

PATTERNS OF CHILD REARING:

A CURRENT STUDY

By

LAURA KERSHNER WILSON

Bachelor of Arts

University of Tulsa

Tulsa, Oklahoma

1972

Submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate
College of the Oklahoma State University in
partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the Degree of
MASTER OF SCIENCE
July, 1980



PATTERNS OF CHILD REARING:

A CURRENT STUDY

Thesis Approved:

John C. McCuller

Thesis Adviser

Frances Stromberg

Godfrey Ellis

Norman A. Durham

Dean of Graduate College

1063308

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Appreciation is expressed to all who aided in this study, and there have been many. This research has been supported in part by research funds from the Division of Home Economics, Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, Oklahoma. Preliminary reports of selected aspects of the results were presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Home Economics Association, St. Louis, 1979 and at the OACUS "Year of the Child" Meeting, Norman, Oklahoma, 1979. Travel funds to St. Louis were provided by the Family Study Center, Oklahoma State University. Thanks go to the Parent-Teacher Associations and kindergarten teachers in Tulsa, Oklahoma for providing necessary information.

I wish to thank my committee members, Dr. Frances I. Stromberg and Dr. Godfrey J. Ellis, for guidance. For their helpful advice and cooperation I especially want to thank Dr. Robert R. Sears and other persons involved with the original study who very kindly responded to requests for information and aid. Also, I want to extend a special thanks to my major advisor, Dr. John C. McCullers, for all his expert help and encouragement.

I want to express my appreciation to my sister, Cindy Fahs, for her invaluable help with the Connecticut sample. Many thanks go to my family, especially my husband, Tom, and to my friends and fellow graduate students for their enduring support and affection.

Finally a deep felt "thank you" to all those mothers who participated in this study. Without them there would be no study. My life has been enriched by their patience and trust. This thesis is dedicated to them.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
INTRODUCTION.	1
MANUSCRIPT TO BE SUBMITTED FOR PUBLICATION.	5
APPENDICES	
APPENDIX A REVIEW OF LITERATURE.	39
APPENDIX B FACE SHEET.	57
APPENDIX C CORRESPONDENCE.	59
APPENDIX D ORIGINAL INTERVIEW ANALYSIS SCHEDULE.	61
APPENDIX E EXTENSION INTERVIEW AND ANALYSIS SCHEDULE	93

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Selection of Sample	26
2. Sex and Ordinal Position of Children	27
3. Index of SES	28
4. Educational Levels	29
5. Annual Income	30
6. Ethnic Background and Religion	31
7. Reasons for Not Breast Feeding	32
8. Age at Beginning and Completion of Bowel Training	33
9. Aggression	34
10. Extent of Giving the Child Regular Jobs	35
11. How much Good to Spank	36
12. Use of Reasoning	37
13. Sex Role Differentiation	38

INTRODUCTION

Babies the world over, in every kind of society are alike in their needs and this leads to a certain universal quality in child rearing practices. However, each society expects and demands different behaviors from its members, and these differences lead to variations in child rearing. The way each society chooses to rear its young reveals its goals and purposes (Janeway, 1975). Wolfenstein (1953) described the evolution of advice from Infant Care Bulletin through its nine printings from 1914 to 1951. In 1914 thumbsucking and masturbation were to be dealt with by extreme and harsh methods, while in 1951 these behaviors were thought to be minor problems that could be ignored.

Whiting suggested that child rearing practices are dependent upon the maintenance systems of society (Whiting & Child, 1953) and he hypothesized that crises in a culture are met by changes in social structure that influence child rearing practices (Whiting, Chadsi, Antonovsky & Ayres, 1966). The influences of society in the life of the mother have been seen as important factors in her methods and practices of child rearing (Sears, Maccoby, and Levin, 1957).

More than 25 years ago mothers were interviewed concerning their child rearing practices by Robert R. Sears, Eleanor E. Maccoby and Harry Levin. In 1957, approximately six years after beginning this study, the results were published as Patterns of Child Rearing. The authors were concerned with three questions: How do parents raise their

children? How do particular practices affect certain behaviors? and What leads a mother to use one method rather than another? The 1957 Patterns study showed child rearing to be a diverse activity. The great variety of methods and techniques was one of the major findings of this study.

How do today's parents raise their children? That question prompted an attempt to replicate and extend Patterns of Child Rearing. The present report focuses mainly on the replication aspect using mother interviews. Two other studies, related to and originating from this one are nearing completion and another is in the planning stage. These studies involve interviews of the children themselves, their fathers, and their grandmothers, and represent an extension of the original Patterns study beyond mother interviews. When all of this work is completed, which will be some time yet, the presentation of the findings will probably require a book-length manuscript. Therefore, we decided to use this thesis as a means of providing an introduction and overview of this replication effort and all related studies, and a report of the principal findings from the mother interviews.

This thesis format represents a deviation from the usual Graduate College style. Embedded within the thesis is, in effect, a complete manuscript prepared for submission to a technical journal in accordance with the Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association (Second Edition). The manuscript forms the body of the thesis, with pages 5 to 25 of the thesis constituting the manuscript.

The purposes and functions of a manuscript and a thesis are somewhat different. A thesis often contains a variety of information, data, and materials that typically would not be included in a manuscript to

be submitted for publication. To make the thesis complete, these items have been inserted in the Acknowledgments, in this Introduction, or in the Appendices at the end. Thus, it is our hope that this format will offer advantages to the reader, to the authors, and ultimately to the discipline without any corresponding loss of the strengths of the traditional thesis format.

REFERENCES

- Janeway, E. Between myth and morning, women awakening. New York: William Morrow & Company, Inc., 1975.
- Sears, R. R., Maccoby, E. E., & Levin, H. Patterns of child rearing. Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 1957.
- Whiting, J. W. M., & Child, I. L. Child training and personality: A cross-cultural study. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1953.
- Whiting, J. W. M., Chasdi, E. H., Antonovsky, H. F., & Ayres, B. A. The learning of values. In E. Z. Vogt & E. M. Albert (Eds.), People of Rimrock. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1966.
- Wolfenstein, M. Trends in infant care. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry. 1953, 23, 120-130.

Patterns of Child Rearing:

A Current Study

Laura K. Wilson and John C. McCullers

Department of Family Relations and Child Development

Oklahoma State University

This paper is based on the master's thesis research of the first author under the direction of the second. This research was supported in part by funds from the Division of Home Economics, Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, Oklahoma. The authors wish to thank all the mothers who participated in this study, and Dr. Robert R. Sears for his cooperation and assistance in making data, materials, and procedures from the original study available. An earlier version of this paper was presented at the annual meeting of the American Home Economics Association, St. Louis, June, 1979. Requests for reprints may be sent to either author at the above address, Stillwater, OK 74074.

Running head: Patterns of Child Rearing

Abstract

This study replicated the 1957 study of Patterns of Child Rearing by Sears, Maccoby, and Levin, with 100 matching subjects, 23 non-matching, both from Tulsa, Oklahoma, and a comparison sample of 25 mothers from Connecticut. Mothers of kindergarten children answered questions about their child rearing practices from the original Patterns interview schedule of 72 questions and an extension interview schedule of 15 questions. Selection of subjects, interview procedures, and coding and analysis of the data followed the original study as closely as possible. This report presents the principal findings from the matching sample from Tulsa. There are plans for a more extensive report of all data from this study and other current related studies that involve similar interviews with children and fathers.

Patterns of Child Rearing: A Current Study

In the early 1950s, Robert R. Sears, Eleanor E. Maccoby, and Harry Levin undertook a large-scale investigation of American child-rearing practices. The results were published in 1957 in a volume entitled, Patterns of Child Rearing. That volume had a strong and immediate influence, and has remained for nearly 25 years as the principal reference study of how Americans bring up their children. For years, it served as a textbook for parent groups and child-oriented undergraduate courses. Long after instructors no longer felt comfortable enough with its date of publication to adopt it directly, it continued to be absorbed wholesale into child development texts of more recent imprint.

Sears, Maccoby, and Levin interviewed 379 mothers of kindergarten children on topics commonly faced by mothers in the course of rearing their children: feeding and weaning, toilet training, sex and modesty training, and the socialization of aggression and dependency. One aim of the study was to identify the range of child-rearing practices and the relative frequency with which they were being employed. An attempt was made to identify consistent patterns of child-rearing practices across different socialization areas, and some of the characteristics and behavioral dimensions of the mothers related to these patterns.

A central concern of the Patterns authors was the question of identification and the development of conscience. Both psychoanalytic theory and learning theory, the dominant theoretical orientations at the time, provided a basis for believing that child rearing was critically important. There has been no serious challenge to the idea that parents

play a profoundly influential role in the social and personality development of their children, either before or since Patterns was published.

Although there has been little, if any, change in our belief that the way that parents rear their children matters greatly, there has been a number of significant changes in American society within the past 25 years that could have affected child-rearing practices. The Viet Nam war and Watergate have brought about a re-examination of our political and ethical beliefs. Technological advances have made possible the exploration of space and putting a man on the moon. There has been a widespread increase in the influence of television in our lives. It has been said that there are now more American homes with television sets than there are with indoor plumbing.

Closer to the family, perhaps, the "pill" and other reliable contraceptives, and legalized abortion, have allowed women more choice about when and whether they will become mothers. There has been a striking increase in sexual permissiveness in our society. Increasing numbers of men and women now openly live together without being married to each other. There has been increased recognition and acceptance of homosexuality, including the possibility of homosexual marriage and the adoption of children. Multiple-partner, single-parent, and other life styles have prompted some redefinition of the term family.

There have been major changes in the status of women. The women's liberation movement, the Equal Rights Amendment, and similar forces have helped women to redefine their roles in society. Women have been embarking on educational programs at institutions of higher education, and entering the labor force, in ever increasing numbers. On the other hand, fathers have become more actively involved in all phases of child

rearing, including their wives' pregnancy and delivery. Even children may now participate in the labor and delivery of an infant sibling.

One must surely wonder what effects all of these changes are having upon parent-child relationships. It is this question that prompted the present study. The need to collect some current information on American child-rearing practices was obvious. How best to go about it was not obvious. The Sears, Maccoby, and Levin study, and the use of retrospective mother interviews generally, have been criticized on a number of methodological grounds. For example, parental recall of child rearing has been found to be unreliable (Robbins, 1963). Mothers' reports of child behaviors are not the same as direct observation of children (Yarrow, 1963; Yarrow, Campbell, & Barten, 1968). Mother interviews do not take into account the effect of the child on the parent (Bell, 1968; 1971), or the role of the father in the child rearing process (Le Master, 1970).

Many child psychologists have experienced a need both to reject mother interviews on methodological grounds and to accept them, for lack of a demonstrably better alternative, because of their rich yield. This conflict was perhaps best expressed by the late Boyd R. McCandless (1967) in the second edition of his textbook, Children: Behavior and Development, published ten years after Patterns. McCandless devoted a preliminary chapter to warning the reader of the methodological shortcomings of research on child-rearing practices before discussing the research evidence itself. Early in the chapter devoted to child-rearing practices, he commented:

No systematic attempt has been made to bring everything up to date, in the sense of including all recent studies in the area, as the number of papers written in the years since the first edition of this book is enormous, their quality (as a group) has not improved noticeably, and general conclusions remain about as they were when the first edition was published in 1961 (p. 104).

Given such an introduction, one might wonder if McCandless could have found a kind word for the Sears, Maccoby, and Levin study. Here is what he said in the area of infant feeding practices: "A major study to which this chapter makes repeated reference has been done by Sears, Maccoby, and Levin (1957)" (p. 108). On toilet training, he said: "Sears, Maccoby, and Levin (1957) provide a good picture of how toilet training is actually carried on in twentieth-century United States" (p. 130). In the area of sex training, we find: "The most comprehensive and the soundest survey of child-rearing practices in the area of sexual behavior known to the author is provided by Sears, Maccoby, and Levin (1957)" (p. 135). And so on.

In brief, there are lamentable methodological shortcomings inherent in any attempt to study child-rearing practices by means of retrospective mother interviews. Among the first to acknowledge this point no doubt would be Sears, Maccoby, and Levin themselves. Nevertheless, mother interviews have given us most of what we know about child-rearing practices in America. The value and usefulness of that information cannot be denied. There is unique knowledge to be gained from talking to an individual mother about her child.

So, for better or for worse, we decided to attempt to replicate the original Sears, Maccoby, and Levin study as closely as we could. No other approach, we concluded, would allow us to make realistic comparisons with the findings reported in Patterns. While our present study will have all the methodological problems of the original, we hope that it will possess some of its strengths as well. We believed that a replication might yield several benefits. First, it should provide us with some current information about how today's parents rear their children. Also, it would allow the opportunity to make comparisons with an earlier, classic investigation in order to determine the nature and extent of any changes in child-rearing practices that may have occurred over the years, and perhaps to gain some insight into the reasons for such changes. Finally, it would provide a rare opportunity to make some interesting cross-generational comparisons. The Patterns mothers are now today's grandmothers, and their children are now today's mothers with kindergarten children of their own.

As might be imagined, our replication effort has generated a great amount of data. We have interviewed a sample of mothers matched as closely as possible to the original Patterns sample, as well as a smaller sample of mothers that did not match, from two geographic regions. To report these data fully, and to compare them in detail with the Patterns findings, would require more space than can be permitted in a journal article. Our aim here is merely to present some of the highlights of the present study, indicating where there have been some major changes in child-rearing practices since 1957, as well as where there appears to have been some remarkable lack of change over the years.

Method

Because this was a replication study, considerable effort was devoted to making the current sample as comparable as possible to the original on all the variables that helped to determine the original sample. In order that the reader can judge the success of that effort, the characteristics of the sample are reported in greater detail than otherwise might be warranted.

Subjects

In the original Patterns study, 640 mothers of kindergarten children in eight schools were contacted. Of this number, 379 constituted the final sample. For this replication, 331 mothers of kindergarten children in six schools were contacted. From these a matching sample of 100 mothers was obtained. Table 1 presents a comparison of the samples for both studies.

Insert Table 1 about here

Sears, Maccoby, and Levin used only mothers from intact families, both parents native born, living together, and whose children were not handicapped, were the natural children of the parents, and were enrolled in public school kindergarten. Our sample of 100 mothers, living in Tulsa, Oklahoma, met the above conditions. All of these had children enrolled in public school kindergarten in 1978. The children were matched as closely as possible to those of the original study as to sex and ordinal position (see Table 2.) There was an additional

Insert Table 2 about here

sample of 23 Tulsa mothers for whom one or more of the above sampling restrictions were not met, and a sample of 25 Connecticut mothers, matching and non-matching to allow for regional comparisons.¹

Subjects for the current study were matched also as closely as possible on socio-economic level, education of parents, and family income. The index for the socio-economic status (SES) is presented in Table 3.

Insert Table 3 about here

The SES measure for the replication sample was computed in the same way as in the original study: weighting the occupational status of the father by 2, education of the father by 1, and family income by 1. The Patterns SES measures were based on occupational scales developed by Warner, Meeker, and Eells (1949). These scales probably do not give an accurate representation of current occupations in the United States today, or their respective status. For instance, there is no mention of computer programmer or analyst as an occupation. We plan to look at the occupations of the participants of this current study again with a more recent rating scale. The increase in the educational level of husbands today (see Table 4), particularly the proportion of college

Insert Table 4 about here

¹For the sake of simplicity and brevity, only the data from the 100 matching mothers from Tulsa are presented in the Tables and included in the Results and Discussion.

graduates, may account for some of the SES disparity between the original and replication samples. We also plan to compute the SES index without the educational level, as was done in the 1950's study.

The educational level of the husband and wife (Table 4) has increased sharply. In the original study, 24% of the fathers had not gone beyond high school; in the current study, this was the case for only 9% of the fathers. The Statistical Abstract (1978) shows, from current population surveys, that approximately one-half of the population in the 1950's and approximately 90% in the 1970's finished high school or more. Considering these changes that have occurred in educational level over the years, the two samples become more comparable, in terms of being representative of the general population.

The measure of the annual family income presented a similar problem. The income levels for the 1957 study were multiplied by 4.2 to set the levels for this study. The Statistical Abstract (1977) shows that the median income of all families in the United States has increased 420% between 1952 and 1976, 4.2 times. Since the original sample was interviewed in 1951-52 and the replication sample in 1978, we felt that it would be appropriate to multiply the original annual income ratings by a factor of 4.2. Table 5 shows the income distribution of both studies.

Insert Table 5 about here

The median income for all families in the United States in 1950 was \$3,919 and in 1976 was \$14,958, as compared to the sample median incomes of \$7,150 for the 50's and \$22,500 for the 70's. This would place the original sample in the top one-fifth and the current sample in the top

two-fifths of the population as to family income (Statistical Abstract, 1977).

A variety of ethnic backgrounds and religious affiliations were represented in the original study and we tried to match these as closely as possible. Table 6 indicates the distribution of these particulars for this current study.

Insert Table 6 about here

Procedure

All names listed on the Parent-Teacher Association rolls for the kindergarten classes were sent a letter describing the proposed study and asking for cooperation from the parents. (See Appendix C.) We telephoned about a week later to ask if the mother would be willing to participate in the research. Questions concerning the project were answered at that time and appointments were made for the interview. Each interview was conducted individually in the family's home. A "face sheet" was used by the interviewer to collect demographic information, such as ages of parents, child, education of parents, ethnic background, etc. (See Appendix B)

The interviewer told the mother: "that since we are asking the same questions they did 25 years ago, I will just read them to you." The interview was tape recorded. After all the questions from the Patterns interview schedule were asked, an extension schedule of 15 questions were asked (see Appendix E). At any time, the mother was free to terminate the interview or to refuse to answer any question. There were no mothers who chose to do either. We tried to interview

the mother alone without other family members present, but this was not always possible, because of younger children, interest of the father, etc. The interview itself took approximately one and one half hours, and the total time for each interview-visit was approximately two to two and a half hours.

All interviews were scored and coded according to the original Patterns procedures² and a new rating schedule was developed for the extension questions. In order to establish inter-observer reliability, one-half (50) of the Tulsa interviews were coded by two different scorers (Reliability coefficients are presented in Appendices D and E).

Results and Discussion

The 1950's mothers were warm and loving but somewhat anxious about their children's training. They toilet-trained their children at an early age, were intolerant of masturbation, sex play and nudity around the house, were concerned about their children's progress in school, and tolerated little dependency. Although warm and loving, they often used this warmth and love as a means of guidance toward socially approved behavior; this guidance was augmented by object-oriented discipline techniques, such as spanking and taking away privileges.

Our mothers of the 1970's appeared to be warmer, less sex anxious, to use more love-oriented techniques of training, more reasoning, and to expect more from their children by way of help around the house. They were more accepting of dependent behavior, seemed to be more aware of their children's level of development and abilities, and more aware

²We wish to extend our grateful thanks to Dr. Robert R. Sears for providing us with the original Patterns coding schedule and for his generous help and advice with this project.

of their children's individuality as well as their own. A comparison of the two groups of mothers in the specific areas of child rearing used by Sears, Maccoby, and Levin follows.

Feeding. Our current data showed only a slight increase in the incidence of breast feeding. One interesting result of the current study was in reasons mothers gave for not breast feeding. These are presented in Table 7.

Insert Table 7 about here

The 1950's reasons seemed to reflect concern more for social acceptability. At that time, the only justifiable reason for a mother to not breast feed seemed to have been physical disability. Today, mother's personal preference dictates breast or bottle feeding. In the 1950's most mothers said they did not breast feed because they were physically unable, "not enough milk, inverted nipple, etc.," or were following doctor's orders. Sears, Maccoby and Levin expressed surprise that the commonest reason for not breast feeding was "physically unable." Today's mothers simply said "they did not want to, did not want to be tied down, just didn't like the idea, etc."

Mothers today are less concerned with establishing feeding schedules and more interested in meeting the child's needs on an individual basis. The current lack of reported feeding problems may stem from decreased demands in the feeding area, while mothers do seem to be interested in their children's nutrition. Most report few feeding problems, and little concern for those that do come up.

Toilet training. One of the most dramatic changes to have occurred in child rearing practices is the time or age of the child when toilet training begins, as can be seen in Table 8.

Insert Table 8 about here

Most mothers today say that they wait until their children seem "ready," and so the procedure takes less time. By the age of nine months 49% of the Patterns mothers had begun toilet training, and now only 7% of the mothers have started by that age.

In the 1950's, Sears, Maccoby, and Levin remarked that mothers seemed to be toilet training their children at an earlier age than experts such as Dr. Spock recommended. They found that the sex anxiety of the mother was related to when she began toilet training. The Patterns authors found a positive correlation between severity of toilet training and feeding problems. Very little severe toilet training was evident in the present study. Since toilet training begins at a much later age today, it goes quickly and is not severe.

Dependency. According to mothers' reports, children these days exhibit about the same amount of dependent behavior as they did in the 1950's. Mothers today on the other hand seem more inclined to accept dependent behavior. Mothers seemed to be more responsive to and less punitive of the child's dependency behaviors.

Sex. Current mothers evidenced much less sex anxiety than the mothers of the original study. They are less concerned about nudity around the house and more permissive of masturbation. In the 1950's only 5% of the mothers felt that masturbation was "natural, just

curiosity"; in the 1970's 34% of the mothers felt that way. It is perhaps not surprising that current mothers are also less sex anxious. Greater willingness to believe sexual self exploration occurs as a natural phenomenon in children could be the result of an increasingly more permissive attitude toward sex by society in general.

Aggression. Most mothers today disapprove of aggression, whether expressed toward parents, siblings, or other children, as can be seen in Table 9. This increased disapproval of aggression directed toward

Insert Table 9 about here

children outside the family, represents an interesting change from the attitudes of the 1950's. At that time, mothers were intolerant of parent directed aggression but more permissive of aggressive behavior directed toward others. According to mothers' reports, children today are showing less aggression around the home and mothers are using milder punishment when it occurs. This would be consistent with the original study's interpretation that severity of punishment is directly related to level of aggression.

Instead of fostering aggressive competitiveness, mothers seem to stress the importance of mutual consideration. Mothers are more interested in how well their children "get along with others." Miller and Swanson (1958) examined the child training techniques of "bureaucratic" families and those of "entrepreneurial" families. They described the "bureaucratic" family as one that put greater emphasis on "getting along with others," and predicted that families in our society were

becoming more "bureaucratic." The present results would appear to confirm their prediction.

Restrictions and demands. Although the 1970's mothers had more relaxed standards of neatness, orderliness and cleanliness, they maintained about the same level of restrictions pertaining to care of the home and furnishings. Current mothers expect their children to perform more regular jobs around the house. In the original study, 35% of the mothers said that their children had "one or two regular jobs" around the house: and now, 76% of the mothers reported that their children had such chores to perform (see Table 10).

Insert Table 10 about here

Gadlin (1978) has commented on the increased importance of a close parent-child relationship. He claims that this relationship has become more of a partnership with emphasis on enjoyment for all parties involved. The current changes in practices relating to feeding, toilet training, sex, and so forth, seem to reflect a trend toward a closer, more equal relationship. The 1970's mothers' requirement of more child participation in household maintenance may be viewed as a move toward greater closeness and equality between parent and child.

Bedtime comes much later now. In the 1950's the majority of children went to bed at 8:00 p.m. or earlier. Now the majority goes to bed after 8:00 p.m. Mothers in both studies showed a similar degree of permissiveness and strictness about bedtime. Sears, Maccoby, and Levin found a correlation between working mothers and the bedtime hour. Mothers who had worked any of the five years since the child was born

set a later bedtime for their children. The number of working mothers has grown enormously since the 1950's and this may account for the much later bedtime hour of children today. In the original study, 16% of the mothers had worked after their child's second birthday, while in the 1970's 43% had worked during this same time period.

Techniques of training. There has been a change in mothers' perception of the effectiveness of spanking. Today's mothers seem to spank about as often as the mothers of the 1950's. However, mothers today seem more likely to believe that it does some good, reporting that it is a successful method of punishment (see Table 11). However, spanking is effective most often when used with reasoning to provide a means of stopping an objectionable behavior and beginning an approved one (see Table 12).

The development of conscience. Children of the 1970's appear to have slightly higher level of conscience development. The Patterns authors found that a child's conscience was related to mother's response to dependency, her warmth and the use of love-oriented discipline techniques. The higher conscience of today's children could be explained by the mothers' greater tolerance of dependency, and their higher ratings on maternal "warmth." Sears, Maccoby, and Levin classified discipline methods into love-oriented and object-oriented. Mothers of today are using more isolation and praise, both love-oriented techniques. The object-oriented techniques, described as tangible rewards, deprivation of privileges, and spanking, are now being used to the same or a slightly less degree than they were in the 1950's.

Sex roles. More mothers today see fewer sex differences in kindergarten boys and girls (see Table 13). The 1970's mothers seem to be more willing to accept individual differences in their children and less insistent on the sex stereotyped behaviors. This was more true for mothers of girls than mothers of boys. For instance, one mother remarked: "I am not upset if she plays rough games and is a tomboy, but I would not like it if her brother was a sissy and cried when he got hurt. I know that's not right, but I think that's the way everybody is."

Gadlin (1978) suggested a division of child rearing into processes. One, "actualization," consisted of methods and practices related to personality development; the other, "acculturation," related to the formation of cultural values. Gadlin noted that current changes in child rearing were emphasizing "actualization" and that this emphasis was considered to be the result of greater insight into the child's innate qualities. Without speculating on the basis for it, today's mothers seem more interested in "actualization" than "acculturation" with regard to sex roles and sex typing.

Extension interview questions. During the five pilot interviews, three mothers asked why there were no questions having to do with religious training. So a question was included in the extension schedule asking mothers about religion, religious training, political views, and the effects of religion and politics on child rearing. The results indicated that politics were of little importance, but that religion was considered to have great consequences. Table 6 indicates the religious affiliations of the parents of this study.

Most of the mothers at some time during the interview spontaneously mentioned religion and remarked on its value and effect in their daily

lives. There was almost no topic that some mother did not connect with religion. There was little evidence of this orientation in the original study. In the 1970's religious ideas were expressed in regard to toilet training ("we prayed about it") and table manners ("we take turns saying grace"). Several mothers said that they handled sibling quarrels by having the children memorize Bible verses. All of the current sample of mothers, matching and non-matching, from Tulsa and from Connecticut, demonstrated this strong interest in religion.

A Final Comment

Mothers of the 1950's seem to have done a good job. Today's mothers were raised, so to speak, by those mothers. It is evident from our data that these mothers of the 1970's are concerned and loving parents. In many ways they are more relaxed, knowledgeable, thoughtful and self-confident than their mothers, and less anxious about sex and child rearing in general. So, it will be interesting to see how the children of the 1970's turn out. As parents of the 1990's, will they continue to improve, or were there some special benefits of the more self-conscious and anxious style of child rearing of the 1950's that we have overlooked?

A further goal of this research project is to study child rearing from the perspective of the fathers and the children themselves. We believe that a better view of child rearing might be obtained this way. We hope to include the grandmothers also. Grandmothers of the 1970's are about the same age as the original Patterns mothers would be now. So it would be interesting to see how today's grandmothers' views in retrospect compare with the original Patterns results.

At this time interviews with 34 children of the 100 matched mothers have been completed and are being analyzed. An interview schedule was developed from the Patterns schedule, but shortened and modified for use with children. We are now in the process of interviewing the fathers of those 34 children, using an interview schedule very similar to the one used with mothers. The grandmother interviews are yet to come.

References

- Bell, R. Q. A reinterpretation of the direction of effective studies of socialization. Psychological Review. 1968, 75, 81-85.
- Bell, R. Q. Stimulus control of parent or caretaker behavior by offspring. Developmental Psychology. 1971, 4, 63-72.
- Gadlin, H. Child discipline and the pursuit of self: An historical interpretation. in H. W. Reese and L. P. Lipsitt (Eds.) Advances in child development and behavior. New York: Academic Press, 1978.
- Le Masters, E. E. Parents in modern America, a sociological analysis. Homewood, Illinois: The Dorsey Press, 1970.
- McCandless, B. R. Children behavior and development. (2nd ed.). New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1967.
- Miller, D. R. and Swanson, G. E. The changing American parent. New York: Wiley, 1958.
- Robbins, L. C. The accuracy of parental recall of aspects of child development and child rearing practices. Journal of Abnormal Social Psychology, 1963, 66, 261-270.
- Sears, R. R., Maccoby, E. E., & Levin, H. Patterns of child rearing. Evanston, Illinois: Row, Peterson and Company, 1957.
- Statistical abstract of the United States. U. S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of Census, 1977.
- Statistical abstract of the United States. U. S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of Census, 1978.
- Warner, W. L., Meeker, M., & Eells, K. Social class in America. Chicago: Science Research Associates, 1949.
- Yarrow, M. R. Problems of methods in parent-child research. Child Development, 1963, 34, 215-226.
- Yarrow, M. R., Campbell, J. D., & Burton, R. V. Child rearing: An inquiry into research methods. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1968.

Table 1
Sample Selection

	<u>Patterns</u>		Current Study	
	<u>N</u>	% ^a	<u>N</u>	% ^a
Total number of mothers contacted.	640		331	
Shrinkage due to:				
Parents foreign born	38	6%	14	4%
Child not living with natural parents	13	2	4	1
Parents separated, divorced, dead	15	2	57	17
Twins	8	1	-	-
Disproportionate ordinal position	41	7	17	5
Other (handicapped, etc.)	6	1	3	1
Disproportionate socio-economic status	38	6	-	-
Used in pilot study	-	-	4	1
Could not reach (letter returned, unlisted phone)	-	-	87	26.5
Mother refused, or did not have time	62	10	44	14
Other (sickness, defective recording, moved, unknown)	40	6	1	.5
Final Sample	379	59%	100	30%

^aPercentages are of the total number of mothers contacted, for instance: the total sample for the replication study was 30% of the 331 mothers contacted, N = 100.

Table 2
Sex and Ordinal Position of Children

	<u>Patterns</u>	Current Study
Sex		
Boys	53%	43%
Girls	47%	57%
Ordinal Position		
Only	14%	13%
Oldest	29%	29%
Middle	27%	25%
Youngest	30%	32%

Table 3
Index of SES^a

(Occupational Status x2, Education x1, Income x1)	<u>Patterns</u>	Current Study
4-6	14%	7%
7-9	16	25
10-12	12	25
13-15	13	15
16-18	11	9
19-21	15	5
22-24	9	5
25-27	5	1
28-29	1	0
NA	<u>4</u>	<u>9</u>
	100%	100%
<u>N</u> =	379	100

^aThe lower numbers represent a higher SES. Explanation of SES is given in the text.

Table 4
Educational Level of Parents

Educational Level of Husband	<u>Patterns</u>	Current Study
1. College plus some graduate	21%	38%
2. College graduate	14	33
3. Some college, vocational, etc.	24	20
4. High school graduate	24	9
5. Some high school	14	0
6. Grade school or less	<u>3</u>	<u>0</u>
	100%	100%
<u>N</u> =	379	100

Educational Level of Wife	<u>Patterns</u>	Current Study
1. College plus graduate	7%	12%
2. College graduate	15	28
3. Some college, vocational, etc.	30	36
4. High school graduate	34	21
5. Some high school	13	2
6. Grade school or less	<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>
	100%	100%
<u>N</u> =	379	100

Table 5
Annual Income^a

<u>Patterns</u>		<u>Current Study</u>	
\$15,000 or more	6%	\$63,000 or more	6%
\$10,000-\$14,000	11	\$42,000-\$62,999	7
\$7,500-\$9,999	11	\$31,500-\$41,999	10
\$5,000-\$7,400	25	\$21,000-\$31,499	32
\$4,000-\$4,999	15	\$16,800-\$20,999	23
\$3,000-\$3,999	20	\$12,600-\$16,799	7
\$2,000-\$2,999	8	\$8,400-\$12,599	6
Less than \$2,000	0	Less than \$8,400	0
NA (not ascertained)	<u>3</u>	NA (not ascertained)	<u>3</u>
<u>N</u> = 379	100%	<u>N</u> = 100	100%

^aEstimated increase in family income in the 1970's due to inflation, prosperity, working mothers, etc., is 4.2 times the income in the 1950's.

Table 6
Ethnic Background and Religious Affiliation
of the Current Study

Ethnic Background	<u>N</u> = 100	Father	Mother
England, Scotland, Canada, Australia		32%	32%
Northern & Western Europe		28	34
Latin Countries		3	1
Ireland		12	15
N.A. (not ascertained)		25	15
Religion		Father	Mother
Catholic		12	9
Jewish		2	2
Protestant		82	86
Agnostic or Athiest		4	3

Table 7
Reasons for Not Breast Feeding

	<u>Patterns</u>	Current Study	<u>z</u>
1. Unable to, not enough milk, inverted nipple, etc.	43% ^a	4%	5.57
2. Doctor advised against	16	9	
3. Didn't want to, didn't like idea, indication emotional barrier, etc.	11	36	4.16
4. Didn't want to be tied down	12	15	
5. Didn't want to, not ascertained why	12	20	
6. Baby ill, premature, etc.	4	2	
7. Family pressure against	2	4	
8. No reason given, or did not consider	0	10	
Number in sample not breast feeding	227	55	
Number in sample breast feeding	<u>152</u>	<u>45</u>	
Total sample	379	100	

^aPercentage of those not breast feeding

Note: Throughout all the Tables the z scores are based on the proportional differences between the two samples. Only z scores significant at the $p < .01$ are reported.

Table 8
Age at Beginning of and at Completion
of Bowel Training

<u>Age in Months</u>	<u>At Beginning</u>			<u>At Completion</u>		
	<u>Patterns</u>	Current Study	<u>z</u>	<u>Patterns</u>	Current Study	<u>z</u>
Under 5	6%	0%		0%	0%	
5-9	41	1	7.27	8	0	2.96
10-14	30	8	4.48	25	3	
15-19	10	20	3.70	24	8	3.20
20-24	5	38	5.27	23	33	
25-29	1	11	3.68	4	13	
30-34	1	12	5.50	6	19	4.06
After 34	1	0		5	19	4.66
Not Ascertained	5	10		5	5	
<u>N</u> =	379	100		379	100	

Table 9
Aggression

Degree of <u>Permissiveness</u>	<u>Parents</u>			<u>Expressed Against Siblings</u>		<u>Other Children</u>		
	<u>P^a</u>	<u>CS^a</u>	<u>z</u>	<u>P^a</u>	<u>CS^a</u>	<u>P^a</u>	<u>CS^a</u>	<u>z</u>
1. Non-permissive	38%	38%		5%	9%	5%	24%	6.33
2. Slightly	24	15		25	30	29	23	
3. Moderately	27	42	3.00	55	46	39	35	
4. Quite	10	2		14	11	22	16	
5. Very permissive	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>		<u>1</u>	<u>4</u>	3.00	<u>5</u>	<u>2</u>
<u>N</u> =	375	100		308	80	346	93	
	100%	100%		100%	100%	100%	100%	

^aP = Patterns, and CS = Current Study

Table 10
Extent of Giving the Child Regular Jobs to Do
Around the House

	<u>Patterns</u>	Current Study	<u>z</u>
1. Nothing expected - Mother feels child too young.	12%	5%	
2. No regular jobs so far - Mother encourages helping.	42	18	4.08
3. One or two regular jobs, moderate pressure to enforce	35	76	7.32
4. Several regular jobs, fairly strict to enforce	9	2	
5. Many regular, difficult jobs, strictly enforced	1	0	
Not ascertained	<u>1</u>	<u>0</u>	
	100%	100%	
<u>N</u> =	379	100	

Table 11

How Much Good Does It Do To Spank

	<u>Patterns</u>	Current Study	<u>z</u>
1. Does good, no reservations	26%	41%	3.00
2. Does good, some reservations	21	14	
3. Good in some ways, bad in others	8	22	4.00
4. Does no good, with reservations	18	8	
5. Does no good.	22	8	3.50
Never spans or not ascertained	<u>5</u>	<u>7</u>	
	100%	100%	
	<u>N</u> = 379	100	

Table 12
Extent of the Use of Reasoning

	<u>Patterns</u>	Current Study	<u>z</u>
1. Never uses	2%	1%	
2. Rare use	18	2	4.00
3. Some use	36	45	
4. Considerable, frequent use	19	51	6.53
Not Ascertained	<u>25</u>	<u>1</u>	5.33
	100%	100%	
	<u>N =</u> 379	379	

Table 13
Sex-Role Differentiation

	<u>Patterns</u>	Current Study	<u>z</u>
1. Low. Mothers believe little or no differentiation.	5%	43%	10.00
2.	9	20	3.23
3.	22	8	3.33
4.	20	6	3.41
5.	26	9	3.61
6.	13	6	
7. High. Mother stresses and trains for wide differentiation.	4	6	
Not Ascertained	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	
	100%	100%	
<u>N</u> =	379	100	

APPENDIX A

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Review of Literature

Childrearing Practices and Methods of Research

What research method will give the most realistic picture of child-rearing practices? Yarrow, Campbell and Burton (1968) criticized the interview method. They attempted a replication of the methods used by the Sears, Maccoby and Levin's research (1957), and found little correlation with that study. The authors stated that little evidence was found that the child's behavior was determined by the mother's behavior. Aggression, dependency and conscience were investigated. Only conscience showed a significant relationship to the mother's practices, and this was found to differ according to the sex of the child. This 1968 study used interviews of the mothers, questionnaires filled out prior to the interview by the mothers, and ratings by the pre-school teachers of the children. The data from the three sources were compared and then further comparisons were made with pertinent data from other comparable studies, mainly the Patterns study. One of the recommendations of the authors was that mothers be trained to be observers of the data desired. Also Yarrow (1963) suggested that observations from both parents, children and outside observers be used. This 1963 study looked at the idea of using other dimensions of mother-child interactions. Besides suggesting that the genotypic similarities and differences of parents be studied, Yarrow (1963) stated that child rearing studies should be designed to yield more reliable causative inferences.

How well do parents recall early events in their children's lives? Robbins (1963) surveyed accounts of parents given in a longitudinal

study and found many inaccuracies. Errors were greatest in remembering the exact time of toilet training and weaning. Fathers were less accurate than mothers and the errors of both parents were in the direction of expert advice. In other words, parents tend to recall events happening as they feel would meet with the approval of child experts. This study compared answers given throughout a period of three years, from the birth of the child to age three years. The poor memory on the parents' part seems unusual considering the amount of time and the frequency of recalling the events in such a longitudinal study. McCord and McCord (1961) compared like families in obtaining information concerning child rearing. One group was observed at home and in the neighborhood. The second group was given structured and unstructured interviews. The authors found some indications of leaning toward cultural conventions in the data obtained by the interviews. For instance, it revealed more leadership by father, greater esteem by father, and less rejection between parent and child. However, only small differences were discovered between the interview group and observation group in mothers' disciplinary techniques, the loving and conflicting relations between the parents, and the perception of the mother's role in the family, etc.

In research pertaining to family behavior, Walters (1960) found that the questionnaire could be relied on to give as accurate information as the interview. This study was trying to find out which method could be counted on as to the reliability of the answers, the questionnaire or the interview. The questionnaire is more economical and the author wanted to know if the interview would be that much more accurate to recommend its use. Lytton (1973, 1974) compared data from three

types of research methods. When compared with the experimental method, he found the interview and observation to be superior. The experimental method of an artificial setting in a laboratory was not conducive to reaching accurate and reliable data of child rearing practices and methods. Lytton suggested that the interview used with observation would give superior information as compared to either alone.

Lambert, Yackley and Hein (1971) had parents listen to a tape of children's requests for attention and then reported the parents' reactions. This method was used as a substitute of observation of parent-child interaction. Parents of six-year-olds were asked to respond to taped requests of children, such as "Mummy, help me; Why can't I; etc." Rothbart and Maccoby (1966) developed this procedure and felt that it would give a truer picture of the parents' actual behavior. This method originated to take the place of direct observation since that method is so time consuming.

There are criticisms of the research method of interviewing parents for seeking child-rearing information. This objection seems to center mainly on the correlation of mothers' childrearing practices and children's behavior. Yarrow, et al (1968) found very little correlation. Even Sears, et al (1957) findings indicated a relatively small correlation. There is also evidence that parents' recollections of previous practices are unreliable, leaning toward the acceptable norms. It has been found that certain experimental situations both reveal and obscure relevant child rearing information.

Childrearing and Society

Do cultural and political affairs of a society affect childrearing practices? Whiting, Chasdi, Antonovsky, and Ayres (1966) explored the

changes in living conditions and their effect on childrearing. In the small town of Homestead, New Mexico, Texan and Mormon childrearing practices were compared with each other, and with the Zuni Indians. The values stressed by the Elizabethan family (a type of family life before the industrial revolution, occurring during the Elizabethan period of history) and those values stressed by the current nuclear family were considered to have differing influences on the childrearing. Texas families represented the independent nuclear family with its emphasis on early independence of the child: early weaning, acceptance of aggression, etc., as opposed to the Elizabethan type family representing dependent extended family life. The Mormon families were found to embrace the strong paternal authority as did the Elizabethan families. The Zuni had an extended family with multiple caretakers.

All three of the societies studied had gone through stable periods of culture and then dramatic changes. The authors felt that this pattern revealed the reasons behind their respective childrearing practices and methods. They suggested that a long period of stable culture, and then rapid change, is probably the normal procedure of cultural change, instead of a slow progressive change. And the rapid change usually involves a change in values and in childrearing. These authors hypothesized that when certain crises occur in a society, there must be a reorganization of the family. For instance, reaction to a crisis may call for certain behaviors to be inhibited. Controls must be instigated for aggression, dependence, sex, etc. In turn there is a reorganization of childrearing methods. From conflicts and changes arising from such crises, new psychological defenses must be formed.

The Russian and American ways of childrearing were contrasted and compared by Bronfenbrenner (1970). While the family is still the main form of socialization of the child in the United States, in Russia heavy responsibility is given to the "Children's Collective". Both nations face the same kind of circumstances of the technological society; however, the values and childrearing methods are different. The contrasting effect of the peer group in each culture was studied. In Russia, the peer group of the child and the family are in agreement and concord in values, while in the United States the peer group of the child and the family seem to be opposed and in disagreement.

The size and type of business organizations and their influence on childrearing was investigated by Miller and Swanson (1958). "Entrepreneurial" and "Bureaucratic" are the occupational divisions. According to Miller and Swanson (1958) the parents' membership in one or the other will have definite effects in their expectations for their children. The "bureaucratic" parents will stress "getting along with others", dependence, controlling aggression, etc. The "entrepreneurial" parents then will stress independence, aggressive competitiveness, etc. The "bureaucratic" individual is defined as one who works in a large corporation or works for others, while the "entrepreneurial" is defined as one who farms or owns own business, etc. The authors used interviews with mothers in Detroit, Michigan to obtain their data for their explanations of different childrearing methods. They felt their research showed a definite trend toward the "bureaucratic" family and method of childrearing. However, Haber (1963) stated that perhaps the changes that Miller and Swanson described, can be attributed to changes in the overall

social and cultural atmosphere. Haber pointed out that the two groups, "bureaucratic" and "entrepreneurial" also differed as to age. Considering this information, he suggested that the findings of Miller and Swanson could not be validated.

Eiduson, Cohen, and Alexander (1971) researched the childrearing practices of the "counter-culture". During the 1960's alternate family life styles became evident, including effects in both marriage and child-rearing. This study was done with home observations, and pilot interviews in rural and urban communities. Many of the practices of the alternate life style parents could be observed in the contemporary nuclear family. The childrearing practices of single middle-class mothers and "unmarried marrieds" (couples with children who are living together in monogamous arrangement) were compared with two parent nuclear families of the 1970's. Among a number of concerns investigated was the effect of multiple care-taking. There was evidence of an interest in nutrition by parents and an increasing interest in stressing non-violence.

The society affects the individual and the individual affects the society. There is a circular motion to this influence. Whiting, et al (1966) discussed the ways in which society changes and the influencing aspects of these changes. Miller and Swanson used the example of work organization to describe child rearing as differing according to the parents' occupational orientation. Then current societal practices are investigated as to their correlation with child rearing practices. Russian and American parental practices differ and these differences may be traced to the differences in the society's practices. It seems to be that changes in a society's outlook and systems will be evident in the rearing

of the young. Societal changes of the past 25 years may show significant differences in the childrearing patterns.

Childrearing and Socialization of the Child

How does society expect parents to prepare their children for adult membership in the society? Bernard (1974) stated that society encourages the methods that will eventually produce the citizens necessary for the culture. The history of "motherhood" and its future were the issues involved in this author's study. The role of the mother was seen as being affected by technology, industry, etc.

Whiting and Child (1953) discussed the effects of age on socialization and the development of guilt. This study looked at various cultural practices in childrearing techniques and compared them to the resulting attitudes of the adults toward illness. Besides age, the role of the agent and techniques of socialization were reviewed. Sears, Rau, and Alpert (1965) researched the development of identification and child-rearing practices. This was studied by using interviews with the parents and also a laboratory experimental situation for the child. This was an attempt to make clear the primary identification process. Initially the children identify with the mother. At age three or four the boys begin a process of identification with the father. It was thought that the childrearing methods concerning dependence and discipline affect the identification process.

Brim (1963) has stated that socialization first occurs as the control of primary drives. Bell (1968, 1971; Bell & Harper, 1977) discussed the numerous studies of socialization of children by parents. It was

concluded that there were many other factors involved besides the assumed one of parent affecting the child. The effect of the child on the parent, the constitutional differences among children, etc., should be considered when exploring childrearing practices. The increasing socializing influence of the peer group was discussed by Eiduson, Cohen, and Alexander (1973) as being due to the early stress on independence by mothers. By stressing independence the mother allows the child to make many decisions for him/herself and the child then relies on his/her peer group for guidance.

Baldwin (1948) in studying socialization, found correlations in childrearing methods and curiosity, aggressiveness, kindness, cruelty, etc. Stollenberger's study (1969) of Chinese-American childrearing practices revealed that methods used by parents were related to the amount of aggressiveness displayed by the child. He used the Patterns interview schedule and did observations of the neighborhood in gathering his data.

Society depends on parents to develop its useful citizens. The early parenting influences will be found in the participating adult of the society. Socialization comes first through inhibition and control of primary drives (Brim, 1963). Whiting and Child (1953) found evidence that socialization practices of these primary drives (hunger, sex, etc.) would result in certain adult practices. While there are other important influences besides parental in the socialization processes, many researchers could find correlations between particular socialization methods and the social practices of adults.

Childrearing and the Personality of the Child

How do the early experiences of children affect their personalities? Freudian theory has always insisted on personality development being formed by the early childhood experiences. Sears, Maccoby and Levin (1957) described a cause and effect relationship between mothers' methods and techniques and the behaviors of their children. The Patterns study indicated that one of its objectives was to find out what effects the mothers' training had on the children. How much of a contribution to personality development do childrearing experiences make was an issue involved in this study. The mother's warmth, techniques of punishment and permissiveness were seen as important factors in the development of the child's personality. Sears (1951) discussed methods of analyzing personality development through, among other things, the parent-child interaction. He stated that a theory of development of personality would have to concern the potential for action, the learning process, and combine the diadic and monadic transactions.

Barton, Dielman and Cattell (1977) used questionnaires from parents and high school students to foretell personality factors from childrearing practices. Using the Child Rearing Practices Questionnaire and the High School Personality Questionnaire, the authors found that a large part of the personality fluctuations could be prophesized from childrearing methods.

Guthrie and Jacobs (1968) reported from a study of Philippine mothers that different practices will result in different personality formations. This study, a replication of the 1957 Patterns study, was done in the Philippines. The major differences between the Patterns

mothers and the Philippine mothers was in the first three questions of the second part of the interview schedule. These questions deal with infant feeding and weaning. These authors stress the importance of how the family is structured as to what will be the childrearing practices. How a society defines a "child" and "child development" will affect the attitudes and practices of the parents.

Rousell and Edwards (1971) found in a study using some young adults from the original Patterns study that sex was a factor in the effect of childrearing practices in disturbed individuals. By giving the MMPI to sixty-four young adults whose mothers were interviewed for the Patterns study in 1957, it was found that a warm permissive home would possibly lead to disturbed females. While alternately it was found that a cold rejecting home would produce a disturbed male.

Obviously personality does not develop in a vacuum. There is always another human that interacts with the infant. The human infant cannot sustain life without support from an adult member of the species. The potential of this necessary interaction is studied and investigated by all personality theorists. The majority of studies do indicate the importance of this early interaction in personality formation, an interaction that in turn is influenced by the societal pressures and mores on the supporting adult.

Parents and Childrearing

What influences the parents? Where are their ideologies and practices concerning childrearing coming from? Culture and political events in the society have been seen as potent forces. Past and present

experiences of the parents, including how they were raised, are influencing the childrearing practices.

Loevenger (1959) suggested that parents' childrearing practices come from a "learning theory" when raising their children. Then the children, when they are adults and become parents, develop and use their own "learning theory", frequently a "learning theory" that is in direct opposition to the one used by their parents. In this manner Loevenger stated that each generation has a new method of childrearing. Parents are either using methods and practices that are the opposite from their parents or very similar.

Stolz (1967) found in her study that parental behavior developed from a number of sources including past childhood experiences, mass media, organized education, etc. Mothers and fathers were interviewed as to what they felt were the most important influences on their behavior as parents. The parents were interviewed separately and they were asked to discuss present day practices. It was reported that any one parental action was found to be the result of a variety of influences, plus the setting in which the action or event was taking place.

Social class and education of the parents are thought to be influencing factors on the methods of childrearing. Maccoby and Gibbs (1964) looked into the differences of childrearing by social class. They found the "upper middle" class more permissive than the "upper lower". Although there were no differences in "feeding" practices. Staples and Smith (1954) while researching grandmothers and mothers, found the amount of formal education to be influential in childrearing methods. Both were found to be less permissive with less education. The attitudes of mothers

living separate from grandmothers and those of mothers and grandmothers living together were examined. If grandmother and mother lived apart, both were more permissive.

The condition of the society can affect the parents' actions in dealing with their children. B. Whiting (1974) discussed "folk wisdom" and its affect on childrearing advise to parents. She looked at the heavy reliance in the United States on expert advice and the beginning anti-professionalism that is becoming evident in young parents at this time. Klapper (1971) looked at the Women's Liberation Movement and its influence on books concerning children's development. McBride (1973) discussed the ambiguous feeling of mothers and Hammer (1976) discussed the difficulty of being a mother. A difficulty she traced to the division between "home" and "work".

There are myriad influencing agents and events upon parents. Their own parents, past experiences, the current life situation in which they find themselves, are only a few factors impinging on their child rearing methods. How much education they have had and what social class they belong to are important too. The current social norms and political climate can produce affects on how parents deal with their children. What these certain affecting factors are and how much influence they wield are always important research considerations.

Summary

Most researchers are in agreement that parental practices do shape children's personality and social adaptation. They do not agree as to how much and what kind of influence prevails, as well as on what. The

influences of cultural and political aspects of society are considered to affect the parents' methods. The social class and cultural background of mothers is studied for its influence on childrearing.

How best to examine these influences of childrearing is also debated. Direct observation would be one way, however, an outside observer always determines the event in some way. Laboratory experiments are too often contrived and stilted.

The questionnaire has the possibility of leaving out an important question or of not allowing elaboration. Although it is economical, there are inaccuracies in parents' recall of past events during interviews or in answering questionnaires. Parents may give answers they believe are acceptable. The interview and observation used together were found to give good results. The open-ended interview does give the parents' perceptions, if not factual practices. There were suggestions of new methods and also suggestions for using different variables.

Childrearing practices of parents and the intermingling influences from society (cultural and political) are all interacting to produce and shape a child's personality and sociability. A re-examination of the childrearing practices of the parents of today, by a method used for discerning the grandparents' childrearing practices, would help to discover what the effect was of the experiences of parents during these past years, since one of the factors affecting childrearing was found to be the past and present experiences of the parents. The obvious changes of our society during these past twenty-five years have changed parents and their child-rearing methods. So far there seems to be no perfect way to investigate

these interactions. Further study of this research problem seems to be best approached by the use and refinement of known research methods and development of more accurate and reliable techniques.

REFERENCES

- Baldwin, A. L. Socialization and the parent-child relationship. Child Development. 1948, 19, 127-136.
- Barton, K., Dielman, T. E. & Cattell, R. B. Child rearing practices related to child personality. Journal of Social Psychology. 1977, 101, 75-85.
- Bell, R. Q. A reinterpretation of the direction of effects in studies of socialization. Psychological Review. 1968. 75, 81-85.
- Bell, R. Q. Stimulus control of parent or caretaker behavior by offspring. Developmental Psychology. 1971, 4, 63-72.
- Bell, R. Q. & Harper, L. V. Child effects on adults. Hillsdale, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 1977.
- Bernard, J. The future of motherhood. New York: Dial Press, 1974.
- Brim Jr., O. G. Socialization through the life cycle. In M. Sussman (Ed), Sourcebook in marriage and the family. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1974.
- Bronfenbrenner, U. Two worlds of childhood. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1970.
- Eiduson, B. T., Cohen, J. & Alexander, J. Alternatives in child rearing in the 1970's. Journal of Orthopsychiatry. 1973, 43, 720-731.
- Guthrie, G. M. & Jacobs, P. J. Child rearing and personality development in the Philippines. University Park and London: Penn. State University Press, 1966.
- Haber, L. D. Age and integration setting: A re-appraisal of The changing American parent. American Sociological Review. 1962, 27, 682-689.
- Hammer, S. Daughters and mothers - Mothers and daughters. New York: Quadrangle/The New York Times Book Co., 1976.
- Klapper, Z. S. The impact of the women's liberation movement on child development books. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry. 1971. 41, 730.
- Lambert, W. E., Yackley, A., & Hein, R. N. Child training values of English Canadians and French Canadians. Canadian Journal of Behavioral Science. 1971, 3, 217-236.

- Loevinger, J. Patterns of parenthood as theories of learning. Journal of Abnormal Social Psychology. 1959, 59, 148-150.
- Lytton, H. Three approaches to the study of parent-child interaction: Ethological interview, and experimental. Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry. 1973, 14, 177.
- Lytton, H. Comparative yield of three data sources in the study of parent-child interaction. Merrill-Palmer Quarterly. 1974, 20, 53-64.
- Maccoby, E. E., & Gibbs, P. K. and the Staff of the Laboratory of Human Development, Harvard University. Methods of child rearing in the two social classes. In C. B. Stendler (Ed.), Readings in child behavior and development (Second Edition). New York-Burlingame: Harcourt, Brace & World, 1964.
- McBride, A. B. The growth and development of mothers. New York: Harper & Row, 1973.
- McCord, J., & McCord, W. Cultural stereotypes and the validity of interviews for research in child development. Child Development. 1961, 32, 171-185.
- Miller, D. R., & Swanson, G. E. The changing American parent. New York: Wiley, 1958.
- Robbins, L. C. The accuracy of parental recall of aspects of child development and of child rearing practices. Journal of Abnormal Social Psychology. 1963, 66, 261-270.
- Rothbart, M. K., & Maccoby, E. E. Parents' differential reactions to sons and daughters. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology. 1966, 4, 237-243.
- Rousell, C. H., & Edwards, C. N. Some developmental antecedents of psychopathology. Journal of Personality. 1971, 39, 362-377.
- Sears, R. R. A theoretical framework for personality and social behavior. The American Psychologist. 1951, 6, 476-483.
- Sears, R. R., Maccoby, E. E., & Levin, H. Patterns of child rearing. Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 1957.
- Sears, R. R., Rau, L., & Alpert, R. Identification and child rearing. Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 1965.
- Staples, R., & Smith, J. W. Attitudes of grandmothers and mothers toward child rearing practices. Child Development. 1957, 25, 91-97.

- Stollenberger, R. T. Chinese-American child rearing practices and juvenile delinquency. Child and Family. 1969, 31, 279-288.
- Stolz, L. M. Influences on parent behavior. Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 1967.
- Walters, J. Relationship between reliability of responses in family life research and method of data collection. Marriage Family Living. 1960, 22, 232-237.
- Whiting, B. B. Folk wisdom and child rearing. Merrill-Palmer Quarterly. 1974, 20, 9-19.
- Whiting, J. W. M., Chasdi, E. H., Antonovsky, H. F. & Ayres, B. A. The learning of values. In E. V. Vogt & E. M. Albert (Eds.), People of Rimrock. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1966.
- Yarrow, M. R. Problems of methods in parent-child research. Child Development. 1963, 34, 215-266.
- Yarrow, M. R., Campbell, J. D., & Burton, R. V. Child rearing: An inquiry into research methods. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1968.

APPENDIX B

FACE SHEET

Name _____ Age _____ Birth Date _____ Birth Place _____ E/C _____

Address _____ Phone _____

Mother

Father

Age _____ Birth Date _____ E/C _____ Age _____ Birth Date _____ E/C _____

Current Occupation _____ Current Occupation _____

Approx. Income _____ Approx. Income _____

Ordinal Position _____ Ordinal Position _____

Married _____ Separated _____ Divorced _____

Date _____ Date _____ Date _____

Highest Grade of School _____ Highest Grade of School _____

Religion _____ Race _____ Religion _____ Race _____

Ethnic Background _____ Ethnic Background _____

Mother's Parents

Father's Parents

Father's Occupation _____

Father's Occupation _____

Birth Place _____

Birth Place _____

Birth Date _____

Birth Date _____

Mother's Occupation _____

Mother's Occupation _____

Birth Place _____

Birth Place _____

Birth Date _____

Birth Date _____

Number of Child's Siblings _____

Ages of Siblings _____

How many hours a week does your child spend watching T.V.?

Mother's employment since having family

Date of Interview _____

Time of Interview _____

Notes _____

APPENDIX C

CORRESPONDENCE



Oklahoma State University

DEPARTMENT OF FAMILY RELATIONS
AND CHILD DEVELOPMENT

STILLWATER, OKLAHOMA 74074
241 HOME ECONOMICS WEST
(405) 624-5057

We are presently conducting a research project that deals with the child rearing methods and attitudes of parents of young children. The cooperation of parents of kindergarten children is needed for this work at this time. Our plan is to interview mothers and fathers, beginning with mothers, on a series of questions related to parenting.

These interviews will take about 30 to 45 minutes and can be done at your convenience in your home. All interviews will be kept confidential and the results of the study will be shared with you at the completion of the project. The questions pertain to the usual parental concerns of feeding and weaning, toilet training, discipline, dependency, aggression, sex and modesty training and the like. While much has been said and written over the years on these important topics, very little is known in terms of today's parents, values, and life-styles.

We will be contacting you again in about a week to see if you might be interested in participating in this project. We will try to answer any questions you may have and make arrangements for the interview at that time. Your assistance and cooperation is greatly appreciated. Thank you.

Sincerely,

John C. McCullers, Ph.D.
Professor of Family Relations and
Child Development
Professor of Psychology

JCM/bgm

APPENDIX D

ORIGINAL INTERVIEW ANALYSIS SCHEDULE

Original Interview Analysis Schedule

Age of Husband			<u>M</u> =34.43
Age of Wife			<u>M</u> =32.26
Occupation of Husband			
1. Professional	20		<u>M</u> =2.86
2. Semi-professional	25		
3. Business, managerial	27		
4. Clerical, sales	11		
5. Blue collar, skilled, semi-skilled	12		
6. Service policeman, janitor	4		
7. Student	1		
0. NA (Not ascertained)	0		
Occupation of Wife			
1. Professional	1	<u>N</u> =75	<u>M</u> =2.62
2. Semi-professional	29		
3. Business, managerial	10		
4. Clerical, sales	23		
5. Blue collar, skilled, semi-skilled	5		
6. Service policeman, janitor	1		
7. Student	2		
0. NA	25		
Number of children in family			
1. One	12	<u>N</u> =99	<u>M</u> =2.54 <u>r</u> =1.00
2. Two	40		
3. Three	32		
4. Four	12		
5. Five	2		
6. Six or more	1		
0. NA	1		

^aPercentages are based on N=100. The mean is based on N=100 or the correct N is given. The interobserver reliability is r based on one-half N.

Age difference between X and next oldest sibling

1. 15 or less months	4	<u>N=93</u>	<u>r=.867</u>
2. 16-21 mos.	0		
3. 22-31 mos.	16		
4. 32-43 mos.	20		
5. 44-55 mos.	10		
6. 56-67 mos.	2		
7. More than 67 mos.	3		
8. No older sibling	38		
0. NA	7		

Age difference between X and next Youngest Sibling

1. 15 mos. or less	4	<u>N=96</u>	<u>r=.431</u>
2. 16-21 mos.	1		
3. 22-31 mos.	12		
4. 32-43 mos.	25		
5. More than 43 mos.	14		
6. No younger sibling	40		
0. NA	4		

Separations from mothering during first 9 mos.

1. Never	92	<u>N=99</u>	<u>M=1.24</u>
2. Only weekend	2		
3. 1-3 weeks	2		
4. Fairly frequent weekends	0		
5. Two or more 1-3 week periods	0		
6. 3 weeks to 2 mos.	2		
7. Over 2 mos. to 5 mos.	0		
8. Over 5 mos.	0		
9. Mother home intermittently	1		
0. NA	1		

Separation 9-24 mos.

1. Never	96	<u>N=99</u>	<u>M=1.04</u>
2. Only weekend	2		
3. 1-3 weeks	1		
4. Fairly frequent weekends	0		
5. Two or more 1-3 week periods	0		
6. 3 weeks to 2 mos.	2		
7. Over 2 mos. to 5 mos.	0		
8. Over 5 mos.	0		
9. Mother home intermittently	1		
0. NA	1		

Separation after 2 years

1. Never	97	$\underline{M}=1.04$ $\underline{r}=.979$
2. Only weekend	2	
3. 1-3 weeks	1	
4. Fairly frequent weekends	0	
5. Two or more 1-3 week periods	0	
6. 3 weeks to 2 mos.	2	
7. Over 2 mos. to 5 mos.	0	
8. Over 5 mos.	0	
9. Mother home intermittently	1	
0. NA	1	

Separations from Father first 9 mos.

1. Never	90	$\underline{M}=1.56$ $\underline{r}=.957$
2. Only weekend	0	
3. 1-3 weeks	0	
4. Fairly frequent weekends	0	
5. Two or more 1-3 week periods	3	
6. 3 weeks to 2 mos.	3	
7. Over 2 mos. to 5 mos.	1	
8. Over 5 mos.	1	
9. Mother home intermittently	2	
0. NA	0	

Separation (father) 9-24 mos.

1. Never	94	$\underline{M}=1.33$ $\underline{r}=.977$
2. Only weekend	0	
3. 1-3 weeks	0	
4. Fairly frequent weekends	0	
5. Two or more 1-3 week periods	3	
6. 3 weeks to 2 mos.	1	
7. Over 2 mos. to 5 mos.	0	
8. Over 5 mos.	0	
9. Mother home intermittently	2	
0. NA	0	

Separation (father) after 2 years

1. Never	92	$\underline{M}=1.40$ $\underline{r}=.971$
2. Only weekend	0	
3. 1-3 weeks	0	
4. Fairly frequent weekends	1	
5. Two or more 1-3 week periods	2	
6. 3 weeks to 2 mos.	3	
7. Over 2 mos. to 5 mos.	1	
8. Over 5 mos.	0	
9. Mother home intermittently	1	
0. NA	0	

Proportional amount of care-taking by mothers

1. Practically none	0	<u>M</u> =5.30	<u>r</u> =.663
2. Less than half	0		
3. About half	2		
4. More than half, considerable help	6		
5. Most	63		
6. Nearly all, rare help	38		
7. All	1		
0. NA	0		

Care-taking by father

1. None	2	<u>M</u> =3.21	<u>r</u> =.834
2. Very little	23		
3. Some	29		
4. Quite a bit	44		
5. Shared equally with mother	2		
6. Did more than mother	0		
9. Some, But NA how much	0		
0. NA	0		

Care-taking by other agent

1. None	77	<u>N</u> =90	<u>M</u> =1.30	<u>r</u> =.231
2. Very little	5			
3. Some	4			
4. Quite a bit	2			
5. Approx. Half	2			
6. More than half	0			
9. Some, NA how much	0			
0. NA	0			

Mother's responsiveness to crying

1. Extremely unresponsive	0	<u>M</u> =3.88	<u>r</u> =.675
2. Generally picked up when something wrong	5		
3. "It Depends"	34		
4. Relatively responsive	29		
5. Highly responsive	32		
0. NA	0		

How much did X cry as a baby

1. Very little	23	<u>N</u> =41	<u>M</u> =1.89	<u>r</u> =.769
2. Some	7			
3. A great deal	6			
4. Colicky	5			
0. NA	59			

Amount of mother's affectionate interaction

1. None	0	$\underline{M}=3.87$	$\underline{r}=.544$
2. A little	2		
3. Some	21		
4. Much	65		
5. A great deal	12		
0. NA	0		

Amount of enjoyment of babies

1. None	1	$\underline{N}=98$	$\underline{M}=3.25$	$\underline{r}=.586$
2. A little	35			
3. Some	29			
4. Much	4			
5. A great deal	29			
0. NA	2			

Warmth of affectional bond

1. Mother cold	1	$\underline{M}=4.08$	$\underline{r}=.674$
2.	2		
3. Moderately warm	17		
4.	47		
5. Very warm and affectionate	32		
0. NA	0		

Was baby breast fed, How long

1. Not Breast fed	55
2. Yes, less than 1 mo.	6
3. Yes, 1-3 mos.	9
4. 3-5 mos.	13
5. 5-7 mos.	6
6. 7-9 mos.	0
7. 9-12 mos.	4
8. 12-15 mos.	4
9. More than 15 mos.	3
0. NA	0

If breast fed wean directly to cup or use bottle

1. Directly to cup	8	$\underline{r}=.902$
2. Used bottle	26	
3. Not breast fed	55	
4. NA	1	

Reason for not breast feeding

1. Unable to, not enough milk, etc.	2
2. Doctor advised against	5
3. Didn't want to, didn't like idea, etc.	20
4. Didn't want to be tied down, bust too large, etc.	8
5. Didn't want to, NA why	11
6. Baby ill	1
7. Family pressure against	2
8. Did breast feed	45
0. No reason given, did not consider	6

Age of beginning change weaning

1. Under 2 mos.	0	<u>N</u> =87	<u>M</u> =3.72	<u>r</u> =.131
2. 2-4.9	4			
3. 5-7.9	43			
4. 8-10.9	18			
5. 11-15.91	18			
6. 16-23.91	3			
7. 2 years of older	1			
0. NA	13			

Age at completion of weaning

1. Under 5 mos.	0	<u>N</u> =92	<u>M</u> =4.55	<u>r</u> =.663
2. 5 mos. to 7.9	4			
3. 8-10.9	42			
4. 11-15.91	0			
5. 16-23.91	20			
6. 2 years or older	12			
7. NA	8			

Amount of time for completion of change of mode weaning

1. Instantly, 24 hours	5	<u>N</u> =83	<u>M</u> =4.69	<u>r</u> =.239
2. 1 day to 6 days	6			
3. 1 week to .9 mos.	2			
4. 1 to 3.9 mos.	24			
5. 4 to 7.9 mos.	29			
6. 8 to 11.9 mos.	4			
7. 1 year to 17.9 mos.	6			
8. 18 to 23.9 mos.	3			
9. 2 years or more	4			
0. NA	17			

Amount of preparation in drinking mode

1. No preparation	3	<u>N=93</u>	<u>M=1.96</u>
2. Some preparation	90		
0. NA	7		

Amount of punishment involved in change-of-mode weaning

1. No evidence of punishment	100
2. Physical punishment	0
3. Bitter substance on breast or bottle	0
4. Scolding	0
5. Punishment, NA what kind	0
0. NA	0

Severity of child's reaction to change-of-mode weaning

1. No reaction at all	82	<u>N=98</u>	<u>M=1.29</u>	<u>r=.544</u>
2. Slight reaction	9			
3. Some reaction	3			
4. Considerable	2			
5. Severe reaction	2			
0. NA	2			

Severity of weaning, Summary scale

1. Child weans self	33	<u>N=95</u>	<u>M=2.26</u>	<u>r=.503</u>
2. Mother gradually, no punish	28			
3. Mother fairly gradually	18			
4. Moderately abruptly	10			
5. Quite abruptly	5			
6. Very abruptly	1			
7. Same as 6 but punish	0			
0. NA	5			

Scheduling of feeding

1. Complete self demand	38	<u>N=98</u>	<u>M=2.50</u>	<u>r=.660</u>
2. Vague attempts at schedule	16			
3. Rough schedule	13			
4. Rough schedule	20			
5. Fairly rigid	10			
6. Rigid feeding schedule	1			
0. NA	2			

Severity of feeding problems

1. No feeding problems	49	$\underline{M}=1.68$	$\underline{r}=.759$
2. Mild problems	40		
3. Finicky about food	7		
4. Considerable problems	3		
5. Severe problems	0		
6. Food allergies	1		

Severity of mother's handling of feeding problems

1. No pressure	18	$r=.501$
2. Moderate pressure	23	
3.		
5. Severe pressure	6	
9. No feeding problems	48	
0. NO	4	

Does child eat with family for evening meals

1. Yes, always	94	$M=1.16$
2. Except when company	1	
3. Eats with mother, father not at home	1	
4. With family sometimes	3	
5. No, before parents	1	
0. NA	0	

Amount of restrictions of physical mobility during meals

1. Great deal of freedom	11	$r=.768$
2. Required to stay most of time	5	
3. Child required to stay throughout	28	
9. Issue doesn't come up	4	
0. NA	6	

Amount of restriction in use of fingers for eating

1. No restrictions	7	$\underline{N}=95$	$\underline{M}=2.57$	$\underline{r}=.543$
2. Slight restrictions	40			
3. Restrictions, no severity	30			
4. May not use fingers	15			
9. Never uses fingers	3			
0. NA	5			

Amount of restriction of interruption of adult conversation

1. No restrictions	8	$\underline{N}=96$	$\underline{M}=2.63$	$\underline{r}=.517$
2. Some restrictions	23			
3. Restrictions	61			
4. Severe restrictions	4			
0. NO	4			

Level of demands, table manners

1. Low		<u>M</u> =2.93	<u>r</u> =.258
2.			
3. Moderate			
4.			
5. High			
0. NA			

Amount of pressure for conformity with table standards

1. None	0	<u>N</u> =99	<u>M</u> =2.88	<u>r</u> =.201
2.	18			
3. Moderate	75			
4.	5			
5. Constant and severe	1			
0. NA				

If child goes for several days without giving trouble at table

1. Praise or thanks, indication of emphasis	14	<u>N</u> =88	<u>M</u> =3.125	<u>r</u> =.555
2. Praise or thanks	26			
3. Usually pay no attention	8			
4. Doesn't do anything	35			
9. Inapplicable, never happened	5			
0. NA				

Early unsuccessful attempts at bowel training

1. 0-3 mos.	0
2. 4-6	0
3. 7-9	1
4. 10-12	4
5. Later than 12 mos.	15
9. No such attempts	71
0. NA	9

Age of beginning of continuous bowel training

1. 0-4 mos.	0	<u>N</u> =90	<u>M</u> =4.95	<u>r</u> =.772
2. 5-9	1			
3. 10-14	8			
4. 15-19	20			
5. 20-24	38			
6. 25-29	11			
7. 30-34	12			
8. 35-39	0			
9. 40-44	0			
0. NA	10			

Time when training was completed

1. 0-4 mos.	0	<u>N=95</u>	<u>M=6.03</u>	<u>r=.620</u>
2. 5-9	0			
3. 10-14	3			
4. 15-19	8			
5. 20-24	33			
6. 25-29	13			
7. 30-34	19			
8. 35-39	15			
9. 40-44	4			
0. NA	5			

Time between initiation and completion of bowel training

1. 1-2 mos.	37	<u>N=89</u>	<u>M=2.96</u>	<u>r=.889</u>
2. 3-4	8			
3. 5-6	23			
4. 7-8	2			
5. 9-20	1			
6. 11-12	10			
7. 13-14	1			
8. 15-16	1			
9. 17 mos. or more	6			
0. NA	11			

Does X still wet the bed

1. Never, not since 2 yrs.	51	<u>N=98</u>	<u>M=2.74</u>	<u>r=.520</u>
2. Never, not since 3 yrs.	8			
3. Not since 4 yrs.	3			
4. Not since 5 yrs.	7			
5. Never, NA when stopped	12			
6. Occasionally nowadays	14			
7. Fairly often	3			
8. Almost every night	0			
0. NA	2			

Severity of toilet training

1. Not at all severe	53	<u>N=99</u>	<u>M=1.81</u>	<u>r=.513</u>
2.	16			
3. Moderate	27			
4.	1			
5. Very severe	2			
0. NA	1			

Severity of child's reaction to toilet training

1. No reaction	61	<u>N=87</u>	<u>M=1.48</u>	<u>r=.195</u>
2.	13			
3. Some	11			
4.	1			
5. Severe reaction	1			
6. NA	13			

Permissiveness for going without clothes indoors

1. Not at all permissive	8	<u>N</u> =93	<u>M</u> =3.32	<u>r</u> =.655
2.	5			
3. Moderately	40			
4. "I don't mind"	29			
5. Entirely permissive	11			
0. NA	7			

Amount of pressure which mother has applied for modest indoors

1. None	10			<u>r</u> =.549
2. Slight	30			
3. Moderate	10			
4. Considerable	1			
5. Severe	1			
9. Problem has not come up	24			
0. NA	24			

Age of beginning modesty training

1. Before 2 yrs.	3
2. 2-3.9	10
3. 4 yrs. or later	14
0. NA	73

Permissiveness for masturbation

1. Not at all	2	<u>N</u> =92	<u>M</u> =3.90	<u>r</u> =.464
2.	7			
3. Moderately	23			
4.	26			
5. Entirely permissive	34			
0. NA	8			

Severity of pressure which has been applied against masturbation

1. No pressure	16			<u>r</u> =.689
2. Slight	26			
3. Moderate	13			
4. Considerable	2			
5. Severe	0			
9. Issue has not come up	35			
0. NA	8			

Permissiveness of sex play among children

1. Not at all permissive	9	<u>N</u> =89	<u>M</u> =2.94	<u>r</u> =.675
2.	19			
3. Moderate	35			
4.	20			
5. Entirely permissive	6			
0. NA	11			

Severity of pressure which has been applied against sex play

1. No pressure	2			
2. Slight	20			$\underline{r}=.596$
3. Moderate	17			
4. Considerable	1			
5. Severe	2			
9. Problem has not come up	49			
0. NA	9			

Mother's sex anxiety

1. No anxiety evident	26	$\underline{N}=95$	$\underline{M}=2.48$	$\underline{r}=.230$
2.	29			
3.	19			
4. Moderate	14			
5.	4			
6.	2			
7. High	1			
0. NA	5			

Level of standards, neatness and orderliness and cleanliness

1. Low	5		$\underline{M}=3.06$	$\underline{r}=-.086$
2.	9			
3. Moderate	68			
4.	11			
5. High	7			
0. NA	0			

Restriction, care of house and furniture

1. Few	2		$\underline{M}=3.90$	$\underline{r}=.575$
2.	1			
3. Moderate	21			
4.	57			
5. Many restrictions	19			
0. NA	0			

Pressure for conformity to restrictions

1. No pressure	0	$\underline{N}=99$	$\underline{M}=3.35$	$\underline{r}=1.00$
2.	3			
3. Moderate	62			
4.	30			
5. Extreme pressure	4			
0. NA	1			

What is child's bedtime

1. 6:00 or earlier	0			$\underline{r}=.715$
2. 6:05 to 6:30	0			
3. 6:35 to 7:00	0			
4. 7:05 to 7:30	1			
5. 7:35 to 8:00	19			
6. 8:05 to 8:30	32			
7. After 8:30	27			
9. No specific bedtime	15			
0. NA	6			

Strictness about bedtime behavior

1. Not at all strict	6	$\underline{N}=88$	$\underline{M}=2.98$	$\underline{r}=.456$
2.	23			
3. Moderately	28			
4.	28			
5. Very strict	3			
0. NA	12			

Strictness about noise

1. Not at all strict	16	$\underline{N}=99$	$\underline{M}=2.58$	$\underline{r}=.372$
2.	27			
3. Moderately	42			
4.	10			
5. Very strict	4			
0. NA	1			

Restrictions on radio and TV

1. No restrictions	42	$\underline{N}=97$	$\underline{M}=2.13$	$\underline{r}=.520$
2.	12			
3. Moderate	33			
4.	8			
5. Severe restrictions	2			
0. NA	3			

Amount of interest child expresses in TV

1. Child loves it	0	$\underline{N}=52$	$\underline{M}=3.53$	$\underline{r}=.266$
2. Likes it a lot	3			
3. Fairly interested	18			
4. Slightly interested	31			
5. Not at all interested	0			
9. No TV	0			
0. NA	48			

Restrictiveness, physical mobility

1. No restrictions	1	$\underline{M}=3.04$	$\underline{r}=.546$
2. A few	22		
3. Quite a bit	57		
4. Restricted to front of house	12		
5. Great deal	8		
0. NA	0		

Giving child regular jobs

1. Nothing expected of child	4	$\underline{M}=2.76$	$\underline{r}=.545$
2. No regular jobs so far	18		
3. One or two small jobs	76		
4. Several regular jobs	2		
5. Many regular and difficult jobs	0		
0. NA	0		

Mother's realistic standards for obedience

1. Doesn't expect obedience	1	$\underline{M}=3.46$	$\underline{r}=.655$
2. Expects some	6		
3. Wants child to obey, but expects delay	48		
4. Wants and expects obedience	36		
5. Expects instant obedience	9		
0. NA	0		

Father's standards for obedience

1. Doesn't expect obedience	0	$\underline{N}=97$	$\underline{M}=3.96$	$\underline{r}=.799$
2. Expects some	6			
3. Wants child to obey, but expects delay	15			
4. Wants and expects obedience	44			
5. Expects instant obedience	30			
0. NA	3			

Relative level of father and mother obedience demands

1. Father is more strict	49	$\underline{N}=98$	$\underline{M}=1.62$	$\underline{r}=-.03$
2. About equal	37			
3. Mother more strict	12			
0. NA	2			

If child jumps up right away and does what mother asks

1. Praise or thanks, emphasis	47	$\underline{N}=90$	$\underline{M}=1.61$	$\underline{r}=.546$
2. Praise or thanks	34			
3. Usually pays no attention	6			
4. Doesn't pay attention	3			
0. NA	10			

How much of a problem does mother have with obedience

1. None	7	<u>N</u> =97	<u>M</u> =1.96	<u>r</u> =.101
2. Some	86			
3. Much	4			
0. NA	3			

Does mother ever drop the subject

1. No special value attached to following through	1	<u>N</u> =95	<u>M</u> =4.22	<u>r</u> =.219
2. Fairly often drops subject	1			
3. Sometimes	20			
4. Usually carries through	27			
5. Practically always carries through	46			
0. NA	5			

Keeping track of child

1. Practically never checks	7	<u>N</u> =99	<u>M</u> =3.21	<u>r</u> =.652
2. Checks occasionally	15			
3. Checks fairly often	29			
4. Checks frequently	46			
5. Whereabouts of child constantly on mind	2			
0. NA	1			

How much attention does X seem to want from mother

1. Practically none	7	<u>N</u> =99	<u>M</u> =3.13	<u>r</u> =.655
2. Little	23			
3. Some	29			
4. Quite a bit	30			
5. A great deal	10			
0. NA	1			

Extent to which child wants to be near mother, currently

1. Doesn't clint, follow, etc.	56	<u>N</u> =96	<u>M</u> =1.68	<u>r</u> =.818
2. Slight tendency	19			
3. Some tendency	16			
4. Considerable tendency to cling	5			
0. NA	4			

Earlier tendency to cling

1. Never showed this	19	<u>N</u> =59	<u>M</u> =2.00	<u>r</u> =.367
2. Some	21			
3. Went through stage	19			
0. NA	41			

Extent of child's objections to separation from mother

1. No objection to separation	65			
2. Occasionally objects	18			
3. Fairly often	1			
4. Usually objects	1			
5. Always objects	0			
9. Problem hasn't come up, mother doesn't go out	6			
0. NA	9			

r=.613

Amount of dependency exhibited by X at present

1. None	8	<u>N</u> =98	<u>M</u> =2.71	<u>r</u> =.525
2. A little	40			
3. Some	24			
4. Quite a bit	24			
5. A great deal	2			
0. NA	2			

Mother's response to dependency

1. Strong positive, rewards, approves	0	<u>N</u> =99	<u>M</u> =3.76	<u>r</u> =.194
2. Positive	11			
3. Somewhat positive	21			
4. Pro-con neutral	50			
5. Somewhat negative	14			
6. Negative	3			
7. Strong negative, punishes	0			
0. NA	1			

Reaction to child's starting school

1. Mother relieved	5	<u>N</u> =97	<u>M</u> =2.72
2. Glad to have child maturing	36		
3. Mixed feelings	39		
4. Mild pangs	15		
5. Hated to see go	2		
0. NA	3		

Amount of affectional demonstrativeness

1. None	0	<u>N</u> =99	<u>M</u> =3.94	<u>r</u> =.513
2.	3			
3. Moderate	30			
4.	23			
5. Very	31			
0. NA	3			

Find time to play with X

1. Yes, frequently	2	<u>N</u> =98	<u>M</u> =2.65	<u>r</u> =.771
2. Fairly often	49			
3. Sometimes	32			
4. Not very often	11			
5. Practically never	4			
0. NA	2			

Nature of affectional relationship and warmth with mother

1. Extremely warm, loving	30	<u>M</u> =1.99
2.	41	
3. Loves child, warm	29	
4.	0	
5. Not much warmth	0	
6. Ambivalent	0	
7. Predominantly hostile	0	
0. NA	0	

Mother (and father) teaching of reading, etc. before school

1. No teaching	24	<u>N</u> =97	<u>M</u> =1.87	<u>r</u> =.656
2. Some	61			
3. Considerable	12			
0. NA	3			

Extent of child's demand for teaching before school

1. None	11	<u>N</u> =41	<u>M</u> =1.81	<u>r</u> =.230
2. Some	27			
3. Considerable	3			
0. NA	59			

How important for child to do well in school

1. Unimportant	1	<u>N</u> =95	<u>M</u> =4.43	<u>r</u> =.724
2. Not very important	3			
3. Fairly	12			
4. Important, with reservations	35			
5. Important	26			
6. Very important	18			
0. NA	5			

How far is child expected to go in school

1. Grade school	0	<u>N</u> =94	<u>M</u> =4.21	<u>r</u> =.08
2. High school	2			
3. College, if wants	12			
4. College, reservations	53			
5. Finish college	21			
6. Graduate school	6			
0. NA	6			

Sex role differentiation by mother for child X's age

1. Mother believes little or no differences exist	43	<u>N</u> =98	<u>M</u> =2.59	<u>r</u> =.728
2.	20			
3.	8			
4.	6			
5.	9			
6.	6			
7. Mother stresses and trains for wide differences	6			
0. NA	2			

Quarreling among siblings

1. None	5			<u>r</u> =.478
2.	24			
3. Fair amount	46			
4.	9			
5. Continual severe	2			
9. No siblings	12			
0.	2			

Permissiveness for aggression among siblings

1. Not at all permissive	7	<u>N</u> =80	<u>M</u> =2.71	<u>r</u> =.795
2.	24			
3. Moderate	37			
4.	9			
5. Entirely permissive	3			
0. NA	20			

If children play together nicely for awhile

1. Praises and thanks, emphasis	25	<u>N</u> =80	<u>M</u> =3.02	<u>r</u> =.208
2. Praises, thanks	19			
3. Usually pays no attention	10			
4. Does not pay attention	17			
9. No siblings	9			
0. NA	20			

Socialability of child

1. Low, prefers to play alone	0
2. Low, other children dislike	1
3. Middling	31
4. High enjoys playing	61
9. No other children available	6
0. NA	1

Extent of demands for socialability

1. Mother tries to arrange social contacts	1	$\underline{r} = -.199$
2. Some	28	
3. No evidence of demands	23	
4. Mother restricts contacts	1	
9. Problem hasn't come up, child naturally sociable	39	
0. NA	8	

Level of parents' demands for child to be aggressive toward other children

1. None	22	$\underline{r} = .254$
2. No demands, no discouragement	21	
3. Slight demands	33	
4. Moderate	15	
5. High demands	2	
6. Mother no, father some	5	
7. Father no, mother some	0	
0. NA	2	

Extent to which parent has encouraged child to fight back

1. Never	29	$\underline{r} = .312$
2. Occasionally	33	
3. Moderate	10	
4. Much	1	
5. Very strong	0	
9. Problem hasn't come up, child defends self	25	
0. NA	2	

Permissiveness for inappropriate aggression

1. None	20	$\underline{N} = 94$	$\underline{M} = 2.29$	$\underline{r} = .415$
2.	31			
3. Moderate	40			
4.	1			
5. Entirely permissive	2			
0. NA	6			

Amount of aggression within the home that child displays

1. None	14	$\underline{N} = 88$	$\underline{M} = 2.28$	$\underline{r} = .630$
2. Mild	42			
3. Some	26			
4. Quite a bit	5			
5. A great deal	1			
0. NA	12			

Mother's permissiveness for aggression to parents

1. Not at all permissive	38	$\underline{M}=2.14$	$\underline{r}=.382$
2.	15		
3. Moderate	42		
4.	2		
5. Completely permissive	2		
0. NA	0		

Severity of punishment which has been used to stop aggression to parent

1. Never punished	2	$\underline{r}=.437$
2. Mild	25	
3. Moderate	36	
4. Considerable	20	
5. Severe	0	
9. Issue hasn't come up	15	
0. NA	2	

When child deviates, does he come and tell

1. Seldom or never	40	$\underline{N}=90$	$\underline{M}=1.91$	$\underline{r}=.553$
2. Sometimes	32			
3. Usually	14			
4. Always	2			
0. Never deviates	2			
0. NA	10			

When asked about deviations, does he admit or deny

1. Always admits	24	$\underline{N}=98$	$\underline{M}=2.03$	$\underline{r}=.387$
2. Usually	47			
3. Tends to deny	27			
0. NA	2			

Evidence of super-ego in child

1. No evidence	2	$\underline{N}=95$	$\underline{M}=3.02$	$\underline{r}=.539$
2.	15			
3. Moderate	60			
4. Considerable	16			
5. High	2			
0. NA	5			

Can the child earn money

1. Yes, regular system	35	$\underline{N}=85$	$\underline{M}=2.56$	$\underline{r}=.539$
2. Occasionally	27			
3. Money not used as reward	23			
0. NA	15			

Extent of use of reward

1. Mother never uses	22	<u>N=99</u>	<u>M=3.39</u>	<u>r=.564</u>
2.	12			
3.	2			
4. Sometimes	51			
5.	1			
6.	2			
7. Regularly given rewards for "good" behavior	9			
0. NA	1			

Extent of use of praise

1. Doesn't use	0	<u>N=97</u>	<u>M=6.15</u>	<u>r=.469</u>
2. Seldom	1			
3.	0			
4. Sometimes praises	16			
5.	11			
6.	7			
7. Mother regularly praises	62			
0. NA	3			

Extent of setting up models of good behavior

1. Never	34	<u>M=2.45</u>	<u>r=.547</u>
2. Rarely	16		
3. Occasionally	28		
4. Fairly often	15		
5. Uses, NA how often	7		
0. NA	0		

Does mother refer to models of "how now to behave"

1. No, tries to avoid	26	<u>N=97</u>	<u>M=2.31</u>	<u>r=.596</u>
2. No	21			
3. Occasionally uses	43			
4. Fairly often	7			
0. NA	3			

How often does mother spank

1. Never	1	<u>M=4.38</u>	<u>r=.695</u>
2. Only once or twice	8		
3. Rarely	17		
4. More than twice a year	28		
5. More than once a month	28		
6. About once a week	10		
7. Several times a week	6		
8. Practically every day	2		
0. NA	0		

How often does father spank

1. Never	9	<u>N</u> =98	<u>M</u> =3.53	<u>r</u> =.710
2. Only once or twice	12			
3. Rarely	30			
4. More than twice a year	23			
5. More than once a month	16			
6. About once a week	5			
7. Several times a week	3			
8. Practically every day	0			
0. NA	2			

How often spanked when younger

1. Rarely	17
2. Occasionally	13
3. Fairly often	7
4. Very often	5
5. More often than now	32
6. Less often than now	14
9. Rated 1 or 2 above	3
0. NA	9

How does child act when spanked

1. Hurts feelings	71	<u>N</u> =95	<u>M</u> =1.80
2. Makes angry	12		
3. Hurts pride	3		
4. Makes feel unloved	0		
5. Startles	1		
6. Amuses	0		
7. No particular emotion	5		
9. Doesn't bother	3		
0. NA	5		

How much good does it do to spank X

1. Does good	41	<u>N</u> =94	<u>M</u> =2.22	<u>r</u> =.229
2. Does good, reservation	14			
3. Pro-con	22			
4. Does no good, reservation	8			
5. Does no good	8			
9. Question inapplicable, never spans	1			
0. NA	6			

Extent of use of physical punishment

1. Never uses	1	<u>N</u> =98	<u>M</u> =3.43	<u>r</u> =.753
2. Has occasionally slapped hands	16			
3.	41			
4.	23			
5.	15			
6.	2			
7. Frequent, painful	0			
0. NA	2			

Extent of use of deprivation of privileges

1. Never uses	13	<u>N</u> =99	<u>M</u> =3.62	<u>r</u> =.325
2.	10			
3.	20			
4.	33			
5.	13			
6.	1			
7. Frequent	9			
0. NA	1			

Frequency of use of isolation

1. None	1	<u>N</u> =80	<u>M</u> =2.92	<u>r</u> =.530
2. Slight	28			
3. Moderate	35			
4. Considerable	8			
5. Much	8			
0. NA	20			

Use of warnings of danger

1. None	3	<u>N</u> =97	<u>M</u> =2.96	<u>r</u> =.200
2. Uses, reservations	4			
3. Uses	83			
4. Uses, with emphasis	7			
0. NA	3			

Extent of use of "reasoning"

1. Never	1	<u>N</u> =99	<u>M</u> =3.47	<u>r</u> =.260
2. Rare	2			
3. Some	45			
4. Considerable	51			
0. NA	1			

Mother's preferred technique of punishment

1. Physical	20
2. Denial of privileges	24
3. Isolation	21
4. Restraint	2
5. Ridicule	0
6. Withdrawal of love	0
7. Scolding, verbal	21
0. NA	2

How often say going to punish and not follow through

1. Never	12	<u>N</u> =85	<u>M</u> =2.51	<u>r</u> =.414
2. Seldom	38			
3. Sometimes	25			

4. Quite often	7
5. Very often	1
9. Doesn't come up	2
0. NA	15

How X and his father act toward each other

1. Always happy to see, lots of affection	42	<u>N</u> =98	<u>M</u> =1.76	<u>r</u> =.786
2.	40			
3. Moderate attachment	13			
4.	3			
5. Acts cold	0			
0. NA	2			

Does husband ever stay with child, when mother out

1. Never, not his job	0			<u>r</u> =.612
2. Practically never	2			
3. Occasionally	22			
4. Fairly often	14			
5. Yes, frequently	1			
6. Yes, NA how frequent	56			
0. NA	5			

How much does husband do these days in connection with care-taking of child

1. None	8	<u>N</u> =98	<u>M</u> =2.65	<u>r</u> =.448
2. Relatively little	29			
3. Moderate amount	50			
4. Husband does quite a bit	11			
0. NA	2			

Nature of affectional bond, father to child

1. Extremely warm and loving	31	<u>N</u> =97	<u>M</u> =2.08	<u>r</u> =.404
2.	35			
3. Loves child, but less than above	25			
4.	5			
5. Not much warmth	0			
6. Ambivalent	1			
7. Predominantly hostile	0			
0. NA	3			

Who disciplines, husband or wife

1. Husband	16	<u>N</u> =98	<u>M</u> =3.00	<u>r</u> =.940
2. Husband, usually	16			
3. Fifty-fifty	34			
4. Wife usually	16			
5. Wife	16			
0. NA	2			

How strict is husband with child

1. Very	25	<u>N</u> =94	<u>M</u> =1.93	<u>r</u> =.722
2. Fairly	50			
3. Quite lenient	19			
0. NA	6			

Does husband do any thing in disciplining that wife doesn't like

1. No	39	<u>N</u> =96	<u>M</u> =1.66	<u>r</u> =.601
2. Some	56			
3. Yes, great deal	0			
9. Inappropriate, husband doesn't discipline	1			
0. NA	4			

Does wife think husband too strict

1. Yes	18	<u>N</u> =69	<u>M</u> =1.91	<u>r</u> =.222
2. About right	39			
3. No, not enough	12			
0. NA	31			

Does husband think wife too strict

1. Yes	17			<u>r</u> =.628
2. About right	18			
3. Not strict enough	46			
4. Hasn't said	6			
0. NA	13			

Extent of mother father agreement on child rearing

1. Perfect	14	<u>N</u> =99	<u>M</u> =2.51	<u>r</u> =.178
2.	45			
3.	23			
4.	12			
5.	3			
6.	1			
7. Complete disagreement	1			
0. NA	1			

Responsibility for policy regarding children

1. Mother entirely	3	<u>N</u> =98	<u>M</u> =3.17	<u>r</u> =.512
2. Mother almost entirely	14			
3. Mother mainly	50			
4. Share	26			
5. Father mainly	4			
6. Father almost entirely	1			
0. NA	2			

Does mother depend on other sources than self and husband

1. Yes considerable	0	<u>N=99</u>	<u>M=2.82</u>
2. Some	15		
3. No dependence	84		
4. NA	1		

Responsibility for financial policy

1. Wife, nearly all	3	<u>N=97</u>	<u>M=3.37</u>	<u>r=.490</u>
2. Wife more	6			
3. Share	51			
4. Husband mainly	26			
5. Husband nearly all	11			
0. NA	3			

Who makes leisure time decisions

1. Wife most	13			<u>r=.971</u>
2. Share	56			
3. Husband most	22			
9. Don't share leisure	4			
0. NA	5			

Decision to move to new house

1. Wife	10	<u>N=93</u>	<u>M=2.13</u>	<u>r=.579</u>
2. Share	60			
3. Husband	23			
0. NA	7			

Adult role differentiation division of labor at home

1. Definite division	6	<u>N=97</u>	<u>M=3.16</u>	<u>r=.698</u>
2. Occasionally help each other, dry dishes	19			
3. Some division	39			
4. Little or no division	19			
5. Little or no division, wife does all	14			
0. NA	3			

Family authority

1. Father complete authority	0	<u>N=97</u>	<u>M=4.02</u>	<u>r=-.327</u>
2.	3			
3.	15			
4.	57			
5.	21			
6.	1			
7. Mother complete authority	0			
0. NA	3			

Does X take after mother or father more

1. Mother	24			<u>r</u> =.921
2. Mother, reservations	8			
3. Both	27			
4. Father, reservations	7			
5. Father	19			
6. Another member of family	3			
9. Nobody	4			
0. NA	8			

Importance and number of characteristics like mother

1. Not like her	23	<u>N</u> =78	<u>M</u> =2.61	<u>r</u> =.382
2. Small	3			
3. Important and small	33			
4. Important	19			
0. NA	22			

Importance and number of characteristics like father

1. Not like him	26	<u>N</u> =79	<u>M</u> =2.56	<u>r</u> =.792
2. Small	3			
3. Important and small	29			
4. Important	21			
0. NA	21			

Behave better with father or mother

1. Father	48
2. No difference	33
3. Mother	11
4. With both	1
5. With either above, bad when both	1
6. With strangers	1
0. NA	5

How alike are father and mother

1. Completely different	11	<u>N</u> =95	<u>M</u> =3.38	<u>r</u> =.581
2. Mostly different	6			
3. Equal	32			
4. Alike mostly	27			
5. Alike all ways	19			
0. NA	5			

Mother's evaluation of father

1. Highly critical	0	<u>N</u> =98	<u>M</u> =4.97	<u>r</u> =.544
2.	2			
3.	5			
4.	19			
5.	44			
6.	23			
7. Highly admiring	5			
0. NA	2			

How mother felt when discovered she was pregnant

1. Delighted	55	<u>N</u> =98	<u>M</u> =2.00	<u>r</u> =.860
2. Pleased	22			
3. Pleased generally	5			
4. Mixed feelings	5			
5. Generally displeased	4			
6. Displeased	7			
0. NA	2			

How father felt when discovered she was pregnant

1. Delighted	53	<u>N</u> =99	<u>M</u> =2.06	<u>r</u> =.895
2. Pleased	20			
3. Pleased generally	11			
4. Mixed feelings	3			
5. Generally displeased	6			
6. Displeased	6			
0. NA	1			

Would things have worked out better if waited

1. No	82	<u>N</u> =94	<u>M</u> =1.38
2. Some ways yes and no	7		
3. Yes	2		
4. Couldn't wait	3		
0. NA	6		

How mother felt about giving up work to have baby

1. Much sacrifice	4	<u>r</u> =.962
2. Some	8	
3. No sacrifice	33	
4. Glad	14	
5. Not working at that time	19	
6. Took leave of absence	7	
9. Never worked	5	
0. NA	10	

Mother's attitude to "mother role"

1. Values highly	19	<u>N=99</u>	<u>M=2.36</u>	<u>r=.261</u>
2.	26			
3. Important, but other roles important too	53			
4.	1			
5. "mother role" subordinate	0			
0. NA	1			

Mother's acceptance of current life situation

1. Entirely satisfied	55	<u>N=98</u>	<u>M=1.58</u>	<u>r=.781</u>
2. Satisfied	30			
3. Mixed feelings	12			
4. Generally dissatisfied	1			
5. Entirely dissatisfied	0			
0. NA	2			

Mother working during first 2 years of child's age

1. Never worked	5			<u>r=.372</u>
2. Worked before marriage	4			
3. Not since this child born	44			
4. Occasional part-time	8			
5. More than 2 days a week	7			
6. Full time	8			
7. NA how much or how long	3			
8. NA whether first 2 years	1			
9. NA during first 2 years	10			
0. NA	10			

Mother working during the childhood of this child

1. No work in this period	58			<u>r=.343</u>
2. Half time for 6-24 mos.	8			
3. More than half time	0			
4. Half time continuously	9			
5. More than half time continuously	15			
9. NA how much	6			
0. NA	4			

Mother's self-esteem

1. Bad "I am a poor mother"	0	<u>M=4.81</u>	<u>r=.598</u>
2.	1		
3.	10		
4.	17		
5.	52		
6.	19		
7. High self-esteem	1		
0. NA	0		

Which is stricter, father or mother

1. Father, much	21	$\underline{M}=2.72$	$\underline{r}=.212$
2. Father, somewhat	23		
3. About equal	31		
4. Mother, somewhat	13		
5. Mother, much	12		
0. NA	0		

Rejection by mother

1. None	15		$\underline{r}=.416$
2.	16		
3.	0		
4.	0		
5. Much rejection			
0. No evidence of rejection	69		

Mother's child rearing anxiety

1. Not at all worried	4	$\underline{M}=2.23$	$\underline{r}=.473$
2.	72		
3. Moderate	22		
4.	1		
5. Extremely anxious	1		
0. NA	0		

Child dominance in family

1. No evidence	21	$\underline{M}=1.80$	$\underline{r}=.307$
2. Some child dominance	78		
3. A great deal	0		
0. NA	1		

Amount of care by other agents other than father

1. None	64	$\underline{M}=1.71$	$\underline{r}=.174$
2. Very little	14		
3. Some	13		
4. Quite a bit	5		
5. More than half	4		
6. Some, NA how much	0		
0. NA	0		

Comparison of own child rearing with parents

1. Mother's parents more strict	36	$\underline{N}=79$	$\underline{M}=1.69$	$\underline{r}=.427$
2. About equal	31			
3. Less strict	12			
0. NA	21			

Is Mother trying to pattern her own methods after mother

1. Consciously trying to do things the same way	25	<u>N</u> =90	<u>M</u> =2.05	<u>r</u> =.627
2. Some ways yes, some ways different	35			
3. Consciously trying to do things different	30			
4. NA	10			

APPENDIX E

EXTENSION INTERVIEW AND

ANALYSIS SCHEDULE

Extension Interview and Analysis Schedule

1. Nowadays we hear a lot about ERA, Women's Liberation and the changing roles of men and women. Do you feel that any of these ideas have influenced your life?

Yes	27%	<u>N</u> =99	<u>M</u> =2.939	<u>r</u> ^a =.927
No, already felt that way	10			
Somewhat	16			
No	34			
Yes, against	12			
Not ascertained	1			

...the way you raise your children?

Yes, children's goals	27%	<u>N</u> =93	<u>M</u> =2.860	<u>r</u> =.934
Yes, children's chores	5			
Somewhat	19			
No	42			
NA	7			

2. At this time do you feel like your family is complete or do you plan to have more children?

Yes, complete	71%	<u>N</u> =98	<u>M</u> =1.438	<u>r</u> =.642
No, not complete	11			
Unsure	16			
NA	2			

3. If you had not had children, what would you have done about that? How do you think your life would be different?

No difference	5%	<u>N</u> =98	<u>M</u> =2.816	<u>r</u> =.912
Adopted	45			
Career	20			
Much different life	19			
Don't know	9			
NA	2			

4. Nutrition and how it affects behavior is in the news a lot these days, for instance, the Feingold diet, the amount of additives in our foods, and so forth. How important do you feel diet is in a child's development?

Very important	73%	<u>N</u> =98	<u>M</u> =1.275	<u>r</u> =.757
Somewhat	23			
Not important	2			
NA	2			

^aInter-observer reliability is based on one-half N.

Is there anything special you try to do about diet?

Yes, definitely	14%	<u>N</u> =95	<u>M</u> =2.610	<u>r</u> =.671
Yes	32			
Somewhat	36			
No, but want to	4			
No	8			
NA	5			

5. How or why did you decide to breast feed the baby (or younger child)?

Nutrition	10% ^a	<u>N</u> =49	<u>M</u> =2.714	<u>r</u> =.838
Bonding	22			
Allergies	6			
Combination of above	20			
Advice of friends, family, etc.	29			
Don't know	12			

^aPercentages of those who breast fed N=49

6. There seems to be a greater amount of sexual freedom in our society right now. Do you feel that this general atmosphere of permissiveness has changed the way parents are handling sex and modesty training of young children?

Yes	40%	<u>N</u> =97	<u>M</u> =2.340	<u>r</u> =.834
Yes, in society, not our family	14			
Somewhat	24			
No	8			
Don't know	11			
NA	3			

7. Some people feel a woman should stay at home until her youngest child starts school or when her youngest is at least three years old, and others believe that it is just fine for her to work while her children are infants, and then others feel that the economic need should be the guideline. How do you feel about this?

All right any time	8%	<u>N</u> =99	<u>M</u> =2.969	<u>r</u> =.581
Depends on mother	36			
Depends on child	15			
No, unless economic need	32			
No, not at any time	7			
Don't know	1			
NA	1			

8. If a mother does work, what do you think are the best arrangements for child care?

Depends on available care	5%	<u>N</u> =93	<u>M</u> =4.053	<u>r</u> =.640
Day care centers, nurseries	19			
Day care homes	11			
Relatives, friends, etc.	15			
Sitter at home	24			
Depends on child	12			
Don't know	7			
NA	7			

9. How did you select the child care that you are now using or used at one time (if working or used to work)?

Visited center or home	9%	<u>N</u> =44	<u>M</u> =3.136	<u>r</u> =.332
Advice from friends, etc.	9			
Other, what child liked, etc.	41			
Don't know	41			

10. Do your parents live here in town; how far away, husbands' parents?

Both in same town	27%	<u>N</u> =99	<u>M</u> =3.454	<u>r</u> =.509
One in town, other less 50 mi.	10			
One in town, other more than 50 mi.	23			
One 50, other 150	3			
Both 50	7			
Both 150	26			
Deceased	2			
NA	1			

11. How many times have you moved since X was born?

None	23%	<u>N</u> =88	<u>M</u> =1.469	<u>r</u> =.770
Once	21			
Twice	21			
Three	13			
Four	5			
Five or more	0			
NA	12			

12. How important is religious training to you? Has your religious training influenced your child rearing practices?

Yes, very important	25%	<u>N</u> =90	<u>M</u> =2.300	<u>r</u> =.900
Important	32			
Somewhat	19			
No	9			
Parents' not important, child's yes	5			
Don't know	0			
NA	10			

How about the influence of political attitudes and beliefs?

Yes, important	14%	<u>N</u> =86	<u>M</u> =2.953	<u>r</u> =.933
Somewhat	20			
Don't know	8			
No	44			
NA	14			

13. Are circumstances such that you feel that you can raise your family the way you want to?

Yes	56%	<u>N</u> =56
-----	-----	--------------

What's helping?

Relatives, friends, children	41%	<u>N</u> =44	<u>M</u> =2.75	<u>r</u> =.483
Church, religion, Bible, prayer	21			
Neighborhood, schools, etc.	20			
Money, financial affairs	13			
Other	5			

What's interfering?

Relatives, friends, children	11%	<u>N</u> =39	<u>M</u> =4.461	<u>r</u> =.951
Church, religion	7			
Neighborhood, schools	11			
Society, outside influences	34			
Money, financial matters	22			
Other	15			

14. Where do you feel you have gotten the most help or best advice with raising your child?

Instinct, common sense, own childhood	33%	<u>N</u> =98	<u>M</u> =2.41	<u>r</u> =.950
Relatives, friends, doctors, etc.	27			
Religion, Bible, prayer	8			
Classes, previous schooling	27			
Other	3			

15. Is there any question that we didn't ask or area that we didn't cover that you think we should have?

Influence of grandparents	2%	<u>N</u> =88	<u>M</u> =5.500	<u>r</u> =.715
Toys	2			
School	14			
Other	6			
None	66			
NA	12			

VITA

Laura Kershner Wilson

Candidate for the Degree of

Master of Science

Thesis: PATTERNS OF CHILD REARING: A CURRENT STUDY

Major Field: Family Relations and Child Development

Biographical:

Personal Data: Born in Tulsa, Oklahoma, July 31, 1930, the daughter of Frederick Vance and Calista Kershner; married to Thomas Arthur Wilson; two daughters, Mimi Louella Wixson and Darby Sue Wixson-Stout, and one son, Douglas Reid Wixson.

Education: Graduated from Tulsa Central High School, Tulsa, Oklahoma, May 1948; received Bachelor of Arts degree in Psychology from the University of Tulsa, Tulsa, Oklahoma, in May 1972; completed requirements for Master of Science degree at Oklahoma State University at Stillwater, Oklahoma, in May 1980.

Professional Experience: Pre-school teacher, Channing Day School, Tulsa, Oklahoma, 1964-1971; Director-Teacher, Channing Day School, Tulsa, Oklahoma, 1971-1977; Graduate Research Assistant, Family Study Center, Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, Oklahoma, 1978-1979; Part-time instructor, Developmental Psychology, Tulsa Junior College, Tulsa, Oklahoma, Spring Semester, 1980; member of National Association on Education for Young Children, American Home Economics Association, and Southwestern Society for Research in Human Development.