

"A PARENTAL PUNITIVE SCALE" FOR THE
KIKUYU RURAL ADOLESCENTS

BY

LGUCHU, ANNE WANJIKU

"A Thesis Submitted in Fulfilment for the Degree of
Master of Arts in the University of Nairobi".

AUGUST, 1974.

UNIVERSITY OF NAIROBI LIBRARY



0100056 1

EA-112

Afu

BF

723

.DGG8

"This thesis is my original work and has not been presented
for a degree in any other University"

Signed..... Quelby
10/3/75

This thesis has been submitted for examination with my
approval as University Supervisor

Signed..... McNeill Jones
10/3/75

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I would like to thank all the members of departmental committee, Educational Psychology, University of Nairobi for their constructive criticisms given when I presented the pilot study results.

I would also like to thank the headmasters of Karuri, Kanunga, Ndumberi and Uthiru secondary schools and also the headmistress of Precious Blood secondary school for the enormous co-operation that they showed when interviews were carried out in their respective schools.

I also wish to thank Mr. Ocitti, P.J. and Mr. Jiven, L. for their criticisms and encouragement given when they read this study.

I wish to thank very much my external supervisor, Dr. Opolot for his constructive criticisms and encouragement that he gave when he read this study.

Above all I would like to thank very much, Dr. Young, W.C., my internal supervisor for not only working tirelessly and continuously in order to bring this study into what it is, but also for his great encouragement especially in times when I felt like I should give up.

I would also like to thank all the secretaries who patiently typed either the first draft or the final copy of this thesis: Mrs. Hinga, G. Mrs. Omondi C.A.; Miss Guchu, T.W.; Miss Kamani, A.N.; Miss Mureria, S.N.; Miss Njeri, L., Miss Geteca, F. and Mrs. Kamiri, N.

Lastly I would like to thank very much Kahohi, M.N., Gichukia, P. and Njenga S.P. for their encouragement throughout my whole Master of Arts degree course, in the university of Nairobi.

University of Nairobi
1974

Guchu, A. W.

ABSTRACT

"A Parental Punitive Scale" for Kikuyu, Rural Adolescents.

This study was designed in order to construct "A Parental Punitive Scale" for Kikuyu, rural adolescents. The method used in designing and validating this scale was based on a study by Epstein and Komorita (1965).

The trial study consisted of pupils in standards 5 and 7 in rural primary schools and when it was decided that the questionnaires were to be given in English and it was found that the pupils in standards 5 and 7 could not handle the questionnaires in English, it was agreed that in the pilot study, pupils in Forms I and II were to be used. Ndumberi and Uthiru secondary schools were used because of the following reasons:

a) It was felt that travelling distances would be minimized since both of these schools were very near Nairobi.

b) Both schools were day secondary schools. This was a great advantage in this study, since it was felt that only pupils who live at home with adults who discipline them should be included in the pilot study.

c) Since in the review of literature it was obvious that discipline techniques depend on either tribal or cultural background, it was decided that only Kikuyu adolescents should be used in the pilot study in order to control variation due to tribal background of the sample. Since the majority of the pupils

(ii)

in Ndumberi and Uthiru secondary schools were Kikuyu, it was easy to get the required number of Kikuyu adolescents.

d) Both schools were also chosen because they were located in rural areas. It was felt that a rural community should be used in this study because unlike the urban community, the rural community tends to be more homogeneous than the urban community (Mayer, 1971).

After the selection of schools, pupils were then randomly selected within the schools.

The first stage of this study concerned itself with designing and analysing the trial and pilot studies in order to:-

- a) Gain experience in conducting this type of study.
- b) Iron out administrative difficulties in conducting this study.
- c) Develop a reliable and reproducible instrument e.g. questionnaires for use in the final study.

The following trial study result was considered vital in the choice of a design for the pilot study:-

Instead of standards 5 and 7 subjects, forms I and II subjects who could handle the questionnaires in English should be used.

The pilot study consisted of four minor studies each of which had its own questionnaire and subjects consisted of

(iii)

twenty Kikuyu, rural, day secondary school adolescents in forms I and II.

In questionnaire I, version A, of the first minor study, the subjects were required to give a variety of discipline techniques which would be administered to them by their mothers and fathers for behaving in a manner similar to that portrayed in the given twelve stories (appendix A).

In questionnaire II, of the second minor study, the subjects were required to rate the severity of the given discipline techniques (appendix C). The discipline techniques given in questionnaire II were those obtained from the first minor study.

Questionnaire III, of the third minor study assessed the subjects' parental punitiveness towards aggression.

Questionnaire IV, of the fourth minor study assessed the subjects' prejudice and aggression.

The reliability of the scale was calculated using Kuder-Richardson's formula 20 and its results showed that the scale had an acceptable reliability.

Construct validity was used in the validation of the scale and the theoretical construct used in the validation of this scale was based on the hypothesis that:

There was a relationship between parental punitiveness for aggression and children's prejudice and aggression. This

relationship was suggested by the "Scapegoat" hypothesis, derived from both psychoanalytic and social-learning theorists (Allport, 1954; Young, 1957).

The 'Scapegoat hypothesis states that severe punishment for aggression may increase rather than inhibit the instigation to aggress. Since the child has learned to anticipate punishment for aggression, hostile impulses will be displaced from the original source of frustration to members of out-groups. Consequently children who are often harshly treated, severely punished and often criticised are more aggressive and more prejudiced than those who are treated otherwise (Allport, 1965; Young, 1957).

A chi-square test was used in calculating the validity of the scale. The value of the observed ' χ^2 ' was not statistically significant, but it was thought that the results would have been more reliable if the sample size was more than twenty subjects.¹

The following pilot study results were considered vital in the choice of a design for the final study:-

¹ There were only twenty subjects in the first, second and third and fourth minor studies in this study.

(v)

a) The sample size in each of the minor studies should be increased to one hundred subjects in order to produce more reliable results especially in the validation of the scale in the fourth minor study.

b) Questionnaires I and III should each be divided into two parts in order to rule out the possibility of subjects giving duplicate answers for 'father' and 'mother' and for Persons A and B in questionnaires I and III respectively. Questionnaires IA and IB and questionnaires IIIA and IIIB were consequently constructed for use in the final study (appendices B and H).

c) The meanings of the three pairs of words, fair/unfair, right/wrong and good/bad used in questionnaire II (appendix C) should be clearly explained to the subjects.

d) Instead of the common nouns 'father' and 'mother' used in questionnaire III, the terms Person A and Person B should be used in questionnaires IIIA and IIIB to represent any two persons who often discipline the subjects when they do something wrong.

Using the above modifications the following final study questionnaires were constructed:-

Questionnaires IA and IB, version B, for the first minor

study (appendix B).

Questionnaire II, for the second minor study (appendix D).

Questionnaires III_A and III_B for the third minor study (appendix H).

Questionnaire IV, for the fourth minor study (appendix I) was the same as that used in the pilot study.

The content of all the above questionnaires was the same as that described in the pilot study (pages 35-38).

In questionnaire I_A, the subjects were required to give responses for 'father' and for mother in questionnaire I_B. When an analysis of subjects responses in these two questionnaires was done, twenty-six discipline techniques were obtained. The discipline technique, 'Beat me', was not only mentioned more frequently than all the other discipline techniques but it was also the 'father' who was said to beat more frequently than the 'mother' and the boys were more frequently beaten than the girls.

In questionnaire II, the subjects were required to rate the severity of the twenty-six discipline techniques obtained in the first minor study. An analysis of the subjects responses showed that they considered the verbal discipline techniques as less severe than the physical discipline techniques. There were, however two exceptions; the discipline techniques, 'Stop me from going to school', and 'Refuse to pay my school fees', though not

entirely physical were considered to be the most severe. The reason for this could be that the subjects in this study considered formal education as the most important asset in their lives and hence viewed deprivation of this asset as being very severe.

In questionnaires III_A and III_B, the punitive scores for Persons A and B were calculated for each of the subjects in the sample. This study found no statistically significant difference in punitiveness between girls and boys but the difference in punitiveness between Persons A and B was found to be statistically significant. Person A who was represented by 'father' was found to be more punitive than Person B, represented by mother. The following conclusions were reached in this study that:-

- a) The 'father' was more punitive than the 'mother'.
- b) The 'father' punished boys more often than did the mother.

This study also found that there was a statistically significant difference in prejudice and aggression between girls and boys so that girls were more prejudiced and more aggressive than boys.

According to the findings of this study, birth-order of child and formal education of parents had no statistically

significant effect on 'Parental' punitiveness.

The data in this study was based only on adolescent reports therefore no conclusive remarks could be made on Kikuyu 'parental' discipline but it was hoped that another study could be done and that both adolescents and their 'parents' should be used in order to make conclusive remarks on Kikuyu 'parental' discipline.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Abstract.....	i
Chapter I Introduction.....	1
Chapter II Review of Literature.....	7
Chapter III Choosing the pilot study sample.....	26
Chapter IV A description of the pilot study.....	35
Chapter V The pilot study results.....	59
Chapter VI Choosing the main study sample	82
Chapter VII A description of the main study.....	86
Chapter VIII The results of the main study.....	99
Chapter IX Summary and conclusion.....	117

T A B L E S:

	PAGE
Table I A detailed description of the pilot study sample.	33
Table II Different age groups in the pilot study sample by school.	34
Table III Changes suggested by subjects to be made in questionnaire I, version A	43
Table IV Tribes represented by names	51
Table V Districts representing six tribes of Kenya.	53
Table VI Tribes represented by names.	54
Table VII The calculation of mean severity scores of discipline techniques	66
Table VIII The mean severity scores and the standard deviations of discipline techniques obtained in the pilot study	67
Table IX The mean severity scores across age using the pilot study sample.	70
Table X The mean severity scores across the education level of the subjects' fathers using the pilot study sample	71
Table XI The parental punitive scores of the pilot study sample.	76

Table XII	The observed frequency by parental punitive scores and aggression scores	77
Table XIII	A detailed description of the main study subjects.	84
Table XIV	Different age groups in the main study sample	85
Table XV	The mean severity scores and the standard deviations of discipline techniques obtained in the main study.....	102
Table XVI	The mean severity scores across age in the main study sample	106
Table XVII	The mean severity scores across subjects' fathers' education level in the main study sample	107
Table XVIII	The mean severity scores across sex in the main study sample	108
Table XIX	The observed frequencies by parental punitive scores and prejudice scores.....	114
Table XX	The observed frequencies by parental punitive scores and aggression scores.	115

APPENDICES:

	PAGE
A Questionnaire I, Version A	126
B Questionnaires I _A and I _B , Version B	131
C Questionnaire II - (Pilot study)	139
D Questionnaire II - (Final Study)	145
E A Parental Punitive Scale by Epstein and Komorita (1965).	151
F Changes made by the interviewer in the Parental Punitive scale by Epstein and Komorita (1965).....	160
F ^a Changes suggested by subjects to be made in the Parental Punitive scale by Epstein and Komorita (1965).....	162
G Questionnaire III, A Parental Punitive Scale -(Pilot study)	164
H Questionnaires III _A and III _B , A Parental Punitive Scale -(Final Study).....	171
I Questionnaire IV	191
J The pilot study subjects' paternal, maternal and mean parental punitive scores; their sex, birth-order, prejudice and aggression score and also their fathers' educational level.	194
K Computation of a t - test to test whether there was a statistically significant difference in punitiveness between mother and father	196

I	The subjects' Punitive scores for Persons A and B, their sex, birth - order, prejudice and aggression scores and the educational level of their 'fathers' and 'mothers' (Main study sample).....	197
M	Computation of a t-test to test whether there was a statistically significant difference in punitiveness for aggression between Persons A and B.	201
N	Computation of a t-test to test whether there was a statistically significant difference in punitiveness for aggression between boys and girls.	202
O	Computation of a t-test to test whether there was a statistically significant difference in punitiveness for aggression between boys and girls in Person A	204
P	Computation of a t - test to test whether there was a statistically significant difference in punitiveness for aggression between boys and girls in Person B.	205
Q	Computation of a t-test to test whether there was a statistically significant difference in punitiveness for aggression between 'fathers' who had been to school and those who had never been to school	207

R	Computation of a t-statistic test to test whether there was a statistically significant difference in punitiveness between 'mothers' who had been to school and those who had never been to school.....	209
S	Computation of a t - test to test whether there was a statistically significant difference in punitiveness for aggression between the first - borns and the non-first borns.....	211
T.	Computation of a t-test to test whether there was a statistically significant difference in aggression between girls and boys.	213
U	Computation of a t - test to test whether there was a statistically significant difference in prejudice between the girls and the boys.	215
V	Computation of a t-test to test whether there was a statistically significant difference in aggression between the first - borns and the non-first-borns.	217
W	Computation of a t - test to test whether there was a statistically significant difference in prejudice between the first-borns and the non-first-borns.	219
	Bibliography.....	221

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

In recent years a number of psychologists have focused their research on parental discipline because of its influences on certain aspects of the personality of a child (Grinder, 1962; Becker, 1964; Hoffman 1968; Sears et al. 1957). As Baruch (1949) noted the way a child is disciplined at home is very important and throughout his life a child carries with him the influences of parental discipline. The question therefore is not whether a child should be disciplined but rather what the best possible methods of parental discipline are.

In order to obtain information on parental discipline most of the researchers have relied on maternal reports as the main source of data (Sears et al. 1957; Grinder, 1962; Prothro, 1966). Paternal reports have either been de-emphasized or neglected. Even when included in the research, the information on paternal discipline is often second-hand from either the mother or the child. Children reports have also been neglected. As Yarrow (1963) noted researches regarding the influences of parental discipline on the personality of a child often produce inconsistent and uninterpretable findings mainly due to the lack of validity and reliability of the measuring instruments. Maternal reports which most of the researchers on parental discipline rely on are often biased and lack both validity and reliability (McCord and McCord, 1961; Yarrow, Campbell and Burton, 1970) hence the inconsistent and uninterpretable findings produced by them.

Since children are the recipients of parental discipline their reports ought to be included in researches on parental discipline. Children reports could be used to determine the validity and reliability of parental reports.

As Hurlock (1949) suggested the best method to use in order to determine the effectiveness of any discipline technique is to observe and study closely the attitudes of the child on whom the discipline technique is administered. It would be very misleading to judge the effectiveness of any discipline technique by observing only the outward behaviour of a child. Outwardly a child's attitudes towards parental discipline may seem very favourable but on either studying or questioning the same child one may find that he harbours deep resentment towards parental discipline. Without letting his parents detect it, the child may feel that he not only resents but also considers parental discipline to be very unfair. He may also be harbouring within himself a grudge by being sullen, resentful and rebellious not only towards his parents but also toward everyone no matter how innocent. In a case such as this, parental reports would provide incorrect and distorted information because the child, out of may be fear of being punished does not let his parents know his negative feelings and unfavourable attitude toward parental discipline. It is only the child or the adolescent who could give the correct information on the effectiveness of parental discipline techniques.

Epstein and Komorita (1965) designed a Parental Punitive Scale for children in United States of America. In order to

design this scale they used children reports on both paternal and maternal discipline. This scale is extremely useful because:-

a) It has ventured to include children's reports in studies of parental discipline, something which all their predecessors had completely ignored.

b) It gives children's perceptions of both paternal and maternal discipline so that none of the two is emphasized at the expense of the other.

Though available, Epstein and Komorita's Parental Punitive Scale (1965) cannot be used in Kenya unmodified because of two main reasons:-

a) Parental discipline differs widely cross-culturally (Fischer, 1966, page 142-144). While for example the New Englanders in U.S.A. do not expect prompt obedience from their children, the Nyansongo (Le Vine, 1966) who are a Gusii community in Kenya expect prompt obedience from their children. Parents in U.S.A. (Fischer, 1966) use less physical punishments than do parents in Taira (Maretzki, 1966).

b) In their study Epstein and Komorita (1965) dealt with such variables as socio-economic class. It was impossible in Kenya to delimit socio-economic class using the same criteria as that used in U.S.A. hence any study that deals with socio-economic class cannot be applicable in Kenya without change.

It was because of the above reasons that it was felt it is essential to design and validate Parental Punitive Scales for different tribes in Kenya.

Delimitation of the Problem:

The aim of this study was to design and validate a parental punitive scale for the Kikuyu, rural adolescents of central Province in Kenya. In the construction and validation of this scale, Kikuyu, rural adolescents who were either in form I or II in day secondary schools were used. This scale measured these adolescents' perceptions of parental punitiveness.

After it had been designed and validated this scale was found to be extremely useful because it could be used by later researchers to determine the validity and reliability of parental reports on parental discipline. Although no one has as yet done research among the Kikuyu on parental discipline it was hoped that investigators would soon research into this field.

The Selection of the Sample Used in This Study:

The following schools were used in this study:-
Karunga Primary School, Ndumberi, Uthiru, Kanunga, Karuri and Precious Blood Secondary school. Before visiting any of these schools to carry out the interviews, permission was obtained from the headmasters of all these schools in order to interview some of the pupils. At Karunga Primary School, permission was obtained to interview forty-five pupils in Standard V and VII while in the secondary schools permission was obtained to interview forms I and II pupils.

On arrival in each of these schools the headmaster introduced the interviewer to the two class teachers whose classes were going to be used in the study. The subjects used in this

study were selected randomly. The class teachers and the interviewer using a table of random numbers and the class registers selected the required number of subjects in each school. The selected sample was then assembled in one classroom where one of the class teachers in each school introduced the interviewer to the sample before leaving. The questionnaires were then handed to all the subjects and after giving the preliminary explanations, the interviewer allowed the subjects to fill out the questionnaires. This procedure was followed in all schools interviewed in the trial, pilot and main studies.

DEFINITIONS

The term 'discipline' is defined in the English Oxford Dictionary Volume D - E as:

"To bring under control; to educate or to train in habits of order and subordination."

The term 'parent' is defined by the English Oxford Dictionary Volume VII, N-POY as:

"A person who has brought forth a child, i.e. the father or the mother."

In this study however the phrase 'parental discipline' did not limit itself to discipline administered only by the natural father and mother but included any two adults who were responsible for disciplining any one of the adolescents used in this study.

In the Kikuyu society an elder brother is often responsible for the general welfare and education of his younger

brothers and sisters. This often happens when the parents are either very old or dead. In such homes the elder brother assumes the duties of his parents and therefore becomes responsible for the disciplining of all those who are younger than he.

If the parents are dead the wife of the elder brother plays the role of the natural mother which includes disciplining her sisters and brothers-in-law. She will also perform this role to her sisters-in-law if the mother-in-law is dead and the father-in-law is alive. In this case she rarely disciplines her brothers-in-law since this is the duty of her husband and her father-in-law. She could however discipline them if she is living with them (i.e. her brothers-in-law) far away from her father-in-law or if her father-in-law is very old.

Because of the above reasons, this study did not use the common nouns, 'parent', 'father' and 'mother' to necessarily refer to either the natural 'parents', father or mother respectively but rather to any two persons who often disciplined the adolescent at home.

The term construct validity means the degree to which a test is based upon a particular theory or theoretical construct. The theoretical construct used in the validation of the scale in this study was that:

a) Children who are harshly treated, severely punished and continually criticised are often more prejudiced and aggressive than those who are treated otherwise (Allport, 1954; Young, K., 1959).

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The problem of defining discipline scales has been studied by many investigators and many different approaches have been used.

Becker (1964) gives two categories of discipline - the love - oriented, and, the power-assertive discipline techniques. The love - oriented discipline techniques include both negative and positive methods of discipline. The negative methods consist of those methods which threaten the love-relationship that normally exists between parents and the child. These threats may be in form of either of the parents showing disappointment when the child misbehaves or even withdrawing love or threatening to do so because of the child's misconduct. The positive methods of discipline often include the parents' use of praise and reasoning with the child.

The power-assertive techniques often include physical punishment - yelling, shouting, forceful commands and verbal threats.

Sears et al. (1957) have also suggested two categories of discipline - negative and positive sanctions. Positive sanctions consist of such discipline techniques as rewards and praise used by parents in order to reinforce acceptable behaviour. Negative sanctions on the other hand consist of - physical punishments, withdrawal of love, isolation, and threats to administer any of the already mentioned discipline techniques. Negative sanctions are used by parents in order to curb the occurrence of undesirable behaviour in their children. Sears and his colleagues (1957)

define punishment as any type of punishment which creates an unpleasant situation to the child after it has been administered to him.

Some psychologists (Bull, 1967) have limited themselves to scales involving physical discipline and psychological discipline. Physical discipline includes all forms of physical punishments - beating, slapping, whipping, yelling and deprivation of meals or other privileges. Psychological discipline includes such techniques as withdrawal of love or threats to do so, isolation appealing to a child's esteem or guilt and expressions of parents' disappointment.

Douvan (1966) has considered all forms of deprivation as a discipline technique on its own. Under this category Douvan names such discipline techniques as preventing the child or adolescent from going out, forbidding adolescents to use the family car, etc.

Some psychologists believe that parental discipline is a very important aspect of child-rearing (Hoffman, 1963; Grinder, 1962; Becker, 1964). Most of these psychologists do not question the importance of parental discipline. Their attention is focussed rather on discipline techniques which are best suited for bringing up children successfully.

In African societies, good manners, obedience and respect for all (especially elders) play a crucial role in the upbringing of children. Ammar (1962) studied the whole process of a child's growing up among the Egyptians and the role played by parental discipline in the acquisition of the necessary traits which

enable children to conform to societal norms. Discipline, Ammar emphasizes, is so important among the Egyptians that the worst abuse or the greatest insult to an Egyptian youth would be to tell him or her that he or she has no one to discipline him or her. Authors who have written of child-rearing in other African settings have not emphasized the importance of parental discipline as much as Ammar has (Cagnolo, 1933; Kenyatta, 1938; Raum, 1940; Ominde, 1948; Maleche, 1953; Kaye, 1962; Levine, 1966; Lijembe, 1967; Apoko, 1967; Nzioki, 1967). They have however with the exception of Cagnolo (1933) pointed out that various forms of parental discipline techniques were used in order to make children and youth behave appropriately and consequently conform to societal norms. Since African tribes emphasize communal life in their interactions, parental discipline which enables children and youth to interact with the community is desirable and plays an important role in the process of an African child's growing up.

Some studies done in non-African settings have concerned themselves with the influences of parental discipline on a child's personality (Grinder, 1962; Hoffman, 1963; Becker, 1964; Douvan, 1966; Rutherford and Mussen, 1968). These studies suggest that parental discipline has two major functions:-

a) It guides and directs a child's actions hence it influences behaviour during childhood and also in the later years of a child's life (Baruch 1949). It aims at making the child or adolescent behave appropriately. It guides and directs a child's actions so that he may conform to societal norms. In order to make children behave appropriately, and therefore conform

to societal norms, parents use both negative and positive sanctions when disciplining their children. Negative sanctions curb undesirable behaviour while positive sanctions reinforce desirable behaviour in children (Sears et al., 1957)

b) Parental discipline influences the development of certain aspects of a child's personality (Grinder, 1962; Hoffman, 1963; Becker, 1964; Rutherford and Mussen 1968; Whiting, 1953). Several studies have produced evidence that there is a relationship between maternal punitiveness and aggressive behaviour in children. Becker (1964) cited that Sears, Whiting and Nowlis (1953) examined the consequences of maternal punitiveness for aggression among nursery school children and found a positive relationship between punitiveness and overt aggression among boys. Among girls the relationship was curvilinear. Girls of both highly punitive and least punitive mothers were less aggressive than those of moderately punitive mothers. Becker and his colleagues (1962) reached similar conclusions.

Several studies have produced evidence that parental discipline influences the development of a child's conscience (Sears et al., 1957; Burton, 1961; Rutherford and Mussen, 1968; Whiting, 1953, Grinder, 1962). Different indices of conscience guilt (Whiting, 1953), resistance to temptation, (Grinder, 1962), generosity (Rutherford and Mussen, 1963) and consideration for others (Hoffman, 1963) were studied.

Several studies have produced relations between love-oriented disciplines and the signs of guilt or acceptance of responsibility in relation to transgressions. Whiting and Child

(1953) in a cross-cultural study produced suggestions that there is a relationship between love-oriented disciplines and signs of guilt shown by individuals. The cross-cultural guilt index was based on the extent to which individuals accepted responsibility for their illness. Individuals who came from societies where love - oriented disciplines predominated had higher scores of guilt on the cross-cultural guilt index discussed above than did those who came from societies where power-assertive disciplines predominated. Becker (1964) cited that Allinsmith (1960) in his study found that those junior high school boys whose mothers mostly used psychological discipline manifested greater guilt on a study completion test than did those boys whose mothers predominantly used physical discipline.

Studies have also focussed their attention on the relationship between parental discipline and resistance to temptation. Grinder (1962) used a method involving "resistance to transgression in a game" in order to study the relationship between parental discipline and resistance to temptation. The boys were tempted to violate the rules of the game in order to win a desirable prize. Grinder found that resistance to temptation was related to love-oriented techniques of discipline rather than to physical forms of control. Burton et al. (1961) found that resistance to temptation was related to measures of psychological discipline.

Rutherford and Mussen (1968) studied the relationship between generosity among nursery school boys and parental discipline. They found that the generous boys viewed their fathers as warmer and more sympathetic than did the less generous boys.

Although there is some information on parental discipline in some tribes of Africa, this information is inadequate because it is merely discussed in passing by authors writing on general techniques of child-rearing in their tribes of interest (Kenyatta, 1938; Raum, 1940; Ominde, 1948; Maleche, 1953; Kaye, 1962; Ammar 1962; LeVine, 1966; Lijembe, 1967; Nzioki, 1967; Apoko, 1967).

The information in Kaye (1962) consists of:

- (a) Past childhood and adolescent experiences of his students and
- (b) of the information collected by the same students when interviewed parents of tribes in South Ghana on general techniques of child-rearing.

Reading Kaye (1962) it is impossible to distinguish which information represents his students' past experiences and which information was gathered by students when they interviewed parents.

The information in Lijembe (1967) Apoko (1967) and Nzioki (1967) consists of accounts of authors' personal past experiences of child-rearing techniques in their respective tribes.

The information given by Kaye's students and that written by Lijembe (1967) Apoko (1967) and Nzioki (1967) is selective. This was information given by grown-up men and women based on their experiences as children. Many years had elapsed between the time when the experiences took place and when the accounts were given. Since these students must have forgotten some of their childhood and adolescent experiences, what they have written must therefore be selective since it consists of only those experiences which they could remember.

The information given by the above authors consists of retrospective

accounts. Although there were some experiences which the students could remember vividly; the experiences which they could not recall vividly must have been recalled with distortions making the accounts inaccurate and unreliable. Studies done abroad have produced evidence that retrospective accounts have many distortions consequently they are inaccurate and unreliable (Yarrow, Campbell and Burton, 1970; Wener and Coulter 1962).

The information in Lijembe, Nzioki & Apoko is highly generalised. These three authors, made a mistake of assuming that their personal experiences could be generalised to represent their respective tribes. A much larger sample is required before the information can be generalised to represent the whole tribe (Ammar, 1962).

Despite the shortcomings of some of the studies done in Africa, one cannot however, fail to appreciate the detailed accounts given by most of the authors on parental discipline in some African tribes (Raum, 1940; Ominde, 1952; Maleche, 1953; Ammar, 1962; Kaye, 1962; Levine, 1966; Lijembe, 1967; Apoko, 1967; Nzioki, 1967) It appears as though whipping is the most common form of physical punishment and that physical punishment is more commonly used than psychological discipline. Ominde notes that,.

"When they (the Luo girls) are disobedient the normal disciplining action is whipping" (Ominde 19 , Page 16).

Other forms of physical punishment are:

a) Placing the disobedient child in a bag of nettles or one with either lizards, frogs or snails (Raum, 1940; Kaye, 1962).

b) Suspending the disobedient child over a smoky fire until he chokes (Raum, 1940)

c) Tying the disobedient child to a tree with a rope (Raum, 1940; LeVine, 1966).

d) Sending the disobedient child out of the house naked during broad day-light (LeVine, 1966).

Among tribes of southern Ghana, pepper or ginger is applied to either the eyes or the genitals of the disobedient child (Kaye, 1962; Page 139 - 145). Deprivation of meals is another common form of physical punishment administered to disobedient children by the Gusii of Kenya (LeVine, 1966) and the Chaga of Tanzania (Raum, 1940).

Instilling fear in children is another common discipline technique used by parents. Among the Ghanian tribes parents threaten their children with boggy men, monsters and circumcisers in order to make them behave appropriately (Kaye, 1962; page 162, LeVine 1966). Lijembe relates certain instances when this discipline technique was used by his mother in order to make him behave appropriately,

"Whenever my mother would hear me shouting greetings to ~~greetings~~ to passer-by she would rebuke me, explaining that strangers were known to kidnap friendly children, thus instilling fear in me.....Yes, fear played a big part in growing up of most of us from very young age" (Lijembe, 1967, page 18).

Curses especially those of parents are very much feared by most of the Africans. Threats of parental or relatives' curses are therefore used by both parents and relatives in disciplining children. This remains a very effective method of discipline not only youth but also adults. (Raum, 1940; Kenyatta, 1938; Levine 1966).

Riddles and stories especially those with a moral ending are also used in order to make children behave appropriately. (Nzioki, 1967; Kenyatta 1938).

Parents also use such psychological discipline techniques as:

(a) Reasoning with the child and verbal explanations.

Lijembe (1967) relates how his mother used verbal explanations in order to make him behave appropriately,

"She used to give me instructions: do not leave the home unguarded, she would tell me, for fear that thieves would steal our property. Do not leave Alusa crying for long periods of time for that would be dangerous to her health. Feed her when she cries. Guard the chicken from wild cats and chicks from wild birds....." (Lijembe 1967, page 3)

(b) Appealing to children or adolescents pride or esteem, Kenyatta says that, among the Kikuyu, if a circumcised youth erred in any way he was told by his parents,

"You have passed the period of childhood and you cannot behave like this; you are circumcised and you are man enough to know right and wrong." (Kenyatta, 1938 page 108).

Other forms of discipline techniques used by African parents in disciplining their children are - pinching the child

on his buttocks, ears or any other parts of the body; giving forceful commands; yelling; shouting abusing or scolding the child or adolescent; ridiculing the child or slapping him or her. Threats to carry out any of the above mentioned discipline techniques are made. These threats do not in most cases materialize.

Positive sanctions in form of either praise or material gifts are used by parents in order to reinforce desirable behaviour in children and adolescents. Some parents allow children to go out and play if they find, when they return home in the evening that their children have done all that was required of them.

Among the Chaga youths of Tanzania good deeds are rewarded (Raum 1940). If a small boy fetched firewood for either his mother or an old woman he was given a calabash of milk. Adolescent girls are rewarded by being given hens which they keep and take to their husbands home after marriage. A girl who has been very obedient will have a lot of hens and cocks when she gets married. This is not only pleasing to her husband but also to her in-laws. It is also a sign that she will be an obedient, hardworking and competent wife. Adolescent boys are given goats which become their sole property when they get married. (Raum, 1940)

Blessings and praises are also given to those who are polite, respectful and obedient not only to their parents but also to all elders. (Kenyatta, 1938; Raum, 1940).

Parental discipline is not always consistent among African parents (Maleche, 1953; Lijembe 1967). Lijembe notes the inconsistency of parental discipline when he says,

"In my case there were moments when my father or my mother, separately or jointly, would punish me for something they never told me was wrong. There were other times when I would receive the closest attention when by crying I showed them I had done the wrong thing. It was at times hard to know the accepted way of expressing respect towards parents until one had acted in one way or another and had been rebuked or, less frequently, praised."

Maleche (1953) concludes that because parental discipline is both erratic and inconsistent, children fail to develop close ties of affection with their parents. Inconsistency of parental discipline is not, as other authors have noted, the only reason why children fail to develop close ties of affection with their parents (Raum, 1940; Kenyatta, 1938). Other reasons are:-

a) Abrupt weaning which results in a conflict between children and their mothers. Children, without having been prepared for it, are quickly forced to leave their mothers company and start establishing new relations elsewhere. Although the mother remains with the child after weaning him, she pays less attention to him than before.

b) Hostilities that often arise between the mother and her son when he is finally forced to leave her company completely in order to start herding his fathers cattle, sheep or goats (Raum 1940, page 285).

c) The father's role as a disciplinarian makes his children regard him with great fear and awe. Children fear their father not only because of the severe punishments he may administer

to them if they misbehave but also because of the fear that the spirits of the dead will punish them if they fail to obey him,

"If there is strife or dissention in the family (i.e. between the child and father) the spirits can intervene and punish the wrongdoer." (Kenyatta, 1938, page 71)

Most of the researches that have already been discussed (i.e. both local and those done abroad) have mainly used maternal reports as the main source for their data. (Raum, 1940; Maleche, 1953; Kaye, 1962; Ammar, 1962; Sears et al. 1957; Levine, 1966). All of these researches have de-emphasized paternal reports and completely ignored children's reports. (Epstein and Komorita, 1965).

A variety of researches have produced evidence that researches which mainly rely on maternal reports often produce findings which lack reliability (Yarrow, Campbell and Burton, 1970; Wenar and Coulter, 1962) and validity (McCord and McCord, 1961.) Yarrow (1968) suggested various reasons for this:-

a) The mother's concern to protect her child will often result in her giving the interviewer distorted information. Such need is often found in indulgent mothers who do not only want to believe but also want others to believe that their children are very good. Such a mother filters information so that she gives the interviewer only that information which paints her child as the 'good-boy' or 'good-girl' type.

b) The mother's need to impress the interviewer may also result in her giving the interviewer distorted information. Some mothers may try to show the interviewer that they know the

answers to all discipline problems. And when she does not know the answer, she is prone to give wrong and invented information in order to impress and satisfy the interviewer.

c) Studies done abroad have produced evidence that maternal reports lack validity because of the mothers' need to identify with their culture (McCord and McCord, 1961). In their study McCord and McCord found that the validity of maternal reports is marred by the mothers' tendency to portray their family life in such a way that the information they give conforms to cultural stereotypes.

The interviewed parents view the 'ideal' family as one in which parents love their children (and vice versa), the father directs the family affairs and the father is a "decent" person who treats his son with kindness. The information given by the mothers who were in the interview group corresponded to the above described cultural stereotypes.

d) Maternal reports not only contain distorted information but also lack reliability because often the interviewer requires the mother to give retrospective accounts. An interviewer will for example ask the mother, "What did you do to X to make him obey?" or "Did you spank X everytime he disobeyed or what did you do?" Answers to such questions require the mother to recall incidents which took place many months or even years ago. Studies have produced evidence that retrospective accounts often lack reliability (Yarrow, Campbell and Burton, 1970; Wenar and Coulter, 1962; Wenar, 1961). In their study Yarrow, and her colleagues found that on their second interview, mothers reported greater use of some discipline techniques, than they had done in

their first interview¹. Most mothers for example reported greater use of isolation, threats, fear, deprivation of pleasure (Privileges) and other techniques. Other techniques such as reasoning, praise, bribes and corporal punishment increased but not to a statistically significant amount. The following reasons were suggested by Yarrow and her colleagues for the lack of reliability in the retrospective accounts:-

(i) The mothers wanted to get their children admitted into nursery school and therefore were hesitant to admit using certain techniques which they may have felt were not in vogue or acceptable to school administrators. (ii) It could also be possible that now that the child has turned out well, there is no need to be defensive about their child-rearing techniques hence they are freer to admit less "acceptable" techniques.

In their study Wener and Coutler found that the least reliable item in child-rearing were:- health in pregnancy, discipline, relations to father and mother, attitude towards problems and comments.

d) Maternal reports are also distorted because of the form of questions which the interviewer asks the mother. Questions such as "How often do you spank X?" assume that all the events between mother and child have a simple modal level of occurrence. Since this is not the case in real life,

1

The first interview took place when children entered nursery school. The mothers were required to fill a questionnaire on their child-rearing techniques. The same mothers traced and reinterviewed on the same topic when their children were either young adults, adolescents or were in preschool age.

the mother gives answers which she thinks will satisfy the interviewer. Such information is often distorted.

e) The interviewer also asks the mother to comment on the child's actions. The interviewer may for example ask the mother, "What does X do when you hit him? Can the interviewer expect the mother to give the correct answer to such a question? Shouldn't the interviewer ask the child such a question if he wants the correct answer?"

f) Prior knowledge by the couple as to whether both or only one of them is going to be interviewed was found to influence the content of the information given on child-rearing techniques, (Yarrow, 1968). Yarrow, cited that in their study Kohn and Carroll (1960) interviewed eighty families (they interviewed the parents and ten year olds). Their findings were as follows:-

- i) There were discrepancies between the information given by the mother, father and the child.
- ii) The mothers who knew that their husbands were also going to be interviewed gave more favourable reports concerning their husbands and their interactions with the child than did those mothers who had been told that their husbands were not going to be interviewed.

Some psychologists have questioned the ingenuity of continued reliance on maternal reports when it has empirically been proved that the maternal reports often lack reliability, validity and often contain systematic distortions (Yarrow, 1968; Epstein and Komorita, 1965). These psychologists do not however suggest that the maternal reports should be disregarded completely in studies of parental discipline. Their suggestion is that both

paternal and children's reports should be included in studies of parental discipline in order to determine the validity and reliability of maternal reports.

Epstein and Komorita (1965) devised a method of obtaining information from children in studies of parental discipline. They devised a scale called "A Parental Punitive Scale" for use in U.S.A. Children's reports were used in designing this scale. These children were living in urban areas; they belonged to different socioeconomic groups; and they were between seven and fifteen years old. This "Parental Punitive Scale" measures children's perceptions of the severity of parental discipline towards aggression. This scale is extremely valuable because:-

- a) It has made it possible to include children reports in studies of parental discipline.
- b) It requires children to give balanced accounts of both maternal and paternal discipline.
- c) It provides data (the data obtained after administering the "Parental Punitive Scale") which can be used in order to determine the validity and reliability of maternal as well as paternal reports.
- d) It is both objective and economical. It is objective because it requires children to say what their mothers and fathers do to them if they behave in an aggressive manner. It is economical because it can be quickly administered to a large sample. It saves plenty of time for both the subjects and the interviewer.

A "Parental Punitive Scale" would be extremely valuable in

Kenya where very little has been done on parental discipline. A "Parental Punitive Scale" for use in Kenya would be very useful because not only would it pioneer into this neglected field of parental discipline but would also provide later researchers on this field with economical and objective measure for determining the reliability and validity of parental reports.

Summary

Different psychologists have given different categories of parental discipline. Parental discipline is one of the most important aspects of child-rearing techniques because it remains an influential force behind a child's personality throughout his life. As Baruch (1949) noted parental discipline is not only important to parents but also to those outside the home. When a child goes to school he takes with him all the years that have gone before. Into Kindergarten he takes infancy and toddling days. Even in high school and indeed in later life he still carries with him parental influences. Thus parental discipline is one of the parental influences that, as noted above, remains with the child throughout his life.

In U.S.A., several studies have focussed not only on parental discipline but also on its influences on the personality of a child, (Sears et al., 1957; Grinder, 1962; Hoffman, 1963; Becker, 1964; Rutherford and Mussen, 1968). In Africa however, information on parental discipline is almost lacking. No one research has up to now been focussed on parental discipline, and the information that we have is only that which has been discussed in passing by authors writing on child-rearing techniques in different tribes, (Kenyatta, 1938; Raum, 1940; Ominde, 1952; Maleche, 1953; Kaye, 1962; LeVine, 1966; Lijembe, 1967; Apoko; 1967; Nzioki, 1967). Such information is usually inadequate, inaccurate and unreliable.

Most of the studies on parental discipline have mainly relied on maternal reports as the main source of their data (Sears et al., 1957; Prothro, 1966). Empirical evidence has proved that maternal reports often provide unreliable, distorted and invalid data which is often difficult to interpret. Epstein and Komorita (1965) have devised "A Parental Punitive Scale" which is both objective, economical and an efficient measure for determining the validity and reliability of parental reports. The aim of this study was to design and validate a parental punitive scale for Kikuyu adolescents of central province, Kenya, based on the methods suggested by Epstein and Komorita, (1965.)

CHAPTER III

CHOOSING THE PILOT STUDY SAMPLE

A trial study and a pilot study were done. In the trial study fourty-five pupils in standards 5 and 7 at Karunga primary school were used. The procedure used in the selection of this study has already been discussed in chapter I page 4-5.

The results of this trial study showed that the standards 5 and 7 pupils were not suitable because they could not handle all the questionnaires planned for use in the main study in English. Although most of the standard 7 pupils could handle questionnaire I, version A (appendix A) in English some of them had difficulties with such simple vocabulary (used in the stories in questionnaire I, version A) as:-

Imagine

Ignore

Fetch

Snatch

Hid

Annoy

The above words had either to be translated into Kikuyu or into simpler English so that those standard 7 pupils who had difficulties with them could understand their meanings. Since none of the standard 5 pupils could understand questionnaire I, version A in English the whole questionnaire had to be translated

into Kikuyu. They were also allowed to give their responses in Kikuyu.

Ability to handle the questionnaires in English was desirable because questionnaire II (appendix C) could not be translated into Kikuyu. The translation of this questionnaire into Kikuyu would be lacking because the different meanings of the three English pairs of words - fair-unfair, right - wrong and good - bad - could not be adequately translated into Kikuyu.

In questionnaire II, the subjects were required to rate the severity of the given discipline techniques using the three - five - point Semantic differential scales - fair - unfair, right - wrong and good - bad (Osgood, Suci and Tannenbaum, 1957). The above mentioned three pairs of English words have only one equivalent pair of words in Kikuyu. Translating these three pairs of words into Kikuyu could have meant distorting the meaning of above scale completely. In fact when attempts were made to translate the scales into Kikuyu and these Kikuyu translations were given to Kikuyu native speakers it was impossible for them to give the correct English translations.

Because of their inability to handle the questionnaires in English, the standards 5 and 7 pupils were dropped out of the study and forms I and II secondary school pupils were used instead. It was found that the forms I and II pupils could handle the questionnaires in English.

Because of the following reasons also it was desirable to use form I and II pupils:-

- a) Because there was similarity of age between the standards 5 and 7 pupils and the forms I and II pupils. While the mean age of the standards 5 and 7 pupils was 13.8 years, that of forms I and II pupils was 14.4 years.
- b) Also because of this similarity of age it was felt that the original questionnaire I version A (appendix A) would not need major changes. This questionnaire was given to thirteen forms I and II pupils from Ndumberi Secondary School and an analysis of their responses indicated that some changes be made in this questionnaire and that it was not necessary that a new questionnaire be constructed.
- c) Since forms I and II pupils in Kikuyu community are still under the care and protection of adults it was assumed that they are still very much disciplined by adults. This assumption was proved correct when questionnaire I, version A (appendix A) was given to the same group of thirteen pupils in forms I and II at Ndumberi Secondary School.
- The analysis of their responses showed that the discipline techniques they mentioned were similar to those mentioned by the standards 5 and 7 pupils (chapter IV page 42).

d) The forms I and II pupils were also chosen to be used in this pilot study because it was felt that at that age they were morally mature enough to be able to make individual moral judgements. Ability to make moral judgements was desirable in questionnaire II (appendix C). In this questionnaire the subjects were required to rate the severity of the given discipline techniques using the three five - point Semantic defferential Scales:- fair - unfair, right - wrong and good - bad (Osgood, Suci and Tannenbaum 1957). In order to rate the severity of the given discipline techniques the subjects had to make personal decisions as to whether they considered each of the given discipline techniques as very fair/right/wrong, slightly fair/right/wrong, partly fair and partly unfair, partly right and partly wrong, partly wrong, partly good and partly bad, slightly unfair/wrong/bad and very unfair/wrong/bad. These decisions, required in the use of the above scale, are moral judgements and unless one has reached a certain stage of moral judgement one cannot make such decisions. According to Piaget's theory of moral judgement (1932) pupils in forms I and II have already attained the autonomous stage of moral judgement therefore, they are able to make their own moral rules and moral judgements. The pilot study proved this to be correct because after having been given

the preliminary explanations as to how they were going to use the above mentioned scales, the forms I and II pupils showed no further difficulties. The analysis of their responses also showed that they were able to use the scales (chapter IV page 45).

In the pilot study Ndumberi and Uthiru Secondary Schools were used. The procedure used in the selection of the required forms I and II pupils in both schools has already been described in chapter I (page 4-5).

These two Secondary Schools were chosen because of the following:-

- a) It was felt that travelling distances would be minimized since both of these schools were very near Nairobi.
- b) Both schools were day secondary schools. This was a great advantage in this study. It was felt that only those pupils who lived at home with adults who disciplined them should be included in the pilot study.
- c) Since in the review of literature it is obvious that discipline techniques depend on tribal or cultural background, it was decided that only Kikuyu adolescent boys and girls should be used in the pilot study in order to control the variation of the tribal background of the sample. The majority of the pupils in Ndumberi and Uthiru Secondary Schools were

Kikuyu and it was easy to get the required number of adolescents.

- d) Both schools were also chosen because they were located in the rural areas. It was felt that a rural community should be used in this study because unlike the urban community, the rural community tends to be more homogeneous than the urban community, (Mayer 1971). Urban dwellers live in crowded multi-tribal (and often multi-racial) estates:

"Town, unlike the country does not allow for the full dramatization of cultural divisions in visual terms."
(Mayer, 1971, page 71).

Some of the sociologists refer to urban areas as 'melting-pots', (Mayer, 1971) i.e. places where different cultures mix to form one single conglomeration. Mayer (1971) noted that this 'melting-pot' process does to a certain extent detribalize urban dwellers.

"Even if the ties of individuals with their rural homes were not cut, their behaviour while in town might be expected to assimilate resulting in the over-all common culture".
(Mayer, 1971).

One of the cultural changes that Lambo (1969) thought had taken place among the African Urban Communities was their

traditional pattern of mother-child relationships:

"In many urban centres and towns, undergoing rapid socio-economic change, the pattern of mother-child relationship is neither traditional nor western and cannot be clearly defined, it is in fact transitional". (Lambo, 1969).

All the Kikuyu adolescents living in urban areas were eliminated from this study because it was felt that their urbanized parents had lost most of their traditional African culture (Mayer, 1971) and especially their traditional pattern of child-rearing practices, (Lambo, 1969). Only Kikuyu rural adolescents were used in this study.

THE SELECTION OF THE SAMPLE

Fifty-four subjects were used in the pilot study. Table I, below reports the following details:-

- a) The name of the school from which the subjects came.
- b) The district in which the school was located.
- c) The number of subjects interviewed in each school.
- d) The form of the subjects interviewed and the number of subjects interviewed in each form.
- f) The group of the subjects interviewed.

TABLE I A DESCRIPTION OF THE PILOT STUDY SAMPLE

a	b	c			d			e	f
Name of the School	District in which school is located	Number of subjects interviewed			Forms of subjects interviewed			Part of the study in which the subjects were used	Group Numbers
		Girls	Boys	Total	Form I	Form II	Total		
Ndumberi Secondary school	Kiambu	7	6	13	8	5	13	First Minor study.	One
Ndumberi Secondary school	Kiambu	10	10	21	10	11	21	Second Minor study	Two
Uthiru Secondary school	Nairobi	9	9	20	10	10	20	Third and Fourth Minor studies	Three

Table II reports the distribution of age of the pilot study sample and also the school from which they came

TABLE II DIFFERENT AGE GROUPS IN THE PILOT STUDY SAMPLE BY SCHOOL:

Age of subjects in years	Ndumberi secondary school	Uthiru secondary school	Total number of subjects in each group
13	4	3	7
14	5	1	6
15	15	9	24
16	6	3	9
17	4	4	8
	34	20	54

CHAPTER IV

A DESCRIPTION OF THE PILOT STUDY

In the pilot study the aim was to try out the questionnaires and, based on the analysis of the responses, to standardize them for use in the main study. The pilot study consisted of four minor studies.

In the first minor study, questionnaire I, version A (Appendix A) containing twelve stories were given to group one (table I, page 33)¹. In each of these stories a girl or a boy was portrayed as having done something naughty that called for her or his parents' response respectively. The subjects in group one were asked to imagine that they were the ones who had been naughty in all the twelve stories. They were then asked to say what they thought their mothers and fathers would do or say to them for having been naughty. From the subjects' responses a list was made of all discipline techniques mentioned by them.

In the second minor study an attempt was made to obtain the mean and severity ratings of the discipline techniques mentioned by subjects in the first minor study. The mean severity ratings of these discipline techniques were obtained as follows:-

A questionnaire (i.e. questionnaire II, appendix C) containing all the discipline techniques mentioned by subjects in the first minor study was given to group two (table I page 33) and these subjects were asked to rate the given discipline techniques

1

At first it had been decided that standards 5 and 7 pupils would be used in the pilot study but because of their inability to handle the questionnaires in English, Forms I and II pupils who could handle the questionnaires in English were used instead.

using the three, five-point semantic differential scales: fair - unfair, right-wrong and good-bad (Osgood, Suci and Tannenbaum, 1957). An analysis of the responses made by subjects in group two was made and the mean severity ratings and the standard deviations of all the discipline techniques were calculated. Using the four Criteria (Epstein and Komorita, 1965), four discipline techniques were chosen to be used as response alternatives in another questionnaire.

The third minor study concerned itself with the assessment of the severity of parental discipline towards aggression. A questionnaire, (i.e. questionnaire III, appendix G) consisting of forty-five statements which portray aggression towards parents, teachers siblings, other girls and boys and inanimate objects was given to group three (table I, page 33) These subjects were asked to imagine that they were the ones who had behaved in a manner similar to that portrayed in the forty-five statements in questionnaire III (appendix G). The subjects were then asked to choose one of the four alternatives given in each statement as an example of what their mothers and fathers would do to them if they behaved in a manner similar to that portrayed in the forty-five statements. These subjects were also told that each of the given four alternatives represented a category of other discipline techniques. The subjects were given examples of discipline techniques represented by each of the four alternatives. The four alternatives were labelled a, b, c, and d. They ranged from the least to the most punitive and 'a' was the least punitive

while 'd' was the most punitive. By giving weights of 1,2, 3, and 4 to each of the four discipline techniques respectively, it was possible to calculate the maternal and paternal punitive scores for each of the subjects in the sample.

In order to calculate the reliability of questionnaires III (appendix G) Kuder-Richardson formula 20 was used (Thorndike, R.L., 1951)

In order to validate the scale the subjects parental punitive scores were compared with their: (a) tribal and religious prejudice scores and also (b) aggression scores.

In the fourth minor study questionnaire IV (appendix I) was given to group three (table I, page 33) in order to assess these subjects tribal and religious prejudice and also their aggression.

Questions 1, 2, 3, 6 and 7 of questionnaire IV assessed the tribal prejudice of subjects whilst questions 4 and 5 assessed their religious prejudice. In questions 1, 2 and 3 the subjects were given fourteen common names used by seven well known tribes of Kenya. The order of these names was randomly chosen for each question. In question 6, the subjects were given names of six districts of Kenya and in question 7, they were given six girls names. In all these questions (i.e. 1, 2, 3, 6 and 7) the subjects were asked to choose one name and it was through this choice that they showed whether they had or had no tribal prejudice.

In questions 4 and 5 the subjects were given a list of seven well-known religions found in Kenya and they were asked to

choose one name from the list. Their choice showed whether they had or had no religious prejudice.

In question 8 which assessed their aggression, these subjects were given a list of nine descriptions showing aggressive behaviour. They were asked to name against each of the descriptions, three people in the sample whom the descriptions suited.

PROCEDURE OF THE TRIAL STUDY

Before carrying out the pilot study, a trial study was done in order to determine what population should be used in the pilot study.

In the trial study standards 5 and 7 pupils were used, permission was obtained from the district education officer of Kiambu¹ and also from the headmaster of Karunga¹ primary school to interview some pupils in standards 5 and 7 in that school.

On arrival in this school the headmaster introduced the interviewer to the class teachers of standards 5 and 7. The subjects used in the trial study were selected randomly. The class teachers and the interviewer using a table of random numbers and class registers selected the required sample. The subjects chosen were assembled in one classroom and one of the class teachers introduced the interviewer to the subjects before leaving the classroom. Questionnaire I version A (appendix A) was handed to all the subjects and after preliminary explanations, the subjects were allowed to fill out questionnaires (introduction of questionnaire I version A , appendix A).

¹Karunga primary school is in Kiambu district.

A short description of the trial study:-

In the trial study twelve stories were constructed and they appear in questionnaire I version A (appendix A). These twelve stories were given to forty-five pupils¹ from Karunga Primary School. A description of these stories as well as what subjects were required to do has already been given in the description of the pilot study page 35.

Although most of the pupils in standard 7 could handle questionnaire I, version A in English, a few of them had difficulties with simple vocabulary such as: Imagine, ignore, fetch, snatch, hid and annoy. Although it was not necessary to translate the stories into Kikuyu for the standard 7 pupils, the above mentioned words which had proved difficult for some of them had either to be translated into Kikuyu or into simpler English as follows:-

Imagine - 'gwiciria undu utari ho, kana utari wama'.

Fetch - another word for get e.g. instead of saying 'get water from the river', one may say 'fetch water from the river'.

Snatch - means 'to take away quickly'. The Kikuyu word for it is, 'kugutha'.

Hid - this is the past tense of the word hide. The Kikuyu word for, 'hide' is 'Kwihitha'.

Annoy - means, 'to make angry'. The Kikuyu word for annoy is 'Kurakaria'.

¹Twenty - two of these subjects were in standard 5 and the rest were in standard 7.

Since none of the standard 5 pupils could handle this questionnaire in English, they were asked to move to the next classroom where more detailed explanations of Questionnaire I version A would be given to them alone.

After making sure that the standard 7 subjects knew what was required of them the interviewer left them filling out the questionnaire in order to deal with the standard 5 subjects. All the twelve stories were translated into Kikuyu verbally for the standard 5 pupils. The inability of the standard 5 pupils to handle the questionnaire in English was a problem which the interviewer had not foreseen, therefore no preparations had been made in order to be able to cope with this problem. The accuracy of the translations could not therefore be checked. The standard 5 subjects were allowed to give their responses in Kikuyu.

PROCEDURE OF THE PILOT STUDY

After the trial study a pilot study was planned and carried out using forms I and II pupils. It was assumed that forms I and II pupils unlike the standard 5 and 7 pupils, could handle all the questionnaires¹ in English.

Permission was obtained from the headmasters of Ndumberi and Uthiru Secondary Schools to interview some forms I and II pupils in each school.

The procedure used in the selection of the required sample in each school and also that used in administering questionnaires I, version A, II III and IV was the same as that already described on page 4-5 (also see introductions of

¹ The pilot study had four questionnaires, questionnaires I version A, questionnaire II, questionnaire III and IV (see appendices A, C, E and F respectively).

questionnaires I version A, II, III and IV in appendices A, C, G and I).

A description of the Pilot Study:-

Because of their inability to handle the questionnaires in English the standard 5 and 7 pupils had to be dropped out of the pilot study. It was desirable to use a sample which could handle the questionnaires in English because questionnaire II (appendix C) could not be translated into Kikuyu without distorting the meanings of the three, five-point semantic differential scales (Osgood et al. 1957)². It was therefore decided that in the pilot study form I and II pupils who as already stated it was assumed could handle the questionnaires in English should be used. The pilot study consisted of four minor studies.

In the first minor study, questionnaire I, version A (appendix A)³ was given to group one (table I page 33) and told

a) To imagine that they were the ones who had been naughty in all the twelve stories.

²A more detailed explanation of this appears in chapter III page 26.

³ This was the same questionnaire as that given to standard 5 and 7 pupils of Karunga Primary School (page 39 and appendix A

They were then asked to say what they thought their fathers and mothers would say or do to them for being naughty.

b)¹ To re-read the stories and put:-

- (i) A star against any of the stories which they thought needed to be changed completely.
- (ii) A cross against any of the stories which they thought needed only slight alterations.
- (iii) A tick against any of the stories which they thought needed no changes.

Results:

a) The analysis of the subjects responses showed that the subjects in forms I and II mentioned discipline techniques similar to those mentioned by primary school subjects. The secondary school subjects however omitted the following discipline techniques:-

Threaten to take me to an approved school

Stop me from playing with others

Refuse to wash my clothes

Tie me to a tree with a rope

threaten to hang me.

¹Although the interviewer knew that questionnaire I version A could not be given to forms I and II pupils as it was in the main study due to the fact that these were older and mentally more mature than the standards 5 and 7 pupils, for whom it had been originally constructed, she was not however very sure whether to construct a completely new questionnaire or to merely make alterations in the original questionnaire. It was for this reason that it decided to give instructions contained in 'b' in order that these forms I and II pupils could make the decision they thought best.

b) Table III

Table III shows the number of crosses, stars and ticks given in each question as shown by the whole sample:-

No. of story	Stars	Crosses	Ticks	What is to be done
1	15	4		Stories to be changed completely.
4	11	2		
7	12	1		
9	16	4	1	
5	1	5	-	Stories to be slightly changed.
6	2	6	2	
8	3	10	2	
11	-	9	-	
12	-	11		
2	1	-	7	Stories which require no changes.
3	2	3	13	
10	1	1	8	

Using the results in Table III it was decided that a new questionnaire was to be constructed for use in the main study.

In the second minor study an attempt was made to obtain the mean severity ratings of the discipline techniques given by the thirteen subjects from Ndumberi Secondary School in the first minor study.

The mean severity ratings were obtained as follows:-

A questionnaire (i.e. questionnaire II, Appendix C) containing all the discipline techniques obtained in the first minor study was given to a group one (Table I, Page 33) and these were asked to rate the given discipline techniques using the three, five-point semantic differential scale: fair-unfair, right-wrong and good-bad (Osgood, Suci and Tannenbaum, 1957).

Before the pupils were allowed to fill out the questionnaire, one discipline technique, 'Abuse the child' was written on the blackboard. Below it were written the three scales and their five weights as follows:-

Abuse the child

unfair---- 1 2 3 4 5 - - - fair

wrong- - - 1 2 3 4 5 - - - right

bad - - - 1 2 3 4 5 - - - good

The meanings of the five weights were explained to the subjects using the introduction of questionnaire II (Introduction, questionnaire II, Appendix C). The subjects were given some time to read these explanations for themselves. Various subjects were then asked to give the meanings of different weights, i.e. 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5. Continuing with the discipline technique 'Abuse the child' the following structured explanations were given:-

"Let us take the discipline technique on the blackboard, 'Abuse the child', how would you weigh it using each of the three scales given? Let us first deal with the first scale,

fair-unfair, would you say it is very fair, slightly fair; partly fair or partly unfair; slightly unfair or very unfair?"

One of the boys answered the question. He responded in words. He was asked to go to the blackboard and circle the number that represented his response. He circled the correct number. A girl was asked the same question. She too gave her response in words. She was asked to go to the blackboard and circle the number that represented her response. She too circled the right number.

The same procedure was followed in order to rate the severity of the same discipline technique using the other two scales: good-bad and right-wrong.

Two or more subjects were asked the same question in order to emphasize that there was no correct response in any of the scales. All that the subjects were required to do was to give their personal opinions when rating the severity of the given discipline techniques.

At this point in the study the interviewer became interested in whether the subjects knew the different meanings of the three pairs of words used in the three scales. They were asked to give sentences in which they used fair-unfair. From their responses it was deduced that the sample knew the meaning of fair-unfair. Those who used good - bad and right - wrong in their sentences showed that they did not know the different meanings of the two pairs of words.

Although efforts were made to explain the different meanings of these words and also to use them in different sentences, these efforts proved fruitless for a few subjects.

Before the sample were allowed to fill out the questionnaire the following points were emphasized:-

(a) Only numbers should be circled in the scales. No words should be circled.

(b) Only one number should be circled in each scale.

(c) There was no correct response in any of the questions.

All responses should be considered as personal opinions.

(d) Pencils should be used so that if one changes ones mind one may rub.

An analysis of the subjects' responses in questionnaire II was made. The mean severity rating and the standard deviation of each of the discipline techniques were calculated. Four criteria were used in order to select four discipline techniques to be used as response alternatives in questionnaire III (Appendix E). The four criteria used information based on the mean severity ratings and the standard deviations of the discipline techniques. They were:-

a) Each of the four discipline techniques should represent a category of discipline techniques for example all the verbal discipline techniques should be represented by one of the four discipline techniques selected.

b) The variability amongst subjects' severity ratings for a particular discipline technique should be small.

c) Between different age groups in the sample, the mean severity ratings for the discipline techniques should not be significantly different.

d) Between the different educational levels of the subjects' fathers, the mean severity ratings for the discipline techniques should not be significantly different.

Using the above four criteria the following four discipline techniques were selected. They ranged from the least punitive to the most punitive, while discipline technique 'd' was the most punitive, 'a' was the least punitive.

- a. Ask the child to love others as he loves himself.
- b. Pinch the child.
- c. Be angry with the child
- d. Take away some of the child's property.

The third minor study was concerned with the assessment of the severity of parental discipline towards aggression. A questionnaire (questionnaire III, appendix G) consisting of forty five statements which portray aggression towards teachers, parents, other siblings, other boys and girls and inanimate objects had the following format:-

If I kick another person,
My.....A. Ask me to love others as a.....My
FATHER..... I love myselfMOTHER

WOULD..... b. Pinch me b.....WOULD
..... c. Be angry with me c.....
..... d. Take away some of my property d.....

This questionnaire was given to group three (table I, page 33) The subjects were:-

a) Asked to choose one of the four discipline techniques in each item in order to show what they thought their mothers and fathers would do to them for behaving in a manner similar to that portrayed in the forty-five items (Introduction, questionnaire III, appendix G).

b) Told to consider each of the four discipline techniques as representative of a category of other discipline techniques. Discipline technique (a) represented such verbal discipline techniques as:

Advice me how to behave

Warn me not to misbehave again

Ask me to tell my mother or my father why I misbehaved

Ask me why I misbehaved

The discipline technique 'b' represented:-

Report me to my father or mother scold me

Ask me to apologize

Scold me

Tell me that I shall not be sent again

Tell me that I am stupid.

The discipline technique 'c' represented:-

Hit me

Beat me

Tell me that I am naughty

Give me extra work for example digging

Threaten to beat me

Ask the teacher to punish me

Refuse to pay my school fees

Report me to the headmaster or any other teacher

Threaten that I shall sleep out of doors.

The discipline technique 'd' represented:-

Deprive me of a meal or threaten to deprive me of a meal.

Tell me that I am mad

Threaten me that I shall never be sent again.

Stop me from going to school

Tell me that I am like a thief

Send me out of the house

Stop me from going to bed

The subjects were told that since each of the four discipline techniques represented a category of other discipline techniques, they should be able to choose one alternative for mother and another or the same alternative for father. After these explanations, the subjects were allowed to fill out the questionnaire.

CODING INSTRUCTIONS:

Since the four alternatives ranged from the least to the most punitive, weights 1, 2, 3 and 4 were assigned to discipline techniques a, b, c and d respectively. This was done in order to calculate the maternal and paternal punitive scores for each of the subjects in the sample.

THE RELIABILITY OF THE SCALE:

The test reliability of questionnaire III (appendix G) was measured by Kuder-Richardson formula 20. An assumption was made that all those subjects who had given responses 'a' and 'b' in questionnaire III had failed the test while all those who had given 'c' and 'd' had passed the test.

CODING INSTRUCTIONS:

Those subjects who gave either responses 'a' or 'b' were given zeros while those who gave either responses 'c' or 'd' were given ones, for the purpose of calculating the reliability of this instrument.

THE VALIDATION OF THE SCALE:

In order to validate the scale the concept construct validity was used. Each subject's parental punitive score obtained in questionnaire III, was compared with her or his (a) tribal and religious prejudice score and (b) aggression score obtained in questionnaire IV (appendix I) discussed below.

Questionnaire IV, consisting of eight questions formed the fourth minor study. It was given to group three (table I page 33). Questionnaire IV attempted to assess the subjects:

- (a) Tribal and religious prejudice
- (b) aggression

The questions corresponding to 'a' and 'b' are listed below:-

<u>Prejudice</u>	<u>Question numbers</u>
Tribal	1, 2, 3, 6, 7.
Religious	4, 5.
<u>Aggression</u>	<u>Question numbers</u>

DESCRIPTION OF THE QUESTIONS:

PREJUDICE

PURPOSE OF THE QUESTIONS

Questions 1, 2 and 3 gave a list of fourteen names. These names are randomly distributed in the three questions in order to rule out the possibility of the subjects' giving responses without reading the questions. The fourteen common names used by seven well-known tribes of Kenya as follows:-

TABLE IV' Tribes represented by names

TRIBE	NAMES
KIKUYU	MWANGI, MWANIKI
EMBU	NYAGA, NJAGI
MERU	MARETE, MUKWANJERU
KAMBA	MUTUA, KISILU
LUHYA	SHIYUKAH, KHASIANI
LUO	OLOO, ONEKA
SWAHILI	ALI, HAMISI

In question 1, the subjects were asked to choose only one name of the person they would like to share the camp work with. In question 2, they were asked to choose one name of the person whom they would like to lead their group.

The information in this table was not given to the subjects.

PREJUDICE

PURPOSE OF THE QUESTION

Tribal prejudice would be shown by any subjects who would choose Kikuyu names. The subject who chooses Kikuyu names would show tribal prejudice because it meant he would only like to work with or be under the leadership of a Kikuyu person and not otherwise.

In question three the subject was told that his sister was in love with a certain boy. When his parents came to know about it they were furious. They asked their daughter to stop the whole affair because they would never consent to such a marriage. The subject was asked to show whom he thought this boy was by choosing one name out of the given fourteen names. The subjects who would choose names of other tribes would show tribal prejudice because it showed they would expect their parents to be furious if their sisters fell in love with boys from other tribes. Question six gave a list of nine districts. These districts were supposed to

PREJUDICE

PURPOSE OF THE QUESTION

represent six tribes of Kenya as follows:-

TABLE V¹

DISTRICTS REPRESENTING SIX TRIBES OF KENYA

(TRIBAL PREJUDICE)

TABLE V

TRIBE	DISTRICTS
KIKUYU	MURANGA, NYERI
EMBU	EMBU
MERU	MERU
KAMBA	MACHAKOS, KITUI
LUHYA	BUSIA, KAKAMEGA
LUO	KISUMU

The subjects were told that Mr. Kimani² had worked in most of these districts as a social worker. In one of them he was not only very unhappy but could not get on with the people there. The subjects were asked to say which district they think Kimani could have encountered such problems.

1

This information was not given to the subjects.

2.

The name Kimani is a Kikuyu name. Subjects were not told so however

PREJUDICE

PURPOSE OF THE QUESTION

Those subjects who would choose districts other than Muranga and Nyeri would show tribal prejudice because their choice would reveal that they could not expect Kimani, a Kikuyu, to be happy and be able to get along with people other than those of his own tribe.

Question seven gives a list of six girls' names. These names represent six tribes of Kenya as follows:

TABLE VI¹

TRIBES REPRESENTED BY NAMES

TRIBE	NAMES
KIKUYU	WAITHIRA
MERU	KARWITHA
KAMBA	NDUKU
SWAHILI	HADIJA
LUHYA	AKALA
LUO	AKIINYI

In this question the subjects were told that Kimani² had stopped

¹ The information in this table was not given to the subjects.

² Kimani is a Kikuyu name. The subjects were however not told this.

PREJUDICE

PURPOSE OF THE QUESTIONS

befriending one of the girls in the above list of names after finding out where she came from. The subjects are asked to choose one name to show who this girl was. Those subjects who would choose names other than 'Waithira' would show tribal prejudice. Their choice would reveal that they would only expect Kimani to leave a girl if she belonged to another tribe.

PREJUDICE

Religious Prejudice

PURPOSE OF THE QUESTIONS

Questions 4 and 5 assessed the religious prejudice of subjects. A list of seven religions were given. These were: Catholic, Protestant, African Independent Church, 'the Aroti' (i.e. The African tarban Sihks), the Hindu, Islam and Legion of Marie. The subjects said they knew all the religions except the one. They were told that Legion of Marie was a religious group which has broken away from the Catholic church. This religion was mainly practiced by the Luo.

In question four the subjects were told to say (by choosing one of

PREJUDICE

PURPOSE OF THE QUESTIONS

the religions) which religion Mr. Kamau had refused to give money to. Those who would choose a religion other than their own¹ would show prejudice.

Through their choice they would reveal that they would not visualize Kamau refusing to give money to their own religion but would visualize such a thing happening to other religions.

In question 5 the subject was told that his sister was in love with a boy from a certain religious background. When his parents came to know about it they were very angry. They told her to stop the whole affair because they would never consent to such a marriage. The subjects were asked to say to which religion this boy belonged. They were asked to choose one of the religions listed in the question. Those subjects who chose religions other than their own would show religious prejudice.

¹

The subjects were asked to give their religions at the beginning of the questionnaire IV.

Through their choice they would reveal that they would expect their parents to refuse to allow their¹ to marry boys from other religions.

AGGRESSION

In question 8, the subjects were asked to name at least three people in the sample whom any of the nine descriptions given would suit. The subjects were told to name only the people who were in the sample. These nine descriptions were:-

-
1. When he/she does not get his way he/she gets very angry.
 2. He/She is very mean.
 3. He/she is very wild.
 4. He/she makes fun of people.
 5. He/she does not pay attention to the teacher.
 6. He/she tries to get others into trouble.
 7. He/she always messes around and gets into trouble.
 8. He/she says he/she can beat everybody up.
 9. He/she likes to pick on anyone younger than he/she is.

¹ In this question an assumption was made that the subject and his belonged to the same religion and so did their parents.

CODING INSTRUCTIONS

<u>QUESTIONS, NUMBERS</u>	<u>DESCRIPTION OF CODING</u>
1 and 2	All those subjects who chose names other than 'Mwaniki' and 'Mwangi' (i.e. Kikuyu names) were give '0' All those who only chose the Kikuyu names i.e. 'Mwaniki' and Mungai were given '1'
3,6 and 7	All those subjects who chose Kikuyu names were given '0', and all those who chose names from other tribes were given '1'.
4 and 5	All those subjects who chose a religion corresponding to that of their own were given '0' while all those who chose a religion not corresponding to their own were given '1'.
Scoring in 1 - 7	All the ones given to each subject were added together. This was a subject prejudice score.
8	The number of times each subject was mentioned by his colleagues in the sample were tallied against his name These tallies were added together for each subject in order to obtain his or her aggression score.

CHAPTER V

PILOT STUDY RESULTS:

Although a trial study and a pilot study were carried out, only the first minor study of the trial study was discussed, the rest of the discussion was based on the pilot study. Both the trial and the pilot studies consisted of four minor studies.

THE RESULTS OF THE FIRST MINOR STUDY OF THE

TRIAL STUDY:-

The content analysis of the responses made by subjects from Karunga Primary School, in the first minor study was made and it yielded thirty-seven discipline techniques. These were:-

1. Beat me
2. Be angry with me
3. Send me out of the house
4. Tell me that I am naughty
5. Laugh at me
6. Give me extra work e.g. digging
7. Warn me not to misbehave again
8. Ask the teacher to punish me e.g. by beating me
9. Take away some of the child's property
10. Tell me that I am mad
11. Report me to the teacher or the headmaster
12. Advise me how to behave
13. Threaten to beat me
14. Stop me from playing with others
15. Ask me why I misbehaved

16. Threaten to take me to prison
17. Deprive me of a meal
18. Tell me that they will not send me again
19. Threaten to take me to an approved school
20. Ask me to apologise
21. Threaten to deprive me of a meal
22. Pinch me
23. Tell me that I am like a thief
24. Report me to my father
25. Be very disappointed with me
26. Stop me from going to bed
27. Tell me that I am stupid
28. Refuse to pay my school fees.
29. Refuse to wash my clothes
30. Tie me to a tree with a rope
31. Hit me
32. Ask me to tell my mother why I misbehaved
33. Threaten me that they will help me again
34. Ask me to love others as I love myself
35. Threaten me that I shall sleep out of doors
36. Scold me
37. Report me to my mother

The following discipline techniques were attributed only to the father:-

Threaten to hang me

Threaten to take me to an approved school

Threaten to take me to prison

No discipline technique was attributed to the mother alone, this perhaps is an index that the punitive agent in the family is more the father than the mother.

A t - test for the difference in punitive scores between mother and father when computed led to a value that was less than the critical value of t.

THE RESULTS OF THE PILCT STUDY

The analysis of the responses made by subjects in group one (table I, page 33) in the first minor study yielded the following discipline techniques:-

1. Beat me
2. Be angry with me
3. Send me out of the house
4. Tell me that I am naughty
5. Give me extra work for example digging
6. Warn me not to misbehave again
7. Ask the teacher to punish me for example by beating me
8. Take away some of my property
9. Tell me that I am mad
10. Report me to the headmaster or any other teacher
11. Advise me how to behave
12. Threaten to beat me
13. Ask me why I misbehaved

14. Deprive me of a meal
15. Stop me from going to bed
16. Ask me to apologise
17. Pinch me
18. Tell me that I am like a thief
19. Report me to my father
20. Report me to my mother
21. Ask me to tell my mother why I misbehaved
22. Threaten me that they will not send me again
23. Threaten me that I shall sleep out of doors
24. Scold me
25. Refuse to pay my school fees
26. Stop me from going to school
27. Tell me that I am stupid
28. Tell me that they will not send me again

The following two discipline techniques were attributed only to the father:-

Ask me to tell my mother why I misbehaved

Report me to my mother

Although only one discipline technique was attributed to the mother alone i.e. report me to my father, about eighty-three percent of the subjects said that their fathers would refuse to pay their school fees. Only 17% attributed this discipline technique to their mothers. A possible explanation for this was that in most families it was the father's duty and not the mother's to pay the school fees hence majority of the subjects

visualized this discipline technique being administered mainly by their fathers and not by their mothers.

The following discipline techniques were mentioned by subjects in the first pilot study (i.e. subjects from Karunga Primary School) but they were not mentioned by Ndumberi Secondary School subjects in the second pilot study:-

1. Laugh at me
2. Stop me from playing with others
3. Refuse to wash my clothes
4. Threaten to tie me to a tree with a rope
5. Threaten to take me to prison
6. Threaten to take me to an approved school

The possible reasons why the thirteen subjects in Forms I and II at Ndumberi Secondary School did not mention the above named discipline techniques were:-

a) The discipline technique, 'laugh at me' may no longer be considered effective to adolescents (who are mentally more mature than pre-adolescents) hence parents may not administer it. Among the pre-adolescents such as those in Std. 5 and Std. 7 at Karunga Primary School, this discipline technique may still be administered by parents because of its effectiveness. It may also be possible that adolescents are so much used to people laughing at their mistakes that they no longer consider it to be of any importance.

b) The discipline technique, 'stop me from playing with

others' was not mentioned by these adolescents because to them play is no longer a priority, it is however a priority among pre-adolescents. Rather than play when they are at home, Kikuyu adolescent boys and girls are expected to carry out such duties as either digging, repairing broken tools, looking after livestock or weeding, cooking, washing and fetching water respectively.

c) The discipline technique, 'Refuse to wash my clothes,' was not mentioned by adolescents because they do all their washing including that of their parents and younger siblings sometimes. Pre-adolescents have most of their washing done for them hence parents may threaten to administer this discipline technique.

d) The last two threats were not mentioned by adolescents because their parents ~~did~~ not perhaps use such threats as a discipline technique. Their parents knowing that adolescents were mentally more mature than the pre-adolescents did not use such threats because the adolescents would quickly see the futility of such threats. The adolescents know not only that no parent can imprison his child since this is primarily the privilege of the state but also that no child can be imprisoned before the age of eighteen. Below the age of eighteen pre-adolescents may be taken to approved schools for juvenile delinquency but not for merely being naughty as was portrayed in the twelve stories in questionnaire I, version A (appendix A).

Threats such as these could be used on pre-adolescents whom the parents knew were not very conversant with the above facts.

The threat 'tie me to a tree with a rope,' was not mentioned by adolescents because their parents would not use such a threat to them. In Kikuyu society, no parent would actually tie her or his child to a tree. Since the Kikuyu parents probably know that their adolescent boys and girls know this, they do not bother to use such a threat.

Using the responses made by group two subjects (table I page 33) in the second minor study (questionnaire II, appendix C) the means severity ratings and standard deviations of each of the twenty-eight discipline techniques obtained in the first minor study (page 61) were calculated as follows:-

Example:

Beat the child

First scale

Fair 1 2 3 4 5 . . . unfair

responses made by

subjects under each

weight 6 6 5 1 2

Second Scale

right 1 2 3 4 5 . . . wrong

responses made by

subjects under each

weight 3 7 8 2 1

Third Scale

good 1 2 3 4 5 . . . bad

responses made by

subjects under each weight 4 6 7 1 4

All the responses made by subjects under each of the five weights were added together as follows:-

Table VII Responses made by Subjects under each of the three weights:-

Weights in the three Scales (W)	1	2	3	4	5
$X = 3W$	3	6	9	12	15
Responses	6 + 3 + 4	6 + 7 + 6	5 + 8 + 7	1 + 2 + 1	2 + 1 + 14
Total number of responses under each weight (f)	13	19	20	4	7

The formula used to calculate the mean severity scores was:-

$$\bar{X} = \frac{\sum fX}{n}$$

For the response, 'beat the child,' $\bar{X} = \frac{486}{63} = 7.7$

The standard deviations of the discipline techniques were calculated as follows:-

Formula:-

$$S.D. = \sqrt{\frac{1}{n} \left[\sum fX^2 - \frac{(\sum fX)^2}{n} \right]}$$

For the response, 'beat the child',

$$S.D. = \sqrt{\frac{1}{63} \left[4572 - \frac{236196}{63} \right]}$$

$$= \sqrt{\frac{1223}{63}} = 4.40$$

Table VIII shows the mean severity scores and the standard deviations of all the discipline techniques. They range from the highest mean to the lowest mean. Only the mean severity scores are arranged in this order.

TABLE VIII THE MEAN SEVERITY SCORES AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS OF THE DISCIPLINE TECHNIQUES

DISCIPLINE TECHNIQUES	MEAN ^a	S.D.
Advise the child how to behave	12.20	3.55
Warn the child not to misbehave again	12.19	3.96
Ask the child to tell the mother why he misbehaved	10.95	4.14
Ask the child why he misbehaved	10.90	3.98
Ask the child to love others as he loves himself	10.80	4.36
Report the child to the father	9.20	4.37
Slap the child	8.42	3.33
Ask the child to apologise	8.38	4.67
Scold the child	8.19	2.90
Tell the child that they will not send him again	8.04	4.56
Tell the child that he is stupid	8.00	3.76
Pinch the child	8.00	4.36
Beat the child	7.70	4.40
Tell the child that he is naughty	7.67	3.95
Give the child extra work e.g. digging	7.62	3.28
Threaten to beat the child	7.48	4.29
Ask the teacher to punish the child	7.47	3.85
Refuse to pay school fees for the child	6.80	4.34
Report the child to the headmaster or any other teacher	6.70	3.77
Threaten the child that he will sleep out of doors	6.60	3.81
Be angry with the child	6.57	3.49
Deprive the child of a meal	6.40	3.54
Tell the child that he is mad	6.00	4.48
Threaten the child that they will not send him again	5.90	3.70
Stop the child from going to school	5.86	3.36
Tell the child that he is like a thief	5.86	3.68
Send the child out of the house	5.76	2.90
Stop the child from going to bed	5.62	3.73
Take away some of the child's property	4.67	2.86

^a A low mean indicates a high severity score and vice versa

The four criteria described in Chapter IV, pages 46-47, were used to select four discipline techniques to be used as response alternatives in questionnaire III (appendix G).

The first criterion required that the four alternatives should each represent a range of severity ratings. Using the mean severity scores (table VIII, page 67) it was possible to locate the most punitive and the least punitive discipline techniques. Also two other discipline techniques were chosen by subtracting 2.51 and 5.02 from the mean severity score of the least punitive discipline technique. Since the total range of the discipline techniques was represented by a difference of 7.33 in the mean severity scores, the above method ensured that the discipline techniques used as alternatives were equally spaced and represented a wide range of techniques. Using the above method the following discipline techniques were chosen as the four alternatives:-

Advise the child how to behave

Report the child to the father

Ask the teacher to punish the child

Take away some of the child's property.

Each of the above mentioned discipline techniques represented a group of discipline techniques whose mean severity scores were near to the mean severity score of the four discipline techniques.

The second criterion required that each of the four alternatives should have a small variance in order to minimize disagreement among the subjects regarding the severity ratings.

Three of the above mentioned discipline techniques satisfied the requirement of this criterion. These were:-

Advise the child how to behave

Ask the teacher to punish the child

Take away some of the child's property.

The discipline technique, 'report the child to the father' did not satisfy the requirement of this criterion.

The discipline technique, 'scold the child' which was in the same range or category as 'report the child to the father' and which satisfied the requirement of this criterion was chosen.

The third criterion required that each of the four alternatives should not differ significantly in their mean severity scores across different age groups in the sample so that the disagreement of severity ratings across age groups may be minimized. Of the four discipline techniques which had satisfied the requirement of the first criterion, only one discipline technique, 'take away some of the child's property' satisfied the requirement of this criterion, the other three did not. Other three discipline techniques which were in the same range as the three discipline techniques which failed to satisfy this criterion, were chosen. These were:-

Ask the child to love others as he loves himself

Pinch the child

Be angry with the child

Discipline technique, 'Scold the child,' which had been substituted for, 'report the child to the father,' under criterion two did not satisfy the requirement of the third criterion so

it was rejected.

Table IX below shows the mean severity scores across the five age groups in the sample.

TABLE IX THE MEAN SEVERITY SCORES ACROSS DIFFERENT AGE GROUPS
IN THE SAMPLE

DISCIPLINE TECHNIQUES	13 YEARS	14 YEARS	15 YEARS	16 YEARS	17 YEARS
Ask the child to love others as he loves himself	10.5	10.0	10.4	10.5	10.0
Pinch the child	7.5	6.5	7.8	6.5	6.0
Be angry with the child	6.0	5.5	5.7	5.5	5.6
Take away some of the child's property	4.5	5.0	4.8	4.3	4.3

An analysis of variance test showed that the means in table IX were homogeneous.

The last criterion required that each of the four discipline techniques should not differ significantly in their mean severity ratings across the subjects' fathers' education level so that the disagreement regarding severity ratings across the subjects' fathers' education level may be minimized. All the above mentioned discipline techniques satisfied the requirement of this criterion. The following two discipline techniques which had been selected under criteria one and two but were rejected under the third criterion were also rejected under this criterion:-

Advice the child how to behave

Ask the teacher to punish the child.

The discipline technique, 'report the child to the father', which had been rejected under the second and third criteria was also rejected under this criterion. The discipline technique, 'scold the child', which had been selected under criterion two, instead of 'report the child to the father', was also rejected under this criterion.

TABLE X THE MEAN SEVERITY SCORES ACROSS THE DIFFERENT EDUCATION LEVELS OF THE SUBJECTS' FATHERS

Discipline techniques	Education levels of the subjects' fathers in classes		
	0 - 2	3 - 5	6 - 8
Ask the child to love others as he loves himself	10.80	10.00	10.50
Pinch the child	8.20	7.08	8.00
Be angry with the child	6.60	6.20	6.00
Take away some of the child's property	5.00	4.77	4.50

An analysis of variance test showed that the means in table X were homogeneous.

After having considered the four criteria, it was felt that the following four discipline techniques should be selected since they fulfilled the requirements of the third and fourth criteria very well and also partly fulfilled the requirements of the other two criteria. These four discipline techniques were:-

Ask the child to love others as he loves himself

Pinch the child

Be angry with the child

Take away some of the child's property.

Each of the above discipline techniques represented a category of discipline techniques (chapter IV page 46).

The four discipline techniques were first labelled a, b, c, and d and then given the weighted scores of 1, 2, 3, and 4 respectively. An analysis of responses given by group three subjects in the third minor study (questionnaire III, appendix G) was made. For each subject the weighted scores were added together, first for father and then for mother. These two separate scores gave the paternal and maternal punitive scores for each subject. The mean parental punitive score was calculated for each subject. These results are in appendix J.

The mean punitive score for paternal punitive scores was 111.26 while the mean punitive score for maternal punitive scores was 109.5. An attempt was made, using a t - test to find out whether these two means were significantly different from each other. The following formula was used since the paternal and maternal punitive scores were correlated:-

$$t = \frac{\bar{d} - 0}{S.E.(d)}$$

Where, 'd' was the difference between paternal and maternal punitive scores for each subject;
' \bar{d} ' was the arithmetic mean of 'd' and 'S.E.' of 'd' was the standard error of 'd'.

$$\begin{aligned}\bar{d} &= 0.8421 \\ \text{S.E.}(\bar{d}) &= \frac{\text{S.d.}(\bar{d})}{\sqrt{n}} = \frac{13.4737}{\sqrt{19}} = 3.0911 \\ t(18 \text{ d.f.}) &= \frac{0.8421 - 0}{3.0911} = 0.27\end{aligned}$$

Since the critical 't' (18 d.f.) was 2.10 at 5% significance level and since the observed 't', which was 0.27 was smaller than the critical value, then the observed 't' was not significant. We therefore concluded that the difference between paternal and maternal punitive scores was not significant.

THE RELIABILITY OF THE TEST:-

To determine the reliability of the scale, Kuder-Richardson formula 20 was used. It was necessary to assume that all these subjects whose responses were either 'a' or 'b', these subjects who reported less severe punishment in questionnaire III (appendix G) had "failed" the test while those who responded either 'c' or 'd' in the same questionnaire had "passed" the test.

Kuder-Richardson formula 20:-

$$r_{11} = \left(\frac{n}{n-1}\right) \left(\frac{S_t^2 - \sum p_i q_i}{S_t^2}\right)$$

where,

r_{11} was the estimate of reliability

n was the number of items

St_2^2 was the variance of the whole test

P_i was the proportion passing a particular item

q_i was the proportion failing the same item
(or $1 - p_i$).

The reliability of the test was calculated separately for father and mother.

The reliability for father items was:-

$$\begin{aligned} r_{11} &= \left(\frac{45}{45 - 1} \right) \left(\frac{69.9335 - 10.776}{69.9335} \right) \\ &= 1.0227 \left(\frac{59.1575}{69.9335} \right) = 0.8651 \\ &= 0.87 \end{aligned}$$

The reliability for mother items was:-

$$\begin{aligned} r_{11} &= \left(\frac{45}{45 - 1} \right) \left(\frac{52.73 - 10.52}{52.73} \right) \\ &= 1.0227 \left(\frac{42.21}{52.73} \right) = 1.0227 \times 0.8004 \\ &= 0.818 \end{aligned}$$

The internal consistency for father items was 0.87 and for mother, 0.82. These reliability coefficients indicated that the scale was unidimensional.

VALIDATION OF THE SCALE:

Construct validity was used in order to validate the scale. This was done by correlating the subjects' mean parental punitive scores with their:-

- a) Tribal and religious prejudice scores
- b) Aggression scores.

The relationship between parental punitiveness and both prejudice and aggression is suggested by the "Scapegoat" hypothesis which is derived from both psychoanalytic and social-learning theorists. (Allport, 1954; Young K. 1957; and Epstein and Komorita, 1965).

The 'Scapegoat' hypothesis states that severe punishment for aggression may increase rather than inhibit the instigation to aggress. Since the child has learnt to anticipate punishment for aggression, hostile impulses will be displaced from the original source of frustration to members of out-groups. Consequently children who are harshly treated, severely punished and often criticised are often more aggressive and prejudiced than those treated otherwise (Allport, 1954; Young K. 1957).

The theoretical construct used in the validation of this scale and based on the above hypothesis was:-

a) There is a relationship between parental punitiveness and both prejudice and aggression. Adolescents who are harshly treated, severely punished and continually criticised are more prejudiced and aggressive than those who are treated otherwise.

Following the coding instructions given in chapter IV (page 58), scores of ones obtained by individual subjects in questions 1 - 7 of questionnaire IV (appendix I) were added together in order to obtain a prejudice score for individual subjects in the sample.

In question 8 of the same questionnaire all the tallies obtained by individual subjects were added together in order to obtain an aggression score for individual subjects in the sample.

It was felt that the relationship that might exist between the subjects' parental punitive scores and their:-
(a) tribal and religious prejudice and also (b) aggression might be curvilinear hence a chi-square test was used.

Table XI shows the observed frequency by punitive scores and prejudice scores.

TABLE XI OBSERVED FREQUENCY BY PUNITIVE SCORES AND PREJUDICE SCORES

Parental Punitive Scores	Prejudice scores		Total
	4 - 5	6 - 8	
85 - 114	4	5	9
115 - 144	5	1	6
Total	9	6	15 ¹

1 Four subjects were not allowed to fill out questionnaire IV, because they had failed to complete questionnaire III.

Formula:

$$X^2 = \frac{E(O - E)^2}{E},$$

where 'O' was the observed frequency and 'E' was the expected frequency in each cell.

$$X^2(1d.f.) = 2.26$$

The expected 'X²' (1d.f.) was 3.841 at 5% significance level and the observed 'X²' was 2.26. Since the expected value was greater than the observed value, the observed value was not significant. It was therefore concluded that there was no correlation between parental punitive scores and prejudice scores.

Table XII shows the observed frequency by punitive scores and aggression scores.

TABLE XII OBSERVED FREQUENCY BY PUNITIVE SCORES AND AGGRESSION SCORES

Parental punitive Scores	Aggression Scores		Total
	2 - 12	13 - 15	
85 - 114	6	3	9
115 - 144	3	3	6
Total	9	6	15

$$X^2 (1d.f.) = 1.44$$

The expected 'X²' (1d.f.) was 3.841 at 5% significance level and the observed 'X²' was 1.44. Since the expected

value was greater than the observed value then the observed value was not significant. It was therefore concluded that there was no correlation between the punitive scores and the aggression scores.

It was however felt that if the sample size was larger the results of the above ' χ^2 ' and also those of the ' χ^2 ' on page 76 would have been more reliable. It was therefore decided to increase the sample to one hundred subjects in the main study in order to produce more reliable results.

CRITICISM AND SUGGESTIONS MADE BY THE

DEPARTMENTAL COMMITTEE ON THIS PILOT STUDY:-

A) The departmental committee felt that it was unwise to ask subjects to give responses for father and mother in questionnaires I and III (appendix A and G). Each of these questionnaires, the departmental committee felt, should be split into two, one questionnaire for the mother and the other for the father, in order to rule out the possibility of subjects giving duplicate responses in either questionnaires I or III. They also recommended that the subjects should be allowed to respond to one questionnaire first (i.e. either for father or mother) and when they finish, this should be collected and they should be allowed to respond to the other questionnaire.

B) The committee also felt that parents in most African tribes handle the same misbehaviour done by the same adolescent differently. While for example the father may beat his son very severely for allowing cattle to stray into the farm, the mother of the same adolescent may either ignore the incident or just warn her son not to allow such a thing to happen again. While adolescent boys are in most cases disciplined by their fathers, adolescent girls are mostly disciplined by their mothers. There was need therefore, to control for the different roles

played by the fathers and mothers when disciplining their sons and daughters. In order to control for this, the committee recommended that in questionnaires IA and IB, (appendix B) the subjects should be given an alternative to write the word 'nothing' against any of the stories if they felt that their fathers or mothers would do or say nothing to them for behaving in a manner similar to that portrayed in the story. By asking the subjects to do this, one would avoid the possibility of forcing the subjects to respond inaccurately in any of the stories. No subject was therefore forced to give a response if he felt that in any of the stories either his father or mother would do or say nothing to him, (introductions to questionnaires IA and IB, appendix B).

C) It was also suggested that the interviewer should find out whether boys were more, or less, severely punished than girls.

D) It was also suggested that the interviewer should not assume that the father is automatically the head of the family; rather than make such an assumption the committee suggested that the interviewer should ask the subjects who the head of their family was. Some African adolescents, it was felt, may consider the mother to be the head of their family because it is she who runs all the family affairs in the absence of her husband who may be working far away from home (the question on the front page of questionnaire II, appendix D).

E) The committee did not accept the changes made by the interviewer in the forty-five item questionnaire (questionnaire III, appendix G). It was recommended by the committee that a sample similar in age, education and background to the one that would be used in the main study should be given the items in the original questionnaire (appendix E) which needed to be changed. These subjects should be asked to suggest the required changes.

F) The committee felt also that subjects should be told that the common nouns, 'father' and 'mother' did not necessarily represent their natural fathers and mothers but the two adults in their homes who often disciplined them. In questionnaire III (appendix H) it was decided that instead of using the common nouns 'father' and 'mother' Person A and Person B, respectively would be substituted. The subjects would be asked at the beginning of questionnaire IIIa (appendix H) to name two persons in their homes who often disciplined them. The first person they would name would be Person A. In the first questionnaire (questionnaire IIIA) the subjects would be asked to give responses for Person A while in the second questionnaire, (questionnaire IIIB) they would be asked to give responses for Person B. (introductions to questionnaires IIIA and III_B appendix H).

CHAPTER VI

CHOOSING THE MAIN STUDY SAMPLE:--

The subjects used in the main study consisted of two hundred and fifty seven rural Kikuyu adolescent boys and girls. These subjects were in forms I and II at the following schools: Kanunga, Karuri, Precious Blood and Uthiru Secondary Schools.

Forms I and II were chosen for the main study because the pilot study had shown that they could handle all the questionnaires¹ in this study in English and were also sufficiently developed, morally, to make the required moral judgements.² Ability to handle the questionnaires in English was desirable because questionnaire II (appendix D) in the second minor study could not be translated into Kikuyu. A detailed explanation of this has already been given in Chapter III, page 27. The pilot study had also proved that supplementary explanations were required in order to clarify further the different meanings of the two pairs of words, right-wrong and good-bad used in the three, five-point semantic differential scales (osgood, Suci and Tannenbaum, 1957). The pilot study had also shown that the pupils in forms I and II knew the meaning of the pair of words fair-unfair used in the above mentioned scale and hence no further explanations were necessary. Explanations were given to the subjects in order to explain the different meanings of right-wrong and good-bad

¹ The study had four questionnaires (appendix B, D, H, and I)

² It is mainly in questionnaire II (appendix C) that the subjects were required to make certain moral judgements (Chapter III page 29).

(Chapter VII page 90). The main study sample like the pilot study sample showed that it also knew the meaning of fair-unfair and hence no further explanations were given (Chapter VII page 89).

Uthiru, Kanunga, Karuri and Precious Blood Secondary Schools were chosen for the main study. The procedure followed before and during the interviews as well as the procedure used in the selection of the required forms I and II pupils were the same as those described in Chapter I page 4 - 5.

The reasons why these four schools were chosen are exactly the same as those discussed in Chapter III pages 30-31. Another reason why these four schools were chosen was that they all provided the required sample of adolescent boys and girls. Uthiru and Karuri Secondary Schools are mixed schools therefore they conveniently provided both boys and girls. Kanunga was a boys' school while Precious Blood was a girls' school.

THE SELECTION OF THE SAMPLE:-

Two hundred and fifty-seven subjects were used in the main study. Table XIII reports the following details:-

- a) The name of the school from which the subjects came.
- b) The district in which the schools are located.
- c) The number of subjects interviewed in each school.
- d) The form of the subjects interviewed
and the number of subjects interviewed in each form

- e) The group number
- f) The part of the study in which the subjects were used.

TABLE XIII

a	b	c			d			e	f
		Girls	Boys	Total	Form I	Form II	Total		
Names of secondary schools	District in which the secondary schools were	Number of subjects interviewed in each school			Form of the subjects interviewed			Group number	Part of the study in which the subjects were used.
Uthiru Secondary School	Nairobi	29	51	80	40	40	80	1	First minor study
Kanunga Secondary School	Kiambu	-	41	41	20	21	41	2	Second minor study
Precious Blood Secondary School	Nairobi	40	-	40	20	20	40	3	Second minor study
		38	-	38	19	19	38	4	Third and fourth minor studies
Karuri Secondary School	Kiambu	12	48	60	30	30	60	5	Third and fourth minor studies

119 140 259 129 130 259

Table XIV reports the distribution of age and the school from which the subjects come:-

TABLE XIV DIFFERENT AGE GROUPS IN THE SAMPLE BY SCHOOLS

	First Minor Study	Second Minor study	3rd & 4th Minor Studies	Total
Age of Subjects in years	Uthiru Secondary School Subjects	Kanunga and Precious Blood Sec. School Subjects	Karuri and Precious Blood Sec. School Subjects	
12	4	-	-	-
13	8	3	7	18
14	16	17	21	54
15	20	23	25	68
16	19	18	27	64
17	13	12	10	35
18	-	9	5	14

The mean age of the sample was 15.29 years.

The procedure used in the selection of the main study sample has already been described in chapter I page 4 - 5.

CHAPTER VII

THE PROCEDURE OF THE MAIN STUDY

Before carrying out the main study permission was obtained from the headmasters of Uthiru, Kanunga, Precious Blood and Karuri Secondary Schools to interview some of the pupils in forms I and II in each of these schools.

The procedure followed in the selection of the required sample and also that followed when administering questionnaires I version B, II, III and IV (appendices B, D, H and I) in these schools was exactly the same as that which has already been described in Chapter I page 4-5.

A DESCRIPTION OF THE MAIN STUDY

The main study like the pilot study had four minor studies. In the first minor study, twelve stories were constructed using the results in table III, Chapter IV (page 43). In each of these twelve stories a boy or a girl was portrayed as having done something naughty which required his parents' response. Using these twelve stories two questionnaires were constructed, questionnaire I_A and I_B¹ both of which appear in appendix B. These two questionnaires were given to group I (table XIV, page 85).

¹ It was the departmental committee which recommended that two questionnaires i.e. questionnaire I_A and I_B be constructed and be used in the main study instead of using only one questionnaire as was the case in the pilot study. (Chapter V, page 79.)

Before the subjects were allowed to fill out the questionnaires the following information was written on the blackboard so that they could refer to it when it was necessary:-

a) "You should first fill out the front page in every questionnaire. The word 'Birth-order' requires you to say whether you are the first, second, third etc. born."

b) "The common nouns 'father' and 'mother' used in the first and second questionnaire respectively do not necessarily mean your natural father and natural mother but rather any two persons in your home who often discipline you. Such two persons may be your natural parents, your elder brothers, sisters etc."

In questionnaire I_A the subjects were told to imagine that they were the ones who had been naughty as was portrayed in the twelve stories. They were then asked to say what they thought their 'fathers' would do or say to them for being naughty. They were also told to write the word 'nothing' against any of the stories if they thought that their 'fathers' would do or say nothing¹ to them for behaving in a manner such as the one portrayed in that story (introduction, of questionnaire I_A appendix B). The subjects were allowed to fill out this

¹ This was one of the recommendations made by the departmental committee (Chapter V page 80). This Committee felt that in most African tribes fathers and mothers could react differently towards the same misconduct done by either their son or daughter. In most cases boys are punished by their fathers. If for example a boy misbehaves his father may punish him very severely while his mother (if the father was not around when the boy misbehaved) could turn a blind eye to the whole incident. The opposite may happen if it was the girl who had misbehaved.

questionnaire¹ and after they had finished it was collected and they were allowed to fill out questionnaire I_B².

An analysis of the subjects responses in questionnaires I_A and I_B was done and the discipline techniques which were most frequently attributed to both 'father' and 'mother' were listed.

In the second minor study an attempt was made to obtain the mean severity ratings of the discipline techniques obtained in the first minor study. The mean severity ratings were obtained as follows:-

A questionnaire (questionnaire II, Appendix D) containing all the discipline techniques obtained in the first minor study was given to groups 2 and 3 (table XIII page 84). These subjects were asked to rate the given discipline techniques using the three, five-point semantic differential scales: fair-unfair, right-wrong and good-bad (Osgood, Suci and Tannenbaum, 1957).

¹ The subjects were allowed to respond to questionnaire I_A first and then to questionnaire I_B in order to rule out the possibility of their giving duplicate answers for 'father' and mother. (Chapter V page 79).

² See introduction of questionnaire I_B in appendix B. The instructions given in this introduction is similar to that given in questionnaire I_A except that in questionnaire I_B the subjects are asked to say what they thought their 'mothers' would do or say to them for being naughty.

Before it was explained to the subjects how to rate the severity of the given discipline techniques using the three, five-point scales; fair-unfair, right-wrong and good-bad, they were asked to use each of the three pairs of words in their own sentences.

Most of the sentences given using fair-unfair were those regarding school discipline. From their sentences, the subjects showed that they knew the meaning of this pair of word. The following example given by one of the subjects of Kanunga Secondary School was written on the blackboard:-

"If the whole class does something wrong, it is unfair for the teacher to pick one pupil and punish him."

After writing the above sentence on the blackboard the subjects were asked, 'What should the teacher do in that case?' One of the subjects answered,

"If the teacher cannot find out who did the wrong thing, he should punish the whole class." Here the interviewer asked once again, "What would you say about the teacher in the second sentence?" (this sentence had also been written on the blackboard).

In chorus they answered, "fair", so the interviewer added the following sentence to the second sentence on the blackboard, "In this case the teacher is fair".

In Precious Blood Secondary School, the following sentence given by one of the subjects was also written on the blackboard, "If the teacher finds the class talking it would be unfair for her to punish some of the girls".

The interviewer asked, 'What should she do in order to be fair?' One of the subjects answered, "In order to be fair she should punish the whole class". (This sentence was also written on the blackboard.)

In both schools, subjects showed a clear understanding of the meaning of the words fair-unfair but little or no understanding between the different meanings of the pairs of words right-wrong and good-bad.

The subjects were first of all asked to look up the meanings of the words 'right' and 'good' from their dictionaries. In the dictionary the word 'right' was defined as that which is according to duty; the standard of permitted and forbidden action within a certain sphere.

The word 'good' was defined as 'being what it ought to be; useful; favourable.'

In order to clarify the differences in meaning between the words 'good' and 'right' to mean 'according to duty' hence the following explanations were given to subjects.

Let us take the words 'good' and 'bad'. A discipline technique is good if it is also useful to the pupils, and it is bad if it is not useful to the pupils.

The following sentence was written on the blackboard,

"If majority of pupils do not do the homework given by teacher X, it would be bad for teacher X to keep on punishing the pupils every time they fail to do their homework."

The interviewer asked the subjects why, in the first sentence, the punishment given by teacher X was bad. In Kanunga Secondary School, one of the subjects said, 'It is bad because the pupils will not know how to do their homework just because they have been punished.' In Precious Blood Secondary School one of the subjects answered, "It is bad because the pupils will gain no knowledge just because they have been punished. If it is in Mathematics for example they will not know how to solve the problems."

It was explained to the subjects that the punishment given by teacher X was useless because it did not help the pupils in any way. If the teacher wanted to help the pupils it would have been good if he found out why they always fail to do his homework. May be one of the reasons why this happened was because the pupils did not know how to do the given homework. May be they did not understand what the teacher taught. If teacher X knew this he might in future not only try to teach better but also make sure that his pupils knew what they were supposed to do in every homework he gave.

The subjects were asked to make sentences using the words 'good' and 'bad'. From their sentences they showed that they understood the meanings of these words.

It was explained to the subjects that a discipline technique is right if it is administered by the person who is supposed to administer it. The following examples were written on the blackboard:-

"When a pupil misbehaves in class it is right for a teacher to punish him but it is wrong if another pupil wakes up and hits the pupil who misbehaves."

The pupils were told that it was right for the teacher to punish the pupil who misbehaved because it was the teacher's duty, to see that all pupils were well behaved in the class. On the other hand it was wrong for another pupil to hit the pupil who misbehaved because it was not his duty, to see that pupils behaved well in the class.

The discipline technique is right if it is administered in the right place. The following example was written on the blackboard:-

"If a pupil in form four misbehaves it would be wrong for a teacher to punish him in front of form I pupils. It would be right however even if he was punished in front of his colleagues in form four."

In this case it was wrong for the teacher to punish a form four pupil in front of form one pupils because he would feel very humiliated. The form one pupils would not only laugh at him but also not respect him any more.

The subjects were asked to give their sentences using the words 'right' and 'wrong' in their sentences. Through their sentences they showed that they had understood the meaning of the words 'right' and 'wrong'.

The procedure followed in order to explain how the subjects were required to rate the severity of the given discipline techniques using the three, five-point semantic differential scales: fair-unfair, right-wrong and good-bad was the same as that which has already been described in Chapter IV, pages 44-45.

An analysis of the subjects' responses in questionnaire II was made. The mean severity rating and the standard deviation of each of the discipline techniques were calculated. Five criteria were used in order to select the four discipline techniques to be used as response alternatives in questionnaire III which appears in Appendix H. These four criteria used information based on the mean severity ratings and the standard deviations of the discipline techniques given in questionnaire II. Four of these criteria have already been discussed in details in Chapter IV page 46 and Chapter V pages 68-71 but the following one (i.e. the fifth criteria) was not:-

e) Between the two sexes in the sample the mean severity ratings of each of the four discipline techniques should not be significantly different.

Using the five criteria the following four discipline techniques were selected. They range from the least punitive to the most punitive i.e. discipline technique 'a' is the least punitive while discipline technique 'd' is the most punitive (see below)

- a. Advise the child how to behave
- b. Tell the child that he is naughty

- c. Scold the child
- d. Refuse to help the child

The third minor study was concerned with the assessment of the punitiveness of parental discipline towards aggression. Two questionnaires (questionnaires III_A and III_B, appendix H) each consisting of forty-five items which portrayed aggression towards parents, teachers, siblings, other boys and girls, and inanimate objects, had the following format:

QUESTIONNAIRE III_A

If I kick another boy or girl

- | | |
|--------------|------------------------------|
| PERSON | c. Scold me |
| A | b. Tell me that I am naughty |
| WOULD | d. Refuse to help me |
| | a. Advice me how to behave |

QUESTIONNAIRE III_B

If I kick another boy or girl

- | | |
|--------------|-------------------------------|
| PERSON | d. Refuse to help me |
| B | c. Scold me |
| WOULD | a. Advise me how to behave |
| | b. Tell me that I am naughty. |

Questionnaires III_A and III_B were given to groups 4 and 5 (table XIII, page 84).

In the introduction of questionnaire III_A, these subjects

were asked to name two persons¹ in their homes who often disciplined them. The first person they named was PERSON A and the second was PERSON B (introduction, Questionnaire III_A, Appendix H). In questionnaires III_A and III_B, the subjects were told to imagine that they were the ones who had behaved in a manner similar to that portrayed in the forty-five statements. They were then asked to choose one of the four alternatives in order to show what they thought PERSON A (questionnaire III_A) and PERSON B (questionnaire III_B) respectively, would do to them for behaving in a manner similar to that portrayed in the forty-five items. (Introductions of questionnaires III_A and III_B Appendix H).

Letters a, b, c, d were randomly distributed through the whole questionnaire in order to rule out the possibility of subjects merely circling letters without reading through the questionnaires.

Before the subjects started working on the questionnaires the following point was emphasized:-

The four discipline techniques represented a variety of discipline techniques. Every subject should therefore be able to choose one alternative in all the forty-five items in the questionnaires.

¹ The words Person A and Person B were substituted for father and mother because it was felt that in African Society, persons other than the natural parents could be responsible for disciplining adolescents and children (Chapter I pages 5-6).

The following examples, given, were written on the blackboard so that the subjects could refer to them when it was necessary.

The discipline technique, 'a' for example represented such verbal discipline techniques as:-

Warn me not to misbehave again

Ask me to behave properly

Ask me to apologize

Tell me that I ought to behave properly

Ask me why I misbehaved

Tell me that I ought to be ashamed of my behaviour

Report me to my mother

Report me to my father

The discipline technique 'b' represented:-

Pinch me

Threaten to beat me

Report me to the headmaster or teacher so that I may

be punished for example by being beaten

Give me extra work for example digging or

cultivating

Tell me to leave school if I do not want to learn

Threaten to deprive me of a meal

The discipline technique 'c' represented:-

Be angry with me

Slap me

Threaten not to pay my school fees

Deprive me of a meal

Send me out of the house

The last discipline technique represented:-

Refuse to pay my school fees

Stop me from going to school

After the above explanations the subjects were asked whether there were any discipline techniques they knew but could not place them under any of the given four alternatives. Since no response was given they were told that each one of them should be able to choose one alternative in every one of the forty-five items in questionnaires III_A and III_B (appendix H).

The subjects were allowed to fill out questionnaire III_A. After they had finished and the questionnaire was collected, they were allowed to fill out questionnaire III_B. This was done in order to rule out the possibility of the subjects giving duplicate answers in both questionnaires.

CODING INSTRUCTIONS:-

These have already been discussed (chapter IV, page 49).

THE RELIABILITY OF THE SCALE:-

The test reliability of the scale was measured in the same way as it was in the pilot study, chapter IV gives a detailed description of the technique (pages and also chapter V page 50).

THE VALIDATION OF THE SCALE:-

In order to validate the scale, the concept of construct validity was used. The method was the same as that used in the pilot study and is discussed in chapter IV (pages 50-58) and also chapter V (pages 74-78).

CHAPTER VIII

RESULTS OF THE MAIN STUDY

The content analysis of the responses give by subjects in the twelve stories in questionnaires 1A and 1B (appendix B) of the first minor study was done and it yielded the following twenty-six discipline techniques:-

1. Beat me
2. Be angry with me
3. Send me out of the house
4. Tell me that I am naughty
5. Give me extra work e.g. digging or cultivating
6. Warn me not to misbehave again
7. Report me to the teacher or headmaster to be punished e.g. by being beaten
8. Scold me
9. Advise me how to behave
10. Slap me
11. Deprive me of a meal
12. Ask me why I misbehaved
13. Threaten not to pay my school fees
14. Pinch me
15. Tell me that I ought to behave properly
16. Refuse to help me e.g. not buy me clothes, pens etc.,
17. Tell me to leave school if I do not want to learn
18. Threaten to deprive me of a meal
19. Ask me to apologize
20. Report me to my father

21. Report me to my mother
22. Tell me that I ought to be ashamed of my behaviour
23. Refuse to pay school fees for me
24. Tell me to behave properly
25. Threaten to beat me
26. Stop me from going to school

The discipline technique 'Beat me', was mentioned more frequently than all the other discipline techniques by both girls and boys. It was however the father who was said to beat more frequently than the mother and, it was the boys who were more frequently beaten than the girls.

The discipline technique, 'Ask me why I misbehaved' was attributed more to the father than to the mother by both girls and boys.

The boys also said that their mothers rarely administered the discipline technique, 'Slap me'.

The discipline technique, 'Be angry with me' was mentioned more frequently by boys than by girls and it was the father who often became angry with the boys.

The girls said that their fathers unlike their mothers rarely deprived them of their meals.

Both girls and boys attributed the discipline technique 'Refuse to pay my school fees,' mainly to their fathers.

When an analysis of the subjects' responses in questionnaires I_A and I_B (appendix B) was made it was found that the difference in punitive scores between 'mother' and

'father' led to a value that was less than the critical value of 't'.

Using the responses made by subjects in questionnaire II (appendix D), the mean severity ratings and the standard deviations of each of the twenty-six discipline techniques were calculated. The method used in these computations has already been discussed in detail in chapter V, page 66.

Table XVIII shows the mean severity scores and the standard deviations of all the twenty-six discipline techniques. Only the mean severity scores range from the highest to the lowest mean severity score.

TABLE XV THE MEAN SEVERITY SCORES AND THE STANDARD DEVIATIONS OF THE DISCIPLINE TECHNIQUES

DISCIPLINE TECHNIQUES	MEAN ¹	S.D.
Advise the child how to behave	13.20	3.02
Warn the child not to misbehave again	13.14	2.79
Ask the child to behave properly	12.52	3.22
Ask the child to apologise	12.31	3.09
Tell the child he ought to behave properly	12.26	3.51
Ask the child why he misbehaved	12.25	3.40
Tell the child he ought to be ashamed of his behaviour	10.68	3.83
Report the child to the mother	10.00	3.62
Report the child to the father	9.48	4.01
Tell the child that he is naughty	9.10	3.53
Pinch the child	7.96	3.72
Threaten to beat the child	7.94	3.64
Report the child to the headmaster of teacher so that he may be punished e.g. by being beaten	7.70	3.10
Give the child extra work e.g. digging or cultivating	7.68	3.91
Tell the child to leave school if he does not want to learn	7.63	3.82
Threaten to deprive the child of a meal	7.33	3.53
Scold the child	7.22	3.55
Be angry with the child	6.77	3.19
Slap the child	6.72	3.49
Beat the child	6.53	3.61
Threaten not to pay school fees for the child	6.43	3.70
Deprive the child of a meal	5.85	3.32
Send the child out of the house	5.46	3.24
Refuse to help the child e.g. not buy him clothes, school uniform, pens etc.,	4.83	2.85
Refuse to pay school fees for the child	4.61	2.56
Stop the child from going to school	4.60	2.65

Footnote: 1 A high mean score indicates a low severity score and vice versa

The following five criteria were used in order to select four discipline techniques which were used as response alternatives in questionnaires III_A and III_B (appendix H).

These five criteria were:

- a) Each of the four discipline techniques should represent a category of discipline techniques, for example verbal discipline techniques should be represented by one of the four alternatives selected. Under the first criterion the following four discipline techniques were selected:

Advise the child how to behave

Report the child to the mother

Tell the child to leave school if he does not want to learn,

Threaten not to pay school fees for the child

Each of the above four alternatives represented a group of discipline techniques and these discipline techniques had mean severity scores which were near the mean severity score of the discipline technique which represented them.

The second criterion required that each of the four alternatives should have a small variance in order to minimize disagreement among subjects regarding their severity ratings. None of the four discipline techniques chosen under the first criterion satisfied the requirement of the second criterion. Four other discipline techniques had to be chosen under this criterion. Each of the four discipline techniques selected

under this criterion belonged to each of the four groups represented by the four discipline techniques chosen under the first criterion. The four discipline techniques chosen under the second criterion were chosen as follows:-

Instead of the discipline technique, 'Advise the child how to behave,' chosen under the first criterion, the discipline technique, 'Warn the child not to misbehave again', was chosen, and instead of the discipline technique, 'Report the child to the mother,' also chosen under the first criterion, the discipline technique, 'Tell the child that he is naughty,' was chosen. Instead of the discipline technique, 'Tell the child to leave school if he does not want to learn,' the discipline technique, 'Be angry with the child,' was chosen and instead of the discipline technique, 'Threaten not to pay school fees for the child,' the discipline technique 'Refuse to pay school fees for the child,' was chosen. The four discipline techniques chosen under the second criterion were:-

Warn the child not to misbehave again

Tell the child that he is naughty

Be angry with the child

Refuse to pay school fees for the child.

The third criterion required that each of the four alternatives should not differ significantly in their mean severity scores across different age groups in the sample so that the disagreement of severity ratings across age groups in the sample may be minimized. Out of the four discipline techniques which satisfied the requirement of the first criterion,

the only discipline technique which satisfied the requirement of this criterion was, 'Advise the child how to behave,' the other three discipline techniques failed to satisfy the requirement of this criterion. Among the four discipline techniques chosen under the second criterion only one discipline technique that satisfied the requirements of this criterion. Instead of the discipline techniques, 'Deprive the child of a meal' and 'Be angry with the child', chosen under the first and second criterion respectively, the discipline technique, 'Scold the child' which unlike the former two discipline technique did satisfy the requirement of the third criterion was chosen. Instead of the discipline techniques, 'Stop the child from going to school' and 'Refuse to pay school fees for the child', chosen under the first and second criteria, the discipline technique ' Refuse to help the child' which satisfied the requirement of this criterion was chosen. Under the third criterion therefore, the following four discipline techniques.

Advise the child how to behave

Tell the child that he is naughty

Scold the child

Refuse to help the child

The method used for calculating the mean severity scores across the age of the sample has already been described in detail in Chapter V, page 70.

Table below shows the mean severity scores by age for the four alternatives.

TABLE XVI MEAN SEVERITY SCORES ACROSS AGE.

FOUR DISCIPLINE TECHNIQUES	AGE IN YEARS					
	13	14	15	16	17	18
Advise the child how to behave	13.67	14.05	13.39	13.11	12.58	13.44
Tell the child that he is naughty	8.33	8.63	9.43	9.78	8.73	8.89
Scold the child	7.67	7.26	7.75	6.42	7.45	6.00
Refuse to help the child e.g. not buy him clothes etc.	4.33	4.44	4.87	5.05	5.00	5.11

The fourth criterion required that each of the four discipline techniques should not differ significantly in their mean severity ratings across the subjects' fathers' education level in order to minimize the disagreement regarding severity ratings across the subjects' fathers' education level. Of the four discipline techniques chosen under the first criterion, the only discipline technique which also satisfied the requirement of this criterion was, 'Advise the child to behave'. Out of the four discipline techniques chosen under the second criterion the only discipline technique which also satisfied the requirement of this criterion was, 'Tell the child that he is naughty.' All the four

discipline techniques chosen under the third criterion however, satisfied the requirement of this criterion too. Under this criterion therefore the following four discipline techniques were selected:-

Advise the child how to behave

Tell the child that he is naughty

Scold the child

Refuse to help the child e.g. not buy him clothes etc.

In order to calculate the mean severity scores across the subjects' fathers' education level the same procedure as that already discussed in chapter V page 71 was used. Table below shows the mean severity scores of the four discipline techniques across the education level of the subjects' fathers:-

TABLE XVII MEAN SEVERITY SCORES ACROSS EDUCATION LEVEL OF Ss' FATHERS.

FOUR DISCIPLINE TECHNIQUES	EDUCATION LEVEL OF Ss FATHERS BY CLASSES			
	0-2	3-5	6-8	Above 8
Advise the child how to behave	13.27	13.86	13.83	13.50
Tell the child that he is naughty	9.27	8.28	9.44	9.00
Scold the child	7.06	7.00	7.80	7.50
Refuse to help the child e.g. not buy him clothes	5.06	4.63	4.42	4.50

The fifth criterion required that each of the four discipline techniques should not differ significantly in their mean severity ratings across sex in order to minimize the disagreement regarding severity ratings across sex. Out of the four discipline

techniques chosen under the first criterion the only discipline technique which also satisfied the requirement this criterion was, 'Advise the child to behave.' Out of the four discipline techniques chosen under the second criterion only one discipline technique also satisfied the requirement of this criterion, this was the discipline technique, 'Tell the child that he is naughty'. All the four discipline techniques chosen under the third and fourth criterion however satisfied the requirement of this criterion too. These were:-

Advise the child how to behave

Tell the child that he is naughty

Scold the child

Refuse to help the child e.g. not buy him clothes. etc.

In order to calculate the mean severity scores across sex, the same procedure as that used in calculating the mean severity scores across age and the education level of the subjects' fathers was used. This procedure has already been discussed in detail in chapter V page 70-71 Table XVIII below shows the mean severity scores across sex.

TABLE XVIII THE MEAN SEVERITY SCORES ACROSS SEX

DISCIPLINE TECHNIQUES	GIRLS	BOYS
Advise the child how to behave	6.08	6.25
Tell the child that he is naughty	3.73	4.27
Scold the child	3.25	2.95
Refuse to help the child for example not buy him clothes,	2.35	2.05

After having considered all the five criteria it was felt that the above four discipline techniques should be selected to be used as response alternatives in questionnaires III_A and III_B because they fulfilled more of criteria than all the other discipline techniques in their respective groups. The discipline technique 'Tell the child that he is naughty', fulfilled the requirements of criteria two, three, four and five. Under the first criterion it was the third choice hence it also fulfilled the requirement of this criterion fairly well.

The discipline technique, 'Advise the child how to behave', fulfilled the requirements of the first, third, fourth and fifth criteria, and under the second criterion it was the second choice, therefore it fulfilled the requirement of this criterion also fairly well.

The discipline techniques, 'Scold the child', and 'Refuse to help the child', were chosen because they were the only discipline techniques in their respective groups which fulfilled more of criteria than all the others.

The chosen four discipline techniques were given letters a, b, c, and d respectively and in order to compute punitive scores for each of the subjects in the sample, weighted scores of 1, 2, 3, and 4 were given to discipline techniques a, b, c, and d respectively. The analysis of the responses given by subjects in questionnaires III_A and III_B of the third minor study (appendix H) was made. For each subject in the sample, the weighted scores were added together, first for Person A and then for Person B. Mean punitive scores were computed for each of the subjects in the sample (appendix I). A mean punitive score was calculated for the whole group and it was found to be 103.2.

An attempt was made in order to find out whether there was a statistically significant difference in punitiveness for aggression between girls and boys. The mean punitive scores for girls was 105.43 and that for boys was 101.02. A t-test was used to test whether these two means were statistically significantly different from one another. The value of the observed 't' was not significant at 5% significance level hence it was concluded that there was statistically no significant difference in punitiveness between girls and boys (appendix N).

An attempt was also made to find out whether there was a statistically significant difference in punitiveness between Persons A and B. In order to do this the mean punitive scores for Persons A and B were computed for the whole sample and these were 106.36 and 100.46 respectively. When a t-test was used to test whether these two means were statistically significantly different from one another, it was found that the value of the observed 't' was significant at 5% significance level. It was therefore concluded that there was a statistically significant difference in punitiveness between Persons A and B (appendix M). Person A was more punitive than Person B.

Using a t-test an attempt was made to test whether there was a statistically significant difference in punitiveness between girls and boys in Persons A and B. Neither of the values of the observed 't's', was significant at 5% significance level, hence it was concluded that neither Person A nor Person B was statistically different in punitiveness with girls and boys (appendices O and P).

Two t-tests were used to test whether there was a statistically significant difference in punitiveness between 'fathers' who had been to school and those who had never been to school and also between 'mothers' who had been to school and those who had never been to school. Neither of the values of the observed 't's' were significant at 5% significance level hence it was concluded that there was statistically no significant difference in punitiveness between 'parents' who had been to school and those who had never been to school (appendices Q and R)

Lastly a t - test was used to test whether there was a statistically significant difference in punitiveness between the first-borns and the non-first-borns. The value of the observed 't' was not significant at 5% significance level, hence it was concluded that there was statistically no significant difference in punitiveness between first-borns and non-first-borns (appendix S).

THE RELIABILITY OF THE SCALE:

The same procedure as that which was discussed in chapter V Page 73 was used in calculating the reliability of the scale.

Kuder - Richardson formula 20 was used in calculating the reliability of the scale.

Kuder - Richardson formula 20:

$$r_{11} = \left(\frac{n}{n-1} \right) \left(\frac{S_t^2 - E P_i q_i}{S_t^2} \right)$$

The reliability of questionnaire III_A (appendix H) was first calculated and then that of questionnaire III_B (appendix H). The internal consistency for questionnaire III_A

was 0.83 and that for questionnaire III_B was 0.90. These reliability coefficients indicated that the scale was unidimensional.

The computation of the reliability of questionnaire III_A was as follows:-

The variance for Person A items was found to be 51.18

Kuder-Richardson formula 20:-

$$r_{11} = \left(\frac{n}{n-1} \right) \left(\frac{S_e^2 - E_{p.i.}}{S_e^2} \right)$$

$$E_{p.i.} = 9.0364$$

$$\begin{aligned} r_{11} &= \left(\frac{95}{95-1} \right) \left(\frac{51.18 - 9.0364}{51.18} \right) \\ &= 1.010638 \times 0.8234 = 0.8322 \\ &= 0.83 \end{aligned}$$

The internal consistency for person A was 0.83

The computation of the reliability of questionnaire III_B was as follows:- The variance for Person B items was found to be 93.51.

Kuder-Richardson formula 20:-

$$r_{11} = \left(\frac{n}{n-1} \right) \left(\frac{S_e^2 - E_{p.i.}}{S_e^2} \right)$$
$$E_{p.i.} = 10.182$$

$$\begin{aligned} &= \left(\frac{95}{95-1} \right) \left(\frac{93.5196 - 10.182}{93.5196} \right) \\ &= \left(\frac{95}{94} \right) \left(\frac{83.3376}{93.5196} \right) \\ &= 1.010638 \times 0.8911 = 0.900519 \\ &= 0.90 \end{aligned}$$

The internal consistency for Person B items was 0.90.

The reliability of boys' and girls' responses were calculated separately in questionnaires III_A and III_B and it was found that the reliability of boys responses in questionnaire III_A was 0.79 while that of girls' was 0.86. In questionnaire III_B the reliability for boys' responses was found to be 0.92 while that for the girls' responses was 0.90

Validation of the scale:

The theoretical construct used in this study is the same as that given in chapter V page 75.

The coding instructions used in the validation of the scale have already been discussed in chapter V, page 58 as in the pilot study (see chapter V page 76) it was felt that the relationship that might exist between the subjects' parental punitive scores and their:-

- a) Tribal and religious prejudice
- b) Aggression

may be curvilinear hence a chi-square test was used in calculating the validity of the scale.

Table XIX below shows the observed frequency by parental punitive scores and tribal and religious prejudice scores.

TABLE XIX THE OBSERVED FREQUENCY BY PUNITIVE SCORES AND PREJUDICE SCORES.

PUNITIVE SCORES	PREJUDICE SCORES		TOTAL
	1-4	5-8	
46 - 105	10	37	47
106 - 165	20	28	48
Total	30	65	95 ¹

$\chi^2 = \frac{\sum (O - E)^2}{E}$, where O was the observed frequency and E was the expected frequency in each cell.

$$\chi^2(1.d.f) = 4.59$$

The value of the expected ' χ^2 ' (1.d.f.) was 3.841 at 5% significance level and the value of the observed ' χ^2 ' was 4.59. Since the value of the observed ' χ^2 ' was more than the expected value, then the observed ' χ^2 ' was statistically significant. It was therefore concluded that there was a correlation between the punitive scores and the prejudice scores of subjects.

When, however, the mean punitive scores and prejudice scores for girls and boys were taken separately and chi - square test computed for each set of scores, none of the values of the observed ' χ^2 ' were statistically significant.

An attempt was made using a t - test to test whether

there was a statistically significant difference in prejudice between the girls and the boys. The value of the observed 't' was significant at 5% to significance level. It was therefore concluded that there was a statistically significant difference in prejudice between the girls and the boys . The girls were more prejudiced than the boys (appendix U).

A t - test was also computed to test whether there was a statistically significant difference in prejudice between the first - borns and the non - first - borns. The value of the observed 't' was not statistically significant at 5% significance level, hence it was concluded that there was no statistically significant difference in prejudice between the first - borns and the non - first - borns (appendix W).

Table XX below shows the observed frequency by punitive scores and aggression scores.

TABLE XX THE OBSERVED FREQUENCY BY PUNITIVE SCORES AND AGGRESSION SCORES:

MEAN PUNITIVE SCORES	AGGRESSION SCORES		TOTAL
	0 - 19	20 - 39	
46 - 105	41	7	48
106 - 165	30	17	47
Total	71	24	95

$$\chi^2 (1. d. f.) = 5.57$$

The value of the expected ' χ^2 ' (1.d.f.) was 3.841 at 5% significance level and the value of the observed ' χ^2 ' was 5.57. Since the value of the observed ' χ^2 ' was more than the expected value, then the observed ' χ^2 ' was statistically significant. It was therefore concluded that there was a correlation between the punitive scores and the aggression scores.

When, however, the mean punitive scores and the aggression scores for girls and boys were taken separately and a chi-square test computed for each set of scores, none of the values of the observed ' χ^2 ' were significant.

Using a t-test an attempt was made to test whether there was a statistically significant difference in aggression between the girls and the boys. The value of the observed ' t ' was significant at 5 % significance level, hence it was concluded that there was a statistically significant difference in aggression between the girls and the boys. The girls were more aggressive than the boys (appendix T).

A t-test was also used to test whether there was a statistically significant difference in aggression between the first - borns and the non - first - borns. The value of the observed ' t ' was not significant at 5% significance level, hence it was concluded that there was no statistically significant difference in aggression between the first - borns and the non-first - borns (appendix V).

CHAPTER IX

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS:

The aim of this study was to design and validate 'A Parental Punitive Scale' for the Kikuyu, Rural Adolescents .

In the design and validation of the scale responses of adolescent girls and boys were used since the scale was meant for adolescents. The subjects used in the study were only those adolescents who were in forms I and II in day secondary schools.

The designing and the validation of the scale was done through four minor studies each of which had its own questionnaire.

The first minor study consisted of questionnaires I_A and I_B (appendix B).

The second minor study had questionnaire II (appendix D).

The third minor study had questionnaires III_A and III_B (appendix H).

The fourth minor study had questionnaire IV (appendix I).

In questionnaires I_A and I_B of the first minor study, the subjects were required to give a variety of discipline techniques administered to them by their 'fathers' and 'mothers' for behaving in a manner similar to that portrayed in each of

the twelve stories (appendix B). The discipline techniques mentioned by subjects were listed (chapter VIII, page 99).

The discipline technique, 'Beat me' was mentioned most frequently. The investigator had expected that this discipline technique would rarely be mentioned by adolescents since at their age, their parents would rarely administer this discipline technique but would more often administer, verbal discipline techniques. The investigator thought that at adolescence, parents would more often administer verbal discipline techniques because the adolescents can reason out things. An explanation as to why certain things are wrong and should not therefore be done, would be a more effective discipline technique than mere beating. Ominde (1952) found out that among the Luo the adolescents were rarely beaten. The findings of this study could possibly have been due to cultural differences so that among the Kikuyu, beating is still administered to adolescents.

The discipline technique 'Beat me', was also more frequently mention by boys than by girls. Sears and his colleagues (1957) reached similar conclusions. In their study, they found that the boys received more physical punishments than the girls.

It was also the father who was said to beat more frequently than the mother. This, as already been stated in chapter VIII, page 100, is one of the reasons why the father not

only in the Kikuyu tribe but also in some other African tribes (Maleche, 1953) is feared by both children and adolescents. They have less fear for the mother.

A mean severity score for all the verbal discipline techniques was calculated by adding together the mean severity scores of all verbal discipline techniques and then dividing the total by the number of verbal discipline techniques. When this was done, the mean severity score of all verbal discipline techniques was found to be 10.59. Using the same method, a mean severity score was calculated for all physical discipline techniques and this was found to be 6.45. As was expected by the investigator, the subjects considered the verbal discipline techniques to be less severe than the physical discipline techniques.

Although they were not entirely physical discipline techniques, 'Stop me from going to school' and 'Refuse to pay my school fees', were considered by most of the subjects as the most severe. The reason for this could be that most of the subjects in this sample considered formal education as one of the most important assets in their lives. Earlier investigators found that in Africa, formal education is considered to be extremely important (Callaway, 1963; Silvey, 1969). In Africa, it is considered to be important because both parents and their children look at it as a venue through which one can

escape from the drudgery of farming and also through which one can get a well paid job. Those, in school, hope that the job they get after leaving school will bring them enough money to enable them not only to live a comfortable life, be economically independent from their parents, but also be able to help their families. Being stopped from going to school and being refused money to pay school fees were consequently considered by most of these subjects as the most severe discipline techniques. They felt administering any of these discipline techniques meant crushing forever the aspirations of a bright future.

Questionnaires III_A and III_B of the third pilot study assessed the punitiveness of 'parental' discipline towards aggression shown to people and inanimate objects. When an attempt was made to find out whether there was a statistically significant difference in punitiveness between girls and boys. It was found that the difference was not statistically significant (appendix N). In their studies, Raum (1940) and Apoko (1967) found that girls were more severely punished than boys. The inconsistency between the present investigator's finding and that of the above investigators could be due to cultural differences. It could be that among the Kikuyu there is no difference in punitiveness between girls and boys.

When an attempt was made to test whether there was a statistically significant difference in punitiveness between

Persons A and B, it was found that there was a statistically significant difference in punitiveness between Persons A and B. Person A who was represented by the 'father' was more punitive than Person B represented by the 'mother'. This finding was similar to the finding of the first minor study in which the subjects said that it was the 'father' who administered the discipline technique, 'Beat me', more frequently than the mother (page 100). In answer to the question 'Who often punishes you when you do something wrong?' asked on the front page of questionnaires IA, II and III_A (appendices B, D and H), 63% of the whole sample said it was the 'father'. When however the girls and boys were taken separately, it was found that it was only 48% of the girls who said it was the 'father' as against 78% of the boys. From these findings the following conclusions could be drawn:

- a) Generally speaking it is the 'father' who punishes more frequently and more severely than the 'mother'.
- b) The 'father' punished the boys more frequently than he punished girls.
- c) The 'mother' punished the girls and the boys less severely than the father.
- d) The 'mother' punished the girls more frequently than she punished the boys.

When an attempt was made to find out the effect of formal education on 'parental' punitiveness for aggression, it was found that formal education had statistically no significant

effect on 'parental' punitiveness for aggression (appendices Q and R). This finding was similar to that of Nance, D. and Treichel (1970) who in their study on the effects of formal education on child-rearing practices reached the conclusion that formal education had no significant effect on child-rearing practices.

Like Kohn and Schooler (1956) and Sears et al. (1957), the present investigator found no significant effects of birth-order patterns on 'parental' punitiveness for aggression.

The reliability of the scale using Kuder-Richardson's formula 20 was 0.83 in questionnaire III_A and 0.90 in questionnaire III_B. These results indicated that the scale had an acceptable internal consistency (chapter VIII, page 112-113).

The validity of the scale, based on the theory that high parental punitiveness for aggression leads to high prejudice and aggression was calculated. A Chi-square test was in computing the validity of the scale and the results obtained showed that the scale had an acceptable validity (chapter VIII, page 114-116).

In questionnaire IV, which was used for the validation of the scale, questions, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 and 7 assessed the prejudice of subjects. When a Chi-square test was computed using the mean parental punitive scores and the prejudice scores of subjects, a positive relationship was found between

the mean parental punitive scores for aggression and the prejudice scores. Similar findings had earlier been reached by Allport (1954), Frenkel - Brunswick (1948) and Young, K. (1957). These investigators had reached the conclusion that most children who are severely punished, harshly treated and continually criticised have more prejudice than those who are less severely punished, less harshly treated and not criticised often.

There was statistically no significant difference in prejudice between the first borns and the non-first-borns (appendix W).

In questionnaire IV of the fourth minor study, question 8 assessed the aggression of subjects. When a Chi-square test was computed between the mean parental punitive scores for aggression and the aggression scores of subjects, a direct and positive relationship was found between them. This finding was similar to that of earlier investigators (Sears et al, 1957, Becker, 1964).

In this study, the differences observed in aggression and prejudice between the girls and the boys were statistically significant, hence it was concluded that the girls were more prejudiced and more aggressive than the boys (appendices T and U). The finding was contrary to the expectations of the present investigator who expected that there would be no statistically

significant differences in aggression and prejudice between the girls and the boys since there were no statistically significant differences between them in 'parental' punitiveness.

There were no birth-order effects observed on aggression (appendix V).

Although throughout this study, the investigator compared her findings with those of local studies (Raum, 1940; Apoko, 1967; Kaye 1962; Ammar, 1962; etc.) and others done abroad (Sears et al. 1957; Nance, D. and Treichel, 197 ; Kohn and Schooler, 1956; etc.), it should be borne in mind that these comparisons were done with certain reservations and limitations since parental discipline as already stated in chapters I and II, differ not only cross-culturally but also across tribes. It is possible that some of the contradictions found between some of the findings in this study and other findings of earlier studies were mainly due to cultural and tribal differences.

It is also important to bear in mind that even though there were some similarities between some of the findings in the present study and others done earlier among the Kikuyu, it would be unwise to make definite and conclusive remarks regarding parental discipline among the Kikuyu since the findings of this study are wholly based on adolescent reports. The perceptions of adolescents on parental discipline may differ from those of their parents, hence in order to make

definite and conclusive remarks on Kikuyu, parental discipline parental reports on parental discipline should also be obtained, and it would only be after the comparisons between adolescent and parental reports had been made that conclusive remarks could be made on Kikuyu, parental discipline. The present investigator felt that research should soon be directed in to this field of parental discipline among the Kikuyu, in order to obtain data on parental discipline using parental reports. The designing of this scale has made it very easy to obtain data on adolescents' perceptions on parental discipline. The data from parental reports should be compared with that of adolescent reports and its reliability should be calculated. This would be a very important research:-

- a) Both the parents and the adolescent should be interviewed.
- b) It would be better to concentrate on adolescents attending day secondary schools because it would be easy to trace the parents of such adolescents. Since the adolescents live at home with their parents.

APPENDIX AQUESTIONNAIRE I, VERSION AINTRODUCTION:

There are twelve stories here. In each story a boy or a girl has said or done something naughty. His parents come to know about it. I want you to imagine that you are the one who has said or done something naughty in all the twelve stories. I want you to tell me what you think your father would do or say to you and also what you think your mother would say or do to you for being naughty.

STORIES

1. Kamau was going home from school one day. He entered a nearby farm and picked some unripe oranges to play "football" with. The owner of the farm caught him and reported him to his parents.
 Kamau's father _____

 Kamau's mother _____

2. Wambui was sitting next to the pot of drinking water. Her brother, Njuguna asked her for water. Wambui told her "Why don't you wake up and fetch water for yourself?" His parents heard this.
 Wambui's father _____

 Wambui's mother _____

3. Wanjiku was one day sent by her teacher to fetch him some chalk from the headmaster's office. Wanjiku told the teacher, "Why don't you go and get the chalk yourself or send someone else?"

Wanjiku's father _____

Wanjiku's mother _____

4. Njenga liked eating from one particular plate. One day his mother served his sister, Wanjiru, food in his favourite plate. Njenga started eating it. His parents were there.

Njenga's father _____

Njenga's mother _____

5. One day Ngugi was sent to the shops to buy sugar. He met an old woman who started making various jokes to him. Ngugi did not like her jokes so he took a stone and threw it to her. This old woman reported him to his parents.

Ngugi's father _____

Ngugi's mother _____

6. Ngigi and his brother went to graze their sheep one day. They started playing. The sheep went into their farm and started eating the maize which was growing. His mother saw the sheep and came and drove it out. They were reported to his father.

Ngigi's father _____

Ngigi's mother _____

7. Kimani was one day annoyed with his brother. He hid his pen. When Kimani's brother went to school he had to use a pencil. Kimani's brother reported Kimani to his father.

Kimani's father _____

Kimani's mother _____

8. Kiarie was one day late to go to school. His teacher took a stick to beat him because he had come late. Kiarie ran away and hid. He missed the first lesson in class. His teacher reported him to his parents.

Kiarie's father _____

Kiarie's mother _____

9. One day Mburu and his sister were dressing to go to school. Mburu's sister asked him, "Why are your clothes so dirty and it is only Tuesday?" Mburu instead of telling his sister anything hit her. His sister reported Mburu to his parents.

Mburu's father _____

Mburu's mother _____

10. One day Mbugua's partner, Kinuthia was out during break time. Mbugua took Kinuthia's English exercise book and tore out papers. Kinuthia came to know. He told Mbugua's brother. Mbugua's brother reported him to his parents.

Mbugua's father _____

Mbugua's mother _____

11. Gaceru was one day asked for a rubber by Kogi his friend. Gaceru asked Kogi, "Why don't you ask your father to buy you a rubber or is he too poor to buy a rubber?"

Gaceru's father _____

Gaceru's mother _____

12. One day Kaniaru got very poor marks in the test. His parents came to know about it. They told him, "You could have got better marks than that", Kaniaru replied "You people, why don't you mind your own business?".

Kaniaru's father _____

Kaniaru's mother _____

APPENDIX B

QUESTIONNAIRE IA, VERSION B.

NAME
SEX
ORDER OF BIRTH
NUMBER OF BROTHERS
NUMBER OF SISTERS
NUMBER OF OLDER BROTHERS
NUMBER OF OLDER SISTERS
NAME OF FATHER
NAME OF MOTHER
FATHER'S EDUCATION LEVEL
MOTHER'S EDUCATION LEVEL
FATHER'S OCCUPATION
MOTHER'S OCCUPATION
AGE OF FATHER
AGE OF MOTHER

WHO OFTEN PUNISHES YOU WHEN YOU DO SOMETHING WRONG?

Introduction:-

Here are twelve stories. In each story a child has said or done something naughty. His father has come to know about it. I want you to imagine that you are the one who has said or done something naughty in all these stories.

I want you to tell me what you think your father would do or would say to you for being naughty. If in any of the twelve stories you think your father would say or do nothing to you, write word 'nothing' against that story.

1. At school everyone in Kimani's class had been asked to bring a stick about ten feet long. These sticks were to be used for constructing a small store. When going home Kamau entered a nearby farm and cut one stick to take to school the next day. The owner of the farm caught him and reported him to his father;

Kimani's father

2. Njuguna was sitting next to the pot of drinking water. His sister, Wambui, asked him for water. Njuguna told her, "Why don't you wake up and fetch the water for yourself?" His father heard this.

Njuguna's father

3. Njoroge one day was sent by his teacher to fetch him some chalk from the headmaster's office. Njoroge replied, "Why don't you go and get it yourself or send someone else?" The teacher reported Njoroge to his father.

Njoroge's father.....

4. Wanjiku's parents had visitors. Wanjiku was sent by her mother to buy milk, sugar and a loaf of bread for these visitors. She met Kamau, who was a friend of hers. They started talking. They talked for over an hour. When Wanjiku returned home she found that her father had become very impatient. Wanjiku's father

5. Ngugi was going to the shops to sell milk one day. An old man saw him. He gave Ngugi ten cents to go and buy him some snuff. Ngugi refused. The old man went and reported him to his father. Ngugi's father

6. Ngugi and his brother went to graze their cattle one day. Each of them carried a book to read. When both were busy reading, one cow strayed into the farm and started eating maize. The mother who was cultivating nearby saw the cow and drove it away. She reported Ngugi and his brother to the father. Ngugi's father

7. Wambui was one day annoyed by her friend Njeri, who lived near her home. She decided to take revenge by also annoying Njeri. She started telling other pupils in the class how poor Njeri's parents were. Wambui's father came to know about this. Wambui's father

8. Kiarie was one day late to attend the morning assembly. He was sermoned by the teacher who was on duty that

day to the staffroom. He refused to go and instead hid. He missed all the morning lessons. This was reported to Kiarie's father.

Kiarie's father

9. Wanjiru had been late to prepare lunch one day. She started hurrying up everything so that the time her parents arrive the food would at least be on the fire. Her brother was in the meanwhile sitting idle watching her. She asked him, "Why don't you help me with lighting the fire instead of sitting there doing nothing. You too will eat this food!" In reply his brother slapped her saying "That is not my work. It is all your fault that you are late to cook." Wanjiru reported him to her father when he arrived home.

Wanjiru's father

10. It was at the end of the term and all the test papers had been handed back to the pupils. Kinuthia wanted very much to know what Mbugua (his rival in class) got in all his tests. When Mbugua went out for break, Kinuthia took all his test papers. He failed to return them before Mbugua's return. On missing his test, papers Mbugua reported it to the class teacher. The papers were later found in Kinuthia's desk. The teacher reported this to Kinuthia's father.

Kinuthia's father

11. Gaceru was one day asked for a rubber by Kogi, his friend. Gaceru asked Kogi, "Why don't you ask your father to buy you a rubber or is he too poor to buy you one?" Kogi lost his temper and hit Gaceru. When the matter was reported to the teacher, Gaceru got the biggest blame. The teacher reported Gaceru to his father.

Gaceru's father

12. One term Kaniaru got a very poor report. When his father received the report from the headmaster he sermoned Kaniaru and told him, "Last term your report was very poor. You could have got better marks than that." Kaniaru replied, "You, why don't you mind your own business?"

Kaniaru's father

APPENDIX B:QUESTIONNAIRE IB VERSION B:Introduction:-

Here are twelve stories. In each story a child has said or done something naughty. His mother has come to know about it. I want you to imagine that you are the one who has said or done something naughty in all these stories.

I want you to tell me what you think your mother would do or say to you for being naughty. If in any of the twelve stories you think your mother would say or do nothing to you write the word 'nothing' against that story.

1. At school everyone in Kimani's class had been asked to bring a stick ten feet long. These sticks were to be used for construction of a small store. When going home Kimani entered a nearby farm and cut one stick to take to school the next day. The owner of the farm caught him and reported him to his mother. Kimani's mother

2. Njuguna was sitting next to the pot of drinking water. His sister, Wambui, asked him for water. Njuguna told her, "Why don't you wake up and fetch water for yourself?" His mother heard this.

Njuguna's mother

3. Njoroge one day was sent by his teacher to fetch him some chalk from the headmaster's office. Njoroge replied, "Why don't you go and get it yourself or send someone else?" The teacher reported Njoroge to his mother.

Njuguna's mother

4. Wanjiku's parents had visitors. Wanjiku was sent by her mother to the shops to buy milk, sugar and a loaf of bread for these visitors. She met Kamau, who was a friend of hers. They started talking. They talked for over an hour. When Wanjiku returned home she found that her mother had become very impatient.

Wanjiku's mother.....

5. Ngugi was going to the shops to sell milk one day. An old man saw him. He gave Ngugi ten cents to go and buy him some snuff. Ngugi refused. The old man went and reported him to his mother

Ngugi's mother

6. Ngigi and his brother went to graze their cattle one day. Each of them carried a book to read. When both were busy reading one cow strayed into the farm and started eating maize. The mother who was cultivating nearby saw the cow drove it away.

Ngigi's mother

7. Wambui was one day annoyed by her friend Njeri, who lived near her hom. She decided to take revenge by also annoying Njeri. She started telling other pupils in the class how poor Njeri's parents were. Wambui's mother came to know about this.

Wambui's mother

8. Kiarie was one day late to attend the morning assembly. He was sermoned by the teacher who was on duty on that day to the staffroom. He refused to go and instead hid. He missed all the morning lessons. This was reported to Kiarie's mother.

Kiarie's mother

9. Wanjiru had been late to prepare lunch one day. She started hurrying up everything so that by the time he parents arrived the food would at least be on the fire. Her brother was in the meanwhile sitting idle watching her. She asked him, "Why don't you help me with lighting the fire instead of sitting there doing nothing. You too will eat this food!" In reply his brother slapped her saying "That is not my work. It is your fault that you are late to cook." Wanjiru reported him to her mother when she arrived home.

Wanjiru's mother

10. It was at the end of the term and all the test papers had been handed back to the pupils. Kinuthia wanted very much to know what Mbugua (his rival in class) had got in all his tests. When Mbugua went out for break, Kinuthia took all his test papers. He failed to return them before Mbugua's return. On missing his test papers Mbugua reported it to the class teacher. The papers were latter found in Kinuthia's desk. The teacher reported this to Kinuthia's mother.

Kinuthia's mother

11. Gaceru was one day asked for a rubber by Kogi, his friend. Gaceru asked Kogi, "Why don't you ask your father to buy you a rubber or is he too poor to buy you one?" Kogi lost his temper and hit Gaceru. When the matter was reported to the teacher, Gaceru got the biggest blame. The teacher reported Gaceru to his mother.

Gaceru's mother

12. One term Kaniaru got a very poor report. When his mother received the report from the headmaster, she sermoned Kaniaru and told him, "Last term your report was very poor. You could have got better marks than that". Kaniaru replied, "You, why don't you mind your business?"

Kaniaru's mother

APPENDIX CQUESTIONNAIRE IIRATING AND WEIGHING PARENTAL DISCIPLINE TECHNIQUESIntroduction:-

Here are forty discipline techniques. I want to rate each one of them on the given three scales:

1. fair/unfair
2. good/bad
3. right/wrong

Besides rating each of the forty discipline technique I also want you to weigh them on the given five point scale, starting from 1 - 5. The following are meanings of the five weights:-

- 1 - very unfair; very wrong; very bad.
- 2 - slightly unfair; slightly wrong; slightly bad.
- 3 - partly unfair and partly fair
partly wrong and partly right
partly bad and partly good.
- 4 - slightly fair; slightly right; slightly good.
- 5 - very fair; very right; very bad. *good*

METHOD:

Example:

Abuse the child;

Unfair	1	2	③	4	5	fair
Wrong	1	2	3	④	5	right
Bad	1	②	3	4	5	good.

For each discipline technique you should CIRCLE ONLY ONE NUMBER IN EACH OF THE THREE SCALES. You should use all the three scales. In the end you will have circled three numbers for each discipline technique as shown above. (example on the Blackboard).

RATING AND WEIGHING PARENTAL DISCIPLINE

1. Beat the child

Unfair	1	2	3	4	5	fair
Wrong	1	2	3	4	5	right
Bad	1	2	3	4	5	good.

2. Be angry with the child

Unfair	1	2	3	4	5	fair
Wrong	1	2	3	4	5	right
Bad	1	2	3	4	5	good.

3. Send the child out of the house

Unfair	1	2	3	4	5	fair
Wrong	1	2	3	4	5	right
Bad	1	2	3	4	5	good

4. Tell the child he is naughty

Unfair	1	2	3	4	5	fair
Wrong	1	2	3	4	5	right
Bad	1	2	3	4	5	good

5. Give the child extra work e.g. digging

Unfair	1	2	3	4	5	fair
Wrong	1	2	3	4	5	right
Bad	1	2	3	4	5	good.

6. Warn the child not to misbehave again

Unfair	1	2	3	4	5	fair
Wrong	1	2	3	4	5	right
Bad	1	2	3	4	5	good.

7. Ask the teacher to punish the child e.g. by beating him

Unfair	1	2	3	4	5	fair
Wrong	1	2	3	4	5	right
Bad	1	2	3	4	5	good

8. Scold the child

Unfair	1	2	3	4	5	fair
Wrong	1	2	3	4	5	right
Bad	1	2	3	4	5	good

9. Take away some of the child's property.

Unfair	1	2	3	4	5	fair
Wrong	1	2	3	4	5	right
Bad	1	2	3	4	5	good.

10. Tell the child he is mad.

Unfair	1	2	3	4	5	fair
Wrong	1	2	3	4	5	right
Bad	1	2	3	4	5	good

11. Report the child to the H/Master or teacher.

Unfair	1	2	3	4	5	fair
Wrong	1	2	3	4	5	right
Bad	1	2	3	4	5	good.

12. Advise the child how to behave.

Unfair	1	2	3	4	5	fair
Wrong	1	2	3	4	5	right
Bad	1	2	3	4	5	good.

13. Threaten to beat the child

Unfair	1	2	3	4	5	fair
Wrong	1	2	3	4	5	right
Bad	1	2	3	4	5	good

15. Ask the child why he misbehaved.

Unfair	1	2	3	4	5	fair
Wrong	1	2	3	4	5	right
Bad	1	2	3	4	5	good.

15. Deprive the child of a meal

Unfair	1	2	3	4	5	fair
Wrong	1	2	3	4	5	right
Bad	1	2	3	4	5	good

16. Tell the child they will not send him again.

Unfair	1	2	3	4	5	fair
Wrong	1	2	3	4	5	right
Bad	1	2	3	4	5	good.

17. Stop the child from going to bed

Unfair	1	2	3	4	5	fair
Wrong	1	2	3	4	5	right
Bad	1	2	3	4	5	good

18. Ask the child to apologise

Unfair	1	2	3	4	5	fair
Wrong	1	2	3	4	5	right
Bad	1	2	3	4	5	good.

19. Pinch the child

Unfair	1	2	3	4	5	fair
Wrong	1	2	3	4	5	right
Bad	1	2	3	4	5	good

20. Tell the child that he is like a thief.

Unfair	1	2	3	4	5	fair
Wrong	1	2	3	4	5	right
Bad	1	2	3	4	5	good.

21. Report the child to the father.

Unfair	1	2	3	4	5	fair
Wrong	1	2	3	4	5	right
Bad	1	2	3	4	5	good

22. Stop the child from going to school

Unfair	1	2	3	4	5	fair
Wrong	1	2	3	4	5	right
Bad	1	2	3	4	5	good

23. Tell the child that he is stupid

Unfair	1	2	3	4	5	fair
Wrong	1	2	3	4	5	right
Bad	1	2	3	4	5	good

24. Refuse to pay school fees for the child.

Unfair	1	2	3	4	5	fair
Wrong	1	2	3	4	5	right
Bad	1	2	3	4	5	good.

25. Ask the child to love others as he loves himself.
- | | | | | | | | | |
|--------|-------|---|---|---|---|---|-------|-------|
| Unfair | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | | fair |
| Wrong | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | | right |
| Bad | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | | good. |
26. Ask the child to tell the mother why he misbehaved.
- | | | | | | | | | |
|--------|-------|---|---|---|---|---|-------|-------|
| Unfair | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | | fair |
| Wrong | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | | right |
| Bad | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | | good. |
27. Threaten the child that he will sleep out of doors.
- | | | | | | | | | |
|--------|-------|---|---|---|---|---|-------|-------|
| Unfair | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | | fair |
| Wrong | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | | right |
| Bad | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | | good |
28. Slap the child
- | | | | | | | | | |
|--------|-------|---|---|---|---|---|-------|-------|
| Unfair | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | | fair |
| Wrong | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | | right |
| Bad | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | | good. |
29. Threaten to beat the child
- | | | | | | | | | |
|--------|-------|---|---|---|---|---|-------|-------|
| Unfair | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | | fair |
| Wrong | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | | right |
| Bad | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | | good. |

APPENDIX D

QUESTIONNAIRE II

NAME

SEX

AGE

ORDER OF BIRTH

NUMBER OF BROTHERS

NUMBER OF SISTERS

NUMBER OF OLDER BROTHERS

NUMBER OF OLDER SISTERS

NAME OF FATHER

NAME OF MOTHER

FATHER'S EDUCATION LEVEL

MOTHER'S EDUCATION LEVEL

FATHER'S OCCUPATION

MOTHER'S OCCUPATION

AGE OF FATHER

AGE OF MOTHER

WHO OFTEN PUNISHES YOU WHEN YOU DO SOMETHING WRONG?

1. Beat the child

Unfair	1	2	3	4	5	fair
Wrong	1	2	3	4	5	right
Bad	1	2	3	4	5	good

2. Be angry with the child

Unfair	1	2	3	4	5	fair
Wrong	1	2	3	4	5	right
Bad	1	2	3	4	5	good

3. Send the child out of the house.

Unfair	1	2	3	4	5	fair
Wrong	1	2	3	4	5	right
Bad	1	2	3	4	5	good

4. Tell child that he is naughty

Unfair	1	2	3	4	5	fair
Wrong	1	2	3	4	5	right
Bad	1	2	3	4	5	good

5. Give the child extra work e.g. digging or cultivating

Unfair	1	2	3	4	5	fair
Wrong	1	2	3	4	5	right
Bad	1	2	3	4	5	good.

6. Warn the child not to misbehave again

Unfair	1	2	3	4	5	fair
Wrong	1	2	3	4	5	right
Bad	1	2	3	4	5	good.

7. Report the child to the teacher or Headmaster so that he may be punished e.g. by being beaten.

Unfair	1	2	3	4	5	fair
Wrong	1	2	3	4	5	right
Bad	1	2	3	4	5	good.

8. Scold the child.

Unfair	1	2	3	4	5	fair
Wrong	1	2	3	4	5	right
Bad	1	2	3	4	5	good

9. Advise the child on how to behave.

Unfair	1	2	3	4	5	fair
Wrong	1	2	3	4	5	right
Bad	1	2	3	4	5	good.

10. Slap the child

Unfair	1	2	3	4	5	fair
Wrong	1	2	3	4	5	right
Bad	1	2	3	4	5	good

11. Deprive the child of a meal.

Unfair	1	2	3	4	5	fair
Wrong	1	2	3	4	5	right
Bad	1	2	3	4	5	good.

12. Ask the child why he misbehaved.

Unfair	1	2	3	4	5	fair
Wrong	1	2	3	4	5	right
Bad	1	2	3	4	5	good.

13. Threaten not to pay school fees for the child.

Unfair	1	2	3	4	5	fair
Wrong	1	2	3	4	5	right
Bad	1	2	3	4	5	good.

14. Pinch the child

Unfair	1	2	3	4	5	fair
Wrong	1	2	3	4	5	right
Bad	1	2	3	4	5	good.

15. Tell the child he ought to behave properly

Unfair	1	2	3	4	5	fair
Wrong	1	2	3	4	5	right
Bad	1	2	3	4	5	good.

16. Refuse to help the child e.g. not buy him clothes.

Unfair	1	2	3	4	5	fair
Wrong	1	2	3	4	5	right
Bad	1	2	3	4	5	good.

17. Tell the child to leave school if he does not want to learn.

Unfair	1	2	3	4	5	fair
Wrong	1	2	3	4	5	right
Bad	1	2	3	4	5	good.

18. Threaten to deprive the child of a meal.

Unfair	1	2	3	4	5	fair
Wrong	1	2	3	4	5	right
Bad	1	2	3	4	5	good.

19. Ask the child to apologise

Unfair	1	2	3	4	5	fair
Wrong	1	2	3	4	5	right
Bad	1	2	3	4	5	good

20. Report the child to the father.

Unfair	1	2	3	4	5	fair
Wrong	1	2	3	4	5	right
Bad	1	2	3	4	5	good

21. Tell the child he ought to be ashamed of his misbehaviour.

Unfair	1	2	3	4	5	fair
Wrong	1	2	3	4	5	right
Bad	1	2	3	4	5	good.

22. Refuse to pay school fees for the child.

Unfair	1	2	3	4	5	fair
Wrong	1	2	3	4	5	right
Bad	1	2	3	4	5	Good.

23. Tell the child to behave properly.

Unfair	1	2	3	4	5	fair
Wrong	1	2	3	4	5	right
Bad	1	2	3	4	5	good.

24. Report the child to the mother

Unfair	1	2	3	4	5	fair
Wrong	1	2	3	4	5	right
Bad	1	2	3	4	5	good.

25. Threaten to beat the child

Unfair	1	2	3	4	5	fair
Wrong	1	2	3	4	5	right
Bad	1	2	3	4	5	good.

26. Abuse the child.

Unfair	1	2	3	4	5	fair
Wrong	1	2	3	4	5	right
Bad	1	2	3	4	5	good.

APPENDIX E.

PARENTAL PUNITIVENESS SCALE

RAPH EPSTEIN AND SAMUEL S. KOMURITA

INSTRUCTIONS: When children do something wrong, their parents may react in different ways. We would like to know what you think would happen if you did something wrong.

Look at the following example:

If I hit another child,

MY	a. Whip me	a. MY
FATHER	b. Send me to bed without supper	b. MOTHER
WOULD	c. have a long talk with me	c. WOULD
	d. Take away my television	d.

Make believe that you hit another child. Your parents might react by: Whipping you, sending you to bed without supper, having a long talk with you or taking away television.

Show what you think your father would do by putting a circle around the letter a. or b. or c. or d. Then show what your mother might do by putting a circle around one of the letters on the other side. Circle one letter on the 'Father' and one letter on the 'Mother' side.

Any questions?

1. If I paint on someone's house

MY	a. Take away my television	a. MY
FATHER	b. Have a long talk with me	b. MOTHER
WOULD	c. Whip me	c. WOULD
	d. Send me to bed without supper	d.

2. If I throw a rock at someone's car

MY	a. Send me to bed without supper	a. MY
FATHER	b. Take away my television	b. MOTHER

- WOULD c. Whip me a. WOULD
d. have a long talk with me d.
3. If I lie to my brother (or sister)
- MY a. Whip me a. MY
FATHER b. have a long talk with me b. MOTHER
WOULD c. take away my television c. WOULD
d. Send me to bed without supper d.
4. If I throw something at my brother (or sister)
- MY a. take away my television a. MY
FATHER b. Send me to bed without supper b. MOTHER
WOULD c. Whip me c. WOULD
d. have a long talk with me d.
5. If I steal something that belongs to a teacher
- MY a. Send me to bed without supper a. MY
FATHER b. take away my television b. MOTHER
WOULD c. whip me c. WOULD
d. have a long talk with me d.
6. If I lie to another child
- MY a. take away my television a. MY
FATHER b. whip me b. MOTHER
WOULD c. have a long talk with me c. WOULD
d. send me to bed without supper d.
7. If I scream at another child
- MY a. send me to bed without supper a. MY
FATHER b. take away my television b. MOTHER
WOULD c. have a long talk with me c. WOULD
d. whip me d.

8. If I break something that belongs to another child,
- | | | |
|--------|----------------------------------|-----------|
| MY | a. whip me | a. MY |
| FATHER | b. send me to bed without supper | b. MOTHER |
| WOULD | c. take away my television | c. WOULD |
| | d. have a long talk with me | d. |
9. If I talk back to another child,
- | | | |
|--------|----------------------------|-----------|
| MY | a. have a long talk with | a. MY |
| FATHER | b. whip me | b. MOTHER |
| WOULD | c. take away my television | c. WOULD |
| | d. send me to bed without | d. |
10. If I start a fire on someone's lawn
- | | | |
|--------|----------------------------------|-----------|
| MY | a. send me to bed without supper | a. MY |
| FATHER | b. take away my television | b. MOTHER |
| WOULD | c. whip me | c. WOULD |
| | d. have a long talk with me | d. |
11. If I kick another child,
- | | | |
|--------|----------------------------------|-----------|
| MY | a. have a long talk with me | a. MY |
| FATHER | b. take away my television | b. MOTHER |
| WOULD | c. whip me | c. WOULD |
| | d. send me to bed without supper | d. |
12. If I talk back to my brother or (sister)
- | | | |
|--------|----------------------------------|-----------|
| MY | a. send me to bed without supper | a. MY |
| FATHER | b. whip me | b. MOTHER |
| WOULD | c. have a long talk with me | c. WOULD |
| | d. take away my television | d. |
13. If I hit my sister (or brother)
- | | | |
|--------|----------------------------------|-----------|
| MY | a. take away my television | a. MY |
| FATHER | b. send me to bed without supper | b. MOTHER |
| WOULD | c. have a long talk with me | c. WOULD |
| | d. whip me | d. |

14. If I break a window,

- | | | |
|--------|----------------------------------|-----------|
| MY | a. have a long talk with me | a. MY |
| FATHER | b. send me to bed without supper | b. MOTHER |
| WOULD | c. whip me | c. WOULD |
| | d. take away my television | d. |

15. If I scream at a teacher,

- | | | |
|--------|----------------------------------|-----------|
| MY | a. take away my television | a. MY |
| FATHER | b. send me to bed without supper | b. MOTHER |
| WOULD | c. whip me | c. WOULD |
| | d. have a long talk with me | d. |

16. If I put on someone's clothing,

- | | | |
|--------|----------------------------------|-----------|
| MY | a. have a long talk with me | a. MY |
| FATHER | b. send me to bed without supper | b. MOTHER |
| WOULD | c. whip me | c. WOULD |
| | d. take away my television | d. |

17. IF I hit a teacher

- | | | |
|--------|----------------------------------|-----------|
| MY | a. whip me | a. MY |
| FATHER | b. take away my television | b. MOTHER |
| WOULD | c. send me to bed without supper | c. WOULD |
| | d. have a long talk with me | d. |

18. If I steal something that belongs to my brother (or sister)

- | | | |
|--------|----------------------------------|-----------|
| MY | a. send me to bed without supper | a. MY |
| FATHER | b. whip me | b. MOTHER |
| WOULD | c. take away my television | c. WOULD |
| | d. have a long talk with me | d. |

19. If I scream at my brother (or sister)

- | | | |
|--------|----------------------------------|-----------|
| MY | a. whip me | a. MY |
| FATHER | b. have a long talk with me | b. MOTHER |
| WOULD | c. take away my television | c. WOULD |
| | d. send me to bed without supper | d. |

20. If I lie to a teacher,

- | | | |
|--------|----------------------------------|-----------|
| MY | a. take away my television | a. MY |
| FATHER | b. whip me | b. MOTHER |
| WOULD | c. have a long talk with me | c. WOULD |
| | d. send me to bed without supper | d. |

21. If I break something that belongs to my brother (or sister),

- | | | |
|--------|----------------------------------|-----------|
| MY | a. whip me | a. MY |
| FATHER | b. take away my television | b. MOTHER |
| WOULD | c. send me to bed without supper | c. WOULD |
| | d. have a long talk with me | d. |

22. If I swear at my brother (or sister),

- | | | |
|--------|----------------------------------|-----------|
| MY | a. have a long talk with me | a. MY |
| FATHER | b. send me to bed without supper | b. MOTHER |
| WOULD | c. take away my television | c. WOULD |
| | d. whip me | |

23. If I kick my brother (or sister),

- | | | |
|--------|----------------------------------|-----------|
| MY | a. send me to bed without supper | a. MY |
| FATHER | b. have a long talk with me | b. MOTHER |
| WOULD | c. whip me | c. WOULD |
| | d. take away my television | d. |

24. If I put sand in someone's car,

- | | | |
|--------|----------------------------------|-----------|
| MY | a. have a long talk with me | a. MY |
| FATHER | b. send me to bed without supper | b. MOTHER |
| WOULD | c. take away my television | c. WOULD |
| | d. whip me | d. |

25. If I swear at another child,

- | | | |
|--------|----------------------------------|-----------|
| MY | a. have a long talk with me | a. MY |
| FATHER | b. whip me | b. MOTHER |
| WOULD | c. send me to bed without supper | c. WOULD |
| | d. take away my television | d. |

26. If I pull up flowers in someone's garden,
- | | | |
|--------|-----------------------------|-----------|
| MY | a. take away my television | a. MY |
| FATHER | b. whip me | b. MOTHER |
| WOULD | c. have a long talk with me | c. WOULD |
| | d. send me to bed without | d. |
27. If I swear at my parents,
- | | | |
|--------|----------------------------------|-----------|
| MY | a. have a long talk with me | a. MY |
| FATHER | b. whip me | b. MOTHER |
| WOULD | c. take away my television | c. WOULD |
| | d. send me to bed without supper | d. |
28. If I mess up someone's lawn,
- | | | |
|--------|----------------------------------|-----------|
| MY | a. whip me | a. MY |
| FATHER | b. send me to bed without supper | b. MOTHER |
| WOULD | c. have a long talk with me | c. WOULD |
| | d. take away my television | d. |
29. If I steal something that belongs to another child,
- | | | |
|--------|----------------------------------|-----------|
| MY | a. send me to bed without supper | a. MY |
| FATHER | b. have a long talk with me | b. MOTHER |
| WOULD | c. take away my television | c. WOULD |
| | d. whip me | d. |
30. If I throw something at my parents,
- | | | |
|--------|----------------------------------|-----------|
| MY | a. have a long talk with me | a. MY |
| FATHER | b. send me to bed without supper | b. MOTHER |
| WOULD | c. take away my television | c. WOULD |
| | d. whip me | d. |
31. If I hit another child,
- | | | |
|--------|----------------------------------|-----------|
| MY | a. whip me | a. MY |
| FATHER | b. send me to bed without supper | b. MOTHER |
| WOULD | c. take away my television | c. WOULD |
| | d. have a long talk with me | d. |

32. If I swear at a teacher,

- | | | |
|--------|-----------------------------|-----------|
| MY | a. whip me | a. MY |
| FATHER | b. send away my television | b. MOTHER |
| WOULD | c. take away my television | c. WOULD |
| | d. have a long talk with me | d. |

33. If I steal something that belongs to my parents,

- | | | |
|--------|----------------------------------|-----------|
| MY | a. take away my television | a. MY |
| FATHER | b. send me to bed without supper | b. MOTHER |
| WOULD | c. have a long talk with me | c. WOULD |
| | d. whip me | d. |

34. If I tear someone's book on purpose,

- | | | |
|--------|----------------------------------|-----------|
| MY | a. whip me | a. MY |
| FATHER | b. have a long talk with me | b. MOTHER |
| WOULD | c. take away my television | c. WOULD |
| | d. send me to bed without supper | d. |

35. If I kick my parents,

- | | | |
|--------|----------------------------------|-----------|
| MY | a. send me to bed without supper | a. MY |
| FATHER | b. whip me | b. MOTHER |
| WOULD | c. take away my television | c. WOULD |
| | d. have a long talk with me | d. |

36. If I throw something at a teacher,

- | | | |
|--------|----------------------------------|-----------|
| MY | a. take away my television | a. MY |
| FATHER | b. send me to bed without supper | b. MOTHER |
| WOULD | c. have a long talk with me | c. WOULD |
| | d. whip me | d. |

37. If I break something that belongs to a teacher,

- | | | |
|--------|----------------------------------|-----------|
| MY | a. have a long talk with me | a. MY |
| FATHER | b. whip me | b. MOTHER |
| WOULD | c. Send me to bed without supper | c. WOULD |
| | d. take away my television | d. |

38. If I throw something at another child,
- | | | |
|--------|----------------------------------|-----------|
| MY | a. send me to bed without supper | a. MY |
| FATHER | b. have a long talk with me | b. MOTHER |
| WOULD | c. take away my television | c. WOULD |
| | d. whip me | d. |
39. If I kick a teacher,
- | | | |
|--------|-----------------------------|-----------|
| MY | a. whip me | a. MY |
| FATHER | b. send me to bed without | b. MOTHER |
| WOULD | c. have a long talk with me | c. WOULD |
| | d. take away my television | d. |
40. If I lie to my parents,
- | | | |
|--------|----------------------------------|-----------|
| MY | a. take away my television | a. MY |
| FATHER | b. send me to bed without supper | b. MOTHER |
| WOULD | c. have a long talk with me | c. WOULD |
| | d. whip me | d. |
41. If I talk back to a teacher,
- | | | |
|--------|----------------------------------|-----------|
| MY | a. send me to bed without supper | a. MY |
| FATHER | b. take away my television | b. MOTHER |
| WOULD | c. have a long talk with me | c. WOULD |
| | d. whip me | d. |
42. If I hit my parents,
- | | | |
|--------|----------------------------------|-----------|
| MY | a. whip me | a. MY |
| FATHER | b. send me to bed without supper | b. MOTHER |
| WOULD | c. take away my television | c. WOULD |
| | d. have a long talk with me | d. |
43. If I scream at my parents,
- | | | |
|--------|----------------------------------|-----------|
| MY | a. send me to bed without supper | a. MY |
| FATHER | b. whip me | b. MOTHER |
| WOULD | c. have a long talk with me | c. WOULD |
| | d. take away my television | d. |

44. If I talk back to my parents,

- | | | |
|--------|----------------------------------|-----------|
| MY | a. take away my television | a. MY |
| FATHER | b. whip me | b. MOTHER |
| WOULD | c. have a long talk with me | c. WOULD |
| | d. send me to bed without supper | d. |

45. If I break something that belongs to my parents,

- | | | |
|--------|----------------------------------|-----------|
| MY | a. send me to bed without supper | a. MY |
| FATHER | b. whip me | b. MOTHER |
| WOULD | c. take away my television | c. WOULD |
| | d. have long talk with me | d. |

APPENDIX F.

The forty-five item questionnaire given to twenty pupils forms I and II at Uthiru Secondary School (chapter IV page and also Appendix G) was not exactly the same as the original questionnaire by Epstein and Komorita (1965, Appendix E). The interviewer made slight alterations in the original questionnaire in order to make her questionnaire suit both the environment and the age of her pilot study sample.

The alterations made in order to make the questionnaire (Appendix G) suit the age of the sample were:-

Instead of the word 'Child' that occurs in numbers, 1, 6, 7, 8, 9, 11, 25 and 31 of the original questionnaire (Epstein and Komarita, 1965); the word 'person' was substituted since the sample consisted of students all above the age of thirteen. It was considered that in most cases such a sample would be aggressive to someone of age similar to theirs. Such a person would not therefore be a 'child' but a more grown-up person hence the word 'person'.

The alterations made in order to make the questionnaire (Appendix G) suit the environmental background of the sample were:-

Original:

1. If I put paint on someone's house.

changed to:-

1. If I dirty someone's house.

N.B.

Original:

7. If I scream at another child.

changed to:-

7. If I abuse another person.

N.B.

(Similarly the word "Abuse" was substituted for the word scream in numbers 15, 19 and 43).

Original:

9. If I talk back to another child

Changed to:

If I am rude to another person.

N.B. (Similarly the word 'rude' was substituted for the phrase 'talk back to' in numbers 12, 41 and 44).

Original:

10. If I start a fire on someone's lawn.

CHANGED TO:

10. If I start a fire on someone's farm (e.g. with crops).

Original:

11. If I break a window.

changed to:-

14. If I break a cooking pot.

Original:

24. If I put sand in someone's car.

changed to:

24. If I put mud on someone's car.

Original:

26. If I pull up the flowers in someone's garden.

changed to:-

If I pull off growing maize stalks from someone's farm.

Original:

28. If I mess up someone's lawn

changed to:

If I dirty our relatives' house after it has been cleaned.

APPENDIX F:

The departmental committee rejected the alterations made by the interview (Appendix F). The interview gave questions 1, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 14, 15, 19, 24, 25, 26, 28, 31, 41, 43, 44, from original questionnaire by Epstein and Komorita (1965, see appendix E) to twenty boys and twenty girls in forms I and II at Riara Secondary School.

They were given the following instructions:-

1. In questions, 1, 6, 7, 8, 9, 11, 25 and 31 the word 'child' has been used. If you were referring to people of your age which word or words would you use instead of this word 'child'.
2. You are requested to read very thoroughly questions 1, 7, 9, 10, 12, 14, 15, 19, 24, 26, 28, 41, 43, and 44. You should then make alternations or changes in these questions so that they may suit an African background.

Results:-

1. Instead of the word child in questions 1, 6, 7, 8, 9, 11, 25 and 31 most of the students substituted the words 'boy' or 'girl'.
2. The results of questions 1, 7, 9, 10, 12, 14, 15, 19, 24, 26, 28, 41, 43 and 44 are below:-

Original:-

1. If I put paint on someone's house.

changed to:-

1. If I write on someone's door with charcoal.

Original:-

7. If I scream at another child.

changed to:

7. If I shout at another boy or girl.

N.B.

(Similarly the word 'Abuse' was substituted for the word scream in numbers 15, 19 and 43).

Footnote: a Here the word original is supposed to mean the

statement as it is in Epstein and Komorita's questionnaire (1968).

Original:

9. If I talk back to another child.

changed to:-

If I abuse another boy or girl.

N.B. (Similarly the word 'Abuse' was substituted for the phrase 'talk back to' in numbers 12, 41 and 44).

Original:

10. If I start a fire on someone's lawn.

changed to:-

14. If I break a cooking pot/glass or calabash.

Original:

24. If I put sand in someone's car.

changed to:

23. If I pull up the flowers in someone's garden.

changed to:-

26. If I pull off growing maize cobs or bean pods from someone's farm.

Original:

28. If I mess up someone's lawn.

changed to:-

If I let cows or goats go into someone's farm.

The above alterations were used in questionnaires IIIA and IIIB of the main study (see appendix II).

APPENDIX G:QUESTIONNAIRE III:PARENTAL PUNITIVE SCALE

Name

Sex

Age

Name of Father

Name of Mother

INSTRUCTIONS:

When children do something wrong their parents may react in different ways. We would like to know what you think would happen if you did something wrong. Look at the following example:

If I hit another person.

MY FATHER	a. ask me to love others as I love myself ..	a. MY
WOULD	b. pinch me ..	b. MOTHER
	c. be angry with me ..	c. WOULD
	d. take away some of my property ..	d.

Show what you think your father would do by putting a circle around the letter a, b, c, or d. Then show what you think your mother might do by putting a circle around one of the letters on the other side. Circle one letter on the 'Father' and one letter on the 'Mother' side.

Any questions?

Please answer all 45 questions. Ask for help any time you need it. I shall be very willing to help.

1. If I dirty someone's house.
 MY a. Ask me to love others as I love myself a. MY
 FATHER b. Pinch me b. MOTHER
 WOULD c. Be angry with me c. WOULD
 d. Take away some of my property d.
2. If I throw a rock at someone's car
 MY a. Ask me to love others as I love myself a. MY
 FATHER b. Pinch me b. MOTHER
 WOULD c. Be angry with me c. WOULD
 d. Take away some of my property d.
3. If I lie to my brother.
 MY a. Ask me to love a. MY
 FATHER b. Pinch me b. MOTHER
 WOULD c. Be angry with c. WOULD
 d. Take away some of my property d.
4. If I throw something at my brother (or sister)
 MY a. Ask me to love others as I love myself a. MY
 FATHER b. Pinch me b. MOTHER
 WOULD c. Be angry with me c. WOULD
 d. Take away some of my property d.
5. If I steal something that belongs to a teacher
 MY a. Ask me to love others as I love myself a. MY
 FATHER b. Pinch me b. MOTHER
 WOULD c. Be angry with me c. WOULD
 d. Take away some of my property d.
6. If I lie to another person
 MY a. Ask me to love others as I love myself a. MY
 FATHER b. Pinch me b. MOTHER
 WOULD c. Be angry with me c. WOULD
 d. Take away some of my property d.
7. If I abuse another person
 MY a. Ask me to love others as I love myself a. MY
 FATHER b. Pinch me b. MOTHER
 WOULD c. Be angry with me c. WOULD
 d. Take away some of my property d.

8. If I break something that belongs to another person
- | | | |
|--------|---|-----------|
| MY | a. Ask me to love others as I love myself | a. MY |
| FATHER | b. Pinch me | b. MOTHER |
| WOULD | c. Be angry with me | c. WOULD |
| | d. Take away some of my property | d. |
9. If I am rude to another person
- | | | |
|--------|---|-----------|
| MY | a. Ask me to love others as I love myself | a. MY |
| FATHER | b. Pinch me | b. MOTHER |
| WOULD | c. Be angry with me | c. WOULD |
| | d. Take away some of my property | d. |
10. If I start a fire on someone's farm (e.g. with crops)
- | | | |
|--------|---|-----------|
| MY | a. Ask me to love others as I love myself | a. MY |
| FATHER | b. Pinch me | b. MOTHER |
| WOULD | c. Be angry with me | c. WOULD |
| | d. Take away some of my property | d. |
11. If I kick another person
- | | | |
|--------|---|-----------|
| MY | a. Ask me to love others as I love myself | a. MY |
| FATHER | b. Pinch me | b. MOTHER |
| WOULD | c. Be angry with me | c. WOULD |
| | d. Take away some of my property | d. |
12. If I am rude to my brother (or sister)
- | | | |
|--------|---|-----------|
| MY | a. Ask me to love others as I love myself | a. MY |
| FATHER | b. Pinch me | b. MOTHER |
| WOULD | c. Be angry with me | c. WOULD |
| | d. Take away some of my property | d. |
13. If I hit my brother (or sister)
- | | | |
|--------|---|-----------|
| MY | a. Ask me to love others as I love myself | a. MY |
| FATHER | b. Pinch me | b. MOTHER |
| WOULD | c. Be angry with me | c. WOULD |
| | d. Take away some of my property. | d. |
14. If I break a cooking pot
- | | | |
|--------|---|-----------|
| MY | a. Ask me to love others as I love myself | a. MY |
| FATHER | b. Pinch me | b. MOTHER |
| WOULD | c. Be angry with me | c. WOULD |
| | d. Take away some of my property | d. |

15. If I abuse a teacher
- | | | |
|--------|---|-----------|
| MY | a. Ask me to love others as I love myself | a. MY |
| FATHER | b. Pinch me | b. MOTHER |
| WOULD | c. Be angry with me | c. WOULD |
| | d. Take away some of my property | d. |
16. If I put ink on other person's clothes
- | | | |
|--------|---|-----------|
| MY | a. Ask me to love others as I love myself | a. MY |
| FATHER | b. Pinch me | b. MOTHER |
| WOULD | c. Be angry with me | c. WOULD |
| | d. Take away some of my property | d. |
17. If I hit a teacher
- | | | |
|--------|---|-----------|
| MY | a. Ask me to love others as I love myself | a. MY |
| FATHER | b. Pinch me | b. MOTHER |
| WOULD | c. Be angry with me | c. WOULD |
| | d. Take away some of my property | d. |
18. If I steal something that belongs to my brother (or sister)
- | | | |
|--------|---|-----------|
| MY | a. Ask me to love others as I love myself | a. MY |
| FATHER | b. Pinch me | b. MOTHER |
| WOULD | c. Be angry with me | c. WOULD |
| | d. Take away some of my property | d. |
19. If I abuse my brother (or sister)
- | | | |
|--------|---|-----------|
| MY | a. Ask me to love others as I love myself | a. MY |
| FATHER | b. Pinch me | b. MOTHER |
| WOULD | c. Be angry with me | c. WOULD |
| | d. Take away some of my property | d. |
20. If I lie to a teacher
- | | | |
|--------|---|-----------|
| MY | a. Ask me to love others as I love myself | a. MY |
| FATHER | b. Pinch me | b. MOTHER |
| WOULD | c. Be angry with me | c. WOULD |
| | d. Take away some of my property | d. |
21. If I break something that belongs to my sister (or brother)
- | | | |
|--------|---|-----------|
| MY | a. Ask me to love others as I love myself | a. MY |
| FATHER | b. Pinch me | b. MOTHER |
| WOULD | c. Be angry with me | c. WOULD |
| | d. Take away some of my property | d. |

22. If I swear at another person
- | | | |
|--------|---|-----------|
| MY | a. Ask me to love others as I love myself | a. MY |
| FATHER | b. Pinch me | b. MOTHER |
| WOULD | c. Be angry with me | c. WOULD |
| | d. Take away some of my property | d. |
23. If I kick my brother (or sister)
- | | | |
|--------|---|-----------|
| MY | a. Ask me to love others as I love myself | a. MY |
| FATHER | b. Pinch me | b. MOTHER |
| WOULD | c. Be angry with me | c. WOULD |
| | d. Take away some of my property | d. |
24. If I put mud on someone's car
- | | | |
|--------|---|-----------|
| MY | a. Ask me to love others as I love myself | a. MY |
| FATHER | b. Pinch me | b. MOTHER |
| WOULD | c. Be angry with me | c. WOULD |
| | d. Take away some of property | d. |
25. If I swear at my parents
- | | | |
|--------|---|-----------|
| MY | a. Ask me to love others as I love myself | a. MY |
| FATHER | b. Pinch me | b. MOTHER |
| WOULD | c. Be angry with me | c. WOULD |
| | d. Take away some of my property | d. |
26. If I pull off growing maize stalks from someone's farm
- | | | |
|--------|---|-----------|
| MY | a. Ask me to love others as I love myself | a. MY |
| FATHER | b. Pinch me | b. MOTHER |
| WOULD | c. Be angry with me | c. WOULD |
| | d. Take away some of my property | d. |
27. If I swear at my brother (or sister)
- | | | |
|--------|---|-----------|
| MY | a. Ask me to love others as I love myself | a. MY |
| FATHER | b. Pinch me | b. MOTHER |
| WOULD | c. Be angry with me | c. WOULD |
| | d. Take away some of my property | d. |
28. If I dirty our house after it has been swept
- | | | |
|--------|---|-----------|
| MY | a. Ask me to love others as I love myself | a. MY |
| FATHER | b. Pinch me | b. MOTHER |
| WOULD | c. Be angry with me | c. WOULD |
| | d. Take away some of my property | d. |

29. If I steal something that belongs to another person
 MY a. Ask me to love others as I love myself a. MY
 FATHER b. Pinch me b. MOTHER
 WOULD c. Be angry with me c. WOULD
 d. Take away some of my property d.
30. If I throw something at my parents
 MY a. Ask me to love others as I love myself a. MY
 FATHER b. Pinch me b. MOTHER
 WOULD c. Be angry with me c. WOULD
 d. Take away some of my property d.
31. If I hit another person
 MY a. Ask me to love others as I love myself a. MY
 FATHER b. Pinch me b. MOTHER
 WOULD c. Be angry with me c. WOULD
 d. Take away some of my property d.
32. If I swear at a teacher
 MY a. Ask me to love others as I love myself a. MY
 FATHER b. Pinch me b. MOTHER
 WOULD c. Be angry with me c. WOULD
 d. Take away some of my property d.
33. If I steal something that belongs to my parents
 MY a. Ask me to love others as I love myself a. MY
 FATHER b. Pinch me b. MOTHERS
 WOULD c. Be angry with me c. WOULD
 d. Take away some of my property d.
34. If I tear someone's book on purpose
 MY a. Ask me to love others as I love myself a. MY
 FATHER b. Pinch b. MOTHER
 WOULD c. Be angry with me c. WOULD
 d. Take away some of my property d.
35. If I kick my parents
 MY a. Ask me to love others as I love myself a. MY
 FATHER b. Pinch me b. MOTHER
 WOULD c. Be angry with me c. WOULD
 d. Take away some of my property. d.

36. If I throw something at my teacher
 MY a. Ask me to love others as I love myself a. MY
 FATHER b. Pinch me b. MOTHER
 WOULD c. Be angry with me c. WOULD
 d. Take away some of my property d.
37. If I break something that belongs to a teacher
 MY a. Ask me to love others as I love myself a. MY
 FATHER b. Pinch me b. MOTHER
 WOULD c. Be angry with me c. WOULD
 d. Take away some of my property d.
38. If I throw something at another person
 MY a. Ask me to love others as I love myself a. MY
 FATHER b. Pinch me b. MOTHER
 WOULD c. Be angry with me c. WOULD
 d. Take away some of my property d.
39. If I kick a teacher
 MY a. Ask me to love others as I love myself a. MY
 FATHER b. Pinch me b. MOTHER
 WOULD c. Be angry with me c. WOULD
 d. Take away some of my property d.
40. If I lie to my parents
 MY a. Ask me to love others as I love myself a. MY
 FATHER b. Pinch me b. MOTHER
 WOULD c. Be angry with me c. WOULD
 d. Take away some of my property d.
41. If I am rude to a teacher
 MY a. Ask me to love others as I love myself a. MY
 FATHER b. Pinch me b. MOTHER
 WOULD c. Be angry with me c. WOULD
 d. Take away some of my property d.
42. If I hit my parents
 MY a. Ask me to love others as I love myself a. MY
 FATHER b. Pinch me b. MOTHER
 WOULD c. Be angry with me c. WOULD
 d. Take away some of my property d.

43. If I abuse my parents
- | | | |
|--------|---|-----------|
| MY | a. Ask me to love others as I love myself | a. MY |
| FATHER | b. Pinch me | b. MOTHER |
| WOULD | c. Be angry with me | c. WOULD |
| | d. Take away some of my property | d. |
44. If I am rude to my parents
- | | | |
|--------|---|-----------|
| MY | a. Ask me to love others as I love myself | a. MY |
| FATHER | b. Pinch me | b. MOTHER |
| WOULD | c. Be angry with me | c. WOULD |
| | d. Take away some of my property | d. |
45. If I break something on purpose that belongs to my parents
- | | | |
|--------|---|-----------|
| MY | a. Ask me to love others as I love myself | a. MY |
| FATHER | b. Pinch me | b. MOTHER |
| WOULD | c. Be angry with me | c. WOULD |
| | d. Take away some of my property | d. |

APPENDIX II.QUESTIONNAIRE III.

NAME

SEX

AGE

ORDER OF BIRTH

NUMBER OF BROTHERS

NUMBER OF SISTERS

NUMBER OF CLER BROTHERS

NUMBER OF CLER SISTERS

NAME OF FATHER

NAME OF MOTHER

FATHER'S EDUCATION LEVEL

MOTHER'S EDUCATION LEVEL

FATHER'S OCCUPATION

MOTHER'S OCCUPATION

AGE OF FATHER

AGE OF MOTHER

WHO OFTEN PUNISHES YOU WHEN YOU DO SOMETHING WRONG?

PARENTAL PUNITIVE SCALEQUESTIONNAIRE III

Name two persons in your home who often punish you when you do something wrong.

A. PERSON A

B. PERSON B

QUESTIONNAIRE III_AINSTRUCTIONS:

When boys and girls of your age do something wrong, the persons who often punish them may react in different ways. We would like to know what you think person A (named above) would do to you if you did something wrong.

Look at the following example:

If I hit another boy or girl

- | | |
|--------|---|
| PERSON | a. Advise me on how to behave |
| A | b. Tell me that I am naughty |
| WOULD | c. Scold me |
| | d. Refuse to help me e.g. not buy clothes; pens; pencils etc. |

Imagine that you hit another boy or girl. Person A might react in different ways:

He may react by:

- Advising you on how to behave
- Telling you that you are naughty
- Scolding you
- Refusing to help you e.g. not buy you clothes; pens; pencils etc.

Show what you think Person A would do by putting a circle around the letter a. b. c. or d.

Any questions?

1. If I write on someone's door with charcoal
- PERSON d. Refuse to help me e.g. not buy clothes; pens;
 A pencils etc.
- WOULD a. Advise me on how to behave
 b. Tell me that I am naughty
 c. Scold me
2. If I throw a rock at someone's car
- PERSON a. Advise me on how to behave
 A b. Tell me that I am naughty
 WOULD c. Scold me.
 d. Refuse to help me e.g. not buy me clothes; pens;
 pencils etc.
3. If I lie to my brother (or sister)
- PERSON c. Scold me
 A a. Advise me on how to behave
 WOULD b. Tell me that I am naughty
 d. Refuse to help me e.g. not buy me clothes; pens;
 pencils etc.
4. If I throw something at my brother (or sister)
- PERSON b. Tell me that I am naughty
 A a. Advise me on how to behave
 WOULD c. Scold me
 d. Refuse to help me e.g. not buy me clothes;
 pens; pencils etc.
5. If I steal something that belongs to a teacher
- PERSON a. Advise me on how to behave
 A d. Refuse to help me e.g. not buy me clothes; pens;
 pencils etc.

- WOULD b. Tell me that I am naughty
c. Scold me
6. If I lie to another boy or girl
PERSON d. Refuse to help me e.g. not buy me clothes; pens;
pencils etc.
A a. Advise me on how to behave
WOULD c. Scold me
b. Tell me that I am naughty
7. If I shout at another boy or girl
PERSON a. Advise me on how to behave
A c. Scold me
WOULD b. Tell me that I am naughty
d. Refuse to help me e.g. not buy me clothes; pens;
pencils etc.
8. If I break something that belongs to another boy or girl
PERSON a. Advise me on how to behave
A b. Tell me that I am naughty
WOULD c. Scold me
d. Refuse to help me e.g. not buy me clothes; pens;
pencils etc.
9. If I abuse another boy or girl
PERSON b. Tell me that I am naughty
A d. Refuse to help me e.g. not buy me clothes; pens;
pencil etc.
WOULD c. Scold me
a. Advise me on how to behave.
10. If I start a fire on someone's farm
PERSON c. Scold me
A a. Advise me on how to behave
WOULD b. Tell me that I am naughty
d. Refuse to help me e.g. not buy me clothes; pens;
pencils etc.

11. If I kick another boy or girl
 PERSON d. Refuse to help me e.g. not buy me clothes; pens; pencils etc.
 A b. Tell me that I am naughty
 WOULD a. Advise me on how to behave
 c. Scold me
12. If I abuse my brother or sister
 PERSON c. Scold me
 A a. Advise me on how to behave
 WOULD b. Tell me that I am naughty
 d. Refuse to help me e.g. not buy me clothes; pens; pencils etc.
13. If I hit my brother (or sister)
 PERSON b. Tell me that I am naughty
 A d. Refuse to help me e.g. not buy me clothes; pens; pencils; etc.
 WOULD c. Scold me
 a. Advise me on how to behave
14. If I break a cooking pot/glass or calabash
 PERSON a. Advise me on how to behave
 A. d. Refuse to help me e.g. not buy me clothes; pens; pencils etc.
 WOULD b. Tell me that I am naughty
 c. Scold me
15. If I shout at a teacher
 PERSON d. Refuse to help me e.g. not buy me clothes; pens; pencils etc.
 A

- WOULD b. Tell me that I am naughty
 c. Scold me
 a. Advise me on how to behave
16. If I put ink on someone's clothing
- PERSON a. Advise me on how to behave
 b. Tell me that I am naughty
 c. Scold me
 d. Refuse to help me e.g. not buy me clothes; pens;
 pencils etc.
- WOULD
17. If I hit a teacher
- PERSON c. Scold me
 b. Tell me that I am naughty
 d. Refuse to help me e.g. not buy me clothes; pens;
 pencils etc.
 a. Advise me on how to behave
- WOULD
18. If I steal something that belongs to my brother or sister
- PERSON b. Tell me that I am naughty
 c. Scold me
 a. Advise me on how to behave
 d. Refuse to help me e.g. not buy me clothes; pens;
 pencils etc.
- WOULD
19. If I shout at my brother (or sister)
- PERSON d. Refuse to help me e.g. not buy me clothes; pens;
 pencils etc.
 a. Advise me on how to behave
- A
- WOULD b. Tell me that I am naughty
 c. Scold me

20. If I lie to a teacher

PERSON b. Scold me

A d. Refuse to help me e.g. not buy me clothes; Pens; pencils etc.

WOULD a. Advise me on how to behave

b. Tell me that I am naughty

21. If I break something that belongs to my sister or brother

PERSON b. Tell me that I am naughty

A d. Refuse to help me e.g. not buy me clothes; pens; pencils, etc.

WOULD c. Scold me

a. Advise me on how to behave.

22. If I swear at my brother or sister

PERSON a. Advise me on how to behave

A b. Tell me that I am naughty

WOULD c. Scold me

d. Refuse to help me e.g. not buy me clothes; pens; pencils etc.

23. If I kick my brother (or sister)

PERSON a. Advise me on how to behave

A d. Refuse to help me e.g. not buy me clothes; pens; pencils etc.

WOULD b. Tell me that I am naughty

c. Scold me

24. If I put mud on someone's car on purpose

PERSON b. Tell me that I am naughty

A c. Scold me

WOULD d. Refuse to help me e.g. not buy me clothes; pens; pencils etc.

25. If I swear at another boy or girl
 PERSON d. Refuse to help me e.g. not buy me clothes; pens;
 pencils etc.
 A a. Advise me on how to behave
 WOULD b. Tell me that I am naughty
 c. Scold me
26. If I pull up maize cobs or bean pods from someone's farm
 PERSON c. Scold me
 A a. Advise me on how to behave
 WOULD b. Tell me that I am naughty
 d. Refuse to help me e.g. not buy me clothes; pens;
 pencils etc.
27. If I swear at my parents
 PERSON a. Advise me on how to behave
 A d. Refuse to help me e.g. not buy me clothes; pens;
 pencils etc.
 WOULD b. Tell me that I am naughty
 c. Scold me
28. If I let cows or goats go into someone's farm
 PERSON b. Tell me that I am naughty
 A d. Refuse to help me e.g. not buy me clothes; pens;
 pencils etc.
 WOULD a. Advise me on how to behave
 c. Scold me
29. If I steal something that belongs to another boy or girl
 PERSON d. Refuse to help me e.g. not buy me clothes; pens;
 pencils etc.
 A c. Scold me
 WOULD b. Tell me that I am naughty
 a. Advise me on how to behave
30. If I throw something at my parents
 PERSON a. Advise me on how to behave
 A b. Tell me that I am naughty
 WOULD c. Scold me
 d. Refuse to help me e.g. not buy me clothes; pens;
 pencils etc.
31. If I hit another boy or girl
 PERSON d. Refuse to help me e.g. not buy me clothes; pens;
 pencils etc.

- A a. Advise me on how to behave
 WOULD b. Tell me that I am naughty
 c. Scold me
52. If I swear at a teacher
 PERSON c. Scold me
 A d. Refuse to help me e.g. not buy me clothes;
 pens; pencils
 WOULD b. Tell me that I am naughty
 a. Advise me on how to behave
53. If I steal something that belongs to my parents
 PERSON c. Scold me
 A d. Refuse to help me e.g. not buy me clothes; pens;
 pencils etc.
 WOULD b. Tell me that I am naughty
 a. Advise me on how to behave
34. If I tear someone's book on purpose
 PERSON a. Advise me on how to behave
 A c. Scold me
 WOULD b. Tell me that I am naughty
 d. Refuse to help me e.g. not buy me clothes; pens;
 pencils etc.
35. If I kick my parents
 PERSON b. Tell me that I am naughty
 A d. Refuse to help me e.g. not buy me clothes; pens;
 pencils etc.
 WOULD a. Advise me on how to behave
 c. Scold me
36. If I throw something at my teacher
 PERSON a. Advise me on how to behave
 A b. Tell me that I am naughty
 WOULD c. Scold me
 d. Refuse to help me e.g. not buy me clothes; pens;
 pencils; etc.
37. If I break something that belongs to a teacher
 PERSON c. Scold me
 A d. Refuse to help me e.g. not buy me clothes; pens;
 pencils etc.
 WOULD a. Advise me on how to behave
 b. Tell me that I am naughty

38. If I throw something at another boy or girl
 PERSON d. Refuse to help me e.g. not buy me clothes;
 Pens; pencils etc.
 A a. Advise me on how to behave
 WOULD b. Tell me that I am naughty
 c. Scold me
39. If I kick a teacher
 PERSON b. Tell me that I am naughty
 A a. Advise me on how to behave
 WOULD c. Scold me
 d. Refuse to help me e.g. not buy me clothes;
 pens; pencils etc.
40. If I lie at my parents
 PERSON c. Scold me
 A a. Advise me on how to behave
 WOULD b. Tell me that I am naughty
 d. Refuse to help me e.g. not buy me clothes;
 pens; pencils etc.
41. If I abuse my teacher
 PERSON a. Advise me on how to behave
 A d. Refuse to help me e.g. not buy me clothes;
 pens; pencils etc.
 WOULD c. Scold me
 b. Tell me that I am naughty.
42. If I hit my parents
 PERSON b. Tell me that I am naughty
 A d. Refuse to help me e.g. not buy me clothes;
 pens; pencils etc.
 WOULD a. Advise me on how to behave
 c. Scold me
43. If I shout at my parents
 PERSON a. Advise me on how to behave
 A d. Refuse to help me e.g. not buy me clothes;
 pens; pencils etc.
 WOULD b. Tell me that I am naughty

c. Scold me.

44. If I abuse my parents

PERSON a. Advise me on how to behave

A b. Tell me that I am naughty

WOULD c. Scold me

d. Refuse to help me e.g. not buy me clothes;
pens; pencils etc.

45. If I break something on purpose that belongs to my parents

PERSON c. Scold me

A a. Advise me on how to behave

WOULD b. Tell me that I am naughty

d. Refuse to help me e.g. not buy me clothes;
pens; pencils etc.

APPENDIX II:PARENTAL PUNITIVE SCALE:QUESTIONNAIRE IIIB:INSTRUCTIONS:-

When boys and girls of your age do something wrong, the persons who often punish them may react in different ways. We would like to know what you think person B (named previously by you) would do to you if you did something wrong.

Look at the following example:-

If I hit another boy or girl

PERSON	a. Advise me on how to behave
	b. Tell me that I am naughty
B	c. Scold me
WOULD	d. Refuse to help me e.g. not buy me clothes; pens; pencils etc.

Show what you think Person B would do by putting a circle around letter a. b. c. or d.

Any questions?

1. If I write on someone's door with charcoal
 PERSON d. Refuse to help me e.g. not buy me clothes;
 pens; pencils etc.
 B a. Advise me on how to behave
 WOULD b. Tell me that I am naughty
2. If I throw a rock at someone's car
 PERSON a. Advise me on how to behave
 B b. Tell me that I am naughty
 WOULD c. Scold me
 d. Refuse to help me e.g. not buy me clothes;
 pens; pencils etc.
3. If I lie to my brother (or sister)
 PERSON c. Scold me
 B a. Advise me on how to behave
 WOULD b. Tell me that I am naughty
 d. Refuse to help me e.g. not buy me clothes;
 pens; pencils etc.
4. If I throw something at my brother (or sister)
 PERSON b. Tell me that I am naughty
 B a. Advise me on how to behave
 WOULD c. Scold me
 d. Refuse to help me e.g. not buy me clothes;
 pens; pencils etc.
5. If I steal something that belongs to a teacher
 PERSON a. Advise me on how to behave
 B d. Refuse to help me e.g. not buy me clothes;
 pens; pencils etc.
6. If I lie to another boy or girl
 PERSON d. Refuse to help me e.g. not buy me clothes;
 B pens; pencils etc.
 WOULD a. Advise me on how to behave
 c. Scold me
 b. Tell me that I am naughty
7. If I shout at another boy or girl
 PERSON d. Refuse to help me e.g. not buy me clothes;
 pens; pencils etc.
 B a. Advise me on how to behave
 WOULD b. Tell me that I am naughty
 c. Scold me

8. If I break something that belongs to another boy or girl
- PERSON a. Advise me on how to behave
 B b. Tell me that I am naughty
 WOULD c. Scold me
 d. Refuse to help me e.g. not buy me clothes;
 pens; pencils etc.
9. If I abuse another boy or girl
- PERSON b. Tell me that I am naughty
 B d. Refuse to help me e.g. not buy me clothes;
 pens; pencils etc.
 WOULD a. Advise me on how to behave
 c. Scold me.
10. If I start a fire on someone's farm
- PERSON a. Scold me
 B a. Advise me on how to behave
 WOULD b. Tell me that I am naughty
 d. Refuse to help me e.g. not buy me clothes;
 pens; pencils etc.
11. If I kick another boy or girl
- PERSON d. Refuse to help me e.g. not buy me clothes;
 pens; pencils etc.
 B b. Tell me that I am naughty
 WOULD a. Advise me on how to behave
 c. Scold me
12. If I abuse my brother (or sister)
- PERSON c. Scold me
 B a. Advise me on how to behave
 WOULD b. Tell me that I am naughty
 d. Refuse to help me e.g. not buy me clothes;
 pens; pencils etc.
13. If I hit my brother (or sister)
- PERSON b. Tell me that I am naughty
 B d. Refuse to help me e.g. not buy me clothes;
 pens; pencils etc.
 WOULD c. Scold me
 a. Advise me on how to behave.

14. If I break a cooking pot/glass or calabash
 PERSON a. Advise me on how to behave
 B d. Refuse to help me e.g. not buy me clothes;
 pens; pencils etc.
15. If I shout at a teacher
 PERSON d. Refuse to help me e.g. not buy me clothes;
 pens; pencils etc.
 B b. Tell me that I am naughty
 WOULD c. Scold me
 e. Advise me on how to behave
16. If I put ink on someone's clothing
 PERSON a. Advise me on how to behave
 B b. Tell me that I am naughty
 WOULD c. Scold me
 d. Refuse to help me e.g. not buy me clothes;
 pens; pencils etc.
17. If I hit a teacher
 PERSON c. Scold me
 B b. Tell me that I am naughty
 WOULD d. Refuse to help me e.g. not buy me clothes;
 pens; pencils etc.
 a. Advise me on how to behave.
18. If I steal something that belongs to my brother or sister
 PERSON b. Tell me that I am naughty
 B c. Scold me
 WOULD a. Advise me on how to behave
 d. Refuse to help me e.g. not buy me clothes;
 pens; pencils etc.
19. If I shout at my brother (or sister)
 PERSON d. Refuse to help me e.g. not buy me clothes;
 pens; pencils etc.
 B a. Advise me on how to behave
 WOULD b. Tell me that I am naughty
 c. Scold me.
20. If I lie to a teacher
 PERSON c. Scold me
 B d. Refuse to help me e.g. not buy me clothes;
 pens; pencils etc.
 WOULD a. Advise me on how to behave
 b. Tell me that I am naughty.

21. If I break something that belongs to my sister or brother
- PERSON b. Tell me that I am naughty
 B d. Refuse to help me e.g. not buy me clothes;
 pens; pencils etc.
- WOULD c. Scold me
 a. Advise me on how to behave
22. If I swear at my brother or sister
- PERSON a. Advise me on how to behave
 B b. Tell me that I am naughty
 WOULD c. Scold me
 d. Refuse to help me e.g. not buy me clothes;
 pens; pencils etc.
23. If I kick my brother (or sister)
- PERSON a. Advise me on how to behave
 B d. Refuse to help me e.g. not buy me clothes;
 pens; pencils etc.
- WOULD b. Tell me that I am naughty
 c. Scold me
24. If I put mud on someone's car on purpose
- PERSON b. Tell me that I am naughty
 B c. Scold me
 WOULD d. Refuse to help me e.g. not buy me clothes;
 pens; pencils etc.
- a. Advise me on how to behave
25. If I swear at another boy or girl
- PERSON d. Refuse to help me e.g. not buy me clothes;
 pens; pencils etc.
- a. Advise me on how to behave
 B b. Tell me that I am naughty
 WOULD c. Scold me
26. If I pull up maize cobs or bean pods from someone's farm
- PERSON c. Scold me
 B a. Advise me on how to behave
 WOULD b. Tell me that I am naughty
 d. Refuse to help me e.g. not buy me clothes;
 pens; pencils etc.

27. If I swear at my parents
 PERSON
 B
 WOULD
 a. Advise me on how to behave
 b. Refuse to help me e.g. not buy me clothes; pens; pencils etc.
 c. Scold me
 d. Tell me that I am naughty
28. If I let cows or goats go into someone's farm
 PERSON
 B
 WOULD
 a. Advise me on how to behave
 b. Tell me that I am naughty
 c. Scold me
 d. Refuse to help me e.g. not buy me clothes; pens; pencils etc.
29. If I steal something that belongs to another boy or girl
 PERSON
 B
 WOULD
 a. Advise me on how to behave
 b. Tell me that I am naughty
 c. Scold me
 d. Refuse to help me e.g. not buy me clothes; pens; pencils etc.
30. If I throw something at my parents
 PERSON
 B
 WOULD
 a. Advise me on how to behave
 b. Tell me that I am naughty
 c. Scold me
 d. Refuse to help me e.g. not buy me clothes; pens; pencils etc.
31. If I hit another boy or girl
 PERSON
 B
 WOULD
 a. Advise me on how to behave
 b. Tell me that I am naughty
 c. Scold me
 d. Refuse to help me e.g. not buy me clothes; pens; pencils etc.
32. If I swear at a teacher
 PERSON
 B
 WOULD
 a. Advise me on how to behave
 b. Tell me that I am naughty
 c. Scold me
 d. Refuse to help me e.g. not buy me clothes; pens; pencils etc.
33. If I steal something that belongs to my parents
 PERSON
 B
 WOULD
 a. Advise me on how to behave
 b. Tell me that I am naughty
 c. Scold me
 d. Refuse to help me e.g. not buy me clothes; pens; pencils etc.

34. If I tear someone's book on purpose
 PERSON
 B
 WOULD
 b. Tell me that I am naughty
 a. Advise me on how to behave.
35. If I kick my parents
 PERSON
 B
 WOULD
 b. Tell me that I am naughty
 d. Refuse to help me e.g. not buy me clothes; pens; pencils etc.
 a. Advise me on how to behave
 c. Scold me
36. If I throw something at my teacher
 PERSON
 B
 WOULD
 a. Advise me on how to behave
 b. Tell me that I am naughty
 c. Scold me
 d. Refuse to help me e.g. not buy me clothes; pens; pencils etc.
37. If I break something that belongs to a teacher
 PERSON
 B
 WOULD
 c. Scold me
 d. Refuse to help me e.g. not buy me clothes; pens; pencils etc.
 a. Advise me on how to behave
 b. Tell me that I am naughty
38. If I throw something at another boy or girl
 PERSON
 B
 WOULD
 d. Refuse to help me e.g. not buy me clothes; pens; pencils etc.
 a. Advise me on how to behave
 b. Tell me that I am naughty
 c. Scold me
39. If I kick a teacher
 PERSON
 B
 WOULD
 b. Tell me that I am naughty
 a. Advise me on how to behave
 c. Scold me
 d. Refuse to help me e.g. not buy me clothes; pens; pencils etc.

40. If I lie at my parents

PERSON c. Scold me

B a. Advise me on how to behave

WOULD b. Tell me that I am naughty

d. Refuse to help me e.g. not buy me clothes;
pens; pencils etc.

41. If I abuse my teacher

PERSON a. Advise me on how to behave

B d. Refuse to help me e.g. not buy me clothes;
pens; pencils etc.

WOULD c. Scold me

b. Tell me that I am naughty

42. If I hit my parents

PERSON

b. Tell me that I am naughty

B

d. Refuse to help me e.g. not buy me clothes;
pens; pencils etc.

WOULD

a. Advise me on how to behave

c. Scold me

43. If I shout at my parents

PERSON

a. Advise me on how to behave

B

d. Refuse to help me e.g. not buy me clothes;
pens; pencils etc.

WOULD

b. Tell me that I am naughty

c. Scold me

44. If I abuse my parents

PERSON

a. Advise me on how to behave

B

b. Tell me that I am naughty

WOULD

c. Scold me

d. Refuse to help me e.g. not buy me clothes;
pens; pencils etc.

45. If I break something on purpose that belongs to my parents

PERSON

c. Scold me

B

a. Advise me on how to behave

WOULD

b. Tell me that I am naughty

d. Refuse to help me e.g. not buy me clothes;
pens; pencils etc.

APPENDIX IQUESTIONNAIRE IV

NAME

AGE

SEX

RELIGION/RELIGIOUS DENOMINATION

Circle only one number in questions 1 - 7.

1. Suppose you have gone to a Girl Guides' or Boy Scouts' camp. On arriving at the Camps ground you are requested to choose one girl/boy to share camp the camp work with. Since you do not know anyone in the camp you are given a list of few of names of boys or girls attending the camp. You are asked to choose from this list one person with whom to share the tent. If the following were the names given to you which one person would you choose?

- | | |
|------------|---------------|
| 1. Shiykah | 8. Oneko |
| 2. Mutua | 9. Mukwanjeru |
| 3. Kwaniki | 10. Ali |
| 4. Oloo | 11. Kisilu |
| 5. Mareto | 12. Mwangi |
| 6. Hamisi | 13. Njagi |
| 7. Nyaga | 14. Khasiani |

2. Let us suppose that you belong to the Young Farmer's Association. You are sent by the other members of Young Farmer's Association in your school to represent them in the yearly meeting of Young Farmer's Association held in Nairobi. On arriving in Nairobi you are told that after the meeting is opened all members must join the group given to them. Since the various group members do not know each other, they are given a list of names of people in their group. Each one of them is asked to choose one name of the person they want to lead their group. Suppose the following are the names given to you, which name would you choose?

- | | |
|---------------|-------------|
| 1. Mukwanjeru | 8. Mwangi |
| 2. Oloo | 9. Shiyukah |
| 3. Mutua | 10. Ali |
| 4. Njagi | 11. Oneko |
| 5. Kwaniki | 12. Nyaga |
| 6. Khasiani | 13. Kisilu |
| 7. Kamisi | 14. Marete |

3. Suppose your sister falls in love with a boy. Your parents come to know about it, and they become very angry. They tell her to leave the boy because they would never consent to their marriage. Whom do you think the boy was?

- | | |
|-------------|----------------|
| 1. Ali | 8. Kisilu |
| 2. Karote | 9. Kwaniki |
| 3. Khasiani | 10. Nyaga |
| 4. Uloo | 11. Shiyukah |
| 5. Kijagi | 12. Onoko |
| 6. Mutua | 13. Kamisi |
| 7. Mwangi | 14. Mukwanjeru |

4. A group of people from a certain religious denomination or religion are collecting donations to build a church. They approach Mr. Kamau who is very rich. Mr. Kamau refuses to give them any money. To which religion or religious denomination do you think these people belonged?

1. Islam
2. Israeli
3. Prophets
4. Catholic
5. Protestant
6. Religion of Mary
7. Hindu

5. Suppose your sister fell in love with a boy. On finding out about this boy your parents become very angry and ask her to leave the boy because they could never agree to their marriage. Of the following religions mentioned, to which do you think the boy belonged?

- | | |
|---------------------|-------------|
| 1. Religion of Mary | 5. Prophets |
| 2. Catholic | 6. Islam |
| 3. Hindu | 7. Israeli |
| 4. Protestant | |

6. Kamau is a social worker. He worked in many different districts of Kenya. In one of those districts he could not get on with the people. He was also very unhappy there. Which of the district mentioned below do you think this happened to him?

- | | |
|-------------|-------------|
| 1. Maru | 6. Embu |
| 2. Makamega | 7. Kisumu |
| 3. Nyeri | 8. Machakos |
| 4. Kitui | 9. Murang'a |
| 5. Lusia | |

7. Kimani went to a student camp during one Christmas holiday. On the first day he met a girl. After talking to her he like her. He also decided to make friends with her so that he could do most of the camp jobs with her. He however dropped this idea when he found out more about her. Whom do you think this girl was? Circle one number below.

1. Mukwanjeru
2. Madja
3. Waithera
4. Nduku
5. Akinyi
6. Akala

8. Below are nine descriptions of fellow students who are in this group. Against each of the descriptions name all the students whom you think the description best fits.

1. When he/she does not get his way he/she gets very angry.
2. He/she is very mean.
3. He/she is very wild.
4. He/she makes fun of people.
5. He/she does not pay attention to the teacher.
6. He/she tries to get others into trouble.
7. He/she always messes around and gets into trouble.
8. He/she says he/she can beat everybody up.
9. He/she likes to pick on anyone who is younger than he/she is.

APPENDIX J

The pilot study subjects' paternal, maternal and mean parental punitive scores; their sex, birth - order, prejudice and aggression scores and also their fathers' educational level

1	2		3	4	5	6	7	8
Number of Subjects	Paternal Punitive Scores	Maternal Punitive Scores	Mean Parental Punitive Scores	Sex	Birth-Order	Prejudice Scores	Aggression Scores	Subjects' Fathers' Education Level
1	108	111	109.5	F	Fourth	5	2	1
2	136	140	138	M	Third	4	27	1
3	132	118	125	F	Third	5	3	1
4	129	120	124.5	F	First	6	31	0
5	115	126	120.5	M	Second	5	5	0
6	116	118	117	F	Fourth	5	-	1
7	113	120	116.5	M	Third	-	25	0
8	108	123	115.5	M	Sixth	5	10	1
9	117	107	112	F	Second	6	8	1
10	100	122	111	F	First	6	26	1
11	127	94	110.5	M	First	-	-	1
12	116	100	108	F	Third	4	7	1
13	110	101	105.5	M	Third	6	6	1
14	104	105	104.5	M	First	-	-	1
15	112	94	103	M	Second	4	12	1
16	89	110	99.5	M	Seventh	5	14	1
17	105	92	93.5	F	Second	-	-	1
18	98	99	93.5	F	Fourth	7	21	1
19	79	98	88.5	F	Third	6	9	1

Column 4, M stands for male and F for female.

Column 8, I represents 'fathers' who had been to school while

'O' represents those had never been to school.

APPENDIX K

Computation of a t - test to test whether there was a statistically significant difference in punitiveness between the mother and the father.

Ed = 16, where 'd' was the difference between punitive score for an individual obtained in mother and father

$$d = 0.8421$$

$$S. d. = 14.8969$$

$$S.E. (\bar{d}) = \frac{14.8969}{\sqrt{19}} = 3.4176$$

$$t = \frac{0.8421}{3.4176} = 0.2465$$

$$d.f. = 18$$

The value of critical 't' (18 d.f.) was 2.10 at 5% significance level and the value of the observed 't' was 0.2465. Since the critical value was greater than the observed value, it was concluded that there was statistically no significant difference in punitiveness between mother and father.

APPENDIX I

The subjects' punitive scores for Persons A and B, their sex, birth order, prejudice and aggression scores and the education level of their 'fathers' and 'mothers'

1 Subject Number	2 Punitive scores			3 Sex	4 Birth Order	5 Prejudice Scores	6 Aggression Scores	7 Education Level of mothers	8 Education Level of fathers
	Person	Person	Ave.						
	A	B							
1	111	96	103.5	M	Third	7	4	1	1
2	100	92	96	M	Fourth	6	17	1	1
3	104	69	86.5	M	Last	6	1	0	0
4	100	88	94	M	Third	6	26	1	0
5	113	114	113.5	M	Last	4	4	1	1
6	98	93	95.5	M	First	6	9	0	1
7	112	135	123.5	M	Sixth	6	14	0	0
8	112	108	110	M	Fifth	7	2	1	1
9	109	64	86.5	M	Seventh	7	4	1	1
10	120	107	113.5	M	Second	4	12	1	1
11	111	112	111.5	M	Last	6	8	1	1
12	111	121	116	M	Fifth	7	9	0	1
13	111	115	113	M	Third	6	5	0	0
14	93	92	92.5	M	Fourth	6	15	1	1
15	93	91	92	M	Second	7	15	1	1
16	101	106	103.5	M	Last	2	14	0	0
17	111	82	96.5	M	Fourth	5	17	0	1
18	103	99	101	M	Last	7	5	0	0
19	89	112	100.5	M	Fourth	4	11	0	1
20	125	126	125.5	M	First	6	6	1	1
21	118	115	116.5	M	Third	5	6	0	0
22	94	79	86.5	M	First	7	0	0	1
23	10	111	109	M	Fourth	7	6	0	0

1	2			3	4	5	6	7	8
24	117	72	94.5	M	Second	6	3	1	1
25	110	95	102.5	M	Third	6	3	1	1
26	120	102	111	M	Second	3	2	1	1
27	119	122	120.5	M	Third	6	7	1	1
28	112	116	114	M	Fourth	6	17	1	1
29	119	109	114	M	Fifth	6	21	1	1
30	112	99	105.5	M	Sixth	4	10	0	1
31	115	129	122	M	Second	6	8	1	1
32	119	103	111	M	Third	7	22	0	1
33	66	89	77.5	M	Third	5	5	1	1
34	50	45	47.5	M	Second	3	6	1	1
35	113	85	99	M	Last	6	6	1	1
36	73	61	67	M	Third	5	5	1	1
37	85	110	97.5	M	First	5	6	1	1
38	97	90	93.5	M	Third	7	9	1	1
39	111	112	111.5	M	Second	4	3	0	1
40	67	46	56.5	M	Fifth	5	3	0	0
41	108	105	106.5	M	Ninth	5	1	0	0
42	103	74	88.5	M	Third	6	5	1	1
43	101	133	117	M	Second	4	7	0	0
44	93	114	103.5	M	Third	6	8	1	1
45	100	97	98.5	M	Sixth	6	10	0	0
46	92	100	96	M	First	7	1	1	1
47	100	111	105.5	M	Second	5	10	1	1
48	112	96	104	M	Third	5	11	1	1
49	85	52	68.5	F	Fourth	7	6	1	1
50	126	127	126.5	F	Third	3	10	1	1
51	90	85	87.5	F	Third	4	6	1	1

1	2			3	4	5	6	7	8
52	119	117	118	F	Second	2	0	1	1
53	112	104	108	F	First	5	3	1	1
54	117	104	110.5	F	Last	5	4	1	1
55	107	94	100.5	F	First	6	3	0	1
56	124	118	121	F	First	4	3	0	1
57	120	88	104	F	First	4	4	1	1
58	114	111	112.5	F	Fourth	3	0	1	1
59	119	110	114.5	F	Third	2	0	0	0
60	105	98	101.5	F	Fifth	6	5	0	0
61	115	124	119.5	F	Seventh	2	18	0	0
62.	123	114	118.5	F	First	4	36	1	1
63	124	87	105.5	F	First	7	22	1	1
64	45	101	73	F	First	5	13	1	1
65	45	99	72	F	Fourth	5	7	0	1
66	70	61	65.5	F	Fourth	7	14	1	1
67	121	107	114	F	Fourth	6	14	1	1
68	113	111	112	F	First	7	24	1	1
69	109	100	104.5	F	First	5	21	0	1
70	119	97	108	F	Second	6	24	1	1
71	114	104	109	F	First	7	14	0	1
72	98	102	100	F	Fourth	6	12	0	1
73	110	118	114	F	First	5	14	0	1
74	117	112	114.5	F	Eighth	4	13	0	1
75	109	118	113.5	F	Sixth	6	21	1	1
76	113	121	117	F	Last	6	19	0	1
77	126	125	125.5	F	Second	4	2	1	1
78	119	45	82	F	Third	6	9	1	1
79	129	55	92	F	Third	5	33	1	1

1	2			3	4	5	6	7	8
80	102	112	107	F	Third	4	13	1	1
81	98	93	95.5	F	First	6	15	1	1
82	93	109	101	F	Fourth	5	4	1	1
83	134	134	134	F	Seventh	3	12	1	1
84	162	151	156.5	F	First	5	20	1	1
85	126	119	122.5	F	Fourth	3	5	1	1
86	127	45	86	F	Third	6	3	1	1
87	113	128	120.5	F	Second	5	13	0	1
88	96	118	107	F	First	5	9	1	1
89	107	93	100	F	Fifth	5	22	0	1
90	116	101	108.5	F	First	6	6	1	1
91	97	108	102.5	F	First	4	21	0	1
92	92	91	91.5	F	Second	3	7	0	0
93	116	103	109.5	F	First	4	33	1	1
94	100	109	104.5	F	Second	4	27	1	1
95	108	79	93.5	F	Second	6	21	1	1

APPENDIX M

Computation of a t - test to test whether there was a statistically significant difference in punitiveness for aggression between Person A and Person B.

The punitive scores for Persons A and B appear in appendix L (page

Since these two variables were correlated the following method was used.

(d) = 526, where 'd' was the difference between the punitive scores of an individual obtained in Persons A and B.

$$\bar{d} = 5.5368$$

$$\text{S.d.} = \sqrt{\frac{1}{94} \left[46960 - \frac{(526)^2}{95} \right]} = 21.647$$

$$\text{S.E.}(\bar{d}) = \frac{\text{S.d.}(\bar{d})}{\sqrt{n}} = \frac{21.647}{\sqrt{95}} = 2.2209$$

$$t = \frac{\bar{d} - 0}{\text{S.E.}(\bar{d})} = \frac{5.5368}{2.2209} = 2.493$$

$$\text{d.f.} = 94$$

The value of critical 't' (94 d.f.) was 1.986 at 5% significance level and the value of the observed 't' was 2.493. Since the observed value was greater than the critical value, 't' was statistically significant, hence it was concluded that there was a statistically significant difference in punitiveness between Person A and Person B. Person A was more punitive than Person B.

APPENDIX N

Computation of a t statistic to test whether there was a statistically significant difference in punitiveness for aggression between boys and girls.

The punitive scores for boys and girls appear in appendix I (pages 197-200).

$$\bar{X} \text{ (Boys' sample)} = 202.1042$$

$$\text{Variance (Boys' sample)} = 1009.9684 (S_B^2)$$

$$\bar{X} \text{ (Girls' Sample)} = 211.6179$$

$$\text{Variance (Girls' Sample)} = 1161.7190 (S_G^2)$$

$$\text{Total number of boys} = 48 (n_B)$$

$$\text{Total number of girls} = 47 (n_a)$$

$$t = \frac{\bar{X}_B - \bar{X}_a}{\text{S.E.}(\bar{X}_B - \bar{X}_a)}$$
$$\text{S.E.}(\bar{X}_B - \bar{X}_a) = \sqrt{S_p^2 \left(\frac{1}{n_B} + \frac{1}{n_a} \right)}$$

$$S_p^2 = \frac{(n_B - 1) S_B^2 + (n_a - 1) S_a^2}{(n_B - 1) + (n_a - 1)}$$
$$= \frac{47(1009.9684) + 46(1161.7190)}{47 + 46}$$

$$= 1085.0278$$

$$\text{S.E.}(\bar{X}_B - \bar{X}_a) = \sqrt{1085.0278 \left(\frac{1}{48} + \frac{1}{47} \right)}$$

$$= \frac{46.6736}{6.8318} = 6.8318$$

$$t = \frac{202.1042 - 211.6170}{6.8318} = - \frac{9.5128}{6.8318}$$

$$= - 1.3924$$

$$t(d.f.) = 93$$

The value of critical 't' (93 d.f.) was 1.986 at 5% significance level and the value of the observed 't' was - 1.3924. Since the critical value was greater than the observed value, t was not statistically significant hence it was concluded that there was no significant difference in punitiveness for aggression between boys and girls.

APPENDIX O

Computation of a t statistic test to test whether there was a statistically significant difference in punitiveness for aggression between boys and girls in Person A.

The punitive scores for Person A appear in appendix L (pages 197 - 200).

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Number of boys} &= 48 \quad (n_B) \\ \bar{X} \text{ (Boys' sample)} &= 103.3333 \quad (\bar{X}_B) \\ \text{Variance (Boys' sample)} &= 234.1844 \quad (S_B^2) \\ \text{Number of girls} &= 47 \quad (n_G) \\ \bar{X} \text{ (Girls' sample)} &= 109.4468 \quad (\bar{X}_G) \\ \text{Variance (Girls' sample)} &= 404.3830 \quad (S_G^2) \\ S_p^2 &= \frac{47(234.1844) + 46(404.3830)}{93} = 318.3686 \\ \text{S.E.}(\bar{X}_G - \bar{X}_B) &= \sqrt{\frac{318.3686 \left(\frac{1}{47} + \frac{1}{48}\right)}{}} = 3.6615 \\ t &= \frac{109.4468 - 103.3333}{3.6615} = \frac{6.1138}{3.6615} \\ &= 1.6697 \\ \text{d.f.} &= 93 \end{aligned}$$

The value of critical 't' (93 d.f.) was 1.986 at 5% significance level and the value of the observed 't' was 1.6697. Since the critical value was greater than the observed value, 't' was not statistically significant, hence it was concluded that there was no significant difference in punitiveness between boys and girls in Person A.

APPENDIX P

Computation of a t statistic test to test whether there was statistically a significant difference in punitiveness for aggression between girls and boys in Person B.

The punitive scores of Person B appear in appendix L (pages 197 - 200).

$$n_G = 47$$

$$\bar{X}_G = 102.1702$$

$$S_G^2 = 498.0139$$

$$n_B = 48$$

$$\bar{X}_B = 98.7917$$

$$S_B^2 = 418.8493$$

$$S_p^2 = \frac{47(418.8493) + 46(498.0139)}{93} = 458.0060$$

$$S.E.(\bar{X}_G - \bar{X}_B) = \sqrt{\frac{458.0060 \left(\frac{1}{47} + \frac{1}{48} \right)}{}} = 4.3916$$

$$t = \frac{102.1702 - 98.7917}{4.3916} = 0.76931$$

$$d.f. = 93$$

The value of critical 't' (93 d.f.) was 1.986 at 5% significance level and the value of the observed 't' was 0.76931. Since the critical value was greater than the observed value, 't' was not statistically significant, hence it was concluded that there was statistically no significant difference in punitiveness for aggression between girls and boys in Person A.

APPENDIX Q

Computation of a t statistic test to test whether there was a statistically significant difference in punitiveness between 'fathers' who had been to school and those who had not.

The education level of 'fathers' appear in appendix L (pages 197 - 200).

Number of 'fathers' who had been to school was 76 (n_1)

$$\bar{X}_1 = 106.6184$$

$$S_1^2 = 375.8925$$

Number of 'fathers' who had not been to school was 19 (n_2)

$$\bar{X}_2 = 105.2105$$

$$S_2^2 = 128.6199$$

$$S_p^2 = \frac{75(375.8925) + 18(128.6199)}{75 + 18}$$

$$= 328.0332$$

$$S.E.(\bar{X}_1 - \bar{X}_2) = \sqrt{328.0332 \left(\frac{1}{76} + \frac{1}{19} \right)}$$

$$= 4.7537$$

$$t = \frac{106.6184 - 105.2105}{4.7537} = 0.2962$$

$$d.f. = 93$$

The value of critical 't' (93 d.f.) was 1.986 at 5% significance level and the value of the observed 't' was 0.2962. Since the critical value was greater than the observed value, 't' was not statistically significant, hence it was concluded that there was no statistically significant difference in punitiveness between 'fathers' who had been to school and those who had never been to school.

APPENDIX R

Computation of a t statistic test to test whether there was a statistically significant difference in maternal punitiveness between mothers who have been to school and those who have not.

The education level of mothers and the punitive scores of all subjects appear in appendix L.

Number of mothers who had not been to school was 35(n_1)

$$\bar{X}_1 = 104.3429$$

$$S_1^2 = 313.9378$$

Number of mothers who had been to school was 60(n_2)

$$\bar{X}_2 = 98.2000$$

$$S_2^2 = 531.4847$$

$$S_p^2 = \frac{34(313.9378) + 59(531.4847)}{93}$$

$$= 451.9514$$

$$S.E.(\bar{X}_1 - \bar{X}_2) = \sqrt{451.9514 \left(\frac{1}{35} + \frac{1}{60} \right)} = 4.5216$$

$$t = \frac{104.3429 - 98.2000}{4.5216} = 1.3586$$

The value of critical 't' (93 d.f.) was 1.986 at 5% significance level and the value of the observed t was 1.359. Since the critical value was greater than the observed value, 't' was not statistically significant, hence it was concluded that there was no statistically significant difference in punitiveness between mothers who had been to school and those who had never been to school.

APPENDIX S

Computation of a t statistic test to test whether there was a statistically significant difference in punitiveness between the first borns and those who were not first-borns.

The punitive scores for first-borns and those who were not first-borns appear in appendix L.

Number of all first borns was 23(n_1)

$$\bar{X}_1 = 209.3913$$

$$S_1^2 = 1410.9763$$

Number of all those who were not first borns was 72(n_2)

$$\bar{X}_2 = 206.3333$$

$$S_2^2 = 1022.3380$$

$$S_p^2 = \frac{22(1410.9763) + 71(1022.3380)}{93}$$

$$= 1894.7686$$

$$S.E.(\bar{X}_1 - \bar{X}_2) = \sqrt{1894.7686 \left(\frac{1}{23} + \frac{1}{72} \right)}$$

$$= 10.4258$$

$$t = \frac{209.3913 - 206.3333}{10.4258} = 0.2933$$

The value of the critical 't' (93 d.f.) was 1.986 at 5% significance level and the observed 't' was 0.293. Since the critical value was greater than the observed value, 't' was not statistically significant, hence it was concluded that there was no statistically significant difference in punitiveness between first-borns and the non-first-borns.

APPENDIX T

Computation of a t statistic test to test whether there was a statistically significant difference in aggression between girls and boys.

The aggression scores for girls and boys appear in appendix L (page 197 - 200).

$$\begin{aligned}n_G &= 47 \\ \bar{X}_G &= 12.8723 \\ S_G^2 &= 86.1573 \\ n_B &= 48 \\ \bar{X}_B &= 8.3125 \\ S_B^2 &= 35.0705 \\ S_p^2 &= \frac{46(86.1573) + 47(35.0705)}{93} \\ &= 60.3392 \\ \text{S.E.}(\bar{X}_G - \bar{X}_B) &= \sqrt{\frac{60.3392 \left(\frac{1}{47} + \frac{1}{48}\right)}{}} = 1.5940 \\ t &= \frac{12.8723 - 8.3125}{1.5940} = 2.8606\end{aligned}$$

The value of critical 't' (93 d.f.) was 1.986 at 5% significance level and the value of the observed 't' was 2.861. Since the observed value was greater than the critical value, 't' was significant, hence it was concluded that there was a statistically significant difference in aggression between girls and boys.

APPENDIX U

Computation of a t statistic test to test whether there was a statistically significant difference in prejudice between girls and boys.

The prejudice scores appear in appendix L (pages 197-200).

$$\begin{aligned}n_B &= 48 \\ \bar{X}_B &= 5.5833 \\ S_B^2 &= 1.4823 \\ \\ n_G &= 47 \\ \bar{X}_G &= 4.8511 \\ S_G^2 &= 1.9121 \\ S_p^2 &= \frac{47(1.4823) + 46(1.9121)}{93} = 1.6949 \\ \text{S.E.}(\bar{X}_B - \bar{X}_G) &= \sqrt{(1.6949)\left(\frac{1}{48} + \frac{1}{47}\right)} = 0.2700 \\ t &= \frac{5.5833 - 4.8511}{0.2700} = 2.7118\end{aligned}$$

The value of critical 't' (93 d.f.) was 1.986 at 5% significance level and the value of the observed 't' was 2.712. Since the observed value was greater than the critical value, 't' was statistically significant, hence it was concluded that there was a statistically significant difference in prejudice between girls and boys.

APPENDIX V

Computation of a t statistic test to test whether there was a statistically significant difference in aggression between the first-borns and those who were not first-borns.

The aggression scores for first-borns and those who were not first-borns appear in appendix L (pages 197-200).

Number of first-borns was 23(n_1)

$$\bar{X}_1 = 12.4348$$

$$S_1^2 = 103.6205$$

Number of those who were not first borns was 72(n_2)

$$\bar{X}_2 = 9.9722$$

$$S_2^2 = 52.3936$$

$$S_p^2 = \frac{22(103.6205) + 71(52.3936)}{93}$$

$$= 64.5118$$

$$S.E.(\bar{X}_1 - \bar{X}_2) = \sqrt{(64.5118)\left(\frac{1}{23} + \frac{1}{72}\right)} = 1.9237$$

$$t = \frac{12.4348 - 9.9722}{1.9237} = 1.208$$

The value of critical 't' (93 d.f.) was 1.986 at 5% significance level and the value of the observed 't' was 1.208. Since the critical value was greater than the observed value, 't' was not statistically significant, hence it was concluded that there was no statistically significant difference in aggression between first-borns and the non-first-borns.

APPENDIX W

Computation of a t statistic test to test whether there was a statistically significant difference in prejudice between the first-borns and the non-first-borns.

The prejudice scores for the first-borns and non-first-borns appear in appendix L.

The number of first-borns was 23(n_1)

$$\bar{X}_1 = 5.4348$$

$$S_1^2 = 1.1660$$

The number of non-first-borns was 72(n_2)

$$\bar{X}_2 = 5.1667$$

$$S_2^2 = 2.0563$$

$$S_p^2 = \frac{22(1.1660) + 71(2.0563)}{93}$$

$$= 1.8457$$

$$S.E.(\bar{X}_1 - \bar{X}_2) = \sqrt{(1.8457)\left(\frac{1}{23} + \frac{1}{72}\right)} = 0.3254$$

$$t = \frac{5.4348 - 5.1667}{0.3254} = 0.8239$$

The value of critical 't' (93 d.f.) was 1.986 at 5% significance level and the observed value was 0.824. Since the critical value was greater than the observed value, 't' was not statistically significant, hence it was concluded that there was no statistically significant difference in prejudice between the first-borns and the non-first-borns.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Allport, G.W., The Nature of Prejudice. New York, Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1954.
- Apoko, A., 'At Home In the village: Growing up in Acholi.'
In Fox, L.K. (Ed.), East African childhood. London, Oxford University Press, 1967, page 45 - 70.
- Ammar, H., Growing Up in an Egyptian Village .
New York, Octagon, 1966.
- Ausubel, D.P. and Sullivan, E.V., Theory and Problems of Child Development. 2 ed. New York, Grune & Strantton, 1970
page 461 - 504.
- Bruch, D. N., New Ways of Discipline. New York, McGraw - Hill, 1949.
- Becker, W.C., 'Consequences of Parental Discipline' In Hoffman L.C. and Hoffman, M.L. (E.d.s.), Review of Child Development Research. London, Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1964, Vol, 1
page 169 - 209.
- Bull, N.J. , Moral Education. London, Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1969.
- Cagnolo, G., The Akikuyu; Their customs, traditions and folklore.
English tr., Nyeri Mission Printing School, 1933,
page 49 - 106.
- Callaway, A., 'Unemployment Among African School leavers' 1963.
In Cowan, L.C., O'connel, J. and Scanlon, D.C., (Eds.),
Education and Nation Building in Africa.
New York, F.A. Praeger, 1965, page 235 - 265.
- Castle, E. B., Growing Up in East Africa. London, Oxford University
Press, 1966, page 57 - 73 .

- Cox, S.H., 'Intrafamily Comparison of Loving and Rejecting Child Rearing Practices.' In Child Development, 1970, vol 41, page 437 - 448
- Douvan, E.A.M. and Adelson, J., The Adolescent Experience. New York, John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1966 pages 79 - 173 and 310 - 340.
- Elkin, F., Child and Society. New York, Random House, 1960, page 142 - 149.
- Epstein, R. and Komorita, S.S., 'The Development of a Parental Punitive Scale Towards Aggression.' In Child Development, 1965, Vol. 36, page 129 - 142.
- Evans, J.L., Children in Africa; A review of Psychological research. New York, Teachers' College Press, 1970, Page 29 - 61.
- Frenkel - Brunswick, E., Levinson, D.J. and Sanford N.R., 'The Antidemocratic Personality,' In Maccoby, E.E., Newcomb, T.M. and Hartley, E.L. (Eds.), Readings in Social Psychology. 3d. ed., London, Methuen & Company Ltd., 1968, page 636 - 646.
- Fischer, J.L. & Fischer, A., 'The New Englanders of Orchard Town U.S.A.' In Whiting, B. (Ed.), Six Cultures. New York, John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1966, page 142 - 144.
- Foster, P.J., Education and Social Change in Ghana. London, Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1965, page 260 - 291.
- Goodwin, W., 'Some Personality Differences in Children Related to Strick or Permissive Parental Discipline', In Haimowitz, M. L. and Natalie, R., (Eds.), Human Development; Selected Readings. New York, Crowell, 1966, page 19 - 34.

- Grinder, R. W., 'Parental Child Rearing Practices, Conscience and Resistance to Temptation of Six - grade Children.'
In Child Development, 1962, Vol 33, page 802 - 882
- Hoffman, M.L., 'Parental Discipline and a Child's Consideration for Others.' In Child Development, 1963, Vol. 34, page 573 - 588
- Hurlock, E.B., Child Growth and Development. New York, McGraw - Hill, 1949, page 221 - 236.
- Kaye, B., Bringing up Children in Ghana. London, George Allen & Unwin LTD., 1962, page 133 - 189.
- Kenyatta, J., Facing Mount Kenya; the tribal life of Gikuyu. London, Secker & Warburg, 1938 page 98 - 185.
- Lambo, T. A., 'The Child and the Mother-Child Relationship in Major Cultures of Africa.'
Assignment Children (UNICEF) 10 June, 1969, Page 61 - 71.
- LeVine, R.A. & LeVine, B.B., 'Nyansongo: A Gusii Community in Kenya.' In Whiting B. (Ed.) Six Cultures. New York, John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1966 page 111 - 184.
- Lijembe, J.A., 'The Valley Between; A Muhlyha's Story.' In Fox L.K. (Ed.), East African Childhood. London, Oxford University Press, 1967 Pages 1- 37.
- Maleche, A.J., Growing Up in Nyanza. Unpublished, 1953.
- Mayer, P., Townsmen and Tribesmen. Cape Town Oxford University Press, 1971, page 68 - 89.
- McCord, J. and McCord, W., 'Cultural Stereotypes and Validity of Interviews for Research.' In Child development, 1961, Vol. 32, Pag 171 - 185.

- Mosher, D. and Scodel, A., 'Relationship Between Ethnocentricism in Children and Ethnocentricism and Authoritarian Rearing Practices of the Mother.' In Child Development, 1960, Vo. 31 page 369 - 376.
- Mussen, P.H., Child Development and Personality. 3d. ed., New York, Harper & Row, 1969, page 605 - 695.
- Nance, D. and Treichel, B. 'Attitudes of Educated Young Adults Towards Child - Rearing.' In Psychological Reports, (1970), Vol. 36, page 53 - 54.
- Nzioki, M.J., 'Thorns in the Grass: The Story of a Kamba Boy.' In Fox, L.L. (Ed.), East African Childhood. London, Oxford University Press, 1967, pages 79 - 126.
- Ominde, S.H., The Luo Girl: From infancy to marriage. London, McMillan 1952.
- Piaget, J., The Moral Judgement of the Child. New York, Free Press, 1932.
- Prothro, E.T., 'Socialization and Social Class in a Transitional Society.' In Child Development, 1966, Vol 37, page 219 - 228
- Raum, F.O., Chaga Childhood. London, Oxford University Press, 1940, pages 225 - 241 and 281 - 294.
- Rutherford, E. and Mussen, P. H., 'Generosity in Nursery School Boys.' In Child Development, 1968, Vol. 39, page 755 - 765.
- Sears, R.R., MacCoby, E. E. and Levin, H. 'The Socialization of Aggression.' In MacCoby E.E., Newcomb. T.M. and Hartley, E.L. (Eds.) Readings in Social Psychology, 3 edition. London, Methuen 4 Company. (1968), page 350 - 359.
- Sears, R.R., MacCoby, E.E. and Levin, H. Patterns of Child-Rearing. New York, Harper & Row publishers, 1957.
- Schooler, C. 'Birth - order Effects: Not here not now.' In

- Psychological Bulletin, 1972, Vol. 78, No. 3 Page 161 - 165.
- Sherif, M. Social Psychology. New York, Harper & Row publishers, 1969, pages 129 - 182 and 267 - 288.
- Siegel, S., Nonparametric Statistics. New York, McGraw - Hill, 1956, page 174 - 178.
- λ Silvely, J. 'Occupational Attitudes of Secondary School Leavers in Uganda'. In Jolly, R. (Ed.), Education in Africa: Research and Action. Nairobi, East African Publishing House, 1969, page 135 - 153.
- Thorndike, R. L. Reliability. In Lindquist, E.F., (Ed.) Education Measurement. Washington D.C. American Council of Education, 1970, page 560 - 619.
- Travers, R.M.W., An Introduction to Educational Research. London, McMillan Limited, 1964, page 198.
- Watterberg, W.W., The Adolescent Years. New York, Brace & World, Inc., 1955, page 351 - 353.
- Wenar, C. and Coulter, J.B. A., 'Reliability Study of Development Histories in Child Development'. In Child Development, 1961, Vol. 32 page 171 - 185.
- Whiting, J.W.M., Child Training and Personality. New York, John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1953.
- Whiting, J.W.M., Field Guide for a Study of Socialization. New York, John Wiley & Sons, Inc. 1966.
- Yarrow, M.R. Problems of Methods in Parental - child Research.' In child development, 1968, Vol. 34, page 215 - 226.
- Yarrow, M.R. Campell, J.D. and Burton, R.V., 'Reliability of Maternal Retrospection: A preliminary report'. In Danziger, K. (Ed.). Readings in Child Socialization. London, Exford