

University of Nebraska - Lincoln

DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln

Historical Research Bulletins of the Nebraska
Agricultural Experiment Station (1913-1993)


Agricultural Research Division of IANR

8-1939

Personality Development in Farm, Small-Town, and City Children

Leland H. Stott

Follow this and additional works at: <http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/ardhistrb>

 Part of the [Human Ecology Commons](#), [Place and Environment Commons](#), and the [Rural Sociology Commons](#)

Stott, Leland H., "Personality Development in Farm, Small-Town, and City Children" (1939). *Historical Research Bulletins of the Nebraska Agricultural Experiment Station (1913-1993)*. 167.

<http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/ardhistrb/167>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Agricultural Research Division of IANR at DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln. It has been accepted for inclusion in Historical Research Bulletins of the Nebraska Agricultural Experiment Station (1913-1993) by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln.

COLLEGE OF AGRICULTURE UNIVERSITY OF NEBRASKA
AGRICULTURAL EXPERIMENT STATION
RESEARCH BULLETIN 114

Personality Development in Farm, Small-Town, and City Children

Leland H. Stott
Department of Home Economics

LINCOLN, NEBRASKA
AUGUST 1939

LIBRARY
NEBRASKA WESLEYAN UNIVERSITY

COLLEGE OF AGRICULTURE UNIVERSITY OF NEBRASKA
AGRICULTURAL EXPERIMENT STATION
RESEARCH BULLETIN 114

Personality Development in Farm, Small-Town, and City Children

Leland H. Stott
Department of Home Economics

LINCOLN, NEBRASKA
AUGUST 1939

CONTENTS

	Page
The Subjects	4
The Personality Variables	4
Home Setting and Intelligence	5
Home Setting and Personal Adjustment	8
Independence of Decision in Personal Problems and Difficulties	11
Personal Responsibility	14
Rationality of Thinking	15
Attitude Toward Work	17
Resourcefulness in Group Situations	20
Ethical Judgment	23
Honesty in the School Situation	25
Attitude Toward Home Life	26
Home Settings in Terms of Favorable Answers to Home-Life Questionnaire	28
General Discussion and Summary	31
Literature Cited	35

Personality Development in Farm, Small-Town, and City Children

LELAND H. STOTT¹
Department of Home Economics

The relative advantages and disadvantages of living in the city, in a small town, or in the country have been the subject of innumerable discussions. Many people believe that a farm in the open country, away from the artificiality and restrictions of city life, is the ideal place to rear a family. Others would question whether the advantages of the more natural, more simple, yet perhaps more rigorous life in the country are not more than compensated for by the greater educational facilities and more abundant opportunities for social participation in the city. Life in the small town, still others would maintain, is free from the evils of the city environment and also the disadvantages of farm life.

Because of modern means of transportation and communication the actual differences between these three general home settings are not nearly so marked as formerly. Despite these many leveling influences of modern life, the total environment, including that of the home, in each of the three general settings is in many respects quite different. Each undoubtedly has its advantages as well as its disadvantages from the point of view of child development. However, an answer to the question of how the three general home situations, as they exist today, actually rank in that regard can be determined only through research. Research should also finally reveal those features of the home environment and family life which characterize each general home setting, and specify which of these features are favorable and which are unfavorable to the most adequate personal development of young people.

Some research has already been accomplished in this field. A conclusion of one important study was that "the average level of family relations and personality adjustment of the children is somewhat higher for urban than for rural children" (24, p.7). Other investigators have furnished data on various specific aspects of the problem. For example, Furfey, by comparing the "development-age" scores of urban and rural boys, found differences favoring the urban boys "equivalent to about a year and one-third at age eleven, about two years at twelve, and about one-third of a year at thirteen" (8). This development-age difference Furfey attributes to the factor of urban, as against rural, environment.

One purpose of the present research project was to contribute further toward an adequate knowledge of the relative merits of urban and rural environments. In this bulletin the three general home settings already mentioned, namely the farm in the open country, the small town (600 to 1,300 in population), and the city, are compared as to their "favorable-

¹ The author wishes to acknowledge the cooperation and assistance of the school authorities, the teachers, and the pupils of the Omaha city high schools and of the ten high schools of rural Nebraska who participated in this study.

ness" in regard to the personality development of the children who grow up in them. The data for the comparisons are the average scores made by representative samples of young people from each environment on a set of tests and scales designed to measure certain aspects of character and personality. Certain home environmental factors and influences concerning which data were obtained, as well as other factors external to the home, are discussed in relation to some of the group differences in test performance which appeared.

THE SUBJECTS

The data of the study were obtained from 1,855 adolescents of the state of Nebraska. Of these young people, 695 were living and had grown up on farms in various parts of the state, 640 were children of parents not engaged in farming and were living in small towns, while the remaining 520 were from homes representing the various occupational and economic levels of the city of Omaha.

TABLE 1.—*Age and sex distributions of subjects.*

Age, nearest birthday	Farm group			City group			Town group		
	Boys	Girls	Both	Boys	Girls	Both	Boys	Girls	Both
11	1	..	1
12	3	1	4	1	2	3
13	11	27	38	5	4	9	19	34	53
14	48	69	117	51	47	98	62	68	130
15	79	98	177	101	71	172	78	87	165
16	75	85	160	79	71	150	72	91	163
17	73	53	126	32	36	68	54	40	94
18	23	28	51	8	11	19	11	11	22
19	10	7	17	2	..	2	5	4	9
20	2	1	3	2	..	2	..	1	1
22	..	1	1
N	325	370	695	280	240	520	302	338	640
Mean age (years)	15.8	15.6	15.7	15.4	15.5	15.5	15.4	15.2	15.3
σ	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.2	1.1	1.2	1.4	1.4	1.4

All testing was done with the cooperation of the high-school authorities and during school time. Since care was taken in the selection of the schools to sample the various parts of the state and each section of the city, our groups may be regarded as fairly representative of the high-school population of the state. The age range was 11 to 22 years and the sexes were approximately equally represented. Complete sex and age distributions are presented in Table 1.

THE PERSONALITY VARIABLES

Ten different aspects of personality were selected for study from among the many which are usually considered socially and personally desirable and which presumably are more or less amenable to environmental influences. These were (1) general scholastic aptitude as measured by the

Otis group test of mental ability, (2) personal adjustment, (3) independence of decision in regard to personal problems and difficulties, (4) personal responsibility in maintaining satisfactory relationships with others, (5) rationality of thinking (freedom from irrational and emotionalized associations), (6) attitude toward work, (7) ethical judgment, (8) resourcefulness in group situations, (9) honesty in the school situation, and (10) attitude toward home life.²

It will be observed that variables 1 to 6 represent to a large degree general personal adequacy and integrity without dependence upon or direct reference to other individuals. Variables 7 to 10, on the other hand, represent traits and tendencies involving or implying more directly social relationships. High ratings in all of them, it is assumed, are socially desirable, and hence the size of the average scores made by representatives of a particular environmental group may be taken as indices of the "favorableness" of that environment for personality development of a desirable sort.

HOME SETTING AND INTELLIGENCE

The findings of recent investigations of the relation between the cultural environment and the I.Q. have served to raise anew the whole question of the stability and the meaning of the tested I.Q. No one, of course, would doubt the obvious fact that individuals actually vary widely in native intellectual capacity regardless of the cultural environment. The main point at issue seems rather to be whether or to what extent the I.Q., as measured by the tests of "intelligence" in current use, may be depended upon as an index of the degree of native endowment possessed by the individual.

The theoretical assumption of the makers of the tests is, of course, that the environmental factor is controlled by the nature of the test items themselves, and to the extent to which that assumption is valid, differences in I.Q. may be taken to represent differences in native capacity. Findings of recent years, however, suggest that the importance of the environmental factor has been underestimated, and that the degree of control experimentally imposed upon it by the nature of the tests has not been sufficient to equalize it, even within the range of the cultural environment to be found in the ordinary American community. Studies made at the Iowa Child Welfare Research Station, for example, have shown the effects of changes in school and home environments. Attendance at the University preschool laboratories and at the University junior high school, according to their results, produced substantial gains in I.Q. These gains, furthermore, were found to be actual and not temporary or spurious (23). In a study of the effects of changing very young children from an underprivileged to a more favorable home environment, Skeels (18) showed that (1) the mean intelligence level of the children, after a period of residence in the better environment, was higher than would be expected

² Scores on four of these variables, namely adjustment, rationality of thinking, honesty and ethical judgment, were obtained by use of Maller's inventory (13). The other variables were measured by means of scales developed for use in the present study. Some technical details and fuller descriptions of these scales, including estimates of their reliability, are reported elsewhere (20 and 21).

for children coming from the educational and socio-economic levels represented by the true parents; (2) there was a zero correlation between the I.Q. of the mother and that of the child; and (3) the mental level of the children compared favorably with that reported by others for children of similar age from superior occupational levels. It was also shown that the length of time during which children remained in impoverished environments was negatively correlated with I.Q., showing again the importance of the home environment in determining the scholastic aptitude of children (19).

A number of other investigators both in the United States and in Europe have obtained results which lead to similar conclusions (2, 4, 7, and 16). The I.Q. as tested is without doubt in most cases a valuable indication of scholastic aptitude of the individual child, but that I.Q. apparently has been determined to a considerable degree by the level of

TABLE 2.—*Comparisons of mean Otis I.Q.'s of farm, small-town, and city adolescents.*

Group	N	Mean Otis I.Q.	CR
City boys	226	105.4	City >farm, 5.29
Town boys	294	102.9	Town >farm, 3.23
Farm boys	318	99.9	City >town, 2.52
City girls	204	107.0	City >farm, 5.10
Town girls	330	104.5	Town >farm, 2.93
Farm girls	364	102.1	City >town, 2.55
Total city	430	106.1	City >farm, 7.04
Total town	624	103.8	Town >farm, 4.45
Total farm	682	101.1	City >town, 3.19

the cultural environment in which the child has grown, and is definitely subject to future change with radical changes in the cultural environment.

In Table 2 are presented the mean Otis I.Q.'s of our three residence groups of adolescents. The means are shown for boys and girls separately as well as for the total groups. The differences are not great but they may be taken as representing actual differences existing in the three populations, since they are from two to seven times their standard errors. The groups are listed in the table in the order of the size of the mean I.Q., the urban group being first, the small-town group second, and the farm group last. Differences of a similar magnitude in tested mental ability between city children and rural children have, of course, been obtained by a number of previous investigators.³ Usually, however, the suggestion has been that population movements from the country to the city or from the city to the country have tended to raise the average level of native intelligence in the city at the expense of the country and that the differences in tested intelligence favoring the urban children were therefore hereditarily determined. Clearly, the extent to which this has been true is not known.

³ Baldwin and others (3) reported no significant differences in intelligence score between rural and urban preschool children, but for older children they found the urban children superior. They suggested the environmental factor, *i.e.*, the difference in cultural advantages of school and community, as the important differentiating factor.

Another explanation of obtained differences favoring urban over rural children which has often been suggested is that the tests were constructed primarily for use with city children—that the test items are based upon the common cultural environment of the city and that they, therefore, arbitrarily impose a handicap upon rural children when compared directly with urban children. According to this view, rural children average lower in “intelligence” as measured, not only because their past cultural environment has not been so stimulating to mental development, but also because they are given an unfair disadvantage, in comparison with urban children, by the test itself. As was stated above, this eventuality is guarded against in the construction of the tests and probably is, therefore, a relatively unimportant factor. The obtained group differences probably represent actual differences in average mental ability, but those differences may well be largely due to differences in cultural advantages.

TABLE 3.—*Comparison of mean ratings of the “cultural level” of the homes of farm, small town, and city subjects.*

Group	Mean rating cultural level of home	CR
City	11.1	City > farm, 3.81
Town	10.6	Town > farm, 3.24
Farm	9.5	

That the general cultural advantages of home, school, and community are, on the average, greatest for the city child and least for the farm child is a matter of common observation. In the present investigation a crude quantitative rating of the cultural level of the family of each subject was made. This rating was derived from answers to questionnaire items regarding the education of the parents and the amount and quality of the reading matter in the home. The rating was definitely limited in scope and did not take into account many of the factors that in one way or another may have affected the total cultural environment of the home. The many factors of school and community which constitute the greater cultural environment were of course not touched upon. It proved, however, to be satisfactorily reliable as an index to that limited aspect of the cultural environment.⁴

The means of these ratings of the homes of each residence group are given in Table 3. As would be expected, the city homes ranked highest and the farm homes lowest in mean “cultural level.” Both the city and the town means were reliably higher than that for the farm. This ranking of the three home situations corresponds to the ranking of the residence groups in mean Otis I.Q.

⁴ The reliability of this rating, in terms of the correlation between 250 sibling pairs, was +.89. The items on which it was based were adapted directly from the Sims Score Card of Socio-economic Status, Public School Publishing Company, Bloomington, Illinois. A description of the home-life questionnaire and of the items used in the rating of cultural level may be found in an earlier report (21).

Correlations between "cultural level" of family and I.Q. for our groups were found to be rather low, ranging between $+.21$ for farm boys and $+.34$ for city boys.⁵ The standard errors of these r 's were $.053$ and $.058$ respectively. There is, of course, no way of determining the nature of this relationship, *i.e.*, whether or to what extent intelligence is cause or effect in its relation to cultural status. However, the evidence from other sources referred to above strongly suggests that the differences in mean I.Q. favoring the urban and small-town groups were, to some extent at least, due to differences in cultural advantages both in the home and in the larger social environment and especially the school. Just as the underprivileged children showed definite gains in tested I.Q. under the stimulating influences of their foster homes, so also might the average "intelligence" level of the farm population rise as the cultural aspects of the farm home, school, and community environments are gradually raised through improved educational practices and the various forms of educational and rural community betterment programs.

HOME SETTING AND PERSONAL ADJUSTMENT

The adequacy of an individual's adjustments to life in general, and particularly to the social aspects of his environment, undoubtedly depends to some extent upon his inherent nature, but it is generally considered rather an individual achievement growing directly out of experience and training. A youngster is adequately and happily adjusted to life to the extent to which his general social environment has furnished him opportunity for the practice and establishment of attitudes and modes of thinking related to real situations and to persons and groups involved in those situations. Since the home and its setting constitute to a large extent the social environment of childhood, one's personal adjustment is largely determined by the home environment in relation to the larger social environment—the community. As Sidonie M. Gruenberg (9) writes, "during this development from infancy through the subsequent stages of growth, the home stands out as the most important single influence. For it is, in its very essence, a continuity of relationships, a unifying and coordinating agency for all of the child's experiences. Whatever he sees in the outside world, all that he experiences in thought and feeling, is, in the last analysis, interpreted under the psychological domination of the home pattern."

In so far as this may be true, one of the best tests of the desirability of a particular home setting would be the extent to which the children—the products of that home setting—have, on the average, achieved an adequate and happy personal adjustment.

With the Maller adjustment score as a measure of personal adjustment, a comparison of our three home settings may be drawn from the data in Table 4. The urban group again ranked definitely and reliably above the small-town and farm groups. This agrees with the finding of the White

⁵ These coefficients are of about the same order as those obtained by others between socio-economic status, as measured by the Chapman-Sims method, and I.Q.; Chapman and Wiggins (5) obtained a correlation of $+.32$, while Chauncey (6) found one of only $+.21$.

House Conference study mentioned in the beginning. The farm, however, instead of ranking lowest, as in I.Q., ranked above the town in mean adjustment score. The difference is not significant in the case of the boys, but for the girls and for the combined groups, though not large, the differences are reliable. Whatever may have been the factor or factors responsible for the difference in ease of adjustment between small-town and city adolescents, they apparently were somewhat more effective in the case of the girls.

TABLE 4.—*Comparison of mean personal adjustment (Maller "A") scores of farm, small-town, and city groups.*

Group	N	Mean adjustment score	CR
City boys	260	38.0	City >town, 3.33
Farm boys	317	36.8	City >farm, 2.11
Town boys	302	36.0	
City girls	221	38.4	City >town, 7.46
Farm girls	372	35.9	City >farm, 4.55
Town girls	332	34.0	Farm >town, 3.52
Total city	481	38.2	City >town, 7.86
Total farm	689	36.3	City >farm, 4.75
Total town	634	34.9	Farm >town, 3.50

Is the explanation for these group differences to be found in the actual quality of the home life and the family relationships characteristic of the three home settings, or is it to be found in certain inherent factors in each general setting quite outside the home environment as such, or which, perhaps, exert certain influences, favorable or unfavorable, upon the home life and family relationships? The quality of the home life and relationships of a family in most cases, of course, would depend to a large extent upon its larger cultural environment. The effectiveness in the life of the child of any family custom or parent-child relationship would also be conditioned by certain community attitudes and patterns of conduct and thinking. The home environment in relation to the general cultural setting in which a child is reared, then, is probably largely responsible for the adequacy of his adjustment to life.

In an attempt to discover some of the items of family life which were related to the various measures of personality development in our subjects, answers to a set of questions regarding their home background were obtained.⁶ Biserial correlations between the subjects' answers and the personality scores were computed. In Table 5 are listed, in the order of the size of the relationship for each home setting, the family-life items which yielded correlations of +.20 or greater with personal adjustment score. These correlations ranged up to +.44 with standard errors ranging from .059 to .086. As will be seen in the table, certain items were of some importance for one sex but not for the other.

⁶ These questions, together with those concerning the economic and cultural status of the family, constituted the home-life questionnaire. This was described in some detail in a previous report (21).

As judged by the number of questionnaire items which yielded significant correlations, home and family life appears to have been considerably more important in determining the adequacy of the child's personal adjustment in the city than either in the small town or on the farm. It will also be noted that the items dealing with person-to-person relationships with parents were, in general, of relatively greater importance to the urban youngsters' adjustments. This, together with the fact that the urban subjects averaged significantly higher in adjustment scores, fits well the suggestion offered by the authors of the report of the White House Con-

TABLE 5.—*Family-life items which were significantly related to personal adjustment scores, listed in the order of their importance for each home setting. The correlations ranged between +.20 and +.44.*

Urban	Town	Farm
Confidential relationship with father.	Parents welcome child's friends in home.	Infrequent punishment.
Mother not nervous.	Family excursions, picnics, visits, church, etc.	Parents welcome child's friends in home. ¹
Affectionate relationship with mother.	Enjoyable times in home as family group.	Enjoyable times in home as family group. ¹
Infrequent punishment.	Infrequent punishment. ¹	Confidential relationship with father. ²
Family excursions—picnics, visits, church.	Mother not nervous. ²	Mother does not work outside the home. ²
Father not nervous.	Father not nervous. ¹	Mother not nervous. ¹
Nothing in mother's behavior to criticize. ¹	Confidential relationship with mother. ²	
Enjoyable times in home as family group. ¹	Affectionate relationship with mother. ¹	
Regular meals together as family group. ¹		
Nothing in father's behavior to criticize. ¹		
Father seldom sick in bed. ¹		
Confidential relationship with mother. ¹		

¹ Relationship significant for boys but not for girls.

² Relationship significant for girls but not for boys.

ference study referred to in the beginning, that "the loss of certain economic and other functions from the home makes possible the more harmonious organization of family life upon a cultural and affectional basis" (24, p. 7). This of course would be more true in general of the urban than of the rural home. As they suggest further, this greater amount of available time together with greater opportunity to affiliate with child study and child care movements probably makes for greater appreciation of the importance of harmonious personal relationships in the home. Greater freedom from household tasks also means more time for the establishment of those relationships and for family group activities.

The social life and group activities of the family (Table 5) appear to have been of considerable importance to all groups. They were, however, of particular importance, in comparison with the other items, to the town group. As was suggested above, there are probably present in each of the home settings peculiar difficulties and problems to cope with in rearing children. The adolescent girl in the small town apparently labors under certain handicaps, so far as her personal adjustment is concerned, which are more or less peculiar to the small-town situation. To bring about an improvement in the general level of family life in small towns, particularly in those matters which prove to be associated with the girl's adjustment, should help to counteract to a greater extent the unfavorable effects of those aspects of the small-town situation, whatever they may be, which hinder the adolescent girl in achieving a desirable personal adjustment to life.

As child study and parent-education activities and agencies are extended more and more into rural areas, and as the importance of family leisure-time activities is more fully appreciated, perhaps better use will be made of the available leisure and of the opportunities for constructive and happy family life. With this should come a rise in the level of adjustment of farm young people.

INDEPENDENCE OF DECISION IN PERSONAL PROBLEMS AND DIFFICULTIES

Another trait which has been regarded not only as extremely important to the individual but also as directly dependent upon home influences and training for its development is "self-reliance". The term "self-reliance", however, as is true with most trait names, has been used in a variety of senses and to refer to a variety of sorts of behavior. An analysis (20) of a "test" designed to measure the trait revealed at least four independent aspects or varieties of self-reliance. One of these was described as "independence of decision in regard to personal problems and difficulties." The mean score of any residence group on a scale which was designed to measure this particular variable is here regarded as one index of the "favorableness" of that particular home setting for desirable personality development.

This trait, as was stated before, has to do with personal adequacy to meet a certain type of life situation. Young persons scoring high in this trait would be inclined to "stand on their own feet" in time of crisis or when confronted with difficulty. They would assume responsibility for, and be willing to take the consequences of, their own acts. This independence and personal adequacy in an adolescent, however, would not necessarily mean that he was non-communicative or inclined not to confide in his parents or friends. A confidential relationship of the best sort with his parents should, on the contrary, contribute to the development of such a trait of independence. With the realization that he can always depend upon a sympathetic understanding, without personal censure or blame, from his parents in regard to his independent decisions and the solutions

of his difficulties, even in cases where they were perhaps not the most wise or desirable ones possible, he would not only be more inclined to confide in them in all matters but he would also continually receive encouragement to stand upon his own feet and to meet life's problems realistically.

Another point which we should mention is that this trait is clearly related, to some extent, with personal adjustment. Many persons who rate high in "independence", it would be expected, would also rate relatively high in "adjustment", since an adequate adjustment to life would involve the tendency personally to meet life's problems. The degree of correlation actually found between the two sets of scores was of the order of +.50. This of course indicates considerable overlapping between the two measures. That each involves much that is independent of the other, however, is indicated by the coefficient of alienation of +.87 between them.

TABLE 6.—*Comparison of mean scores in "independence in regard to personal problems and difficulties" of farm, small-town, and city subjects.*

Group	N	Mean independence score	CR
City boys	265	41.1	City >town, 2.95
Farm boys	315	39.9	
Town boys	284	38.8	
City girls	224	40.4	City >town, 5.17
Farm girls	352	37.6	City >farm, 3.37
Town girls	320	35.9	Farm >town, 2.21
Total city	489	40.8	City >town, 5.83
Total farm	667	38.7	City >farm, 3.67
Total town	604	37.3	Farm >town, 2.50

Our interest now is to see how the three home settings compared in the extent to which they produced young folks who scored high in this variety of self-reliance. In Table 6 are shown the mean "independence" scores for the various groups and the reliable differences in terms of standard units (CR). The urban group maintained first place as before. As in personal adjustment, the farm group came second in size of mean score. The difference between farm and city boys was negligible, as was also that between town and farm boys. The difference between the city and the town boys, however, had a critical ratio of 2.95. All the differences for the girls, as well as those between the total groups, were reliably large. Again the factors in the three home settings which underlay the differences in mean "independence" scores were more effective in producing differences in the case of the girls. It will also be noted that the town and farm girls averaged definitely lower than the boys of the corresponding residence groups, whereas in the case of the city group the means for the boys and girls were not significantly different.

As we have said, home training is generally regarded by writers in the field of child development as an extremely important factor in the development of self-reliance. Among the factors which presumably would have

some part in determining the amount and nature of home training for independence and self-reliance are parental attitudes regarding the question of authoritarian control over children. Ojemann in one of his studies (17) has shown that on the average the attitude of child-development specialists is more "favorable" toward self-reliance than that of parents. He suggests that through training the average attitude of parents might be made more nearly to approach that of the specialists and thus to become more conducive to the development of self-reliance in their children.

In connection with the present project, scores in attitude toward the question of adolescent freedom vs. parental control were obtained from samples of the parents of our three residence groups (22). Parents' attitude against strict parental control was found to correlate slightly with their youngsters' scores in independence in personal matters. With fathers' attitude the correlation was $+ .23$, standard error $.104$. Agreement between mother and father in attitude seemed also to be a factor, since the correlation between the averages of the two parental attitude scores and childrens' independence scores was $+ .30$, with a standard error of $.118$.

TABLE 7.—*Comparison of mean scores in attitude toward adolescent freedom vs. strict parental control of samples of the fathers of the three residence groups.*

Group	N	Mean attitude score	CR
City fathers	25	65.2	City >town, 3.97
Farm fathers	27	46.0	City >farm, 3.42
Town fathers	20	44.7	

Differences in attitude between the parents from the three home settings were also determined. Since fathers' attitude was found to be of some importance in relation to our present problem the comparisons of fathers' scores are presented in Table 7. The ranking of the three father groups in attitude favoring the granting of freedom of decision to adolescent children, it will be noted, is the same as that of the corresponding groups of young people in regard to mean independence scores. Our data suggest, then, that fathers' attitude was a factor in the determining of the relative ranking of the three home settings in "favorableness" for the development of this particular variety of self-reliance.

Of the specific items of home life covered by our questionnaire, only a few showed any significant degree of relationship with scores in independence. For city boys, a confidential relationship with father, a confidential relationship with mother, nothing in mother's behavior to criticize, and family recreational excursions gave correlations of between $+ .36$ and $+ .23$ (standard errors between $.074$ and $.079$) with the trait score. None of the correlations for the city girls was significant. For the town girls, however, three of the items showed some degree of correlation. These were parental welcome of the child's friends in the home and enjoyable times in the home (coefficients were $+ .35$ and $+ .28$ with standard

errors of .069 and .066 respectively). These same two items also appeared to have some importance for the farm boys. The correlations, however, were even lower (+.22 for both). In general all of these items were reported most frequently by the city subjects.

Again we may suggest that with the continued extension of parent educational movements into rural areas, an improvement should result in the average level of the development of independence and self-reliance in rural youth. As Ojemann suggests, attitudes are susceptible to educational influences.

PERSONAL RESPONSIBILITY

Another aspect of self-reliance is one which we have called "personal responsibility." This trait, like "independence," has particularly to do with one's adequacy and efficiency in handling one's own affairs in everyday life. It differs from the "independence" factor in that the individual's relationships with others are involved. A young person scoring high in the variable states that he may be depended upon, and that he relies upon himself to keep his appointments and promises and to meet his obligations to others—that he holds himself alone responsible for his part in generally maintaining satisfactory personal relationships with others.

TABLE 8.—*Comparison of mean scores in "personal responsibility" of farm, small-town, and city subjects.*

Group	N	Mean responsibility score	CR
Farm boys	315	20.9	Farm > town, 3.26
City boys	265	20.2	City > town, 2.29
Town boys	288	19.4	
City girls	223	22.8	City > town, 5.00
Farm girls	352	22.1	Farm > town, 2.56
Town girls	321	21.0	
Total farm	667	21.5	City > town, 4.62
Total city	488	21.4	Farm > town, 4.19
Total town	609	20.2	

The extent to which a child forms habits of this sort clearly depends upon the opportunity—perhaps the necessity—for practice which his home life and other portions of his social environment provide for him. A family in which children are taught by example and trained by actual practice, in their relationships with each other and with their parents, to keep their promises and agreements and to assume personal responsibility for them—where children are gradually placed more and more upon their own responsibility in such matters as getting up in time for school or doing their home work or "getting in" at the proper time at night—would provide a favorable environment for the development of "personal responsibility."

As may be seen in Table 8 the three residence groups were not greatly different in mean score in "personal responsibility." Between the farm and

the city groups the differences are insignificant. Both farm and city, however, averaged a little higher than the small town, suggesting again the superiority of the urban and farm home settings over that of the small town when judged in terms of the mean scores of the children.

It will also be noted that the girls of each group scored higher than the boys. This sex difference in each case is statistically reliable. Girls, according to their self-estimates, then, take their personal obligations a little more seriously than do boys.

The sort of family experience which, from a theoretical standpoint, should favor the development of "responsibility" has already been suggested. None of the items of the home-life questionnaire was especially designed to obtain specific information relative to that particular kind of family experience. Some of the questionnaire items, nevertheless, yielded low but significant correlations with the "responsibility" score. In the city situation according to these correlations the families which tended to favor the development of personal responsibility were those in which punishment was infrequent, where the children shared their joys and troubles with their parents, where the members had frequent good times together in the home, where frequent family picnics and other recreational excursions were enjoyed, and where the father showed a minimum of nervousness.

In the small-town situation, in general the same group of items gave indications of relationship with the "responsibility" score in one sex or in both. In addition parental welcome of the child's friends in the home yielded a slight correlation. The latter item appeared to be the most important of all in its relation to the "responsibility" score in the farm subjects. Enjoyable times in the home, family recreational excursions, and a minimum of nervousness in mother tended also to characterize the farm families whose children scored high in personal responsibility.

It will be observed that all of the family-life items which were associated with personal responsibility scores in the children had directly to do with either the general social life of the family or with the personal relationships with the parents. Most of these items were reported less frequently by the small-town group than by either the farm or the city group. This suggests once more the possibilities of parent education as a means of raising the level of family life and, hence, of the personal development of the rural children, particularly those growing up in small towns.

RATIONALITY OF THINKING

Part I of Maller's CASE Inventory, the controlled association test, according to its author, furnishes an indirect measurement of emotionalized response patterns in the individual. The test consists of 50 stimulus words selected from the Kent-Rosanoff and the Jung "free association" lists, with two response words following each stimulus word. The subject is instructed simply to look at the stimulus word and then underline the response word which seems to him to be the more closely connected in his mind with the stimulus. One of these response words in each case is the word reported by previous investigators as the most frequent response given in

free-association tests to the stimulus word. It is therefore regarded as the "normal" response. The other response word in each case is one which in free-association tests was found to be extremely uncommon, or which indicated an emotionalized, personalized connection with the stimulus word or which, in addition to being uncommon, represented a superstition rather than a rational associative connection. Each of the 50 items of the test was found by Maller to differentiate significantly between pupils of the New York probationary schools and normal children.

The score on the test is simply the number of "normal" response words underlined. The higher a child's score on the test, the more frequently do his associations correspond to those most common among normal individuals. The lower the score the more eccentric, irrational, emotionalized, or superstitious are his associations, and the more frequently are his responses the same as those commonly given by children who are mal-adjusted, emotionally or otherwise.

TABLE 9.—*Comparison of mean rationality of thinking scores of farm, small-town, and city groups.*

Group	N	Mean rationality- of-thinking score	CR
City boys	260	38.4	City >town, 3.45
Farm boys	318	36.9	City >farm, 2.88
Town boys	300	36.5	
City girls	221	39.9	City >town, 6.33
Farm girls	363	37.3	City >farm, 5.20
Town girls	333	36.8	
Total city	481	39.1	City >town, 6.76
Total farm	681	37.1	City >farm, 5.56
Total town	633	36.6	

A child's ideational connections and superstitions, it is assumed, are products of his social environment. His score in "rationality of thinking" is regarded, therefore, as one possible indirect measure of the desirability of the environment in which he has developed. If his score reflects a relatively large number of eccentric, emotionalized, and superstitious associations presumably some portion or aspect of his immediate social environment is responsible.

May our three home settings, then, fairly be compared as to "favorableness" in terms of the mean scores of the youngsters in "rationality"? The means, and the significant group differences, are given in Table 9. The city environment, if we accept this as a criterion of "favorableness," was significantly more "favorable" than either the town or farm. The latter two settings ranked practically the same. None of our group means, however, were significantly lower than the mean obtained by Maller (14) for a group of well adjusted junior high school students (37.6).

The question as to what particular aspects of the total environment of the child have most weight in determining "rationality" or "irrationality"

of thinking as measured by the test is left quite unanswered by our data. One would quite naturally expect that in the home life would most frequently be found the determining factors. Of the home-life items covered by our questionnaire only two, namely, punishment during the previous week and being an only child, gave any indication of a relationship with "rationality" scores. In city boys the correlation between punishment and "rationality" was $-.27$, standard error $.076$, and in farm boys it was $-.21$, standard error $.073$. For the city girls, the farm girls, and both boys and girls of the town group the corresponding correlations were insignificant.

When each of the 140 "only" children in the total sample was matched as to sex, Otis I.Q., socio-economic status, and home setting, the mean score in "rationality of thinking" of the "non-only" children was 1.8 points higher than the mean for the "only" children. This difference is, of course, small but reliable statistically. This offers at least the suggestion that the lack of other children in the family may favor the development of peculiar or "irrational" word associations. This does not help us directly to account for the average superiority of the city youngsters in "rationality" since there were about two "only" children among the urban subjects for each one among the rural subjects.⁷ It does suggest, however, that the "rationality" score depends to some extent upon the number and variety of intimate social contacts with other children, either in the home or outside the home. A child reared in relative isolation from other children, one might reasonably expect, would naturally form more uncommon and "eccentric" word associations than the average child. He might, at the same time, be just as "normal" and free from emotional maladjustment and from hampering superstitions as many others with higher scores. This suggests, further, that perhaps the small difference in mean "rationality" scores between the urban and the rural subjects reflects merely a difference in the average frequency and variety of social contacts with other children, which naturally makes for "commonness" of ideational connections. If this is true, then the association test, even though it may be very useful and diagnostic when used within a given cultural group, is perhaps not a fair measure of relative "favorableness" of different cultural environments.

ATTITUDE TOWARD WORK

It is probably true that, on the average, farm boys and girls do more and heavier manual work and have less leisure time than do young people living in the town or city. Farm work in general, however, is more varied and less routinized than most town or city jobs. There are, of course, the inevitable daily "chores" on the farm, but for the most part the work varies in character and degree of urgency with the seasons. The kinds of leisure-time activity in which young people might engage also differ in the three home settings, even though modern means of transportation have brought the farm, town, and city much closer together.

⁷ About 6, 8, and 14 per cent of the farm, town, and city groups respectively were "only" children.

In view of the differences in work and play conditions, how do adolescents of the three home situations differ in attitude toward work in general? Does the heavy, rough work through long hours in the fields and in the relatively poorly equipped farm homes tend to make farm youngsters dislike the idea of work in general, or does it give them a relatively greater acceptance and appreciation of its importance? Or does the city youngster, with the near-by playground, tennis court, swimming pool, and amusement park, and with more spare time in which to enjoy them, acquire, on the average, greater or less dislike for work than does the rural youngster? Since most people must necessarily adjust themselves to some sort of life work, attitude toward the idea of work in general, as opposed to a life of leisure and ease, appears to be one rather important aspect of personal adjustment to life.

TABLE 10.—*Comparison of mean scores in attitude toward work of farm, small-town, and city groups.*

Group	N	Mean attitude score	CR
Farm boys	317	77.0	Farm > town, 2.20
City boys	280	75.3	
Town boys	286	73.9	
Farm girls	356	77.8	Farm > town, 4.43
City girls	238	76.3	City > town, 2.95
Town girls	332	72.4	
Total farm	673	77.4	Farm > town, 4.62
Total city	518	75.7	City > town, 2.63
Total town	618	73.1	

One's attitude toward work undoubtedly depends not alone upon the type of work, amount of time spent in work, and the relative attractiveness of leisure-time activities but also upon the attitudes of those in one's immediate environment. Hence the home with its personal relationships is often one important factor in determining the characteristic way in which a child comes to regard work and play.

In the present study an attempt was made to measure attitude toward work in our three residence groups by means of a scale which was constructed for the purpose.⁸ In the instructions accompanying the scale the subject's attention was directed to a consideration and expression of attitude toward work—the daily tasks—which confronted him at home or at school *at the time*, rather than some anticipated life work of the future. In Table 10 are the comparative data for the residence groups in attitude toward work as measured by this scale.

All of the distributions of attitude scores were considerably skewed toward the "favorable" end of the scale. In terms of mean attitude scores, the farm scored highest, the city second, while the town again scored

⁸ A modification of Thurstone's method of "equal appearing intervals" was used in the construction of the attitude scale. The Spearman-Brown estimated reliability based upon a correlation of "odd" item scores with "even" item scores was +.88.

lowest. All of the differences between farm and town were large enough to be reliable, while those between farm and city were insignificant. Something about life on the farm then apparently gives young people a little more of an appreciative attitude toward their daily tasks than does life in town.

As was suggested above, the nature of the work itself and the conditions under which it is done undoubtedly affect the attitude. In addition, there probably is present a general cultural difference between farm and town. Greater emphasis and value are probably placed upon habits and attitudes of industry. An observation made in one study was that "One of the great advantages possessed by rural children is their training in responsibility for certain work that they are required to do regularly. On a farm some of the many duties are generally apportioned to the children who follow a daily routine in their chores" (3, p. 152). The child is made responsible for the carrying on of his particular part of the common farm family enterprise. In the town or city, on the other hand, there usually is no common family enterprise but the job which actually produces the family income is the father's individual concern. Consequently, little tasks and responsibilities which are actually connected with the common financial welfare of the family and which small members of the family can take over, are not to be found. Thus, training in industry and attitude toward daily work for young children is not so naturally a part of the town and city home situations. Perhaps the farm subject tended to score high on the scale partly because that sort of attitude is the acceptable one in his particular culture.

As was the case with the other variables which we have considered, families within any particular culture probably differ widely as to the direction, or the extent to which attitude toward work is influenced in the individual child. What then are the common characteristics of the families in each general setting whose children tended to score higher than average in attitude toward work? Among the items of family life covered by our questionnaire a few showed some degree of association with this attitude variable in each residence group. Rather surprisingly, most of these items bear no obvious relationship to the attitude. According to these correlations, however, those farm families in which the parents welcomed the child's friends in the home, and in which frequent good times were enjoyed in the home, tended to produce more "favorable" attitudes toward work in their children. In the small-town-home situation, in addition to the two items named for the farm situation, another condition favoring this attitude was, that there be nothing in the behavior of the father or the mother which the child wished particularly to criticize.

In the city-home setting nine different items were indicated as having some association with this attitude in one sex or in both. These were, roughly, in the order of the size of the correlation coefficient, as follows: frequent recreational excursions as a family group, confidential relationships between the child and the parents, frequent enjoyable times together in the home, meals together at regular hours, infrequent punishment, a minimum of nervousness in mother, and no work for the mother outside

the home. In brief we may say that the conditions which make for happy companionship and family unity are those which are associated with an appreciative attitude toward everyday tasks and duties in children.

This suggests that perhaps what we are measuring indirectly here is the child's attitude toward his parents, or possibly the whole family situation. The parent is the one who usually sets the task and sees that the child carries it out. The task and its performance, therefore, become associated emotionally with the parent and with the family life in general. In a family atmosphere of congeniality and where happy person-to-person relationships between the child and his parents prevail, that association is more likely to have a pleasurable emotional tone than in a less congenial family situation. Everyday tasks are merely items in the total family-life pattern and thus assume the characteristic affective coloring of the total. Congenial and happy family life, therefore, is more likely to result in a favorable attitude toward work, and hence a measure of the latter may be, to some extent, an indirect measure of the former.

The superiority of the farm home setting in regard to mean attitude score, however, is probably due, not to any superiority in the average quality of its family relationships but rather to certain advantages common to that setting, some of which were suggested above, such as the family enterprise with which all members early in their lives learn to become concerned, or the general background of attitudes toward industriousness and idleness in which the child is reared.

RESOURCEFULNESS IN GROUP SITUATIONS

The personality variables so far considered have been of the sort which, in general, constitute personal adjustment to the realities of life and personal adequacy in dealing with them. For the most part, reference to social relationships has been indirect, and the implication of independence of others has usually been present in the trait descriptions. The remaining variables concerning which comparative data from the residence groups were obtained involve more directly social relationships and judgments of social values.

The particular variable now to be considered is a third factor which came out of the analysis of "self-reliance" previously referred to (20). It may be regarded, therefore, as another variety of self-reliance. It was provisionally named "resourcefulness in group situations." An individual scoring high on the scale is one who tends to take a leading part in group discussions, who is depended upon for suggestions and ideas for group action and who is usually given the job of leading out in the execution of group plans. The trait, then, may be regarded as one important quality of social leadership.

Like the personality variables previously considered, "resourcefulness" would largely depend for its development upon experience and training of a rather specific sort. Other factors being equal, the boy or girl who, from a very early age, has had many contacts and experiences with other children, and who has had the most time and opportunity to become in-

terested, and take active part, in certain types of extra-curricular activities at school would be expected to rate highest in this personality trait.

The farm, the small-town, and city environments offer opportunity for different sorts of social training. They undoubtedly differ also in the extent to which they furnish opportunity for the sort of experience and training upon which the development of "resourcefulness in group situations" depends. In Table 11 are given the mean scores in "resourcefulness" of the representatives of the three home settings. Here for the first time do we find the town environment ranking first as to "favorableness" for personal development when total groups are compared. The farm home setting, as might be expected, ranked third, and reliably lower than either the town or the city. The differences between town and city were insignificant. These two home settings, in other words, take equal rank when judged by the present criterion.

TABLE 11.—*Comparison of mean scores in resourcefulness in group situations of farm, small-town, and city subjects.*

Group	N	Mean resourcefulness score	CR
Farm boys	317	18.8	
City boys	266	18.6	
Town boys	280	18.5	
City girls	223	23.8	City > farm, 4.20
Town girls	324	23.2	Town > farm, 3.73
Farm girls	356	20.4	
Total town	604	21.0	Town > farm, 2.55
Total city	489	20.9	City > farm, 2.28
Total farm	673	19.6	

It will be noticed further that the group differences are contributed practically entirely by the girls. The mean scores of the boys of farm, town, and city were not significantly different one from another. Furthermore, they were all lower than the corresponding means of the girls, and significantly lower in the case of the town and city groups. Boys apparently are not interested, to the same extent as girls, in activities and functions which bring out and develop this particular sort of resourcefulness and self-reliance. It is not difficult to understand how farm girls, who often have to travel considerable distances to and from school, would be handicapped in comparison with town and city girls so far as time and opportunity for taking part in such activities are concerned.

As with the other variables of personality we were interested in knowing whether, and to what extent, the various items of the home environment itself were related to the development of resourcefulness in group situations. It was suggested above that the social environment outside the home and particularly the school probably furnish many of the situations in which the experience and practice necessary for the development of the trait are obtained. Whether or not a particular child takes advantage of

those situations and actually gets that experience, however, probably depends upon certain more basic factors connected with the home and family life. For example, a child who suffers the handicap of a feeling of social inferiority due to home conditions, or who is constantly subjected to an uncongenial atmosphere at home, even with an otherwise equal opportunity for social experience outside the home, probably could not long compete with the child who comes with the prestige of a home to be proud of, or the attitude of confidence born of a congenial and happy family life.

What, then, were the home-life questionnaire items which were related to resourcefulness scores? Three items in town home life were found to correlate to some extent with the trait in girls. These were an attitude of welcome on the part of the parents toward the child's friends in the home, the economic level of the family, and the cultural level of the family. The correlations were $+ .31$, $+ .25$, and $+ .21$ with standard errors of $.071$, $.050$, and $.052$ respectively. Frequent expressions of affection for mother by both boys and girls also gave some indication of a relationship with the variable in question.

In city home life an attitude of welcome on the part of the parents toward the child's friends in the home and the custom of having good times together in the home gave correlations of $+ .34$ and $+ .26$ respectively with the resourcefulness score in girls. The standard errors of these coefficients were $.087$ and $.080$. The latter item was also associated with the score to about the same extent ($+ .27$, standard error $.073$) in boys. In addition the following items in city home life were associated with social resourcefulness in boys: the custom of going on recreational excursions as a family group ($+ .31$), a confidential relationship with father ($+ .23$) and regular family meals ($+ .21$). Standard errors in these cases were $.071$, $.085$, and $.076$ respectively.

The item which was of first importance in both the town and the city homes, namely parental welcome of the child's friends in the home, was also first in the list for the farm home. The correlations were $+ .22$ and $+ .21$ with standard errors of $.042$ and $.039$ for the boys and girls respectively. In addition, the economic level of the family was associated to the extent of $+ .25$ (standard error $.053$) with "resourcefulness" in farm boys, and the customs of going on recreational excursions as a family group and of having good times in the home were related to resourcefulness scores to the extent of $+ .21$ and $+ .20$ in farm girls. The standard errors of the latter two coefficients were $.039$ and $.040$ respectively.

In view of these results we may conclude that although the school and community environments outside the home probably furnish most of the situations in which social self-reliance and resourcefulness are actually developed through practice, the social experiences and training received in a congenial and happy family life are also important, and that this basic training probably determines the extent to which a particular child is able to take advantage of the situations which the school and community provide for the development of the trait. The disadvantages inherent in the farm home setting for this sort of development were apparently rather

effective so far as the girls were concerned. The continued development of rural-community programs for social and recreational training should serve partially to overcome those disadvantages. In any case, to raise the average level of family life in the areas here indicated should tend to bring about a corresponding rise in the average level of development in "resourcefulness in group situations."

ETHICAL JUDGMENT

To know "what to do" in social situations in which ethical or moral values are involved is a personal quality to be desired, and one in which individuals differ rather widely. These individual differences when found within a particular cultural group and among individuals of about the same age probably represent, to some extent, differences in innate capacity, since many of the processes which make up "general intelligence" are involved. The development of the trait in any individual, however, depends directly upon his social environment, upon the variety of social situations in which he gains experience, and the type of training he receives in regard to meeting them. The patterns of ethical and moral behavior which he observes in those about him and which he comes more or less unconsciously to regard as proper and adequate, he naturally adopts as his own as he meets similar situations.

One would expect, then, to find different patterns of ethical behavior and different standards of ethical and moral judgment in cultural groups in which the character and variety of the social situations and relationships differ. There undoubtedly are, at the same time, some general patterns of behavior in certain generalized social situations which are more "socially desirable" and therefore more ethical, in almost any modern culture, than certain other patterns or modes of meeting those situations, even though the cultural groups may differ widely in opportunity for social experience and training in ethical judgment. Our present purpose, then, is to compare our three home environmental settings as to favorableness for the development of ethical discrimination in social situations.

The group comparisons in "ethical judgment" were made in terms of mean scores on Part 4 of Maller's CASE Inventory. This test, like the others making up the inventory, consists of those items from a longer form of the test which were found to have greatest diagnostic value. It was found to differentiate significantly between delinquents and pupils in probation schools, and "normal" children. Each item consists of a brief description of a common social situation in which a moral or ethical issue is involved and four alternative reactions or "ways out" of the situation. These alternatives vary in degree of desirability from an ethical point of view and are weighted accordingly. The subject is instructed not only to indicate which of the four possible reactions he considers right or most correct (ethical judgment) but also to indicate which procedure he would be most likely to follow himself were he confronted with the situation (self evaluation in regard to ethical behavior). The score is the sum of the weights of the reactions chosen for all items in the test.

The mean scores and reliable differences are shown in Table 12. These results give much the same picture as those from the test of "resourcefulness in group situations." The boys from the three settings did not differ significantly. The very small differences, however, placed them in the following order: city first, town second, and farm third. The girl groups ranked in the same order with city and town means again essentially the same. The differences between means of the city girls and town girls and that of the farm girls, however, were large enough for statistical significance. The girls' averages were in each case higher than those of the boys.

This, then, is the second variable in which the town youngsters ranked equally with those of the city and, on the average, definitely above those on the farm. It is quite obvious that the town and urban environments, in general, furnish more numerous and varied situations of the sort which necessitate such discrimination. In so far as the intimate relationships of

TABLE 12.—*Comparison of mean scores in "ethical judgment" of farm, small-town, and city subjects.*

Group	N	Mean ethical-judgment score	CR
City boys	235	24.1	
Town boys	234	23.9	
Farm boys	248	23.4	
City girls	192	26.0	City >farm, 3.50
Town girls	287	25.9	Town >farm, 3.61
Farm girls	300	24.6	
Total town	521	25.0	Town >farm, 3.21
Total city	427	24.9	City >farm, 2.76
Total farm	548	24.1	

family life itself are concerned in the development of ethical judgment, the differences in opportunity among the three home settings appear not to be so great. However, the points of contact and the various interrelationships between the family and community, which perhaps furnish the majority of the situations in which training in ethical behavior and discrimination may be given children, are certainly different in character and less numerous in the farm setting.

Of the items of family life concerning which data were obtained, not a single one gave a correlation as high as $+0.20$ with the ethical-judgment score in the town group. If family life in the town setting had anything to do with the development of this aspect of personality, other features than the ones covered in the questionnaire were involved.

In the city and farm settings, however, some low correlations were found. In terms of these correlations, the city families whose boys tended to score high in ethical judgment were those in which a confidential relationship existed between the boy and his father and mother, in which he had nothing particularly to criticize in his parents' behavior and where frequent recreational excursions (picnics, visits, etc.) outside the home

were enjoyed. In those families whose girls tended to score high in ethical judgment, the parents liked to have her bring her friends in the home, frequent picnics, visits, and other recreational excursions outside the home were enjoyed and the parents' behavior was such that she had nothing particularly to criticize. These correlations ranged between $+ .37$ and $+ .22$, with standard errors from $.080$ to $.096$.

The farm families whose boys scored highest were those in which the family group went frequently on picnics, visits, and the like, and in which meals were eaten together at regular hours. These correlations were $+ .31$ and $+ .22$ with a standard error in each case of $.059$. None of the correlations for the girls was as large as $+ .20$.

Once more the importance of the social activities of family life and the personal relationships between parents and children in relation to the personal development of children was suggested.

HONESTY IN THE SCHOOL SITUATION

There has been considerable discussion during recent years of the question of whether honesty is a general trait of character or whether it is simply a name given to a large number of specific and independent habits which function in specific situations. The conclusion of the authors of the well known Character Education Inquiry (10, 11 and 12) was that there is no such thing as a general trait of honesty—that a given child might cheat more or less consistently in certain situations and under certain conditions of motivation, yet just as consistently tell the truth, or pass up the opportunity to steal in other situations, or that he might lie in certain types of situations and tell the truth in others. Certain students of the problem who have examined the data of the C.E.I. study, on the other hand, find evidence for a considerable degree of generality among the various measures of trustworthiness and deceit.⁹ In view of the evidence at hand, however, it is not wise to assume that any single short test of honesty does anything more than sample the subject's behavior in the particular situation, and under the specific conditions of the test.

Whether general or specific, honesty nevertheless depends upon training and experience for its development. One would expect, furthermore, that the home environment would have more influence than most other portions of the social environment in the formation of habits of honesty or dishonesty and that perhaps some environmental settings for home life might be more advantageous than others in that regard.

Our three residence groups were compared as to average rating on the "self scoring honesty" test of the Maller inventory. In this particular test the subject was simply given an opportunity to claim information dishonestly. He was asked if he knew certain facts about "sports and hobbies." Some of these items were so specific and difficult to remember that, it was assumed, no one could honestly say that he had known them. The honesty score was the number of these difficult items which the subject ad-

⁹ J. B. Maller (15), one of the associates in the C.E.I. study, found such evidence. G. W. Allport (1) gives an interesting discussion of the question of generality *vs.* specificity.

mitted he did not know. The mean scores on this test of honesty for our three residence groups were not significantly different one from another. The three home settings, in other words, were apparently equally advantageous so far as the development of "honesty" of this sort was concerned. Whether other measures of honesty in other situations would yield similar results, of course, cannot be said on the basis of the present data.

The correlations between the honesty score and the home-life questionnaire items indicated very little of significance. "Honesty" was associated slightly *negatively* with the report of frequent good times in the home, among town girls and farm boys, and with the report of kissing mother among farm girls. These coefficients were $-.26$, $-.20$ and $-.20$ with standard errors of $.066$, $.042$, and $.039$ respectively. Whether these negative relationships mean that there was a slight tendency for those families in which good times were frequent to be slack in regard to moral training, or whether the tendency to be dishonest in order to make a good showing for the subject himself was, to the extent of the correlations, associated with the tendency to lie in order to create a good impression concerning his family, again, cannot be determined from the data. The only indication of a positive relationship was a correlation of $+.29$, standard error $.062$, between honesty score and the economic level of the family for the city girls. We must conclude, then, that if family life had anything to do with the development of "honesty" as here measured in young people, other factors of family life than those covered by our questionnaire must have been involved. Perhaps the behavior measured was so specifically related to the school situation and so dependent upon the school environment and training as to be entirely independent of other habits of honesty related to the home and other social situations.

ATTITUDE TOWARD HOME LIFE

Adolescence, we are told, is the stage in personal development in which it is normal to strive for independence from the domination and solicitude of parents. This "revolt" is sometimes rather violent, depending of course upon a number of factors, such for example as the character of the parent-child relationships or the tenacity with which parents "cling" to their offspring. Clinical evidence also suggests that even though the youngster may consciously be revolting against restraint and striving for the status of an independent adult, he may at the same time, perhaps unconsciously, be clinging to the security and the protection which the very thing he is fighting provides. The adult in him strives for personal independence while the child in him shrinks from the responsibilities and the realities which that independence entails. His feeling toward his home life and its relationships, under such circumstances, would likely be rather uncertain and changeable and an expression of attitude at any given time may or may not represent his "true" or most typical attitude.

Expressed attitude toward home life nevertheless probably is, in many cases, an indication of the sort of personal adjustment which the individual has made to his general social environment. A young person who through the play of circumstances or because of certain personal limitations,

imagined or real, adopts certain unhappy and critical attitudes in his adjustments to life, would probably express a somewhat different attitude toward a particular home situation than would his more fortunate brother or sister. But since, as we have seen, home life is definitely related to general personality adjustment, this expression of attitude would be a rough measure of the success of the family so far as that individual child is concerned.

In perhaps a still greater number of cases, expressions of attitude toward home life from adolescent children are more direct indications of the quality of home life as such. One might reasonably expect that, other things being equal, the more congenial the family group and the more satisfying the personal relationships between the family members, the more appreciative would be the attitude toward family life. A score or rating in attitude, therefore, may be regarded as one indication of the degree of "favorableness" of a particular home environment for any individual child.

TABLE 13.—*Comparison of scores in attitude toward home life of farm, small-town, and city subjects.*

Group	N	Mean attitude score	CR
Town boys	287	83.2	
Farm boys	310	82.7	
City boys	283	81.3	
City girls	235	83.7	City > town, 2.53
Farm girls	360	83.4	Farm > town, 2.42
Town girls	330	81.2	
Total farm	670	83.1	
Total city	518	82.4	
Total town	617	82.1	

Similarly, the mean attitude scores of different residence groups should furnish some basis for judging the relative favorableness of the general home settings involved. This basis of comparison would be valid, however, only to the extent to which the standards or ideals, in terms of which the subjects of each cultural group formulate and express their attitudes, were the same or similar. If these standards were different for each cultural group, which they undoubtedly are to some extent, then to that extent the actual relative favorableness of the environments involved would not adequately be revealed in a comparison of the mean attitude scores.

In Table 13 are shown the mean scores in appreciation of (attitude toward) home life for the various groups. These means were, in general, very similar in size, most of the differences being insignificant. In fact only two differences in the nine comparisons were large enough to meet the criterion of statistical significance. These slightly favored the city and the farm over the town, so far as the girls were concerned. The very small and significant differences between the boy groups, however, favored the town and farm over the city.

As was suggested above, this lack of clear differentiation between the residence groups may be due to the subjective nature of the expression of attitude and to the somewhat different experiential standards, or sets of values common to each setting in terms of which attitude was expressed.

That the nature of the home life itself was a factor in determining the degree of appreciation expressed by the subjects is suggested by the correlations which were found between the specific home-life items and the attitude score. Nine of these items showed correlations greater than $+ .20$ with all three residence groups. These were frequent expressions of affection for mother, a confidential relationship with mother, behavior in the mother such that the child had nothing particularly to criticize, behavior in the father such that the child had nothing particularly to criticize, the family custom of going on picnics, visits, and other recreational excursions, an attitude of welcome on the part of parents toward the child's friends in the home, the family custom of having enjoyable times together in the home, regular meals together as a family group, and infrequent punishment. In addition, a confidential relationship with father showed a similar degree of correlation in the city and town groups. Each of these items, it will be observed, has to do with some aspect of the social life or with some person-to-person relationship between the parent and the child. It is equally interesting to note that those items dealing with such matters as the health and nervousness of the parents, the composition and personnel of the household, or with the mother's work outside the home—none of which was concerned directly with the child's own activities or personal relationships—were not at all related to appreciation of home life. The correlations with the measures of economic and cultural level were also negligible.

HOME SETTINGS COMPARED IN TERMS OF FAVORABLE ANSWERS TO HOME-LIFE QUESTIONNAIRE

In the foregoing sections of this report it has been observed that the home-life questionnaire items which appeared to have a significant degree of relationship with personality test scores were usually those items dealing with the personal interactions between parent and child, and with the social activities of family life. The question of whether and to what extent the home-life items were answered favorably because the subject possessed a well adjusted personality, or to what extent the favorable conditions which he reported were the cause of his well adjusted personality, of course, cannot be determined from the present data. Adolescents who, because of factors not directly connected with the home environment, possess certain personality characteristics may be more inclined, because of those very characteristics, to confide in their parents, to show affection for them and to be bothered less by their faults, to join the family in various joint activities and, in general, to raise the level of the social environment of the home. They may also be inclined to be less critical of the family, to remember and emphasize the desirable features of their family life, and thus to answer more of the questionnaire items favorably, than those with differently adjusted personalities in the same or in similar

home situations. On the other hand, in the light of the evidence from other sources and from general observation, it seems reasonable to assume that the home environment, and particularly its social aspects, is an important factor in the development of personality.

Regardless of the direction or the extent of causality in the relationship, however, the fact that high personality scores and "favorable" answers regarding the social aspects of the home environment tended somewhat to occur concomitantly suggests one other comparison of the three home settings as to favorableness for personality development in children. They may be compared in terms of the relative frequencies with which the significant home-life items were answered "favorably" by the residence groups. The data for these comparisons are given in Table 14.

TABLE 14.—*Comparisons of the three residence groups as to percentage of "favorable" reports regarding each of the ten home-life items which were found most frequently to correlate significantly with the scores on the personality tests.*

Home-life item	Total significant correlations	"Favorable" answers			CR ²
		City	Farm	Town	
	No.	P.ct.	P.ct.	P.ct.	
Parents "always" welcome child's friends in the home	20	69	65	66	
"Often" have enjoyable times together in the home	20	47	52	37	Farm > town, 5.54 City > town, 3.40
"Often" go on picnics, visits, and other recreational excursions outside home	17	50	60	43	Farm > town, 6.25 Farm > city, 3.42 City > town, 2.35
No punishment during previous week	17	65	75	62	Farm > town, 5.12 Farm > city, 3.70
Shares joys and troubles with mother "almost always"	13	48	45	44	
Shares joys and troubles with father "almost always"	13	25	24	25	
Kisses mother "occasionally" or "every day"	12	83	57	75	City > farm, 10.28 Town > farm, 7.03 City > town, 3.33
Nothing in mother's behavior criticized	11	65	63	59	City > town, 2.08
Meals at regular hours "almost always"	10	66	73	70	Farm > city, 2.57
Nothing in father's behavior criticized	9	64	62	56	City > town, 2.21 Farm > town, 2.21

¹ The CR in each case is the difference between the two percentages divided by the standard error of that difference. CR's of less than 2.00 are regarded as insignificant and are not shown in the table.

Of the fourteen comparisons in which the percentage differences were significant, seven favored the farm, six favored the city, while only one favored the town. Five of those comparisons were between the city and the town, all of which favored the city. Five were between farm and town, four of which favored the farm. The remaining four comparisons were between city and farm, and three of these favored the farm over the city.

In regard to four of the seven home-life items concerning which significant percentage differences in favorable reports were found, the farm setting ranked first. Three of these were concerned with family group activities, namely, having enjoyable times together in the home, going on picnics, visits and the like, and regular meals together. The city setting ranked second in these three items. The other item in which the farm placed first asked whether the subject had been punished during the past week. In this item the town ranked second. In other words a reliably greater proportion of the city subjects than of the farm subjects reported that they had been punished during the previous week. The city ranked first in the remaining three items in which significant differences were shown. These all involved personal relationships with, or attitudes toward, parents. They asked concerning the frequency of kissing mother and whether father or mother did anything which the child particularly disliked. The three groups did not differ significantly in percentage reporting confidential relationships with parents.

To sum it all up, we may say that the farm came first with the city second in frequency of favorable reports regarding family group activities, while the city came first in frequency of favorable reports regarding personal attitudes and behavior toward parents. The town-home setting again ranked definitely below the others in favorableness for personality development in children when judged according to "favorable" answers to the home-life questionnaire items, which were significantly correlated with high personality test scores.

GENERAL DISCUSSION AND SUMMARY

The most important function of modern family life is psychological in nature. Family life meets certain basic human requirements more directly than is possible in any other area of life. In the family situation are provided the setting, the stimulation, and guidance which determine, very largely, whether the child shall develop into a personally well adjusted and socially useful individual. In that sense, the "success" of any family may, therefore, be judged in terms of the personality adjustments of its children.

In a similar sense, the desirability of any particular culture or community environment as a setting for family life, might be judged in terms of the average "success" of its families, in comparison with those of other general environments. The home environment, of course, never functions independently of its total cultural setting. The quality of the social life and of the person-to-person relationships within the home are always more or less influenced by the community mores and patterns of conduct and thinking, and at the same time the character of the general cultural environment is determined by the families of which it is composed. Family life, then, is regarded as just one, but an extremely important, portion of the total social environment in which personalities develop.

The variables measured in our subjects represent certain aspects of personality which are regarded as desirable from the standpoint of both the individual and society, and which presumably depend for their development to a large extent upon the environment and training of the home in relation to its larger cultural setting. We have compared, then, three general home settings, namely the farm, the small town, and the city, as to "favorableness" for personality development in terms of average scores on tests designed to measure those personality variables. It is assumed that the differences between the averages are largely due to differences in environmental stimulation and opportunity to function.

In these comparisons the differences, for the most part, are in the expected direction. In regard to general aptitude, as indicated by the Otis I.Q., the city group ranked highest and the farm group lowest, with the town group occupying the middle position. This is reasonable in the light of the available evidence, which indicates that the measured I.Q. tends to rise with an improvement in the cultural aspects of the environment. There is little doubt that, in general, the rural school provides less intellectual stimulation than the well organized and equipped school of the town or city. The average farm home likewise does not measure up in regard to sources of intellectual stimulation. As was earlier suggested, just as children from underprivileged town and city homes showed marked rises in I.Q. when placed in the stimulating environments of homes of a higher cultural level, so the average measured I.Q. of farm youngsters might be expected to rise with more stimulating school environments and with the increasing dissemination of culture into rural areas through the various agencies now at work.

Another area in which the farm home setting appeared at a disadvantage was the area of social relationships. Two of the personality variables, *viz.* resourcefulness in group situations and ethical judgment, had particularly to do with facility and discrimination in social relationships. The farm group ranked lowest in both of these variables. The city and town groups averaged about equally but both were significantly superior to the farm group. These differences, however, were almost wholly contributed by the girls.

An examination of the tests themselves makes clear that the experiences which give rise to the expression of these qualities arise for the most part in social situations outside the home, or in the interactions between family and community. Such situations obviously occur much less frequently in the open country than in the town or city. The farm girl, as she must travel some distance back and forth between high school and her home, has less time and opportunity to enter into the social life, to serve on committees, or to take part in extra-curricular activities connected with school life. Her contacts with people in general which give rise to situations in which ethical discriminations are involved are, on the average, less numerous than those of the town or city girl.

There undoubtedly are, however, many factors involved in the development of these social habits which are more basic than those mentioned above. As was suggested before, the prestige of the family in the community—its relative economic and cultural status—as well as the quality of the relationships making up the family life, in many instances have much to do with the extent to which the young person actually takes advantage of his opportunities for social development outside the home. Happy and congenial family relationships help to set up habits of congeniality which tend to function in all social situations. As we have seen, those youngsters from all three home settings who rated their families highest in group activities and social life in the home tended to score highest in “resourcefulness in group situations” and in ethical judgment. To bring about through the medium of education in its various forms a better use of farm family leisure and a greater appreciation on the part of rural folks of the importance of congenial family relationships should do much to offset the disadvantages of the relative isolation of the farm home, so far as the development of desirable social traits and habits is concerned.

Most of the personality variables in which significant group differences were found, however, had to do particularly with personal adequacy. They involved personal responsibility in maintaining satisfactory relationships with others and attitude toward work. All of these quite clearly depend for their development upon experiences and training in more or less specific types of situations. These situations perhaps most frequently arise in the home, particularly during the early years of life. But, as we have said, the influences of the home do not function independently of the larger cultural environment. The community patterns of attitude and of behavior not only determine, to some extent, the type of home experi-

ence and training a child receives, but also, through the numerous out-of-home contacts, condition the effectiveness of home training. This of course becomes increasingly true as the child grows older. A young person's adjustment to life in general, his attitude toward work, or his independence in solving his personal problems are largely determined by the family situation in which he develops, by the wisdom of his parents in letting him do, and assume the responsibility for, his appropriate share of the household work, and by the extent to which he is allowed and encouraged, without blame for mistakes, to choose for himself and make his own decisions, but they are also conditioned and modified by the culturally determined attitudes and mores of the community or the degree of social integration which characterizes the neighborhood. Whether or not every "date" an adolescent girl has is a matter of some concern and of considerable conversational value to the whole neighborhood, for example, might have much to do with the sort of personal adjustment she is able to make to life. Clearly the home setting, as well as the quality of the home environment as such, is a factor of importance in the development of personality.

In regard to the development of these traits involving personal adequacy the city-home setting ranked first and the farm-home setting ranked second. In most cases the average scores of the small-town group were significantly lower than those of the city and farm groups. These relative deficiencies, as has already been suggested, may be to some degree due to certain inherent characteristics of the social situation in a small town. Those same characteristics may also operate indirectly through the parents. That is to say, they may be responsible for certain characteristic attitudes of parents which promote conflict between themselves and their adolescent children. It will be recalled that on the average the attitude of small-town fathers toward the question of strict discipline vs. freedom for adolescent children was found to be reliably more in the direction of strictness than that of either the city or the farm fathers. It was further shown that the "strict" attitude in fathers was negatively correlated with their children's scores in independence in regard to personal problems.

Such attitudes on the part of parents which arise out of certain unfavorable features of the community situation, as well as the reactions of the young people to those attitudes and to the situation in general, may affect the quality of the family life in general. It was shown in the preceding section that according to the youngsters' reports the small-town families less frequently engaged in joint recreational activities both in the home and outside the home, and that the children were more frequently punished and also more often found things to criticize in their parents than did those of farm and city families. These home-life items were among those which showed significant degrees of relationship with the personality variables.

Again the possibility of improvement through educational means is suggested. Through the medium of parent education, not only may parental attitude be changed for the better but perhaps many of the conditions which

give rise to unfavorable attitudes may also be changed. The results of the present study tend to support the conclusion of the White House Conference study previously referred to, that the general level of family relationships is higher in urban than in rural communities. This level is, without doubt, gradually being raised in rural communities. As parents and prospective parents are led to realize the importance of congenial, confidential, and affectional relationships between parents and children, and of the utilization of family leisure in wholesome and stimulating joint recreational activities, there should result also a rise in the general level of personality adjustment of rural young people.

LITERATURE CITED

1. Allport, G. W.
1937. PERSONALITY, A PSYCHOLOGICAL INTERPRETATION. Henry Holt, New York.
2. Asher, E. J.
1935. THE INADEQUACY OF CURRENT INTELLIGENCE TESTS FOR TESTING KENTUCKY MOUNTAIN CHILDREN. *J. Genet. Psychology* 46:480-86.
3. Baldwin, B. F., Fillmore, E. A., and Hudley, L.
1930. FARM CHILDREN. D. Appleton, New York.
4. Bayley, N., and Jones, H. E.
1937. ENVIRONMENTAL CORRELATES OF MENTAL AND MOTOR DEVELOPMENT. *Child Devel.* 8:329-41.
5. Chapman, J. C., and Wiggans, D. M.
1925. RELATION OF FAMILY SIZE TO INTELLIGENCE OF OFFSPRING AND SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS OF FAMILY. *J. Genet. Psychology* 32:414-21.
6. Chauncey, M. R.
1929. THE RELATION OF THE HOME FACTOR TO ACHIEVEMENT AND INTELLIGENCE TEST SCORE. *J. Educ. Res.* 20:88-90.
7. Dawson, S.
1936. ENVIRONMENTAL INFLUENCE ON MENTALITY. *Brit. J. Psychology* 27:129-34.
8. Furfey, Paul H.
1935. A NOTE ON THE RELATIVE DEVELOPMENT-AGE SCORES OF URBAN AND RURAL BOYS. *Child Devel.* 6:88-90.
9. Gruenberg, Sidonie M.
1930. THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE HOME IN THE PERSONALITY AND CHARACTER DEVELOPMENT OF THE ADOLESCENT (pamphlet). American Federation of Mental Hygiene, Inc.
10. Hartshorne, H., and May, M. A.
1928. STUDIES IN DECEIT. Macmillan, New York.
11. ——— and ———
1929. STUDIES IN SELF CONTROL. Macmillan, New York.
12. ———, ———, and Shuttleworth, F. K.
1930. STUDIES IN THE ORGANIZATION OF CHARACTER. Macmillan, New York.
13. Maller, J. B.
1935. THE CASE INVENTORY. Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York.
14. ———
1935. THE CASE INVENTORY, MANUAL OF DIRECTIONS (mimeographed).
15. ———
1934. GENERAL AND SPECIFIC FACTORS IN CHARACTER. *J. Soc. Psychology* 5:97-101.
16. Neff, W. S.
1938. SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS AND INTELLIGENCE: A CRITICAL SURVEY. *Psychol. Bul.* 35:727-57.
17. Ojemann, R. H.
1934. THE MEASUREMENT OF ATTITUDE TOWARD SELF-RELIANCE. RESEARCHES IN PARENT EDUCATION, III. University of Iowa Studies in Child Welfare 10:103-11 and 345-56.
18. Skeels, H. M.
1938. MENTAL DEVELOPMENT OF CHILDREN IN FOSTER HOMES. *J. Consult. Psychology* 2:33-43.
19. ——— and Fillmore, E. A.
1937. THE MENTAL DEVELOPMENT OF CHILDREN FROM UNDERPRIVILEGED HOMES. *J. Genet. Psychology* 50:427-39.

20. Stott, L. H.
1938. AN ANALYTICAL STUDY OF SELF-RELIANCE. J. Psychology 5:107-18.
21. ———
1938. THE RELATION OF CERTAIN FACTORS IN FARM FAMILY LIFE TO PERSONALITY DEVELOPMENT IN ADOLESCENTS. Nebr. Agr. Exp. Sta. Res. Bul. 106.
22. ———
1939. PARENTAL ATTITUDES OF FARM, TOWN AND CITY PARENTS IN RELATION TO CERTAIN PERSONALITY ADJUSTMENTS IN THEIR CHILDREN. J. Soc. Psychology (in press).
23. Wellman, B. L.
1934. GROWTH IN INTELLIGENCE UNDER DIFFERING SCHOOL ENVIRONMENTS. J. Exp. Education. 3:57-83.
24. White House Conference on Child Health and Protection, Committee on the Family and Parent Education, III A.
1934. THE ADOLESCENT IN THE FAMILY. D. Appleton, New York.