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ABSTRACT

This study examined an aspect of Trudy Bradley's (1967) suggestion for research in the field of adoption assessment. She suggested that a comparison of prospective adoptive couples be made through evaluations obtained by caseworkers versus evaluations obtained through objective tests. Little research has been carried out in this area.

Subsequent to a search of the literature, the Parental Attitude Research Instrument (PARI) developed by Schaefer and Bell (1958) was selected for use in the present research project. It was hoped that in addition to supplementing the casework interview and assisting in the decision-making process, it would also indicate areas of weakness in which parent education may be needed, pre and post-adoptively.

It was predicted that individuals who have children would have more positive child-rearing attitudes than those that have no children. It was predicted as well that female applicants would have more positive child-rearing attitudes than male applicants. Also, it was hypothesized that younger adoptive parents would have more positive child-rearing attitudes than older ones.

The sample participating in this study consisted of adoptive parent applicants at the Roman Catholic Children's Aid Society for the County of Essex (R.C.C.A.S.) and at the Children's Aid Society of the County of Essex (C.A.S.). The Head Offices of
both Societies are located in Windsor, Ontario. All couples had received Agency approval for adoption, but a child had not yet been placed in the home. All three hypotheses of the present study were borne out at the .05 level of significance on the one-tailed "t" test.
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1. The present study

The present study was undertaken in order to investigate the possibilities for developing a measuring instrument which could serve as an aid in the adoptive parent assessment process. This search is very important since the future adjustment of children in adoption depends on the adoptive placement that is found for them. This factor clarifies the crucial aspect of the assessment process.

Trudy Bradley (1967)\(^1\) in partial fulfillment of her doctoral thesis undertook an extensive study involving eight adoption agencies in the greater New York city area. Her research project involved 398 adoptive applicant couples. The aim of her dissertation was to examine whether some uniformity exists between agencies regarding criteria for selection of prospective adoptive parents.

Within Bradley’s research, adoption caseworkers were required to complete three questionnaires. One of the most important results was that it became obvious that some decisions were arrived at based on superficialities and arbitrary, subjective judgements of the caseworkers.

Bradley was not merely struck by the lack of objective measuring devices being used in this area. She also expressed the

opinion that objective tools ought to be completed both by case-workers and by prospective adoptive parents. At the conclusion of her research she suggested that the following study be performed:

a comparison of adoption worker assessments with evaluations of couples based on their responses to various test materials...the latter would be of particular interest if some suitable test could serve as an adjunct to the adoption study process, or if some test materials could be used as an early screening-in device.²

Bradley concludes on the note that research is lacking in this area of vital importance. This opinion is shared by the present authors, after having examined the related literature. The lack of research in this area then, along with a genuine concern for the child to be placed for adoption, are the motivating factors and reasons underlying the present investigation.

In order to initiate the investigative process, it was important to search for an objective instrument that could be used in the present study. A review of the related literature made it clear that an attempt should be made to measure parental attitudes toward child-rearing. In this way the present authors found the Parental Attitude Research Instrument developed by Schaefer and Bell.³ The Parental Attitude Research Instrument,

²Ibid., p. 196.

hereinafter referred to as the PARI was constructed on the premise that child-rearing attitudes reflect child-rearing behaviour. Since the PARI has been used extensively in the past, the decision was reached to employ it in the present study. It was hoped that it could ultimately be recommended for use as a tool for social workers as a help in selecting adoptive parents.

The research instrument selected for the present study - the PARI - will be viewed as a source of input. Specifically, it undertakes to investigate how the prospective adoptive parents respond to statements concerning their attitudes regarding child-rearing practices. This could then be compared to the input the caseworker receives through direct interviewing and to the resulting impressions and judgements. The present research, however, will not investigate the content of such interviews, only their outcome. It will solely rely on results obtained on the PARI.

The PARI was specifically constructed to reveal a wide spectrum of attitudes related to child-rearing practices. Its application within this study should provide an index to these attitudes in prospective adoptive parents. It should also provide results connected to the absence or presence of marital conflict, since this is an actual scale item incorporated into the PARI. The absence or presence of marital conflict will further be highlighted by crucial inconsistencies between responses given by husband and wife.

In addition to the above, it is also hoped that the PARI is more objective than the interview process. Furthermore, because
of this objectivity it can serve at least three additional functions:

1. it can assist in the decision-making process for adoption placement.

2. it can indicate areas in which counselling, general service and parent-education may be needed.

3. it can also be used upon follow-up to evaluate the validity of the present authors' predictions.

Adoptive parents are a select group of individuals wanting to make a favourable impression on the Adoption Agency in order to obtain an adoptable child. Consequently the present authors are aware that the existing norms for the PARI can only be applied with some caution.

2. A review of present adoption processes

If, in fact, methods for improvement of the adoption process are needed, a thorough examination of present methods would be appropriate at this time. As an example, within the geographical area of the present investigation one agency follows a procedure that will herein be outlined.4

When a couple, interested in adopting a child, comes to the agency, husband and wife are referred to the adoption intake worker. The latter records their vital statistics and provides them with general information regarding the adoption procedure. At the termination of the interview, the potential adoptive parents

are asked to attend an adoptive applicant meeting, if they wish. This group meeting is conducted by individuals from the agency adoption staff. Adoption procedures are discussed and explained. Agency expectations of adoptive parents are explained in very simple terms. They are to be "good" adoptive parents. Those present are also informed of the children that are available for adoption at the particular time.

These group sessions are used extensively at other agencies as well. Mundloh (1969) advocates such group meetings because he believes that they would aid the couples in the following ways:

1. understanding and acceptance of adoption
2. child-rearing aptitude
3. emotional maturity
4. marital adjustment.5

As well, sometimes these group meetings assist in clarifying gross misconceptions about adoption.

Some individuals who wish to adopt a child come to the adoption agency without an understanding of the procedures that are involved. At times, they come to the agency with "mis-guided motivation" as Lidkea (1971) says. It is important to steer these couples toward a more realistic understanding of what they are undertaking.6 Since it is a known fact that ideas tend to flow


quite naturally in a common-interest group, according to Kasprowicz (1964) these sessions have three basic objectives:

1. to correct the erroneous beliefs and misconceptions of applicants.

2. to give them the correct information about the agency and its procedures.

3. to use the group meetings as a method of observing the couple's group interaction as a beginning for diagnostic thinking.  

Of the three objectives, the third is the most important one from the point of view of the child that will be placed for adoption with the couple. Their group interaction is one manifestation of their behaviour in general. Their behaviour is a basic manifestation of their personalities and will ultimately affect their adoptive child’s behaviour as well. Behaviour is basic and important, whereas mere misconceptions of applicants can theoretically be corrected any time. It is reasonable to expect all these factors to surface in group meetings.

In the agency under review, upon completion of the group sessions, the individuals present are given application forms to be completed and returned to the agency as quickly as possible. At the particular agency presently being described, a very high number of applications are in fact returned.

Upon receipt of the form the adoption supervisor reviews it and assigns it to a caseworker. The latter contacts the couple  

---

invariably within the time limit as outlined in the Child Welfare Act of Ontario (1965), which states that:

Every society shall,
(a) within thirty days after receiving an application to board or adopt a child, begin an investigation of the application;\(^8\)

Consequently, the application is followed up as soon as possible after it is received.

Decision about the frequency of interviews depends on the worker. This can amount to a maximum of any number of interviews, down to a minimum as delineated in the Child Welfare Act of Ontario:

Every society shall,
(b) interview separately and jointly the male and female applicants and assess the consequences for other children in the home of the applicants of granting the application;\(^9\)

In practice, it appears that most frequently actual contacts between the adoption caseworker and the adoptive parents far exceed the minimum number as outlined in the Child Welfare Act.

As reported by Bradley (1967), Fellner (1968), Kadushin (1968) and Mundloh (1969), the adoptive parent assessment process seems to be similar everywhere in North America.\(^10\) Often the entire home

---


\(^9\)Ibid.

study-assessment process relies upon the judgement of the one caseworker involved. No matter how qualified the individual, this is a great responsibility indeed to be handled by a single person. As Kadushin comments in reviewing Bradley's thesis (1968):

> it is surprising to find that so many untrained or partially trained workers have been assigned a task generally regarded as one of the most responsible and difficult in child welfare.\(^{11}\)

At the agency which is being described here, the final decision on acceptance or rejection of the adoptive parents is made jointly by the caseworker and the adoption supervisor. However, the entire home study and assessment process is completed by the caseworker, who is often an untrained individual. Untrained caseworker in this context means an individual who has not had professional social work training at a university school of social work.

It is, therefore, important to underscore the fact that the effects of the conclusions that follow from the assessment process are too crucial to be based solely on the subjective judgement of one person, especially since this same person has also been the caseworker conducting the assessment process itself.

3. Suggesting a supplement to the interview

The general aspects of present adoption procedures have been reviewed. The present investigators have reported on steps being

\(^{11}\) Alfred Kadushin, "An Exploration of Caseworkers' Perceptions of Adoptive Applicants" by Trudy Bradley; A Book Review; Social Casework, XLI, No. 5, p. 302.
followed at an agency in the immediate environment where the present study was being conducted. This agency served as a model of present procedures that are being followed in Ontario. Alternative methods will now be examined in relation to their potential for being more progressive, consistent and reliable than present ones. Fellner (1968) supports this view when he says:

for the most part, the task in adoption has been approached without understanding or imagination, and any field of endeavour that is guilty of working only to maintain the status quo in these times of rapid change will fall. Problems in adoptions will increase if social workers do not face the challenge with all their resources.\footnote{Irving Fellner, "Recruiting Adoptive Applicants", Social Work, XIII, No. 1, 1968, p. 100.}

As a first step toward methods for improvement, there is a great need for more than a mere succession of personal interviews. Especially, since these interviews are at present conducted by a single individual. The need for introducing objective methods is further underscored by the fact that such a high number of caseworkers who bear the responsibility for decision-making in child placement, have a lack of professional training.

As a result of an examination of the present method, indicated in the foregoing material, the authors have investigated the potential for using more objective techniques in the assessment process. This investigation led to the decision to test the PARI as a possible tool in this process. Schaefer and Bell (1958) originally developed this instrument because they felt that:
parental attitudes toward child-rearing and the family life are an important influence in the personality development of the child.\textsuperscript{13}

The present authors agree with this thesis and furthermore feel that parental attitudes toward child-rearing may reflect their ensuing child-rearing behaviour. While both parents' child-rearing attitudes are important, the mother, who in our society spends most of the child's waking hours with him in his most formative years, is of utmost importance. As Schaefer and Bell say:

\begin{quote}
since the most extensive and intensive social interactions of the child during crucial developmental stages occur within the family and especially with the mother, the mother-child relationship would be of major importance in personality development.\textsuperscript{14}
\end{quote}

Since it is the mother who is the essential person in the child's early life and early development, Schaefer and Bell further state that:

\begin{quote}
development of measures of those components of her personality which are relevant to her role as a mother would permit prediction of her behaviour with her child and the future personality adjustment of the child.\textsuperscript{15}
\end{quote}

The importance of the mother's role is commonly held for instance by Bettelheim (1952), and Sears (1957).\textsuperscript{16} However, since

\begin{enumerate}
\item[14] Ibid., p. 340.
\item[15] Ibid.
\end{enumerate}
this only holds true in the early formative years, Schaefer and Bell developed the final form of their Inventory to measure parental attitudes, in general. Consequently the decision was made by the present authors to administer the PARI both to the prospective adoptive mother and the prospective adoptive father.

The literature that was reviewed indicates that often examiners of the PARI come to the conclusion that attitudes are not always and not necessarily indicators of ensuing behaviour. All critics of this measuring instrument tend to agree that the relationship between attitudes and ensuing behaviour are in a pronounced positive direction, without actually always being statistically significant. Becker and Krug (1965) who have performed a most extensive study of the related literature and of the PARI specifically, caution the reader that:

The designers of the PARI conceived of their product as a preliminary, broad-band research instrument and not as a finished product.\(^{17}\)

In spite of the fact that Schaefer and Bell did not view the PARI as a truly finished product, it has been used extensively in the last fourteen years. Becker and Krug further state upon examining the PARI that there is a built-in tendency to agree that is to say an "acquiescence-response set". They assert, though, that Schaefer and Bell were aware of this weakness themselves. Schaefer and Bell state that:

an unresolved problem in studies of social-desirability effects, however, is how to distinguish people who are 'faking good' or 'faking bad' from people who are 'good' or 'bad'.

Another important word of caution is along educational lines. Schaefer and Bell themselves strongly felt that child-rearing attitudes that are currently held in positive regard will be shared by those who had reached high educational levels. They will only be shared to a lesser degree by those who have a lower amount of education. Becker and Krug, modify this hypothesis by saying that:

the evidence implies that attitudinal measures of strict or authoritarian attitudes are more easily modified by educational experiences than we currently believe occurs for actual behaviours or child-rearing practices.\(^{19}\) (emphasis our own).

The implication is that even though individuals may profess to have the appropriate child-rearing attitudes, which are positively valued at a given time, they may not actually manifest behaviour that is consistent with those attitudes. Accordingly, even if we do succeed for instance in changing attitudes of individuals through education, it can not necessarily be concluded that the ensuing behaviour will correlate with this attitude.

Gerhart and Geismar (1969) have performed an extensive study in order to examine the extent of the relationship between

---


\(^{19}\) Wesley Becker and Ronald Krug, *op. cit.*, p. 343.
child-rearing attitudes and actual child-rearing behaviours that
ensue. They were of the opinion that such a study would be of value
since:

as is the case with attitudinal studies
in general, surprisingly little research
has been focused on how attitudes tapped
by the PARI correlate with corresponding
behaviour of the parent.20

Gerhart and Geismar randomly selected forty-nine young
married couples. Shortly after the birth of their first child
the PARI was administered to the mothers. For a period of from
one to two years a longitudinal study ensued. A social worker
visited the home of the parents during this period and observed
the mother-child interaction according to four of the twenty-three
PARI scale items. These were: Acceleration of Development;
Ascendancy of the Mother; Breaking of the Will; and Martyrdom.
Each of these PARI scale items was further broken down into five
behavioural components, developed by Gerhart and Geismar. Each
of these components contained a score range of from one to three.
The social worker visiting the home recorded behavioural components
according to the guidelines devised by the researchers. In the
results reported in this study:

none of the correlations reached the 5% level of statistical significance.21

20 Ursula Gerhart and Ludwig Geismar, "The PARI as a Predictor

21 Ibid.
Yet the relationships all were in a positive direction. In reporting this study, Gerhart and Geismar themselves objectively emphasized and evaluated it as follows:

behave behaviour data were drawn mainly from interviews with the mother, occasional contact with some fathers, and limited observation of mother-child interaction at the time of the social worker's home visits.\textsuperscript{22}

It is commendable that Gerhart and Geismar have attempted to examine the relationship between child-rearing attitudes and ensuing behaviour. The present authors, however, feel that in addition to the ones emphasized by Gerhart and Geismar, there were several other areas to be questioned.

Firstly, Gerhart and Geismar developed behavioural components according to their own arbitrary choice, which they assumed corresponded with attitudinal measures developed by Schaefer and Bell. The rationale for their choice is that:

Four PARI scale items were chosen for this study on the basis of
(1) their test-retest reliability
(2) their theoretical relevance to certain categories of maternal behaviour that could be examined and measured from available data.\textsuperscript{23}

While the scale items that were employed were selected for their test-retest reliability which seems to be a valid reason for including them in their research, the second part of the rationale

\textsuperscript{22}Ibid., p. 605.

\textsuperscript{23}Ibid., p. 603
is not as easily defended or explained. Gerhart and Geismar state that those attitude scale items were selected that could be observed, examined, recorded and "measured" from watching the mother-child interaction. This part of their reasoning may not be valid since it is founded on their own arbitrary decision and judgement of which behaviours in particular lend themselves to recording and measuring.

Secondly, the arbitrary scores that Gerhart and Geismar have allotted to their own scales can be questioned, and what behaviour belongs to which scale is sometimes a fine division indeed. The numerical values of particular behaviour occurrences are even more difficult to determine. All these weaknesses are further underscored by the fact that it is the social worker who observed the mother-child interaction and who recorded the behaviour content. The social worker scored the results as well. The objectivity and validity of his spontaneous and unilateral judgement can be questioned. Thus the scoring could be dependant on mere changes in mood in the observer, his general perception and his perception at the particular time.

Furthermore, the entire study depended upon the presence of the social worker in the home and his observing the mother and child interaction. The social worker's mere presence may well have contaminated the investigation, since his very presence may have influenced the mother's responses and the child's behaviour as well.

Lastly, since the project was performed during the early formative years only, observation of behaviour was limited to the
mother and child only. A properly conceived longitudinal study would have extended beyond the first few years of the child's life. Consequently the father-child behaviour would have had to be observed as well. The PARI ought to have been administered to fathers too. In this case the study would have been well-rounded.

Investigations by the present authors have not revealed any other research specifically structured to examine whether child-rearing attitudes are in fact predictive of the ensuing child-rearing behaviour of prospective parents. Yet there are other authors who have undertaken to analyze the PARI as well, in order to uncover its strengths and weaknesses. Becker and Krug have undertaken the most thorough such study investigated by the present authors and they state:

questionnaire approaches to the assessment of parent attitudes (and perhaps aspects of behaviour) have offered the enticing prospect of finding more efficient and economical methods for data collection in developmental research. At present, the most popular instrument being used in this area is the Parental Attitude Research Instrument.24

In spite of this popularity Becker and Krug are aware of the PARI's limitations, as were its creators themselves. Becker and Krug explain this in the following manner:

Schaefer and Bell have been aware that in its present form the test is strongly influenced by response sets, particularly an acquiescence-response set (tendency to agree) or an extreme-response set.25

\[24\] Wesley Becker and Ronald Krug, op. cit., p. 329.

\[25\] Ibid., p. 332.
Becker and Krug report that Zuckerman, Norton and Sprague (1958), upon examining the PARI and comparing it with the "F" scale, which is a measure of validity:

became alerted to the acquiescence problem from their factor-analytic study of the PARI.26

While being alert to these inherent weaknesses, Becker and Krug are, however, aware and indicate in their article, that the PARI is the most popular instrument used for the assessment of parental attitudes and even as an instrument to reflect aspects of child-rearing behaviour.

Since the present investigators were searching for an objective and reliable instrument to use in the adoption process, the PARI was selected partly due to its overwhelming popularity and partly for other reasons. These will be hereinafter outlined.

Armentrout (1971) observes and speaks of the inherent weaknesses of the PARI. At the same time he depicts the fact that:

attitudes toward child-rearing in general may be much less predictive of a child's behaviour than attitudes toward the rearing of the specific child.27 (emphasis our own.)

In the opinion of the present investigators the PARI will be more predictive of the behaviour of adoptive parents than that of natural parents, since in the adoption process there usually is

26Ibid., p. 332.

a specific child involved.

Furthermore, it is important to point out that the adoption process ought to be a predictive process as well. It should endeavour to highlight strengths and weaknesses in the prospective adoptive parents. Reece and Levin (1968) support this hypothesis since they state that:

ways need to be found to help adoption workers more promptly identify those 'high-risk' applicants who are unlikely to become good parents.\(^2\)

In the present authors' opinion some of those "high-risk" parents may merely need prolonged pre-adoptive and post-adoptive counselling. They may not have to be eliminated as prospective adoptive parents. The idea of counselling is further supported by Lansberry (1969) who states that:

trends in adoption are more and more toward a reliance upon doing a satisfactory adoption study, placing the child, and then co-operating with the adoptive parents in a program of counselling.\(^3\)

Accordingly, Lansberry feels that counselling is as important as the adoption study and the child placement. A search for improved methods in the adoptive parent assessment process must take these three factors into account.

---


Bradley, in her study, emphasized the two first aspects, adoption study and placing the child, as stated by Lansberry. Bradley, in his research for a thorough understanding of present practices was also looking for improved methods of adoptive parent assessment and child placement. She performed her study in eight agencies to represent several forms of the adoptive parent assessment.

Bradley's survey depended on the completion of three questionnaires by adoption caseworkers at the eight agencies. All social workers involved with prospective adoptive parents during the designated time period were requested to respond to these questionnaires. On one form the caseworkers were to rate adoptive parents along specifically described dimensions, contained in 102 extensive questions. The responses highlighted important personality traits and attitudes held by the adoptive parents. The second form was designed to describe the specific child that was placed with the adoptive couple. The rationale for employing this form was to examine whether:

- certain applicant dimensions related to being considered suitable for adoption of a so-called hard-to-place child.\(^{30}\)

The third questionnaire used by Bradley was a self-rating form prepared for the caseworkers participating in the research. It requested information about the number of years of experience, amount of professional training, extensiveness of caseload. The

\(^{30}\)Trudy Bradley, op. cit., p. 18.
personalities of the caseworkers were neither incidentally, nor
specifically focused on.

After compiling the caseworkers' responses to the three
questionnaires, Bradley performed a factor analysis of the data.
She noted that the prospective adoptive couples fell into distinct
groups. She states that:

factors pointed to three varieties of
couple assessments,
1) the overall positive,
2) the marginal, and
3) the poor, or unacceptable.31

As expected, Bradley found a great variety in readiness for
parenting on the part of the couples. A word of caution must be
voiced since Bradley's results are entirely based on caseworkers'
perceptions of the prospective adoptive couples.

Bradley states that caseworkers' perceptions further
influence the adoptive parent assessment process. She says that
frequently the positive marital interaction and an outgoing
personality on the part of the prospective mother were equated with
"Warmth", which seems:

so heavily stressed when one asks
adoption workers what they look for
in the selection of adoptive appli-
cants.32

This further illustrates subjectivities involved in the present
adoptive parent assessment process.

31 Ibid., p. 188.

32 Ibid., p. 191.
In the present authors' opinion it appears to be obvious that more objective instruments than mere personal interviews ought to be employed as supplements to the present adoption process. Thus, in Lansberry's words, a "satisfactory adoption study" may be attained. If the PARI were the instrument employed for instance, and "poor" as Bradley calls them, or "high-risk" applicants as Reece and Levin call them were discovered, the assessment process could then be followed by counselling. This counselling would respond to the weak areas designated by the PARI. Mundloh states that the ultimate goal would be to provide:

individual and group sessions teaching improved ways toward adequate parenthood (which) is the agency's responsibility. 33

Ideally, therefore, a very insignificant number of applicants would ultimately be refused.

It is evident that research is needed in the area of adoption. This is only possible if the prospective adoptive parents' co-operation can be solicited.

4. Co-operation of applicants in research

As mentioned above, one of the initial steps to consider is that of co-operation when doing research with human subjects. The literature had to be investigated to examine whether adoptive parents would in fact co-operate in a research project. Further still, would they co-operate on a continued basis with questionnaires and with pre-adoptive and post-adoptive counselling.

33Raymond Mundloh, op. cit., p. 156.
Brieland (1956) examined in his survey whether adoptive applicants would co-operate with research projects. He found that:

most adoptive parents are willing to participate in research on adoption following the completion of the period of supervision as well as during that period, particularly when they understand that the purpose of research is to improve adoption procedures in the future, and not to alter or extend agency supervision for them.34

It then becomes evident from this survey that as long as the adoptive parents are informed of the purpose of the research, they manifest willingness and eagerness while participating in it. Askwith (1968) underscores the adoptive applicants' willingness to co-operate with research. He also speaks of the prospective adoptive parents' positive attitude toward counseling and casework.

In the study reported here, he states that:

including the visit and the final placement there were five interviews, which took place in less than a week. The amount of travelling was limited as the baby had been placed in a town near one of our offices. The people who did the travelling were the adoptive parents, not the worker. They came twice to the office over miles of winter roads. They were apparently quite happy to do this for an event of such importance to themselves.35

There is probably an element of pride involved as well, in this willingness to co-operate, since the applicants feel that they are


35Gordon Askwith, "Adoption and the Placement Process", The Social Worker, XXXVI, No. 1, p. 27.
contributing toward important and meaningful research that they themselves can understand.

5. The value of counselling

As referred to earlier, in the opinion of the present authors, adoptive parents could benefit from pre-adoptive and post-adoptive counselling. This applies especially to the "high-risk" individuals who have shown important weaknesses in potential parenting. The pre-adoptive meetings and counselling sessions assist in the process of preparing the parent to receive the child. The post-adoptive meetings and counselling sessions are designed to provide a continuation of support. As Olds (1970) states:

> good adoption service involves providing help to adoptive families after placement of a child. Classes for new parents, discussion groups for parents and family and individual counselling should be made available.\(^\text{36}\)

Some individuals approach the adoption agency with the appropriate motivation: that of becoming parents to a child. However, others could benefit from pre-adoptive meetings and counselling, since some individuals come to the adoption agency with inappropriate or misguided motivation. As Lidkea states, they may, for instance, approach the agency explaining their motivation in terms of the wish of:

> providing a companion for our child who is alone.\(^\text{37}\)


Lidkea then follows this quotation with a practical analysis:

Now, it should be painfully obvious to anyone who is a parent that siblings, whether natural or adopted, will make the very worst of companions for each other, a good part of the time. 38

Although Lidkea’s evaluation of the inappropriate remarks stated by the prospective adoptive parents may appear to be a slight exaggeration of facts, it is quite an adequate approximation of what siblings are like toward each other.

If early diagnosis can be effected through the use of a reliable and objective instrument and the prospective adoptive parents are perceived as entering the adoption-assessment-process with misguided motivation, it is important to respond to the latter. This response to the applicants’ feelings, attitudes and motivation ought to be effected with the aim of modifying them toward a realistic and positive direction about adoption before and after placement.

As for the post-adoptive counselling and guidance services, it is important to underscore the fact that not all individuals benefit by them to an equal extent. Nevertheless, it is important to provide them and to make their availability known to all adoptive parents. As Olds says:

Some families will use these services to great advantage; some may not use them, even though they may have problems; some may have no need for them. In any event, the services should not be tied to legal control by the agency over the child. 39

38 William Lidkea, op. cit., p. 2.

It is therefore essential to provide these services and to clarify exactly what they represent. Olds' point is very important to note. Legal control over the child by the agency is not the reason for maintaining post-adoptive contact with the parents. However, it is equally essential to make this point clear to the adoptive parents. What is important is to provide constructive and supportive assistance to the adoptive parent, and not the extension of legal control. The latter can be viewed as a threat by the adoptive parents.

The present authors feel, furthermore, that extended contact should be viewed in terms of a supportive relationship between the caseworker and the parent rather than a controlling one. Even the support will only be a partial one. After all, it is the parent who must function as an independent, well-adjusted, consistent individual with the child on a continued basis. As Sharrar states:

> The caseworker may give continuing support, but it is the adoptive parent who must weather the daily crises and foster the daily growth of the child.\(^{40}\)

The present authors would wish to state that caseworkers may indeed do counselling and give support, and also that parents should be encouraged to seek this counselling and support. Casework post-adoptively is of great importance, it may provide the learning the adoptive parents need. Group meetings and group counselling can be equally effective and are therefore of equal importance. Meeting

other individuals who face the same day-to-day problems gives a certain amount of reassurance to the adoptive parents. Group meetings ought therefore to be an integral part of the follow-up service to be provided by adoption agencies. As Rathbun and Kolodny (1967) appropriately quote one parent:

all adoptive parents should be in a group with other parents, at least the first year they have the children... (because) you think you are the only one with problems in the beginning and you are not so sure you ought to admit them even to yourself, but when you know others feel the same way it helps. 41

The parents can therefore receive support from other parents.

6. Summary

In this chapter the present authors have outlined the need for improved methods to be employed in the adoptive parent assessment process. There is a great need for studies to be performed in this area. As Bradley says:

the investigator (Bradley) was struck by the scarcity of research completed in the field of adoptive parent assessment. 42

With the assistance of the literature and personal interviews, present methods employed in the adoption process were outlined. A review of the literature regarding the PARI and pre-adoptive and post-adoptive counselling were offered. The next two chapters will present an


\[42\] Trudy Bradley, op. cit., p. 4.
outline of the hypotheses and then a description will be given of
the methods that were used by the investigators for this study.
II RESEARCH DESIGN

One of the concerns of the present investigators was to find a reliable instrument to supplement methods currently followed in the adoptive parent assessment process. The decision of placing a child for his lifetime into a particular family is indeed a difficult one, and the responsibility is of considerable magnitude. Yet at the present time to a large extent this decision depends on the impressions of one individual: the caseworker performing adoptive parent assessments.

It is the contention of the present investigators that the Parental Attitude Research Instrument can be used as an instrument to supplement the present adoptive parent assessment process.

"High Risk" 1. The PARI will serve as an aid to identifying "high risk" individuals who will either need extensive counselling in parenting or will have to be rejected as prospective adoptive parents by the Agency. These will be individuals who score less than 300 points on the entire PARI, or less than 90 points on the Seven Selected Scales extensively explained in the Methodology.

"Medium Equipped" 2. The PARI will serve as an aid to identifying "medium equipped" individuals who will need some counselling in parenting before they can be "approved" as prospective adoptive parents by the Agency. These will be individuals who score between 300 and 349 points on the entire PARI, or between 90 and 104 points on the Seven Selected Scales.
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"Well Equipped"  3. The PARI will serve as an aid to identifying "well equipped" individuals who will not be in actual need of counselling in parenting before they can be "approved" as prospective adoptive parents by the Agency. These will be individuals who score more than 350 points on the entire PARI, or more than 105 points on the Seven Selected Scales.

"Discrepancy"  4. A discrepancy between the scores obtained by one prospective parent and those obtained by his or her spouse ought to alert the caseworker to a need for additional counselling or possible rejection.

a) "High Risk"  A discrepancy of more than 105 points between the total scores obtained by each member of a prospective parent couple, will be considered as a "high risk". On the Seven Selected Scales a discrepancy of more than 49 points will be considered a "high risk".

b) "Medium Equipped"  A discrepancy of scores between spouses on the total PARI of between 90 and 104 points will be considered as "medium equipped". On the Seven Selected Scales a discrepancy of between 35 and 48 points between spouses will be considered as "medium equipped".

c) "Well Equipped"  A discrepancy of scores between spouses below 90 points on the total PARI will be considered as "well equipped". On the Seven Selected Scales a discrepancy below 35 points will be considered as "well equipped".

1. Research Hypotheses

(a) Prospective adoptive parents who have other children
will be better equipped for child-rearing than prospective adoptive parents who have not.

(b) Prospective adoptive mothers will have more "positive" child-rearing attitudes than prospective adoptive fathers will. "Positive" child-rearing attitudes in this instance signify those child-rearing attitudes that are currently held in positive regard.

(c) Younger adoptive parents will tend to have more positive child-rearing attitudes than older adoptive parents will.

2. Null Hypotheses

(a) Prospective adoptive parents who have other children will not be better equipped for child-rearing, than prospective adoptive parents who have not had any children.

(b) Prospective adoptive mothers will not differ from prospective adoptive fathers in terms of child-rearing attitudes.

(c) Younger adoptive parents will not differ from older adoptive parents in terms of child-rearing attitudes.
III METHODOLOGY

The literature relevant to this study was reviewed and the hypotheses were given. The authors now wish to present a description of the methodology of this research.

1. Setting of the study

The two agencies from which the study sample was drawn are located in Windsor, Ontario. They are the Children's Aid Society of the County of Essex, hereinafter referred to as C.A.S., and the Roman Catholic Children's Aid Society for the County of Essex, hereinafter referred to as R.C.C.A.S. At times both will be referred to as the "Agency" or the "Agencies" as well.

The definition of a "children's aid society" as indicated in the Child Welfare Act, 1965, amended by The Child Welfare Amendment Act, 1966, is as follows:

(b) 'children's aid society' or 'society' means a children's aid society approved by the Lieutenant Governor in Council under this Act,¹

The children's aid societies' duties are further outlined as follows:

(2) Every children's aid society shall be operated for the purpose of,

(a) investigating allegations or evidence that children may be in need of protection;

(b) protecting children where necessary;
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(c) providing guidance, counselling and other services to families for protecting children or for the prevention of circumstances requiring the protection of children;

(d) providing care for children assigned to its care under this or any other Act;

(e) supervising children assigned to its supervision under this or any other Act;

(f) placing children for adoption;

(g) assisting unmarried parents and their children; and

(h) any other duties given to it by this or any other Act.²

Children's Aid Societies, furthermore, are sole adoption agencies in the Province of Ontario. At the same time adoption is merely one of the services provided.

2. Selecting the sample

The sample used in the present study was a time-limited one, drawn from the two above named Agencies. In other words, all prospective adoptive parents willing to participate in the research project from the period of December 10th, 1971 until February 15th, 1972 were to be included in the study. It was hoped that a total of 20 participant couples from each of the two Agencies will have accumulated by that date. Bradley followed a similar format for the selection of her sample. She explains this procedure in the following terms:

²Ibid., p. 3.
The research plan called for a gradual accumulation of the sample until a total of 50 cases had built up in each of the eight agencies. Our aim was to obtain a total sample of 400 applicant couples who had been interviewed one or more times.\(^3\)

Even though Bradley's study was considerably larger in scope than the present one, the decision was made to follow her format in the present project because of its similarity.

The sample itself consisted of 32 applicant couples, the individual participants' age-range being from 23 to 55 years. Educational levels were from a minimum of grade eight to a maximum of doctoral degrees. Since all were married couples there was a total of 64 applicants, 32 being males and 32 being females. In the sample, 40 individuals were of the Protestant faith, 22 were Roman Catholics and two were Greek Orthodox.

Within the scope of the present study, at the C.A.S. one adoptive father refused to participate in the project. Consequently the adoptive mother was not requested to participate either, since it had been decided in advance that it is essential that both partners complete the PARI.

At the P.C.C.A.S. one couple refused to take part in the study. Another couple was deemed to be insufficiently fluent in the English language for completion of the Research Instrument. In the case of a third couple, the prospective adoptive mother had completed the forms, but became pregnant before the adoptive father had completed them. Consequently, these individuals withdrew their

\(^3\)Trudy Bradley, op. cit., p. 21.
application to adopt and the male applicant did not have the opportunity to respond to the inventory of statements. This couple was, therefore, omitted from the research project. A fourth couple was omitted from the present study since only the female applicant had completed the PARI before the cut-off date.

Based on estimates given by the Adoption Department supervisors, the anticipated number of persons participating in the research project was to be eighty. As this number was not reached by February 15, 1972, the time limit was extended until March 16, 1972 for the R.C.C.A.S. and February 29, 1972 for the C.A.S. By this time, 12 couples had completed the research instrument at the R.C.C.A.S., and the expected twenty couples had completed it at the C.A.S. This brought the total to 32 couples. Each member of the entire group of 64 participants within the sample was married. Also, in the case of each couple both the male and the female partner participated in the research project. The number of males and females involved, therefore, was 32 each.

Those individuals included in the present study were couples who had applied to be parents to an adopted child. All individuals had gone through the adoptive parent assessment process of the particular Agency that was investigating them. At the time when they were requested to complete the PARI all couples had been "approved" as prospective adoptive parents and had been advised of this "approval". "Approval", in the present research refers to the affirmative result of the investigative procedure normally followed with adoptive parents. In other words, the applicant
couple had been judged as appropriate candidates for parenting an adopted child. Without any exception, the couples participating in the present study had not received the adoptive child in their home when completing the PARI. During the Agency's investigation, the prospective adoptive parents were not aware that their participation in a study would subsequently be sought. Therefore, the present research project did not introduce any contaminating factors into the assessment process. It is conceivable, however, that the adoption caseworkers of the Agencies involved approached their investigation with more caution than usual, since they were aware of the investigative nature of the present study. This factor, then, could be considered as a possible, intervening variable, even though normal operations were supposed to be followed at the two Agencies.

Bradley's approach in her research project is a similar one. She speculates that:

Although the very presence of the research project may have altered the atmosphere in these agencies, and the amount of time spent by workers in completing questionnaires inevitably changed agency operations to some extent, the interest of the investigator was in "business as usual".4

The possibility, therefore, exists that the presence of the research may have been a minor modifying factor in the investigative process followed at the two Agencies.

At the C.A.S, the subjects participating in the study, ranged in age from 24 to 47. The female participants were between the ages of 24

---

4Ibid., p. 22.
and 46 and the male participants were between the ages of 24 and 47.

The age range at the R.C.C.A.S. was from 23 to 55. Female participants were between the ages of 23 to 45 and the male participants were between the ages of 27 to 55.

With the exception of the one male participant who was 55, the age range fell between 23 and 47 years.

The educational level of female participants at the C.A.S. was as follows. All participants had at least grade nine education, fourteen out of twenty individuals had completed grade eleven. There was one female participant who had studied beyond the Bachelor of Arts degree level. The male participants all had at least grade eight education, sixteen out of twenty had completed grade eleven. There was one physician and one individual with a Doctorate in Philosophy among them.

The female participants at the R.C.C.A.S. had a minimum of grade nine education, nine out of twelve individuals had completed grade eleven and there were two female participants who had completed Teacher's College. The male subjects had a minimum of grade eight education, and seven male participants out of a total of twelve had completed grade eleven. At the R.C.C.A.S. the highest attained level of education for male subjects was one Bachelor of Arts degree.

2. Data collection procedure

All individuals participating in the present study were asked to do so on a voluntary and gratuitous basis. The procedure followed for enlisting the applicant couples' co-operation, and then for data collection was similar at the two Agencies and will hereinafter be
described.

(a) C.A.S.

At the C.A.S. the caseworkers who had been investigating the couple through the adoptive parent assessment process, telephoned the participating couple and arranged for an appointment to visit them at their residence. The Agency caseworker carried the explanatory and co-operation-soliciting letter (Appendix No. 1, p. 92) with him, and personally handed it to the two individuals, who then read it.

Subsequently, the PARI (Appendix No. 2, p. 93) was presented. The marriage partners then either both remained in the room occupied by the caseworker, or one participant went to a separate room to complete the PARI there. At all times, the adoption worker was supervising the couple, so that no communication could take place between marriage partners while responding to the statements in the PARI.

The procedure herein outlined was the one followed with all participant couples except for one. In this one case, the caseworker telephoned the participating couple and arranged for an appointment at the offices of the Agency. The explanatory and co-operation-soliciting letter was presented to the adoptive parents at the Agency. After reading it, they completed the PARI in separate offices and no communication could take place between marriage partners while responding to the statements in the PARI.

(b) R.C.C.A.S.

At the R.C.C.A.S. a letter was first sent to the participant
couples. Most individuals in the sample obtained the letter prepared at the R.C.C.A.S., (Appendix No. 3, p.102) which was essentially very similar to the one prepared by the present authors and used by the C.A.S. Other individuals were sent the letter prepared by the present authors, earlier referred to as Appendix No. 1, p. 92.

Whichever letter was sent to the prospective adoptive parents, the latter were advised in it to telephone the caseworker. All those who participated in the present study had complied with this request. Over the telephone the caseworker proceeded to explain the purpose of the study and the importance of completing the PARI. The guidelines followed during this telephone conversation were identical to the ones outlined in the letters. All couples were requested to arrange for an appointment at the offices of the Agency.

All subjects who participated in the present research through the R.C.C.A.S. completed the PARI in an office of the Agency. No forms were completed at the residence of a participant. All individuals completed the PARI in separate offices and no communication could take place between marriage partners while responding to the statements of the Inventory.

Some of the participant couples came to the offices of the R.C.C.A.S. together and completed their PARI simultaneously, in separate offices. Others came to the Agency separately, at entirely different times.

At the R.C.C.A.S., most frequently it was the caseworker who had been investigating the couple through the adoptive parent assess-
ment process who handed the prospective adoptive parents their PARI for completion. At times, however, it was the Agency's receptionist who performed this task. She had been given the appropriate instructions for handing out the PARI, and the initial explanation had been offered over the telephone by the couple's own caseworker. All subjects had appointments for completing the Inventory within three weeks of the date when Appendix No. 3, p. 102, or Appendix No. 1, p. 92 had been sent out to them.

At the C.A.S. four caseworkers were involved in collecting the data from the participant couples. At the R.C.C.A.S. seven caseworkers were involved in collecting the data. They were, in turn, further assisted in certain cases by the Agency receptionist.

4. The Questionnaire

The data gathering instrument administered to both male and female participants was the Parental Attitude Research Instrument (PARI), Appendix No. 2, p. 93 developed by Carl S. Schaefer and Richard Q. Bell. The PARI consists of one hundred and fifteen statements related to child-rearing attitudes. For each statement, one out of four possible responses must be selected by the respondent. A circle must be drawn around the letter that corresponds the closest to the respondent's own feelings about the given statement. The letters are explained by Schaefer and Bell as follows:

draw a circle around the "A" if you strongly agree, around the "a" if you mildly agree, around the "d" if you mildly disagree, and around the "D" if you strongly disagree.5

5Schaefer and Bell, op. cit., p. 354.
The written instructions composed by Schaefer and Bell and used by the present researchers specifically state that there are no "right" or "wrong" answers and that each individual is expected to offer his own opinion. In other words, the respondent is not expected to attempt to "please" those that will score the Inventory. Had the participant couples been requested to respond to the PARI while the investigative process of the agency was being carried out, it could have been postulated that they were attempting to "please" their caseworker. Since the adoptive parent assessment process had already been completed and the couples had been advised of the "approval", it was hypothesized that the responses would, indeed, be reflecting the individuals' own opinions. The only intervening factor at this time was that the adoptive child was not yet placed in the home. Fear of not obtaining a child if the caseworker is not "pleased" could be considered the only contaminating factor between offering actual opinions or attempting to "please" the caseworker.

All statements on the PARI remained identical to the original form designed by Schaefer and Bell, except for statement No. 92. It originally read:

Most women need more time than they are given to rest up in the home after going through childbirth.\(^6\)

Since the female participants involved in the present study were not having a child through childbirth, at least not within the foreseeable future, the wording of statement No. 92 was slightly

\(^{6}\text{Ibid., p. 358.}\)
modified to read:

Most women need more help and rest in the home when they are looking after a small infant.

The PARI has twenty-three scales, which consist of five statements each. Items are cycled and every twenty-third statement relates to the same scale. These scales are listed in Table 1, p. 42. For instance, a typical statement in the Strictness scale is:

Children are actually happier under strict training. 

A typical statement in Encouraging Verbalization is:

A child has a right to his own point of view and ought to be allowed to express it.

The respondents were then asked to either mildly or strongly agree or disagree with such statements.

The PARI was actually developed by Schaefer and Bell in order to obtain homogeneous measures of parental attitudes. Their main focus of interest in constructing the Inventory was to measure the child's adjustment as a result of parental child-rearing attitudes. While Schaefer and Bell were matching and sorting statements as a preliminary measure toward developing the PARI, they observed that:

Items which make what seem to be either purely factual statements or which state

---

7 Appendix 2, p. 93.

8 Ibid. p. 100.

9 Ibid. p. 96.
TABLE 1

Names of 23 PARI scales

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>23 PARI Scales</th>
<th>&quot;desirable&quot; answers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Encouraging Verbalization</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Fostering Dependency</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Seclusion of the Mother</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Breaking the Will</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Martyrdom</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Fear of harming the Baby</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Marital Conflict</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Strictness</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Irritability</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Excluding outside Influences</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Deification</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Suppression of Aggression</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Rejection of the homemaking Role</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Equalitarianism</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Approval of Activity</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Avoidance of Communication</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Inconsiderateness of the Husband</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Suppression of Sexuality</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Ascendancy of the mother</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Intrusiveness</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Comradeship and Sharing</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Acceleration of Development</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Dependancy of the Mother</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
attitudes that would be generally endorsed by psychologists as expressing approved attitudes toward child-rearing do not differentiate effectively between parents of normals and parents of maladjusted children.\textsuperscript{10}

Schaefer and Bell further state that those scale items that reflect currently approved child-rearing attitudes:

typically have very poor reliabilities because there is a strong tendency for all persons to agree.\textsuperscript{11}

They concluded that such items then would be weak discriminators and predictors. Subsequently they attempted to concentrate on statements that were to contradict currently held child-rearing attitudes. However, Schaefer and Bell found that those mothers who responded in this pilot project were frustrated by these. A short version of the total test was then constructed, using both the contradicting and the positive statements. This short form of the PARI was tried out on several groups of twenty-five mothers. Subsequent to this trial performance:

items were eliminated if they did not reveal variation in attitudes or did not vary with other items which were used to define the scale. Promising items were noted, and new items were written based upon hypotheses about the successful items.\textsuperscript{12}

Subsequent sequential experimentation still involved many

\textsuperscript{10}Earl S. Schaefer and Richard E. Bell, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 346.
\textsuperscript{11}\textit{Ibid.}
\textsuperscript{12}\textit{Ibid.}
other samples of different sizes. Finally, the five statements for each of the twenty-three scales were cyclically arranged so that, for example:

the first subscale includes items 1, 24, 47, 70 and 93, the second subscale
titems 2, 25, 48, 71 and 94, etc.\textsuperscript{13}

In this way, statements that pertain to the same scale are not arranged to be in proximity to each other. This assists in avoiding awareness of the purpose of each statement in respondents.

Scoring of the research instrument was effected according to the key developed by Schaefer and Bell. Weighting of each of the items on the PARI was effected according to the guidelines offered by Dr. Earl S. Schaefer during a telephone conversation with one of the present authors: Mrs. Eva E. Philipp. On each scale there is an "expected" or "desirable" answer. "Expected" or "desirable" in this connection means that a weight of four is accorded to either "strongly Agree" or "strongly Disagree". If the "desirable" answer is "strongly Disagree", then "mildly disagree" has a weight of three, "mildly agree" has a weight of two and "strongly Agree" has a weight of one. For example, if the statement is:

Parents should adjust to the children some rather than always expecting the children to adjust to the parents.\textsuperscript{14}

The "desirable" answer for this statement is: "strongly Agree".

\textsuperscript{13}Ibid., p. 351.

\textsuperscript{14}Appendix 2, p. 93.
Those individuals that responded accordingly, obtained a score of four on this item. If the response is "mildly agree", the score obtained is three; if it is "mildly disagree", the score obtained is two. Finally, if the respondent circles "strongly Disagree", he obtains a score of one. On statements where the "desirable" response is "strongly Disagree", the weighting is reversed. "Strongly Disagree" obtains a score of four and so on down the line.

Graphically represented, the scoring would appear as indicated on Table 2 as follows:

TABLE 2

If "desirable" answer is "strongly Agree":

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If "desirable" answer is "strongly Disagree":

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results of each individual who participated in the study were added up. The highest possible score on the total of one hundred and fifteen statements was 460 and the minimum score on the total statements was 115.

Individuals were categorized into groups of "high risk", "medium equipped" and "well equipped" for parenting, according to the scores they obtained. "High risk" applicant couples are those whose attitudes would not be congruent with the expectations of the Agency. They would, therefore, be in need of further extensive
guidance and counselling, or ultimately in certain cases, rejection by the Agency. "Medium equipped" applicant couples would be those who would be in need of some counselling, and finally the "well equipped" group of prospective adoptive parents are those individuals whose attitudes are congruent with Agency expectations and who would make appropriate parents even without further counselling.

Individuals were placed into several categories. In other words, individuals who scored "high" on the entire research instrument, that is to say between a point total of 350 and 460, were classified as either "low risk", or "well equipped" individuals. Individuals who scored between 300 and 349 points on the total PARI, were classified as "medium equipped" applicant couples. Those whose scores were between 115 and 299 points for the total PARI were categorized as "high risk" prospective adoptive parent couples.

The manner in which these scores were arrived at is as follows. The maximum obtainable score on the total PARI is 460 points, arrived at only if all the responses have a value of 4 points each. If all the responses were 3's, the total score on the PARI would be 345. If all responses were 2's, the total score on the PARI would be 230. The lowest possible attainable score would be 115 points, where the respondent would have to score 1's unilaterally. The decision was therefore made to select out the group of individuals who would score between 350 points and 460 points. Most of their answers would either have a value of 3 or 4. These were the "well equipped" individuals. The "medium equipped" was a much smaller category, based on those individuals who would have a limited
amount of 1's and 2's but would still score predominantly 3's and 4's. These were the adoptive applicants whose total score on the PARI was between 300 and 349. Finally, those who would have mostly 1's and 2's on their PARI would be individuals within the 115 and 299 range. These were the "high risk" applicants.

The obtained data were further divided through the selection of seven scales that were analyzed as a separate unit. It was hoped that a shortened form of the PARI could be devised as a saving. The Seven Selected Scales were: Strictness, Acceleration of Development, Fostering Dependency, Ascendancy of the Mother, Suppression of Sexuality, Breaking the Will, and Marital Conflict. The criterion for selecting these specific scales was that their degree of reliability was high. Schaefer and Bell had cross-validated the reliability of all items with Kuder-Richardson Formula 20. The reliability of no item on the Seven Selected Scales is lower than .60. Marital Conflict was specifically used, because interviews with Adoption Department supervisors revealed that this factor is of great importance in deciding on placement. A break-down of all the degrees of reliability on the total PARI is shown on Table 3, p. 48. Reliabilities for the Seven Selected Scales are marked with an asterisk on the same table. It will further be noted that degrees of reliability are broken down into two columns. One is for parents who have no children: Primiparae. The other one is for parents who already have children: Multiparae.

5. Scoring the Questionnaire

Individuals whose total scores were "high" on the Seven
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Primiparae</th>
<th>Multiparae</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Equalitarianism</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suppression of Aggression</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breaking the Will *</td>
<td>.60*</td>
<td>.68*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strictness *</td>
<td>.69*</td>
<td>.74*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intrusiveness</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suppression of Sex *</td>
<td>.63*</td>
<td>.67*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceleration of Development *</td>
<td>.65*</td>
<td>.70*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comradeship and Sharing</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deification</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martyrdom</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encouraging Verbalization</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seclusion of the Mother</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependency of the Mother</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of harming the Baby</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fostering Dependency *</td>
<td>.77*</td>
<td>.73*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Conflict *</td>
<td>.69*</td>
<td>.60*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irritability</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excluding outside Influences</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rejection of the Homemaking Role</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoidance of Communication</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ascendancy of the Mother *</td>
<td>.71*</td>
<td>.76*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inconsiderateness of the Husband</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approval of Activity</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15Schaefer and Bell, op. cit. Table adapted from p. 350. Those figures and Scale Names marked with an asterisk are the reliability scores of the Seven Selected Scales.
Selected Scales, that is to say, those who scored between 105 and 140 points on them were classified as "low risk", or "well equipped" individuals. Those subjects who scored between 90 and 104 points were categorized as "medium equipped" couples. Finally, those who scored between 35 and 89 points were classified as "high risk" prospective adoptive parent couples.

On the Seven Selected Scales the categories of "well equipped", "medium equipped" and "high risk" were arrived at as follows. The maximum obtainable score on the Seven Selected Scales is 140, arrived at only if all the responses have a value of 4 points. If all the applicant's responses were 3's, the total score on the Seven Selected Scales would be 105. If all responses were 2's, the total score on the Seven Selected Scales would be 70 points and finally, the lowest attainable score is 35 points. In this case, the respondent would have to score 1's unilaterally. The decision was made to select the group of individuals scoring between 105 and 140. Most of their answers would either be 3's or 4's. These were the "well equipped" individuals. The "medium equipped" was a smaller category, comprised of individuals who would have a limited amount of 1's and 2's, but would still predominantly score within the 3 and 4 range. Their score on the Seven Selected Scales was between 90 and 104 points. Finally, those who would have mostly 1's and 2's would be individuals whose range was between 35 and 89. These were the "high risk" applicants.

A further criterion for classifying applicant couples was to examine discrepancies in scores between husband and wife. If the
discrepancy in total points was more than 105 points, the couple was classified as "high risk". If the difference between the scores of the marriage partners on the entire PARI was between 90 and 104 points, the subjects were classified as a "medium risk" couple. Wherever a discrepancy in scores between spouses was less than 90 points, the prospective adoptive parents were classified as "well equipped" couples.

On the Seven Selected Scales if a difference of 49 points or in excess of that occurred the couple was categorized as "high risk". When discrepancies in scores added up to between 35 and 48 points, the applicant couple was placed in the category of "medium risk". Those couples who had a difference in scores of less than 35 points on the Seven Selected Scales were categorized as "well equipped" couples. The high numbers that were selected to emphasize the differences in scores between husband and wife were to highlight gross differences between the results obtained. It was expected that fine discrepancies would occur all the time, but that the gross differences would have to be focused upon.

All results were then tabulated onto a Summary Sheet, (Appendix 4, p. 103) where each of the categories herein described were designated. Each Summary Sheet contained the results obtained both from the female and the male participant and was attached to the prospective adoptive mother's PARI. Total scores, discrepancies in scores and the Seven Selected Scale Scores were entered onto each Summary Sheet to facilitate reference to figures when performing statistical analyses.
6. Coding the data

Permission for performing the present research project was formally obtained through the submission of a letter by the present authors to the R.C.C.A.S. (Appendix 5, p. 104). The same permission was obtained verbally from the C.A.S., more informally. From the initial stages on, agreement was reached between the present researchers and both Agencies that the names of participating adoptive parents remain anonymous. The decision was therefore made to code each one of the Research Instruments that would be completed by those individuals participating in the project.

All female adoptive applicants in the sample at the R.C.C.A.S. were designated by the letters CF and all male adoptive applicants in the sample at the R.C.C.A.S. were designated by the letters CM. The first couple were allotted the number 1, the next obtained number 2. Even though only twelve couples participated in the present study at the R.C.C.A.S. the last number used was 15. The numbers CF5 and CM5 were not employed, since the prospective adoptive mother became pregnant after completing her PARI. The couple withdrew their adoptive application before CM5 completed the PARI. The numbers CF12 and CM12 were not used because only the female applicant had completed the PARI before the cut-off date: March 16, 1972. The numbers CF14 and CM14 were not used at all. The last numbers used, therefore, were CF15 and CM15. Accordingly, on the first page of each PARI, the following coding information appeared: either CF1, or CM1, or CF2, or CM2, continuing down to the last numbers: CF15, CM15.
All female adoptive applicants in the sample at the C.A.S. were designated by the letters PF and all male adoptive applicants in the sample at the C.A.S. were designated by the letters PM.
The first couple were allotted the number 1, the next obtained number 2 and this procedure was continued down to the last number: 20. Accordingly, on the first page of each PARI, the following coding information appeared: either PF1, or PM1, or PF2, or PM2, continuing down to the last numbers: PF20, PM20.

Two master charts, one for each of the two Agencies, were prepared: Appendix 6, p. for the C.A.S. and Appendix 7, p. for the R.C.C.A.S. Code numbers were listed on these master charts, enabling the adoption department supervisors at each of the two Agencies to record the pertinent information about each individual in the sample. In this way, the present researchers were able to obtain information regarding the educational level, the age, the income, the religion and whether there were any existing children in the home of each applicant couple without the necessity of revealing the identity of individuals in the sample.

In this section a review of the sampling and the data collecting procedures were reviewed. This was followed by a brief description of the Research Instrument being used in the present research project. Then the categorization of applicant couples according to the scores obtained on the PARI was explained. Finally, the rationale for coding the questionnaires was stated. The authors will now analyze, interpret and discuss the collected data.
IV RESULTS

The results obtained by each individual on the PARI were entered from the Summary Sheets (Appendix 4, p. 103) onto a Comprehensive Chart devised by the present authors (Appendix 8, p. 110). In addition to the information originating from the Summary Sheet - regarding total PARI scores and scores obtained on the Seven Selected Scales, plus discrepancy scores - the Comprehensive Chart contained information collected from Appendices Nos. 6, p. 105, and 7, p. 108. Accordingly, data regarding sex, age and whether there already were children in the home of applicants, was tabulated as well. On this chart, scores for each individual, Female and Male, were recorded separately. A breakdown of the distribution of scores on the Seven Selected Scales for Females and Males is indicated on Table 4, as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>High Risk</th>
<th>Medium Equipped</th>
<th>Well Equipped</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35-89</td>
<td>90-104</td>
<td>105-140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A breakdown of the distribution of scores on the total PARI for Females and Males is illustrated on Table 5, as follows:

53.
TABLE 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>High Risk 115-299</th>
<th>Medium Equipped 300-349</th>
<th>Well Equipped 350-460</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It had been predicted that those individuals who would obtain scores of less than 300 points on the entire PARI or less than 90 points on the Seven Selected Scales would be considered "high risk" prospective adoptive couples. Participant parent couples who would score between 300 and 349 points on the total PARI and 90 to 104 points on the Seven Selected Scales were considered "medium equipped" couples. Those that would score above 350 points on the entire PARI and over 105 points on the Seven Selected Scales were identified as "well equipped" individuals.

Another dimension along which predictions were made was the discrepancy in scores between marriage partners. Taking both dimensions into account, 10 couples out of the total 32 were identified as "well equipped", seven couples were identified as "medium equipped" and 15 couples were identified as "high risk".

The final category into which an applicant couple could fall was determined by six criteria.

1. The total score attained by the prospective adoptive mother on the entire PARI.
2. The prospective adoptive mother's score on the Seven Selected Scales.
3. The total score obtained by the prospective adoptive father on the entire PARI.

4. The prospective adoptive father's score on the Seven Selected Scales.

5. The discrepancy in scores between the total number of points of the two marriage partners.

6. The discrepancy between the scores of the marriage partners on the Seven Selected Scales.

The decision was made to use certain criteria for rating applicant couples. If one out of the six outlined results fell within the classification "high risk", and two or three results were in the "medium equipped" range, the couple were categorized as "high risk". Wherever there were two or more "high risk" results out of the six, the couple were classified as "high risk" as well.

Prospective adoptive parents who had at least four scores within the "medium equipped" range were classified as "medium equipped". Those couples who had three "medium equipped" scores between them and one "well equipped", were categorized as "medium equipped". If two of the couple's scores entered the classification "well equipped", one within the "medium equipped" range and one within the "high risk" range, they were categorized as "medium equipped".

Prospective adoptive parents who had three or more "well equipped" and only one "medium equipped" results, were categorized
as "well equipped". If there were two scores within the "well equipped" range and two scores within the "medium equipped" range, the couple was also categorized as "well equipped".

There were only four prospective adoptive couples who had significant discrepancy scores. All these were judged "high risk" through the above described criteria as well.

According to the present authors' first hypothesis, it was expected that parents who already have other children would be better equipped for child-rearing than prospective adoptive parents who have none. There were 14 couples without children and 18 couples who had at least one child in their home. These two groups were compared in terms of their scores on the Seven Selected PARI Scales. The difference between means produced a "t" value of 1.21 which approached significance at the .10 level (one-tailed). This is represented on Table 6. Thus the evidence, although not clear-cut, does point in the predicted direction.

**TABLE 6**

Parent With or Without Children

Comparison of Scores on the Seven Selected Scales

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No Children</th>
<th>Some Children</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\bar{x}$</td>
<td>96.64</td>
<td>100.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\sigma$</td>
<td>12.52</td>
<td>12.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$t$</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p close to</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(one-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A comparison of the two groups in terms of their scores on the total PARI is represented in Figure 1, p. 58. When examining the results obtained on the total PARI scores, however, the difference between means results in a "t" value of 1.80, which is significant at the .05 level (one-tailed). These results are represented on Table 7, as follows.

**TABLE 7**

**Parent With or Without Children**

**Comparison of Scores on the Total PARI**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No Children</th>
<th>Some Children</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N = 28</td>
<td>N = 36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\overline{X} = 316.32$</td>
<td>$\overline{X} = 327.83$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\sigma = 32.83$</td>
<td>$\sigma = 35.06$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$t = 1.80$

$p < .05$ (one-tailed)

When looking at the results obtained on the "t" test, therefore, regarding the first hypothesis, it would appear impossible to accept the null hypothesis.

According to the second hypothesis prospective adoptive mothers were expected to have more "positive" child-rearing attitudes than prospective adoptive fathers. The results regarding this hypothesis were highly encouraging and are highlighted regarding the total PARI score on Figure 2, p. 59. When these two groups were compared with the aid of the "t" test on the Seven Selected PARI Scales, the value obtained was 2.32 which is significant at less
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than the .01 level (one-tailed). These results are illustrated on Table 8, as follows:

**TABLE 8**

Female-Male Comparison of Scores on the Seven Selected Scales

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \bar{X} )</td>
<td>102.38</td>
<td>95.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \sigma )</td>
<td>10.60</td>
<td>13.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ t = 2.32 \]
\[ p < .01 \text{ (one-tailed)} \]

The results were even more positive on the total PARI, for when the results of the prospective adoptive mothers and fathers were compared with the aid of the "t" test, the value obtained was 3.48 which is significant at less than the .005 level (one-tailed). These results are shown on Table 9, as follows:

**TABLE 9**

Female-Male Comparison of Scores on the Total PARI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \bar{X} )</td>
<td>336.78</td>
<td>308.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \sigma )</td>
<td>26.86</td>
<td>35.74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ t = 3.48 \]
\[ p < .005 \text{ (one-tailed)} \]

Therefore, the null hypothesis that prospective adoptive
mothers will not differ from prospective adoptive fathers in child-
rearing attitudes will have to be rejected.

The third hypothesis stated that younger adoptive parents
would tend to have more positive child-rearing attitudes than
older adoptive parents. Results regarding this hypothesis were
encouraging as well. They are illustrated regarding the total
PARI on Figure 3, p. 62. The value obtained on the "t" test for
the Seven Selected PARI Scales was 2.16 which is significant at
less than the .025 level (one-tailed). These results are reported
in Table 10, as follows:

| TABLE 10 |
|---|---|
| Age Comparison of Scores on the Seven |
| Selected Scales | |
| <32 years | >32 years |
| N = 37 | N = 27 |
| $\bar{X} = 101.86$ | $\bar{X} = 94.70$ |
| $\sigma = 10.83$ | $\sigma = 14.12$ |

$t = 2.16$
$p < .025\text{(one-tailed)}$

Older and younger individuals were categorized in the following
manner. Since the mean age of all the participants was 32, those
that were over thirty-two years of age were classified as "older"
and those individuals who were under thirty-two years of age were
classified as "younger". "Older" will hereinafter be illustrated
as $\geq 32$ and "younger" will hereinafter be illustrated as $<32$. The
results of these two groups were compared in terms of their total
scores on the PARI as well. The difference between means resulted
Figure 3
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in a "t" value of 1.62 which is significant at the .05 level (one-tailed). These results are illustrated on Table 11, as follows:

**TABLE 11**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>&lt;32 years</th>
<th>≥32 years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\bar{X}$</td>
<td>330.08</td>
<td>312.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\sigma$</td>
<td>33.15</td>
<td>46.42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$t = 1.62$

$p<0.05$ (one-tailed)

This was the only case in which the results were more significant for the Seven Selected Scales than the total PARI.

Thus the null hypothesis that younger adoptive parents will not differ from older adoptive parents in terms of child-rearing attitudes must also be rejected.

Due to the fact that all the results pointed in the expected direction, all three hypotheses are accepted, and therefore, all three null hypotheses are hereby rejected.
V DISCUSSION

The adoption caseworker has little opportunity to observe the child-rearing practices of prospective adoptive parents. He depends on interviews which provide him with impressions, many of which are the child-rearing attitudes expressed by each prospective adoptive parent. An assumption is frequently made that these impressions, attitudes and brief samples of the couple's behaviour will be adequate predictors of child-rearing abilities and behaviour. In many cases observation of interaction with a child is impossible since there are no offspring in the home of the prospective adoptive parents.

The measurement of attitudes using a questionnaire like the PARI likewise makes this assumption. Human beings can be quite adaptive and it is reasonable to assume as well that prospective adoptive parents may express inappropriate child-rearing attitudes and yet can modify their position with appropriate counselling. Their attitudes may change simply through the subsequent experience of having a child in the home. Because the PARI has numerous scales (23) which tap various areas of child-rearing attitudes, it follows that the instrument may be employed in a diagnostic and prescriptive way. A given prospective parent can have a low overall score, yet have many areas of strength. By looking at his or her PARI protocol, the areas of weakness can be identified and explored through further interviews with the case-
worker. Counselling could then ensue and it would be focused in
the areas of weakness. This means that a low score on the PARI
should not automatically "rule out" a candidate. The result ought
to become a part of the total impression about the couple. The
PARI is therefore being proposed as a tool for social workers to
assist in the adoptive parent assessment process.

The practice in most Children's Aid Societies is to provide
follow-up counselling to all adoptive parents for six months to a
year, or sometimes longer. The results of the PARI in the present
sample suggest, as was expected, that some couples are higher risks
for parenting than others. They would need a measure of pre-
adoptive counselling, and more follow-up counselling than others.
The results of a few raise a serious question of the suitability
of one or even both parents. Certainly some of these would at
least need extensive pre-adoptive counselling. The question of
the suitability cannot be answered however, in the absence of
additional information regarding any given couple.

Based on the criteria employed in this study, the following
results represented in Table 12, were obtained supporting the view
that couples differ widely in terms of their child-rearing attitudes:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>&quot;Well Equipped&quot;</th>
<th>&quot;Medium Equipped&quot;</th>
<th>&quot;High Risk&quot;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10 couples</td>
<td>7 couples</td>
<td>15 couples</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. The "high risk" couples

It is the 15 couples whose PARI scores identify them as "high
risks" who deserve the highest degree of attention. Four of these
had large discrepancies between husband and wife which suggests a major source of problems within a family with children. In each of these four cases, the husband had "high risk" scores both on the Seven Selected Scales and on the total PARI scores and the wife had a "medium equipped" or "well equipped" rating. It is a well-known fact that parents should agree in terms of how to raise their children. A lenient or democratic parent coupled with a strict or authoritarian individual will produce a couple who will give conflicting messages to their children. This may create many anxiety-provoking situations within the home. The child is also liable to play one parent off against the other, thus adding to the problem.

In addition to looking at discrepancies in scores between husband and wife, the actual points obtained on the Scale item: Marital Conflict were also examined. Out of the total sample of 32 couples, eight obtained low scores on Marital Conflict. Three of these couples were classified "well equipped" on their total rating as per the six criteria indicated on page 54. It therefore seems that the results obtained according to the Scale item: Marital Conflict alone, is not an appropriate indicator.

There were 11 other couples within the "high risk" category. In this case both parents had low scores on the PARI. If one is ready to believe that a person can display inappropriate or questionable child-rearing attitudes and yet behave in a positive manner with children, then these results could be discounted. It would be more realistic to use this information in conjunction with
other material obtained in the adoptive parent assessment process.

In the present study, all couples surveyed with the PARI had been previously "approved" as prospective adoptive parents by the Agencies. It would be a mistake to look at the number of "high risk" couples and conclude that the Agencies should have rejected these. It would also be an error to disregard these results. Results obtained on the PARI for all participants in the present study will be made available to the respective Agencies. They may use this information in conjunction with their casework counselling after the actual placement of the child occurs. The PARI scores can serve to indicate which marriage partner will require more counselling—especially if that one is the one who has the greater influence in the "tone" or "atmosphere" of the home.

General discussion

In the first hypothesis it was stated that prospective adoptive parents who already have children will be better equipped for child-rearing than those who have not. This prediction was borne out by the findings, both through results on the Seven Selected Scales and on the total PARI. Results were more significant upon comparing the total scores than the Seven Selected Scale scores. In future research it would appear that scoring the PARI using only the Seven Selected Scales would be done at the expense of the sensitivity of the instrument.

Out of the total number of 32 couples that participated in the study, 18 have children and 14 have none. When looking at these
18 couples who have children, only seven were classified as "high risk". This represents a proportion of 38%. By contrast eight of the 14 couples who do not have children were classified as "high risk". This represents a proportion of 57%, which is in the predicted direction. It can be postulated that childless couples will tend to modify their attitudes once they have a child. However, they might need counselling regarding those attitudes which are not positive. This counselling ought to be available both pre-adoptively and post-adoptively. In the case of those parents who have at least one child and were classified as "high risk", it would be very interesting to investigate their actual child-rearing behaviour and its effect on their child or children.

It is possible that there is an interaction effect between the age of a couple with or without children and their child-rearing attitudes. By taking the mean age of each couple and classifying them as <32 or ≥32 years old, it was possible to examine them in terms of the "well equipped", "medium equipped", and "high risk" ratings, (See Figure 4, p. 69). For those couples with children the distribution appears to follow the overall trend: couples who are ≥32 scored slightly lower than those who are <32.

There is an absence of couples who are ≥32 and without children, receiving a "well equipped" or "medium equipped" rating. All three such couples received a "high risk" rating. The implications based on this small sample may be that older childless couples tend to have inappropriate or questionable child-rearing attitudes. It could also be simply a lack of practical knowledge which would
Figure 4

Mean Age of Couples With and Without Children Related to PARI Score Rating

"Well equipped"  "Medium equipped"  "High risk"

Couples with children  N = 18

No. of Couples
0  1  2  3
<32  >32  <32  >32  <32  >32

Couples without children  N = 14

No. of Couples
0  1  2  3  4  5
<32  >32  <32  >32  <32  >32
be based on child-rearing. This specific prediction was not made
in the hypotheses, but follows when one combines the first and
third hypotheses that were made: regarding age and the presence
of children in the home.

The second hypothesis regarding Male-Female differences of
scores on the PARI, was strongly confirmed, both on the Seven
Selected Scales and the total PARI scores. This raises a question
of interpretation. Could the questionnaire be written with the
mother in mind? A careful review of the 115 items provides evidence
that the term "mother" is used more often than the term "parent".
However, an important point is that the term "father" is seldom
employed. When reference is made to the male parent, he is most
often called the "husband". This term does not automatically
imply parenthood. Examples from three different scales suggest
a bias in the construction of the PARI.

Scale No. 7 - Marital Conflict

Sometimes it's necessary for a wife to
tell off her husband in order to get
her rights.1

Scale No. 17 - Inconsiderateness of the Husband

If mothers could get their wishes they
would most often ask their husbands to be
more understanding.2

Scale No. 19 - Ascendancy of the Mother

If a mother doesn't go ahead and make rules
for the home, the children and husband will
get into troubles they don't need to.3

1Appendix 2, p. 95.

2Ibid., p. 99.

3Ibid., p. 94.
It is a fact that in the three examples cited the male appears in a rather negative light. If the PARI is indeed designed to measure parental attitudes, as its name implies, then it ought to treat males and females equitably. Terms such as father or husband should be employed in conjunction with their respective counterparts, mother or wife with equal frequency. All this is necessary if the instrument is to be employed with both parents.

A valid counterargument would be that mothers do play a more important role in child-rearing, especially during the early, formative years. However, the PARI was not designed to measure parental attitudes of those couples specifically who have newborn infants or very young children per se. It was rather constructed to reflect attitudes towards children in general. In the well-adjusted family, the father's role will be more positive, effective and involved than the PARI implies it would be.

The evidence of higher PARI scores on the part of the female participants in the present study can be viewed from another position. It is a possibility that in many cases of parents applying for adoption it is the prospective adoptive mother who is more enthusiastic about this decision. As well, she may have a greater need to have a family and play a mothering role. In our society the female parent knows that she will initially be faced with the responsibility of child-rearing, more so than the father. In our culture, child-rearing is a topic of conversation discussed more frequently by females than by males. In childless couples, for instance, in our society, the female is more likely to show an interest in the births
of friends' children and to discuss their development. Her husband, by contrast, will often do little more than smoke a cigar handed to him by a friend upon becoming a father. Articles on the topic of childbirth and child-rearing regularly appear in the women's section of newspapers and journals written for women. Rarely do they appear in the male counterparts of the mass media. Mothers more often attend PTA meetings than fathers, they also take their children to the physician or a child guidance clinic. One could conclude that women in our society are more concerned with this topic than men are.

The two preceding interpretations of the Male-Female differences on the PARI scores are not necessarily mutually exclusive. However, they could both have contributed to the results obtained.

The third hypothesis which predicted higher PARI scores for younger prospective adoptive parents than for older ones, was strongly supported by the results as well. The most obvious interpretation would be that the most suitable age for parents to be when beginning a family is under 32 years old. Many families are well on their way or even complete by the time the parents reach this age. It may be that individuals are physically and psychologically more adaptive and flexible in terms of their role as parents while they are younger. Their tolerance for the demands of raising children is most likely to be higher and their attitudes less rigid. This latter point held true when the attitudes of couples without children were previously compared. It is reasonable to assume that having children must have some effect on the child-rearing attitudes
of individuals.

Another comparison which was possible was to look at the interaction between age, education and PARI scores. The mean of the total PARI scores obtained is 323 and this figure was employed as a cut-off score to split the sample population into high and low scoring individuals. In examining the data illustrated on Table 13 regarding the level of education of each participant, it was found that Grade 11 could be used as a cut-off point to roughly divide the population in half.

**TABLE 13**

A Comparison of Age, Level of Education and Total PARI Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total PARI Scores</th>
<th>under 323</th>
<th>323 and over</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt;32 years, Grade 11 or less</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;32 years, Grade 12 or more</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;32 years, Grade 11 or less</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;32 years, Grade 12 or more</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The PARI seems to be most sensitive in discriminating between individuals when dealing with the <32 population who have a Grade 12
education or better. Of the 20 individuals in this category, 16 obtained higher than average scores. This would support the findings of Becker and Krug as well as those of Schaefer and Bell who maintain that higher education results in higher scores on the PARI.

It was also found that individuals who were $\geq 32$ and had Grade 11 education or less were more likely to score below average on the PARI, which further supports the view that the educational level of the individual and the PARI scores are related.

It is important to point out, however, that the discriminative powers of the PARI were not as much in evidence with the $< 32$ individuals who had Grade 11 education or less. There were seven individuals who scored low and 10 individuals who obtained higher than average scores. The difference between the size of these two groups is rather small.

Neither were the discriminative powers in evidence with the $\geq 32$ individuals who had Grade 12 education or more. There were seven individuals who scored lower than average scores and six individuals who scored higher. It is impossible to discriminate between these two groups, since the difference in size is minimal. It may even be due to chance alone.

Thus, it can be said that there may be some truth to the contention that the level of education and age are moderately related in determining the PARI scores.
VI IMPLICATIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

1. Limitations of present study

The PARI has 23 scales, each consisting of five items. Without reducing the total number of statements in the PARI it may be more meaningful to revise it so that there would only be about 10 scales with 10 to 12 items each. Certainly, in its present form, interpretive statements and inferences about the degree of Marital Conflict, Fostering Dependency or Strictness of the prospective parents can only be made with caution. After all, such interpretation or inference would be based on their responses to merely five statements regarding their attitudes on each of these respective scales. The number and complexity of the 23 scales makes it quite difficult for a researcher or a caseworker to employ the pattern or profile of attitude scale responses in a meaningful way. It would seem that a 10 scale PARI would be less cumbersome in terms of interpretation.

In the present research an attempt was made to test and examine whether a reduced version of the PARI would serve a simplifying purpose - namely the use of the Seven Selected Scales. The results proved to be less sensitive than the total PARI scores on two hypotheses, however, they proved to be the reverse on one hypothesis. The total PARI seems to be more sensitive than the Seven Selected Scales on two occasions out of three. Therefore, the present authors recommend the use of the complete PARI or
some modification of it in terms of the number of scales, while maintaining the same number of questions. This type of modification would be more appropriate than a shortened form because the shortened form does not seem to be as sensitive as the total PARI.

It was not feasible to scientifically test the PARI and its usefulness as a source of input within the adoptive parent assessment process in the context of the present study. Ideally, the PARI ought to be administered prior to the time when a decision has been reached regarding the suitability of a prospective adoptive couple. The results then obtained from the assessment interviews, the application and personal references could all be compared to the results obtained through the PARI. An assumption was made in the present study which suggested that prospective adoptive parents would not try to please or make "desirable" statements after their application had been "approved". Whether this assumption is indeed correct cannot be answered by the present study. If the PARI is to be employed as part of the adoption assessment in the future, then it would be absolutely necessary to test out this assumption first. The question still remains. Are there couples who desire to adopt a child and have the supposed need to please the caseworker? If so, will they make "desirable" statements and will this distort or contaminate the PARI scores?

Due to the nature of the present study it was not possible to administer the PARI to those individuals who applied for an adoptive child and withdrew their application or those who were either not approved or dissuaded by the Agency. According to
the predictions the PARI scores of such individuals would have been lower than of those whose applications were already approved. If the PARI would have been administered at the first contact with the applicants, then this valuable information would have been incorporated into the present study. Unfortunately, it was impossible to administer the PARI to prospective adoptive parents prior to "approval".

2. Implications for future research

In the course of this research, allegations and assumptions were made to the effect that either counselling or actually having had children for a while would result in a positive change in child-rearing attitudes, if they were unfavourable to begin with. To adequately investigate this hypothesis, the PARI will have to be re-administered perhaps one or two years after the adoption has been effected. During that period of time the Agency will have had sufficient time to assess the degree of adequacy of adjustment that has been made by the adoptive parents, the adopted child and between parents and adopted child. The true usefullness of the PARI will have been thoroughly evaluated only after having been put through all these tests.

The only study in the literature which came to the attention of the present authors that dealt with the PARI and observed child-rearing behaviour was the one carried out by Gerhart and Geismar. The limitations and specific weaknesses observed by the present authors were discussed in the Introduction of this paper. The need still exists for a well-controlled study regarding the
relationship between child-rearing attitudes and the ensuing child-rearing behaviour of individuals. This would have to be a well-controlled study which would be greatly facilitated by a longitudinal investigation carried out one or two years after adoption, as has been suggested. During this period of time the caseworker would have ample opportunity to observe the child's and the parents' behaviour and their interactions.

Because of the limitations of time imposed by a thesis, a larger sample of prospective adoptive parents could not be collected. In order to make more definite statements about the PARI it would be imperative to study a much larger sample than was possible in the present research project.

The present research could serve as a baseline measure for a future study employing the same population. Two years from now the same couples could be re-assessed through caseworker interviews and the PARI. It would be of considerable interest and value to examine whether the present ratings of applicant couples based on the PARI scores would be appropriate predictors in certain areas. These areas would be the extent of post-approval or post-adoption counselling or casework that was in fact required and offered; a rating of the level of adjustment of parents to children and vice-versa and the number of either adoption breakdowns or problems within the present adoptive parent population.

In the Discussion the argument was raised that the PARI is inequitable in reference to the manner in which it presents the male and the female parent roles. The present findings certainly
indicate strongly that females score higher on the PARI than do males. It ought to be possible to modify the PARI in such a manner as to present both parent roles in more equitable fashion and then examine whether the scores remain as disparate as previously. In the event that they do, it is probably a cultural phenomenon that is being tapped through the PARI, rather than an artifact of the wording used.

If it is true that older childless couples tend to have inappropriate or questionable child-rearing attitudes, as the present research suggests, then this finding deserves further study as well.

Research in the field of adoption is badly needed. What is called for is an actuarial approach much like the insurance companies employ in arriving at their premiums. All factors which are believed to contribute to the risk of an adoption ought to be carefully researched, much like insurance companies would consider the factors which contribute to the fire risk of a given property. Each factor ultimately will have to be weighted in terms of the extent it contributes to the total adoption risk. Surely a child's welfare and life is worth more than an insurance policy benefit. Perhaps agencies should take out insurance policies on each child they place for adoption. This would force them to calculate the costs, both in the economic sense and especially in terms of human suffering which accrue when an adoption either does break down or requires extensive casework to prevent such an outcome. Insurance companies are experts in this field and could serve as excellent
consultants.

Above all, it is important that adoption research be geared toward the direction of prevention. Ultimately the result of research ought to serve to prevent inadequate placements, and to prevent either poor adjustment or breakdowns. It is hoped that the PARI, in its suggested modified form, may assist first in the research aspect and ultimately in the future preventative process.
VII SUMMARY

The present authors' interest in investigating current adoptive procedures was developed from Trudy Bradley's recommendations for further adoption research. Dr. Bradley in her study *An Exploration of Caseworkers' Perceptions of Adoptive Applicants* indicated that there should be more objective measures to supplement present adoption procedure.

The Parental Attitude Research Instrument (PARI) developed by Drs. Earl S. Schaefer and Richard Q. Bell, investigates child-rearing attitudes and had been used by Dr. David Fanshel in an extensive study of foster parent assessment. While, to the present authors' knowledge, the PARI had never before been employed with adoptive parents, it was postulated that it would be an objective instrument. It could be used as a supplement to the adoptive casework interviewing and group sessions upon which the present adoptive parent assessment process usually relies. The PARI's objectivity could serve three further functions as well. It could:

1. assist in the decision-making process for adoption placement;
2. indicate areas in which parent education may be needed;
3. be used as a follow-up to evaluate the validity of the predictions made within the present study.

Upon examining the present practices in the adoptive parent
assessment process, it seems evident that the decision to accept or reject rests almost solely upon one caseworker's observations. At the same time the latter often lacks professional social work training and education. No matter how well qualified the individual, this is a great responsibility to be handled by one person, without any objective tools to assist in the process. In searching for an objective instrument the decision was reached to test the PARI.

The PARI was developed by Schaefer and Bell because they postulated that child-rearing attitudes of parents were essential factors in the personality development of their children. Upon examining some studies concerning the PARI, it became evident that presently this instrument seems to be the one that has been employed most frequently for indicating child-rearing attitudes. This popularity was one of the reasons for selecting the PARI as an instrument in the present research project. Another reason was that in one study it had been emphasized that the PARI is an adequate indicator of child-rearing attitudes toward a specific child. This is a very significant factor to consider within the adoption process. A further reason was that the PARI could also highlight specific areas of strengths and weaknesses of prospective adoptive parents. Casework counselling could then focus on improvement within the highlighted weak areas.

Pre-adoptive counselling was felt to be a necessity as it assists in preparation of the actual child placement. Post-adoptive counselling was viewed to be of great importance as a
supportive measure for the adoptive family after child placement, both on an individual and on a group contact basis.

The sample in this study was time-limited. At the R.C.C.A.S. 12 couples completed the PARI by March 16, 1972. Twenty couples had completed the PARI by February 29, 1972 at the C.A.S. The total number of the sample was 32 couples.

Individuals had been "approved" as adoptive parents, but a child had not yet been placed in the homes while participating in the study. At the C.A.S. the age range was from 24 to 47 years. At the R.C.C.A.S. individuals were from 23 to 55 years of age. At the C.A.S. educational levels ranged from Grade 8 to doctoral degrees. At the R.C.C.A.S. the individuals ranged from a minimum of Grade 9 to a maximum of a Bachelor of Arts degree.

Participation in the study was on a voluntary basis. At the C.A.S. the co-operation of the parents was solicited by the caseworker, during a telephone conversation while at the R.C.C.A.S. this was done by a letter. All individuals completed the PARI either under the caseworkers' or a receptionist's supervision without any communication between marriage partners.

The PARI consists of 115 statements related to child-rearing. The respondents were asked to express their own opinion on each item or statement. Each item was scored separately. The "desirable" answer had a value of four points, a less "desirable" answer had a value of three points, down the line through two points to one point for the least "desirable" answer for each statement. The highest possible score on the PARI would be 460 points and the
lowest score is 115 points.

Based on their PARI scores, some participants were categorized into a "high risk" grouping, which meant that there were many areas of weakness and the couple was either in need of extensive pre-adoptive and post-adoptive counselling, or of rejection. The next grouping was called "medium equipped" and referred to those couples where areas of weakness as highlighted by their scores on the PARI were not as pronounced as in the first group. The "well equipped" participants were those who scored consistently in the most "desirable" ways on the PARI.

As well, the present study served to pinpoint gross discrepancies in scores between couples. Emphasis was not only placed on the total PARI. According to their reliabilities seven scales were selected out of the total 23 for further scrutiny. It was hoped that by using these Seven Selected Scales, a short form of the total PARI could be discovered.

In order to maintain the anonymity of each couple, all pertinent information, including the completed PARI forms were assigned code numbers by the two Agencies.

It was predicted that the PARI could be used as a supplemental tool to the adoptive parent assessment process. Hence it was hypothesized that:

1. Prospective adoptive parents who have other children will be better equipped for child-rearing than prospective adoptive parents who have none.
2. Prospective adoptive mothers will have more "positive" child-rearing attitudes than prospective adoptive fathers will. "Positive" in this context referred to child-rearing attitudes that are currently held in positive regard.

3. Younger adoptive parents will tend to have more positive child-rearing attitudes than older adoptive parents will.

When one-tailed "t" tests were applied to the results, all three hypotheses proved to be significant at the .05 level on the total PARI. Two of the three hypotheses were significant at even higher levels. A .05 level of significance was reached for two of the three hypotheses even on the Seven Selected Scales. The results on the third one only approached such significance. The hypotheses were therefore all supported by this study.

According to the scores obtained on the PARI, the participants were classified in the following manner. Ten couples were categorized as "well equipped", seven as "medium equipped" and 15 as "high risk".

Casework counselling ought to be available to all couples and it is hoped that the adoptive parents will be encouraged to receive the same.

As predicted, female participants scored considerably higher than male participants did on the PARI. In the opinion of the present authors this could be partially due to the actual
construction of the PARI, which may have a built-in prejudicial bias toward fathers. It could also be partially due to differential cultural role-expectations for mothers and fathers in our society.

There are 23 scales in the PARI in its present form and each merely contains five statements. It would be preferable, while retaining the 115 items, to reduce the number of scales to about 10 and thereby increase the amount of items on each scale to about 11. The short form of the PARI developed for the present study seems to be less sensitive than the total form.

It is recommended by the present authors that the PARI be administered in the beginning of the adoptive parent assessment process, at the Agency's first contact with the applicants.

A further recommendation was made that a follow-up study be performed within two or three years in order to highlight actual performance, extent of counselling that was needed and possible adoption breakdowns that may have occurred during that time among the population used in this study.

Further research in the area of adoption assessment is urgently needed to reduce the human and economic costs incurred when adoptions break down.
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APPENDIX 1

Mr. Donald Bevan,
Mrs. Eva Philipp,
School of Social Work,
University of Windsor,
Windsor, Ontario.

Dear Sir and Madam:

We would appreciate your assistance for a study we are doing in co-operation with the University of Windsor, School of Social Work.

Your social worker will either visit you at your home and give you a form to be completed by each of you or ask both of you to come to the office to do the same. In filling out the form you will be making a much needed contribution to our knowledge of adoption. This would take only twenty minutes to complete.

We assure you that your names will remain unknown to us.

Thanking you in advance for your kind co-operation, we remain,

Yours very truly,
APPENDIX 2

PARENTAL ATTITUDE RESEARCH INSTRUMENT
Earl S. Schaefer and Richard Q. Bell

Read each of the statements below and then rate them as follows:

A  strongly agree
a  mildly agree
d  mildly disagree
D  strongly disagree

Indicate your opinion by drawing a circle around the "A" if you strongly agree, around the "a" if you mildly agree, around the "d" if you mildly disagree, and around the "D" if you strongly disagree.

There are no right or wrong answers, so answer according to your own opinion. It is very important to the study that all questions be answered. Many of the statements will seem alike but all are necessary to show slight differences of opinion.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Children should be allowed to disagree with their parents if they feel their own ideas are better. A a d D

2. A good mother should shelter her child from life's little difficulties. A a d D

3. The home is the only thing that matters to a good mother. A a d D

4. Some children are just so bad they must be taught to fear adults for their own good. A a d D

5. Children should realize how much parents have to give up for them. A a d D
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6. You must always keep tight hold of baby during his bath for in a careless moment he might slip.</td>
<td>A a d D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. People who think they can get along in marriage without arguments just don't know the facts.</td>
<td>A a d D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. A child will be grateful later on for strict training.</td>
<td>A a d D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Children will get on any woman's nerves if she has to be with them all day.</td>
<td>A a d D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. It's best for the child if he never gets started wondering whether his mother's views are right.</td>
<td>A a d D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. More parents should teach their children to have unquestioning loyalty to them.</td>
<td>A a d D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. A child should be taught to avoid fighting no matter what happens.</td>
<td>A a d D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. One of the worst things about taking care of a home is a woman feels that she can't get out.</td>
<td>A a d D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Parents should adjust to the children some rather than always expecting the children to adjust to the parents.</td>
<td>A a d D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. There are so many things a child has to learn in life there is no excuse for him sitting around with time on his hands.</td>
<td>A a d D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. If you let children talk about their troubles they end up complaining even more.</td>
<td>A a d D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Mothers would do their job better with the children if fathers were more kind.</td>
<td>A a d D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. A young child should be protected from hearing about sex.</td>
<td>A a d D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. If a mother doesn't go ahead and make rules for the home the children and husband will get into troubles they don't need to.</td>
<td>A a d D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
20. A mother should make it her business to know everything her children are thinking.

21. Children would be happier and better behaved if parents would show an interest in their affairs.

22. Most children are toilet trained by 15 months of age.

23. There is nothing worse for a young mother than being alone while going through her first experience with a baby.

24. Children should be encouraged to tell their parents about it whenever they feel family rules are unreasonable.

25. A mother should do her best to avoid any disappointment for her child.

26. The women who want lots of parties seldom make good mothers.

27. It is frequently necessary to drive the mischief out of a child before he will behave.

28. A mother must expect to give up her own happiness for that of her child.

29. All young mothers are afraid of their awkwardness in handling and holding the baby.

30. Sometimes it's necessary for a wife to tell off her husband in order to get her rights.

31. Strict discipline develops a fine strong character.

32. Mothers very often feel that they can't stand their children a moment longer.

33. A parent should never be made to look wrong in a child's eyes.
34. The child should be taught to revere his parents above all other grown-ups. Agree Disagree
   A a d D

35. A child should be taught to always come to his parents or teachers rather than fight when he is in trouble. A a d D

36. Having to be with the children all the time gives a woman the feeling her wings have been clipped. A a d D

37. Parents must earn the respect of their children by the way they act. A a d D

38. Children who don't try hard for success will feel they have missed out on things later on. A a d D

39. Parents who start a child talking about his worries don't realize that sometimes it's better to just leave well enough alone. A a d D

40. Husbands could do their part if they were less selfish. A a d D

41. It is very important that young boys and girls not be allowed to see each other completely unclothed. A a d D

42. Children and husbands do better when the mother is strong enough to settle most of the problems. A a d D

43. A child should never keep a secret from his parents. A a d D

44. Laughing at children's jokes and telling children jokes makes things go more smoothly. A a d D

45. The sooner a child learns to walk the better he's trained. A a d D

46. It isn't fair that a woman has to bear just about all the burden of raising children by herself. A a d D

47. A child has a right to his own point of view and ought to be allowed to express it. A a d D
48. A child should be protected from jobs which might be too tiring or hard for him.  
   Agree: A a d Disagree: D

49. A woman has to choose between having a well run home and hobnobbing around with neighbours and friends.  
   Agree: A a d Disagree: D

50. A wise parent will teach a child early just who is boss.  
   Agree: A a d Disagree: D

51. Few women get the gratitude they deserve for all they have done for their children.  
   Agree: A a d Disagree: D

52. Mothers never stop blaming themselves if their babies are injured in accidents.  
   Agree: A a d Disagree: D

53. No matter how well a married couple love one another, there are always differences which cause irritation and lead to arguments.  
   Agree: A a d Disagree: D

54. Children who are held to firm rules grow up to be the best adults.  
   Agree: A a d Disagree: D

55. It's a rare mother who can be sweet and even tempered with her children all day.  
   Agree: A a d Disagree: D

56. Children should never learn things outside the home which make them doubt their parent's ideas.  
   Agree: A a d Disagree: D

57. A child soon learns that there is no greater wisdom than that of his parents.  
   Agree: A a d Disagree: D

58. There is no good excuse for a child hitting another child.  
   Agree: A a d Disagree: D

59. Most young mothers are bothered more by the feeling of being shut up in the home than by anything else.  
   Agree: A a d Disagree: D

60. Children are too often asked to do all the compromising and adjustment and that is not fair.  
   Agree: A a d Disagree: D

61. Parents should teach their children that the way to get ahead is to keep busy and not waste time.  
   Agree: A a d Disagree: D

62. Children pester you with all their little upsets if you aren't careful from the first.  
   Agree: A a d Disagree: D
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>63. When a mother doesn't do a good job with children it's probably because the father doesn't do his part around the home.</td>
<td>A a d D</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64. Children who take part in sex play become sex criminals when they grow up.</td>
<td>A a d D</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65. A mother has to do the planning because she is the one who knows what's going on in the home.</td>
<td>A a d D</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66. An alert parent should try to learn all her child's thoughts.</td>
<td>A a d D</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67. Parents who are interested in hearing about their children's parties, dates, and fun help them grow up right.</td>
<td>A a d D</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68. The earlier a child is weaned from its emotional ties to its parents the better it will handle its own problems.</td>
<td>A a d D</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69. A wise woman will do anything to avoid being by herself before and after a new baby.</td>
<td>A a d D</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70. A child's ideas should be seriously considered in making family decisions.</td>
<td>A a d D</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71. Parents should know better than to allow their children to be exposed to difficult situations.</td>
<td>A a d D</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72. Too many women forget that a mother's place is in the home.</td>
<td>A a d D</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73. Children need some of the natural meanness taken out of them.</td>
<td>A a d D</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74. Children should be more considerate of their mothers since their mothers suffer so much for them.</td>
<td>A a d D</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75. Most mothers are fearful that they may hurt their babies in handling them.</td>
<td>A a d D</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76. There are some things which just can't be settled by a mild discussion.</td>
<td>A a d D</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
77. Most children should have more discipline than they get.  

78. Raising children is a nerve-wracking job.  

79. The child should not question the thinking of his parents.  

80. Parents deserve the highest esteem and regard of their children.  

81. Children should not be encouraged to box or wrestle because it often leads to trouble or injury.  

82. One of the bad things about raising children is that you aren't free enough of the time to do just as you like.  

83. As much as is reasonable a parent should try to treat a child as an equal.  

84. A child who is "on the go" all the time will most likely be happy.  

85. If a child has upset feelings it is best to leave him alone and not make it look serious.  

86. If mothers could get their wishes they would most often ask that their husband be more understanding.  

87. Sex is one of the greatest problems to be contended with in children.  

88. The whole family does fine if the mother puts her shoulders to the wheel and takes charge of things.  

89. A mother has a right to know everything going on in her child's life because her child is part of her.  

90. If parents would have fun with their children, the children would be more apt to take their advice.  

91. A mother should make an effort to get her child toilet trained at the earliest possible time.
92. Most women need more help and rest in the home when they are looking after a small infant.  
Agree | Disagree |  
---|---|---
A | a | d | D

93. When a child is in trouble he ought to know he won't be punished for talking about it with his parents.  
Agree | Disagree |  
---|---|---
A | a | d | D

94. Children should be kept away from all hard jobs which might be discouraging.  
Agree | Disagree |  
---|---|---
A | a | d | D

95. A good mother will find enough social life within the family.  
Agree | Disagree |  
---|---|---
A | a | d | D

96. It is sometimes necessary for the parents to break the child's will.  
Agree | Disagree |  
---|---|---
A | a | d | D

97. Mothers sacrifice almost all their own fun for their children.  
Agree | Disagree |  
---|---|---
A | a | d | D

98. A mother's greatest fear is that in a forgetful moment she might let something bad happen to the baby.  
Agree | Disagree |  
---|---|---
A | a | d | D

99. It's natural to have quarrels when two people who both have minds of their own get married.  
Agree | Disagree |  
---|---|---
A | a | d | D

100. Children are actually happier under strict training.  
Agree | Disagree |  
---|---|---
A | a | d | D

101. It's natural for a mother to "blow her top" when children are selfish and demanding.  
Agree | Disagree |  
---|---|---
A | a | d | D

102. There is nothing worse than letting a child hear criticisms of his mother.  
Agree | Disagree |  
---|---|---
A | a | d | D

103. Loyalty to parents comes before anything else.  
Agree | Disagree |  
---|---|---
A | a | d | D

104. Most parents prefer a quiet child to a "scrappy" one.  
Agree | Disagree |  
---|---|---
A | a | d | D

105. A young mother feels "held down" because there are lots of things she wants to do while she is young.  
Agree | Disagree |  
---|---|---
A | a | d | D

106. There is no reason parents should have their own way all the time, any more than that children should have their own way all the time.  
Agree | Disagree |  
---|---|---
A | a | d | D
107. The sooner a child learns that a wasted minute is lost forever the better off he will be.  

108. The trouble with giving attention to children's problems is they usually just make up a lot of stories to keep you interested.  

109. Few men realize that a mother needs some fun in life too.  

110. There is usually something wrong with a child who asks a lot of questions about sex.  

111. A married woman knows that she will have to take the lead in family matters.  

112. It is a mother's duty to make sure she knows her child's innermost thoughts.  

113. When you do things together, children feel close to you and can talk easier.  

114. A child should be weaned away from the bottle or breast as soon as possible.  

115. Taking care of a small baby is something that no woman should be expected to do all by herself.
APPENDIX 3

ROMAN CATHOLIC CHILDREN'S AID SOCIETY
For the County of Essex

P.O. Box 300
Walkerville Postal Station
Windsor 15, Ontario

Telephone 256-3176
1700 Assumption Street
Windsor 15, Ontario

Reply Attention of
M_____________________

Mr. and Mrs. Jones,

Dear Mr. and Mrs. Jones:

We have been asked to participate in a study about adoption through the University of Windsor, School of Social Work. The enclosed letter is from the two graduate students, Mr. D. Bevan, and Mrs. E. Philipp.

We would like you to consider whether you wish to participate in this study and you can telephone me regarding your answer. Please be assured your identity will remain confidential to us, and this study will have no effect upon your present interest in adopting.

Sincerely,

Social Worker.
### APPENDIX 4
### SUMMARY SHEET
#### Wife

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale</th>
<th>Wife</th>
<th>Husband</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fostering Dependency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breaking the Will</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strictness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suppression of Sexuality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ascendancy of the Mother</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceleration of Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Conflict</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Scores on seven scales: [ ]

High score on 7 scales: 105-140
- Wife [ ]
- Husband [ ]

Medium score on 7 scales: 90-104
- Wife [ ]
- Husband [ ]

Low score on 7 scales: 35-89
- Wife [ ]
- Husband [ ]

Discrepancy in scores between parents on the seven scales listed above: [ ]

If more than 49 points then "high risk": [ ]

If between 35-48 points then "medium equipped": [ ]

---

Comparison of total score on PARI:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score Range</th>
<th>Wife</th>
<th>Husband</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>350-460</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300-349</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115-299</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discrepancy in total scores: [ ]

If more than 105 points then "high risk": [ ]

If between 90-104 points then "medium equipped": [ ]

---

Distribution of Scores:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wife</th>
<th>Husband</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4's</td>
<td>3's</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4's</th>
<th>3's</th>
<th>2's</th>
<th>1's</th>
<th>0's</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
November 4, 1971.

The Board of Directors,
Roman Catholic Children's Aid Society
of the County of Essex,
1700 Assumption Street,
Windsor, Ontario

Dear Madams and Sirs:

We, the undersigned from the School of Social Work,
University of Windsor wish to request your permission to carry
out a study within your Agency.

As discussed with Mrs. Mary MacDougall and the social
workers in her department, our research will involve adoptive
parents.

Once acceptance of adoptive parents will have been
finalized by the Agency, a straightforward questionnaire
will be submitted for completion by these adoptive parents.
Once the results of these questionnaires will have been
tabulated, we hope that the results will strongly coincide
with the agency's decision. If the results are very similar
between the Agency's decision and that of the questionnaire,
then the latter could be used in the future as an added
instrument in the home finding process.

Thanking you in advance for your kind co-operation in
the above matter, and hoping to hear about your decision
soon, we remain,

Yours very truly,

Eva Philipp, Master's Student
Don Bevan, Master's Student,
V. J. Cruz, Thesis Supervisor.
## APPENDIX 6

**Master Chart**

*Agency Population - Descriptive Data (C.A.S.)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Religion</th>
<th>Other Children in Family (Yes or No)</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Income Level (A, B, C)</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PF 1</td>
<td>Prot.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Teacher's College</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM 1</td>
<td>Prot.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Factory Worker</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Grade 12</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PF 2</td>
<td>Prot.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Housewife</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>Grade 12</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM 2</td>
<td>Prot.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Transmission Inspector</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Grade 12</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PF 3</td>
<td>Prot.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Housewife</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>R.N.</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM 3</td>
<td>Prot.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Doctor</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Medical School</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PF 4</td>
<td>Prot.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Housewife</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>Grade 12</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM 4</td>
<td>Prot.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Automobile Repairman</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Grade 10</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PF 5</td>
<td>Prot.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Medical Secretary</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Grade 12</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM 5</td>
<td>Prot.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Transport Driver</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Grade 8</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PF 6</td>
<td>Prot.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Housewife</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>Teacher's College</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM 6</td>
<td>Prot.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Farmer</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Grade 12</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PF 7</td>
<td>Prot.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Saleslady</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Grade 11</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM 7</td>
<td>Prot.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Labourer</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Grade 11</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PF 8</td>
<td>Prot.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Cashier</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Grade 13</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM 8</td>
<td>Prot.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Engineer</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>University Degree</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>Religion</td>
<td>Other Children in Family (Yes or No)</td>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td>Income Level (A, B, C)</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PF 9</td>
<td>Prot.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Housewife</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>Grade 9</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM 9</td>
<td>R.C.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Painter</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Grade 12</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PF 10</td>
<td>Prot.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Housewife</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>R.N.</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM 10</td>
<td>Prot.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>School Principal</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>B.A.</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PF 11</td>
<td>Prot.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Housewife</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>Grade 13</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM 11</td>
<td>Prot.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Engineering Detail Man</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B.A.</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PF 12</td>
<td>Prot.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Housewife</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>Grade 12</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM 12</td>
<td>Prot.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Printer</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Grade 9</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PF 13</td>
<td>Prot.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Housewife</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>Grade 11</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM 13</td>
<td>Prot.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Labourer</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Grade 9</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PF 14</td>
<td>Prot.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Housewife</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>B.A. plus some post graduate</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM 14</td>
<td>Prot.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PF 15</td>
<td>Prot.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Housewife</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>Grade 10</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM 15</td>
<td>Prot.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Grocery Clerk</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Grade 10</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PF 16</td>
<td>Prot.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Advertisement Solicitor</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Grade 11</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM 16</td>
<td>Prot.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Maintenance Foreman</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Grade 12</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PF 17</td>
<td>Prot.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Cosmetician</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Grade 9</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM 17</td>
<td>Prot.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Tool and Die Worker</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Grade 11</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PF 18</td>
<td>Prot.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Packer</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Grade 10</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM 18</td>
<td>Prot.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Mechanic</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Grade 13</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
C.A.S. Population Cont'd

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Religion</th>
<th>Other Children in Family (Yes or No)</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Income Level (A,B,C.)</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PF 19</td>
<td>Prot.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Housewife</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>Grade 9</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM 19</td>
<td>Prot.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Machine Operator</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Grade 10</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PF 20</td>
<td>R.C.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Housewife</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>Grade 10</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM 20</td>
<td>R.C.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Stationary Engineer</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Grade 10</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The abbreviations used to denote "Religion" have the following significance:

"R.C." - Roman Catholic
"Prot." - Protestant

The letters used to denote "Income Level" have the following significance:

"A" - individual earns $7,999.00 per year or less
"B" - individual earns between $8,000.00 and $11,999.00 per year
"C" - individual earns $12,000.00 per year or more
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Religion</th>
<th>Other Children in Family (Yes or No)</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Income Level (A,B,C,)</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CF 1</td>
<td>R.C.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Housewife</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>One year Teacher's College</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CM 1</td>
<td>R.C.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Engineer</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Two years University</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CF 2</td>
<td>R.C.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Housewife</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>Grade 12</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CM 2</td>
<td>R.C.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Chrome Plater</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Grade 11</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CF 3</td>
<td>G.O.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Customs Officer</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Grade 12</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CM 3</td>
<td>G.O.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Pharmaceutical Inspector</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Grade 10</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CF 4</td>
<td>R.C.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Teacher's College</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CM 4</td>
<td>R.C.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B.A.</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CF 6</td>
<td>R.C.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Housewife</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>One Year Business College</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CM 6</td>
<td>R.C.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Labourer</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Grade 10</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CF 7</td>
<td>R.C.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Housewife</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>Grade 11</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CM 7</td>
<td>R.C.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Labourer</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Grade 8</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CF 8</td>
<td>R.C.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Housewife</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>Grade 9</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CM 8</td>
<td>Prot.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Security Guard</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Grade 12</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CF 9</td>
<td>R.C.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Housewife</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>Grade 10</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CM 9</td>
<td>R.C.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>New Car Inspector</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Grade 8</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>Religion</td>
<td>Other Children in Family (Yes or No)</td>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td>Income Level (A,B,C.)</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CF 10</td>
<td>R.C.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Housewife</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>Grade 11</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CM 10</td>
<td>Prot.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Security Guard</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Grade 10</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CF 11</td>
<td>R.C.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Housewife</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>Grade 12</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CM 11</td>
<td>R.C.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Sales Manager</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Two Years University</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CF 13</td>
<td>R.C.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Sales Clerk</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Grade 9</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CM 13</td>
<td>R.C.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Sales Representative</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Grade 11</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CF 15</td>
<td>R.C.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Secretary</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Grade 12</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CM 15</td>
<td>Prot.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Services Manager</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>3 Years University</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The abbreviations used to denote "Religion" have the following significance:

"R.C." - Roman Catholic
"G.O." - Greek Orthodox
"Prot." - Protestant

The letters used to denote "Income Level" have the following significance:

"A" - individual earns $7,999.00 per year or less

"B" - individual earns between $8,000.00 and $11,999.00 per year

"C" - individual earns $12,000.00 per year or more
## APPENDIX 8

### Comprehensive Chart

**PARI Scores of Subjects**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Seven Scale Score</th>
<th>Rating (H,M,W)</th>
<th>Discrepancy</th>
<th>Total Score</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Discrepancy</th>
<th>Other Children in Family</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Couple's Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PP 1</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>302 (M)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM 1</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>313 (M)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PP 2</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>351 (W)</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM 2</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>H</td>
<td></td>
<td>286 (H)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PP 3</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>360 (W)</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>36</td>
<td>W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM 3</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>W</td>
<td></td>
<td>393 (W)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PP 4</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>338 (W)</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM 4</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>H</td>
<td></td>
<td>311 (H)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PP 5</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>324 (M)</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM 5</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>H</td>
<td></td>
<td>290 (H)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PP 6</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>389 (W)</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>31</td>
<td>W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM 6</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>319 (M)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PP 7</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>343 (M)</td>
<td>105(H)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM 7</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>H</td>
<td></td>
<td>238 (H)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PP 8</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>313 (M)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>46</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM 8</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>333 (M)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PP 9</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>311 (M)</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM 9</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>W</td>
<td></td>
<td>351 (W)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PP 10</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>334 (M)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM 10</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>328 (M)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PP 11</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>339 (M)</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM 11</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>302 (M)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PP 12</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>311 (H)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM 12</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>H</td>
<td></td>
<td>304 (H)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>Seven Score</td>
<td>Rating (H, M, W)</td>
<td>Discrepancy</td>
<td>Total Score</td>
<td>Rating</td>
<td>Discrepancy</td>
<td>Other Children in Family</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Couple's Rating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PF 13</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>(M)</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM 13</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>295</td>
<td>(H)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PF 14</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>376</td>
<td>(W)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM 14</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>W</td>
<td></td>
<td>346</td>
<td>(M)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PF 15</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>344</td>
<td>(M)</td>
<td>94 (H)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM 15</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>H</td>
<td></td>
<td>250</td>
<td>(H)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PF 16</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>(W)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM 16</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>349</td>
<td>(M)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PF 17</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>(M)</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM 17</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>H</td>
<td></td>
<td>272</td>
<td>(H)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PF 18</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>358</td>
<td>(W)</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM 18</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>337</td>
<td>(M)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PF 19</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>41 M</td>
<td>342</td>
<td>(M)</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM 19</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>H</td>
<td></td>
<td>254</td>
<td>(H)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PF 20</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>(M)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM 20</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>304</td>
<td>(M)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CF 1</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>(H)</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CM 1</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>W</td>
<td></td>
<td>337</td>
<td>(M)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CF 2</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>(M)</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CM 2</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>W</td>
<td></td>
<td>346</td>
<td>(M)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CF 3</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>(H)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CM 3</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>H</td>
<td></td>
<td>263</td>
<td>(H)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CF 4</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>344</td>
<td>(M)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CM 4</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>W</td>
<td></td>
<td>359</td>
<td>(W)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CF 6</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>36 M</td>
<td>388</td>
<td>(W)</td>
<td>148 (H)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CM 6</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>H</td>
<td></td>
<td>240</td>
<td>(H)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>Seven Scale Score</td>
<td>Rating (H,M,W)</td>
<td>Discrepancy</td>
<td>Total Score</td>
<td>Rating (H,M)</td>
<td>Discrepancy</td>
<td>Other Children in Family</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Couple's Rating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CF 7</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>(M)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CM 7</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>(M)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CF 8</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>(M)</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CM 8</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>(H)</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CF 9</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>(W)</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CM 9</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>(H)</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CF 10</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>(W)</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CM 10</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>(K)</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CF 11</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>(W)</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CM 11</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>(M)</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CF 13</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>(M)</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CM 13</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>(H)</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CF 15</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>(M)</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CM 15</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>(M)</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
VITA

Donald J. Bevan was born in Dodsland, Saskatchewan on August 9, 1947. He attended elementary school in Ontario. He graduated from Vincent Massey Secondary School in Windsor, June, 1966.

In August, 1966, he enrolled in the University of Detroit where he pursued the study of History. After two years he transferred to the University of Windsor. In June, 1970, he graduated from that University with a Bachelor of Arts Degree in History.

Mr. Bevan enrolled into the Master of Social Work Make-up Year program in the University of Windsor School of Social Work, September, 1970.

Mr. Bevan's first year field placement was with the Social Service Department of Hotel Dieu Hospital. He spent his second year field placement at the Windsor Public School Board. He expects to graduate in May, 1972.
VITA

Eva E. Philipp was born in Budapest, Hungary, on December 16, 1934. She attended elementary school in Hungary and Switzerland. She graduated from Sir George William's High School in Montreal, Quebec.

While working during the day as office manager, she attended Sir George William’s University in the evening and graduated with a Bachelor of Arts Degree in May, 1960. During this period of time she married and subsequently had two children. While her children were in their early formative years she held part-time positions, first teaching in Mon..--l and then working as a teaching assistant with undergraduate students at Queen's University in Kingston. After this period she was research assistant in the Psychology Department at Queen's University.

Subsequent to both her children entering elementary school on a full day basis, she was able to return to studying and pursue her aim at becoming a social worker.

Mrs. Philipp was admitted to the Master of Social Work Degree Make-up Year program in September, 1970. Her first year field placement was at the Roman Catholic Children's Aid Society for Essex. She spent her second year's field placement at the I.O.D.E. Hospitals, Adult Psychiatric Unit, in Windsor. She expects to graduate in May, 1972.
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