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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION: AN OVERVIEW

This study focuses on the one parent family in contemporary society and the effects of such family structure upon the attitudes of children toward authority as it is represented by their teachers.

The structural pattern of the family appears to be changing universally. A trend from the traditional two parent nuclear family to a one parent pattern is evolving almost unnoticed within a context of sweeping social change related to the proliferation of modern technological society. By 1968, twelve and one-half percent of U. S. families with children under eighteen years old were headed by one adult. This is a proportion whose magnitude causes the one parent family to be an important unit for sociological consideration.

This study assumes that the attitudes and values transmitted to its children through the family’s function of primary socialization have instrumental effects bearing upon other basic societal institutions. The assumption creates an imperative need for research and theory in the area of the one parent family. By utilizing the several disparate theoretical orientations provided by small group and dissonance theorists, a theoretical synthesis or frame
of reference was developed as a perspective from which to compare the social attitudes of children of one and two parent families toward authority figures, e.g. teachers.

This theoretical perspective (to be elaborated upon in the following discussion) assumes that the attitudes of children toward authority figures is likely to differ depending on whether the children are from one or two parent families. More specifically, it postulates that a unique conflict between social necessity and situational reality exists for children from one parent families as contrasted to children from two parent families. This conflict is likely to cause the children of one parent families to experience dissonance between their overt behavior and their covert attitudes. The general thesis of this study is that, in contrast to children of two parent families, children of one parent families are more likely to be overtly accepting of their teachers while covertly rejecting them. Elaborations of this thesis are presented in the following chapter.

The Problem

Careful examination of statistics on divorce for the past decade indicates a growing rate of legally dissolved marriages in the United States. (See Figure 1, appendix.) By 1960 the post World War II divorce rate (which had peaked at four and three-tenths per one thousand population in 1945) had declined to two and two-tenths, a rate
only slightly above its pre-war level. In the early 60's Rodman\(^1\) could aver with satisfied overtones that the divorce rate in the U. S. "had remained somewhat stable" for almost ten years.

As Rodman wrote, a new generation, the children of World War II unions, were divorcing. By 1968 the two and two-tenths percent rate of 1960 had grown to two and nine-tenths percent, the largest peacetime rise for any comparable period in the century.

During the same period, known illegitimate births increased in more dramatic fashion. (See Figure 2, appendix.) In 1940 three and five-tenths percent of all live children were born to unmarried mothers. By 1960 this percentage had risen less that two percentage points. Seven years later, however, in 1967 the 1940 percentage was almost tripled. Nine percent of all live births were illegitimate.

During the twenty-five year period from 1940 to 1965, the number of children orphaned by death of one or both parents declined. (See Figure 3, appendix). During the first five years of the 60's, however, the number rose from 29,550 to 32,900. Most of these children were orphaned by paternal death.

We conclude, therefore, that the one parent family

is a growing trend. If significant differences in social attitude do exist in fact between its children and those from two parent families, the implications may be extremely grave for the total society.

If increasing numbers of children internalize a covert rejection of authority, they may manifest their rejection overtly as adolescents and young adults. If their rejection is evidenced in a rising school dropout rate, a massive new pool of unskilled labor will be created. Its potentiality as a source of civil unrest and economic malfunction would necessitate adjustment in existing welfare and education agencies. If their rejection is manifested in epidemic deviant behavior, large scale reorganization and expansion of law enforcement and custodial agencies would be needed.

It seems probable that many problems within the total society may already be related to the one parent family. For example: a portion of the youthful rejection of establishment mores may be related to distrust and hostility internalized covertly during insecure years of primary socialization. Viewed from this perspective, non-conformist involvements such as communal living arrangements, occult religions, drug experimentation, and deviant sexual behavior may be seen as attempts to find emotional security in new living patterns. Non-conformist involvements may create additional one parent families. The one parent trend may then become self-renewing.
Significance of the Study

There is a paradox present within the discipline of sociology today. On one hand sociology verbalizes the need to consolidate and utilize existing theories concerning basic institutions of society. At the same time its activity often appears to have a "life of its own," as sociologists increasingly engage in examining effects; i.e., delinquency, mental illness, school dropouts, rather than the structural contexts which produce them. It has been almost a decade since Nye and Bayer\(^1\) pleaded for extension of theory and research on the family. The period since then is notable for a paucity of response.

This study has important implications for sociology through its concern for testing and amplifying existing theory about the family as a basic institution of society. If significant and structurally created differences exist in children from one and two parent families, theory of the traditional family may be vindicated and the beginnings of a theory of the one parent family developed.

If the one parent family is a permanent social phenomenon, its origins, activities and effects must be understood. If it is a temporary phenomenon, it is nonetheless an important social fact to the degree in which it affects

\(^1\) Nye, F. Ivan and Bayer, Alan, "Some Recent Trends in Family Research." *Social Forces*, XII (March 1963), 297, 301.
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other basic institutions and their functions.

Implications for education

1968 census figures indicate that within three years one-eighth of the families of America's school children may be headed by one adult. This figure comprises a sizable minority within the educational system. If this minority shares a covert social attitude which blocks its ability to profit from the formal learning opportunities presently offered by society, the sizable proportions of the group lend a quality of urgency to questions the educational establishment has debated for almost a generation. Lowered pupil-teacher ratios, personalized counselling for all grade levels, pre-school socialization programs, systematic provision of teachers of both sexes as role models; these are presently topics for discussion within the educational community. Stimulated by the trend to the one parent family, debate may be ended by an imperative need for decisions.

Organization of the Study

This study investigates an assumed dissonance between the overt and covert attitudes toward adult authority of children from one parent families. Chapter I has created a rationale for such an investigation of the effects of family structure. Its focus has been on the
growing magnitude of the one parent familial pattern and upon the possible implications for other societal institutions of extensive changes in the primary socialization of children which may be affected by mutation of the traditional family.

Chapter II will review the available literature in order to assimilate inferential information concerning the problems and the effects of the one parent family from the theory and research which has been published in the areas of the family and of social problems. It will endeavor to reconcile these through a theoretical synthesis of dissonance and small group theory in order to justify the postulating of two general hypotheses and their elaboration through control of race, sex and socio-economic status as test factors. More specifically, Chapter II will hypothesize:

(1) that more children of one parent than two parent families regard their teachers with dissonance of overt and covert attitudes.

(2) that more children of one parent than two parent families regard their teachers with attitudes of overt acceptance and covert rejection.

Chapter III will be devoted to summarizing the research strategy designed to provide empirical support or rejection of the hypotheses listed above. The chapter will describe the research setting and the subjects. It also will detail the characteristics of the measurement instrument, the
techniques used in collecting data, and the statistical procedures appropriate to an analysis of the findings.

These statistical procedures will be utilized in the analysis of Chapter IV. Tests of both general and control hypotheses will be presented in a statistical and tabular comparison of the overt and covert attitudes of responding subjects from one and two parent families.

Chapter V will summarize the perspective and the findings of the study. From this summation, it will move to a discussion of the conclusions and the questions brought forth by the study in order to project suggestions for further research and for modes of societal adjustment geared to evolving variations in family structure.
CHAPTER II

THEORETICAL BACKGROUND AND RESEARCH GOALS

Once upon a time there were three bears:

--- A P A P A B E A R

--- a m a m a b e a r

&

a baby bear.

The fantasy animals in the familiar old folk tale are a paradigm of typical human familial structure. Powerfully influenced by the structural-functional view point, most sociologists have considered the primary responsibility of the nuclear family to be the reproduction of children. According to this perspective, its other traditional responsibilities have included education, economic cooperation, and the satisfaction of adult sexual and emotional needs. Each responsibility is a functional requisite for societal survival.¹

In the past the functions of the nuclear family were supported by extended kinship systems of varying sizes and complexities. Intra-familial economic dependence was


9
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the basis of its solidarity. Obedience and respect were given the father as an "intrinsic necessity" of social survival.

With the spread of industrialization and urbanization kinship systems have decreased in importance in most present day societies. There appears to be a world-wide movement toward the nuclear, or conjugal, family. At the same time the functions of the nuclear family have tended to diminish and disappear in the most advanced industrial societies. By 1955 only two responsibilities remained, according to Parsons and Bales. These remaining family functions were, they indicated, the maintenance of emotional stability for family members and the primary socialization of the young.

In 1965 the accepted definitions of the nuclear family were challenged in an article by Reiss. He maintained that neither the multiple functions of the Murdock definition nor the twin responsibilities, declared by Parsons


and Bales, were characteristic of all families in all societies. He claimed that the nurturant socialization of the newborn is the only function of the family that is universal to all societies.

These definitions may be modified anew if a growing trend toward a one parent nuclear family continues.

Not only structural-functionalism, but also interactionist theory has had considerable influence on existant theory and research concerning the family. In a recent survey of the field, Klein, et. al.,¹ found that fifty-one and eight-tenths percent of the articles on the family which were published in twelve leading journals over a six year period utilized either the structural-functionalist or the interactional-theoretical-conceptual framework. Because the latter is a perspective for viewing the family as a "unity" of interacting personalities in a constant state of dynamic process,² the interactional approach is possibly the more flexible of the two theoretical orientations. The utility of this framework in examining the emerging one parent pattern of inter and


intra-familial relationships remains, however, an untested possibility.

Burgess stated, "The family lives as long as interaction of its members exists and dies when this interaction ceases."¹ In one parent families interaction with the second parent is intermittent or non-existent. The Burgess position leads to the assumption that the one parent pattern is a pathological structure.

On the other hand, Slater has stated a more hopeful position. "...the only time in a child's existence when two parents are 'necessary' is when it is conceived."² From Slater's perspective the one parent family may be viewed as the lusty modification of a traditional nuclear family better fitted to the necessities of technological societies than the two parent model.

In attempting to deal with this issue, perhaps an examination of the instrumental functions of the parents within the structure of the traditional family would be helpful.

Roles of Parents and Family Structure

The effects of the traditional two parent nuclear family have been studied repeatedly, usually in terms of

¹ibid

shared parental tasks. The "task" model, most often used, was developed by Zelditch.\(^1\) It assigns the major responsibility for expressive leadership to the maternal parent. She is the integrating force within the family unit, the principal source of nurturant attention and affection for its members. Instrumental leadership is delegated to the father. His principal responsibility is to provide for the material welfare of his family.

As instrumental leader, the father role becomes one of vital linkage between the family and the social system in which it exists. It is generally asserted that: (1) family status is derived from the paternal social position; (2) the social perspectives of the father mold the social attitudes of his children; and (3) final authority is vested in the paternal role through its attributes of instrumentality.

Sociology has accorded little attention to the combination of instrumental and expressive role performance which is a necessary responsibility of the lone parent. As a result, little is known concerning the possible impact upon children when their physical and emotional security depends upon a family relational structure containing only one participating parent.

\(^1\)Zelditch, Morris, Jr., "Role Differentiation in the Nuclear Family: A Comparative Study." In Parsons and Bales, op. cit., pp. 307-353.
Glasser and Navarre\(^1\) have focused on the structural problems of the one parent family. They see its structure as resulting from a convergence of narrowing kinship patterns. These contracting relationships are related to the spatial mobility which modern technological societies demand of their members.

The Glasser and Navarre model suggests that the lone parent often will feel overburdened by the responsibility for double and often conflicting parental roles. Thus burdened (and deprived at the same time of positive adult support and sexual-emotional release which are part of the traditional conjugal relationship), the lone parent will tend to neglect and/or de-emphasize performance in one or both expressive and instrumental roles. This tendency toward inadequate parental performance will in turn affect the socialization function of the family, adversely influencing the social perceptions of its children.

Because ninety percent of all lone parents are women, Glasser and Navarre suggest that children of one parent families may develop personality defects related to their affiliation with a single sex parental model. As a result of early deprivation of hetero-sexual role models, the child of the lone parent may (1) perceive the social world with sexually distorted vision resulting in sex-role

confusion; (2) experience self-concept and status ambivalence; (3) become non-adaptive in normal peer group relationships; and (4) depend on adult support to an abnormal degree, thus tending to increase adolescent conflict.

Family Structure and Other Outcomes

Studies focused on the one parent family often have considered a single category of the phenomenon. In these divorce and illegitimacy tend to be treated as dependent variables. The researcher, who is interested in the structure of the one parent family as a causal variable affecting its children, must search the available literature in diverse areas. Data which can be interpreted inferentially as having relevance for understanding the influence of the one parent structure are discovered in studies primarily concerned with social problems, deviant behavior, marital relationships, and employed women. The findings indicate contradictory and often ambiguous conclusions.

In the article, "Authoritarianism and the Family," Horkheimer relates the decline of the traditional family as an essential source of shared economic cooperation to the rise of totalitarianism in Nazi Germany. Using the two parent family as a model, Horkheimer suggests that the modern family is without economic or emotional substance.

1 Anshen, op. cit., p. 391.
As a result, "the growing child, who instead of the image of a father has received only the abstract idea of arbitrary power, looks for a stronger, more powerful father, for a superfather, as it is furnished by fascist imagery."¹ Of today's "scientific" motherhood, he states, "Where she reigns supreme, she often enhances by bigoted and ill-advised activities the same spirit of authoritarian repression which a lack of love and of primary contact with the child promotes unconsciously in the latter."²

Horkheimer presents evidence which indicates that children who behave with overt intractability are most likely to turn in late adolescence or early adulthood to an authoritarian "gang." Because they have experienced family as an ideology rather than a reality, its influence does not furnish them with moral resistance to totalitarian movements of political extremism.

The article is a thought-provoking one. In the case of the one parent family the elements he outlines are inherent within the status structure of the pattern. Acceptance of Horkheimer's position would entail inferential acceptance of a connection between the emergence of the one parent family and the current "tribalistic" political activities of some segments of the young adult population.³

¹loc. cit., p. 388. ²loc. cit., p. 391.
³For example: Weathermen; Panthers, both Black and White; radical Women's Liberationists; violent "Peace" protesters.
Research on the structural patterns of the families of political extremists is non-existent in the literature.

The hypothesis that the one parent pattern is contributory to mental illness appears to be supported by data on families of schizophrenics reported by Lidz and associates.¹ They indicate that sixty-one percent of the patients studied were from broken or unhappy homes. In their concluding analysis of this manifestation of extreme social withdrawal, the authors stated that the "most consistent etiology of schizophrenia is pathology of the family environment."

More recently, Stanley² studied one hundred and seventy-six patients between the ages of seven and seventeen. The children were treated for emotional disorders in a state mental hospital during the six year period from July 1, 1961 to June 30, 1967. Sixty percent of the young patients were committed for treatment of acting-out-aggressive behavior; thirty percent for depressive-withdrawal symptoms; and ten percent were categorized as hyperkinetic.


Stanley's data indicate that sixty and two-tenths percent of the children were from mother dominated families. Over fifty percent had experienced one hundred and eighty days or more without a paternal parent in their homes. Some had experienced a succession of "fathers."

Hunt and Smith¹ have related AFDC support of single parent, female headed families to repetitive instances of illegitimacy and "inferior social, educational and physical development" in children.² Research, cited by the authors,³ reports almost double the percentage of community cross-sectional psychiatric problems in children of welfare families. Black children from both welfare and non-welfare families were found to suffer the highest incidence of psychiatric impairment. Although for Blacks as a group the phenomenon was reported to be a problem of the teen years, for black children from welfare families the onset of mental problems often occurred during the ages from six to nine, the early elementary years of education.

The book, Emotional Blocks to Learning,⁴ analyzes the


²loc. cit., abstract.


contributing factors which differentiate learners from non-learners in a sample of two hundred school-aged boys. In this study difficulties in concentrating, reading, and grade repeating were attributed to a chronic feeling of anxious insecurity in the boy as to whether his home would stay intact or come apart. This feeling, in turn, was traced to the personality of the mother who was unable to function as a homemaker or rejected that role.\(^1\)

On the other hand, employed mothers, like lone parents, are often "burdened with double and conflicting roles." Yet studies indicate their career activities have little or no effect upon their young children's attitudes. For example: A study by Nye, et. al.\(^2\) found no significant differences in nervous symptoms, antisocial, or withdrawing behavior between children of working mothers and those of mothers who were not employed.

In a study of child adjustment and mothers' attitudes, Hoffman concluded that differences manifested in the behaviors of children of working mothers were related more to the mother's attitude toward her employment than to her absence from the home. In instances when the mother held a positive attitude toward her work, Hoffman found children

\(^1\)loc. cit., p. 140.

to be significantly less successful in peer group relationships than children of non-working maternal parents. When mothers held a negative attitude toward employment, children manifested low frustration levels and aggressive tendencies. Boys exhibited teacher dependence to a significantly higher degree than did sons of non-employed mothers.¹

No significant differences in dependency or aggression were found in matched groups of children of working and non-working mothers in a study by Siegel, et. al.²

Burchinal's investigation of personality and school adjustment characteristics of white children from intact families³ also reported no significant differences between the children of employed and non-employed maternal parents who were his subjects.

In his book, Women in Divorce, Goode concedes that there is "no doubt that broken homes are related to juvenile delinquency, even within the same economic stratum."⁴ Goode concludes, however, that most divorced mothers felt that their children were better off in a tranquil one


²Siegel, Alberta Engvall; Stolz, Lois Meek; Hitchcock, Ethel Alice; and Adamson, Jean, "Dependence and Independence in Children." Nye and Hoffman, op. cit., pp. 67-81.


parent family than they had been in the atmosphere of conflict antecedent to divorce.

Further support for Goode's position was provided by a study by Nye who found that adolescents from broken homes were better adjusted in thirteen of twenty-one measures than children from unhappy but intact families. Neither Goode nor Nye, however, made their comparisons with children from home environments which could be rated as "normal" in marital satisfaction.

A report by Davidoff focused on parental loss through death. Her thesis emphasized loss of the same sex parent as contributing to neurotic marital interaction at maturity. Davidoff indicated this factor to be particularly influential in instances when a husband had lost his father during the prepubescent years from ten to fourteen. She concluded that marital strife was often a substitute for psychosomatic illness related to early emotions of yearning, and reproach which had never been allowed full expression.

Young concluded that family pattern had largely

---


3 Young, Leontine R., "Personality Patterns in Unmarried Mothers." The Family, XXVI No. 8 (December 1945), 296-303.
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determined the personalities and the life experiences of most of a sample of one hundred unmarried mothers. Fifty-eight percent of these came from families dominated by the mother to an abnormal degree. Without exception the girls experienced love/hate dissonance toward their mothers. Young reported that all but seventeen of the randomly selected subjects came from a home dominated by one parent, "and the girl's relationship to that parent was a battle-ground. . ." 1

In his book, Unmarried Mothers, Vincent quotes Young, 2 "If one factor can be considered fundamental in the family background of unwed mothers, it is the consistent pattern of dominance of the home by one parent...usually the mother." Vincent found that fifty-six percent of his small sample of unwed mothers came from broken homes. His subjects typically experienced non-adaptive peer group relationships during adolescence. Finding little acceptance within a peer group, the girls tended to use sexually submissive behavior in order to elicit love, affection, and protection from males in what Vincent interpreted as a foredoomed search for a substitute father-image.

More recently, Vincent 3 participated in a study of

1 loc. cit., p. 301.


three-generational patterns of illegitimacy which involved 1032 black females in a metropolitan area in North Carolina. The hypothesis that "illegitimacy runs in families," is supported by this research with highly significant findings indicating rising patterns of illegitimacy from generation to generation.

Most investigators agree that proportionally more juvenile delinquents come from broken homes than from intact ones. In their book, *Family Environment and Delinquency*, the Gluecks¹ compared the personal attributes of five hundred delinquent boys, ranging in age from seven to seventeen years, with matched non-delinquents. The emphasis of their report was on the characteristics of personality and physiology and the environmental factors which are more often found among delinquents than among non-delinquents. One characteristic, prevalent among nearly sixty-one percent of their delinquent subjects, was a family background in which there was a severed conjugal relationship.

Chilton and Markle² found that delinquents from low income families are more likely to be living with only one

---


parent than delinquents from higher income backgrounds. They suggest that income has more influence in mediating the effect of family structure on delinquency than does race, sex, age or neighborhood.

Chilton and Markle conclude that more juvenile delinquents live in broken families than do children in the non-delinquent population. They also conclude: (1) that serious offenses are more often committed by children from one parent families; and (2) that children from one parent families are more often recidivistically delinquent than children from traditionally structured families.

A summary of eight studies made between 1899 and 1949 indicates that broken homes influence females more consistently than males. In these studies the proportion of male delinquents from broken families ranged from fourteen to fifty-four percent. For girls the proportion was from thirty-eight to sixty-eight percent, an appreciably higher range. In this recapitulation of fifty years of research the median percentage of male delinquents from one parent families was thirty-four and five-tenths percent. The median for girls was seventeen and five-tenths higher.

A percentage differential similar to that of the "eight study summary" of delinquents was found in a 1964 assessment of the self concepts of school dropouts in

---

Modesto, California.¹ Sixty-four percent of the girls and forty-eight percent of the boys who dropped out of high school were from broken homes. Only twelve percent of the girls and twenty-eight percent of the boys who graduated were from disrupted family backgrounds.

A comparison of studies on school dropouts in Alabama during 1964 and in Los Angeles in 1965² shows almost identical relationships between dropout and family background. Forty-two percent of the Alabama dropouts and forty-three percent of those in Los Angeles were not living in homes shared by both natural parents.

Lindvall³ asserted that the primary purpose of a review of literature should be to relate the researcher's problem and findings to those of others in order to develop ever wider patterns of understanding and explanation. The literature examined in this chapter presents a paradox regarding the children of one parent families which may furnish an important clue to unique attributes shared by them as a group.

On one hand children of one parent families have been found to be no different in manifested attitudes than

²Ibid.
children from traditional familial backgrounds. There is reason to assume, however, that the studies reporting attitudinal equality based their comparisons on one parent versus unhappily married two parent samples.

On the other hand investigations of social problems have been shown to report in common a greater susceptibility of children from one parent backgrounds to mental illness, criminal and sexual delinquency, learning problems, and school dropout. This susceptibility constitutes the unexplained element which is implicitly present in the theoretical discussion which follows, and in the remaining chapters of this study.

A Theoretical Synthesis

It is the purpose of this section to reconcile paradoxical findings and statements within the literature in order to examine varying theoretical patterns of early adolescent responses to adult authority figures. It is proposed that the paradox may indicate differences in the degree to which age cohorts from one and two parent families overtly express "socially acceptable" attitudes while at the same time covertly holding conflicting views. In other words, there may be a substantive dissonance between hidden attitudes and open behavior for children from one parent families which does not prevail among children from intact familial structures.
Cognitive dissonance theory and behavior

According to Festinger,\(^1\) the theory of cognitive dissonance is based upon the assumption that attitudinal consistency is the normal and comfortable state which each individual strives to maintain through decision adjustments. These serve to bring conflicting attitudes into peaceful equilibrium. In other words, dissonance theory is inherently a theory of choosing.

The time of choosing is one of strain and anxiety which increase as the tension of dissonance becomes an almost unbearable pressure. This tension may be relieved by sudden and explosive action, temporarily alleviating the personal imbalance and disorganization.\(^2\) Permanent balance, however, can only be gained by reversal of the weaker of the conflicting attitudes.

The one parent family as a dyad

As a group, the one parent-child dyad has an irreplaceable membership structure which creates a peculiarly close and dependent relationship of intense but insecure interaction. This insecurity stems from the fact that the


dyadic structure ceases to exist if either of its members is lost to it.\textsuperscript{1} Because it is basically a dyad, the one parent family contains two disparate potentials within its structure: (1) the optimum conditions for the internalization of parental values, since nurturance and discipline necessarily come from a single source;\textsuperscript{2} and (2) the optimum conditions for development of anxiety, rigidity and repressed hostility.\textsuperscript{3}

A stable group, indicates Coser, must be large enough to furnish an outlet for free expression of both positive and negative emotional tension. To provide this outlet, the group's size should allow flexibility to the extent that the loss of one of its members can be tolerated but not ignored. The dyadic lone parent-child relationship does not meet Coser's criterion.

In contrast the structure of the two parent family contains both dyadic and triadic permutations\textsuperscript{4} which may


become dysfunctional in stressful circumstances. Normally these permutations are wholesome, mediating hostile tendencies in a give and take of changing coalitions.\(^1\) In the traditional family system these sub-systems, or permutations, evolve through time as the child identifies with an expanding social world from a haven of security provided by the combined solicitations of both natural parents.

This cannot be true to the same degree in the one parent family. Through its very structure and interactional system, the single parent family is a permanently dyadic group as per age. The inter-generational relationship is such that the child must be follower to the parent as leader.

In consequence of the unique pattern of the one parent family, its children may be denied the customary physical and emotional security accorded children by the structure of the traditional family. Lacking this security, he may never develop the "basic trust" which Erik Erickson has called the "first component of a healthy personality,"\(^2\) and which Bettelheim described as "the ground rock of all later trust in others (including one's teachers) and in

---

\(^1\) Simmel, op. cit., p. 14.

oneself (so vital in attacking problems)...."¹

As a further consequence of the dyadic pattern of the one parent family, adult authority is represented to the child in the figure of his single parent who, possessed of totalitarian power but deprived of emotional outlet and support available in the traditional conjugal coalition, may create malevolence in the child through inconsistent treatment brought about as a result of the parent's own deprivation of emotional and physical need satisfactions.²

Even if the dyadic child-parent relationship escapes this tendency to malevolence development, the child's achievement of personal autonomy may still be impeded by perception of his parent as an undemocratic and tyrannical authority. The resentment caused by this perception will tend to remain unresolved because of an intense need of the child to maintain the stability of his family relationship. Since it is suppressed, his resentment may be extended over time to other persons whom the child perceives as similarly personifying authority and frustration.³


Concomitantly, the child's chronic anxiety which was internalized in his dyadic family vis-a-vis his mother will be reinforced by his maturing need for expanded social interaction. This intensified need for security may cause him to seek affiliation with these same irritant adult figures and to suppress overt manifestation of his hostility toward their authority.

Children from two parent families normally will not share a tendency to (1) dependence caused by chronic anxiety or (2) hostility caused by suppressed resentment. They will, therefore, be less likely to share ambivalence toward adult authority, tending to regard their teachers with both overt and covert consistency of acceptance or rejection.

Research Goals

Viewed from the perspective of small group and dissonance theory discussed above, children of one parent families will experience both intense dependence and suppressed hostility toward adults. These will be caused by their intimate but insecure relationships with their dyadic parents. With adolescence the pressures of dissonance will mount, creating matching drives to gain consonance

equilibrium or avoid the continuation of dissonance tension. It is theoretically assumed that persons manifesting acceptance/rejection inconsistency between overt behavior and covert attitudes are living with two cognitive elements which are not likely to coexist compatibly for a long period; therefore they may be predicted to be approaching a time for choosing one or the other as consistent overt and covert attitudes. Their dissonance will cause children of one parent families to experience a degree of adolescent trauma greater than that normal to their age cohort. It may result in youthful behaviors and mature living styles dysfunctional to the larger society.

Based upon this synthesis of small group and dissonance theory, the following general hypotheses constitute the elaborated thesis tested in this study:

\[ H_{R1} \] More children of one parent than two parent families regard their teachers with dissonance of overt and covert attitudes.

\[ H_{R2} \] More children of one parent than two parent families regard their teachers with attitudes of overt acceptance and covert rejection.

In order to determine the influences of Race, Sex, and Socio-economic Status as control variables affecting the attitudes of the subjects, twelve additional hypotheses were treated also as related tests of the general hypotheses stated above:

\[ H_{R3} \] More children of one parent than two parent black families regard their
teachers with dissonance of overt and covert attitudes.

$H_{R4}$: More black children of one parent than two parent families regard their teachers with attitudes of overt acceptance and covert rejection.

$H_{R5}$: More children of one parent than two parent white families regard their teachers with dissonance of overt and covert attitudes.

$H_{R6}$: More white children of one parent than two parent families regard their teachers with attitudes of overt acceptance and covert rejection.

$H_{R7}$: More female children of one parent than two parent families regard their teachers with dissonance of overt and covert attitudes.

$H_{R8}$: More female children of one parent than two parent families regard their teachers with attitudes of overt acceptance and covert rejection.

$H_{R9}$: More male children of one parent than two parent families regard their teachers with dissonance of covert and overt attitudes.

$H_{R10}$: More male children of one parent than two parent families regard their teachers with attitudes of overt acceptance and covert rejection.

$H_{R11}$: More children of middle class one parent families than middle class two parent families regard their teachers with dissonance of overt and covert attitudes.

$H_{R12}$: More children of middle class one parent families than middle class two parent families regard their teachers with attitudes of overt acceptance and covert rejection.

$H_{R13}$: More children of lower class one parent families than lower class two
parent families regard their teachers with dissonance of overt and covert attitudes.

Hr14: More children of lower class one parent families than lower class two parent families regard their teachers with attitudes of overt acceptance and covert rejection.

These hypotheses guided the research phase of this investigation which studied children from one and two parent families in a large midwestern city in the United States. The following chapter explicates the nature of this population and the methodological procedures employed.
CHAPTER III

METHODS

The Problem

The problem to be investigated, as discussed in the previous chapters, is derived from a theoretical perspective that the children of lone parents will experience both greater dependency on their single parents, and at the same time suppressed hostility for them, than will children from two parent families. These dissonant attitudes of dependency and hostility will tend to become displaced upon other adult authority figures, creating overt behavior characterized by docility and acceptance but covert mistrust and rejection. Conflict between accepting and rejecting attitudes will cause growing pressures to be experienced by the one parented children. These pressures will attain their peak intensity as the children attain adolescence.

This theoretical perspective is summarized in the following general research hypotheses:

1. More children of one parent than two parent families regard their teachers with disso-
nance of overt and covert attitudes.

2. More children of one parent than two parent families regard their teachers with attitudes of overt acceptance and covert rejection.

The Research Setting

The research was undertaken in two public schools, a junior high and a middle school, in a large mid-western industrial city with a population of approximately 205,000. The city contains several distinct and sizeable ethnic communities within its boundaries. Many members of these subcommunities send their children to parochial and private schools. Forty percent of the school children in the city are educated in this manner. The public school system serves a population of approximately 34,000 students.¹

Over the past three decades this urban community, like many modern cities, has become the core of sprawling metropolitan development. From the south to the city's center is located a Black ghetto. This is surrounded by areas in transition. These in turn are rimmed by the homes of lower middle class workers. Finally, there is an outermost residential zone which edges the core city with the homes of business and professional people.

The city is divided into two parts by a river. Origin-

ally it was a reason for the city's genesis. More recently, it has served to divide it. The two schools utilized in this research are located in transitional areas on opposite sides of the river. Both serve pupils, not only from the immediately surrounding areas, but also from both ghetto and lower to upper class homes.¹

The Subjects

Because the theoretical perspective of this study suggests that dissonant attitudes of one parented children will reach their greatest intensity with adolescence, the research model utilized seventh and eighth grade students as subjects. This age cohort encompasses varying individual levels of maturation. While some junior high aged students are still pubescent, many others have attained puberty. It may be assumed, however, that few, if any, seventh and eighth grade students have resolved adolescent conflict and become emotionally adult. On the other hand all of them have experienced the transition from an elementary school atmosphere to the more demanding one of middle school or junior high.

The sample

A sample of four hundred seventh and eighth grade pupils served as the basis for this study. Two hundred of

¹See map in appendix.
these were students at the middle school; two hundred attended the junior high school. Since the middle school pupils are randomly assigned to sections, this sample was drawn by random selection of classes at each grade level. Students in the junior high are assigned to classes by a modified system of tracking. The junior high sample was secured, therefore, by selecting classes which would ensure a representative cross-section of the students on each grade level.¹

From the sample provided by these two sources all students who indicated a one parent familial background were selected. \((n = 50)\). These were paired for comparison with a control group made up of fifty children from

TABLE 3.1.-Characteristics of the subjects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attribute</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sex</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Race</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Socio-Economic Status</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Class (Unskilled, unemployed, ADC, Relief)</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Class (Professional, office, sales, skilled labor, civil service)</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹Bryan and Erickson, loc. cit., pp. 45-46.
two parent families. The groups were matched on the basis of sex, grade level, socio-economic status, and race. General characteristics of the sample are presented in Table 3.1.

Since the school population from which the subjects were drawn comprises a representative cross-section of the larger community, the sample includes children of both black and white races from widely divergent socio-economic and cultural backgrounds.

The Measurement Instrument

The subjects responded to six items in the form of structured questions. These responses formed five-point Likert-type attitude scales\(^1\) assessing the students' overt and covert acceptance and/or rejection of their teachers. The items used in this study were buried within a fifty-nine item questionnaire which explored a number of areas pertaining to the students' school experiences.

The following three items measured the extent to which the students manifested overt acceptance or rejection of their teachers:

1. The next few questions deal with how you feel about your teachers. In general, would you say that you get along well with the teachers that you have in your classes?

a. Yes, definitely
b. Yes, for the most part
c. Not sure either way
d. Probably not, for the most part
e. Definitely not

2. In general, would you say that the teachers that you have are interested in how well you do in school?

a. Yes, definitely
b. Yes, probably
c. Not sure either way
d. Probably not
e. Definitely not

3. In general, how often would you say that you have talked to your teachers about the work you have done in school this semester?

a. More than once a day
b. About once a day
c. Two or three times a week
d. About once a week
e. About two or three times a month
f. Less than once a month

Question number one measures the kind of overt relationship the student maintains with teachers. Question two should be seen as a measure of the perceptual image which the student feels his teachers have of him as a class member in a nomothetic sense; and question three is an indicator of frequency of teacher-pupil interaction.

To measure the pupils' covert opinions of their teachers, the subjects responded to the following questions:

1. To get good grades you have to tell the teachers what they want to hear.
   
a. This is definitely true.

1 Responses e and f combined for scaling purposes.
b. This is probably more true than false.
c. I am unsure.
d. This is probably more false than true.
e. This is definitely false.

2. Would you say that a lot of teachers in this school used grades as a way of getting back at students?
   a. Yes, definitely
   b. Yes, probably
   c. Not sure either way
   d. Probably not
   e. Definitely not

3. Would you say that your teachers have always been fair with you in this school?
   a. Yes, definitely
   b. Yes, for the most part
   c. Not sure either way
   d. No, not for the most part
   e. Definitely not

The questions in this section measure the extent to which the respondent sees teachers as self-centered, vengeful, and unfair.

Collection of Data

The data were collected during mid-April, 1970. With the cooperation of the central administration and of the principals of the two schools, survey time was scheduled within class periods which were uninterrupted by lunch hours, special activities, or the bustle of pupil arrival and departure at the schools.

Two members of a research team from Western Michigan

1Order of responses reversed for scaling purposes.
University visited each individual class to be surveyed. Since the printed questionnaires and the directions were orally repeated by one member of the team during the administration of the measurement instrument, the presence of the second "team" member served as a constant reminder to the researcher of the necessity for neutral oral presentation of the printed material in order to minimize interviewer bias through vocal inflection or physical expression.

Several techniques were used in order to elicit frank responses from the subjects. First, all measurement instruments were identity coded and names were not requested on the questionnaires. Second, the interviews were administered to the subjects together with their larger classroom groups, thus providing an atmosphere in which the respondents would be most likely to feel that their answers would have anonymity. Finally, to encourage their candid participation, pre-test instructions to the students emphasized an assurance that individual questionnaires would not be available to school staff members.¹

Analysis of Data

The format of the questionnaire, utilizing a double set of Likert-type scales, yielded two possible total scores of fifteen for each subject. The first total represented

¹See questionnaire instructions in appendix.
overt attitudes. The second represented covert opinions. Possible range of scores for each condition was from three (very accepting) to fifteen (very rejecting). Subjects in both one parent and two parent categories of family structure were designated as accepting or rejecting of their teachers according to the positions of their total scores above or below the mean for all respondents on each set of scales. On both overt and covert scales this mean fell between eight and nine.

Frequency distributions of acceptance and/or rejection were converted to percentages and overall proportional chi-squares ($X^2$) for dependent samples were calculated, according to the method outlined by Peatman. Peatman defines the criterion for use of this statistical technique by example, saying, "The use of matched pairs for the establishment of two experimental groups is . . . an example of two related samples, i.e., samples not independent of each other." The effect is of measuring the same group twice. Since they are matched on other characteristics, any change in response is "presumably (but not necessarily) the

---


²op. cit., p. 267.
consequence of the condition which has been varied for the samples. In this case, family structure may be presumed to have affected the differing responses of the two groups if the calculated chi-square permits rejection of the null hypothesis at the .05 level, one-tailed test.

Related analysis

Even though a distinction between one and two parented subjects might be found to exist, this differential could be related to other determining influences, hidden within the category of family structure. Overall calculation of statistical significance was followed, therefore, by an application of the same statistical techniques to determine the influences of race, sex, and socio-economic status as control variables affecting the responses of the subjects.

The findings are reported in terms of comparisons between the group of subjects from one parent backgrounds with that from two parent home environments. Within this exploratory design no attempt was made to compare individual psychological or historical home factors within families. Influences like marital compatibility, states of family disorganization in time predating the research, duration of one parent family status, and sibling influ-

\[^1\text{op. cit., p. 268.}\]
ences are not considered. The study is limited, therefore, to the gross effects of familial structural influence, specifically to the effects of the one parent structure. These are the basis for the findings which are presented in the chapter to follow.
CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS

The thesis of this study is that children of one parent families will tend to be both overtly accepting and compliant while at the same time they are covertly rejecting and hostile toward their teachers. Their inconsistency of attitude is seen as related to tension inherent to the dyadic parent/child pattern of their familial environments.

This focus on the one parent family structure as an influence affecting children's attitudes generated the two general hypotheses to be tested and also governed the choice of race, sex, and socio-economic status as test factors for elaboration.

Statistical Procedure

Since the matched subjects' responses resulted in data which are reported in terms of proportions and frequencies in discrete categories, an appropriate statistical test is the chi-square test for related samples.¹ (The test procedure is described more fully on page 35 of the preceding chapter.) Alpha level for significance is .05; and, because the hypotheses are directional, a one-

¹Peatman, op. cit., pp. 267-269.
tailed test is indicated to compare the observed attitudinal frequencies of the one parented subjects with the proportions of two parented subjects in each attitudinal category.

$H_{R1}$: More children of one parent than two parent families regard their teachers with dissonance of overt and covert attitudes.

$H_{R2}$: More children of one parent than two parent families regard their teachers with attitudes of overt acceptance and covert rejection.

Table 4.1 indicates that the pattern of subject responses was in the direction hypothesized for both attitudinal combinations.

**TABLE 4.1.—Overt and covert acceptance/rejection of teachers: one and two parent families**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overt/Covert Attitudes</th>
<th>One Parent No.</th>
<th>One Parent %</th>
<th>Two Parent No.</th>
<th>Two Parent %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Rejection/Acceptance</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Rejection/Rejection</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Acceptance/Acceptance</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Acceptance/Rejection</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fifty percent of the children from one parent families reported dissonance of overt and covert attitudes toward their teachers. (a. and d. above) This percentage is based on their scores above or below the mean for all subjects. The same base indicates only thirty percent of the
subjects from two parent families hold equally inconsistent attitudes.

A similar differential by family structure may be noted in overt acceptance and covert rejection of teachers. (d. above) Thirty-two percent of the one-parented subjects indicated overt acceptance coupled with covert rejection, while merely eighteen percent of the subjects from traditionally patterned families responded within the same dissonance pattern of overt acceptance and covert rejection.

**TABLE 4.2.- Consonance/dissonance toward teachers: one and two parent families**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overt/Covert Attitudes</th>
<th>One Parent</th>
<th></th>
<th>Two Parent</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consonance</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissonance</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2 = 4.50 > 2.71, \ p < .05 \]

Table 4.2 represents the data of Table 4.1 compressed to indicate the differences in consonance/dissonance between the one and two parented groups. These differences were utilized to calculate a directional chi-square \( (\chi^2 = 4.50) \). The test affirms a disparity in consistency between overt and covert attitudes according to family type with one parented subjects more dissonant in their
overt/covert attitudes beyond the .05 level of significance. Therefore \( H_{R1} \) was supported by rejection of the null hypothesis.

**TABLE 4.3.**—Overt acceptance/covert rejection toward teachers: one and two parent families

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overt/Covert Attitudes</th>
<th>One Parent</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>One Parent</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Two Parent</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Two Parent</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acceptance/Rejection</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ x^2 = 4.45 > 2.71, p < .05 \]

Table 4.3 represents the data of Table 4.1 compressed to indicate the differences in overt acceptance/covert rejection reported by the one and two parented groups. The computed chi-square \( (x^2=4.45) \) indicates support of \( H_{R2} \) by allowing rejection of the null hypothesis at a level beyond .05.

**Controlling for race**

**\( H_{R3} \):** More children of one parent than two parent black families regard their teachers with dissonance of overt and covert attitudes.

**\( H_{R4} \):** More black children of one parent than two parent families regard their teachers with attitudes of overt acceptance and covert rejection.

**\( H_{R5} \):** More children of one parent than two parent white families regard their teachers with dissonance of overt and covert attitudes.
More white children of one parent than two parent families regard their teachers with attitudes of overt acceptance and covert rejection.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overt/Covert Attitudes</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>White</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>One Parent</td>
<td>Two Parent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Rejection/Acceptance</td>
<td>2 (15%)</td>
<td>1 (8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Rejection/Rejection</td>
<td>4 (31%)</td>
<td>8 (62%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Acceptance/Acceptance</td>
<td>2 (15%)</td>
<td>2 (15%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Acceptance/Rejection</td>
<td>5 (39%)</td>
<td>2 (15%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.4 indicates that the patterns of greater dissonance and overt acceptance in combination with covert rejection continues in the direction hypothesized when race is used as a control variable.

While the overall proportions in Table 4.4 are in the direction hypothesized, a comparison of all black subjects with all white subjects also indicates interesting racial differences in overt attitude toward adult authority figures. The data indicate a rather overwhelming incidence of open rejection on the part of black subjects from two parent families. Calculation of a proportional chi-square indicates this incidence to be significant in comparison to both one parent black and one and two parent white groups. Significantly more black children than white
children reported either overt or covert rejection of teachers when these were compared by similar family groups. (See a. and b. above.)

TABLE 4.5.-Consonance/dissonance toward teachers: one and two parent black families

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overt/Covert Attitudes</th>
<th>One Parent No.</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Two Parent No.</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consonance</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissonance</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2 = 4.00 > 2.71, \ p < .05 \]

Table 4.5 indicates the patterns of consonance/dissonance of the black subjects. The calculated chi-square indicates significant differences in dissonance exist between children of one and two parent black families, allowing rejection of the null hypothesis at the .05 level.

TABLE 4.6.-Overt acceptance/covert rejection toward teachers: one and two parent black families

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overt/Covert Attitudes</th>
<th>One Parent No.</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Two Parent No.</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acceptance/Rejection</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2 = 3.00 > 2.71, \ p < .05 \]

Table 4.6 represents the data of Table 4.4 compressed to focus attention on the differences in overt acceptance/
covert rejection reported by the black subjects from one and two parent families. Although the sample is small, it assumes a measure of reliability through its conformity to the general pattern of attitudes indicated in Table 4.1. The chi-square, computed to 3.00, supports $H_R4$ with a rejection of the null hypothesis at the .05 level of significance.

TABLE 4.7.-Consonance/dissonance toward teachers: one and two parent white families

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overt/Covert Attitudes</th>
<th>One Parent No.</th>
<th>One Parent %</th>
<th>Two Parent No.</th>
<th>Two Parent %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consonance</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissonance</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$X^2 = 3.00 > 2.71, p < .05$

Table 4.7 focuses attention on the patterns of consonance/dissonance of the white students. It indicates that $H_R4$ is supported by both the directional patterns of the responses and by statistical test for significance.

TABLE 4.8.-Overt acceptance/covert rejection toward teachers: one and two parent white families

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overt/Covert Attitudes</th>
<th>One Parent No.</th>
<th>One Parent %</th>
<th>Two Parent No.</th>
<th>Two Parent %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acceptance/Rejection</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$X^2 = 2.67 < 2.71, p > .05$
Table 4.8 also presents compressed data from Table 4.4. This table compares the overt acceptance/covert rejection reported by children of one and two parent white families.

Chi-square, computed to a level higher than .05, does not permit support of the hypothesis (H_{R6}) that more children of one parent white families than two parent white families regard their teachers with attitudes of overt acceptance and covert rejection.

The findings within this section indicate some differential in overt/covert attitude related to family structure, i.e., one or two parent familial pattern, with race elaborated as a control variable. It is not the intention of this analysis to suggest the elimination of race as a contributing factor. The data suggest, however, that family structure should be considered a pertinent influence in the determination of overt/covert attitudes of students of both black and white racial backgrounds.

Controlling for sex

H_{R7}: More female children of one parent than two parent families regard their teachers with dissonance of overt and covert attitudes.

H_{R8}: More female children of one parent than two parent families regard their teachers with attitudes of overt acceptance and covert rejection.

H_{R9}: More male children of one parent than two parent families regard their teachers with dissonance of overt and covert attitudes.
More male children of one parent than two parent families regard their teachers with attitudes of overt acceptance and covert rejection.

TABLE 4.9.-Overt and covert acceptance/rejection of teachers: one and two parent families by sex

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overt/Covert Attitudes</th>
<th>Female One Parent No.</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Female Two Parent No.</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Male One Parent No.</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Male Two Parent No.</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Rejection/Acceptance</td>
<td>6 21</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3 14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Rejection/Rejection</td>
<td>6 21</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>6 27</td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Acceptance/Acceptance</td>
<td>4 15</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>9 41</td>
<td>46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Acceptance/Rejection</td>
<td>12 43</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4 18</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As presented in Table 4.9, the relationship between family structure and consistency of overt and covert attitudes continues to obtain with sex controlled as a variable. A notable attribute of this focus on the data discloses the fact that all female subjects appear to be both more ambivalent and more rejecting in attitudes toward their teachers than are the male subjects. A statistical comparison of all male and female subjects indicates the girls' greater ambivalence to be highly significant. The same type comparison indicates the girls, as a group, to be more overtly accepting and covertly rejecting than the boys.

\[ \chi^2 = 7.32. \] Significant beyond the .05 level, one-tailed test. (See a. and d., Table 4.9.)

\[ \chi^2 = 3.42. \] Significant beyond the .05 level, one-tailed test. (See d., Table 4.9.)
TABLE 4.10.-Consonance/dissonance toward teachers: one and two parent females

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overt/Covert Attitudes</th>
<th>One Parent</th>
<th>Two Parent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consonance</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissonance</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ x^2 = 3.27 > 2.71, p < .05 \]

Table 4.10 presents data from Table 4.9 which have been combined to clarify the consonance/dissonance patterns of the female students from one and two parent families. The table shows clearly the opposing patterns of consonance/dissonance for the two groups of girls. A chi-square comparison of the one-parented subjects with subjects from traditional families indicates a significant differential which supports \( H_{R7}^* \).

TABLE 4.11.-Overt acceptance/covert rejection toward teachers: one and two parent females

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overt/Covert Attitudes</th>
<th>One Parent</th>
<th>Two Parent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptance/Rejection</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ x^2 = 3.60 > 2.71, p < .05 \]

The computed chi-square, significant at the .05 level, supports \( H_{R8} \) by rejection of the null hypothesis.
TABLE 4.12.—Consonance/dissonance toward teachers: one and two parent males

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overt/Covert Attitudes</th>
<th>One Parent No.</th>
<th>One Parent %</th>
<th>Two Parent No.</th>
<th>Two Parent %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consonance</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissonance</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ x^2 = 1.28 < 2.71, p > .05 \]

Clarification of the consonance/dissonance patterns of the male subjects from one and two parent families is presented in Table 4.12. The data indicate a pattern of male responses in the direction hypothesized for the pattern of consonance/dissonance. Thirty-two percent of the boys from one parent families reported dissonant attitudes toward their teachers compared to eighteen percent of those from two parent backgrounds. The size of the sample, however, does not permit calculation of a significantly large chi-square to support the hypothesis \( H_{R9} \) that more male children of one parent than two parent families regard their teachers with dissonance of overt and covert attitudes.

Table 4.13 presents a similar pattern of male responses in the direction hypothesized for the pattern of overt acceptance/covert rejection. The numbers, represented by the proportions in Table 4.13, do not lend themselves to calculation of a significant chi-square. Therefore, despite the confirming pattern direction of the
TABLE 4.13—Overt acceptance/covert rejection toward teachers: one and two parent males

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overt/Covert Attitudes</th>
<th>One Parent</th>
<th>Two Parent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptance/Rejection</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2 = 0.33 < 2.71, p > .05 \]

proportions, the hypothesis (\(H_{R10}\)) (that more male children of one parent than two parent families regard their teachers with attitudes of overt acceptance and covert rejection) is not supported by statistical test.

Controlling for socio-economic status

\(H_{R11}^{*}\): More children of middle class one parent families than middle class two parent families regard their teachers with dissonance of overt and covert attitudes.

\(H_{R12}^{*}\): More children of middle class one parent families than middle class two parent families regard their teachers with attitudes of overt acceptance and covert rejection.

\(H_{R13}^{*}\): More children of lower class one parent families than lower class two parent families regard their teachers with dissonance of overt and covert attitudes.

\(H_{R14}^{*}\): More children of lower class one parent families than lower class two parent families regard their teachers with attitudes of overt acceptance and covert rejection.
TABLE 4.14.-Overt and covert acceptance/rejection of teachers: one and two parent families by socio-economic status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overt/Covert Attitudes</th>
<th>Lower Class</th>
<th></th>
<th>Middle Class</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>One Parent</td>
<td>Two Parent</td>
<td>One Parent</td>
<td>Two Parent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.  %</td>
<td>No.  %</td>
<td>No.  %</td>
<td>No.  %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Rejection/Acceptance</td>
<td>4  18</td>
<td>3  14</td>
<td>5 17.5</td>
<td>3  11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Rejection/Rejection</td>
<td>7  32</td>
<td>8  36</td>
<td>5 17.5</td>
<td>11 39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Acceptance/Acceptance</td>
<td>5  23</td>
<td>8  36</td>
<td>8  29</td>
<td>8  29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Acceptance/Rejection</td>
<td>6  27</td>
<td>3  14</td>
<td>10 36</td>
<td>6  21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Table 4.14 for the first time there may be observed an instance in which the general directional pattern is not consistent. Both one and two parent middle class children report consonant acceptance of teachers in the same proportions.¹ Twenty-nine percent of the subjects from both one and two parent familial patterns express both overt and covert acceptance of their teachers. The effect of this acceptance is mediated by the large proportion of two parented subjects who express consonant rejection of teachers, however.²

Table 4.15 presents the combined consonant and dissonant rejection and acceptance attitudes of the middle class subjects. Despite the deviation from the general direction of the findings which is apparent in the table,

¹See c. in Table 4.14 above.
²See b. in Table 4.14 above.
the combined consonant patterns of overt/covert acceptance and rejection create a significant difference between middle class subjects of one and two parent families which supports \( H_{RL1} \).

**TABLE 4.15.**—Consonance/dissonance toward teachers: one and two parent middle class families

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overt/Covert Attitudes</th>
<th>One Parent No.</th>
<th>One Parent %</th>
<th>Two Parent No.</th>
<th>Two Parent %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consonance</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>46.5</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissonance</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>53.5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2 = 3.60 > 2.71, \ p < .05 \]

**TABLE 4.16.**—Overt and covert acceptance/rejection of teachers: one and two parent middle class families

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overt/Covert Attitudes</th>
<th>One Parent No.</th>
<th>One Parent %</th>
<th>Two Parent No.</th>
<th>Two Parent %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acceptance/Rejection</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2 = 1.60 < 2.71, \ p > .05 \]

The same general pattern of greater overt acceptance and covert rejection of teachers on the part of the one parent group is indicated in Table 4.16. The computed chi-square of 1.60 is not significant at the .05 level, however. Therefore \( H_{RL2} \) (more children of middle class one parent families than middle class two parent families...
regard their teachers with attitudes of overt acceptance and covert rejection) is not statistically supported.

TABLE 4.17.-Consonance/dissonance toward teachers: one and two parent lower class families

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overt/Covert Attitudes</th>
<th>One Parent No.</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Two Parent No.</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consonance</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissonance</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ x^2 = 4.00 > 2.71, p < .05 \]

The confirming pattern of proportions and a calculated chi-square of 4.00 (shown in Table 4.17 above) permit rejection of the null hypothesis and support of the hypothesis \( H_{R13} \) that more children of lower class one parent families than lower class two parent families regard their teachers with dissonance of overt and covert attitudes.

TABLE 4.18.-Overt and covert acceptance/rejection of teachers: one and two parent lower class families

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overt/Covert Attitudes</th>
<th>One Parent No.</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Two Parent No.</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acceptance/Rejection</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ x^2 = 1.29 < 2.71, p > .05 \]
Although the proportions in Table 4.18 indicate a pattern in the direction hypothesized, calculation of chi-square does not support the hypothesis \(H_{R14}\) which states that more children of lower class one parent families than lower class two parent families regard their teachers with attitudes of overt acceptance and covert rejection.

**Summary**

The theoretical section of this study developed a rationale for two general propositions. It was hypothesized that (1) More children of one parent than two parent families would regard their teachers with dissonance of overt and covert attitudes, and (2) More children of one parent than two parent families would regard their teachers with attitudes of overt acceptance and covert rejection. In addition twelve hypotheses were treated as related research in the foregoing analysis. These provisionally proposed that the differential patterns of dissonance/consonance and of overt acceptance/covert rejection would obtain for children of one parent families when the influences of race, sex, and socio-economic status were controlled.

The data indicate that structural pattern of the family does indeed influence the attitudes, both overt and covert, of children. While patterns of proportions generally support the major hypotheses and the twelve related
TABLE 4.19.-Summary of effects of family structure: influences of race, sex, and socio-economic status controlled

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>One Parent Family</th>
<th>Dissonance</th>
<th>Acceptance/Rejection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Race</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sex</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Socio-Economic Status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Class</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Class</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Conjectural statements, four hypotheses among those treated as related research were not supported by statistical analysis. (See Table 4.19 above.) These hypotheses were as follows:

- \( H_{R9} \): More male children of one parent than two parent families regard their teachers with dissonance of overt and covert attitudes.
- \( H_{R10} \): More male children of one parent than two parent families regard their teachers with attitudes of overt acceptance and covert rejection.
- \( H_{R12} \): More children of middle class one parent families than middle class two parent families regard their teachers with attitudes of overt acceptance and covert rejection.
- \( H_{R14} \): More children of lower class one parent families than lower class two parent families regard their teachers with attitudes of overt acceptance and covert rejection.
In all comparisons a differential may be observed among the pre-adolescent subjects from one parent families. With the exception of the four hypotheses which were not confirmed statistically, expectations concerning one and two parent family structures as determinants of overt and covert rejection/acceptance were confirmed by the direction and the scope of the findings.

These findings will be the focus of the discussion which follows in Chapter V.
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Summary

Theoretical background

This study was designed to explore the effects of the one parent family upon its children. Although the one parent family appears to be increasing, its influence has seldom been documented. More sociological attention has been focused on other social issues. Among these, studies concerning social problems like juvenile delinquency, school dropout, mental health, pre-marital pregnancy, and alienation furnish inferential information pointing to the one parent family as a possible factor contributing to these phenomena.

Viewed as a dyadically structured small group, the one parent family may be seen as a likely setting for producing anxiety and hostility toward authority figures. This in turn may create deviant behavior. Within the dyadic pattern of the lone parent/child relationship are unique possibilities for childhood insecurity which may result in unusual dependency coupled with suppressed hostility toward adults on the part of many one parented children. This contradiction of overt and covert atti-
tudes may tend to result in the discomfort of attitudinal imbalance. The tension of disequilibrium may, in turn, traumatize the children's adolescent years. It may cause many one parented children to seek relief in deviant and seemingly unexplicable behavior.

**Procedures and findings**

To explore the validity of this theoretical perspective, this study utilized one hundred junior high and middle school early adolescent subjects in equal numbers from one and two parent families. The children represented a cross-section of the public school population in a large midwestern industrial city.

Six questions forming Likert-type scales measured the students' overt and covert acceptance or rejection of their teachers. Related analyses of their responses were conducted controlling for race, sex, and soci-economic status.

It was hypothesized and confirmed that more children in the one parented group regard their teachers with dissonant overt and covert attitudes. Evidently the observable attitudes of children from two parent families are more likely to be manifestations of their true inner feelings than are the observable attitudes of children from one parent families. On the other hand the observable attitudes of many children from one parent families...
may mask inner feelings in opposition to their open behavior.

From this perspective the eighteen percent of the one parented subjects who reported overt rejection and covert acceptance of their teachers (see a., Table 4.1) may be manifesting overtly the influence of a dependency orientation toward a peer group which includes members of whom some are consistent and some inconsistent in their rejection of authority figures. Those who are inconsistent may be "caught" in an overt pattern of behavior that is a group norm rather than a true expression of their personal values. The thirty-two percent who report overt acceptance and covert rejection (see d., Table 4.1) may be equally "caught" by a dependency orientation toward adult provided security more powerful than that of many of their peers.

It was also hypothesized and confirmed that more one parented than two parented children regard their teachers with attitudes of overt acceptance and covert rejection. This confirming pattern obtained when one parent subjects were compared to those with two parents while controlling for race.

When sex and socio-economic status were controlled, there were some discrepancies in findings from those of the main hypotheses. No statistically significant relationships between family structure and overt/covert attitudes were ascertainable among the male subjects. Analysis
of subjects' responses controlling for socio-economic status did not reveal statistically significant differences in overt acceptance/covert rejection between children of one parent and traditional family structures within either the middle or the lower class.

A statistical comparison of male and female subjects showed girls to be significantly more dissonant and also more overtly accepting and covertly rejecting than boys. Perhaps the rejecting attitudes of the female subjects may be attributed to the greater degree of social conformity expected of girls. This may lead to a greater degree of hidden hostility. A less dramatic, but perhaps more valid, inference might involve sexually differentiated rates of maturation. Since most girls of junior high age have attained puberty, often several years before their masculine counterparts, the findings may indicate a developmental state of adolescent independency conflict which the boys have not attained.

Discussion

While the results of this study indicate differences in the overt and covert attitudes of one parent children from those of children with two parents as groups, they also indicate overlapping similarities in attitude. A number of subjects from one parent backgrounds did not report dissonant attitudes. Fewer still reported overt
acceptance in combination with overt rejection of their teachers. On the other hand some responses of two parented subjects fell into both attitudinal categories. Using the responses of the two parented subjects as a benchmark, the findings suggest a tendency, not an absolute.

Lewin\(^1\) has described the adolescent as a "marginal man," who lives in conflict with the opposing values and living styles of childhood and adulthood alternately in ascendancy. At best it is a difficult time. Evidently, for many of the children from one parent families and for some of the children from two parent families, normal adolescent conflict in achieving personal autonomy is augmented in magnitude by the addition of other components.

This study has offered intense childhood dependency and pre-existing hostility as elements which augment adolescent trauma for children of one parent families. Are there not circumstances in which these same components might be operative upon the attitudes of children from families headed technically by two parents?

Goode,\(^2\) Nye,\(^3\) and Burchinal\(^4\) have indicated that


\(^2\)Goode, op. cit. \(^3\)Nye, op. cit.

children in homes headed by a single divorced parent evi-
dence fewer manifestations of maladjustment than do child-
ren from unhappy or disorganized two parent homes. Some
of the dissonant children within the two parent group
may be presumed to live in family situations made less
than ideal by the marital and social dissatisfactions of
the parents. Other dissonant children, technically part
of the two parent group, may actually come from "part time"
parent families. Many school children today may seldom
see their parents. No child in the study indicated that
his father worked at home. Almost certainly, many of the
maternal parents of the subjects were also employed. In
1968, according to the Bureau of the Census, 9,257,000
married women with children under the age of eighteen
years were part of the labor force. Some of the children
within the two parent group may be presumed to come from
these family environments in which one or both parents
are often absent. For these children the benefits of tra-
ditional family interaction may have been pre-empted by
the demands of both parents' jobs and, often, their so-
cial activities which tend to become increasingly indi-
vidual rather than family centered, as the children mature.

On the other hand the results of this study indicate

---

1The American Almanac, The Statistical Abstract of
that a single parent background is neither a necessary nor a sufficient cause for dissonance of overt and covert attitudes. Why do some children escape this conflict? In attempting to answer this question, the responses of the one parented children who expressed overt and covert acceptance of their teachers were reviewed. Of the thirteen children from one parent families who expressed consonant acceptance, only five mentioned employment of their mothers in response to the question, "What does your father (or whomever supports your family) do for a living?"

One boy answered, "My mother is a secretary -- (at home)." Another carefully crossed out the word, "father," and inserted "mother." His response was "Silk finisher -- works very hard." A third boy indicated that his mother was a teacher's aide. He said, "She helps another teacher (mother) do her work." A fourth wrote that his mother was a waitress but told us verbally that she "really works for the F.B.I." Only one of the five was a minimum response, "dishwasher." All five respondents were males.

The point is that each of these respondents, with the exception of the last, felt obligated to write an addenda to assure us, and perhaps himself, of his own importance to his parent.

Perhaps two parents aren't really necessary to the growing child. Perhaps, as Slater\(^1\) says, two sexes are

\(^1\)Slater, op. cit., p. 297.
necessary only when a child is conceived. More probably the effects of single parenthood upon children are contingent upon the emotional stability of the parent; for it is the lone parent who must provide the integrated family life and security needed by children.

The amount of overt rejection reported by the subjects from both one and two parent families in this study is disconcerting. Forty-two percent of the one parent and forty-eight percent of the two parent group reported overt attitudes which were rejecting of teachers. (See a., Table 4.1.) The life of a junior high school teacher cannot always be a happy one if almost fifty percent of his students are openly rejecting of him.

Conclusions

Viewed from the perspective of dissonance theory, the subjects of the study who manifest acceptance/rejection inconsistency between overt and covert attitudes are living with two cognitive elements which cannot co-exist compatibly. The dissonant children can attain resolution of the tension caused by their attitudinal imbalance only by choosing one attitude over the other in overt and covert consistency.

Their choices may take various forms as these are influenced by intervening variables of social interaction and circumstance:
(1) They may choose to avoid further dissonance occasioned by the objects of their displaced and adolescent hostility. Since these objects are their teachers, these students may become truants and/or quietly drop out of school when they are legally able.

(2) They may seek out other persons whose values will give social support to both their dependency needs and to the selection of a consonant set of values which may or may not be within the normal range of social acceptability depending upon the group in which they find acceptance.

(3) Their social dependence or their perception of eventual reward may force a change in attitude which will lessen their hostility.

(4) They may have suffered such a degree of dissonance that they have become incapable of choice. This is an anticipatory avoidance reaction to the possibility of new dissonances which might be experienced with any change in situation. These young people will prefer to live with familiar pain rather than to hazard an unknown.

Festinger has called the last of these "the inability to commit oneself behaviorally," a passive and negative life style which is pathological in its extreme form.

Suggestions for further research

It would seem that the incidence of dissonance observed in children of one parent families in this study is great enough to warrant further research for the development of theory. Further investigations might, for

example, consider the effects of age level as a variable of control. According to the theoretical orientation guiding this study, dissonant adolescents are likely to become more consistent in their overt and covert attitudes over time. Sibling interaction and birth order also deserve analysis as possible mediators of dyadic intensity and perceived parental inconsistency. In addition, exploration of the weight of parental values is suggested by the non-significant findings differentiating male, lower class, and middle class children of one and two parent families. These children may be reflecting the social expectations of their parents. Their responses may be indicators of conditional relationships hidden within the findings of this study.

The pattern of overt rejection of teachers also warrants further investigation. Its magnitude within both groups suggests the possibility of an interaction of rejections, pupil rejecting teacher and teacher rejecting pupil.

Relevance for society

Given more definitive research support, the relevance of family structure may merit attention by those concerned with educational policy. It is doubtful that optimum learning can occur when pupils regard their instructors with either overt or covert attitudes of rejection.
Perhaps dissonance and rejection could be alleviated or even averted through adoption by the educational establishment of some of the programs which it has debated for so long.¹ Male employees for pre-school and elementary programs, lowered pupil-teacher ratios continuing over a span of years, personalized counselling for all grade levels: these might counteract inconsistency and insecurity experienced in the family.

Family structure may also be a relevant consideration for organizations concerned with informal socialization like the YMCA, the YWCA, Boy and Girl Scouts, and Camp Fire Girls. It may be that the needs of children require that youth organizations repattern their programs to provide diffuse interaction with adults within groups much smaller than those presently provided.

Finally, it would seem that the one parent family has reached a condition of normalcy within society which warrants societal attention in terms of counselling, adult education, and child care centers which can be supportive of the lone parent, thus enabling him to provide a healthy family environment for his children.

¹See Chapter I, p. 6.
# APPENDIX A

## FIGURE 1

Divorce Rates: 1940 - 1968
(includes annulments)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Rate per 1,000 Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1940</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1945</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1946</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1955</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1962</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Illegitimate Live Births: 1940 - 1967

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Rate by Color of Mother (per 1,000 never married)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percent of all Births</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1945</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1955</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1964</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FIGURE 3

Orphaned Children: 1940 - 1965

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total Number (1000)</th>
<th>% of all Children</th>
<th>Type of Orphan Paternal No.</th>
<th>Maternal No.</th>
<th>Full No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940</td>
<td>3,840</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>2,180</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>1,370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1949</td>
<td>2,930</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>1,890</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>2,955</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>2,055</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td>3,290</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>2,330</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>890</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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GRAND RAPIDS, MICHIGAN

Shaded Area: Middle school and junior high attendance areas, May, 1970.
APPENDIX C

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GRADE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLASS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCHOOL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRE
MSC, 69 - 70

Introduction:

If your school is to better serve your needs, it is essential that we have your views and opinions. This is just a questionnaire; it is not a test. Questions will be read to you and you are asked to put a circle around the answer that best describes how you feel about different things. The answers that you give will be treated as confidential; these answers will not be shown to your teachers or anyone else other than the research staff at the Evaluation Office. The research staff will submit a report to the Grand Rapids Board of Education about how you and other pupils feel about your school, your educational and occupational plans and desires, and what you think about education and life in general.

Since we are able to ask only a few persons to express their opinions, your personal opinion is worth that much more. Won't you please help us by answering the following questions:

1. What suggestions do you have for improving your school. Briefly list these suggestions; describe them if it is necessary.

2. Do you think that going to this school is likely to help you get ready for high school?
   a. Yes
   b. No
   c. Not sure either way
1. There are many people who are concerned about how well young people do in school. In the spaces below, list the NAME of the people you feel are concerned about how well you do in school. Please indicate who each person is.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAMES</th>
<th>WHO IS THIS PERSON</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Now we would like to ask you some things about what you wish to do and plan to do in the future. If you were free to go as far as you wanted to go in school, how far would you like to go?

   a. I'd like to quit right now.
   b. I'd like to go to high school for a while.
   c. I'd like to graduate from high school.
   d. I'd like to go to secretarial or trade school.
   e. I'd like to go to college for a while.
   f. I'd like to graduate from college.
   g. I'd like to do graduate work beyond college.

3. Sometimes what we would like to do is not the same as what we really expect to do. How far in school do you expect you will really go?

   a. I plan to quit as soon as I can.
   b. I plan to continue in high school for a while.
   c. I plan on graduating from high school.
   d. I plan on going secretarial or trade school.
   e. I plan on going to college for a while.
   f. I plan on graduating from college.
   g. I plan to do graduate work beyond college.
4. Now we would like to ask you a few questions about how you feel about your school. Would you say that you are happy about being in this school?

a. Yes, I am definitely happy with this school.
b. I am happy with this school more often than not.
c. I am unsure about how happy I am about this school.
d. I am unhappy with this school more often than not.
e. No, I am definitely unhappy with this school.

5. In general would you say that the problems of this school are important to you?

a. Yes, the problems of this school are very important to me.
b. The problems of this school are important to me more often than not.
c. I am unsure about how important the school's problems are to me.
d. The school's problems are usually not too important to me.
e. The problems of this school are not important to me at all.

6. Would you say that you feel pleased when you tell people that you are a student of this school?

a. Yes, I am very pleased.
b. I am usually pleased.
c. I am unsure.
d. I am usually not too pleased.
e. I am not pleased at all.

7. As far as going to school is concerned, would you say that one of the best things that has happened to you is when you came to this school?

a. Yes, definitely.
b. Yes, for the most part.
c. I am unsure.
d. Probably not.
e. Definitely not.
8. If you were free to have any job you wanted after you finish your schooling, which one would you most like to have?

9. Sometimes the job that a person wishes to have is not the one that he actually gets. What kind of a job do you think you really will get when you finish school?

10. Now we would like to ask you a few questions about how you feel about your school work. Forget for a moment how others grade your work. Please tell us about how YOU feel about the kind of work you do in class.

   a. My work is excellent.
   b. My work is good.
   c. My work is average.
   d. My work is below average.
   e. My work is much below average.

11. What kind of grades do you think you are capable of getting?

   a. Mostly A's
   b. Mostly B's
   c. Mostly C's
   d. Mostly D's
   e. Mostly E's

12. How important to you are the grades you get in school?

   a. Very important
   b. Important
   c. Not particularly important
   d. Grades do not matter to me at all.

13. It isn't how much you know but how much you are willing to put up with that gets you good grades.

   a. This is definitely true.
   b. This is probably more true than false.
   c. I am unsure.
   d. This is probably more false than true.
   e. This is definitely false.
14. To get good grades you have to tell the teachers what they want to hear.

a. This is definitely true.
b. This is probably more true than false.
c. I am unsure.
d. This is probably more false than true.
e. This is definitely false.

15. How important is it to you to be high in your class at school?

a. Very important
b. Important
c. Not particularly important
d. It doesn't matter to me at all.

16. How do you feel if you don't do as well in school as you know you can?

a. I feel very badly.
b. I feel badly.
c. I don't feel particularly badly.
d. It doesn't bother me at all.

17. If the odds are against you in your work at school, you can come out on top by persisting and keeping at your studies.

a. This is definitely true.
b. This is more true than false.
c. I am unsure.
d. This is more false than true.
e. This is definitely false.

18. You have to learn what the teachers say you must. You cannot use your own initiative or imagination in this school.

a. This is definitely true.
b. This is more true than false.
c. I am unsure.
d. This is more false than true.
e. This is definitely false.

19. What happens to a person in the future is largely a matter of fate or luck.

a. This is definitely true.
b. This is more true than false.
c. I am uncertain about this.
d. This is more false than true.
e. This is definitely false.
20. How important is it to you to do better than others in your school?  
   a. Very important  
   b. Important  
   c. Not particularly important  
   d. It doesn't matter to me at all.  

21. In your school work, do you try to do better than others?  
   a. All of the time  
   b. Most of the time  
   c. Occasionally  
   d. Never  

22. How important to you are good grades as compared with other aspects of school?  
   a. Good grades are the most important thing in school.  
   b. Good grades are among the important things in school.  
   c. Some other things in school are more important than grades.  
   d. Good grades don't matter to me at all.  

23. Now we would like to ask you some questions about how parents feel about what you are doing in school. In general, would your PARENTS say you are doing as well in school as you are capable of doing?  
   a. Yes, definitely  
   b. Yes, probably  
   c. Not sure either way  
   d. Probably not  
   e. Definitely not  

24. How important is it to your PARENTS that you get mostly B's or better?  
   a. Very important  
   b. Important  
   c. Not sure either way  
   d. Not particularly important  
   e. My grades don't matter to my parents at all.
25. How far do you think your PARENTS expect you to go in school?
   a. They expect me to quit as soon as I can.
   b. They expect me to continue in high school for a while.
   c. They expect me to graduate from high school.
   d. They expect me to go to secretarial or trade school.
   e. They expect me to go to college for a while.
   f. They expect me to graduate from college.
   g. They expect me to do graduate work beyond college.

26. How well informed are your PARENTS about what you do in school? Choose the statement which comes closest to describing your parents.
   a. They are extremely well informed. They pay very close attention to what I am doing in my school work. Regularly, I or others keep them informed. No matter how well or how poorly I am doing, they will find out.
   b. They are well informed. They know quite a bit about what and how well I am doing. They generally know what and how well I am doing, but not always.
   c. They are fairly well informed. Occasionally they ask me and once in a while I or someone else tells them what I am doing. Seldom do I or does anyone else tell them.
   d. They know nothing about what or how well I am doing in my school work.

27. The following questions are about what your best friends think about the work you do in school. In general, would your closest FRIEND say you are doing as well in school as you are capable of doing?
   a. Yes, definitely
   b. Yes, probably
   c. Not sure either way
   d. Probably not
   e. Definitely not
28. How important is it to your closest FRIEND that you get mostly B's or better?
   a. Very important
   b. Important
   c. Not sure either way
   d. Not particularly important
   e. My grades don't matter to my friend at all.

29. How far do you think your best FRIEND expects you to go in school?
   a. He (she) expects me to quit as soon as I can.
   b. He (she) expects me to continue in high school for a while.
   c. He (she) expects me to graduate from high school.
   d. He (she) expects me to go to secretarial or trade school.
   e. He (she) expects me to go to college for a while.
   f. He (she) expects me to graduate from college.
   g. He (she) expects me to do graduate work beyond college.

30. In general, would you say that your FRIENDS are doing as well in school as they are capable of doing?
   a. Yes, definitely
   b. Yes, probably
   c. Not sure either way
   d. Probably not
   e. Definitely not

31. How important is it to your closest FRIENDS that they get mostly B's or better?
   a. Very important
   b. Important
   c. Not sure either way
   d. Not particularly important
   e. Grades don't matter to them at all.

32. How far do you think your best FRIEND will go in school?
   a. He (she) will quit as soon as he can.
   b. He (she) will continue in high school for a while.
   c. He (she) will graduate from high school.
d. He (she) will go to secretarial or trade school.

e. He (she) will go to college for a while.

f. He (she) will graduate from college.

g. He (she) will do graduate work beyond college.

33. In general, would you say that you get along well with other students in your classes?

   a. Yes, definitely
   b. Yes, for the most part
   c. Not sure either way
   d. Probably not, for the most part
   e. Definitely not

34. In this school, is it easy to be accepted into different friendship groups to which you would like to belong?

   a. Yes, definitely
   b. Yes, for the most part
   c. Not sure either way
   d. Probably not, for the most part
   e. Definitely not

35. The next few questions deal with how you feel about your teachers. In general, would you say that you get along well with the teachers that you have in your classes?

   a. Yes, definitely
   b. Yes, for the most part
   c. Not sure either way
   d. Probably not, for the most part
   e. Definitely not

36. If you had a problem with one of your daily assignments for a class at school, who is the first person that you would go to see about it?

   a. A close friend
   b. A classmate who is good in that class
   c. My parents
   d. The teacher who has that class
   e. My favorite teacher
   f. A counselor
   g. No one
   h. Someone else (please tell who it is_________)

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
37. If you had a class in which ALL of the work seemed very hard for you, who is the first person that you would go to for help?  

  a. A close friend  
  b. A classmate who is good in that class  
  c. My parents  
  d. The teacher who has that class  
  e. My favorite teacher  
  f. A counselor  
  g. No one  
  h. Someone else (please tell who it is__________)

38. In general, would you say that the teachers that you have are interested in how well you do in school?  

  a. Yes, definitely  
  b. Yes, probably  
  c. Not sure either way  
  d. Probably not  
  e. Definitely not

39. Would you say that the teachers in your school make you feel that they are interested in you?  

  a. Yes, definitely  
  b. Yes, for the most part  
  c. Not sure either way  
  d. No, not for the most part  
  e. Definitely not

40. Would you say that your teachers have always been fair with you in this school?  

  a. Yes, definitely  
  b. Yes, for the most part  
  c. Not sure either way  
  d. No, not for the most part  
  e. Definitely not

41. When is the last time that you talked to one of your teachers about your school work?  

  a. Today  
  b. From two to five days ago  
  c. From five to ten days ago  
  d. More than ten days ago  
  e. I haven't talked to a teacher about my work this year.  
  f. I don't remember.
42. In general, how often would you say that you have talked to your teachers about the work you have done in school this semester?
   a. More than once a day
   b. About once a day
   c. Two or three times a week
   d. About once a week
   e. About two or three times a month
   f. Less than once a month

43. In general, would you say that you have been able to talk to your teachers as often as you needed to about the work you do in school?
   a. Yes, definitely
   b. Yes, probably
   c. Not sure either way
   d. Probably not
   e. Definitely not

44. If there were more opportunities for you to talk to your teachers would you talk to them about your school work more often than you do now?
   a. Yes, definitely
   b. Yes, probably
   c. Not sure either way
   d. Probably not
   e. Definitely not

45. Would you say that a lot of teachers in this school used grades as a way of getting back at students?
   a. Yes, definitely
   b. Yes, probably
   c. Not sure either way
   d. Probably not
   e. Definitely not

46. Would you say that the teachers discourage you from using your own opinions when answering questions in class and in tests?
   a. Yes, definitely
   b. Yes, for the most part
   c. Not sure either way
   d. No, not for the most part
   e. Definitely not
47. Would you say that your teachers surprise you by getting you interested in subjects you had never really thought much about before?

54. 

a. Yes, definitely  
b. Yes, for the most part  
c. Not sure either way  
d. No, not for the most part  
e. Definitely not

48. As compared to your closest friends at school, how often do you talk to your teachers about your school work?

55. 

a. Much more often than they  
b. Somewhat more often than they do  
c. About the same as they do  
d. Somewhat less often than they do  
e. Much less often than they do

49. Is there any one particular teacher in your school that you consider to be your favorite teacher?

56. 

a. Yes, there is one teacher that is my favorite.  
b. Yes, but there are several whom are my favorite teachers.  
c. No. There is no one in particular, for I like them all about the same.  
d. No. I do not particularly care for any of them.

50. In general, would your favorite teacher say you are doing as well in school as you are capable of doing?

57. 

a. Yes, definitely  
b. Yes, probably  
c. Not sure either way  
d. Probably not  
e. Definitely not

51. How important is it to your favorite teacher that you get mostly B's or better?

58. 

a. Very important  
b. Important  
c. Not sure either way  
d. Not particularly important  
e. Other things are more important to my favorite teacher.
52. How far do you think your favorite teacher expects you to go in school?  
   a. He (she) expects me to quit as soon as I can.
   b. He (she) expects me to continue in high school for a while.
   c. He (she) expects me to graduate from high school.
   d. He (she) expects me to go to secretarial or trade school.
   e. He (she) expects me to go to college for a while.
   f. He (she) expects me to graduate from college.
   g. He (she) expects me to do graduate work beyond college.

53. What is your favorite subject in school?  

54. Is your favorite subject taught by your favorite teacher?  
   a. Yes
   b. No

55. What does your father (or whomever supports your family) do for a living?  

56. Describe what your father (or whomever supports your family) does on the job.

57. How old were you on your last birthday?

58. What is your race?  
   a. Black
   b. White
   c. Other (please tell what it is)

59. Are you  
   a. Male
   b. Female
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