Krug, Ronald S.

Evaluation of Parental Attitudes and Behavior

Inventory. Terminal Progress Report.

Oklahoma Univ., Oklahoma City. Medical Center.

Aug 71. 44p.

MF-\$0.65 HC-\$3.29 S PRICE

Behavior; Behavior Rating Scales; *Comparative CRIPTORS

Statistics; Correlation; Interaction; Item Analysis; Measurement Techniques: Norms: *Parent Attitudes; *Parent Child Relationship; Predictive Validity; *Questionnaires; Response Style (Tests); *Scoring; Social Behavior; Test Construction: Test Reliability:

Test Validity

*Parental Attitude and Behavior Inventory Form III NTIFIERS

TRACT

HOR

TITUTION

DATE

LE

An investigation was conducted to determine whether Parental Attitude and Behavior Inventory (PABI) Form III, a gthy self-report instrument (577 items each for both parents) for essing parents' attitudes and behavior toward their children and h other, could be shortened to a more feasible length. This minal report summarizes the results of the statistical evaluation the final scoring system for the PABI. The reliability and idity of the revised system has been demonstrated to be comparable the original system. In addition, the cross-validity of the ised system is noted to be within acceptable limits of shrinkage. uiescence contributions are available for various subgroups, and, mative tables have been established. (AG)

001 100

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH.

EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM
THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY
REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

PRIVILEGED COMMUNICATION

TERMINAL PROGRESS REPORT RESEARCH GRANT 1 RO3 MH 19369-01

EVALUATION OF PARENTAL ATTITUDES AND BEHAVIOR INVENTORY

(September 1, 1970 - August 31, 1971)

RONALD S. KRUG, Ph.D.

August, 1971

DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHIATRY AND BEHAVIORAL SCIENCES

UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA SCHOOL OF MEDICINE

OKLAHOMA CITY, OKLAHOMA 73104

EVALUATION OF PARENTAL ATTITUDE AND BEHAVIOR INVENTORY

Ronald S. Krug, Ph.D.

INTRODUCTION

This terminal report summarizes the results of the statistical evaluation of the final scoring system for the Parental Attitude and Behavior Inventory (PABI) Form III.

Background - The history of attempts to develop adequate questionnaires to assess parent attitudes and behaviors has been rather discouraging (Schaefer and Bell, 1958; Becker and Krug, 1965). In the latter review of the most popular and effective parent-child inventory, the Parental Attitude Research Instrument (PARI), it was concluded that education of parents and uncontrolled response sets had strong enough influence on the PARI scores to consider a new approach to questionnaire-type assessment of parent attitudes and behaviors. The repeated failures of construct validity studies with the PARI reinforced this conclusion. Becker and Krug felt it was time to turn to specific first-person behavioral statements concerning a particular child, rather than thirdperson generalized attitude statements. It was felt a questionnaire should be derived with established relations to more direct assessment of parent behavior, and the effects of possible response sets and background variables (parents' age, education, socio-economic status, etc.) known, controlled or correctable. Also, it was believed the relations to assessments of parent behavior derived by more intensive methods should be demonstrable.



The <u>Parental Attitude</u> and <u>Behavior Inventory</u> (PABI), Form II, is the result of approximately ten years of effort to develop a self-report procedure to facilitate parents reporting how they interact with their children and each other. While many of the areas of inquiry covered by the PABI obviously overlap those which are included in an intensive interview evaluation, the PABI offers the advantage of an efficient, economical, standardized evaluation which can be compared against "norms" of behavior and eliminates the bias of an interviewer's theoretical or educational predisposition.

The developmental studies with the PABI have demonstrated its usefulness in assessing dimensions of parent-childrearing attitudes and behaviors in "normal" samples, clinic camples, various specific clinical disorders, selected socio-economic groups and in comparison to other more intensive interpersonal assessment techniques. 1

In summary of the developmental steps, an initial 1000-item pool of questions was collected and "armchair" scoring procedues hypothesized. All items were administered to a group of "normal" parents from Champaign, Illinois, and responses scored according to the hypothesized scales. These scales were then intercorrelated and factor analyzed. Related scales were combined and all 1000 items correlated with these scales to detect good items not included before and delete items of no value. After this item analysis was completed, item characteristics considered and ineffective questions discarded, a second new sample from throughout Illinois was administered the PABI, Form II. Item characteristics were again examined, scales correlated with one another and factor analyzed. Construct validity studies were carried out to determine the PABI's usefulness in various



samples of subjects and in comparison to other more intensive assessment techniques.

It was obvious at this point that the PABI was too lengthy for general use as a broad band evaluation instrument. The decision at this point was to eliminate items which were of limited value, and to discard scales which demonstrated little validity when correlated with independent criteria of child behavior. As a result of these latter multiple analyses, non-effective scales and extraneous items were deleted, resulting in the final PABI, Form III. This reduction in the number of score scales and extraneous items has reduced the size of the questionnaire from 577 items for mothers to 319 items; and, from 557 items for fathers to 322 items. In actuality, only three scales of mother's questionnaire and two scales of father's questionnaire were changed. Other scales which were retained remained identical. Table 1 lists the final scales retained in both mother's and father's questionnaires.

Insert Table I About Here

Specific Aims - The present investigation was designed to evaluate four distinct statistical problems.

- The reliability of the final scoring system as compared with the previous scoring system.
- 2. The validity of the final scoring system as compared with the previous scoring system.
- 3. The acquiescence contribution to each scale.
- 4. The normative data for various child age levels, and sex of parent and child.



METHOD

Data for this study had been collected previously. The data consisted of parents' responses to the PABI, Form II, (separate responses for mothers and fathers) and rated social behavior of the children of these parents. The latter data were obtained from the mother, father, and teacher of each child. The total number of cases consisted of 628 children from different families. All scale scores from both the previous and present scoring system were intercorrelated. This analysis gave information regarding the relation between homologous scales in the two scoring systems. It also yielded comparative information regarding interscale correlations within the two scoring systems.

Reliability - All scale scores, from both the previous and present scoring system, were intercorrelated. This analysis gave information regarding the relation between homologous scales in the two scoring systems. It also yielded comparative information regarding interscale correlations within the two scoring systems.

<u>Validity</u> - To examine the relative predictive validity of the two scoring systems, the following data analysis was performed.

A. The total N of 628 cases were separated on a random basis into two groups (N=314 each). For Group 1, correlations between both the old and new scoring system and their criterion data were calculated. Correlations with the criterion data for homologous scales from the two systems were examined for significance. This provided information about relative predictive efficiency of the two scoring systems.



B. For Group II, only correlations between the new scoring system and the criterion scores were determined. These data compared to the similar data obtained from Group I were examined for significance. This provided information about the shrinkage of prediction co-efficients from one sample to another.

Acquiescence Contribution - After the above steps were completed to provide information regarding reliability and validity, the two groups were recombined and reformed into 12 subsets of data according to the following diagram.

• •		BOYS			GIRLS	
GRADE OF CHILD	0-2	3-4	5-8	0-2	3-4	5-8
MOTHERS	I	II	III	VII	VIII	IX
FATHERS	IV	v	YI	Х	XI	XII

Intercorrelations among the revised scales (including an acquiescence scale) for each subset were determined in order to establish the relationship of acquiescence to each set of data.

Normative Data - T-score tables (X=50; SD=10) were constructed for conversion of raw scores to a standardized presentation format, for each of the 12 subgroups given in the above section. The following formula was applied.

RESULTS

Reliability - Table 2 lists the correlations between the two scales of the fathers' data which were revised (Permissive and Acquiescence) and the



other fathers' scales retained.

Insert Table 2 About Here

It also gives the correlations between the revised scales and the scales from which they were derived. Since few scales changed their number of items, and the correlations between old and new scales were so high, homogeniety coefficients were not calculated.

Table 3 lists similar data for the three scales of the mothers' data which were revised (Warmth, Permissive, and Acquiescence).

Insert Table 3 About Here

<u>Validity</u> - Table 4 lists the differences in correlations between original scales and revised scales with the rated social behavior of the children

Insert Table 4 About Here

for both the mothers' and fathers' data. Differences between these two sets of correlations reflect differences in predictive validity between the old and revised scales.

Insert Table 5 About Here

ERIC
Full Text Provided by ERIC

amount of shrinkage of the validity coefficients from one sample to another.

Acquiencence Contribution - Table 6 lists the correlations between Acquiescence and other scales retained. This table is separated by Parent, sex of child, and grade group of child.

Insert Table 6 About Here

Columns 1 and 8 of this table contain the correlations between the revised Acquiescence scale and all other scales, with the data combined over age and sex of child.

Normative Date - Due to the magnitude of data generated by the T-score conversion of the scales under each of the conditions set forth in the methodology section above; tables for conversion from raw scores to T-score format (mean = 50; standard deviation = 10) are given in Appendix A.

DISCUSSION

Reliability - Examination of Tables 2 and 3 shows a very high correlation between original and revised scales for both Fathers and Mothers data.

Further, the comparison of the correlations between other scored scales and the original versus the revised scales demonstrate virtually no changes in the interrelationships. That is, the revised scales have retained the same relationship to other scored scales as did the original scales from which they were derived.



It is apparent from these analyses that the revised scoring system is essentially unchanged by the deletion of select items from their scoring system.

<u>Validity</u> - The object of this analysis was first to determine if the revised scales predicted criterion behavior in children similarly; and, second, to establish the amount of shrinkage from one sample of data to another.

Table 4 lists the differences in correlations between original and revises scales with assessments of children's social behavior as rated by Fathers, Mothers, and Teachers. Due to the size of the sample (N-314) relatively small differences are statistically significant. However, in terms of practical usage, a difference of .34 (accounting for 10% of the common variance) was considered significant. Obviously from Table 4, no practical differences were noted. Apparently the revised scoring systems ar equally as good as the original systems in predicting criterion behaviors.

The question of shrinkage in predictive power from one sample to another is addressed by data in Table 5. The second sample (N-314) to which the revised scoring system was applied is comparable to the first sample in demographic variables. As noted in the method section, both samples were derived from the original 628 cases, but randomly separated into two groups of N=314 each. While validity coefficients did change from one sample to another, again looking at differences between the two sets of coefficients the previously stated criterion of 10% common variance is not attained by any of these differences.

From these two different sets of data, it is suggested that the predictive validity between the original and revised scoring systems is not significantly different; and, the shrinkage from one sample to another with L. revised scoring systems is not appreciable in a practical sense.



Acquiescence - Table 6 is divided into subgroups by parent--sex of child, and school grade of the child. Also, there are data for acquiescence contribution to the scales separated only by parent, collapsed over school grade and sex of child. Examination of Table 6 demonstrates that for some scales, the correlation with acquiescence is significant. Looking at these data, in almost all instances, if a correlation between acquiescence and a scale reached practical significance (.34) in one of the subgroupings by sex and school grade of child, the correlation was also significant and of similar magnitude in the combined parent group (collapsed over sex and school grade of child).

While the original plans were to establish some manner of removing the acquiescence contribution from various scales, two difficulties have been encountered. First, theoretically there is controversy as to the desirability of doing this since by virtue of the existance of the correlation, there is implication that acquiescence is an indigenous part of the trait being assessed and should not be statistically removed. On the other hand, some authors state it should be controlled; however, it is suggested rather pointedly that no acceptable method for effecting this has been developed.

With these points in mind the data on the acquiescence contribution are presented so that the users of this inventory are aware of the existence of the relationships between acquiescence and the various scored scales.

Also, if in the future acceptable methods for control are established, the data are available for appropriate control.

Normative Data - Appendix A lists T-score conversion tables for various subgroupings of Parent, sex of child, and school group of child, as well as data collapsed over sex and school group of child, but separated by Parent.



These data show that differences in scores do occur as a function of various subgroupings of the data. The user should be aware of these differences and be cautioned to take advantage of the appropriate group to which his particular subject belongs.

SUMMARY

The reliability and validity of the revised scoring system has been demonstrated to be comparable to the original system. In addition, the cross-validity of the revised system is noted to be within acceptable limits of shrinkage. Acquiescence contribution are available for various subgroups, and, normative tables have been established.



FOOTNOTES

1. These studies are being combined into appendices for the manual of the PABI.



TABLE I
SCALES RETAINED IN MOTHER'S AND FATHER'S QUESTIONNAIRES

ABBREVIATION	MOTHER'S SCALES	FATHER'S SCALES
WARM	Warmth*	Warmth
IPAR	Interparental Attitudes	Interparental Attitudes
POWA	Power Assertion	Power Assertion
RATL	Rational Approach to Discipline	Rational Approach to Discipl
PERM	Permissive (Behavior)*	Permissive (Behavior)*
ACQU	Acquiescence*	Acquiescence*
AGEN	Aggression Encouraging	Aggression Encouraging
ISOL	Use of Isolation	Use of Isolation
DEPR	Deprivation of Privileges	Deprivation of Privileges
REWD	Use of Rewards	Use of Rewards
VISF	Visible Suffering	Visible Suffering
DMAF	Demonstrative Affection	Demonstrative Affection
FAPT	(Not Scored for Mothers)	Father Participation in Child Care

^{*} Indicates scales whose item content was altered. Other scales were not altered.



TABLE 2

CORRELATIONS BETWEEN ORIGINAL AND REVISED FATHERS'SCALES

WITH OTHER RETAINED SCALES*

	PERM	ISSIVE	ACQUIESC	ence
	Original	Revised	Original	Revised
WARM	12	12	- 05	- 03
IPAR	- 10	- 11	- 06	- 06
POWA	- 53	- 54	26	24
RATL	- 08	- 08	47	49
AGEN	18	17	02	- 02
ISOL	- 17	- 17	11	08
DE P R	- 45	- 45	18	16
REWD	- 08	- 08	12	10
VISF	- 41	- 41	42	42
DMAF	- 01	- 02	- 04	- 06
FAPT	- 02	- 02	- 02	- 01
ACQU (Original)	- 26	- 25	1.00	97
ACQU (Revised)	- 26	- 25	.97	1.00
PERM (Original	1.00	99	- 26	- 26
PERM (Revised)	99	1.00	25	- 26

^{*} Decimals removed.



TABLE 3

CORRELATIONS BETWEEN ORIGINAL AND REVISED MOTHERS' SCALES

WITH OTHER RETAINED SCALES*

				·	*	
	WAF	RMTH	PERMI	SSIVE	ACQUIE	SCENCE
	Original	Revised	Original	Revised	Original	Revised
IPAR	30	29	-08	-08	06	08
POWA	-49	-49	-49	-50	34	32
RATL	21	21	-12	-12	47	49
AGEN	-15	-15	16	15	02	02
ISOL	-31	-32	-06	-06	-03	-03
DEPR	-15	-16	-34	-34	11	12
REWD	-14	-13	-06	-06	16	16
VISF	-31	-31	-4 1	-42	40	40
DMAF	28	27	03	02	07	08
WARM (Original)	1.00	99	06	07	-13	-10
WARM (Revised)	99	1.00	07	07	-12	-09
PERM (Original)	06	07	1.00	99	-26	-25
PERM (Revised)	07	07	99	1.00	-26	-25
ACQU (Original)	- 13	-12	-26	-26	1.00	99
ACQU (Revised)	-10	-09	-25	-25	99	1.00
	1					

^{*}Decimals removed.



TABLE 4 DIFFERENCES BETWEEN ORIGINAL AND REVISED SCALE CORRELATIONS WITH RATED SOCIAL BEHAVIOR OF CHILD* (Original Subtracted From Revised)

	FATH	E R		MOTHE	R
	Permissive	Acquiescence	Warmth	Permissive	Acquiescence
Mothers' Rating Child					
Incroversion	01	-03	-01	00	00
Cmotional Stability	00	01	01	-01	01
Calm-Compliant	00	01	01	-01	01
Submissive	00	02	00	00	-01
Withdrawn	00	-04	00	-01	-01
Distrusting	01	-02	00	-01	01
Defiant-Hostile	00	00	01	01	02
Fathers' Rating Child					
Introversion	00	04	-01	00	00
Emotional Stability	-01	-01	01	-01	. 01
Calm-Compliant	00	00	02	00	01
Submissive	-01	03	-01	00	00
Withdrawn	01	-03	00	00	00
Distrusting	-01	00	00	00	01
Defiant-Hostile	01	00	00	00	01
reachers' Rating Child					
Introversion	-01	04	00	-01	00
Emotional Stability	00	01	-01	02	-01
Calm-Compliant	00_	00	00	00	-01
Submissive	01	04	00	01	00
Withdrawn	-01	04	-01	-01	- 00
© trusting	-01	. 03	00	-01	00
ENU Liant-Hostile	00	-01 16	-01	00	00

TABLE 5
DIFFERENCES BETWEEN REVISED SCALE VALIDATION CORRELATIONS
AND CROSS VALIDATION CORRELATIONS WITH RATED SOCIAL BEHAVIOR
OF CHILD (Validation Subtracted From Cross Validation)*

	FAT	THER		MOTHER	
	Permissive	Acquiescence	Warmth	Permissive	Acquiescence
Mothers' Rating Child		•			
Introversion	00	-01	-02	-07	09
Emotional Stability	16	08	-11	10	-14
Calm-Compliant	13	-08	-17	07	-10
Submissive	06	-03	00	-06	-02
Withurawn	-03	04	-03	-06	12
Distrusting	-07	03	-04	-06	15
Defiant-Hostile	-16	07	05	-09	15
Fathers' Rating Child	• 4 ₁				. •
Introversion	02	-05	-24	-06	80
Emotional Stability	07	01	10	04	-10
Calm-Compliant	04	-01	00	-03	-16
Submissive	12	-11	-16	-02	05
Withdrawn	-07	01	-2 5	-09	09
Distrusting	06	00	-16	-05	-01
Defiant-Hostile	-08	02	-14	-06	-04
Teachers' Rating Child					
Introversion	04	-17	-06	00	04
Emotional Stability	06	. 08	13	03	-04
Calm-Compliant	02	08	02	-01	-08
Submissive	03	-16	00	-01	00
Withdrawn	04	-18	-08	-01	06
Distrusting	00	-16	-16	-03	00
Defiant-Hostile	-10	-02	-16	-08	01

^{*}Decimais removed. Negative score indicates shrinkage.



TABLE 6

CORRELATIONS OF ACQUIESCIENCE WITH OTHER RETAINED SCALES*

- 19 02 33 8 02 8 5 3 8 ¥ ‡ **₽** S-8 à GIRLS ಜ 47 5 8 93 109 0 07 S 5 27 З-ђ З-ђ 17 0 ೫ 56 <u>.</u> ٥ 9 59 27 咒 5 • 2-0 GRADES 9 ജ 9 જ 33 33. = = S 27 31 5-8 6карез **BOYS** 23 92 表 23 5 16 6 8 # 5 3-у Скарез 113 <u>~</u> 8 25 3 03 さ き # 2 Z-0 GRADES ₹ 85 0Ş COMBINED. 23 な 02 8 5 유 き 3 OF CHILD SEX AND AGE 104 03 53 5 = 오 8 02 壳 റ്റ S 6 - 17 2-8 Скарез GIRLS . اح 53 33 さ 23 72 8 109 5 = 0 2 3-у склоез 8 - 16 # 4 8 ⇉ 26 25 5 5 3 27 8 GRADES ထ္ထ 3 ക 5 07 6 5 33 5 さ 3 5 2-8 33 င္ပ 6 8 6 **=** 8 4 <u>†</u> 2 110 27 07 BOYS 3-4 ı င္ပ 56 さ 8 2 8 \$ 020 9 = 5 2 S-0 GRADES COMBINED 56 25 さ റ്റ 60 5 05 07 # 3 429 OF CHILD 5 SEX AND AGE SAMPLE 18 ARM ARM PAR **ERM** GEN **DWA** EWD MATL FPR SF 6 MAF APT



Appendix A

T-Score conversion tables for each scale scored.



T - Scores

	ı	1	ı																		
		-		0-0	6 01	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	19	20	21	22	23	5ф	25	26	•
	R	1	- =	13	÷ †	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	7 hZ	25	26	27	58	29	
	OTHE		Level	18	19	20	20	21	22	23	5ф	25	26	27	28	. 62	30	31	32	33	
-	X		Grade	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	7d	25	56	27	28	29	30	
		B 0 Y	m	12	13	ηŢ	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	214	25	26	27	28	
			0-2	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30	31	32	
		Combined over	Grade & Sex	ľ	1.5	16	17	1.8	19	20	21	22	23	h2	25	26	27	28	29	30	
			5-8	ស	7	8	6	10	11	12	13	14	15	17	. 8 1.	19	. 20	21	22	23	ā
		IRL	3-4	6	10	1	12	1.3	14	15	16	17	18	13	20	21	22	23	5ф	25) C
		ິວ	Level K-2	0-	0	-	~	_	2	9	∞	6	10	11	13	14	15	16	18	19	סנ
	THER		irade 5-8	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	7.0
	FA	B 0 Y	3-t	_ 	6	10	11	12	13	11	15	16	18	19	20	21	22	23	5 t	25	26
			0-2	=	Ŋ	9	&	ວ	10	1	12	13	μť	16	17	18	16	20	21	23	211
	position,	over	Grade & Sex	9	7	~	10	1	12	13	ā.	<u>ج</u>	16	17	18	19	21	22	23	hZ	25
			w Score	H	Ν.	ന	.	ம ்.	9		œ	6	10	1	12		‡	15	16	17	18

	82	59	30	31	32	33	Эф	35	36	37	38	39	4 1	42	1 3	##	45	9†1	47	81	64	0.5
-	31	32	33	34	35	36	37	38	39	01	t1	r 2h	th3	t3	#	H2	911	т.	H8	— 6ħ	20	- 13
-	— 	35	36						~	. m	<u>.</u> درين	ம	9								<u> </u>	
-	32	<u></u>	34 3	35 37	36 38	37 3	38 10	39 41	40 H2	1 43	ht	43 45	911 111	9th 5th	2h 9h	2 H	8 H	49 51	0 51	1 52	2 53	3 511
		<u> </u>	<u> </u>	m	<u></u>	· 	<u> </u>		<u> </u>		_ 			<u> </u>		h 1	58		50			5.3
-	30	31	32	33	33	34	35	36	37	38	39	9	- -	15	H3	3	H2	917	ф_	- 1	611	5.0
_	34	35	36	37	38	39	Q†	H1.	rt 5	13	##	45	911	ф1	841	611	20	51	- 25	53	54	55
	35	33	Эф	35	36	37	38	39	9	0+	_ t1	142	th 3	#	115	911	41	28	6 ћ	20	51	52
	. 26	27	28	53	30	31	32	33	35	36	37	38	39	0†1	th	42	†	45		41	81	6ћ
_	27	5 8	59	30	31	32	33	Эф	35	36	37	38	39	0†1	th	t 3	#		91	2 h	84	ц9
_	22	23	2 _t	22	27	28	53	30	32	ee ee	34	36	37	38	30	3	2	£3	#	9†1	т 1	th8
·	53	30	31	32	33	ħε	35	36	37	38	39	0†		45	t 13	#	45	911	41	8 1	611	50
	27	28	53	33	R R	33	Эф	35	36	37	38	39	0	4	rt 5	th3	‡	H2	<u> </u> 47	6 4	61	50
	52	26	27	% 87	30		32	33	æ Tæ		36	38	G	9	=	2 <u>1</u>	£1	<u>.</u>	91	2 h	81	ф
	56	22	28	29	30	.സ ന	8	3 €		36	37	æ	39	9	3	ဌာ	3	. .	9†1	47	<u></u>	61)
	19	20	21	22	23	5 ₽	22	5 6	27	58	53	30	31	32	e E	34	35 5	36	37	38	36	т П



_				
₽-0:		-		
=				
arm				
54				
m.	110			
~	-			
_	٠.			
	11			
			-	
		٠,	٠.	
	- ",			٠
1.7			_	
200				
				3
٠			- 6	d
	-	-		ï
	L	ш	,	ı
1		-113		ı
	_	-	1	Ĉ
	▲ Full	Text P	rovid	S
				_

- Page 3

	•								*						Activities and a second					•		
	51	22	53	54	55	56	57	58	.59	09	62	63	1 9	65	99	29	- 68	69	70	7	72	73
	52	53	5 4	55	56	57	28	59	09	61	62	63	ћ9	65	99	29	89	69	70	7	72	73
	55	56	29	58	59	59	09	61	62	63	1 9	65	99	29	89	69	70	71	72	72	73	ή/
	54	55	56	57	58	59	- 60	61	62	63	ђ9	65	99	99	29	89	69	70	71	72	73	74
	51	52	53	54	55	56	57	28	59	09	19	62	63	ћ9	65	99	29	89	69	20	71	72
_	56	57	58	59	09	- 19	62	63	1 9	65	99	29	89	69	69	70	71	72	73	<u></u> μΖ	75	92
:	53	5ù	55	56	57	28	59	09	61	62	63	1 19	65	99	2.9	89	69	70	71	72	73	74
, ar 	20	51	52	54	55	56	57	58	.29	09	1 9	63	ћ9	65	99	29	68	69	70	72	73	7ц
	50	51	52	53	24	55	56	57	58	59	09	61	62	63	1 9	65	99	29		69	02	7.1
	50	51	52	53	55	56	57	58	09	1 9	62	† 19	65	99	29	69	70	71	72	7#	75	76
	50	51	52	53	24	55	56	57	58	59	09	61	62	63	, 19	65	99	29	89	69	70	71
	51	52		54	55	56	57	58	59	- 19	9	63	119	65	99	29	. 68	69	70	7	72	73
	. 50	52	53	1 5	5.5	56	57	58	`09`	19	62	63	1 9	65	29	89	69	70	77	72	74	75
	50	S	52	ည်	υ C	56	57	8 8	59	09	61	62	၉	1	99	29	89	69	02	71	72	73
	4	Zπ	ж т		1	91	4	∞ ±	611	50	1 5	გ გ	53	45	55	56	25	28	29	09	19	62

	74	
	74	
	75	
	75	_ .
	•	
	73	
	- 1 · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
	77	
	∓	
		· • • · ·
	75	76
	<u> </u>	
100	. 4	
	\sim	ന
	72	73
	<u> </u>	79 73
	78 72	79 73
	<u> </u>	73 79 73
	<u> </u>	[73 79 73
	<u> </u>	76 73 79 73
	<u> </u>	6
† eg	<u> </u>	6
Page 4	<u> </u>	6
1	<u> </u>	6
1	<u> </u>	6
	<u> </u>	6

INTERPARENTAL ATTITUDE

T - Scores

	FA	T H T				 - 9			1				1
		=				Combined			Σ	OTHE	R		1
-1	B 0 Y		2. 1. 1. 1. 1.	GIRL	-	over		B 0 Y			α ⊢ υ		
0-2	3-t	Grade 5-8	Level K-2	3-4	5-8	Grade	0-2	۳	Grad	e Level]	. 1
~	8	ħ	8	2	1.0	10		11	12		5	11	•
6	6	9	6	#	11	12	13	12	11	11	7	12	•
10	1	∞	7	9	13	13	15	 #I	1.5	13	∞	14	
12	12	6	12	7	14	1 1	16	15	16	14	10	15	
13	7.	#	#	6	16	16	17	16	18	16	Ħ	16	
15	15	13	15	7	17	17	19	18	19	17	13	18	
16	17	14	17	12	19	19	20	19	20	1.9	14	19	100
18	&	16	19	#	20	20	21	20	22	20	16	20	
20	20	18	20	16	22	21	23	22	23	21	17	22	
77	7	19	22	17	23	23	5th	23	24	23	19	23	
23	23	21	23	19	25	h2	25	- 5ф	26	7г	20	25	
74	25	23	25	21	26	26	27	26	27	26	22	26	, į
26	56	2ф	56	22	27	27	28	27	28	27	23	27	
27	28	26	28	5ф	29	28	29	29	30	29	25	29	
29	29	28	30	26	30	30	31	30	31	30	26	30	
31	31	29	31	27	32	31	32	31	32	31	28	31	
32	32	31	33	29	33	32	33	33	34		29	ຕ	
34	Эф	33	34	31	35	34	35	34	35	3#		317	

		•																	•			1 11
	36	37	38	01	41	43	11	45	47	118	6ћ	51	52	24	55	26	58	59	09	62	63	65
-	32	т е	25	37	38	04	ηı	(† 3	#	911	14	81	20	51	53	₽5	56	57	59	09	62	63
, -	36	37	39.		TH.	rt3	##	94	ф.	611	50	51	53	т <u></u>	56	57	59	09	19	63	1 19	99
<u>-</u>	36	38	39	011	42	t 3	† †	911	h7	811	50	5.1	25	54	52	26	58	59	61	62	63	65
	35	37	38	39	th.	42	ф3	45	94	84	6ћ	50	52	53	д	26	22	28	09	61	62	t)9
_	36	37	39	· 0tı	t1	1 3	† †	45	2ћ	8†1	20	51	52	1 5	55	26	58	59	09	62	63	1 9
_	35	37	38	39	Ë	42	† †	45	911	811	6 ф	20	52	53	55	26	22	65	09	62	63	1 9
_	36	38	39	II	142	#	45	47	817	50	51	53	Ъ	56	57	59	61	62	ħ9	65	99	89
-	33	Эф	36	38	39	T.	rt3	1 1 1	911	81	611	21	53	- н2	56	58	59	19	63	65	99	68
	36	38	39	ti	42	##	45	4 7	6ћ	50	52 '	53	5.5	56	28	09	19	63	† 9	99	29	69
	35	36	38	HO.	th	t 3	45	9 †1	8ћ	50	51	53	55	56	58	09	62	63	65	2 9	89	70
	35	37	38	9	ηJ	£ †	45	9†	84	6ћ	21	52	53	55	57	58	09	62	т9	65	99	89
. <u>-</u>	35	37	38	0+	45	43	45	911	81	6h	51	52	53	56	57	59	09	62	63	65	29	89
.	35	37	1	0+	T	t3	45	94	8 ₁	61	5	52	5 t	56	57	59	09	62	ћ9	65	29	68
	19	20	21	22	23	7π	22	56	27	28	29	30	31	32	e C	ħ£	35	36	37	38	39	01

ERIC

Full feat Provided by ERIC

25

Interparental Attitude - Page 3

	99	29
	65	99
	29	69
	99	67
	65	99
	99	29
· •	99	29
	69	
	70	
	7.1	
	72	
	69	
	70	
	2	
	4	<u>2</u>

1	ì	1		İ												•					
		L)	5-8	28	30	32	: ∃ 3π	36	38	39	41	43	45	47	6ћ	51	52	54	56	. 82	
٥		G I R	3-4	26	28	30	32	34	36	38	0+1	42	ħtı	911	811	50		53	55	57	
1 H L C	=	Level	K-2	26	28	30	32	33	32	37	39	41	43	45	9 ф	ф ф	50	52	54	56	
2		Grade	5-8	27	29	30	32	Эф	36	38	0†	42	t ₃	45	/ h	6ħ	51	53	. 55	56	
	6		3-4	25	27	29	31	33	35	37	38	υħ	th 2	ħħ	.9ħ	8ћ	50	52	5ц	56	. *
			0-5	56	28	30	31	33	35	37	38	0†1	42	43	45	41	84	50	52	54	
	Combined	Grade	& Sex	26	28	30	32	ћ Е	36	38	39	Th	th3	45	Δή	6ћ	51	52	54	56	
	i i	1	2-8	88	30	32	Эф	36	38	0h	42	53	45	4 7	6ћ	51	53	55	57	59	0.0
	GTR	. ا	7-6	30	32	34	35	37	39	T	t3	45	911	8:1	20	52	2 ф	99	22	59	
В		Level	7-V	27	53	31	33	д е	36	38	011	Z 1	1	9†1	8 ₁	20	52	2 ф	56	58	ΓO
THE		Grade	0 - 0	ћ 2	26	28	31	33.	35	37	39	4	f 1 3	45		6ħ	52	2 ft	56	28	60
F A	B 0 Y		<u>+-</u> C	56	28	30	32	35	37	39	H1	ц 3	45	μ,	6ћ	51	53	52	57	59	61
		0_2	I	23	25	27	29	31	33	35	37	39	H 1	£†	91	81	50	52	т <u>.</u>	56	5.8
	Combined	Grade	X	27	29	31	33	35	3 6	38	40	2	3	9†	811	50	52	7€	56	28	60
		Soone	7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7	H	2	æ	⇒	ம	9	7	æ	6	10	7	12	13	7	15	91	17	18

											. ^{1,42} 2	4			•	•
•	62	1 9	65	67	69	7.1	73	75	77	78	80	82	1 8	98	88	06
	61	63	65	29	69	71	73	75	77	79	81	83	85	87	89	91
	59	61	63	65	29	69	70	72	74	76	78	80	82	83	85	87
	09	62	ħ9	99	89	69	71	73	75	77	62	81	82	η8	98	88
	09	62	ф9 1	99	89	70	72	ћ2	92	78	80	82	₩8	98	88	06
	57	59	09	62	† 9	65	29	69	7.1	72	ħ /2	9,2	11	62	81	- 82
	09	62	63	9	29	69	7.1	73	75	92	78	80	82	₩8	98	88
	63	119	99	89	70	72	74	92	78	80	82	₩8				
	63	65	29	89	70	72	74	92	78	79	81	883	:			
	- [9	63	65	29	69	71	73	75	77	62	81	83	e V <u>a</u> ra			
	. 2 9	†9	99	89	70	7.3	75	7.7	79	81	83	85				
	63	65	29	70	72	14	92	28	80	82	₩8	98				
· .	09	62	† 9	99		20	72	74	92	78	80	82				
	62	ђ 9	99	89	70	72	74	92	78	80	82	1 8				
	19	20	21	22	23	5 π	25	26	27	88	5 9	30	31	32	33	ne ne

RATIONAL APPROACH TO DISCIPLINE

T - Scores

Combined B 0	В		< ≻	THER		GIRL		Combined		B 0 Y	0 N	THE	۳ ک ۲ ک	-
Grade Grade Level & Sex 0-2 3-4 5-8 K-2	Grade -2 3-4 5-8	Grade 5-8		Leve K-2] I	3-ц	5-8	Grade & Sex	0-2	3-4	Grade 5-8	Level	⇃ᆿ	1
5 0 10 -2 5	10	27	<u>.</u>	2		9	#			-7	O ₁	ı]	7-	-3
7 3 13 0 8	13 0	0	-	∞		∞	7	Ţ	-5	7	\ \ \	m	7	0,
10 6 15 3 11	15 3	ന	3 11	11		11	10	- -	-2	ני	=	9	7	~
13 8 17 6 1 ₄	17 6	9	· · ·	1,4		1	12	#	0	H	7	· &	·	.
15 11 20 9 17	20 9	6		17		16	15	9	3		10	11	=	7
18 14 22 12 19	22 12	12		19		19	18	6	9	7	12	13	7	10
21 17 25 15 22	15	15		22		21	20	12	6	10	15	1.6	6	13
23 20 27 18 25	27 18	18		25		24	23	15	12	13	17	19	12	16
26 23 30 21 28	30 21	21		28		27	56	18	15	16	20	21	15	18
29 26 32 24 31	32 2н	ът.	· · ·	31		53	28	20	18	1.9	23	- 5ф	18	21
32 29 35 27 33	35 27 3	27 3	<u> </u>	33		32	31	23	,,,,,	21	25	26	21	7г
34 31 37 30 36	37 30	30		36		35	3ц	56	77	ħΖ	28	29	5th	27
37 34 40 33 39	to 33			39		37	37	29	27	27	31	31	27	59
40 37 42 36 42	H2 36	98		112		O 1	39	31	30	30	33	Эц	30	32
42 40 45 40 45	0th Sth	0th		61		t2	rt2	34	33	33	36	.36	33	35
2h 8h 2h 8h 5h	th 2h	t 3	<u>.</u>	th		45	45	37	36	36	39	39	36	38
05 9h 05 9h 8h	91 09	9ћ	-	50		81	₁ 2h	011	39	39	HJ	24	38	0+
50 49 52 49 53	52 49	6h		53		50	50	ц3	42	ch	ប់ព	uu ,	III	11.2

Rational Approach to Discipline - Page 2

			-					
911	6ћ	51	5th	57	09	62	65	89
 	th	20	53	95	59	62	†19	67
Lt7	6 ф	52	1	57	09	62	65	67
П1	6h	52	54	57	09	62	65	89
Sti .	811	51	±5	56	59	62	9	89
H5		51	5ц	57	09	63	99	69
45	81	51	ħS	57	29	62.	65	89
53	26	28	61	ћ9	99	69		
53	99	28	61	63	99	69		
56	28	19	† 9	29	70	72		
52	55	58	61	1 9	29	70	•	
. 54	57	59	62	† 9	67	69	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
52	5.5	57	09	63	99	69		
53	56	59	61	- ф9	29	69		
19	 20	21	22	23	<u>т</u> г	25	56	- 22

T - Scores

		1	24	25	27	28	. 58	31	32	33	35	36	37	39	011		t3	111	<u>.</u>	1
6	F	<u>ا</u> =	22	23	25	26	27	29	30	31	33	ЭЦ	96	37	38	0+1	t ₁	- Zh	#	
11 12 13		Level	4	21	22	5th	25	27	58	30	'n	33	34	36	37	38	0†1	ťή	43	
2	1	Grade	₹.	25	56	27	29	30	31	35	33	32	36	37	38	011	Th	42	t 3	, ,
	\ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \) m	21	23	7	25	27	28	30	31	32	Эф	35	37	38	39	Τh	t 2 h	† †	
		0-2	2	23	25	56	27	29	30	32	33	34	36	37	38	0 1 1	Th	th2	ħħ	
	Combined	Grade & Sex		23	25	56	27	59	30	32	33	34	36	37	38	011	11	42	ħħ	Ī
		-8-5		26	28	59	30	32	33	34	36	37	38	0+1	t ₁	42	43	45	917	
	IRL	<u>ന</u>	24	25	27	28	59	31	32	33	35	36	38	39	O±	t 5	th3	45	911	
2	Ð	Level K-2	27	53	30	31	32	#£	35	36	37	38	011	th.	42	43	45	91	rt7	0.0
THE		Grade 5-8	25	26	28	29	31	32	33	35	36	800	39	011	45	43	45	9†1	47	0.0
F A	B 0 Y	3-4	25	27	28	29	31	32	33	35	36	37	39	0+1	t1	t 3	†	tt 2	h7	ווס
		0-2	25	27	28	29	31	32	34	35	36	38	39	0+1	2 th	t3	45	911	th	lin.
	Combined	Grade & Sex	25	27	28	53	31	32	33	35	36	37	36	알	돠			th2	47	110
		Raw Score	.	Ņ	ĸ		S	9	1	~	6	10	7	15	13	1	15	16	17	18

												•										
4	811	61	20	. 52	53	5t	36	22	58	19	19	62	1 19	65	99	89	69	20	72	73	74	75
<u>-</u>	L h	811	611	51	52	53	55	99	58	59	09	62	63	h9	99	29	69	20	7.1	73	h/_	7.5
_	911	th	6 h	20	52	53	55	56	57	59	09	62	63	65	99	89	69	7.1	72	1	75	92
	911	4 4	8+	20	15	52	53	55	56	57	58	09	19	62	63	65	99	29	89	20	7.1	72
	th 2	8+1	6h	51	52	1 9	55	26	58	29	61	62	63	65	99	89	69	7.1	72	73	75	92
_	th	8 +	6h	21	Ω (4	53	55	56	57	59	09	61	636	1 19	99	29	. 89	20	7.1	72	h 2	75
	d17	84	6 h	51	52	53	55	56	57	59	09	62	63	1 9	99	29	89	70	71	72	14	75
	611	20	51	53	ъ <u>5</u>	55	57	58	59	09	62	63	h9	99	29	89	70	71	72	ћ/	75	76
	6 h	50	51	53	- 1 2d	56	57	58	09	19	29	ђ 9	65	29	89	69	7.1	72	73	75	92	82
_	611	51	52	53	5t	56	57	28	59	09	62	63	h9	65	29	89	69	02	72	73	74	7.5
;	20	52	53	54	56	22	59	09	19	63	119	99	29	89	20	71	73	h/	22	77	78	80
	611	51	52	က	55	56	57	59	09	19	63	1 9	65	29	89	69	71	72	73	7.5	26	77
	20	51	53	54	55	57	28	09	61	62	h 9	65	99	89	69	71	72	73	75	92	77	62.
	611	51	52	53	55	56	57	59	09		63	1 9	65	29	89	69	71	72	73	75	92	77
	1.9	50	21	22	23	7 7	25	26	27	88	29	30	31	32	33	34	35	36	37	38	39	t0

		•						`,		:	•	
٠	11	78	79	81	85	83	85	98	87	83	90	91
	77	78	80	81	85	1 8	85	98	88	89	91	92
-	78	79	81	82	1 8	85	87	88	06	91	93	 ∂6
-	73	7.5	92	77	78	80	81	85	83	85	98	87
	78	.62	80	85	83	85	98	87	89	06	92	93
_	92	78	62	81	82	83	82	98	87	68	06	91
	77	78	62	81	82	83	82	98	87	89	06	91
_	77	79	80	81	83	₩8	82	87	88	89	91	
	62	80	82	83	₩8	98	87	68	06	16	93	
	92	78	79	80	81	83	₩8	85	98	87	80	35 - 11 - 11 <u>8 41</u> 8
٠.	81	82	1 8	82	87	88	89	16	92	†6	95	
÷	79	80	82	8	† 8	98	87	&	S	6	92	
	80	81	83	₩	86	87	88	06	16	35	†6	
	62	80	81	83	#8	85	87	& &	6 8	9	92	
		<u>N</u>	<u> </u>	=	<u>က</u>	<u> </u>	_	∞	တ		<u>-</u>	

T-Scores

	1	T	<u> </u>							· · · ·				·		
		5-8	村乙	ಜ	35	읓	45	51	56	61	99	72	11		(14 <u>)</u> (14)	
	G - R	η-€	72	<u>چ</u>	37	감	91	51	26	61	%	F	92	2000 2000 2000		
MOTHER	LEVEL	K-2	27	31	36	7	145	50	7₽	59	75	89	73			
Q ¥	GRADE	5-8	₹2	82	33	8	143	84	52	57	62	29	7	18847	5	
	λ 0	3-4	25	62	3₽	33	£ 1	<u>&</u> †	52	57	ত	%	F			
	<u>B</u>	0-5	23	82	33	82	75	#	25	2/	85	99	٦			=
	-	GRADE & SEX	25	3	35	39	#	6η	54	59	63	88	73			
		5-8	සූ	32	36	<u></u>	#	17	51	55	59	63	29	71		
	3 I R L	3-4	56	31	35	66	#	8 ‡	52	21	61	65	69	₹.		
THER	LEVEL	K-2	28	82	36	O _T	7.	8 1	5	55	29	63	29	٦		
FAT	GRADE	2-8	స	53	33	37	h	Ŧ	64	23	57	5	છ	69		
	ВОҮ	3-4	ති	23	33	<u>&</u>	- 	9	20	- д	<u> 2</u> 9	8	%	22		
		0-5	7 2	28 82	32	98	 유	3	∞	52	56	ઙ	₹	8		
	_	GRADE &	92	೭	i€o	æ	15	9ħ	50	16	28	5	99	2		
		SCORE		ď	n	3	٦	9		o	σ.	0		<u></u>		
	- 1 - 1 - 1	an are at all at a second at a		<u> </u>	n de la servición. Se de la servición	a serie. Necestaria	<u>.</u>	general service.	and and the	e in result (Aurille	in National	See at 15 See at 15 au		to the time of a		

ACQUIESCIENCE T Scores

		٠	*			*					•	_				_	
	- 0		5-8	5	7	- ∞	10		12	17	15	17	18	50	21	23	5/t
	-	- '	3-4	_	က	4	. 9	&	6	=	12	† 1	15	17	18	50	22
	MOLHER	LEVEL	K-2	4	9	2	6	10	12	13	15	16	18	19	21	23	₩ 2
Į į	S S	GRADE	2-8	e e	#	9	1	&	10	11	13	#	16	17	19	20	2
	> 0	•	3-4	-3	2.	Ŷ	-	N	#	9	8	6	Ξ	13	₹ 1	16	18
			0-2	7	Ŷ	<u>-</u>	က	. 	9	8	6	=	12		16	17	19
	COMBINED	OVER	SEX SEX	7	က	5	9	&	6	=	12	1,	15	17	81	50	22
			5-8	9	7	6	10	11	13	14	15	17	18	19	20	22	23
	GIRL		3-4	80	6	0	12	13	14	15	17	18	19	23	22	23	力で
FATHER		LEVEL	K~2		Q		5	2	80	10	11	13	15	16	18	19	21
F.A.		GRADE	5-8	7	5	9	8	6	10	12	13	1 1	16	17	18	50	21
	80 ₹		3-4	က	5	9	7	6	0	12	က	† ‡	91	17	61 6	8	<u>ر</u>
			2-0	က	5	9	&	6	10	12	13	#	16	11	18	20	21
	COMBINED	OVER GRADE &			9	2	6	10	÷	13	2	15	17	18	19	2	22
			SCORE		N	က		ر ا	9		ω	6	<u></u>		۵	13	

2222222223333222 26.28 27 6[†]1 23 25 ₹ 27 ജ 3 25 23 29 \$\frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2} \frac 10 17 18 19 8 2 8 5 8 8 7 8 8 8 E 8 E #

 5
 8
 8
 8
 8
 8
 8
 8
 8
 8
 8
 8
 8
 8
 8
 8
 8
 8
 8
 8
 8
 8
 8
 8
 8
 8
 8
 8
 8
 8
 8
 8
 8
 8
 8
 8
 8
 8
 8
 8
 8
 8
 8
 8
 8
 8
 8
 8
 8
 8
 8
 8
 8
 8
 8
 8
 8
 8
 8
 8
 8
 8
 8
 8
 8
 8
 8
 8
 8
 8
 8
 8
 8
 8
 8
 8
 8
 8
 8
 8
 8
 8
 8
 8
 8
 8
 8
 8
 8
 8
 8
 8
 8
 8
 8
 8
 8
 8
 8
 8
 8
 8
 8
 8
 8
 8
 8
 8
 8
 8
 8
 8
 8
 8
 8
 8
 8
 8
 8

₫

ERIC ATUITED PRODUCTION

·									
	R L	5-8	31	38	15	51	28	65	
	5	3-4	59	36	43	20	57	79	
	MOTHER DE LEVEL	K-2	31	38	ħħ	51	22	1 9	
	GRADE	5-8	59	36	143	50	56	63	
	ВОУ	3-4	30	37	143	50	57	75	
		0-2	27	34	11	64	26	63	
 	COMBINED OVER	GKADE & SEX	29	36	43	50	27	₫,	
·.		5-8	32	O 1	L tt	54	61	89	
	2 - R	3-4	 ₽	약	2tt	54	61	88	
FATHER	LEVEL	K-2	32	39	45	52	59	65	
FA7	GRADE	5-8	59	36	43	15	58	99	
	ВОУ	3-4	33	O 1	911	53	59	99	
		0-2	33	38	¹ √2	52	59	29	
	COMBINED OVER GRADF &	SEX	35	39	9†	53	9	29	
	RAW	SCORE		a	က	a	٦	9	

DEPRIVATION OF PRIVILEGES

T-Scores

	R L	5-8	29	₹	O †	9†	51	57	63	
	<u> </u>	3-4	28	3,4	읓	9†	52	53	49	
MOTHER	LEVEL	K-2	82	34	유	94	52	<u></u>	†9	
MO	GRADE	5-8	†i2	31	37	43	64	55	- 19	
	∀ 0	3-4	56	32	38	††	20	96	છ	
	B	0-2	25	31	37	43	ß	56	62	
	COMB I NED	GRADE & SEX	12	33	39	45	51	22	63	
		5-8	31	36	142	L†1	52	58	63	
	G I R L	3-4	30	36	—	1 1	53	53	†9	
FATHER	LEVEL	K-2	29	35	¥	2 ħ	53	55	65	
FAT	GRADE	5-8	ħΖ	31	37	h3	50	56	62	
	ВОУ	3-4	29	35	μ1,	L t	52	58	79	
		0-2	28	34	39	45	51	57	62'	
	COMBINED OVER	GRADE & SEX	53	8	Ot	91	52	58	63	
		SCORE		N	ന	.	گ	9	7	

T-Scores

·										
		R L	5-8	37	† †	55	59	99	47	
		- 5	3-4	36	43	50	22	65	72	
	MOTHER	רבאבר	K-2	37	43	50	56	63	2	
	MOT	GRADE	5-8	36	43	50	96	63	2	
	. 1	ВОУ	₹-£	36	43	51	58	65	72	
		•	0-2	8	24	64	55	62	69	
		COMBINED OVER	GRADE & SEX	36	43	50	25	† 9	11	
			5-8	37	43	20	56	63	69	
	1	G – R L	3-4	36	ф3	50	25	₹	11	
	FATHER	LEVEL	K-2	36	₹	51	59	99	1/2	
	FA	GRADE	5-8	34	왉	47	54	99	29	
		A 0 A	3-4	35	12	20	28	99	†∠	
			0-5	35	42	617	26	63	2	
	THE THEOLOGY		GRADE & SEX	36	43	50	57	1 9	٦	
					N	က	4	2	9	

USE OF VISIBLE SUFFERING

T-SCORES

		∔ —⊣		<u>.</u>								
	R L	5-8	31	38	††	50	27	63	69	92	88	₩
	<u> </u>	3-4	32	38	45	51	58	49	12	11	83	8.
MOTHER	LEVEL	K-2	31	37	ħħ	22	57	63	02	92	83	88
MO	GRADE	5-8	28	36	р†3	51	28	99	73	81	68	96
	B O ≺	3-h	31	38	†	51	58	65	71	. 8/	8	26
		0-2	30	37	ф3	20	23	₹9	11	11	₹8	6
	COMBINED OVER	GRADE &	33	37	††	51	27	1 79	11	11	<u>ಹ</u>	
		5-8	34	0 1 7	Ĺή	54	61	L 9	4/	8	. 87	
	GIRL	3-4	36	742	64	55	61	29	73	62	8	
JER	LEVEL	K-2	37	μ3	50	26	63	20	92	83	89	
FATHER	GRADE	5-8	31	39	917	54	62	.69	77	85	92	
	ВОҮ	3-4	36	††	51	59	29	4 <i>L</i>	82	8	26	
		0-2	 7€	112	64	57	65	72	&	88	95	
		GKAUE &	35	71	64	56	63	2	9/	83	8.	
		SCORE	-	N	m	a	5	9	7	8	6	

DEMONSTRATIVE AFFECTION

T-Scores

	R L	5-8	20	25	33	33	읓	45	50	55	જ	79		·		
	<u>–</u> 5	3-4	21	56	31	35	01		64	53	58	63				
MOTHER	LEVEL	K-2	17	22	28	33	38	43	84	53	58	63				
MO	GRADE	5-8	22	22	31	36	17	9†	50	55	8	. 62		. F. T.	nen (
	≻	4-€	21	56	31	36	읓	£	50	12/1	59	79	_			
-	B	0-5	19	ħ2	56	₹	38	h3 .	₁ 48	53	58	62				
		GRADE & SEX	20	25	Se Se	35	Oħ,	ħħ	61	54	59	₹				
		5-8	30	35	39	††	64	54	29	63	88		_			
[-	ב ה ב	3-4	28	33	æ	h3	84	52	25	. 29	29	-				
FATHER	LEVEL	K-2	28	32	37	#	91	50	55	59	63					e Stage
FAT	GRADE	5-8	33	37	24	9†	5	55	8	† ₉	88		_			
> 		3-4	31	36	, t 4	£	50	54	53	63	88					
		0-5	27	32	37	75	ل ر	53	58	63	88			:		
COMBINED	OVER GRADE &		99	3₽	39	-	1 ₁ 8	53	23	89	29					
	RAW	SCORE		N	က္က		Ŋ	9		ω	6	0				

FATHER PARTICIPATION IN CHILD CARE

T-Scores

G I GRADE LEVEL	LEVEL
5-8 K-2	\dashv
20 24 21	42
2γ h2	
28 31 29	31
32 35	<u>.</u>
36 38 36	36 38
Ot	71 01
tt	£ .
8t 6t 8t	64
53 53 52	53 53
57 56 56	56
61 60 60	8