

**THE GENERATION GAP: AN ANALYSIS OF  
SIMILAR AGE-COHORTS AND THEIR  
PARENTS AT TWO TIME PERIODS**

**By**

**LYNN PARKIN ATKINSON**

**||**

**Bachelor of Art  
Phillips University  
Enid, Oklahoma  
1976**

**Master of Social Work  
University of Oklahoma  
Norman, Oklahoma  
1983**

**Submitted to the Faculty of the  
Graduate College of the  
Oklahoma State University  
in partial fulfillment of  
the requirements for  
the Degree of  
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY  
December, 1986**

Thesis  
1986D  
A876g  
cop. 2



THE GENERATION GAP: AN ANALYSIS OF  
SIMILAR AGE-COHORTS AND THEIR  
PARENTS AT TWO TIME PERIODS

Thesis Approved:

*Richard D. D... ..*

Thesis Adviser

*Edgar L. Wolsten...*

*Kathleen McKinney*

*Frances Stromberg*

*Norman N. Durham*

Dean of the Graduate College

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

During the course of this research, I received the support and assistance of several people and it is only befitting that they be recognized here. First and foremost among these is the chair of my committee, Dr. Richard Dodder. Dr. Dodder has been a good friend and a constant inspiration. I have deeply appreciated his time and careful dedication in helping me to gain new skills and come to new understandings. The quality of his work, his generous giving, and his seemingly unending patience amaze me. He is always a model to look to when I want to discover what professionalism can be. He is someone I have met who has given me a deep respect for the profession of sociology. Another fine quality that Dr. Dodder possesses is his capacity for enjoying life. I don't think I could have had a more fun chair to work with.

The next person I wish to acknowledge is Dr. Kathleen McKinney. Dr. McKinney is the lady with the encouraging word whenever things get rough. Her intellect and ability to ferret out detail have been a great asset in this research. Dr. McKinney has a talent for motivating her students to reach to be the best they can be and stands before them as a model to emulate. Her capacity for hard work and her commitment to her profession and to her

students is fantastic. The quality that has inspired me most about Dr. McKinney is her warm humanness--her sincerity in caring about each student as a person and respecting each student for what they may be.

Dr. Edgar Webster is the third person I wish to acknowledge. Dr. Webster is a most thoughtful person and has shown me sides to my ideas that I had not examined before. Dr. Webster's care and patience have been an asset to me in this project.

I wish to thank Dr. Fran Stromberg for her willingness to step out of her retirement in assisting me with this project. Her good humor and assistance is appreciated.

I also wish to thank Dr. Charles Edgley and the staff of the sociology department here at OSU. The department provided me with secretarial assistance as well as some financial assistance in paying for the mailings. In addition, several faculty and teaching assistants were gracious enough to let me survey their classes. Their help in these matters as well as their emotional support has been greatly appreciated.

In addition, I would like to acknowledge Dr. Stella Hughes and Iris McPherson. Both of these ladies have greatly paved my way in understanding the SAS system.

Dissertations and graduate work does not seem to pull you towards peace and contentment, but more towards hysteria. I want to thank my husband, Ross, for putting up

with my moments of hysteria and being a constant source of support.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. THE STUDY OF GENERATIONS: AN INTRODUCTION. . . .	1
Statement of Problem . . . . .	3
Organization of Study. . . . .	5
II. A THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK ON GENERATIONAL CONTINUITY . . . . .	7
Individual Life Time . . . . .	8
Developmental Theory. . . . .	9
Individual Life Course Events . . . . .	13
Family Time. . . . .	15
Historical Time. . . . .	18
Why Historical Change Occurs. . . . .	19
Sources of Influence on Historical Time	20
Process of Change of Historical Time. .	22
A Study of Life-Span Developmental Theory . . . . .	23
Research Needs. . . . .	23
Proposal of Study . . . . .	25
III. CONTRIBUTIONS TO UNDERSTANDING GENERATIONAL CONTINUITY: A SELECTED LITERATURE REVIEW. . . .	27
The Existence of a Generation Gap. . . . .	30
Studies That Support a Generation Gap .	30
Studies That Question a Generation Gap.	32
Problems and Issues in Studies. . . . .	35
Operalization of Measurement . . . . .	35
Generalizing Results . . . . .	37
Social Variables and Generational Change . . . . .	39
Education and the Generation Gap. . . .	39
Working Moms and the Generational Continuity. . . . .	41
Gender and Generational Continuity. . .	42
Gender of Child and Generational Differences. . . . .	42
Gender of Parent and Generational Differences . . . . .	44
Parent/Child Gender and Generational Differences . . . . .	45

Chapter	Page
Problems and Issues in Studies . . . . .	47
Operationalization of Measurement . . . . .	47
Generalizing Results . . . . .	49
The Effect of Time on the Generation Gap . . . . .	50
Review of Studies . . . . .	50
Issues and Problems in Studies . . . . .	52
Summary . . . . .	52
Hypotheses . . . . .	55
IV. METHODS . . . . .	57
Sample and Procedure . . . . .	59
1972 Data Collection . . . . .	59
1985 Data Collection . . . . .	60
Demographics of Samples . . . . .	62
Issues in Sample and Data Collection . . . . .	69
Reliability in Data Collection . . . . .	69
Validity in Data Collection . . . . .	69
Ethical Issues in Data Collection . . . . .	70
Issues Concerning Sample . . . . .	71
Survey Instrument and Operationalization . . . . .	72
The Survey Instrument . . . . .	72
Coding and Scoring of Instrument . . . . .	73
Issues in Survey Operationalization . . . . .	76
Issues Concerning Validity . . . . .	76
Issues Concerning Reliability . . . . .	80
Method of Data Analysis . . . . .	82
The Analysis of Variance . . . . .	82
The Factor Analysis . . . . .	84
Summary . . . . .	84
V. RESULTS OF STUDY . . . . .	86
Generational Continuity Over Time . . . . .	86
Hypothesis 1A . . . . .	87
Hypothesis 1B . . . . .	91
Hypothesis 1C . . . . .	100
Gender of Parent and the Generation Gap . . . . .	108
Hypothesis 2A . . . . .	108
Hypothesis 2B . . . . .	113
Summary of Results . . . . .	116
VI. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS . . . . .	118
Introduction . . . . .	118
Generational Changes in Historical Time . . . . .	123
Parent-Child Dyads at Different Times . . . . .	123

Chapter	Page
Changes By Time of Successive Age Cohorts . . . . .	127
Demographics and Generational Continuity. . . . .	128
Gender of Parent and Generational Change . .	130
Parental Gender and A Generation Gap . . . . .	130
Gender and Generation Gaps. . . . .	131
Methodological Implications. . . . .	132
Limitations of Research. . . . .	134
Recommendations for Future Research. . . . .	135
SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY. . . . .	137
APPENDIX A - COVER LETTER TO PARENTS (1972 AND 1985) . .	151
APPENDIX B - FOLLOW UP ON PARENT SURVEYS (1972 AND 1985)	153
APPENDIX C - STUDENT DEMOGRAPHIC QUESTIONS FOR 1972 AND 1985. . . . .	157
APPENDIX D - PARENT DEMOGRAPHIC QUESTIONS FOR 1972 AND 1985. . . . .	161
APPENDIX E - SURVEY ITEMS FOR 1972 AND 1985. . . . .	165
APPENDIX F - CODE SHEETS FOR SURVEYS (1972 AND 1985) . .	169
APPENDIX G - ADDITIONAL TABLES . . . . .	173

## LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
I. Demographic Characteristics of Students for Both Years . . . . .	62
II. Demographic Characteristics of Mothers for Both Years . . . . .	65
III. Demographic Characteristics of Fathers and Mothers. . . . .	67
IV. Factor Table for All Items on Self-View and Predicting Other in Four Value Areas . . . .	77
V. Scaled Items and Their Factors on Self-View and Predicting Other in the Four Value Areas . .	78
VI. Means and F-Scores by Year on Generational Anticipation of Values and Generational Similarity--Long Scales. . . . .	87
VII. Means and F-Scores by Year on Generational Anticipation of Values and Generational Similarity--Short Scales . . . . .	89
VIII. Means and F-Scores for Students on All Items by Year . . . . .	93
IX. Means and F-Scores for Mothers on All Items by Year . . . . .	96
X. F-Scores by Year, Education and Employment of Mother, and Sex of Child on Generational Anticipation of Values and Generational Similarity--Long Scale . . . . .	100
XI. F-Scores by Year, Education and Employment of Mother, and Sex of Child on Generational Anticipation of Values and Generational Similarity--Short Scale. . . . .	104
XII. Means and F-Scores by Sex of Parent on Generational Similarity--Long Scale. . . . .	108

Table	Page
XIII. Means and F-Scores by Sex of Parent on Generational Similarity--Short Scale . . . .	111
XIV. Means and F-Scores by Generation and Sex of Parent on Similarity of Values . . . . .	113
XV. Mean Scores for Significant F-Values on Individual Variables for Tables IX and X . .	174
XVI. Mean Scores for Significant F-Values on Interactions for Tables IX and X . . . . .	175
XVII. Factor Analysis for All Items on All Views for Both Years . . . . .	176

## CHAPTER I

### THE STUDY OF GENERATIONS: AN INTRODUCTION

"Age and the difference of age are among the most basic and crucial aspects of human life and determinants of human human destiny." (Eisenstadt)

Generational change has long been a concern of human-kind. Early records from Egypt in 2500 B.C. give advice to the older generation on ways to keep the younger generation in order (Bertman, 1976). The first record of open conflict in Egypt dates back to 2100 B.C. (Bertman, 1976). In present times as well, generational conflict and continuity have continued to be of concern and remain a major issue.

The long-standing concern over generational conflict and continuity is justified. It is through generational transmission that the culture is continued and that the world of today becomes the world of tomorrow (see Mannheim, 1972; Eisenstadt, 1972; Hartup, 1978; Hagestad, 1981). Generational transmission acts in two major ways to pass on culture. First, it serves as the mechanism through which values, attitudes, and ways of life are kept alive. Secondly, it serves as the major mechanism for social change. Each generation determines what aspects of culture it will

keep from the previous generation and what aspects of culture it will change.

One theoretical model that is very useful in examining generational change and continuity is the life-span developmental model. This model hypothesizes that there are three different types of time which influence how generational change occurs.

First, there is individual developmental time. As people pass through their lives, they go through a series of developmental stages, each of which has different life crises to resolve. How a person deals with the crisis of each stage of development determines how the person handles future stages and crises in life. In addition, people of different ages are in different stages dealing with different crises. This explains in part the differences that exist between age groups (see Erikson, 1963).

Secondly in the model, is the individual life course and the events that occur in it. The sequencing of a life course differs from individual to individual. The timing and ordering of life events as well as the events experienced help determine people's outlook on life. As various age groups tend to experience similar life events close in time, a generational or cohort bond is formed and helps to distinguish the group from other age brackets (cf. Mannheim, 1972). In addition, people experience various family life stages as they go through their life-course (cf. Duvall,

1962). This also has an impact on the views and attitudes experienced in life.

The third type of time in the model is historical time. People are not only influenced by their developmental stages and life events but are also influenced by the period in which they live and the socio-cultural conditions which exist at the time. The period of time in which people live as well as their physical location impacts what people believe and think as well as how they behave. As different ages experience different socio-cultural periods during the course of their lives, they see the world a little differently depending on the periods of time through which they have lived.

In the life-span developmental model, these three types of time interact together to determine how generational transmission occurs as well as what types of generational change take place. There is a need for research that considers all three types of time in studying generational continuity.

#### Statement Of Problem

It is the purpose of this research to examine generational continuity at two different points in time utilizing the general orientations found in the life-span developmental model. To do this, the study uses cohort analysis to examine similar age cohorts and their parents at two

different points in time. The sample was composed of 369 college students and their mothers from 1972 and 217 college students and their parents from 1985 who were surveyed using a questionnaire consisting of 48 value items constructed for four Likert scales on sexuality, community, economics, and childrearing. The sample was chosen based on the developmental theory assumption that people are well into their teens before establishing relatively permanent values and attitudes (see Erikson, 1963). College students are thought to be old enough to have established attitudes and share the same life developmental stage, resulting in the influences of this type of time on generational continuity being frozen. In addition, college students share the same family developmental stage as well as a similar major life event--attending college--thereby partially controlling the influence of individual life course time.

This study is concerned with examining two major research questions. First, the study examines the influence of historical period and location on similarity of attitudes between generations as well as ability of each generation to gauge the attitudes of the other generation. The study investigates the impact of period of time on differences in generational values, differences in values of similar age cohorts at two periods of time, and on differences between similar age cohorts who have different demographic characteristics. Next, the study examines the gender of the parent and its influence on family continuity. The study

also investigates whether parental gender influences the relationship with a young adult child and whether parental gender or generation is the more important factor in determining family continuity.

### Organization Of Study

This study is organized into six chapters. Chapter I introduces the general theoretical framework in which the study operates as well as noting the purpose and general research questions the study will investigate. Chapter II presents the theoretical foundations in detail and suggests the portions of the theory to be tested by this study. Chapter III reviews the literature relevant to this study. Literature is included which involves studies aimed at determining whether or not a generation gap exists, studies that examine the influence of different demographic variables on the generation continuity, and studies that examine the influence of period of time on generational continuity. In addition, Chapter III states the specific hypotheses to be examined in the study.

The methodology used in this study is covered in Chapter IV. Here the reader will find information concerning the procedures used to select the sample, a description of the sample characteristics, a description of the survey instrument and scales of measurement used, and a description of the operationalization and measurement of the data gathered through use of the survey with the sample. In

addition, the various statistical techniques used to analyze the data are explained.

The results of the analysis are presented in Chapter V. Each hypothesis and its results are examined in turn. Chapter VI begins with a summary of the research methods, procedures and findings. Next, comes a discussion of the findings and their relationship to theory as well as to previous literature. This chapter ends with a discussion of the limitations of the study as well as the implications in the study for future research.

## CHAPTER II

### A THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK OF GENERATIONAL CONTINUITY

In the study of generational continuity, one theoretical model that is frequently used as a basis for explanation by those studying the sociology of age is the life-span developmental model. This model claims its early roots from the work of Elstandt (1972), Parsons (1943, 1963), and Mannheim (1972), among others. It is an integrative model, utilizing theoretical contributions from the the fields of family development, developmental psychology, and social psychology as well as the field of sociology.

In the life-span developmental model, intergenerational relations are based on three types of time: individual life time, family time, and historical time (Hagestad, 1981). Individual life time consists of individual developmental stages as well as the timing and sequencing of individual events. Family time is based on family developmental stages and tasks. Historical time is based on socio-cultural influences of specific historical periods and specific historical location. These three types of time serve as the shaping forces for intergenerational stability as well as intergenerational change. The theory of life-span

development is concerned with how each type of time explains generational change and stability as well as how the three types of time interrelate with each other to contribute to generational continuity.

It is the purpose of this chapter to examine the theory of life-span development as an integrative theory of generational continuity and examine this theory as a basis of this study. First, the chapter examines major theoretical contributions to the study of the three types of time and how these types of time influence generational change. Next, there is a discussion of research needs in the area of life-span development theory and suggestions of specific areas of theory to be tested by this study. It is hoped that by examining life-span developmental theory more knowledge can be gained in terms of the influences on and processes of generational change.

#### Individual Life Time

The first type of time that has an influence on generational stability and change is that of individual life time. Individual life time is defined as "individual events which are experienced as part of the usual life course" (Hultach and Plemons, 1979, p. 18). Theory on individual life time has its focus on both developmental stages that all individuals go through during their life times, and the life events that may differ between people such as educational

experiences or marital experiences. This discussion will focus on both of these, beginning with developmental theory.

### Developmental Theory

According to Maccoby (1984), developmental theory can be distinguished by two characteristics. First, developmental theories are composed of sequentially dependent steps that may or may not be taken by individual children. Secondly, developmental theories are composed of developmental changes that occur in a predictable order in almost all children. There are many developmental theorists; Freud, Piaget, and Kohlberg are examples of a few. Perhaps one of the most well known and most comprehensive of the developmental theorists is Erik Erikson; and it is his theory of developmental change that will be examined here.

According to Erikson (1963), people progress through eight developmental stages in the course of their lives. Each stage has a central developmental concern that influences and guides people while they are in that stage. Much emphasis is placed on the social and cultural context in which the developmental stage occurs as a strong influence on how the developmental concern is seen as well as how it is resolved. As Erickson states,

While it is quite clear, then, what must happen to keep the baby alive (the minimum supply necessary) and what must not happen, lest he die or be severely stunted (the maximum frustration tolerable) there is an increasing leeway in regard to what may happen; and different cultures make extensive use of their prerogative to decide what

they consider workable and insist on calling necessary (p. 72).

If the developmental concern is not successfully resolved, it will interfere with the successful resolution of concerns in future developmental stages.

The first stage Erikson proposes is trust vs. mistrust. This stage begins at birth and ends when a child is about eighteen months. Here, the child goes from the security of the womb into the normal frustrations of being in the world. The task is trust--to see the world as a safe place and its people as helpful and dependable. If trust does not develop, fear and suspicion will.

The second stage proposed by Erikson is autonomy vs. doubt and shame. This stage begins at about eighteen months and continues until the child is around the age of three. Autonomy, the central task here, is to discover competence in asserting one's own will and know that it is alright to do so. Failure to achieve autonomy results in doubt about one's abilities as well as shame regarding one's behaviors and desires.

Initiative vs. guilt is the stage that occurs for the child from roughly three to six years of age. Here the child is expected to learn to actively seek opportunities for self accomplishment and self assertion--to initiate activities. Problems result when the child learns instead to feel guilt over the behaviors and desires resulting from increasing independence.

The fourth stage, industry vs. inferiority, is proposed to come when a child is about six years of age and ends around the time a child reaches twelve. In this stage, developing a sense of industry by having confidence in the ability to succeed in whatever activity is required of one by society is the central task. Failure in this stage results in feelings of inferiority and general inadequacy.

The fifth stage, from the ages of roughly twelve to eighteen, is conceptualized at the stage of identity vs. role confusion. Here, the critical task is thought to be the development of a sense of self--a self concept that will become the base of one's future life. It is during this stage that attitudes and opinions begin to form and develop. If failure occurs in this stage, a person is not expected to have a stable self concept and might have either no self concept at all or a superficial concept that is based on the need to satisfy others.

Next, comes the stage conceptualized as intimacy vs. isolation which runs roughly from the ages of eighteen to thirty. The task in this stage is to develop emotionally close relationships with other people. Failure to do so might result in emotional isolation for the rest of the person's life.

The seventh stage of development, generativity vs. stagnation begins when a person is around thirty years old and ends when a person is around sixty years old. Here the central task concerns the establishment and guiding of the

next generation as well as productivity and creativity for the individual. Failure in this stage results in continuing self-absorption and withdrawal from the world.

The last stage of development in Erikson's model is ego integrity vs. despair. This stage begins when a person is about sixty and continues until the person's death. Here, the task is to obtain a sense of acceptance of one's self and one's life. Failure to do this results in a sense of desperation and despair.

One factor which has great influence in people's development during the stages is their gender. According to Erikson (1963) as well as other developmental theorists such as Freud, gender plays a significant role in a child's socialization as males and females are socialized differently by parents as well as other adults.

Developmental theory as proposed by Erikson can lend a great deal of insight into the understanding of generational differences. How people deal with each developmental stage contributes to their ability to trust, understand, and relate to people of a different generation. In early childhood, the relationship of children with an adult from a different generation is crucial to their development as people. When children are in adolescence and early adulthood, how they handle this stage may determine what aspects of the previous generation's culture are kept and what aspects are discarded. In later stages, people are concerned with

passing on beliefs and values and this will influence the components of the culture that are left behind.

Developmental theory might help explain generational change in other ways. Each generation in a family dyad will be in separate developmental stages (cf. Erickson, 1963). The two generations are concerned with different life tasks, and because of this, may act differently in the manner in which they deal with life. This may lead to generational conflict or change.

Another insight for understanding generational differences that comes from the study of developmental theory is the issue concerning the gender of the members of each generation. As theory suggests that sexual identity is a big issue for a child (Erikson, 1963; Deaux, 1976) and socialization processes are different for males and females, the relationship between sexes of each generation may vary also. It could be that the generational discontinuity becomes greater when members of each generation are of an opposite gender.

#### Individual Life Course Events

Individual life course events are major events which hold great social significance for the individual such as beginning college, getting married, or becoming a parent (Mousfakas, 1977). Life-span developmental theory examines three factors in the individual life course when accounting for generational change. These are the pattern of life

events, the timing of life events, and the entry and exit into major life roles.

The pattern or ordering of life events is very important in understanding changes that occur in the life course. When patterns vary widely from the cultural norm in ordering of events, there is more possibility for conflict as well as more possibility for change (Hogan, 1978). In addition, early patterns of life events must be taken into consideration when understanding what happens in later life events as earlier patterns have a cumulative effect on later patterns (Hareven, 1981).

Closely related to the pattern of life events is the timing of major life events. When timing for events does not follow the normative time, the event can become disruptive in the life-course (Hogan, 1978). Timing can be a matter of individual choice or can be forced by circumstances or other people. When major historical shifts occur that effect life event timing, social change may also occur. For example, war forces people to delay life events such as marriage and also serves as a force for social change.

The entry and exit patterns from various life roles used by individuals are also important in the study of life events. Life roles impact how those who occupy them see and interpret their world. When life roles are exchanged, behavioral patterns and perceptions of life are also changed. According to Bridges (1980), there are three phases in the transition from one role to another. How the phases are

handled will determine the future course of people's lives as well as how they handle transitions in the future. The first phase is the ending phase where individuals leave a current life role. From this phase comes a period of confusion and distress, where individuals realigns their lives. Finally, comes the phase of the new beginning where individuals accept a new life role as their own.

The timing, patterning and exit/entry roles in life events can have an impact on generational continuity. If the patterning and timing of different generations vary widely, theory proposes the generations will be less similar and there will be more chance of generational change (cf. Hill, 1970; Hareven, 1978). Theory states that when the patterns do not vary greatly from one another, the values and ways of life of one generation are more likely to be continued on by the next generation.

#### Family Time

Family time is the second type of time in the life-span developmental model. The family is a major mediator between individual development and historical and social change (Hartup, 1978). It is in the family context that we first share common experiences, first learn to interpret social experiences, and first learn to write and rewrite history for ourselves (Hagestad, 1981). Indeed, family time is as important in influencing generational relations as is individual life time.

Both Duvall (1962) and Hareven (1978) delineate several developmental stages that encompass family time and which traditional families go through. The stages determine what tasks are most prevalent in the family at that time. Families with multiple children may be in more than one stage at a time.

The first stage is early marriage and expectant family. In this stage, the family exists as a childless married couple. Here the main task for the family is to establish the couple as a new recognized family.

The second stage of family development is the child-bearing family stage. This stage begins at birth of the first child and ends as the last child reaches the age of thirty months. During this stage the main task is to have children and thereby establish the structure and membership in the family.

The preschool family is the third stage of family development. This stage begins when the first child reaches thirty months and ends when the last child reaches the age of five. During the preschool phase, the child is socialized to learn to develop a wider circle than just the immediate family. The main task is to prepare the child for membership in the larger society.

The fourth stage is that of the school age family. This stage begins when a child reaches age five and ends when the last child reaches age twelve. Here the family helps the child to deal with increasing independence. The

family must maintain itself as a family and allow the child the independence to develop relations in the wider world.

Next comes the stage of the family with teenagers. Here the issue for independence for the teenager becomes a major focus. Socializing teens into an adult role and recognizing their right to govern themselves are tasks in this stage.

In the family as launching pad stage, renegotiation of relationships is the major task. In this stage which begins when the first child leaves home and ends when the last child leaves, parents and children must learn to see all family members as adults, and must widen their circle to include the marriages of children. This is a time when the parents, if still married, must also renegotiate their relationship as husband and wife, as the children will no longer be a part of their household.

The last stage is the aging family. In this stage, husband and wife will reestablish their relationship. Adult children will need to learn to deal with the problems of an aging parent and the parents will need to learn to deal with the declining health of both themselves and their spouse.

In looking at family development and family time, there is much to offer in the explanation for generational relations. First, the influence of family life on members of the family is of great importance. How a family goes about handling the tasks of socializing its members, maintaining order, and placing members in a larger society may influence

generational stability and change (cf. Hill, 1970, 1979). In addition, the stage of development in which a family finds itself may have an influence on generational relations (Duvall, 1962). Stages such as the family with teenagers, and the family as launching pad which stress the continuing independence of the children and call for the renegotiation of generational relationships may be more volatile and exhibit more generational dissimilarity than other stages.

#### Historical Time

The third type of time that has an influence on generational stability and change according to life-span development theory is historical time. Historical time is based both on the period of time in which one lives as well as the location at which one lives. Historical time suggests that it is the point at which one lives that influences one's views. As Laura Nash stated,

Individuals who belong to the same generation who share the same year of birth, are endowed, to that extent with a common location in the historical dimension of the social process (1979, p. 30).

Historical time sees change arising as a result of the fact that different age groups live through different historical periods and events, and that the different times lived through influence each generation's view of things. There are three foci in the theory regarding the idea of historical time in the life-span developmental model. The first focus is on propositions of why historical change occurs, the next focus is the various sources of influence which

which have an effect on what happens in historical time, and the last focus is on the process of change through historical time.

### Why Historical Change Occurs

Karl Mannheim is one of the major theorists in the area of historical change. Mannheim (1972) looked at generations as sharing a specific location in history and as being the mechanism by which society regenerated itself. Mannheim had four basic proposition to account for generational change across time. The propositions are as follows:

- a. New participants in the cultural process are emerging and former members in the process are continually disappearing.
- b. Members of any one generation can participate only in temporary limited sections of the historical process.
- c. Because of the above, it is therefore necessary to continually transmit the accumulated cultural heritage.
- d. The transition from generation to generation is a continuous process (p. 107).

Mannheim's propositions provide an explanation as to the importance of the study of generational continuity. It is only through generational transmission that a culture or society can continue.

### Sources Of Influence On Historical Change

There are several sources of influence on historical change. One of the major sources of influence are cultural events. Cultural events are defined by Hultach and Plemons (1979, p. 18) as events which are "not experienced as part

of a life course and which effect a large number of individuals." An example of a cultural event would be war. War is not considered a part of a life course, however it does happen and it does effect a large number of people when it occurs. Cultural events influence the social and community context of a historical time, the life path of the individual involved, as well as cohort size and composition (Hultach and Plemons, 1979).

Another source of influence for historical change is the status position of age cohorts. When age cohorts are discriminated against or are blocked in some manner from obtaining social status, this may cause pressure that brings about social change (O'Donnel, 1985). Two status factors which have changed over time have been the educational level and employment level of women (cf. Etaugh, 1974; Troll, 1978; Hareven 1981). Educational level of women as well as employment of women have increase over the last 100 years.

Life imprints of family and how life imprints are obtained are another source of influence on historical change. Life imprints are the impressions left on people from their past socialization which influence present attitudes and behavior. Margaret Mead (1970) suggests that there are three cultural periods which specify how life imprints are obtained. In the first period, that of post-figurative culture, the children learn primarily from their forebearers. This type of culture represses change. The stability results as children accept unquestioningly what

parents accept unquestioningly. The second period is that of co-figuration. Here children learn primarily from peers. Change occurs rapidly here as children set their own standards. Last, there is the pre-figurative culture, the culture Mead would contend we are just now entering. In this culture parents learn from their children as well as children learning from parents. In the pre-figurative culture, more homogeneity between parents and children would exist and there would be less of a state of generational discontinuity.

Demographic variables also serve as a source of historical change. Cohort size and composition are very important as to how society is structured. Demographic variables have an influence on how each generation or cohort sees the world. Indeed, one demographic variable, that of location of cohort, is seen by life-span developmental theory as almost as important as the variable of historical time.

There are many sources of influence which are important when one looks at the idea of historical time. Variables which influence historical time also greatly influence generational stability and change because it is through historical time that generations create their patterns of stability and change (Mannheim, 1972).

#### Process Of Change Of Historical Time

Change occurs through time when the younger generations do not accept or pass on ways of life which were practiced

by their forbearers. The change of ways between generations occurs constantly and may not even be noticed. As Hareven states,

Many aspects of human behavior, which some scientists have previously considered constant over time, have actually been subject of major historical changes (1981, p. 145)

Bengston and Troll (1978) give a three step sequence of socializing interactions that lead to historical change. The first step is that of establishing forerunner families. In this step a new cohort of adolescents comes of age and locates a keynote area in which to bring about change. If the issue truly fits the times, a second step happens. Here other adolescents who are not forerunners and parents who are forerunners will choose to adapt the issue. There is a great deal of similarity among the forerunner parents and adolescents, but not among the non-forerunner parents and adolescents. If the keynote issue continues to hold relevance for the times, a third step emerges. In this step the keynote issue is adapted by all and change occurs. When a new cohort of adolescents come about, the process begins again.

The sequence of socializing steps given by Troll and Bengston show a process of change that is continual as each new cohort of adolescents finds key issues to focus on and change. Here differences are seen as not only existing between generations alone, but between different age cohorts as well.

## The Study Of Life-Span Development Theory

In order to test the life-span developmental model of generational stability and change, it is necessary to develop hypotheses that consider all three types of time and their relation to each other as factors that influence generational change. There have been recommendations for issues of study which would yield much benefit in testing the life-span developmental model. In this section, we will discuss the recommendations that will be operationalized in this study, and the portions of the theory that this study will test.

### Research Needs

One of the issues that must be considered when examining generational change and stability in the life-span developmental model is the issue of theory intergration (Jorgenson & Miller, 1978). There is a need for studies that consider the influences of all three types of time separately and in interaction and their effect on generational continuity.

A second issue that needs to be considered when testing the theory to account for generational change and stability is the choice of subjects. One recommendation for studying intergenerational relationships from the model of life-span developmental theory is that exploration of the relationships should be based on kinship networks rather than based

only on age differences (Sussman, 1965). As the family is a strong vessel of cultural continuity as well as being the only source of family time and family life imprints, the influence on kinship networks are important in understanding generational transmission. In addition to studying kinship ties in generational analysis, recommendations have been made to study different age cohort and their kin (Hareven, 1978; Jorgenson and Miller, 1978) to better understand the influence of historical time on the transference of culture through the family. Age cohorts are those who share the same time and location. As Hareven (1978, p. 7) states, "Change occurs when there is a marked discontinuity between the experiences of a cohort and that of its predecessor." When examining generational stability and change, different cohorts should be examined to see if generational relations are different based on the cohort group.

One other research need in testing the life-span developmental model as applied to generational change is the need for studies that examine change over cross sections of time (Jorgenson and Miller, 1978; Nash, 1979). Most studies of generational analysis have been conducted with one group at one time period. There are few studies which document the change over time.

### Proposal of Study

This study hopes to examine the influence of the three different types of time on generational continuity. Both

the individual developmental stage and the family developmental stage of two cohorts were frozen in order to control for change that could be a result of development. Two separate cohorts were chosen, one from 1972 and one from 1985, and their parents were surveyed. Both cohorts were facing the same major event in their lives, that of attending college and both cohorts surveyed were at the same location, a state university in the south-west.

The study will examine generational continuity focused mainly on the suggestions regarding historical time made by the life-span developmental model. If the theory regarding historical change is correct, there should be a difference in the generational continuity between the two cohorts and their parents. In addition, if we have only now left Mead's co-figurative culture and entered the pre-figurative culture the generations surveyed in 1985 should be more similar than the generation surveyed in 1972. In addition to looking at the difference over time, this study will examine some individual life variables to see how these influence generational change. The variables examined will be the education and employment level of mothers, as the meaning of these variables has altered between 1972 and 1985, and the gender of both parent and child as there is much theory to suggest that gender may account for differences as much as age accounts for differences.

Before specific hypothesis can be given however, an examination of relevant literature must take place. The

next chapter will focus on literature dealing with the study of late adolescents and their parents.

## CHAPTER III

### CONTRIBUTIONS TO UNDERSTANDING GENERATIONAL CONTINUITY: A SELECTED LITERATURE REVIEW

The theme of generational continuity has been the focus of much debate, much discussion and much research. Major issues in the examination of stability and change between generations have included concern with the existence and degree of generational discontinuity (eg. Adams, 1968; Mahoney, 1976), concern with correlations and causes of generational differences (e.g., Davis, 1940; Brittain, 1963; Thomas and Stankiewicz, 1974; Hareven, 1983), and remedies that would reduce generational differences (eg. Friedenborg, 1959; Bethelheim, 1965; Zaenglein-Senger and Stewart, 1985). General surveys of the literature have been conducted by Troll (1970), Bengtson (1970), Bengtson and Kuypers (1971), Bengtson, Furlong, and Laufer (1974), and Hagestad (1981), among others. The reader is referred to these reviews for more in-depth discussion of issues surrounding the study of generations.

There has been considerable confusion in the study of generations due in some part to the ambiguity of the term "generation gap". As Bengtson (1970) states,

the phenomenon to which it (generation gap) refers is undoubtedly neither strictly generational nor is it a gap, using any reasonable definition of those terms. Be that as it may, the term has worldwide usage and a sort of connotative reality. The man on the street knows, in his own way, what the generation gap refers to, and social scientists have, rightly or wrongly, followed his lead in using the term (p. 8).

It is beyond the scope of this literature review to cover all the research dealing with the subject of the "generation gap". For the purpose of this study then, the term generation gap will be restricted to intrafamilial differences in perception of attitudes and/or similarity of attitudes between parent and child. There is a large body of literature suggesting that parent/child relations offer the best grounds for study of generational continuity as it is frequently thought that the family transmits values and attitudes from generation to generation (see Troll, 1970; Hagestad, 1981). The study of transmission of values and attitudes has also received much attention as well as being an area that requires further research (Bengtson, 1970; Bengtson and Lovejoy, 1973; Thomas, 1974; Bengtson, 1975; Coleman and Ganong, 1984).

In addition, this literature review will be restricted to studies that focus on the generational continuity between late adolescents and early adults (ages sixteen to twenty-two) and their parents. This age was chosen for the data set and literature review as it is the age at which children establish their independence from their parents as well as

being the age at which values and attitudes become solidified (Rintala, 1979). As Mannheim (1972) states,

The possibility of really questioning and reflecting on things only emerges at the point where personal experimentation with life begins--round about the age of 17, sometimes a little earlier and sometimes a little later. It is only then that life's problems begin to be located in a "present" and are experienced as such. That level of data and attitudes which social change has rendered problematic and which therefore requires reflection, has now been mocked, now for the first time one lives in the present (p. 121).

The literature focusing on the difference in perception and/or similarity of attitudes between late adolescents/early adults and their parents can be divided into three sections. First, there are general studies that examine only one period of time and focus only on the degree of generational continuity. These studies aim to address the question, "Does a generation gap exist?". Next, there are studies that examine the effect of different demographic variables on the generation gap. In this section, the variables of gender of parent and child, education of parent, and employment of mother will be examined. These studies hope to address the question, "What leads to generational continuity?". Last, there are longitudinal and panel studies that examine some of the tenants of the life-span developmental model, particularly those of historical change. These studies look at the question, "Does historical period effect the process of generational continuity?".

This chapter will first focus on the results of the studies in each section and then present a discussion of the

methodological problems and issues presented by these studies. After this literature review, specific hypotheses will be introduced which will incorporate both theoretical concerns and results of studies into the basic tenants.

### The Existence of the Generation Gap

Literature results are mixed as to their conclusions regarding a generation gap. There is some literature that supports the idea of generational discontinuity and suggests that there is a gap between generations. There is also literature that gives little support for a gap and literature that is ambiguous in its results, which might suggest that the great concern over generational discontinuity is exaggerated.

### Studies that Support A Generation Gap

Six studies out of fourteen reviewed which focused only on the issue of the existence of a generation gap were supportive that such a gap exists. These six studies were based on survey research of attitudes of students and their parents.

Early studies (Friedman, Gold, and Christie, 1972; Payne, Summers, and Stewart, 1973; Gallagher, 1974; Thomas, 1974) focus on the degree of attitude similarity between young adult children and their parents. Friedman, Gold, and Christie (1972) collected their sample from male college students who had responded to an earlier survey and had

agreed to respond to future surveys if paid for it. When surveying these students and their parents on different value areas, they found that there was a radical difference in ideology between parents and sons, although the parents were similar to each other. Payne, Summers, and Stewart (1973) examined the similarity of parents and young adult children in their self-judgements on different issues. Again, there were significant differences in the way the generations judged issues. Gallagher (1974) found not only differences in attitudes, but differences in the intensity of which the attitudes were felt in his study of 148 family units in Philadelphia. Value orientations are also cited as a major difference between young adults and their parents in research Thomas (1974) did with college students and their parents.

In later studies, the view of what constituted generational continuity changed. A study by Callan and Gallois (1983) had as its focus the accuracy of young adult children's perception of their parents. Surveys were given to 180 college females and their mothers. Mothers were asked to give their responses on items regarding perceptions about raising children. Daughters were asked not only to give their responses to the items but also to give the responses they thought their mothers would give. Daughters were unable to perceive their mothers accurately, and thereby believed that their mothers were more similar to them than was actually the case.

In a study by Cashmore and Goodnow (1985) the two methods of measuring generational discontinuity were combined. Cashmore and Goodnow examined both the similarity of attitudes between young adults and their parents and the accuracy of the young adults' perception of their parents in their study of 100 first-born children and their parents in Australia. Cashmore and Goodnow found that there was a gap in similarity between the two generations and in the ability of the young adults to perceive their parent's views on qualities of occupational aspiration. In addition, Cashmore and Goodnow found that the more similar the generations were, the better the young adult was in perceiving parental values.

#### Studies That Question A Generation Gap

Eight of the studies reviewed that focused only on the existence of a generation gap either saw the generation gap as an illusion or were ambiguous in their findings on the generation gap. These studies also employed survey research to measure generational continuity among their subjects. Three of the studies conducted propose that the idea that a generation gap exist only inside people's heads and is not what is found in reality. The other five studies did not take this stance, but gave more ambivalent results in their analysis of generational discontinuity.

Bengtson (1973), Bengtson and Lovejoy (1975), and Acock and Bengtson (1980) concluded that the generation gap was an

illusion that had been much exaggerated by those who take the position that there is a "great gap" between young adults and their parents. The earlier two studies (Bengtson, 1973; Bengtson and Lovejoy, 1975) used the same subjects and data collection instrument and obtained the same results. The subjects for these studies were drawn from male members on a medical care plan in a large metropolitan area. These subjects, their children, and their grandchildren were surveyed. Although there were some minor differences in these studies, the generations were more similar than different in their views, causing the authors to conclude that a generation gap was non-existent. In the third study (Acock and Bengtson, 1980), 466 father-mother-young adult triads were surveyed to examine both similarity between generations and the predictive ability of young adults on both parent's views. Acock and Bengtson found that perceived differences between parents and the young adults were more important to the young adults than were the actual differences. From this, the authors concluded that the generation gap existed more in the minds of the young adults surveyed than it did in real generational differences.

There are five other studies reviewed which were ambiguous in their conclusions. These studies found some support for a generation gap in some areas but also found lack of support for a generation gap in other areas.

Three of the studies examined the similarity of attitudes between young adult children and their parents. In a study of 161 college students and 100 of their parents Weinstock and Lerner (1972) found no real differences in direction of attitudes but did find significant differences in intensity of attitudes. Following up on this study with a similar study examining 46 high school students and either parent (16 mothers and 7 fathers), Lerner, Schroeder, Rewitzer, and Weinstock (1972) obtained similar results. There were still no real differences in direction of attitudes but significant differences in intensity of attitudes were found, although the differences were smaller than those found with the college population. A third study on similarity of values in raising children by Wheeler and Oles (1979) examined 43 college students and their parents. They found no differences in values between young adult children and their parents but did find that the parents varied more in their ratings on the scale than their children did.

Two other studies examined both similarity of views between the two generations and the ability of the young adults to perceive their parent's views. Tedin (1974) in a study of political attitudes of 322 dyads of young adults and at least one of their parents found no gap between the generations in their views, but did find that the young adults were not very accurate in their perception of parental views. Another study by Sleven and Wingrove (1983) examined young adult females, their mothers, and grandmothers on

their views towards roles in society. They found mothers and daughters to be similar in views, and found that mothers were the best predictors of other generation's views.

### Problems and Issues in Studies

In examining the studies which looked only at the existence of a generation gap, there are some issues that arise that may account in part for the ambiguity in the results concerning generational continuity. First, there were issues regarding the operationalization of measurement of the generation gap. Next, there were issues concerning the ability to generalize from these studies.

Operationalization Of Measurement. Part of the ambiguity between studies may be accounted for by the variation in the specific phenomena used to measure the idea of generation gap. Some viewed the generation gap in terms of similarity of values between generations (Friedman, Gold, and Christie, 1972; Weinstock and Lerner, 1972; Lerner, Schroeder, Rewitzer, and Weinstock, 1972; Bengtson, 1973; Payne, Sumner and Stewart, 1973; Gallagher, 1974; Thomas 1974; Bengtson and Lovejoy, 1975; Wheeler & Oles, 1979). Another view measured accuracy of perception between generations as the defining criteria for generational continuity (Callan & Gallois, 1983). A third method used and advocated by much recent research (Tedin, 1974; Acock & Bengtson, 1980; Steven and Wingrove, 1983; Cashmore & Goodnow, 1985) is the two-process method that examines both similarity be-

tween generations and ability of each generation to perceive the position of the other generation. Although the differences in measures did not account for all the variation between studies, it could make a difference in the results obtained. As the two-process method is more comprehensive, it will be used in this study.

Another issue regarding the specific phenomena measured revolved around the subject matter of the attitudes. Only the studies which shared authors (Weinstock and Lerner, 1972, and Lerner, Schroeder, Rewitzer, and Weinstock, 1972; Bengtson, 1973 and Bengtson and Lovejoy, 1975) examined attitudes on the same subject matter. In these studies the authors found similar trends in patterns of attitudes, between their studies, however, the two groups of authors (the group involving Lerner and Weinstock, and the group involving Bengtson) came up with different conclusions. In the other studies the subject of the attitude varied, so no comparison on attitude areas could be made.

There is also the issue of whose views should be examined when looking at similarity and perceptual ability between the two generations. Only one of the studies examined the differences recommended in the two process method based on a comparison of both generation's ability to perceive the other generation. Slevin and Wingrove (1983) in their examination of daughters and mothers looked at mother's ability to perceive daughter's views as well as daughter's abilities to perceive mother's views. Other efforts examined only the

young adult children's perception of parent's views and similarity to parents, not the parent's perception of their children's views. This study will examine both generation's abilities to gauge the attitudes of the other generation as this is the more comprehensive approach.

Another problem concerned how the measure of generational differences were operationalized. Most studies compared the parent-child combinations directly with each other, however two studies, Weinstock and Lerner (1972), and Lerner, Schroeder, Rewitzer, and Weinstock (1972), collected family dyad responses but only compared across the age groups, not by the family dyads. Comparisons by family dyads will be utilized in this study as it is the more common approach.

Generalizing Results. In addition to the problem of operationalizing measures for the generation gap, other limits can be seen in the generalization of results. Several of the studies obtaining mixed results use only one gender when examining generational continuity and this limits their generalizability (Friedman, Gold, And Christie, 1972; Callan and Gallois, 1983; Slevin and Wingrove, 1983). The studies by Bengtson (1973) and Bengtson and Lovejoy (1975) use only male recipients of medical benefits from which to locate other generations and this could cause some problems. In addition, there are other methodological problems in the three-generation studies. For a further discussion of these problems see Bytheway (1977). An additional

problem found in Freeman, Gold, and Christie (1972) is the use of paid volunteers for the study. Paid volunteers may respond differently from unpaid volunteers, and this limits the generalizability of these results.

One further problem that is common to all the studies examined here is the use of only one sample group of generations to examine generational continuity. Elder (1975) recommends use of more than one sample group in measuring the concept of generational continuity. He further recommends that these sample groups come from different time periods in order to get a better perspective on generational continuity.

In order to sidestep some of these problems, this study will examine cohort groups from two different periods of time. Young adults of both genders are included in both sample groups. The later sample also includes parents of both genders so a more detailed comparison can be made. Attitudes in four value areas will be examined to get at some of the problems with measuring only one kind of attitude. In addition, those who were surveyed are volunteers who were not paid for participation in the study.

#### Social Variables and Generational Change

Literature on generational continuity between young adults and their parents addresses not only the existence of a generation gap, but also examines the influence of different variables on generational discontinuity. As the plan

of this study is to examine the influence of education of mother, employment of mother, and gender, the literature reviewed in this section will be limited to studies that examine the relationship of these three variables to differences in perception and/or similarity of attitudes between young adults and their parents. The literature on the three variables will be presented followed by a discussion of some of the problems and issues found in the studies.

### **Education And The Generation Gap**

No studies were located in the literature which focused on the influence of the educational level of mothers alone on the similarity and/or perception of attitudes between young adults and their parents. Four studies were found, however, that examined the influence of parental educational level in general, without differentiating educational level based on gender. All four studies used surveys to gather their data.

The studies which examined the influence of educational level of parents in general found mixed results. Three of the studies found that educational level was a major influence on generational differences (Kirkpatrick, 1936; Brunswich, 1970; Rapoport, 1985). The fourth study (Thomas and Stankiewicz, 1974) found no relationship between educational level and generational differences.

Kirkpatrick (1936) examined the influence of educational level of parents on attitudes of the generations towards

feminism. In his study of 165 parent-child triads and 317 gender matched parent-child dyads he found that the direction of views of young adults were influenced by educational level. When educational level of parents was high, both generations were more feminist in their views and were more similar in their attitudes. A study by Brunswich (1970) adds support to Kirkpatrick's findings. In her study based on secondary analysis from several national studies on the generation gap, she found that the educational level of parents made a great difference in young adults' attitudes. Brunswich did not find much generational discontinuity and suggested that the educational level of parents is as important a factor as generational membership in determining differences in attitudes of young adults. In the most recent study by Rapoport (1985) which examined attitude expression based on secondary analysis of surveys from eight nations found that the transmission of attitude expression from parent to child increased for parents with higher educational levels.

One study (Thomas, 1974) did not support the idea that educational level had an influence on generational transmission of attitudes. In a study of college students and their parents, he found no significant difference in similarity between the generations based on education level of parents. He concluded that education level does not have an influence on generational continuity.

### Working Moms And Generational Continuity

Several studies have been made of the influence of maternal employment on children as they are growing up. The reader is referred to Etaugh (1974) for a review of the studies. Only two studies were located, however, that examined the influence of the employment of mothers during their children's lives on the similarity and/or perception of attitudes between parents and children when their children reached young adulthood. Both studies used surveys to collect their data.

A study by Rollins and White (1982) indicated that employment of mother may not have as negative effects as have been attributed to it by the popular press. To the contrary, in their study of 100 mother-daughter dyads, they found that mothers who were in careers that were personally rewarding shared more views with their daughters than mothers who were full-time housewives. There was no difference in similarity of views between mothers and daughters when mothers were full-time housewives and when they were employed out of economic necessity.

The second study did not find the same results as Rollins and White. Acock, Barker, and Bengtson (1982) looked at the effect of maternal employment on parent-youth similarity in 647 mother-father-youth triads. Although maternal employment did not have an effect on the level of similarity between youth and their parents as a whole, there was a significant difference based on maternal

employment between the similarity of youth and their mothers. When mothers had been employed their young adult children were less similar to them and more similar to the fathers.

### Gender and Generational Continuity

The studies which examine the influence of gender on similarity and/or perception of attitudes between young adult children and their parents can be sub-divided into three areas. First, there are studies that focus on the gender of the child and its influence on generational similarity and attitude perception. Next come studies that concentrate on the gender of the parent and its influence on the generation gap. Lastly, there are studies that examine the gender of both parent and child and its relationship to generational differences. A review of the literature in each of these areas follows.

Gender Of Child And Generational Differences. In surveying the literature three studies were found which focus on the influence of gender of young adults in generational continuity. All three studies used surveys to gather their data and all three surveys showed significant differences in generational continuity based on gender of the child.

The first study by Jacobson, Berry and Olson (1975) examined the similarity on views towards current social problems between university students and their fathers.

Jacobson, Berry, and Olson found that both generations were similar in their views. The areas of disagreement between the generations varied, however, based on the gender of the young adult child. Daughters almost always agreed with their fathers, while sons disagreed in the areas of abortion, inflation, and drug use. A study by Hare-Mustin, Bennett, and Broderick (1983) added to these findings. This study examined attitudes of college students and their parents towards motherhood. Little generational difference was found on attitudes, however, gender differences between daughters and sons were found in the area of reproductive freedom, with daughters being the most similar to mothers, indicating that gender as well as generation may lead to some gaps of attitudes between people. The most recent study (Wilks and Callan, 1984) focused on the views of late adolescents and their parents toward use of alcohol. Respondents in this study included 72 mother-father-daughter triads and 30 mother-father-son triads. Findings indicated that sons were more in agreement with both their parent's attitudes than were daughters. Sons were also more in agreement with either parent on views than were daughters. All three studies indicated that gender of child is a factor that bears further consideration when examining generational continuity.

Gender Of Parent And Generational Differences. Literature that examines the gender of parents on generational continuity showed mixed results. In reviewing the

literature, two studies were found that give support to the idea that gender of parent has an influence on similarity of attitudes and/or prediction of attitudes between the generations. Two studies found no support for the influence of parental gender on generational continuity. All four studies gathered data by using surveys.

One study that supported the idea that parental gender has an influence on generational similarity is an early study by Kirkpatrick (1936) that was discussed earlier under the examination of the influence of educational level on generational continuity. In addition to his findings concerning education level, Kirkpatrick found that gender of parents also makes a difference in generational similarity with mothers being more similar to their children than fathers. A second study by Acock and Bengtson (1978) examined 653 father-mother-youth triads and found that mothers were better able than fathers to predict the attitudes of their young adult children.

Other studies did not find support for gender differences between mothers and fathers in their relationship with young adult children. Jennings and Langton (1969) found no definite influence based of gender of parent when they examine 430 mother-father-youth triads on their political party orientations. They did find however, that when conflict was strong, young adult children were more likely to hold the views of their mothers than the views of their fathers. A more recent study by Penn (1977) examined 168

female college students and their parents and found no difference in generational similarity on attitudes based on the gender of the parent. Both these studies leave some doubt as to the influence of gender of parent on generational continuity.

Parent/Child Gender And Generational Differences. The studies which examined the gender of both parent and child focus on two different issues. First, there was the issue of the influence of gender of both generations on the degree of generational continuity. Next, there was the issue which examined whether an age gap or a gender gap is the most predominant gap in families. Data for studies of both issues were gathered using self-administered questionnaires. Each of these issues will be examined in turn.

Two studies examined the issue of the influence of gender of both generations on the degree of generational continuity. In a study by Freeman (1972) which examined 200 college students and their parents on attitudes towards contemporary topics, generational differences were found; however, gender of parents and gender of children showed no significant influence on generational similarity when data were analyzed. Another study (Thompson, Acock, and Clark, 1985) found different results. This examination of 280 mother-father-young adult triads found that mothers and fathers had limited ability to gauge the attitudes of their children. However, mothers were able to gauge the attitudes

of their daughters better than fathers. Neither parent was better at estimating the opinions of their sons.

A second area of concern to researchers that were interested in both the influence of age and gender on family continuity examines whether family discontinuity results more from the age of the family member or the gender of the family member. Here, again, results were mixed.

A study by Steininger and Lesser (1974) examined generational differences and sex differences in the liberalness and conservativeness of social attitudes among college students and their parents. Generational differences were more marked than gender differences; however, gender differences were also significant in showing differences in some areas. McBride (1983) examined undergraduates and their parents of the same gender. Gender differences were pronounced in her study of attribution of parenting skills; however, no generation differences were found. This analysis caused McBride to conclude that gender, not generation, was the significant factor influencing family discontinuity.

#### Problems And Issues In Studies

Results of studies that examined the social variables of education level of mother, maternal employment, and gender, and their influence on generational continuity between young adults and their parents were inconclusive. Only the studies that examined gender of child showed consistent

differences. Studies that examined the relationship of the other variables were mixed in their results.

Problems of inconsistency of methodology and operationalization of the variables may account in part for the differences in results between the studies. Some issues and problems are common across all the studies reviewed on the different social factors, while other problems are unique to studies on each social factor. A discussion of problems in the operationalization of measurement and generalizability of results follows. The discussion will cover common problems that exist across the literature for all the categories of variables as well as problems that are unique to the study of the individual variables.

Operationalization Of Measurement. Studies concerned with the influence of social factors on generational continuity share some of the same problems as the studies focusing only on the existence of a generation gap. Most of the studies examined focus only on similarity between generations as a measure of generational continuity (Kirkpatrick, 1936; Jennings and Langton, 1969; Brunswich, 1970; Freeman, 1972; Steininger and Lesser, 1974; Thomas and Stankiewicz, 1974; Jacobson, Berry and Olson, 1975; Penn, 1977; Rollins and White; 1982; Acock, Barker, and Bengtson, 1982; Hare-Mustin, Bennett, and Broderick 1983; McBride, 1983; Wilks and Callan, 1984; Rapoport, 1985). Two studies, however, focused on parent's perception of young adult children (Acock and Bengtson, 1978; Thomas, Acock, and Clark, 1985).

None of the studies used the two-process approach mentioned earlier in the chapter. The two studies that examined perception only looked at parent's perception of their young adult children's views. No study looked at the similarity in views and perception of other generation across both generations. In addition, all studies focused on different attitude content areas.

In addition, studies that examined social factors did not look at the influence of multiple factors on generational continuity. Only Kirpatrick (1936) examined the influence of more than one of the social variables reviewed in this chapter. The present research will overcome this problem by examining the influence of the multiple variables.

Some methodological issues are unique to the social factor being studied. As mentioned before, no studies could be located that differentiate between education level of mother and father, therefore, there is still a question about the influence of the education level of mothers alone on generational continuity. This study will examine the influence of educational level of mothers only.

Studies which examined the influence of maternal employment on parent/child similarity and perceptual abilities when the child is a young adult are sparse and leave more room for study. In addition, one of the two studies located (Rollins and White, 1982) examined only daughters when looking at the effects of maternal employment.

Studies of gender range according to whose gender is examined as well as the method used to examine it. No studies examined the influence across both genders in both generations on generational similarity and abilities of both generations to gauge perceptions of the other generation's attitudes. This study will use this method in order to expand on findings of previous studies.

Generalizing Results. Problems given above in operationalization of measurement contribute to the generalization of results. In addition to these problems, the studies on the influence of education level, maternal employment, and gender shared the same problems in generalizing results that the studies on the existence of the generation gap have. There are studies that examined only one gender in one of the generations, as mentioned above. The studies are also limited in that they examined the influence of the three social variables on only one sample in one historical location. This study will address these problems.

#### The Effect Of Time On The Generation Gap

Studies were also examined that tested portions of the life-span developmental model with late adolescents/young adults, and their parents. Most of the studies focused only on the effects of historical time on the generation gap. One study, however, did test both the influence of developmental life stages as well as historical time. One study examined was a panel study, two studies were cohort studies,

and the fourth study combined both a panel and cohort approach. All four studies made use of survey research and all four found support for the theory.

### Review Of The Studies

The panel study by Acock and Fuller (1984) examined 114 parent and post-adolescent children dyads in Thailand on attitudes of mobility. The study finds that parents have little influence over the mobility attitudes of their children over time and that the external social influences of historical time and location are much more influential on attitudes than family beliefs. The authors conclude that in areas of rapid social change, younger generations respond to the external forces of the times.

A cohort analysis by Chand, Crider, and Willets (1975) surveyed high school students in 1947, 1960, and 1970 on their perceived disagreements with their parents. In this study, the students were surveyed on their own views and their perception of parental views. The actual views of parents were not collected. Chand, Crider, and Willets found that the generation gap did exist over time and that time did have an influence on the nature of the gap. Roper and Labeff (1977) conducted a cohort study comparing the 1934 Kirpatrick sample of parents and their young adult children with parents and their young adult children in 1974 on attitudes towards feminism and sex roles. Results showed that both generations had moved towards more egalitarian

attitudes and concluded that historical time is a factor in this change.

The last study, by Jennings and Niemi (1981) utilized a more integrative approach by combining both panel and cohort designs in studying the three kinds of time and their influence on generational continuity. The study examined a national sample of high school seniors and their parents in 1965, reinterviewed the same group in 1973, and also gathered a fresh group of high school students from 1973 on their political attitudes. The study found that certain stages of the life cycle were more open to change in attitudes, and that there were both generational differences in attitudes as well as historical or period effects on attitudes.

#### Issues And Problems In Studies

There are several problems or weaknesses in the studies which examined the life-span developmental model that this research will try to address. First, only one study examined (Jennings and Niemi, 1981) took into consideration the three types of time in testing generational continuity. Next, the views of both generations were not considered by the studies. Only Roper and Labeff (1977) examined the effects of time on the parental generation. All other studies focused only on the young adult generation. Chand, Crider, and Willets (1975) don't even include a survey of parental views in their study, but rely on the young adults to have

accurate knowledge of this view. Last, none of the studies examined used the two-process approach of examining both similarity between generations and ability of each generation to gauge the attitude of the other generation. It is felt that by using such a process the study of the influence of historical time can be improved.

### Summary

The studies that examined generational continuity in attitudes between young adult children and their parents were mixed in their results. Out of the fourteen studies that examined only whether a generation gap existed or not, six studies found support for a generation gap while eight studies were either ambiguous in their results or found no support for a generation gap.

The literature testing the influence of the social variables of educational level of parent, maternal employment, and gender gave differing results. Three of the four studies that examined educational level of parents found this variable to be an influence on parent-child dyads ability to gauge each other's attitudes or their similarity. One study did not support educational level as influencing generational continuity. The two studies examining maternal employment gave opposite results with one study finding that maternal employment made a difference in generational continuity between mothers and young adult children while the other study found no difference in this relationship.

The studies which tested gender as an influence on generational continuity had focused on gender in three separate ways. Three studies examined only the gender of the child in relationship to generational continuity. All found gender of child had an influence on generational continuity. Four studies examined only the gender of the parent and gave mixed results with two studies supporting parental gender as an influence on generational continuity and two studies finding no support for this idea. Of the four studies that examined gender of both parent and child, three found support for gender as an influential variable on generational continuity and one study found no support for the idea.

Four studies examined the influence of historical time on generational continuity. All four studies found support for the idea that historical time and location influences generational continuity.

Some major problems in the literature were: a. separate domains of attitudes were used in different studies, b. studies varied in measurement of what constituted generational continuity--similarity between generations, ability to gauge attitudes between generations, or both, c. studies varied in which generation's view they examined, d. studies examined only one gender, e. studies examined only one time period, f. studies that examined the social variables of parental education level, maternal employment, and gender differed in their operationalization of the variables, g. studies did not examine the influence of multiple variables

on generational continuity, and f. studies did not consider the influence of the three types of time in the life-span developmental model in their research design. This study plans to test the theory base of the life-span developmental model and address the problems in previous literature by conducting a cohort analysis examining two similar age cohorts and their mothers at two different points in time. In addition, generational similarity and attitude perception for both generations in four different value domains will be compared. Comparisons will be made on a multiple of variables and planning of the research design will control for the influence of the types of time given in the life-span developmental model.

#### Research Hypotheses

Considering both the results of the literature review and the basic propositions of the theory base, the following hypotheses are proposed.

1. If similar cohorts of college students and their mothers for the years 1972 and 1985 are examined, historical time will be significant in accounting for changes in generational perceptions. Historical change will be influential in the following manner:

- a. First, there will be a difference in how well students and their mothers gauge each other's attitudes and how similar they are based on the year of the study.

b. Second, in comparing the opinions of students in 1972 and 1985, and the opinions of mothers in 1972 and 1985, significant differences should be found in their opinions based on the year studied.

c. When examining the influence of the variables of gender of child, educational level of mother, and maternal employment status on generational continuity, these variables should be found significant in influencing generational similarity and attitude prediction but will not be as influential as the year of study in influencing generational similarity and attitude prediction.

2. The gender of the parent is an important influence in generational similarity and ability of each generation to gauge attitudes of the other generation.

a. First, there should be significant differences between the similarity and ability to gauge attitudes between mothers and their children and fathers and their children, with mothers and children being more similar and better able to predict each other's attitudes than fathers and children.

b. Next, there should be both generational differences and gender differences when mothers, fathers, and children are examined to see how similar they are in values to each other.

## CHAPTER IV

### METHODS

The need for longitudinal analysis in the study of generational differences has been pointed out by many researchers interested in the sociology of age (see Bengtson, 1972; Bengtson, Furlong, and Laufer, 1974; Elder, 1975; Hareven, 1978; Klein, Jorgensen, and Miller, 1978; Hill and Mattessich, 1979; Hagestad, 1981). Two different methodological designs were used in the literature reviewed.

The first design, the panel study, examines the same specific individuals at two or more points in time. The purpose in this design is to look at individual change over time. The focus in this design for life-span developmental theory is to examine the impact of different life stages on generational change.

The second design, cohort analysis, refers to:

any study in which there are measures of some characteristic of one or more cohorts (birth or otherwise) at two or more points of time (Glenn, 1979, p. 9).

Cohort analysis, according to Glenn (1979) is used to study three types of change. First, it can be used to examine actual changes in the behavior or attitudes of a cohort. Secondly, cohort analysis is used to examine changes that can

be attributed to the aging process of a cohort, and thirdly, cohort analysis is used to examine changes that are associated with different historical periods. The advantage of cohort analysis is that simultaneous comparisons can be made by both synchronic and diachronic time. That is, comparisons can be made between groups at one point in time as well as over a period of time. As this study examines the changes of attitudes over time of similar age cohorts, cohort analysis was the method of choice used in this study.

The purpose of this chapter is to give a description of the methodology used to carry out a cohort analysis of generational continuity. Generational continuity was measured by using the two-process approach discussed in Chapter II that examines both the similarity between parents and their young adult children as well as the ability of both parents and their young adult children to gauge each other's attitudes. In addition, two separate cohorts, that were similar in age, and their parents were examined in this study. The two cohorts were chosen so that they would reflect the same developmental stage, that of intimacy vs. isolation, as well as the same family developmental stage, family as a launching pad, yet share different historical times. Both cohorts were also experiencing the same life event, that of attending college, when the samples were collected.

#### Sample And Procedure

In order to test the influence of historical time on

generational continuity, a data set collected by Hodgkin and Dodder in 1972 comparing attitudes of mothers and their young adult children was utilized. In addition, another sample of young adult children and both parents was collected in 1985 utilizing the same instrument used by Hodgkin and Dodder in 1972. This section will present the procedures used for collecting the data in both 1972 and 1985, a description of the samples collected, and problems and limitations encountered in the sampling process.

### 1972 Data Collection

In order to examine generational continuity, Hodgkin asked instructors to give a self-administered questionnaire to their introductory sociology students at Oklahoma State University. Responses were collected from 384 students. This class was chosen because it was a general education class so the students were more likely than upperclassmen to show a diversity of views and backgrounds and were more likely than upperclassmen to be representative of the college population as a whole.

The students were asked to complete a questionnaire, giving their responses to 48 value statements, and the responses they believed their mothers would give. The students were told that participation in the study was voluntary and that their answers would be kept confidential. They were also told that a questionnaire would be sent to their

mothers, and asked not to discuss the questionnaire with their mothers until after their mothers had returned the questionnaire.

After completing the survey, the students were given envelopes to address to their mothers. A survey, coded to match the student survey, was then mailed to the mothers asking for their participation in the study. A copy of the cover letter sent to the mothers can be found in Appendix A. As their children, mothers were asked to give their responses to the items, then give the responses they thought their son or daughter would give.

In order to improve the response rate of mothers in the study, follow up letters were sent at two different times to those who did not return a survey. The first follow up letter was sent four weeks after the original survey. The second follow up letter was sent six weeks after the original survey. A copy of each of the follow up letters can be found in Appendix B. Of the 384 surveys sent, 369 mothers returned the survey, giving a response rate of 96%.

#### 1985 Data Collection

To collect the 1985 sample, this researcher administered the Hodgkin-Dodder questionnaire to 350 introductory sociology students at Oklahoma State University. Of the 350 students, 343 filled out the survey giving a response rate of 98%. In this sample the students were asked to give their responses to the value statements and the responses

they believed each of their parents would give to the value statements. Again, students were informed of the voluntary nature of the survey, assured of the confidentiality of their answers, and asked not to discuss the survey with either parent until the parent had completed the survey.

Coded surveys that matched the student's survey were then sent to both parents with the same cover letter used in the 1972 data collection. The student's parents were each asked to give their own responses to the items, then give the responses they thought their son or daughter would give without consulting with each other or the student.

When surveys were sent to the parents of the 343 students, eighteen of the surveys to both parents were returned by the post office because the parent either did not live at that address or the address was unknown. This brought the total number of students who had at least one parent who could respond down to 325. Out of the 325 students, 43 had fathers who were deceased or whose addresses were unknown, making the total number of possible responses from fathers 282. Out of the 325 students, seven had mothers who were deceased or whose addresses were unknown, making the total number of possible responses from mothers 318. The total number of two parent dyads who received surveys was 275.

After four weeks, a post-card was sent to parents who had not responded asking for a response. A copy of the post-card can be found in Appendix B. Due to financial limitations, a second follow up request was not sent.

There were 217 responses received from either one or both parents of the students, making the overall response rate for the 1985 data 67%. Out of the 282 fathers of students who were sent surveys, 173 (61%) responded. Out of the 318 mothers of students who were sent surveys, 193 (61%) responded. Out of the 275 two parent dyads that could have responded, 176 (64%) responses were received from both parents.

### Demographics of Samples

In addition to answering the value items, demographic questions were also asked of both students and their mothers in the 1972 survey and of students and both parents in the 1985 survey. Demographic questions for the students in 1972 and 1985 were the same, with the exception that the 1985 sample was asked for the address of their fathers as well as their mothers. A copy of the student demographic questions for both years can be found in Appendix C. In addition to the demographic questions asked in 1972, parents in 1985 were also asked about their income from employment and day care arrangements for students during different periods of the student's life. Copies of the parent demographic for both years can be found in Appendix D.

Comparisons of the demographic data for students in 1972 and students in 1985 are found in Table I. Chi-squares were significant in six of the nine sets of comparison. The three comparisons that were similar enough to be non-

TABLE I  
DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS OF STUDENTS FOR BOTH YEARS

Demographics	1972 N=369	1985 N=217	Chi- Square
<u>Sex</u>			
Male	44%	40%	.94
Female	56%	60%	
<u>Age</u>			
16-19	40%	64%	25.96*
20-22	36%	26%	
23 and up	24%	13%	
<u>Marital Status</u>			
Single	97%	94%	3.15
Married	3%	6%	
<u>Classification</u>			
Freshman	60%	71%	11.34*
Sophomore	27%	15%	
Junior	8%	9%	
Senior	5%	5%	
<u>Overall GPA</u>			
< 1.5	4%	3%	42.68*
1.5-2.49	35%	23%	
2.5-3.49	36%	63%	
3.5-4.0	25%	11%	
<u>Hometown Size</u>			
< 10,000	33%	23%	15.66*
10,000-50,000	24%	29%	
50,001-100,000	5%	12%	
> 100,000	38%	36%	
<u>Number of Siblings</u>			
0	5%	5%	5.70
1	25%	34%	
2	36%	32%	
3 or more	34%	29%	

\* indicates the Chi-square was significant at .05

TABLE I (Continued)

<u>Demographics</u>	<u>1972</u> <u>N=369</u>	<u>1985</u> <u>N=217</u>	<u>Chi-</u> <u>Square</u>
<u>Position in family</u>			
Oldest	38%	34%	14.73*
Middle child	35%	25%	
Youngest	27%	41%	
<u>Political View</u>			
Conservative	36%	36%	41.79*
Moderate	57%	39%	
Liberal	6%	23%	
Other	1%	2%	

\* indicates the Chi-square was significant at .05

significant are in the gender composition, the marital status, and the sibling structure of the two samples.

Four sets of significant variations were found. Age between the samples varies (Chi-square=25.96) with the 1985 sample having more younger students than the 1972 sample. One explanation for this variation could be that the 1972 population was sampled at the time the Vietnam war was ending. Many of the students may have been involved in the war in their younger years and were therefore unable to attend college until their military service was complete. Some variation can also be seen in the classification level of students (Chi-square=11.34) with the 1985 sample having a higher level of freshman students. Grade point average (Chi-square=42.68), and hometown size (Chi-square=15.66) show degrees of variation. On the grade point average, the 1972 sample had a higher level of A's than the 1985 sample. The 1972 sample also came from smaller towns than the 1985 sample. Position in family shows a variation (Chi-square=14.73) with the 1985 sample having more more children who are the youngest in their family in the survey sample. Political view also shows variation (Chi-square=41.79). The 1972 sample has a higher percentage of students with moderate views and conservative views while the 1985 sample shows that a greater proportion of the students consider themselves to be liberal in their views.

A comparison of the common demographic data for mothers of both samples can be found in Table II. The Chi-square

TABLE II

## DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS OF MOTHERS FOR BOTH YEARS

Demographics	1972 N=369	1985 N=193	Chi- Square
<u>Marital Status</u>			
Married	88%	80%	12.76*
Divorced	4%	9%	
Widowed	5%	3%	
Remarried	3%	8%	
<u>Age at First Marriage</u>			
< 18 years	10%	14%	11.53*
18-22 years	65%	72%	
23-30 years	23%	14%	
> 30 years	2%	0%	
<u>Education Level</u>			
< High School	10%	4%	20.26*
High School Diploma	31%	25%	
College/Trade School	40%	39%	
College Degree	12%	15%	
Graduate School	7%	17%	
<u>Employment During Student's Childhood</u>			
0-1 year old	6%	18%	20.60*
1-6 years old	14%	32%	25.48*
7-12 years old	22%	39%	18.07*
> 12 years old	39%	55%	12.97*
Never employed	55%	31%	49.22*
<u>Political Views</u>			
Conservative	35%	41%	1.96
Moderate	57%	51%	
Liberal	8%	8%	
Other	0%	0%	

\* indicates the Chi-square was significant at .05

was significant in eight out of the nine sets of comparisons. The comparison that was not significant was between the two sample groups on their political views.

The eight significant sets of comparisons are on marital status (Chi-square=12.76), age at first marriage (Chi-square=11.53), educational level (Chi-square=20.26), and the and the five different employment comparisons (0-1 year old, Chi-square=20.60; 1-6 years old, Chi-square=25.38; 7-12 years old, Chi-square=12.97; > 12 years old, Chi-square=12.97; never employed, Chi-square=49.22). The mothers in 1985 married earlier than their 1972 counterparts, they also have a great deal more education than their 1972 counterparts. In addition, the mothers in the two samples varied on their marital status and employment status over the five comparisons. On all five of the comparisons for employment status, mothers in 1985 had higher employment rates than mothers in 1972.

A comparison of the common demographic data for mothers and fathers in the 1985 sample can be found in Table III. The Chi-square was significant in all five comparisons. Mothers and fathers varied in their marital status (Chi-square=56.83) with more mothers being divorced or widowed than fathers. Mothers married at an earlier age than fathers (Chi-square=86.03), had lower levels of education than fathers (Chi-square=25.82), and were more conservative in their political views than fathers (Chi-square=20.45). Out of the 193 mothers, 133 were employed at some point

TABLE III  
DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS OF FATHERS AND MOTHERS

Demographics	Fathers N=173	Mothers N=193	Chi- Square
<u>Marital Status</u>			
Married	84%	80%	56.83*
Divorced/Widowed	5%	12%	
Remarried	11%	8%	
<u>Age at First Marriage</u>			
< 18 years	1%	14%	86.03*
18-22 years	41%	72%	
23-30 years	55%	14%	
> 30 years	4%	0%	
<u>Education Level</u>			
< High School	2%	4%	25.82*
High School Diploma	16%	25%	
College/Trade School	27%	39%	
College Degree	24%	15%	
Graduate School	31%	17%	
<u>Political Views</u>			
Conservative	35%	41%	20.45*
Moderate	57%	51%	
Liberal	8%	8%	
Other	0%	0%	
<u>Average Income From Employment During Student's Childhood</u>		(N=133)	
< 10,000	20%	52%	78.45*
10,000 - 20,000	38%	41%	
20,001 - 30,000	21%	7%	
> 30,000	21%	0%	

\* indicates the Chi-square was significant at .05

during their lives. The comparison between the average earnings of the employed mothers and fathers shows that fathers had significantly higher (Chi-square=78.45) average earnings than mothers.

### Issues In Sample And Data Collection

There were several issues, problems and limitations that arose in the course of this study. This section will examine some of these issues and problems beginning first with problems and issues found in the data collection process and continuing with issues concerning the sample itself.

Reliability In Data Collection. Reliability is the first issue that must be considered in the data collection process. Evaluation of reliability deals with estimating how much of the variation of scores is due to transitory influence or chance or random errors (Selltiz, Wrightman, and Cook, 1976). In order to increase reliability between the two data collection processes, the same procedure for data collection was used in both the 1972 and 1985 sample. In 1972, however, the individual instructors administered the questionnaires, while in 1985 one person was responsible for administering the questionnaires. Systematic error could have occurred as the same person did not administer the questionnaires in all circumstances.

Validity In Data Collection. Another issue that must be dealt with in the data collection process is the validity

of the collection process. Validity is defined as the extent to which differences reflect true differences among individuals on characteristics rather than constant or random errors (Selltiz, Wrightsman, and Cook, 1976). While reliability deals only with random errors, validity takes into account both constant and random errors. Issues of validity were found in this research dealing with the wording of the questions for the demographic data and with the response rate of the questionnaire.

Regarding the wording of the questionnaire, categories of marital status on both the student and parent questionnaire were overlapping and this could cause errors in validity of the data. In addition, the questions regarding employment on the parent demographics leaves out employment during student's junior high school years. This also could cause some error in the validity of the data as the time frame on grammar school could have different meanings to different people. Also, the question on employment during student's high school years is open to error as there may be different interpretations of what high school is, with some interpreting high school to be ninth grade and up and some interpreting it to be tenth grade and up.

In regards to the response rate, roughly 60% of the parents responded in 1985. The responses of these parents may not adequately reflect the responses of those parents that did not return a questionnaire, adding a further problem to the validity of the data.

Ethical Issues In Data Collection. Other issues concerning the data collection process deal with the ethics of the study. Ethical concerns were dealt with in the study by making participation voluntary and assuring the confidentiality of the participants. Harm of subjects was not an issue as the study was not experimental in nature and as participation was voluntary.

Issues Concerning Sampling. Two issues concerning the sample collected were of importance in this study. The first issue concerns the acceptability of the response rates as being representative of the views of the sample measured. The second issue concerns the extended validity or generalizability of findings based on the sample surveyed relative to the population.

The response rate for the 1972 sample was 96%. This response rate is unusually high and stands for itself in being representative of the sample collected. The response rate of the 1985 sample is over 60% for all the categories included. Although this response rate is not as high as the 1972 response rate, it is generally considered to be an acceptable level (Babbie, 1986). However, as roughly 35% of the parent sample did not respond to the survey, there is some question if the sample that did respond gives a fair representation of the views of those who chose not to participate in the study.

Extended validity or generalizability of the sample may be another problem in the study. Sampling the views of

introductory students and their parents may not be representative of any other population. Students were surveyed at only one university in one state. It is unclear whether results of this study could be generalized to university students as a whole. The last concern in the generalizability of this study has to do with surveying of college students and their parents. College students may vary well have different views from the young adult population as a whole. It is questionable whether results from this study could be generalized therefore to the population of young adults and their parents as a whole. This study does have an advantage, however, as it does examine two similar cohorts in two different periods of time. Analysis can be made therefore on the influence of historical time in generational continuity.

#### Survey Instrument and Operationalization

In order to study the change in generational continuity over time, the same data instrument used in the 1972 data collection was used to collect data in the 1985 sample. This section of the chapter gives a description of the data collection instrument, followed by a description of the coding and scoring of the instrument. The section will end with a disucssion of issues and problems that were encountered in using and opertaionalizing the data collection instrument as a measure of generational continuity of attitudes.

### The Survey Instrument

A questionnaire devised by Hodgins and Dodder (1972) was used for data collection in both 1972 and 1985. In addition to the demographic information discussed earlier, the questionnaire contained forty-eight value statements. Twelve items were constructed in each of the following four value areas: sexuality, child socialization or childrearing, sense of community, and economics. These areas were based on Murdock's (1949) four "universal" functions and Bell's and Vogel's (1968) family functions. The value items were scored on a four point Likert scale from strongly disagree to strongly agree. No allowance was made for the undecided category, so respondents were forced to either agree or disagree to varying degrees with the statements.

Representative items concerning sexuality that were used were: "People who engage in sex before marriage are likely to make better marriage partners" and "It is perfectly alright for a woman to be aggressive in sex and enjoy it." Representative items for child socialization were: "It is desirable for parents to select playmates for their children" and "Permissive parents produce spoiled, unruly children." Sense of community was represented by such items as: "If a person has good friends, he doesn't need kinfolks" and "A person is not a whole person until he has put down roots somewhere." Examples of economic items were: "A person should spend all that he has and a little

more too" and "It is easier to be happy if you are rich." A copy of the value statements is contained in Appendix E.

#### Coding And Scoring Of Instrument

After data collection was complete, the surveys were coded so that the mother-child dyads in 1972 and the mother-father-child triads in 1985 were matched. Coding of the individual items was taken directly from the surveys so that the coded responses were the same numbers as those circled by the individual respondents on the survey. A copy of the code labels for both years can be found in Appendix F.

Coding of the 1972 survey was done by paid keypunchers. Coding of the 1985 survey was done by this researcher in order to insure continuity in the coding. After coding of the items was completed, a number of surveys were pulled at random in order to check the accuracy of the coding. Out of 1572 coded responses checked, seven were in error, yielding an error rate for the coding of .0044, or less than one-half a percent error.

After individual items had been coded into the computer, tabulations were made of total scores in each of the four value areas as well as total scores for all of the value areas for the mother-child dyads in 1972, and for the mother-child, father-child, and mother-father dyads in 1985. These tabulations were made for both similarity of attitudes in the value areas for mother-child, father-child, and mother-father responses, as well as in the ability of each

generation to gauge the attitude of the other generation for the mother-child and father-child dyads. The tabulations for the dyads in the four value areas were based on the extent of variation between the scores in each dyad's answers. If the dyads responded the same on a question, they had a variation of 0, if one member of the dyad rated a question strongly agree while the other rated the question strongly disagree, the dyad was given a variation of 3 as there would be three points difference between their answers. The maximum number of points a dyad could score if they were at opposite ranges on everything in a value area was 36 (i.e. 3 x 12 items), the minimum a dyad could score was 0. After coding of the tabulations for the totals of the value areas was completed, a survey was pulled at random and the tabulations were hand checked. In all of the areas, the hand tabulations and the computer tabulations were exactly the same.

After tabulations for total scores on all of the value areas for both similarity of dyads and ability to gauge attitudes on generational dyads were completed, tabulations were made that would operationalize the variables of employment of mothers and educational level of mothers. In order for mothers to be considered employed, they had to be employed full-time during at least one period in their children's lives. Only mothers who were never employed were considered non-working mothers. Educational level was divided into two levels for the purpose of this study. The first level was composed of mothers who had a high school

education or less. The second level was composed of mothers who had more than a high school education.

### Issues In Survey Operationalization

Several issues, problems, and limitations were encountered in utilizing the survey instrument to measure generational continuity. These issues concern both the validity of the survey as a measure of generational continuity and the reliability of the survey in measuring the changes in attitudes. Problems as well as solutions in both these areas will be discussed in turn.

Issues Concerning Validity. As stated before, validity is concerned with both random and constant error in the instrument's ability to measure what it is supposed to measure. Concern with validity in this study was over the scale construction for the four value areas and the measure-for agreement-disagreement in the four value areas.

Validity of the scales for the four value areas was examined for face validity to assess that the concepts were different. In order to further assess the validity for the value areas, factor analysis was executed as it is recommended by several researchers as a good tool for assessing construct validity (see Kirlinger, 1964; Cattell, 1978). Before the factor analysis could be performed however, there was another problem that had to be considered. This study was not concerned with only one type of measurement. Here, the concern is not only with measuring the attitudes of

respondents in the four value areas, but also measuring their perception of the attitudes of others in the four value areas. Teevan (1975) presents the case that attitudes and perception of others' attitudes are two different concepts and must be considered separately. As this is the case, two factor analyses were run for each value area. One factor analysis was run on respondent attitudes, and a second factor analysis was run on the respondent's gauge of the other generation's attitudes. Results of these raw factor analyses can be seen in Table IV. As items in the four value areas were not concerned with measuring a continuum of liberalism to conservativeness on the value areas, negative scores are not detrimental to the loading of the various factors. Items were considered to scale if the loading was either greater than .30 or less than -.30 (Cattell, 1978). In view of comparisons to be made, items had to load both for self-view and view of other in order to be considered as part of the newly created short scale.

After the original factoring was complete, items with low loadings were pulled and factor analyses of the four value areas for self-view and view of others were rerun. The final shortened scales for each of the value areas can be found in Table V. As can be noted, there was one item, item ten on economics that did not load at the .30 level across both self-view and view of other. The item was close to this loading however, and as the scale was already quite short, it was decided to leave item ten in.

TABLE IV  
 FACTOR TABLE FOR ALL ITEMS ON SELF-VIEW AND PREDICTING  
 OTHER IN FOUR VALUE AREAS

Community			Childrearing		
items	Self-view	Predict other	items	Self-view	Predict other
1	-.75*	-.61*	1	.49*	.46*
2	-.76*	-.32*	2	.03	-.54*
3	-.42*	-.55*	3	.83*	.62*
4	.47*	.56*	4	-.84*	-.38*
5	-.13	.54*	5	-.14	.53*
6	-.36*	-.21	6	.05	.41*
7	.27	.28	7	.63*	-.29
8	.57*	.57*	8	-.27	-.61*
9	.79*	.78*	9	-.53*	.56*
10	.55*	.42*	10	-.13	.38*
11	.73*	.66*	11	-.46*	.47*
12	-.34*	.49*	12	.38*	-.49*

Economic			Sexuality		
items	Self-view	Predict other	items	Self-view	Predict other
1	-.10	.47*	1	.47*	.49*
2	.24	.11	2	-.41*	.65*
3	.62*	.52*	3	-.41*	-.29
4	-.48*	.32*	4	.35*	.34*
5	.61*	.56*	5	.37*	.47*
6	.77*	.65*	6	.68*	.46*
7	-.34*	.19	7	-.10	.28
8	-.49*	.23	8	-.67*	-.40*
9	.52*	.46*	9	-.43*	.28
10	.42*	.38*	10	.79*	.44*
11	-.36*	.16	11	.14	.29
12	-.02	.52*	12	.36*	.71*

Total N=1321

\*asterisk by a number indicates that the factor loaded at .30 or greater.

TABLE V  
 SCALED ITEMS AND THEIR FACTORS ON SELF-VIEW  
 AND PREDICTING OTHER IN THE  
 FOUR VALUE AREAS

Comm. items	Self View	Predict other	Child rearing items	Self view	Predict other
1	-.79*	-.64*	1	.48*	.45*
2	-.80*	-.32*	4	.85*	.64*
3	-.42*	-.55*	5	-.87*	-.33*
4	.49*	.58*	7	.67*	-.33*
8	.63*	.58*	8	.34*	-.68*
9	.83*	.80*	9	-.57*	.57*
10	.58*	.43*	11	-.51*	.48*
11	.78*	.65*	12	.49*	-.55*
12	-.47*	.50*			

  

Econ. items	Self view	Predict other	Sex. items	Self view	Predict other
3	.71*	.63*	1	.48*	.67*
4	.52*	.72*	2	-.30*	.70*
5	.70*	.40*	4	.46*	.44*
8	.83*	.54*	6	.74*	.52*
9	.63*	.55*	8	.47*	-.43*
10	-.41*	.26	10	.75*	.38*
			12	.47*	.70*

Total N = 1321

\*asterisk by a number indicates that the item loaded at  
 .30 or better.

The other issue of validity in this study concerns the validity of the measurement of generational disagreement. The measurement used to score disagreement is based on the variation between how each generation scored a particular item. There is a problem with this method of measurement, as the difference between disagree somewhat and agree somewhat may be greater than the differences between disagree strongly and disagree somewhat or agree strongly and agree somewhat. This does cause some problems in the validity of the measure. However, alternative methods of measurement also had problems. For example, if the scale had been collapsed so that the only differences were between agree and disagree, the ability to gauge items right could be explained by chance alone and therefore, there would still be problems with the validity of the findings. Scoring the scales so that the different variations between items received different scores would also prove to be inadequate in its validity. Therefore, this method was chosen as it was thought to be the best of the possible measures.

Issues Concerning Reliability. Issues of reliability were also of concern in conducting this study. Efforts were made to improve the reliability of the study by using the same instrument to measure attitudes in both time periods, coding and scoring the instrument the same over both time periods. In addition, the 1985 data was all coded by this researcher in order to insure continuity. Checks were made on both the coding and tabulation of the items so that error

resulting in unreliability was minimized. Problems in reliability of coding could result from the fact that keypunchers were used to code the 1972 data and data for 1985 was coded by the researcher, however as the coding in both instances was taken directly from the questionnaire, this problem is minimal.

Additional safeguards for reliability were made in this study. Reliability of the concept areas is dealt with by including several similar statements aimed at measuring each concept. Lazarsfeld (1955) discusses the interchangeability of indexes as a measure of reliability. As the original scale and the shortened factored version of the original scale represent slightly different indexes of the value areas, it was decided that both the original scale and the shortened scale would be used in measuring results on generational continuity. In addition, generational continuity in the four value areas is measured by both similarity and ability of each generation to gauge the other's attitude. Similar results across both of these dimensions of continuity strengthen reliability.

There are some other problems with reliability in this study. First, no test-retest method was utilized to examine the reliability of the measure over time. It is hoped that the use of the two scales of measurement will offset this problem somewhat. In addition, the word 'he' is used as a referent in several of the questions. The issue of male

language referents was not a problem when the 1972 data was collected; however, it has become an issue since that time. This could possibly represent a problem in reliability in the study as the reaction to the word 'he' might make a difference in how people responded to the question in 1972 and 1985. No comment was made to the researcher about this referent during the course of the study, however, so this issue may not be a problem.

### Method Of Data Analyses

This last section gives a description of the statistical tests used to analyze the data. Two types of statistical tests were used in this research. First, several analyses of variance were used to test each of the hypotheses. Second, a factor analysis was run to examine overall differences between the various groups studied.

#### The Analyses of Variance

Analysis of variance is a statistical test which can examine the influence not only of several variables individually, but also the interaction between various independent variables on the dependent variables. Because of this advantage, analysis of variance was used to measure the influence of the variables of time, gender of child, gender of parent, educational level of mother, and maternal employment on generational continuity. A discussion of the

use of AOV for each of the hypotheses and sub-hypotheses follows.

First, Hypothesis 1a which concerns the changes over time in the similarity of mother-student dyads and in the ability of both mothers and students to gauge each other's attitudes. A one-way AOV by year was run on both the original scales and the shortened scales on this hypothesis.

Hypothesis 1b was concerned with the changes in opinion between the mothers in the 1972 and 1985 sample, and the changes in opinion of students in the 1972 and 1985 sample. A one-way AOV on all items for each generational group was run by year in order to examine this hypothesis.

Hypothesis 1c is concerned with the influence of gender of child, education of mother, and maternal employment on the differences in similarity between generations and their ability to gauge each other's attitudes at the two time periods. Multiple AOVs based on year, gender of child, employment of mother and educational level of mother were run for both the original scales and the shortened scales.

Hypothesis 2a was concerned with the influence of the parent's gender on the generation gap. As data for both parents were collected in 1985 only, this data set was the only one used in this analysis. Here a one-way AOV was run based on gender of the parent for the two scales to compare both similarity between generations as well as ability of each generation to gauge the other generation's attitudes.

Hypothesis 2b was concerned with whether gender of parent or generational differences was the most influential in the gap. A one-way AOV by dyads (mother-father, mother-child, and father-child) was run on the similarity between the dyads for both scales. Again, comparisons could only be made on the 1985 data set as the 1972 set did not collect information from fathers.

### The Factor Analysis

In addition to the AOVs, Factor Analysis was also used to examine this data set. First, Factor Analysis was used as a check for validity as described earlier in this chapter. A Factor Analysis was also run for the four value areas on all items based on year of study, self-view and view of others, gender of parent, and generational membership. This was to compare the conceptions of the four value areas for all of the above mentioned items in order to further test all of the hypotheses.

### Summary

This study is based on the life-span developmental model. The study examined both the influence of time on generational continuity as well as the influence of gender of parent on generational continuity. In addition, other variables of gender of student, education level of mother, and maternal employment were used to study generational continuity over time. The study, which is a cohort analysis,

used the two-process approach that examines both similarity between generations as well as the ability of each generation to gauge the attitudes of the other generation. Data from mothers and their college students in 1972, and mothers, their college students, and fathers were used in the 1985 study. The survey instrument contains value statements in four areas--sexuality, community, childrearing, and economics which are measured using both the original scale and a shortened scale. In order to analyze the data, two different statistical measures, Analysis Of Variance and Factor Analysis were used. The results obtained from this study will be presented in the next chapter.

## CHAPTER V

### RESULTS OF STUDY

The previous chapters have presented the theory base, literature base, and methodology used in this study. This chapter presents the results of this study beginning first with Hypothesis 1 and its three sub-hypotheses. This set of hypotheses is concerned with the generational continuity over time. The chapter will address Hypothesis 2 and its two sub-hypotheses. This set of hypotheses is concerned with the influence of parental gender and generational continuity. In addition, this chapter presents findings concerning patterns in the four value areas which denote that value area as a specific source of concern in the study of generational continuity.

#### Generational Continuity Over Time

The first hypothesis is: If similar cohorts of college students and their mothers for the years 1972 and 1985 are examined, historical time will be significant in accounting for changes in generational perceptions. In order to test this hypothesis, it was divided into three sub-areas for testing. This section will take each of these sub-

hypotheses and examine the analyses for each of the sub-hypotheses.

### Hypothesis 1a

Hypothesis 1a states: There will be a difference in how well students and their mothers gauge each other's attitudes and how similar they are based on the year of the study. Two analyses were performed to test this hypothesis. The first used the original twelve item scale for each of the four value areas (sexuality, community, economics, childrearing). The other analysis used the shortened scales resulting from the loadings of the factor analysis.

To compare the ability of mothers and their children to gauge each other's responses in the four value areas, as well as their similarity in the four value areas for the original twelve item scales, means and the F values were calculated (see Table VI).

The first mean, 16.79, indicates the amount of difference between the mother's attitudes in the area of community and their children's gauging of their attitude. The mean could have ranged from 0 for a perfect match over all 12 items to 36 for the maximum difference of 3 over all 12 items (i.e. strongly disagree is 4, strongly agree is 1, 4-1=3). For this study an error rate was calculated by dividing the mean by the maximum score possible (i.e., 16.79/36) resulting in a range of values where total agreement=0.00 and total disagreement=1.00. The youth in 1972 had an error

TABLE VI

MEANS AND F-SCORES BY YEAR ON GENERATIONAL ANTICIPATION  
OF VALUES AND GENERATIONAL SIMILARITY--LONG SCALES

	1972 N=369	1985 N=193	F-Scores
<u>youth gauges</u>			
<u>mother</u>			
Community	16.79	10.16	460.23*
Childrearing	14.63	8.71	393.79*
Economics	13.35	9.76	141.49*
Sexuality	13.92	10.80	90.86*
<u>Total</u>	<u>57.96</u>	<u>39.36</u>	<u>609.23*</u>
<u>mother gauges</u>			
<u>youth</u>			
Community	15.30	10.61	219.94*
Childrearing	13.04	9.85	119.42*
Economics	12.78	10.47	52.52*
Sexuality	14.11	10.92	99.12*
<u>Total</u>	<u>55.11</u>	<u>41.27</u>	<u>270.48*</u>
<u>mother and</u>			
<u>youth agree</u>			
Community	15.32	10.62	232.29*
Childrearing	13.99	9.17	282.70*
Economics	13.15	9.79	105.79*
Sexuality	15.67	10.98	202.93*
<u>Total</u>	<u>57.84</u>	<u>40.13</u>	<u>435.17*</u>

Means indicate amount of difference between each generation's answers. Lower means indicate more accuracy.

\*Asterisk indicates the F-Score was significant at greater than .05.

rate of .47 in gauging their mother's attitudes. The mean 16.79 is the highest mean in the table for the single value areas. The lowest mean, 8.71, indicates that young adult children in 1985 had an error rate of .24 in gauging their mother's attitudes in the area of childrearing.

The F-scores for the ability of the youths to gauge their mother's attitudes, the ability of mothers to gauge their children's attitudes, and the similarity between mothers and their children in the four value areas as well as the total were all significant at a .05 alpha level. In addition, all differences were in the same direction, with the 1985 mother-child dyads having both a better rate of gauging each other's attitudes as well as being more similar to each other than the 1972 mother-child dyads.

The second analysis compared the ability of mothers and their children to gauge each other's responses in the four value areas, as well as their similarity in the four value areas for the shortened factored scales. The means and the F-values for this analysis can be found in Table VII. As each of the four scales had a different number of items, the total possible number for maximum disagreement differs for each area. The shortened community scale had a total of nine items giving a maximum disagreement of 27. The child-rearing scale had eight items giving total possible disagreement a score of 24. The economic scale had six items giving the total possible amount of disagreement a score of

TABLE VII

MEANS AND F-SCORES BY YEAR ON GENERATIONAL ANTICIPATION  
OF VALUES AND GENERATIONAL SIMILARITY--SHORT SCALES

	1972 N=369	1985 N=193	F-Scores
<u>-----</u>			
youth gauges			
<u>mother</u>			
Community (27)	14.40	7.53	630.35*
Childrearing (24)	10.73	5.32	543.03*
Economics (18)	7.84	5.02	170.15*
Sexuality (21)	8.59	6.73	62.62*
<u>Total (92)</u>	<u>41.27</u>	<u>24.49</u>	<u>925.58*</u>
mother gauges			
<u>youth</u>			
Community (27)	11.80	7.77	240.80*
Childrearing (24)	9.02	6.27	144.78*
Economics (18)	6.52	4.95	55.78*
Sexuality (21)	8.49	6.48	59.21*
<u>Total (92)</u>	<u>35.67</u>	<u>25.18</u>	<u>332.51*</u>
mother and			
<u>youth agree</u>			
Community (27)	12.40	7.83	277.45*
Childrearing (24)	10.12	5.66	394.25*
Economics (18)	7.96	4.63	247.02*
Sexuality (21)	10.95	7.83	156.20*
<u>Total (92)</u>	<u>41.38</u>	<u>25.01</u>	<u>679.00*</u>

Means indicate amount of differences between each generation's answers. Lower means indicate more accuracy. Numbers in parentheses indicate the maximum value a mean could be if both generations scored the items the same.

\*Asterisk indicates the F-Score was significant at greater than .05.

18. The sexuality scale had seven items which gave the total possible disagreement a value of 21.

The largest mean on the table, 14.40, indicates that youth in the the 1972 sample had an error rate of .53 in gauging their mother's responses on the community items. The mean which had the lowest error rate, .22, is 5.32 for the 1985 youth's ability to gauge their mother's responses on the childrearing scale.

Again, the F-scores for all four value areas as well as the total value areas on both similarity between generations and ability of each generation to gauge the other's attitudes were significant at a .05 alpha level. In addition, all differences were still in the same direction, with the 1985 mother-child dyads having both a better rate of gauging each other's attitudes as well as being more similar to each other than the 1972 mother-child dyads.

Both the original scale and the shortened factor scale gave the same results and showed the same pattern of variation among the means. All value areas were significant, so no value area was singled out as more critical than the others. Support was found in both analyses for hypothesis 1a. In addition, differences in generational views and ability to gauge the other generation had an error rate of at least .22 in both scales.

#### Hypothesis 1b

Hypothesis 1b states: In comparing the opinions of

students in 1972 and 1985, and the opinions of mothers in 1972 and 1985, significant differences should be found in their opinions based on the year studied. First, an analysis of the students for 1972 and 1985 was done on all items. Next, an analysis for mothers in 1972 and 1985 was conducted on all items.

The F-scores and means for all items in each value area for students in 1972 and 1985 can be found in Table VIII. A mean value below 2.5 indicates that the students tended to disagree with the value statement, while a mean value above 2.5 indicates that the students tended to agree with the value statement.

In looking at the differences on the community items, the opinions of students in 1972 and in 1985 were significant at an alpha level of .05 for eleven out of the twelve items. The one item that was not significant is item four which reads "A person is not a whole person until he has put down roots somewhere." The opinions of students on eight of the items, including item 1 (F=9.47), item 2 (F=9.17), item 3 (F=26.46), item 7 (F=20.45), item 8 (F= 18.63), item 9 (F=11.19), item 10 (F=4.19), and item 11 (F=4.80) indicated that the students in 1985 held more traditional views in this area than students in 1972. Exceptions to this trend were observed three times with item 5 (F=3.91), item 6 (F=4.98), and item 12 (F=59.45). Here, students in 1972 held more traditional views than the students in 1985. Items were seen as traditional or non traditional based on

face content analysis of items. A copy of the specific value items can be found in Appendix E.

When examining childrearing items, opinions of students in 1972 and 1985 were significantly different at an alpha level of .05 for seven of the twelve items. Items that were not significant were item 2, "Children learn best under stress," item 6, "How to live as an adult can best be taught in our homes," item 7, "We should worry about boys who play with dolls," item 8, "Permissive parents produce spoiled unruly children," and item 11, "An unhappy child indicates a parent that is incapable of love." In examining the items which were significant based on year, the means of student's opinions in 1972 and 1985 on four items, item 1 ( $F=15.47$ ), item 3 ( $F=14.93$ ), item 4 ( $F=5.00$ ), and item 9 ( $F=10.73$ ), indicated that students in 1985 were the more traditional, while the means of student's opinions on three items, item 5 ( $F=12.83$ ), item 10 ( $F=42.88$ ), and item 12 ( $F=13.01$ ), would indicate that the students in 1972 were more traditional in their views.

The economic items were significantly different at an alpha level of .05 on student's opinions based on year for nine out of the twelve items. The items which were not significant by year were item 2, "Money can buy anything or anybody," item 4, "A proud husband would keep his wife from seeking outside employment," and item 11, "A person should always spend all that he has and a little more too." When examining the items where the differences between the means

face content analysis of items. A copy of the specific value items can be found in Appendix E.

When examining childrearing items, opinions of students in 1972 and 1985 were significantly different at an alpha level of .05 for seven of the twelve items. Items that were not significant were item 2, "Children learn best under stress," item 6, "How to live as an adult can best be taught in our homes," item 7, "We should worry about boys who play with dolls," item 8, "Permissive parents produce spoiled unruly children," and item 11, "An unhappy child indicates a parent that is incapable of love." In examining the items which were significant based on year, the means of student's opinions in 1972 and 1985 on four items, item 1 ( $F=15.47$ ), item 3 ( $F=14.93$ ), item 4 ( $F=5.00$ ), and item 9 ( $F=10.73$ ), indicated that students in 1985 were the more traditional, while the means of student's opinions on three items, item 5 ( $F=12.83$ ), item 10 ( $F=42.88$ ), and item 12 ( $F=13.01$ ), would indicate that the students in 1972 were more traditional in their views.

The economic items were significantly different at an alpha level of .05 on student's opinions based on year for nine out of the twelve items. The items which were not significant by year were item 2, "Money can buy anything or anybody," item 4, "A proud husband would keep his wife from seeking outside employment," and item 11, "A person should always spend all that he has and a little more too." When examining the items where the differences between the means

TABLE VIII  
 MEANS AND F-SCORES FOR STUDENTS ON ALL ITEMS BY YEAR

Community items	1972 N=369	1985 N=217	F-Scores	Childrearing items	1972 N=369	1985 N=217	F-Scores
1	1.81	1.60	9.47*	1	1.79	2.00	15.47*
2	1.81	1.60	9.17*	2	1.95	1.95	0.00
3	1.43	1.75	26.46*	3	2.10	1.83	14.93*
4	2.17	2.03	3.13	4	3.52	3.39	5.00*
5	3.30	3.17	3.91*	5	1.50	1.30	12.83*
6	2.44	2.64	4.89*	6	2.50	2.43	.89
7	2.59	2.25	20.45*	7	2.92	3.00	1.05
8	2.34	2.73	18.63*	8	3.09	3.03	.74
9	2.01	3.03	11.19*	9	1.72	1.51	10.73*
10	2.24	2.10	4.19*	10	2.67	2.22	42.80*
11	2.95	3.13	4.80*	11	1.91	1.93	.00
12	2.99	2.39	59.45*	12	3.70	3.49	13.01*

Economic items	1972 N=369	1985 N=217	F-Scores	Sexuality items	1972 N=369	1985 N=217	F-Scores
1	1.83	2.02	7.48*	1	3.19	3.53	25.86*
2	1.44	1.50	.93	2	2.17	2.37	5.92*
3	2.14	1.61	63.73*	3	1.71	1.01	1.55
4	3.07	3.11	.29	4	2.40	2.10	11.50*
5	1.70	2.00	19.37*	5	2.28	2.31	.17
6	2.12	1.32	126.97*	6	2.66	2.60	.48
7	1.97	2.35	21.24*	7	1.83	1.73	1.16
8	2.14	2.39	8.86*	8	2.38	2.12	10.59*
9	1.87	1.71	4.61*	9	1.73	1.64	1.53
10	2.54	2.19	16.79*	10	3.39	3.11	20.19*
11	1.89	1.99	2.11	11	2.10	1.78	12.16*
12	1.72	2.09	21.16*	12	2.34	2.35	.03

Total N=586

\*asterisk by a number indicates that the f-Score is significant at .05

Means indicate the amount of agreement with statement. Lower means indicate more accuracy.

of the two groups of students were significant, seven items, item 1 ( $F=7.48$ ), item 5 ( $F=19.37$ ), item 6 ( $F=121.24$ ), item 7 ( $F=21.24$ ), item 8 ( $F=8.86$ ), and item 12 ( $F=21.16$ ) indicated that students in 1985 were more traditional in their views than students in 1972, while three items, item 3 ( $F=63.73$ ), item 9 ( $F=4.61$ ), and item 10 ( $F=16.79$ ) indicated that students in 1972 held the more traditional or conservative view.

Student's opinions from 1972 and 1985 differed least in the area of sexuality. Here, six out of the twelve items were significant at an alpha of .05. The items which were not significant were item 3, "The primary purpose of sex is to have children," item 5, "A person's body is his own. If he wished, he can expose it, enjoy it, or even give it away. It is nobody's business but his own," item 6, "Whether or not a person's morality is good or bad depends upon the situation the person is in at the time," item 7, "Adultery is not a law of God but a law of man," item 9, "If they want to, it is alright for parents to go around the house naked in front of their children," and item 12, "People who engage in sex before marriage are likely to make better marriage partners." In examining the items which were significant at alpha level .05 based on year, the means of the student's scores indicated that students in 1985 answered more traditionally on two items, item 10 ( $F=20.19$ ) and item 11 ( $F=12.16$ ), while students in 1972 answered more traditionally

on four items, item 1 ( $F=25.86$ ), item 2 ( $F=5.92$ ), item 4 ( $F=11.50$ ) and item 8 ( $F=10.59$ ).

In looking at all four value areas, the student's opinions in 1972 and 1985 were significantly different on 33 (69%) of the 48 items. The 1985 sample scored more traditional on 21 items while the 1972 sample scored more traditional on 13 items. In all areas except sexuality, the 1985 sample was the more traditional. It is interesting to note that the 1985 sample believed themselves to be more liberal than the 1972 sample.

The F-scores and means for all items in each value area for mothers in 1972 and 1985 can be found in Table IX. A mean value below 2.5 indicates that the mothers tended to disagree with the value statement, while a mean value above 2.5 indicates that the mothers tended to agree with the value statement.

In looking at the differences on the community items, the opinions of mothers in 1972 and in 1985 were significantly different. The opinions of mothers on seven of the items, including item 1 ( $F=648.52$ ), item 2 ( $F=953.22$ ), item 4 ( $F=78.21$ ), item 8 ( $F=234.22$ ), item 9 ( $F=861.59$ ), item 10 ( $F=209.78$ ), and item 11 ( $F=623.03$ ) indicated that the mothers in 1985 held more traditional views than mothers in 1972. In the cases of responses of mothers to five items, item 3 ( $F=143.10$ ), item 5 ( $F=13.64$ ), item 6 ( $F=38.22$ ), item 7 ( $F=22.86$ ), and item 12 ( $F=219.12$ ), the mothers in 1972 held more traditional views than the mothers in 1985.

TABLE IX  
MEANS AND F-SCORES FOR MOTHERS ON ALL ITEMS BY YEAR

Community items	1972 N=369	1985 N=193	F-Scores	Childrearing items	1972 N=369	1985 N=193	F-Scores
1	3.28	1.51	648.52*	1	1.69	2.69	184.32*
2	3.46	1.30	953.22*	2	1.86	1.82	.17
3	2.40	1.45	143.10*	3	1.69	1.53	5.42*
4	1.39	2.11	78.21*	4	1.37	3.67	1351.45*
5	3.57	3.32	13.64*	5	3.35	1.86	1729.37*
6	1.39	1.81	38.22*	6	2.98	2.95	.14
7	1.90	2.26	22.86*	7	2.07	3.47	338.51*
8	1.36	2.56	234.22*	8	3.59	3.16	48.25*
9	1.34	3.26	861.59*	9	2.31	1.40	178.18*
10	1.16	1.98	209.78*	10	2.30	1.92	22.91*
11	1.37	3.17	623.83*	11	2.41	1.35	191.53*
12	3.27	2.13	219.12*	12	2.96	3.63	88.48*

Economic items	1972 N=369	1985 N=193	F-Scores	Sexuality items	1972 N=369	1985 N=193	F-Scores
1	1.67	1.91	13.80*	1	2.85	3.72	142.93*
2	1.61	1.89	52.49*	2	3.27	1.98	214.84*
3	2.67	1.53	213.48*	3	2.35	1.48	99.68*
4	1.73	2.79	179.85*	4	1.68	2.86	28.87*
5	2.99	1.68	253.41*	5	1.63	1.67	.22
6	3.57	1.48	1019.74*	6	1.85	1.74	167.23*
7	1.63	2.07	33.23*	7	2.17	1.49	76.19*
8	1.63	2.70	170.68*	8	3.47	2.27	237.57*
9	2.49	1.49	153.47*	9	2.67	1.53	229.41*
10	1.64	2.55	138.82*	10	1.29	3.49	1217.68*
11	1.68	1.45	8.82*	11	1.83	1.45	24.42*
12	1.33	1.75	37.79*	12	1.88	1.77	.18

Total N=570

\*asterisk by a number indicates that the f-score is significant at .05

Means indicate the amount of agreement with statement. Lower means indicate more accuracy.

Traditional and liberal were determined by a face analysis of the content of the item. Again, specific value items can be found in Appendix E.

When examining childrearing items, opinions of mothers in 1972 and 1985 were significantly different at an alpha level of .05 for ten of the twelve items. Items that were not significantly different are item 2, "Children learn best under stress," and item 6, "How to live as an adult can best be taught in our homes." In examining the items which were significantly different based on year, the means of mother's opinions in 1972 and 1985 on six items, item 1 ( $F=184.32$ ), item 3 ( $F= 5.42$ ), item 4 ( $F=1351.35$ ), item 7 ( $F=330.51$ ), item 9 ( $F=178.18$ ) and item 12 ( $F=80.48$ ), indicated that mothers in 1985 are the more traditional, while the means of mother's opinions on four items, item 5 ( $F=1729.37$ ), item 8 ( $F=40.25$ ), item 10 ( $F=22.91$ ), and item 11 ( $F=191.53$ ) indicated that the mothers in 1972 were more traditional in their views.

The economic items are significantly different on all twelve items on mother's opinions based on year. In examining the differences between the means of the two groups of mothers on the items, six items, item 1 ( $F=13.80$ ), item 4 ( $F=179.85$ ), item 7 ( $F=33.23$ ), item 8 ( $F=170.68$ ), item 10 ( $F=138.82$ ) and item 12 ( $F=37.79$ ), indicated that mothers in 1985 were more traditional in their views than mothers in 1972, while six items, item 2 ( $F=52.49$ ), item 3 ( $F=213.48$ ), item 5 ( $F=253.41$ ), item 6 ( $F=1019.74$ ), item 9 ( $F=153.47$ ),

and item 11 ( $F=8.02$ ), also indicated that mothers in 1972 held the more traditional or conservative view.

Mother's opinions in 1972 and 1985 were significantly different at an alpha level of .05 on ten of the twelve value statements in the area of sexuality. The items which were not significant were item 5, "A person's body is his own. If he wished, he can expose it, enjoy it, or even give it away. It is nobody's business but his own," and item 12, "People who engage in sex before marriage are likely to make better marriage partners." In examining the items which were significantly different at alpha .05 based on year, the means of the mother's scores indicated that mothers in 1985 answered more traditionally on five items, item 2 ( $F=214.84$ ), item 4 ( $F=20.07$ ), item 7 ( $F=76.19$ ), item 9 ( $F=229.41$ ) and item 11 ( $F=24.42$ ) while mothers in 1972 also answered more traditionally on five items, item 1 ( $F=142.93$ ), item 3 ( $F=99.68$ ), item 6 ( $F=167.23$ ), item 8 ( $F=237.57$ ), and item 10 ( $F=1217.68$ ).

In examining all the value items, there were significant differences in mother's opinion based on year for 44 (92%) of the 48 value statements. In addition, the F-scores for mothers were much higher than then F-scores in the analysis of the students, meaning that the mothers were more different, but there was no pattern between the means of the mothers in 1972 and 1985 on the traditionality of their views.

Both the examination of student's opinions in 1972 and 1985 and mother's opinions in 1972 and 1985 indicated that the year was significant in determining the differences of opinion between the groups. Both of these analyses gave support to hypothesis 1b.

#### Hypothesis 1c

Hypothesis 1c states: Gender of child, educational level of mother, and maternal employment status on generational continuity should be found significant in influencing generational similarity and attitude prediction, but not as influential as the year of study. Two analyses were performed to test this hypotheses. One of the analyses used the original twelve item scale for each of the four value areas. The other analyses used the shortened scale.

The first analysis examined the influence of the variables of gender of child, educational level of mother, employment of mother, and year of study on the ability of mothers and their children to gauge each other's responses in the four value areas, as well as on their similarity in the four value areas for the original twelve item scales. The F-scores for this analysis can be found in Table X.

All comparisons by year were significant. The results of these significances have already been presented in the discussion of hypothesis 1a.

Out of the 210 remaining comparison, eight (4%) comparisons were significant at an alpha level of .05.

TABLE X

F-SCORES BY YEAR, EDUCATION AND EMPLOYMENT OF MOTHER,  
AND SEX OF CHILD ON GENERATIONAL ANTICIPATION  
OF VALUES AND GENERATIONAL SIMILARITY  
LONG SCALE

---

Ind. Var.	Mother Anticipates Youth				Total
	Comm.	Sex.	Econ.	Rearing	
Year	221.05*	97.59*	51.50*	119.59*	265.12*
Education	.49	.00	.20	.01	.29
Work of mom	3.42	4.25*	.51	1.46	2.81
Sex	.01	.50	.41	9.43*	.16
Year x Ed	.04	.06	.27	.03	.25
Year x Sex	3.60	.00	.66	3.14	2.83
Year x Work	.68	.26	.23	1.55	1.14
Ed x Sex	.48	2.12	.96	.01	.00
Ed x Work	.96	.44	.00	.02	.19
Sex x Work	.01	.49	.73	2.55	.74
Y x Ed x Sex	1.10	.15	.56	.64	.17
Y x Ed x Work	.98	.30	3.22	2.52	.68
Y x Sex x Work	1.11	.49	.04	.03	.08
Ed x Sex x W	3.01	1.38	.33	2.37	.05
Four Variables	.18	.02	.11	1.60	1.19

---

Ind. Var.	Youth Anticipates Mother				Total
	Comm.	Sex.	Econ.	Rearing	
Year	448.92*	90.07*	140.51*	389.01*	596.52*
Education	.15	1.91	.39	.11	1.51
Work of mom	.36	.11	.03	.07	.27
Sex	.17	.02	1.93	.00	.00
Year x Ed	.05	.45	1.55	.25	.01
Year x Sex	.16	.38	.11	.83	.28
Year x Work	.03	.10	1.54	3.06	.32
Ed x Sex	.90	.12	.50	.18	.14
Ed x Work	.00	3.94*	1.17	.00	.04
Sex x Work	.08	.05	.01	1.37	.39
Y x Ed x Sex	.04	.11	1.31	.74	.11
Y x Ed x Work	.79	.00	.20	.04	.78
Y x Sex x Work	.15	.33	.17	.41	.36
Ed x Sex x W	.19	.00	1.18	.65	.02
Four Variables	.08	.82	5.64	.03	3.98*

---

\*Asterisk indicates the F-Score was significant at greater than .05.

TABLE X (Continued)

Ind. Var.	Youth and Mother Agree				Total
	Comm.	Sex.	Econ.	Rearing	
Year	230.80*	199.25*	106.38*	275.35*	427.64*
Education	2.37	.07	.41	.51	.22
Work of mom	.59	1.32	.20	.04	.18
Sex	2.28	2.06	9.00*	.00	6.71*
Year x Ed	2.17	1.93	.91	3.65	.23
Year x Sex	4.56*	2.68	.14	.78	1.23
Year x Work	.35	.15	.10	.02	.03
Ed x Sex	.95	2.19	.50	.03	.11
Ed x Work	.79	.47	.83	.03	.08
Sex x Work	.00	.15	.58	.54	.03
Y x Ed x Sex	.41	.07	.21	.01	.05
Y x Ed x Work	.01	.08	.08	.11	.17
Y x Sex x Work	.05	.09	2.45	.78	.11
Ed x Sex x W	2.56	.06	4.66*	.09	.17
Four Variables	.04	.34	.86	.16	1.92

\*Asterisk indicates the F-Score was significant at greater than .05.

These could have been by chance alone. On mother's anticipation of youth, employment of mother was significant for sexuality items ( $F=4.25$ ). Non-employed mothers knew their children better than employed mothers. Gender of child was also significant on childrearing ( $F=9.43$ ). Mothers knew their sons better than their daughters. On youth's anticipation of mother, the interaction of education and work was significant on sexuality items ( $F=3.94$ ). Mothers who had a high school education or less and were working are gauged better by their children than other mothers. A significant difference was also found on the total score for all four areas when all four variables interacted together. Similarity between mother and youth showed significant differences by sex on the economic items ( $F=9.00$ ) and the total for all items in the four value areas ( $F=6.71$ ). Here daughters knew their mothers best in both areas. The interaction of year and sex was significant on community items ( $F=4.56$ ) with 1985 daughters being more similar to their mothers than the other groups. The interaction of education, employment and gender was also significant ( $F=4.66$ ) on the economic items.

Mean scores for the significant single variables can be found in Table XV in Appendix G and mean scores for the significant interactions can be found in Table XVI in Appendix G. As there were so few significances (8 out of a possible 210 or 3.8%), the differences could be a result of chance. The totals are not independent measures, however,

and if they are excluded, the 4.8% of the comparisons are significant. Gender of the child was significant alone or in interaction with the other variables in six of the eight comparisons, therefore, gender appears to be important, after year, in explaining generational differences.

The second analysis examined the influence of the variables of gender of child, educational level of mother, maternal employment and year of study on the ability of mothers and their children to gauge each other's responses in the four value areas, as well as on their similarity in the four value areas for the factored item scales. The F-scores for this analysis can be found in Table XI.

Again, in the analysis of the shortened scales, all comparisons for year alone were significant. As these results were discussed previously under hypothesis 1a, they will not be repeated here.

Out of the 210 remaining comparisons, six (or 3%) of the other variables were significant at .05 or with the total values excluded, 4.1% of the other variables were significant. In both cases, the significant comparisons are less than expected by chance alone. When examining mother's anticipation of youth, maternal employment was significant on the total score ( $F=3.88$ ) with unemployed mothers gauging their children better than employed mothers. Gender of child on the childrearing items ( $F=17.19$ ) was also significant with mothers gauging their sons better than their daughters. Last, the interaction of year and sex were

TABLE XI

F-SCORES BY YEAR, EDUCATION AND EMPLOYMENT OF MOTHER,  
AND SEX OF CHILD ON GENERATIONAL ANTICIPATION  
OF VALUES AND GENERATIONAL SIMILARITY  
SHORT SCALE

Ind. Var.	Mother Anticipates Youth				
	Comm.	Sex.	Econ.	Rearing	Total
Year	242.11*	59.62*	55.27*	144.79*	329.55*
Education	.03	.04	.50	.42	.51
Work of mom	2.79	3.08	1.17	1.04	3.88*
Sex	.37	2.27	3.48	17.19*	.73
Year x Ed	.00	3.18	.36	.00	1.24
Year x Sex	5.89*	1.77	.28	1.37	.91
Year x Work	.45	1.11	1.10	.41	1.49
Ed x Sex	.09	.00	.76	.03	.24
Ed x Work	.05	2.45	.10	.13	.01
Sex x Work	.12	.54	.04	2.10	.70
Y x Ed x Sex	.33	1.97	2.99	.31	.75
Y x Ed x Work	.12	.30	1.21	1.40	.69
Y x Sex x Work	.81	.00	.47	.00	.19
Ed x Sex x W	2.09	.00	.27	.28	1.13
Four Variables	.02	.91	.01	.86	.63

  

Ind. Var.	Youth Anticipates Mother				
	Comm.	Sex.	Econ.	Rearing	Total
Year	623.06*	61.85*	168.66*	536.56*	910.33*
Education	.02	.78	.78	1.31	1.59
Work of mom	.06	1.36	.16	.44	.00
Sex	.01	.05	.00	.02	.58
Year x Ed	.00	.01	.49	.32	.03
Year x Sex	.05	.13	2.53	.02	.02
Year x Work	.13	.79	1.30	.81	.62
Ed x Sex	.04	.53	.15	.47	1.17
Ed x Work	.02	7.18*	1.14	.42	.24
Sex x Work	.29	.03	1.15	1.90	.62
Y x Ed x Sex	1.46	.06	.13	1.24	.05
Y x Ed x Work	1.31	.01	1.29	.71	.52
Y x Sex x Work	.31	.39	.57	.00	.00
Ed x Sex x W	2.29	.03	.85	1.30	.36
Four Variables	.04	.32	1.75	.00	1.72

\*Asterisk indicates the F-Score was significant at greater than .05.

TABLE XI (Continued)

Ind. Var.	Youth and Mother Agree				Total
	Comm.	Sex.	Econ.	Rearing	
Year	277.70*	156.18*	246.16*	385.39*	657.73*
Education	.55	.04	.62	.09	.01
Work of mom	.31	3.10	.47	1.21	.05
Sex	.69	6.29*	.91	.28	1.40
Year x Ed	1.97	3.10	.47	3.07	.08
Year x Sex	8.26*	2.68	.61	.60	.00
Year x Work	.26	1.48	.20	.29	.46
Ed x Sex	.14	2.32	.37	.01	.50
Ed x Work	.11	3.49	.13	.01	.08
Sex x Work	.17	.06	3.32	.93	.00
Y x Ed x Sex	1.67	.47	.36	.92	.37
Y x Ed x Work	.09	.00	.02	.02	.08
Y x Sex x Work	.35	.27	1.98	1.70	.00
Ed x Sex x W	3.32	.01	2.90	.45	.29
Four Variables	.09	.16	.42	.20	.74

\*Asterisk indicates the F-Score was significant at greater than .05.

significant, with mothers gauging their 1985 daughters better than mothers gauging of children in the other groups.

When looking at variables other than year that were significant on youth's ability to gauge mother, only one comparison gave significance. The interaction of education and work was significant ( $F=7.18$ ) on sexuality items with employed mothers who had a high school education or less being gauged less well by their children than other mothers.

Similarity of youth and mothers had two comparisons other than year alone where  $F$ -values were significant. Gender of child was significant on the sexuality items ( $F=6.29$ ) with daughters being more similar to their mothers than sons. The interaction of year and gender of child was also significant on community items ( $F=8.26$ ) with sons in 1985 being more similar to their mothers than other groups. As there were so few significances (6 out of 210 or 3%) and there was no pattern of significances on these variables, the significances could result from chance. Four of the six significances did have gender of child for at least one of the significant variables, however, so children's gender could possibly be an influential factor in generational continuity. Means for the single variables can be found in Table XV, while means for interactions can be found in Table XVI. Both of these tables are in Appendix G.

The analyses of both the original scale and the shortened scale gave very similar results. The few differences that did occur between the two analyses could

have occurred by chance. In both analyses, there was little support found for hypothesis 1c that other variables were influential in generational continuity. The year of study is the variable that accounted for most of the changes in generational similarity and ability of each generation to gauge responses of the other generation.

#### Gender of Parent and the Generation Gap

The second hypothesis reads: The gender of the parent is an important influence in generational similarity and ability of each generation to gauge the attitudes of the other generation. The second hypothesis was divided into two sub-hypotheses. This section will examine the results of the analyses for the two sub-hypothesis. The analysis was over the 1985 sample only.

#### Hypothesis 2a

Hypothesis 2a states: There should be significant differences between similarity and ability to gauge attitudes between mothers and their children and fathers and their children, with mothers and children being more similar and better able to predict each other's attitudes than fathers and their children. Two analyses were again conducted one with the original scales and the other with short scales.

The first analysis examined the ability of each gender of parent to gauge the attitude of their children, be gauged

TABLE XII

MEANS AND F-SCORES BY SEX OF PARENT ON GENERATIONAL  
ANTICIPATION OF VALUES AND GENERATIONAL  
SIMILARITY--LONG SCALES

	Mothers N=193	Fathers N=173	F-Scores
<u>youth gauges</u>			
<u>parent</u>			
Community	10.16	10.73	2.36
Childrearing	8.71	9.64	6.78*
Economics	11.08	13.03	26.54*
Sexuality	10.80	11.16	.80
<u>Total</u>	<u>40.98</u>	<u>44.31</u>	<u>10.70*</u>
<u>parent gauges</u>			
<u>youth</u>			
Community	10.61	11.27	2.94
Childrearing	9.85	10.21	1.00
Economics	10.86	10.95	.06
Sexuality	10.92	11.05	.13
<u>Total</u>	<u>41.65</u>	<u>43.31</u>	<u>2.68</u>
<u>parent &amp; youth</u>			
<u>agree</u>			
Community	10.62	10.70	.05
Childrearing	9.17	9.53	1.14
Economics	9.79	10.65	5.62*
Sexuality	10.98	11.28	.56
<u>Total</u>	<u>40.13</u>	<u>41.64</u>	<u>2.03</u>

Means indicate the amount of difference between each generation's answers. As the means decrease, the guess becomes more accurate.

\*Asterisk indicates the F-Score was significant at greater than .05.

in attitude by their children, and their similarity of attitudes with their children on the original four value scales. Results of this analysis is found in Table XII. The highest single mean in the table was 13.03 for youth's ability to gauge father on economic items. In this case, the error rate for youth was .36 on gauging their father's responses. The lowest mean, 8.71 was for youth's ability to gauge mother on childrearing items. The error rate for youth in gauging their mothers was .24.

When examining the F-scores for the ability of each generation to gauge the attitudes of the other generation, and the similarity between the generations, significant differences were found in four of the fifteen (26.7%) comparisons when the total areas are taken into account and three of the twelve (25%) comparisons when total areas are excluded. When examining the ability of youth to gauge their parents attitudes, childrearing ( $F=6.78$ ), economics ( $F=26.54$ ), and total items ( $F=10.70$ ) showed significant differences. In all three cases, youth knew their mothers better than they knew their fathers. The other significant difference was found when examining the similarity between parent and youth on economics ( $F=5.62$ ). Here, mothers were more similar to their children than fathers to their children. Although these were the only differences that were significant in the analysis, the means of mothers were lower than those of the fathers in all fifteen comparisons. This pattern indicated that mothers were better able,

sometimes significantly so, to gauge the attitudes of their young adult children, were gauged better by their young adult children, and were more similar to their young adult children than fathers.

The second analysis looked at generational similarity and ability to gauge attitudes of the other generation in the four value areas based on gender of parent for the shortened factor scales. Results of this analysis can be found in Table XIII.

The short scales have differing number of items in them. The mean that represented the highest single item error rate is 7.98 for fathers and youth similarity on sexuality. Here fathers and their children were dissimilar at a .37 error rate. The mean that represented the lowest differences between generations is 5.32 for youth's ability to gauge their mother's attitude on childrearing. The error rate for youth gauging mothers was .22.

Five of the fifteen (33.3%) comparisons were significant in this analysis when the total areas were considered. Three of the twelve comparisons (25%) were significant when total areas were excluded. Children were able to gauge their mothers better than their fathers on childrearing ( $F=5.46$ ), economics ( $F=39.04$ ), and total areas ( $F=12.09$ ). Mothers were more able than fathers to gauge their children on the overall total ( $F=4.35$ ) and were also more similar to their children on economics ( $F=11.99$ ). In addition to these significant differences, the pattern of the means indicated

TABLE XIII

MEANS AND F-SCORES BY SEX OF PARENT ON GENERATIONAL  
ANTICIPATION OF VALUES AND GENERATIONAL  
SIMILARITY--SHORT SCALES

	Mothers N=193	Fathers N=173	F-Scores
<u>youth gauges</u>			
<u>parent</u>			
Community (27)	7.53	8.06	3.04
Childrearing (24)	5.32	5.95	5.46*
Economics (18)	5.02	6.63	39.04*
Sexuality (21)	7.47	7.65	.34
<u>Total (92)</u>	<u>25.85</u>	<u>28.40</u>	<u>12.09*</u>
<u>parent gauges</u>			
<u>youth</u>			
Community (27)	7.77	8.33	3.24
Childrearing (24)	6.27	6.55	.97
Economics (18)	4.95	5.13	.62
Sexuality (21)	7.31	7.43	.18
<u>Total (92)</u>	<u>25.98</u>	<u>27.46</u>	<u>4.35*</u>
<u>parent &amp; youth</u>			
<u>agree</u>			
Community (27)	7.83	7.83	0.00
Childrearing (24)	5.66	5.74	.10
Economics (18)	4.63	5.43	11.99*
Sexuality (21)	7.83	7.98	.26
<u>Total (92)</u>	<u>26.01</u>	<u>27.39</u>	<u>3.53</u>

Means indicate the amount of difference between each generation's answers. Lower means indicate more accuracy. Number representing greatest possible mean for area is in parenthesis.

\*Asterisk indicates the F-Score was significant at greater than .05.

that mothers are able to gauge their children better, are gauged better by their children, and were more similar to their children than fathers. Only one comparison, parent and youth similarity on community items, showed both parents as being equal in their relationship with their children. In every other case, mothers and children were closer in views and ability to gauge each other than were fathers and children.

The analyses of both the original scales and the short scales gave very similar results. The fluctuation that did occur between the two analyses could have occurred by chance. In both analyses, there was some support found for hypothesis 2a, that is both gender and generation are family gaps, based on the pattern of the means and based on the fact that roughly 30% of the differences were significant. No one area can be specified out as being of a central concern, however, as no pattern of which value areas are significant was detected. Both parents showed an error rate of .22 in gauging attitudes of their children.

#### Hypothesis 2b

Hypothesis 2b states: there should be both generational differences and gender differences when mothers, fathers, and children are examined to see how similar they are in values to each other. Analyses for this hypothesis were conducted on both the original scale and the shortened scale for mother-child, father-child, and

TABLE XIV

MEANS AND F-SCORES BY GENERATION AND SEX  
OF PARENT ON SIMILARITY OF VALUES

	Mother/ Child N=193	Father/ Child N=173	Mother/ Father N=146	F-Scores
<u>Long scale</u>				
Community	10.62	10.71	9.40	7.05*
Childrearing	9.17	9.53	8.10	8.56*
Economics	9.79	10.65	8.59	14.69*
Sexuality	10.98	11.28	9.00	17.48*
Total	40.13	41.64	34.81	20.76*
<u>Short scale</u>				
Community	7.83	8.01	6.91	6.70*
Childrearing	5.66	5.72	4.86	6.90*
Economics	4.63	5.43	4.73	6.61*
Sexuality	7.83	7.98	6.28	19.02*
Total	26.01	25.83	27.39	2.58

Means indicate the amount of difference in the dyads' answers. As the means decrease, the perception becomes more accurate.

\*Asterisk indicates the F-Score was significant at greater than .05.

mother-father similarity. The results of this analysis can be found in Table XIV.

In comparing the original scale items, 11.28 was the largest mean difference for a single variable. The error rate for this mean was .31 for the comparison between father and child in similarity on sexuality. The smallest difference was represented by the mean 8.10. The error rate for this mean was .23 for mother-father similarity on child-rearing. All five of the comparisons on the original scales were significant, Mothers and fathers were most similar in their views, followed by mothers and children, with fathers and children being the least similar.

In looking at the shortened scales, the mean which indicated the greatest dissimilarity was 7.98 for similarity between fathers and their children on sexuality items. The error rate for fathers and their children in similarity is .38. The mean which indicated the greatest similarity was 4.86 for mothers and fathers on their views of childrearing. This mean had an error rate of .20. Four out of the five (80%) comparisons on the shortened scales were significant. There were significant differences on community ( $F=6.70$ ), childrearing ( $F=6.90$ ) and sexuality ( $F=19.02$ ), with mothers and fathers being the most similar in views and fathers and children being the least similar in views. The other significant difference was on the economic scale ( $F=6.61$ ). Here, mothers and children were most similar with fathers and children being the least similar.

Both scales gave similar results and similar patterns although there were some variations. The F values indicate that there were differences between mother-father, mother-child, and father-child similarity. Fathers and their children were the least similar of the dyads, while mothers and fathers were the most similar with the exception of the comparison on economics on the shortened scale. This analysis gave support to hypothesis 2b and indicated that there are both generational differences with mothers and fathers being more similar than parents and children, and gender differences with mothers and children being more similar than fathers and children.

In addition to the AOV's that were computed to test the hypotheses, a factor analysis for all items on all scales separated by year, generation and gender of parent was computed for self view and view of others to see if there was evidence of changes based on generation, gender of parent, and year. Table XVII which is for this analysis can be found in Appendix G. The items which factored to make up the scales for each group in this comparison were different in every case. Only item 11 on community, items 2, 5, and 12 on sexuality, item 7 on childrearing, and items 10, 11, and 12 on economics had factor loadings above .30 across all categories examined. Because of the great variation between years, generation, and gender on what items constituted a scale, further support that differences occur based on generation, gender and year of study was found.

### Summary Of Results

The two main hypotheses, that time is a factor that influences generational continuity, and that gender of parent influences generational continuity found support in these analyses. Strong support was found for three of the sub-hypotheses. These were for 1a (there would be a difference between mothers and children in similarity and ability to gauge each other's attitudes based on year of study), 1b (the opinions of students in 1972 and 1985, and the opinions of mothers in 1972 and 1985 would be different), and 2b (there are both generational and gender differences when mothers, fathers, and children are examined for similarity). Partial support was found for the other two of the sub-hypotheses. There was some support based on the patterns of the means to indicate a gender difference between mothers and fathers in their similarity to their children and in their ability to gauge and be gauged by their children. The smallest support was for the influence of the three variables, gender of child, educational level of mother and maternal employment, on differences in similarity and ability to gauge attitudes between the generations. Some support was found that gender of child might be an influence; however, support was not found that would indicate maternal employment or maternal education level to be an influence. In addition, there was no value area that seemed to be more critical than the others in generational continuity. In utilizing two measures of generational

continuity (the original scale and a shortened scale), both scales gave very similar results suggesting reliability to the results.

## CHAPTER VI

### DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

#### Introduction

The continuity of generations had long been an area that has sparked concern as well as controversy. One theoretical model that has been particularly useful in examining generational continuity is the life-span developmental model. This model integrates previous theory and proposes that three types of time must be taken into consideration when examining the differences between generations. These types of time are developmental time which is concerned itself with differences that result from the developmental stages of the individuals involved, historical time and location which is concerned with the particular time period in which the individual lives as well as differing demographic variables which influence the individual, and the timing and sequencing of individual life course events which is concerned with the family developmental stage that people are in as well as the timing of major life events.

The purpose of this study was to examine generational continuity from the framework of the life-span developmental model. In order to consider the influence of the three

types of time, college-age students and their parents at the same location in two different historical time periods were examined. College students were chosen as they represent the same developmental period (Erikson's intimacy vs. isolation), the same family developmental period (Maccoby's family as launching pad stage), and the same major life event, that of attending college. With individual developmental stage, timing of family stage and a major life event controlled for, the study examined the influence of historical period as well as demographic variables on the degree of generational continuity.

Previous literature concerning the degree of generational continuity in attitudes as well as the factors that influence generational continuity had ambiguous results. The ambiguity stems in part from some of the problems this study addressed, which focused on the measurement of generational continuity. First, there were problems of what to study. Content areas of attitudes differed from study to study, and studies differed on whether they examined similarity between generations, or ability to gauge the attitudes of the other generation, or both. Next, when looking at ability to gauge attitudes, there was a question of whose attitudes to study, parents or their young adult children. A related issue dealt with the gender of those studied. Some studies focused on only one gender in their examination of generational continuity. In addition, most of the previous research examined only one period of time

and did not explore the changes in generational continuity over time. This study hoped to overcome these limitations by examining four different value areas using two forms of each scale, and by using Cashmore's and Goodnow's (1985) two-process approach which examines both generational similarity as well as ability of each generation to gauge the attitude of the other. In addition, gender of parent and child was considered in the study as well as period of time.

The study utilized cohort analysis in order to examine the hypotheses. Surveys were distributed to college students and their mothers in 1972 and college students and both parents in 1985. Students and parents responded to forty-eight value items, first giving their own response, and then the response they believed the other generation would give. Students in 1985 gauged responses for both their mothers and fathers. Results were analyzed on two similar measures for added reliability. Analysis of Variance was used to analyze the data.

The hypothesis and results are as follows:

1. If similar cohorts of college students and their mothers for the years 1972 and 1985 are examined, historical time will be significant in accounting for changes in generational perceptions. This hypothesis was accepted.

- a. There will be a difference in how well students and their mothers gauge each other's attitudes and how similar they are based on the year of study. This hypothesis was

accepted. Year of study was significant on every comparison. Mothers and children in 1985 were more similar and gauged each other better than mothers and children in 1972.

b. In comparing the opinions of students in 1972 and 1985, and the opinions of mothers in 1972 and 1985, significant differences will be found based on the year of study. This hypothesis was accepted. Students in 1972 and 1985 and mothers in 1972 and 1985 were different in their opinions with students in 1985 being more traditional than students in 1972. A consistent direction of differences between the two groups of mothers was not found.

c. When examining the influence of the variables of gender of child, educational level of mother, and maternal employment, these variables will be found significant in influencing generational similarity and attitude prediction, however, will not be as influential as the year of study in influencing generational similarity and attitude prediction. This hypothesis was rejected. There was only weak support for the influence of gender. Support was not found for the influence of the other variables.

2. The gender of the parent is an important influence in generational similarity and ability to gauge attitudes between mothers and their children and fathers and their children. This hypothesis was accepted.

a. There will be significant differences between the similarity and ability to gauge attitudes between mothers

and their children and fathers and their children. This hypothesis is accepted, the pattern of means as well as the significances that were observed support the idea that mothers have more generational continuity with their children than fathers.

b. There will be both generational differences and gender differences when mothers, fathers, and children are examined to see how similar they are in values to each other. This hypothesis was accepted. Significant differences and patterns of means support the ideas that mothers and fathers are more similar than parents and children and that mothers and children are more similar than fathers and children.

This chapter focuses on the results of this study and their implications. The study begins with a discussion of generational continuity and changes resulting from period of time and the implications for this on the theoretical base, and previous research, as well as other implications of the findings. A discussion of the influence of parental gender will follow. Results of parental gender will also focus on implications to theory base and previous literature, as well as other implications of the findings. After discussion of the results is completed, methodological implications, limitations of study, and implications and recommendations for future research will be examined.

## Generational Changes In Historical Time

In examining generational continuity and changes resulting from historical time, three issues are of concern. First, there is the issue of how differences between generational dyads of parents and children are influenced by the period of time. Next, there is the issue of changes by period of time for successive cohorts sharing the same individual developmental stages and family developmental stages, as well as the same major life events. Last, there is the issue of demographic variables and their influence on generational continuity over time. Implications of each of these three areas will be examined in turn.

### Parent-Child Dyads At Different Times

The historical time in which people live has a strong impact on the strength or weakness of generational continuity. In examining the mother-child dyads for 1972 and 1985, the year of study was quite significant in determining their similarity and ability to gauge each other's attitudes. In 1985, mothers and children were much more similar and able to gauge each other's answers than mothers and children in 1972. There are several possible explanations for this phenomena.

One simple explanation for these changes is since historical times are different in their cultural context, they produce varying degrees of generational continuity (see Mannheim, 1972; Bengtson, Furlong, and Laufer, 1974; Buss,

1977; Nash, 1979; Hareven, 1981). This would explain why the results are different for the two periods of time, but offers no explanation as to why children in 1985 should be more similar to their mothers than children in 1972.

Other theories give explanations that may shed a little more light on the problem. One such theory is that of Margaret Mead (1970). Mead proposes that the culture is moving through different developmental periods. At the time she was writing, Mead believed the U. S. culture was in a co-figurative period. In this period, young adults leave the past behind and set their own culture, establishing and learning values, norms, and patterns of activity primarily through association with age peers. This period is a time where generational conflict occurs, and where similarity and ability to gauge attitudes between generations would be lessened. Mead believed the culture would soon be moving from the co-figurative period to a prefigurative period. Here adults learn from their children as well as children learning from adults. If we have indeed become established in the pre-figurative period that may explain why the 1985 dyads were more similar and better able to gauge each other's attitudes than the 1972 dyads.

Hagestad (1981) offers another explanation which could account for the changes in generational continuity from the 1972 and 1985 samples. According to Hagestad, we have entered times of increasing homogeneity between generations.

The homogeneity is due in part to four elements: (1). the increased life-span of individuals due to better medical care which brings about the emergence of long-term generational bonds between adults, (2). the smaller family size where children are spaced closer together, giving families the opportunity to know each other better, (3). living in a time of mass media culture which has the ability to influence vast numbers of individuals irregardless of age or sex which causes more homogeneity in the culture, and (4). the turbulent times since the 1950's leading to increased flexibility of both older and younger age groups so that there are less differences between the ages. Hagestad's hypothesis seems the more plausible in accounting for the changes in generational similarity. It may not be that generations were more similar and able to gauge each other better in 1985 than in 1972 because of increased efforts to bridge generations gaps, but that the 1985 sample was more similar and gauged each other better because there was less diversity and more homogeneity among both parents and children at that period of time. As more homogeneity is experienced in each group as a whole, one would expect the 1985 sample to be show more generational continuity simply because people were less diverse in their views than in 1972.

Several authors have noted that social change occurs when the younger generation makes breaks from the ways of the older generation (Mannheim, 1972; Mead, 1970; Bengtson and Troll, 1978). If Hagestad's theory is valid, a

practical issue then arises. What mix of similarity is enough to transmit essential aspects of culture from generation to generation and allow for flexibility to adapt to changing social conditions? In other words, how much similarity is functional, and where does similarity become dysfunctional for the culture? Concern in the study of generational continuity could further explore this issue and develop theory that would give more explanation of the tension inherent in cultural transmission.

There are other explanations for the changes in generational continuity from the 1972 sample and the 1985 sample. If the culture has become more open and accepting since the early 1970's, it may be that generations now are more open with each other about values that were at one time considered more deviant and kept secret. Another explanation arises from the difference in response rates between the 1972 and 1985 sample. The 1972 sample had a much higher response rate. In 1985, it could be that only parents who shared similarity with their child responded. Those who did not share similarity with their child might be less apt to respond. The 1985 sample may show more similarity only because of the differences in response rate.

The results of this portion of the study is consistent with previous literature. All four studies of generational continuity over time examined in the literature review (Chand, Crider, and Willets, 1975; Roper and Labeff, 1977;

Jennings and Niemi, 1981; Acock and Fuller, 1984) found differences due to historical period. In addition, Roper and Labeff found evidence on increased similarity between young adult children and their parents in 1974 when compared with an earlier sample of parents and children in 1935.

#### Changes By Time Of Successive Age Cohorts

This study suggests that even a difference of a decade can make an impact on attitudinal changes for both the parent generation as well as the young adult student generation. Here, again, support is found for the impact of historical period on what people think and believe.

The issue then arises whether the character of a decade determines the individual attitudes or whether individual attitudes determine the character of the decade or whether individual attitudes and the character are reciprocal in their determination. If it is the times that determine what people think, rather than what people think determining what happens in the times, then it seems that those involved in treating the human ills of society should place more emphasis on correcting cultural conditions and patterns and less emphasis on attempting to change individual attitudes and behavior. If both are influential, then again more emphasis on cultural conditions may be in order.

Previous literature also supports that the socio-cultural influences of the time have an impact on the attitudes and behaviors of people. A study by Felson and

Gottfredson (1984) examined the pattern of activities of adolescents from cohort to cohort. Based on a survey constructing social activity patterns at age 17, Felson and Gottfredson conducted 662 interviews with respondents regarding features of daily life at age 17. They found that activity patterns have changed and that as decades have gone on, adolescents have spent less time in family and household activities. Another study by Gifford (1984) examined the affective meaning of attitudes over seven decades (1920's to 1980's) for seven separate age groups. Gifford found that the emotional character of the individual decades differed significantly for cohorts in the same age brackets.

#### Demographics And Generational Continuity

This study found very little support for the idea that the demographic variables of gender of child, maternal employment and maternal educational level had an effect on generational continuity when time of study was taken into account. This goes against part of the theoretical base of life-span developmental theory (Mannheim, 1972; O'Donnel, 1985) which suggests that life imprints or the various social factors that differ between individual families is significant in determining their views.

The results of this study in this area also contradict some of the previous research while supporting other research. Kirpatrick (1936), Brunswich (1970), and Rapoport (1985) found that educational level of parents was a major

influence on generational differences. This study contradicts these findings, but agrees with the findings of Thomas (1974), who found no influence on generational similarity based on parent's educational level. This study also supports the findings of Rollins and White (1982) that indicate employment does not have a negative effect on the similarity between young adult children and their parents. In addition, this study lends further weight to the studies in the childhood development literature which find no negative repercussions to the child of maternal employment (see Etaugh, 1974; Yinger and Culter, 1978; Coangelo, Rosenthal, and Dettmann, 1984). The study contradicted the findings of Acock, Barker, and Bengtson (1982) that maternal employment resulted in a significant difference in similarity between youth and their mothers.

When examining the third variable, gender of child on generational continuity, this study finds weak evidence that gender of child might have some influence. This does not add credence to the previous literature which finds differences in generational continuity based on the gender of the child (see Jacobson, Berry, and Olson, 1975; Mustin, Bennett, and Broderick, 1983; Wilks and Callan, 1984). The previous literature surveyed did not take into account the historical period as an influence of generational continuity, however, and this may account for the differences in the findings. In addition the genders may experience more homogeneity in values as per Hagestad's theory.

## Gender Of Parent And Generational Change

Two areas of interest arose in examining gender of parent and generational continuity. The first was influence of parental gender on generational continuity. The second was whether family continuity is influenced more by gender or by generation. Each area will be examined in turn.

### Parental Gender And A Generation Gap

The results of this study lend some support to theory in the area of child development which indicates that gender differences in adults influence their relationship with their children (see Maccoby, 1966; Lipps and Colwill, 1978) as well as supporting child development literature which finds differences in socialization based on gender of the parent (Gurwitz and Dodge, 1975; Osmond, Withers, and Martin, 1975; Corter, Abramovitch, and Pepler, 1983; Bronstein, 1984). In examining the research surveyed in the literature review, these results support the findings of Kirpatrick (1936) who finds that mothers are more similar to their children than fathers and Acock and Bengtson (1978) who found that mothers were better able to gauge the attitudes of their young adult children than fathers were. Support was not found for the studies of Jennings and Langton (1969), Freeman (1972), and Penn (1977) who found no differences in similarity of attitudes based on the gender of the parent. Part of the explanation behind these differences could be that each study looked at attitudes

in different areas. Differences between gender might arise as a result of the area of attitude.

There is much concern over factors that may influence generational continuity. If mothers share closer relationships with their children than fathers do, perhaps closer study of the relationship between mothers and their children could locate patterns of behavior which help to bring about this closeness. The same skills or patterns of behavior could then be taught to fathers. In addition, if those working in the human services area could become more familiar with the patterns of behavior which bring about closeness, this knowledge could be used to help families in which generational conflict is a major issue.

#### Gender and Generation Gaps

One of the issues found in the literature in family continuity is whether gender or generation makes the bigger difference when looking at family gaps. This research supports the finding by Steininger and Lesser (1974) which indicate that generational differences are more marked than gender differences. The claim of McBride (1983) that gender differences are more responsible for family discontinuity than generational differences is not supported by this study.

The greater differences by generation rather than gender find one explanation in child development theory. Although Erikson (1963) notes that the different genders go

through slightly different processes in each developmental stage, differences between the age groups are a result more of the stages of development of each age group rather than gender. College students are in the stage of separating from their parents (Maccoby, 1984); therefore, one could expect age gaps between this group and their parents regardless of gender.

#### Methodological Implications

This research supports the need for studies that examine differences over time in research on generational continuity. Differences in the results between this study and other studies can find a partial explanation in the fact that most studies of generational continuity do not examine historical period as a factor influencing generational change.

Methodological issues also arise over the definition of generational continuity. This study focused on differences between family members as it is thought that the family is most responsible for socializing each new generation (Maccoby, 1966; Hareven, 1978; Hill and Mattessich, 1979; Hagestad, 1981). Other studies, however, have focused on generational change by examining non-related generations (see Brunswich, 1970; Armstrong and Scotzin, 1974; Mahoney, 1976; Caspi, 1984). Generational continuity as measured only by age can determine changes over time, however can not examine how intergenerational change occurs as it is

through the family that continuity is transmitted. The study of generational continuity in family transmission can make closer observation as to why change occurs, however may miss some broad general sweeps that can be discovered by comparing unrelated age groups. This issue does need further clarification, however, if research on generational continuity is to be consistent.

Other issues regarding definition of generational continuity concern what specifically is studied and who is studied. Here, we examined attitudes, but, other measures of generational continuity, such as behavior, could be explored. Specific area of attitude where generational continuity takes place also requires more study, as studies that share contents of attitude are not plentiful. Also when examining generational continuity, there seems to be a need for research that examines both generation's relations to each other. Much research examines only one generation, and this gives an incomplete picture of generational continuity and change.

The life-span developmental model needs further exploration and research. Very few studies have examined the three types of time and the impact of these types on generational continuity. This study made a start by operationalizing variables in a manner that took more than one kind of time into consideration, however, much more could be done in this area.

### Limitations Of Research

There are several limitations in this research. Many of these limitations have already been pointed out in Chapter IV. In this section, only a few major limitations will be mentioned.

First is the limitation that comes from only having mothers represented in both studies. Results of the study could be enhanced if fathers as well as mothers from more than one time period could be included as this would give a more accurate picture of gender changes over time. Another related limitation deals with the the respondents chosen for the study. This study was limited to students at one university. Age cohorts and their parents in various locations at various points in time could be surveyed to strengthen results of the study.

Limits also arise from the use of only one instrument for measurement of generational continuity. Attitudes do not necessarily remain constant, and examining only attitudes of each sample at one point in time limits the results of the study. The difference between the two sample response rates may also pose a limit as the parents who were more similar may have responded in 1985 giving a biased sample. The study was also based on self-report and this could have introduced bias into the study. In addition, the scales used were developed in 1972 and used the referent

'he' which could have introduced problems as the use of this referent had become an issue by 1985.

#### Recommendations For Future Research

Several recommendations for future research can be made based on the past literature as well as the results of this study. Some of these recommendations, including further exploration of the life-span developmental model, studies that examine behavior as well as attitudes, as well as cohort analysis studies that include both parents in their study have been discussed earlier. In addition, Longitudinal analysis which examines different groups of age-cohorts and their parents as well as examining these same groups over time could be carried out.

Future study could also examine the entire family's (mothers, fathers, brothers, sisters, husbands, and wives) similarity in attitudes and values, and ability to gauge the attitudes of each other. It is possible that the differences that were found between generations may also exist between sibling groups, or between spouses. A better understanding of family continuity might result from using the entire family in the research approach.

It was the hope of this study to contribute to the understanding of generational continuity. This study has tried to integrate some of the approaches used by previous researchers as well as cover territory not examined before. As future research comes about in the area of generational

relations, it is hoped that some of the suggestions made in this study can be utilized to increase knowledge in the area of generational continuity and change.

#### SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Acock, A. C. and V. L. Bengtson. "On the Relative Influence of Mothers and Fathers: A Covariance Analysis of Political and Religious Socialization." Journal of Marriage and The Family, 40 (1978), 519-530.
- Acock, A. C., and V. L. Bengtson. "Socialization and Attribution Processes; Actual Versus Perceived Similarity Among Parents and Youth." Journal of Marriage and The Family, 42 (1980), 501-515.
- Acock, A. C., D. Barker, and V. L. Bengtson. "Mother's Employment and Parent-Youth Similarity." Journal of Marriage and The Family, 44 (1982), 441-455.
- Acock, A. C., and T. Fuller. "The Attitude-Behavior Relationship and Parental Influence: Circular Mobility in Thailand." Social Forces, 62 (1984), 973-994.
- Acock, A. C. and W. S. Yong. "Parental Power and Adolescents' Parental Identification." Journal of Marriage and The Family, 46 (1984), 487-495.
- Adams, B. N. Kinship in an Urban Setting. Chicago: Markham Pub. Co., 1968.
- Armstrong, B. N. and M. M. Scotzin. "Intergenerational Comparison of Attitudes Towards Basic Life Concepts." The Journal of Psychology, 87 (1974), 293-304.
- Babbie, E. The Practice of Social Research. 4th Ed. Belmont, Ca.: Wadsworth Publishing Company, 1986.
- Baruch, G. K. "Maternal Influences upon College Women's Attitudes towards Women and Work." Developmental Psychology, 6 (1972), 32-37.
- Bell, N. J. and A. W. Avery. "Family Structure and Parent-adolescent Relationships: Does Family Structure Really Make a Difference?" Journal of Marriage and The Family, 47 (1984), 503-508.
- Bell, N. and E. Vogel. "Toward a Framework for Functional Analysis of Family Behavior." A Modern Introduction to

- the Family. Eds. Norman Bell and Ezra Vogel. New York: Free Press, 1968, pp. 1-36.
- Bellah, R. N., R. Madsin, W. M. Sullivan, A. Swidler, and S. M. Tipton. Habits of the Heart. Berkley and Los Angeles: Univ. of California Press, 1985.
- Bengtson, V. L. "The Generation Gap." Youth and Society, 2 (1970), 7-32.
- Bengtson, V. L. "The Generation Gap: A Review and Typology of Social-Psychological Perspectives." The New Pilgrims. Ed. Philip G. Altbach AND Robert S. Laufer. New York: David McKay Company, Inc., 1972, pp. 195-217.
- Bengtson, V. L. "Generations and Family Effects in Value Socialization." American Sociological Review, 40 (1975), 358-371.
- Bengtson, V. L., M. J. Furlong, and R. S. Laufer. "Time, Aging and the Continuity of Social Structure: Themes and Issues in Generational Analysis." Journal of Social Issues, 30 (1974), 45-71.
- Bengtson, V. L. and J. A. Kuypers. "Generational Differences and the Developmental Stake." Aging and Human Development, 20 (1971), 249-260.
- Bengtson, V. L. and M. C. Lovejoy. "Values, Personality, and Social Structure." American Behavioral Scientist, 16 (1973), 880-912.
- Bengtson, V. L. and L. Troll. "Youth and their parents: Feedback and Intergenerational Influence in Socialization." Child Influences on Marital and Family Interaction: A Life-Span Perspective. Eds. Richard M. Lerner, and Graham B. Spanier. New York: Academic Press, Inc. 1978, pp. 215-240.
- Bertman, S. The Conflict of Generations in Ancient Greece and Rome. Amsterdam: B. R. Gruner, 1976.
- Bethelheim, B. "The Problem of Generations." The Challenge of Youth. Ed. Erik Erikson. Garden City, New York: Anchor Books, 1965, pp. 76-109.
- Bradley, R. H. and B. M. Caldwell. "The HOME Inventory and Family Demographics." Developmental Psychology, 26 (1984), 315-320.
- Breines, W. "The 1950's: Gender and Some Social Science." Sociological Inquiry, 56 (1986), 69-92.

- Bridges, W. Transitions. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley Publishing Co., 1980.
- Brittain, C. V. "Adolescent Choices and Parent-Peer Cross-Pressures." American Sociological Review, 28 (1963), 385-391.
- Brody, E., P. Johnsen, and M. Fulcomer. "What should Adult Children Do for Elderly Parents? Opinions and Preferences of Three Generations of Women." Journal of Gerontology, 39 (1984), 736-746.
- Bronfenbrenner, U. "The Changing American Child--A Speculative Analysis." Journal of Social Issues, 17 (1961), 6-18.
- Bronstein, P. "Differences in Mothers' and Fathers' Behavior toward Children: A Cross-cultural Comparison." Developmental Psychology, 20 (1984), 995-1003.
- Brunswick, A. "What Generation Gap? A Comparison of Some Generational Differences among Blacks and Whites." Social Problems, 17 (1970), 358-371.
- Burr, W. R., Geoffrey Leigh, R. D. Day and John Constantiene. "Symbolic Interaction and the Family." Contemporary Theories about the Family. Volume 2. Eds. W. R. Burr, R. Hill, F. I. Nye, and Ira L. Reiss. New York: Free Press, 1979, pp. 42-111.
- Buss, A.R. "Dialectics, History, and Development: Roots of the Individual-Society Dialectic." Life-Span Development and Behavior. Volume 2. Eds. Paul B. Baltes & Orville G. Brim, Jr. New York: Academic Press, Inc., 1977, pp. 313-332.
- Bytheway, B. "Problems of Representation in 'The Three Generation Family Study'." Journal of Marriage and The Family, 39 (1977), 243-250.
- Callan, V. J., and C. Gallois, "Perceptions About Having Children: Are Daughters Different from their Mothers?" Journal of Marriage and The Family, 45 (1983), 607-611.
- Cashmore, J. A. and Jacqueline Goodnow. "Agreement between Generations: A Two-Process Approach." Child Development, 56 (1985), 493-501.
- Caspi, A. "Contact Hypothesis and Inter-age Attitudes: A Field Study of Cross-age Cohorts." Social Psychology Quarterly, 47 (1984), 74-80.

- Cattel, R. B. The Scientific Use of Factor Analysis in Behavioral and Life Sciences. New York: Plenum Press, 1978.
- Chand, I. P., D. M. Crider, and F. K. Willets. "Parent-youth Disagreement as Perceived by Youth; A Longitudinal Study." Youth and Society, 6 (1975), 365-375.
- Chickering, S. B. "How We Got That Way." Natural Enemies? Ed. Alexander Klein. Philadelphia and New York: J. B. Lippencott Co., 1969, pps. 196-205.
- Condry, J. C. and D. F. Ross. "Sex and Aggression: The Influence of Gender Label on the Perception of Aggression in Children." Child Development, 56 (1985), 225-233.
- Colangelo, N., D. M. Rosenthal, and D. F. Dettmann. "Maternal Employment and Job Satisfaction and Their Relationship to Children's Perceptions and Behaviors." Sex Roles, 10 (1984), 693-702.
- Coleman, M. and L. Ganong. "Effects of Family Structure on Family Attitudes and Expectations." Family Relations, 33 (1984), 425-432.
- Corter, C., R. Abramovitch, and D. J. Pepler. "The Role of Mother in Sibling Interaction." Child Development, 54 (1983), 1599-1605.
- Davis, K. "The Sociology of Parent-Youth Conflict." American Sociological Review, 5 (1940), 523-535.
- Deaux, K. The Behavior of Women and Men. Monterey, Ca.: Brooks, Cole Publishing Company, 1976.
- Doob, L. "The Behavior of Attitudes." Psychological Review, 54 (1947), 135-156.
- Douvan, E. and J. Adelson. The Adolescent Experience. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1966.
- Duvall, E. M. Family Development. Philadelphia and New York: J. B. Lippencott Company, 1962.
- Eisenstadt, S. N. "Generational Conflict and Intellectual Antagonism." The New Pilgrims. Ed. Philip G. Altbach and Robert S. Laufer. New York: David McKay Company, Inc., 1972, pp.139-154.
- Elder, G. H., Jr. Children of the Great Depression. Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press, 1974.

- Elder, G. H., Jr. "Age Differentiation and the Life Course." Annual Review of Sociology. Volume 1. Palo Alto, Ca.: Annual Reviews Inc., 1975, pp. 165-190.
- Elder, G. H., Jr. "Historical Change in Life Patterns and Personality." Life-Span Development and Behavior. Volume 2. Eds. P. B. Baltes, and Orville G. Brim, Jr. New York: Academic Press, Inc., 1979, pp. 118-161.
- Erikson, E. Childhood and Society. Second Edition. New York: Norton Press, 1963.
- Etaugh, C. "Effects of Maternal Employment on Children: A Review of Recent Research." Merrill-Palmer Quarterly, 20 (1974), 71-98.
- Felson, M. and M. Gottfridson. "Social Indicators of Adolescent Activities Near Peers & Parents." Journal of Marriage and The Family, 46 (1984), 709-714.
- Freeman, H. R. "The Generation Gap: Attitudes of Students and of Their Parents." Journal of Counseling Psychology, 19 (1972), 441-447.
- Friedenburg, E. The Vanishing Adolescent. Boston: Beacon Press, 1959.
- Friedman, L. N., A. R. Gold, and R. Christie. "Dissecting the Generation Gap: Intergenerational and Intra-familial Similarities and Differences." Public Opinion Quarterly, 36 (1972), 334-346.
- Gallagher, B. J. "An Empirical Analysis of Attitude Differences Between Three Kin-Related Generations." Youth and Society, 5 (1974), 327-349.
- Gifford, R. "Age, Era, and Life Perspective: Emotional Connotations of the 1920's Through the 1980's to Individuals in Their Twenties Through Their Eighties." International Journal of Aging and Human Development, 20 (1986), 33-40.
- Glenn, N. D. Cohort Analysis. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications, 1977.
- Gold, D., and D. Andres. "Comparison of Adolescent Children with Employed and Non-employed Mothers." Merrill-Palmer Quarterly, 24 (1978), 243-254.
- Gurwitz, S. B. and K. A. Dodge. "Adults' Evaluations of a Child as a Function of Sex of Adult and Sex of Child." Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 32 (1975), 822-828.

- Hagestad, G. O. "Problems and Promises in the Social Psychology of Intergenerational Relations." Aging: Stability and Change in the Family. Eds. Robert Fogel, Elaine Hatfield, Sara B. Kiesler, and Ethel Shanas. New York: Academic Press, 1981, pp. 11-46.
- Hare-Mustin, R. T., Bennett, S. K., and Broderick, P. C. "Attitude toward motherhood: Gender, generational, and religious comparisons." Sex Roles, 9 (1983), 643-659.
- Hareven, T. K. Transitions: The Family and the Life Course in Historical Perspective. New York: Academic Press, Inc., 1978.
- Hareven, T. K. "Historical Changes in the Timing of Family Transitions: Their impact on Generational Relations." Aging: Stability and Change in the Family. Eds. Robert Fogel, Elaine Hatfield, Sara B. Kiesler, and Ethel Shanas. New York: Academic Press, 1981, pp. 143-168.
- Hareven, T. K. "American Families in Transition: Historical Perspectives on change." Families in Transition. Eds. Arlene S. Skolnick & Jerome H. Skolnick. Boston: Little, Brown & Company, 1983, pp. 73-91.
- Harris, J. D. and K. I. Howard. "On Psychological Resemblance: A Questionnaire Study of High School Students." Psychiatry, 47 (1984), 125-134.
- Hartup, W. W. "Perspectives on Child and Family Interaction: Past, Present, and Future." Child Influences on Marital and Family Interaction: A Life-Span Perspective. Eds. Richard M. Lerner, and Graham B. Spanier. New York: Academic Press, Inc., 1978, pp. 23-46.
- Helms, D. B., and J. S. Turner. Exploring Child Behavior. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1976.
- Hill, R. Family Development in Three Generations: A Longitudinal Study of Changing Family Patterns of Planning and Achievement. Cambridge, Mass.: Schenkman Pub. Co., Inc., 1970.
- Hill, R. and P. Mattessich. "Family Development theory and Life-Span Development." Life-Span Development and Behavior, Volume 2. Eds. P. B. Baltes & O. G. Brim, Jr. New York: Academic Press Inc., 1979, pp. 161-200.
- Hoam, N. "Moral Redefinition in Families as the Critical Aspect of the Generation Gap." Youth and Society, 2 (1970), 259-283.

- Hodgin, J., and R. Dodder. "The Generation Gap: An Exploration of Students and Their Mothers." (Unpublished study.) Stillwater, Oklahoma: Oklahoma State University, Department of Sociology, 1972.
- Hoffman, L. W. "Changes in Family Roles, Socialization and Sex Differences." American Psychologist, 32 (1977), 644-657.
- Hoffman, L. W. "Maternal Employment." American Psychologist, 34 (1979), 859-865.
- Hogan, D. P. "The Variable Order of Events in the Life Course." American Sociological Review, 43 (1978), 573-586.
- Hogan, H. W. and H. N. Mookherjee. "Values and Selective Antecedents." Journal of Social Psychology, 113 (1981), 29-35.
- Huesmann, J. R., L. Eron, M. Liffkowitz, and L. Walder. "Stability of Agression over Time and Generations." Developmental Psychology, 20 (1984), 1120-1134.
- Hultach, D. F. and J. K. Plemons. "Life Events and Life-Span Development." Life-Span Development and Behavior. Volume 2. New York: Academic Press, Inc., 1979, pp. 1-36.
- Hunter, F. T. "Socializing Prodecures in Parent-child and Friendship Relations During Adolescence." Developmental Psychology, 20 (1984), 1092-1099.
- Iverson, G. R. and Helmut N. Analysis of Variance. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications, 1976.
- Jacobsen, R. B., K. J. Beng, and K. F. Olson. "An Empirical Test of the Generation Gap: A Comparative Intra-family Study." Journal of Marriage and The Family, 37 (1975), 841-852.
- Jennings, M. K. and K. P. Langton. "Mothers versus Fathers: The Formation of Political Orientations Among Young Americans." The Journal of Politics, 31 (1969), 329-358.
- Jennings, M. K. and R. G. Niemi. Generations and Politics: A Panel Study of Young Adults and Their Parents. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton Univ. Press, 1981.
- Joe-On, K. and C. Mueller. Introduction to Factor Analysis: What it is and how to do it. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications, 1978.

- Jones, E. E. and V. A. Harris. "The Attribution of Attitudes." Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 3 (1967), 1-24.
- Joy, S. S., and P. S. Wise. "Maternal Employment, Anxiety, and Sex Differences in College Students' Self-descriptions." Sex Roles, 9 (1983), 519-525.
- Kandel, D. B. and G. S. Lesser. Youth in Two Worlds: United States and Denmark. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Pub., Inc., 1972.
- Katz, M. and C. S. Piotckowski. "Correlates of Family Role Strain Among Employed Black Women." Family Relations, 32 (1983), 331-339.
- Keller, M. "Reflections on Politics and Generations in America." Generations. Ed. Stephen R. Graubard. New York: W. W. Norton & Co., 1979, pp. 123-136.
- Kidwell, J. S. "Number of Siblings, Sibling Spacing, Sex, and Birth Order: Their Effects on Perceived Parent-Adolescent Relationships." Journal of Marriage and the Family, 47 (1985), 315-331.
- Kerlinger, F. N. Foundations of Behavioral Research. Third edition. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Wilson, Inc., 1964.
- Kirkpatrick, C. "A Comparison of Generations in Regard to Attitudes Towards Feminism." Journal of Genetic Psychology, (1936), 343-361.
- Klein, D. M, S. Jorgensen, and B. Miller. "Research Methods and Developmental Reciprocity in Families." Child Influences on Marital and Family Interaction: A Life-Span Perspective. Eds. Richard M. Lerner & Graham B. Spanier. New York: Academic Press, 1978, pp. 107-136.
- Knight, G. P. "Cooperative-Competitive Social Orientations: Interaction of Birth Order with Sex and Economic Class." Child Development, 53 (1982), 664-667.
- Kriegel, A. "Generational Differences: The History of an Idea." Generations. Ed. S. R. Gruabard. New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 1979, pp. 23-38.
- Laufer, R. S. "Sources of Generational Consciousness and Conflict." The New Pilgrims. Eds. Philip G. Altbach, and Robert S. Laufer. New York: David McKay Company, Inc., 1972, pp. 218-237.

- Lazersfeld, P. F. and M. Rosenberg. The Language of Social Research. New York: The Free Press, 1955.
- Lein, L. and M. C. Blehor. "Working Couples as Parents." Family in Transition. Eds. A. S. Skolnick and J. H. Skolnick. Boston: Little, Brown & Co., 1983, pp. 420-437.
- Leon, M. "Rules Mothers and Sons Use to Intergrate Intent and Damage Information in Their Moral Judgements." Child Development, 55 (1984), 2106-2113.
- Lerner, R. M., J. Pendorf, and A. Emery. "Attitudes of Adolescents and Adults Towards Contemporary Issues." Psychological Reports, 28 (1971), 139-145.
- Lerner, R. M., C. Schroeder, M. Rewitzer, and A. Weinstock. "Attitudes of High School Students and Their Parents Towards Contemporary Issues." Psychological Reports, 31 (1972), 255-258.
- Levine, M. S. Canonical Analysis and Factor Comparison. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications, 1977.
- Levinger, G. and H. Raush. Close Relationships: Perspectives on the Meaning of Intimacy. Amherst, Mass.: University of Mass. Press, 1977.
- Lipps, H. M. and N. L. Colwill. The Psychology of Sex Differences. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1978.
- Maccoby, E. E. The Development of Sex Differences. Stanford, Ca.: Stanford Univ. Press, 1966.
- Maccoby, E. E. "Socialization and Developmental Change." Child Development, 55 (1984), 317-328.
- MacDonald, K. and R. D. Parke. "Bridging the Gap: Parent-Child Play Interaction and Peer Interactive Competence." Child Development, 55 (1984), 1265-1277.
- MacKinnon, C. S., G. H. Grody, and Z. Stoneman. "The Effects of Divorce and Maternal Employment on the Home Environments of Preschool Children." Child Development, 53 (1982), 1392-1399.
- McBride, A. B. "Differences in Parents' and Their Children's Perceptions of Parenting." Developmental Psychology, 19 (1983), 686-693.
- McBride, A. B. and K. N. Black. "Differences that Suggest

- Female Investment in and Male Distance From, Children." Sex Roles, 10 (1984), 231-246.
- Mahoney, J. "Age and Values: The Generation Non-Gap." Psychological Reports, 39 (1976), 62.
- Mannheim, K. "The Problem of Generations." The New Pilgrims. Ed. Philip G. Altbach & Robert S. Laufer. New York: David McKay Company, Inc., 1972, pp.101-138.
- Markides, K. S. and S. K. Hoppi. "Marital Satisfaction in Three Generations of Mexican Americans." Social Science Quarterly, 66 (1985), 147-154.
- Mead, M. "Growing up in America." Natural Enemies? Ed. A. Klein. Philadelphia & New York: J. B. Lippencott Co., 1969, pp. 54-61.
- Mead, M. Culture and Commitment: A Study of the Generation Gap. New York: Basic Books, 1970.
- Murdock, G. P. Social Structure. New York: Macmillan Pub. Co., 1949.
- Mott, F. L. and S. H. Mott. "Prospective Life Style Congruence Among American Adolescents: Variations in the Association Between Fertility Expectations and Ideas Regarding Women's Roles." Social Forces, 63 (1984), 184-208.
- Moustakas, C. E. Turning Points. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice Hall Inc., 1977.
- Nash, L. "Concepts of Existence: Greek Origins of Generational Thought." Generations. Ed. Stephen R. Gruabard. New York: W. W. Norton & Co., 1979.
- Nye. F. Ivan, H. M. Bahr, S. J. Bahr, J. E. Carlson, V. Gecas, S. McLaughlin, and W. L. Slocum. Role Structure and Analysis of the Family. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications, 1976.
- Nye, F. I. "Choice, Exchange and the Family: Paid Employment by Mothers." Contemporary Theories about the Family. Volume II. Eds. Wesley R. Burr, Reuben Hill, F. Ivan Nye & Ira L. Reiss. New York: Free Press, 1979, pp. 11-17.
- O'Donnell, M. Age And Generation. London: Tavestock Pub, 1985.
- Ogburn, W. F. and M. F. Nimkoff. Technology and the

- Changing Family. New York: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1955.
- Osmond, M. W. and P. Y. Martin. "Sex and Sexism: A Comparison of Male and Female Sex-Role Attitudes." Journal of Marriage and the Family, 37 (1975), 744-758.
- Owen, M. T., M. A. Easterbrooks, L. Chase-Lansdale, and W. A. Goldberg. "The Relation between Maternal Employment Status & the Stability of Attachments to Mother and to Father." Child Development, 55 (1984), 1894-1901.
- Parsons, T. "Youth in the Context of American Society." Youth: Change and Challenge. Ed. E. Erikson. New York: Basic Books, 1963, pp. 93-119.
- Parsons, T. "Age and Sex in the Social Structure of the United States." American Sociological Review, 7 (1943), 604-616.
- Payne, S., D. A. Summers, and T. R. Stewart. "Value Differences Across Three Generations." Sociometry, 36 (1973), 20-30.
- Penn, J. R. "Measuring Intergenerational Value Differences." Social Science Quarterly, 58 (1977), 293-301.
- Pipps, S., P. Phaver, S. Jennings, S. Lanborn, and K. W. Fischer. "Adolescents' Theories About the Development of their Relationships with Parents." Journal of Personality & Social Psychology, 48 (1985), 991-1001.
- Proudian, A. "Perceived Parental Power and Parental Identification Among Armenian-American Adolescents." Psychological Reports, 53 (1983), 1101-1102.
- Pulkkinen, L. "Self-Control and Continuity from Childhood to Late Adolescence." Life-Span Development and Behavior. Volume 4. Eds. Paul B. Baltes and O. G. Brim, Jr. New York: Academic Press, 1982, pp. 64-107.
- Rapaport, R. B. "Like Mother, Like Daughter: Intergenerational Transmission of DK Response Rates." Public Opinion Quarterly, 49 (1985), 198-208.
- Rintala, M. The Constitution of Silence. Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press, 1979.
- Rollins, J., and P. N. White. "The Relationship Between Mothers' and Daughters' Sex-role Attitudes and Self-concepts in Three Types of Family Environment." Sex Roles, 8 (1982), 1141-1155.

- Roper, B. S., and E. Labeff. "Sex Roles and Feminism Revisited: an Intergenerational Attitude Comparison." Journal of Marriage and the Family, (1977), 113-119.
- Rosenblum, K. E. The Conflict Between and Within Gender: An appraisal of Contemporary American Femininity and Masculinity. Sociological Inquiry, 56 (1986), 93-104.
- Selltiz, C., L. Wrightsman, and S. Cook. Research Methods in Social Relations. Third edition. New York: Hold, Rinehart, and Wilson. 1976.
- Selva, P. C. D. and J. B. Dusek. "Sex Role Orientation and Resolution of Ericksonian Crises During the Late Adolescent Years." Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 47 (1983), 204-212.
- Shanas, E. and G. F. Strub. Social Structure and the Family: Generational Relations. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice Hall, Inc., 1965.
- Shulman, N. "Life-Cycle Variations in Patterns of Close Relationships." Journal of Marriage and the Family, 37 (1975), 813-821.
- Siegel, F. "The False Promise of Generational Politics." Dissent, 31 (1983), 391-292.
- Sigelman, C. K., L. Sigelman, and M. Goodlitte. "Sex Differences in the Moral Values of College Students and Their Parents." Sex Roles, 70 (1984), 877-883.
- Slevin, K. F. and C. R. Wengrove. "Real vs. Percieved Differences in how Three Intra-family Generations of Women View their Roles in Society." Perceptual and Motor Skills, 56 (1983), 959-970.
- Smith, T. E. "The Case for Parental Transmission of Educational Goals: The Importance of Accurate Offspring Perceptions." Journal of Marriage and the Family, 44 (1982), 661-674.
- Smith, T. E. "Sex and Sibling Structure: Interaction Effects Upon the Accuracy of Adolescent Perceptions of Parental Orientations." Journal of Marriage and the Family, 46 (1984), 901-905.
- Steininger, M., and H. Lesser. "Sex and Generation Differences and Similarities in Social Attitudes." Journal of Counseling Psychology, 21 (1974), 459-460.
- Stuckey, M. F., P. E. McGhee, and N. J. Bell. Parent-Child

- Interaction: the Influence of Maternal Employment." Developmental Psychology, 18 (1982), 635-694.
- Tedin, K. L. "The Influence of Parents on the Political Attitudes of Adolescents." The American Political Science Review, 68 (1974), 1579-1592.
- Teevan, J. J. Jr. "On Measuring Anomia: Suggested Modifications of the Srole Scale." Pacific Sociological Review, 18 (1975), 20-35.
- Thomas, L. E. "Generational Discontinuity in Beliefs: An Exploration of the Generation Gap." Journal of Social Issues, 30 (1974), 1-22.
- Thomas, L. E. and J. F. Stankiewicz. "Family Correlates of Parent-child Attitude Congruence: Is it Time to Throw in the Towel?" Psychological Reports, 34 (1974), 1038.
- Thompson, L., A. Acock, & K. Clark. "Do Parents Know Their Children? The Ability of Mothers and Fathers to Gauge the Attitudes of Their Young Adult Children." Family Relations, 34 (1985), 315-320.
- Tomeh, A. K. "Parents, Friends, and Familial Sex Role Attitudes." Sociological Inquiry, 54 (1981), 72-88.
- Trimberger, R., and M. MacLean. "Maternal Employment: the Child's Perspective." Journal of Marriage and the Family, 44 (1982), 469-475.
- Troll, L. E. "Issues in the Study of Generations." Aging and Human Development, 20 (1970), 199-218.
- Troll, L. E. "Is Parent-Child Conflict What We Mean by the Generation Gap?" The Family Coordinator, 21 (1972), 347-349.
- Turner, R. R. and H. W. Reese. Life-Span Developmental Psychology. New York: Academic Press, 1980.
- Tzeng, O. C. S. and M. G. Dimit. "Attitudinal Differences of College Students and Their Parents." Psychological Reports, 35 (1974), 1247-1249.
- Voydanoff, P. and R. F. Kelly. "Determinants of Work-related Family Problems Among Employed Parents." Journal of Marriage and The Family, 46 (1984), 881-892.
- Weinstock, A. and R. M. Lerner. "Attitudes of Late Adolescents and their Parents Towards Contemporary Issues." Psychological Reports, 30 (1972), 239-244.

- Weiner, R. and D. Stillman. Woodstock Census: The Nationwide Survey of the Sixties Generation. New York: Viking Press, 1979.
- Wheeler, R. W. and H. Oles. "Motives for Parenthood: A Comparison of Students' and Parents' Values." Psychological Reports, 44 (1979), 1074.
- Wilks, J. and V. J. Callan. "Similarity of University Students' and Their Parents' Attitudes Toward Alcohol." Journal of Studies on Alcohol, 45 (1984), 326-333.
- Yinger, J. M. and S. J. Culter. Major Social Issues: A Multidisciplinary View. New York: The Free Press, 1978.
- Yost, E. D. and R. J. Adamck. "Parent-Child Interaction and Changing Family Values: A Multivariate Analysis." Journal of Marriage and The Family, 36 (1974), 115-121.
- Zaenglein-Senger, M. M. and C. S. Stewart. "The Parent-Adolescent Power Contest: Rigid Parents, Flexible Adolescents." Social Casework, 66 (1985), 309-313.

**APPENDIX A**

**COVER LETTERS TO PARENTS (1972 AND 1985)**

To: The parent of the student

Dear Parent:

Your student here has helped us on our study of the "generation gap" (if there is such a thing) and we are asking you to take part in the completion of it. It will not take much of your time and your answers will be absolutely confidential.

We are trying to find out what the differences are, if any, between parents and youngsters and what educational systems might do to help.

We ask you to fill out the enclosed survey as soon as possible and return it to us in the enclosed envelope. We are interested in how you "feel" about the items rather than how you "think" so don't take too much time in wondering what you should say.

Also we ask that you not discuss your answers with anyone until after you have mailed the questionnaire. We will be interested in your first impressions.

We thank you for your cooperation, and we assure you that our first interest is toward the health and welfare of your student here.

We will look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely yours,

**APPENDIX B**

**FOLLOW-UP ON PARENT SURVEYS (1972 AND 1985)**

## FIRST LETTER TO MOTHERS (1972)

Dear

As yet we have not received the questionnaire we sent to you about a week ago. Your questionnaire is very important, so we will ask you to return it to us as soon as you can.

We know that parents are busy, but perhaps you could spare a few minutes to help us with this study so that we can better understand college youth and some of the problems they face.

The other questionnaire may have become misplaced or our record keeping may have been in error. At any rate, we are enclosing another questionnaire for your convenience. Please fill it out and return it.

Again, remember that all of this information is CONFIDENTIAL. Our only interest is in helping schools better cope with youngsters of today.

Thank you for your cooperation. We will look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely,

## SECOND LETTER TO MOTHERS (1972)

Dear

We are so near our goal that we feel obligated to impose upon you again. Out of 396 questionnaires sent out, only 32 remain unanswered.

We know that you will want to help us make this a complete effort. We are sure that your questionnaire will add to our understanding of the "Generation Gap."

Please fill out the questionnaire enclosed and return it to us as soon as possible. If, for some reason, you do not feel you can, please write and tell us why.

We will appreciate so much your cooperation. Remember, the information is confidential.

We look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely yours,

## POST CARD MESSAGE TO PARENT (1985)

## OKLAHOMA STATE UNIVERSITY

You recently received a questionnaire from me in your mail. I want to thank you for returning it. If yours got tossed out, misplaced, or was not delivered, please call me at 405-360-5184 and I will send you another one today.

It is very important that we hear from you via the questionnaire if the results of the study are to be accurate.

Thank you very much for your cooperation.

Lynn Atkinson, MSW

Sociology Dept., CLB 016, Oklahoma State University  
Stillwater, Ok. 74078

**APPENDIX C**

**STUDENT DEMOGRAPHIC QUESTIONS FOR 1972 AND 1985**

## STUDENT DEMOGRAPHIC QUESTIONS--1972

1. Sex (1) male (2) female
2. Classification (1) freshman (2) sophomore (3) junior  
(4) senior (5) graduate student (6) other \_\_\_\_\_
3. What is your declared major or intended major at this  
time? \_\_\_\_\_
4. What is your approximate overall grade point average?  
\_\_\_\_\_
5. What is your marital status? (1) single (2) married  
(3) separated (4) divorced (5) widowed (6) remarried
6. Size of hometown: (1) 600,000 or more  
(2) 100,001 - 600,000 (3) 50,001 - 100,000  
(4) 25,001 - 50,000 (5) 10,001 - 25,000  
(6) 2,501 - 10,000 (7) 1,001 - 2,500  
(8) less than 1,000 (9) I live on a farm
7. What is your age to the nearest birthday? \_\_\_\_\_years
8. Do you consider your political views to be:  
(1) conservative (2) liberal (3) moderate (4) other:\_\_\_\_\_
9. Number of children in your family (not including  
yourself)?  
(1) no brothers or sisters (2) one (3) two (4) three  
(5) four or more
10. What position were you in the family?  
(1) oldest child (2) middle (3) youngest child  
(4) other:\_\_\_\_\_
11. Participation in high school peer group (please select  
only one)  
(1) in leading crowd in high school  
(2) in another crowd in high school  
(3) in no crowd in school  
(4) in crowd outside of school
12. What is your mother's name and address? (If there is  
any question about this item, please ask the researcher  
present.)

Name: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Street: \_\_\_\_\_  
 City: \_\_\_\_\_  
 State: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Zip code: \_\_\_\_\_

## STUDENT DEMOGRAPHIC QUESTIONS--1985

1. Sex (1) male (2) female
2. Classification (1) freshman (2) sophomore (3) junior  
(4) senior (5) graduate student (6) other \_\_\_\_\_
3. What is your declared major or intended major at this  
time? \_\_\_\_\_
4. What is your approximate overall grade point average?  
\_\_\_\_\_
5. What is your marital status? (1) single (2) married  
(3) separated (4) divorced (5) widowed (6) remarried
6. Size of hometown: (1) 600,000 or more  
(2) 100,001 - 600,000 (3) 50,001 - 100,000  
(4) 25,001 - 50,000 (5) 10,001 - 25,000  
(6) 2,501 - 10,000 (7) 1,001 - 2,500  
(8) less than 1,000 (9) I live on a farm
7. What is your age to the nearest birthday? \_\_\_\_\_years
8. Do you consider your political views to be:  
(1) conservative (2) liberal (3) moderate (4) other:\_\_\_\_\_
9. Number of children in your family (not including  
yourself)?  
(1) no brothers or sisters (2) one (3) two (4) three  
(5) four or more
10. What position were you in the family?  
(1) oldest child (2) middle (3) youngest child  
(4) other:\_\_\_\_\_
11. Participation in high school peer group (please select  
only one)  
(1) in leading crowd in high school  
(2) in another crowd in high school  
(3) in no crowd in school  
(4) in crowd outside of school
12. What is your mother's name and address? (If there is  
any question about this item, please ask the researcher  
present.)

Name: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Street: \_\_\_\_\_  
 City: \_\_\_\_\_  
 State: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Zip code: \_\_\_\_\_

13. What is your father's name and address? (if there is any question about this item, please ask the researcher present.)

Name: \_\_\_\_\_  
Street: \_\_\_\_\_  
City: \_\_\_\_\_  
State: \_\_\_\_\_  
Zip code: \_\_\_\_\_

**APPENDIX D**

**PARENT DEMOGRAPHIC QUESTIONS FOR 1972 AND 1985**

## PARENT DEMOGRAPHIC QUESTIONS--1972

1. What is your marital status? (1) married (2) separated  
(3) divorced (4) widowed (5) remarried
2. How old were you when you first got married? \_\_\_\_\_years
3. Do you consider your political views to be:  
(1) conservative (2) liberal (3) moderate (4) other:\_\_\_\_\_
4. How much formal education have you had?  
(1) no formal schooling or some grade school only  
(2) finished grade school  
(3) some high (secondary) school  
(4) finished high school  
(5) business or trade school  
(6) some college  
(7) finished college (four years)  
(8) attended graduate or professional school but did not finish.  
(9) attained a graduate degree (M.A., Ph. D.)
5. Were you employed full-time outside the home while this student was an infant (up to 1 year old)? \_\_\_yes \_\_\_no  
If yes, how many months? \_\_\_\_\_
6. Were you employed full-time outside the home while this student was a child (1-6 years old)? \_\_\_\_\_yes \_\_\_\_\_no  
If yes, how many years? \_\_\_\_\_
7. Were you employed full-time outside the home while this student was in grammar school? \_\_\_\_\_yes \_\_\_\_\_no  
If yes, how many years? \_\_\_\_\_
8. Were you employed full-time outside the home while this student was in high school? \_\_\_\_\_yes \_\_\_\_\_no  
If yes, how many years? \_\_\_\_\_

## PARENT DEMOGRAPHIC QUESTIONS--1985

1. What is your sex? (1) male (2) female
2. What is your marital status? (1) married (2) separated  
(3) divorced (4) widowed (5) remarried
3. How old were you when you first got married? \_\_\_\_\_years
4. Do you consider your political views to be:  
(1) conservative (2) liberal (3) moderate (4) other:\_\_\_\_\_
5. How much formal education have you had?  
(1) no formal schooling or some grade school only  
(2) finished grade school  
(3) some high (secondary) school  
(4) finished high school  
(5) business or trade school  
(6) some college  
(7) finished college (four years)  
(8) attended graduate or professional school but did not finish.  
(9) attained a graduate degree (M.A., Ph. D.)
6. Were you employed full-time outside the home while this student was an infant (up to 1 year old)? \_\_\_yes \_\_\_no  
If yes, how many months? \_\_\_\_\_  
If yes, what was your average annual income earned?  
(1) less than \$10,000 (2) \$10,000-20,000  
(3) \$21,000-\$30,000 (4) over \$30,000  
If yes, who cared for the student?  
(1) spouse (2)relative (3)baby-sitter  
(4) day care center (5) other:\_\_\_\_\_
7. Were you employed full-time outside the home while this student was a child (1-6 years old)? \_\_\_yes \_\_\_no  
If yes, how many years? \_\_\_\_\_  
If yes, what was your average annual income earned?  
(1) less than \$10,000 (2) \$10,000-20,000  
(3) \$21,000-\$30,000 (4) over \$30,000  
If yes, who cared for the student?  
(1) spouse (2)relative (3)baby-sitter  
(4) day care center (5) other:\_\_\_\_\_
8. Were you employed full-time outside the home while this student was in grammar school? \_\_\_yes \_\_\_no  
If yes, how many years? \_\_\_\_\_  
If yes, what was your average annual income earned?  
(1) less than \$10,000 (2) \$10,000-20,000  
(3) \$21,000-\$30,000 (4) over \$30,000  
If yes, who cared for the student?  
(1) spouse (2)relative (3)baby-sitter  
(4) day care center (5) other:\_\_\_\_\_

9. Were you employed full-time outside the home while this student was in high school? \_\_\_\_yes \_\_\_\_no  
If yes, how many years? \_\_\_\_  
If yes, what was your average annual income earned?  
(1) less than \$10,000 (2) \$10,000-20,000  
(3) \$21,000-\$30,000 (4) over \$30,000  
If yes, who cared for the student?  
(1) spouse (2)relative (3)baby-sitter  
(4) day care center (5) other:\_\_\_\_\_

**APPENDIX E**

**SURVEY ITEMS FOR 1972 AND 1985**

## ITEMS OF FOUR VALUE AREAS (1972 AND 1985)

## Items concerning sexuality:

1. It is perfectly alright for a woman to be aggressive in sex and enjoy it.
2. Virginity in women is an old fashioned value.
- \*3. The primary purpose of sex is to have children.
- \*4. Sex is the most important gift a person can give to someone they love.
5. A person's body is his own. If he wished, he can expose it, enjoy it, or even give it away. It is nobody's business but his own.
6. Whether or not a person's morality is good or bad depends upon the situation the person is in at the time.
7. Adultery is not a law of God but a law of man.
- \*8. Public displays of affection (hugging and kissing) is not in good taste.
9. If they want to, it is alright for parents to go around the house naked in front of their children.
10. Sex should be discussed openly in the home.
11. If a man wants to marry a man or a woman wants to marry a woman, society should recognize their right to do so.
12. People who engage in sex before marriage are likely to make better marriage partners.

## Items concerning community:

1. If a person has good friends, he doesn't need kinfolk.
2. As they grow old, homes, like automobiles, should be traded in or junked.
- \*3. Formal weddings are important to the success of the marriage.
- \*4. A person is not a whole person until he has put down roots somewhere.
- \*5. A family's first obligation is to its own.

6. Interracial marriages do not make any difference if the couple is really in love.
7. If you wouldn't visit them if they were not relatives, then it's not right to visit them simply because they are relatives.
- \*8. Divorce is about the worst thing that can happen to a married couple.
- \*9. Family tradition and respect for elders is important to one's living the good life.
10. If a young married couple accepts help from their in-laws, they are in trouble.
- \*11. A person's first loyalty is to his family.
- \*12. Women should be obedient to their husbands.

Items concerning childrearing:

- \*1. It is desirable for parents to select playmates for their children.
- \*2. Children learn best under stress.
3. Family traditions hamper the search for one's self.
4. If a person can't find his place in the world, it is basically his parent's fault.
- \*5. Whenever possible, one's parents should approve of one's marriage partner before marriage.
- \*6. How to live as an adult can best be taught in our own homes.
- \*7. We should worry about boys who play with dolls.
- \*8. Permissive parents produce spoiled unruly children.
9. "Reading, writing, and arithmetic" are old-fashioned concepts that have no place in a modern society.
- \*10. Parents and children should eat their meals together.
11. An unhappy child indicates a parent that is incapable of love.
- \*12. A day-care center or a nursery cannot take the place of a mother.

## Items concerning economics:

- \*1. Because boys carry on the family name, it is important for them to inherit property.
2. Money can buy anything or anybody.
- \*3. A man who does not financially provide for his family is not much of a man.
- \*4. A proud husband would keep his wife from seeking employment outside the home.
- \*5. Money that is made in a certain community should be spent in that community.
6. It is easier to be happy if you are rich.
- \*7. Any boy who has inherited money from his father should spend that money the way his father would have wanted him to.
- \*8. Young married couples should be financially independent before they get married.
- \*9. A woman should never have a job with a higher income than her husband's job.
- \*10. A working wife's wages should be turned over to her husband.
11. A person should always spend all that he has and a little more too.
- \*12. If a young married couple is in debt, it is wrong for them to spend any money on having fun.

**APPENDIX F**

**CODING SHEETS FOR SURVEYS (1972 AND 1985)**

## CODE SHEET (1972)

	<u>IBM COLUMN</u>	<u>VARIABLE</u>
		<b>SURVEY ITEMS</b>
Card 1	1-48	Student's view on items
Card 2	1-48	Student guesses mother on items
Card 3	1-48	Mother's view on items
Card 4	1-48	Mother guesses student on items
		<b>STUDENT DEMOGRAPHICS</b>
Card 5	1	Sex
	2	Year in school
	3-5	Grade point average (no decimal)
	6	Marital status
	7	Hometown size
	8-9	Age
	10	Political views
	11	Number of siblings
	12	Ordinal position (4=only child, 2=any middle child)
		<b>PARENT DEMOGRAPHICS</b>
	26	Marital status
	27-29	Age
	30	Political views
	31	Education
	32-33	Employment during infancy
	34	Employment during childhood
	35	Employment during grammar school
	36	Employment during high school
	76-78	I. D.

0 = no response

## CODE SHEET (1985)

	<u>IBM COLUMN</u>	<u>VARIABLE</u>
		<b>STUDENT DEMOGRAPHICS</b>
Card 1	1	Sex
	2	Year in school
	3	Major declared (0=no, 1=yes)
	4-5	Grade point average (no decimal)
	6	Marital status
	7	Hometown size
	8	Age
	9-10	Political view
	11	Number of Siblings
	12	Ordinal position (4=only child, 2=any middle child)
	13	Peer group participation
		<b>SURVEY ITEMS</b>
	15-63	Student's view on items
	64-74	Student guesses mom on items
Card 2	1-38	Student guesses mom on items
	40-74	Student guesses dad on items
Card 3	1-14	Student guesses dad on items
		<b>MOTHER DEMOGRAPHICS</b>
Card 4	1	Sex
	2	Marital Status
	3-4	Age at first marriage
	5	Political view
	6	Education
	7	Employment during infancy
	8	Months employed
	9	Average annual income
	10	Day care arrangements
	11	Employment during childhood
	12	Years employed
	13	Average annual income
	14	Day care arrangements
	15	Employment during grammar school
	16	Years employed
	17	Average annual income
	18	Day care arrangements
	19	Employment during grammar school
	20	Years employed
	21	Average annual income
	22	Day care arrangements
	24-71	Mother's view on items
	73-75	Mother guesses student on items
Card 5	1-45	Mother guesses student on items

	<u>IBM COLUMN</u>	<u>VARIABLE</u>
		<b>FATHER DEMOGRAPHICS</b>
Card 6	1	Sex
	2	Marital Status
	3-4	Age at first marriage
	5	Political view
	6	Education
	7	Employment during infancy
	8	Months employed
	9	Average annual income
	10	Day care arrangements
	11	Employment during childhood
	12	Years employed
	13	Average annual income
	14	Day care arrangements
	15	Employment during grammar school
	16	Years employed
	17	Average annual income
	18	Day care arrangements
	19	Employment during grammar school
	20	Years employed
	21	Average annual income
	22	Day care arrangements
		<b>SURVEY ITEMS</b>
	24-71	Father's view on items
	73-75	Father guesses student on items
Card 7	1-45	Father guesses student on items
All cards	76-79	I.D.

Blank = no response

APPENDIX G

ADDITIONAL TABLES

TABLE XV

MEAN SCORES FOR SIGNIFICANT F-VALUES ON INDIVIDUAL  
VARIABLES FOR TABLES IX AND X

	<u>Sex</u>		<u>F-Value</u>
	<u>Males</u> N=249	<u>Females</u> N=337	
<u>Mother gauges youth</u>			
Long scale-childrearing	11.47	12.20	9.43
Short scale-childrearing	7.61	8.37	17.19
<u>Youth and Mother agree</u>			
Long scale-economics	12.57	11.57	9.00
Long scale-total	52.73	50.53	6.71
Short scale-sexuality	10.30	9.58	6.29
	<u>Work</u>		<u>F-Value</u>
	<u>Worked</u> N=299	<u>No Work</u> N=263	
<u>Mother gauges youth</u>			
Long scale-sexuality	12.98	13.10	4.25
Short scale-total	32.21	31.69	3.88

Means indicate amount of differences in each generations answers. As the means decrease the perception becomes more accurate.

TABLE XVI

MEAN SCORES FOR SIGNIFICANT F-VALUES ON INTERACTIONS  
FOR TABLES IX AND X

	Year * Sex				F-Values				
	1972		1985						
	Males N=138	Females N=195	Males N=73	Females N=108					
<u>Mom guesses Youth</u>									
Short scale-Community	11.46	12.07	8.16	7.51	5.89				
<u>Youth and Mom agree</u>									
Long scale-Community	15.29	15.32	11.31	10.15	4.56				
Short scale-Community	12.44	12.38	7.29	8.06	8.26				
	Work * Ed.				F-Values				
	High School or less		Above High School						
	Worked N=86	No Work N=101	Worked N=171	No Work N=150					
<u>Youth guesses Mom</u>									
Long scale-Sexuality	12.65	13.96	12.69	12.63	3.94				
Short scale-Sexuality	11.86	13.10	11.38	12.35	7.18				
	Sex * Ed * Work								F-Value
	Males				Females				
	H. S. or less Worked N=41		Above H. S. Worked N=61		H. S. or less Worked N=45		Above H. S. Worked N=110		
<u>Youth &amp; Mom agree</u>									
Long scale-Economic	12.12	12.62	12.26	12.25	11.89	13.16	11.72	12.58	4.66
	Sex * Ed * Work * Year								F-Value
	Males				Females				
	H. S. or less Worked N=20		Above H. S. Worked N=31		H. S. or less Worked N=24		Above H. S. Worked N=48		
<u>Youth guesses Mom</u>									
Long scale-Total	57.05	59.28	58.90	57.17	58.88	57.17	58.90	57.51	3.98
<u>1985</u>									
N=15	N=9	N=20	N=16	N=14	N=9	N=48	N=26		
<u>Youth guesses Mom</u>									
Long scale-total	41.33	37.11	37.90	39.75	38.64	42.56	38.85	40.12	

TABLE XVII

## FACTOR ANALYSIS FOR ALL ITEMS ON ALL VIEWS FOR BOTH YEARS

Items	1972				1985							
	Mom N=369	Kid N=369	Mom on kid	Kid on mom	Mom N=193	Kid N=217	Dad N=173	Mom on kid	Dad on kid	Kid on mom	Kid on dad	
<u>Community</u>												
1	.86	-.46*	.42*	-.42*	-.60*	-.34*	-.29	-.56*	.61*	-.54*	-.46*	
2	-.56*	-.87	.40*	-.20	.26	.89	.82	-.16	.38*	-.31*	-.34*	
3	.56*	.24	.83	.32*	.85	.48*	.20	-.81	.35*	.34*	.18	
4	-.85	.50*	.27	.27	.29	.39*	.40*	.30*	.87	.32*	.48*	
5	-.85	.49*	-.23	.52*	.61*	.43*	.49*	.57*	-.41*	.52*	.68*	
6	.32*	-.44*	.63*	-.23	.89	-.40*	-.43*	-.18	.38*	-.30*	.31*	
7	.52*	-.36*	.31*	-.44*	-.12	-.84	-.25	.24	.40*	-.37*	-.12	
8	-.39*	.36*	.86	.58*	.45*	.54*	.62*	.34*	-.18	.37*	.38*	
9	-.22	.68*	.58*	.68*	.61*	.62*	.47*	.70*	-.68*	.53*	.65*	
10	.87	-.18	.21	.22	-.87	.27	.25	.41*	-.14	.32*	.24	
11	.48*	.56*	.56*	.52*	.43*	.36*	.55*	.58*	-.66*	.51*	.61*	
12	-.48*	.30*	.88	.48*	.29	.61*	.37*	.27	-.87	.51*	.43*	
<u>Sexuality</u>												
1	.23	.52*	.58*	.54*	-.88	.32*	.24	.11	.14	.42*	.54*	
2	.52*	.67*	.55*	.61*	.46*	.43*	.44*	.47*	.53*	.58*	.57*	
3	.54*	-.33*	.60*	-.38*	-.85	-.13	-.35*	-.38*	.81	-.22	-.21	
4	-.18*	.24	.64*	.32*	.18	.22	.27	.46*	.66*	.22	.38*	
5	.33*	.57*	-.42*	.52*	.51*	.68*	.59*	.59*	.43*	.70*	.70*	
6	.28	.34*	.40*	.37*	.56*	.42*	.64*	.60*	.55*	.47*	.49*	
7	.44*	.52*	-.23	.25	.59*	.49*	.37*	.68*	.46*	.34*	.39*	
8	.58*	-.52*	-.24	-.25	-.38*	-.49*	-.24	-.28	-.16	-.40*	-.27	

Items that factor together (.30) are \*.

TABLE XVII (Continued)

Items	1972				1985						
	Mom N=369	Kid N=369	Mom on kid	Kid on mom	Mom N=193	Kid N=217	Dad N=173	Mom on kid	Dad on kid	Kid on mom	Kid on dad
<u>Sex. (cont.)</u>											
9	.23	.55*	.07	.44*	.35*	.35*	.41*	.38*	.00	.48*	.43*
10	.27	.32*	-.15	.48*	.20	.37*	.21	.30*	.01	.47*	.47*
11	.59*	.47*	-.35*	.38*	.69*	.47*	.49*	.36*	.12	.51*	.38*
12	.33*	.71*	.51*	.61*	.53*	.57*	.62*	.67*	.75*	.63*	.66*
<u>Childrearing</u>											
1	.03	.50*	.11	.31*	.52*	.21	.40*	-.20	-.29	.37*	.42*
2	.54*	.33*	.48*	-.28	-.31*	.63*	.18	.20	.46*	-.18	-.25
3	.34*	.47*	.47*	.60*	.43*	.28	.06	-.60*	-.52*	.61*	.54*
4	.34*	-.15	-.14	-.39*	-.60*	.38*	-.17	.54*	.60*	-.29	-.27
5	.06	.39*	.18	.26	.49*	.47*	.55*	-.25	.32*	.17	-.04
6	.58*	.12	-.47*	-.12	-.05	.31*	.47*	.23	.38*	-.22	.08
7	.45*	.59*	.51*	.61*	.43*	.39*	.48*	-.56*	-.51*	.47*	.47*
8	.05	.49*	-.66*	.59*	.20	.21	.59*	-.29	-.46*	.61*	.67*
9	.32*	.10	-.35*	-.37*	.13	.72*	-.09	.59*	.62*	-.28	-.20
10	.28	-.41*	-.25	-.47*	-.28	.15	-.05	.36*	.40*	-.53*	-.39*
11	.33*	.15	.64*	-.17	-.31*	.11	.43*	.45*	-.02	.03	.23
12	.60*	.37*	-.35*	.19	.37*	.36*	.57*	-.38*	-.35*	.55*	.60*
<u>Economics</u>											
1	-.33*	.38*	-.36*	.39*	.40*	.01	.56*	.13	.18	.43*	.43*
2	.58*	.31*	.45*	-.18	-.13	.21	.09	.28	.51*	.25*	.15
3	-.53*	.32*	-.06	.34*	.15	.60*	.62*	.53*	.60*	.49*	.66*
4	-.37*	.15	.44*	.27	.20	.12	.05	.14	.06	.02	.17
5	-.14	.46*	.21	.54*	.56*	.48*	.40*	.49*	.02	.34*	.47*

Items that factor together (.30) are \*.

TABLE XVII (Continued)

Items	1972				1985							
	Mom N=369	Kid N=369	Mom on kid	Kid on mom	Mom N=193	Kid N=217	Dad N=173	Mom on kid	Dad on kid	Kid on mom	Kid on dad	
<u>Eco. (cont.)</u>												
6	-.29	.18	.21	.43*	.53*	.50*	.62*	.52*	.61*	.63*	.76*	
7	-.08	.41*	.33*	.42*	.29	.38*	.05	.56*	.57*	.39*	.45*	
8	.52*	.31*	.39*	.29	.20	-.01	.22	-.01	-.07	.31*	.15	
9	-.27	.53*	.63*	.44*	.55*	.64*	.46*	.50*	.43*	.51*	.53*	
10	.35*	.49*	-.50*	.55*	.51*	.39*	.33*	.35*	.44*	.60*	.59*	
11	.61*	.46*	-.30*	.47*	.40*	.51*	.41*	.59*	.66*	.41*	.46*	
12	.42*	.55*	-.49*	.39*	.54*	.58*	.35*	.64*	.68*	.48*	.54*	

Items that factor together (.30) are \*.

VITA

Lynn Parkin Atkinson

Candidate for the Degree of  
Doctor of Philosophy

**Thesis:** THE GENERATION GAP: AN ANALYSIS OF SIMILAR AGE-COHORTS AND THEIR PARENTS AT TWO TIME PERIODS

**Major Field:** Sociology

**Biographical:**

**Personal Data:** Born in Salt Lake City, Utah, July 31, 1954, the daughter of William G. and Rebecca Bell Parkin. Married to Ross T. Atkinson on April 17, 1976.

**Education:** Graduated from College High School, Bartlesville, Oklahoma, in May, 1972; received Bachelor of Arts Degree in Social Work and Religion from Phillips University in May, 1976; received Master of Social Work degree from University of Oklahoma in December, 1973; completed requirements for the Doctor of Philosophy degree at Oklahoma State University in December, 1986.

**Professional Experience:** Social Worker, Department of Human Services, May 1976, to July, 1971; Social Worker, Youth Services of North Central Oklahoma, May 1982, to May, 1983; Teaching Assistant, Department of Sociology, Oklahoma State University, August 1983, to August 1985; Lecturer, Department of Sociology, Oklahoma State University, August 1985, to present.

**Professional Organizations:** American Sociological Association; Clinical Sociological Association; National Association of Social Workers; Mid-South Sociological Association, Southwestern Sociological Association; Alpha Kappa Delta.