Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology
Vol. 1, No. 2, June, 1970, pp. 139-152.

RECALLED PARENT-CHILD INTERACTION OF MEXICAN AND UNITED STATES MALES[1]

GERALD P. GINSBURG
University of Nevada

NOEL F. McGINN
Graduate School of Education
Harvard University

and

ERNEST HARBURG
University of Michigan

Dimensions of recalled parent-child interaction, from the viewpoint of the child, were obtained by means of a Parent Image Differential. PID data of a North American group and a Mexican group, all males, were factor analyzed and analytically compared. A number of highly stable dimensions emerged, some culturally specific, some specific to sex of parent, but almost all specific to a particular context of parent-child interaction (how the parent treated, taught or disciplined the child). Cross-cultural differences are discussed, and reasons for the differences between these results and those reported by others are suggested. It is urged that studies of primary relations attend to differential relevance of dimensions in terms of categories of participants and in terms of interaction contexts (e.g., teaching, disciplining).

The importance of examining parent-child interaction is obvious and hardly requires justification. However, most of the approaches used in studies of parent-child relations rely on parents' recollections of those relations (e.g., Sears, Maccoby & Levin, 1957; Sewell, Mussen & Harris, 1955).[2] This practice has certain disadvantages: First, although parents can describe their own actions and intentions, they cannot describe their child's perception of those actions or his attribution of intentions. Yet, theories of personality which

---

[1]This research was supported in part by a grant from the Horace H. Rackham School of Graduate Studies, University of Michigan.

[2]This obviously is not an exhaustive list, nor is it intended to be. However, these two major publications may be considered archetypal of a very large body of investigations to which our textual comments apply. This same point applies to our later discussions of the PARI (Schaefer, 1961a) and other techniques which lend themselves to circumplex ordering. In fact, it is a special case of the more general criticism set forth by Marion Radke-Yarrlow(1963).

involve parent-child relations stress the child's perception of the parent-child interaction and his attribution of intention to the parents. That is, the child's later behaviors are felt to be importantly determined by the parent-child relations as they were experienced by him. Parental reports seem to be an unnecessarily indirect measure of the child's perception of the interaction.

Second, parents are biased informants, as we know by now (Pyles, Stolz & MacFarlane, 1935; Robbins, 1963; Yarrow, 1963). If we are interested in the child's perception of parent-child relations, then it seems unwise to introduce additional and unnecessary sources of error by inferring the child's world from the parents' reports.

Therefore, if we want information about parent-child relations which will have a bearing on the later behavior of the child, it seems most practical to measure the child's perception of those relations. Perhaps the best known instrument which appears to use such a technique is the Parent Attitude Research Instrument (PARI), developed by Schaefer (1961a) and his colleagues. PARI was constructed by obtaining from parents a number of dimensions of parents' attitudes about child-rearing. These dimensions were set into rating scales by which children could respond, and they were then administered to adolescents. Factor analysis of the ratings yielded four factors which accounted for about 50% of the total variance. The factors were love-hostility, psychological control, physical control, and extreme autonomy. This approach still relies on the parents' picture of the world: the dimensions which underlie the scales to which the children respond were generated by parents. Furthermore, the children are asked to judge their parents' intentions and thoughts rather than report how they saw their parents treating them.

The PARI approach, then, still avoids the more direct attack--the child's report of his relations with his parents.[3] The present authors are unaware of any explicitly psychometric technique which is designed specifically to measure the child's perceptions of his relations with his parents, on his own perceptual terms.

The Parent Image Differential (PID), described in detail below, was developed in an attempt to measure more directly the parent-child interactions as they were experienced by the child. It was assumed, following Cooley (1956), that persistent patterns of interaction in primary relations will be internalized by the participants as expectations. Furthermore, it was assumed that various gestures which are employed in the interaction--especially vocal gestures--will take on a shared meaning for the participants and will serve to signify or represent the whole social act of which they are only a part (G. H. Mead, 1934). That is, these "significant symbols," as Mead terms them, will serve as cues

---

[3] Schaefer (1959) also has argued for a circumplex ordering of his scales about two orthogonal reference axes: love/hostility and autonomy/control. However, such an ordering involves not only the above objection but also an a priori definition of a highly restricted universe of parent-child interaction categories (cf. Schaefer, 1961b).

for the evocation of expectations. Significant symbols, and their underlying sets of expectations, are conceptually analogous to Osgood's (1953) "representational mediation responses," the affective connotations of which purportedly are amenable to measurement through semantic differential techniques (Osgood, Suci & Tannenbaum, 1957). In essence, we felt that the emotional connotations of internalized interaction patterns of the child are important variables in parent-child relations and that they could be measured through an appropriately designed semantic differential.

Another problematical factor in the investigation of parent-child relations derives from the typical focus on a single culture, viz.--a broad, verbally skilled, middle class segment of the United States. To the extent that we restrict our investigations to that or any other limited subpopulation we will be unable to distinguish between potentially universal dimensions of interaction and those based upon background norms idiosyncratic to the culture under study. Therefore, it is desirable to include at least two distinguishable cultural groups in studies of parent-child relations; it would be best to include more than one national group.

Our argument to this point would direct us to administer an appropriate semantic differential instrument to young children of two or more national groups. However, young children would be incapable of responding adequately to a standard semantic differential. On the other hand, the emotional components of the interaction patterns internalized in childhood and young adolescence should be describable along dimensions still available in late adolescence, and perhaps even adulthood. If appropriate semantic differential instruments were given to late adolescents and young adults in two or more national groups, the data could be analyzed so as to yield dimensions of recalled parent-child interactions from the perspective of the child. We could not depend automatically on either the accuracy or the stability of the specific ratings of any one informant, but the dimensions of the recalled interactions should be of considerable interest in their own right.

Our research objectives were 1) to construct an instrument which would reliably measure underlying dimensions of parent-child interactions, reportedly experienced by the child; and 2) to assess the cross-national stability of those dimensions. Using a semantic differential technique and factor analysis, we wanted to extract dimensions from at least two groups and compare those dimensions for stability across the groups. Our guiding questions were: What dimensions are stable across groups? What dimensions are common to both mother-son and father-son relations? What dimensions are unique to the sex of the parent?

To the extent that the dimensions prove stable across groups, one could reasonably infer the existence of the dimensions in the child's world of parent-child relations. In the case of unstable dimensions, several alternative explanations are possible, depending upon the specific nature of the instability. These will be discussed individually below.

METHOD

Subjects

The results presented in this paper stem primarily from two groups of white male students.[4]

NA: A North American undergraduate group of introductory psychology students at the University of Michigan; N = 91; mean age 19.4.

MEX: Spanish-speaking students at a college preparatory high school in Guadalajara, Mexico; all middle class; N = 95; mean age 17.6. This group was included so as to provide information about the cultural specificity of the obtained dimensions. A Spanish form of the instrument was developed for this purpose (see McGinn-Bruck, Harburg & Ginsburg, 1963).

Instrument

A semantic differential format was used, on which Ss rated each of six concepts on fifteen to eighteen bipolar scales (the number of scales differed across concepts). The concepts were devised so as to have some circumscribed location in time and to represent different categories of parent-child relations. The six concepts were:

How My Father Treated (or Taught, or Disciplined) Me When I Was a Child.

How My Mother Treated (or Taught, or Disciplined) Me When I Was a Child.

These concepts are longer and more complex than those typically used in semantic differential research (e.g., see Osgood et al., 1957), but prior experience of the authors has indicated that Ss could respond without trouble to concepts which were two full paragraphs in length (Harburg, 1962).

The scales on which Ss rated the concepts were selected after two years of pretesting and are listed in Tables 1, 2 and 3 of McGinn, Harburg and Ginsburg (1965a). The scales were devised so as to approximate both the linearity and bipolarity criteria suggested by Osgood et al. (1957). Different scales were used for each interaction category (Treated, Taught, and Disciplined),

---

[4]The PID has been administered to over 1,000 Ss but the current report mainly is concerned with those groups of male Ss in which stability of the dimensions was the main focus of the investigation. However, results based on the other PID studies will also be mentioned for purposes of comparison. Other groups studied include U.S. female college students, male U.S. college students with unusual blood pressure, their parents, U.S. teachers, Mexican high school females, and Bennington College students.

but within an interaction category the Father and Mother concepts were rated on identical sets of scales.

Instructions for the Parent Image Differential (PID) followed the general form used by Osgood et al. (1957), with such minor modifications as were necessitated by the parent-child context of the instrument. The instructions contained a definition of each scale position ("extremely," "quite," "slightly," "neutral"), requested that Ss respond in terms of "immediate impressions," and defined the clause "when I was a child" as covering the period from S's earliest memory to about age fourteen.

Reliability and Validity of the PID

Since the Parent Image Differential is designed to measure the perceptions which Ss as children had of their interactions with their parents, the validity of the PID is not directly testable except through self-report data. Self-report data, especially of a recall nature, are apt to be undependable. However, if responses on the PID prove to be stable over time (test-retest reliability) and if those responses correlate highly with other sources of self-report data (concurrent validity), the construct validity of the technique and the findings are given support. Moderate concurrent validity has been found and is reported briefly in McGinn, Harburg and Julius (1965), McLeod (1962), and Warwick (1963), and is reported in complete detail by Harburg (1962) and McGinn (1962).

Test-retest reliability was assessed by administering the PID to twenty-four Ss twice, with an eleven-month interval between administrations. Product-moment reliability coefficients were computed for eleven factors. One factor yielded a coefficient of .48; all others were over .50 (six were .75 or higher, and four were between .52 and .66). These factor reliability data together with the concurrent validity data support the construct validity of the instrument. More complete validation must come from between-group stability of the obtained dimensions, and this is reported and discussed below, both for the two focal groups (NA and MEX) and for other groups to whom the PID has been administered.

Design and Analysis Procedures

For each group, the intercorrelations of the scales for each concept were factor analyzed, using a principal axis technique and normalized varimax rotation. Thus, we obtained, for each group, a separate factor structure for each concept (six such structures for each group). The stability of the factors across groups was assessed by comparing the factor matrix of a given concept (e.g., Father Treated) or one group (e.g., NA) with the equivalent matrix of the other group. These comparisons were undertaken for each of the six concepts (Father Treated, Mother Treated, Father Taught, Mother Taught, Father Disciplined, Mother Disciplined). Furthermore, the stability of a factor structure across parents was compared within each interaction category (Treated,

Taught, or Disciplined), separately for each group. One such Mother-Father comparison was undertaken for each of the three interaction categories for each of the groups. For example, the Father Treated and Mother Treated matrices were compared for the NA group and for the MEX group.

The matrices were compared by means of Kaiser's coefficient of factor similarity (Kaiser, 1960). Since the statistical distribution of the similarity coefficient is not known, there is no technical basis for estimating the significance of the coefficient. However, we selected a value of /.85/ as indicative of significant and meaningful similarity between factors from each of the two matrices. This value served as our index of stability.[5]

RESULTS

The emphasis of this paper is on stability data,[6] and these are summarized in Table 1 which shows how frequently the more stable factors appeared. The columns headed "Father x Mother" indicate how often the same factor appeared in both the Mother and Father versions of a given concept in a particular group. For example, Potency appeared as a factor in both the Mother and Father versions of the concept Treated in both the NA and MEX groups. The columns headed "NA x MEX" show how often a factor appeared for a given parent on a given concept in both groups. For example, the Potency factor appeared in the Father Treated factor matrices of both the NA and MEX groups.

Examination of Table 1 shows that two factors were very stable, appearing across both groups within a parental role and in both Mother and Father versions of the concepts: Potency (Treated, Taught and Disciplined) and Ambivalence vs. Inclusion-Understanding (Taught). The latter factor appears to represent the tendency of a parent to be awkward and uncertain in his relations with his child as opposed to spontaneously and understandingly including the child in his activities. The Potency factor represents the severity and immovability of the parent. It should be noted that these dimensions appear common to both our North American and our Mexican groups, although the

---

[5] After the data were gathered and analyzed, the distribution of all obtained factor similarity coefficients was plotted. It was observed that a coefficient of $\pm$ .75 roughly approximated a .05 probability of occurrence and $\pm$ .85 a .01 level of probability. Obviously, such a distribution is not an unbiased estimate of the sampling distribution of the statistic, but it does lend some support to the a priori selection of $\pm$ .85 as our criterion for stability.

[6] Summaries of the six factor analyses for each of the two groups are available from the senior author. The summaries identify the salient scales for each factor (scales which loaded $\geq$ /.40/ on that and only that factor) for each of the six concepts for each of the two groups. The factor matrix for each concept accounted for at least fifty percent of the total variance of scale scores, and usually for about sixty-five percent.

TABLE 1

COMPARISONS IN WHICH SIGNIFICANTLY SIMILAR FACTORS OCCURRED

Concept	Factor	Father x Mother		NA x MEX	
		NA	MEX	Father	Mother
Treated	Potency	X	X	X	X
	Justice	X			
Taught	Potency	X	X	X	X
	Ambivalence[a]	X	X	X	X
	Tolerance	X			X
	Irritability	X	X		X
Discipline	Potency	X	X	X	X
	Intropunitiveness	X			
	Irritability			X	X
	Demand Style		X	X	

[a]Full label of factor: "Ambivalence vs. Inclusion-Understanding."

Note: – The above table lists those factors which reflected sufficient stability in the present study or in the related studies mentioned in Footnote 4 to be worthy of attention. The X-marks in the table indicate the occurrence of highly similar factors in each of two factor matrices, ie., - factor pairs whose similarity coefficients $\geq$ /.85/. For example, a stable Justice factor appeared in both the Mother Treated and Father Treated matrices for the NA group but not for the MEX group; and a Tolerance factor appeared in Mother Taught matrix of both the NA and MEX groups, but a Tolerance factor did not appear which was common to the Father Taught matrices of the NA and MEX groups.

mean positions of the Mexican and North American groups are significantly different (cf. McGinn, Harburg & Ginsburg, 1965a). Furthermore, the Potency dimensions appeared under all three situations whereas the Ambivalence dimension appeared only in the situation where the child is being taught things by the parent, but this probably is because the Treated and Disciplined scales precluded the appearance of Ambivalence. Finally, both the Potency and Ambivalence dimensions are common to both mother-child and father-child relations.

Two other factors were stable across groups in only one parental role implying some functional differences in the mother and father roles as perceived by the child: Demand Style (Father Disciplined), and Tolerance (Mother Taught). An Irritability factor of complex stability appeared in the contexts of Taught and Disciplined and will be discussed later.

One factor was stable only between parental roles within the North American group. That factor was Justice (Mother Treated and Father Treated). It is defined by the salient scales "just/unjust" and "consistent/inconsistent." An important feature of this factor is that it appeared in several of our groups of male Ss in the U.S., and in a group of parents of one of our subject groups. We will return to this point later.

One factor which was characteristic of mother-son relations across groups appeared as characteristic of father-son relations only within the North American group: Tolerance (Father Taught).

A number of factors proved unstable. In a few cases, it is not clear whether this is due to the instrument or to the non-existence of the dimensions. In certain cases, however, the factor instability clearly is due to a flaw in the instrument, and these instances will be discussed below so as to provide "negative information" for other investigators who may be interested in using a similar technique to tap perceived interaction patterns.

DISCUSSION

The Potency dimension was the most stable and pervasive of the extracted factors. It appears to reflect the severity of hardness of the parent, as seen by the child, in each of three contexts: Treated, Taught and Disciplined. This inference is supported not only by the concurrent validity data cited earlier (Harburg, 1962; McGinn, 1962; McGinn, Harburg & Julius, 1965), but it also has received predictive support: McGinn, Harburg, and Ginsburg (1965a) found predicted differences between ratings by middle class Mexicans and middle class North Americans on a number of the PID dimensions, including Potency. Furthermore, they found cultural differences in typical reactions to hypothetical threats against one's friendships, reactions which had been predicted on the basis of cultural differences in Father Potency. The cultural differences were consistent with descriptions of Mexican parent-child relations offered by Mexican authors (Maslow & Diaz-Guerrero, 1960). The Potency factors imply a dimension of parent-child interaction which is strikingly similar to the "hostility" half of the love-hostility dimension frequently reported in the literature (e.g., Schaefer, 1959). However, the use of a wide-ranging set of scales

yielded a factor in the present study which was independent of "love" and which also was free of the strong socially negative connotations of the concept "hostility" when used to describe a parent's reactions to his child. "Hostility," for example, would not describe the parents of the MEX group--they tend to be stern and immovable, but not hostile toward their children. In essence, then, the Potency factor may be viewed as representing direct control over S's actions plus immovability of the controlling agent (in the present study, the parent) by S.

Another stable factor, relevant only to the context in which the child is being taught by the parent, was Ambivalence vs. Inclusion-Understanding. Our interpretation of the complex set of loadings of this stable and pervasive factor is reflected in its title. The factor had high loadings on the "basically understood me" scale and on the "often discussed things with me" and "often did things together with me" scales. It makes intuitive sense for Inclusion and Understanding, as characteristics of parental behavior, to go together; but a more specific bridge between the two is provided by another scale which invariably appeared with the "understood" scale: "Skillful (vs. awkward) in teaching me new things." The "awkward" connotation suggests perception of ambivalence in the parent's behavior; that is, the parent appears unsure about how to act or respond to the child and gives the appearance of not being spontaneous or of being ill at ease. To the extent that this is so, the parent is likely to avoid including the child in his activities and avoid discussions with him. Furthermore, the child will perceive the parent as not understanding him because of the perceived "unsureness" of the parent's behavior and because of the sparse parent-child communication. Additional support for this interpretation of the factor comes from the high correlations between the scales "skillfully/awkwardly" and "consistently/inconsistently" on the Father Treated concept for each of the groups. Despite its obvious importance in the parent-child relations, the authors are aware of only one published psychometric study containing a dimension which connotes ambivalence or uncertainty in the parent's behavior, and that particular study (Gildea, Glidewell & Kantor, 1961) deals with self-reports of maternal attitudes rather than with overt behaviors. Two of the factors reported by Gildea et al. are relevant at this point. Their first factor reflected parental uncertainty over how to handle their children. Their second factor, ostensibly dealing with rejection and discipline, can be interpreted as implying control and knowledge of the child's behavioral tendencies as means of reducing involvement. These two factors taken together appear to be in concordance with our finding of a direct link between parental ambivalence and a lack of inclusion and understanding. Final validation of such a dimension must wait upon behavioral or longitudinal effects of ambivalence. However, the pervasiveness and stability of the factor extracted in the present research, within and across cultures, argues strongly for the practicability of pursuing it further.

The existence of a dimension of tolerance for disagreement by the child and of the child's autonomy is implied by the factor of Tolerance, defined by such scales as "disagreeing with him was discouraged (vs. encouraged),"

"acted as if he were always right (vs. willing to admit his mistakes)," and "displeased (vs. pleased) when I acted on my own." This factor is similar to the Autonomy-Control dimension suggested by Schaefer (1959). However, it should be noted that the Tolerance factor was stable across the two groups only for mother-son relations. That is, the factor had a stable composition in the NA and MEX groups for the Mother Taught concept, but not for the Father Taught concept. The instability of the factor in the Father Taught matrices is due primarily to the MEX group, which did not generate a Father Taught Tolerance factor. The factor actually is very stable within the North American group. Thus, we have a cultural difference in which the North American pattern, for both Mother and Father Taught, is similar to the maternal role pattern in the Mexican group, but where the Mexican father-son pattern stands alone, different from the rest. The basis for this apparent cultural difference most likely rests in the tendency for the Mexican father to be the undisputed authority in all family matters (Holtzman, 1964). Moreover, Peck and Diaz-Guerraro (1963) suggest that there are strong overtones of obedience in the expression of respect within the Mexican milieu. To the extent that these tendencies do exist, Tolerance for Disagreement on the part of the father would be an irrelevant dimension for the MEX Ss. Similar differences will be discussed below regarding other dimensions (Intropunitiveness and Justice).

The child's reactions to discipline from his parents are described by the Intropunitiveness dimensions (Mother and Father Disciplined), but examination reveals that this is not a stable factor across the cultural groups. Instead, its stability is restricted to the North American group. The MEX factor contained additional scales which caused us to interpret it as a Demand Style dimension (to be discussed below) rather than Intropunitiveness. The implication is that the existence (or lack thereof) of an Intropunitiveness dimension reflects a cultural difference between Mexican and North American middle class patterns of parent-child relations. The absence of Intropunitiveness in the Mexican group may be due to the relatively greater importance placed upon the mood of the parent as opposed to external standards to which both parents and children adhere (the latter being more the case for middle class North Americans; cf. McGinn, Harburg & Ginsburg, 1965a, for a more detailed discussion). That is, there simply may not be enough variability among middle class Mexican parents in guilt-inducing vs. resentment-inducing behaviors to yield a stable Intropunitiveness factor. At present, however, we can only point to the apparent cultural difference (an important one in terms of behavior control); we cannot provide clear interpretive data.

Two factors reflecting the perceived Irritability of the parent arose, one in the context of Taught and the other in the context of Disciplined. The Irritability factor in the Taught context was stable across parental roles within each group but was stable across groups only within the mother role. The dimension appears to reflect the ease with which a parent becomes irritated and impatient with the child when trying to teach him things.

The Irritability factor stemming from the Disciplined concepts presents a different picture. The factor was not stable across parents within either of

the two groups, suggesting sex-role differences. For fathers, the factor contains a connotation of arbitrariness (viz., "expected me to do as he wished/expected me to know the rules") in addition to "easy to irritate." For mothers, however, the "easy to irritate" scale was joined by the "got angry when punishing me" scale. Thus, the Irritability factor appears to have a differential relevance for mother-son relations and father-son relations in the context of discipline. The functional meaning of this differential relevance remains to be investigated.

One factor which is moderately stable within the MEX group and also across fathers but not across mothers is Demand Style (Father Disciplined). This factor connotes arbitrariness, because of the scale "always (vs. rarely) explained why he punished me." However, Demand Style overlaps somewhat in composition with the Intropunitiveness dimension, and its existence as a characteristic component of disciplinary interactions is uncertain.

None of the dimensions discussed above emanated from the Father Treated or Mother Treated concepts, except Potency. With one interesting exception, the Treated concepts yielded no further stable factors. This is surprising, since the Treated concepts were rated on scales which were though to represent dimensions of control through positive reinforcement. Indeed, such dimensions (e.g., Affection, Support) were generated, but they were not stable either across groups or across parents within a group. A detailed examination of group differences and of possible response sets led to the following conclusions regarding the Treated concepts: they are too general and may thereby facilitate the operation of response sets and preclude the operation of differentiated perceptual categories (e.g., for Father Treated, Affection and Support tended to collapse into a single factor). It is necessary to revise the concept so as to both make it less general and to make it as inherently positive in connotation as Disciplined is negative.

In addition to the pervasive Potency factor, one other stable dimension was generated within the context of Treated: Justice, defined primarily by the scales "just/unjust" and "consistent/inconsistent." This factor was stable across the NA and another North American group not reported in this paper, and across parents within each of those groups; but the Mexican group did not generate even a reasonable approximation of it. For the Father Treated concept in the MEX group, Justice scales were part of a general evaluative factor which also contained Affection and Support scales. In the Mother Treated factor matrix, Justice was part of a strong Support factor. Thus, we again find evidence of cultural differences; the MEX Ss did not differentiate Justice from Support. This is consistent with our interpretations of the other cultural differences, mentioned earlier, wherein it was suggested that middle class North Americans rely on external standards as guides for behavior whereas middle class Mexicans are likely to be guided much more heavily by each other's moods. The "personalismo" theme in Mexican interpersonal relations has been discussed at length elsewhere (Maslow & Diaz-Guerrero, 1960; McGinn, Harburg & Ginsburg, 1965b) and stands in fairly clear contrast to the external norms which guide the interpersonal behaviors of North Americans. Apparently,

this difference is reflected once again in the existence of a stable Justice dimension, separated from other affectional factors, in the NA group, and the incorporation of that factor into a general personal support factor in the MEX group.

CONCLUSIONS

The use of the PID, with white male Ss, to isolate and quantify basic, stable dimensions of parent-child interaction as perceived by the child yielded several dimensions, a few of which were pervasive both across parents and across cultures (e.g., Potency and Ambivalence) and others of which indicated cultural differences or parental sex-role differences. Furthermore, there was a tendency for a stable dimension to appear in only one of the three interaction contexts (i.e., either in Treated, Taught or Disciplined) rather than in all three. Although the context-specific nature of many of the dimensions assuredly is due in part to our choice of different scales for the concepts, it also is testimony to a point stressed by Cronbach (1960, p. 601)--viz., that a person's behavior changes from one situation to another and that it is necessary to determine the meanings which different classes of situations have for the person. Moreover, the findings suggest that interaction in primary relations may be studied more profitably as relatively homogeneous subsets of interactions, rather than as an undifferentiated whole.

Our findings reflecting father-mother differences in dimensions (not in positions on a dimension, but in the existence or absence of the dimension), and the likelihood of differential relevance of some dimensions to father-child and mother-child interactions also emphasize the value of breaking down primary relation interactions into subsets. In this case, the subset would be organized in terms of the other participant in the interaction (or class of other participants), e.g., --mother vs. father, or supervisor vs. subordinate vs. peer. In other words, primary relation interactions should be divided conceptually into context categories (e.g., Taught and Disciplined) and also into participant categories (e.g., Father and Mother); and the primary relations of any individual should be viewed as sets comprised of various "context-participant" subsets.

Earlier in this report we critically assessed the works of others in the parent-child interactions, noting their tendency to generate a small number of factors. It is our opinion that small sets of two or three dimensions do not adequately describe parent-child interactions and will not provide a basis for prediction of the focal person's later behaviors or provide worthwhile information instrumental to a clinical assessment of the focal person. In fact, other reports (Becker & Krug, 1964; Lorr & McNair, 1963, 1964; Schaefer, 1961b) which have described a high degree of concordance among numerous studies when the various sets of data are reanalyzed and placed within the structure of a circumplex model may actually be pointing at a sampling bias. That is, it is possible that the concordance is not due as much to the definitive validity of the model (a claim which Becker and Krug explicitly disavow) as to a similarity

in the selective biases of various researchers. As Yarrow (1963) points out, most parent-report studies of childrearing have used the same small set of variables (relative to the total domain).

The conceptual strategy described above seems all the more valuable when one turns to cross-cultural research. The cultural differences described above (e.g., the existence of a separate Justice factor for North Americans and its incorporation into a general personal Support factor by the Mexican Ss) probably would not have appeared had we not presented the Ss with context- and parent-specific judgmental tasks. Our feeling is that to profitably examine primary interactions, including parent-child relations, and to get the most out of cross-cultural investigations of primarily relations, separate interaction categories defined as context-by-participant subsets should be sampled and studied. The PID appears to be one technique for approaching this objective.

REFERENCES

Becker, W. C. & Krug, R. S. A circumplex model for social behavior in children. Child Development, 1964, 35, 371-396.

Cooley, C. H. Social organization. Glencoe: Free Press, 1956.

Cronbach, L. J. Essentials of psychological testing. (2d ed.) New York: Harpers, 1960.

Gildea, Margaret C. L., Glidewell, J. C., & Kantor, Mildred B. Maternal attitudes and general adjustment in school children. In J. Glidewell (Ed.), Parental attitudes & child behavior. Springfield, Illinois: Charles C. Thomas, 1961.

Harburg, E. Covert hostility: Its social origins and relationship with overt compliance. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Michigan, 1962.

Holtzman, W. H. Cross-cultural research on personality development. Invited address presented at the American Psychology Association, Los Angeles, September, 1964.

Kaiser, H. F. Relating factors between studies based upon different individuals. Mimeo. Urbana: Bureau of Educational Research, University of Illinois, July 15, 1960.

Lorr, M., & McNair, D. M. An interpersonal behavior circle. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1963, 67, 68-75.

Lorr, M., & McNair, D. M. Expansion of the interpersonal behavior circle. Paper presented at the American Psychology Association, Los Angeles, September, 1964.

McGinn, N. F. Perception of parents and blood pressure. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Michigan, 1962.

McGinn, N. F., Harburg, E., & Ginsburg, G. P. Dependence relations with parents and affiliative responses in Michigan and Guadalajara. Sociometry, 1965, 28, 305-321. (a)

McGinn, N. F., Harburg, E., & Ginsburg, G. P. Responses to interpersonal conflict by middle class males in Guadalajara and Michigan. American Anthropologist, 1965, 67, 1483-1494. (b)

McGinn, N. F., Harburg, E., & Julius, S. Blood pressure reactivity and recall of treatment by Parents. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1965, 1, 147-153.

McGinn-Bruck, N. F., Harburg, E., & Ginsburg, G. P. Differences between Mexicans and North Americans in their reaction to interpersonal conflict. Revista Mexicana de Psicologia, 1963, 1, 109-122.

McLeod, J. M. Yielding as a response to cognitive imbalance. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. University of Michigan, 1962.

Maslow, A. H., & Diaz-Guerrero, R. Delinquency as a value disturbance. In J. G. Peatmen & E. L. Hartley (Eds.), Festschrift for Gardner Murphy. New York: Harper, 1960.

Mead, G. H. Mind, self & society. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1934.

Osgood, C. E. Method and theory in experimental psychology. New York: Oxford University Press, 1953.

Osgood, C. E., Suci, G. J., & Tannenbaum, P. H. The measurement of meaning. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1957.

Peck, R., & Diaz-Guerrero, R. Two core-culture patterns and the diffusion of values across their border. Proceedings of the VIIth Inter-American Congress of Psychology. Mexico City: Sociedad Interamericana de Psicologia, 1963.

Pyles, M. K., Stolz, H. R., & MacFarlane, J. The accuracy of mothers' reports on birth and developmental data. Child Development, 1935, 6, 165-176.

Robbins, Lillian C. The accuracy of parental recall of aspects of child development and of child rearing practices. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1963, 66, 261-270.

Schaefer, E. S. Multivariate measurement and factorial structure of children's perceptions of maternal and parental behavior. Paper read at the American Psychology Association, August, 1961. (a)

Schaefer, E. S. Converging conceptual models for maternal behavior and for child behavior. In J. C. Glidewell (Ed.), Parental attitudes and child behavior. Springfield, Illinois: Charles C. Thomas, 1961. (b)

Sears, R., Maccoby, E., & Levin, H. Patterns of child rearing. Evanston: Row, Peterson and Company, 1957.

Sewell, W. H., Mussen, P. H., & Harris, C. W. Relationships among child-training practices. American Sociological Review, 1955, 20, 137-148.

Warwick, D. P. Socialization and value change in a college community. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. University of Michigan, 1963.

Yarrow, Marian R. Problems of methods in parent-child research. Child Development, 1963, 34, 215-226.