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This study examined the relationship between family status and child behavior and the relationship between the primary caregiver groups and child behavior. In total, there were 40 non-randomly selected participants who took part in a cross-sectional design. The Final Survey consisted of a combined questionnaire of the Child Behavior Checklist and the Eyberg Child Behavior Inventory. This study found that there were no statistically significant differences between singular and dual households in regards to child behavior (p = .222) and no statistically significant differences between the primary caregiver groups in regards to child behavior (p = .312). The conclusions drawn from the findings suggest that living arrangements and the primary caregiver groups do not influence maladaptive child behavior.
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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

This study will examine the relationship between child behavior and his or her family status. Background, incidence, and scope of the research will be presented. The statement of the research problem will acknowledge influences of singular and dual parenting. Lastly, this chapter will present the research questions and hypotheses.

Background, Incidence, and Scope of the Research Problem

Background

There are many factors that contribute to a child’s behavior. Those factors may include the environment, academics, peers, and parenting (Dodge, Coi, & Lynam, 2007). Variables such as these can influence a child’s behavior in both a positive and negative manner. Children living in poverty-stricken areas with single parents who have low levels of education, lack of social support, and frequent occurrence of moving homes are at a high risk of presenting cognitive complications and behavioral issues (Cabrera, Fagan, Wright, & Schadler, 2011). Household dynamics – dual or single parent households – as well as the relationship of the caregiver to the child(ren) have also affect child behavior. Historically speaking, sociologists suggested that instability and chaotic situations, regarding household dynamics, emerged from slavery (Ruggles, 1994). During slavery, families were torn apart. Family members were sold to different plantations, marriages were not recognized, and women were violated by the slave master. These acts destroyed
the family life; because of this, the slave households often centered on fatherless arrangements (Roberts, 2014).

Dynamics that have led to single parent homes include the mother not marrying prior to the birth of her child, or being divorced or widowed (Weinraub & Wolf, 1983). Divorce has risen over the past 150 years; marriage rates have been declining, and rising divorce rates were followed by high remarriage rates. Additionally, the importance of marriage and childbearing has changed through generations; partners have delayed time to get married and start families of their own. Due to these factors, out-of-wedlock births have been on the rise (Stevenson & Wolfrers, 2007).

Dynamics that have led to changes in the nuclear family include the parents being divorced, separated, remarried or widowed (Weinraub & Wolf, 1983). Within the families that are divorced or separated, they are considered to be “binuclear” or “intact” families because their jobs are the same: to care for the children and build relationships (Ahrons, 1994). After divorce, men are more likely to remarry because the mother is more likely to have full custody of the children. The mother may not have time to look for another potential partner due to taking on additional responsibilities as a single parent. On the other hand, remarriage has been replaced by cohabitation, in which the mother or father lives with their partner (Casper & Bianchi, 2001).

Youth that develop from single parent homes are likely to experience single parenthood in their adult life. Single parenthood homes have been correlated to result in teenage pregnancies and juvenile delinquency (Hogan & Kitagawa, 1985). It was discovered that youth from single parent homes are likely to engage in sexual or criminal activity than their counterparts in dual parent homes. This is due to the lack of attention
and communication between the parent and child (Blum et al., 2000). Researchers found that single parent homes did not provide its children with sufficient support and encouragement (McLanahan & Astone, 1991). It is suggested that single parents experience different stressors than dual parent families. Family support and environmental factors were concerns for single parent families (Friedemann & Andrews, 1990). Fathers were absent in single mother homes, impacting children emotionally. Contrary to married parents, single mothers labored long hours to accommodate financial status. Due to such factors, single parent homes experienced less support and social interaction (Weinraub & Wolf, 1983).

Incidence

In particular, single mothers of African American (54%) and Latino families are affected by the instability of homes and maladaptive child behavior (Kalil and Foster, 2007). Research has shown that children from dual parent households have greater opportunities to succeed educationally, emotionally, and psychologically (Kalil and Foster, 2007). In 2002, it was reported that 36% of African American children, 15% of Latino children, and 12% of White children lived in single mother homes; on the other hand, 69% of White children, 55% of Latino children, and 27% of African American children lived in two-parent homes (Wherry, & Finegold, 2004; Kreider & Fields, 2005). Also, at least 67% of African American youth are more likely to live in a single mother household during childhood and adolescence (U.S. Census Bureau, 2009).

Scope

African-American and Latino families are more likely to include co-parenting in their households. Co-parents are the relative of the child and live in the home in which
the child is being raised; typically, the co-parent is deemed to be the
grandparent, aunt or uncle of the child. These groups of families are also more likely to
experience this long-term challenge compared to their counterpart (Sterrett et al., 2013).
Consequences that have resulted from unstable family status include the low
socioeconomic status, educational disadvantages, neighborhood disadvantages,
household composition, and children modeling internalized and externalized behaviors
(Kalil and Foster, 2007; Sterrett et al., 2013). Single parenthood leads to maladaptive
behaviors that include drug and alcohol use, criminal activity, promiscuous sexual
activity, unplanned pregnancies, and truancy (McLanahan, 1988).

Statement of the Research Problem

The issue that prompted the need for this study was singular parent households
being a vulnerable population because it is perceived that children from these households
exert maladaptive behaviors. Households headed by single parents are limited in support,
parenting, financial status, and education. The problem needs to be studied because these
youth are said to be more at risk for behavior issues and cognitive development
complications.

Children tend to learn the basis of their behaviors, including aggressive behaviors,
from their primary caregivers. A child is heavily dependent on the caregiver and their
notion of marital and social support and quality (Dadd, 1987). Cabrera, Fagan, Wright,
and Schadler (2011) conducted the Early Childhood Longitudinal Study, which examined
whether an association between children's cognitive and social behaviors existed. Social
behaviors, paternal and maternal chances were indirectly correlated to maternal
sensitivity and father commitment. Youth between the ages of six and sixteen that come
from singular parenting are likely to engage in antisocial activity ranging from fighting and disobedience to alcohol and drug use, theft, and other misdemeanors in comparison to youth that come from dual parenting (Loeber, 1982). It is important to study these behaviors as a result of single parent households because with limited financial resources and support, the parent experiences stress due to responsibilities. This stress is inflicted on the child who exerts maladaptive behaviors (Jackson, Preston, & Franke, 2010).

**Purpose of the Study**

The purpose of this quantitative study is to provide knowledge addressing how family status impacts child behavior.

**Research Questions and Hypotheses**

Overarching question. Does a family status of singular or dual parenthood influence child behavior?

RQ1. Is there a statistically significant difference between groups of singular and dual parenthood in regard to child behavior?

Null hypothesis. There is no statistically significant difference between groups of singular and dual parenthood in regard to child behavior.

Alternative hypothesis. There is a statistically significant difference between groups of singular and dual parenthood in regard to child behavior.

RQ2. Is there a statistical significant difference between the primary caregiver groups in regard to child behavior?

Null hypothesis. There is no statistically significant difference between the primary caregiver groups in regard to child behavior.
Alternative hypothesis. There is a statistically significant difference between the primary caregiver groups in regard to child behavior.

**Summary Statement**

In brief, Chapter I reviewed the background, incidence and scope of the research problem. Furthermore, the segment discussed the state of the research problem, research questions and hypotheses.
CHAPTER II
LITERATURE REVIEW

The purpose of this chapter is to explain the conceptual definitions used in the study. The review of previous literatures will be synthesized and analyzed according to themes suggested. Lastly, the theoretical frameworks will explain the relationships between the variables.

Conceptual Definitions

In order to fully understand what is being examined, the variables have been defined. The independent variable, familial status, is the responsibility for the care of an immediate family member. Familial status is broken down into two types: 1) singular parenthood, which is one who is a parent to child(ren) under the age of 18; this person is either widowed, divorced, or never remarried and 2) dual parenthood, which are two persons in the state of being parents and the responsibilities involved (Equal Opportunities Commission, 2014). Terms such as family status, household dynamics, structure of a family, and family structure will used interchangeably. The dependent variable, child behavior, is broken down into two types: 1) internalized behavior, which is described as the withdrawn, anxious, and depressed conduct, and 2) externalized behavior, which is described as the hostile, aggressive, hyperactive, and disruptive conduct (Campbell, Shaw, and Gilliom, 2000; Eisenberg et al., 2001; Jianghong, 2004; Chen, Lewis, and Liu, 2011). This study will consider all themes concerning externalized
and internalized behaviors.

Review of Literature

This section explains prior research pertaining to children and their externalized and internalized behavior. Children tend to become antisocial, aggressive, and delinquent. The literature below examined the factors of household dynamics that influenced children’s behaviors. Sedatives are distributed to calm or elevate a child’s mood; however, the situation is deeper than adjusting a child’s attitude. Behavior is a modeled reinforcement and starts in the home, where children are exposed to various attitudes, behaviors, and transitions. These contributing factors are responsible for displayed internalized and externalized behaviors. This review will focus on two major themes that were identified throughout literature reviewed: family status and child behavior.

Family Status

Cognitive Development

Family status can greatly influence a child’s cognitive and socio-emotional balance (Ferguson, Cassells, MacAllister, & Evans, 2013). Family transitions within household dynamics can influence a child’s advancement through social and emotional interactions with others and themselves (Cabrera et al., 2011). Cavanagh and Fomby (2012) found that children that experience constant transitions are likely to attend schools that do not produce high levels of achievement and experience levels of stress and depression. African-American children living in blended environments displayed high levels of externalizing problems compared to only living with their mother (Kalil & Foster, 2007).
Emotional Development and Self-Esteem

Emotions and self-esteem are also of consideration. One study conducted by Bornstein, Hendricks, Haynes, and Painter (2007) examined co-parent depression in relation to the child’s externalized behavior and also reported high levels of self-esteem due to high level of warmth given by the co-parent. Co-parenting has been associated with low concentrations of externalizing behaviors. Co-parents were reported to have been inspiring in terms of displaying positive behaviors (Bornstein et al., 2007). On the contrary, in a study conducted by Sterrett et al. (2015), two participants reported that their relationship with the co-parent was not encouraging. Results showed that the more interactions a child has with co-parents, increased levels of self-esteem and decreased levels of externalized behaviors would be displayed (Sterrett et al., 2015). It was found that irritable emotions amongst the mother and co-parent would originate the child’s maladaptive behavior (Gonzalez et al., 2014).

Household Transitions

Home arrangements have been known to be a great support to children and their development (Bradley & Putnick, 2012). As reported by Coleman (1988), familial stability includes family time, affection, and attention. The stability of a household needs to be strong and consistent. It would be benefiting to the child to have both parents in the home or the strong, dependable and reliable monitoring of the parent and co-parent. These factors assist in providing the child with stable care, comfort, and watchfulness (Bornstein et al., 2007). Transitions were due to single mothers bringing partners into the home. These unstable, in-home modifications create emotional predicaments for children. Mothers with multiple transitions are negatively correlated with a child’s social behavior;
the fathers’ nonexistence was positively correlated to conflict for the child. These dynamics influence the child’s behavior in a positive or negative manner; they may experience a number of unstable family transitions or dwell in parent-stepparent households. These instances do not provide a comforted or loving space for the child, causing conflict (Bornstein et al., 2007).

Through household transitions, children see who comes into the home and the disruption that is caused. This creates a feeling of neglect and strife among the child, mother, and partner(s). In this case, the partner is identified as the male companion the mother chooses to date. The mother may choose to exchange her companion, or date other men that she might find as a suitable partner. Married mothers were reported to have many partner exchanges before giving birth to their children. On the contrary, unmarried mothers experienced numerous partner exchanges prior to and following the birth of their children (Cabrera et al., 2011). Children with unmarried mothers were exposed to multiple partnerships aside from their counterparts (Osborne & McLanahan, 2007). Single mothers have more transitions in the home compared to married mothers due to finding a stable partner. Households are believed to be sacred regarding the upbringing of families (Bornstein et al., 2007).

**Home Arrangements**

When common arrangement of parents are never married, divorced, or separated, the co-parent is brought into the home. The presence of co-parents is common within the African-American community (Sterrett et al., 2015). The co-parent is the grandparent, aunt, or cousin living with the single mother; they are very influential and positive for the child. Other frequent persons in the home would apply to the stepmother, godmother, or
adoptive mother (Sterrett et al., 2015; Barnett, Rowley, Zimmerman, Vansadia, & Caldwell, 2011). Gonzalez, Jones, and Parent (2014) found that most co-parents were women over the age of fifty. The co-parent living in or visiting the home relieves stress for the household. The co-parent provides assistance, social support, and endearment. Co-parenting maintains additional support when transitions are overwhelming (Bornstein et al., 2007). Grandparents can guide behavior according to the sensitivity of the parent, affecting the child’s development (Mesman, van IJzendoorn, & Bakermans-Kranenburg, 2012). Co-parents are positive and influential for the children in single-parent homes. Grandparents are reported be supportive emotionally, psychologically, and financially. Children are more drawn to their grandparents when they live in the home; there is stability and fewer familial transitions. Household arrangements that include co-parenting are very supportive and reflect parental behaviors (Monserud & Elder, Jr., 2011).

Child Behavior

Cognitive Development

Aggression, attention, anxiety, and conduct are all important components of behavior. These dynamics are established when the child is in the developmental stages (McAdams, 2001; Gorney, Moore, & Rosenthal, 1981). According to literature, it is vital for a child to develop cognitively, emotionally, and psychologically well (Bornstein et al., 2007; Cabrera et al., 2011; Mesman et al., 2012; Ferguson et al., 2013). Children who display nonmaladaptive behaviors have high levels of cognitive learning and retention (Wentzel, 1991). Linares et al. (2005) were able to account that the higher amount of efficacy a child displays, the lower their disruptive behavior; on the contrary, the lower amount of efficacy a child displays, the higher their disruptive behavior.
Parental Influence

Children with single mothers were more likely to have aggressive behaviors (Osborne & McLanahan, 2007). The mothers’ age was positively correlated to the child’s delinquent behavior; therefore, the higher the mothers’ age, the more likely the child will display externalized behaviors. It was concluded that the older the parent, the less time the parent is able to provide attention for the child (Taylor, Budescu, & Gebre, 2014).

Paternal sensitivity is equally important regarding a child’s behavior (Mesman et al., 2012). Children from single parent homes were likely to display reckless behavior (Formby & Cherlin, 2007). Crowder and Teachman (2004) found their sample of young women more at risk for premarital pregnancy due to many changes in the household. Parental and peer norms were initiators of the child’s behavior (Biddle, Bank, Anderson, Hauge, & Keats, 1985). Parents should participate in their children’s lives. Household burdens and establishments are gateways to their children’s behavior (Eve, Byrne, & Gagliardi, 2014). Transitions in the household can affect a child’s behavior depending on the support the parents maintain. It is the parent’s responsibility to provide a substantial living condition, emotional backing, and financial growth for a child’s proper development. When care and guidance is benefited, the child is less likely to become deviant and mischievous (Mesman et al., 2012; Ferguson et al., 2013).

Internalized and Externalized Behavior

Mothers with multiple transitions are negatively correlated with a child’s social behavior (Cabrera et al., 2011). Antisocial behavior is highly correlated to the parents’ neglect in supervising their children. It has been assumed that the lack of parental awareness would cause a significant level of antisocial behavior (Loeber, 1982). In
another report, mothers who support their children resulted in having positive social behaviors (Mesman et al., 2012). A child's antisocial and delinquent behavior is caused by rejection and negative learning criticism. (Wentzel, 1991).

Regarding behavior, adolescents from single parent homes reported drug and alcohol use. Adolescents exposed to familial transitions displayed internalized behaviors (Barnett et al., 2011). Negligent behavior distracts and hinders teachers from disposing knowledge for other children. The child's behavior is exhibited at home and later reinforced at school (Wentzel, 1991).

In brief, children misbehave according to factors such as familial status and the relation of the primary caregiver to the child. However, there is a strong correlation concerning children's behavior and household dynamics.

**Theoretical Frameworks**

**Afrocentric Perspective**

The Afrocentric Perspective was formed by Molefi Kete Asante, the founder of Afrocentrism. Its origin derives from the African diaspora. The Afrocentric Perspective is an explanation for the observed facts and laws that regulate ideas and constructs. Afrocentricity exposes and actively resists "white racial domination" over African-Americans. It transforms African-Americans toward the cultural center and presents an ideology of values, spirituality, and rituals; and analyzes disciplines, such as literature, music, art, politics, science, religion, history, languages, and economics (Asante, 2014).

The term "afrocentrism" dates back to 1962. It appears in a proposal for an entry in *Encyclopedia Africana* by W.E.B. Du Bois. The theoretical noun dates back to the 1970s, and was commercialized by Molefi Kete Asante's novel *Afrocentricity: The*

Molefi Kete Asante, born Arthur Lee Smith, Jr., is a prominent figure in the knowledge of African and African-American Studies. Currently, Asante is a professor of African-American Studies at Temple University, where he founded the doctoral program in African-American Studies and holds presidency of the Molefi Kete Asante Institute for Afrocentric Studies. Asante is highly recognized for his thoughts and writings on Afrocentricity. His work has significantly impacted sociology, intercultural communication, critical theory, political science, African history, and social work (Asante, 2014).

The Afrocentric Perspective explains that the value of life lies in the interpersonal relationships between people; one gains knowledge through symbolic imagery and rhythm; one should live in harmony with nature; there is oneness between humans and nature; the survival of the group holds the utmost importance; men should appropriately utilize the materials around them; one’s self is complementary to others; change occurs in a natural, evolutionary cycle; spirituality of inner divinities hold the most significance; there are a plethora of deities to worship; cooperation, collective responsibility, and interdependence are the key values to which all should strive to achieve; and the Afrocentric worldview is a circular one, in which all events are tied together with one another (Asante, 2014).

The Afrocentric Perspective provides reinforcement for continual sensitivities to the need of filtering all social, economical, and political experiences. The paradigm understands consequences that affect Blacks and other oppressed people. Its concepts
emphasize the sense of collectivism, holistic care, stability, and unity among people (Asante, 2014). In regards to the philosophy of the Afrocentric Perspective, if primary caregiver groups provide strong and stable households, then the child will not display maladaptive behaviors.

**Social Cognitive Theory**

Albert Bandura developed a theory that focused on the impact of modeling and observational learning. The Social Cognitive Theory deals with learning by observing the attitudes and behaviors of others, reasoning development, and the environment. While observing the behavior, communication, and the person, Bandura (1985) suggested that these factors can be strong at any point. Furthermore, the observer will learn from the more responsive factor. Different from his Social Learning Theory, Bandura renamed his standpoint because concepts in this particular view had advanced. Unfortunately, the theory became misrepresentative because it applied to several other theories. This theory is very similar to Vygotsky's Social Development Theory, Lave's Situated Learning, Miller and Dollard's drive theory, and Rotter's Expectancy Theory, which all highlight the magnitude of social learning (Bandura, 1985).

Bandura considered reciprocal causation model, believing that there were strong associations among constant relationships concerning behavior and personal factors, cognition, and the environment. He also mentioned if environment causes behavior, then behavior causes environment as well. Bandura suggested that personality was an interaction between the environment, behavior, and psychological process. It is linked between behaviorist and cognitive learning theorists based on attention, memory and motivation (Bandura, 1985).
Social cognitive theory surveyed the reasoning and makeup of self-efficacy and adolescent development. Self-efficacy determines and develops the scope considering child interactions. Children gain their development through interactions at home and at school. Their cognitive learning and self-efficacy is derived from their peers, teachers, and designed activities (Eccles & Gootman, 2001; Tseng & Seidman, 2007).

Household dynamics take account for the motivation behind internal and external behavior (Bandura, 2002). Children display behavior due to their home environment. Factors include familial transitions, parental sensitivity, and responses of situations encountered (Bornstein et al., 2007). The level of the parents’ behavior around the child impacts their cognitive development. Children see positive modeling of the parent, increasing their social and language development (Roggman, Cook, Innocenti, Norman, & Christiansen, 2013). If the household displays positive interactions, then the child displays nonmaladaptive behavior.

**Summary Statement**

The themes, familial status and child behavior were thoroughly clarified for the information that is to be examined for the significance of the study. A literature review was conducted. The theories previously mentioned can be applied to familial status impact on child’s behavior.
CHAPTER III
METHODOLOGY

The purpose of this chapter is to re-introduce the research questions and hypotheses of the study and present the research design. The sampling methods will be examined, as well as the data collection methods. Lastly, the data analysis methods will be discussed.

Research Questions and Hypotheses

Overarching question. Does a family status of singular or dual parenthood influence child behavior?

RQ1. Is there a statistically significant difference between groups of singular or dual parenthood in regard to child behavior?

Null hypothesis. There is no statistically significant difference between groups of singular or dual parenthood in regard to child behavior.

Alternative hypothesis. There is a statistically significant difference in groups of singular or dual parenthood in regard to child behavior. There is a negative relationship between groups of singular or dual parenthood and the aggressive behavior of the child; therefore, if the status of a family increases, then the aggressive behavior of the child decreases.

RQ2. Is there a statistically significant difference between the primary caregiver
groups in regard to child behavior?

Null hypothesis. There is no statistically significant difference between the primary caregiver groups in regard to child behavior.

Alternative hypothesis. There is a statistically significant difference between the primary caregiver groups in regard to child behavior.

**Research Design**

A cross-sectional, quantitative design was used to test the hypotheses. The independent variable was household dynamics and relation of the primary caregiver, and the dependent variable was child behavior. The data was conducted at one time and designed to seek objectivity.

**Sampling Methods**

The questionnaire was administered to forty nonrandomly selected parents of children between the ages of six and thirteen within the community. The sample for this study included female and male participants, who were parents of students, particularly elementary and middle school. This nonrandom procedure is availability sampling. Because these participants spend a great amount of time with their children, they were able to assess their children's behavior. This sampling was completed by recruiting participants in the community through email and person-to-person contact. Additionally, snowball sampling was used. Participants also received follow-up emails prior to the study in the hopes of increasing responses. The informed consent was attached to the survey link, and the participants were all informed of the potential risks and benefits of their participation in the study. They were all notified that they could withdraw from the study without penalty.
Data Collection Methods

For the demographic inquiry, the participants were asked to identify the type of household in which they live, their education level, the age of their child, the number of children in the home, and their primary caregiver’s relation to the child. Additionally, items from two surveys were merged to measure child behavior – the Child Behavior Checklist and the Eyberg Child Behavior Inventory questionnaires. The survey would take ten minutes to complete.

The Child Behavior Checklist (CBCL) developed by Thomas M. Achenbach is a scale that assesses attention, anxiety, and conduct. The scale consists of items on a three point Likert scale. Responses of the scale include: 0 = Not True, 1 = Somewhat True or Sometimes True, and 2 = Very True or Often True. This school-aged checklist consists of 120 questions. The total score from the scale ranges from 0 - 240, with 240 being the ultimate potential score and representing maladaptive behavior. The CBCL had solid counts of interrater reliability and convergent validity (Nakamura, Ebesutani, Bernstein, & Chorpita, 2009; Achenbach & Rescorla, 2001).

The Eyberg Child Behavior Inventory (ECBI) developed by Sheila Eyberg is a scale that assesses aggression and conduct among children ages 2-16. The scale consists of 36 items on a seven point Likert scale. Responses of the scale include: 1= Never, 2 or 3 = Seldom, 4 = Sometimes, 5 or 6 = Often, and 7 = Always. This questionnaire consists of 36 questions. The total score from the scale ranges from 36 – 252, with 252 being the ultimate potential score and representing maladaptive behavior. The ECBI scale had high internal consistency reliability and validity (Eyberg, Boggs, & Reynolds, 1980; Gross et al., 2007).
Data Analysis Methods

The research questions were analyzed by using parametric tests. Research question one was analyzed using the Independent $t$-test in which the independent variable was measured at a nominal level with two groups, and the dependent variable was measured at an interval level. Research question two was analyzed using the One-Way ANOVA in which the independent variable, being of four groups, was measured at a nominal level, and the dependent variable was measured at an interval level. Reliability of the scales was investigated by using the SPSS software. The rejection criterion was set at .05.

Summary Statement

This chapter stated the research questions and hypotheses, in addition to the detailed description of sampling, data collection and analysis methods used to undertake the research.
CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

The purpose of this chapter is to present the results of the study. The sample description includes the living situation, relation of the primary caregiver, and level of education achieved. Reliability was conducted to check internal consistency. Descriptive statistics of the Final Survey, used to operationalize child behavior, are explained. Data was cleaned and evaluated in order to assure that variables were suitable for analysis. Lastly, the hypotheses for the study were tested.

Sample Description

In the sample, among the living situation and family status, there were single parents households (n=16, 40%) and two-parent households (n=24, 60%). Among the primary caregivers, there were the biological mother and father (n=22, 55%), mother and father either as stepparent (n=3, 7.5%), single mother (n=13, 32.5%), and foster parent (2, 5.0%). Among the level of education, there were those with less than a high school diploma (n=1, 2.5%), a high school diploma (n=14, 35%), an undergraduate degree (n=16, 40%), and a graduate or professional degree (n=9, 22.5%). In total, there were forty participants. Below Table 1 displays the descriptive statistics of the sample.
Table 1

*Descriptive of the Study Sample (N = 40)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Attributes</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Living Situation</td>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Single Parent</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Two-Parent</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>60.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relation of the Primary Caregiver</td>
<td>Mother &amp; Father (Birth)</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>55.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mother &amp; Father (Either as step parent)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Single Mother</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>32.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Foster Parent</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of Education</td>
<td>Less than High School</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High School</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>35.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Graduate or Professional</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>22.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Reliability Analysis**

The researcher used a twenty-question survey, a combination of the Child Behavior Checklist and the Eyberg Child Behavior Inventory that measure attention, aggression, anxiety, and conduct, to operationalize child behavior. In order to understand whether the questions in the survey all reliably measure child behavior, a Cronbach’s alpha was run on a sample size of forty parents. The Final Survey is reliable, based upon the Cronbach’s alpha coefficient of .87. Given that the coefficient is above .80, this scale has high internal consistency.
Descriptive Statistics for Scales

The Final Survey, containing 20 items, was used to operationalize child behavior. The range of scores was from 24 – 67. The survey was on a 5-point Likert scale, which ranged from “never” to “always”. The higher scores are interpreted as higher levels of maladaptive behaviors. The total score for behavior following the responses of the survey (M=45.30, SD=10.42) had a maximum score of 67.00 and a minimum score of 24.00, bringing the midpoint of the scale to 45.50. Table 2 shows these results.

Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th># of Items</th>
<th>Alpha</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Midpoint</th>
<th>Min - Max</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CBC</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>.875</td>
<td>45.30</td>
<td>10.42</td>
<td>45.50</td>
<td>24 - 67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Items on the scale included those similar to the following. Forty percent (n=16) of the participants selected “rarely” in regards to the statement “My child verbally fights with children own age”, whereas 37.5% (n=15) selected “never”, 17.5% (n=7) selected “sometimes”, and 5% (n=2) selected “often” with this statement.

Forty-seven point five percent (n=19) of the participants selected “never” in regards to the statement “My child bites his/her fingernails”, whereas 27.5% (n=11) selected “sometimes”, 12.5% (n=5) selected “often”, 10% (n=4) selected “rarely”, and 2.5% (n=1) selected “all of the time” with this statement.
Thirty-five percent (n=14) of the participants selected “rarely” in regards to the statement “My child clings to adults”, whereas 27.5% (n=11) selected “never”, 25% (n=10) selected “sometimes”, and 12.5% (n=5) selected “often” with this statement.

**Data Evaluation**

The data was cleaned prior to completing the analyses of the independent t-test and one-way ANOVA. First, incomplete cases were deleted. Missing data were replaced for the statement “my child gets teased a lot” by using the median. There was no need to reverse the scores to yield the same interpretation, as they already did. Reliability was checked to determine whether scale items were highly correlated. The total score was computed for the scale.

The child behavior variable was slightly negatively skewed, as revealed by the Fisher’s coefficient (-0.52) but normally distributed because it was in the range of (-1.96) and (+1.96). Figure 1 of the Q-Q normal probability plot and histogram confirms these results below.

![Normal P-P Plot of TS_Behavior and Histogram](image)

*Figure 1. Q-Q normal probability plot and histogram for the Final Survey.*
Additionally, regarding the first research question, homoscedasticity was run to assess for variances between the familial status groups using the Levene’s test of equality of means (p=.807). Homogeneity was satisfied because there were no significant differences between family status, as the p value was greater than .05.

The Levene’s statistic test was run for the second research question to test the homogeneity of variances (p=1.034) between primary caregiver types. Homogeneity was satisfied because the p value, being greater than .05, indicated that there were no statistically differences in the relation of the primary caregiver.

**Hypothesis Testing**

The study examined the following research questions: 1) Is there a statically significant difference between groups of family status in regard to child behavior? and 2) Is there a statistically significant difference between the primary caregiver groups in regard to child behavior?

Research Question 1:

Is there a statically significant difference between groups of family status in regard to child behavior? An independent t-test was run to determine if there were differences in family status and child behavior. The null hypothesis was not rejected; there were no statistically significant differences between groups of family status and child behavior. The p-value was greater than .05, so child behavior is not dependent on family status. The results are shown below in Table 3.
Table 3

Results of the Independent t-test – Behavior by Parenthood

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Behavior Single</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>42.81</td>
<td>10.19</td>
<td>-1.241</td>
<td>.222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent Home Two-Parent</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>46.95</td>
<td>10.45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Two-tailed p-value

Research Question 2:

Is there a statistically significant difference between the primary caregiver groups in regard to child behavior?

The one-way ANOVA was run to determine if there were differences among the relation of the caregiver and child behavior. The null hypothesis was not rejected; there were no statistically significant differences between the relationship of the primary caregiver to the child with regard to their child’s behavior ($F(3,36)= 1.233$, $p= .312$). A Bonferroni post hoc test further confirmed that there were no statistically significant differences between all of the groups (biological mother and father, mother and father either as step parent, single mother, and foster parent). This information is shown in Tables 4 and 5.
CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION

The purpose of this study was to determine if a statistically significant difference in the relationship between family status and child behavior and a relationship between the relation of the primary caregiver and child behavior exists. Major findings were summarized and compared to previous research. Here, it will be examined how the results fit into extant literature. The significance of the study will be presented. The study recognizes its limitations and provides recommendations for use of further research. Lastly, there were minimal risks to all participants, with benefits that will also be addressed.

Summary of Study Findings

The study results found that there are no statistically significant differences between family status in regards to child behavior, as well as there being no statistically significant differences between the relation of the primary caregiver in regards to child behavior.

It was found that two-parent households were more prevalent than single parent households. Single mothers and biological parents represented the majority of the sample. Ultimately, children that came from single parent homes did not display a significant level of maladaptive behavior as previous literature has suggested.
Discussion of Findings

Cleveland, Wiebe, van den Oord, and Rowe (2000) agree with this current study's finding that there were no differences in the primary caregiver groups in consideration to child behavior. Furthermore, this is explained as there are no differences between the number of parents in the home and the primary caregiver groups in consideration to the degree that the child externalizes his or her behaviors.

Crowder and Teachman (2004) came to the conclusion that children from single parent home display high levels of troubling behavior. The results of this study disagree with their outcome because children from single parent homes did not display high levels of maladaptive behaviors. Kalil and Foster (2007) stated that single mothers did not provide stability, causing children to act out aggressively and confront others. Results of this study disagree and conclude that children from single parent homes do not necessarily exert maladaptive behaviors. The findings of this study disagree with researchers Osborne and McLanahan (2007) and their findings that living arrangements and the primary caregiver impact child behavior. Results from this study conclude that living arrangements and the relation of the primary caregiver to the child do not influence maladaptive behavior. Finally, this study differed from previous research in that certain demographic factors, such as ethnicity was not taken into consideration (Hogan & Kitagawa, 1985; McLanahan, 1988; Blum et al., 2000; Wherry & Finegold, 2004; Kreider & Fields, 2005; Kalil & Foster, 2007; Bornstein et al., 2007; Osborne & McLanahan, 2007; Fomby & Cherlin, 2007; Barnett et al., 2011; Sterrett et al., 2013; and Gonzalez et al., 2014).
Significance of Study

This study will contribute to the body of knowledge regarding the influence of family status on child behavior because it used the variables of the study to link the principles of the preservation of life. The Afrocentric Perspective values harmony and assistance in relationships – being complimentary to others, cooperation, collective responsibility, and interdependence. This idea has a holistic view and is tied to kinship standards, emphasizing the importance of working together for the benefit of a group of vulnerable people. Those key factors contributed to the study because the values were reflected in living situations in which children did not display maladaptive behavior. Specifically, the paradigm is seen in the living situation of single parent homes. That factor presents strong and resilient parents and households for their children.

Of importance, some research on this topic is extremely outdated. Between this study and previous research conducted, there are thirty-three years in which research was completed. There is at least a fifteen-year difference between this current study and that of Cleveland et al., and the findings mirror each other. As a result, the study will contribute by providing updated results on this topic.

Regarding the profession, social workers can act as mediators and counselors to assist families in how they can be cared for, including providing the needed resources for single parent homes. Social workers will also provide integrity, competence, and exert the importance of human relationships.

Limitations and Recommendations

In regards to the methodology, the study had limitations because the survey was self-reported, and participants were selected nonrandomly, which could leave the
opportunity for affecting generalizability. Due to the limitation in sampling method, it would be recommended that there be random selection of participants so results can be generalized.

Additional research questions for future studies might include the impact of other variables on the topic. Future researchers could examine how socioeconomic status of a singular and dual parenthood influences child behavior, as well as examining if the primary caregiver’s choice of disciplinary actions influences child behavior. Also all possible primary caregivers should be taken into consideration.

**Human Subject Issues**

While there were no direct benefits to the study, participants were able to add to the body of knowledge regarding the impact of child behavior due to family status. Based on the variables and purpose of the study, as participants, parents were able to contribute to the knowledge because they could account for externalized and internalized behaviors displayed at home.

There was no incentive for participating in the study. The study posed minimal risks, including possible emotional distress, as the questions on the survey were very personal. Since such risks were expected, the researcher was able to manage the risks by reiterating confidentiality of the parents and their children. Secondly, the participants were made aware of their choice to withdraw their survey from the study without penalty if they felt uncomfortable about the study and survey questions that were being asked. Lastly, following the completion of the survey, referrals to counseling centers were readily available to participants if they experienced emotional and psychological distress.
The data from the survey will be discarded by being deleted from the computer. The researcher used unbiased language in the online consent form and electronic survey. No information was falsified.

**Summary Statement**

Previous research was compared to major finding of this study. Suggestions were presented for further research. The significance of this study in regards to social work was discussed. Additionally, limitations, recommendations, and human subject issues were presented.
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CLARK ATLANTA UNIVERSITY
Institutional Review Board
Office of Sponsored Programs

March 25, 2016

Ms. Keiona A. Noel <keiona.noel@gmail.com>
School of Social Work
Clark Atlanta University
Atlanta, GA 30314

RE: Does Singular or Dual Parenthood Influence Child Behavior?
Principal Investigator(s): Keiona A. Noel
Human Subjects Code Number: HR2015-9-599-1/A

Dear Ms. Noel:

The Human Subjects Committee of the Institutional Review Board (IRB) has reviewed your protocol and approved of it as exempt in accordance with 45 CFR 46.101(b)(2).

Your Protocol Extended Approval Code is HR2015-9-599-1/A2
Type of Review: Expedited.

This permit will expire on March 24, 2016. Thereafter, continued approval is contingent upon the annual submission of a renewal form to this office.
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survey questions being asked, you are welcome to withdraw your survey from the study without penalty.

Contacts and Questions:

The researcher conducting this study is Keiona A. Noel. You may ask any questions you have now. If you have questions later about the research, you may contact the researcher(s) at Phone: (404) 880-8399 or via email at keiona.noel@gmail.com. For additional inquiries or concerns, you may contact the Research Advisor, Dr. Tiffanie-Victoria Jones via email at tvjones@cau.edu. If you have any questions now, or later, related to the integrity of the research, (the rights of research subjects or research-related injuries, where applicable), you are encouraged to contact Dr. Georgianna Bolden at the Office of Sponsored Programs (404 880-6979) or Dr. Paul I. Musey, (404) 880-6829 at Clark Atlanta University.

You will be given a copy of this form to keep for your records.

Statement of Consent: I have read the above information. I have asked questions and have received answers. I consent to participate in the study.

Signature ___________________________ Date: ___________________________
Signature of Investigator ___________________________ Date: ___________________________
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CHILD BEHAVIOR CHECKLIST


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0 = Not True (as far as you know)</th>
<th>1 = Somewhat or Sometimes True</th>
<th>2 = Very True or Often True</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 1 2 1. Acts too young for his/her age</td>
<td>0 1 2 2. Drinks alcohol without parents' approval (describe)</td>
<td>0 1 2 22. Feels his/her job has to be perfect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 1 2 3. Argues a lot</td>
<td>0 1 2 4. Has to finish things or else start</td>
<td>0 1 2 23. Feels or complains that no one loves his/her</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 1 2 5. There's very little he/she enjoys</td>
<td>0 1 2 6. Bowel movements outside toilet</td>
<td>0 1 2 24. Feels others are out to get him/her</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 1 2 7. Bragging, boasting</td>
<td>0 1 2 8. Can't concentrate, can't pay attention for long</td>
<td>0 1 2 25. Feels worthless or inferior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 1 2 9. Daydreams or thinks of things that aren't there (describe)</td>
<td>0 1 2 10. Often daydreams or loses in his/her thoughts</td>
<td>0 1 2 26. Feels others are out to get him/her</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 1 2 11. Tries to avoid adult contact</td>
<td>0 1 2 12. Complains of pain in head</td>
<td>0 1 2 27. Feels others are out to get him/her</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 1 2 13. Seems to be in a fog</td>
<td>0 1 2 14. Cries a lot</td>
<td>0 1 2 28. Feels others are out to get him/her</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 1 2 15. Cruel to animals</td>
<td>0 1 2 16. Cruel, bullying, or mean to others</td>
<td>0 1 2 29. Feels others are out to get him/her</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 1 2 17. Daydreams or gets lost in his/her thoughts</td>
<td>0 1 2 18. Deliberately harms self or attempts suicide</td>
<td>0 1 2 30. Feels others are out to get him/her</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 1 2 19. Demands a lot of attention</td>
<td>0 1 2 20. Destroys his/her own things</td>
<td>0 1 2 31. Feels others are out to get him/her</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 1 2 21. Destroys things belonging to his/her family or others</td>
<td>0 1 2 22. Disobedient at home</td>
<td>0 1 2 32. Feels others are out to get him/her</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 1 2 23. Disobedient at school</td>
<td>0 1 2 24. Doesn't eat well</td>
<td>0 1 2 33. Feels others are out to get him/her</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 1 2 25. Doesn't get along with other kids</td>
<td>0 1 2 26. Doesn't seem to feel guilty after misbehaving</td>
<td>0 1 2 34. Feels others are out to get him/her</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 1 2 27. Easily jealous</td>
<td>0 1 2 28. Breaks rules at home, school, or elsewhere</td>
<td>0 1 2 35. Feels others are out to get him/her</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 1 2 29. Feels certain animals, situations, or places, other than school (describe)</td>
<td>0 1 2 30. Feels others are out to get him/her</td>
<td>0 1 2 36. Feels others are out to get him/her</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 1 2 31. Feels he/she might do something bad</td>
<td>0 1 2 32. Feels others are out to get him/her</td>
<td>0 1 2 33. Feels others are out to get him/her</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sample
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Does Singular or Dual Parenthood Influence Child Behavior?

CONSENT FORM

You are invited to be in a research study of examining the effects of family status on child behavior. You were selected as a possible participant because you are a parent or guardian of at least one elementary or middle school student between the ages of six and thirteen. We ask that you read this form and ask any questions you may have before agreeing to be in the study. This study is being conducted by Keiona A. Noel, a graduate student at the Whitney M. Young, Jr. School of Social Work at Clark Atlanta University.

Background Information:

The purpose of this study is to examine the effects of family status on children’s behavior.

Procedures:

If you agree to be in this study, we would ask you to do the following things. First, read and sign the consent form. You will be asked to participate in an anonymous survey where you will identify the family status – whether in a single parent or two-parent household – and the behavior of the children. The survey will be administered once and should take no longer than 10 minutes to complete. As a token of our appreciation, you will gain the understanding for a child’s conducted behavior.

Risks and Benefits of Being in the Study:

The minimal risks of participating in the study include emotional and psychological distress due to delicate questions in the surveys. To manage this risk, we have prepared referrals to local therapy facilities and counseling centers to address any emotional and psychological distress and frustration. The benefit of participating in the study is the ability to contribute to the body of research.

Confidentiality:

The records of this study will be kept private. In any sort of report we might publish, we will not include any information that will make it possible to identify you as a participant. Research records will be kept in a locked file; only the researchers will have access to the records. All proof of participation will be destroyed within three years after the study is complete.

Voluntary Nature of the Study:

Your decision whether or not to participate will not affect your current or future relations with the researcher, Keiona A. Noel, or Clark Atlanta University. Your choice to participate in this study is voluntary and valued. If for any reason you feel uncomfortable about the study and the
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University of Oregon Health Sciences Center.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Seldom</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Always</th>
<th>Is this a problem for you?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Dawdles in getting dressed</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Dawdles or lingers at mealtime</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Has poor table manners</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Refuses to eat food presented</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Refuses to do chores when asked</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Slow in getting ready for bed</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Refuses to go to bed on time</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Does not obey house rules on own</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Refuses to obey until threatened with punishment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Acts defiant when told to do something</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Argues with parents about rules</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Gets angry when doesn’t get own way</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Has temper tantrums</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Sasses adults</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Whines</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Cries easily</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Yells or screams</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Hits parents</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Destroys toys and other projects</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Is careless with toys and other objects</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Steals</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Lies</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Teases or provokes other children</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Verbally fights with friends own age</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX C CONTINUED

EYBERG CHILD BEHAVIOR INVENTORY


University of Oregon Health Sciences Center.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Rating Scale</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25. Verbally fights with sisters and brothers</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Physically fights with friends own age</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Physically fights with sisters and brothers</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Constantly seeks attention</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Interrupts</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Is easily distracted</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Has short attention span</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Fails to finish tasks or projects</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. Has difficulty entertaining self alone</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. Has difficulty concentrating on one thing</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. Is overactive or restless</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. Wets the bed</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX D

FINAL SURVEY

Participants will take a combined survey of the Child Behavior Checklist (CBCL) and the Eyberg Child Behavior Inventory (ECBI) regarding their child’s behavior. The scores of the items will be ranged from 0-5. Statements will have the following as choices: Never, Rarely, Sometimes, Often, All of the Time.

1. What best describes your living situation? [Single Parent Home or Two Parent Home]
2. Please select your highest level of education. [Less than High School Degree, High School Degree, Undergraduate Degree, or Graduate or Professional School]
3. Please state the number of children in the home.
4. Please state the age of your child.
5. What is your relation to the child? [Mother & Father (Birth), Mother & Father (Either as Step Parent), Single Mother, Single Father, Maternal Grandmother, Maternal Grandfather, Paternal Grandmother, Paternal Grandfather, Relative, Family Friend, or Foster Parent]

1. My child argues a lot.
2. My child whines a lot.
3. My child cries easily or a lot.
4. My child is careless with toys.
5. My child verbally fights with children own age.
7. My child is easily distracted.
8. My child has difficulty entertaining self.
9. My child is overactive or restless.
10. My child bites his/her fingernails.
11. My child has nightmares.
12. My child breaks rules at home or school.
14. My child gets teased a lot.
15. My child would rather be alone than with others.
16. My child is too fearful or anxious.
17. My child enjoys activities.
18. My child fails to finish thing he/she starts.
19. My child is easily jealous.
20. My child daydreams.
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