DISCUSSION OF RESULTS.

This study has sought to determine whether several broad aspects of maternal attitude could be related to a mother's behavior with her child, when observed in a standardized situation with systematic recording procedures. The main hypothesis was reduced to five specific sub-hypothesis. In general, the hypothesis were only partly confirmed, although the total pattern of results was in the direction predicted.

The Experimental setting:

It may be well to look at several procedural factors which should be considered in interpreting the results of this study.

1. The behavioral situation should readily and realistically provide stimuli that will elicit the attitudes measured by the attitude scales. In the present study it was felt that maternal attitudes would be operating in a situation where the mother and child were together in a play situation.

2. The subjects should be unaware of the connection between the attitude scales and the behavior situation. The present study attempted to meet this criterion by presenting the attitude ques-
tionnaires as part of another study which had no relationship to the mother-child sessions. The child's play behavior was the presumed focus of the present research. How successful the experimenter was in divorcing the attitude questionnaires from the behavior sessions cannot be directly determined; however, there was no indication that mothers saw the connection between the two.

3. The experimental situation should not involve abilities that differ from individual to individual. In the present study the behavior situation was not one which elicited individual abilities of the mothers such as intellectual capacity, etc.

4. The experimental situation should have a minimum of objective cues for behavior so as to allow for the maximum operation of the particular attitudes. In the present study an attempt was made to reduce objective cues for behavior by having the situation unstructured. No explicit instructions were given to the mother which might guide her behavior.

5. The experimental situation should yield a quantitative measure of performance. This criterion was met by the use of a recording system which gave quantitative behavior scores.

The question may naturally be raised as to whether the mother-child interaction in the experimental situation is a sample of their true relationship. While this cannot be answered definitively, the presumed focusing of attention on the child's behavior was designed to reduce the mother's awareness that her own behavior was
being observed. Another factor which would tend to elicit the usual mother-child relationship was the familiarity of the setting to mother and child. Situations in which a mother and child are dependent on each other's company for a period of 30 minutes, or in which a third person is present, occur in daily living. In the brief post-session interviews held with each mother, practically all reported that the child had displayed his usual behavior for this type of situation, and none showed any indication that their own behavior was of interest in the study. On this basis it can be assumed that the behavior observed was at least not widely divergent from what would have been shown in a completely 'natural' setting.

Undoubtedly observation under controlled conditions narrows the range of behavior; however, this disadvantage is compensated for by other advantages, such as the elimination of external factors which influence behavior and made comparability more difficult. The fact that no significant changes in maternal behavior occurred over time could be interpreted as additional evidence that the experimental situation was fairly constant and uniform in its effect.
Although each of the three PARI factors and both of the PARS scales showed some relationships to behavior, the patterns of these relationships were not similar. Looking first at the PARI, the Democratic factor appeared to show the least relationship to behavior, the Hostility-Rejection factor the most, with the Authoritarianism factor occupying an intermediate position.

It was perhaps surprising that the Democratic factor of the PARI showed any relationship to behavior. Since it is composed of socially approved statements on child rearing with which most mothers agree, the range and variability on this factor were quite restricted. According to Schaefer and Bell (1958), in constructing the PARI they concentrated upon developing:

****the more differentiating scales which state attitudes contrary to the usually approved child-rearing opinions. It was soon found that tests composed entirely of such scales left many mothers very dissatisfied. They frequently expressed the feeling that they did not see any items with which they could agree and therefore could not indicate their own ideas. To correct this we include in our own inventory a number of scales which we should expect, from previous studies, to have relatively low reliability and poor discrimination.
The scales composing the Democratic Factor were of the latter type and were designed to be "rapport" scales.

Even with its restricted range and variability, the Democratic Factor of the PARI was able to differentiate mothers on the basis of their rate of compliance. The high democratic mothers showed a significantly higher ratio of compliance to the child's requests than the low democratic mothers. In addition, one of the expected findings on the Democratic Factor showed a tendency (p = .07) for the less democratic mothers to be more directive. When the Democratic Factor was combined with the PAS Disciplinarian Scale, the low democratic-high disciplinarian mothers used significantly more directing behavior.

The Authoritarian Factor of the PARI differentiated mothers only on the basis of their restrictive behavior. The extremely high authoritarian mothers used significantly more restriction than the extremely low authoritarian mothers. There were no other statistically significant relationships between the Authoritarian Factor and behavior.
One aspect to be considered in evaluating the effectiveness of the Authoritarian Factor in predicting behavior is the role of response set - the tendency to respond to test items on the basis of something other than the content of the items. Zuckerman and Norton (1958) investigated the PAI Authoritarian Factor in terms of an acquiescence set (the tendency to agree with oppositely worded item) and an extreme set (the tendency to choose extreme categories, e.g., "strongly agree" or "strongly disagree"). From a factor analysis of the usual and reversed forms of the PAI they found that 39 percent of the factor loadings was due to the acquiescence set, 16 percent was due to the extreme set, and 26 percent was due to the authoritarian content of the items.

Interestingly, Schaefer and Bell (1958), Zuckerman et al (1958, 1960), and Nelson (1959) reported high negative correlations between the PAI Authoritarian Factor and educational level achieved by the mothers. One possible reason for this is that mothers with more education are more able to resist the acquiescence set.
In any event, if factors other than content have an important influence on the scores of the PARI Authoritarian factor, this could also account for its lack of predictability to interaction behavior.

The Hostility-Rejection factor of the PARI differentiated mothers on the basis of their nonattentive behavior to the child, verbal interaction, and interactive play with the child. The extremely hostile-rejecting mothers were more nonattentive and less interactive on the verbal and play levels. An additional finding obtained by combining this factor with the rejecting scale of the PAS was that mothers who were high on both scales used significantly more forbidding behavior with the child than those who were low on both. It seems that the Hostility-Rejection factor of the PARI is more closely related to behavior than the other two factors of the PARI.

Of the two scales of the PAS used in this study, both showed some relationships to behavior. However, in contrast with the PARI, where the Hostility-Rejection factor seemed to have more significant relationships to behavior than the Authoritarian factor, the PAS Disciplinarian scale seemed to show more relationships to behavior than the Rejection scale.
The PAS Disciplinarian scale showed significant relationships to directing and restrictive behavior, with the more disciplinarian mothers showing more of this behavior than those who were less disciplinarian. The Rejecting Scale was significantly related to forbidding behavior, with the more rejecting mothers exhibiting more of this behavior than the less rejecting.

In contrast with the PAR Authoritarian and Hostility-Rejection Factors, which discriminated only between those extremely high and those extremely low, both PAS scales differentiated between the total High and Low groups. Since relatively little research has been done with the PAS, these findings cannot be compared with those of other investigators.

It is difficult to assess the success of the PAS in eliminating the factor of social desirability. However, the fact that both the Disciplinarian and Rejecting scales of the PAS had wider variability in score distributions compared to the Authoritarian and Hostility-Rejection Factors of the PAR (V = 16.38 and 12.82 for the PAR factors and 30.52 and 30.49 for the PAS scales) supports the notion that social desirability
was a less potent factor in the PAS than in the PARI. The greater variability of the PAS scales may also explain why they differentiated between the total high and low groups, while the PARI usually differentiated only between extreme groups.

Limitations of Time:

The half-hour experimental session was selected because of its demonstrated usefulness in previous research as well as for practical considerations such as limited availability of the playroom and limited time schedules of subjects. The elements of fatigue and stress, which would probably have operated in a longer session, might have resulted in greater variability of behavior with possibly more opportunity for attitude behavior linkages.

Characteristics of the Attitude Scales:

Intrinsic characteristics, such as various response sets, limited variability, correlation with education, etc., have already been discussed in analyzing the pattern of relationships to behavior shown
by the PARI and the PAS. It was concluded that to the extent that factors other than content influence the attitude scores, the relationship to behavior will be more complex and less predictable.

The Nature of Attitude-Behavior Linkage:

Probably the most important factor to be considered in interpreting the results of this research is that there may not necessarily be a one to one relationship between attitude and behavior. This factor will be discussed later in this chapter.

The Relationship of the Findings to Other Research:

Since there are no other studies reported in the literature on the relationship of objectively measured maternal attitudes to observed maternal behavior in a controlled situation, the findings of this study cannot be directly compared with others to determine whether they refuse or agree with previous findings. However, it may be worthwhile to look at some of the studies on the relationship of attitude to behavior in areas other than mother-child relationships.
Murphy, Murphy, and Newcomb (1937) report three early studies in which attitude scores appeared to correlate with overt conduct. They found positive relationships between attitudes toward war and over commitments such as military enlistment and conscientious objections; between international attitudes and international activities; and between attitudes toward the church and church attendance. In another early study Lapiere (1934) obtained negative results in a comparison of expressed attitudes and behavior. He travelled with two Chinese companions and was refused service by hotels and restaurants only once in 251 times.