

Chapter II

Methods and Procedures

Subjects

Subjects were two hundred and eighty pratom 5-7 students (140 boys and 140 girls) from private schools in Bangkok and municipal schools in Pranakorn District. All subjects were "Ethnic Thai, male and female students between 11 and 13 years of age, both of whose parents were of Thai background and living with the child.

The first step in selecting subjects was the completion of a preliminary questionnaire by approximately 800 students in private schools in Bangkok and municipal schools in Pranakorn District. About 500 respondents stated that either one or both grandparents or parents were of Chinese ethnic origin or a different ethnic origin than Thai. Therefore, these respondents were not included in the final sample.

In addition, subjects were asked to provide information about age, sex, whether parents were alive and lived together, and whether she or he lived with them.

The private and municipal schools were chosen by simple random sampling method. Two hundred and eighty students out of three hundred which met the requirements

were chosen by stratified random sampling method and simple random sampling method.

Various kinds of questionnaires were administered to varying numbers of subjects : 80 students were asked about children's aggression and about types of punishments used by parents, another 80 students were asked about the severity of the punishments, and 120 students were asked to respond to the final ~~scale~~ **scale**.

Stages in the Development of the Scale

In developing the items concerning children's aggression recent research by Epstein¹ was consulted. Forty-three of his original forty-five items were considered to be appropriate to Thai culture and were translated into Thai for administration to subjects. After several revisions, the final translation was checked and corrected by a Thai lecturer, proficient in both Thai and English.

The forty-three items used in this study which represented forms of misbehavior that might be punished by parents are listed below.

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

1. Draw something on the wall or other places.
2. Draw something on someone's car.
3. Lie to a brother (or sister).
4. Throw something at a brother (or sister)
5. Steal something that belongs to a teacher.
6. Lie to a friend
7. Scream at a friend
8. Talk back to a friend
9. Break something that belongs to a friend
10. Kick a friend
11. Talk back to a brother (or sister)
12. Hit a brother (or sister)
13. Break things in the house
14. Scream at a teacher
15. Make a friend's clothes dirty.
16. Annoy a teacher
17. Steal something that belongs to a brother (or sister)
18. Scream at a brother (or sister)
19. Lie to a teacher
20. Break something that belongs to a brother (or sister)
21. Swear at a brother (or sister)
22. Kick a brother (or sister)
23. Put a nail in someone's tire
24. Swear at a friend
25. Pull up someone's flowers
26. Swear at parents

27. Mess up someone's house.
28. Steal something that belongs to a friend.
29. Throw something at parents
- 30 Hit another child
31. Swear at a teacher
32. Tear something on purpose that belongs to a friend
33. Steal something that belongs to parents
34. Kick parents.
35. Break something that belongs to a teacher
36. Throw something at a friend
37. Kick a teacher
38. Lie to parents
39. Talk back to a teacher
- 40 Have a temper trantrum when angry.
41. Scream at parents.
42. Talk back to parents
43. Break something on purpose that belongs to parents

Subjects were given three categories from which they were to select one response for each of the items:

(1) "very much agree" which means the child often shows that kind of behavior.

(2) "**a**gree" which means the child sometimes shows that kind of behavior

(3) "disagree" which means the child never shows

that kind of behavior.

At the bottom of the questionnaire, the investigator left a space for the students to add other kinds of misbehavior that they might sometimes show.

In analyzing the data the investigator retained those items which 60 percent or more of the students checked as "very much agree" and "agree". These were considered to be representative of the kinds of misbehavior common among Thai children.

The next step was concerned with the type of punishment used by parents. Again, the kinds of disciplines developed by Epstein² were consulted and twenty-seven of the original thirty-one were selected.

As before, the selection was based on those items which were considered to be appropriate to Thai culture.

The twenty-seven forms of punishment which were used in this study are listed below.

1. Tell the child how he ought to behave
2. Have a long talk with the child
3. Tell the child he's not liked
4. Ask the child why he did a bad thing
5. Make the child do more housework than usual

² Ibid.

6. Scold the child
7. Tell the child he'll have trouble
8. Make the child apologize
9. Warn the child of a spanking
10. Tell the child to go away
11. Take away allowance
12. Tell the child he hurt the parents' feelings
13. Make the child do work that he dislikes
14. No movies for a month
15. Look mad at the child
16. Send the child to bed earlier than usual
17. Take away television
18. Take away dessert
19. Spank the child
20. Tell the child to stand for a long time
21. Don't pay attention to the child
22. Take away toys
23. No new clothes
24. Tell the child he can't play with friends
25. Send the child to bed without supper
26. Make the child leave home
27. Whip the child

The procedure for rating these items was the same as before i.e. subjects were given three categories from which they were to select one response for each of the items:

(1) "very much agree" which means they think that their parents often use that kind of punishment

(2) "agree" which means their parents sometimes use that kind of punishment

(3) "disagree" which means their parents never use that kind of punishment

Again, a space was provided for the students to add other kinds of punishment that their parents might use but which did not appear in this list.

As before, those items which were checked "very much agree" and "agree" by 60 percent or more of the subjects were chosen as types of parental punishment used by Thai parents. types of parental punishment u

In the next step, eighty students were asked to rate the relative severity of these disciplines on a six-point scale. These were as follows:

- 5 - extremely severe
- 4 - moderately severe
- 3 - severe
- 2 - not severe
- 1 - moderately not severe
- 0 - extremely not severe

Each number was given an arbitrary integral weight of 6, 5, 4, 3, 2, and 1 respectively. In analyzing the data, means and standard deviations were obtained and the punishments were ranked from high to low. The results are presented in Table 1.

Table 1
Means and Standard Deviations for Severity
Ratings of Each Discipline

Discipline	Mean*	S.D.
Tell child how he ought to behave	5.23	1.00
Ask child why he did bad thing	4.89	1.13
Have a long talk with child	4.64	1.21
Send child to bed early than usual	4.45	1.20
Make child apologize	4.44	1.22
Take away toys	4.35	1.38
Take away television	4.23	1.41
Warn child of spanking	3.73	1.33
Tell child he's not liked	3.60	1.60
Take away allowance	3.45	1.37
Tell child he can't play with friends	3.44	0.52
Make child do work that he dislikes	3.07	1.28
Tell child he hurt parents' feelings	2.94	1.65
Look mad at child	2.90	1.32
Spank child	2.88	1.17
Whip the child	1.46	0.82

* A high number indicates a low severity rating.

From this list, four alternatives were selected according to the following criteria: (1) they should represent the range of severity ratings, (2) in order to minimize disagreement among children regarding severity ratings, they should have the smallest variability, and (3) in order to generalize the scale across different class groups, the alternatives should not differ significantly in severity ratings across different groups. On this basis the following discipline techniques, ranging from least to most punitive, were selected as response alternatives and were given arbitrary integral weights of 1, 2, 3 and 4 respectively:

006934

- (1) tell me how I ought to behave
- (2) make me apologize
- (3) tell me I can't play with friends
- (4) whip me

In the final scale, the thirty-two of the original forty-three items concerned with situations of misbehavior that were checked by 60 percent or more of the subjects were retained, and the four response alternatives, randomly ordered, followed each of these situations. (A copy of the final scale is shown in the appendix) A sample item was as follows:-

If I hit another child,



My Father would

My Mother would

- a. Whip me.....a
- b. tell me how I ought to behave.....b
- c. make me apologize.....c
- d. tell me I can't play with friends.....d

The students' task was to respond to each of the thirty-two items by choosing one of the four alternatives first, in terms of what they thought their father would do and secondly, in terms of what they thought their mother would do. Responses to each item were differentially weighted from 1 to 4 in terms of their relative severity, and the score on the final scale consists of the sum of the weighted item scores. The scale was scored separately for father and mother resulting in two scores for each child.

Statistical Procedure

In order to determine the reliability of this scale, the thirty-two items of misbehavior along with the four alternatives of punishment were administered to 120 students. A reliability coefficient was obtained by using Hoyt's Analysis of Variance Procedure. Hoyt assumes that the score of an individual on a test may be divided into four dependent components as follows:-

1. A component common to all individuals and to all items.

2. A component associated with the items.
3. A component associated with the individuals.
4. An **e**rror component that is independent of
1, 2 and 3.