

Chapter III

Presentation of Results and Interpretation

As indicated earlier, in order to determine the reliability of the scale, Hoyt's Analysis of Variance Procedure was employed. The internal consistency coefficients of children's perceptions of father and mother punishment responses, as presented in Table 1 and 2, were .90 and .87 respectively.

Table 2

Hoyt's Analysis of Variance: Punishment of Father

	d.f.	Variance
Persons	119	11.07
Items	31	20.22
Error	3689	1.07
Total	3839	

Table 3

Hoyt's Analysis of Variance: Punishment of Mother

	d.f.	Variance
Persons	119	8.82
Items	31	11.42
Error	3689	1.19
Total	3839	

This finding is consistent with that of Epstein¹ in which he found internal consistency coefficients for father and mother of .93 and .92 respectively. Means and standard deviations for each item are presented in Tables 2 - 10 (See appendix G). These results show that for each item father or mother use the particular punishment indicated by the number 1-4 mentioned in Chapter II.

The correlation coefficient for the father and mother versions of the Parental Punitiveness Scale for the total sample was obtained by using the method of Pearson

¹ Epstein, R., and Domorita S.S. "The Development of a Scale of Parental Punitiveness. Towards Aggression." Child Development, 1965, 36, 129 - 142.

Product Moment Correlation. The correlation between responses of private and municipal school children was .14, indicating that there was a low positive relationship between the types of punishment used by mothers and those used by fathers. However, the correlation was not significant. This finding may possibly be due to differences between family values in these two kinds of families. It may also be that parents of both groups of children did not have sufficient time to work of a consistent plan of punishment for their children. (see Figure I)

Figure I

Scatter Diagram of Father and Mother Punitive Scores
for Total Sample
(N = 120)

		Mother Punitive Score																
		x	30-34	35-39	40-44	45-49	50-54	55-59	60-64	65-69	70-74	75-79	80-84	85-89	90-94	95-99	100-104	105-109
Father Punitive Score	y	30-34	35-39	40-44	45-49	50-54	55-59	60-64	65-69	70-74	75-79	80-84	85-89	90-94	95-99	100-104	105-109	110-114
	110-114					1	1							1				
	105-109				2	4								1			1	1
	100-104				1	1	1				2	1	1	1			1	
	95-99						1			2	2	2		2	1			
	90-94						2	1	2	1	1	4	1		1			
	85-89					3	1		1	1	2	2	2	1	2			
	80-84						1	1	2	4	3	4	2	1				
	75-79								1		2					1		
	70-74					1	1		1			1	2				1	
	65-69						1	2		1		1						
	60-64				1	1			1		2	1		1	1			
	55-59					1	1		1					1	1			
	50-54						1	1						1				
	45-49				2	1			1		1		2					
	40-44		1	1														
35-39																		
30-34																		

$$r = .14$$

The correlation coefficient between the father and mother versions for private school students, was found to be .28.

Figure II

Scatter Diagram of Father and Mother Punitive Scores
for Private School Students

(N = 60)

Mother Punitive Score

Father Punitive Score y	Mother Punitive Score x																
	30-34	35-39	40-44	45-49	50-54	55-59	60-64	65-69	70-74	75-79	80-84	85-89	90-94	95-99	100-104	105-109	110-114
110-114								1									
105-109				1		2											
100-104						1		1		1	1						
95-99						1			2				1				
90-94						1	1	1		1	1						
85-89					3		1		1	1		2					
80-84							1	1	1	2	2	3					
75-79											1						
70-74					1		1		1								
65-69							1	2	2								
60-64						1			1		2			1			
55-59						1		1									
50-54						1	1						1				
45-49				2		1			1				1				
40-44		1	1														
35-39																	
30-34																	

 $r = .28$

In this case, the condition was significant at the .05 level of significance. There was a relationship between the punishment of fathers and of mothers. It may be that their parents may more often discuss the type of punishment to be used and reach some agreement or understanding before actually punishing the child.

The correlation coefficient between the father and mother versions for female private school students was found to be .74, significant at the .05 level, indicating that there was a high positive relationship between the punishment shown by fathers and that shown by mothers. A partial explanation for this finding may be that there was a warm family relationship between these children and their parents and, therefore the parents may more often discuss ways of punishment and family activities. Pitsamai² found that non-delinquents have good relationships with their parents and they feel that home is meaningful for them because they participate in discussions of family activities. The members of the family have a feeling of "oneness".

² Pitsamai Piboonsawadi, "A Comparative Study of the Family Relationship As Perceived By Juvenile Delinquents And Juvenile Non-Delinquents." Master's Thesis, Chulalongkorn University, 1966, 70.

Figure III

Scatter Diagram of Father and Mother Punitive Scores
for Female Private School Students

(N = 130)

		Mother Punitive Score																	
		x	30-34	35-39	40-44	45-49	50-54	55-59	60-64	65-69	70-74	75-79	80-84	85-89	90-94	95-99	100-104	105-109	110-114
Father Punitive Score	y	110-114																	
	105-109																		
	110-104																		
	95-99																		
	90-94										1								
	85-89							1					2						
	80-84								1		1	1	1						
	75-79											1							
	70-74					1		1		1									
	65-69							1	1										
	60-64						1			1	2								
	55-59					1		1											
	50-54						1	1						1					
45-49				2		1			1										
40-44		1	1																
35-39																			
30-34	1																		

$$r = .74$$

For male private school students the correlation was $-.50$, for municipal school students $-.72$, and for female municipal school students $-.33$. These results were significant at the $.05$ level. The scatter diagrams of these results are shown in Figures IV - VI

Figure IV

Scatter Diagram of Father and Mother Punitive Scores
for Male Private School Students

(N = 30)

		Mother Punitive Score																
Father Punitive Score	Y \ X	30-34	35-39	40-44	45-49	50-54	55-59	60-64	65-69	70-74	75-79	80-84	85-89	90-94	95-99	100-104	105-109	110-114
	110-114									1								
105-109				1		2												
100-104						1		2		1	1							
95-99						1		1	2					1				
90-94						1	1				1							
85-89					3				1	1								
80-84							1		1	1	1	1	1	1				
75-79																		
70-74																		
65-69								1										
60-64																1		
55-59																		
50-54																		
45-49														1				
40-44																		
35-39																		
30-34																		

$r = -.50$

Figure V

Scatter Diagram of Father and Mother Punitive Scores
for Municipal School Students

(N = 60)

		Mother Punitive Score																	
Father Punitive Score	x		y																
			30-34	35-39	40-44	45-49	50-54	55-59	60-64	65-69	70-74	75-79	80-84	85-89	90-94	95-99	100-104	105-109	110-114
110-114							1	1	1						1				
105-109						1		2							1			1	
100-104					1				1			1	1	1			1	1	
95-99											2	2		1	1				
90-94							1		1	1		3	1		1				
85-89												2		1	2				
80-84										1	2	1	1	2	1				
75-79										1		1					1		
70-74													1	2				1	
65-69											1		1						
60-64					1								1				1		
55-59										1				1	1				
50-54																			
45-49												1		1					
40-44																			
35-39																			
30-34																			

$$r = -.72$$

Figure VI

Scatter Diagram of Father and Mother Punitive Scores
for Female Municipal School Students

(M = 30)

Mother Punitive Score

Father Punitive Score	y \ x	Mother Punitive Score																
		30-34	35-39	40-44	45-49	50-54	55-59	60-64	65-69	70-74	75-79	80-84	85-89	90-94	95-99	100-104	105-109	110-114
110-114																		
105-109					1	2											1	
100-104					1		1			1								
95-99										2								
90-94									1		2		1					
85-89											2		2					
80-84									1	1			1					
75-79											1				1			
70-74													2					
65-69					1							1						
60-64												1						
55-54																		
50-54																		
45-49											1		1					
40-44																		
35-39																		
30-34																		

$r = -.33$

These results indicate that the fathers and mothers did not use the same punishment. It may be that fathers approve of severe punishment like whipping as the most effective method in child-rearing while mothers regard it as out of date.³ It may also possibly be that according to Thai culture the most important duty of the husband is to be a leader of the family and that of the wife is to look after the family welfare.⁴ Another point is that fathers might treat boys more severely than girls because they feel boys should be patient and strong in order to be "real men". In contrast girls were treated more lightly than boys.

For male municipal school students the correlation was found to be $-.24$, indicating that while there was a low negative relationship between the types of punishment used by fathers and those used by mothers it was not significant. Again this result may be due to the fact that working parents did not have time to discuss consistent ways of punishing their children and, therefore, behaved differently as each situation occurred.

³ Karnya Sangsuchat. "The Values With Respect To Marriage and Family of Educated Older Generation and Younger Generation Individuals A Comparative study." Master's Thesis, Chulalongkorn University, 1966, 49.

⁴ Ibid. 48.

Figure VII

Scatter Diagram of Father and Mother Punitive Scores
for Male Municipal School Students

(N = 30)

		Mother Punitive Score																
		X																
Father Punitive Score	Y	30-34	35-39	40-44	45-49	50-54	55-59	60-64	65-69	70-74	75-79	80-84	85-89	90-94	95-99	100-104	105-109	110-114
		110-114					1	1	1						1			
	105-109													1				
	100-104												1	1			1	1
	95-99											2			1			
	90-94					1			1		1	1						
	85-89												1					
	80-84									1	1	1	1	1				
	75-79								1			1					1	1
	70-74									1		1					1	1
	65-69									1								
	60-64															1		
	55-59								1					1	1			
	50-54																	
	45-49																	
	40-44																	
	35-39																	
	30-34																	

 $r = -.24$