 1.63	+ 0.56	0.29	N.S.
G	M 13.75 SD 3.89	11.62 1.87	- 2.13	1.21	N.S.

N.S. No Significant Differences. t for df = 22 (two tailed)

$\pm$  Signs indicate direction (higher/lower) of second measure in relation to the first.

TABLE 27.

Perceived Play Centre Parental Attitudes of  
Fathers of Beginners and Play Centre "Experts"

Attitude Scales	Paternal Beginners M/SD	Experts M/SD	Differences in Means $\mp$	t (df = 22)	Sig.
A	M 55.75 SD 13.75	33.25 5.58	-22.50	4.33	0.001
D	M 36.07 SD 9.52	25.75 2.63	-10.32	2.87	0.01
E	M 34.18 SD 8.74	23.37 1.92	-10.81	4.14	0.001
C	M 25.38 SD 5.19	21.87 2.03	- 3.51	1.39	N.S. (0.20)
I	M 22.00 SD 4.62	24.25 2.14	+ 2.25	0.96	N.S.
H	M 18.63 SD 2.89	19.87 1.79	+ 1.24	1.00	N.S.
J	M 28.13 SD 3.51	30.00 2.24	+ 1.87	1.01	N.S.
B	M 47.88 SD 5.20	48.25 2.99	+ 0.37	0.16	N.S.
F	M 16.56 SD 3.85	18.25 1.63	+ 1.69	1.03	N.S.
G	M 13.00 SD 2.70	11.62 1.87	- 1.38	0.95	N.S.

N.S. = No significant difference. t for df = 22 (two tailed)

$\mp$  Signs indicate direction (higher/lower) of second measure in relation to the first.

TABLE 28.

Perceived Play Centre Parental Attitudes of  
Mothers of "Finishers" and Play Centre "Experts"

Attitude Scales	Maternal Finishers M/SD	Experts M/SD	Differences in Means ±	t df = 23	Sig.
A	M 54.36 SD 7.70	33.25 5.53	- 21.11	4.24	0.001
D	M 34.71 SD 7.17	25.75 2.63	- 8.96	2.75	0.02
E	M 32.23 SD 8.90	23.37 1.92	- 8.86	5.84	0.001
C	M 26.41 SD 4.13	21.87 2.03	- 4.54	2.14	0.05
I	M 22.00 SD 5.04	24.25 2.14	+ 2.25	1.10	N.S.
H	M 19.17 SD 2.28	19.87 1.79	+ 0.70	1.05	N.S.
J	M 29.64 SD 3.05	30.00 2.24	+ 0.36	0.24	N.S.
B	M 48.12 SD 4.08	48.25 2.99	+ 0.13	0.11	N.S.
F	M 17.29 SD 2.42	18.25 1.63	+ 0.96	0.78	N.S.
G	M 12.82 SD 3.64	11.62 1.87	- 1.20	0.74	N.S.

N.S. = No significant difference. t for df = 23 (two tailed)

± Signs indicate direction (higher/lower) of second measure in relation to the first.

TABLE 29

Perceived Play Centre Parental Attitudes of  
Fathers of "Finishers" and Play Centre "Experts"

Attitude Scale	Paternal Finishers M/SD	Experts M/SD	Differences in Means *	t df = 18	Sig.
A	M 63.25 SD 14.16	33.25 5.58	-30.00	5.78	0.001
D	M 36.50 SD 7.43	25.75 2.63	-10.75	3.54	0.01
E	M 37.00 SD 6.00	23.37 1.92	-13.63	5.32	0.001
C	M 26.50 SD 4.14	21.87 2.03	- 4.63	2.72	0.02
I	M 23.75 SD 4.65	24.25 2.14	+ 0.50	0.20	N.S.
H	M 18.42 SD 2.59	19.87 1.79	+ 1.45	1.16	N.S.
J	M 27.67 SD 1.97	30.00 2.24	+ 2.33	1.83	N.S. (0.10)
B	M 49.75 SD 3.81	48.25 2.99	- 1.50	1.00	N.S.
F	M 17.75 SD 3.95	18.25 1.63	+ .50	0.32	N.S.
G	M 13.75 SD 3.69	11.62 1.87	- 2.13	1.22	N.S.

N.S. = No Significant Difference. t for df = 18 (two tailed)

\* Signs indicate direction (higher/lower) of second measure in relation to the first.

For Finishers, mothers' PASQ (B) scores differed significantly from the Play Centre experts (Table 28) on A (.001) C (.05) D (.02) and E (.001), and approached significance on J (.10). In all cases except J the PASQ (B) scores were higher (more authoritarian) than the Play Centre movement but the lower score on J also indicated that parents perceive Play Centre to be more authoritarian than the Play Centre movement itself admits. The bulk of the data obtained thus lends strong support for hypothesis five which predicted that not only would parents not accept fully the attitudes of the Play Centre movement but they could not understand or perceive these clearly enough to accept them even if they wished to do so.

Data presented to this point have indicated indirectly that there is little sex difference in parental attitudes or in parents' perception of Play Centre attitudes. A direct examination of this data (Table 30 - 33) in relation to hypotheses six and seven confirms this, although there is a slight indication that sex differences in parental attitudes existed.

No consistently significant sex difference in parental attitudes of Beginners (Table 30) is revealed except for scale H (.05) on which fathers' mean score is lower, (i.e. more authoritarian) than mothers', and on scale I where the difference is only approaching significance (.20). On this scale and on A, D and C fathers' mean scale score is slightly higher than mothers' and on scale J is slightly lower. Although these differences are not significant they do indicate a tendency toward a more authoritarian-restrictive attitude on the part of fathers than mothers in relation to their children.

TABLE 30.

Parental Attitudes of Mothers and Fathers  
Of Beginners

Attitude Scale	Mothers M/SD	Fathers M/SD	Differences in Means *	t df = 36	Sig.
A	M 56.21 SD 14.90	61.74 12.70	+ 5.53	1.20	N.S.
D	M 34.63 SD 5.32	36.36 7.88	+ 1.73	0.60	N.S.
E	M 29.57 SD 7.04	29.42 5.94	- 0.15	0.06	N.S.
C	M 25.00 SD 4.24	26.26 6.76	+ 1.26	0.63	N.S.
I	M 18.53 SD 4.39	21.22 3.05	+ 2.69	1.46	N.S. (0.20)
H	M 19.53 SD 1.73	17.42 2.44	- 2.11	2.05	0.05
J	M 30.17 SD 2.34	28.44 2.98	- 1.73	1.21	N.S.
B	M 49.16 SD 5.11	49.21 4.59	+ 0.05	0.02	N.S.
F	M 19.16 SD 3.70	17.58 3.81	- 1.58	1.08	N.S.
G	M 14.11 SD 3.75	14.11 2.93	-	0	N.S.

N.S. = No Significant Difference. t for df = 36 (two tailed)

\* Signs indicate direction (higher/lower) of second measure in relation to the first.

TABLE 31.

Parental Attitudes of Mothers and Fathers  
Of Finishers

Attitude Scale	Mothers M/SD	Fathers M/SD	Differences in Means *	t df = 36	Sig.
A	M 55.69 SD 12.25	62.00 12.45	+ 6.31	1.54	N.S.
D	M 31.50 SD 5.52	37.31 9.96	+ 5.81	2.24	0.05
E	M 28.11 SD 7.44	30.86 6.56	+ 2.75	1.07	N.S.
C	M 26.58 SD 4.88	26.11 5.07	- 0.47	0.24	N.S.
I	M 19.00 SD 4.65	22.47 3.30	+ 3.47	2.13	0.05
H	M 18.95 SD 1.67	18.63 2.03	- 0.32	0.32	N.S.
J	M 30.05 SD 2.86	28.37 2.91	- 1.68	1.38	N.S. (0.20)
B	M 48.84 SD 5.19	49.47 5.25	+ 0.63	0.32	N.S.
F	M 19.16 SD 2.99	18.05 3.64	- 1.11	0.68	N.S.
G	M 13.95 SD 3.37	14.58 3.81	+ 0.63	0.29	N.S.

N.S. = No Significant Difference. t for df = 36 (two tailed)

\*- Signs indicate direction (higher/lower) of second measure in relation to the first.

A more noticeable tendency is evident in the parental attitudes of parents in the Finishers group (Table 31). Differences are significant on scales D (.05) and I (.05) and approach significance on scales A (.20) and J (.20). In all cases the direction of difference indicates less authoritarian/restrictive attitudes on the part of mothers. Similar slight differences between mean scores are noted also on scale E. In most cases the increased difference between mean scale scores in the Finishers group was accounted for by slightly higher scores by fathers and slightly lower scores by mothers (in relation to the scores of the Beginners groups) rather than by a significantly lower score by mothers which would indicate a closer acceptance of the Play Centre movement's attitudes.

Perception of Play Centre attitudes by parents differed little between sex groups. Parents in the Beginner group (Table 32) differed only very slightly on Scale A (.10) and in the Finisher group (Table 33) slight differences were evident on scales A (.20) E (.20) and J (.20) with a tendency towards fathers scoring higher than mothers. However the tendency towards a difference is so slight that the evidence of a complete lack of statistically significant difference is the only one that can be accepted in relation to sex differences in parents' perception of Play Centre attitudes.

Some sex difference in expressed parental attitudes was evident but lends only slight support to the hypothesis. In general, the data presented does not support hypotheses 6 or 7.

TABLE 32.

Perceived Play Centre Parental Attitudes  
of Mothers and Fathers of Beginners

Attitude Scale	Mothers M/SD	Fathers M/SD	Differences in Means *	t (df = 30)	Sig.
A	M 52.63 SD 13.90	55.75 13.75	+ 3.12	2.03	N.S. (0.10)
D	M 33.25 SD 6.27	36.07 9.52	+ 2.82	0.87	N.S.
E	M 34.51 SD 9.33	34.18 8.74	- 0.33	0.09	N.S.
C	M 26.50 SD 4.10	25.38 5.19	- 1.12	0.52	N.S.
I	M 22.38 SD 4.49	22.00 4.62	- 0.38	0.21	N.S.
H	M 19.13 SD 2.32	18.63 2.89	- 0.50	0.44	N.S.
J	M 29.63 SD 3.37	28.13 3.51	- 1.50	0.93	N.S.
B	M 49.94 SD 5.14	47.88 5.20	- 2.06	0.90	N.S.
F	M 17.69 SD 4.49	16.56 3.85	- 1.13	0.65	N.S.
G	M 13.75 SD 3.89	13.00 2.70	- 0.75	0.49	N.S.

N.S. = No Significant Difference. t for df = 30 (two tailed)

\* Signs indicate direction (higher/lower) of second measure in relation to the first.

TABLE 33  
Perceived Play Centre Parental Attitudes of  
Mothers and Fathers of Finishers

Attitude Scales	Mothers M/SD	Fathers M/SD	Differences in Means *	t (df = 27)	Sig.
A	M 54.36 SD 7.70	63.25 14.16	+ 8.89	1.57	N.S. (0.20)
D	M 34.71 SD 7.17	36.50 7.43	+ 1.79	0.54	N.S.
E	M 32.23 SD 8.90	37.00 6.00	+ 4.77	1.39	N.S. (0.20)
C	M 26.41 SD 4.13	26.50 4.14	+ 0.09	0.04	N.S.
I	M 22.00 SD 5.04	23.75 4.65	+ 1.75	0.76	N.S.
H	M 19.17 SD 2.28	18.42 2.59	- 0.75	0.74	N.S.
J	M 29.64 SD 3.05	27.67 1.97	- 1.97	1.49	N.S. (0.20)
B	M 48.12 SD 4.08	49.75 3.81	+ 1.63	0.91	N.S.
F	M 17.29 SD 2.42	17.75 3.95	+ 0.46	0.33	N.S.
G	M 12.82 SD 3.64	13.75 3.69	+ 0.93	0.52	N.S.

N.S. = No Significant Difference. t for df = 27 (two tailed)

\* Signs indicate direction (higher/lower) of second measure in relation to the first.

In summary, then only hypothesis five was supported by the data obtained from the survey. There do appear to be significant differences between the parental attitudes of the Play Centre on the one hand and both the parental attitudes of parents and their perception of Play Centre attitudes on the other. Furthermore these differences are consistent for both husbands and wives in the test group. However there was no apparent difference in parental attitudes or in the perception of Play Centre's parental attitudes between those who were new to Play Centre and those who had been involved for some time. This lack of significant difference was also noted between husbands and wives in the test group.

Footnotes, Chapter 5

<sup>1</sup>Harvin Zuckerman et.al. "Normative Data and Factor Analysis on the PAPI" (1958), pp.165-171.

<sup>2</sup>Zuckerman et.al. op.cit.

<sup>3</sup>Robert C. Nichols. "A Factor Analysis of Parental Attitudes of Fathers" (1962) op.cit.

## Chapter 6: Discussion and Interpretation of Results

### 1. Factor Analysis of Parental Attitudes.

Of the ten factor scales obtained from the factor analysis it appears that four (A, C, D, and E) are useful in measuring differences in attitudes. These factors showed polarity on the second order factor analysis, contained a relatively large number of items (12 to 25) and had Kuder Richardson reliability coefficients ranging from .86 to .72 (the four highest of the ten coefficients calculated). However these four factor scales were all intercorrelated and loaded significantly on the same factor in the second order factor analysis.

The results here follow the pattern of results of overseas research using the PARI which indicates that the measurement of parental attitudes is a difficult process and that at best only broad differences will be indicated by the use of a forced four-choice, self-administered questionnaire. The results also support the investigator's decision to abandon the 26 five-item scales of the PASQ in favour of the factor scales derived from the 128 item of the test.

Discussion of the factor analyses has already been presented so that the conceptual basis for item-inclusion could be established and scale names provided. Discussion of the t-Test comparisons follows.

### 2. t-Test Comparisons.

The lack of any significant difference between test groups in their perception or understanding of the Play Centre's parent attitudes could be explained in a number of ways. It is possible that the results indicate that parents learn either very quickly, or very slowly, about Play Centre's ideas.

If parents learn quickly it would seem that the Beginners group had learned very quickly, for none of this group had had a child enrolled at Play Centre for more than six months. For the majority the period of contact was even less, and in general prior contact with, or knowledge about, Play Centre was minimal. And if parents do learn quickly they would form an impression of Play Centre's attitudes which is remarkably resistant to change in that the Finishers group with 18 months or more of contact interpret Play Centre's attitudes in the same way as the Beginners.

If parents learn slowly, then they learn very slowly for the interpretation that these groups make of the Play Centre's attitudes differs quite markedly on the significant scales from the scores of the experts who reflect the Play Centre's parental attitudes. It may be that parents have a good deal of difficulty in interpreting the Play Centre's point of view in that so many individuals are involved in the many aspects of parent education in the Play Centre.

In either case, whether parents learn something about Play Centre in the initial months of contact and then do not accept a great deal more, or whether parents face difficulty in interpreting the Play Centre's attitudes, then some doubt is raised about the effectiveness of parent education in the Play Centre.

The lack of any significant difference between the parental attitudes of Beginners and Finishers would also tend to raise at least some doubts about the effectiveness of parent education in the Play Centre.

Similar interpretations to those made about parents perception of Play Centre attitudes can be made about the attitudes expressed by

Beginners and Finishers. It is possible that the attitudes of the new members of the Play Centre considered in this study had already undergone some degree of modification in the first two or three months of contact, but that after this initial modification, attitudes have changed very little, for the Finishers mean scale scores differed very little, (and none significantly at even the .10 level of confidence) from the mean scale scores of the Beginners.

If this initial rapid modification did not take place when the Finishers group first entered Play Centre, and they are expressing as Finishers the same parental attitudes as they did upon entry, then association with the Play Centre has done little to modify their attitudes, least of all in the direction of those that the Play Centre itself would endorse as desirable.

Parental attitudes (and parents' perception of Play Centre's parental attitudes) do differ significantly from the Play Centre attitudes on a number of scales; this hypothesised difference was the only one supported by the data obtained. Mothers and fathers in both groups expressed attitudes that were more authoritarian and restrictive (or less democratic and permissive) than those of the Play Centre apart from Scale I where the scores indicated differences in the opposite direction. On this scale Dissatisfaction with the Homemaking Role, women's scores were lower than the Play Centre's indicating a greater degree of dissatisfaction with their lot as housewives than the Play Centre would see as desirable or healthy or realistic. Perhaps the personal satisfactions that mothers gain from having interests other than the home<sup>1</sup> induces an over-reaction to items in this scale. However the degree of difference should not be overemphasised. Converted to the 4 point scale score used in the PASQ the Play Centre mean score on Scale I would indicate "mild disagreement" with the items, Mothers

mean scores would indicate "mild agreement". Responses were similar for mothers in both test groups.

That there are significant differences between the parental attitudes of the Play Centre and parents' attitudes (Both Beginners and Finishers) would support the proposition that parents will not come to accept Play Centre ideas completely. Having established some basis for this claim it is interesting to speculate about reasons for this situation. The data available from this study would indicate that even if parents wished to subscribe fully to Play Centre attitudes, they would be prevented from doing so because they would not have an accurate conception of what Play Centre attitudes were in a number of areas. Support for this claim is indicated by the significant differences between Form B scores of parents and the scores of Play Centre experts on Scales A, C, D and E for all subjects in both test groups (see Tables 26-29).

We see then that not only are these significant differences in some attitude areas between parents and the Play Centre, but there are also significant differences between what parents think are the Play Centre attitudes and the attitudes actually endorsed by Play Centre. It would seem then that parents have difficulty in interpreting what the Play Centre is saying. It may be that the attitudes themselves are unacceptable to parents or that the education programme of the Play Centre is less effective than has previously been considered. In either case the situation needs further investigation.

Another of the hypothesised differences that was not supported by the data from the survey was that between the attitudes of parents and

these same parents perception of the parental attitudes of the Play Centre. It had been anticipated that there would be significant differences on these scores, that parents would see the Play Centre as being more permissive than they were themselves.

In fact there was little actual difference between the mean scale scores of the Form A and Form B responses apart from a significant difference at the .05 level of confidence on Scale I (Mothers score lower) for Mothers in the Beginners group and a significant difference (.05 level) on Scale E for Fathers in the Finishers group (Fathers score lower).

In terms of parents' perception of Play Centre attitudes it is difficult to explain why Parents have such an apparently ill informed concept of Play Centre attitudes. But the evidence suggests that this is so. An explanation in terms of cognitive dissonance theory is suggested. Assuming that there were at one time significant differences between parents' attitudes and their understanding or interpretation of Play Centre attitudes it would follow that this perceived difference would create dissonance in parents and that in order to reduce this dissonance their interpretation of the Play Centres attitudes would be modified to fit their own, (which would be much simpler than modifying their own attitudes to fit those of the Play Centre).

A further interpretation of the lack of statistically significant differences in these measures is offered in terms of the testing programme. It is feasible that because of the unannounced nature of the administration of Form B of the PASQ that parents anxious to complete the questionnaire tended to respond again from their own point

of view rather than from that of the Play Centre, or alternatively, that if they did attempt to answer from the Play Centre point of view, that their own attitudes could not be prevented from intruding. Recall of responses may have been possible in spite of the unannounced nature of the administration and the intervening distractor of the ETO.

The lack of any significant sex differences except for Scale B ( $p = .05$ ) and I ( $p = .05$ ) for Finishers (in all cases Mothers were more democratic than Fathers) presents results which were unexpected, but consistent with other results from the study. There was even less indication of sex differences in parents' perception of play centre's attitudes indicating a high degree of conformity in parental attitudes.

The lack of sex difference in parental attitudes places some strain on the previous interpretation of either a lot of quick learnings versus no learning (and a little forgetting.) Where it was suggested that lack of significant difference could be explained by the fact that parents had learned very little in their time with Play Centre, a similar explanation could be offered for fathers of Finishers. However the alternative interpretation offered for the husbands in the Beginner group does not provide an adequate explanation. It would not seem credible that there could have been an initial development or modification of attitudes in husbands during the brief three to six month period when their wives first became associated with the Play Centre.

The most obvious explanation is that there are in fact few if any differences in the parental attitudes or in perception of

the Parent attitudes of the Play Centre, between husbands and wives in this sample. This explanation for lack of sex difference in these areas would need to be linked with the explanation offered for lack of modification of parental attitudes or of parents' perception of Play Centre attitudes - that of the inability of the Play Centre to present its ideas clearly in a programme which should serve to provide information and assist in the development of 'favourable' attitudes towards children and family life.

### 3. Parental Attitudes.

Although no hypotheses were formulated to examine this aspect of the study it would be useful at this point to comment on the factor-scales which appear to be reliable enough to measure parental attitudes. The mean scale scores have been divided by the number of items in the scale and these mean scores in relation to the original 4 - 1 weighting are presented for Mothers and Fathers of Beginners and Play Centre Experts. It was decided not to present results for Finishers as well as it had been shown that there is little significant difference in scale scores between Beginners and Finishers. The results are presented in Table 34.

TABLE 34

Parent Attitudes Mean Scale Scores, Beginners And  
Play Centre Experts, By 4 - 1 Weighting.

Scale	Group Score		
	Fathers	Mothers	Experts
A	2.47	2.15	1.33
C	2.19	2.08	1.82
D	1.57	1.40	1.12
E	2.10	2.11	1.67

Scores on Factor A, Authoritarian Attitudes (25 items) indicate a mean score of just below "Strong Disagreement" for the Play Centre. This is almost as extreme as is possible to score on this scale which reflects a complete rejection of the Authoritarian attitudes expressed in the scale. Mean scores for mothers are around the "mild disagreement" score which indicates a possible range from mild agreement (with the authoritarian attitudes) to strong disagreement. In general then the mothers here are moderately permissive. The mean score for fathers leaves them sitting on the fence indicating some permissiveness, some authoritarianism - but certainly neither would appear to be as authoritarian in the areas of discipline, punishment domination and obedience as the Ritchies' research indicates.<sup>2</sup>

The group is however more specific, less representative than the Ritches' sample, and committed to a concern for children because of their association with the Play Centre.

Factor D Restrictive Attitudes (23 items) is considered next because of its close relation to A. Scores for the three groups are low, indicating extreme rather than moderate responses. Experts' mean score of 1.12 expresses an even stronger rejection of the restrictive items expressed in the scale than in Factor A. Mothers' mean score of 1.40 ranging between strong and mild disagreement indicates again a fairly positive rejection of the attitudes expressed on the scale; and husbands (mean 1.57) are not that far behind. Play Centre parents appear to reject fairly positively restrictive attitudes towards sexuality and verbal behaviour. Those Play Centre parents sampled there, far from being prudish and defensive about sexual display and behaviours in their pre-school children as the Ritches suggest, would express open-minded, healthy and non-restrictive attitudes in relation to their children.

Scale C, Ascendancy of Mother, indicates a dominating attitude by mothers in relation to other members of the household. Experts' mean score of 1.82, mothers' of 2.08 and fathers' of 2.19, all express mild rejection of these attitudes. The rejection of the scale by mothers would appear to indicate a desire for a shared role in heading the family rather than the pattern of maternal autonomy in many fields indicated by Brown, Garrett, Gilson, Houston and the Ritches.<sup>3</sup> The results may not be in conflict however. Scores on the PASQ may not reflect actual parental behaviour but perhaps, as has been indicated, a desire for the ideal situation. This ideal situation could be one of shared interacting parental roles rather than the autonomous roles that exist because of family circumstances.

Scale E, Discouraging Independence, again displays mean scores for the three samples of around the mild disagreement level. Parents are again expressing non-restrictive and non-authoritarian attitudes and reject active efforts to discourage independence, and to shield the child from outside influences.

Scores on these scales then indicate that husbands and wives in the group of Beginner play centre parents express fairly permissive, democratic attitudes and reject, quite strongly in some cases, restrictive authoritarian attitudes towards children and the home. These results conflict with other New Zealand research and will be discussed in the final chapter.

#### Bibliography

1. D. Garrett "The Open Community" 1969b.  
Geraldine McDonald. Thesis 1969.
2. James E. and Jane Ritchie. Patterns of Child Rearing in New Zealand, 1970.
3. L. C. Brown, "New Zealand Family Pattern" 1970., D. Garrett, *ibid*, 1969b., Miriam Gilson, "The Changing New Zealand Family" 1970., Stewart Houston (ed) Marriage and the Family in New Zealand 1970., James E. and Jane Ritchie, *ibid*, 1970.

## Chapter 7: Conclusions and Implications

### 1. General Conclusions and Implications

Contrary to expectations (p.21), parents of children attending Play Centres did not express restrictive or authoritarian attitudes towards children or the home situation. A Beginner group of parents displayed relatively permissive and non-dominating attitudes in the areas of discipline and punishment and strongly rejected restrictive expressions relating to children seeing each other or their parents without clothes and to expressions of sexuality in the pre-school child. They also expressed a moderate rejection of maternal domination in the home and indicated that they were concerned not to discourage the development of independence in their children.

A Finishers group of parents obtained similar scores on the same items. There was no significant difference in attitudes expressed by the two groups. Again this finding was contrary to expectation as were the facts that neither of the two groups saw the parental attitudes of the Play Centre as differing significantly from their own and that no significant sex differences were obtained on the various group comparisons. Thus there are no significant differences in attitudes expressed by husbands and wives in either test group, and neither sex in either group saw the Play Centre's attitudes as differing from their own. However a significant difference was found to exist: the attitudes expressed by the Play Centre experts group were more permissive than those of the parent groups already discussed. In relation to attitude change

Play Centre appears to be unable to modify the parental attitudes of the parent group involved.

This conclusion is the most significant that can be drawn from the findings of the study and it raises a number of questions about the Play Centre's parent education programme and the basic assumptions underlying this.

It would appear that the basic assumption underlying the Play Centre's parent education programme is that there are a large number of parents who need help and guidance in learning about children and child-rearing processes and practices. This help, knowledge and guidance is provided in a variety of ways as has already been indicated. But is this assumption a valid one? Do large numbers of parents come to Play Centre without at least some knowledge about older pre-school children. It would seem also that Play Centre assumes that the parental attitudes of "new entrant" parents are high in the expression of authoritarian and restrictive attitudes and that these people will need help in modifying the attitudes to a more acceptable child-centred point of view.

The attitudes expressed by the Beginner group in the study would indicate that this assumption may need reconsideration: that perhaps new entrant parents do subscribe to fairly non-restrictive, non-authoritarian attitudes towards their children and that the traditional emphasis on educating parents away from authoritarian and restrictive attitudes needs to be shifted along the continuum to begin at a different level or point of emphasis.

In any education programme the problems increase when extremes have to be considered. Perhaps this is true with parents in the Play Centre. It has been suggested that one reason for there not being any significant difference between attitudes of the Beginners and Finishers was that in the first few months of association with the Play Centre prior to the testing programme this group had learned enough to bring it to the same attitudinal level as the Finishers group. If so then in the remainder of the time in Play Centre, little additional learning and modification of attitude could be expected.

It has been suggested also that many parents are confused about what Play Centre is saying to its members. The fact that both test groups in this study had very incomplete perceptions of the parental attitudes or policy of the Play Centre would support this suggestion.

There appears to be a need then for the Play Centre movement to clarify its own position, or at least for there to be some clarification "down the line" between experts and local or regional organizers and administrators. Another problem in the clarification of ideas is that so many individuals and agencies are involved in providing information and parent education programmes that some confusion could be expected.

For whatever reason though, the Play Centre would appear to have failed in providing information that would increase the accuracy of parents' perception about Play Centre ideas.

The lack of any of the anticipated sex differences in parental attitudes was puzzling. The bulk of the New Zealand evidence available indicates that some sex differences would be indicated, if for no other reason than purely on a behavioural basis, i.e. women are the ones who become involved in the Play Centre movement and because of this would have a more accurate perception of Play Centre ideas. The suggestion that husbands learn from their wives is an attractive one and would provide a neat explanation. However, as has been indicated, there are some limitations to this explanation, principally a time limit. This explanation would need to be rejected for the Beginners group at least if we accept that the Beginners learnt quickly about Play Centre before the testing programme to reach the same level as those parents who had been involved for 18 months or so.

A further explanation that there are in fact no sex differences in parental attitudes could be made with confidence if we accept that in the study the attitudes expressed by Beginners are their pre-Play Centre attitudes and that the Finishers group has learnt very little during the time of its association with Play Centre. The question of lack of sex differences is probably best left at this stage for further consideration.

## 2. Limitations to Conclusions.

The New Zealand Play Centre movement has been operating for some years now so that any comment on its programmes and operation need to be soundly based. Certain limitations must be stated here which will influence the degree to which these results and discussion can be generalised.

- a. Sample: The sample is representative of neither the Play Centre movement nor the population of New Zealand as a whole. A high degree of self selection was involved so that it is likely that only the less defensive, more open and permissive type of parent would have agreed to take part in the study anyway. The relatively permissive attitudes expressed by this group may not be representative of the total sample of beginning Play Centre parents. The small size of the sample prevented the detailed analysis of sub group differences. It is felt that it is here that differences would show out. However the group samples themselves were small enough and could not be subdivided further.
- b. Sample Comparison: It has been assumed that the matching procedures have ensured that this cross-group comparison can be treated as a pre- and post-test comparison. If there are any factors that invalidate this assumption then the results of the comparisons must be called into doubt and any comments relating to the Play Centre itself withdrawn.
- c. Measurement of Attitudes: Although the results of the cross-group comparisons are presented with some confidence from a technical point of view, the theory of attitudes and attitude change and the extensive review of the literature indicates that results tend to be coloured somewhat in favour of the responder so that although the Beginner group appears very permissive, in actual behaviour they may be less so. The usual limitations relating to attitude assessment apply in this study. It was considered that an acquiescence response set might act to contaminate some of the parental attitude measures. This acts to increase

the number of "agree" responses so that parents display more authoritarian attitudes than do actually exist. This acquiescence was not noted in this study where scores on the factors were consistent in the "disagree" areas. The set to acquiesce or agree did not seem to operate in this study. However general limitations relating to the measurement and assessment of attitudes must be remembered when generalising from the study.

### 3. Suggestions for Further Research.

The fact that the parent education programme of the New Zealand Play Centre movement has been questioned suggests that further consideration be given to this question. It would be useful to distinguish between the two areas which have been labelled as formal and the informal parent education and to assess which type of programme works but with which type of person.

The measurement of parental attitudes is still difficult, a refinement of the four factors derived from the factor analysis of the PASQ could be useful, especially as there was little evidence of the operation of an Acquiescence Response set on these.

Assessment of the Play Centre's programmes may be possible on a broader basis; the possibility of personality variables relating to attitude change in specific situations or programmes would appear to be a worthwhile follow up study.

The suggestions in the literature that there may be different marriage patterns (parallel and interactional) has received some attention in New Zealand recently. Information relating to these patterns was actually collected for this study but not used because

the small sub-group comparisons would not have meant very much. It is intended to analyse this data at a later date for a further report on the study.

Parental perception of Play Centre standards, attitudes or opinions, appears to be very inaccurate. It may be that the Play Centre attitudes of the "experts" as presented here are too extreme for local or regional organisers and administrators. It is possible that at this local or regional level the attitudes of the "experts" are being interpreted and presented in less extreme fashion. Some information has been collected from regional administrators in the Play Centre which suggests that their responses in the same manner as the Expert group result in less extreme measures on the PASQ than the "Experts" group considered in this study. It is planned to report these measures at a later date. The investigation of parental attitudes by sex and socio-economic group membership is another area of child-rearing that could prove to be a fruitful area of research, especially in view of recent suggestions that differences in parental attitudes between males and females are lessening i.e. that parental roles are becoming less autonomous.

The present results should be considered as rather tentative indications based on a preliminary investigation in the area. More extensive programmes which follow different groups of parents and their children through the Play Centre should yield more conclusive results.

Appendices

for

List of Contents. see p. vii.

APPENDIX 1ITEM SCALES WRITTEN FOR THIS SURVEYRESTRICTING UNDESSSED DISPLAY

It's not right for children to see their parents undressed because it makes them more curious about sex.

A boy shouldn't see his mother in the shower.

It develops unhealthy attitudes when children play round together with nothing on.

It's not right for a girl to see her father when he's undressed.

A child shouldn't see its mother or father in the bath.

---

RESTRICTING AGGRESSIVE BEHAVIOUR

Parents should stop children from fighting.

Aggressive children require constant supervision.

If children are allowed to fight they will grow up always wanting to fight.

It's worse for a child to hit its father or mother, than to hit another child.

It is worse for a boy to hit his mother than his sister.

REJECTION OF FAMILY LIFE (MEN)

The things wives and children ask of a man after his hard days work are enough to make anyone lose his temper at times.

Having to be with the family all the time gives a man the feeling his wings have been clipped.

It's no wonder men reach boiling point when they come home and run right into family problems straight away.

Men don't realize how much they enjoy being free until they start raising a family.

Settling down to family life is hard for a man because it means giving up so many things.

---

PARENTAL ASCENDANCY

As long as you tell a child what to do he should do it no matter what.

If children obeyed their parents more they would get along better in life.

Children have no need to fear parents as long as they do as their parents tell them.

Children should not disobey their parents even if they feel their own ideas are better.

Children should be taught that their parents always know what is best for them.

VERBAL CONTROL OF BEHAVIOUR

If you praise a child for good behaviour he will only get a swollen head.

It's a waste of time talking to children about things they have done wrong; this won't stop them doing it again.

If you reward a child for being good this is only bribing him and he will expect it all the time.

It's no use reasoning with a child, you've got to punish him in some way.

Praising children for being good has little effect on stopping bad behaviour.

---

HARSH DISCIPLINE

You are being soft when you don't punish your children for being bad.

Smacking your child is the most effective way of stopping bad behaviour.

If your children insist on fighting they should be spanked.

If children were smacked more they would soon learn to do as they were told.

If you smack a child this soon teaches him what to do.

MARITAL DECISION MAKING

There is little need for husband and wife to decide things together, talking about things leads to misunderstandings and arguments.

It's often a waste of time for a wife and her husband to talk over problems, they usually have their own ideas anyway.

There is little need for a woman to be consulted if her husband wishes to change his job.

A wife should have the last say in deciding how many children to have.

A wife has little need to consult her husband before buying herself new clothes.

MARITAL ROLE

Fathers should bath and change the new baby more often than they do.

The best relationship in marriage is where husband and wife each have their set tasks and stick to these most of the time.

A wife should not expect her husband to have to change the baby's napkins.

Even if they wanted to, most fathers are not able to spend more time than they do with their children.

A wife should give in to her husband's wishes because he is head of the home.



- |     |  |   |   |   |   |
|-----|--|---|---|---|---|
| 16. | If you let children talk about their troubles they end up complaining even more.   | A | a | d | D |
| 17. | Mothers would do their job better with children if fathers were more kind.   | A | a | d | D |
| 18. | A Young child should be protected from hearing about sex.  | A | a | d | D |
| 19. | If a mother doesn't go ahead and make rules for the home the children and husband will get into troubles they don't need to. | A | a | d | D |
| 20. | A mother should make it her business to know everything her children are thinking.   | A | a | d | D |
| 21. | Children would be happier and better behaved if parents would show an interest in their affairs.                             | A | a | d | D |
| 22. | Most children are toilet trained by 15 months of age.  | A | a | d | D |
| 23. | As long as you tell a child what to do, he should do it, no matter what.   | A | a | d | D |
| 24. | If you praise a child for good behaviour he will only get a swollen head.  | A | a | d | D |
| 25. | The things wives and children ask of a man after his hard day's work are enough to make anyone lose his temper at times.     | A | a | d | D |
| 26. | You are being soft when you don't punish your children for being bad.  | A | a | d | D |
| 27. | Children should be encouraged to tell their parents about it whenever they feel that the family rules are unreasonable.      | A | a | d | D |
| 28. | Parents should do their best to avoid any disappointment for their children.   | A | a | d | D |
| 29. | A boy shouldn't see his mother in the shower.  | A | a | d | D |
| 30. | It is frequently necessary to drive the mischief out of a child before he will behave.                                       | A | a | d | D |
| 31. | The best relationship in marriage is where husband and wife each have their set tasks and stick to these most of the time.   | A | a | d | D |
| 32. | It is worse for a boy to hit his mother than his sister.   | A | a | d | D |
| 33. | Sometimes it's necessary for a wife to tell off her husband in order to get her rights.                                      | A | a | d | D |
| 34. | Strict discipline develops a fine strong character.  | A | a | d | D |
| 35. | Parents often feel that they can't stand their children a moment longer.   | A | a | d | D |
| 36. | A parent should never be made to look wrong in a child's eyes.   | A | a | d | D |
| 37. | The child should be taught to honour his parents above all other grown ups.  | A | a | d | D |
| 38. | A child should be taught to always come to his parents or teachers rather than fight when he is in trouble.                  | A | a | d | D |

39. Having to be with children all the time gives a woman the feeling her wings have been clipped. A a d D
40. Parents must earn the respect of their children by the way they act. A a d D
41. It's often a waste of time for a wife and husband to talk over problems, they usually have their own ideas anyway. A a d D
42. Parents who start a child talking about his worries don't realise that sometimes it's better to just leave things as they were. A a d D
43. Husbands could do more if they were less selfish. A a d D
44. It is very important that young boys and girls not be allowed to see each other completely undressed. A a d D
45. Children and husbands do better when the mother is strong enough to settle most problems. A a d D
46. A child should never keep a secret from his parents. A a d D
47. Laughing at children's jokes and telling children jokes makes things go more smoothly. A a d D
48. The sooner a child learns to walk the better he's trained. A a d D
49. If children obeyed their parents more they would get along better in life. A a d D
50. It's a waste of time talking to children about things they have done wrong; this won't stop them doing it again. A a d D
51. Having to be with the family all the time gives a man the feeling his wings have been clipped. A a d D
52. Smacking your child is the most effective way of stopping bad behaviour. A a d D
53. A child has the right to his own point of view and ought to be allowed to express it. A a d D
54. A child should be protected from jobs which might be too tiring or hard for him. A a d D
55. It develops unhealthy attitudes when children play round together with nothing on. A a d D
56. A wise parent will teach a child early just who is boss. A a d D
57. A wife should not expect her husband to have to change the baby's napkins. A a d D
58. If children are allowed to fight they will grow up always wanting to fight. A a d D
59. No matter how well a married couple love one another, there are always differences which cause irritation and lead to arguments. A a d D
60. Children who are held to firm rules grow up to be the best adults. A a d D
61. It is a rare parent who can be sweet and even-tempered with his/her children all day. A a d D

62. Children should never learn things outside the home which make them doubt their parents ideas. A a d D
63. A child soon learns that there is no greater wisdom than that of his parents. A a d D
64. There is no good excuse for a child hitting another child. A a d D
65. Most young mothers are bothered more by the feeling of being shut up in the home than by anything else. A a d D
66. Children are too often asked to all the compromising and adjustment and that is not fair. A a d D
67. There is little need for a woman to be consulted if her husband wishes to change his job. A a d D
68. Children pester you with their little upsets if you aren't careful from the very beginning. A a d D
69. When a mother doesn't do a good job with children it's probably because father doesn't do his part around the home. A a d D
70. Children who take part in sex play become sex criminals when they grow up. A a d D
71. A mother has to do the planning because she is the one who knows what's going on in the home. A a d D
72. An alert parent should try to learn all her child's thoughts. A a d D
73. Parents who are interested in hearing about their children's parties, friends and games will help them grow up right. A a d D
74. Parents should know better than to allow their children to be exposed to difficult situations. A a d D \*
75. Children have no need to fear parents as long as they do as their parents tell them. A a d D l.
76. If you reward a child for being good this is only bribing him and he will expect it all the time. A a d D
77. It's no wonder men reach boiling point when they come home and run right into family problems straight away. A a d D
78. If your children insist on fighting they should be spanked. A a d D
79. A child's ideas should be seriously considered in making family decisions. A a d D
80. Parents should know better than to allow their children to be exposed to difficult situations. A a d D
81. It's not right for a girl to see her father when he's undressed. A a d D
82. Children need some of the natural meanness taken out of them. A a d D
83. Even if they want to, most fathers are not able to spend more time than they do with their children. A a d D
84. If children are allowed to fight they will grow up always wanting to fight. A a d D \*

\* Deleted.

1. Items 75-130 (excluding 84) renumbered 74-128.

85. There are some things in marriage which just can't be settled by mild discussion. A a d D
86. Most children should have more discipline than they get. A a d D
87. Raising children is a nerve-wracking job. A a d D
88. The child should not question the thinking of his parents. A a d D
89. Parents deserve the highest esteem and regard from their children. A a d D
90. Children should not be encouraged to box or wrestle because it often leads to trouble and injury. A a d D
91. One of the bad things about raising children is that you aren't free for enough time to do just as you like. A a d D
92. As much as is reasonable a parent should try to treat a child as an equal. A a d D
93. A wife should have the last say in deciding how many children to have. A a d D
94. If a child has upset feelings it is best to leave him alone and not make it look serious. A a d D
95. If mothers could get their wishes they would most often ask that their husbands would be more understanding. A a d D
96. Sex is one of the greatest problems to be contended with in children. A a d D
97. The whole family does fine if the mother puts her shoulders to the wheel and takes charge of things. A a d D
98. Parents have a right to know everything going on in their child's life because the child is part of them. A a d D
99. If parents would have fun with their children the children would be more apt to take their advice. A a d D
100. A mother should make an effort to get her child toilet trained at the earliest possible time. A a d D
101. Children should not disobey their parents even if they feel their own ideas are better. A a d D
102. It's no use reasoning with a child, you've got to punish him in some way. A a d D
103. Men don't realise how much they enjoy being free until they start raising a family. A a d D
104. If children were smacked more they would soon learn to do as they were told. A a d D
105. When a child is in trouble he ought to know he won't be punished for talking about it with his parents. A a d D
106. Children should be kept away from all hard jobs which might be discouraging. A a d D
107. A child shouldn't see its mother or father in the bath. A a d D

108. It is sometimes necessary for the parents to break the child's will. A a d D
109. A wife should give in to her husband's wishes because he is head of the home. A a d D
110. It's worse for a child to hit its father or mother, than to hit another child. A a d D
111. It's natural to have quarrels when two people who both have minds of their own, get married. A a d D
112. Children are actually happier under strict training. A a d D
113. It's natural for parents to "blow their top" when children are selfish and demanding. A a d D
114. There is nothing worse than letting a child hear criticisms of his parents. A a d D
115. Loyalty to parents comes before anything else. A a d D
116. Most parents prefer a quiet child to a "scrappy" one. A a d D
117. A young mother feels "held down" because there are lots of things she wants to do while she is young. A a d D
118. There is no reason parents should have their own way all the time, any more than children should have their own way all the time. A a d D
119. A wife has little need to consult her husband before buying herself new clothes. A a d D
120. The trouble with giving attention to children's problems is that they usually just make up a lot of stories to keep you interested. A a d D
121. Few men realise that a mother needs some fun in life too. A a d D
122. There is usually something wrong with a child who asks a lot of questions about sex. A a d D
123. A married woman knows that she will have to take the lead in family matters. A a d D
124. It is a mother's duty to make sure she knows her child's innermost thoughts. A a d D
125. When you do things together, children feel close to you and can talk easier. A a d D
126. A child should be weaned away from the bottle or breast as soon as possible. A a d D
127. Children should be taught that their parents always know what is best for them. A a d D
128. Praising children for being good has little effect on stopping bad behaviour. A a d D
129. Settling down to family life is hard for a man because it means giving up so many other things. A a d D
130. If you smack a child, this soon teaches him what to do. A a d D

141.

APPENDIX 3.  
INFORMATION SHEET.

FAMILY IDEAS SURVEY

INFORMATION SCHEDULE

Name (surname first) Mr/Mrs \_\_\_\_\_

Address \_\_\_\_\_ Age (years) \_\_\_\_\_

Telephone \_\_\_\_\_ Years married \_\_\_\_\_

Occupation: 1. present occupation \_\_\_\_\_  
2. of wife (husband) \_\_\_\_\_  
3. your father's occupation \_\_\_\_\_  
4. Women only - occupation before marriage \_\_\_\_\_

Family:

- A. 1. How many brothers and sisters do you have? \_\_\_\_\_  
2. Your position in your family (e.g. 1st, 3rd, last) \_\_\_\_\_
- B. 1. Number of children in present family \_\_\_\_\_  
2. Age and sex e.g. 7½, Boy; 3½, Girl; \_\_\_\_\_, \_\_\_\_\_, \_\_\_\_\_,  
3. In B2 above, circle those who have attended play centre.  
4. At what age did your child(ren) commence play centre  
(list separately if more than one) \_\_\_\_\_, \_\_\_\_\_, \_\_\_\_\_

Education:

1. When did you leave school (a) age \_\_\_\_\_ (b) class \_\_\_\_\_  
2. Major subjects \_\_\_\_\_  
3. Examinations passed. \_\_\_\_\_  
4. Additional training or qualifications (include partially completed)  
\_\_\_\_\_  
5. Experience with children (apart from family/play centre).

Play Centre:

1. Previous contact with play centre (before enrolling first child.  
(please underline)  
(i) NONE (ii) A LITTLE (iii) A LOT  
details of (ii) or (iii) \_\_\_\_\_
2. What did you know about play centre ideas before you joined?  
(please underline)  
(i) NOTHING (ii) A LITTLE (iii) A LOT
3. How did you first find out about play centre?
4. Why did you enrol your child(ren) at play centre?
5. Why have you become involved in play centre?  
e.g. I had to (mother helping), friends were there,  
I made new friends there, good for babysitting, etc.  
Please list:

6. What position(s) do you, or have you held in your play centre  
(with dates)
7. List the courses, discussions, training sessions, workshops etc,  
that you have attended in relation to play centre in the past  
2½ years.  
(give some time indication - e.g. "Introductory" - three, 1½ hours.)
8. How much of the supervisor training course have you completed.  
(please underline)
- (i) NONE                      (ii) SOME                      (iii) ALL
- NOTE: if NONE. - Do you intend to start. Yes/No. Year \_\_\_\_\_  
if SOME - Do you intend to finish. Yes/No. Year \_\_\_\_\_  
if ALL - Indicate year of completion. 19. \_\_\_\_\_
9. Name of present play centre \_\_\_\_\_

APPENDIX 4.  
FAMILY RELATIONS QUESTIONNAIRE (FRQ).

FAMILY TASKS SCHEDULE

FAMILY IDEAS SURVEY

Name (please print) Mr/Mrs.

In your household - who makes the following decisions.	Wife	Wife more than husband	Decide jointly	Husband more than wife	Husband
1. What bills to pay.					
2. Whether wife should work.					
3. When to have children.					
4. Whether to change husband's job.					
5. How to discipline the children.					
6. How much to spend on wife's clothing.					
7. Whether to move house.					
8. Amount of children's pocket money.					
In your household - who does the following jobs.	Wife	Wife more than husband	Decide jointly	Husband more than wife	Husband
1. buys the groceries.					
2. gets breakfast.					
3. puts out the rubbish bag.					
4. pays the bills.					
5. gets up to the children at night.					
6. Does the washing.					
7. disciplines the children					
8. answers the telephone in the evening.					

Do You Talk to Your Husband/Wife?	Never	Seldom	Half the Time	Usually	Always
1. When you feel depressed.					
2. When you have health problems.					
3. When you have money problems.					
4. When you have work problems.					
5. When you have problems with the children.					
6. About politics					
7. When you hear other peoples ideas on Vietnam					
8. About child's progress at Play Centre.					
DO YOU?	Never	Seldom	Half the Time	Usually	Always
1. Regularly attend church together.					
2. Watch and discuss t.v. together					
3. Visit friends together					
4. Get out together at night at least once a month.					
5. Go to entertainment without your partner.					
6. Share decisions about the children.					
7. Visit relatives together					
8. Attend Play Centre meetings together.					
9. Read stories together with the children.					

APPENDIX 5REQUEST FOR INFORMATIONPLAY CENTRE EXPERTS

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

24th November, 1969.

Dear

I am at present engaged in conducting a survey in Palmerston North of some parental attitudes of couples whose children are attending a Play Centre. As part of this survey both husband and wife are being asked to respond to this enclosed questionnaire "as you think the Play Centre would want you to". This is an attempt to assess what aspects of the Play Centre movement's ideas about bringing up children are recognized and accepted by parents.

It is necessary for me to have some measure of the "official" or "generally accepted" Play Centre attitudes and I thought that these would best be gained from those who have been concerned with play centre for a number of years or who are actively involved in teaching and training play centre parents. You have been recommended as one of these people and I am hoping that you will be kind enough to help in this survey.

In this instance I am calling on your help to respond as though you were expressing the "official" play centre view. Would you be kind enough to reply to the questionnaire not from a personal point of view, but as though you were giving the official play centre opinion about pre-schoolers.

Could you please return by Friday, 5 December as I will be leaving this address soon after this date.

Thankyou,

Yours faithfully,

(Harry E. Burdon.)

(Stamped return envelope is enclosed)

APPENDIX 9FACTOR SCALE AAUTHORITARIAN ATTITUDES

ITEM		Mean	S.D.	Factor Loading
Number	Statement			
8.	A child will be grateful later on for strict training.	2.6	1.0	-.57
11.	More Parents should teach their children to have unquestioning loyalty to them	2.4	0.9	-.64
23.	As long as you tell a child what to do, he should do it, no matter what.	2.4	1.0	-.58
26.	You are being soft when you don't punish your children for being bad.	2.3	0.9	-.49
32.	It is worse for a boy to hit his mother than his sister.	2.7	1.1	-.53
34.	Strict discipline develops a fine strong character.	2.2	0.9	-.55
37.	The child should be taught to honour his parents above all other grown ups.	2.8	0.9	-.55
49.	If children obeyed their parents more they would get along better in life.	2.7	0.8	-.51
52.	Smacking your child is the most effective way of stopping bad behaviour.	1.9	0.8	-.41
56.	A wise parent will teach a child early just who is boss.	2.8	0.9	-.56
72.	An alert parent should try to learn all her child's thoughts.	2.2	1.0	-.34
77.	If your children insist on fighting they should be spanked.	2.2	0.9	-.49
81.	Children need some of the natural meanness taken out of them.	2.0	0.9	-.34
84.	Most children should have more discipline than they get.	2.6	0.8	-.50

Number	Statement	Mean	S.D.	Factor Loading
86.	The child should not question the thinking of his parents.	1.8	0.7	-.42
87.	Parents deserve the highest esteem and regard from their children.	2.8	0.9	-.58
96.	Parents have a right to know everything going on in their child's life because the child is part of them.	2.5	0.9	-.55
98.	A mother should make an effort to get her child toilet trained at the earliest possible time.	2.5	1.1	-.58
99.	Children should not disobey their parents even if they feel their own ideas are better.	2.6	0.9	-.45
108.	It's worse for a child to hit its father or mother, than to hit another child.	2.7	1.0	-.58
110.	Children are actually happier under strict training.	2.3	0.9	-.44
112.	There is nothing worse than letting a child hear criticisms of his parents.	2.6	0.9	-.49
113.	Loyalty to parents comes before anything else.	2.6	0.9	-.67
125.	Children should be taught that their parents always know what is best for them	2.6	0.9	-.62
128.	If you smack a child, this soon teaches him what to do.	1.9	0.8	-.36
Factor Scale Score (25 items)		Mean 62.28	S.D. 12.98	

APPENDIX 10.FACTOR SCALE BREALITIES OF PARENTHOOD

<u>REALITIES OF PARENTHOOD</u>				
<u>ITEM</u>				<u>Factor</u>
<u>Number</u>	<u>Statement</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>S.D.</u>	<u>Loading</u>
21.	Children would be happier and better behaved if parents would show an interest in their affairs.	3.7	0.5	+ .48
22.	Most children are toilet trained by 15 months of age.	1.8	0.9	- .27
57.	A wife should not expect her husband to have to change the baby's napkins.	1.8	0.9	+ .47
58.	If children are allowed to fight they will grow up always wanting to fight.	1.6	0.8	+ .49
59.	No matter how well a married couple love one another, there are always differences which cause irritation and lead to arguments.	3.4	0.9	+ .64
60.	Children who are held to firm rules grow up to be the best adults.	2.3	0.9	+ .43
61.	It is a rare parent who can be sweet and eventempered with his/her children all day.	3.4	0.9	+ .61
64.	There is no good excuse for a child hitting another child.	2.0	0.8	+ .30
66.	Children are too often asked to all the compromising and adjustment and that is not fair.	2.8	0.9	+ .47
68.	Children pester you with their little upsets if you aren't careful from the very beginning.	1.8	0.9	+ .44
69.	When a mother doesn't do a good job with children it's probably because father doesn't do his part around the home.	2.0	1.0	+ .42

Number	Statement	Mean	S.D.	Factor Loading
71.	A mother has to do the planning because she is the one who knows what's going on in the home.	2.4	0.9	+ .51
73.	Parents who are interested in hearing about their childrens parties, friends and games will help them grow up right.	3.6	0.8	+ .71
74.	Children have no need to fear parents as long as they do as their parents tell them.	2.3	1.0	+ .38
85.	Raising children is a nerve-wracking job.	2.5	1.0	+ .25
89.	One of the bad things about raising children is that you aren't free for enough time to do just as you like.	2.4	0.9	+ .31
90.	As much as is reasonable a parent should try to treat a child as an equal.	3.0	0.9	+ .28
106.	It is sometimes necessary for the parents to break the child's will.	1.9	0.9	- .27
Factor Scale Score (18 items)		Mean 47.65	S.D. 8.14	

APPENDIX 11.FACTOR SCALE CPARENTAL ASCENDANCY

<u>ITEM</u>				
<u>Number</u>	<u>Statement</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>S.D.</u>	<u>Factor Loading</u>
5.	Fathers should bath and change the new baby more often than they do.	2.9	0.9	-.39
19.	If a mother doesn't go ahead and make rules for the home the children and husband will get into troubles they don't need to.	2.1	1.0	+.30
31.	The best relationship in marriage is where husband and wife each have their set tasks and stick to them most of the time.	2.0	0.9	+.31
51.	Having to be with the family all the time gives a man the feeling his wings have been clipped.	2.5	0.9	+.48
78.	A child's ideas should be seriously considered in making family decisions.	3.0	0.8	-.40
95.	The whole family does fine if the mother puts her shoulders to the wheel and takes charge of things.	2.1	0.9	+.36
97.	If parents would have fun with their children the children would be more apt to take their advice.	3.3	0.7	-.25
101.	Men don't realise how much they enjoy being free until they start raising a family.	2.3	1.0	+.39
107.	A wife should give in to her husband's wishes because he is head of the home.	2.0	0.8	+.25
114.	Most parents prefer a quiet child to a "scrappy" one.	2.6	0.8	+.25

Number	Statement	Mean	S.D.	Factor Loading
121	A married woman knows that she will have to take the lead in family matters.	2.1	0.9	+ .58
127	Settling down to family life is hard for a man because it means giving up so many other things.	2.2	0.8	+ .47

Factor Scale Score : Mean 26.06  
(12 items) S.D. 5.43

---

APPENDIX 12.FACTOR SCALE D.RESTRICTIVE ATTITUDES

ITEM				Factor Loading
Number	Statement	Mean	S.D.	
3.	It's not right for children to see their parents undressed because it makes them more curious about sex.	1.4	0.8	- .58
4.	Some children are just so bad they must be taught to fear adults for their own good	1.4	0.8	- .36
15.	There is little need for husband and wife to decide things together, talking about things leads to arguments.	1.3	0.6	- .37
16.	If you let children talk about their troubles they end up complaining even more.	1.4	0.7	- .36
18.	A young child should be protected from hearing about sex.	1.4	0.7	- .52
24.	If you praise a child for good behaviour he will only get a swollen head.	1.3	0.6	- .50
27.	Children should be encouraged to tell their parents about it whenever they feel that the family rules are unreasonable.	3.5	0.7	+ .43
29.	A boy shouldn't see his mother in the shower.	1.6	0.8	- .61
30.	It is frequently necessary to drive the mischief out of a child before he will behave.	1.7	0.8	- .43
41.	It's often a waste of time for a wife and husband to talk over problems, they usually have their own ideas anyway.	1.5	0.8	- .29
44.	It is very important that young boys and girls not be allowed to see each other completely undressed.	1.4	0.7	- .66
47.	Laughing at children's jokes and telling children jokes makes things go more smoothly.	3.1	0.7	+ .47

Number	Statement	Mean	S.D.	Factor Loading
55.	It develops unhealthy attitudes when children play round together with nothing on.	1.9	0.9	- .47
67.	There is little need for a woman to be consulted if her husband wishes to change his job.	1.4	0.8	- .28
70.	Children who take part in sex play become sex criminals when they grow up.	1.4	0.7	- .41
80.	It's not right for a girl to see her father when he's undressed.	1.7	0.8	- .71
94.	Sex is one of the greatest problems to be contended with in children.	1.9	0.9	- .38
100.	It's no use reasoning with a child, you've got to punish him in some way.	1.5	0.8	- .42
105.	A child shouldn't see its mother or father in the bath.	1.4	0.7	- .59
118.	The trouble with giving attention to children's problems is that they usually just make up a lot of stories to keep you interested.	1.7	0.8	- .31
120.	There is usually something wrong with a child who asks a lot of questions about sex.	1.4	0.6	- .50
124.	A child should be weaned away from the bottle or breast as soon as possible.	1.8	0.9	- .26
126.	Praising children for being good has little effect on stopping bad behaviour	1.7	0.8	- .42

Factor Scale Score : Mean 35.89  
(23 items) S.D. 9.49

APPENDIX 13  
FACTOR SCALE E

DISCOURAGING INDEPENDENCE

ITAP				Factor Loading
Number	Statement	Mean	S.D.	
2.	A good mother should shelter her child from life's little difficulties.	1.9	0.9	+ .54
20.	A mother should make it her business to know everything her children are thinking	1.8	0.8	+ .36
28.	Parents should do their best to avoid any disappointment for their children.	2.3	1.0	+ .51
36.	A parent should never be made to look wrong in a child's eyes.	2.4	1.0	+ .36
38.	A child should be taught to always come to his parents or teachers rather than fight when he is in trouble.	2.6	0.9	+ .37
45.	Children and husbands do better when the mother is strong enough to settle most problems.	2.2	1.0	+ .35
46.	A child should never keep a secret from his parents.	2.2	0.9	+ .33
62.	Children should never learn things outside the home which make them doubt their parents ideas.	1.8	1.0	+ .47
63.	A child soon learns that there is no greater wisdom than that of his parents.	2.0	1.0	+ .63
79.	Parents should know better than to allow their children to be exposed to difficult situations.	2.1	0.9	+ .50
91.	A wife should have the last say in deciding how many children to have.	2.5	1.0	+ .25
104.	Children should be kept away from all hard jobs which might be discouraging.	1.8	0.8	+ .34

Number	Statement	Mean	S.D.	Factor Loading
119.	Few men realise that a mother needs some fun in life too.	2.5	1.0	+ .33
122.	It is a mother's duty to make sure she knows her child's innermost thoughts.	1.9	0.8	+ .38

Factor Scale Score : Mean 30.46  
14 items S.D. 6.90

---

## FACTOR SCALE F

## INADEQUACY OF VERBAL COMMUNICATION

ITEM		Mean	S.D.	Factor Loading
Number	Statement			
7.	People who think they can get along in marriage without arguments just don't know the facts.	3.1	0.9	+ .52
33.	Sometimes it's necessary for a wife to tell off her husband in order to get her rights.	2.8	0.9	+ .46
42.	Parents who start a child talking about his worries don't realise that sometimes it's better to just leave things as they were.	1.9	0.9	+ .39
75.	If you reward a child for being good this is only bribing him and he will expect it all the time.	2.0	0.9	+ .35
83.	There are some things in marriage which just can't be settled by mild discussion.	2.6	1.0	+ .38
109.	It's natural to have quarrels when two people who both have minds of their own, get married.	3.3	0.8	+ .55
111.	It's natural for parents to "blow their top" when children are selfish and demanding.	2.9	0.9	+ .40

Factor Scale Score : Mean 18.70  
 (7 items) S.D. 3.57

APPENDIX 15.FACTOR SCALE GIRRITABILITY

ITEM				Factor Loading
Number	Statement	Mean	S.D.	
9.	Children will get on any persons nerves if they have to be with children all day.	2.5	1.0	+ .38
25.	The things wives and children ask of a man after his hard day's work are enough to make anyone lose his temper at times.	2.2	0.9	+ .50
50.	It's a waste of time talking to children about things they have done wrong; this won't stop them doing it again.	1.6	0.7	+ .43
54.	A child should be protected from jobs which might be too tiring or hard for him.	2.5	0.9	+ .47
76.	It's no wonder men reach boiling point when they come home and run right into family problems straight away.	2.4	0.9	+ .50
92.	If a child has upset feelings it is best to leave him alone and not make it look serious.	2.4	0.8	+ .45

Factor Scale Scores : Mean 13.60  
 (6 items) S.D. 3.38

FACTOR SCALE HEQUALITARIANISM

ITEM		Factor Loading		
Number	Statement	Mean	S.D.	
1.	Children should be allowed to disagree with their parents if they feel their own ideas are better.	3.2	0.7	+ .27
10.	It is best for the child if he never gets started wondering whether his parents views are right.	1.6	0.8	- .34
14.	Parents should adjust to the children more rather than always expecting children to adjust to the parents.	2.8	0.8	+ .37
40.	Parents must earn the respect of their children by the way they act.	3.7	0.5	+ .43
116.	There is no reason parents should have their own way all the time, any more than children should have their own way all the time.	3.2	0.8	+ .37
117.	A wife has little need to consult her husband before buying herself new clothes.	2.3	0.9	+ .47
Factor Scale Score : Mean 18.65 (6 items) S.D. 2.71				

APPENDIX 17FACTOR SCALE IDISSATISFACTION WITH HOUSEWIFES ROLE

ITEM				Factor Loading
Number	Statement	Mean	S.D.	
13.	One of the worst things about taking care of a home is that a woman feels she can't get out.	2.4	1.0	+ .57
17.	Mothers would do their job better with children if fathers were more kind.	2.2	1.0	+ .45
35.	Parents often feel that they can't stand their children a moment longer.	2.9	0.9	+ .29
39.	Having to be with children all the time gives a woman the feeling her wings have been clipped.	2.6	0.8	+ .60
43.	Husbands could do more if they were less selfish.	2.4	1.0	+ .58
65.	Most young mothers are bothered more by the feeling of being shut up in the home than by anything else.	2.3	1.0	+ .39
93.	If mothers could get their wishes they would most often ask that their husbands would be more understanding.	2.8	0.8	+ .41
115.	A young mother feels "held down" because there are lots of things she wants to do while she is young.	2.6	0.7	+ .38
Factor Scale Score : Mean 20.33 (8 items) S.D. 4.41				

APPENDIX 18.FACTOR SCALE JRESPECT FOR INDIVIDUALITY

		ITEM		Factor Loading
Number	Statement	Mean	S.D.	
6.	Parents should stop children from fighting	2.6	0.7	- .40
12.	A child should be taught to avoid fighting no matter what happens.	1.8	0.8	- .42
48.	The sooner a child learns to walk the better he is trained.	1.7	0.8	- .29
53.	A child has the right to his own point of view and ought to be allowed to express it.	3.5	0.6	+ .40
82.	Even if they want to, most fathers are not able to spend more time than they do with their children.	2.8	0.8	+ .33
88.	Children should not be encouraged to box or wrestle because it often leads to trouble and injury.	2.0	0.8	- .33
102.	If children were smacked more they would soon learn to do as they were told.	1.6	0.8	- .36
103.	When a child is in trouble he ought to know he won't be punished for talking about it with his parents.	3.6	0.6	+ .54
123.	When you do things together, children feel close to you and can talk easier.	3.7	0.4	+ .41

Factor Scale Score : Mean 29.01  
(9 items) S.D. 3.44

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Material Relating to the Play Centre: Play Centre Publications.  
 Hill, C.G.N., Somerset, G.L., and Grey, A. Living and Learning with Children. Wellington: Price Milburn, 1965.  
 Somerset, G.L. (ed). I Play and I Grow. Auckland: The New Zealand Play Centre Federation, 1967.  
 Somerset, G.L. and Grey, A. Belonging in the Family. Wellington: The New Zealand Play Centre Federation, 1962.  
New Zealand Play Centre Federation Journal. (editor G.L. Somerset).  
 Published bi-annually.
2. Theses, Monographs and Research Reports.  
 McDonald, Geraldine. Title Unknown. Unpublished Master's Thesis, Department of Education, Victoria University, 1969.  
 Ritchie, James E. and Jane Ritchie. Patterns of Child Rearing in New Zealand; Some Preliminary Results, Hamilton: Waikato University, 1966, (Mimeographed Report).
3. Articles and Assorted Papers.  
 Becker, Wesley C. and Ronald S. Krug. "The Parent Attitude Research Instrument - A Research Review". Child Development, 1965 (36) 329-365.  
 Bell, Richard Q., W.W. Hartup, and D. H. Crowell. "Mailed Versus Supervised Administration of a Projective Questionnaire", Journal of Consulting Psychology, 26, 1962, 290.  
 Boneau, C. "The Effects of Violations of Assumptions Underlying the t-test". Psychological Bulletin, LVII, 1960, 49-64.  
 Boneau, C. "A Note on Measurement Scales and Statistical Tests". American Psychologist, XVI, 1961, 260-261.  
 Brodbeck, Arthur J., Philip Noguee and Arthur Di Mascio. "Two Types of Conformity: A Study of the Riesman Typology Applied to Standards of Parental Discipline". Journal of Psychology, 41, 1956, 23-45.  
 Burt, Cyril. "An Enquiry into Public Opinion Regarding Educational Reform." Occupational Psychology XVII, 1, (4), 1943, 157-167.

- Congalton, Athol A. and Robert J. Havighurst. "Status Ranking of Occupations in New Zealand". Australian Journal of Psychology 6, 1954, 10 - 15.
- Costin, Frank. "Measuring Attitudinal Outcomes of Child Psychology with the Parental Attitude Research Instrument." Journal of Educational Research, 53, 1960, 289- 294.
- Costin, Frank. "Attitudinal Outcomes of Child Psychology Courses Having Different Orientations". Journal of Psychology, 51, 1961, 113 - 119.
- Freedheim, D.K. and Wally, Reichenberg-Hackett. "An Experimental Investigation of Parent-Child Attitudes With the PARI Scales". Child Development, 30, 1959, 353 - 361.
- Garrett, Dennis "Mothers and Fathers: Brothers and Sisters". Notes for discussion in Plunket Series on Child Development, August, 1968. Dept. Univ. Extension, Victoria University of Wellington. (mimeograph).
- \_\_\_\_\_ "Can We Communicate Both to Mothers and Fathers." A Paper for the 12th Annual Preschool Conference, Arahina, June 1969 a.
- \_\_\_\_\_ "The Open Community". Play Centre Journal, 15, 1969 b. 16 - 18.
- Garrett, Ephra M. "Social Change and the New Zealand Family". Delta 5, Palmerston North, Massey Education Society, 1969 53-58.
- Gilson, Miriam. "The Changing New Zealand Family". The New Zealand Family and Child Development, Assoc. Study Childhood, 1969, 65 - 75.
- McCreary, J.R. "An Introduction to the New Zealand Family". The New Zealand Family and Child Development Wellington, Assoc. Study Childhood, 1969, 11-20.
- Nash John. "The Father in Contemporary Culture and Current Psychological Literature." Child Development, 36, 1, 1965, 262-297.
- Nichols, Robert C. "A Factor Analysis of Parental Attitudes of Fathers". Child Development, 33, 1962, 791-802.
- Schaefer, Earl S. "Converging Conceptual Models For Maternal Behaviour and For Child Behaviour" in J. C. Glidewell (ed) Parental Attitudes and Child Behaviour, Springfield, Ill: Thomas, 1961.
- Schaefer, Earl S. and Richard Q. Bell. "Patterns of Attitudes toward Child Bearing and the Family". Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 54, 1957, 391-395.
- \_\_\_\_\_ "Development of A Parental Attitude Research Instrument." Child Development, 29, 1958, 339-361.

- Schaefer, Earl S. and Betty R. Burgoon. "References on the Parental Attitude Research Instrument, 1957-1965". National Institute of Mental Health, 1966. (Mimeographed.)
- Shallcrass J.J. "What Can A Parent Trust in Psychology." What Do We Know About Child Development, Assoc. Study Childhood, 1969, 57-66.
- Smith Joan. "Our Directors of Training, What Are they Thinking About," Play Centre Journal, 15, 1969, 3-4.
- Stroobant, R. "Current Methods of Child Control". Conformity and Individuality. Assoc. Study Childhood, 1958. in Houston S. (ed) Marriage and the Family in New Zealand, Wellington, Sweet and Maxwell 1970, p 26.
- Vellekoop, Cora. "Streaming and Social Class." Delta 5. Palmerston North, Massey Education Society, 1969, 13 - 20.
- Zuckerman, M "Reversed Scales to Control Acquiescence Response Set in the Parental Attitude Research Instrument". Child Development, 3, 1959, 523-532.
- 
- Beatrice H. Barrett and Raymond Bragiel. "The Parental Attitudes of Parents of Child Guidance Cases: 1. Comparisons with Normals, Investigation of Socioeconomic and Family Constellation Factors and Relations of Parents Reactions to the Clinics." Child Development, 31, 1960, 401-417.
- 
- \_\_\_\_\_ and James Norton. "Response Set Content Factors in the Californian F Scale and the PARI." Journal of Social Psychology, 53, 1961, 199-210.
- 
- \_\_\_\_\_ James Norton and D.S. Sprague. "Acquiescence and Extreme Sets and Their Role in Tests of Authoritarianism". Psychiatric Research Reports, 10, 1958, 28-45.
- 
- \_\_\_\_\_ and Mary Oltean. "Some Relationships between Maternal Attitude Factors and Authoritarianism, Personality Needs, Psychotherapy, and Self-Acceptance". Child Development, 30, 1959, 27-36.
- 
- \_\_\_\_\_ Mary Oltean and Irwin Monashkin. "The Parental Attitudes of Mothers of Schizophrenics". Journal of Consulting Psychology, 22, 1958, 307-310.
- 
- \_\_\_\_\_ Beatrice Barrett Ribback, Irwin Monashkin and James A. Norton Jr. "Normative Data and Factor Analysis on the Parental Attitude Research Instrument". Journal of Consulting Psychology, 22, 3, 1958, 165-171.

4 Books

- Adcock, C.J. Factorial Analysis for Non Mathematicians, Melbourne, Melbourne University Press, 1954.
- Ausubel, David P. The Fern and the Tiki, Sydney, Angus and Robertson, 1960.
- Bandura, A. "Behavioural Modification Through Modelling Procedures", in Krasner L. and P. Ullman eds. Research in Behaviour and Modification, New York, Holt Rinehart and Winston, 1964
- Bem, Daryl J. Beliefs Attitudes and Human Affairs. California, Brooks Cole, 1970.
- Brown, Laurence B. "New Zealand Family Pattern : A Rural-Urban Comparison" in Houston, Stewart (ed) Marriage and the Family in New Zealand. Wellington, Sweet and Maxwell, 1970.
- De Cecco, John P. The Psychology of Learning and Instruction : Educational Psychology, Englewood Cliffs, N.J. Prentice-Hall Inc., 1968.
- Ferguson, George A. Statistical Analysis in Psychology and Education. New York, McGraw-Hill, 1966.
- Fox, David J. The Research Process in Education. New York, Holt Rinehart and Winston, 1969.
- Garry, Ralph and Howard L. Kingsley. The Nature and Conditions of Learning. New Jersey, Prentice-Hall Inc. 1970.
- Gilson, Miriam. "The Changing New Zealand Family : A Demographic Analysis". in Houston, Stewart (ed) Marriage and the Family in New Zealand. Wellington, Sweet & Maxwell, 1970.
- Guilford, J.P. Fundamental Statistics in Psychology and Education. N.Y. McGraw Hill, 1956.
- Horst, Paul. Factor Analyses of Data Matrices. N.Y., Holt Rinehart & Winston, 1970.
- Kerlinger, Fred M. Foundations of Behavioural Research. N.Y., Holt Rinehart & Winston, 1970.
- Krech, David, Richard S. Crutchfield and Norman Livson. Elements of Psychology, New York, Knopf, 1970.
- Ritchie, James E. and Jane Ritchie. Child Rearing Patterns in New Zealand, Wellington, Reed, 1970.