

Student Work

8-1-1969

Social Class and Parental Discipline

Marianne P. Hanson

University of Nebraska at Omaha

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.unomaha.edu/studentwork>

Recommended Citation

Hanson, Marianne P., "Social Class and Parental Discipline" (1969). *Student Work*. 1599.
<https://digitalcommons.unomaha.edu/studentwork/1599>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by DigitalCommons@UNO. It has been accepted for inclusion in Student Work by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@UNO. For more information, please contact unodigitalcommons@unomaha.edu.



SOCIAL CLASS AND PARENTAL DISCIPLINE

A Thesis
Presented to the
Department of Sociology
and the
Faculty of the College of Graduate Studies
University of Nebraska at Omaha

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Master of Arts in Sociology

by
Marianne P. Hanson

September 1969

UMI Number: EP73539

All rights reserved

INFORMATION TO ALL USERS

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.



UMI EP73539

Published by ProQuest LLC (2015). Copyright in the Dissertation held by the Author.

Microform Edition © ProQuest LLC.

All rights reserved. This work is protected against unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code



ProQuest LLC.
789 East Eisenhower Parkway
P.O. Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106 - 1346

Accepted for the faculty of the College of Graduate Studies
of the University of Nebraska at Omaha, in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for the degree Master of Arts.

Chairman	<i>J. B. Beyer</i>	<i>Sociology</i>
		Department

Graduate Committee

Name	<i>Francis M. Hurst</i>	<i>Psychology</i>
		Department
	<i>Wayne W. Whitcomb</i>	<i>Sociology</i>

Gift 4-2-70

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

To the following I owe special gratitude in the writing and completion of this thesis: Dr. George Barger for his suggestions, prodding, encouragement and time which he generously contributed throughout the process of writing; Dr. Wayne Wheeler for his critical analysis of earlier drafts and his general concern; Dr. Cora Martin for her assistance and willingness in the research project; Dr. George Helling for his contribution in formulating my sociological perspective from which future sociological questions could be asked; Mr. Kenneth Root for his understanding and guidance in my early graduate days and Dr. Francis Hurst for serving on my committee. To my fellow graduate students; Charles Fuchs, Vince Webb and Nancy Wilson, I owe my appreciation for their discussions and friendship which makes a graduate career more tolerable.

Special thanks and recognition must be given to my husband, Don, who not only provided tremendous psychological support and humor but who so willingly gave of his time in the typing, computations, tables and proof reading of this thesis.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
I. THE PROBLEM	1
Problems in determining the relationship of social class and parental disciplinary techniques.	
II. THEORETICAL PERSPECTIVE	
Problems in defining social class	6
Approaches to a definition of social class	
Harold M. Hodges	8
Cuber and Kenkel	8
Bernard Barber	9
Joseph A. Kahl	11
Leonard Reissman	12
Gerhard Lenski	12
Kurt Mayer	13
Roger Brown	15
Nominal definition of social class	18 -
Social class and the family	
Parsonian perspective	19
McKinley--Rewards and Strains of Occupational Status.	23
Kohn--Parental Values	28
Bronfenbrenner--Sexual differentiation	33
Elder and Bowerman--Family composition and Size . . .	37
Summary	39
Social Class and Child-Rearing Studies	
Erieson	40
Davis and Havighurst	42
Maccoby, Sears and Levin	44
White	50
Miller and Swanson	53
✓McKinley	57
Littman et. al.	62
✓Kohn	67 68
Bronfenbrenner	72
Bronson, Katten and Livson	74
Emmerich	75
Waters and Crandall	76
Elder and Bowerman	77
Summary	79
Statement of Hypotheses	80
Operational Definitions of Terms	81
III. METHODOLOGY	
Population and Sample	84
Data Collection	85
Resultant Sample Size	86

IV. FINDINGS

Hypothesis I--Use of External and Internal Behavior	
Controls by Middle- and Working-Class Parents	92
To fibbing	95
To fighting	96
To tantrums	98
To snitching	100
To lack of promptness	102
Summary	105
Hypothesis II--The Use of Physical Discipline in	
Middle- and Working-Class Families	106
Summary	108
Hypothesis III--The Use of External and Internal	
<u>Behavior Controls</u> as Effected by Social Class and	
Sex of Parent and Child	108
Response of middle-class parents	109
Response of working-class parents	110
Response of middle- and working-class	
mothers to daughters	112
Response of middle- and working-class	
mothers to sons	114
Response of middle- and working-class	
fathers to sons	116
Response of middle- and working-class	
fathers to daughters	117
Summary	118
V. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	121
Suggestions for future research	133
SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY	137
APPENDIX A	140
APPENDIX B	155

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER II

TABLE		PAGE
I.	Comparison of Chicago and Boston Studies on Techniques of Discipline	51
II.	Agents of Discipline in Chicago and Boston Studies . . .	51
III.	Techniques of Discipline Utilized by Middle- and Lower- Class Parents in Eugene	64
IV.	Agents of Discipline in Eugene Study	65
V.	Disciplinary Techniques Compared: Chicago, Detroit, Eugene and Boston	66

(68)

CHAPTER III

I.	Resultant Sample Size	89
----	---------------------------------	----

CHAPTER IV

I.	The Use of External and Internal Behavior Controls by Middle- and Working-Class Parents	92
II.	Frequencies and Percentages of No. of times Middle- and Working-Class Parents Used External and Internal Behavior Controls	94
III.	The Use of External and Internal Behavior Controls by Middle- and Working-Class Parents to Fibbing . . .	95
IV.	Explanations Given by Parents for Disciplining Child for Fibbing	96
V.	The Use of External and Internal Behavior Controls by Middle- and Working-Class Parents for Child Hitting Another Child	97
VI.	Explanations Given by Parents for Disciplining Child for Hitting Another Child	97
VII.	The Use of External and Internal Behavior Controls . . .	98
	by Middle- and Working-Class Parents for Tantrums	
VIII.	Explanations Given by Parents for Disciplining Child for Tantrums	100

CHAPTER IV

TABLE		PAGE
IX.	The Use of External and Internal Behavior Controls by Middle- and Working-Class Parents to "Snitching" . . .	101
X.	Explanations Given by Parents for Disciplining Child for Snitching	102
XI.	The Use of External and Internal Behavior Controls by Middle- and Working-Class Parents for Child not Being Prompt	103
XII.	Explanations Given by Parents for Disciplining Child for not Being Prompt	104
XIII.	Total Reported Frequencies of Number of Times External Controls (Physical and Non-Physical) Were Chosen by Middle- and Working-Class Parents	107
XIV.	Comparisons of External and Internal Behavior Controls of Middle-Class Fathers and Mothers to Sons	109
XV.	Comparison of External and Internal Behavior Controls of Middle-Class Fathers and Mothers to Daughters	109
XVI.	Comparison of Use of External and Internal Behavior Controls of Working-Class Mothers and Fathers to Sons	111
XVII.	Comparison of Use of External and Internal Behavior Controls of Working-Class Mothers and Fathers to Daughters	111
XVIII.	Total Reported Frequencies of Number of Times External and Internal Behavior Controls Were Chosen with Regard to Social Class and Sex of Child and Parent	113
XIX.	Comparisons of Use of External and Internal Behavior Controls of Middle- and Working-Class Mothers to Daughters	114
XX.	Comparisons of Use of External and Internal Behavior Controls of Middle- and Working-Class Mothers to Sons	115
XXI.	Comparisons of Use of External and Internal Behavior Controls of Middle- and Working-Class Fathers to Sons	116
XXII.	Comparisons of Use of External and Internal Behavior Controls by Middle- and Working-Class Fathers to Daughters	117

SOCIAL CLASS AND PARENTAL DISCIPLINE

CHAPTER I

THE PROBLEM

Whether one is a social scientist, natural scientist, humanist or layman, he views the world about him from a certain perspective. The perspective each hold will lead to different questions regarding the same phenomena. Attempting and completing empirical research, however, involves more than asking questions.

A research situation indicates that a hypothetical prediction is being tested. The hypothetical prediction is derived from a theoretical perspective. Theory provides the researcher with "logically interconnected sets of propositions from which empirical uniformities can be derived."¹ The testing of hypotheses derived from the propositions is not an isolated endeavor for testing constantly refers back to its theoretical origin.

Robert Dubin discusses the activity of the scientist involved in research in the following context:

. . . the activities of research are a re-search---activities undertaken to repeat a search. . . The scientist is constantly concerned with re-searching the accepted conclusions of his field--- the theoretical models he uses. He does this re-searching by probing for facts of the empirical world that falsify one or more predictions generated by his accepted conclusions, or theoretical models. Then the re-searching turns to the construction of new theoretical models to take the place of those no longer able to make sense out of the empirical world.²

¹Robert K. Merton, Social Theory and Social Structure (New York: The Free Press, 1968), p. 39.

²Robert Dubin, Theory Building (New York: The Free Press, 1969), p. 7.

From this brief introduction, the reader can see that research involves more than questioning phenomena. The questioning only makes sense in terms of a theoretical perspective. The feedback of research leads to clarification, verification and modification of the perspective.

In the present study the question to be asked is, "Does social class have an effect on the types of discipline administered to children by their parents?" This question generates a concomitant inquiry, "Within the confines of social class, is the discipline affected by the sex of the parent and child?"

These questions involve a re-searching of conclusions in the area of socialization studies. The relationship of social class and child-rear-practices has been the object of many scientific studies since the early 1930's.³ The extensive empirical studies indicate that socialization practices differ according to social class. The reported findings, however, are lacking in consistency.

When major studies are repeated or compared, socialization practices which are found to differ between classes in one study⁴ are in other

³For a brief review of studies see Urie Bronfenbrenner, "Socialization and Social Class Through Space and Time," in Reinhard Bendix and Seymour Martin Lipset (eds.), Class Status and Power (New York: The Free Press, 1966), pp. 362-377. A similar discussion is also presented in Bernard Berelson and Gary A. Steiner, Human Behavior (New York: Harcourt Brace and World, 1964), pp. 478-481.

⁴Allison Davis and Robert J. Havighurst, "Social Class and Color Differences in Child-Rearing," American Sociological Review, 11(December, 1946), pp. 698-710. Middle-class parents were found to be more restrictive in child-rearing practices than lower-class parents.

studies, either negated by an opposite finding⁵ or receive little support of any relationship between social class and socialization practices.⁶ These studies controlled for similar variables and were all concerned with similar activities in which the parent and child would interact. Although each study is not a replica of the other, there are enough similar variables on which they could be compared. In other studies,⁷ new insights or additional variables are brought to the surface or there may be a refocusing of theoretical interests within the confines of class.⁸

In addition to the discrepancies found among studies regarding the relationship of social class and socialization practices, the issue

⁵Robert E. Sears, Eleanor E. Maccoby and Harry Levin, Patterns of Child-Rearing (Evanston, Illinois: Row, Peterson and Company, 1957). Middle class parents were found to be more permissive in child-rearing practices than lower class parents.

⁶Richard A. Littman, Robert C. A. Moore and John Pierce-Jones, "Social Class Differences in Child-Rearing: A Third Community for Comparison with Chicago and Newton," American Sociological Review, 22 (December, 1957), pp. 694-695. The Eugene study did not support or repudiate either the Boston or Chicago study. No significant differences between classes and socialization practices were found.

⁷Melvin L. Kohn, "Social Class and the Exercise of Parental Authority," American Sociological Review, 24(June, 1959), pp. 353-366 and Urie Brenfenbrenner, "Some Familial Antecedents of Responsibility and Leadership in Adolescents," in L. Petrulle and B. M. Bass (eds.), Leadership and Interpersonal Behavior (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1961), pp. 239-269. Both of these authors concentrated upon the effects of sexual differentiation within the confines of the family and its effects on socialization practices.

⁸Glenn H. Elder J. and Charles E. Bowerman, "Family Structure and Child-Rearing Patterns: The Effect of Family Size and Sex Composition," American Sociological Review, 28(December, 1963), pp. 891-905. Although Elder and Bowerman focus upon the effects of class as the independent variable, they refocus their interests to consider the effects of size and sex composition on socialization practices.

is further complicated by the nominal and operational definitions used to delineate class. The independent variable of social class acquires a different emphasis depending upon the theoretical orientation of the investigator. Indices used by investigators to measure class includes: occupations (bureaucratic, entrepreneurial, blue collar, white collar), education (parents, grandparents, relatives), income, property, residential areas, and club memberships. The above are not exhaustive of all indices nor of their dimensions. Many of the indicators are used singularly or in combination with other indexes.

In discussing the relationship of social class and socialization practices, individual studies stress the importance of different intervening variables. Intervening variables from the separate studies include: the father's satisfaction or dissatisfaction with his occupation,⁹ parental values,¹⁰ the autonomy of the father's occupation,¹¹ family size and composition,¹² and the effects of sexual differentiation,¹³ Again this is not exhaustive of the intervening variables that have been included in studying the relationship of social class and socialization practices.

⁹Donald G. McKinley, Social Class and Family Life (New York: The Free Press of Glencoe, 1964).

¹⁰Kohn, op. cit., pp. 353-366.

¹¹Daniel R. Miller and Guy E. Swanson, The Changing American Parent (New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1958).

¹²Elder and Bowerman, op. cit., pp. 891-905.

¹³Brenfenbrenner, op. cit., pp. 239-269.

The problem under consideration in the present study is to determine whether a relationship exists between social class and parental disciplinary techniques. Disciplinary techniques are but one area of possible socialization practices that could be studied. Within the framework of class and disciplinary techniques, the variable of sexual differentiation will be introduced to determine the effect it may have on the employment of disciplinary techniques.

The family as a social system and its relationship with other systems in society will be discussed from a Parsonian perspective.¹⁴ It is felt that the previous investigations can be more clearly understood, explained and related if they are incorporated into a systematic framework. Socialization practices, and in this particular case, disciplinary techniques, can not be fully or clearly understood when the family is viewed as a separate and isolated system. Instead, the family must be viewed as a system influenced and affected by the interpenetrations of other systems within the social structure. At the same time, subsystems appear within the family due to differential sex and role expectations as well as size. Although the present focus will be limited to disciplinary techniques, hopefully, the findings will lead to a greater understanding of other facets of the socialization process when incorporated and interpreted from a systematic framework,

¹⁴Talcott Parsons and Robert F. Bales, Family, Socialization and Interaction Process (Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1955).

CHAPTER II

THEORETICAL PERSPECTIVE

Social class is a difficult concept to delineate clearly both in nominal and operational terms. This difficulty can be partially explained by the extreme multidimensionality imposed upon the concept in scope and in usage from both the professional and lay levels. The nominal definition of class, however, is transformed into an empirical reality through its effects upon human behavior.¹ The task of any theoretical explanation is to ferret out what actually composes the nominal definition of class and in turn precisely elaborate on those variables or combinations of variables which mainly influence behavior.

The effects of social class on human behavior have been correlated in several areas including voting behavior, marital selection, mental illness, juvenile delinquency, voluntary associations and child rearing. The forementioned are not exhaustive of all the reported associations, but only selections indicating the breadth of investigated social class influences. Correlations are not to be equated with theoretical explanations; instead the investigator must seek to explain why this phenomenon of class has an effect on behavior. It is only with the combination of nominal and operational definitions, that the concept of class can become less obfuscated.

As mentioned, even though the concept of social class has been

¹Leonard Reissman, Class in American Society (New York: The Free Press, 1959), p. 227.

correlated with many variables and has been purported to have wide ramifications and effects, the concept remains nebulous. The term is used extensively by educators, investigators and laymen, but the definition of what actually comprises a class is obscure. Since the nominal and operational definitions of class will coincide with the theoretical orientation of the researcher, the properties to which class will refer from a Marxian theoretical framework will differ markedly from class as discussed by Talcott Parsons, Max Weber or F. S. Chapin. Correspondingly, the methodology used to ascertain the relationship of class and social behavior must differ. The concept of class can become further obscured by the mere accumulation of data on supposedly related dependent variables, and then attempting to relate these to class as the assumed independent variable. In order to avoid the accumulation of dependent variables and attributing these to class as the causal factor, an attempt must be made to develop a systematic theory which will explain rather than add to the compilation of simple correlations.

Research studies which are germane to this thesis have one common characteristic in that they are concerned with the differences that class makes in the utilization of discipline on children. An attempt will be made to incorporate these studies into one theoretical orientation with social class as the explanatory concept. A problem may arise, however, with the various definitions that are used to ascertain class.

APPROACHES TO A DEFINITION OF SOCIAL CLASS

The problem of defining class both nominally and operationally is discussed by several leading students of social stratification.

Harold M. Hodges, Jr. maintains that a satisfactory definition of class is difficult because its contours are so diverse and so intricate that no single definition is sufficiently all-embracing to do it full justice.

. . . social classes are the blended product of shared and analogous occupational orientations, educational backgrounds, economic wherewithal, and life experiences. . . because of their approximately uniform backgrounds and experiences, and because they grew up perceiving or 'looking at things' in similar ways, they will share comparable values, attitudes and life styles. Each of these likenesses will be in turn reinforced by clique, work, and friendship ties which are limited, in the main, to persons occupying the same level.²

Even though a person occupies a given class level due to education, income and life experiences does not imply that he will recognize or be conscious of his class identity. The person, however, is conscious of the indicators. Because of their occupation, education, and income, persons will be in contact with others with similar characteristics. This contact with others who are similar in status is important in forging one's attitudes, beliefs, and values. This interaction is not merely restricted to the occupational setting.

John F. Cuber and William F. Kenkel indicate that social class has been defined so many different ways that a systematic treatment would be time consuming and of doubtful utility.

Radical differences, to be sure, do exist in wealth, privilege, and possessions; but the differences seem to range along a continuum with imperceptible gradations from one

²Harold M. Hodges, Jr., Social Stratification (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Schenkman Publishing Company, 1964), p. 13.

person to another . . . The differences are not categorical, but continuous.³

Certain characteristics or modes of behavior may be found to be more prevalent in one class than in another, however, the characteristics are not consistent. Because variations occur which seem to cloud the distinction between these two seemingly distinct classes, this should not call for the dispensing of the hypothetical construct of class. A question raised pertaining to the inconsistencies in behavioral patterns as related to class concerns the possibility that social class may only be a hypothetical construct which has no actual empirical referent. Bernard Barber states that questions concerning the reality of social class mistake the nature of scientific inquiry.

Any social class unit within a system of stratification is an analytically conceived aspect of empirical social reality; as such, it is a hypothetical construct of exactly the same character as all scientific concepts. Of course, such constructed concepts correspond to social reality with varying degrees of accuracy and utility, both of which investigation is constantly trying to improve. The conceptual constructs of science are inherently provisional. Social classes are one way of usefully pointing to certain aspects of social reality, not all aspects, of social reality, for a conceptual construct is never exhaustive of what can be pointed to in social reality. In short, social classes do refer to social reality, but they are not necessarily concrete entities of which the participants in a society are fully aware.⁴

Barber implies that to pose such questions concerning the existence of concrete social classes in society is not contributing a

³John F. Cuber and William F. Kenkel, Social Stratification (New York; Appleton-Century Crofts, Inc., 1954), p. 12.

⁴Bernard Barber, Social Stratification (New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc., 1957), pp. 76-77.

suitable answer to the question. If the participants in society were fully aware of definite classes existing as concrete entities, there would be no need for expending the time to develop hypothetical constructs to describe them. Furthermore, if classes existed as definite concrete categories, ideological distortions would not occur among participants regarding the nature and operations of the social structure.⁵

The position earlier advocated by Cuber and Kenkel, that differences among classes range along a continuum rather than appearing as definite categories, is in accordance with Barber's theoretical orientation.

A social stratification system seems to be most usefully construed as a hierarchial structure that is continuous along its vertical dimension. There seems to be no reason to suppose that there are any gaps in the linear dimensions of evaluation based on the functionally significant social roles that are the determinants of stratificational positions in society.⁶

The different classes which may emerge from this continuous hierarchy depend upon several factors. The theoretical perspective, the scientific technique used to ascertain class and the preciseness of discrimination desired by the investigator will all affect the particular lines of demarcation on the continuum. It must be stressed that class is not an imposed category of the investigator with no existence in reality. The imposed classification must correspond to an underlying social reality.

Joseph A. Kahl's perspective of social class differs from that of

⁵Ibid., p. 77.

⁶Ibid., p. 77.

Barber and Cuber and Kenkel. Kahl defines social class as: "If a large group of families are approximately equal to each other and clearly differentiated from other families, we call them a social class."⁷ Kahl believes this definition is in accordance with the definition used by Max Weber, only in simple terminology. He departs with some of the previous theorists concerning the idea of gradations in class.

Logically, it is possible for a society to be stratified without having distinct classes, for there could be a continuous gradation from high to low without any sharp lines of division, but in reality this is most unlikely. The sources of a family's position are shared by many other similar families; there are only a limited number of types of occupation or of possible positions in the property system.⁸

The limited types of occupations in which one could engage are working the soil, trading, manufacturing or performing intellectual, military or political functions. From each of these broad occupational groups, members within each of these types become similar and at the same time dissimilar from those outside of their occupational type. ". . . the various stratification variables tend to converge; they form a pattern, and it is this pattern that creates social classes."⁹ Kahl indicates that since there are major functions to be performed in order for society to operate, each major occupational group consists of a group of persons who perform similar functions. Because these persons perform these different functions, a different way of life is imposed on them.

⁷Joseph A. Kahl, The American Class Structure (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1957), p. 12.

⁸Ibid., p. 13.

⁹Ibid., p. 13.

The variables which Kahl illustrates as affecting stratification are prestige, occupation, possessions, interaction, class consciousness and value orientations.¹⁰ Within these main occupational types, patterns emerge as a result of the crystallization of the above variables.

From the above discussion, it is obvious that a range of variables can have an effect on the stratification system. The range of such variables is another indication of the breadth of social class. Leonard Reissman, however, does not feel that the reality of social class will be obscured if the investigators concentrate on different definitions emphasizing different variables. Reissman claims:

Class, however, it is defined, is presumed to style the individual's environment and experience in such a way that certain phenomena hit him differently than they do individuals in other classes. . . Class, in short, creates a significant social milieu in which the individual moves and thereby predetermines a wide range of what the individual sees, experiences, and does. The tie to social structure is evident. It is the structure that is responsible for the creation of the class worlds to which individuals belong and in which they move.¹¹

Departing from earlier mentioned theorists of stratification, Gerhard Lenski focuses upon the variables of power and privilege as the underlying dimensions of stratification. Class is defined as "an aggregation of persons in a society who stand in a similar position with respect to some form of power, privilege or prestige."¹²

Lenski cautions the student against taking an unidimensional approach

¹⁰Ibid., p. 10.

¹¹Reissman, op. cit., p. 223.

¹²Gerhard Lenski, Power and Privilege (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1966), p. 75.

to stratification. A focus upon one variable may be misleading for this variable may take many forms. The variables which Kahl listed, for example, could overlap in many cases making it difficult to analyze class in terms of one common denominator. Lenski further maintains that, "Human populations are stratified in various ways, and each of these alternative modes of stratification provides a basis for a different conception of class."¹³ Reissman did not seem to feel that definitions of social class emphasizing alternative modes of stratification would blur the reality of social class. From the discussion of social class thus far, it can be seen that unanimity is lacking concerning the interrelatedness of the major variables of stratification. If one assumes that the major variables are overlapping and interrelated, then a selection of one or more variables would tap the dimensions of class. If one assumes that society is stratified in various ways, an approach to class would require tapping several different variables.

Kurt B. Mayer's conception of the social class structure is analogous to the orientation of Cuber and Kenkel and Barber. Mayer states that in a class system:

the social hierarchy is based primarily upon differences in monetary wealth and income. Social classes are not sharply marked off from each other nor are they demarcated by tangible boundaries. . . social classes are not organized, social groups. Rather they are persons with similar amounts of wealth and property and similar sources of income.¹⁴

¹³Ibid., p. 74.

¹⁴Kurt B. Mayer, Class and Society (New York: Random House, 1966), p. 8.

Mayer discusses how these differences in wealth and income are expressed in different ways which are reflected in manners, dress and cultural attributes. Besides allowing for different modes of expression, these differences give rise to the formation of status groups which he defines as "informal social groups whose members view each other as equals because they share common understandings, as expressed in similar attitudes and similar modes of behavior, and who treat or regard outsiders as social superiors or inferiors."¹⁵

Mayer contends that the economic dimension stratifies society. The economic dimension being derived from occupational activities or ownership of property or a combination of the two. Differences in income, property and occupations stratifies society into classes. Status hierarchies are highly conditioned by the class structure. Status hierarchies tend to stabilize the existing class structure in legitimizing the class positions. There is a dynamic and reciprocal relationship between class hierarchies and status hierarchies.¹⁶

The inclusion of the relationship of status and class hierarchies is to lay the groundwork for those who would contend that classes do not exist in society. Some may argue that instead of classes, "life in the United States is organized by socio-economic status, organized as a continuum of positions rather than as a set of classes."¹⁷

¹⁵Ibid., p. 8. ¹⁶Ibid., pp. 23-27.

¹⁷Roger Brown, Social Psychology (New York: The Free Press, 1965), p. 106.

Roger Brown, a social psychologist, maintains that if the concept of class can be empirically tested and meet the following requirements, then it undeniably exists:

1) the population is conscious of classes, agreed on the number of classes, and on the memberships of them; 2) styles of life are strikingly uniform within a stratum and there are clear contrasts between strata; 3) interaction is sharply patterned by stratum; 4) the boundaries suggested by the three kinds of data are coincident. . . in the degree that the conditions listed are not satisfied, the reality of class becomes doubtful.¹⁸

Brown then reviews studies based upon the consciousness of class, interaction and styles of life and concludes that there is scant evidence that class exists as a social-psychological reality. He concludes that a continuum of occupational prestige exists but nothing in the prestige ratings given to occupations suggest a class structure.¹⁹

Brown is suggesting that respondents in studies who were not aware of their class affiliation or who denied the existence of classes are a fairly strong indication of the reality of the concept.²⁰ If people are not aware of their class standing or deny the existence of classes, does unawareness or denial of class negate the existence of social class? It is a popular cliché in American culture that "everyone is equal" or that "the next person is just as good as I am" but is there a tendency to confuse the ideal with the real? If persons are not aware of class factors which influence their social behavior and experiences, nonawareness is not to be equated with the non existence of classes.

¹⁸Ibid., p. 114.

¹⁹Ibid., pp. 115-133.

²⁰Ibid., p. 117.

Brown further maintains that it is true that persons in the population discuss differences but in terms of occupations and income instead of social class.

These /occupation and income/ are distinctions thought to be determinative of social class but they are not identical with the concept of class. Income is a continuous variable, not a small number of categories; occupations are categories, but they are much more numerous than the social classes any investigator has described in America.²¹

As quoted earlier by Kahl, however, there are only a limited number of types of occupations or of possible positions in the property system. In agreement with Brown, there are numerous occupations in society but quantity is not to be confused with the generic term of types. A pattern emerges from the various types of occupations. The numerous occupations within the main types bear a resemblance which distinguishes them from those occupations of another classification. As Kahn indicated, it is the pattern which emerges from these main types which creates the existence of social classes.

It is important for the purpose of the present study to clarify the relationship of social class and the occupational structure. While occupation is one index used by both laymen and social scientists to gauge positions in the social structure, occupation does not exhaust the other illuminative components of class. Moreover, a strict and sole occupational definition of class can produce complex and overlapping strata because of the many gradations which are involved in the occupational hierarchy.

²¹Ibid., p. 116.

Reissman discusses the relationship of class and occupation in the following context:

. . . class is a primary social category. . . people depend upon a class label in order to categorize others and thereby to style their own responses to others. . . a man's occupation thus becomes his symbol of distinctiveness at the same time that it categorizes him for others.²²

The types of occupations will be one of the indices used for a component of class. From the main types of occupations, as discussed by Kahl and indicated in the above by Reissman, a distinctive pattern emerges. This pattern is not from each occupation per se but from similarities in the occupational types and on variables such as education and styles of life. "The correlations between occupation, income and education are high and any or all of the three are important symbols to categorize people in the necessary shorthand of social interaction."²³ In summary, a pattern emerges from occupational types but a sole reliance upon occupation to measure class would not tap other dimensions. Occupational types can function as indices of social class but are not synonymous with social class.

It can be seen from this brief review of the major stratification texts that a clear and precise definition of social class is difficult to obtain. It will be maintained by this author that the concept of class is a useful hypothetical construct which represents a social reality through its effects upon human behavior. A multidimensional

²²Reissman, op. cit., p. 228.

²³Ibid., p. 158

approach is emphasized to study the intricate pattern which emerges from the convergence of class variables.²⁴ The reality that class represents is a convergence of variables which forms a distinctive pattern of life for its occupants. Depending upon the particular types, amounts and combinations of class variables, different patterns will emerge. The resultant patterns present a different type of social reality for the occupants of these different combinations. To describe the pattern of life which emerges and differentiates occupants from occupants of another pattern, social class will be defined as an aggregate of persons²⁵ who are the blended products of shared and analogous occupational orientations and educational backgrounds.²⁶

²⁴Joseph A. Kahl, The American Class Structure (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston Inc., 1957), p. 13.

²⁵Kurt B. Mayer, Class and Society (New York: Random House, 1966), p. 8.

²⁶Harold M. Hodges, Social Stratification (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Schenkman Publishing Co., 1964), p. 13. Hodges also included shared and analogous economic and life experiences in his definition of class.

SOCIAL CLASS AND THE FAMILY

PARSONIAN PERSPECTIVE

The presentation thus far, has been concerned with the "why" of social class as a useful hypothetical construct. The "how" of social class, the process by which social class becomes a reality, will be discussed within the framework presented by Talcott Parsons. Parson's conceptualization of the systemic relationship between the family system and other systems of society provides an excellent framework from which to view and incorporate more detailed perspectives, regarding the socialization process. Melvin Kohn, Urie Bronfenbrenner Donald McKinley, Glen Elder and Charles Bowerman present more detailed perspectives of particular facets of the system discussed by Parsons. These particular perspectives will be incorporated into the Parsonian schema in order to provide a richer and more detailed framework from which to view the socialization process as affected by class and sex differentiation.

Parsons treats the relationship of the family unit to the occupational structure by the phenomenon of "interpenetration." The ties between the two systems are united in that the same adults are both members of a nuclear family and incumbents of occupational roles. Society should not be considered as a separate entity but as an intricate network of these various interdependent and interpenetrating subsystems. As such, the individual by participating in the various social subsystems of society, has multiple role expectations. In the same vein, the various subsystems of society are also highly differen-

tiated and contain subsystems within themselves.²⁷ In discussing the family as one of the subsystems of society, Parsons states:

. . . the parents, as socializing agents, occupy not merely their familial roles but these articulate, i.e. interpenetrate, with their roles in other structures of the society. . . this fact is a necessary condition. . . of their functioning effectively as socializing agents, i.e. as parents, at all. Secondly, the child is never socialized only for and into his family of orientation but into structures which extend beyond this family, through interpenetration with it. These include the school and peer group in later childhood and the family of procreation which the child will help to form by his marriage, as well as occupational roles in adulthood.²⁸

To view the relationship between the subsystem of the family and the occupational structure, a "boundary-role" is created. An analysis or understanding of the socialization process, however, can not be fully grasped by limiting the analysis to these two subsystems. To do so, the effects of the myriad of other interdependent subsystems would be partially excluded. A concentration on the other interrelated subsystems, at the same time should not dismiss lightly the effects of the occupational subsystem. Parsons maintains that in viewing the boundary-role between family and occupation that:

The husband-father, in holding an acceptable job and earning an income from it is performing an essential function or set of functions for his family (which of course includes himself in one set of roles) as a system. The status of the family in the community is determined probably more by the "level" of job he holds than by any other single factor, and the income he earns is usually the most important basis of the family's standard of living and hence "style of life."²⁹

²⁷Talcott Parsons and Robert F. Bales, Family Socialization and Interaction Process (Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1955), pp. 13-35.

²⁸Ibid., p. 35.

²⁹Ibid., p. 13.

One's position in the occupational structure has further ramifications for the family other than being one of the determinants for the status that it receives. The occupational role also affects role differentiation within the family system. By virtue of the importance of one's occupational role as a component of his familial role, the husband-father emerges as the "instrumental leader" of the family system. The role of the adult male is primarily enacting his occupational responsibilities, earning an income for his family and conferring status upon the family. The role of the adult female is primarily centered around the internal dynamics of the subsystem as she enacts her expectations of wife, mother and manager of the household. The differentiation of sex roles which occurs in the family is along "instrumental-expressive lines."³⁰

The type of sexual differentiation that emerges in the family is not only restricted to the family subsystem. Parsons contends that differentiation tends to appear in all groups of social interaction regardless of their composition. In the family subsystem, the mother emerges as the expressive leader because of the dependency of the child upon the mother. The father who is exempt from these functions, can participate in alternate functions which are "instrumental" or adaptive conditions for the maintenance of equilibrium of the family subsystem.³¹

³⁰Ibid., p. 13. Instrumental activity was defined as the goal attainment and adaptation aspects of the coordinate system. Expressive activity was defined as the integrative and tension aspects of the coordinate systems.

³¹Ibid., pp. 15-23.

Differentiation occurs in the family also with regard to the concept of power, the quantitative degree of influence. In the structure of the nuclear family, Parsons contends, four main role types exist which are differentiated from each other by generation and sex. The effect of generation is discussed in the realm of power since the adult members of the family have more power in directing the affairs of the family than the younger members. Sexual differentiation is elaborated on by the differentiation of the instrumental-expressive functions.³² The four main familial role types of father, mother, sister and brother rank differently with regard to power and instrumental-expressive activity.

Viewing the family network from a Parsonian approach as a consequence of differentiation on the axes of power and instrumental-expressive function, it can be seen that at any time, it is possible for various subsystems to develop within the family as a whole. Parsons states that, "Any combination of two or more members as differentiated from one or more other members may be treated as a social system which is a subsystem of the family as a whole."³³ Of course, the smaller the family, the smaller the number of subsystems which can emerge from the family as a whole.

There are a multitude of factors which could affect the axes of power and instrumental-expressive functions and accordingly the roles within the nuclear family. The instrumental-expressive axis could be

³²Ibid., p. 45. ³³Ibid., p. 37.

affected by the type of occupation of the father, the educational attainment, the income and other similar variables. Correspondingly, the expressive function can be modified by whether the homemaker is employed outside the home, her education and perhaps the conception she has of her husband's occupation. Power, in turn, could be affected by age of parents in relation to child, number of children in the family, sex composition of the family members and the intervals between the children. The manner in which the parent will execute his role in the socialization process will be affected by where the parent stands in relation to other members of the family on the continuum of high or low on the axes of power and instrumental-expressive functions.

Parsons discussed several variables which can have an effect upon the relationships within the family system. These variables are accorded different priorities depending upon the theoretical perspective of the investigator. The perspectives of McKinley, Kohn, Bronfenbrenner and Elder and Bowerman are incorporated into the Parsonian framework to illustrate the impact these variables have on the socialization process in the family.

MCKINLEY Rewards and Strains of Occupational Status

In discussing social class and the socialization process, Donald R. McKinley approaches the subject with a concentration upon the occupation of the head of the household. Such a concentration illuminates the "boundary-role" discussed by Parsons. McKinley defends his focus upon the grounds that a person is evaluated by the contributions he makes to society. One's occupation is the best indicator to tap this

contribution. McKinley views the socialization process from the rewards and strains which are particular to different statuses in society.

McKinley states that:

The work situation and its emotional climate and social structure influence, to an important extent, the personality of the husband-father and the way in which he plays his roles in the family. Furthermore, the evaluation of the worth of his occupational activity places him in a certain position in society with regard to the economic and social power he enjoys and the esteem or social approval he and his family receive. Variations in these social dimensions opens and closes the door to a multitude of "life chances", and requires a number of basic adjustive responses within the nuclear family.³⁴

McKinley views the role of the father as the main link between the economic system where the father has a definite occupational status and the private life of his family. The father has a direct involvement in both systems.

McKinley states the manner in which expressed hostility or aggression is displaced is affected by one's occupation. McKinley explains that this takes place because if the individual's position is in the upper class, he is in a position where he can displace aggression toward extra-familial individuals without a threat to his security or position. An individual in the lower class can not display his aggression as easily to extra-familial sources. He occupies a less secure position and such an act could place his job in jeopardy. McKinley sees their aggression as being displaced in the family or to their equals.³⁵

³⁴Donald Gilbert McKinley, Social Class and Family Life (New York: The Free Press of Glencoe, 1964), p. 4.

³⁵Ibid., pp. 55-56.

The process of socialization will also differ because of the father's occupational status. Individuals in higher positions receive more prestige and esteem from society, and in return can give their children more emotionally and materially. McKinley contends that more positive sanctions than negative are given to children in the upper class. This is congruent with the status of the father, who is in a position where he receives more positive sanctions from society. The lower class father, whose occupational position in society is not as secure because of his position, receives less from society as far as prestige, esteem and material benefits. The lower class father does not have the same kind of influence in the socialization process as the father in higher positions. If the emotional bond is weak between the parent and the child because of the lack of positive rewards the father brings to the situation, there is less internalization of parental expectations and love. When the child is to be negatively sanctioned, the withdrawal of love is not an effective mode of discipline because a strong emotional bond with positive rewards has not been a characteristic of the relationship.³⁶

The differential distribution of status, prestige and material benefits makes socialization a more difficult process in the lower class.

The parent resorts to physical punishment, to hostile deprivation, as the means to bringing about control and as a means of displacing hostility in order to maintain his personality and enhance his own status. Aggression and hostility may enhance status, for status is to some degree a relative matter; the expression of negative sanctions toward those about the individual tends to decrease their status and, relative to others (the child), to increase his own.³⁷

³⁶Ibid., pp. 57-58.

³⁷Ibid., p. 58.

McKinley utilized the classification scheme of Hollingshead to ascertain class. The values and distinctions of these classes were elaborated on by Kahl.³⁸ The analysis of values that correspond to each of the classes is from a review of many descriptive studies of class behavior. Kahl contends that these value orientations emerge as a response to the class situation. The upper-class or class I is characterized by a life of graceful living. The occupants of this class can operate with poised control, for the members have an emotional climate of security, material rewards and confidence because of their position in society. This emotional climate is usually only achieved by the occupant after he has inherited the material and social advantages. The upper middle class or class II is comprised of the group that is career oriented. This class is characterized by a fusion of work and personal life where the two are not thought of as separate entities. The wife is a social and emotional assistant to her husband in his business career. Since this class reinforces the dominant value in American society of career orientation, classes both above and below seem to view this class as a focal point to gauge or compare their own attitudes toward work. Class III, the lower-middle class is characterized as placing more of an emphasis upon respectability and morality rather than upon the value of career orientation or productivity. They are viewed as over-conformists by the occupants of the classes above them. The classes below them do not emulate this class for the occupants are viewed as being so traditional, conforming and missing the fun of life without having anything to show

³⁸Ibid., pp. 21-42.

for it. If these are the liabilities, they also have assets such as the freedom from striving occupational demands which are exercised upon members of the upper middle class. The morality emphasis permeates all aspects of their life. The working-class or class IV is composed of the skilled and the regularly employed blue-collar workers. This class struggles to get by at a reasonable level of living. Since most of the emphasis seems to be upon the realities of the present, career aspirations are more unrealistic. The lower-class or class V are the ones at the bottom who are defined by themselves, family and society as immoral, irresponsible and unproductive. Certain attitudes develop toward authority, work and morality which tends to be apathetic. One lives for the physical, the emotional and is present oriented.

Using the classification scheme of Hollingshead and the descriptions given by Kahl, McKinley hypothesizes that different child rearing methods will emerge from these life conditions. The father in the upper-class can exercise strong authority because of the resources at hand to bring compliance. Compliance does not make the control appear as severe as it may appear in a class without emotional or material resources at hand. The structure of the family may be more patriarchal because of the father's position and since there is not the necessity for the wife to be employed. The upper-class father may consider himself more adequate as a person because of the prestigious position he occupies which in turn influences his conception of his fatherly role and the respect which is afforded him from his family. A lower-class father does not have the bargaining power of prestige and material benefits which may

operate to make his parental role appear less effective or less deserving of respect. McKinley located the upper-middle class father's authority midway between the upper- and lower-class father's authority.³⁹

The theoretical perspective presented by McKinley will not be adhered to rigidly. Although he presents some interesting insights, the perspective at times appears to be ethnocentric or value laden. It is not questioned that parents bring different elements to the situation in the socialization of their children but McKinley seems to take a condescending approach toward the lower-class. Many of the concepts which are used would be difficult to operationalize and measure empirically since they appear to be more introspective in nature. His perspective, however, is necessary to illustrate the patterns that may emerge when considering occupation as one of the main determinants of social class in relation to child rearing techniques. Many of the factors which he attributes may be counterbalanced, heightened, or negated when the effects of the other components of class are brought into the picture.

KOHN Parental Values

The theoretical approach to social class and the socialization process as advanced by Melvin Kohn does not stress an unidimensional approach to class as the one advanced by McKinley. Kohn views class as aggregates of individuals who occupy broadly similar positions in the scale of prestige. The concept of social class is a useful concept, he maintains, because it not only captures occupation, education and other related variables but it also captures the reality which is resultant from the

³⁹Ibid., pp. 21-42.

interplay of all these variables. Because of the different life conditions of the members in these different classes, the members develop different conceptions of social reality.⁴⁰

In discussing the effects of occupation, it could be assumed that parents have different expectations for their children and different value orientations because of differences in their occupational circumstances. The above does not imply that parents consciously attempt to train their child in accordance with the occupational positions of the parents. The occupational milieu, however, will affect what the parent may deem desirable and undesirable both off and on the job.⁴¹ Even though occupational circumstances may be basic to the difference between working-class and middle-class parents in what they consider as desirable behavior of their children, occupation is not sufficient as the sole criterion in explaining these social class differences.

Kohn, also, explores in depth the effects that education may have upon the child rearing process in relation to discipline. Parents will utilize different means to accomplish desired tasks of their children. Kohn maintains that middle-class parents focus more attention on the child's developing of internal controls. This particular type of socialization technique is facilitated by the parents ability due to their educational backgrounds to deal with the ideational and the sub-

⁴⁰Melvin Kohn, "Social Class and Parent Child Relationships: An Interpretation," American Journal of Sociology, 68(January, 1963), p. 472.

⁴¹Ibid., p. 476.

jective. Middle class parents also have a greater and more stable income, a more prestigious occupation and thus can take for granted respectability which the working-class parent may not feel secure to assume.⁴²

Kohn maintains that the difference in values between middle-class and working-class parents extends beyond income and occupation. Some other aspects which differentiate the two classes are:

1. Middle-class occupations deal more with the manipulation of interpersonal relations, ideas, and symbols, while working-class occupations deal more with the manipulation of things.

2. Middle-class occupations are more subject to self-direction while working-class occupations are more subject to standardization and direct supervision.

3. Getting ahead in the middle-class is more dependent upon one's own actions, while in working-class occupations, it is more dependent upon collective action, particularly in unionized industries. Thus middle-class occupations require a greater degree of self-direction; working-class occupations, in large measure, require that one follow explicit rules set down by someone in authority.⁴³

What the parent deems as desirable behavior in his child, according to Kohn, reflects their values or their conceptions of the desirable. Because of the parents position in the social structure, his education, his income, and his life experiences, the values will be accordingly affected. The dominant motif of the middle-class parent in his child rearing techniques will be upon the child developing his own standards of conduct. The emphasis upon self-direction is reflective of the middle-class occupations. The working-class parents will expect their children to adhere more to the norms of desirable behavior prescribed by the parent. This is similar to the milieu of the working-class parent where they are

⁴²Ibid., pp. 476-477.

⁴³Ibid., p. 476.

more often in positions of receiving commands rather than in positions of asserting independence.⁴⁴

It can be seen that Kohn views the parental values as a bridge between the social structure, where one's occupations is situated and the behavior that the parent displays. When the middle-class parent punishes the child's misbehavior, more of an emphasis will be placed upon the child's motives and feelings. The child will more likely be punished for his loss of self control. The working-class child will more likely have his misbehavior viewed as disobedience or transgression of authority. The act or consequence of the behavior is focused upon rather than the intent or loss of self control.⁴⁵

The same act of misbehavior committed by children of different classes will receive different treatment in accordance with the values of the parents. The working-class parents emphasize conforming to external authority because of their position in the social structure. Conformance is a means of obtaining respect and security. Middle-class parents do not have to emphasize conformance because they already have the respect and security because of their position in the social structure.⁴⁶ In affect, what is deemed as desirable behavior for the parents in the social structure, has an effect on what the parents correspondingly expect in their children's behavior.

⁴⁴Ibid., pp. 476-478.

⁴⁵Melvin Kohn, "Social Class and the Allocation of Parental Responsibilities," Sociometry, 23(December, 1960), p. 372.

⁴⁶Kohn, op. cit., p. 477.

The values of the parents in the middle-class and working-class not only affect how they view misbehavior and the discipline to be used but also the types of disciplinary techniques to be utilized.

In discussing the effects of class on values in the use and type of disciplinary techniques, Kohn maintains that:

Working-class parents are more apt to resort to physical punishment when the direct and immediate consequence of their children's disobedient acts are most extreme, and to refrain from punishing when this might provoke an even greater disturbance. . . Middle-class parents seem to punish or refrain from punishing on the basis of their interpretation of the child's intent in acting as he does. Thus, they will punish a furious outburst when the context is such that they interpret it to be a loss of self-control, but will ignore an equally extreme outburst when the context is such that they interpret it to be merely an emotional release.⁴⁷

Middle-class parents look beyond the deviant act and will be concerned with the intent of the act whereas working-class parents will more likely view the overt act as a transgression of externally imposed rules. Kohn notes that the values stemming from the social structure not only effect the use and types of discipline, but also has an effect depending on the sex of the child. The expectations for both sexes in the middle-class are not as differentiated as in the working-class where there are definite distinctions in the appropriate role behavior for each sex.⁴⁸

As mentioned earlier, occupation provides a necessary basis for the existence of social class differences but it does not provide for a suf-

⁴⁷Ibid., p. 478.

⁴⁸Melvin Kohn, "Social Class and Parental Values," American Journal of Sociology," 64(January, 1959), pp. 340-341.

ficient explanation. McKinley discussed differences in the use and type of discipline between middle- and working-classes as stemming from the satisfaction and dissatisfaction the parent receives from his occupation. The intervening variable of satisfaction or dissatisfaction bridged parental role behavior and the occupational structure. Kohn bridges the two dimensions with values. Kohn views the occupational experiences as having a profound effect upon what the parent will view as desirable or undesirable in life. From McKinley's emphasis, it would appear that parents discipline as a reaction to their position in the social structure while Kohn seems to indicate that parents act in accordance to their demands in the occupational structure.

The theoretical perspective advanced by Kohn entails additional subsystems for the explanation of social class and socialization. Kohn does not restrict Parsons's "boundary-role" to the occupational structure and the family. The effects of the subsystem of education are felt to be one of the main determinants in explaining different socialization practices among social classes. Kohn does not replace occupation with education as an explanatory variable but merely takes more subsystems into account to describe the viability of class.

BRONFENBRENNER Sexual Differentiation

Urie Bronfenbrenner, however, indicates that the relationship between a family's social position and its attitudes and actions in the area of child rearing have not received ample theoretical or methodological consideration. He claims that many of the existent theories in the field have assumed that children are accorded different punishment and

training depending upon the sex of the child and parent with regard to class, yet little is known about the variations in the treatment. The association of class and behavior is often overlooked by existing theories which assume that sex differences in parental treatment are similar and have similar effects at all socio-economic levels. Bronfenbrenner doubts the validity of such assertions but maintains that precise facts must be established to confirm the association of family position and child-rearing practices.⁴⁹

Bronfenbrenner states that the patterns of child rearing have changed in the last twenty-five years with gaps on child rearing practices between the various classes decreasing. He indicates that with all parents there is a trend toward greater permissiveness toward the child's spontaneous desires, a freer expression of affection and an increased reliance upon modes of psychological disciplining which include tactics of reasoning, rewards and appeals to guilt as opposed to modes of physical disciplining. In the same line, he asserts that the traditional role behavior of parents is also shifting. Previously, the father was more authoritative, displaying less affection whereas the father now appears to be becoming more affectionate and the mother becoming more active as the agent of discipline. The shift in all of these areas

⁴⁹Urie Bronfenbrenner, "Some Familial Antecedents of Responsibility and Leadership in Adolescents." in L. Petrullo and B. M. Bass (eds.) Leadership and Interpersonal Behavior (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1961), p. 24.

is more toward the middle class way of life.⁵⁰

From a review of past studies, Bronfenbrenner indicates that parental behavior is differentially distributed according to socioeconomic status and sex. His analysis indicates that boys are subjected to more punishment and less affection than girls. The differential treatment of children, however, is at a minimum in the upper middle class and more pronounced at lower class levels.⁵¹

Bronfenbrenner states that:

. . . it is primarily at lower middle class levels that boys get more punishment than girls, and the latter receive greater warmth and attention. With an increase in the family's social position, direct discipline drops off, especially for boys, and indulgence and protectiveness decrease for girls. As a result, patterns of parental treatment for the two sexes begin to converge. In like manner, the differential effects of parental behavior on the two sexes are marked only in the lower middle class.⁵²

Differential treatment also appears to be influenced by the sex of the parent. Mothers are more prone to use "love-oriented" techniques of discipline. The administering of direct punishment, however, is more pronounced with father-son than with mother-daughter relationships. The pattern emerges with the parent being more lenient and indulgent with the opposite sex child and more demanding, firm and active with the same sex child. Bronfenbrenner notes that the differential treatment of children is more likely to be emitted by the father.⁵³

⁵⁰Urie Bronfenbrenner, "The Changing American Child - - A Speculative Analysis," in Neil J. Smelser and William T. Smelser (eds.) Personality and Social Systems (New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1963), pp. 347-349.

⁵¹Ibid., pp. 350-351. ⁵²Ibid., p. 351. ⁵³Ibid., p. 353.

When the variable of education is introduced, irregardless of the sex of the child, less educated parents exercise more punitive and rejecting methods of discipline. At every educational level, boys were the recipients of more punitive measures and girls with affection. Even though the same general pattern emerges for the children, the behavior of parents deviates. Bronfenbrenner indicates that the mother's behavior is most affected by the educational attainment of her husband. To predict a mother's behavior in discipline, Bronfenbrenner indicates that a more reliable estimate would be to base it upon the attainment of her husband than upon her own. As Bronfenbrenner explores the relationship, he indicates:

. . . the lower the father's education, the more the mother becomes the authority figure, especially for girls. It is only in the better educated families that the father in any way approaches or surpasses the mother as a generally influential person in the child's life. Thus the relative predominance of the father over the mother in "instrumental" companionship with boys occurs only in families where the father has held at least some college education. Similarly, it is only the better-educated father who serves as the principal agent of physical punishment for the daughter. Quite the opposite trend, however, appears for boys: here it is the lower class father who is most likely to administer corporal punishment to his son.⁵⁴

The theoretical perspective of Bronfenbrenner focuses more on the dimensions of sexual differentiation. Parsons discussed the effects of this subsystem within the family in terms of power and generation. Subsystems emerge within the family subsystem because of different role configurations, sex, power and generation. Although Bronfenbrenner does not dismiss the effects of education and occupation on the socialization

⁵⁴Bronfenbrenner, op. cit., pp. 250-252.

process, his selective focus on sexual differentiation brings other explanatory variables to the socialization scene.

ELDER AND BOWERMAN Family Composition and Size

Whereas Donald, McKinley, Melvin Kohn and Urie Bronfenbrenner explain the variations that occur in disciplinary procedures in terms of physical vs. psychological or symbolic punishment or love-oriented techniques vs. physical techniques, Elder and Bowerman explain the variations in terms of external vs. internal behavior control techniques. External behavior controls consist of techniques of physical punishment, shouting, criticizing or autocratic controls which the parent employs to terminate or direct a child's behavior. The effectiveness of such controls is more dependent on parental actions for they are imposing a system of controls to elicit obedience and at the same time they are discouraging the transgression of these imposed controls. External or direct controls are measured more by the effectiveness of the parent for Elder and Bowerman contend that these controls do not aim at engaging the child's own mechanisms of self-control.⁵⁵

Internal behavior controls or indirect methods involve techniques of parental explanations and reasoning which attempt to engage the child's own mechanisms of self-control in determining appropriate behavior. Elder and Bowerman maintain in their theoretical perspective that:

⁵⁵Glen H. Elder, Jr., and Charles E. Bowerman, "Family Structures and Child-Rearing Patterns: The Effect of Family Size and Sex Composition," American Sociological Review, 28(December, 1963), p. 892.

Since external methods attempt to arrest undesirable behavior without appealing to the child's understanding, there is often conflict between parent and child. Indirect or "psychological" methods of behavior regulation aim at reducing or eliminating motivational differences between parent and child and eliciting compliance.⁵⁶

Elder and Bowerman contend that family size, paternal involvement in child rearing and the use of external behavior controls are correlations of social class. The correlation will be further elaborated upon in the presentation of the findings. It can be seen that the theoretical orientation of Elder and Bowerman parallels very closely the theoretical framework of Kohn in that Elder and Bowerman's concept of external behavior controls clearly adheres to Kohn's classification of physical punishment or punishment which centers on the immediate consequences of the deviant act. Internal behavior controls discussed by Elder and Bowerman correspond to the symbolic methods or psychological methods of control which center on the intent or the child's motives and feelings. Elder and Bowerman contend that larger and lower-class families are more likely to use physical punishment or external behavior controls and less likely to use symbolic rewards or internal behavior controls as techniques of control or discipline.⁵⁷

The theoretical perspective of Elder and Bowerman can be discussed from the Parsonian perspective. When viewing the family as a social system, Parsons maintains that it is possible for other subsystems to emerge within it because of differentiation along the axes of power, other subsystems which interpenetrate the family system, and the size of the fa-

⁵⁶Ibid., p. 892.

⁵⁷Ibid., p. 892.

mily. Elder and Bowerman concentrate upon the axes of power in socialization as related to sexual differentiation and the size of the family. Another illuminating aspect of the socialization process is thus brought to light by focusing on the number of subsystems emerging from the change in family size.

As a result of participating in similar subsystems within society, the reality of class emerges from a crystallization of similar variables of occupation, educational attainment and economic status, to mention just a few. Boundaries result from such a crystallization. Within the boundaries of social class as an interdependent and intricate system, "the members interact and develop common feelings and values and, in time, behavior patterns which give them identifying characteristics and a sense of unity."⁵⁸ Sussman states:

By defining the people with whom an individual may have intimate social relationships, therefore, our social-class system narrows his learning and training environment. His social investigations and goals, his symbolic world and its evaluation, are largely selected from the narrow culture of the class with which alone he can associate freely.⁵⁹

Summary and Synthesis

Relying on Parsons's theoretical stance of the boundary-roles which are resultants of the interpenetration of subsystems, the nuclear family cannot be viewed as an isolated subsystem of society but only as a composite of interdependent factors from other subsystems. Correspondingly,

⁵⁸Allison W. Davis, "Child Rearing in the Class Structure of American Society," in Marvin B. Sussman (ed.), Sourcebook in Marriage and the Family (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1963), p. 223.

⁵⁹Ibid., p. 226.

within any system or subsystem, differentiation takes place. The types of differentiation vary depending upon the theoretical orientation of the investigator, the particular system involved, the number of systems involved, the boundary-roles of the occupants or any number of related variables. The social reality of these individuals will be similar or dissimilar depending on the aspects of the subsystems in which they interact. A common way of life emerges from the interdependent factors which is characterized by the concept of class.

Thus far, the main theoretical girdings have been presented to form a foundation or framework in which the following studies will be analyzed. The studies are presented in a chronological order to illustrate how earlier findings in studies served as launching points for the later analysis, refinement and clarification of the concepts of class, role and sex differentiation and disciplinary techniques in the socialization process.

CHILD REARING STUDIES

Ericson

One of the earliest studies, concerning social class and child rearing practices, was conducted by Martha Ericson.⁶⁰ The main problem was to test the hypothesis that systematic differences in child-rearing practices would be found because of the different environments within the particular classes. Ericson was also interested in the effects of these training procedures on the personality of the child. This paper will

⁶⁰Martha Ericson, "Social Status and Childrearing Practices," in T. M. Newcombe and Eugene L. Hartley (eds.), Readings in Social Psychology. (New York: Henry Holt and Co., 1947), pp. 494-501.

only focus upon the disciplinary techniques and will not be concerned with the personality or the effects on the child's personality for the future. It will only focus upon parental behavior and will not analyze the child's response to the disciplinary techniques.

The sample of 100 mothers was obtained through nursery schools and child study groups in various sections of Chicago in the early 1940's. Mothers were stratified into middle- or lower-class standing by a correlation of variables such as the education of the grandparents of the children and the occupation and education of the parents and of the parents' siblings. The club membership of parents and the land ownership of the grandparents were also included. Those families who were categorized as middle-class had occupations which were located in the first four categories of the 7-point occupational classification and subsequently families which were categorized into the three lowest categories composed the lower class.

The results indicated that generally middle-class families were more restrictive in all areas of training their children than lower-class parents.

Middle class families' children were expected to assume responsibilities in the home earlier than were lower-class children. Children in the middle class families are expected to begin helping at home earlier than children in working-class families. Middle-class boys and girls were expected to be in the house earlier at night than the lower-class boys and girls. The lower-class boys and girls begin going to the movies alone earlier than the middle-class boys and girls and many more lower-class boys and girls are paid for working than were the middle-class boys and girls.⁶¹

⁶¹Ibid., p. 500

Although Ericson did not explore disciplinary techniques per se, the above was included to illustrate that differences were found between the two groups in training in a similar area. Perhaps if the above situation and demands were not obeyed, the subsequent negative sanctions would follow the same pattern with lower-class parents being more permissive. Ericson concluded that the differences are largely due to the life styles of the two groups. The life of the lower-class children consists of a pattern that is less strictly organized with fewer demands while the middle-class children learn to conform to more demanding expectations which are illustrative of life in the middle class.⁶²

DAVIS AND HAVIGHURST-Chicago Study

In 1943, Allison Davis and Robert J. Havighurst investigated the relationship of social class and color differences in child-rearing in Chicago.⁶³ Davis and Havighurst had four groups for comparison; white middle-class, white lower-class, Negro middle-class and Negro lower-class. For the purpose of the present study, only the white findings will be considered.

The families were categorized into classes according to the socioeconomic scale developed by Warner and Lunt.⁶⁴ Factors included were occupation, residential area, education, property ownership and

⁶²Ibid., p. 500

⁶³Allison Davis and Robert J. Havighurst, "Social Class and Color Differences in Child-Rearing." American Sociological Review, 11(December, 1946), pp. 693-710.

⁶⁴W. Lloyd Warner and Paul S. Lunt, The Social Life of a Modern Community (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1941).

memberships in churches and other associations. The sample consisted of 80 families, 48 middle-class and 32 lower-class and all of the mothers were native born. The sample of middle-class mothers was drawn mainly from those mothers who had children in nursery schools. The sample of lower-class mothers was drawn from areas of poor housing and from acquaintances of the interviewee. The middle-class was more upper-middle than lower-middle and the lower-class was more representative of the upper-lower than the lower-lower class.

It was found that the middle-class parents expected their children to assume responsibility earlier than that expected by lower-class parents. The middle-class parents were more restrictive in their expectations of when the children should be in the home at night, in the free play of their impulses, in the taking of naps and at the age at which children should be permitted to attend movies alone. The middle-class children were expected to assume responsibility in the home earlier with tasks such as caring for the younger children and household chores.⁶⁵

Davis and Havighurst conclude:

. . . middle-class people tend to train their children for early achievement and responsibility, while lower-class people train their children to take responsibility only after the child is old enough to make the effort of training pay substantial returns in the work the child will do. . . middle-class parents encourage their children to be venturesome in the "constructive" activities, from a middle-class point of view, of going down town alone to the museums, department stores, dancing lessons and the like.⁶⁶

It is not enough to view the restrictions placed upon activities but

⁶⁵Davis and Havighurst, op. cit., p. 707.

⁶⁶Ibid., p. 708.

also the types of activities in which one participates. Middle-class parents were more restrictive of their children going to movies alone and on coming in the house earlier at night but were more permissive in other activities, which Davis and Havighurst entitled "constructive."

Davis and Havighurst stated that the emphasis of training in the middle-class is on socializing a child which will internalize the norms of orderliness and responsibility; thus becoming a more conscientious child.⁶⁷

A possible interpretation of findings is that disciplinary actions which are viewed as more restrictive or demanding in one period of life may provide the means for more permissive techniques in the following years. If the child has more restrictions placed upon him at an earlier age, in the sense of learning to become more conscientious of internalizing norms and accepting responsibilities, then restrictions from these external sources will not be as necessary in later periods of life. If the emphasis in early child training is allowing more permissiveness in activities and in responsibilities then it could be interpreted that the child will be experiencing external controls for a longer period of time, because emphasis had not been given to the development of his internalized controls.

MACCOBY, SEARS AND LEVIN-Boston Study

In 1951-52, Robert R. Sears, Eleanor E. Maccoby and Harry Levin conducted a study in Boston with 379 mothers of kindergarten children

⁶⁷Ibid., p. 707

in two suburbs, one which was predominately middle-class and the other working-class.⁶⁸

Only intact families of native born and natural parents were included. Children were eliminated if handicapped, adopted, twins or any other special cases. Warner's S.E.S. classification was used. Occupation and incomes were weighted to produce a score of SES. Seven cases were excluded and the remaining 372 were divided into middle-class (198) cases and working-class (174) cases. The middle-class contained mainly professionals, businessmen and other white-collar occupations whereas the working class was mainly composed of blue collar workers, the largest category within this group being the skilled workers who were not self-employed.

When the education of the mothers was controlled, most (72%) of the mothers possessing beyond high school education were in the middle-class group and (71%) of the mothers who had less than a high school education were in the working class group.⁶⁹

Although some of the findings presented here do not deal directly with disciplinary techniques, they will give a broader and more unified perspective when analyzing disciplinary techniques separately.

Aggression, which was defined as "behavior that is intended to hurt or injure someone,"⁷⁰ produced notable class differences. Over all, mid-

⁶⁸Robert R. Sears, Eleanor E. Maccoby and Harry Levin, Patterns of Child Rearing (Evanston, Illinois: Row, Peterson and Company, 1957.)

⁶⁹Ibid., pp. 424-425.

⁷⁰Ibid., pp. 424-425.

die-class mothers were more permissive and less punitive than were the working-class mothers. In aggression toward the parents and neighborhood children, the middle-class mothers were more permissive, however, in neither class was there a tendency for one class to be more permissive than the other with quarreling and fighting between siblings.⁷¹

Middle-class mothers and those with better educations were more permissive in allowing the child more freedom whereas working-class mothers kept a close check on the whereabouts of their children. The working class mothers were more restrictive on the child's behavior within the home on subjects such as care for furniture, taking care of own clothes, and quietness in the home, yet it was the middle-class mother who more frequently assigned chores to the child.⁷²

In the area of discipline, working class mothers seemed to be more punitive towards their children and also used different methods from those mothers of the middle class.

There was little or no class difference in the ratings on isolation and withdrawal of love, although in this latter dimension there was a significantly higher average rating for the lower educational level mothers when the comparison was made on the basis of education rather than socio-economic status. The greatest amount of punishment used by working-class mothers was composed mainly of physical punishment and deprivation of privileges. There was a larger proportion of working-class mothers than of middle-class mothers who were rated high on these latter two techniques.⁷³

More punishment of every kind was utilized by the working-class mothers than by the middle-class mothers. Within punishment, there was a great difference in the use of techniques, with the working-class

⁷¹Ibid., p. 259.

⁷²Ibid., p. 429.

⁷³Ibid., p. 431.

mothers using techniques which were object oriented rather than love oriented techniques. This only appeared to be evident when the child was negatively sanctioned.⁷⁴

When the mothers were questioned as to the father's involvement in the child rearing practice, there was more concordance over child-rearing practices among the middle-class families than in the working-class families where there was more quarreling over the practices between the parents themselves. "Regardless of socio-economic status or education, the husbands were inclined to believe that their wives were not strict enough with the children, while the wives tended to believe that their husbands were too strict."⁷⁵

When the education is controlled and classes are compared, the middle-class mother utilize isolation more frequently and ridicule less frequently as a technique of discipline and are more in agreement with their husbands as to how the children should be raised. When people of the same socio-economic status are compared but with different educational attainments, the better educated mothers utilize reasoning more often as a technique of training and resort less to tangible rewards. The better educated mothers were less inclined to dichotomize behavior which was appropriate for a boy to be masculine and a girl to be feminine. They were also more permissive with the child's neatness, orderliness, and with the treatment of the house. Once the mother's education was held constant, there was no difference with respect to these matters.⁷⁶

⁷⁴Ibid., p. 431.

⁷⁵Ibid., p. 432.

⁷⁶Ibid., p. 434.

Comparing the study of Davis and Havighurst of 1943 with the study of Sears, Maccoby and Levin a major trend or reversal in child-rearing techniques by the two classes has taken place or either a large disparity in their sampling techniques. Havighurst and Davis in a comparison of the two different studies illustrate that even though there were some major disagreements, the agreements are also numerous. The Chicago study indicated that the age at which boys and girls are allowed to go to the movie alone is reliably earlier for the lower class but reliably earlier for the middle class in allowing their child to go down town alone. Middle class boys and girls are also expected to be in reliably earlier at night. The Boston study stated that middle class children were allowed to be away farther from home visiting in the neighborhood than the working-class children who were more closely supervised, however, this tendency was not significant.⁷⁷

As far as responsibilities in the home, in the Boston study there were no reliable differences although the middle-class mothers more frequently assigned household tasks while in the Chicago there was more of a tendency for middle-class mothers to have higher expectations for the child in having more early responsibility than was expected by the lower-class mothers.⁷⁸

In parent child relations, the Chicago study indicated that both

⁷⁷Robert Havighurst and Allison Davis, "A Comparison of the Chicago and Harvard Studies of Social Class Differences in Child-Rearing," American Sociological Review, 20(August, 1955), p. 440.

⁷⁸Ibid., p. 441.

middle- and lower-class fathers participated in activities with their children. The participation seemed to vary with the occasion for working-class fathers more often played with the children while the middle-class fathers were more likely to be involved with instructive activities and reading with their children. The Boston study indicated that the lower-class father was reliably less affectionate. When comparing classes, there were no reliable differences on aggression although the middle-class mothers in the Boston study were more permissive of such behavior.⁷⁹

When the disciplinary techniques are compared, it is found that in the Chicago study, the only significant difference between the lower- and middle-class was on the area of reward or praise which was given as the most successful method of getting children to obey. Spanking or whipping was resorted to more often by a higher percentage of middle-class mothers than lower-class however the difference was not significant at the 5% level. A larger percentage of lower-class mothers rated reasoning, threat or scolding, deprivation of meals, isolation and standing in a corner as more successful ways of getting children to obey than did the middle-class mothers. In the Boston study there are more differences significant at the 5% level between the middle- and working-class. The mean scores which were computed for the different disciplinary techniques for the two classes indicates that scolding statements involving withdrawal of love was the most highly utilized by both but more in the

⁷⁹Ibid., p. 441.

middle-class. Other differences significant at the 5% level were deprivation of privileges which was more frequently utilized by the working-class. Differences which were not found to be significant were techniques of reward, praise, reasoning and isolation. Of all the techniques of discipline, physical punishment illustrated the greatest significant difference between the two groups.⁸⁰

In comparing the agents of discipline in the Chicago study there were no differences significant at the 5% level, to indicate that either parent is the sole agent of discipline. There were more lower- than middle-class fathers reported to be the agent. The main agents of discipline were the mothers with a slight margin of percentage of lower class mothers reporting to be the agent than the middle-class mothers. The middle-class indicated with a higher percentage than the lower-class families that both the mother and the father were the same. When asked in the Boston study as to whom the main disciplinary agent when both parents are present, there were no differences significant at the 5% level.⁸¹ See Tables I and II. on following page.⁸²

WHITE-California

In 1953, White conducted a study in California hypothesizing that child rearing practices have changed since the earlier studies made by Ericson and Davis and Havighurst. It was also hypothesized that these

⁸⁰Ibid., p. 442.

⁸¹Ibid., p. 442.

⁸²Richard A. Littman, Robert C. A. Moore and John Pierce-Jones, "Social Class Differences in Child-Rearing: A Third Community for Comparison with Chicago and Newton," American Sociological Review, 22 (December, 1957), p. 700.

TABLE I

Comparison of Chicago and Boston Studies on Techniques of Discipline

(Adapted from Littman et. al., "Social Class Differences in Child-Rearing: A Third Community for Comparison with Chicago and Newton," American Sociological Review, 22(December, 1957), p. 700)

	Middle-class mother	Lower-class mothers
TECHNIQUES OF DISCIPLINE (Chicago)		
Percentage of mothers mentioning various procedures as "most successful ways of getting children to obey."		
Reward of Praise	78*	53*
Reason	53	57
Threat or Scold	53	55
Deprive of meals	0	6
Isolate	13	17
Stand in corner or sit in chair	13	19
Spank or whip	53	51
Number of mothers	45	47
*Differences significant at 5% level		
TECHNIQUES OF DISCIPLINE (Boston)		
Mean score, extent of use of each technique (1:no use, 9:extensive use)		
Reward	4.6	4.9
Praise	4.8	4.8
Reason	5.0	4.8
Scolding Statements involving withdrawal of love	6.4*	6.0*
Deprivation of privileges	4.6*	5.1*
Isolation	5.7	5.5
Physical Punishment	3.9*	4.8*
*Differences significant at 5% level		

TABLE II

AGENTS OF DISCIPLINE

(Adapted from Littman, et. al., p. 700)

AGENTS OF DISCIPLINE in percentage of families. (Chicago)

Who punishes Children Most?

	Middle	Lower
Father	2	8
Mother	81	85
Both the same	17	8
When both parents are present which one discipline the child? (Boston)		
Father	29	32
Mother	39	42
Both or either	32	26

changes were a result of the different reference groups used by the mothers of the middle- and working-classes.⁸³

The sample of 74 mothers and 74 children were a part of a larger study. The parents had to be living together and also native born. Fifty of the mothers were expectant and the remaining twenty-four comprised the control group. Each family had only one child.

Social class was determined by Warner's classification. The 74 families were divided into nine SES levels on the basis of weighted indices for occupation and income. These nine levels were then categorized into two groups, working-class (38) and middle-class (36).

Results indicated that both groups of mothers indicated they expected immediate obedience, however, there was a significant difference in that the middle-class mothers were more likely not to be insistent. Both groups verbally espoused immediate obedience but the working-class mothers were more likely to remain firm. Although no class differences were found with the father's behavior, mothers in both groups felt the fathers were more strict than they.⁸⁴

As in the Boston study, there was a significant difference in the area of the permissiveness of aggression towards the parents. The middle-class mothers were found to be more permissive of displayed aggression. When such aggression is expressed, the working-class child-

⁸³Matilda Sturm White, "Social Class, Child Rearing Practices and Child Behavior, American Sociological Review, 22(December, 1957), pp. 704-712.

⁸⁴Ibid., p. 708.

ren are more severely punished than their counterparts in the middle class. The aggression which appeared to be more apparent in the working-class was fighting with other children. The manner in which middle- and working-class mothers respond to the aggression of their children in part reflects the mothers orientation of the kind of person they wanted their child to be. The working-class mothers value the qualities of a nice or good child whereas middle-class mothers valued a well-adjusted child that is happy and independent.⁸⁵

One particular aspect which was investigated in the California study was the extent to which mothers are influenced by child-rearing literature and experts. It was summarized that middle-class mothers are much more attentive to these sources and friends in rearing their children. Although this area was not investigated in the present study, it is included to indicate that although authors may agree that class differences do exist, the differences are attributed to other variables within the class situation. The main variables to which White attributed the difference in child rearing was the notion that a change may have taken place in child rearing since the earlier mentioned studies. The differences between the classes were attributed to the different reference groups of the middle- and working-class.⁸⁶

MILLER AND SWANSON-Detroit

In the same year, Daniel R. Miller and Guy E. Swanson conducted

⁸⁵Ibid., pp. 708-709. ⁸⁶Ibid., p. 712.

a study of child rearing practices with a sample of approximately 600 children from Detroit and surrounding villages, suburbs and cities. The area sampling technique was used and the researchers had a completion rate of 92.6% of the homes in the original list. The sample was to include only private households therefore military, religious and educational institutions, hospitals and large hotels and rooming houses were excluded. They conducted two types of interviews; "mother interviews" were conducted in all households where there was a child under nineteen and "Census type interviews" where only census type information was received from any adult. There were 582 of the former and 575 of the later.⁸⁷

To assign social class, the occupation of the husband was classified according to the United States Bureau of Census and then revisions were made according to the operational definitions of entrepreneurial or bureaucratic. The same controls were not utilized by Miller and Swanson as in earlier studies, but the groups are comparable. Approximately 95% (94.6) of the families were intact and 94.1% of the children were their parents own. As in previous studies, divorced, separated and parents with step children or adopted children were eliminated. Negroes were included. The resultant sample consisted of 479 families after the forementioned controls were exercised.⁸⁸

The study of Miller and Swanson was not comparable to the studies

⁸⁷Daniel R. Miller and Guy E. Swanson, The Changing American Parent (New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1958), pp. 65-66.

⁸⁸Ibid., p. 83.

which preceded it. The earlier studies on child-rearing practices had focused upon the differences between middle-class and working-class families whereas Miller and Swanson were interested in the differences between two occupational groups at the same social class level. They sought to distinguish the entrepreneurial families from the bureaucratic families within the upper middle-class but all families at all class levels were to be classified as entrepreneurial and bureaucratic.

From their operational definitions, they were essentially dividing the class into groups where its members operated in more of a competitive setting and placed emphasis upon initiative and flexibility whereas the other group was characterized by more structure and routine. To be classified as entrepreneurial the husband had to be self-employed, gain at least half of his income from profits, fees or commissions or to be employed in a small scale organization having only two levels of supervision. If the husband did not meet these characteristics of risk taking and individuating experience, he was then classified as bureaucratic.⁸⁹

The findings for middle-class bureaucratic families did not support the findings of Davis and Havighurst for middle-class families but the findings for the middle-class entrepreneurial families were in accordance with Davis and Havighurst. Middle-class mothers were found to be more likely to emphasize self-control in their child rearing and teaching of the child. The findings also revealed that middle-class mothers are

⁸⁹Ibid., p. 68.

much less likely to resort to physical punishment such as slapping or spanking and are more likely to utilize symbolic punishment. When the child is twelve or older, middle-class mothers are more likely to relinquish close supervision over his behavior than are lower-class mothers. Middle-class mothers are reported to become more disturbed when the child fails to internalize the norms of responsibility. This applies to school performance, household tasks and as well as other behavior that has been expected of him.⁹⁰

Miller and Swanson hypothesized that similar findings would be found between the entrepreneurial middle and the entrepreneurial lower as was found between the lower- and middle-class of Davis and Havighurst that lower-class mothers tend to be more permissive in their child rearing practices. On the other hand, Miller and Swanson hypothesized that the differences found between the two classes in the Chicago study would not reoccur in the Detroit study when the bureaucratic-middle was compared with the bureaucratic lowers.⁹¹

When the data was analyzed, the hypotheses did receive some support but the evidence was not consistent with the hypotheses. No differences appeared between the older middle-class mother and lower-class mothers in training their children in stressing independence and responsibility. The differences between bureaucratic middle- and lower-class mothers were also insignificant in their child-rearing practices. No significant differences were found in the child-rearing practices between the entrepreneurial lower- and middle-class mothers.⁹²

⁹⁰Ibid., pp. 122-128.

⁹¹Ibid., p. 144.

⁹²Ibid., p. 144.

MCKINLEY

In Social Class and Family Life Donald McKinley conducted extensive research into the relationship of social class and family life using a variety of techniques to obtain his information. The main body of his analysis concerns questionnaires which were administered to eleventh- and twelfth- grade boys. Although McKinley's study is mainly concerned with boys, many of the findings are applicable to the present study. His main hypothesis pertains to the parents position in society and different techniques of discipline in socializing the child which may be reflective of his position.⁹³

McKinley's study was a departure from previous studies on child-rearing practices in the sense that previous studies relied upon the mothers as the main source of information rather than upon the fathers. Mothers were viewed as the main link between the family and the social structure in that as a wife she represents the status of her husband's occupation and if class has an effect on socialization practices, it could be witnessed in her behavior.

The testing of the theory utilized several sources. Sixteen interviews with fathers of boys who were 13 to 19 years old comprised one part of the study. Subjects were obtained from census listings, boy's club membership lists and personal contacts. The interviews from the 360 mothers in the Boston study by Sears, Maccoby and Levin were re-

⁹³ Donald Gilbert McKinley, Social Class and Family Life (New York: The Free Press of Glencoe, 1964), pl 4.

analyzed for interests relevant to McKinley's theoretical interests. Two hundred and sixty eleventh and twelfth grade boys in the three high schools near Boston were administered questionnaires. All three sources of data yielded information on intact, Caucasian, suburban and urban families. All but one of the sixteen fathers were categorized into classes III and IV as measured by Hollingshead's index of social class. The senior high school boys were situated in upper class (I and II), middle class (III) and lower class (IV and V) which is the major source of data.⁹⁴

An analysis of the data indicates that a higher percentage of lower-class mothers and fathers, especially fathers, are more severe in their socialization techniques than middle class mothers and fathers. Techniques which are used are more indicative of releasing and expressing more aggression whereas the middle-class families are not as punitive and are more permissive. The middle-class child is disciplined to develop self-control and responsibility whereas a lower-class child is punished for his offenses. McKinley maintained that even though the discipline of the middle-class parent may not be as harsh as discipline used by lower-class parents, the middle-class child develops more of a sense of guilt which the lower-class child may only weakly possess.⁹⁵

When classes are compared on the use of disciplinary techniques, McKinley found the following pattern:

Data indicates that the upper-class parent more than other parents, uses "emotional" control of the child; the middle-class

⁹⁴Ibid., pp. 64-68.

⁹⁵Ibid., pp. 83-84.

parent tends to use direct verbal communication of sanctions or control; and the lower-class parent tends to use physically expressed sanctions. This difference in the use of physical sanctions between the middle-class white-collar father (21 per cent) and the lower-class manual worker (39 per cent) is rather sharp, and again the association between paternal behavior and class is greater than is the association for maternal behavior. The white-collar worker is more likely (63 per cent) to use verbal communication of sanction than the manual worker (49 per cent).⁹⁶

It can be seen how McKinley views the dissatisfaction and satisfaction which an individual experiences in his occupation as the intervening variable between social status and parental role behavior. A lower-class child is punished in a more aggressive manner because the parent may be experiencing dissatisfaction with his own life, opportunities and security.

The father's occupational status has further ramifications in the family setting. As the status of the husband decreases, there is an increase of power and authority with the wife. McKinley attributes this gain of power and authority to the fact that it may be necessary for the wife to be employed and therefore is contributing as an equal to the family. McKinley states that the above change occurs because the lower-class wife feels that the husband is less adequate because of his lower-status occupation. There is not an increase in power and authority with the upper-class wife for she has status to gain by adjusting her needs to those of her husband, however, there is an increase in the percentage of parents who contribute equally to decision making in the upper-class.⁹⁷

The power and authority which the wife yields in the family affects her disciplinary techniques. According to McKinley:

⁹⁶Ibid., p. 86.

⁹⁷Ibid., pp. 92-107.

Evidence shows parents at the lower levels of society are more severe, more likely to use physical modes of discipline, and less warmth. Also evidence that the relative severity of mothers and fathers varies from class to class. . . mothers are almost as severe or even more severe than fathers at the higher levels of society, but fathers become increasingly severe and cool to the child, relative to mothers, in the lower strata of society.⁹⁸

Mothers in the lower-class appear to have a much more significant relationship with their sons but become decreasingly significant as one moves to the higher levels. The husbands in upper levels have more authority in the family relationship because of their occupational and their involvement in the family.

In conclusion, McKinley explains disciplinary techniques as a resultant of the satisfactions and dissatisfactions which the father experiences because of his occupational role. The techniques and severity of discipline utilized by the father is more highly associated with class than is the discipline utilized by the mother. This discrepancy is explained by the fact that the fathers are closer to the rewards, frustrations and aggressions that society has to offer through his occupation. The father's occupational role has wide ramifications in his parental and husband-role. If lower-class, the father not only lacks in prestige from society's evaluation but also from his wife and family. It may be necessary for the wife to be employed which would further reduce the effectiveness or autonomy of the father. Because of his feeling of inadequacy, aggression and frustration, the father has a difficult time establishing a bond with his children. The lower-class father uses the dis-

⁹⁸Ibid., p. 152.

disciplining situation as one of the vents for the frustration and aggression that he could not vent on the job, and as such, there is a lack of love-oriented or psychological punishment being administered.

Although it is possible that the lower-class child may be punished in a more aggressive manner, one must not lose sight of other variables which may contribute to the situation. The manner in which the lower-class individual copes with the exigencies of life and his family situation need not arise out of his dissatisfaction with life and his occupation. The mode of behavior may be merely an example of the style of life resulting from his position in the occupational structure, the amount of education received and other related variables. Frustration, undoubtedly is involved in any occupation and is vented in the family system, but an undue emphasis upon frustration could deter attention from other related variables. A point which McKinley did not seem to consider is that there could be as much if not more frustration exercised at home by the white-collar father whose work day usually transcends the working hour day of the blue collar workers. In the higher white-collar positions, there is less separation of professional and private roles. Because there is not a strict separation, the occupant of the role could become frustrated and act accordingly with his family. Although frustration and aggression may be evident in all classes, the venting and displacing of frustration may take different forms depending upon the frame of reference of the individual administering the discipline. Because of one's occupation, education and life experiences, frustration and aggression may be disguised in more approved forms of behavior. If the form of behavior dif-

fers, the content of the frustration or aggression can still exist in the same intensity. If differences are supposedly found between classes on aggression, one should not confuse presence or absence of frustration and aggression with the differing forms that frustration or aggression may take.

LITTMAN ET AL.-Oregon Study

Another study conducted in Eugene, Oregon in 1955-56 was designated to attempt to validate the differences found between the Chicago and Boston studies. The interest centered around whether class differences, sex of parent and geographical location affect the socialization process.

The sample consisting of 206 pairs of white parents, comprised five per cent of the households in Eugene in which there were children under 18 years of age. A proportionate random sample of sex and age was drawn from each precinct. Parochial children were not included. The distribution for the middle- and lower-classes had more of a spread than the Chicago study of Havighurst and Davis, and the Boston (Newton) study by Maccoby et. al.⁹⁹ The socio-economic status classification of Warner with weights placed on occupation and income was used. As in most of the previous studies, the largest response came from the mothers. If fathers were interviewed, the parents were never interviewed simultaneously.⁹⁹

The Eugene findings found no difference on the amount of aggression permitted between lower- and middle-class mothers. The earlier studies

⁹⁹ Richard A. Littman, Robert C. A. Moore and John Pierce-Jones, "Social Class Differences in Child-Rearing: A Third Community for Comparison with Chicago and Newton," American Sociological Review, 22 (December, 1957), pp. 694-695.

by Havighurst and Davis and Sears, Maccoby and Levine indicated that middle-class mothers are more permissive of aggressive behavior. The Eugene data did indicate that mothers are more permissive of aggressive acts than are the fathers, yet the mothers had more rules for their children's aggressive behavior.¹⁰⁰

In home requirements and responsibility which usually consist of household chores, the Eugene data showed no class differences for same sex parents, however, a greater proportion of lower- and middle-class mothers than fathers reported rules and chore expectations of their children. Middle-class mothers more often reported that their chore expectations were unmet. The Boston study did not show any class differences and the Chicago study indicated that middle-class mothers expect their children to help in the home to a greater degree than lower-class mothers.¹⁰¹

In analyzing the techniques of discipline, no differences were apparent between the middle- and lower-classes. The techniques of isolation did bring significant differences with more mothers than fathers utilizing the technique. Although these differences were not significant at the 5% level, scolding was used by a larger percentage of lower-class fathers than middle-class fathers and also by mothers of both groups. Deprivation of privileges and possessions received the smallest percentage of approval from lower-class fathers. Middle- and lower-class parents did not differ on techniques of discipline such as reasoning, ignoring the child, or physical punishment. Although the proportion is not

¹⁰⁰Ibid., p. 698.

¹⁰¹Ibid., p. 700.

a significant difference, more middle-class fathers reported using physical discipline as a technique of punishment than did their wives lower class counterparts.¹⁰² The Chicago study as mentioned earlier, found middle-class mothers to resort to rewarding and praises in order to get their children to obey more often than lower-class mothers resorted to such tactics. The Boston area study found significant differences in the technique of physical punishment, deprivation of privileges and the use of scolding statements accompanied with the withdrawal of love. The first two were used more extensively by lower- than middle-class mothers and the latter being used more often by middle-class mothers. See Table III.

TABLE III

TECHNIQUES OF DISCIPLINE UTILIZED BY MIDDLE- and LOWER-CLASS PARENTS IN EUGENE. (Adapted from Littman *et. al.*, p. 700.)

TECHNIQUES OF DISCIPLINE (Eugene)

Percentage of parents reporting punishment used for rule infractions	Middle		Lower	
	Father	Mother	Father	Mother
Reasoning	19	20	22	20
Scolding	34	39	44	32
Isolation	12*	33*	15*	27*
Deprivation of privileges or possessions	12	17	6	17
Distracting-ignore	2	4	6	6
Physical punishment- only	<u>19</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>15</u>	<u>13</u>
Number of parents reporting	85	85	121	121

*Differences significant at 5% level.

There were no class differences in the Eugene data as to whom should administer the discipline. Parents of both classes agreed that the father should not be the sole punitive agent. Although this was posed

¹⁰²Ibid., p. 700.

hypothetically, no attempt was made to ascertain which parent actually does function as the punitive agent. In the Chicago and Boston studies, no significant differences were found as to whom administers punishment. In the Chicago study, the mothers punished more than the fathers and in the Boston study, the mothers did more punishing than the fathers but the proportion was not large.¹⁰³ See Table IV.

TABLE IV

AGENTS OF DISCIPLINE IN EUGENE STUDY
(Adapted from Littman et. al., p. 700)

Percentage of parents who do not believe that the father should be the sole agent of discipline. (Eugene)

	Middle	Lower
Father	100	97
Mother	99	100

In parent-child relationships, no significant differences were found, however, it was reported that there were over-all better parent-child relationships for middle- than lower-class fathers. Middle-class relations between the father and the child were significantly better than between the mother and the child. The Boston and Chicago studies also indicated that the middle-class father has a better relationship with his children than lower-class fathers.¹⁰⁴

The Eugene data did not repudiate or support the Chicago or Boston study. When comparing most of the variables and making class comparisons, no significant differences were to be found in the socialization techniques. When Littman et. al., compared the data from the Chicago, Boston, and Eugene samples, they found out of 108 comparisons between

¹⁰³Ibid., p. 701.

¹⁰⁴Ibid., p. 701.

status groups, there were only 21 differences significant at or beyond the 5% level. The two classes were practically equally divided. In fourteen of the comparisons, the middle-class were more permissive and in seventeen the lower-class. The authors conclude,

. . . twenty-one significant differences are more than one would expect to obtain by chance, the fact that they are equally divided between the two status groups undercuts the hypothesis of class differences in socialization.¹⁰⁵

The authors indicate that since a much larger proportion of the hypotheses were not significant, they must be viewed as contrary to the hypothesis regarding class-differences in socialization. See Table V.

TABLE V

DISCIPLINARY TECHNIQUES COMPARED: CHICAGO, DETROIT, EUGENE, AND BOSTON

(Adapted from Urie Bronfenbrenner, "Socialization and Social Class Through Time and Space," Reinhard Bendix and Seymour Martin Lipset (eds.), Class, Status and Power (New York: The Free Press, 1966), p. 37.)

PERMISSIVENESS TOWARD IMPULSE EXPRESSION

	<u>Direction of Relationship</u>				Nature of love-oriented technique
	Physical punishment	Reasoning	Iso-lation	Love-oriented technique	
Chicago	+		-	+ *	Praise for good behavior
Detroit	-			+	Mother uses symbolic rather than direct rewards or punishment.
Eugene	-	0	+ *		
Boston	- *	+	+	0	No difference in overall use of praise or withdrawal of love.

+ sign indicates practice was more common in middle class than in working class. * denotes difference between classes significant at 5% level or better.

¹⁰⁵ibid., p. 702.

KOHN- Washington D.C.

In the following year, Melvin Kohn conducted a study in Washington D. C. focusing upon parental values of the middle- and working-class and how these values affect their child rearing techniques. Kohn selected his families through a stratified random sampling procedure by selecting census tracts and families from records in the public and parochial school within these census tracts. Parents were selected who had children in the fifth grade.¹⁰⁶

Four hundred families were randomly chosen and equally divided between families with a father with a white-collar occupation and fathers with manual occupations. The mothers in all 400 families were to be interviewed and with every fourth family, the father and the fifth grade child were also to be interviewed. Broken families were retained in a sub-sample and a substitute was chosen for them in the over-all sample. Kohn's study is one of the first of the child rearing studies thus far presented which focuses upon the response of the father rather than relying solely on the mother's response of what the father's response would be. Littman et. al. included responses of the fathers but a rigorous systematic attempt was not made to include them as was done in Kohn's study. The rates of response did not seem to be affected for they were similar

¹⁰⁶Melvin L. Kohn, "Social Class and the Exercise of Parental Authority," American Sociological Review, 24 (June, 1959), p. 353. Census tracts were excluded if twenty per cent or more of the population was comprised of Negroes. Census tracts were also excluded which were in the highest quartile with respect to median incomes. The final tracts were chosen with four predominately middle-class, four predominately working-class and three with a combination of both. Factors determining the selection of tracts depended upon occupational distribution, median incomes, education, rent and property values.

when interviewing mothers alone and in combination with the fathers and child.¹⁰⁷

Families were categorized into social classes based upon Hollingshead's Index of Social Position. Classes I, II, and III were classified as middle-class and classes IV and V were categorized as working-class.¹⁰⁸

Kohn viewed parental authority from a trifocal perspective. He was interested in the role of mothers and fathers in making family decisions, in setting limits upon the children's behavior and the frequency to which each will resort to physical punishment to enforce obedience.¹⁰⁹

The evaluation made by both parents and children on areas of parental decision making processes, strictness and amount of physical disciplining showed no appreciable differences between the working- and middle-class. Although physical discipline was similar in frequency for both classes, there were dissimilarities in the conditions under which it was employed. Physical discipline was usually resorted to under extreme circumstances of deviation in both classes, yet the extreme conditions were

¹⁰⁷Ibid., p. 353. Rates of non response were evenly distributed in relation to social class, neighborhoods and types of schools. As Kohn suggests this does not rule out bias which may have occurred with non-respondents.

¹⁰⁸Ibid., p. 353. The groups designated as middle class consists of two distinct groups. Classes I and II consists of professionals, proprietors or managers with at least some college training. Class III consists of small shopkeepers, clerks, salespersons, foremen and skilled workers of unusually high educational status. The working class which is composed of classes IV and V consists almost entirely of manual workers, but preponderantly those of higher skill levels. Families are of the stable working class rather than lower-class. The men have steady jobs and their income, education and skill levels are above those of the lowest socio-economic strata.

¹⁰⁹Ibid., p. 353.

defined differently. A deviant circumstance in one class would go unpunished in another. Kohn attempted to specify the conditions under which physical discipline would be resorted to by middle- and working-class parents. Hypothetical questions relating to deviancy in different situations were presented to the parents in which they were to respond as to how they would act in such a situation. Situations involved wild play, fighting with siblings and other children, extreme loss of temper, refusal to obey, swiping, smoking cigarettes or using language disapproved by parents.¹¹⁰

It was found that if the children persist in such behavior, mothers of both classes will resort to another form of punishment. It was found that:

Working-class mothers are more likely than are middle-class mothers to resort to physical punishment when their sons persist in wild play or fighting with brothers or sister, or when their daughters fight with other children. There may be in addition a general, albeit slight, greater tendency for working-class mothers to resort to physical punishment no matter what the situation.¹¹¹

Out of sixteen comparisons between middle- and working-class mothers, Kohn found that thirteen of the comparisons showed a larger proportion of working-class mothers indicating that they resort to physical discipline. Further analysis, however, indicates that only three of the thirteen were significant at the 5% level.¹¹²

Differences between the two classes becomes more apparent when the

¹¹⁰Melvin L. Kohn, "Social Class and the Exercise of Parental Authority," American Sociological Review, 24(June, 1959), pp. 353-355.

¹¹¹Ibid., p. 357.

¹¹²Ibid., p. 357.

conditions are examined. Kohn stated that:

Working-class mothers are apt to resort to physical punishment when the immediate consequence of their sons' disobedient acts are more extreme, and to refrain from using punishment when its use might provoke even greater disturbance.¹¹³

Working-class mothers are more likely than middle-class mothers to utilize physical punishment when their sons participate in aggressive and destructive wild play. Working-class mothers will more often sanction their sons for physical fighting with siblings with physical punishment than will middle-class mothers. Physical punishment is less likely to be administered by working-class mothers if the son engaged in physical fighting with the neighbor children. Working-class sons are usually subject to more physical punishment for disobedience. Working-class mothers are more likely to punish sons for violation of negative injunctions than for refusal of positive injunctions whereas middle-class mothers are more likely to punish for disobedience of the latter. Middle-class mothers are more prone to physically punish for aggressive outbursts of temper in their sons than are working-class mothers.¹¹⁴

Middle-class mothers are not as likely to differentiate between the sexes of the children when employing discipline whereas working-class mothers respond to the sexes differently. Working-class mothers are more likely to resort to physical discipline with daughters when they swipe things or fight with neighbor children. Working-class mothers are also more likely to punish their daughters physically for refusing to obey while the sons refusal will more likely be ignored.¹¹⁵

¹¹³Ibid., p. 357.

¹¹⁴Ibid., pp. 357-360.

¹¹⁵Ibid., p. 361.

→ hypoth -
+ re-int
+ aggress
fighting

→ - re-int
of fighting

↓ in f aggress
7 87 "

An analysis of the father's behavior indicates that working-class fathers are less apt to punish their sons for wild play than are their wives. If the particular situation attracts the attention of the father and is disruptive, the child is more likely to be physically punished than if the same situation did not attract the attention of the father. This seems to indicate the responsiveness to the immediate consequences of the act rather than to the intent or motive. Working-class fathers are more likely to use physical discipline and when fighting is serious, they are more likely to resort to isolation and restriction. The behavior of middle-class fathers is more in accordance with their wives in that they are more likely to physically punish for loss of control of temper rather than for wild play. Working-class fathers are more likely to physically punish for defiant refusals of both sons and daughters.¹¹⁶

addl message
since
defi on
mood

Although Kohn did not find striking differences between the two classes in the amount of physical discipline used, differences were visible in the circumstances in which it is employed by the two different classes. Limits appear to be posted before parents of both classes will resort to physical discipline. The middle-class emphasis is upon the development of internalized self control and view the misbehavior as to its intent whereas the working-class emphasis is upon the consequences of the immediate situation rather than upon the intent.

BRONFENBRENNER

Urie Bronfenbrenner conducted research on socialization techniques

¹¹⁶Ibid., pp. 36-362.

and how it is affected by the parental socio-economic status of the family and the sex of the child involved. Although no specific hypotheses were involved, Bronfenbrenner was exploring the effects of parental practices on adolescent responsibility and leadership with an emphasis on the intervening variables of the sex of the parent and child and the family's social position.¹¹⁷

The data were drawn from students in the tenth grade in a medium sized city in New York. Class was measured by the subjects response to the father's level of education. Four educational levels were designated: some graduate work, completion of college, completion of high school and those who did not complete high school. After the educational levels were obtained, a stratified random sample was obtained by drawing an equal number of boys and girls (24 each) from each level for a total of 192 subjects. The questionnaire consisted of 100 items to measure dimensions of parent-child relationships. The 10 per cent level of confidence (two-tailed test) was used in testing the findings.¹¹⁸

When analyzing the effect of sex differences, the findings indicated that parents were more demanding and firm of the same-sex child and more lenient and indulgent with a cross-sex child. Within discipline, however, physical punishment follows a pattern, with girls being more likely to be physically punished by mothers than by fathers. If the children

¹¹⁷Urie Bronfenbrenner, "Some Familial Antecedents of Responsibility and Leadership in Adolescents," in L. Petrullo and B. M. Bass, Leadership and Interpersonal Behavior (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1961), pp. 239-269.

¹¹⁸Ibid., pp. 241-245.

are treated differentially by parents because of sex, it is the father who is most likely to differentiate behavior appropriate for each.¹¹⁹

At every educational level, there is a tendency for girls to receive more affection and for the boys to be the recipients of more achievement demands and punishment. Children of the lower class rated their parents as over-protective, rejecting and punitive. Descending the social ladder, the mother becomes more authoritative especially for girls. Ascending the social ladder, the father serves as the main punitive agent in the employment of physical discipline for the daughter. In the lower class, the father is the main agent in administering physical discipline for boys.¹²⁰ "Punishment of the same sex child and indulgence for the opposite sex is most marked at the lowest educational levels and decreases as the family rises along the academic ladder."¹²¹

Bronfenbrenner found that:

In physical punishment, the child is likely to receive more discipline from the parent of the same sex. . . reversal is most complete with respect to physical punishment, with fathers being stricter with boys, mothers with girls. In the spheres of affection and protectiveness, there is no actual shift in preferences, but the tendency to be especially warm and solicitous with girls is much more pronounced among fathers than among mothers.¹²²

In comparing the findings of Bronfenbrenner with those of Kohn's with regard to the roles of the mother and father, Kohn's findings indicate that in the middle class family, the roles of the mother and father are not as differentiated as in the working-class family. Mothers and fathers in the middle-class are more in agreement as to their child-

¹¹⁹Ibid., pp. 248-252.

¹²⁰Ibid., p. 252.

¹²¹Ibid., p. 249.

rearing responsibilities. This concordance is not as prevalent in the working-class for the father feels that child-rearing is largely a function of the mother's role. Middle class mothers place more emphasis upon the father as being supportive whereas working-class mothers place a greater emphasis upon the father as the constraining agent. Kohn noted that if any type of differentiation exists in the middle-class family it is largely in the realm of each parent taking the responsibility of being more supportive of the same sex child whereas in the working-class family, the mother is almost always the most supportive parent.

BRONSON, KATTEN and LIVSON

Bronson, Katten and Livson, in a longitudinal study of 100 families, investigated the patterns of authority and affection in two generations. Class was determined by the classification of Warner.¹²³

Findings revealed that if the parents remembered either of the grandparents as exercising strong authority, it precluded the grandparent as being remembered with a high level of affection. The findings pertaining to the parents of the children in the study indicated that significantly more mothers than fathers are rated high in authority toward both sons and daughters. When the children were interviewed as to

¹²³Wanda C. Bronson, Edith S. Katten and Norman Livson, "Patterns of Authority and Affection in Two Generations," Journal of American Social Psychology, 58(March, 1959), pp. 143-152. The data is from 200 families who participated in the Guidance Study of the Institute of Child Welfare in Berkely, California. Parents provided retrospective descriptions of their own childhood in the early 1900's and were interviewed and observed in their behavior toward their own children born in 1928-1929. Children were studied by the institute until they were eighteen years old. The children were also interviewed to obtain how they perceived the parental roles.

how they perceived their parents, there was a slight tendency for more sons than daughters to perceive their fathers in a strong authority role whereas the daughters show an opposite tendency. The study found no mother-father differences on affection and involvement although the mother was found to be a stronger source of authority than the father. Differential treatment of children of either sex by their parents was not found.¹²⁴

EMMERICH

A study conducted by Walter Emmerich attempted to help clarify the assumption that marked differences exist in the socialization process between mothers and fathers and also in relation to the sex of the child. Data were obtained from questionnaires mailed to parents of 225 children. The return rate was 68% but 79% of these were categorized into Classes I and II of Warner's socio-economic scale. Because of the return, the study largely represents middle-class parents. Emmerich centered upon the dimensions of nurturance-restriction and power as the descriptive properties of parent-role differentiation.¹²⁵

The findings indicated that when analyzing the effect of the sex of the parent, mothers were found to be more nurturant and less restrictive than fathers. The analysis of the nurturance-restrictive scale per-

¹²⁵Walter Emmerich, "Variations in the Parent Role as a Function of the Parent's Sex and the Child's Sex and Age," Merrill Palmer Quarterly, 8(January, 1962), pp. 3-6. Nurturance was defined as a positive, facilitating reaction to dependent (legitimate) reciprocal child role behavior. Restriction as a negative, interfering reaction to deviant (illegitimate) reciprocal child role behavior. Power, the amount of active control exerted by the parent in response to reciprocal child behaviors. Emmerich added the dimension of power to measure the amount of active control exerted by the parent as distinguished from the attitudinal control.

training to the sex of the child showed no parental differentiation.¹²⁶

Emmerich's findings indicate:

Parents were neither more nurturant nor more restrictive toward their same-sex than toward their opposite-sex children. However, fathers exerted more power toward sons than daughters, whereas mothers exerted more power toward daughters than sons. ($P < .01$) The trend is particularly marked in the case of fathers.¹²⁷

Emmerich contends that the addition of the variable of power is justifiable since it differentiated between the two aspects of parental-role differentiation.

WATERS and CRANDALL

Waters and Crandall conducted a longitudinal study with mothers of three to five year old children who were enrolled in a research institute of human development in Ohio. The 1930, 1940 and 1950 samples did not differ significantly in socio-economic status as measured by Hollingshead's classification.¹²⁸

The analysis of the findings revealed that no significant correlations were found between social class and the variables of maternal nurturance, maternal affectionate, or maternal protectiveness. When correlations were run separately by sex of child, no appreciable differences were found. When maternal coerciveness was correlated with social class, a marked relationship occurred in all of the samples and particularly in

¹²⁶Ibid., p. 7.

¹²⁷Ibid., p. 7.

¹²⁸Elinor Waters and Vaughn J. Crandall, "Social Class and Observed Maternal Behavior from 1940 to 1960," Child Development, 35(December, 1964), pp. 1020-1032. The 1940 group consisted of 40 mothers; the 1950 group, 32 mothers and the 1960 group consisted of 35 mothers.

the 1960 sample.¹²⁹ Waters and Crandall indicated that:

The higher the family status, the less dictatorial were mothers' attempts to influence their children's behavior, and the less severe were their penalties for misbehavior. The variable most consistently related to socio-economic status was restrictiveness of regulation. At all three time periods, the higher the family socio-economic status, the less a mother was prone to impose restrictive regulations on her offspring's behavior.¹³⁰

The sample of mothers was not equally divided between middle- and lower-classes so generalizations about the lower-class are limited. Findings, however, indicated that lower-class mothers were more prone to use coercive suggestions and severe penalties. Waters and Crandall conclude that in the third period of their study, mothers have become more permissive in general with few restrictions placed upon the child, fewer coercive suggestions for compliance and less severe in the administering of punishment.¹³¹

ELDER and BOWERMAN

In a study by Elder and Bowerman, it was hypothesized that social class has an effect upon family size, paternal involvement in child-rearing and on the use of external behavior control. The subjects were Protestant seventh graders of unbroken homes from predominately urban areas. The subjects were drawn from larger samples of students from public and parochial schools in central Ohio and public schools in North Carolina. Class was measured by assigning the father's occupation to the categories in the United States Bureau of Census.¹³²

¹²⁹Ibid., p. 1028 ¹³⁰Ibid., p. 1028. ¹³¹Ibid., pp. 1030-1032.

¹³²Glen H. Elder Jr, and Charles E. Bowerman, "Family Structure and Child-Rearing Patterns: The Effect of Family Size and Sex Composition," American Sociological Review, 28(December, 1963), pp. 891-905.

Findings indicated that parental dominance and family size are directly related, as the family size increases, the more likely the father is to be more dominant in child-rearing. The sons more often reported the father as being dominant than the daughters. Egalitarianism was the most prevalent form of decision making in disciplinary policies but this becomes transformed into father dominance as the size of the family increases. The actual administration of discipline forms a pattern in relation to class. The relationship of family size (three or more siblings) and father as chief disciplinarian agent is positive with middle-class boys and girls and lower-class girls. The relationship is negative with lower-class boys.¹³³ Data on the agents of discipline indicate:

The ratio of girls checking fathers as disciplinarian over those reporting mothers increases from small to large families. Sons in larger lower-class families are less likely to see the father as the chief disciplinarian than they are in small lower-class families. Daughters of lower-class families are slightly more apt to report father as the principle disciplinarian when there are four or more children.¹³⁴

Lower-class girls and middle-class boys are more likely to report that as family size increases, parental control increases with a corresponding decrease in the parental explanation of the rules and policies. Children from the larger families were less likely to report any relinquishing of parental authority (from the last few years) than were children from smaller families. This was most notable with lower-class

¹³³Ibid., p. 896.

¹³⁴Ibid., p. 897.

girls from large families.¹³⁵ "The relation between stability of control and family size is stronger among girls than among boys, and for paternal than for maternal control."¹³⁶

Elder hypothesized that external control may also be apparent in the type of discipline utilized. As family size increases, large families are more likely to use physical punishment, ridicule, shouts and less likely to use praise, approval or encouragement. Elder found that with an increase in family size, "parents tend to use physical discipline more and verbal methods less is supported in 17 out of 24 comparisons."¹³⁷ The relationship of physical discipline and family size was strongest for lower-class girls and middle-class boys. Lower-class girls and middle-class boys from larger families were subject to more external behavior control.¹³⁸

SUMMARY

The studies presented have the common concern of attempting to explain the relationship of the family subsystem to that of the larger social structure. Does the interpenetration of systems and subsystems within society affect the activities within the family, in particular, the socialization process? The theoretical framework maintains that the family is affected and the studies lend support to this assumption. It has also been assumed from the theoretical framework and supported by empirical findings that the socialization process within the family

¹³⁵Ibid., p. 899. ¹³⁶Ibid., p. 899. ¹³⁷Ibid., p. 898.

is further affected by subsystems emerging within the family as affected by role and sex differentiation, composition and size. The affects that the system are purported to have upon the socialization process and specifically, disciplinary techniques, are not consistent.

For the present purpose of analysis and in an attempt to clarify some of the obscurities in the area of parental discipline as affected by social class and sex differentiation, disciplinary techniques will be viewed from the context of external and internal behavior controls. Disciplinary techniques will be viewed as external if discipline is employed which concentrates more on the immediate consequences and the termination of the deviant act. Disciplinary techniques will be viewed as internal behavior controls when discipline is employed which attempts to understand the child's motives and feelings and which encourages the child to develop his own mechanisms of self-control. From the theoretical perspective advanced, it is contended that in disciplining their children, middle-class parents will utilize internal behavior controls while the working-class parents will utilize external behavior controls. Within the context of external behavior controls, attention will be focused upon physical discipline, to determine if its usage is affected by social class. Each disciplinary situation will be viewed not only in terms of external and internal behavior controls as affected by social class, but also as affected by the sex of the parent and the child.

HYPOTHESES

H₁ In disciplining the child, the use of external behavior controls as opposed to internal behavior controls will be more evident in the working-class families than in the middle-class families.

H₂ Within external behavior controls, physical discipline will be more pronounced in working-class families than in middle-class families.

H₃ Within social classes, same sex parents are more likely to use external behavior controls with a same-sex child and internal behavior controls with a cross-sex child.

OPERATIONAL DEFINITIONS

In order to test the hypotheses regarding disciplinary techniques, parents were asked how they would react to the following hypothetical situations.

1. Suppose you give _____ permission to go to the park with some friends, and find out later that he (she) has actually gone downtown instead of the park. What would you most likely do when he (she) comes home? Why?

2. Suppose you look out the window and you see _____ get angry and haul off and hit a neighbor boy (girl) without a good reason. What would you most likely do? Why?

3. Suppose _____ has been expecting to go swimming Saturday and it becomes impossible for some good reason. When you inform him (her) that he (she) can't go, he (she) begins to cry and runs from the room, slamming the door very hard behind him (her). What would you most likely do? Why?

4. Imagine that you discover _____ snitching pocket money from your (your wife's) purse. What would you most likely do? Why?

5. Suppose you are going to visit friends on a Sunday afternoon and _____, who knows you plan to leave in ten minutes, goes out to play. When it's time to leave you can't find him (her). After 30 minutes you locate him (her) at a friend's house. What would you most likely do? Why?

OPERATION DEFINITIONS OF EXTERNAL AND INTERNAL BEHAVIOR CONTROLS

The responses to these questions were then categorized as internal or external behavior controls. External behavior controls consisted of responses which include the following: restriction of possessions and activities, restitution, admonishing (scolding, yelling, threatening), demanding obedience, isolation (sending to room), separation from others

and physical discipline. Responses were categorized as internal behavior controls if the parent indicated that he would engage in discussion with the child, seek explanation or ignore behavioral act.

OPERATIONAL DEFINITION OF SOCIAL CLASS

The nominal definition of class stated earlier was operationally defined by the use of the Hollingshead Two-Factor Index. Hollingshead maintains that this index was developed:

to meet the need for an objective, easily applicable procedure to estimate the positions individuals occupy in the status structure of our society. . . It is based upon three assumptions: 1. the existence of a status structure in the society; 2. positions in this structure are determined mainly by a few commonly accepted symbolic characteristics; and 3. the characteristics symbolic of status may be scaled and combined by the use of statistical procedures so that a researcher can quickly, reliably, and meaningfully stratify the population under study.¹³⁹

Hollingshead defends his reliance upon occupation and education as indices on the basis that education is presumed to "reflect the skill and power which individuals possess as they perform the many functions in the society. Education is believed to reflect not only knowledge but also cultural tastes."¹⁴⁰

In order to utilize the Two-Factor Index to determine the social position of an individual or of a household, two basic requirements must be fulfilled. First, the education scale is based upon the years of school completed by the head of the household. Secondly, there must be

¹³⁹Harold M. Hodges, Social Stratification (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Schenkman Publishing Co., 1964), p. 99.

¹⁴⁰Ibid., p. 100.

precise knowledge of the head of the household's occupation.¹⁴¹

Hollingshead Two-Factor Index was used to determine social class because of its emphasis upon occupation and education. Classes I, II, and III comprised the middle-class. Classes IV and V comprised the working-class.

¹⁴¹A. B. Hollingshead, "Two-Factor Index of Social Position," New Haven: privately printed, 1957.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

POPULATION AND SAMPLE

The purpose of the present study was to study the disciplinary techniques of parents within the city limits of Omaha, Nebraska. The data were collected in 1966-67 as a part of a larger study of socialization practices in the same city.¹ The sampling frame consisted of all Caucasian families who had children born in 1954.² Families included in the sample had a child enrolled in the public school district or in a parochial or private school. At the time of this study, the children were enrolled in the sixth or seventh grade and were between eleven and thirteen years of age. The population consisted of 5,987

¹This study was a part of a larger study conducted in a research seminar on Socialization under the supervision of Dr. Cora Martin at the then University of Omaha. Dr. Martin had conducted previous research concerning the relationship of social class and parental values on the socialization process in another geographical setting. An attempt was made in the present research design to further verify and clarify some of the findings or questions obtained in the previous research. Since parental values compose only one aspect of the socialization process, it was possible and practical for other areas to be investigated at the same time. Each of the seven graduate students in the seminar was responsible for a review of the literature dealing with his chosen area of socialization. Each student submitted questions relevant to his area. In order to avoid redundancy and length, many questions were found to be adequate in testing the theoretical framework of different students. With a team effort, it also provided for a larger sample to be interviewed than if one had to complete this individually.

²Persons other than Caucasians were eliminated from the sampling frame. In order to have obtained a sample which would have adequately represented non-Caucasians, the sampling frame would have had to have been greatly expanded. Such an increase was not feasible or desirable within the amount of time allotted for the study and with the number of students available in the seminar. Because the non-Caucasian would most

families. From this population, 388 families were randomly chosen by a table of random numbers.³

DATA COLLECTION

Prior to the pre-testing of the interview schedules, interviewers were trained in sessions involving interviewing techniques. Seven teams, each consisting of one graduate student and one undergraduate student from another sociology class, pretested the interview schedule. The pre-testing was conducted with families who had a child of approximately the same age as the subject child in the sample. The pretest families were not a part of the sampling frame. Revisions and clarifications were made in questions which were ambiguous or problematical to the respondents in the pretest group.

When the final interview schedule⁴ was ready to be fielded, each potential respondent was informed by a letter⁵ as to the nature and purpose of the study.⁶

likely be involved in another subculture, it was felt this would affect the individual's response. Lastly, most of the previous research done in the area of socialization, which was pertinent to this study, focused upon Caucasians.

³The original plan was a randomly select 400 families to insure that a response rate of 200 families would be obtained. In the process of drawing the sample, however, a total of twelve respondents were either inadvertently skipped or had duplicate cards from the table of random numbers. This reduced the actual sample to 388 respondents.

⁴See Appendix A.

⁵See Appendix B.

⁶Instead of sending letters to all of the respondents within the sampling frame at once, letters were sent only to those respondents who were to be interviewed within each week. This was to avoid confusion

The team consisting of the two trained interviewers then called upon the respondent for an interview or to establish a convenient time. If respondents were called upon and one spouse was absent, or if no one was home, as many as six attempts were made at different points in time to obtain an interview. If one of the parents had been contacted in person by the interview team, appointments were made by telephone to establish an appropriate interview time. The initial contact with the respondents was always made in person. Both parents were interviewed simultaneously in separate rooms for approximately forty-five to sixty minutes. Separation was required so that the response of either spouse would not be biased because of the presence of the other. The subject child was not in the room during the interview. Following the completion of the interviews, respondents were telephoned to verify that the interview had been conducted. At all times, the respondents were assured of the confidentiality of the research.

SAMPLE SIZE

The original sample of 388 families was reduced during the investigation partially because of the restrictions which had been imposed on the sampling frame from the theoretical perspective and also from the research process itself.

In order to be used as a respondent, several qualifications had to be met. The family had to be intact with both parents residing in the

which may have occurred by misplacement of the letter by the potential respondent and to avoid disorganization which may have occurred by sending letters and then having the research teams unable to meet promptly with the potential respondents.

household. This requirement eliminated 34 families.⁷ Fifty-five families could not be located.⁸ Twenty families had to be eliminated due to the subject child being retarded or a twin; residing outside of the city limits; language barriers or non-Caucasian. Families with a child born in 1954 who was retarded or a member of a set of twins were eliminated because it was felt that the child rearing process would differ for those individuals and bias the sample. The main restriction of the study was that both parents had to be interviewed simultaneously. Thirty-seven families were eliminated because of this stipulation. Within this group, the husbands and wives often had jobs which precluded them from being home at the same time. Several of the husbands were involved in jobs which demanded a great deal of traveling, therefore, their days at home were few. Six families were excluded because of the illness or hospitalization of one of the spouses. There were 55 refusals.⁹

The refusal rate must be considered in light of the restrictions of the sample. Many of the previous studies focused their attention on only one member of the family which was usually the mother or in other

⁷In ten families, a spouse was deceased and had not remarried; twenty-one were divorced and living alone; three were separated.

⁸Forty-two families had moved from the city within the year. Eight residences were replaced by vacant lots or for the interstate highway and their present address could not be found. Five families were repeatedly absent regardless of the hour of the visitation and could not be contacted by telephone.

⁹Of the 55 refusals, in 8 families the refusal was made by the husband while the wife was willing to be interviewed and in 8 cases the wives refused to be interviewed and the husbands were willing to do so. There were 39 refusals in which no other information could be obtained.

cases, interviewed both parents in every Nth family. If the present study had not placed the restriction of interviewing both parents and of interviewing them simultaneously, approximately 60 families could have been retained in the sample. Few studies concerned with the socialization process have interviewed both parents. This may be due to the problems encountered in attempting to get the spouses together for an interview. A majority of the studies reviewed interviewed only the mothers and asked her how the father would respond. Such a methodology has its limitations in that the mother might respond as to how she felt he should ideally respond, rather than how he would really respond. The interview schedule of the present study includes the responses of both parents in a separate schedule and also provides a cross check as to how they would predict the response of their spouse. If time allowed and additional interviewers were available, an additional cross check on the validity of the parents responses would have been to interview the child.

After respondents were eliminated due to minor errors in the original sample, to qualifications which they did not meet and due to the refusal rate, 181 completed interviews, consisting of both the husbands and wives were obtained.

A summary of the sample is presented in graphic form in Table I. See Table I on following page.

The study may be criticized as to whether it is testing the real or ideal aspects of the parental and child interaction. A more ideal situation would be to include both interviewing and observation of

TABLE I
RESULTANT SAMPLE

Population
(5,897)

Random sample of parents
with children born in 1954
(388)

Those eliminated from sample because of not meeting qualifications of 1. Caucasian; 2. residing with city limits; 3. family intact and living together; and 4. subject child not a twin or retarded.

Retarded, twins, non-Caucasian, language barriers	Reside outside city limits	Moved, or unable to locate residents	Divorced, separated or deceased
(10) +	(10)+	(55)+	(34)
=			
(109)			

From the original 388 potential respondents, 109 did not meet certain qualifications, thus leaving a total of 279 respondents. The remaining 279 respondents were reduced because of the stipulation of interviewing both parents of the subject child simultaneously.

Spouse ill or hospital- ised	Occupations precluded si- multaneous in-	Wife refused; husband	Husband refused; wife	Refusal; no other informa- tion (39)	Results 388 -109 - 98
(6)+	interviews	(37)+	willing (8)+	willing (8)+	Total N. 181
=					
(98)					

Those meeting the above five qualifications and who were willing to be interviewed composed a final N. (181)

parental-child behavior. Limitations would also be imposed by observation where again the investigator may be observing ideal behavioral patterns rather than the real pattern of behavior. Observation with the intrusion of an interviewer could also distort the family scene and many families might not consent to being observed.

Throughout the interview it was stressed how important it was to be honest and candid. It was stressed that there were no wrong or right answers. In several situations parents would respond, "I suppose I should do this differently but this is what I really do."

When the refusal rates and completed interviews were checked according to areas within the city, they were evenly distributed.

CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS

The hypotheses tested in this study were analyzed from the responses of 362 mothers and fathers (181 couples) to questions regarding disciplinary techniques. The responses were analyzed in terms of the sex of the child and parent, social class and whether the disciplinary technique entailed external or internal behavior controls. Each hypothesis was tested regarding five different behavioral situations in which the child may have hypothetically engaged. Each of the five situations presented to the parent differed in terms of misbehavior in order that a more representative parental response could be obtained.

The Chi Square Test of Significance at .05 level was used to test the following null hypotheses:

1. In disciplining children, middle- and working-class parents do not differ in the use of external and internal behavior controls.
2. Within external behavior controls, the use of physical discipline will not differ in middle- and working-class families.
3. Within the middle- and working-class families, there is no difference in the use of external or internal behavior controls with regard to the sex of the parent and child.

The design of this chapter will present the findings of these predictions and also explanations that parents gave for the utilization of their chosen disciplinary technique. The disciplinary technique chosen by the parent and the explanation given for its usage are based upon the parent's first response to questions regarding a particular type of misbehavior.

HYPOTHESIS I:

In disciplining the child, middle- and working-class parents do not differ in the use of external and internal behavior controls.

Data relating to the above hypothesis are presented in Table I.

TABLE I

THE USE OF EXTERNAL AND INTERNAL BEHAVIOR CONTROLS
BY MIDDLE- AND WORKING-CLASS PARENTS

	TOTAL REPORTED FREQUENCIES			
	External Control	Internal Control		
Middle-Class Parents	740	403		
Working-Class Parents	472	168		
Total Freq.	1212	571		
	$x^2 = 15.36$	d.f = 1	p. < = .01	Q. = -.21

* Chi Square test of significance at .05 level was computed by combining the external and internal behavior controls frequencies from the five different disciplinary situations for the middle-class (n = 116 couples; 232 parents) and the working class (n = 65 couples; 130 parents). Theoretically, there should be 1,810 reported frequencies of discipline if each parent in the sample had responded to each of the five questions; 1783 responses were obtained.

Since parents were questioned regarding five separate situations in which the child may hypothetically engage, the responses to all of the five different situations were totaled for each social class under external or internal behavior controls. The situations revolve around fibbing, fighting, display of tantrums, "snitching" and promptness. In an attempt to determine if parents of the middle- and working-class respond differently with regard to the types of offense committed by the child, it was felt that a more representative response of class behavior

could be obtained if situations were included involving different situations.

The Chi Square computed at .05 level of significance led to the rejection of the null hypothesis indicating that middle-class parents are more likely to use internal behavior controls than working-class parents and working-class parents are more likely to use external behavior controls in disciplining their children than are middle-class parents. The differences were significant at $P < .01$.

In order to obtain the differences for each of the five situations, Chi Squares were computed at .05 level of significance for each of the five situations regarding Hypothesis I. These situations were described in Chapter III and are abbreviated as follows: fibbing; child went downtown instead of to the park as planned, fighting; child hits another child, tantrum; child unable to go swimming and engages in a tantrum, "snitching;" child caught taking money from mother's purse, and promptness; child can not be located when parents plan to leave for a visit.

The data indicates that out of the five different situations requiring some form of disciplinary measure, two of the situations led to the rejection of the null hypothesis. The data from the two situations regarding the child throwing a tantrum and the child "snitching" money indicate that middle-class parents differ from working-class parents on the type of behavior controls utilized. In the situations regarding the child's going downtown instead of to the park and when the child hit a neighbor child, a higher percentage of middle-class parents reported using internal behavior controls as compared to the working-class parents.

These differences were not, however, significant at .05 level of significance. In the situation in which the child could not be located, there were no appreciable differences between the two classes on the use of disciplinary techniques. A summary of the use of external and internal behavior controls by middle- and working-class parents is given in Table II.

TABLE II

FREQUENCIES AND PERCENTAGES OF NO. OF TIMES MIDDLE- AND WORKING-CLASS PARENTS USED EXTERNAL AND INTERNAL BEHAVIOR CONTROLS

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

SITUATIONS REQUIRING DISCIPLINE	Controls		No. Resp.	Controls		No. Resp.	X ²	P.
	Ext. & Int.	(Freq. & Per.)		Ext. & Int.	(Freq. & Per.)			
1. Fibbing - downtown instead of park	172	59	231	106	23	129	2.82	<.10
	(74.46)	(25.54)		(82.17)	(17.83)			
2. Hitting - hitting another child	134	96	230	84	46	130	1.42	<.30
	(58.26)	(41.74)		(64.62)	(35.38)			
3. Tantrum - unable to go swimming	111	119	230	85	45	130	9.81	<.01
	(48.26)	(51.74)		(65.38)	(34.62)			
4. Snitching - taking money	126	97	223	90	34	124	8.76	<.01
	(56.50)	(43.50)		(72.58)	(27.42)			
5. Promptness - can't be located	197	32	229	107	20	127	.21	<.70
	(86.03)	(13.47)		(84.25)	(15.75)			
Total use of External and Internal Behavior Controls	740	403		472	168			

* Each of the above situations which required discipline were tested separately with regard to social class and external and internal behavior controls

In addition to asking the parents how they would respond to the specific situations in terms of disciplinary techniques, parents were also asked why they would respond in such a manner.

"FIBBING:"

Even though the null hypothesis regarding the fibbing situation in the use of external and internal controls could not be rejected at the .05 level, the explanations offered by the parents indicate a different reason for employing discipline. See Table III.

TABLE III

THE USE OF EXTERNAL AND INTERNAL BEHAVIOR CONTROLS BY MIDDLE- AND WORKING-CLASS PARENTS TO FIBBING					
	MIDDLE-CLASS PARENTS (n=231)		WORKING-CLASS PARENTS (n=129)		
	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	
EXTERNAL CONTROLS	172	44.46	106	82.17	
INTERNAL CONTROLS	59	25.54	23	17.83	
	$\chi^2 = 2.82$		d.f. = 1		P. < .10

In the three mentioned categories receiving the most response, working-class parents had a higher representation of responses indicating that the child should not transgress parental rules and should be obedient. The response of middle-class parents (46.8%) to reliability, honesty and trust seems indicative of the stress upon the development of internal control mechanisms as compared to (39.2%) of the working-class parents. The second highest response for middle-class parents (25.5%) and working-class parents (33.1%) involved employing discipline because the child should not disobey. According to the percentages for this choice, working-class parents were more heavily represented in this "external" explanation. The third highest response of middle-class parents (21.6%) and of working-class parents (24.6%) indicated that discipline was administered

because the whereabouts of the child must be known. A summary is presented in Table IV.

TABLE IV

EXPLANATIONS GIVEN BY PARENTS FOR DISCIPLINING CHILD FOR FIBBING (Child went downtown instead of park as planned).				
EXPLANATIONS	MIDDLE-CLASS PARENTS(n=231)		WORKING-CLASS PARENTS(n=130)	
	No.	Percent	No.	Percent
Must know whereabouts	50	21.6	32	24.6
Child should not disobey	59	25.5	43	33.1
Trust, honesty reliability	108	46.8	51	39.2
Prevent re-occurrence	14	6.1	4	3.1

FIGHTING:

In the situation regarding the child hitting a neighbor child, the null hypothesis was unable to be rejected at .05 level. No significant differences between the middle- and working-class parents were indicated in the use of external and internal behavior controls. Although the differences were not significant, a higher per centage of middle-class parents reported using internal controls than working-class parents. See Table V on following page.

The explanations offered by the parents (See Table VI on following page) illustrate that both middle-class parents (49.2%) and working-class

TABLE V

THE USE OF EXTERNAL AND INTERNAL BEHAVIOR CONTROLS
BY MIDDLE- AND WORKING-CLASS PARENTS. (Discipline
administered because child hit another child)

	MIDDLE-CLASS PARENTS (n = 230)		WORKING-CLASS PARENTS (n = 130)	
	No.	Percent	No.	Percent
EXTERNAL CONTROLS	134	58.26	84	64.62
INTERNAL CONTROLS	96	41.74	46	35.38
	$\chi^2 = 1.417$		d.f. = 1	
	P. < .30			

TABLE VI

EXPLANATIONS GIVEN BY PARENTS FOR DISCIPLINING CHILD
(Child hits another child)

EXPLANATIONS	MIDDLE-CLASS PARENTS (n=226)		WORKING-CLASS PARENTS (n=129)	
	No.	Percent	No.	Percent
Most effective way to reach child	97	42.9	47	36.4
Should respect and control emotions	62	27.4	38	29.4
Should not fight	61	26.9	42	32.6
Nothing	6	2.6	2	1.6

parents (36.4%) justify their disciplinary actions by reporting that the techniques they used are the most effective way of dealing with the situation, ceasing the fight. The next two categories illustrate a different priority in explanations for discipline with middle-class parents reporting using discipline in order to teach child to control emotions and respect for others (27.4%) and thirdly, that the child should not fight (26.9%). The working-class parents responded secondly to using discipline because the child should not fight (32.65%) and thirdly, that the child should control his emotions (29.4%). Although there were minor differences in the percentage of responses by both classes, the differences were minor.

TANTRUM

In the third situation in which the child is unable to go swimming, begins to cry and runs from the room, the null hypothesis was rejected at .01 level of significance indicating that middle-class parents and working-class parents differ in their use of external and internal behavior controls in disciplining their children. See Table VII

TABLE VII

THE USE OF EXTERNAL AND INTERNAL BEHAVIOR CONTROLS
BY MIDDLE- AND WORKING-CLASS PARENTS (Discipline
administered when child unable to go swimming, runs
from room, crying, slamming door very hard).

	MIDDLE-CLASS PARENTS(n=230)		WORKING-CLASS PARENTS(n=130)	
	No.	Percent	No.	Percent
EXTERNAL CONTROLS	111	48.26	85	65.38
INTERNAL CONTROLS	119	51.74	45	34.26
	$\chi^2 = 9.81$		d.f. = 1	
			P. < .01	

In parental explanations for the discipline, the response that the child should be responsible and learn to accept disappointments, received the highest response from both the middle-class parents (41.9%) and working-class parents (36.7%). Working-class parents reported that discipline was administered because tantrums are not tolerated (31.2%) as the second highest response with middle-class parents reporting (23.9%) for this response. The remaining responses were not reported in the same priority for working- and middle-class parents. Working-class parents chose thirdly, to administer discipline because the child should not disobey (16.4%) as compared to middle-class parents (11.5%), whereas middle-class parents chose thirdly, to ignore the tantrum (15.9%) as compared to the (11.7%) response of working-class parents. A separate category indicated that the parent must be more understanding because parents often disappoint their children, received a response of (7.5%) from middle-class parents and (3.9%) from working-class parents. In this situation, the display of the tantrum would most likely go unpunished or ignored. If this category were to be combined with the category of ignoring, it would provide a contrast of (23.4%) for the middle-class parents and (15.6%) for working-class parents. The separation was made in order to obtain a finer distinction of parental explanations. The category of ignoring contains responses reporting that the child can not be reasoned with in a moment of anger and that he should not be given the satisfaction of attention. The category of parental blame focuses more on the behavior of the parent than on the child.

In comparing the explanations given for disciplining the child for

the tantrum, explanations for discipline which focus on obeying rules and on the immediate situation were chosen by a higher per centage of working-class parents as compared to middle-class parents as is shown in Table VIII.

TABLE VIII

EXPLANATIONS GIVEN BY PARENTS FOR DISCIPLINING CHILD (Unable to go swimming, child engages in tantrum)				
EXPLANATIONS	MIDDLE-CLASS PARENTS(n=226)		WORKING-CLASS PARENTS(n=128)	
	No.	Percent	No.	Percent
Child should be responsible-learn to accept disappointment	93	41.1	47	36.7
Tantrums are not tolerated	54	23.9	40	31.2
Children should not disobey	26	11.5	21	16.4
Ignore- can't be reasoned or do not give satisfaction	36	15.9	15	11.7
Parents fault	17	7.5	5	3.9

In explanations centering on the need for children to be responsible or on explanations which involved ignoring their acts and thereby imposing no external or imposed infractions from the parents, middle-class parents were more highly represented in these categories than working-class parents.

SNITCHING

The fourth situation in which the parents were asked to respond in-

volved the child's snitching money from the wife's purse. The null hypothesis was rejected at .01 level of significance indicating that middle- and working-class parents differ in their use of external and internal behavior controls involving snitching. See Table IX

TABLE IX

THE USE OF EXTERNAL AND INTERNAL BEHAVIOR CONTROLS BY
MIDDLE- AND WORKING-CLASS PARENTS (Discipline administered when child caught snitching money from mother's purse.)

	MIDDLE-CLASS PARENTS(n=223)		WORKING-CLASS PARENTS(n=124)	
	No.	Percent	No.	Percent
EXTERNAL CONTROLS	126	56.50	90	72.58
INTERNAL CONTROLS	97	43.50	34	27.42
	$\chi^2 = 8.76$		d.f. = 1	P.<.01

In the explanations offered for the use of discipline, the category indicating that discipline was administered because stealing is wrong received (40.9%) of the middle-class responses and (52.3%) of the working-class responses. Both middle-class parents (35.5%) and working-class parents (31.5%) reported secondly, that discipline was administered to emphasize responsibility, trust and reliability. The remaining responses show no appreciable differences, however, more middle-class parents were unable to hypothetically envision the child snitching than working-class parents.

Since the null hypothesis was rejected, it can be assumed that working-class parents would use external behavior controls which focus upon the wrong doing at hand, whereas even though the middle-class

parents also indicated that stealing was wrong, they used internal behavior controls which focused on the future ramifications of such an act. This is also supported by the middle-class parent's second choice or responsibility, reliability and trust which involved a higher percentage of responses than parents of the working-class. The summary of parental explanations for discipline involving snitching is presented in Table X.

TABLE X

EXPLANATIONS GIVEN BY PARENTS FOR DISCIPLINING CHILD (Child snitching money)				
EXPLANATIONS	MIDDLE-CLASS PARENTS(n=232)		WORKING-CLASS PARENTS(n=130)	
	No.	Percent	No.	Percent
No idea	16	6.9	4	3.1
Stealing is wrong	95	40.9	68	52.3
Responsibility, trust	82	35.5	41	31.5
Child could ask	39	16.8	17	13.1

PROMPTNESS

In the situation in which the parents plan to go visiting and can not locate the child, the null hypothesis was unable to be rejected at .05 level of significance indicating that middle- and working-class parents do not differ in their use of external and internal behavior controls. See Table XI on following page.

In explanations offered by parents for using the type of discipline

TABLE XI

THE USE OF EXTERNAL AND INTERNAL BEHAVIOR CONTROLS BY MIDDLE- AND WORKING-CLASS PARENTS. (Discipline administered child was late for visiting appointment with parents).

	MIDDLE-CLASS PARENTS (n=229)		WORKING-CLASS PARENTS (n=127)	
	No.	Percent	No.	Percent
EXTERNAL CONTROLS	197	86.03	107	84.25
INTERNAL CONTROLS	32	13.97	20	15.75
	$\chi^2 = .212$		d.f. = 1 P.<.70	

they had chosen, the category receiving the largest response from middle-class parents (50.4%) and working-class parents (43.9%) cited that the child was punished in order to learn to be considerate and prompt. The response centered around regard for the friends who would be kept waiting by such an unthoughtful act. The category of responsibility was chosen secondly by both middle-class parents (20.2%) and working-class parents (25.4%). The category of responsibility was separated from promptness and being considerate for the main emphasis centered around maturity and the ability to make decisions and carry them out in a responsible manner. The category stating that punishment was administered because the child should not disobey was reported as the third priority by middle class parents (15.5%) and working-class parents (19.2%). Data on the explanations for disciplining the child for promptness are presented in Table XII.

TABLE XII

EXPLANATIONS GIVEN BY PARENTS FOR DISCIPLINING CHILD (Promptness: Late for visiting appointment)				
EXPLANATIONS	MIDDLE-CLASS PARENTS(n=232)		WORKING-CLASS PARENTS(n=130)	
	No.	Percent	No.	Percent
Nothing, concept of time differs	26	11.2	11	8.5
Consideration and promptness	117	50.4	57	43.9
Child should not disobey	36	15.5	25	19.2
Parental anger	6	2.6	4	3.1
Accept responsibilities	47	20.2	33	25.4

For explanations that coincide with internal controls, middle-class parents chose promptness and consideration for others more often than their working-class counterparts, however, working-class parents chose the development of responsibility, as an explanation more often than middle-class parents. For the explanations that characterize external behavior controls, the insistence upon obedience was chosen by more working-class than middle-class parents.

SUMMARY

The rejection of Hypothesis I indicates that differences do exist between middle- and working-class parents in the use of external and internal behavior controls. Two of the five hypotheses pertaining to specific situations were rejected at .01 level of significance. The explanations offered by parents for their chosen disciplinary techniques most often produced the same priorities in each class. The questions were open-ended so the parent's choices were not limited. Categories of parental explanations in most of the five situations produced the same first, second and third priorities for both social classes. Within the priorities, however, it was found that the percentages from each social class differed. Although the differences in the percentages were small in some instances, over all there was a tendency for the working-class parents to have higher representation in disciplinary categories which focused upon the immediate consequences and termination of the deviant act. Correspondingly, there was a higher representation of middle-class parents in disciplinary categories which focused more upon the child's intent and the development of internal controls to cope with the situation.

in the future.

The rejection of the null hypothesis applied to all of the five situations in general; the rejection of two null hypotheses when applied to situations individually; and lastly, the parental explanations; lends support to the assumption that social class has an effect on disciplinary techniques.

HYPOTHESIS II

Within external behavior controls the use of physical discipline will not differ in middle- and working-class families.

Hypothesis II could not be rejected at .05 level of significance indicating that middle- and working-class parents do not differ in using physical discipline, at least, as far as this study was able to measure it. From the responses of parents to the types of disciplinary techniques used, a frequency of the use of external behavior controls was compiled. The external behavior control techniques were dichotomized into physical and non-physical categories. Raw frequencies and percentages were computed for the use of physical and non-physical controls as reported by middle- and working-class parents. See Table XIII on following page.

The analysis indicates that when parents of either social class use external behavior controls, non-physical measures are resorted to much more frequently than physical discipline. From the analysis of external behavior controls, middle-class parents reported a frequency of (14.2%) for physical discipline and working-class parents reported (16.3%). Although working-class parents reported a higher percentage of physical discipline, the difference between the two classes is very

TABLE XIII

TOTAL REPORTED FREQUENCIES OF NO. OF TIMES EXTERNAL CONTROLS (PHYSICAL AND NON-PHYSICAL) WERE CHOSEN BY MIDDLE- AND WORKING-CLASS PARENTS

	EXTERNAL BEHAVIOR CONTROLS				TOTAL
	PHYSICAL		NON-PHYSICAL		
	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	
MIDDLE-CLASS PARENTS	105	14.2	635	85.8	740
WORKING-CLASS PARENTS	77	16.3	395	83.7	472

$$x^2 = .98 \quad \text{d.f.} = 1 \quad \text{P.} < .50$$

- * The table represents the raw frequencies of the no. of time external controls, both physical and non-physical, were resorted to by middle- and working-class parents. There were 232 middle-class parents and 130 working-class parents in the sample and each one was to respond to each of the five situations involving disciplinary action.

small. Furthermore, the similarities between the two classes in the use of external behavior controls of a non-physical nature, (85.8%) of the middle-class parents and (83.7%) of the working-class parents indicates that the similarities within external behavior controls outweighs the dissimilarities of a few percentage points in the use of physical controls.

The reader must be cautioned that this specific analysis is only dealing with the reported frequencies of external behavior controls. The analysis does not include any of the frequencies for internal controls.

SUMMARY

Considering the reported frequencies of external behavior controls from each class and the further dichotomizing of physical and non-physical measures, it is difficult to lend any support to the null hypothesis. The only finding is that when parents of either class use external behavior controls, they are more likely to employ non-physical techniques as opposed to physical techniques.

HYPOTHESIS III

Within the middle- and working-class families, there is no difference in the use of external or internal behavior controls with regard to the sex of the parent and the child.

In order to test the above null hypothesis, the total number of frequencies of external and internal behavior controls were tabulated for mothers and fathers of each social class with regard to the sex of the child. The middle-class representation in the sample consisted of 60 sons and 56 daughters. The working-class representation consisted

of 39 sons and 26 daughters. The frequencies of external and internal behavior controls from both parents were tabulated for sons and daughters separately.

The use of external and internal behavior controls by middle-class parents

In comparing the use of external and internal behavior controls of middle-class parents for their sons and for their daughters, the null hypothesis was unable to be rejected at .05 level of significance for either case as is seen in the following Tables XIV and XV.

TABLE XIV

COMPARISON OF EXTERNAL AND INTERNAL BEHAVIOR CONTROLS OF MIDDLE-CLASS FATHERS AND MOTHERS TO SONS					
	MIDDLE-CLASS FATHERS		MIDDLE-CLASS MOTHERS		TOTAL FREQ.
	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	
EXTERNAL	250	70.4	234	65.7	484
INTERNAL	105	29.6	122	34.3	<u>227</u> 711
		$\chi^2 = 1.78$	d.f. = 1	P. < .20	

TABLE XV

COMPARISON OF EXTERNAL AND INTERNAL BEHAVIOR CONTROLS OF MIDDLE-CLASS FATHERS AND MOTHERS TO DAUGHTERS					
	MIDDLE-CLASS FATHERS		MIDDLE-CLASS MOTHERS		TOTAL FREQ.
	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	
EXTERNAL	225	68.2	222	67.4	447
INTERNAL	105	31.8	107	32.5	<u>212</u> 659
		$\chi^2 = .038$	d.f. = 1	P. < .90	

Middle-class mothers reported using more internal behavior controls (34.3%) than the fathers (29.6%) in disciplining their sons whereas the fathers reported a higher frequency of external behavior controls (70.4%) compared to (65.7%) reported by mothers.

The use of controls as applied to daughters in the middle-class was not significant. The percentage differences between mothers and fathers in the use of external and internal behavior controls with regard to daughters were negligible.

The use of external and internal behavior controls by working-class parents

In testing Hypothesis III in the working-class family with regard to the son and daughter, the null hypothesis was unable to be rejected for either sons or for daughters at the .05 level of significance as is shown in Tables XVI and XVII on the following page. Percentages were tabulated from the reported frequencies of the use of internal and external behavior controls by working-class mothers and fathers.

Regarding their sons, working-class fathers reported a higher percentage of the use of external controls (78.4%) than the mothers (74.8%). Correspondingly, the mothers reported a higher frequency of internal behavior controls (25.2%) as compared to the (21.6%) of the fathers. A summary is presented in Table XVI.

With regard to the controls administered to the daughters mothers reported a higher percentage of external behavior controls (73.3%) as compared to (68.2%) for the fathers. Fathers, in turn, reported a higher percentage of internal behavior controls (31.8%) than did the mothers (26.6%).

TABLE XVI

COMPARISON OF USE OF EXTERNAL AND INTERNAL BEHAVIOR CONTROLS
OF WORKING-CLASS MOTHERS AND FATHERS TO SONS

	WORKING-CLASS FATHERS		WORKING-CLASS MOTHERS		TOTAL FREQ.
	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	
EXTERNAL	182	78.4	172	74.8	354
INTERNAL	50	21.6	58	25.2	<u>108</u>
					<u>462</u>
	$\chi^2 = .88$		d.f. = 1		P. < .50

TABLE XVII

COMPARISON OF USE OF EXTERNAL AND INTERNAL BEHAVIOR CONTROLS
OF WORKING-CLASS MOTHERS AND FATHERS TO DAUGHTERS

	WORKING-CLASS FATHERS		WORKING-CLASS MOTHERS		TOTAL FREQ.
	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	
EXTERNAL	117	68.2	113	73.3	230
INTERNAL	37	31.8	41	21.6	<u>78</u>
					<u>308</u>
	$\chi^2 = .30$		d.f. = 1		P. < .70

In comparing the middle- and working-class parents' response to the reported controls used with respect to their sons and daughters, in all of the comparisons except for one, same sex parents reported a higher percentage of internal controls on the cross sex-child. The only exception was the response of middle-class mothers and fathers to their daughters. Although the percentage differences were small in this case, the trend was in the opposite direction. A summary comparing the raw frequencies and percentages for each class by sex of parent and child is presented in Table XVIII on the following page.

SUMMARY

None of the null hypotheses tested for differences within social classes on the use of external and internal behavior controls with respect to the sex of parent and child could be rejected at the .05 level of significance. Percentages of frequencies, however, indicated that a tendency existed for same sex parents to use external controls for the same sex child and internal behavior controls for the cross sex child. Since this tendency existed, a further analysis was attempted to determine if the same null hypothesis could be rejected when comparisons were made between social classes instead of within social classes.

Middle- and working-class mothers response to daughters.

Comparisons of the frequencies in which external and internal behavior controls were used by middle- and working-class mothers with respect to daughters was not significant at the .05 level of significance but was at $P < .20$. Middle-class mothers reported a higher frequency to employ internal behavior controls (32.5%) as compared to the (26.6%)

TABLE XVIII

TOTAL REPORTED FREQUENCIES OF NO. OF TIMES EXTERNAL AND INTERNAL CONTROLS WERE CHOSEN WITH REGARD TO SOCIAL CLASS AND SEX OF CHILD AND PARENT

MIDDLE CLASS				RESPONSES TO DAUGHTERS			
RESPONSE TO SONS				EXTERNAL		INTERNAL	
EXTERNAL	INTERNAL			EXTERNAL	INTERNAL		
(No. and Percents)				(No. and Percents)			
<u>Fathers</u>	<u>Mothers</u>	<u>Fathers</u>	<u>Mothers</u>	<u>Fathers</u>	<u>Mothers</u>	<u>Fathers</u>	<u>Mothers</u>
250	234	105	122	225	222	105	107
(70.4)	(65.7)	(29.6)	(34.3)	(68.2)	(67.4)	(31.8)	(32.5)
WORKING CLASS							
182	172	50	58	117	113	37	41
(78.4)	(74.8)	(21.6)	(25.2)	(75.9)	(73.3)	(24.1)	(26.6)
TOTAL FREQUENCIES							
MIDDLE-CLASS FATHERS				WORKING-CLASS FATHERS			
Boys		355		Boys		232	
Girls		330		Girls		154	
<u>Total Freq. of Controls</u>		<u>685</u>		<u>Total Freq. of Controls</u>		<u>386</u>	
MIDDLE-CLASS MOTHERS				WORKING-CLASS MOTHERS			
Boys		356		Boys		230	
Girls		329		Girls		154	
<u>Total Freq. of Controls</u>		<u>685</u>		<u>Total Freq. of Controls</u>		<u>384</u>	

THE PERCENTAGES REPRESENT THE PROPORTION OF THE RAW FREQUENCIES OBTAINED ON THE USE OF EXTERNAL AND INTERNAL BEHAVIOR CONTROLS FROM THE TOTAL OF THE FIVE DISCIPLINE SITUATIONS.

reported by working-class mothers. Correspondingly, working-class mothers reported a higher frequency to employ external behavior controls (73.3%) than middle-class mothers. See Table XIX.

TABLE XIX

COMPARISONS OF USE OF EXTERNAL AND INTERNAL BEHAVIOR
CONTROLS OF MIDDLE- AND WORKING-CLASS MOTHERS TO
DAUGHTERS

	MIDDLE-CLASS MOTHERS		WORKING-CLASS MOTHERS		TOTAL FREQ.
	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	
EXTERNAL	222	67.4	113	73.3	335
INTERNAL	<u>107</u>	32.5	<u>41</u>	26.6	<u>148</u>
	329		154		483

$\chi^2 = 1.72$ d.f. = 1 P. < .20

Middle- and working-class mothers response to sons

The same hypothesis was tested for middle-class and working-class mothers with regard to their sons and rejected at $P. < .02$ level of significance. The rejection indicates that between social classes, the use of external and internal behavior controls is affected by the sex of the parent and child. Middle-class mothers reported (65.7%) usage of external behavior controls for sons whereas working-class mothers reported (74.8%). Internal behavior controls had a reported frequency of (34.4%) for middle-class mothers and (25.5%) for working-class mothers. See Table XX on following page.

From the two preceding findings, it appears that if differentiation is made in employing behavior controls, the differentiation with respect

TABLE XX

COMPARISON OF USE OF EXTERNAL AND INTERNAL CONTROLS
OF MIDDLE- AND WORKING-CLASS MOTHERS TO SONS

	MIDDLE-CLASS MOTHERS		WORKING-CLASS MOTHERS		TOTAL FREQ.
	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	
EXTERNAL	234	65.7	172	74.8	406
INTERNAL	122	34.3	58	25.2	180
	<u>356</u>		<u>230</u>		<u>586</u>

$$x^2 = 5.425 \quad \text{d.f.} = 1 \quad \text{P} < .02$$

to the sex of the child will be more pronounced with working-class mothers. Although mothers of both social classes reported using a higher percentage of external behavior controls than internal behavior controls when disciplining their sons, middle-class mothers reported a higher frequency of internal behavior controls than working-class mothers.

Middle- and working-class fathers response to sons

When comparing the frequency of external and internal behavior controls used by middle- and working-class fathers in disciplining their sons, the hypothesis of no differences was rejected at .05 level of significance. Working-class fathers reported a higher tendency to employ external behavior controls (78.4%) than middle-class fathers (70.4%). Middle-class fathers reported a usage of internal behavior controls (29.6%) as compared to (21.6%) of the working-class fathers. Again, external behavior controls were chosen over internal behavior controls but the tendency is not as large with middle-class fathers. See Table XXI.

TABLE XXI

COMPARISON OF THE USE OF EXTERNAL AND INTERNAL BEHAVIOR CONTROLS BY WORKING- AND MIDDLE-CLASS FATHERS TO SONS

	MIDDLE-CLASS FATHERS		WORKING-CLASS FATHERS		TOTAL FREQ.
	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	
EXTERNAL	250	70.4	182	78.4	432
INTERNAL	105	29.6	50	21.6	155
	<u>355</u>		<u>232</u>		<u>587</u>

$\chi^2 = 4.68$ d.f. = 1 $P < .05$

Middle- and working-class fathers response to daughters

The hypothesis of no difference in the use of external and internal behavior controls between social classes with regard to fathers and daughters could not be rejected at .05 level of significance but was significant at $P < .10$. Although external behavior controls were chosen over internal behavior controls by fathers of both classes, working-class fathers (75.9%) reported a higher frequency than middle-class fathers (68.2%). Frequency of internal behavior controls was (31.8%) with middle-class fathers and (24.1%) with working-class fathers. See Table XXII.

TABLE XXII

COMPARISON OF THE USE OF EXTERNAL AND INTERNAL BEHAVIOR CONTROLS BY WORKING- AND MIDDLE-CLASS FATHERS TO DAUGHTERS					
	MIDDLE-CLASS FATHERS		WORKING-CLASS FATHERS		TOTAL FREQ.
	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	
EXTERNAL	225	68.2	117	75.9	342
INTERNAL	105	31.8	37	24.1	142
	<u>330</u>		<u>154</u>		<u>484</u>
	$\chi^2 = 2.86$		d.f. = 1		P < .10

As illustrated in the comparisons by middle- and working-class mothers in the controls utilized to discipline sons and daughters, middle- and working-class fathers also reported a higher frequency of external than internal behavior controls. Working-class fathers show a greater tendency to utilize external behavior controls than middle-class fathers.

Furthermore, if differentiation is made with reference to the sex of the child, this differentiation is more pronounced with working-class fathers than middle-class fathers. The same tendency occurred for mothers.

Conclusion

Data presented in this chapter were the findings derived from testing a series of hypotheses involving the effects of social class on disciplinary techniques. Further analyses were made to determine the effects of sex differentiation. The assumption that external behavior controls will be utilized more in the working-class families than in the middle-class families and that internal behavior controls will be utilized more in the middle-class families than in the working-class families received support. Support was rendered from the rejection of Hypothesis I and further supported by the explanation parents offered for their disciplinary actions.

The hypothesis regarding the use of physical discipline in middle- and working-class families showed no difference in usage. When middle- and working-class families utilize external controls, they are more likely to employ non-physical external controls as opposed to physical external controls.

The hypothesis involving the use of external and internal behavior controls within classes as affected by sex of child and parent did not receive support at .05 level of significance. Percentages, however, within classes indicated that parents utilize external behavior controls to a greater proportion with the same-sex child than with the cross-sex child. Furthermore, a comparison between classes of the effects of

sexual differentiation on the types of disciplinary controls employed revealed that a tendency exists for parents to use external behavior controls more frequently on the same-sex child and to use internal behavior controls more frequently on the cross-sex child. This tendency is more pronounced in the working-class families.

The implications of the present findings will be expanded in the following chapter. Suggestions will be given for possible strategies of bringing the relationship of social class and disciplinary techniques "to a head" instead of briefly skimming the surface with supportive, but non-conclusive findings.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The following question was posed in Chapter I: "Does social class have an effect on the types of discipline administered to children by their parents?" This question generated a concomitant inquiry: "Within the confines of social class, are disciplinary techniques affected by the sex of the parent and child?"

Research, however, involves more than asking questions. Research indicates that hypothetical predictions derived from a theoretical perspective are being tested. The questions asked were developed into the following hypotheses:

H₁In disciplining the child, the use of external behavior controls as opposed to internal behavior controls, will be more evident in working-class families than in middle-class families.

H₂Within external behavior controls, physical discipline will be more pronounced in working-class families than in middle-class families.

H₃Within social classes, same sex parents are more likely to use external behavior controls with a same-sex child and external behavior controls with a cross-sex child.

Testing the above hypotheses in the null form led to the rejection of Hypothesis I at $P < .01$ level of significance. Hypotheses II and III were unable to be rejected at .05 level of significance. The testing of hypothetical predictions, however, is not an isolated endeavor that ends with the rejection or acceptance of the null hypotheses. The testing of hypothetical predictions constantly refers back to its theoretical origins and assumptions.

It was maintained in the theoretical perspective that the concept of social class was a useful hypothetical construct which represented

a distinct social reality through its affects upon human behavior. The reality it represents forms a distinctive way of life for its occupants. How does this distinctive way of life of social class permeate and affect disciplinary techniques in the socialization process? In an attempt to answer this question, propositions derived from the Parsonian framework of family and socialization provided a linkage between the system of social class and the family system. In simple terms, the Parsonian framework provided the how; how the family and the social structure are related. Parsons discussed the relationship of the family unit to the occupational structure by the phenomenon of "interpenetration". Parents, as socialization agents, not only occupy roles in the family system but also in other structures of society. Because an individual participates in a multitude of systems in society, a myriad of effects are produced from this differential participation. The various systems in society are not isolated but "interpenetrate" each other through the occupants who hold positions in each. Consequently, the activities within the family are affected by the boundary-roles of its occupants who participate in other systems. The theoretical perspectives of other investigators included in the Parsonian framework provided the why; why the relationship of social class and disciplinary techniques vary as different variables enter the situation. Propositions produced from the fusion of these perspective were developed into hypotheses which could be empirically tested. The findings of these hypotheses will now be presented and interpreted in terms of the theoretical perspective.

HYPOTHESIS I was concerned with the effect that the "interpene-

tration" of systems and subsystems within society had upon its occupants as they enacted their familial roles in disciplining their children. The rejection of the null hypothesis at $P < .01$ lent support to the hypothetical prediction that in the disciplining of their children, the use of external behavior controls as opposed to internal behavior controls will be more evident in the working-class families than in middle-class families. The present findings indicate that differences do exist between classes in disciplinary techniques. These findings are supportive of research conclusions reached by previous investigators who maintained that class differences are apparent in the use of disciplinary techniques. The explanations given for these differences, however, vary according to the theoretical perspectives of the investigators.

In discussing the effects of social class upon the family, McKinley attributed the differences in the use of disciplinary controls to the rewards and strains the head of the household experiences in his occupation. Since the lower-class father does not have the same autonomy or security in his job as the middle-class father, the lower-class father will vent his frustrations in the home since he can not at work. The middle-class father would not be as threatened in his job so he can displace his aggression at work. As a consequence of this frustration, the lower-class father will use more aggressive disciplinary techniques than his middle-class counterpart. McKinley found that lower-class parents are more severe than middle-class parents in their use of disciplinary techniques. He found that middle-class children were disciplined to develop self-control whereas lower-class children were

punished for offenses. The upper- and middle-class parents used more emotional and verbal controls whereas the lower-class parents tended to use more physically expressed sanctions.¹

Kohn focused more upon punishment in terms of physical and non-physical categories. He maintained that the middle- and working-class families would differ in the use of disciplinary techniques because middle-class families, due to their positions in society deal more with interpersonal relations, ideas, and symbols; their occupations are more subject to self-direction; and lastly, their mobility is more dependent on one's own actions. In comparison, working-class families because of their location in the social structure and because of their educational attainment, deal more with the manipulation of things; are in occupations subjected to more standardization and direct supervision; and lastly, their mobility is more dependent upon collective action. Kohn's findings indicate that middle-class parents discipline with an emphasis on the intent and the future ramifications of such misbehavior whereas working-class parents seem to focus more upon the immediate situation of the act.²

Bronfenbrenner's findings are also supportive of Hypothesis I. He discussed differences in disciplinary techniques in terms of "love-

¹Donald Gilbert McKinley, Social Class and Family Life (New York: The Free Press of Glencoe, 1964), pp. 83-86.

²Melvin Kohn, "Social Class and the Exercise of Parental Authority," American Sociological Review, 24 (June, 1959), pp. 353-356.

oriented" and "direct methods" of discipline. With an increase in the family's positions, the use of direct methods of discipline decreases.³

The perspectives and findings of McKinley, Kohn and Bronfenbrenner were fundamental in the development of the present framework for viewing social class and disciplinary techniques. Other investigators whose orientations were not pursued in the development of the present perspective but whose findings are germane to the present analysis, also found disciplinary techniques to vary according to social class. Sears, Maccoby and Levine found that working-class mothers used physical punishment and deprivation of privileges to a greater extent than middle-class mothers. Working-class mothers were also found to use more object-oriented rather than love-oriented techniques of discipline.⁴ These findings are comparable to the present findings of working-class parents using external behavior controls to a larger extent than middle-class parents. White's results indicated that both middle- and working-class mothers demanded immediate obedience, however, a significant differences appeared in that working-class mothers were more insistent than middle-class mothers.⁵ Miller and Swanson's findings indicated that middle-

³Urie Bronfenbrenner, "Some Familial Antecedents of Responsibility and Leadership in Adolescents," in L. Petrullo and B. M. Bass (eds.), Leadership and Interpersonal Behavior (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1961), pp. 248-249.

⁴Robert E. Sears, Eleanor E. Maccoby and Harry Levin, Patterns of Child-Rearing (Evanston, Illinois: Row, Peterson and Company, 1957), pp. 424-425.

⁵Matilda Sturn White, "Social Class, Child Rearing Practices and Child Behavior," American Sociological Review, 22 (December, 1957), pp. 708-709.

class mothers are more likely than working-class mothers to use symbolic punishment as opposed to physical punishment. Middle-class mothers were found to place more of an emphasis upon self-control and the internalization of norms of responsibility than working-class mothers.⁶ Littman et. al., however, found no significant differences in the kinds of discipline used between middle- and working-class families.⁷ The findings of Waters and Crandall, on the other hand, found that the higher the family status, mothers were less dictatorial toward their children and used "less severe" penalties for misbehavior. Lower-class mothers were more prone to use coercive suggestions and "more severe" penalties in disciplining children than middle-class mothers.⁸

The findings indicate that when differences are found between social classes in the use of disciplinary techniques, generally, the working-class parents are found to utilize discipline that is more object-oriented, more direct and "severe" as compared to middle-class parents. The present findings indicated that external behavior controls as opposed to internal behavior controls were utilized more frequently by working-class parents.

⁶Daniel R. Miller and Guy E. Swanson, The Changing American Parent (New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1958), pp. 708-709.

⁷Richard A. Littman, Robert C. A. Moore and John Pierce-Jones, "Social Class Differences in Child-Rearing: A Third Community for Comparison with Chicago and Newton," American Sociological Review, 22(December, 1957), pp. 698-700.

⁸Elinor Waters and Vaughn J. Crandall, "Social Class and Observed Maternal Behavior from 1940 to 1960." Child Development, 35(December, 1964), pp. 1030-1032.

The findings of previous studies seem to lend support to the present theoretical orientation that due to a differential participation in the systems and subsystems within society, a crystallization emerges or social class which styles a different way of life for its occupants. This style of life, in turn, affects the occupants of the family as they enact their roles.

HYPOTHESIS II was concerned with the effects of social class on the kinds of external behavior controls that are employed; specifically physical versus non-physical. The above hypothesis showed no differences between middle- and working-class parents in the use of physical discipline. The present findings are contradictory to the findings of McKinley who reported that lower-class fathers utilize physical discipline to a much larger extent than middle-class fathers.⁹ Kohn found that the use of physical discipline was similar in frequency for both middle- and working-class parents, however, there were dissimilarities in the conditions of its employment.¹⁰ The findings of Sears, Maccoby and Levin¹¹ and Miller and Swanson¹² indicated that physical discipline is used to a larger extent by working-class parents than middle-class parents.

The categorization of physical versus non-physical types of external behavior controls was used only pertaining to Hypothesis II. Classifying

⁹McKinley, op. cit., pp. 83-86.

¹⁰Kohn, op. cit., pp. 352-356.

¹¹Sears, Maccoby and Levin, op. cit., pp. 424-425.

¹²Miller and Swanson, op. cit., pp. 122-128.

techniques of discipline as psychological or non-physical versus physical appears to be a loose conceptualization. It can be seen that within the psychological or non-physical taxonomy, variations can be found ranging from yelling, ignoring, isolation, restriction of activities, explaining and restitution. Although none of these involves physical punishment, the absence of physical punishment should not immediately place them in the same category.

In the present findings, physical discipline was found to be only one of the several kinds of external behavior controls which would be utilized instead of being a main differentiating type of discipline.

An attempt was not made to ascertain whether methods of discipline were love-oriented, object-oriented, "more or less" severe, restrictive or permissive. Such classifications appear to be rather subjective and nebulous. The present analysis was concerned with the parental responses and parental explanations to acts hypothetically committed by their children. Parents may use a variety of techniques in disciplining but these techniques were simply viewed from whether they focused on the termination of the misbehavior, the immediate situation; or whether they focused more upon the intent of the act and the development of self-control.

Since no significant difference was found between middle- and working-class parents in the use of physical discipline, an attempt was made to ascertain whether parents of the social classes differed in the specific situations in which they would use external and internal behavior controls. Hypothesis I indicated that the middle- and working-class differed in the use of external and internal behavior controls.

Specific situations involving different types of misbehavior were analyzed. These specific situations were analyzed in terms of the employment of external and internal behavior controls rather than in terms of physical versus non-physical discipline.

In two specific situations when the child engaged in a tantrum and when the child snitches money produced significant differences at $P < .05$ between the middle- and working-class in the use of external and internal behavior controls. Working-class parents were found to resort more to external behavior controls and less to internal behavior controls than their middle-class counterparts.

In testing similar circumstances, Kohn found that working-class mothers had a much higher tendency to resort to physical discipline than did middle-class mothers.¹³ The three remaining situations of misbehavior involving "fibbing", promptness and hitting a neighbor child did not produce significant differences between the middle-class and the working-class in the use of external and internal behavior controls.

The difference between the two classes regarding their use of behavior controls in the situations of tantrum throwing and snitching and not in "fibbing," fighting and promptness may be an indication of a different style of life for the occupants of the two different classes. A note should be made that the situation involving fibbing was significant at ($P < .10$) indicating that the reaction to this situation seems to receive differential treatment with respect to social class. Perhaps hit-

¹³Kohn, op. cit., pp. 352-356.

ting another child and promptness are viewed as "normal" behavior for children and the types of disciplinary controls employed are concerned with rectifying the present situation.. In using discipline for hitting another child, middle-class parents more frequently chose internal behavior controls than working-class parents and working-class parents more frequently chose external behavior controls. Concerning promptness, where the child detained the family, middle-class parents had a higher frequency of external behavior controls than working-class parents. This difference in frequency was slight. It appears that in this latter situation, because of the inconvenience the child has caused the parent, the parents of both classes react to the inconvenience rather than the implications or consequences of such an act. This type of deviancy infringes upon the parents' rights. The hitting of another child does not infringe upon the parents' rights and at the same time, it may not be viewed as a serious of an act as snitching, "fibbing" or tantrum throwing.

The differences between classes in the use of controls in "fibbing," snitching and tantrums, however, could be interpreted as a response conditioned by the style of life and values of its occupants. In all three situations, working-class parents reported a higher frequency of external behavior control than their middle-class counterparts. Middle-class parents by reporting a higher usage of internal behavior controls than working-class parents seemed to view the situations in terms of the child's intent and future ramifications. The author feels that the differences in the use of controls, especially in these particular situations, is an indication of the different styles of life of the

class occupants.

Although tantrums and being late may both upset the parent, being late may have been responded to in terms of aggravation for infringement on parental rights. Tantrums, however, are not a direct infringement on parental rights and thusly, the techniques of discipline accorded may center on the immediate situation or on the future implications of such an act. Although the controls that the parents used in this situation differed, the explanations the parents gave for the use of the controls were similar. The discipline issued for snitching and "fibbing" also showed similar explanations given by the parents of both classes, yet again, the disciplinary techniques to accomplish the goal differed.

Hitting another child and promptness are not thought by this author to be significant differentiators between classes because of circumstances of these acts. Being late is an annoyance and inconvenience. Hitting another child may not be defined as serious since children participate in this kind of behavior. "Fibbing" and snitching, however, seem to carry moral implications or are considered more serious offenses. They may be dealt with in a more serious manner which is congruent with the family's values and attitudes toward life. The findings seem to indicate that parents of both social classes have similar goals in mind from the explanations they gave for disciplining but respond with different techniques. These techniques seem to be a response to their particular way of life.

HYPOTHESIS III was concerned with the effects that role and sex differentiation may produce in disciplining children in middle- and

working-class families. Although the null hypothesis could not be rejected at .05 level of significance, an analysis of the percentages compiled supported the assumption of differential treatment within classes with respect to the sex of the child and parent. External behavior controls were used to a larger extent on the same-sex child than on the cross-sex child. This tendency was more pronounced in the working-class family. Sears, Maccoby and Levine found that better educated mothers were less likely to differentiate appropriate behavior with respect to sex.¹⁴ Kohn reported similar findings in that middle-class mothers are not as likely to differentiate between the sexes when employing discipline as compared to working-class mothers.¹⁵ Bronfenbrenner found that parents were more demanding and firm with the same-sex child and more lenient and indulgent with the cross-sex child. This finding was more pronounced in the lower educational levels. When differential treatment was evident, the father is more likely to differentiate regarding the sex of the child than the mother.¹⁶ Bronson, Katten and Livson, however, found no significant differences of differential treatment of children with regard to sex.¹⁷ Emmerich's findings show fathers exerting more power toward sons than daughters and mothers more power toward

¹⁴Sears, Maccoby and Levin, op. cit., p. 434.

¹⁵Kohn, op. cit., pp. 353-355.

¹⁶Bronfenbrenner, op. cit., pp. 248-249.

¹⁷Wanda C. Bronson, Edith S. Katten and Norman Livson, "Patterns of Authority and Affection in Two Generations," Journal of American Social Psychology, 38(March , 1959), pp. 146-152.

daughters than sons.¹⁸ Elder and Bowerman found sons more often reporting the father as being dominant than reports from daughters.¹⁹

The present findings seem to indicate that a more egalitarian philosophy is pervasive in the middle-class families where the instrumental and expressive roles may not be as sharply differentiated. In both classes, the findings seem to indicate that parents feel that the disciplining of the cross-sex child is more of a responsibility of the same-sex parent. A special kind of insight seems to be attributed to the parent of the same sex child in that fathers should have more responsibility in disciplining sons and the mothers in disciplining their daughters. A comparison of responses from middle-class mothers and fathers regarding their daughters found that little differentiation was made in the use of external and internal behavior controls by either parent. Perhaps the idea prevails that daughters are "common property" but sons, on the other hand, should have more male supervision and guidance. In all other comparisons of middle-class parents to sons and working-class parents to sons and daughters, the same-sex parent used more external behavior controls on the same-sex child and more internal behavior controls on the cross-sex child. Thus, differentiation is operant in the family system as in any other system. The differentiation,

¹⁸Walter Emmerich, "Variations in the Parental Role as a Function of the Parent's Sex and the Child's Sex and Age," Merrill Palmer Quarterly, 8 (January, 1962), p. 7.

¹⁹Glen H. Elder, Jr. and Charles E. Bowerman, "Family Structure and Child-Rearing Patterns: The Effects of Family Size and Sex Composition," American Sociological Review, 28 (December, 1963), p. 896.

however, is not strongly enforced. The differentiation is undoubtedly affected by other variables which could either lessen or strengthen the lines of differentiation. It does appear, however, that disciplinary techniques administered to children are affected by the interpenetration of various systems surrounding the family as well as within the family. Sexual differentiation within the family also appears to contribute to the types of disciplinary techniques utilized as well as who will employ the techniques.

From the present findings, theoretical assumptions were both supported and questioned. Such findings should serve as a catalyst for further re-searching. The findings which indicated that social class affects the use of disciplinary techniques should be further researched to clarify the relationship. This last step requires the investigator to return to the first step of posing new questions regarding his theoretical assumption.

CONCLUSIONS AND SUGGESTIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

The problem presented in Chapter I has been pursued but not resolved. From the present empirical findings, social class does have an effect upon the use of disciplinary techniques. The relationship, however, is not strong. The question then is raised, how strong should the relationship be in order to validate the assumptions of the effects of class differences? If the differences that exist among social classes are continuous rather than clearly demarcated by tangible boundaries,²⁰ cor-

²⁰Kurt B. Mayer, Class and Society (New York: Random House, 1966) p. 8.

respondingly, the effects or patterns which result from class memberships will be continuous rather than categorical. Another question is raised whether the sole reliance upon an objective approach to social class is obscuring the continuous differences that exist among social classes.

In order to obtain a more vivid picture of the reality of class, perhaps the subjective approach to class should be used in conjunction with the objective approach. The present research as well as research completed by previous investigators utilized the objective method of class assignment. A re-search should be conducted to determine the effects that aspirations or class identifications have upon the family. The sole reliance upon the objective approach to social class may be blurring the relationship of social class and disciplinary techniques since it has no way of tapping the identification of the members. A family may be classified as middle- or working-class by objective criteria yet their behavior may be oriented in another direction depending upon the class identification they hold.

Questions along the same line should be posed to the parents with respect to the sources they may consult or to whom they refer regarding questions pertaining to the disciplining of their child. Such an inquiry would also aid in establishing their class identification.

The categorization of disciplinary techniques may also be clouding a more explanatory phenomenon. If the present findings were to be re-searched, parents would also be directly asked if they employ discipline which focuses upon the immediate deviant act, or upon stressing the development of internalized self-controls. Parents would also be

questioned as to why they differ in their employment of discipline with reference to different deviant acts committed, and with respect to the sex of the child. Research situations perpetually create different inquiries concerning the theoretical assumptions and this questioning should also filter into the queries posed to the respondents.

Another variable which may have an effect upon the relationship of social class and disciplinary techniques is the age of the child. Discipline administered to children of nursery school age may differ from discipline administered to twelve year old children. This question may be approached by selecting families who have children of both ages to determine if the age of the child has an effect upon the use of disciplinary techniques.

In addition to the concern raised over the age of the child, an attempt should also be made to interview the subject child. The present study departed from previous studies in its inclusion of couples instead of solely relying upon the responses of only one parent. The present departure could also be strengthened by the inclusion of the subject child.

CONCLUSIONS

The present findings are ^{not} supportive of the theoretical assumption that social class has an effect upon disciplinary techniques used by parents. Significant differences at $P < .01$ indicate that the use of external controls will be more pronounced in working-class than in middle-class families and that the use of internal controls will be more pronounced in middle-class families than working-class families. The use of physical discipline as affected by class produced no sig-

nificant differences. The hypothetical prediction of the effects of sexual differentiation within the family on disciplinary techniques was not statistically significant at $P < .05$ but did show percentage differences.

This author feels that different questions and techniques must be utilized to test the same phenomenon. A reliance upon similar questions and techniques as used by previous investigators may only be adding to sterility and obscurity instead of clarifying the relationship of social class and disciplinary techniques.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

A. BOOKS

- Barber, Bernard. Social Stratification. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc., 1957.
- Berelson, Bernard and Gary A. Steiner. Human Behavior. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, 1964.
- Brown, Roger. Social Psychology. New York: The Free Press, 1965.
- Cuber, John F. and Wm. F. Kenkel. Social Stratification. New York: Appeltion-Century-Crofts Inc., 1954.
- Dubin, Robert. Theory Building. New York: The Free Press, 1969.
- Hodges, Harold M. Jr. Social Stratification. Cambridge, Mass: Schenkman Publishing Co., 1964.
- Kahl, Joseph A. The American Class Structure. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1957.
- Lenski, Gerhard. Power and Privilege. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1966.
- Mayer, Kurt B. Class and Society. New York: Random House, 1966.
- Merton, Robert K. Social Theory and Social Structure. New York: The Free Press, 1968.
- McKinley, Donald Gilbert. Social Class and Family Life. New York: The Free Press of Glencoe, 1964.
- Miller, Daniel R., and Guy E. Swanson. The Changing American Parent. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1958.
- Parsons, Talcott and Robert F. Bales. Family, Socialization and Interaction Process. Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1955.
- Reissman, Leonard. Class in American Society. New York: The Free Press, 1959.
- Sears, Robert R., Eleanor E. Maccoby and Harry Levin. Patterns of Child-Rearing. Evanston, Illinois: Row, Peterson and Co., 1957.
- Warner, Lloyd., and Paul S. Lunt. The Social Life of a Modern Community. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1941.

B. PERIODICALS

- Bronson, Wanda C., Edith S. Katten and Norman Livson, "Patterns of Authority and Affection in Two Generations," Journal of American Social Psychology, 38:143-152, 1959.
- Davis, Allison and Robert J. Havighurst, "Social Class and Color Differences in Child-Rearing," American Sociological Review, 11:678-710, 1946.
- Elder, Glen H. Jr., and Charles E. Bowerman, "Family Structure and Child-Rearing Patterns: The Effects of Family Size and Sex Composition," American Sociological Review, 28:891-905, 1963.
- Emmerich, Walter, "Variations in the Parent Role as a Function of the Parent's Sex and the Child's Sex and Age," Merrill Palmer Quarterly, 8:3-11, 1962.
- Havighurst, Robert and Allison Davis, "A Comparison of the Chicago and Harvard Studies of Social Class Differences in Child-Rearing," American Sociological Review, 20:438-442, 1955.
- Kohn, Melvin L., "Allocation of Parental Responsibility," Sociometry, 23:372-392, 1960.
- _____, "Exercise of Parental Authority," American Sociological Review, 24:352-366, 1959.
- _____, "Parent-Child Relationships," American Journal of Sociology, 68:471-480, 1963.
- _____, "Social Class and Parental Values," American Journal of Sociology, 64:337-351, 1959.
- Littman, Richard A., Robert C.A. Moore and John Pierce-Jones, "Social Class Differences in Child-Rearing: A Third Community for Comparison with Chicago and Newton," American Sociological Review, 22:694-704, 1957.
- Water, Elinor and Vaughn J. Crandall, "Social Class and Observed Maternal Behavior from 1940 to 1960," Child Development, 35:1021-1032, 1957.
- White, Matilda Sturn, "Social Class, Child-Rearing Practices and Child Behavior," American Sociological Review, 22:704-712, 1957.

C. ESSAYS AND ARTICLES IN COLLECTIONS

- Bronfenbrenner, Urie. "Socialization and Social Class Through Time and Space," in Rinehard Bendix and Seymour Martin Lipset (eds.). Class, Status and Power. New York: The Free Press, 1966. Pp 362-377.

_____. "Some Familial Antecedents of Responsibility and Leadership in Adolescents," in L. Petrullo and B. M. Bass (eds.). Leadership and Interpersonal Behavior. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1961. Pp. 239-269.

_____. "The Changing American Child---A Speculative Analysis," in Neil J. Smelser and William T. Smelser (eds.). Personality and Social Systems. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1963. Pp. 347-356.

Davis, W. Allison. "Child Rearing in the Class Structure of American Society," in Marvin B. Sussman (ed.). Sourcebook in Marriage and the Family. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1963. Pp. 225-231.

Ericson, Martha. "Social Status and Child Rearing Practices," in T. M. Newcombe and Eugene L. Hartley (eds.). Readings in Social Psychology. New York: Henry Holt and Co., 1947. Pp. 494-501.

D. PUBLICATIONS

Hollingshead, A. B. "Two-Factor Index of Social Position," New Haven: privately printed, 1957.

APPENDIX A

RESPONDENT NUMBER _____ DATE _____

TIME INTERVIEW BEGAN: _____ TIME INTERVIEW ENDED: _____

CIRCLE ONE: HUSBAND

WIFE

This interview is designed to give us an understanding of parent-child behavior. This is an area in which we need much more information. Before we begin, let me express a word of caution. We have found that in answering our questions, people will often naturally try to put their best foot forward, so to speak. They will tell us what they think we want to hear rather than what they really believe to be true, or they will tell us how they wish they behaved, rather than how they usually act. Therefore, at the very beginning we want to encourage you to be completely frank in answering our questions. There are no right and wrong answers. We are interested in how you as parents go about the business of raising your children. And, of course, we want to remind you that you may be completely confident that what you report this evening will be used only for scientific study and will never at any time be identified with you personally.

Now, since we are interested in your children and your role as a parent, we would like to start by getting the names and ages of your children:

NAME (FIRST NAME ONLY) All Children	AGE	SEX	SCHOOL GRADE
_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____

SELECT THE BOY OR GIRL 11 or 12 YEARS OLD.

We will ask all of our questions about _____.

Are the children in parochial school?

Television has become an important part of our lives today. We'd like to find out some of the patterns of television viewing of children like _____.

1. How much time would you estimate that _____ spent watching T. V. last week? _____ hours

2. Is that amount about normal? Yes _____ No _____

What would you say is the normal amount of time that _____ watches T. V.?

3. Do you have any rules for _____'s TV watching? No _____ Yes _____

What are they?

What are your reasons for having these rules?

4. Can you recall ever discussing scientific contributions of space shots, for example, their importance, with _____ while watching the TV coverage? No _____ Yes _____

Would you say that you did this

always _____
often _____
sometimes _____
seldom _____
never _____

5. Can you recall ever discussing moral lessons, for example, kindness to those less fortunate than you or to animals or interracial relations or the like when you were watching movies on TV with _____? No _____

Yes _____

Would you say that you did this

always _____
often _____
sometimes _____
seldom _____
never _____

6. Can you recall ever discussing TV programs about great Americans with _____? No _____

Yes _____

Would you say that you do this

always _____

often _____

sometimes _____

seldom _____

never _____

Now I am going to read you stories about situations which might be like something that you could expect to happen with _____. Whether or not this has ever happened, try to think what you would do if it did come up, and tell me. Again, please tell us what you think you would do, not what you think you ought to do. (To interviewer: Probe question, if parent does not answer with a punishment,--"What if the same thing happened again?")

1. Suppose you give _____ permission to go to the park with some friends, and find out later that he (she) has actually gone downtown instead of to the park. What would you most likely do when he (she) comes home?

Why?

2. Suppose you look out the window and you see _____ get angry and haul off and hit a neighbor without a good reason. What would you most likely do? _____ boy (girl) (use same sex as child)

Why?

3. Suppose _____ has been expecting to go swimming on Saturday, and it becomes impossible for some good reason. When you inform him (her) that he (she) can't go, he (she) begins to cry and runs from the room, slamming the door very hard behind him (her).

What would you most likely do?

Why is that?

4. Imagine that you discover _____ snitching pocket money from your (your wife's) purse.

What would you most likely do?

Why is that?

5. Suppose _____ leaves his (her) personal belongings lying all over the house for you and your (wife/husband) to pick up.

What would you most likely do?

Why?

7. Suppose you are going to visit friends on a Sunday afternoon and _____, who knows you plan to leave in ten minutes, goes out to play. When it's time to leave you can't find him (her). After 30 minutes you locate him (her) at a friend's house.

What would you most likely do?

Why is that?

8. Do you allow _____ to date in the sense of going to a party at a home of some friend where there will be an equal number of boys and girls?

Yes _____

No _____

Why?

9. What do you think of the old saying, "Spare the rod and spoil the child."

- d 10. Who in your family really has the final say about things concerning _____'s discipline, e.g. staying out late, getting special privileges, etc? HAND CARD

- _____ 1. Really up to husband
 _____ 2. Mainly up to husband, but wife's opinion counts a lot
 _____ 3. Both parents about equal, but a little more up to husband
 _____ 4. Both parents exactly equal
 _____ 5. Both parents about equal, but a little more up to wife
 _____ 6. Mainly up to wife, but husband's opinion has counted a lot
 _____ 7. Really up to wife.

11. Do you ever feel unsure of yourself when you deal with _____?
Would you say that this happens:

- _____ always
- _____ often
- _____ sometimes
- _____ occasionally
- _____ never

12. Do you think your husband (wife) is ever unsure of himself (herself) when he (she) deals with _____? Would you say that he (she) feels unsure:

- _____ always
- _____ often
- _____ sometimes
- _____ occasionally
- _____ never

13. Do you have a religious preference? Yes _____ (skip to 13c)

No _____ (ask 13a)

(a) Have you ever belonged to a religious congregation? Yes _____ (ask 13b)
Which? (be specific) No _____ (skip to 14)

(b) When did you leave it?

(c) What is your religion? (be very specific)

(d) Have you always been a _____? Yes _____ (skip to 14)

No _____ (ask 13e)

(e) What was your previous religious affiliation?

(f) When did you change?

(g) Why did you change?

14. How often do you attend religious services?

- _____ once a week or more
- _____ once or twice a month
- _____ less than once a month
- _____ never

15. How important would you say your religion is to you? Would you say

- _____ extremely important
- _____ very important
- _____ rather important
- _____ not very important
- _____ not at all important

16. Which one of you is primarily responsible for _____.

	Father	Mother	Both	Neither
Attending weekly services				
Attending other than the major weekly service				
Praying before meals				
Praying before bedtime				
Participation in family devotions				

17. How important do you think it is that _____

	Very important	Important	Not very important	Not at all important
Attend church services every week?				
Attend other than the major religious service every week?				
Pray before meals?				
Pray before bedtime?				
Participate in family devotion e.g. evening prayers, bible reading, etc.				

18. We are used to using thermometers to measure heat. Let's use this same device to estimate how you feel about your religion.

- (a) For example, if valuable were at 100 and worthless at 0, where would you rate your feelings? _____
- (b) If strong were 100, and weak were 0? _____
- (c) If deep were 100, and shallow were 0? _____
- (d) If active were 100, and passive were 0? _____
- (e) If fair were 100, and unfair were 0? _____

ard
II

19. Which of the following is primarily responsible for teaching a child (Mark "1" for primary reason, "2" for second reason.) Which is the second most important?

	School	Church	Family	None
How to treat those from different races				
Personal responsibility				
Responsibility to others				
Concern for those with less than he/she has materially				
Sexual standards				
Religious behavior				
Tolerance of others opinions				
Patriotism				

rd I 20. Here are some reasons different people have given for wanting to have their children finish a certain amount of education. Which one of these would you say is most important? (HAND CARD) Least important? (Mark "M" for most and "L" for least)

1. _____ To obtain a better job or income
2. _____ To obtain a broader outlook on life
3. _____ To improve one's social position in the community
4. _____ To be helpful to other people
5. _____ To use their special abilities or talents
6. _____ To develop personality
7. _____ To develop moral standards

21. How far would you like _____ to go in school?
 (Don't read choices)
 Don't know _____
 High School _____
 Some college _____
 Finish college _____
 Trade school after high school _____
 Professional education _____

22. How far do you think realistically that _____ will go in school?
 (Don't read choices)
 Don't know _____
 High School _____
 Some college _____
 Finish college _____
 Trade school after high school _____
 Professional education _____

23. Here are three different kinds of jobs. If you were advising _____ who had to make a choice among the three, which would you feel he should pick?

1. _____ A job which pays a moderate income but which he/she is sure of keeping.
2. _____ A job which pays a good income but which there is a 50/50 chance of losing.
3. _____ A job which pays an extremely good income if he/she makes the grade, but in which they will lose almost everything if they don't make it.

24. What would you prefer as a life career for _____?

25. What do you expect as a life career for _____?

26. Which of these statements do you agree with most completely?

_____ Mothers have a right to a career

_____ Mothers may work if it is desirable to supplement the family income

_____ Mothers should remain at home with their families

_____ Part time work for mothers is all right provided that the children are taken care of

27. Would you simply tell me whether you agree or disagree with these statements: (if agree with qualification code agree; same for disagree)

- a. In a family it is the husband who usually should make the most important decisions.
- b. A married woman with small children at home should have complete freedom to compete with men for any job she desires.
- c. It is a good thing for a husband and wife occasionally to take separate vacations.
- d. Most ^{parents} parents in these times are not strict enough with their children.
- e. A wife should give up her own occupation if that will help in her husband's success.

	Agree	Disagree	NA
a.			
b.			
c.			
d.			
e.			

28. Now, we are interested in what people call work. Which one of these statements best explains the difference between something you would call work and something you would not call work: (Interviewer: Enter "1" in the appropriate blank below.)
Now, in your opinion, which one of the statements is the second best explanation of the difference between something you would call work and something you would not call work: (Interviewer: Enter "2" in the appropriate blank below.)

- ard
VI
1. _____ Work is not enjoyed, not liked.
 2. _____ Work is exertion, physical or mental.
 3. _____ Work is something for which you are paid.
 4. _____ Work is required, something you have to do.
 5. _____ Work is something productive; a contribution.
 6. _____ Work is scheduled and done regularly.

29. If you had enough money to live comfortably without working would you:

1. _____ feel better
2. _____ feel the same
3. _____ feel worse
0. _____ does not apply

30. If you didn't have a job, but did have enough money to live comfortably without working would you:

1. _____ feel better
2. _____ feel the same
3. _____ feel worse
0. _____ does not apply

31. ✓ Some things about our jobs are more important than others. Listed on this card (Interviewer: HAND RESPONDENT CARD) are eight statements given by a group of people as things they considered important about their jobs. In your opinion, which one of these statements best explains what you think (would think) most important about your job? (Interviewer: Enter "1" in the appropriate blank below.)
Now, in your opinion, which one of the statements is the second best explanation of what you think (would think) important about your job? (Interviewer: Enter "2" in the appropriate blank below.)

- ard
VII
1. _____ enables me to make a good living for myself and my family
 2. _____ a way of filling the day or passing the time
 3. _____ a source of self respect
 4. _____ gives me the chance to be with people
 5. _____ gives purpose to my life
 6. _____ provides a secure future for me and my family
 7. _____ a way of getting recognition and respect from others
 8. _____ provides me with new and interesting experiences

Interviewer _____

Field Number _____

Respondent Number _____

Summary remarks - (Include such things as estimate of respondent's cooperativeness, brief description of the house - size, state of repair or anything else of interest.)

APPENDIX B

We are conducting a scientific survey designed to study Omaha parents and their patterns of raising children. Your cooperation is appreciated for we feel that you can make an important contribution to the scientific understanding of this area of family life. We think also that you will find that this is a very interesting experience.

Two graduate students from the University of Omaha will contact you within the next few days. We would like the opportunity to interview both of you at the same time. The interview will take about 30 to 45 minutes. Information that you give us will be used for scientific purposes, and your answers will be treated with the strictest confidence.

Thank you for your courtesy.

Sincerely yours,

Cora A. Martin, Ph.D.
Director, Research on Family Life