

THE EFFECTS OF ENCOURAGEMENT, PRAISE, AND DISCOURAGEMENT
ON INTERNALLY AND EXTERNALLY ORIENTED CHILDREN

A Dissertation
Presented to
The School of Graduate Studies
Indiana State University
Terre Haute, Indiana

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Doctor of Philosophy

by
Judith A. Anderson
December 1977

PS4

INDIANA STATE UNIVERSITY LIBRARY

APPROVAL SHEET

The dissertation of Judith A. Anderson, Contribution to the School of Graduate Studies, Indiana State University, Series III, Number 162, under the title The Effects of Encouragement, Praise, and Discouragement on Internally and Externally Oriented Children is approved as partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Doctor of Philosophy Degree.

September 27, 1977

Date

Keece Chaney
Director of Dissertation

Keece Chaney
Chairperson

Michael J. Murphy
Committee Member

Cynthia M. Hume
Committee Member

Mark B. Olsen
Committee Member

J. Lawrence Cassmore
Committee Member

October 20, 1977

Date

W. Tasker Witham
For the School of Graduate Studies

ABSTRACT

The primary aim of this study was to investigate three types of parent communication--encouragement, praise, and discouragement--with regard to feelings elicited and perceived helpfulness, as reported by fifth- and sixth-grade subjects grouped according to high, medium, or low locus of control. Subjects for the study were 37 male and 47 female volunteers.

Bialer's Children's Locus of Control Scale was used to classify males and females into a high (internal), medium (middle range), or low (external) group. Encouragement, praise, and discouragement were operationally defined as those responses receiving total agreement from a panel of experts as representing the Adlerian concepts under investigation.

Perceptions were assessed by having subjects listen to an audio-tape, made specifically for this study, portraying parent-child interactions. Three parent responses, representing encouragement, praise, and discouragement followed the presentation of each stimulus situation. Subjects rated each response: (a) on selected scales of the Semantic Differential measuring Evaluative and Potency dimensions, and (b) on a Likert scale measuring the degree of perceived helpfulness. The data were analyzed by a $2 \times 3 \times 3$ (sex \times locus of control \times response type) analysis of variance, with repeated measures on the third dimension. A separate ANOVA was done for each of the three dependent variables--Evaluative, Potency, and Helpfulness.

The following results and conclusions were reported as a result of this study.

1. Praising and encouraging responses were perceived by children as more helpful and more positive than discouraging responses. Discouraging responses were perceived as being as potent as praising responses and more potent than encouraging responses. These findings suggest that children discriminate between positive and negative parental communications.

2. Praising responses were perceived by children as more helpful, more positive, and more potent than encouraging responses. This suggests that children prefer person-oriented praise rather than task-oriented encouragement from parents. In some respects, these findings appear to be at odds with Adlerian principles which suggest risks involved in responding to children with praise. However, this study suggests that Adlerians may have underestimated the usefulness of praise and overestimated the usefulness of encouragement.

3. Males perceived encouraging responses to be more helpful than discouraging responses, while females perceived responses defined as encouragement to be similar to responses defined as discouragement. Sex did not appear to function as a discriminating variable with regard to how children responded to the Evaluative and Potency dimensions.

4. Internally oriented children more clearly differentiated between praise and encouragement than did medium or low locus of control children. Praise was perceived as more helpful, more positive, and more potent than encouragement. This was unexpected in light of literature which has suggested that the encouragement process can enhance the development of an internal control situation.

5. Sex did not appear to function as a discriminating variable between males and females of corresponding locus of control orientations in regard to their judgments of the helpfulness and value of parental responses. However, sex did appear to contribute to the perceptual framework within which internally oriented children judged the potency of parental responses. Males perceived discouragement as the most potent response, while females perceived praise as the most potent response.

Recommendations for future research included: (1) examining children's reactions to parental responses in an on-going parent-child relationship, (2) examining the effects encouragement, praise, and discouragement have on behavior, (3) longitudinal studies to increase understanding of how particular responses have come to take on reinforcing qualities, (4) the continued investigation of sex and locus of control as independent variables in future research of this nature.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Space does not permit me to acknowledge the many persons whose contributions have led to the completion of this project.

To Dr. Reece Chaney, my chairperson, I wish to express my appreciation for his encouragement throughout my doctoral program and his invaluable assistance in the preparation of this dissertation. I also want to thank committee members, Drs. J. Laurence Passmore, Arthur Horne, Merle Ohlsen, and Michael Murphy for their support.

To my husband, Hal, whose presence communicated support and encouragement, and strengthened my faith in myself, I am deeply grateful.

To my son, Ryan, whose enthusiasm for life itself rekindles my spirit, I am appreciative of his sharing.

To my mother, Irene Jagers, for her role in my development of a valuing of education, I am also grateful.

To my fellow doctoral students, I wish to express my appreciation for providing a support group conducive to my personal and professional growth.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ABSTRACT	iii
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	vi
LIST OF TABLES	ix
Chapter	
1. STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM	1
IMPORTANCE OF THE STUDY	1
RESEARCH QUESTIONS	4
DEFINITION OF TERMS	4
LIMITATIONS	6
ASSUMPTIONS	7
ORGANIZATION OF THE REMAINDER OF THE STUDY	7
2. RELATED RESEARCH AND LITERATURE	8
ENCOURAGEMENT	8
PRAISE	10
DISCOURAGEMENT	14
LOCUS OF CONTROL	18
SUMMARY	24
3. GENERAL PLAN AND PROCEDURES	26
HYPOTHESES INVESTIGATED	26
DESCRIPTION AND SELECTION OF THE SAMPLE	28
INSTRUMENTS USED IN THE STUDY	29
Stimulus Situations	30

Chapter	Page
Production of the Audiotape	31
Answer Booklet	32
Children's Locus of Control Scale	32
Semantic Differential	33
Helpfulness Scale	37
COLLECTION OF THE DATA	39
STATISTICAL METHODOLOGY	40
4. RESULTS	42
DESCRIPTION OF THE LOCUS OF CONTROL GROUPS	42
PRESENTATION AND DISCUSSION OF THE DATA	44
RESULTS AND DISCUSSION OF THE EVALUATIVE DATA	44
RESULTS AND DISCUSSION OF THE POTENCY DATA	50
RESULTS AND DISCUSSION OF THE HELPFULNESS DATA	58
SUMMARY OF THE RESULTS AND FINDINGS	66
5. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS	68
SUMMARY	68
CONCLUSIONS	75
IMPLICATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH	80
BIBLIOGRAPHY	84
APPENDIXES	
A. Judges' Rating Scale for Encouragement, Praise, and Discouragement	91
B. Letter and Release Form Sent to Parents	95
C. Children's Locus of Control Scale	97
D. Children's Answer Booklet	99

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Means and Standard Deviations for the Locus of Control Scores by Sex and for the Total Group	43
2. Means and Standard Deviations for the High, Medium, and Low Locus of Control Groups for Males and Females	43
3. Results of the 2 X 3 X 3 Analysis of Variance on the Evaluative Dimension	45
4. Duncan's Multiple Range Test for Differences Between the Means of Response Types on the Evaluative Dimension	45
5. Means, Standard Deviations, and t Tests of Differences Between Means of Response Types for the Low, Medium, and High Locus of Control Groups in the Evaluative Dimension	47
6. Results of the 2 X 3 X 3 Analysis of Variance on the Potency Dimension	51
7. Duncan's Multiple Range Test for the Differences Between Means of Response Type on the Potency Dimension	51
8. Means, Standard Deviations, and t Tests of Differences Between Means of Response Types for Low, Medium, and High Locus of Control Groups on the Potency Dimension	53
9. Means, Standard Deviations, and t Tests of Differences Between Means of Response Types for Male and Female Low, Medium, and High Locus of Control Groups on the Potency Dimension	55
10. Results of the 2 X 3 X 3 Analysis of Variance on the Helpfulness Scale	59

Table

Page

11.	Duncan's Multiple Range Test for the Differences Between Means of Response Type on the Helpfulness Scale	60
12.	Means, Standard Deviations, and t Tests of Differences Between Means of Response Types for Males and Females on the Helpfulness Scale	61
13.	Means, Standard Deviations, and t Tests of Differences Between Means of Response Types for Low, Medium, and High Locus of Control Groups on the Helpfulness Scale	63

Chapter 1

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

The purpose of this study was to investigate children's perceptions of three types of verbal communication made by parents in a parent-child interaction.

More specifically, this study was designed to investigate whether there are significant differences in children's perceptions of encouraging, praising, and discouraging verbal communications of parents as measured by Evaluative, Potency, and Helpfulness scales among children grouped by sex and classified as high, medium, and low locus of control.

IMPORTANCE OF THE STUDY

A parent's verbal response to a child is believed to have an important effect on the child's developing self-concept (Dinkmeyer & McKay, 1973; Dreikurs, 1964; Ginott, 1965; Gordon, 1970). Adlerians have stressed the importance of responding to children in an encouraging rather than discouraging manner, and they also differentiate encouraging from praising responses. While a few persons operating outside an Adlerian orientation (Ginott, 1965; Gordon, 1970) have also noted the negative aspects of employing praise, there has been little research which attempts to discriminate praise from encouragement and measure the child's perception of particular types of verbal communications.

This research was conducted in an attempt to investigate the parameters of the Adlerian constructs of encouragement, praise, and

discouragement. While research studies are important to all scientists regardless of theoretical orientation, they are particularly needed in the area of Adlerian psychology. Much criticism has been directed toward Adlerian psychology for lack of empirical research to substantiate presented theoretical and conceptual positions. This study focused on encouragement, praise, and discouragement in an attempt to contribute to validation of these concepts as they are used by Adlerians.

Further research on the concepts of praise, encouragement, and discouragement is particularly needed, given the importance Adlerians attach to the process of these constructs:

A child's difficulties . . . are always based on some form of discouragement. Perhaps the parents themselves or the other persons of his environment have disheartened him, or perhaps repeatedly unsuccessful efforts to master some task or acquire some ability have caused him to lose faith in his own powers. But whatever the reason for his difficulty, and in whatever guise it appears, it is the parent's duty to bolster his self-confidence. Encouragement is for the child's development what water is for the plant; neither can grow without it. (Dreikurs, 1972, p. 43)

The construct of locus of control as it relates to the Adlerian concepts of encouragement, praise, and discouragement is an important one. Julian Rotter, a prominent social learning theorist, credits Adler as a major contributor to his own theoretical orientation (Rotter, 1973). Out of Rotter's social learning theory has come the internal-external control of reinforcement construct. Locus of control is a personality construct which is related to generalized expectancies for internal versus external control of reinforcement. Rotter (1966, p. 1) notes:

When a reinforcement is perceived by the subject as following some action of his own but not being entirely contingent upon his action, then, in our culture, it is typically perceived as the result of luck, chance, fate, as under the control of powerful

others, or as unpredictable because of the great complexity of the forces surrounding him. When the event is interpreted in this way by an individual, we have labeled this a belief in external control. If the person perceives that the event is contingent upon his own behavior or his own relatively permanent characteristics, we have termed this a belief in internal control.

Lefcourt has linked the Adlerian concept of encouragement with internal locus of control, and discouragement with an external locus of control. Lefcourt (1966a, p. 191) notes:

In Adlerian theory where discouragement, or external control, is an important part of psychopathology, encouragement or a shifting toward belief in personal control, indeed becomes important for psychotherapy. Encouragement would often be the creation of an internal control situation for the patient.

If encouragement is linked to internal locus of control and discouragement is linked to external locus of control, how does the concept of praise fit in? According to Adlerian theory, praise represents an external evaluation; thus, externally oriented children would be expected to respond more favorably to praise than to encouragement. Likewise, it would be expected that internally oriented children would respond more favorably to encouragement than to praise.

This study was designed to investigate how children, grouped by sex and classified on a locus of control dimension, differentially respond to praise, encouragement, and discouragement. Knowledge of any relationship between locus of control and selected Adlerian concepts should contribute to a better understanding of how internally and externally oriented children differentially perceive praise, encouragement, and discouragement.

RESEARCH QUESTIONS

This study attempted to answer the following questions:

1. Do children perceive encouraging, praising, or discouraging communications differently as measured by ratings on Evaluative and Potency dimensions of selected semantic differential scales?
2. Do children differ in their ratings of helpfulness of three types (encouraging, praising, or discouraging) of verbal communication by parents?
3. Do children grouped by sex and classified as high, medium, or low on locus of control perceive encouraging, praising, or discouraging communications differently as measured by ratings on Evaluative and Potency dimensions of selected semantic differential scales?
4. Do children grouped by sex and classified as high, medium, or low on locus of control differ in their ratings of helpfulness of three types (encouraging, praising, or discouraging) of verbal communication by parents?

DEFINITION OF TERMS

Encouragement refers to a parent's verbal response to a child that conveys an almost unlimited acceptance of the child. Encouragement is based upon a belief in the innate capacity of the child to overcome the challenges of life if the child has the support of significant others (Dinkmeyer & McKay, 1973).

Examples of encouragement include: "That took a lot of effort!" "Keep up the good work." "It looks rough, but I think you can do it." In this study encouragement was operationally defined as those verbal responses rated by a panel of judges as typifying encouraging responses.

Praise refers to a parent's verbal response to a child that conveys an external judgment, positive evaluation, or approval.

Dinkmeyer and McKay (1973) note that praise is like a reward for something well done and implies a spirit of competition.

Responses conveying praise include: "I'm proud of you." "You're smart." "You're a good son/daughter." Praise was operationally defined in this study as those verbal responses rated by a panel of judges as typifying praising responses.

Discouragement refers to a parent's verbal response to a child that conveys negative evaluation, disapproval, blame, or criticism (Gordon, 1970). Dreikurs (1964, pp. 38-39) states that "anything we do that supports a child's lack of faith in himself is discouraging." Examples of discouragement include: "I don't think you can do it." "That was stupid of you." "I don't like you when you do that." Discouragement was operationally defined in this study as those verbal responses rated by a panel of judges as typifying discouraging responses.

Locus of control refers to the personality construct that distributes individuals according to the degree to which they accept personal responsibility for what happens to them in contrast to attributing responsibility to forces outside their control. According to Lefcourt (1966b, p. 207):

As a general principle, internal control refers to the perception of positive and/or negative events as being a consequence of one's own actions and thereby under personal control; external control refers to the perception of positive and/or negative events as being unrelated to one's own behaviors in certain situations and thereby beyond personal control.

Locus of control was operationally defined in this study as the score obtained on the Bialer (1960, 1961) Children's Locus of Control Scale.

LIMITATIONS

The following are limitations of this study:

1. The procedure used in this study only approximated a parent-child interaction. As a result, the findings are of limited generalizability as to how children will respond to the verbal communication of a parent in actual situations.

2. Children were classified as high, medium, or low locus of control by rank-ordering the scores obtained on the locus of control instrument separately for boys and girls and dividing the resulting distributions into thirds. This limits the confidence with which the locus of control groups can be accepted as representative of internally and externally oriented individuals.

3. The sample of children used for this study was limited to fifth and sixth graders. Generalizations as to how children might perceive the parent-child interactions portrayed in this study cannot be made beyond the particular grade levels used in this study.

4. This study was limited to children enrolled in a public elementary school in southwestern Indiana. Generalizations of results can only be made to populations which are believed to be not significantly dissimilar to the population examined in this study.

ASSUMPTIONS

The following assumptions were made in this study:

1. That responses given to the audiotape were influenced by the subject's view of him/herself in relation to his/her own life situations.
2. That responses to the Children's Locus of Control Scale provide a measure of the child's characteristic outlook and approach to situations.
3. That responses to the Semantic Differential accurately and validly survey the child's feeling responses to parent verbal communication presented on the audiotape.

ORGANIZATION OF THE REMAINDER OF THE STUDY

Chapter 1 of this study has presented the statement of the problem and its importance. It has also presented the research questions, definition of terms, limitations, and assumptions of the study. Chapter 2 presents a review of the literature related to the study. Chapter 3 discusses the general plan and procedures employed in the study. The results are discussed in the fourth chapter. Chapter 5 includes the summary, conclusions, implications, and recommendations for further research.

Chapter 2

RELATED RESEARCH AND LITERATURE

The research and literature related to this study are organized and presented in four sections: (1) encouragement, (2) praise, (3) discouragement, and (4) locus of control. The interaction and interrelationship of these variables is such that there is some overlap of sections.

ENCOURAGEMENT

Only one study specifically designed to investigate the Adlerian concept of encouragement was noted in the research. Hillman and Shields (1975) reported the use of encouragement to increase attending behavior and achievement of a seventh grade student's arithmetic performance in the classroom. Attending behavior increased from a mean of 51 percent during baseline to 97 percent during Treatment 1, when encouragement and immediate corrective feedback were given. During reversal, attending behavior dropped to a mean of 82 percent; but after encouragement and feedback were reintroduced in Treatment 2, attending behavior returned to the 97 percent level. During baseline a mean of .47 correct arithmetic answers per minute were recorded. During Treatment 1 the rate increased to 1.36 and then declined to a mean of .98 during reversal. The mean rate increased again to 1.44 during reinstatement of treatment. The results give evidence of the effectiveness of a systematic program of encouragement and corrective feedback in increasing attending behavior and arithmetic achievement.

While the bulk of research literature refers to verbal reinforcement of a positive nature as praise, a number of studies were observed to use the concept praise in a manner the Adlerians would identify as encouragement. Lackowicz (1971) conducted an experiment with pre-school children to determine the comparative reinforcing effectiveness of verbal stimuli. The results indicated that praise-plus-description ("good, you put the marble in the yellow hole") was significantly more effective than non-specific praise ("good," "right") in producing higher rates of responses and a greater percent of on-task behavior. Praise-plus-description as defined by Lackowicz is very similar to Adlerian encouragement in that it acknowledges the act rather than focusing on the actor (Soltz, 1967).

Madsen, Becker and Thomas (1968) reported a study conceptualized from a learning theory orientation in which rules, praise, and ignoring were used by two elementary school teachers to determine the effects on classroom behavior. Showing approval for appropriate behavior included the use of verbal praise, attention, and smiles by the teacher. The examples of praising comments ("I like the way you're doing your work quietly," "you got two right") given by the authors would be recognized in an Adlerian framework as examples of encouragement. They found that while rules alone exerted little effect on classroom behavior, ignoring inappropriate behavior and showing approval for appropriate behavior were very effective in achieving better classroom behavior.

Similarly, Bernhardt and Forehand (1975) reported a study which investigated the effects of labeled and unlabeled praise upon the performance of lower- and middle-class children. Social reinforcement

was classified according to whether or not reference was made to the behavior which was being praised. The results indicated that children were more responsive to labeled ("way to go, you put another marble in the red hole") than to unlabeled ("good boy") praise. In this study labeled praise was similar to the Adlerian definition of encouragement.

In other reported research (Fitz, 1970; Redd, Morris, & Martin, 1975) related to effects of positive and negative verbal interactions, either lack of differentiation between encouragement and praise was noted or insufficient description and definitions of the content of positive verbal reinforcers were included in the literature.

In summary, few studies were reported in the literature which have investigated encouragement. Studies that investigated the concept support the effectiveness of using encouragement. The literature appeared to support the use of encouragement over either person-oriented praise or negative verbal interactions. Research is needed to demonstrate the differential effects of encouragement compared to other forms of communication.

PRAISE

In a study which stimulated much research and is still frequently cited in the literature, Zigler and Kanzer (1962, p. 157) stated:

Although energy continues to be expended in demonstrating that positive social reinforcers heighten or improve performance while negative social reinforcers attenuate performance, little in the way of a careful analysis of the effectiveness of particular reinforcers within these broad reinforcement categories has been carried out.

During the past fifteen years, as advocated by Zigler and Kanzer, much attention in the research literature has been directed toward

investigation of particular types of reinforcement. In addition, characteristics of sex, age, socioeconomic status, IQ, and locus of control have been investigated with regard to the effectiveness of various types of social reinforcement.

In the Zigler and Kanzer study cited above, two types of verbal reinforcers--those emphasizing praise and those emphasizing correctness--were dispensed to groups of middle- and lower-class children. The praise reinforcers were found to be more reinforcing than the correct reinforcers with lower-class children, while the correct reinforcers were more effective than the praise reinforcers with middle-class children. The results have been interpreted in terms of a "developmental view" of social class. This view asserts that as children mature they become more strongly affected by the intrinsic reinforcement that comes from solving cognitive problems than by personal praise or tangible reinforcement. Middle-class children can be said to develop faster than lower-class children in this respect.

Settles and Hamm (1973) investigated the effectiveness of two classes of verbal reinforcers, correctness and social (praise), on the performance of 108 second-, fifth-, and eighth-grade middle-class children using a marble-sorting task. Children were assigned to one of three groups: correct reinforcement, social reinforcement, or a control group. Only the oldest group manifested a significant effect for the correct reinforcement treatment, while no statistically reliable age effect was found for social approval. The study, which used suburban children as subjects, was reported by the authors to be consistent with Zigler and

Kanzer's finding that words signifying correctness were more reinforcing for middle-class children than for lower-class children.

In a related study designed to examine the effects of socio-economic class, sex, and kind of verbal reinforcement on the performance of black children, Carringer and Wilson (1974) matched 24 middle-class and 24 lower-class black first graders in chronological age and intelligence. Subjects played a game with blocks and were rewarded with statements of praise ("good boy") or correctness ("you are right"). There were no differences by sex or type of reinforcement, although middle-class children performed significantly better than the lower-class children.

Munson and Lehrer (1975) have suggested that disparate findings of previous studies regarding sex and social class might have been reconciled if baseline and IQ had been considered. In their study, 24 middle-class and 24 lower-class children, equally divided as to sex, were assigned to one of three reinforcement conditions. One group was performance reinforced ("right," "correct"), one was person or praise reinforced ("good," "fine"), and one group received tangible reinforcers (poker chips) which were traded for money at the conclusion of the task. No differences were found across type of reinforcement. Significant effects due to social class and sex were reported, with middle-class children learning better than lower-class children and males performing better than females. Munson and Lehrer, in a further analysis of the data, found that when IQ and baseline were controlled, the significant sex and social class effects disappeared.

Taffel, O'Leary, and Armel (1974) gave a total of 70 second-grade children either reasons or praise for engaging in an academic task. The

effects of reasoning and praise were evaluated by assessing the subsequent independent maintenance of that task behavior. Verbalizing reasons to the child was found to be as effective as or more effective than praise. The reasoning and praise subjects worked longer and completed more problems correctly than the control group.

The results of Pawlicki's (1974) research did not indicate a developmental change in the effectiveness of various types of social reinforcers, but showed a consistent superiority in the effectiveness of information connoting social reinforcers at each grade level. His research was conducted with one hundred forty-five subjects in grades three, four, six, and seven.

In a study investigating the influence of social reinforcement on achievement behavior, fourth-grade boys and girls tested by male or female examiners, were exposed to one of four reinforcement conditions: praise, correct, disapproval, or alone. Achievement behavior was measured by the rate of response on a digit-letter coding task. All reinforcement conditions produced more achievement behavior than the alone condition. Stein (1969) reported that praise was significantly more effective than either the correct or disapproval condition. There were no sex differences in response to any of the conditions with the exception of greater variance of the girls in the disapproval condition.

The review of the literature reported on praise has shown it to be a complex variable which has defied clear-cut categorizations and classifications when compared with other social reinforcers. In addition, the research has shown little consistency with regard to how character-

istics of sex, age, socioeconomic status, and IQ interact to alter the effectiveness of various verbal reinforcements.

DISCOURAGEMENT

Studies on discouragement conceptualized from an Adlerian orientation were not found in a review of the literature. However, a number of articles have been reported on the effect of verbal social responses such as blame, criticism, and disapproval. It was appropriate for the purposes of this study to examine these studies, since the definition of discouragement used in this research was that of verbal responses which conveyed negative evaluation, disapproval, blame, or criticism (Gordon, 1970).

Forty middle-class children attending a nursery school were assigned to a friendly-approving condition or to an aloof-critical condition in an attempt to investigate the effects of contrasting styles of adult-child interaction on children's curiosity. The data reported by Moore and Bulbulian (1976) revealed that children in the presence of an aloof, critical adult were less likely to display incidental task-related curiosity and exploratory behavior, had longer latencies before beginning to explore, and were less inclined to venture guesses as to the identity of objects than children in the presence of a friendly, approving adult.

Kennedy and Willcutt (1965) investigated the effect of praise and blame on the discrimination performance of 720 subjects in grades two, four, seven, and ten. The results of the study indicated a consistent superiority of praise over blame in a discrimination-learning task.

Blame was noted to have an increasingly detrimental effect as one moved up the grade levels. There were no significant interactions between sex and verbal incentives.

Gall (1972) provided additional support for the research evidence attesting to the general superiority of praise over reproof. His study utilized a sample of 240 seventh graders. Performance scores on a sentence-construction task served as the dependent measure.

Differing results were reported by Stein (1969), who found achievement behavior, measured by the rate of response on a digit-letter coding task, to be significantly higher for fourth-grade subjects in a disapproval condition than for a control group which worked alone. However, the direction of the responses varied for individuals in the disapproval condition. Girls, in particular, manifested both large increases and large decreases in achievement behavior when they received disapproval.

Spear (1970) studied the effect of reinforcement conditions of praise, criticism, irrelevant comments, and silence on the motivational level and learning of 60 first-grade and 60 fifth-grade boys. The task was either an easy or difficult two-choice simultaneous discrimination task. Motivational level was measured by the rate of responding and learning was measured by acquisition of the desired response. Response rates of younger boys were more affected by approval and disapproval than those of older boys. The younger subjects receiving criticism were consistently slower in responding than the subjects receiving praise or assigned to the control group.

In another study of the effects of social reinforcement on learning, acquisition, and retention in children, Allen, Spear and Lucke

(1971) reported that disapproval led to slower rates of responding compared to approval or silence. Children who were criticized made the most errors and were least likely to reach the acquisition criterion. However, subjects tended to complete more trials or remain in the simple motor task longer when they were criticized than when they were praised or received no comments from the examiner. In a more complex task, subjects tended to complete fewer trials or remained in the task for shorter periods of time when they were criticized rather than when they received praise or no comments.

In a study that examined the differential effectiveness of criticism, Mauer (1973) found that fifth-grade children who demonstrated low test anxiety performed at a much higher level in the criticism condition than did the high-test-anxiety subjects.

Three other studies also attesting to the effectiveness of criticism in task- or performance-based situations were also noted.

Sinatra (1973) reported a study the purpose of which was to condition the reading behavior of small groups of potential language disability first graders. Children were assigned to one of four incentive conditions: token reinforcement, verbal praise, verbal criticism, or feedback of response. As hypothesized, the token reinforcement used to acknowledge correct reading responses appeared to provide stronger motivation than the three verbal incentives. Criticism appeared to alert the child to refocus attention on cue features of incorrectly read words and did not appear to produce any greater aversion to reading tasks than did positive verbal incentives.

Likewise, Llewellyn (1973) found that while praise increased accuracy significantly more than criticism or no evaluative feedback, criticism increased performance speed at a significant level over either praise or no evaluative feedback.

Fontana (1972) also reported the effective use of criticism in a study designed to investigate the frequency of speech disfluency in children. Forty children between the ages of seven and nine years were assigned to one of four experimental treatments: group A received the verbal stimulus "wrong" contingent upon each disfluency; group B received "very good" following each 30-second fluent period; group C received a combination of "wrong" contingent upon each disfluency and "very good" following each 30-second fluent period; group D served as a control group and received no treatment. It was found that the group presented with "wrong" demonstrated a mean difference score between baserate and conditioning which was significant at the .05 level. Neither "very good" nor the combination of "wrong" and "very good" revealed a difference score between baserate and conditioning which was significant when compared with the control group.

In summary, again disparate findings were presented in the literature on blame, criticism, and disapproval. Although a number of researchers have noted the detrimental effect of disapproval or criticism (Gall, 1972; Kennedy & Willcut, 1965; Spear, 1970), others have reported its effectiveness in specific situations (Fontana, 1972; Llewellyn, 1973; Sinatra, 1973). Those studies which examined differential effectiveness for particular types of tasks or groups of subjects (Allen, Spear, & Lucke, 1971) demonstrate the need for more refined future studies.

LOCUS OF CONTROL

Rotter, a social learning theorist, has developed an internal-external construct which describes the degree to which an individual believes that reinforcements are contingent upon his own behavior. Joe (1971, p. 619) has noted:

Internal control refers to individuals who believe that reinforcements are contingent upon their own behavior, capacities, or attributes. External control refers to individuals who believe that reinforcements are not under their personal control but rather are under the control of powerful others, luck, chance, fate, etc. Thus, depending on his past reinforcement experiences, a person will have developed a consistent attitude tending toward either an internal or external locus as the source of reinforcement.

A number of scales have been designed for testing children (Battle & Rotter, 1963; Bialer, 1961; Crandall, Katkovsky, & Crandall, 1965). The use of existing locus of control measures is amenable to Adlerian research in that the items included on scales make it clear that the items deal exclusively with the subject's belief about the nature of the world (Rotter, 1966). The items are concerned with the subject's expectations and perception about how reinforcement is controlled.

Locus of control research most closely related to this study has been included in this section.

A number of studies investigating a developmental view of locus of control have appeared in the literature. This view hypothesizes that as mastery is increased there should be a concomitant increment in a child's feelings that events are under his control and a decrease in the generalized view that events are a product of chance.

Findings which support the developmental view were reported by Penk (1969). Penk administered a locus of control questionnaire (Bialer, 1961) to five groups of children seven to eleven years of age. A significant relationship between levels of verbal abstraction and internal-external control was found. Specifically, children employing verbally mature abstractions tended also to be higher in generalized expectancy that reinforcement occurs as a result of one's own actions, than were children employing less mature verbal abstractions.

Gorsuch, Henighan, and Barnard (1972) have suggested a relationship between children's level of verbal ability and the reliability of the locus of control scale. They found this relationship to be the same for black children and white children, as well as for children of lower- and children of middle-class status.

Beebe (1970) also found support for the developmental theory. Internality increased with age and leveled off at adolescence for both sexes. Her study employed fourth, sixth, eighth and tenth graders, with approximately 50 subjects at each age level.

Bartel (1971) administered Bialer's locus of control measure to lower- and middle-class children in grades one, two, four, and six. Lower- and middle-class children did not differ significantly from one another on locus of control in grades one and two. However, by the fourth and sixth grades the difference had reached significance.

A trend analysis of the locus of control variable reported by Pawlicki (1974) revealed a significant developmental trend in feelings of control over the environment as grade level increased. However, in strong contradiction to previous studies (McGrade, 1966; Stevenson &

Cruse, 1961), which have reported a developmental change in the effectiveness of social reinforcers, Pawlicki found that at each grade level (third, fourth, sixth, and seventh) information-connoting social reinforcers were more effective than praise-connoting social reinforcers.

Several studies related to locus of control and variables of reinforcement contingencies, achievement, and performance were also noted in the literature.

Fine (1973) administered the Intellectual Achievement Responsibility Questionnaire, a measure of children's belief in locus of control, to 109 black children. Children were then assigned randomly to either a 25 percent or 75 percent reinforcement condition. Rate of reinforcement was defined as the percentage of trials on which subjects were given statements of praise by the examiner as children completed a sequence of experimental procedures. An analysis of the data revealed a correlation between locus of control and achievement for girls, but not for boys. Girls with internal beliefs had significantly higher performance scores than girls with external beliefs under the 75 percent reinforcement.

Baron and Ganz (1972) examined the effects of variations in locus of control on the efficiency of intrinsic and extrinsic types of feedback. The experimental task required the subjects to learn a simple form discrimination in order to find a hidden object. Subjects in the extrinsic condition were separated from the task by a screen and received verbal feedback from the experimenter. Subjects in the intrinsic condition made their own observations, with no response being given by the examiner. As hypothesized, internally controlled subjects given intrinsic reinforcement performed significantly better than

externally controlled subjects given intrinsic reinforcement ($p < .03$). The results also indicated that, as hypothesized, externally controlled subjects given extrinsic reinforcement performed significantly better than internally controlled subjects given extrinsic reinforcement. The subjects for this study were 60 inner-city black males in the fifth grade.

Lintner and Ducette (1974) studied the effects of locus of control on elementary school student's responsiveness to praise. Within the same study positive, negative, and neutral responses to praise were found within certain subsets of the sample. Male externals increased their efforts and improved their performance when praised. Male internals, on the other hand, when praised, significantly decreased efforts and performance when compared to a non-praise condition. Females responded minimally to praise, regardless of locus of control orientation.

Fitz (1970) assigned 120 male high school juniors to one of three reinforcement conditions: praise, censure, or neutral-control. He found an interaction between the reinforcement conditions and locus of control for internally oriented males. The internal subjects had fewer errors under the control condition than under either praise or censure. The result was attributed to the subjects' internal source of reinforcement. The praise and censure conditions not only did not increase motivation, but also provided distractions which impaired performance.

Epstein and Komorita (1971) investigated self-esteem, success-failure, and locus of control in black children. They found that failure rather than success experiences were attributed to external causes. High-self-esteem subjects were found to be more internal than low- or moderate-esteem subjects.

In a related study reported by Wickersham (1970), boys indicated significantly more internality of control for positive occurrences in their lives than did girls.

The remainder of studies in this section report on locus of control as it is related to parental variables.

One study has been reported (Runyon, 1972) which examined the effect of Adlerian parent study groups upon a child's locus of control as measured by pre- and post-tests. No significance was found, although the author suggested that a longer time period might have shown significance. The study groups were shown to be effective in changing parental attitudes and children's behavior at home and at school.

Rigg (1972) reported highly significant results in the correlation between children's perception of the reinforcement orientations of their parents and their own reinforcement orientation. Rigg concluded that the perceived orientation of mothers has a greater influence on the internalization of a child's own reinforcement orientation than does the perceived orientation of fathers.

Loeb (1975) also noted, in evaluating parental influence, that maternal behavior may be a more consistent predictor of locus of control in boys than paternal behavior. In his research, Loeb found that the internal son was more likely than the external son to have a mother who relied on helping or suggesting rather than doing or directing. The opposite was reported for external sons. Similarly, mothers of internal sons were more likely than mothers of external sons to make general requests for suggestions which allow the son to choose whether or not

to respond. Mothers of external sons were relatively more likely to direct a specific request for a suggestion to their sons which essentially directed them to respond.

Ollendick (1977) tentatively concluded that parents' locus of control may be an important antecedent variable related to children's locus of control, anxiety, achievement, and locus of conflict.

Hilaeel (1972) conducted a study to determine whether children's beliefs in internal-external control were related to their perception of selected parental behavior. The results showed that perceived parental behaviors differed between internal and external children primarily with regard to the socioeconomic status of the family.

Shafer (1969) also found perception of perceived parental behaviors to be related to social class and locus of control. Boys from middle-class families perceived their parents as being more consistent and scored higher in internal control than did boys from lower-class families.

Shore (1968) found that children who perceived their parents as exercising more psychological control, and as being less warm and less intrinsically accepting, scored in a more external direction than did children who described their parents in opposite terms.

Reimanes (1971) reported that a warm, supportive, and stable home environment related positively to internal control in a group of first and third graders.

Solomon, Houlihan, Busse, and Parelius (1971), in contradiction to the results of Reimanes, found that parental hostility was associated with internality in a sample of fifth-grade boys. Spohn (1973) did not

find support for his hypotheses that parents of internal children would demonstrate more encouragement of independent effort, would give less direct influence, and would show more nurturance than parents of external sons.

In summary, some literature has supported a developmental view of locus of control, with internality increasing with age. Others (Gorsuch, Henighan & Barnard, 1972; Penk, 1969; Shafer, 1969) have suggested that variables of verbal abstraction, IQ, and social class rather than age, per se, account for differences among reported locus of control studies.

A number of studies were reported which examined locus of control as it interacted with types of verbal social reinforcers. No clear-cut conclusions can be made from existing research evidence.

The research relating children with parental characteristics and locus of control was also examined. While not conclusive, research evidence tends to support the hypothesis that parental behavior, particularly that of the mother, contributes to a locus of control orientation in the child.

SUMMARY

This chapter has reported on the research and literature surrounding encouragement, praise, discouragement, and locus of control. Few Adlerian studies pertinent to this study were found in the literature, although a large number of studies investigating verbal social reinforcement have appeared.

The literature appears to support the use of encouragement over either person-oriented praise or negative verbal interactions. The literature surrounding the use of praise has shown it to be a complex

variable. The literature related to praise has shown little consistency with regard to how characteristics of sex, age, socioeconomic status, and IQ interact to alter the effectiveness of praise as a verbal reinforcement. Likewise, disparate findings have resulted from research designed to investigate discouragement--which for the purposes of this research was defined as including disapproval, blame, and criticism--as a type of verbal reinforcement. A number of articles which noted detrimental effects of discouragement were reported, as well as those which presented contradictory results.

Overall, the review of the literature on effects of social reinforcement indicated a need for more refined future studies that investigate the differential effectiveness of the various types of reinforcement.

Locus of control, as a variable amenable to Adlerian research, was examined and reported in this chapter. Literature related to the developmental view of locus of control was generally supported, although conflicting studies were also present in the literature. There is some support in the literature for the position that internally oriented subjects have less need for social reinforcement than external subjects. There is also evidence of a relationship between parent-child interactions and locus of control, although the research suggests that this is a highly complex and not clearly understood relationship at this time.

Chapter 3

GENERAL PLAN AND PROCEDURES

The general plan and procedures used in this study are presented in this chapter. The presentation is divided into the following five sections: (1) hypotheses investigated, (2) description and selection of the sample, (3) instruments used in the study, (4) collection of the data, and (5) statistical analysis of the data.

HYPOTHESES INVESTIGATED

The hypotheses that were investigated in this study are stated below in null form.

Evaluative Dimension

Hypothesis 1. There is no significant difference in children's perceptions of encouragement, praise, and discouragement as measured by ratings on the Evaluative dimension of semantic differential scales.

Hypothesis 2. There is no significant difference between males and females in their perceptions of encouragement, praise, and discouragement as measured by ratings on the Evaluative dimension of semantic differential scales.

Hypothesis 3. There is no significant difference among children classified as high, medium, or low locus of control and their perceptions of encouragement, praise, and discouragement as measured by ratings on the Evaluative dimension of semantic differential scales.

Hypothesis 4. There is no significant difference among children grouped by sex and classified as high, medium, or low locus of control and their perceptions of encouragement, praise, and discouragement as measured by ratings on the Evaluative dimension of semantic differential scales.

Potency Dimension

Hypothesis 5. There is no significant difference in children's perceptions of encouragement, praise, and discouragement as measured by ratings on the Potency dimension of semantic differential scales.

Hypothesis 6. There is no significant difference between males and females in their perceptions of encouragement, praise, and discouragement as measured by ratings on the Potency dimension of semantic differential scales.

Hypothesis 7. There is no significant difference among children classified as high, medium, or low locus of control and their perceptions of encouragement, praise, and discouragement as measured by ratings on the Potency dimension of semantic differential scales among children classified as high, medium, or low locus of control.

Hypothesis 8. There is no significant difference among children grouped by sex and classified as high, medium, or low locus of control and their perceptions of encouragement, praise, and discouragement as measured by ratings on the Potency dimension of semantic differential scales.

Helpfulness Scale

Hypothesis 9. There is no significant difference in children's perceptions of encouragement, praise, and discouragement as measured by ratings of Helpfulness.

Hypothesis 10. There is no significant difference between males and females in their perceptions of encouragement, praise, and discouragement as measured by ratings of Helpfulness.

Hypothesis 11. There is no significant difference among children classified as high, medium, or low locus of control and their perceptions of encouragement, praise, and discouragement as measured by ratings of Helpfulness.

Hypothesis 12. There is no significant difference among children grouped by sex and classified as high, medium, or low locus of control and their perceptions of encouragement, praise, and discouragement as measured by ratings of Helpfulness.

DESCRIPTION AND SELECTION OF THE SAMPLE

This study was concerned with the investigation of three types of parent communication--encouragement, praise, and discouragement--with regard to the feelings elicited and the perceived helpfulness as reported by fifth- and sixth-grade subjects grouped according to high, middle, and low locus of control.

The educational level of fifth and sixth grade was selected because children in these grade levels were considered to be representative of Havinghurst's (1972) developmental level of middle childhood. Children within this level are expected to be able to make independent judgments concerning how they feel and to be able to communicate through a paper and pencil format.

The sample was obtained from a population of all fifth- and sixth-grade students attending classes in a southwestern Indiana elementary

school. The superintendent assisted in the selection of the school, which is located in a coal-mining and agricultural community. The cooperation of the principal was obtained, and all eight fifth- and sixth-grade classroom teachers agreed to release students from the classroom in order for them to participate in the study. A brief description of the study was made in the classrooms and a letter and release form was sent home with each student to his/her parents. The letter explained the purpose of the study and assured parents of the confidentiality of the responses. The release form, if signed by a parent and returned, gave the investigator permission to administer the instruments to the child. All subjects were volunteers.

The population of the study consisted of 186 subjects, 91 females, and 95 males. Thirty-seven, or 39 percent, of the males returned the release form and completed the instruments. Forty-eight, or 53 percent, of the females returned the release form and completed the instruments, although one female was dropped from the sample because of failure to record responses in a scoreable manner.

INSTRUMENTS USED IN THE STUDY

The investigation of the three types of verbal responses of parents with regard to their perceived helpfulness and the feelings they elicited in children was assessed by having subjects listen to an audiotape, made specifically for this study, portraying parent-child interactions in selected positive and negative stimulus situations. Three parent responses representing encouragement, praise, and discouragement followed the presentation of each stimulus situation. Subjects

responded on answer sheets that had a written text accompanying the audiotape. Subjects rated each response (a) on selected scales of the Semantic Differential measuring Evaluative and Potency dimensions, and (b) on a Likert scale measuring degree of perceived helpfulness. The locus of control instrument used in this study was the Bialer (1960, 1961) Children's Locus of Control Scale.

Stimulus Situations

Social, emotional, physical, and school developmental tasks of middle childhood (Havinghurst, 1972) were used to generate specific situations (see Appendix A) depicted in the audiotape. Two stimulus situations were included for each of the four developmental tasks--one situation portraying a child demonstrating success at mastering the developmental task (positive stimulus situation) and one situation portraying a child experiencing difficulty at mastering the developmental task (negative stimulus situation). Eight stimulus situations were presented in all. Each situation was followed by three parental responses representing encouragement, praise, or discouragement. The order of presentation of the parental responses was arranged to counter-balance for response set.

Responses classified as encouraging, praising, or discouraging were operationally defined in this study by having a panel of four experts independently judge a number of parent responses. The judges were staff members of the Consultation and Education Department of a comprehensive mental health center. All judges had had training and experience in leading Adlerian-oriented parent study group. The judges

were asked to read a number of stimulus situations, each followed by a series of parent responses (see Appendix A). The judges independently scored the responses as representative of encouragement, praise, or discouragement. Only those responses receiving total agreement from the panel of judges as representing the Adlerian concepts under investigation were used in this study.

Production of the Audiotape

An adult male and an adult female were selected to role-play a mother and a father on the audiotape. Similarly, a sixth-grade male and a sixth-grade female role-played the children heard on the audiotape. Each role-playing child was given a script. He or she was then asked to portray the role as though he or she was a person in that situation and was actually presenting it to a parent. Each person practiced the role several times, and then three to six role-playing takes were recorded so that the investigator could select the best take for inclusion in the master audiotape. A similar procedure was used for the adults who role-played the parent responses. The most realistic and audible takes were then dubbed onto a master tape to simulate parent-child interactions. The master audiotape consisted of eight stimulus situations, with the female and the male role-playing child each presenting two positive and two negative situations. Parental responses were arranged in such a way as to insure an equal distribution of positive and negative situations to each parent. There were also an equal number of father-son, father-daughter, mother-son, and mother-daughter interactions.

Answer Booklet

The audiotape for this study was used in conjunction with an answer booklet (see Appendix D). Space was provided on the first page for subjects to record their name, grade level, sex, and age. There was also space to record responses to the locus of control instrument on the first page of the answer booklet. On each of the following pages of the answer booklet, the stimulus situation that corresponded to the situation heard on the audiotape was printed at the top. Below the stimulus situation was printed the parental response. Subjects were asked to record their reactions to the parental responses on seven scales. Three scales represented the Evaluative dimension of the Semantic Differential, three scales represented the Potency dimension of the Semantic Differential, and one scale represented the degree of helpfulness perceived in the parental response.

Children's Locus of Control Scale

The instrument used to classify the subjects according to locus of control was the Children's Locus of Control Scale (CLCS) (Bialer, 1960, 1961). This is a 23-item, verbally administered inventory, worded so that for 18 items a "yes" answer and for 5 items a "no" answer are taken as indicating internal control. This scale was developed from the perspective of Rotter's (1954) discussion of social learning theory, and it used items adapted from studies with youth (James, 1957; Phares, 1955).

Support for the construct validity of the test is reported by Gozali and Bialer (1968, p. 623), who state that there is ". . . presumptive evidence that the CLCS seems to be reliably measuring a valid personality construct." Further validity information shows that the

CLCS has been correlated significantly with Battle and Rotter's Children's Picture Test of Internal-Control Scale ($r = -.42$, $p < .01$, $N = 40$). Bialer (1960) reported that individual administration of the CLCS to educable mentally retarded children resulted in split-half reliability of .76, adjusted by the Spearman-Brown formula to .86. Miller (1960) replicated this study in a sample of mentally retarded teenagers. He reported a reliability coefficient of .87. From evidence such as this, Cromwell, Rosenthal, Shakow, and Zaber (1961) suggested that this scale could be used with subjects who have a mental age as low as four years.

In this study the scores obtained on the Children's Locus of Control Scale were rank-ordered for males and females. The distribution for each group was divided into thirds to comprise a high, middle, and low group on the locus of control dimension. The high group (internals) consisted of males and females who obtained scores on the locus of control instrument in the upper third of their respective distributions. The medium (middle range) group consisted of males and females who obtained scores which placed them in the middle third of their respective distributions. The low group (externals) consisted of males and females who obtained scores in the lower third of their respective distributions.

Semantic Differential

The Semantic Differential, developed by Osgood, Suci, and Tannenbaum (1957), was the instrument selected to measure children's perceptions of the various parental responses in this study. It is a tool which provides a means of measuring the psychological meaning of

concepts. The instrument elicits metaphoric responses rather than literal interpretations, with the responses dependent on the individual's subjective experiences. Therefore, the Semantic Differential appeared to be particularly appropriate for measuring the psychological impact of the Adlerian concepts of encouragement, praise, and discouragement.

The Semantic Differential consists of a number of bipolar adjectives (e.g., good-bad; strong-weak; hot-cold) which can be used by a subject to judge a particular concept or phrase. After extensive investigations, Osgood, Suci, and Tannenbaum (1957) reported on fifty of these bipolar scales from which three major groups could be identified: (1) those which indicated a judgment of value, (2) those indicating a judgment of strength, and (3) those indicating a judgment of activity. These are referred to as the "evaluative," "potency," and "activity" dimensions, respectively.

Following Osgood's introduction of the Semantic Differential as a useful and valid instrument for measuring the meaning of concepts in adults, a number of studies have been done to examine its applicability for research with children.

Maltz (1963) reported on developmental change in the meaning of concepts by children as measured by the Semantic Differential. It was shown in his study that the Semantic Differential measured a change in the meaning of concepts to the child as he/she became older. The results of Maltz's study, which included subjects from second grade, fourth grade, sixth grade, and college, suggested that the meaning of concepts of younger children is not as consistent as it is for older children. The age at which the meaning of the concepts had consistency seemed to be reached prior to fourth grade.

Maltz (1963), in his early adaptation of the Semantic Differential for use with children, made modifications of Osgood's original scales. His adaptations are noted here, since they have been widely accepted in the research literature. The major change made was the use of a five-step scale as opposed to a seven-step scale. In addition, the adverbs "very," "somewhat," and "not" were used to define the five alternatives. The definitive adjectives were also printed directly below the appropriate alternatives to make the format of the scales clear to young children. A model scale is shown below:

:	:	:	:	:	:
Very	Somewhat	Not +	Somewhat	Very	
+	+	Not -	-	-	

In scoring the Semantic Differential, the values +2, +1, 0, -1, and -2 were assigned to the respective gradients from the positive pole to the negative pole. The polarity of the scales was randomized so the positive pole did not always appear on the subject's left and the negative pole on the subject's right. The order of scales was also randomized so that it differed for all concepts. The form of the test was the same from subject to subject. The adaptations presented by Maltz were used in the research reported in this study.

DiVesta (1965) reported a systematic investigation of the development of affective meaning systems through his study of the modifiers used by subjects in grades two through six. His procedure was standardized by use of a restricted work-association task which required each subject to respond with a single modifier for each of 100 substantives. The frequency and diversity of each modifier was summarized and described by a frequency-diversity index. A list of modifiers for application in

Semantic Differential studies was then selected. Modifiers having higher values on the frequency-diversity index were those represented by the Evaluative and Potency dimensions. Color and Activity dimensions were also reported with lower values on the frequency-diversity index.

DiVesta (1965, p. 212) stated that

These findings point to the expectation that we may not find differences between adult groups and the age groups studied here in the factorial structure of the meaning systems typically investigated by use of the semantic differential, that is, the affective meaning systems.

In research done on age and sex differences in the semantic structure of children, Small (1958) noted that the Evaluative dimension is the most powerful in the measurement of meaning, followed by Potency and then Activity, in order of magnitude. Her results support studies done by Osgood and his associates on an adult population. Small (1958) noted that in all their previous factor analytic studies, the first three factors have been in essentially the same content and order of magnitude. Although these dimensions do not always emerge independently, they do, either jointly or independently, measure the dominant aspects of affective meaning a person attributes to stimuli. With regard to the efficacy of using the Semantic Differential in research on children, Small (1958, p. 873) stated:

. . . the similarity of the factors obtained in our children's groups as compared with adult groups suggests that the cultural use of the polar terms of the dominant semantic dimensions is adequately learned by the third grade level.

The research reported in this study was designed to include the dimensions found most powerful in the quantitative approach to the measurement of meaning, Evaluative, and Potency dimensions. The Evaluative dimension was measured by three scales (good-bad; clean-dirty;

nice-awful). The Potency dimension was also measured by three scales (strong-weak; large-small; hard-soft). The selection of these six scales followed a precedent set by Downing, Moed, and Wight (1961), who used these scales for investigating the psychological effects of disability and institutionalization on the growth and development of children.

In this study there were eight stimulus situations and three parent responses to each. Therefore, subjects were asked to rate 24 parent-child interactions. Each of the parent-child interactions was rated on six semantic differential scales--three measuring the Evaluative dimension, and three measuring the Potency dimension. Scores for each scale ranged from a minus two on the low negative end of the scale to a plus two on the high positive end of the scale. An Evaluative score for encouragement was obtained by adding the scores on the three Evaluative scales for each parental response representing encouragement, and then averaging the totals. The same scoring procedure was used for parental responses representing praise and discouragement. Potency scores for encouragement, praise, and discouragement were obtained in the same manner, using the Potency scales in each parent-child interaction.

Helpfulness Scale

The investigation of the perceived helpfulness of the three parent response types made to children in a parent-child interaction was patterned after research reported done by Helner (1973) and Dougherty (1974).

In this study, a Likert scale was constructed with perception of helpfulness rated by the subjects on a five-point scale ranging from

"very helpful" on the high positive end to "very unhelpful" on the low negative end. A model scale is shown below:

:	:	:	:	:	:
Very Helpful	Somewhat Helpful	Not Helpful Not Unhelpful	Somewhat Unhelpful	Very Unhelpful	

In scoring the Helpfulness scale, the values +2, +1, 0, -1, and -2 were assigned to the respective gradients from the positive pole to the negative pole.

In this study there were eight stimulus situations and three parental responses to each. Therefore, subjects were asked to rate 24 parent-child interactions. Each of the interactions was rated on the Helpfulness scale. A Helpfulness score for encouragement was obtained by adding the scores for each parental response representing encouragement, and then averaging the totals. The same scoring procedure was used for parental responses representing praise and discouragement.

A split-half method was used to assess the reliability of the Helpfulness scale for each of the three parental response types (encouragement, praise, and discouragement) investigated in this study. Using this method, the Helpfulness scales for each subject were divided into two halves, and two scores were obtained, representing the cumulative total of the Helpfulness scales on the respective halves. A Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient (Ferguson, 1971, p. 102) was calculated for the two halves of the total sample ($N = 84$). Given this reliability coefficient for a half test, the reliability coefficient for the whole test was estimated, using the Spearman-Brown formula (Ferguson, 1971, p. 367).

A split-half reliability of .50, adjusted by the Spearman-Brown formula to .67, was obtained for the Helpfulness scales measuring encouragement.

A split-half reliability of .48, adjusted by the Spearman-Brown formula to .65, was obtained for the Helpfulness scales measuring praise.

A split-half reliability of .65, adjusted by the Spearman-Brown formula to .79, was obtained for the Helpfulness scales measuring discouragement.

COLLECTION OF THE DATA

The data on all subjects were collected during the same day. The data were collected by the investigator and a student enrolled in the doctoral program in Guidance and Counseling at Indiana State University. Variation in style of instrument administration was held constant by use of standardized instructions communicated via audiotape.

Subjects were taken from their classrooms in groups ranging in size from nine to fourteen. Subjects were seated at tables arranged around a tape recorder. Each subject was given an answer booklet (see Appendix D) and was asked to complete the identifying information requested on the first page. The Children's Locus of Control Scale and the Stimulus Situations were then administered via audiotape. The text of the audiotape was included in the answer booklet for the stimulus situations. The process of data collection took approximately forty to fifty minutes for each group.

STATISTICAL METHODOLOGY

Three separate analyses of variance were computed, one each for the Evaluative, the Potency, and the Helpfulness measures of children's reported perceptions of parental responses.

A 2 X 3 X 3 (sex X locus of control X response type) ANOVA (Winer, 1962) was computed for each of the three dependent measures. The independent variables in this analysis were sex and locus of control. Repeated measurements were done on the dependent variables: encouragement, praise, and discouragement. The level of significance set for rejection of the null hypotheses was $p < .05$.

The computer program used for analysis of the data was a P X Q X R factorial ANOVA with repeated measures on factor R with unequal cell frequency. This program was designed by Carol A. Walker, Research Assistant, Center for Educational Research, Indiana State University, Terre Haute, Indiana.

Whenever a significant main effect was found among the three response types, a Duncan's New Multiple Range Test (Edwards, 1972, pp. 131-134) was used to determine which of the differences between group means were significant and which were not.

Whenever significant interaction effects were found, additional analysis were done by use of a t test (Ferguson, 1971, pp. 153-155). This contributed additional information with regard to how subjects--grouped by sex, or classified on a locus of control dimension--differentially perceived encouragement, praise, and discouragement. The statistical comparisons examined the significance of the differences between response

type means within, rather than between, the locus of control groups, or the male and female groups.

Chapter 4

RESULTS

This chapter presents the results and findings of the present study in five sections: (1) the statistical description of the locus of control groups; (2) the results and discussion of the findings for the Evaluative dimension; (3) the results and discussion of the findings for the Potency dimension; (4) the results and discussion of the findings for the Helpfulness scale; and (5) the summary of the results and findings.

DESCRIPTION OF THE LOCUS OF CONTROL GROUPS

This study was designed to investigate how children, grouped by sex and classified on a locus of control dimension, differentially responded to encouragement, praise, and discouragement.

The sample of 84 subjects comprised 47 females and 37 males. The means and standard deviations of scores obtained on the Children's Locus of Control Scale (CLCS) for males, females, and the total group are presented in Table 1. The mean score for the males was 15.70 and the mean score for the females was 14.15. A t test for independent samples (Ferguson, 1971, pp. 151-153) was used to compare the means of the two groups. A significant difference ($t = 2.43$, $df = 82$, $p < .05$) was found between the locus of control scores for males and females.

Table 1
Means and Standard Deviations for the Locus of Control
Scores by Sex and for the Total Group

<u>Locus of Control</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>\bar{X}</u>	<u>SD</u>
Males	37	15.702	2.214
Females	47	14.148	3.254
Total Group	84	14.833	2.929

The CLCS was scored in an internal direction so that the higher the score the greater the degree of internality as measured by the instrument. The scores were rank-ordered separately for males and females, with the distribution divided into thirds to make three locus of control groups for each sex. The three groups were labeled: high (internals), medium (middle range), and low (externals). The means and standard deviations for the high, medium, and low locus of control groups are presented in Table 2.

Table 2
Means and Standard Deviations for the High, Medium, and
Low Locus of Control Groups for Males and Females

<u>Locus of Control</u>	Males			Females		
	<u>N</u>	<u>\bar{X}</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>\bar{X}</u>	<u>SD</u>
Low	12	13.166	1.039	13	10.0	2.121
Medium	10	15.600	0.516	16	14.062	0.936
High	15	17.800	1.146	18	17.222	1.218

PRESENTATION AND DISCUSSION OF THE DATA

Three separate 2 X 3 X 3 (sex X locus of control X response type) analyses of variance were computed to make comparisons among the treatment combinations. The analyses of variance were computed for the Evaluative and Potency dimensions and a Helpfulness scale for children's perceptions of parental responses representing encouragement, praise, and discouragement. The findings and discussion of the results are presented in three sections organized around the null hypotheses for each of the factors: Evaluative, Potency, and Helpfulness.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION OF THE EVALUATIVE DATA

Scales on the Evaluative dimension of the Semantic Differential (Osgood, Suci, & Tannenbaum, 1957) were used as the dependent measure for the hypotheses presented in this section. The Evaluative dimension is composed of a number of bi-polar adjective scales which indicate a judgment of value. The Evaluative scales used in this study were: good-bad, nice-awful, and clean-dirty.

Hypothesis 1. There is no significant difference in children's perceptions of encouragement, praise, and discouragement as measured by ratings on the Evaluative dimension of semantic differential scales.

Analysis of Results for Hypothesis 1

The results of the main effect for response type on the Evaluative dimension are presented on line 1 in Table 3. A significant difference ($F = 1166.892$, $df = 2/1332$, $p < .001$) was found among the response types (encouragement, praise, and discouragement) on the Evaluative dimension. Thus H_1 was rejected as a tenable hypothesis.

Table 3
Results of the 2 X 3 X 3 Analysis of Variance
on the Evaluative Dimension

Source of Variation	SS	DF	MS	F	Significance
Response type	16863.492	2	8431.746	1166.892	.000001
Sex X Response type	39.354	2	19.677	2.723	.066034
Locus of control X Response type	175.038	4	43.760	6.056	.000079
Sex X Locus of control X Response type	46.167	4	11.542	1.59	.172595
Error within cell	9624.785	1332	7.226		

In order to determine how the response type means for encouragement, praise, and discouragement differed, a Duncan's Multiple Range Test (Edwards, 1972) was used. This test is used to determine which of the differences between the group means are significant and which are not. The results are summarized in Table 4.

Table 4
Duncan's Multiple Range Test for Differences Between the
Means of Response Type on the Evaluative Dimension

Means	P Praise 4.04464	E Encouragement 3.59821	D Discouragement -2.53423	Shortest Significant Range
P = 4.04464		.44633**	6.57887***	R ₂ = .28719
E = 3.59821			6.13244***	R ₃ = .30274
D = -2.53423				

** p < .01

*** p < .001

An examination of the means in Table 4 indicates that praise ($\bar{X} = 4.04$) was greater than encouragement ($\bar{X} = 3.60$) and the latter was greater than discouragement ($\bar{X} = -2.53$). The difference between praise and encouragement on the Evaluative dimension was significant at the .01 level. The difference between praise and discouragement on the Evaluative dimension was significant at the .001 level. The difference between encouragement and discouragement on the Evaluative dimension was significant at the .001 level.

Hypothesis 2. There is no significant difference between males and females in their perceptions of encouragement, praise, and discouragement as measured by ratings on the Evaluative dimension of semantic differential scales.

Analysis of the Results for Hypothesis 2

The results of the interaction of sex and response type employing the Evaluative scores as the dependent variable are presented on line 2 in Table 3. The interaction of sex and perceptions of encouragement, praise, and discouragement ($F = 2.723$, $df = 2/1332$, $p < .066$) did not reach the .05 level of significance. Thus, H_2 was retained as a tenable hypothesis.

Hypothesis 3. There is no significant difference among children classified as high, medium, or low locus of control and their perceptions of encouragement, praise, and discouragement as measured by ratings on the Evaluative dimension of semantic differential scales.

Analysis of the Results for Hypothesis 3

The results of the interaction of locus of control and response type employing the Evaluative scores as the dependent variable are

presented on line 3 in Table 3. A significant interaction ($F = 6.056$, $df = 4/1332$, $p < .001$) between locus of control and response type was noted. Thus, H_3 was rejected as a tenable hypothesis.

Additional data are presented in Table 5, which further reports the significance of the differences between responses to encouragement, praise, and discouragement within each of the three locus of control groups.

Table 5
Means, Standard Deviations, and t Tests of Differences Between
Means of Response Types for Low, Medium, and High Locus of
Control Groups on the Evaluative Dimension

Locus of Control	Response	\bar{X}	SD	Response	\bar{X}	SD	t
Low	P	3.825	2.737	E	3.47	2.498	1.354
	E	3.47	2.498	D	-2.265	3.438	19.084***
	D	-2.265	3.438	P	3.825	2.737	19.598***
Medium	P	3.923	2.799	E	3.562	2.651	1.348
	E	3.562	2.651	D	-2.062	3.277	19.240***
	D	-2.062	3.277	P	3.923	2.799	20.026***
High	P	4.306	2.313	E	3.723	2.372	2.860**
	E	3.723	2.372	D	-3.109	2.623	31.394***
	D	-3.109	2.623	P	4.306	2.313	34.454***
		P = Praise				DF = ∞	
**p < .01		E = Encouragement					
***p < .001		D = Discouragement					

Within the low locus of control group, no significant difference was noted between praise and encouragement. Within the low locus of control group, a significant difference was noted between encouragement and discouragement ($t = 19.084$, $p < .001$), with encouragement rated higher

on the Evaluative dimension. Within the low locus of control group, a significant difference was noted between discouragement and praise ($t = 19.598$, $p < .001$), with praise rated higher on the Evaluative dimension.

Within the medium locus of control group, no significant difference was noted between praise and encouragement. Within the medium locus of control group, a significant difference was noted between encouragement and discouragement ($t = 19.240$, $p < .001$), with encouragement rated higher on the Evaluative dimension. Within the medium locus of control group, a significant difference was noted between discouragement and praise ($t = 20.026$, $p < .001$), with praise rated higher on the Evaluative dimension.

Within the high locus of control group, a significant difference was noted between praise and encouragement ($t = 2.860$, $p < .01$), with praise rated higher on the Evaluative dimension. Within the high locus of control group, a significant difference was noted between encouragement and discouragement ($t = 31.394$, $p < .001$), with encouragement rated higher on the Evaluative dimension. Within the high locus of control group, a significant difference was noted between discouragement and praise ($t = 34.454$, $p < .001$), with praise rated higher on the Evaluative dimension.

Hypothesis 4. There is no significant difference among children grouped by sex and classified as high, medium, or low locus of control and their perceptions of encouragement, praise, and discouragement as measured by ratings on the Evaluative dimension of semantic differential scales.

Analysis of the Results for Hypothesis 4

The results of a 2 X 3 X 3 (sex X locus of control X response type) analysis of variance employing the Evaluative scores as the dependent variable are presented on line 4 in Table 3. No significant three-way interaction effect ($F = 1.54$, $df = 4/1332$, $p < .173$) was noted. Thus, H_4 was retained as a tenable hypothesis.

Discussion of the Results for the Evaluative Dimension

Children's perceptions of parent responses in a simulated parent-child interaction, as measured by the Evaluative dimension, indicated a significant difference among responses to encouragement, praise, and discouragement. When the response types for the total group were examined, praise was rated significantly higher than either encouragement or discouragement, and encouragement was rated significantly higher than discouragement. Males and females did not significantly differ in their perceptions of encouragement, praise, and discouragement on the Evaluative dimension.

When the sample was classified on a locus of control dimension, into a high (internal), medium, and low (external) group, discouragement was evaluated significantly lower than praise or encouragement for all locus of control groups. A significant difference between praise and encouragement was found only for the high (internal) group, with ratings of praise higher than encouragement. When sex, locus of control, and response type were examined in a 2 X 3 X 3 analysis of variance on the Evaluative dimension, no significant interaction effect was found in this study. This indicated that males and females of corresponding high,

medium, and low locus of control groups were not significantly different in their perceptions of encouragement, praise, and discouragement as measured by ratings on the Evaluative dimension.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION OF THE POTENCY DATA

Scales on the Potency dimension of the Semantic Differential (Osgood, Suci, & Tannenbaum, 1957) were used as the dependent measure for the hypotheses presented in this section. The Potency dimension is composed of a number of bi-polar adjective scales which indicate a judgment of strength. The Potency scales used in this study were: strong-weak, hard-soft, and large-small.

Hypothesis 5. There is no significant difference in children's perceptions of encouragement, praise, and discouragement as measured by ratings on the Potency dimension of semantic differential scales.

Analysis of the Results for Hypothesis 5

The results of the main effect for response type on the Potency dimension are presented in Table 6. A significant difference ($F = 14.492$, $df = 2/1332$, $p < .001$) was found among the response types (encouragement, praise, and discouragement) on the Potency dimension. Thus, H_5 was rejected as a tenable hypothesis.

Table 6
Results of the 2 X 3 X 3 Analysis of Variance
on the Potency Dimension

Source of Variation	SS	DF	MS	F	Significance
Response type	192.224	2	96.112	14.492	.000001
Sex X Response type	20.865	2	10.432	1.573	.207808
Locus of control X Response type	85.247	4	21.312	3.213	.012288
Sex X Locus of control X Response type	65.467	4	16.367	2.468	.043174
Error within cell	8834.052	1332	6.632		

In order to determine how the response type means for encouragement, praise, and discouragement differed, a Duncan's Multiple Range Test was used. The results are summarized in Table 7.

Table 7
Duncan's Multiple Range Test for the Differences Between
Means of Response Type on the Potency Dimension

Means	D Discouragement .84375	P Praise .57887	E Encouragement .09524	Shortest Significant Range
D = .84375		.26488	.74851***	R = .27503
P = .57887			.48363***	R = .28993
E = .09524				

***p < .001

An examination of the means in Table 7 indicates that discouragement ($\bar{X} = .844$) was greater than praise ($\bar{X} = .579$) and the latter was greater than encouragement ($\bar{X} = .095$). The difference between discouragement and encouragement on the Potency dimension was significant at the .001 level. The difference between praise and encouragement on the Potency dimension was significant at the .001 level. There was no significant difference between discouragement and praise on the Potency dimension.

Hypothesis 6. There is no significant difference between males and females in their perceptions of encouragement, praise, and discouragement as measured by ratings on the Potency dimension of semantic differential scales.

Analysis of the Results for Hypothesis 6

The results of the interaction of sex and response type employing the Potency scores as the dependent variable are presented on line 2 in Table 6. The interaction of sex and perceptions of encouragement, praise, and discouragement ($F = 1.573$, $df = 2/1332$, $p < .208$) did not reach the .05 level of significance. Thus, H_6 was retained as a tenable hypothesis.

Hypothesis 7. There is no significant difference among children classified as high, medium, or low locus of control and their perceptions of encouragement, praise, and discouragement as measured by ratings on the Potency dimension of semantic differential scales.

Analysis of the Results for Hypothesis 7

The results of the interaction of locus of control and response type employing the Potency scores as the dependent variable are presented on line 3 in Table 6. A significant interaction between locus of control

and response type ($F = 3.213$, $df = 4/1332$, $p < .05$) was noted. Thus, H_7 was rejected as a tenable hypothesis.

Additional data are presented in Table 8, which further reports the significance of the differences between responses to encouragement, praise, and discouragement within each of the three locus of control groups.

Table 8

Means, Standard Deviations, and t Tests of Differences Between Means of Response Types for Low, Medium, and High Locus of Control Groups on the Potency Dimension

Locus of Control	Response	\bar{X}	SD	Response	\bar{X}	SD	t
Low	P	.11000	2.64060	E	-.16000	2.34990	1.080
	E	-.16000	2.34990	D	1.00500	2.76645	4.539***
	D	1.00500	2.76645	P	.11000	2.64060	3.310***
Medium	P	.54808	2.45843	E	.24519	2.19848	1.320
	E	.24519	2.19848	D	.49038	2.86405	-.979
	D	.49038	2.86405	P	.54808	2.47843	-.219
High	P	.95833	2.34200	E	.17045	2.27177	3.925***
	E	.17045	2.27177	D	1.00000	3.03089	-3.559***
	D	1.00000	3.03089	P	.95833	2.34200	.176
		P = Praise		DF = ∞			
***p < .001		E = Encouragement					
		D = Discouragement					

Within the low locus of control group, no significant difference as noted between praise and encouragement. Within the low locus of control group, a significant difference was noted between encouragement and discouragement ($t = 4.539$, $p < .001$), with discouragement rated higher on the

Potency dimension. Within the low locus of control group, a significant difference was noted between discouragement and praise ($t = 3.310$, $p < .001$), with discouragement rated higher on the Potency dimension.

Within the medium locus of control group, no significant difference was noted between praise and encouragement. Also, no significant difference was noted between encouragement and discouragement, or between discouragement and praise.

Within the high locus of control group, a significant difference was noted between praise and encouragement ($t = 3.925$, $p < .001$), with praise rated higher on the Potency dimension. Within the high locus of control group, a significant difference was noted between encouragement and discouragement ($t = -3.559$, $p < .001$), with discouragement rated higher on the Potency dimension. Within the high locus of control group, no significant difference was noted between discouragement and praise.

Hypothesis 8. There is no significant difference among children grouped by sex and classified as high, medium, or low locus of control and their perceptions of encouragement, praise, and discouragement as measured by ratings on the Potency dimension of semantic differential scales.

Analysis of the Results for Hypothesis 8

The results of a $2 \times 3 \times 3$ (sex & locus of control \times response type) analysis of variance employing the Potency scores as the dependent variable are presented on line 4 in Table 6. A significant three-way interaction effect ($F = 2.468$, $df = 4/1332$, $p < .05$) was noted. Thus, H_8 was rejected as a tenable hypothesis.

Additional data are presented in Table 9, which further reports the significance of the differences between responses to encouragement, praise, and discouragement for males, and for females, within each of the three locus of control groups.

Table 9

Means, Standard Deviations, and *t* Tests of Differences
Between Means of Response Types for Male and Female
Low, Medium, and High Locus of Control Groups
on the Potency Dimension

Locus of Control	Response	\bar{X}	SD	Response	\bar{X}	SD	<i>t</i>
<u>Males</u>							
Low	P	.26042	3.05819	E	-.10417	2.52349	.90097
	E	-.10417	2.52349	D	1.29167	2.67510	-3.16396**
	D	1.29167	2.67510	P	.26042	3.05819	2.48685*
Medium	P	1.13750	2.59378	E	.45000	2.41252	1.73597
	E	.45000	2.41252	D	.65000	3.13050	.45262
	D	.65000	3.13050	P	1.13750	2.59378	-1.07256
High	P	.58333	2.87143	E	.00833	2.68984	1.60000
	E	.00833	2.68984	D	1.44167	2.96703	3.96600***
	D	1.44167	2.96703	P	.58333	2.87143	2.27736*
<u>Females</u>							
Low	P	-.02885	2.19203	E	-.21154	2.18855	.60150
	E	-.21154	2.18855	D	.74038	2.83527	2.71055**
	D	.74038	2.83527	P	-.02885	2.19203	2.18898*
Medium	P	.17969	2.33910	E	.11719	2.05293	.22722
	E	.11719	2.05293	D	.39063	2.69217	-.91381
	D	.39063	2.69217	P	.17969	2.33910	.66920
High	P	1.27083	1.73495	E	.30556	1.85215	4.56457***
	E	.30556	1.85215	D	.63194	3.04453	-1.09910
	D	.63194	3.04453	P	1.27083	1.73495	-2.18805*
* <i>p</i> < .05		P = Praise				DF = ∞	
** <i>p</i> < .01		E = Encouragement					
*** <i>p</i> < .001		D = Discouragement					

For males, within the low locus of control group, no significant difference was noted between praise and encouragement. For males, within the low locus of control group, a significant difference was noted between encouragement and discouragement ($t = -3.16$, $p < .01$), with discouragement rated higher on the Potency dimension. For males, within the low locus of control group, a significant difference was noted between discouragement and praise ($t = 2.48$, $p < .05$), with discouragement rated higher on the Potency dimension.

For males, within the medium locus of control group, no significant difference was noted between praise and encouragement. Also, no significant difference was noted between encouragement and discouragement, or between discouragement and praise.

For males, within the high locus of control group, no significant difference was noted between praise and encouragement. For males, within the high locus of control group, a significant difference was noted between encouragement and discouragement ($t = 3.96$, $p < .001$), with discouragement rated higher on the Potency dimension. For males, within the high locus of control group, a significant difference was noted between discouragement and praise ($t = 2.27$, $p < .05$), with discouragement rated higher on the Potency dimension.

For females, within the low locus of control group, no significant difference was noted between praise and encouragement. For females, within the low locus of control group, a significant difference was noted between encouragement and discouragement ($t = 2.71$, $p < .01$), with discouragement rated higher on the Potency dimension. For females, within

the low locus of control group, a significant difference was noted between discouragement and praise ($t = 2.18, p < .05$), with discouragement rated higher on the Potency dimension.

For females, within the medium locus of control group, no significant difference was noted between praise and encouragement. Also, no significant difference was noted between encouragement and discouragement, or between discouragement and praise.

For females, within the high locus of control group, a significant difference was noted between praise and encouragement ($t = 4.56, p < .001$), with praise rated higher on the Potency dimension. For females, within the high locus of control group, no significant difference was noted between encouragement and discouragement. For females, within the high locus of control group, a significant difference was noted between discouragement and praise ($t = -2.18, p < .05$), with praise rated higher on the Potency dimension.

Discussion of the Results for the Potency Dimension

Children's perceptions of parent responses in a simulated parent-child interaction, as measured by the Potency dimension, indicated a significant difference among responses to encouragement, praise, and discouragement. When the response types for the total group were examined, no significant difference was noted between discouragement and praise on the Potency dimension. However, both discouragement and praise were judged to be significantly more potent than encouragement. Examination of the data for males and females, indicated that males and females were not significantly different in their perceptions of

encouragement, praise, and discouragement, as measured by ratings on the Potency dimension.

When the sample was classified on a locus of control dimension, into a high (internal), medium, and low (external) group, encouragement was judged to be the least potent for all locus of control groups. A number of significant interactions were observed from the analysis of the data. The low (external) group judged discouragement to be significantly more potent than praise, although the medium and the high groups failed to make a differentiation between discouragement and praise. The high (internal) group judged praise to be significantly more potent than encouragement, although neither the low nor the middle group judged the responses to be significantly different in their ratings of potency. Discouragement was judged to be more potent than encouragement by both the high and the low locus of control groups.

When sex, locus of control, and response type were examined in a 2 X 3 X 3 analysis of variance on the Potency dimension, males and females classified as internally oriented responded differently. The males judged discouragement to be significantly more potent than encouragement, while the females failed to show a significant difference between discouragement and encouragement on the Potency dimension. In contrast, females judged praise to be significantly more potent than encouragement, while males did not rate the two to be significantly different, as measured by ratings on the Potency dimension.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION OF THE HELPFULNESS DATA

A Helpfulness scale was used as the dependent measure for the hypotheses presented in this section. The Helpfulness instrument was

composed of a five-point scale which was constructed to measure the perceived helpfulness of a parent response to a child in a parent-child interaction. The Helpfulness scale ranged from "very helpful" on the high positive end to "very unhelpful" on the low negative end.

Hypothesis 9. There is no significant difference in children's perceptions of encouragement, praise, and discouragement as measured by ratings of Helpfulness.

Analysis of the Results for Hypothesis 9

The results of the main effect for response type on the Helpfulness scale are presented on line 1 in Table 10. A significant difference ($F = 786.119$, $df = 2/1332$, $p < .001$) was found among the response types (encouragement, praise, and discouragement) on the Helpfulness scale. Thus, H_0 was rejected as a tenable hypothesis.

Table 10
Results of the 2 X 3 X 3 Analysis of Variance
on the Helpfulness Scale

<u>Source of Variation</u>	<u>SS</u>	<u>DF</u>	<u>MS</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>Significance</u>
Response type	1996.446	2	998.223	786.119	0.000001
Sex X Response type	10.275	2	5.138	4.046	0.017709
Locus of control X Response type	16.057	4	4.014	3.161	0.013434
Sex X Locus of control X Response type	11.313	4	2.828	2.227	0.064010
Error within cell	1691.390	1332	1.270		

In order to determine how the response type means for encouragement, praise, and discouragement differed, a Duncan's Multiple Range Test was used. The results are summarized in Table 11.

Table 11
Duncan's Multiple Range Test for the Differences Between
Means of Response Type on the Helpfulness Scale

Means	P Praise 1.29464	E Encouragement 1.16071	D Discouragement -.94494	Shortest Significant Range
P = 1.29464		.13393*	2.23958***	R = .12007
E = 1.16071			2.10565***	R = .12658
D = .94494				

*p < .05

***p < .001

An examination of the means in Table 11 indicates that praise ($\bar{X} = 1.29$) was greater than encouragement ($\bar{X} = 1.16$) and the latter was greater than discouragement ($\bar{X} = -.945$). The difference between praise and encouragement on the Helpfulness scale was significant at the .05 level. The difference between praise and discouragement on the Helpfulness scale was significant at the .001 level. The difference between encouragement and discouragement on the Helpfulness scale was significant at the .001 level.

Hypothesis 10. There is no significant difference between males and females in their perceptions of encouragement, praise, and discouragement as measured by ratings of Helpfulness.

Analysis of the Results for Hypothesis 10

The results of the interaction of sex and response type employing the Helpfulness scores as the dependent variable are presented on line 2 of Table 10. A significant interaction ($F = 4.046$, $df = 2/1332$, $p < .05$) between sex and response type was noted. Thus, H_{10} was rejected as a tenable hypothesis.

Additional data are presented in Table 12, which further reports the significance of the differences between responses to encouragement, praise, and discouragement within both the male group, and the female group.

Table 12

Means, Standard Deviations, and t Tests of Differences
Between Means of Response Types for Males and
Females on the Helpfulness Scale

<u>Sex</u>	<u>Response type</u>	<u>\bar{X}</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>Response type</u>	<u>\bar{X}</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>t</u>
Male	P	1.21284	1.14031	E	1.19932	1.03045	.15145
	E	1.19932	1.03045	D	-.82432	1.40805	19.96881***
	D	-.82432	1.40805	P	1.21284	1.14031	-19.35360***
Female	P	1.35904	1.00999	E	1.13032	1.01799	3.09500**
	E	1.13032	1.01799	D	1.03989	1.18704	1.12251
	D	1.03989	1.18704	P	1.35904	1.00999	-3.97397***
		P = Praise		DF = ∞			
		E = Encouragement					
		D = Discouragement					

For males, no significant difference was noted between praise and encouragement. For males, a significant difference was noted between encouragement and discouragement ($t = 19.968$, $p < .001$), with encourage-

ment rated higher on the Helpfulness scale. For males, a significant difference was noted between discouragement and praise ($t = -19.353$, $p < .001$), with praise rated higher on the Helpfulness scale.

For females, a significant difference was noted between praise and encouragement ($t = 3.09$, $p < .01$), with praise rated higher on the Helpfulness scale. For females, no significant difference was noted between encouragement and discouragement. For females, a significant difference was noted between discouragement and praise ($t = -3.97$, $p < .001$), with praise rated higher on the Helpfulness scale.

Hypothesis 11. There is no significant difference among children classified as high, medium, or low locus of control and their perception of encouragement, praise, and discouragement as measured by ratings of Helpfulness.

Analysis of the Results for Hypothesis 11

The results of the interaction of locus of control and response type employing the Helpfulness scores as the dependent variable are presented on line 3 in Table 10. A significant interaction ($F = 3.161$, $df = 4/1332$, $p < .05$) between locus of control and response type was noted. Thus, H_{11} was rejected as a tenable hypothesis.

Additional data are presented in Table 13, which further reports the significance of the differences between responses to encouragement, praise, and discouragement within each of the three locus of control groups.

Table 13

Means, Standard Deviations, and t Tests of Differences Between
Means of Response Types for Low, Medium, and High Locus
of Control Groups on the Helpfulness Scale

Locus of Control	Response	\bar{X}	SD	Response	\bar{X}	SD	t
Low	P	1.17500	1.11831	E	1.14500	1.00949	.28174
	E	1.14500	1.00949	D	-.80000	1.38912	16.02669***
	D	-.80000	1.38912	P	1.17500	1.11831	-15.66800***
Medium	P	1.26442	1.17637	E	1.25481	.99150	.09012
	E	1.25481	.99150	D	-.89904	1.30195	18.99300***
	D	-.89904	1.30195	P	1.26442	1.17637	-17.79014***
High	P	1.40909	.93071	E	1.09848	1.05629	3.58672**
	E	1.09848	1.05629	D	-1.09091	1.19539	22.31100***
	D	-1.09001	1.19539	P	1.40909	.93071	-26.81800***
		P = Praise		DF = ∞			
		E = Encouragement					
		D = Discouragement					

Within the low locus of control group, no significant difference was noted between praise and encouragement. Within the low locus of control group, a significant difference was noted between encouragement and discouragement ($t = 16.026$, $p < .001$), with encouragement rated higher on the Helpfulness scale. Within the low locus of control group, a significant difference was noted between discouragement and praise ($t = -15.668$, $p < .001$), with praise rated higher on the Helpfulness scale.

Within the medium locus of control group, no significant difference was noted between praise and encouragement. Within the medium locus of control group, a significant difference was noted between encouragement and discouragement ($t = 18.993$, $p < .001$), with encouragement rated higher on the Helpfulness scale. Within the medium locus of control

group, a significant difference was noted between discouragement and praise ($t = -17.790$, $p < .001$), with praise rated higher on the Helpfulness scale.

Within the high locus of control group, a significant difference was noted between praise and encouragement ($t = 3.58$, $p < .01$), with praise rated higher on the Helpfulness scale. Within the high locus of control group, a significant difference was noted between encouragement and discouragement ($t = 22.311$, $p < .001$), with encouragement rated higher on the Helpfulness scale. Within the high locus of control group, a significant difference was noted between discouragement and praise ($t = -26.818$, $p < .001$), with praise rated higher on the Helpfulness scale.

Hypothesis 12. There is no significant difference among children grouped by sex and classified as high, medium, or low locus of control and their perceptions of encouragement, praise, and discouragement as measured by ratings of Helpfulness.

Analysis of the Results for Hypothesis 12

The results of a $2 \times 3 \times 3$ (sex \times locus of control \times response type) analysis of variance employing the Helpfulness scores as the dependent variable are presented on line 4 in Table 10. No significant three-way interaction effect ($F = 2.227$, $df = 4/1332$, $p < .064$) was noted. Therefore, H_{12} was retained as a tenable hypothesis.

Discussion of the Results for the Helpfulness Scale

Children's perception of parent responses in a simulated parent-child interaction, as measured by the Helpfulness scale, indicated a significant difference among responses to encouragement, praise, and

discouragement. When the response types for the total group were examined, praise was rated significantly higher than either encouragement or discouragement, and encouragement was rated significantly higher than discouragement. Males and females differed in their ratings of encouragement, praise, and discouragement on the Helpfulness scale. Males rated encouragement as more helpful than discouragement and showed no significant difference between praise and encouragement in their ratings of helpfulness. Females rated praise as more helpful than encouragement and showed no significant difference between encouragement and discouragement in their ratings of helpfulness.

When the sample was classified on a locus of control dimension, into a high (internal), medium, and low (external) group, a significant interaction effect was noted between locus of control and ratings of helpfulness for encouragement, praise, and discouragement. The high (internal) group rated praise to be significantly more helpful than encouragement, although neither the low nor middle group reported a significant difference between encouragement and praise in their ratings on the Helpfulness scale. All three locus of control groups rated encouragement and praise to be significantly more helpful than discouragement.

When sex, locus of control, and response type were examined in a 2 X 3 X 3 analysis of variance on the Helpfulness scale, no significant interaction effect was found in this study. This indicated that males and females, of corresponding high, medium, and low locus of control groups, were not significantly different in their perceptions of encour-

agement, praise, and discouragement, as measured by ratings on the Helpfulness scale.

SUMMARY OF THE RESULTS AND FINDINGS

In this study, children's perceptions of parent responses, representing encouragement, praise, and discouragement, made to children in a simulated parent-child interaction, were investigated by semantic differential scales measuring Evaluative and Potency dimensions, and by a Likert scale measuring perceived helpfulness.

The semantic differential scales for the Evaluative dimension yielded scores which quantitatively measure the subjective psychological impact of a word or concept. The Evaluative scales are designed to tap the subject's judgment of value.

In this study, the scores for the Evaluative dimension suggested that children valued praise more than encouragement or discouragement and valued encouragement more than discouragement when they were asked to rate parent responses made to children in a parent-child interaction.

The semantic differential scales for the Potency dimension yielded scores which quantitatively measure the subjective psychological impact of a word or concept. The Potency scales are designed to tap the subject's judgment of strength or potency.

In this study the scores for the Potency dimension suggested that children generally perceive praise and discouragement as equally potent and always more potent than encouragement. The semantic differential scales for the Potency dimension did not appear refined enough to differentiate between positive potency and negative potency. Parent responses of praise generally received high ratings on the Evaluative dimension,

while parent responses of discouragement generally received low ratings on the Evaluative dimension. However, both praise and discouragement received similar ratings on the Potency scales. This suggested that praise and discouragement may be judged as "strong," "hard," and "large," which are the ratings for the high positive end of the Potency scale. However, positive strength or potency and negative strength or potency is not tapped by the Potency dimension alone.

Children's perceptions of parent responses, representing encouragement, praise, and discouragement in a simulated parent-child interaction, were also measured by a scale rating the perceived helpfulness of the various parental responses.

In this study, the scores for the Helpfulness scale suggested that children perceived praise to be significantly more helpful than either encouragement or discouragement, and perceived encouragement to be significantly more helpful than discouragement. The findings on this scale were similar to the findings reported on the Evaluative dimension, which may indicate that the Helpfulness scale and the Evaluative scales may be measuring the same, or related, constructs.

In summary, this chapter has reported the analysis of the results of this study for the Evaluative and Potency dimensions and for the Helpfulness scale. These were the measuring instruments used to test the null hypotheses. A discussion of the results was also presented.

In the following chapter the summary, conclusions, implications, and recommendations for future research will be presented based on findings of this study.

Chapter 5

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The summary and conclusions are presented in this chapter. Implications and recommendations are then given for future research.

SUMMARY

The purpose of this study was to investigate children's perceptions of three types of verbal communication made by parents in a parent-child interaction. More specifically, this study was designed to investigate whether there were significant differences in children's perceptions of encouraging, praising, and discouraging verbal communications by parents as measured by Evaluative, Potency, and Helpfulness ratings among children grouped by sex and classified as high, medium, or low locus of control. The constructs of encouragement, praise, and discouragement were defined from an Adlerian orientation.

A review of the literature indicated that little research had been reported which investigated the constructs of encouragement, praise, and discouragement. The existing literature related to these concepts has focused primarily on behavior, with no attention given to children's perceptions of the various response types. The literature suggested that intrinsic reinforcement may be most powerful for internally oriented children while extrinsic reinforcement may be most powerful for externally oriented children. No studies directly investigating the Adlerian con-

structs of encouragement, praise, and discouragement as they related to locus of control were found in the review of the literature.

It was hypothesized that:

Hypothesis 1. There is no significant difference in children's perceptions of encouragement, praise, and discouragement as measured by ratings on the Evaluative dimension of semantic differential scales.

Hypothesis 2. There is no significant difference between males and females in their perceptions of encouragement, praise, and discouragement as measured by ratings on the Evaluative dimension of semantic differential scales.

Hypothesis 3. There is no significant difference among children classified as high, medium, or low locus of control and their perceptions of encouragement, praise, and discouragement as measured by ratings on the Evaluative dimension of semantic differential scales.

Hypothesis 4. There is no significant difference among children grouped by sex and classified as high, medium, or low locus of control and their perceptions of encouragement, praise, and discouragement as measured by ratings on the Evaluative dimension of semantic differential scales.

Hypothesis 5. There is no significant difference in children's perceptions of encouragement, praise, and discouragement as measured by ratings on the Potency dimension of semantic differential scales.

Hypothesis 6. There is no significant difference between males and females in their perceptions of encouragement, praise, and discouragement as measured by ratings on the Potency dimension of semantic differential scales.

Hypothesis 7. There is no significant difference among children classified as high, medium, or low locus of control and their perceptions of encouragement, praise, and discouragement as measured by ratings on the Potency dimension of semantic differential scales.

Hypothesis 8. There is no significant difference among children grouped by sex and classified as high, medium, or low locus of control and their perceptions of encouragement, praise, and discouragement as measured by ratings on the Potency dimension of semantic differential scales.

Hypothesis 9. There is no significant difference in children's perceptions of encouragement, praise, and discouragement as measured by ratings of Helpfulness.

Hypothesis 10. There is no significant difference between males and females in their perceptions of encouragement, praise, and discouragement as measured by ratings of Helpfulness.

Hypothesis 11. There is no significant difference among children classified as high, medium, or low locus of control and their perceptions of encouragement, praise, and discouragement as measured by ratings of Helpfulness.

Hypothesis 12. There is no significant difference among children grouped by sex and classified as high, medium, or low locus of control and their perceptions of encouragement, praise, and discouragement as measured by ratings of Helpfulness.

The sample of this study was composed of 37 male and 47 female fifth- and sixth-grade students attending classes in a southwestern Indiana elementary school. All subjects were volunteers who had received parental permission to participate in this study.

Bialer's Children's Locus of Control Scale was verbally administered via audiotape to measure locus of control. Children's perceptions of parental responses representing encouragement, praise, and discouragement were assessed by having subjects listen to an audiotape portraying parent-child interactions in selected positive and negative stimulus situations. Three parent responses representing encouragement, praise, and discouragement followed the presentation of each stimulus situation. Subjects responded on answer sheets that had the written text accompanying the audiotape (see Appendix D). Subjects rated each response: (a) on selected scales of the Semantic Differential measuring Evaluative and Potency dimensions, and (b) on a Likert scale measuring perceived Helpfulness.

The instruments were administered to groups ranging in size from nine to fourteen subjects. Children were released from their classrooms to take part in the study through cooperation with the school and classroom teachers. The data were collected in April, 1977. Collection of the data was done by the investigator and a doctoral student in Guidance and Counseling.

Three separate analyses of variance were computed, one each for the Evaluative, Potency, and Helpfulness measures of children's reported perceptions of parental responses. A $2 \times 3 \times 3$ (sex \times locus of control \times response type) ANOVA was computed for each of the three dependent measures: Evaluative, Potency, and Helpfulness. The independent variables in this analysis were sex and locus of control. Repeated measurements were done on the dependent variables: encouragement, praise, and discouragement. The level of significance set for rejection of the null hypotheses was

$p < .05$. Duncan's Multiple Range Test was used for post hoc analysis of significant main effects. A t test was used for post hoc analysis of significant interactions effects.

The results of the study on the Evaluative dimension were:

1. A significant difference was found in children's perceptions of encouragement, praise, and discouragement on the Evaluative dimension. A further analysis of the data indicated that children rated praise as more positive than encouragement or discouragement, and rated encouragement as more positive than discouragement.

2. No significant difference was found between males and females in their perceptions of encouragement, praise, and discouragement as measured by ratings on the Evaluative dimension.

3. A significant difference was found among children classified as high, medium, and low locus of control and their perceptions of encouragement, praise, and discouragement as measured by ratings on the Evaluative dimension. A further analysis of the data indicated that only the high (internal) group evaluated praise as significantly different from encouragement, with praise evaluated more positively than encouragement. All three locus of control groups evaluated encouragement more positively than discouragement. Also, all three locus of control groups evaluated praise more positively than discouragement.

4. No significant difference was found between males and females classified as high, medium, and low locus of control and their perceptions of encouragement, praise, and discouragement as measured by ratings on the Evaluative dimension.

The results of the study on the Potency dimension were:

1. A significant difference was found in children's perceptions of encouragement, praise, and discouragement on the Potency dimension. A further analysis of the data indicated that children rated discouragement and praise as significantly more potent than encouragement. Children's ratings of discouragement and praise were not significantly different on the Potency dimension.

2. No significant difference was found between males and females in their perceptions of encouragement, praise, and discouragement as measured by ratings on the Potency dimension.

3. A significant difference was found among children classified as high, medium, or low locus of control and their perceptions of encouragement, praise, and discouragement as measured by ratings on the Potency dimension. A further analysis of the data indicated that the low (external) group perceived discouragement to be more potent than praise, but no significant difference was found between praise and encouragement. The high (internal) group, in contrast, perceived praise to be more potent than encouragement, but no significant difference was found between discouragement and praise. The middle locus of control group reported no significant differences in their perceptions of any response types. Both the high and the low locus of control groups perceived discouragement to be more potent than encouragement.

4. A significant difference was found between males and females classified as high, medium, or low locus of control and their perceptions of encouragement, praise, and discouragement as measured by ratings on the Potency dimension. A further analysis of the data indicated that

males reported discouragement as significantly more potent than encouragement. However, females reported no significant difference between discouragement and encouragement. The males reported no significant difference between praise and encouragement. In contrast, the data for females indicated a significant difference between praise and encouragement, as measured by the Potency dimension.

The results of the study on the Helpfulness scale were:

1. A significant difference was found in children's perceptions of encouragement, praise, and discouragement on the Helpfulness scale. A further analysis of the data indicated that children rated praise as more helpful than encouragement or discouragement, and rated encouragement as more helpful than discouragement.

2. A significant difference was found between males and females in their perceptions of encouragement, praise, and discouragement on the Helpfulness scale. A further analysis of the data indicated that males rated encouragement as more helpful than discouragement and reported no significant difference between praise and encouragement. In contrast, the females rated praise as more helpful than encouragement and reported no significant difference between encouragement and discouragement. Both males and females rated praise as more helpful than discouragement.

3. A significant difference was found among children classified as high, medium, or low locus of control and their perceptions of encouragement, praise, and discouragement on the Helpfulness scale. A further analysis of the data indicated that the high (internal) group rated praise as significantly more helpful than encouragement. The low and middle locus of control group did not rate praise and encouragement

significantly different on the Helpfulness scale. All three locus of control groups rated encouragement as more helpful than discouragement. Also, praise was rated as more helpful than discouragement within all three locus of control groups.

4. No significant difference was found between males and females classified as high, medium, and low locus of control in regard to their perceptions of encouragement, praise, and discouragement as measured by ratings on the Helpfulness scale.

CONCLUSIONS

The questions toward which this investigation focused were:

- (1) Are communications by parents in a parent-child interaction, representing encouragement, praise, and discouragement, perceived differently by children as measured by rating of Evaluative, Potency, and Helpfulness?
- (2) Do children grouped by sex and classified as high, medium, or low locus of control differ in their ratings of communications by parents in a parent-child interaction, representing encouragement, praise, and discouragement, as measured by ratings of Evaluative, Potency, and Helpfulness?

Conclusions reached from the analysis of the data reported in Chapter 4 are made within the framework of the assumptions and limitations of this study which were presented in Chapter 1.

Based on the data resulting from instruments employed in this investigation, the following conclusions are warranted.

1. Praising and encouraging parental communications are perceived by children as being more helpful and more positive than discouraging parental communications. This suggests that children do differentially

perceive positive and negative parental responses. The perception of discouraging responses as less helpful and less positive than either praising responses or encouraging responses was expected. Dreikurs (1972) has asserted that a child's difficulties are always based on some form of discouragement. Although discouragement is a process of losing faith in oneself, it can be influenced by significant others. The conclusion in this study supports the position that discouragement, as defined from an Adlerian orientation, is perceived as discouragement by children receiving the response.

A number of behavioral studies cited in the review of the literature investigated positive versus negative reinforcement and the subsequent effect on behavior. The detrimental effect of disapproval or criticism was noted by a number of researchers (Gall, 1972; Kennedy & Willcutt, 1965; Spear, 1970). However, the effectiveness of using disapproval or criticism in specific task-related situations was noted by others (Fontana, 1972; Llewellyn, 1973; Sinatra, 1973). It is noted that the studies cited in the review of the literature investigated behavior rather than reported perceptions. In this study, discouraging responses were perceived as being as potent as praising responses, and as being more potent than encouraging responses. How the perceived potency, or strength, of a parental response affects behavior was not investigated in this study.

2. Praising responses are perceived by children to be more helpful, more positive, and more potent than encouraging responses. This suggests that children desire specific and direct feedback from parents, especially when it compliments the child's personal worth. The consist-

ency with which children rated praise higher than encouragement suggests that children prefer person-oriented praise rather than task-oriented encouragement from parents. In some respects, these findings appear to be at odds with Adlerian principles which suggest risks involved in responding to children with praise. Dreikurs and Soltz (1964) have recommended that praise be used very cautiously so it does not come to be seen as a reward, the lack of which becomes scorn. Their position asserts that praise can lead to discouragement if the child comes to believe that to be valued he or she must receive praise. Dreikurs and Soltz, however, do not speak specifically to what children might initially prefer from adults, but approach it as a developmental process. It is difficult, therefore, to make specific comparisons of initial reactions, as investigated in this study, and the process of responding to children.

However, the overall preference by children of praise over encouragement suggests that praise may have more to offer as a reinforcer than the Adlerians have previously acknowledged. In summary, it is concluded that Adlerians may have underestimated the usefulness of praising responses and overestimated the usefulness of encouraging responses in parent-child interactions.

3. Males and females are similar in their judgments of value and potency for encouragement, praise, and discouragement. Sex did not appear to function as a discriminating variable with regard to how children perceive the value and strength of parent responses. In some respects, the findings of this study are supported by earlier research which has investigated response conditions and performance. Munson and Lehrer (1975) reported no sex difference on the performance levels of children,

when IQ and baseline performance were controlled. Stein (1969) also found no difference between males and females in achievement behavior when assigned to one of four reinforcement conditions. Although these studies investigated the behavioral effects of various response types rather than perception, their findings support the results of this study with regard to males' and females' judgments of value and potency.

Sex did appear to be a discriminating variable in children's judgments of helpfulness. For males, encouragement is perceived as more helpful than discouragement. In this study, females perceived the helpfulness of responses defined as encouragement, to be similar to responses defined as discouragement. Since ultimately it is the receiver who determines the reinforcement value of a particular response, this finding suggests that encouraging responses may have less positive reinforcement for females than the same responses may have for males.

In summary, this study suggests that sex may contribute to the perceptual framework within which children judge the helpfulness of a parent's responses. Sex does not appear to contribute to children's judgments regarding the potency and the evaluation of parent's responses.

4. Internally oriented children more clearly differentiate between praise and encouragement, with praise being perceived as the more helpful, the more positive, and the more potent. This was unexpected in light of literature which suggests that encouragement may lead to increasing feelings of internal control (Lefcourt, 1966). If encouragement can enhance the development of an internal control situation, then it was expected that children, classified as internally oriented, would be more receptive to receiving encouragement rather than praise. This expectation

was not borne out by the study. Instead, the results suggest that internally oriented children differentiate between praise and encouragement more clearly than either low or medium locus of control children. Although this is not readily explainable, one may speculate that variables other than those under investigation in this study may have influenced children's ratings of the parental responses. For example, several studies investigating a developmental view of locus of control (Bartel, 1971; Beebe, 1970; Bialer, 1961; Gorsuch, Henighan, & Barnard, 1972) were cited in the review of the literature. The developmental view suggests that increasing internality occurs with developmental mastery. Children with verbally mature abstractions tended to score as more internally oriented than did children employing less mature verbal abstractions in research reported by Bialer (1961). How a child's abstract verbal maturity level may have effected discrimination and perception of parental responses in this study is not known. It is known that children in this study who were classified as internally oriented, perceived praise and encouragement to be significantly different, although medium and low locus of control children failed to differentiate between encouragement and praise.

It is noted that this study focused on initial reactions, rather than the developmental encouragement process, as referred to by Lefcourt (1966). In view of this, it is difficult to relate this study specifically to literature which has suggested a relationship between encouragement and an internal locus of control orientation.

5. Sex does not appear to function as a discriminating variable between males and females of corresponding locus of control orientations in regard to their judgments of the helpfulness and value of parental responses.

However, sex does appear to contribute to the perceptual framework within which internally oriented children judge the potency of a parent's responses. Males view discouragement as the most potent parental response while females perceive praise to be the most potent. This suggests that males perceive messages conveying disapproval, criticism, or blame as very powerful parent responses. Females, however, regard specific, direct feedback of a complimentary nature as the most potent form of parental response.

Lintner and Ducette (1974) also reported an interaction effect of sex, locus of control, and responsiveness to praise. However, the direction of the interaction appears to be different from that suggested in this study. Lintner and Ducette found variable of sex and locus of control influenced children's responsiveness to praise. They reported that females, without regard to locus of control, responded only minimally to praise.

IMPLICATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

1. Children's perceptions of parent responses should be assessed more directly in future studies. This study investigated perceptions of encouragement, praise, and discouragement in a simulated parent-child interaction rather than an actual situation. Research should be done to examine children's reactions to parental responses in an ongoing parent-child relationship. Research of this nature could be conducted within family education programs with the cooperation of family members. The data collected could be integrated into the process of helping family members communicate and learn more cooperative ways of living together.

2. This study investigated children's reported perceptions of parent responses representing encouragement, praise, and discouragement. Further research should be done to investigate how children's perceptions of parental response types affect their subsequent behavior. Research of this nature could be patterned after behavioral studies which have examined the effect various response types have on observable and measurable behavior.

For example, in this study discouragement was seen as less helpful and less positive than either praise or encouragement. Discouragement was also seen as more potent than encouragement, and as potent as praise. Further research should investigate how these variables of perception interact to influence behavior.

3. This study investigated children's initial reactions to various parental responses. Longitudinal studies should further investigate how the long-term response patterns of parents affect children's receptiveness to receiving various types of responses from them. Data of this type could serve as a baseline against which receptivity to new response patterns could be measured. Also, longitudinal research could increase understanding of how responses have come to take on reinforcing qualities.

4. In this study, sex was a discriminating variable in children's judgments of the helpfulness of parental responses. However, sex was not a discriminating variable in children's judgments of the value and potency of parental responses. Sex should be considered as an independent variable in future studies to ascertain how sex contributes to the perceptual framework within which children judge parental responses. In

addition to perception, the differential effect of parental responses on the behavior of males and females could be examined if sex were employed as an independent variable in future research.

5. Children with an internal locus of control orientation judged the value, strength, and helpfulness of praise differently than they judged the value, strength, and helpfulness of encouragement. Both medium and low locus of control children did not differentiate between praise and encouragement. Therefore, locus of control was a discriminating variable in children's perceptions of encouragement and praise. Locus of control should continue to be considered as an independent variable in future studies. In addition, research which investigates locus of control from a developmental view should be continued. This could contribute to increasing the validity of locus of control measurements through a more thorough understanding of the variables influencing locus of control.

6. A factor analysis of all the items used to measure Evaluation, Potency, and Helpfulness should be conducted to clarify the meaning children attribute to various parental responses. The items used to measure perceived helpfulness could be analyzed with the original pool of items used by Osgood, Suci, and Tannenbaum (1957). Thus, the relationship between Evaluation and Potency on the one hand, and Helpfulness on the other, would be better understood. This would assist in determining whether the Helpfulness scale used in this study adds a new dimension not included in the Semantic Differential scales.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Allen, S. A., Spear, P. S., & Lucke, J. R. Effects of social reinforcement on learning and retention in children. Developmental Psychology, 1971, 5, 73-80.
- Baron, R. M., & Ganz, R. L. Effects of locus of control and type of feedback on the task performance of lower-class black children. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1972, 21, 124-130.
- Bartel, N. R. Locus of control and achievement in middle- and lower-class children. Child Development, 1971, 42, 1099-1107.
- Battle, E. S., & Rotter, J. B. Children's feelings of personal control as related to social class and ethnic group. Journal of Personality, 1963, 31, 482-490.
- Beebe, J. S. Self-concept and internal and external control in children and adolescents (Doctoral dissertation, University of Rochester, 1970). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1971, 31, 4966B-4967B. (University Microfilms No. 71-1369, 154).
- Bernhardt, A. J., & Forehand, R. The effects of labeled and unlabeled praise upon lower and middle class children. Journal of Experimental Child Psychology, 1975, 19, 536-543.
- Bialer, I. Conceptualization of success and failure in mentally retarded and normal children. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, George Peabody College for Teachers, 1960.
- Bialer, I. Conceptualization of success and failure in mentally retarded and normal children. Journal of Personality, 1961, 29, 303-320.
- Carringer, D., & Wilson, C. S. The effects of sex, socioeconomic class, experimenter race, and kind of verbal reinforcement on the performance of black children. Journal of Negro Education, 1974, 43, 212-220.
- Crandall, V. C., Katkovsky, W., & Crandall, V. J. Children's belief in their control of reinforcements in intellectual-academic achievement situations. Child Development, 1965, 36, 91-109.
- Cromwell, R. L., Rosenthal, D., Shakow, D., & Zahn, T. P. Reaction time, locus of control, choice behavior, and descriptions of parental behavior in schizophrenic and normal subjects. Journal of Personality, 1961, 29, 363-379.

- Di Vesta, F. J. Developmental patterns in the use of modifiers as modes of conceptualization. Child Development, 1965, 36, 185-213.
- Dinkmeyer, D., & McKay, G. D. Raising a responsible child. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1973.
- Dougherty, A. M. Student perceptions of three counseling techniques. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Indiana State University, 1974.
- Downing, R. W., Moed, G., & Wight, B. W. Studies of disability: a technique for measurement of psychological effects. Child Development, 1961, 32, 561-575.
- Dreikurs, R. The challenge of child training: a parent's guide. New York: Hawthorn Books, 1972.
- Dreikurs, R., & Soltz, V. Children: the challenge. New York: Hawthorn Books, 1964.
- Edwards, A. L. Experimental design in psychological research (4th ed.). New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1972.
- Epstein, R., & Komorita, S. S. Self-esteem, success-failure, and locus of control in Negro children. Developmental Psychology, 1971, 4, 2-8.
- Ferguson, G. A. Statistical analysis in psychology and education (3rd ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill, 1971.
- Fine, J. R. The influence of belief in locus of control and rate of reinforcement on expectancy change, task performance, and self-evaluation of performance among lower socioeconomic status black children (Doctoral dissertation, New York University, 1973). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1973, 34, 615A. (University Microfilms No. 73-19423, 178)
- Fitz, R. J. The differential effects of praise and censure on serial learning as dependent on locus of control and field dependency (Doctoral dissertation, Catholic University of America, 1970). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1971, 31, 4310B. (University Microfilms No. 71-1457, 74)
- Fontana, M. Experimental modification of disfluent speech behavior in children (Doctoral dissertation, Columbia University, 1972). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1973, 34, 634A. (University Microfilms No. 73-19345, 75)

- Gall, R. S. The effects of verbal praise and verbal reproof in a sentence-construction task upon the performance of seventh-grade students identified according to I.Q. level and internal-external locus of control (Doctoral dissertation, University of Washington, 1972). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1973, 33, 4173A. (University Microfilms No. 73-3712, 104)
- Ginott, H. G. Between parent and child. New York: Macmillan, 1965.
- Gordon, T. P.E.T.: parent effectiveness training. New York: P. H. Wyden, 1970.
- Gorsuch, R. L., Henighan, R. P., & Barnard, C. Locus of control: an example of dangers in using children's scales with children. Child Development, 1972, 43, 579-590.
- Gozali, J., & Bialer, I. Children's locus of control scales: independence from response set bias among retardates. American Journal of Mental Deficiency, 1968, 72, 622-625.
- Havinghurst, R. J. Developmental tasks and education. New York: David McKay, 1972.
- Helner, P. A. The effects of the use of interpretation as a counseling technique. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Indiana State University, 1973.
- Hilaael, T. M. Perceived parental cognitive control and the development of locus of control modalities in children (Doctoral dissertation, Case Western Reserve University, 1972). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1972, 32, 6808A. (University Microfilms No. 72-18695, 73)
- Hillman, B. W., & Shields, F. L. The encouragement process in guidance: its effect on school achievement and attending behavior. School Counselor, 1975, 22, 166-173.
- Joe, V. C. Review of the internal-external control construct as a personality variable. Psychological Reports, 1971, 28, 619-640.
- Kennedy, W. A., & Willcutt, H. C. A factorial study of praise and blame. Psychological Reports, 1965, 17, 511-517.
- Lachowicz, J. M. The relative effects of praise, praise-plus-description, and praise-plus-instructions with pre-school children (Doctoral dissertation, University of Kansas, 1971). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1972, 32, 7344B. (University Microfilms No. 72-11763, 92)
- Lefcourt, H. M. Belief in personal control: research and implications. Journal of Individual Psychology, 1966, 22, 185-195. (a)

- Lefcourt, H. M. Internal versus external control of reinforcement. Psychological Bulletin, 1966, 65, 206-220. (b)
- Lintner, A. C., & Ducette, J. The effects of locus of control, academic failure and task dimensions on a student's responsiveness to praise. American Educational Research Journal, 1974, 11, 231-239.
- Llewellyn, R. C. Do praise and criticism have different effects on low- and high-esteem children? (Doctoral dissertation, Fuller Theological Seminary, 1973). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1974, 34, 5170B-5171B. (University Microfilms No. 73-31501, 124)
- Loeb, R. C. Concomitants of boys' locus of control examined in parent-child interactions. Developmental Psychology, 1975, 11, 353-358.
- Madsen, C. H., Becker, W. C., & Thomas, D. R. Rules, praise, and ignoring: elements of elementary classroom control. Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis, 1968, 1, 139-150.
- Maltz, H. E. Ontogenetic change in the meaning of concepts as measured by the semantic differential. Child Development, 1963, 34, 667-674.
- Maurer, E. D. The effects of locus of control and test anxiety on children's response to social reinforcement in an evaluation situation (Doctoral dissertation, University of Illinois, 1973). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1973, 34, 7589A-7590A. (University Microfilms No. 74-12102, 113)
- McGrade, B. Effectiveness of verbal reinforcers in relation to age and social class. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1966, 4, 555-560.
- Miller, M. B. Reliability of the Bialer-Cromwell scale in a mentally retarded group. Abstracts of Peabody Studies in Mental Retardation, 1960, 1, No. 73.
- Moore, S. G., & Bulbulian, K. N. The effects of contrasting styles of adult-child interaction on children's curiosity. Developmental Psychology, 1976, 12, 171-172.
- Munson, S., & Lehrer, P. M. Resolving contradictory findings on sex and social class differences in children's responses to reinforcement. Journal of Experimental Child Psychology, 1975, 20, 487-495.
- Ollendick, D. G. Parental Locus of Control, Children's Locus of Control, Anxiety, Achievement, and Locus of Conflict. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Indiana State University, 1977.
- Osgood, C. E., Suci, G. J., & Tannenbaum, P. H. The measurement of meaning. Urbana, Illinois: University of Illinois Press, 1957.

- Pawlicki, R. E. Locus of control and the effectiveness of social reinforcers. Journal of Genetic Psychology, 1974, 125, 153-159.
- Penk, W. E. Age changes and correlates of internal-external locus of control scale. Psychological Reports, 1969, 25, 856.
- Redd, W. H., Morris, E. K., & Martin, J. A. Effects of positive and negative adult-child interactions on children's social preference. Journal of Experimental Child Psychology, 1973, 19, 153-164.
- Reimanes, G. Effects of experimental IE modification techniques and home environment variables on IE. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Psychological Association, Atlantic City, 1971.
- Rigg, L. J. Children's perception of personal and parental locus of control as related to academic achievement (Doctoral dissertation, University of Illinois, 1972). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1973, 33, 5562A. (University Microfilms No. 73-10034, 88)
- Rotter, J. B. Generalized expectancies for internal versus external control of reinforcement. Psychological Monographs, 1966, 80, (1, Whole No. 609).
- Runyon, A. J. Parent education with families of children with extreme reading problems (Doctoral dissertation, University of Oregon, 1972). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1973, 33, 5499A-5500A. (University Microfilms No. 73-7951, 122)
- Settles, D. D., & Hamm, N. H. Effectiveness of social and correctness reinforcers with different aged children. Psychological Reports, 1973, 33, 787-792.
- Shafer, J. K. The relationship between perceived parental consistency and children's orientation of control (Doctoral dissertation, University of Oklahoma, 1969). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1969, 30, 838B. (University Microfilms No. 69-12930, 78)
- Shore, R. E. Some parental correlates of boys' locus of control. Paper presented at the Eastern Psychological Association, Washington, D. C., 1968.
- Sinatra, R. C. The effects of varying incentive conditions upon the word acquisition abilities of potential language disability students at the first-grade level (Doctoral dissertation, Hofstra University, 1973). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1973, 34, 1182A-1183A. (University Microfilms No. 73-16764, 230)
- Small, E. R. Age and sex differences in the semantic structure of children. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Michigan, 1957.

- Solomon, D., Houlihan, R. D., & Parelius, R. J. Intellectual achievement responsibility in Negro and white children. Psychological Reports, 1969, 24, 479-483.
- Soltz, V. Study Group Leader's Manual. Chicago: Alfred Adler Institute, 1967.
- Spear, P. S. Motivational effects of praise and criticism on children's learning. Developmental Psychology, 1970, 3, 124-132.
- Sprehn, G. C. Correlates of parent behavior and locus of control in nine to twelve year old males. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Emory University, 1973.
- Stein, A. H. The influence of social reinforcement on the achievement behavior of fourth grade boys and girls. Child Development, 1969, 40, 727-736.
- Stevenson, H. W., & Cruse, D. B. The effectiveness of social reinforcement with normal and feebleminded children. Journal of Personality, 1961, 29, 124-135.
- Taffel, S. J., O'Leary, K. D., & Armel, S. Reasoning and praise: their effects on academic behavior. Journal of Educational Psychology, 1974, 66, 291-295.
- Wickersham, P. H. Classroom interaction patterns: differential effects and relationships between sixth-grade children's self concepts and locus of control of reinforcements (Doctoral dissertation, University of Illinois, 1970). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1971, 32, 804A. (University Microfilms No. 71-14990, 229)
- Winer, B. J. Statistical principles in experimental design. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1962.
- Zigler, E., & Kanzer, P. The effectiveness of two classes of verbal reinforcers on the performance of middle- and lower-class children. Journal of Personality, 1962, 30, 157-163.

APPENDIXES

APPENDIX A

Judges' Rating Scale for Encouragement,

Praise, and Discouragement

Eight stimulus situations are presented below. Each represents a fifth or sixth grade child talking to a parent. Following each situation there are several parent responses. Classify each parent response as either Encouragement (E), Praise (P), or Discouragement (D) by placing the appropriate letter in the space next to the parent response.

In this proposed study the following definitions are used:

Encouragement refers to an almost unlimited acceptance of the child based on a belief in the innate capacity of the child to overcome challenges when supported by significant others.

Praise conveys an external judgment, positive evaluation, or approval. Praise implies a spirit of competition and is like a reward for something well done.

Discouragement refers to a negative evaluation, disapproval, blame, or criticism.

1. "I wish I'd never have moved to this new school. All the kids act stupid and there's nobody I'd want to be friends with. We've been here two weeks and I still don't know anybody."

____ (P) Oh John, you've always been so popular. I know you can do it here too.

____ (D) Stop feeling sorry for yourself, you'll never get any friends that way.

____ (E) Maybe we can figure out some way together for you to get to know some of the kids better. Have you got any ideas?

____ (E) Making new friends sometimes is hard. I know you're giving it a lot of effort though.

____ (D) If there are no kids in that whole school you want to be friends with there's something wrong with you.

____ (P) You've always been a popular kid, before long things will be better.

2. "We've been running in gym all winter and Mrs. Smith said she's thinking about starting a track team this spring. She said I have fast enough speed to probably make the team!"

 (P) You're such a fast runner, we'd sure be proud of you.

 (D) Don't get your hopes up too high. You've never gone out for a sport before.

 (P) Being on the track team sure would be a big honor.

 (D) I'm not so sure that's a good idea. You know it will take time out from your school work.

 (E) That sounds like something you'd really enjoy.

3. "We're supposed to have all the money for the popcorn the school's selling in by Monday and I haven't sold any yet. I don't know what I'm going to do with all that stupid popcorn."

 (E) Looks like a big job. Would you want to practice your sales pitch on me?

 (P) You've always been a good student when it comes to projects like that.

 (D) If you weren't going to sell it, you shouldn't have brought it home.

 (P) You're a smart girl. I know you won't let your school down.

 (E) You've got a lot of work ahead of you before Monday. Where do you think you might have your best luck finding customers?

4. "Today Mr. Williams talked to us about our reading and he told me that I was doing a lot better this grading period. He said my grade would probably be better on my report card next week!"

 (E) I'll bet that took a lot of effort!

 (D) Well you better keep up the good work. It's still a week until report cards come out, you know.

 (E) I'm really glad to hear that. I bet you feel pretty good about it too.

 (P) I'm real proud of you. I always knew you could do it.

 (P) I always knew you were a smart girl/boy.

 (D) It's about time that reading grade came up.

5. "I hate phys. ed. We've been playing softball all week and I'm always the last one picked to be on a team. I just can't see that dumb ball coming. I struck out both times today."

____(E)____ It takes a lot of courage to hang in there when the going gets rough.

____(P)____ I know you're not that bad. Didn't you tell me you always get more hits than Jimmy or Terry?

____(E)____ I like the way you're still trying. I can see you're not ready to give up yet.

____(P)____ We've always been proud of you. You're one of the best athletes in our family.

____(D)____ Well you never get out and practice. You can't expect to be good if you don't practice.

6. "I've been needing some money. I thought about getting a paper route but first I think I'll see if there's any yards around here I could mow this summer. What do you think?"

____(E)____ Sounds like you've thought a lot about it already. Got any ideas on who you might check with first?

____(P)____ I'm proud of the way you're showing initiative lately.

____(D)____ Mowing yards is a lot of work. Where are you going to get the lawnmower and everything?

____(D)____ What do you mean mow yards around here? You don't even help out here at home with the mowing.

____(E)____ Sounds like you've got a couple good ideas on how to make some money.

7. "I can't do this dumb report like Mrs. Jones said. I don't even know what she wants. And what's more, she wants it done by tomorrow."

 (P) A person with your brains shouldn't have any trouble. Go ahead and write it.

 (E) I know it looks rough, but I think you'll be able to do it.

 (D) Stop fussing and start writing. You're not going to stay up past your bedtime tonight.

 (P) You're a smart kid. Go ahead and write it.

 (E) That sounds like a tough job you've got. Can you think of anyone who might be able to tell you what Mrs. Jones expected?

 (D) You better quit complaining and start writing.

8. "After supper I want to go down to Susie's house for awhile. She's got some really neat records we're going to listen to. Boy I'm glad she moved down the street cause she's just about my best friend."

 (E) Sounds like you do like her a lot.

 (D) I think you're making a mistake spending so much time with Susie. You need lots of friends, not just one.

 (P) I'm proud of you. It really takes a good kid to be able to make friends as quickly as you do.

 (E) I'm glad you've got a new friend so close by.

 (P) I've always been so pleased with the way you can make friends.

APPENDIX B

Letter and Release Form Sent to Parents

Dear Parents:

I have talked with your child's principal and teacher(s) about the possibility of using fifth and sixth grade students at Central Elementary School as part of my doctoral dissertation in counseling at Indiana State University.

I would like to get a sample of student attitudes and opinions about what kinds of verbal communication children see as most helpful. In this study your child would be asked to (1) complete a questionnaire on attitudes, and (2) listen to tape-recorded situations of children and parents talking. The children at Central Elementary will be asked to try and pretend they are the child talking on the tape and give their own reactions to different kinds of responses made by parents. Answers will be marked on special answer sheets that will keep your child's responses confidential.

Children will be leaving their classrooms in groups of ten to complete the questionnaire and rate the tape recordings. Due to space being limited in the Central Elementary School, arrangements have been made to use the Methodist Church across the street from the school for the forty-five minutes necessary to complete the questionnaire and rating form. An adult will be accompanying the children the entire time they are out of the classroom.

I would appreciate your consent and your child's cooperation in this project. Please detach, complete, and return the attached form to your child's teacher. This will allow your child to participate in this project. Data will be collected next week so it is important that you return the consent form tomorrow if at all possible.

If you have any questions, please feel free to call me at Central Elementary School (268-5144) or at home (812-466-9262).

Your cooperation is greatly appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

Judith A. Anderson

I hereby give my consent for my child to participate in the project proposed by Judith A. Anderson in cooperation with Central Elementary School. I understand my child will be asked to complete an attitude questionnaire and rate a number of tape-recorded parent-child discussions. All information collected is to be kept strictly confidential. I also give permission for my child to leave the school building under supervision of an adult for the time necessary to complete the questionnaire and rating form.

Student's Name

Parent/Guardian Signature

(Please return this form to the classroom teacher.)

APPENDIX C

Children's Locus of Control Scale

Instructions

This is not a test. I am just trying to find out how kids your age think about certain things. I am going to ask you some questions to see how you feel about these things. There are no right or wrong answers to these questions. Some kids say "Yes" and some say "No." When I ask the question, if you think your answer should be yes, or mostly yes, write "Yes." If you think your answer should be no, or mostly no, write "No." Remember different children give different answers, and there is no right or wrong answer. Just write "Yes" or "No," depending on how you think the question should be answered. If you want me to repeat a question, ask me. Do you understand? All right, listen carefully, and answer "Yes" or "No."

- 1p. When somebody gets mad at you, do you usually feel there is nothing you can do about it?
- 2f. Do you really believe a kid can be whatever he wants to be?
- 3f. When people are mean to you, could it be because you did something to make them be mean?
- 4f. Do you usually make up your mind about something without asking someone first?
- 5f. Can you do anything about what is going to happen tomorrow?
- 6f. When people are good to you, is it usually because you did something to make them be good?
- 7f. Can you ever make other people do things you want them to do?
- 8f. Do you ever think that kids your age can change things that are happening in the world?
- 9f. If another child was going to hit you, could you do anything about it?
- 10f. Can a child your age ever have his own way?
- 11p. Is it hard for you to know why some people do certain things?
- 12f. When someone is nice to you, is it because you did the right things?

- 13f. Can you ever try to be friends with another kid even if he doesn't want to?
- 14f. Does it ever help any to think about what you will be when you grow up?
- 15f. When someone gets mad at you, can you usually do something to make him your friend again?
- 16f. Can kids your age ever have anything to say about where they are going to live?
- 17f. When you get in an argument, is it sometimes your fault?
- 18p. When nice things happen to you, is it only good luck?
- 19p. Do you often feel you get punished when you don't deserve it?
- 20f. Will people usually do things for you if you ask them?
- 21f. Do you believe a kid can usually be whatever he wants to be when he grows up?
- 22p. When bad things happen to you, is it usually someone else's fault?
- 23f. Can you ever know for sure why some people do certain things?

Note: The letter "f" following item number indicates that an answer of "Yes" is scored as internal control. The letter "p" signifies that an answer of "No" is scored as internal control.

APPENDIX D

Children's Answer Booklet

Name _____ Grade _____

Age _____ Birthdate _____ Sex _____
Mo. Day Yr.

1. _____ 9. _____ 17. _____

2. _____ 10. _____ 18. _____

3. _____ 11. _____ 19. _____

4. _____ 12. _____ 20. _____

5. _____ 13. _____ 21. _____

6. _____ 14. _____ 22. _____

7. _____ 15. _____ 23. _____

8. _____ 16. _____

SITUATION #1

"We've been running in gym all winter and Mr. Smith said he's thinking about starting a track team this spring. He said I have fast enough speed to probably make the team!"

Parent Response 1: "That sounds like something you'd enjoy."

:	:	:	:	:
Very Helpful	Somewhat Helpful	Not Helpful Not Unhelpful	Somewhat Unhelpful	Very Unhelpful
:	:	:	:	:
Very Hard	Somewhat Hard	Not Hard Not Soft	Somewhat Soft	Very Soft
:	:	:	:	:
Very Weak	Somewhat Weak	Not Weak Not Strong	Somewhat Strong	Very Strong
:	:	:	:	:
Very Clean	Somewhat Clean	Not Clean Not Dirty	Somewhat Dirty	Very Dirty
:	:	:	:	:
Very Good	Somewhat Good	Not Good Not Bad	Somewhat Bad	Very Bad
:	:	:	:	:
Very Awful	Somewhat Awful	Not Awful Not Nice	Somewhat Nice	Very Nice
:	:	:	:	:
Very Small	Somewhat Small	Not Small Not Large	Somewhat Large	Very Large

SITUATION #1

"We've been running in gym all winter and Mr. Smith said he's thinking about starting a track team this spring. He said I have fast enough speed to probably make the team!"

Parent Response 2: "You're such a fast runner, we'd sure be proud of you."

:	:	:	:	:
Very Good	Somewhat Good	Not Good Not Bad	Somewhat Bad	Very Bad
:	:	:	:	:
Very Awful	Somewhat Awful	Not Awful Not Nice	Somewhat Nice	Very Nice
:	:	:	:	:
Very Helpful	Somewhat Helpful	Not Helpful Not Unhelpful	Somewhat Unhelpful	Very Unhelpful
:	:	:	:	:
Very Weak	Somewhat Weak	Not Weak Not Strong	Somewhat Strong	Very Strong
:	:	:	:	:
Very Small	Somewhat Small	Not Small Not Large	Somewhat Large	Very Large
:	:	:	:	:
Very Hard	Somewhat Hard	Not Hard Not Soft	Somewhat Soft	Very Soft
:	:	:	:	:
Very Clean	Somewhat Clean	Not Clean Not Dirty	Somewhat Dirty	Very Dirty

SITUATION #1

"We've been running in gym all winter and Mr. Smith said he's thinking about starting a track team this spring. He said I have fast enough speed to probably make the team!"

Parent Response 3: "Don't get your hopes up too high. You've never gone out for a sport before."

:	:	:	:	:
Very Hard	Somewhat Hard	Not Hard Not Soft	Somewhat Soft	Very Soft
:	:	:	:	:
Very Awful	Somewhat Awful	Not Awful Not Nice	Somewhat Nice	Very Nice
:	:	:	:	:
Very Helpful	Somewhat Helpful	Not Helpful Not Unhelpful	Somewhat Unhelpful	Very Unhelpful
:	:	:	:	:
Very Weak	Somewhat Weak	Not Weak Not Strong	Somewhat Strong	Very Strong
:	:	:	:	:
Very Clean	Somewhat Clean	Not Clean Not Dirty	Somewhat Dirty	Very Dirty
:	:	:	:	:
Very Good	Somewhat Good	Not Good Not Bad	Somewhat Bad	Very Bad
:	:	:	:	:
Very Small	Somewhat Small	Not Small Not Large	Somewhat Large	Very Large

SITUATION #2

"I hate P.E. We've been playing softball all week and I'm always the last one picked to be on a team. I just can't see that dumb ball. I struck out both times today."

Parent Response 1: "Well you never get out and practice. You can't expect to be good if you don't practice."

:	:	:	:	:
Very Helpful	Somewhat Helpful	Not Helpful Not Unhelpful	Somewhat Unhelpful	Very Unhelpful
:	:	:	:	:
Very Weak	Somewhat Weak	Not Weak Not Strong	Somewhat Strong	Very Strong
:	:	:	:	:
Very Good	Somewhat Good	Not Good Not Bad	Somewhat Bad	Very Bad
:	:	:	:	:
Very Awful	Somewhat Awful	Not Awful Not Nice	Somewhat Nice	Very Nice
:	:	:	:	:
Very Clean	Somewhat Clean	Not Clean Not Dirty	Somewhat Dirty	Very Dirty
:	:	:	:	:
Very Hard	Somewhat Hard	Not Hard Not Soft	Somewhat Soft	Very Soft
:	:	:	:	:
Very Small	Somewhat Small	Not Small Not Large	Somewhat Large	Very Large

SITUATION #2

"I hate P.E. We've been playing softball all week and I'm always the last one picked to be on a team. I just can't see that dumb ball. I struck out both times today."

Parent Response 2: "It takes a lot of courage to hang in there when the going gets rough."

:	:	:	:	:
Very Awful	Somewhat Awful	Not Awful Not Nice	Somewhat Nice	Very Nice
:	:	:	:	:
Very Small	Somewhat Small	Not Small Not Large	Somewhat Large	Very Large
:	:	:	:	:
Very Helpful	Somewhat Helpful	Not Helpful Not Unhelpful	Somewhat Unhelpful	Very Unhelpful
:	:	:	:	:
Very Good	Somewhat Good	Not Good Not Bad	Somewhat Bad	Very Bad
:	:	:	:	:
Very Weak	Somewhat Weak	Not Weak Not Strong	Somewhat Strong	Very Strong
:	:	:	:	:
Very Clean	Somewhat Clean	Not Clean Not Dirty	Somewhat Dirty	Very Dirty
:	:	:	:	:
Very Hard	Somewhat Hard	Not Hard Not Soft	Somewhat Soft	Very Soft

SITUATION #2

"I hate P.E. We've been playing softball all week and I'm always the last one picked to be on a team. I just can't see that dumb ball. I struck out both times today."

Parent Response 3: "We've always been proud of you. You're one of the best athletes in our family."

:	:	:	:	:
Very Weak	Somewhat Weak	Not Weak Not Strong	Somewhat Strong	Very Strong
:	:	:	:	:
Very Clean	Somewhat Clean	Not Clean Not Dirty	Somewhat Dirty	Very Dirty
:	:	:	:	:
Very Good	Somewhat Good	Not Good Not Bad	Somewhat Bad	Very Bad
:	:	:	:	:
Very Helpful	Somewhat Helpful	Not Helpful Not Unhelpful	Somewhat Unhelpful	Very Unhelpful
:	:	:	:	:
Very Hard	Somewhat Hard	Not Hard Not Soft	Somewhat Soft	Very Soft
:	:	:	:	:
Very Small	Somewhat Small	Not Small Not Large	Somewhat Large	Very Large
:	:	:	:	:
Very Awful	Somewhat Awful	Not Awful Not Nice	Somewhat Nice	Very Nice

SITUATION #3

"After supper I want to go down to Susie's house for awhile. She's got some really neat records we're going to listen to. Boy, I'm glad she moved down the street because she's just about my best friend."

Parent Response 1: "I'm proud of you. It really takes a good kid to be able to make friends as quickly as you do."

:	:	:	:	:
Very Awful	Somewhat Awful	Not Awful Not Nice	Somewhat Nice	Very Nice
:	:	:	:	:
Very Helpful	Somewhat Helpful	Not Helpful Not Unhelpful	Somewhat Unhelpful	Very Unhelpful
:	:	:	:	:
Very Weak	Somewhat Weak	Not Weak Not Strong	Somewhat Strong	Very Strong
:	:	:	:	:
Very Hard	Somewhat Hard	Not Hard Not Soft	Somewhat Soft	Very Soft
:	:	:	:	:
Very Clean	Somewhat Clean	Not Clean Not Dirty	Somewhat Dirty	Very Dirty
:	:	:	:	:
Very Good	Somewhat Good	Not Good Not Bad	Somewhat Bad	Very Bad
:	:	:	:	:
Very Small	Somewhat Small	Not Small Not Large	Somewhat Large	Very Large

SITUATION #3

"After supper I want to go down to Susie's house for awhile. She's got some really neat records we're going to listen to. Boy, I'm glad she moved down the street because she's just about my best friend."

Parent Response 2: "I think you're making a mistake spending so much time with Susie. You need lots of friends, not just one."

:	:	:	:	:
Very Good	Somewhat Good	Not Good Not Bad	Somewhat Bad	Very Bad
:	:	:	:	:
Very Clean	Somewhat Clean	Not Clean Not Dirty	Somewhat Dirty	Very Dirty
:	:	:	:	:
Very Helpful	Somewhat Helpful	Not Helpful Not Unhelpful	Somewhat Unhelpful	Very Unhelpful
:	:	:	:	:
Very Hard	Somewhat Hard	Not Hard Not Soft	Somewhat Soft	Very Soft
:	:	:	:	:
Very Small	Somewhat Small	Not Small Not Large	Somewhat Large	Very Large
:	:	:	:	:
Very Awful	Somewhat Awful	Not Awful Not Nice	Somewhat Nice	Very Nice
:	:	:	:	:
Very Weak	Somewhat Weak	Not Weak Not Strong	Somewhat Strong	Very Strong

SITUATION #3

"After supper I want to go down to Susie's house for awhile. She's got some really neat records we're going to listen to. Boy, I'm glad she moved down the street because she's just about my best friend."

Parent Response 3: "I'm glad you've got a new friend so close by."

:	:	:	:	:	:
Very Awful	Somewhat Awful	Not Awful Not Nice	Somewhat Nice	Very Nice	:
:	:	:	:	:	:
Very Weak	Somewhat Weak	Not Weak Not Strong	Somewhat Strong	Very Strong	:
:	:	:	:	:	:
Very Small	Somewhat Small	Not Small Not Large	Somewhat Large	Very Large	:
:	:	:	:	:	:
Very Clean	Somewhat Clean	Not Clean Not Dirty	Somewhat Dirty	Very Dirty	:
:	:	:	:	:	:
Very Good	Somewhat Good	Not Good Not Bad	Somewhat Bad	Very Bad	:
:	:	:	:	:	:
Very Hard	Somewhat Hard	Not Hard Not Soft	Somewhat Soft	Very Soft	:
:	:	:	:	:	:
Very Helpful	Somewhat Helpful	Not Helpful Not Unhelpful	Somewhat Unhelpful	Very Unhelpful	:

SITUATION #4

"I wish I'd never have moved to this new school. All the kids act stupid and there's nobody I'd want to be friends with. We've been here two weeks and I still don't know anybody."

Parent Response 1: "Making new friends sometimes is hard. I know you're giving it a lot of effort though."

:	:	:	:	:
Very Helpful	Somewhat Helpful	Not Helpful Not Unhelpful	Somewhat Unhelpful	Very Unhelpful
:	:	:	:	:
Very Hard	Somewhat Hard	Not Hard Not Soft	Somewhat Soft	Very Soft
:	:	:	:	:
Very Clean	Somewhat Clean	Not Clean Not Dirty	Somewhat Dirty	Very Dirty
:	:	:	:	:
Very Awful	Somewhat Awful	Not Awful Not Nice	Somewhat Nice	Very Nice
:	:	:	:	:
Very Weak	Somewhat Weak	Not Weak Not Strong	Somewhat Strong	Very Strong
:	:	:	:	:
Very Small	Somewhat Small	Not Small Not Large	Somewhat Large	Very Large
:	:	:	:	:
Very Good	Somewhat Good	Not Good Not Bad	Somewhat Bad	Very Bad

SITUATION #4

"I wish I'd never have moved to this new school. All the kids act stupid and there's nobody I'd want to be friends with. We've been here two weeks and I still don't know anybody."

Parent Response 2: "If there are no kids in that whole school you want to be friends with, there's something wrong with you."

:	:	:	:	:	:
Very Weak	Somewhat Weak	Not Weak Not Strong	Somewhat Strong	Very Strong	:
:	:	:	:	:	:
Very Small	Somewhat Small	Not Small Not Large	Somewhat Large	Very Large	:
:	:	:	:	:	:
Very Hard	Somewhat Hard	Not Hard Not Soft	Somewhat Soft	Very Soft	:
:	:	:	:	:	:
Very Clean	Somewhat Clean	Not Clean Not Dirty	Somewhat Dirty	Very Dirty	:
:	:	:	:	:	:
Very Good	Somewhat Good	Not Good Not Bad	Somewhat Bad	Very Bad	:
:	:	:	:	:	:
Very Awful	Somewhat Awful	Not Awful Not Nice	Somewhat Nice	Very Nice	:
:	:	:	:	:	:
Very Helpful	Somewhat Helpful	Not Helpful Not Unhelpful	Somewhat Unhelpful	Very Unhelpful	:

SITUATION #4

"I wish I'd never have moved to this new school. All the kids act stupid and there's nobody I'd want to be friends with. We've been here two weeks and I still don't know anybody."

Parent Response 3: "You've always been a popular kid, before long things will be better."

:	:	:	:	:
Very Clean	Somewhat Clean	Not Clean Not Dirty	Somewhat Dirty	Very Dirty
:	:	:	:	:
Very Good	Somewhat Good	Not Good Not Bad	Somewhat Bad	Very Bad
:	:	:	:	:
Very Helpful	Somewhat Helpful	Not Helpful Not Unhelpful	Somewhat Unhelpful	Very Unhelpful
:	:	:	:	:
Very Awful	Somewhat Awful	Not Awful Not Nice	Somewhat Nice	Very Nice
:	:	:	:	:
Very Weak	Somewhat Weak	Not Weak Not Strong	Somewhat Strong	Very Strong
:	:	:	:	:
Very Small	Somewhat Small	Not Small Not Large	Somewhat Large	Very Large
:	:	:	:	:
Very Hard	Somewhat Hard	Not Hard Not Soft	Somewhat Soft	Very Soft

SITUATION #5

"I've been needing some money. I thought about getting a paper route, but first I think I'll see if there's any yards around here I could mow this summer. What do you think?"

Parent Response 1: "I'm proud of you. You've been showing more responsibility lately."

:	:	:	:	:
Very Helpful	Somewhat Helpful	Not Helpful Not Unhelpful	Somewhat Unhelpful	Very Unhelpful
:	:	:	:	:
Very Small	Somewhat Small	Not Small Not Large	Somewhat Large	Very Large
:	:	:	:	:
Very Weak	Somewhat Weak	Not Weak Not Strong	Somewhat Strong	Very Strong
:	:	:	:	:
Very Hard	Somewhat Hard	Not Hard Not Soft	Somewhat Soft	Very Soft
:	:	:	:	:
Very Good	Somewhat Good	Not Good Not Bad	Somewhat Bad	Very Bad
:	:	:	:	:
Very Clean	Somewhat Clean	Not Clean Not Dirty	Somewhat Dirty	Very Dirty
:	:	:	:	:
Very Awful	Somewhat Awful	Not Awful Not Nice	Somewhat Nice	Very Nice

SITUATION #5

"I've been needing some money. I thought about getting a paper route, but first I think I'll see if there's any yards around here I could mow this summer. What do you think?"

Parent Response 2: "Sounds like you've thought a lot about it already. Got any ideas on who you might check with first?"

:	:	:	:	:	:
Very Good	Somewhat Good	Not Good Not Bad	Somewhat Bad	Very Bad	:
:	:	:	:	:	:
Very Clean	Somewhat Clean	Not Clean Not Dirty	Somewhat Dirty	Very Dirty	:
:	:	:	:	:	:
Very Weak	Somewhat Weak	Not Weak Not Strong	Somewhat Strong	Very Strong	:
:	:	:	:	:	:
Very Hard	Somewhat Hard	Not Hard Not Soft	Somewhat Soft	Very Soft	:
:	:	:	:	:	:
Very Helpful	Somewhat Helpful	Not Helpful Not Unhelpful	Somewhat Unhelpful	Very Unhelpful	:
:	:	:	:	:	:
Very Small	Somewhat Small	Not Small Not Large	Somewhat Large	Very Large	:
:	:	:	:	:	:
Very Awful	Somewhat Awful	Not Awful Not Nice	Somewhat Nice	Very Nice	:

SITUATION #5

"I've been needing some money. I thought about getting a paper route, but first I think I'll see if there's any yards around here I could mow this summer. What do you think?"

Parent Response 3: "What do you mean mow yards around here? You don't even help out here at home with the mowing."

:	:	:	:	:
Very Weak	Somewhat Weak	Not Weak Not Strong	Somewhat Strong	Very Strong
:	:	:	:	:
Very Hard	Somewhat Hard	Not Hard Not Soft	Somewhat Soft	Very Soft
:	:	:	:	:
Very Clean	Somewhat Clean	Not Clean Not Dirty	Somewhat Dirty	Very Dirty
:	:	:	:	:
Very Helpful	Somewhat Helpful	Not Helpful Not Unhelpful	Somewhat Unhelpful	Very Unhelpful
:	:	:	:	:
Very Good	Somewhat Good	Not Good Not Bad	Somewhat Bad	Very Bad
:	:	:	:	:
Very Small	Somewhat Small	Not Small Not Large	Somewhat Large	Very Large
:	:	:	:	:
Very Awful	Somewhat Awful	Not Awful Not Nice	Somewhat Nice	Very Nice

SITUATION #6

"We're supposed to have all the money in for the popcorn the school's selling by Monday and I haven't sold any yet. I don't know what I'm going to do with all that stupid popcorn."

Parent Response 1: "If you weren't going to sell it, you shouldn't have brought it home."

:	:	:	:	:
Very Good	Somewhat Good	Not Good Not Bad	Somewhat Bad	Very Bad
:	:	:	:	:
Very Small	Somewhat Small	Not Small Not Large	Somewhat Large	Very Large
:	:	:	:	:
Very Weak	Somewhat Weak	Not Weak Not Strong	Somewhat Strong	Very Strong
:	:	:	:	:
Very Hard	Somewhat Hard	Not Hard Not Soft	Somewhat Soft	Very Soft
:	:	:	:	:
Very Awful	Somewhat Awful	Not Awful Not Nice	Somewhat Nice	Very Nice
:	:	:	:	:
Very Helpful	Somewhat Helpful	Not Helpful Not Unhelpful	Somewhat Unhelpful	Very Unhelpful
:	:	:	:	:
Very Clean	Somewhat Clean	Not Clean Not Dirty	Somewhat Dirty	Very Dirty

SITUATION #6

"We're supposed to have all the money in for the popcorn the school's selling by Monday and I haven't sold any yet. I don't know what I'm going to do with all that stupid popcorn."

Parent Response 2: "You're a smart girl. I know you won't let your school down."

:	:	:	:	:	:
Very Awful	Somewhat Awful	Not Awful Not Nice	Somewhat Nice	Very Nice	:
:	:	:	:	:	:
Very Helpful	Somewhat Helpful	Not Helpful Not Unhelpful	Somewhat Unhelpful	Very Unhelpful	:
:	:	:	:	:	:
Very Hard	Somewhat Hard	Not Hard Not Soft	Somewhat Soft	Very Soft	:
:	:	:	:	:	:
Very Clean	Somewhat Clean	Not Clean Not Dirty	Somewhat Dirty	Very Dirty	:
:	:	:	:	:	:
Very Weak	Somewhat Weak	Not Weak Not Strong	Somewhat Strong	Very Strong	:
:	:	:	:	:	:
Very Small	Somewhat Small	Not Small Not Large	Somewhat Large	Very Large	:
:	:	:	:	:	:
Very Good	Somewhat Good	Not Good Not Bad	Somewhat Bad	Very Bad	:

SITUATION #6

"We're supposed to have all the money in for the popcorn the school's selling by Monday and I haven't sold any yet. I don't know what I'm going to do with all that stupid popcorn."

Parent Response 3: "You've got a lot of work ahead of you before Monday. Where do you think you might have your best luck finding customers?"

:	:	:	:	:
Very Good	Somewhat Good	Not Good Not Bad	Somewhat Bad	Very Bad
:	:	:	:	:
Very Clean	Somewhat Clean	Not Clean Not Dirty	Somewhat Dirty	Very Dirty
:	:	:	:	:
Very Awful	Somewhat Awful	Not Awful Not Nice	Somewhat Nice	Very Nice
:	:	:	:	:
Very Hard	Somewhat Hard	Not Hard Not Soft	Somewhat Soft	Very Soft
:	:	:	:	:
Very Helpful	Somewhat Helpful	Not Helpful Not Unhelpful	Somewhat Unhelpful	Very Unhelpful
:	:	:	:	:
Very Small	Somewhat Small	Not Small Not Large	Somewhat Large	Very Large
:	:	:	:	:
Very Weak	Somewhat Weak	Not Weak Not Strong	Somewhat Strong	Very Strong

SITUATION #7

"Today Mr. Williams talked to us about our reading and he told me that I was doing a lot better this grading period. He said my grade would probably be better on my report card next week!"

Parent Response 1: "I'm really glad to hear that. I bet you feel pretty good about it too."

:	:	:	:	:
Very Helpful	Somewhat Helpful	Not Helpful Not Unhelpful	Somewhat Unhelpful	Very Unhelpful
:	:	:	:	:
Very Awful	Somewhat Awful	Not Awful Not Nice	Somewhat Nice	Very Nice
:	:	:	:	:
Very Good	Somewhat Good	Not Good Not Bad	Somewhat Bad	Very Bad
:	:	:	:	:
Very Weak	Somewhat Weak	Not Weak Not Strong	Somewhat Strong	Very Strong
:	:	:	:	:
Very Small	Somewhat Small	Not Small Not Large	Somewhat Large	Very Large
:	:	:	:	:
Very Clean	Somewhat Clean	Not Clean Not Dirty	Somewhat Dirty	Very Dirty
:	:	:	:	:
Very Hard	Somewhat Hard	Not Hard Not Soft	Somewhat Soft	Very Soft

SITUATION #7

"Today Mr. Williams talked to us about our reading and he told me that I was doing a lot better this grading period. He said my grade would probably be better on my report card next week!"

Parent Response 2: "I'm real proud of you. I always knew you were a smart girl."

:	:	:	:	:
Very Weak	Somewhat Weak	Not Weak Not Strong	Somewhat Strong	Very Strong
:	:	:	:	:
Very Clean	Somewhat Clean	Not Clean Not Dirty	Somewhat Dirty	Very Dirty
:	:	:	:	:
Very Good	Somewhat Good	Not Good Not Bad	Somewhat Bad	Very Bad
:	:	:	:	:
Very Small	Somewhat Small	Not Small Not Large	Somewhat Large	Very Large
:	:	:	:	:
Very Helpful	Somewhat Helpful	Not Helpful Not Unhelpful	Somewhat Unhelpful	Very Unhelpful
:	:	:	:	:
Very Awful	Somewhat Awful	Not Awful Not Nice	Somewhat Nice	Very Nice
:	:	:	:	:
Very Hard	Somewhat Hard	Not Hard Not Soft	Somewhat Soft	Very Soft

SITUATION #7

"Today Mr. Williams talked to us about our reading and he told me that I was doing a lot better this grading period. He said my grade would probably be better on my report card next week!"

Parent Response 3: "It's about time that reading grade came up."

:	:	:	:	:
Very Helpful	Somewhat Helpful	Not Helpful Not Unhelpful	Somewhat Unhelpful	Very Unhelpful
:	:	:	:	:
Very Awful	Somewhat Awful	Not Awful Not Nice	Somewhat Nice	Very Nice
:	:	:	:	:
Very Small	Somewhat Small	Not Small Not Large	Somewhat Large	Very Large
:	:	:	:	:
Very Clean	Somewhat Clean	Not Clean Not Dirty	Somewhat Dirty	Very Dirty
:	:	:	:	:
Very Hard	Somewhat Hard	Not Hard Not Soft	Somewhat Soft	Very Soft
:	:	:	:	:
Very Weak	Somewhat Weak	Not Weak Not Strong	Somewhat Strong	Very Strong
:	:	:	:	:
Very Good	Somewhat Good	Not Good Not Bad	Somewhat Bad	Very Bad

SITUATION #8

"I can't do this dumb report like Mrs. Sullins said. I don't even know what she wants. And what's more, she wants it done by tomorrow."

Parent Response 1: "Stop fussing and start writing. You're not going to stay up past your bedtime tonight."

:	:	:	:	:
Very Clean	Somewhat Clean	Not Clean Not Dirty	Somewhat Dirty	Very Dirty
:	:	:	:	:
Very Awful	Somewhat Awful	Not Awful Not Nice	Somewhat Nice	Very Nice
:	:	:	:	:
Very Good	Somewhat Good	Not Good Not Bad	Somewhat Bad	Very Bad
:	:	:	:	:
Very Weak	Somewhat Weak	Not Weak Not Strong	Somewhat Strong	Very Strong
:	:	:	:	:
Very Helpful	Somewhat Helpful	Not Helpful Not Unhelpful	Somewhat Unhelpful	Very Unhelpful
:	:	:	:	:
Very Small	Somewhat Small	Not Small Not Large	Somewhat Large	Very Large
:	:	:	:	:
Very Hard	Somewhat Hard	Not Hard Not Soft	Somewhat Soft	Very Soft

SITUATION #8

"I can't do this dumb report like Mrs. Sullins said. I don't even know what she wants. And what's more, she wants it done by tomorrow."

Parent Response 2: "I know it looks rough, but I think you'll be able to do it."

:	:	:	:	:	:
Very Good	Somewhat Good	Not Good Not Bad	Somewhat Bad	Very Bad	:
:	:	:	:	:	:
Very Small	Somewhat Small	Not Small Not Large	Somewhat Large	Very Large	:
:	:	:	:	:	:
Very Helpful	Somewhat Helpful	Not Helpful Not Unhelpful	Somewhat Unhelpful	Very Unhelpful	:
:	:	:	:	:	:
Very Hard	Somewhat Hard	Not Hard Not Soft	Somewhat Soft	Very Soft	:
:	:	:	:	:	:
Very Awful	Somewhat Awful	Not Awful Not Nice	Somewhat Nice	Very Nice	:
:	:	:	:	:	:
Very Clean	Somewhat Clean	Not Clean Not Dirty	Somewhat Dirty	Very Dirty	:
:	:	:	:	:	:
Very Weak	Somewhat Weak	Not Weak Not Strong	Somewhat Strong	Very Strong	:

SITUATION #8

"I can't do this dumb report like Mrs. Sullins said. I don't even know what she wants. And what's more, she wants it done by tomorrow."

Parent Response 3: "You're a smart kid. Go ahead and write it."

:	:	:	:	:
Very Weak	Somewhat Weak	Not Weak Not Strong	Somewhat Strong	Very Strong
:	:	:	:	:
Very Good	Somewhat Good	Not Good Not Bad	Somewhat Bad	Very Bad
:	:	:	:	:
Very Helpful	Somewhat Helpful	Not Helpful Not Unhelpful	Somewhat Unhelpful	Very Unhelpful
:	:	:	:	:
Very Small	Somewhat Small	Not Small Not Large	Somewhat Large	Very Large
:	:	:	:	:
Very Awful	Somewhat Awful	Not Awful Not Nice	Somewhat Nice	Very Nice
:	:	:	:	:
Very Clean	Somewhat Clean	Not Clean Not Dirty	Somewhat Dirty	Very Dirty
:	:	:	:	:
Very Hard	Somewhat Hard	Not Hard Not Soft	Somewhat Soft	Very Soft

VITA

Judith A. Anderson, the daughter of Elmer and Irene Jagers, was born in Evansville, Indiana, on August 28, 1948. She was graduated from Chrisney High School in Chrisney, Indiana, in 1966. She completed her Bachelor of Science degree in Secondary Education in 1970 at Indiana State University, Terre Haute. She continued at Indiana State University and completed a Master of Arts degree in Sociology in 1972. From 1972 to 1974 she was employed at the Katherine Hamilton Mental Health Center in Terre Haute, Indiana, where she worked as a Community Worker and Primary Therapist. In 1975 she entered the doctoral program in Guidance and Psychological Services at Indiana State University where she was a graduate fellow from 1975-1977. While involved in her doctoral work, she served one year as a Title I Counselor-Consultant in the Vigo County Elementary Schools and completed an internship at the Student Counseling Center at Indiana State University. She was also active in the Family Education Association of West Central Indiana where she led Adlerian-oriented parent study groups.