CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Statement of the Problem

The family is our closest, earliest, and most effective tie to society. Through the family, people learn to be human beings, how to be women and men of a particular culture, how to shape their thoughts and language, and finally, how to be members of the larger groups of which the family is a part. Family is accepted as an essential institution, because of its child rearing practices and the atmosphere of the house which effects the natural development of the child. In the history of research on child development and child rearing, social concerns have often stimulated particular areas of inquiry. The child matures within a family setting. But not all families are alike, and such variations induce personality differences. The individual, however, is not completely at the mercy of his environment. He is not purely passive, to be shaped by circumstances. To some extent he can change his environment on behalf of his personal integrity. Man can modify society.

But not all parents are alike; indeed parental behavior shows initially the extreme range which would be implied by a frequent assertion that every personality is unique. Since both father and mother are adult personalities of great complexity, it must be
expected that they will act out their parental roles in quite varying fashion and the ways parents treat the child and consequent effects of such treatment in inducing variations in the child developing personality. It is inevitable that a major set of determinants of the roles executed will fall in the category of parents’ personality. The mother’s personality determines her treatment of the child and this treatment determines the child personality also. This is the law of the transmission of personality traits. Some influence comes from heredity and a great deal of influence comes from the environment especially the family.

It is commonly accepted that quarrelsome and neglecting homes give rise to delinquency (McCord, McCord & Zola, 1959) and behavior problem (Porter & O’Leary, 1980; Rich & Rothchild, 1979; Slater 1984), that parental conflict is associated with low self-esteem (Cooper, Holman & Braithwaite, 1983; Ferguson & Allan, 1978; Raschke & Raschke, 1979, Watkins, 1976), parental punitiveness and rejection are associated with children’s aggressiveness (Bandura & Walters, 1957; Becker, 1964; Becker et al., 1962; Eron, Walder & Lefkowitz, 1971; Hoffman, 1960; McCord, McCord and Howard, 1961; Sears, Maccoby & Levin, 1957), parental rejection produces anxiety and low self-esteem. (Doyal & Friedman, 1974; Coopersmith, 1967), adolescent rebellion is associated with parents’ marital unhappiness and with both restrictiveness and permissiveness of their child rearing practices (Balswick & Macrides, 1975), while parental attention

Considerable ambiguity is inherent in most of these results, arising from the fact that both sets of variables - those pertaining to family relations and those pertaining to the child's behavior - are typically assessed from the same informant, i.e., the parent (Ferguson & Allen, 1978; Porter & O'Leary, 1980; Sears, Maccoby, & Levin, 1957) or the child (Balawick & Macrides, 1975; Cooper, Holman & Braithwaite, 1983; Doyal & Friedman, 1974; Hoelter & Harper, 1987; Peterson & Kellam, 1977; Raschke & Raschke, 1979; Rich & Rothchild, 1979; Watkins, 1976). In the light of repeated findings concerning the poor agreement between parents and children about the nature of family relations (Hill et al., 1985; Jessop, 1981; Larson, 1974; Olson & McCubbin, 1983), one suspects that spurious consistencies may have been introduced: the parent reporting both the child's behavior and treatment which it warranted, or the child justifying its own behavior in the light of reported treatment by the parent.

Most research in the parent-child area operates on the assumption that there is a direct and discernible relation between parent variables (behavior, attitudes, personality) and child behavior and personality. But for several reasons this may well be an over-simplification. First, the causes of child behavior are complex, involving influences exerted by parent, siblings, peers and others of psychological significance in the child's
environment. It is not surprising that almost no research has considered all of these variables simultaneously. And even if such a study were attempted, it probably would be doomed to failure because it may not be combinations of these variables or even a weighted combination that is important; but perhaps the salience, in a psychological sense, of a single variable is most influential in affecting the child.

Second, parents and children influence each other in a mutual, two way fashion although much of this research is based on a one tail theory, as Bell (1964) has termed it. The infant helps to shape his environment just as he is shaped by it.

Parental behavior creates a climate or atmosphere in the home which has a far reaching influence on the child-adolescent's development (Slater, 1962). Continual decisions must be made about how to properly rear and educate the fathers and mothers of the next generation. In this respect, parents base their decisions, in part, upon the confused and frequently wrong and guilt provoking advice from the many child rearing experts (Brim, 1958). As a result, we had in the past, and will continue in the future, to categorize types and patterns of parental behavior toward their offspring: directly and/or indirectly, any child-adolescent foible or misfortune is therefore traced to the fact that parents have been too accepting or too rejecting, too over protecting or too casual, too autocratic or too democratic, too inconsistent or too conciliatory (Becker, 1964; Hurley 1965; Uyer, 1965). Two specific definite generalization become readily
apparent: parental interest in, and acceptance of, their children produces self confidence and more positive achievement aspirations (Barwich, 1962; Burchinal, 1957), whereas autocratic parental attitudes and lack of concern leads to major indices of maladjustment behavior in children and youth (Kearsley, 1962; Peterson, 1961; Sherwood, 1962). The evidence is vast and contradictory as one searches for the one right way for parents to raise their children. In the long run it becomes increasingly important to remember that in assessing the overall parent child adolescent interaction, a more practical inquiry must be made into the underlying attitudes and the parents' qualities as persons rather than to concentrate only on methods and techniques (Cox, 1961).

Finney (1961), Yarrow (1962) continually stress the importance of the mother in the early months and years of the child-adolescent's growth and development: if a young child is deprived of a warm, intimate, and continuing relationship with his mother, particularly up to three or four years of age, his overall personality will suffer drastically. In general, mothers are consistently perceived as more nurturant and as more controlling through indirect, covert methods by both boys and girls (Droppleman, 1963); nevertheless her function fluctuates depending upon the sex of her offspring and whether or not she adheres to the traditional or developmental maternal role concept (Lillie & Johnson, 1963). Traditionally the mother's role has been that of the authoritarian person who disciplines, teaches, and takes care
of the offspring and the house with little help from the father; more recently, the maternal role has changed to reflect more of a developmental concept; having assistance from father, having interests outside the home, and having outside help so she can do more for and with the offspring (Hurlock, 1964). Regardless of the traditional or developmental role she may prefer, however, the sex of the offspring has much to do with the mother's eventual effectiveness; since her behavior is related to protection and affection for sons and restrictiveness and discipline for daughters (Mussen & Parker, 1965). Offspring favoritism by mothers suggests that when there are boys and girls in the same family, the mother usually prefers and gives greater nurturance to the boy.

Most of the early evidence showed very undesirable effects on child adolescents: their personalities were thwarted, their emotions were unstable; the whole situation looked very gloomy. The more recent evidence indicates an almost unanimous agreement that the employment, per se, of the mother has little effect on the child-adolescent development: their personality characteristics and social relationship patterns do not become distorted (Burchinal, 1961); no significant difference appear in the adjustment of the pre-school children of employed and non-employed mothers (Perry, 1961); maternal employment itself contributes neither positively nor negatively to academic achievement (Frankel, 1964); no differences exist between the offsprings of working and nonworking mothers with respect to
behavior systems related to dependence and independence (Sieger, 1959); non working mothers who are dissatisfied show the greatest problems with their children (Yarrow, 1962, Sharp, 1960); little or no evidence exists to support any conception of the neglected child-adolescent of the employed mother (Nye, 1959); the various family members assure more responsibility roles when the mother is employed (Hoffman, 1961; Powel, 1961); mother daughter relations are not adversely affected by the mother's employment (Peterson, 1961; Whitmarsh, 1965); and the mother’s employment does not seem to have any adverse effects on the child adolescent's social activities, academic performances, or non delinquency traits (Roy, 1969).

On the basis of the existing data, there are no significant differences between working and non-working mothers of similar race and socio-economic status in attitude toward child rearing, family life, domestic responsibilities, and so on. There is no evidence that the majority of families with working mothers are in any way abnormal, that there is an absence of parental love or responsibility, or that, indeed there is any problem other than the need for a good form of supplementary child care (Stolz, 1960). When the mother works, the outcome for her offspring will depend on many factors such as age of the children, the reasons the mother is working, her substitute, the relationship of the family members, and their stability (Maccoby, 1958). It would appear that it is the nature of the mother offspring relationship that is more important than the amount of time they do or do not
spend together.

Studies have been brought to light which reveal the effects of the working women on the adjustment of their children (Nelson, 1971; Seth and Bhatnagar, 1979) and dependence and independence in their children (Sieger et al., 1959). Glueck & Glueck (1957) presented the views of working mothers towards delinquency and mental hygiene. Preurtt (1975) studied the divorced mothers and the basic concerns of their children. Vogel et al. (1970) studied the maternal employment and perception of sex roles among college students. Tenzer (1977) brought to light parental influence on career choices of women in professional and non-professional occupations. Wood (1972) discussed in detail about the unsupervised child of the working mother. Propper (1972) studied the relationship of maternal employment to adolescent role activities and parental relationship.

The role of mother as a socializing agent is universally acknowledged. Traditional socialization theory has assured that the mother is the major and consistent agent in shaping her child's behavior and her impact on child has a life-long significance. Consequently mother-child relationship would be of the major importance in shaping the behavior of the children. It has three major forms: a model, a disciplinarian and a supplier of the child's affectional needs each of which contributes to the child's altruistic behavior (Hoffman, 1963; Mussen & Parker, 1965 and Bryan & London, 1970).

The family nucleus provides the first basic social
environment for the development youngster. To the extent that the individual learns to deal wisely and well with the everyday problems in the friendly atmosphere of the home and learns to give and take, to compromise, to withstand domination, and to develop his personality, he becomes better able to deal more wisely with problems outside the family circle. Fathers, mothers and offsprings imply a subtle relationship of dependence, independence and inter-dependence (Herbert, 1962). The rich environmental experience gained as a result of family life becomes a staff of life; without it, there will always be something lacking in the child-adolescent's social and emotional realms of operation (Foresman, 1965).

Two general types of family make up exist: 1) the typical or nuclear, and 2) the extended or elongated. Although the importance of the family unit as an extended kinship group has been much reduced in recent years, we still find, in some areas, a close interaction between the nuclear family and existing relatives. In this respect, many studies have been made in an attempt to discover how the presence of relatives affects the socialization process of child-adolescents (Bell, 1962; Litwak, 1960). Much has also been written concerning the effect upon children of interfering relatives; some grand parents or aunts or uncles intentionally or unintentionally spoil the children involved; others are very generous with their advice to parents concerning the proper rearing of the offspring (Borden, 1946; Staples, & Smith 1954). In general, it appears undesirable for
grand parents, uncles, aunts, cousins or married brothers and sisters to live in the close nuclear family circle for a long period of time.

The dynamics of our culture has brought about many changes in our patterns of family living (Sussman, 1959). The shift from the primary home influences to a secondary social group influx and social mobility have already been mentioned; other trends are equally evident: families are smaller, more wives and mother work outside the home; divorce and family separations are more common child adolescent rearing methods are more democratic; more training is done and expected in the school; the material rather than spiritual climate of the home has become more important. At the same time, the sub-cultural differences act to the continued variation of the overall socialization process taking place within Indian family framework: child-adolescents from middle class homes have many things in common with other middle class child-adolescents and differ in important aspects from lower and upper class home reared children.

The large family, generally defined as the unit with six or more offsprings is losing ground. The small family, defined as one with three or four offsprings, is taking its place, with more births occurring among the lower class families (Walter, 1964). A prime reason for the current tendency to limit the family size is supposedly to permit the maintenance of a higher standard of living and to provide greater opportunities and benefits to the child-adolescents involved (Higgins, 1962; Hoffman, 1960).
The child-adolescent from a large family is reared in an atmosphere where emphasis is on the group rather than on the individual. The large family unit becomes, through necessity a working unit whereby cooperation is generated and all members learn to organize and submit to authority (Amatora, 1959; Bossard & Storker, 1956). Conformity is thus highly valued with an authoritarian type of living generally evident. In this respect, the father becomes the chief disciplinarian, with supplementary authority resting with the older siblings since less intimate contact exists between the parents and siblings in the large family complex (Elder, 1963). The child-adolescent reared in a small family setting, on the other hand, tends to place more value on individuality and he is likely to experience a greater degree of democratic participation within the nuclear setup. He is more likely to be over protected and made the center of attention in his early social experiences since he does not have to contend with the maternal inavailability found in the large family (Waldrop, 1964); mother becomes the chief disciplinarian, with little interference from other siblings. In the process of receiving individualized attention, the child-adolescent from the small family learns to prize originality more than conformity.

Considerable attention is always given to the ordinal position of the child-adolescent within the family unit and the effects that the various birth order rankings may have on his overall personality makeup. Various personality roles tend to be assigned indiscriminately—the responsible child adolescent is
often the first born; the sociable, well-linked youngster becomes the second born; the spoiled offspring is often the baby of the family; and so on down the list the studious one, the irresponsible one, the sticky one, the isolate (Bosard, 1955). The oldest sibling is stereotyped as being adult oriented - sensitive, good, conscientious, serious, fearful and studious. Second born offspring are typically depicted as being more peer oriented - cheerful, not studious, well-placed and easy going (McArthur, 1956). Altus, (1962) relate that first born and only born children tend to be intellectually inclined and become the eminent scientists, scholars and men of letters. However, Schachter (1964) contends that this relationship is simply a reflection of the fact that scholars derive from a college population in which first and only borns are in marked surplus: it is not the order of birth which is of significance, but simply that their educational opportunities tend to be greater. And certainly, we would not lose sight of the fact that adult pressures, expectations, and over expectations tie into the trend for more first born and last born children and youth to have trouble adjusting to a realistic type of environment (Bruce, 1964).

The spacing factor - age difference between siblings - appears to play a major role in the overall behavior makeup of the child regardless of the ordinal position involved. The age difference becomes an important factor in determining how the parents will treat the siblings. When they are closely spaced, it is better
for both parents and children: the offsprings particularly tend to be treated more rationally and democratically and with more understanding (Lasko, 1954). Few differences exist between siblings separated by less than two years whereas more ranked behavioral differences are found, according to Koch (1956), between siblings separated by four or more years: (1) a two to four years difference between siblings is most threatening to an older child; (2) if the first born is three years old when the second is born, the first born is apt to become anxious over the possible loss of affection; (3) if the first born is one year old when the second is born, the self image of the first is still diffuse and unclear and he probably won't regard the newborn as a major threat; and (4) if the older sibling is seven to eight years old when another offspring appears on the scene, the older youngster tends to be much more independent of his parents, is less threatened by the newcomer, and is likely to become the hero or identification figure for the newborn sibling.

The next step might well be in the direction of examining the specific characteristics attached to each ordinal position: first born, second born, middle born, youngest born, and only born. Sutlonsmit & Rosenberg (1965) suggest to us that comparing first born siblings with all non-first born siblings without regard to family size may conceal more information than it may reveal: as the family size increases, anxiety in first and non first borns tends to decrease with the most favorable position in a two child family being that of the second born with an older like sex
sibling whereas the most favorable position in the three child family is being either a first born girl or a non-first born boy. These researches, among others, Scheir (1964), inform us that the sex of the sibling is the significant variable regardless of ordinal position. Many current studies (Bayley, 1960, Schoonover, 1959; Stroup, 1965; Weller, 1962) are pointing out that birth order is a minimal factor in determining the physical, social, intellectual, emotional and personality development of the child.

Up to the present, little attention has been paid to the effect of density and size of the family on dependency behavior in children. Density is defined here as variation in intervals between siblings, short intervals denoting high density. Aspects of family structure such as ordinal position and sex of siblings have been related to child behavior, by Brim (1958), Koch (1958), Rosen (1961) Schachter (1959) and Toman (1961). None of these studies has taken into consideration the specific relevance of child behavior in the gross structure of the family as reflected in number and spacing of children. This area seems important since family density itself may affect a mother’s contact behavior with a child or her ability to prevent the occurrence of anxiety producing situations, regardless of her method of child rearing.

Some studies have described how the lack of social availability of an adult figure enhances dependency behavior in children; therefore it would follow that the lack of social availability of a mother because of a large high density family should result in an enhancement of dependency behavior.
The socialization of the child is influenced by his parent's position in the class structure (Clausen, 1963; Miller, 1958; Rosen, 1959; 1964; and Sewell, 1961). Research findings over the past twenty five years show parents in the middle class to be more accepting and equalitarian in their relationship to the child than parents in the lower class (Bronfenbrenner, 1958; Mass, 1951; Rosen, 1959). Middle class parents are more tolerant of the child's needs and impulses; they are more likely to take into account his intent and motive when transgressions occur than lower class parents, who tend to respond to the immediate consequences of the child's section (Kohn, 1959). In disciplining the child, middle class parents more often use reasoning and appeals to guilt, and are somewhat less likely in the employment of physical punishment than parents in the lower class (Rosen, 1964; Sears, Maccoby, Levin, 1957).

The lower class family system has been described as rigid and hierarchical, both as regards husband-wife and parent-child relationship (Mass, 1951). Lower class parents are less accessible to the child, particularly the father, whose supportive role in child rearing is less emphasized by lower class than by middle class mothers. The lower class mother expects her husband to be more authoritative and to play a major role in disciplining the child. The father who is accessible both as a companion and an authority figure, especially for the son, is far more often found in middle than in lower class families (Clausen, 1963).

Medinnus (1963) studied the result between parents attitude
and parental acceptance of child. It was concluded that there is no invariable relation between certain parental attitudes towards child rearing and parental acceptance of the child. Other relevant studies conducted are by Falbo and Richman (1979); Shanker & Rao (1976); Frank (1972); Coben et al., (1971); Burke & Weir (1978) and Dhammi, Sathyavathi, & Murthy (1978).

Parental acceptance or rejection of the child is believed by a number of speech clinicians to be a primarily factor in the etiology of the stuttering symptom. Although the direct actions of parents toward their children are unquestionably critical, perhaps for more important for the children's mental health are the parents underlying feelings and attitudes (Symonds, 1949).

Parental Acceptance - Rejection Theory (PART) is a theory of socialization which attempts to explain and predict major consequences of parental acceptance and rejection for behavioral cognitive, and emotional development of children and for the personality functioning of adults everywhere. Moreover, the theory attempts to explain why some children are better able than other children to cope with the corrosive effects of parental rejection and emotional abuse. These are two classes of outcome, variables of primary interest to PART. In addition to these outcomes, PART attempts to predict major psychological, environmental and maintenance systems antecedents to parental acceptance-rejection. The theory is also concerned with the relationship between parental acceptance-rejection and expressive behaviors in society.
Conceptually parental acceptance and rejection together form the warmth dimension of parenting. Parental warmth is construed as a bipolar dimension where rejection, or the absence of parental warmth and affection, stands at one pole of the scale in opposition to acceptance at the other pole. All humans can be placed somewhere along this continuum, because each of us has experienced in childhood more or less warmth and affection at the hands of the persons most important to us, usually our parents. Accepting parents are defined in part as those who show their love or affection toward children either physically or verbally. All are forms of behavior which jointly and individually are likely to induce a child to feel loved or accepted.

Rejecting parents are defined in part as those who dislike, disapprove of, or resent their children. In many cases they view the child as a burden and they sometimes compare him unfavorably with other children. Rejection is manifested around the world in two principal ways, namely, in the form of parental hostility and aggression on the one hand, and in the form of parental indifference and neglect on the other (Rohner, 1975). That is, hostile parents are likely to be aggressive, either verbally or physically. Indifferent parents, however, are likely to neglect their children - to be physically or psychologically remote from them or inaccessible to them, to ignore their children's bids for attention, help or comfort, and to be unresponsive to their children's physical and emotional needs. Such parents are likely to show a restricted concern for child's welfare. Parental
acceptance rejection may be viewed from two perspectives: as subjectively experienced by the child (or subjectively reported by the parent) and as externally measured by an outside observer. However, PART takes an axiomatic that parental rejection has its most consistent and predictable effects on children primarily in so far as the child perceives the parents behavior as being rejecting. This is a view shared by others, for example Kagan (1978) who states: parental reaction is not a specific set of actions by parents but a belief held by the child.

PART predicts that acceptance and rejection - especially when they are perceived by the individual as such have consistent effects on the behavioral and personality dispositions of children everywhere, as well as on the personality functioning of adults who recall being rejected as children. Beyond a certain point, as argued in PART, the dependency response may be extinguished or transformed. In addition, as a result of the grave psychological damage often brought about by rejection, PART postulates that a person who was rejected as a child is inclined to have less tolerance for stress, and is therefore likely to be less emotionally stable than one who was accepted. Rohner (1975a,b) showed that the antecedents and consequences of parental acceptance-rejection permeate widely throughout the entire fabric of life within a society. The effects of rejection are not limited simply to individual personality and behavioral disorders, but reach into such abstract domains as the religious beliefs of a people, their art, music and other expressive behaviors.
Coping with perceived rejection is an important aspect of 
parental relationships. For, even though it seems clear that parental warmth or love—
or the withdrawal of love in its various forms—is a potent force shaping human behavior everywhere, nonetheless, some children are less affected by parental hostility/aggression or parental indifference/neglect than are other children. In fact, some children seem to be able to avoid or overcome to some degree the most deleterious effects of parental rejection and emotional abuse.

Significance of the Present Study

The above review of the studies suggested that most of the studies were conducted in the west and there is a likelihood of some cross-cultural differences in this area of study because of greater amount of industrialization, urbanization and education in the western countries as compared with India. Parent-child relations, child-rearing attitudes and children's perception of their parental behavior in the west are likely to be different from those found in India. Many studies also suggest that the number of cold mothers in the west, is increasing day by day and the interaction of the children with cold mothers has probably created many personality adjustment problems among the western children and adolescents. India is also heading towards urbanization and industrialization and this change is likely to affect the parent-child relationship.

The most important aspect in the mother-offspring relationship is overwhelmingly depicted as the warmth factor and
the empathy which results from it; there exists a kind of emotional linkage, involving emotional contagion or communication, between the child-adolescent and the maternal figure. As a result of this empathy, warm mothers become readily identifiable; they have much affectionate interaction with the child-adolescent, they find ample time to play with him, they react acceptingly to his dependency, and they praise the child-adolescent as reasoning is used as a method of training; cold mothers on the other hand, have children who are feeding problems, bed wetters, aggressive, and slow in developing a conscience.

However, very few studies in this area have been conducted in India and the proposed one aims at throwing more light on the importance specifically of the mother role in terms of the personality characteristics of the children and their perception of maternal behavior.

In India, a great change has been taking place not only due to urbanization and industrialization but also due to the necessity of cultural and family re-adjustments resulting from the fast tempo of life today and the western influence. Many of the personality development problems that the younger generation faces today, have their roots in the adolescent age.

The family conditions in India have changed significantly. In place of the joint family system, today we have more and more of the unitary family system in which the parents have to take up all the responsibilities which were previously shared by several members of the joint family. Even in this sharing of
responsibility between the two parents only, the mother has to bear a greater share, whether she is a working woman or not. The father is too engrossed with his job to spare at the maximum, more than a couple of hours daily towards the urbanizing and education of his children. Secondly, in India of today the adolescent age poses a great question. There are so many differences in the home environment and the outside world that the adolescent becomes dissatisfied, hostile, develops a neurotic tendency and anxiety as well as stubbornness in his behavior. The mother has her roots in the ancient cultural heritage and the child fails to understand her so-called orthodox attitude. Because of this clash, and because of the great importance given to the adolescent age, and also, as mentioned above because of the urbanization and industrialization and the increase in education the study of maternal role as well as perception of the adolescent of the maternal role is of a crucial importance. In India, there has been very little research in this area.

The proposed study will enable us to know whether differences in perceived parental acceptance-rejection and personality dispositions exist among the children living in Nuclear and Extended families. It will also enable us to know whether differences exist among the children of working and non-working mothers.

Objectives

In view of the above, the objectives of the proposed study are:
1. To study the perceived parental Acceptance - Rejection of the children (Boys and Girls) living in Nuclear families and its effect on their personality dispositions.

2. To study the perceived parental Acceptance - Rejection of the children (Boys and girls) living in Extended families and its effect on their personality dispositions.

3. To study comparatively the perceived parental Acceptance - Rejection of the children (Boys and Girls) living in Nuclear and Extended families and also their effect on the personality dispositions.

4. To study the mother’s perception living in a Nuclear family of the way she treats her child (Acceptance and Rejection) and also her assessment of the personality dispositions regarding them.

5. To study the mother’s perception living in an Extended family of the way she treats her child (Acceptance & Rejection) and also her assessment of the personality dispositions regarding them.

6. To study comparatively the mothers’ perception living in Nuclear and Extended families of the way they treat their children (Acceptance & Rejection) and also their assessments of the personality dispositions regarding them.

7. To study the parental Acceptance and Rejection of the children of the working and non-working mothers living in Nuclear family and their effect on their personality dispositions.

8. To study the perceived parental Acceptance and Rejection of the children of the working and non-working mothers living in
Extended family and their effect on their personality dispositions.

9. To study, comparatively, the perception of the working and non-working mothers living in Nuclear and Extended Families of the way they treat their children (Acceptance & Rejection) and also their assessments of their personality dispositions.