

REPRINT FROM
ACTA ACADEMIAE PAEDAGOGICAE JYVÄSKYLÄENSIS XIX

I. PARENTAL ATTITUDES
AND CHILD-REARING PRACTICES:
A METHODOLOGICAL STUDY

BY
MARTTI TAKALA, TAPIO NUMMENMAA,
AND URPO KAURANNE

CENTRE FOR EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH, JYVÄSKYLÄ

JYVÄSKYLÄ 1960

I. PARENTAL ATTITUDES
AND CHILD-REARING PRACTICES:
A METHODOLOGICAL STUDY

BY

MARTTI TAKALA, TAPIO NUMMENMAA,
AND URPO KAURANNE

CENTRE FOR EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH, JYVÄSKYLÄ

JYVÄSKYLÄ 1960

URN:ISBN:978-951-39-8608-7
ISBN 978-951-39-8608-7 (PDF)
ISSN 2736-8475

K. J. Gummerus Osakeyhtiön
kirjapainossa Jyväskylässä 1960

CONTENTS

I.	Introduction	9
11.	Early Studies of Parental Attitudes	9
12.	'Direct' and 'Indirect' Methods in Attitude Research	12
13.	The Problems	14
II.	Dimensions of Parental Attitudes as Revealed by Previous Studies ...	15
21.	Classificatory Descriptions	15
211.	Overprotection	15
212.	Rejection	15
213.	Indulgence	16
214.	Hostility	16
215.	Dominance	17
216.	Ambition	17
22.	Dimensional Descriptions	17
221.	Development of Dimensional Studies	17
222.	A Comparison of the Results on Parental Attitudes	19
223.	General Social Attitudes and Parental Child-Rearing Attitudes	23
III.	Experimental Procedure	25
31.	General Characteristics of the Method	25
32.	The Techniques	26
321.	Child-Rearing Practices Interview	26
322.	Orally Presented Questionnaire of Child-Rearing Preferences	28
323.	Rating of Parent Behaviour	29
324.	Projective Attitude Test	29
33.	Collection of the Data	30
331.	Experiments and Interview	30
332.	The Groups Studied	31
34.	Scoring and Analysis of the Data	32
341.	Interview	32
342.	Preference Questionnaire	33
343.	Rating	34
344.	Projective Attitude Test	34
IV.	The Results of the Single Techniques	35
41.	Child-Rearing Practices Interview	35
411.	The Clusters	35
412.	Factor Analysis of the Clusters IX—XI	43
413.	Discussion	48
414.	The Intercorrelations of the Interview Clusters	49

42.	Orally Presented Questionnaire of Child-Rearing Preferences	49
421.	The Scales	49
422.	The Intercorrelations of the Scales	55
43.	Ratings	55
431.	Rating Factors	55
432.	The Intercorrelations of the Rating Factors	59
44.	Projective Attitude Test	59
441.	The Categories and Reliabilities	59
442.	Interrelation of the Categories	59
V.	Comparisons Between Different Techniques	62
51.	Factor Analysis	62
52.	Comparisons in a Selected Sample	65
53.	Discussion and Conclusions	65
531.	Comparison of the Techniques	66
532.	Comparison Between Child-Rearing Practices and Attitudes	66
533.	Conclusions	67
	Appendix I	68
	References	71

PREFACE

The present studies are the first papers in a series of investigations aimed at elucidating methodological and empirical problems of child rearing practices and attitudes and their relationships with child development which have been made at the *Department of Psychology of the School of Education in Jyväskylä* as well as at the *Centre for Educational Research*. The empirical material was collected already in 1955—56, and therefore, it has not been possible to consider the recent studies of parental attitudes in planning these studies. Other reports will be published simultaneously, mainly in Finnish. Several new investigations based on these results have been begun at the Centre for Educational Research.

The systematic cooperation of several persons has been a prerequisite of the accomplishment of this investigation. The interviews of mothers and teachers, systematic observations of children at schools, test investigations of children (the data connected with child development are not included in these reports) were carried out by Miss *Seija Jokipaltio*, Miss *Hellin Tynni*, Mr. *Lauri Kokkonen*, Mr. *Veli Nurmi*, and others. Mr. Kokkonen participated also in the planning of the study. The task of the interviewers was not very easy, since the program was large, but they succeeded in finding all the mothers who had been selected. A great many persons have participated in the treatment of empirical material. Especially, the Head of the Statistical Unit of the Centre for Educational Research, Mr. *Pentti Pitkänen*, and the personnel of the Centre have given valuable support and help in all the stages of the statistical analysis of results.

The work of translation of Dr. *Annika Takala's* report was done by Mrs. *Eva Palmgren*. Prof. *Anna S. Elonen*, Ann Arbor, Mich., has read both the manuscripts and made great many suggestions for corrections of both language and content.

Our very best thanks are due to all these above-mentioned persons.

We wish further express our indebtedness to the Ministry of Education, to the Central Board for Scientific Research of Finnish Government, as well as to the President of the University College of Jyväskylä for the fellowships granted to us for these studies.

I. INTRODUCTION

11. Early Studies of Parental Attitudes

Interest in research on child rearing practices, attitudes of parents and educators, as well as in the influence of the practices and attitudes on child development has increased very rapidly. The field of investigation has greatly expanded recently in the contrast to the scattered beginnings in the U.S. in the thirties. However, there are still few studies which can be compared with each other and which should constitute a systematic and general background for the theory on child development.

The early studies concentrated on the examination of individual attitudes which were supposed to cause behaviour disturbances and maladjustment in children. The investigations were carried out by clinical methods, statistical comparisons, if any, were based on case material (e.g. *Levy* 1930, 1933, *Fitz-Simons* 1935, *Newell* 1934, 1936). The description of attitudes was usually restricted to classificatory or typological level, although at times dichotomous categories were regarded as extremes of a single dimension. The main attitude categories of these studies were *overprotection* (*Levy* 1930) and *rejection* (*Ferenczi* 1929) which were also given other names. Since the categories were not defined in the same way in different studies, it is extremely difficult to explain the apparent discrepancies between the results of the different investigations.

On the basis of the clinical studies on overprotection/rejection attitudes, attention was focussed on the developmental disturbances of institutionalized children (*Bowlby* 1952 and others). Because of overgeneralizations, the interpretation of these results has been criticized.

When the results for the clinical or institutionalized groups are applied to child-rearing problems within normal families, the differences between the samples cannot be overlooked. The former is heavily weighted with cases of extreme parental attitudes, and since the relationship between attitudes and child development may not be linear, it is not possible to predict the effect of parental attitudes and practices on the basis of only the atypical cases. The effects of smaller deviations of practice within normal family environment may vary, not only in quantity, but also in quality from the effects reported in extreme cases.

The relationships between parents and children have been described more systematically on the basis of human relations. The dimension called *domination/integration* in connection with teachers' attitudes served as the starting point for attitude descriptions (*Anderson* 1939 a, b, 1946 a, b, *Barker & al.* 1943). The authoritarian and democratic climates which were considered in certain ways to be in juxtaposition to each other, were made distinct in the studies of leadership (*Lewin & al.* 1939, *Lippitt* 1940, 1943). The *authoritarian/democratic* dimension turned out to be the core, not only in leadership problems, but also in attitude studies. It was regarded as a general attitude dimension which also was supposed to reflect child-rearing practices. Although the scales developed by *Adorno & al.* (1950) were not directed at parental attitudes, some single items refer to them. In addition, the results of *Frenkel-Brunswik's* interview study seem to (*Adorno & al.* 1950) indicate that there might be a close connection between the adult's attitudes concerning the authoritarian/democratic dimension and his childhood experiences.

Even in these studies either a classificatory (*Lewin, Lippitt, Anderson*), or a unidimensional description was maintained. In the study of *Adorno & al.* the correlations between different scales were usually very high and the personality structure of »authoritarian» people was interpreted on the basis of one hypothetical cluster of traits. It attempted to explain that the variance of the child's personality development to a great extent was the result of the parents' A/D (authoritarian/democratic) attitude. To present this as a general attitude factor is obviously as great an overgeneralization as is the use of a general intelligence factor for group factors. The justification of this procedure in the present case is still more questionable since the results of *Adorno & al.* reveal that the unidimensional description has been achieved by failing to take into account large portion of the variance of attitudes.

Although the correlation is high between the different attitude scales by *Adorno*, one cannot conclude that the A/D attitude would be a general and the most important dimension. Since the construction of the scales was, *viz.*, directed towards variables which would have high correlations one did not attempt to form the individual scales on a single dimension. The intercorrelations between different items mentioned by the authors (*Adorno & al.* 1950, p. 261) indicate that the scales cannot be unidimensional and that the common factor is not strong (see also *Christie & Garcia* 1951). It was also maintained by the authors (*Adorno & al.* 1950) that the organization of the authoritarian personality would be more homogenous and that the interindividual differences between non-authoritarian people would be greater.

If the »authoritarian personality» is defined as a very restricted class and if all the persons remaining outside this class are classified as non-authoritarian personalities, this statement is true *per definitionem*. — On the other hand, the assertion can also mean that the intercorrelations between different attitudes and personality traits would be higher for the authoritarian group than for other selected groups. This hypothesis would agree with the hypotheses on personality differentiation; however, we lack empirical verification. Similar hypotheses have been presented in connection with child-rearing attitudes (*Baldwin* 1954).

The scope of the studies with the A/D attitudes has been too much restricted because of this unidimensional approach. The methods and results of *Adorno & al.* have been strongly criticized (e.g. *Christie & Garcia* 1951, *Christie & Jahoda* 1954, *Hofstätter* 1954), but more extensive attempts have not yet been made to control and verify them. The research hypotheses related to the authoritarian personality have usually been greatly simplified: The authoritarian attitude has been regarded as the central factor causing neurotic traits or maladjustment or as a symptom of behaviour disturbances (e.g. *Anderson* 1939, 1951, *Ephron* 1941, *Zilboorg* 1941, *Frenkel-Brunswik* 1948, 1951). Other environmental factors have been neglected: The effect of the authoritarian attitude may be different in different cultural and social environments. The factors in the »authoritarian attitude» have not been analyzed which contribute to behaviour disturbances, lack of initiative, etc. The differences between the immediate and the delayed effects of the parents' authoritarian attitude in child behaviour have not been investigated. The classification of human beings on the basis of pure A/D dimension could be misleading as may be shown by cross-cultural studies.

On the basis of these critical comments the following requirements can be made of future investigations of attitudes in regard to child rearing and educational problems: The systematic description of attitudes must be made on the basis of relatively general attitude factors

1. which permit taking into account the whole variation of attitudes to a greater extent than hitherto as well as comparing them to other general attitude dimensions;
2. which are in accordance with other personality development hypotheses (not only with that of *Adorno & al.*);
3. which offer greater possibilities for the prediction of the effects of child-rearing practices.

For the present the most important results on the factors or «clusters» or «syndromes» of parental attitudes have been attained in the Fels-Institute studies on parent-child-relationships. The attitude dimensions of previous investigations will be reviewed briefly.

12. 'Direct' and 'Indirect' Methods in Attitude Research

The direct verbal questioning of preferences is the most common method of attitude measurement (*Edwards 1957*). If the attitude is defined as a readiness or tendency to react in a certain manner (*McNemar 1946*), a new problem will arise: To what extent it is possible to predict from the verbal attitude statements how the person will behave outside the paper-pencil-test. Especially, one should question whether there is any correlation between verbal statements and action when such attitudes are under consideration which the individual is unaware of having formulated and cannot express them verbally or which he does not wish to admit openly (*McNemar 1946*). Since direct questioning is not always useful, «indirect» methods disguising the purpose have had to be developed (e.g. *Dubin 1940, Proshansky 1943, Murray & Morgan 1945, Hammond 1948, Campbell 1950, Cattell 1948, 1950, 1952, 1958, McGinnies 1953, Edwards 1957*). The relationships between these different disguised techniques and direct attitude scales have not yet been clarified. In some cases positive correlations have been obtained. *Campbell (1950)* summarized the results as follows: »In numerous instances reported here, considerable correlation has been demonstrated between responses to direct and to indirect tests, justifying the hypothesis that a common attitude lies behind them. Missing

is the demonstration that this pattern of consistency extends beyond paper and pencil to the »real-life« situations which are usually in mind when the concept of 'attitude' is used.» The assumption of a common factor between direct and indirect techniques, however, is not supported by the results or the principles of construction of projective techniques (e.g. *Rotter* 1954, *McClelland & al.* 1953, *Atkinson & al.* 1958). On the contrary, it may be assumed that only in those cases in which the attitude is accepted by the person and is in agreement with social norms of the community in question high positive correlation between »direct« and »indirect« measures might be obtained (*Allport* 1953). Negative correlations could be obtained in the cases when the attitude is repressed or suppressed and does not correspond to the »Ego-ideal« or the social norms. Suggestions for a more useful definition of an attitude and for better methods have been made by *Cattell* (1949).

If the attitude studies are carried out with selected groups, e.g. among teachers or parents from upper social classes, direct questions seem to be more useful, as the subjects hold definitive opinions on child rearing or educational problems and their reaction tendencies are not determined by selection or other personal purposes. In groups in which the attitudes are not consciously held or stated direct questioning is often interpreted as a »test of educational knowledge«. The interviewees are concerned whether they can give the »right answers«, i.e. to respond according to generally accepted norms. Also in the cases in which educational ideals are formulated consciously there is no guaranty of positive correlations between attitudes and policies.

Up to the present, few attempts have been made to clarify the different »layers« of the attitudes. The studies by *Wittenborn* (1956) and *Adorno & al.* (1950) are the exceptions. The influence of the insufficient knowledge of the relationship between indirect methods and behaviour on the arbitrariness of conclusions in the diagnostic work has been described by e.g. *Rotter* (1954) and *Takala* (1953).

Before more knowledge can be gained different types of methods, direct questioning, »indirect« questioning, and projective techniques must be used simultaneously. (»Indirect« questioning can be regarded as a projective measure which can be scored objectively and is more structured than the usual projective techniques.)

13. The Problems

The investigation to be reported was carried out in 1954—58 by the Department of Psychology of the *School of Education in Jyväskylä*. The *Centre for Educational Research* was responsible for the statistical treatment of the results. Children from the 4th grade in the primary school (10—11 years) and their mothers were chosen from different social-class groups in four different communities. In part the investigation was a methodological pilot study. Since it is not possible to plan very extensive projects in Finland the research was designed so that new facts could be obtained simultaneously on the differences between various child-rearing atmospheres and environments as well as on the relationships between the environmental factors and child development.

The first of these reports will be restricted to the following methodological problems:

1. What primary dimensions of child-rearing attitudes can be detected? To what extent are the different dimensions independent of each other and is it possible to find any general factor, e.g. second-order factor?
2. What are the relationships between the child-rearing attitudes and the practices the parent report they use in special educational situations?
3. What are the relationships between the attitude «clusters» or scales which have been obtained by the different methods:
 - a) direct questioning
 - b) ratings
 - c) projective techniques

A partial replication study was made later at one of the communities by using corrected techniques.

II. DIMENSIONS OF PARENTAL ATTITUDES AS REVEALED BY PREVIOUS STUDIES

21. Classificatory Descriptions

The earlier descriptions of parental attitudes were classificatory. Also a portion can be interpreted in terms of a dimensional approach, even though the relationship between the different classes remains indistinct and they are not perceived similarly by the different investigators. Often the labels given to attitudes are not precise, as e.g. »inadequate mothering» (*Ribble 1944*), »parental emotional stability» (*Malcove 1945*).

In the following list only the most common classifications are included. The psychoanalytic observations of love, hate, and anxiety in child upbringing usually were the starting point of later investigations (*Freud 1933, Ferenczi 1924, Flugel 1939, Symonds 1937*).

211. Overprotection

Overprotection may be defined according to the following characteristics of maternal care, which are included in most of the definitions and occur first in *Levy's* studies (1931):

- excessive contact of mother with child
- prolongation of infant care
- prevention of development of independent behaviour
- lack or excess of maternal control

Overprotection, defined in approximately the same way, is found in the following studies: *Sewall, Levy, Ross, Shane, Zimmermann, Knight, Kasanin & al., Newell, Hattwick, Hattwick & Stowell, Silberpfennig, Symonds*. The last criterion mentioned by *Levy* indicates that he was also aware of other variables of parental attitudes.

212. Rejection

Rejection may be defined as the other extreme of overprotection. The following characteristics are usually considered belonging to the concept (*Symonds 1949*):

- neglect of the child
- separation of child from the parent
- denial of the child

- maltreatment of the child
- use of threats
- humiliation of child

The various investigators have differed markedly on two points: a) By some overprotection is regarded as the extreme of the rejection dimension, by others as a different class. *Symonds* (1938, 1939) considers acceptance as the opposite of rejection. From the viewpoint of the psychoanalytic theory *Symonds'* view would be sounder, since the same basic attitude can be revealed either as overprotection or as rejection.

b) In the most simplified descriptions, the definition of rejection also includes the punishment of and aggression towards children (e.g. *Symonds* 1949). On the other hand, the expression of aggression and use of punishment can result, for instance, from the parents' poor frustration tolerance, occasional situational factors or aggressively-toned ideals of parents, which *a priori* cannot be included with rejection as it was stated.

Different variations of rejection has been investigated by the following: *Ferenczi, Lewis, Levy, Ross, Zimmermann, Ginsberg, Knight, Kasanin & al., Newell, Childers, Hattwick, Symonds, Burgum.*

213. *Indulgence*

According to *Symonds* indulgence results from uncontrolled affection. Overprotection, on the other hand, would be caused by anxiety. The distinction is not always clear, although it is possible to ascribe different «mechanisms» to these attitudes. In the psychoanalytic theory indulgence has been interpreted as a reaction formation following the repression of rejection (*Flugel* 1939). This trait is mentioned by *Levy* in a similar way (1930), *Zimmermann*, 1931 (although his terminology overprotection-oversolicitous is different), and *Hattwick*, 1936 (his term overattentiveness includes an overprotective as well as overindulgent attitude).

214. *Hostility*

Hostility may be regarded as a further step in the rejection attitude and is referred to in the following studies: *Sewall, Newell, Silberpfennig, Symonds.*

215. *Dominance*

Dominance has been defined in different ways. The opposite extreme (or class) of dominance can be either democratic or submissive attitude (Symonds 1938, 1939). It appears in the works of the following authors: *Levy, Watson, Mueller, Cattell, Carpenter & Eisenberg, MacDonald, Symonds.*

216. *Ambition*

Hattwick & Stowell (1939) and *Symonds*, who refers to an earlier study by *Young* (1927), refer to it.

22. Dimensional Descriptions

221. *Development of Dimensional Studies*

Dimensional definitions of parental attitudes along together with classifications were used in some of the earliest studies. *Fitz-Simons* (1935) defined overprotection-rejection as a continuum. *Symonds* (1937, 1938, 1939) presented the »primary» dimensions of parental attitudes:

1. acceptance-rejection (1937: overprotection-rejection)
2. dominance-submission

He has also utilized classificatory descriptions (1949).

J. P. Anderson (1940) made scales for these variables, their reliability proved high and they were independent of each other. This two-factor interpretation fits well a great many theoretical hypotheses and empirical results and gives a good, though somewhat rough starting point for the description of parental attitudes.

In the University of California Parent Attitude Survey (*Shoben* 1949) three subscales were developed which discriminated the parents of adjusted from those of maladjusted children:

1. Dominant attitude
2. Ignoring attitude
3. Possessive attitude.

The reliabilities for each are high and their intercorrelations are +.37—+.48. Since the scales were selected to discriminate the children on the basis of adjustment, this fact may effect the correla-

tion between the scales and also restriction in the areas of the selection of items.

Similar attitude scales for some areas of child rearing have been constructed by *Radke* (1946), *Mark* (1953), *Harris, Gough & Martin* (1953), *Shapiro* (1952), *Block* (1955), and *Shaefer & Bell* (1958). *Radke's* scales included A/D control of the child, restrictive attitude, severity of punishment, rapport between parent and child, the relative responsibility of the parents for discipline, and sibling compatibility. *Harris & al.* constructed six scales. From the intercorrelations given (p. 176) three can be regarded as independent, viz., authoritarian attitude, permissive attitude, and effective emotional relations between parents and child. *Shaefer & Bell* developed a very extensive questionnaire (PARI) in which they try to differentiate parental attitudes more thoroughly than is usually the case (*Shaefer* 1958, *Shaefer & Bell* 1958). However, only three factors emerged from the analysis of the PARI scales: authoritarian-control, hostility-rejection, and democratic attitudes.

The Fels Parent Behavior Scale has been studied very intensively. However, the reliance on rating scales has two limitations from which one cannot escape:

1. It is not possible to carry out exact comparisons between different studies.
2. Single rating variables correlate highly with each other and thus one cannot eliminate the halo-effect.

The final form of the Fels Parent Behavior Rating Scale comprises 30 items. The intercorrelations between several items are higher than would be expected on the basis of interrater (retest) reliability (*Champney* 1939, *Baldwin & al.* 1949). Therefore, the rating system seems to be too detailed. The factors which emerge from a rating method always reflect both the discriminative abilities of the raters as well as the behaviour of ratees. Because of these subjective factors ratings cannot give as differentiated results as other methods. On the other hand, the validity of such ratings might be higher than that of verbalized attitudes. About ten «clusters» have been distinguished; however, these are not independent and have changed to some extent in the course of the studies (*Baldwin* 1946, 1948, 1954, *Baldwin & al.* 1945, 1949).

In addition, *Baldwin* has described parent attitude »syndromes» which occur relatively frequently or clearly (*Baldwin & al.* 1945).

Several factor analytic studies have been performed on the basis of questionnaires or ratings. By oblique rotation *Roff* (1949) found six factors from the Fels Parent Behavior Scale:

- duration of contact with parent
- democratic guidance
- permissiveness
- child-parent harmony
- social adjustment of parents
- activeness of the home

In three studies the child-rearing practices have been analyzed. *Sewell & al.* (1955) extracted six factors which could be interpreted, and *Milton* (1958, *Sears & al.* 1957) seven factors. *Wittenborn* (1956, Conditions of child rearing interview) described six clusters for the younger sample (2—5 years) and five for the older sample (over 5 years). Most of these factors seem to correspond those presented by *Baldwin* or *Roff*.

222. *A Comparison of the Results on Parental Attitudes*

Since each of the investigations has used different methods it is not possible to carry out exact comparisons. On the other hand, the number of studies on parental attitudes is so high that it seems to be necessary to present a preliminary system of attitude factors for future discussion in a similar way as has been done by *French* (1951, 1953) and *Cattell* (1950, 1958) in the fields of ability, achievement, and personality factors, even though the comparisons are somewhat vague and intuitive at the present. A summary of the attitude factors which have been given may be done on the basis of clusters of items which have been highly loaded in some factors. Only those factors or clusters will be considered which have demonstrated similarities in at least two of these studies. Since different factors are not independent of each other, small differences in rotation may influence the interpretation of results.

1. *Acceptance — Rejection*

1. expressed acceptance of the child vs. the parent does not completely accept the child as his own
2. rapport with the child vs. neglect of the child, isolation
3. affectionate towards the child vs. hostile towards the child
4. child-centeredness of the home vs. parent-centeredness
5. direction of criticism, approval vs. disapproval, use of threats, humiliation

6. mother's enjoyment of the child vs. shows no enjoyment of the child
7. duration and intensity of contact with parents

The following investigators have dealt with this factor:

Symonds

Anderson (ignoring attitude = rejection)

Baldwin & al. (warmth, acceptance)

Roff (duration of contact with parent does not correspond, because it is not differentiated from overprotection factor)

Sewell & al. (does not correspond exactly, closest to: parent-child-interaction)

Sears & al. and *Milton* (warmth of mother-child relationship)

Wittenborn (rejection)

2. *Dominance—Democratic Guidance*

1. no justification of policy
2. no democracy of policy
3. no readiness for explanation

This factor has been limited in content. As was mentioned earlier it should constitute a general factor for all social attitudes. This factor has been found in the following studies:

Symonds: dominance vs. submission

Anderson: dominant attitude

Baldwin & al.: democracy in the home

Roff: democratic guidance

In the investigations of *Sewell*, *Sears (Milton)*, and *Wittenborn* no such factor was reported. In some other studies, e.g. *Roff*, it has correlated with the variables child-parent harmony or permissiveness. *Wittenborn's* and *Sears'* questionnaires lack some of the items which would belong to this factor. Some dominance items are included in the restrictiveness and responsible child-training orientation factors by *Sears*.

3. *Possessiveness, Overprotection*

1. protectiveness
2. babying
3. oversolicitousness

The other extreme of the dimension is difficult to describe exactly and it occurs in different forms. The following investigations have dealt with this factor:

Anderson: possessive attitude

Baldwin: possessiveness

Roff: not differentiated from acceptance or duration of contact with parent

Wittenborn: overprotection

Sears: not differentiated from acceptance

4. *Restrictiveness—Permissiveness*

1. restrictiveness of regulations
2. coerciveness of suggestions
3. restrictions on play in the house and with furniture
4. restrictions on making noise
5. demands for good table manners
6. severe toilet training
7. non permissiveness for aggression toward parents
8. non permissiveness for sex play

This factor has not always been differentiated from acceptance and overprotection attitudes, though intuitively the distinction seems to be clear. In many studies the number of items has been too few to reveal all these factors.

Restrictiveness factor has been reported in many investigations:

Baldwin: indulgence (=possessiveness+permissiveness)

Roff

Sewell: different areas of permissiveness are separate

Wittenborn: overcontrolling

Sears & al.: Occurs as a central trait in the child's manners and habits, in the expression of aggression and sex.

5. *Severity, Punitiveness, Aggressiveness*

1. high use of physical punishment
2. severe punishment for aggression toward parents
3. severity of penalties
4. readiness of enforcement of rules

The area of severity or punitiveness items is clearly defined. Usually punitiveness has been separated from the dominant attitude (except *Roff*). This factor has been reported in the following studies:

Baldwin: severity

Sewell: punitiveness

Sears & al.: aggressiveness and punitiveness.

According to the interpretation by *Sears* it includes acceptance to the child's aggression toward other children, i.e., a general aggressive-extrapunitive attitude.

6. *Intellectuality, Acceleration, Ambition*

1. attempt at acceleration
2. readiness of explanation
3. understanding of the child
4. amount of parents' cultural interests

This factor seems to vary in the different studies. An essential characteristic seems to be the parents' interest in the child's development and their conscious desire to encourage speed of development by means of difficult tasks and great expectations especially in intellectual activities. The following investigations have dealt with this factor:

Baldwin: intellectuality

Wittenborn: ambition

Although these factors do not quite correspond they do have some identical items.

7. *Harmonious Relations Between Parents and Children*

1. adjustment of the home
2. absence of discord in the home
3. absence of disciplinary friction
4. effectiveness of policy

According to an intuitive analysis it is difficult to separate this factor from that of acceptance. However, through statistical means this has been demonstrated. Has been reported in the following studies:

Baldwin: adjustment of home

Roff: child-parent harmony

Wittenborn: harmonious relations; also includes traits belonging to the acceptance factor.

The interrelationships between these seven factors are not at all clear although they have been reaffirmed by different methods and experimental materials. Some of the factors have correlated highly even though other methods than rating have been used.

There are several other factors which are connected with parental attitudes and still need experimental corroboration:

1. activeness of home atmosphere: Can probably be differentiated from intellectuality and ambition (*Baldwin, Roff*).
2. emotionality: Occurs only in *Baldwin's* studies. The emotional vs. rational attitude of parents is in question.
3. consistency and purposefulness of policies: Corresponds to *Sears'* responsible child training orientation.

223. *General Social Attitudes and Parental Child-Rearing Attitudes*

Hypotheses derived from the Authoritarian Personality provided the basis for the design of the present study. Therefore, studies of the relationship general social attitudes and child rearing will be reviewed.

The original F-scale which most commonly has been regarded as the most important method in the study of the authoritarian personality was constructed from 9 intuitive subscales (*Adorno & al.* 1950). *Christie & Garcia* (1951) showed later that single items correlated in new populations — .50 — + .77. (According to *Adorno* the mean correlation between the F-scale items is +.13). The correspondence of clusters which were found in two new samples was very low as compared with the intuitive subscales of the *Adorno* study. (*Frenkel—Brunswik*, however, stated in her discussion of subscales that »they are not unified in a statistical sense«.) Only three clusters which could be identified to those of the *Adorno* study were found. Actually the single items of these clusters differed greatly from each other. The scales were as follows:

1. submission to authority (authoritarian submission)
2. punitive (authoritarian aggression)
3. low opinion of human nature (destructiveness and cynicism)

The intuitive conventionalism and superstition clusters might be similar to those of conformity and fatalism in the study of *Christie & Garcia*.

Concerning the factors of parental attitudes one could hypothesize that dominance would correlate highly with the authoritarian submission, and severity & punishment with authoritarian aggression. *O'Neil & Lewison* (1954) compared the F and E scales with religious attitude and traditional family ideology and found, besides the religious attitude, two group factors which seem to combine the general social attitudes

with child-rearing attitudes. The factors were named as the authoritarian submission and masculine strength façade. The latter one includes the authoritarian aggression as well as the intuitive cluster of power and toughness by *Frenkel—Brunswik* (*Adorno & al.* 1950). *Shapiro* (1952) compared *Eysenck's* attitude dimensions with parental attitudes, though the original hypotheses of the research were rather vague. Restrictive child-rearing attitude correlated with low radicalism score; they seem to have some general attitude in common. *Cattell* (1950) has presented some assumptions on the correspondences between group »syntality» dimensions and child-rearing attitudes. As yet, no conclusions are possible.

In a recent study *Hart* (1957) found a high correlation between the F-scale scores and the preference of strict and rejective methods of discipline. Similar results have been mentioned also by *Willis* (1956) and *Block* (1955). Several unpublished studies at the *Centre for Educational Research* (*Tasola* 1958, *Kauranne* 1959, *Ruoppila* 1959) have shown that there are common factors determining social as well as educational attitudes. However, the relationships are more complicated than has been assumed.

As a pilot study for the present study *Piipari* (1954) carried out a factor analysis from a modified F-scale which was given to a group of parents. The scale contained 43 items most of which were concerned with opinions about methods of child rearing. In the factor analysis the following four factors were extracted and interpreted:

1. domineering and respect-demanding attitude (traditionalism)
2. satisfaction vs. reproach
3. punitiveness (authoritarian aggression)
4. aggression toward youth; a more specific factor which, however, was separated clearly from the former.

These factors connect the F-scale studies with the investigations of child-rearing attitudes and practices. The hypothetical attitude factors of the present study were developed on the basis of these correspondences, which seemed to be clear. (A great number of studies which are referred to in the review have been published during the last years when the empirical material of the present study already was collected, and therefore, it was not possible to use the whole preliminary system of parental attitude factors as the basis of experimental procedure.)

III. EXPERIMENTAL PROCEDURE

31. General Characteristics of the Method

The experimental design was determined by two kinds of hypotheses: the assumed basic variables of parental attitudes on one hand and some hypotheses on personality development on the other. As the latter is not to be verified within the present study, no further mention will be made of it. The most important hypothetical dimensions of parental attitudes were described by *Piipari* (1954) and *Tynni* (1955) in preliminary studies, which were carried out under the guidance of *Annika Takala & Martti Takala*.

The parental attitudes were measured at different »levels» by »direct» and »indirect» means. The psychoanalytic or depth psychological interview was not relied upon, although *Frenkel—Brunswik* has presented very promising hypotheses based on it (*Adorno & al.* 1950). There were several reasons for omitting it. Too high requirements would have been set for the interviewers. It would be necessary to control the interviewer reliabilities because the method could not be standardized. Since the subjects were chosen from different social groups, not only from the relatively high status groups as was the case in most of the studies to which reference has been made, the interview ought to be planned differently for the different subgroups. Under such circumstances, it would not be possible to maintain a unified and simultaneously detailed scheme. If a family is living in very poor conditions and has many children, the manner of living is determined by numerous external presses. The parental attitudes toward the different children are not clearly distinguished. The parents are not accustomed to expressing verbally their emotional reactions, especially since Finns in general are relatively restrained in their personal and emotional expressions (e.g. *Takala & Määttänen* 1958). These facts determined the whole interview plan.

The problem concerning the flexibility of the interview (e. g. *Sears & al.* 1957) was solved by means of a compromise.

1. A part of the interview was planned as a multiple-choice questionnaire which was given orally by the interviewer (*Questionnaire of Child-Rearing Preferences*). Every item contained two or three alternatives. Because a multiple-choice questionnaire restricts spontaneous ideas this part of investigation took place after informal discussion and Child-Rearing Practices Interview.

2. *Ratings* were made on the basis of all the information obtained by the interviewer. The rating was, of course, also dependent on the interviewees' verbal reactions during the interview, although the interviewers were not informed about the meaning and scoring of the single questions and items. As is often found in interview studies, the total impression in some cases was determined mainly by a few remarks expressed by the mother. The rating, in addition, was influenced by the observations as well as the more relaxed discussion after the interview over a coffee cup or at parting. A great many of the mothers revealed information which had come to mind during the interview but which they had not been free to express then.

3. *The Child-Rearing Practices Interview* was planned as an intermediate form between extreme uncontrolled and controlled methods. It, however, more closely approximated the latter one.

4. The only *projective technique* of the present study was more restricted in scope and more structured than traditional projective measures.

If the methods directed towards different »levels» would give high correlations, the conclusions would be straightforward. From the methodological point of view the investigations with different methodological approaches (with more direct or indirect techniques) could be compared without any greater reservations to each other; it would be easy to generalize from results. If, on the other hand, the corresponding variables obtained from different techniques, would not correlate in spite of the relatively high reliabilities, the conclusion seems to be supported that relations between the more »overt» and »covert» attitudes are not simple and that it is necessary to investigate both of them simultaneously. Besides, one has to examine if the discrepancies between both overt and covert attitudes are symptomatic. In the latter case, a great many generalizations which have been made on the basis of recent studies of parental attitudes would be questionable and in need of re-examination. Every assertion concerning the relationships between parental attitudes and child development ought to be specified.

32. The Techniques*

321. Child-Rearing Practices Interview

The interview as a whole will not be presented but only the questions which were grouped into clusters. The interview was carried out by

*) The design of the interviews as well as of the projective attitude test was carried out under the direction of *Annika Takala*.

means of open questions. The wording of the questions was prescribed but the interviewer was permitted to change their order in the case the mother spontaneously expressed facts which originally belonged to later part of the interview. If the interviewee spontaneously gave information about a fact which had not yet been asked, the interviewer did not repeat the question but used the spontaneous answers. The order of questions in the interview was arranged to begin with areas as neutral as possible and with mainly developmental facts. The child-rearing practices were asked between these questions. The more delicate questions on the relations between parents and child did not come up before the last part of the interview.

The following areas of child development were investigated:

1. the early physical and ability development
2. health
3. eating, sleeping, and cleanliness and toilet training
4. sex information
5. the mother's responsibility in child care
6. the sources of family livelihood
7. school attendance
8. the child's responsibilities within the family
9. the mother's and father's childhood homes
10. the child's offences and punishment
11. the child's fears and attitudes
12. interpersonal relations within the family
13. attitudes toward masculinity and femininity

Since the children of the mothers who were interviewed were of school age, it did not seem feasible to obtain detailed information of early childhood incidents. After preliminary experiments the questionnaire was kept more brief than is usually true of questionnaires dealing with young children. In spite of this, a great many answers were rather vague for the mother of ten or twelve children who was not able to give precise facts on a particular child.

The wording of some questions was designed in a similar way as was simultaneously proceeded by *Sears & al.* (1957), to relieve the mothers of any fears or anxiety concerning »right» answers or »acceptable» procedures. The question assumed that there were different alternatives. In some instances the question was not how the mothers behaved, but how necessity forced her to behave, implying that the

differences in procedure was due to the difference in the environment or the child.

The total number of the question was 147. Most of them were short and required only short answers. Later in a replication study the interview was shortened to include these questions only, which fell in the clusters in the main study. This shortened interview consisted of 57 items.

322. *Orally Presented Questionnaire of Child-Rearing Preferences*

Single items will be presented in connection with the resulting scales. The hypothetical dimensions were as follows:

- aggressive-punitive attitude (preference for strict or physical punishments)
- domineering-directive attitude (authoritarian submission)
- respect-demanding attitude (conventionation, traditionalism)
- fostering of independence
- rational vs. non-rational attitude (partly corresponding to the superstition variable of *Adorno & al.* 1950).

The two first dimensions were established by factor analysis by *Piipari* (1954), and the preliminary scale for the last variable was developed by *Tynni* (1955). The fourth dimension was added only provisionally and the number of items planned for it was too small.

The items for each dimension were not originally planned to be used for the *Guttman* scales. On the contrary, each scale was designed to include rather broad areas of attitudes. The items were usually dichotomized and each alternative was described verbally. The distribution of items did not meet the requirements set by the *Guttman* scale. In different communities the order of the different questions would be changed within the scale. However, a preliminary study of scalability was carried out with the material collected from one community and the resulting scales were checked by another. Some items were excluded because the distribution was not satisfactory. However, as many items as possible were retained to preserve some generality to the scale. In this respect the procedure deviates from those usually followed. As the resulting scales are only preliminary, it was considered that by this means the greatest amount of useful information could be reported.

The questionnaire was presented orally to the subjects after the Child-Rearing Practices Interview. In the replication study the questionnaire of preferences was presented to the subjects in a revised form. New items had been added.

323. *Rating of Parent Behaviour*

The variables were chosen on the basis of the results of the Fels Institute Study. A great many of the rating variables in the Fels study correlated very highly with each other (*Baldwin 1945* etc.). Some rating variables were accepted which did correlate highly, guaranteeing, however, that at least two rating variables were left for every rating cluster. The total amount of ratings was only 13. In all other respects the ratings were carried out as exactly as possible according to the procedure used by *Baldwin & al.*

The following rating variables were used:

- adjustment of home
- acceptance of the child
- activeness of the home
- coordination of household
- protectiveness
- severity of penalties
- justification of disciplinary policies as presented to the child
- accelerational attempt
- emotionality
- planned policy (not in the Fels study)
- domineering-directive and respect-demanding attitude (not in the Fels study)
- emotional vs. controlled tone of the mother's answers
- immediate vs. delayed (partial refused) answers.

324. *Projective Attitude Test*

Those pictures from the children's form of the Rosenzweig Picture Frustration Study were chosen which represent relationships between children and adults. The situation was reversed from the original test. The mothers were shown the pictures in which the response of the child was given. The responses were overtly or latently expunitive. The mothers had to give the reactions of the father or mother to such a situation. Otherways the instruction followed the rules given by Rosenzweig. The interviewees were encouraged to answer immediately. This part of the study was carried out after the interview and the Preference Questionnaire, when the mothers' attitude was less controlled than it had been in the first part of the study.

The drawings and the words in the balloons are as follows: (The numbers refer to the serial numbers of the Rosenzweig Test.)

1. Why did you not leave any sweets for me
2. I won't love you anymore, if you don't fix this car
5. Of course you have money to buy that doll for me
7. I took these flowers by mistake
11. I won't come to bed yet, I want to go on playing
13. Let me go, I haven't taken anything
14. I'm not letting you come in
15. It hurts
16. She took my ball
19. I did not mean to wet my bet
21. I won't come to eat yet
23. I won't eat it because it is cold

The test was designed for four attitude dimensions. Since the same pictures were the basis of the scoring for each dimension, the same reactions could be scored on more than one dimension. The hypothetical variables were the following:

- aggressive-punitive attitude
- domineering-directive attitude
- respect-demanding attitude
- acceptance

33. Collection of the Data

331. *Experiments and Interview*

Three interviewers were trained for the study. Each was a psychology student who had had a psychodiagnostic practicum. Each also had had experience in interviewing. They were trained by *Annika Takala*. First they became acquainted with the outline of the investigation, but not the details. Practice interviews were carried out under the trainer's direction. The procedures were then analyzed and the ratings of each were compared. In none of the controlled cases were the deviations between the ratings after training greater than 1 point on a five point scale.

Each interviewer carried out the interviews at a locality with which they were familiar. The single except was in the case of *Lauri Kokkonen* who collected material at two localities (Kiuruvesi and Jyväskylä). It was not possible to determine the interviewer reliability in the limits of the present study. The only guarantee of the similarity of procedure was the subjective impression of the trainer. Afterwards it was found that the notes of the interviewers were comparable with each other (with some few exceptions; these cases were omitted). The replication study

which was carried out by several interviewers was controlled better.

The interviewers wrote down the answers. They were allowed to use shorthand or abbreviated notes, for most of the answers were short.

For practical reasons it was necessary to perform the interview of the mother in one period, even though it required 2—3 hours, sometimes over 3 hours. The mothers were informed on this before the interview and the appointment was arranged so that the mother had allowed sufficient time. In addition to the experiment and interview, the interviewers discussed with the mothers in a more relaxed atmosphere after the interview during coffee drinking etc. Since the interviews were carried out in winter and many of the families lived under crowded conditions, it was not always possible to have a separate room for the interview. Sometimes the children would be present. The interview, however, was carried out in as great privacy as was possible.

There were thirteen interviewers in the replication study. The interviewers in the replication study had the same qualifications though less practical training than those in the original study.

332. *The Groups Studied*

The subjects were chosen from four different communities, which were not representative of the country as a whole, but yet reflected the dispersion within the country. At one extreme was the capital of Finland (about 450.000 inhabitants) and at the other, a relatively remote, partly isolated rural commune in which the inhabitants mainly support themselves by farming and timber work. The two other localities were industrial centres, a town of 38.000 inhabitants in the centre of Finland, and a smaller industrial centre in the south of Finland. The research communities are described in *Annika Takala's* article.

The distribution of respondents according to community and socio-economic level as determined by occupation and school training is given in Table 1.

T a b l e 1
The Distribution of Subjects According to Sex and Social Class

Community	Sex		Social Class			
	Boys	Girls	I	II	III	IV*)
Helsinki	45	37	27	14	27	14
Jyväskylä	40	41	12	31	23	15
Inkeroinen	39	39	6	17	33	22
Kiuruvesi	48	46	9	29	42	14
Total	172	163				

*) I refers to the highest, and IV to the lowest class.

The mothers interviewed were informed of the purpose and procedure of the study in the following way. In the smaller communities the local newspapers carried out an item on the investigation; it was reported to be a study of the development of children in urban and rural environments. In addition, an explanatory letter with a prearranged appointment hour with the mother was sent through the school to every home.

No refusals were recorded, for mothers consented to be interviewed. Partial refusals occurred occasionally in the course of the interview when the respondents did not answer directly but avoided answering critical questions with «nothing special». Since the investigation was carried out through the schools, the mothers considered it often as a cooperative project for the school and home although the interviewer was not connected officially with the school. Generally the mothers considered the interview a very pleasant occasion and expressed their thanks to the interviewer for being interested in their personal affairs.

The replication study was carried out in one of the communities of the original study, but using different subjects. The subjects, 77 mothers, had also been prepared in the same way. Again no refusal was encountered, only one subject had moved away from the community in question and could not be located.

34. Scoring and Analysis of the Data

341. Interview

The scoring of the interview answers was very simple. The classification and coding were determined first on the basis of the distribution of a small sample. The dispersions of the questions did not always turn out to be satisfactory. A part were dichotomized, and the others were coded according to a three- or five-point scale. The coding reliability was not determined, for the procedure was little influenced by subjective interpretation.

In the replication study the scoring was done in the interviewing situation. On basis of the results of the main study the interview forms provided a classification of answers, thus the writing of the answers and their scoring was done simultaneously.

It was decided to seek clusters on the basis of intercorrelations between items. The significance of the dependence was determined by means of the Chi square. The items were grouped by means of intuitive hypotheses, all the items being correlated with each other within the

intuitive cluster. The items which did not show any significant relationship to most of the others in the hypothetical cluster were excluded. The accepted items were combined into a preliminary sum variable which was still compared with all other single items which had not yet been used for the clusters and which rationally could possibly have any connection with the cluster. No item was thus left outside the clusters if it belonged to it. The reliability of the final cluster scores was determined (*Nummenmaa* 1958).

This procedure is similar to that followed by *Wittenborn* (1956).

Some items showed significant relationships between several items belonging to different clusters. Although it was difficult for this reason to assign them to a particular cluster, they were not excluded, as *Wittenborn* (1956) had done. On the contrary, they were analyzed more exactly. Tetrachoric intercorrelations were computed for all these items and the matrix of intercorrelations was factor-analyzed in order to find better criteria for clustering.

In the replication study the intercorrelations were calculated in each cluster previously found. No other correlations were calculated in this study. The reliability coefficients in each cluster were determined by the S—B formula using the mean of the total intercorrelations as the reliability of one item and the number of items as the indicator of the amount of lengthening the test.

342. *Preference Questionnaire*

The scalability of the hypothetical scales was determined according to *Guttman's* technique (*Stouffer* 1950, *Edwards* 1957). It was shown that the relationships between all the items were not independent of the research community. Therefore, the scales which fulfill the requirements of scalability were different for each locality. In the future the analysis of the local differences on the relationships between single attitude items should give further information of the structure of general attitudes. The purpose of the present study, however, was not the investigation of the attitude patterns of different communities but a further study can be planned on the basis of the results of this investigation.

The following procedure was adopted. Depending on the satisfactory distribution of the answers for the *Guttman* scales, the properties of the scales and of single items were examined for two different research communities. Although the scales are not satisfactory for future use,

they are useful for the present comparisons. In any case, the scales are the best that could be constructed from these items.

In the replication study the scales were re-analyzed after new items were added to the questionnaire. According to the results the items do not form satisfactory unidimensional scales although they correlate with each other. *Guttman* scales can be constructed only from very restricted and more specific attitudes.

343. *Rating*

All the rating variables were intercorrelated separately in two subgroups (research communities). After the factor analyses a comparison was made and the replicated factors were selected for later consideration. A few separate rating variables which showed uniqueness in their variance were also included.

344. *Projective Attitude Test*

Each response was scored in all the hypothetical dimensions. The reliabilities of two dimensions proved to be very low and they were therefore excluded. Only the domineering-directive and aggressive attitude categories were accepted. Both of these are strongly dependent of each other because they are scored from the same answers.

Scoring principles:

◆ *Domineering-Directive Attitude*

+ 1 The adult reaction is determined by his own needs; the difference between the status and the rights of adults and the children is accentuated without any explanations

0 A matter-of-fact reaction, it is explained why the situation has occurred or why it is interpreted from the adult's point of view, no active, immediate and or positive solution is suggested, a moral comment

— 1 The child's behavior is accepted, the adult tries to interpret the situation from the child's point of view; a solution which considers the child's needs is suggested

◆ *Aggressive-Punitive Attitude*

| 1 The adult reacts in an aggressive way or threatens with punishment

0 No aggressive tone or content

IV. THE RESULTS OF THE SINGLE TECHNIQUES

41. **Child-Rearing Practices Interview**

411. *The Clusters*

Eleven clusters were extracted in the analysis each containing from 2 to 8 items. The small clusters include questions on child development and none is concerned with child-rearing practices and attitudes. Eight clusters are clearly differentiated having no common items with the exception of one (Tables 2—9). A factor analysis was carried out from 16 items which did not show clear clustering tendencies and which were considered important in regard to parental attitudes. Three independent factors were found which could be easily interpreted (Tables 10—11). Using oblique axes the factors possibly might be more clear-cut but the final results and the interpretation would not have been changed. The intercorrelations of the items in the different clusters in the replication study are given in Appendix I (p. 64).

The interview clusters will be presented by naming them and giving their general content. The single items as well as the reliabilities are mentioned in connection with the clusters. If possible, the items are converted so that an affirmative answer or an acceptance of the former alternative indicates a positive score whereas a negative answer or the choice of the latter alternative indicates a negative score for each cluster. For other items, the direction of the answer scored positively is indicated in brackets.

A. *Clusters Descriptive of the Satisfaction of Basic Physical Needs*

1. *The Child's Health during Infancy* (Table 2)

1. What was the physical condition of the child immediately after delivery? Was it satisfactory or not?
2. Was he easy to care for as an infant or did he cause trouble for the mother? Did he cry a great deal at night? (No)
3. Did he sleep well or was he awake often?

The cluster correlates also positively with an item concerning the child's health during the entire first year.

Reliability: $+ .64$, replication study was made of three questions concerning the child's early health, but one of these differed from those given above. Reliability: $+ .79$.

T a b l e 2.
Interrelations of Response Items in Cluster I: Early Health

		Chi ²		
		1	2	3
Item Number				
P %	1		4.47	7.11
	2	5		12.70
	3	1	0.1	

The cluster »Early Health» did not correlate with the other interview items descriptive of the mother's attitude toward the child. Therefore, it may not be of great psychological importance. Especially if the mothers had many children the information given was apt to be meager.

II. *Later Health* (Table 3)

1. How was the child's health after infancy? (It has been good, normal.)
2. Did it differ from the siblings' health in any way? (Better, nothing to mention.)
3. Has he had a good appetite?

T a b l e 3.
Interrelations of Response Items in Cluster II: Later Health

		Chi ²		
		1	2	3
Item Number				
P %	1		10.06	46.23
	2	0.1		8.14
	3	0.1	2	

Reliability: +.65.

Reliability in the replication study, with two items, was found to be +.18. This was the only instance which in the replication was found to be unreliable.

The mother's report of the child's health after infancy was not related with the items concerning her attitudes or the child-rearing problems. The appetite item correlates positively with health.

III. *Feeding Habits* (Table 4)

1. Has his appetite been good?
2. Does he eat a sufficient amount or is it necessary to encourage him to eat more?

This cluster correlates also positively with an item concerning the child's attitude towards school meals.

The first item correlates with the health of the child. The cluster is independent of the attitude cluster. Reliability: $+.71$.

Reliability in the replication study was $+.77$.

T a b l e 4.

Interrelations of Response Items in Cluster III: Feeding Habits

P %	Item Number	Chi ²	
		1	2
		1	
2	0.01		

IV. *Toilet Training* (Table 5)

1. Has it ever occurred that the child after learning to control bladder movement had again begun to wet or soil? E.g. when he has been ill, when he began school, when siblings were born, etc.? (No)
2. At what age was he usually dry and clean all day? (Early)
3. At what age was he first placed on the toilet? (Early)
4. At what age did he himself ask to be taken to the toilet? (Early)
5. At what age did he go through the night without wetting? (Early)

T a b l e 5.

Interrelations of Response Items in Cluster IV: Toilet Training

P %	Item Number	Chi ²				
		1	2	3	4	5
		1		37.85	—	13.91
2	0.1		28.54	46.51	231.96	
3	n.s.	0.1		33.11	39.77	
4	0.1	0.1	0.1		63.40	
5	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1		

Reliability : $+.73$, in the replication study $+.82$.

All the items are connected with toilet training. The independence of the toilet training factor from other factors seems to show that, in general, toilet training would not be important from the point of view of child-rearing attitudes.

Another empirical significant result is also indicated by the inter-

correlations. According to the mothers' reports the early institution of toilet training is associated with the early bladder and bowel control.

Furthermore, there is no correlation between the age at which the training of the child was begun and the number of accidents later. On the basis of these results one could assume that, on the average, the early toilet training is a positive factor in the acquiring of control and is not related with the symptoms of »regression» or »nervous instability» at school age.

One should, however, refrain from making too great generalizations from these results. The relationship between the beginning of training and the achievement of control is probably not linear, although these results would suggest it. Among the respondents several families began toilet training much later than has usually been recommended. These families lived in the most remote corner of Kiuruvesi. In more homogeneous material the result could be different. (For a more detailed discussion, see *A. Takala 1960*).

V. *Sleeping Habits* (Table 6)

1. Does the child fall asleep immediately after going to bed?
2. Does he like to go to bed or does he resist?

Additional items which correlate positively with this cluster:

Does he sleep through the whole night? Has he walked in his sleep?

(No) Has he had nightmares? (No)

From what age has he not awakened the mother? (Early)

Table 6.

Interrelations of Response Items in Cluster V: Sleeping Habits

	Item Number	Chi ²	
		1	2
P %	1		20.34
	2	0.01	

Reliability: +.70, in the replication study: +.75.

Also this cluster is independent of the items concerning attitudes or child-rearing problems.

B. *Clusters Comprising the Mother's Rating of the Personality of the Child*

VI *Satisfaction with the Child's Achievements* (Table 7)

1. Does he keep his clothes clean or does he often mess and tear them when playing outdoors?
2. Does he like to wash or is it necessary to remind him?
3. Does the mother feel that the child applies himself school or does she think that the child should to be more industrious?
4. Does he do his lessons without having to remind him?
5. Do the parents do more than encourage studying and in what way? (No) Do they go over the lessons? (No)
6. Is it more of an effort for the mother to take care of the child's clothes than those of his siblings? (No, less)
7. How has he succeeded at school? (Well)
8. Has he done as well as his siblings or is there a difference?

Table 7.

Interrelations of Response Items in Cluster VI: Satisfaction with the Child's Performances

		Chi ²							
Item Number		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
	1		25.97	21.52	14.20	2.73	58.60	15.87	5.02
	2	0.1		13.85	14.28	8.39	12.22	5.49	3.91
	3	0.1	0.1		83.25	14.38	4.50	39.08	10.83
P %	4	0.1	0.1	0.1		16.68	—	24.80	15.21
	5	10	1	0.1	0.1		—	7.82	9.34
	6	0.01	1	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.		9.87	25.50
	7	0.1	10	0.1	0.1	2	5		58.46
	8	10	n.s.	1	0.1	1	0.1	0.1	

Reliability: +.74, in the replication study +.75.

Satisfaction with the child's performance is revealed in two fields of achievement, cleanliness and school success. The mothers' attitudes toward these achievements are not clearly differentiated. It, therefore, may be concluded that a more general attitude of the mother is indicated by this cluster, not only the actual behaviour of the child. It is not possible, of course, to isolate the mutual effect of the child's performance and the mother's demands or expectations from each other.

In comparing the combined cluster scores with the school marks of

the children, an idea can be obtained of the correspondence of the mother's satisfaction and the child's objective achievement. The correlation between the »Satisfaction» cluster score and the children's school marks is $+.25$. Accordingly, the actual success determines to a certain extent the amount of the reported satisfaction. Since a school success correlates positively with variables concerning cleanliness and tidiness, the cluster reflects both the adjustment of the child to the environmental demands, as well as his level of achievement.

The »Satisfaction» cluster correlates positively to these items which were excluded from the cluster:

Was the child able to read before going to school?

Does he like to attend school every day or does he dislike school?

Has he ever complained about the lessons' difficulty? (No)

Does he spontaneously report when he has misbehaved, and when e.g. he has been punished at school?

Does he easily admit his guilt without prompting?

These items do not correlate highly to all the items of the »Satisfaction» cluster. They are partly concerned with the reported school success and with the child's attitude toward school, partly with the child's »acceptance» by the parents.

VII. *The Child's Fears* (Table 8)

1. How does he react to the doctor, nurse, and different types of treatment, e.g. injection? (Resists or fears.)
2. Has he any special fears?
3. Is he afraid of thunder-storms? In what way?
4. Is he afraid of the dark? In what way?
5. Does the mother consider child is generally timid or bold and fearless?

Table 8.

Interrelations of Response Items in Cluster VII: The Child's Fears

		Chi ²				
Item Number		1	2	3	4	5
P %	1		14.6	9.8	10.9	9.0
	2	1		12.5	23.5	56.4
	3	1	1		56.0	75.5
	4	1	0.1	0.1		68.9
	5	2	0.1	0.1	0.1	

Reliability: $+.67$, in the replication study with only items 1--4: $+.84$.

The mothers' answers to the questions on the different kinds of fear and anxiety of the child correlate positively, though not highly, with each other. It is possible that the mothers' attitude and rating of the child is reflected by the answers more than the actual behaviour of the child.

C. Training Procedures Connected with Interpersonal Relations

VIII. Demand for Obedience and Punishment (Table 9)

1. Is the child punished immediately or later in the evening or when the father has come home? (Later, by the father)
2. What kind of punishment has been used? (Spanking, whipping, corporal punishment)
3. When the child is angry at the parents, does he strike or scold them?
4. Does the mother consider the child obedient or not? (Not very obedient)
5. Do the mother and father ever become angry with the child?
6. In the mother's opinion, is the child afraid of punishment and how can it be seen?
7. Has he ever been caught lying?
8. Is the child more afraid of one of the parents? Which one? (Father)
9. Does he obey one parent better? Which one? (Father)

Table 9.

Interrelations of Response Items in Cluster VIII: Severity of Punishment

Item Number	Chi ²									
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	
1		12.4	—	27.47	—	—	15.82	26.42	9.38	
2	0.1		5.7	25.5	13.8	11.1	8.7	14.4	11.7	
3	n.s.	10		43.20	6.93	4.04	16.38	11.75	19.77	
4	1	0.1	0.1		18.93	30.98	19.93	23.09	16.69	
P %	5	n.s.	1	n.s.	1		19.10	21.49	26.66	16.92
	6	n.s.	1	n.s.	0.1	0.1		12.58	52.43	11.70
	7	0.1	2	1	1	0.1	2		14.49	—
	8	0.1	0.1	10	1	0.1	0.1	5		119.55
	9	5	0.1	1	5	5	10	n.s.	0.01	

Reliability $+.75$, in the replication study with items 1--7 and 9: $+.65$.

The content of the »Punishment« cluster seems to be rather general. Some items indicate the actual amount and strenght of the punishment procedure. It is connected with the amount of considered punishment (the first item). Among families which prefer severe punishment the punishment is a regular »ritual« which was traditionally sometimes »paid« after a certain time interval, like weekly wages. In other words, it is a part of normal daily living. Child training consists of obeying the family penal laws.

Secondly, the father is the authority in those families which prefer corporal punishment. He acts as the judge of the court.

Thirdly, usually the child is disobedient and therefore needs severe punishment. On the other hand, the children who are not severely punished, are considered obedient and well adjusted by the mother, corporal punishment not being necessary, and the father is not the authority in the family.

The usual interpretations of behaviour disturbances which are favoured by the adherents of »authoritarian personality« theories could be called upon to explain the obtained correlations: The simplest version being that when the parents use corporal punishment, their children react aggressively and disobediently towards parents. Therefore, it is necessary to use severe punishment continuously, which is not easily done by the father. Accordingly, the parents' attitude and the »authoritarian-aggressive« home atmosphere result in child-parent relationship which require forceful child-rearing methods.

Other influences could also be expected to occur: The sensitivity of children toward adults may differ, and the parents of non-sensitive children must use forceful methods of control in order to re-establish the balance of forces within the family. In the latter case the father would have to maintain the discipline.

As is usually found in human relations obviously there is both kinds of interaction. In individual cases results may differ depending on the main reinforces of the continuous »feed-back« process. Within an individual family changes might be depending on the results of the first »experimentation« in discipline. Some parents may obtain positive results by forceful means and do not need them later. In other cases the experimentation does not produce the desired results and it is necessary to experiment further.

In addition to the items of the present cluster, a few other items correlated with the clusters. They also were related to the use of forceful punishment and with the disobedience of the child.

412. *Factor Analysis of the Clusters IX—IX*

As was mentioned at the beginning of the present chapter, it was not possible to form clusters from a group of intercorrelation items without a more detailed analysis. Sixteen items dealing with attitudes and human relations within the family were factor analyzed (Tables 10—11).

1. Does the child continue to discuss sex matters with the parents?
2. Does he relate at home what happened at school?
3. What kind of tasks does he do at home? Are there any definite tasks for which he is responsible?
4. Has the father or mother ever had to apologize to the child?
9. Does he report spontaneously when he has misbehaved, and when e.g. he has been punished at school?
6. Does he easily confess he is at fault without having to be prodded?
7. If he has done something which is not permitted, is he sorry later or not?
8. Is he spontaneous or reticent?
9. Does he still sit in your lap?
10. Has he ever asked how children are born?
11. Have the parents explained the parents' role in conception and delivery (at least the mother's role)?
12. Has the child told what he hopes to be?
13. Does he receive an allowance?
14. Must he apologize when he has done something wrong?
15. Did he like to be fondled?
16. Did he come or does he still come to the parents' bed in the morning?

In the analysis three factors were extracted. They are relatively pure after an orthogonal rotation, the items in general having no high loadings in more than one factor. Items no. 3 and 12 remain complex as to their factor structure. They have positive loadings in several factors and were excluded. The other items were combined into the following clusters:

Table 10.
Interrelations of Response Items in Clusters IX—XI

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
1	—31	—03	29	—15	00	00	—01	42	70	50	18	06	16	10	21
2		—03	—39	27	12	33	58	—17	—36	—38	—11	—06	—15	—23	—12
3			22	—20	—06	—17	01	05	11	20	17	23	26	11	—02
4				11	—10	02	—18	21	27	55	11	42	43	22	23
5					40	32	39	—22	—26	—17	—05	—01	—19	—10	—21
6						24	27	—22	—04	—04	—18	08	—12	—11	—04
7							17	—05	—25	—18	—24	—06	—32	—15	—13
8								—12	—23	—23	—29	04	—23	—08	—14
9									24	37	38	24	24	42	16
10										81	29	10	20	11	21
11											14	31	31	10	17
12												10	16	17	15
13													19	05	19
14														20	14
15															47

Decimal points have been omitted.

Table 11.
Centroid and Rotated Matrix of Response Items in Clusters IX—XI

Item Number	Centroid Matrix				Rotated Matrix			
	I	II	III	h ²	I	II	III	h ²
1	51	—28	—13	36	55	02	23	36
2	—56	—16	—19	38	—26	—49	—27	38
3	27	—14	10	10	28	15	01	10
4	58	—35	—10	47	65	06	22	47
5	—46	—28	—31	39	—10	—58	—20	39
6	—30	—37	—15	25	07	—42	—26	25
7	—40	—21	—32	30	—11	—52	—13	30
8	—46	—38	—33	47	—02	—64	—23	46
9	53	05	—37	43	31	00	58	43
10	67	—32	16	58	68	31	12	57
11	71	—50	17	78	85	25	03	79
12	42	14	—11	21	17	18	38	21
13	31	—29	—21	22	43	—13	17	23
14	50	10	06	26	41	25	19	27
15	42	28	—41	42	07	01	65	43
16	41	14	—36	32	17	—01	54	32

IX. *Reticence of the Child (The Child's Openmindedness vs. Reticence)*

1. Does not talk about school.
2. Does not report his misbehaving.
3. Does not admit when he is guilty.
4. Is not sorry later.
5. Is reticent.

Reliability: $+.66$, in the replication study $+.51$.

X. *Physical Expression of Affection*

1. Likes to come into one's lap.
2. Likes to be fondled.
3. Has come to the parents' bed in the morning.

Reliability: $+.75$, in the replication study, with one additional item: $+.76$.

XI. *»Democratic Interaction» between Parent and Child*

1. Speaks about sexual matters.
2. The parents have apologized.
3. Has made inquiries about birth.
4. Has been informed about the parents' role.
5. Has an allowance.
6. The child must apologize.

Reliability: $+.80$, in the replication study, with one additional item: $+.74$.

On the basis of the present study alone it is not yet possible to argue whether these three factors are sufficiently distinct to give a complete, and differentiated description of the »authoritarian/democratic» attitude. In description of child rearing one has more often interpreted these items as indications of a more general good/poor contact between parent and child.

One could assume that these three factors would reflect the same basic attitude which would be revealed in different factors only because the subject matter of the items has varied. The latter view could be supported by the fact that the correlations between the items in general are positive.

However, a detailed comparison of the items of each factor does not support the latter interpretation. Each factor seems to cover relatively extensive fields.

The first factor, »Reticence» cluster, seems to show the total amount of verbal communication between child and parents. The spontaneous child relates his experiences at home and also expresses his emotional problems freely. The reticent child does not reveal his emotions and does not talk about his experiences.

The following points should be noted in describing and interpreting the content of this factor. Verbal communication is not used in some social groups for revealing personal and emotional experiences. It might be cultural and independent of acceptance or rejection of children. The results on the differences between small and large families might support this view (*A. Takala 1960*), since we cannot assume that in large families the relationships between parents and children would be less »positive» than in small families. On the other hand, one could postulate that the amount of verbal communication of personal affairs would be connected with the social status of the family. Since there is no correlation to social status (*A. Takala 1960*), the interpretation is rather uncertain.

Secondly, one could begin with the items dealing with misbehaviour and guilt, and assume that the amount of verbal communication reported would reflect a »sensitive» conscience. In those cases in which the conscience of the child has not become sufficiently »sensitive», mutual communication in personal matters is avoided, and the child also abandons other forms of verbal communication with the parents.

The latter interpretation would connect the reported reticence of the child with the parental attitudes of rejection or nonchalance (*Balwin & al. 1945, etc.*) In all probability the relationships between attitudes and reported child behaviour are, however, more complex.

The second factor, »Physical Expressions of Affection», might reveal another part of the relations between parents and child. Non-verbal emotional contacts are indicated by this factor. Non-verbal communication may occur at different levels between adults and children. At the »lowest» level, adults take care of children's basic needs, feed them, and protect them against physical threats. Non-verbal communication comprises also expressions of emotional relations between human beings which are seen more in infant care but continue in different forms in relationships between adults and school aged children as well as among adults. The amount of emotional expression varies

according to social class (*A. Takala 1960*), community etc. in a similar way as the indications of the emotional attachment in sexual relationships (*Kinsey & al. 1948*).

The physical expression of affection could also be connected with parental attitudes. High score in this factor could be indicative of the accepting and protective, especially of the overprotective attitude of the mother, the tendency to maintain emotional relationship with the child immature in the same way as it was in his infancy. The number of items is, however, too small to form definitive conclusions.

The third factor was labeled the »Democratic Interaction between Parent and Child». It seems to be somewhat more heterogeneous, and therefore, it is not possible to know its significance. Two kinds of item are included in this factor. First, some items deal with sex education and information. Open discussion of such issues is often brought up in discussion on child-rearing problems, although the parents' opinions differ in this respect. In general, it has been considered one of the central points of the »authoritarian» attitude (e.g. *Adorno & al. 1950*, F-scale) that sex matters are taboo and cannot be subject to discussion. Secondly, two of the items include apologizing which may be done by the parents as well as the children.

As subject matters which differ to a great extent from each other are interconnected, it seems justified to propose a general interpretation which takes into consideration the mutual interdependence within the family. In correlating interview items with several social and psychological variables this interpretation was strengthened further (special results of the parental attitude study, to be published) that items on sex education are of vital importance in the analysis of different child-rearing attitudes. The items on sex education correlate with a great many items of various content as well as with social variables.

According to this interpretation, the last factor also is connected with verbal communication between parents and children. These contacts are not restricted to every-day events, but include more intimate and personal problems. »Democratic attitude» presupposes open discussion in which both parties have similar rights and is conducted in a rational matter-of-fact way. The parents have a more active role in this cluster of the verbal communication than that which formed the »Reticence» cluster.

Allowances may be regarded as another expression of this actively »accepting» attitude of the parents which presupposes that some responsibility be given the children.

413. *Discussion*

Eleven clusters were found in the analysis of the items. Five clusters are connected with training and with the learned habits of the children. In general, they did not correlate with other clusters which had been interpreted as being indices of the personality of the child as well as the attitudes of the parents. Three clusters include (VI, VII, IX) the mother's rating of the child's personality but simultaneously they may reflect the parents' attitudes. The three last clusters (VIII, X, XI) were mainly connected with parent-child relationships.

As has been found also in other studies using similar methods (*Wittenborn* 1956), the single clusters were not always sufficiently reliable. More than one third (over 50) of the questions were included in one or more of the clusters.

Only at the intuitive or conceptual level can the results be compared with those of other studies which have used different methods as well as with the preliminary hypotheses based on the «Authoritarian Personality».

Severity-factor which may be also labeled as «authoritarian aggression» according to *Adorno & al.* was found in similar interview items as in previous studies. In addition, it was found that this cluster correlates with reported amount of the aggression and disobedience in the child as well as with the father's authority within the family. Some similarities with the interpretation of the corresponding factor by *Sears & al.* (1957) may exist.

The «Democratic Interaction» cluster mainly includes similar items as the democratic/dominant attitude of previous studies and it is negatively correlated with the «authoritarian submission» of *Frenkel-Brunswik* (*Adorno & al.* 1950). The latter could also correlate, however, with the more indefinite factor labeled as «harmonious relations».

The relationship between the «acceptance/rejection» factors of the present study («Reticence of the Child», «Physical Expression of Affection») to those previously reported seems to be more complicated. One could assume that it may be due to unclearly differentiated description of parental attitudes. Usually it has been found that observation and rating studies may have overgeneralized observations made in specific situations and, therefore, the ratings of rejection may have been based on very superficial impressions.

In the present study verbal communication of daily events («rapport with the child» at the casual level and the reticence of the child),

affectionate relations and expressions between parents and child («Physical Expression of Affection»), and satisfaction with the child's performances were differentiated. They are also related with «democratic interaction». «Emotional expressions» could be indicative an over-protective attitude.

The last results might show that the usual descriptions of parental attitudes in terms of acceptance/rejection and dominance/democracy are too general and may be sources of great error when the diagnostic procedures are based on limited observations and ratings. Therefore, it would be better to adopt a more specific basis for description of parental behaviour. The definition of several categories in the Fels study presupposes more generality of parental behaviour than can be found by other methods since the influence of the »halo«-effect may be stronger than in the more specifically defined rating categories.

414. *The Intercorrelations of the Interview Clusters*

The intercorrelations between the clusters and the combined variables of other techniques used are shown in Table 14. It can be seen that most of the clusters do not correlate with each other but are independent.

The correlation between the clusters »Later Health» (II) and »Feeding Habits» (III) is caused by a common item and it can be considered spurious.

The clusters IX, X, and XI which were separated on the basis of factor analysis correlate with each other in spite of the fact that they have no common items. The correlation between »Expression of Affection» and »Democratic Interaction» is $+.30$. Both of them correlate negatively with »Reticence» ($-.27$, $-.23$).

Satisfaction with child's performances correlates negatively with »Reticence» ($-.26$), and positively with »Severity of Punishment» ($+.32$). Therefore, it would seem there is a common factor behind these clusters which will be analyzed in detail later (Ch. V).

42. Orally Presented Questionnaire of Child-Rearing Preferences

421. *The Scales*

Four scales were found which approximately fulfilled the requirements of *Guttman* scales as to reproducibility. The fifth scale is not satisfactory in this respect. The distribution of the answers is not

satisfactory, as most items originally were dichotomous. However, each response category has more scale-types than errors. As many items as possible were accepted in order to increase the reliability of the scale, even those cases in which the distribution of answers were not cumulative. Thirty-two of the original 37 items were included in the scale.

In each scale the single items are presented. The reproducibility of the scales is also given. It must, however, be pointed out that in the replication study the scales were not satisfactory in regard to these requirements, and a rearrangement of the items is necessary. It is also obvious that new types of items will be needed for new populations. Strictly unidimensional scales are not likely to be obtained by this method. On the other hand, the scales are sufficiently broad in content.

1. *Rational — Nonrational Explanation**)

1. One mother informs her child that Father Christmas is, in fact, a makebelieve character through whom people at Christmas time give each other presents, and another that Father Christmas lives in Lapland with a toy workshop and little helpers. Which explanation do you regard to be better or more appropriate?

2. The child asks from where he came. One states that the child grows in the mother's womb, while another says, that the child was found at the hospital or under the sauna floor. (This last explanation was formerly very popular especially in the more remote communities of the country, where the children were usually born in the sauna (-bath), the most hygienic spot available.)

3. The child asks how people become ill. A states that one often catches the disease from other people. B states that if one is disobedient, one becomes ill and C that God sends illness.

4. The mother wishes to persuade her child to be obedient. A states that no one likes naughty children; B that if the child is naughty, God can take mother away, and C that the boogeyman will come and get you if you do not obey.

5. A child's peer has died and the child asks the mother about death. A says that it was caused by disease; B that if you are not kind, the same may happen to you; and C that it is better for the child to be in heaven.

*) The items are converted with the first choice scored positively.

6. A says that there is nothing to fear in the dark; B that good children need not fear; and C that angels protect one.

7. A child states that the moon has eyes, nose, and mouth. A explains that it only seems as if there were eyes, nose, and mouth, but that, in reality, they are only mountains and depressions on the moon's surface. B tells about a moon-man, who looks at the world at night.

8. The child is not allowed to go alone to the lake, because (A) he cannot swim and the water is deep, or because (B) a water-sprite could come to take the child.

9. A explains that lightrays reflect through waterdrops and disperse into the different colours of the spectrum; B that the rainbow was made by painting the sky.

Reproducibility coefficient $+ .89$. Two items were discarded.

The weakness in planning these items might be that the alternatives do not always exclude each other. The non-rational alternatives are more specific because according to the preliminary hypothesis two or three subclass divisions were expected:

1. religious explanations
2. aggressive, threatening and moralistic explanations
3. other magical and emotional, «childlike» explanations.

The preference for aggressive explanations occurred too infrequently to permit comparisons. The religious and childlike explanations correlated with each other (ca. $+ .30$). In future studies it should be possible to differentiate the preferences more by more alternatives and when the mothers of younger children are interviewed.

The total percentages of the rational explanations are for a satisfactory distribution too high. In the items 4—8 the rational alternative has been accepted in about an equal number of cases, and they cannot be distinguished from each other.

The total scale reflects the mother's tendency to emphasize the child's rational attitude towards the phenomena of the world about him and living in it. At the other extreme is the tendency to arouse of the maintain to so-called animistic or non-rational thinking in children. There may be many reasons for this:

1. The mother's own attitude is animistic and emotional or her knowledge is not sufficient for rational explanations.
2. She assumes that it is better to keep the explanations to children at a level which is often regarded as «natural» to children.

3. She considers these explanations the most effective means in child rearing. She believes that fears will help prevent dangerous situations better than rational explanations.

In modern society religious explanations are separated into specific areas or conditions and may coincide with rational explanations. They do not necessarily cover all possibilities which may arise.

II Fostering of Independence

1. Child has saved some money. A considers that the children themselves should be responsible for it, and B that she herself has to supervise its proper spending.

2. A thinks that it is desirable if preadolescent children learn to travel and to take care of themselves on their own, and B that children should not be allowed to travel alone because it is dangerous.

3. Child wants to go alone in the woods to pick berries. A says: See that you do not go any further than we have walked together. B says: You are too small to go alone.

4. According to A's opinion a child must learn to eat without help as soon as possible. B considers that it is better to feed a child until he can eat neatly.

Reproduction coefficient: $+.90$. The majority of replies accepts training toward independence and the distribution is not very satisfactory.

No items concerning acceleration of intellectual development are included in this scale. The total number of items is rather small, and only certain areas of training for independence are covered. No items were discarded from this scale.

The mother's replies, concerning the training toward independence are determined by a conflict between two tendencies. On the one hand, they know that children must learn to be independent, while on the other they try to protect them in the difficult and dangerous life situations.

Protectiveness may also be influenced by other emotional factors. It is possible that due to this type of conflict the training toward independence scale is sensitive to slight changes in a situation, wording of alternatives, and tone of the interviewer.

III. *Punitive-Aggressive Attitude*

1. If the children tease an animal, A prefers to whip them, B thinks that they must be distracted, or that the situation must be explained to them.

2. The children are playing indecent games. A thinks that they must be punished fittingly in order to put a stop to such play, and B that they must be distracted.

3. Some children are caressed often. In A's opinion this is dangerous coddling of the child. B believes that the child learns to like people if it is caressed often.

4. A thinks that youth is more malicious today than it was formerly. B thinks that children and adolescents have always been very much the same.

5. Child comes home and reports receiving low marks at school. A says: You have been lazy, next time you must do better. B says: Perhaps you have done your best.

6. A thinks that children should learn to eat everything served even though they do not wish more. B believes that children need not clean their plates if they feel they have had a sufficient amount.

Reproduction coefficient: $+0.92$. The distribution is again skewed: The majority of respondents did not accept aggressive or punitive alternatives. One item was excluded.

Most items are not related to the strength of punishment. They are mainly concerned with the «authoritarian aggression» and presuppose an acceptance of traditional norms of living and maintenance of traditional restrictions. At the same time they indicate an aggressive and suspicious attitude towards people who do not follow these requirements. The aggressive-punitive attitude might reveal a general acceptance of aggressive behaviour, an aggressive or openly rejecting attitude towards children, or, also, the lack of knowledge of alternative child training methods.

IV *Domineering-Directive Attitude.*

1. Sex play. A considers that child should be frightened sufficiently to stop activity. B considers it of less importance or tries to distract the child to some other activity.

2. A thinks that teacher should demand strict discipline, that he should not just talk to pupils, B that the teacher ought to try to understand children even when they do not obey.

3. A does not allow the children to contradict. B does not mind when children grumble if they obey.

4. A believes that parents are always right, because they have more experience. B's opinion is that children are very aware of the parent's inconsistencies.

5. Adult discussions. Child interrupts discussion to ask something. A says: Children must be quiet when adults are talking. B answers the child's question.

6. Child asks for something which he has been refused by parents. A thinks that one must never give in to children. B believes exceptions can be made.

7. Child asks for money for buying sweets, because his pal has received some. A says: You cannot always have the same as others. B says: Of course, you must also have money for sweets.

Reproduction coefficient: $+ .90$.

The items of the present scale indicate how strongly the mother stresses the difference between adult and child. A high score indicates strict demand on submission. According to the terminology of the Authoritarian Personality this scale could be as well labeled as »authoritarian submission» scale. Strict discipline is presupposed but only the first item has an aggressive tone. The scale might be measuring the essential factors of a dominant/democratic attitude.

V *Respect-Demanding Attitude*

1. A says: Disobedient children usually become good-for-nothing adults. B says: Children may develop into decent adults, even if they are disobedient and undisciplined as young children.

2. According to A's opinion children must learn that they must not criticize clergymen. B thinks that children can consider clergymen to be like other people.

3. If child prefers certain foods, A thinks he should learn to eat everything, and B that child need not necessarily eat all food, because even adults have their preferences.

4. A considers father's decree the irrefutable law of the family, while B believes that each member is free to express his opinion.

5. The mother overhears children criticizing the teacher. A says: Children are not permitted to speak ill of the teacher. B does not interfere with the children's discussion or says: Perhaps he is mistaken but you are not without fault.

6. The child says to his father: You do not understand, you blockhead. A says: You cannot speak to your father in this way. B laughs and says: Try to give a better explanation.

Reproduction coefficient: $+.86$. The scale is formed by more heterogeneous items than the other authoritarian scales (no. III and IV).

A demand for respect seems to be the common element of most of the items. The different authority figures are the father, the minister, and the teacher who are considered inviolable. The scale could be related to the conventionalism subscale of the F-scale.

422. *The Intercorrelations of the Scales*

The intercorrelations of the scales are shown in Table 16. They are not as independent as the clusters of the open interview. The «authoritarian» scales (no. III, IV, and V) correlate positively with each other in the same way as the interview clusters related to «authoritarianism» (no. IX, X, and XI). Domineering-Directive and Respect-Demanding attitudes correlate $+.40$, and Aggressive-Punitive attitude with each separately ($+.34$, $+.37$).

Rational Explanation and Fostering of Independence scales correlate negatively although slightly with the «authoritarian» scales. Domineering-Directive attitude has the highest correlations with the other scales. It could constitute the most central feature of a possible «general» dominant/democratic child rearing attitude.

Since the Respect-Demanding attitude correlates similarly as the other scales, in spite of its low reproducibility it showed not be unreliable.

43. **Ratings**

431. *Rating Factors*

A factor analysis was carried out separately for two of the communities (and two raters) in order to establish the consistency of the factor structure. Rotations were performed with orthogonal axes for five factors. The results are given in Tables 12—13.

Table 12.

*Centroid Matrix and Rotated Factors of Parent Attitude Ratings,
Sample I*

Variable Number	Centroid Matrix						Rotated Factors					
	I	II	III	IV	V	h ²	I	II	III	IV	V	h ²
I	80	14	-22	-07	-28	79	78	22	31	08	20	80
II	74	36	03	-22	03	73	73	16	-01	40	09	73
III	34	20	-10	27	09	25	17	27	04	18	34	26
IV	83	-11	15	17	-25	80	59	62	26	01	-03	80
V	61	33	46	-36	19	84	61	21	-32	51	-25	84
VI	11	-45	49	03	-29	54	03	40	01	-31	-53	54
VII	66	41	08	-19	-22	67	78	15	-11	15	10	68
VIII	49	31	37	23	21	57	27	52	-29	37	10	57
IX	-51	39	50	37	14	81	-44	16	-77	-06	13	83
X	83	-08	18	04	05	72	52	55	21	32	-11	73
XI	55	-36	16	21	19	53	09	57	32	25	-17	53
XII	45	-51	-45	-16	27	76	04	-02	79	32	-12	74
XIII	19	24	-48	26	-12	40	17	00	21	-05	58	41

Table 13.

*Centroid Matrix and Rotated Factors of Parent Attitude Ratings,
Sample II*

Variable Number	Centroid Matrix						Rotated Factors					
	I	II	III	IV	V	h ²	I	II	III	IV	V	h ²
I	50	-14	-19	20	-04	35	50	00	-21	16	-18	36
II	67	-48	08	-06	-10	70	63	-04	14	52	-03	69
III	-18	-15	33	37	20	34	12	08	39	-39	-10	34
IV	58	36	21	04	07	52	35	54	21	11	20	51
V	14	-47	40	-23	-30	54	09	00	53	49	-05	53
VI	-17	49	49	18	-11	55	-29	62	15	-23	00	55
VII	80	-11	18	-19	46	93	75	15	-02	22	53	91
VIII	21	42	20	-29	13	36	-05	38	-15	09	44	37
IX	-70	-34	35	11	-11	75	-41	-17	66	-25	-22	74
X	72	28	28	19	19	75	59	58	-15	03	20	75
XI	22	45	37	12	-36	53	-05	70	-04	09	-12	52
XII	32	28	-32	27	22	41	32	09	-50	-22	00	40
XIII	13	-52	18	28	18	43	46	-14	40	-11	-13	42

Four factors can be interpreted and they correspond to each other in both analysis. A great many variables are not »pure«, as they have relatively high loadings in at least two factors. The factors are interpreted and compared with *Baldwin's* clusters. (*Baldwin & al.* 1946 etc.).

I. General Family Adjustment, Child-Parent-Harmony

	Loadings	
	I	II
7. Readiness of explanations	+ .78	+ .75
1. Harmony in the home	+ .78	+ .50
2. Acceptance	+ .73	+ .63

II. Assumption of Parental Role and Consistency of Training

11. Respect	+ .57	+ .70
10. Determination of procedures	+ .55	+ .58
4. Orderliness of family life	+ .62	+ .54
6. Severity of restrictions	+ .40	+ .62

III. Emotionality

9. Emotional tone of procedures	+ .77	+ .66
12. Emotional tone of replies	+ .79	+ .50
5. Indulgence	+ .32	+ .53

IV. Permissiveness

5. Indulgence	+ .51	+ .49
2. Acceptance	+ .40	+ .52
6. Severity of restrictions	— .31	— .23

It is not possible to make exact comparisons with *Baldwin's* clusters. They were not independent of each other as is indicated by the very high intercorrelations between single rating categories belonging to different clusters. In the present study a number of *Baldwin's* categories were omitted which as parallel variables would contribute to »quasi-clusters« in factor analysis as well as those which would increase the »halo« effect of the ratings. Two of the rating categories were not included in the Fels study.

The first factor corresponds to *Baldwin's* warmth (acceptance) and

adjustment clusters. The intercorrelations between the same categories vary from $+.64$ to $+.45$ in the Fels study (*Baldwin & al.* 1945). However, in *Baldwin's* study this factor is not differentiated from the democracy cluster, which also correlates highly with the warmth and adjustment clusters.

The third factor corresponds to *Baldwin's* emotionality variable. It correlates in a similar way to other rating categories. The fourth factor may be identified with *Baldwin's* indulgence clusters.

There is, however, a great difference between both studies in the second factor which was labeled as the «Assumption of Parental Role». The difference may be explained on the basis of the rating categories. The categories demand for respect and planning of procedures occur only in this study. They could partly be subsumed under coerciveness and suggestion (3.22, *Baldwin & al.* 1945) and clarity of policy of regulations and enforcement (3.16), especially when we consider the «negative» extreme of the dimension. In the Fels study coordination of the household does not correlate positively with any of the «authoritarian» categories, and the clarity of policy of regulations and enforcement has strong negative correlations to restrictiveness of regulations and coerciveness of suggestion. The whole cluster of the Assumption of the Parental Role seems to be lacking in the American environment, and the orderliness and clarity of procedure seems to belong to the democratic attitude of the parents. It is not possible to decide to what extent this difference in the clusters is due to the ideological difference of investigators who have stressed different aspects in the selection of rating categories or to what extent it is due to the raters' or ratees' behaviour. In any case, there seems to be a clear difference. In the American environment those mothers and families are rated as orderly and consistent which are «democratic» and as is shown by other results of *Baldwin*, probably have a good educational background. In Finland the rating of parental role and consistency correlates positively with the more «authoritarian» attitude of demand for respect and the assumption of the parental role. It correlates also positively, though not highly, with severity of restrictions.

More detailed comparisons of European and American atmosphere are needed before definite conclusions can be drawn.

432. *Intercorrelations of Rating Factors*

The intercorrelations were calculated from the cluster scores of three categories of the first factor and four categories of the second factor. Only two categories with strongest loadings formed the cluster scores for the Emotionality and Permissiveness factors. In addition, two single categories which had relatively high specificity, Acceleration and Severity, were included. The cluster scores of the first and fourth factor have, accordingly, Acceptance as the common rating.

The intercorrelations of the factor variables are shown in Table 14. The highest intercorrelations are spurious, caused by a common item.

Factor I, Adjustment and Harmony, correlates positively with Acceleration (+.354), and Assumption of Parental Role (+.251), and negatively with Emotionality (— .298). Factor II, Assumption of Parental Role, correlates positively with Acceleration (+.311). There is also a slight positive correlation between Permissiveness and Acceleration.

In general, these factors are relatively independent. The halo-effect may be relatively slight owing to the wording of the categories and scores.

44. **Projective Attitude Test**

441. *The Categories and Reliabilities*

Since the number of items was only 12, the distribution of scores is too narrow. The categories domineering-respect demanding (= »authoritarian») and aggressive-punitive were, as was mentioned before, scored from the same replies, and they were not technically independent.

Range of scores: Authoritarian attitude	—5—+10
Aggressiveness	0—+12

The scores accumulated between the scores 0—+4. Therefore, the reliabilities were not high:

Authoritarian attitude	+ .65
Aggressiveness	+ .70

442. *Interrelation of the Categories*

Both categories correlate highly with each other. The result is due to the scoring procedure.

Table 14.

Intercorrelations Between Clusters

			I	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII	VIII	IX	X	XI	I	II	III	IV	V	I	II	I	II	III	IV	V	
Practices Interview	I	Early Health																								
	II	Later Health	15																							
	III	Feeding Habits	02	53																						
	IV	Toilet Training	02	06	-02																					
	V	Sleeping Habits	-14	-15	-09	-09																				
	VI	Satisfaction with Performance	09	07	09	17	-10																			
	VII	Fearfulness	-09	-15	-08	-08	06	05																		
	VIII	Severity of Punishment	-06	-02	-04	-18	23	-32	10																	
	IX	Reticence	-07	-06	00	-13	12	-26	-02	17																
	X	Emotional Attachment	-01	-02	-03	09	07	-03	08	00	-27															
	XI	Democratic Interaction	-09	-01	00	16	06	05	-03	05	-23	30														
Preference Questionnaire	I	Rational Explanations	03	01	06	08	-05	-01	-14	-06	-06	23	30													
	II	Independence	04	-01	01	06	-01	06	-05	-03	09	-01	03	00												
	III	Aggressive-Punitive	-08	02	01	02	05	-16	03	16	02	-06	-02	-08	-05											
	IV	Domineering-Directive	05	00	14	-01	-01	-09	-02	18	11	-12	-11	-22	-21	34										
	V	Respect-Demanding	-01	12	10	05	07	-13	-06	14	02	01	-05	-07	-13	37	40									
Projective Attitude Test Rating	I	Authoritarian	03	-02	02	00	-03	-07	05	00	10	-18	-14	-09	-02	20	28	18								
	II	Aggressive	00	05	-01	-06	-02	-04	09	06	05	-12	-05	-09	-08	22	17	12	64							
	I	Harmony, Acceptance	12	06	-10	19	-14	16	-10	-24	26	16	21	19	15	-19	-21	-15	-17	-13						
	II	Assumption of the Parent's Role	06	00	-07	14	01	08	-04	-04	-10	11	21	08	01	01	14	09	05	03	25					
	III	Emotionality	-12	-17	-10	-07	11	-12	19	17	06	-01	07	-13	-06	01	02	02	-03	03	-30	-20				
	IV	Permissiveness	10	-03	-14	07	-06	11	-02	-23	-24	20	08	11	03	-21	-18	-10	-15	-12	62	20	-08			
	V	Acceleration	03	-07	-14	06	-03	03	-08	-17	-05	09	13	05	18	-17	-09	-15	-05	00	35	31	-02	35		
	VI	Severity	-01	-04	-04	-02	14	-04	04	19	01	02	09	-03	-03	12	01	13	02	02	-17	52	12	-15	17	

$r \geq .12; P < .05$

$r \geq .14; P < .01$

Table 15.

*Factor Analysis of Child-Rearing Practice and Attitude Clusters
Centroid Matrix*

Variables		I	II	III	IV	V	h ²
Practices	VI Satisfaction	32	-20	19	44	-15	39
Interview	VIII Punishment	-14	-12	-15	24	20	15
	VII Fearfulness	-37	13	-28	-17	21	31
	IX Reticence	-34	-16	11	-41	18	35
	X Affection	31	24	-38	12	05	32
	XI Democratic Interaction	36	29	-35	09	13	36
Preferences	I Rational Explanations	36	20	-24	-15	-13	27
	II Independence	20	-12	17	-17	15	13
	III Aggressive-Punitive	-40	36	06	08	-10	31
	IV Domineering-Directive	-47	43	26	20	08	52
	V Respect-Demanding	-37	44	11	13	-13	38
Projective	I Authoritarian	-31	13	26	08	05	19
Attitude Test Ratings	I Harmony	62	19	16	-10	-06	46
	II Assumption of the Parent's Role	25	44	23	06	24	37
	III Emotionality	-27	-15	-33	13	29	31
	IV Acceleration	41	09	22	-07	39	38

Table 16.

*Factor Analysis of Child-Rearing Practice and Attitude Clusters
Rotated Matrix*

Variables		I	II	III	IV	V	h ²
Practices	VI Satisfaction	53	-10	-23	00	-24	39
Interview	VIII Punishment	-26	12	29	-01	38	31
	VII Fearfulness	23	01	08	02	32	15
	IX Reticence	-44	-30	00	02	27	35
	X Affection	13	54	-01	09	-04	32
	XI Democratic Interaction	10	55	-02	20	-06	36
Preferences	I Rational Explanations	-11	44	-15	00	-22	27
	II Independence	-10	-10	-26	20	-02	13
	III Aggressive-Punitive	-07	-06	54	-07	-08	31
	IV Domineering-Directive	00	-23	67	15	-06	52
	V Respect-Demanding	-04	-05	59	-04	-17	38
Projective	I Authoritarian	-02	-28	33	08	-02	19
Attitude Test Ratings	I Harmony	-01	21	-32	28	-48	46
	II Assumption of the Parent's Role	01	11	14	52	-29	37
	III Emotionality	10	09	13	-02	51	31
	IV Acceleration	-01	03	23	56	-10	38

V. COMPARISONS OF DIFFERENT TECHNIQUES

51. Factor Analysis

The intercorrelations between the cluster and scale scores are shown in Table 14. The analysis and interpretation were made as follows.

The clusters descriptive of the satisfaction of basic physical needs (Clusters I—V) in the Child-Rearing Practices Interview were examined on the basis of single correlations, since all of them are very low. The other clusters of the Child-Rearing Practices Interview were included in the factor analysis.

The five scales of the Child-Rearing Preference Questionnaire were included in the factor analysis. The Aggressive-Punitive attitude of the Projective Attitude Test as well as the ratings of Permissiveness and Severity were excluded since they had some items or categories with the other scores in common. The correlations of these clusters may be examined from Table 14.

The factor analysis of 16 variables was carried out according to *Thurstone's* centroid method. Five factors were extracted, and a rotation was carried out by graphic method with orthogonal axes and also with *Ahmavaara's* cosine solution (*Vahervuo & Ahmavaara 1958*). There was no practical difference between both solutions. The orthogonal solution is presented in Table 16.

In the interpretation of the results, the main interest is in the comparison of the different techniques and of the clusters which could correspond with each other according to the description given in connection with the single clusters.

The highest loadings of the first factor are restricted to the variables of the Child Rearing Practices Interview:

Satisfaction with the Child's Performances	+.53
Reticence of the Child	— .44
Severity of Punishment	— .26
The Child's Fears	— .23

The loadings of all the other variables are very low.

The general meaning of this factor might be clear: The majority of the single items of clusters are concerned with the parents' contentment and acceptance of the child's behaviour and achievement. From the parental point of view the child behaves/does not behave according to the expectations set for him. Simultaneously satisfaction

is indicated by the fact that it is not necessary to punish the child and on the other hand to cause fear of punishment in the child.

One may examine once more whether the Satisfaction factor reflects more the parental attitude or the child's behaviour. One new fact is revealed by the factor analysis. This factor has no significant loadings in the clusters or scales concerned with the child-rearing principles (Preference Questionnaire) or with the interviewer's ratings. Therefore, satisfaction might be determined by actual interaction with the child concerned and not by the conscious preferences or other general attitudes of the parent.

The second factor has loadings over .20 in the following clusters:

Affection	(Practices Interview)	+.54
Democratic Interaction	» »	+.55
Rational Explanations	(Preferences)	+.44
Reticence	(Practices Interview)	-.30
Authoritarian	(Projective Test)	-.28
Domineering-Directive	(Preferences)	-.23
Harmony & Acceptance	(Ratings)	+.21

The highest loadings occur in three clusters of the Child-Rearing Practices Interview which were found to be interconnected in the factor analysis of single items. They were interpreted as indicative or good/poor contact between parents and child. It was also assumed (p. 43) that they would be related to the authoritarian attitude. However, the »authoritarian» clusters of the Preference Questionnaire and the Projective Attitude Test have only very low negative loadings in this factor. Since the preference of Rational Explanations has a positive loading (+.44), one could advance the hypothesis that the second factor reflects a tendency to verbal or non-verbal communication with the child which fits in well with the content of the four clusters with the highest loadings. It would be relatively independent of the acceptance of the »authoritarian/democratic» principles in child rearing.

The third factor is mainly concerned with the »authoritarian» scales of the Preference Questionnaire:

Domineering-Directive (Preferences)	+.67
Respect-Demanding »	+.59
Aggressive-Punitive »	+.54
Authoritarian (Projective Test)	+.33
Harmony and Acceptance (Ratings)	-.32

Severity of Punishment (Practices Interview)	+ .29
Fostering of Independence (Preferences)	— .26
Satisfaction (Practices Interview)	— .23
Acceleration (Ratings)	+ .23

The three «authoritarian» scales of the Preference Questionnaire correlate positively with each other, with the Projective Test clusters, as well as with the Physical Punishment and Non-permissiveness ratings.

This factor might be labeled the «Acceptance of the Authoritarian/Democratic Ideology». One can conclude that it is not related to the verbal and non-verbal communication between the parents and the child. It is also independent of other child training practices except the amount and severity of punishment. It is reflected to some extent, though not clearly, in the satisfaction of the parents with the child's performances and with the interviewer's total impression of the general home atmosphere.

The fourth factor its restricted to rating variables:

Assumption of the Parent's Role (Rating)	+ .52
Acceleration »	+ .56
Harmony & Acceptance »	+ .28
Fostering of Independence (Preferences)	+ .20
Democratic Interaction (Practices Interview)	+ .20

The factor is related to the parents' ability to plan and to their active interest in promoting the child's development. Similar items were not included in the Practices Interview or Preference Questionnaire. However, the cluster Democratic Interaction and the scale Fostering of Independence which have positive loadings, are related to the child's intellectual or social developmental speeds.

The fifth factor:

Emotionality (Rating)	+ .51
Harmony & Acceptance (Rating)	— .48
Severity of Punishment (Practices Interview)	+ .38
The Child's Fears » »	+ .32
Assumption of the Parent's Role (Rating)	— .29
Reticence (Practices Interview)	+ .27
Satisfaction » »	— .24
Rational Explanations (Preferences)	— .22

It is difficult to describe the content of the last factor exactly. Probably the common characteristic of the variables having negative load-

ings would be the stability and harmony of the family life, and the variables having positive loadings could be characterized by lack of matter-of-fact control in child rearing.

Two of the factors are limited to one single technique (Factors I and IV), but even they seem to be more general in nature. Three other factors extent to different techniques and are corroborated to a great extent.

52. Comparisons in a Selected Sample

The intercorrelations of the different clusters are not usually high. One may ask whether this is related to the mothers' willingness to give information. In some cases the replies were relatively brief in the Practices Interview. This problem can be examined in a sample which is selected on the spontaneity of the answers. The spontaneity of the mothers' answers were rated immediately after the interviews. About a fourth of the whole sample were accepted.

The intercorrelations of clusters having significant loadings in each factor were computed and compared with the intercorrelations for the whole sample. As a result it was found that there were no great differences between the intercorrelations of the two samples, though the latter tended to be somewhat higher, e.g. the clusters with significant loadings in the third factor correlate with each other on the average. .20 for the whole sample and .23 for the selected group.

The intercorrelation between Reticence, Affection, and Permissiveness ratings were higher for the selected group, .44 on the average (.24 for the whole sample). It seems to indicate that in this group, a factor of Permissiveness could be found, though it was not differentiated in the factor analysis for the whole sample.

It may be concluded on the basis of these comparisons that the spontaneity/control of the interview replies is not decisive in determining the factor structure of these variables.

53. Discussion and Conclusions

On the basis of the final factor analysis, it is possible to answer the question posed in the introduction.

531. *Comparison of the Techniques*

Three different techniques for measuring parental attitudes were compared:

1. Orally Presented Questionnaire of Child-Rearing Preferences
2. Projective Attitude Test
3. Ratings

It was found that the factor or cluster structures of different techniques do not correspond completely with each other. Three «authoritarian» scales of the Preference Questionnaire had high loadings in one factor (Factor III). For this factor the Domineering-Directive cluster of the Projective Test had a positive loading and the Harmony and Acceptance cluster of Ratings a negative loading. In addition, the clusters Punitive-Aggressive (Projective Test), Non-permissiveness and Severity (Ratings) which were excluded from the factor analysis correlate positively to the «authoritarian» scales of the Preference Questionnaire.

Accordingly, a general attitude, labeled as the «Acceptance of the Authoritarian/Democratic Ideology», is common in these measures. It is not reflected very clearly by the ratings.

Acceptance of the Authoritarian Ideology can be divided into three subscales, the Punitive-Aggressive, Domineering-Directive, and Respect Demanding attitude. The Punitive-Aggressive and Domineering-Directive clusters of the Projective Test correlate more highly with the corresponding scales of the Preference Questionnaire than with the other «authoritarian» scales.

The scale of Fostering of Independence correlates positively with Acceleration rating and has a similar factor structure, though they cover different fields (social vs. intellectual) of behaviour. Preference for independence training is relatively specific which may be caused by the small number of items and low reliability.

Preference for Rational Explanations is also relatively independent of the other scales, but correlates positively with Harmony and Acceptance (Ratings) and negatively with the «authoritarian» attitudes (Preference Questionnaire).

532. *Comparison Between Child-Rearing Practices and Attitudes*

1. The Acceptance of the Authoritarian Ideology is positively loaded by Physical Punishment (Practices Interview) which correlates with

all »authoritarian« clusters. Furthermore, Physical Punishment correlates positively with Severity (Ratings) and negatively with Permissiveness and Harmony and Acceptance (Ratings).

2. The Preference of Rational Explanation has a positive loading in the practice factor Good/Poor Contact (Factor II). There is also a tendency towards negative correlations between the variables of the Acceptance of the Authoritarian Ideology and those of Good/Poor Contact.

3. The ratings of the Assumption of Parental Role and Acceleration remain relatively independent of the practice clusters. Democratic Interaction is related to them to some degree.

4. The rating factor Lability and Lack of Control/Stability and Harmony is connected with the following clusters of the Practices Interview: Physical Punishment, Timidity, Reticence, and Non-Satisfaction.

9. Policies related to basic physical needs are independent of the Preference scales as well as of the Projective Test clusters. They have some significant correlations with ratings. Good health correlates negatively with the parents' emotionality. Good appetite correlates negatively with the permissive and accelerating attitudes. Early and successful toilet training correlates positively with Harmony and Acceptance as well as with the Assumption of Parental Role. In addition it may be mentioned that Toilet training correlates positively with Good/Poor Contact; however, all the correlations are low.

533. *Conclusions*

In the light of the results obtained in the present investigation some contradictory reports of previous studies may be explained. It was found that different techniques do not yield equivalent results, though they may be reliable, and though they are valid to a degree, e.g. they do discriminate between different social groups (see *A. Takala, 1960*). Vague generalizations made from single techniques may hinder further advance. The labeling of variables must be made in a more specific way than is usually the case in factor or clinical studies.

An attempt was made to analyze the child rearing attitudes which could be related to the authoritarian/democratic ideology. The preference for the authoritarian ideology was found to be a general trait which could be divided into three subscales. It does not correlate

highly, however, with child-rearing practices or with parent-child communication as might have been expected on the basis of earlier work (e.g. *Frenkel—Brunswik*, in *Adorno & al.* 1950). Parent-child communication is related more to the preference for rational/non-rational explanations.

It was found that the clusters and factors of different techniques seem usually to correspond to the »basic factors» of child-rearing attitudes which were compared and classified in the beginning of the present study. However, it is not possible to develop any consistent and complete factor descriptions before relationships between practices, norms, conscious preferences or verbalized attitudes, and unconscious tendencies are clarified to a greater extent. A beginning for more detailed analysis was presented in the study described, and studies along these lines will be continued at the Centre for Educational Research.

Several clusters of child rearing practices which have been reported in former studies (e.g. *Wittenborn* 1956) were not found, and others remained sketchy since the children of the mothers interviewed were older than those in most studies of child rearing (10—11 years of age). On the other hand, it was possible to extend the field of items and to discover clusters, which may not be differentiated at the earlier age levels.

Appendix I

Child-Rearing Practices Interview

Intercorrelations of the Items in the Replication Study.

The intercorrelations of the items in the different clusters in the replication study are given below. The numbers of the clusters as well as of the items in different clusters are the same as in the main study.

Cluster I. $r_{12} = +.60$
 Cluster II. $r_{12} = +.10$
 Cluster III. $r_{12} = +.63$
 Cluster V. $r_{12} = +.60$

Cluster IV

	1	2	3	4	5
1					
2	+33				
3	+18	+63			
4	+16	+75	+67		
5	+37	+33	+30	+60	

Decimal points have been omitted.

Cluster VI

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1								
2	+44							
3	+44	+22						
4	+17	+18	+62					
5	+02	+28	-08	+46				
6	+56	+34	+32	-04	-20			
7	+20	+24	+58	+60	+32	00		
8	+11	+03	+33	+46	+37	+04	+52	

Cluster VII

	2	3	4	5
2				
3	+38			
4	+57	+42		
5	+71	+42	+90	

Cluster VIII

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	9
1								
2	+30							
3	+04	-17						
4	-12	-07	+30					
5	+20	+06	+49	+54				
6	-02	-06	+29	+30	+35			
7	+36	+42	+10	+14	+35	+37		
9	+27	-07	+15	-07	+48	+34	+10	

Cluster IX

	1	2	3	4	5
1					
2	+53				
3	+07	+19			
4	+07	+30	-11		
5	+39	+54	-36	+11	

Cluster X

	1	2	3
1			
2	+65		
3	+71	+33	

Cluster XI

	1	2	3	4	5	6
1						
2	+17					
3	+39	+24				
4	+56	+10	+40			
5	+26	+28	-21	+21		
6	+30	+20	-18	+30	+47	

REFERENCES

- Adorno, T. W. & al.* The authoritarian personality. Harper: New York 1950.
- Allport, G. W.* The trend in motivational theory. *Amer. J. Orthopsychiat.* 23, 1953, 107—119.
- Anderson, H. H.* Human behavior and personality growth. In: *Anderson, H. H. & G. L.* (ed.), Introduction to projective techniques, Prentice-Hall: New York 1951, Ch. 1.
- Anderson, H. H.* The measurement of domination and of socially integrative behavior in teachers' contacts with children. *Child Developm.* 10, 1939, 73—89.
- Anderson, H. H.* Domination and social integration in the behavior of kindergarten children and teachers. *Genet. Psychol. Monog.* 21, 1939, 287—385.
- Anderson, H. H. & Brewer, J. E.* Studies of teachers' classroom personalities: II. Effects of teachers' dominative and integrative contacts on children's classroom behavior. *Appl. Psychol. Monog.* No 8, 128, 1946.
- Anderson, H. H. & al.* Studies of teachers' classroom personalities: III. Follow-up studies of the effects of dominative and integrative contacts on children's behavior. *Appl. Psychol. Monog.* No 11, 156, 1946.
- Atkinson, J. W.* (ed.) Motives in fantasy, action, and society. Van Nostrand: New York 1958.
- Baldwin, A. I.* Behavior and development in childhood. Dryden: New York 1954.
- Baldwin, A. L. & al.* Patterns of parent behavior. *Psychol. Monog.* 58, 268, 1945.
- Baldwin, A. L.* Differences in parent behavior toward three- and nine-year-old children. *J. Personality*, 15, 1946, 143—165.
- Baldwin, A. L.* Socialization and the parent-child relationship. *Child Developm.* 19, 1948, 127—136.
- Baldwin, A. L. & al.* The appraisal of parent behavior, *Psychol. Monog.* 1949, 63:4.
- Barker, R. G. & al.* (ed.) Child behavior and development. McGraw-Hill: New York 1943.
- Block, J.* Personality characteristics associated with fathers' attitudes toward child training. *Child Developm.* 26, 1955, 41—48.
- Bowlby, J.* Maternal care and mental health. World Health Organization: Geneva 1951.
- Burgum, M.* Constructive values associated with rejection. *Amer. J. Orthopsychiat.* 10, 1940, 312—326.
- Campbell, D. T.* The indirect assessment of social attitudes. *Psychol. Bull.* 47, 1950, 15—38.
- Carpenter, J. & Eisenberg, P.* Some relationships between family background and personality. *J. Psychol.* 6, 1938, 115—136.

- Cattell, R. B.* The principle replicated factors discovered in objective personality tests. *J. abn. soc. Psychol.* 50, 1955, 291—314.
- Cattell, R. B.* Personality and motivation structure and measurement. World-Book Company: Yonkers-on-Hudson 1957.
- Cattell, R. B. & al.* The objective measurement of dynamic traits. *Educ. Psychol. Measmt.* 10, 1950, 224—248.
- Cattell, R. B.* Personality. McGraw-Hill: New York 1950.
- Cattell, R. B. & Wispe, L. G.* The dimensions of syntality in small groups. *J. soc. Psychol.* 28, 1948, 57—78.
- Cattell, R. B. & al.* The objective measurement of attitudes. *Brit. J. Psychol.* 40, 1949, 81—90.
- Champney, H.* The parent-behavior rating scales. Yellow Springs: S. S. Fels Research Institute 1939.
- Champney, H.* The variables of parent behavior. *Psychol. Monog.* 1949, 63:4.
- Childers, A. T.* Hyperactivity of children having behavior disorders. *Amer. J. Orthopsychiat.* 5, 1935, 227—243.
- Christie, R. & Garcia, J.* Subcultural variation in authoritarian personality. *J. abn. soc. Psychol.* 1951, 46, 157—369.
- Christie, R. & Jahoda, M.* (ed.) Studies in the scope and method of «The Authoritarian Personality». Free Press: Glencoe, Ill., 1954.
- Dubin, S. S.* Verbal attitude scores predicted from responses in a projective technique. *Sociometry* 3, 1940, 24—28.
- Edwards, A. I.* Techniques of attitude scale construction. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts 1957.
- Ephron, H. S.* Fascism: a challenge to mental hygiene. *Amer. J. Orthopsychiat.* 11, 1941, 652—661.
- Ferenczi, S.* The unwelcome child and his death-instinct. *Intern. J. Psychoanal.* 10, 1929, 125—129.
- Fitz-Simons, M. J.* Some child-parent relationships as shown in clinical case studies. *Teach. Coll. Contr. Educ.* 643, 1935.
- Flugel, J. C.* The psycho-analytic study of the family. Horgarth: London 1939.
- French, J. W.* The description of aptitude and achievement tests in terms of rotated factors. *Psychom. Monog.* No 5, Chicago 1951.
- French, J. W.* The description of aptitude and achievement tests in terms of rotated factors. Princeton: Educ. Testing Serv. 1953.
- Frenkel—Brunswik, E.* A study of prejudice in children. *Human Rel.* 1, 1948, 295—306.
- Frenkel—Brunswik, E.* Patterns of social and cognitive outlook in children and parents. *Amer. J. Orthopsychiat.* 21, 1951, 543—558.
- Freud, S.* Neue Folge der Vorlesungen zur Einführung in die Psychoanalyse. Int. Psa. Verlag, Leipzig—Wien—Zürich 1933.
- Ginsberg, E. L.* The relations of parental attitudes to variations in hyperactivity. *Smith Coll. Stud. in Soc. Work* 4, 1933, 27—53.
- Hammond, K. R.* Measuring attitudes by error-choice: an indirect method. *J. abn. soc. Psychol.* 43, 1948, 38—48.
- Hart, I.* Maternal child-rearing practices and authoritarian ideology. *J. abn. soc. Psychol.* 55, 1957, 232—237.

- Harris, D. B. & al.* Children's ethnic attitudes: 11. Relationship to parental beliefs concerning child training. *Child Developm.* 21., 1950, 169—181.
- Hattwick, B. W.* Interrelations between the preschool child's behavior and certain factors in the home. *Child Developm.* 7, 1936, 200—226.
- Hattwick, B. W. & Stowell, M.* The relation of parental over-attentiveness to children's work habits and social adjustments in Kindergarten and first six grades of school. *J. educ. Res.* 30, 1936, 169—176.
- Hofstätter, P. R.* Einführung in die Sozialpsychologie. Humboldt: Stuttgart—Wien 1954.
- Kasanin, J. & al.* The parent-child relationship in schizophrenia. 1 Overprotection-rejection. *J. nerv. ment. Dis.* 79, 1934, 249—263.
- Kates, S. L. & Diab, L. N.* Authoritarian ideology and attitudes on parent-child relationships. *J. abn. soc. Psychol.* 51, 1955, 13—16.
- Kauranne, U.* Unpublished results. Dept. of Psychology, School of Education, Jyväskylä 1959.
- Kinsey, A. C. & al.* The sexual behavior in the human male. Saunders: New York 1948.
- Knight, E. M.* A descriptive comparison of markedly aggressive and submissive children. *Smith Coll. Stud. in Soc. Work* 4, 1933, 168.
- Lewin, K. & al.* Patterns of aggressive behavior in experimentally created social climates. *J. soc. Psychol.* 10, 1939, 271—299.
- Lewis, M.* How parental attitudes affect the problem of lying. *Smith Coll. Stud. in Soc. Work* 1, 1931, 403—404.
- Levy, D. M.* Relation of maternal overprotection to school grades and intelligence tests. *Amer. J. Orthopsychiat.* 3, 1933, 26—34.
- Levy, D. M.* Paper on maternal overprotection. *Amer. J. Orthopsychiat.* 9, 1930, 900—904.
- Levy, D. M.* Maternal overprotection and rejection. *Arch. Neurol. Psychiat.* 25, 1931, 886—889.
- Levy, D. M.* Maternal overprotection. Columbia Univ.: New York 1943.
- Lippitt, R.* An experimental study of the effect of democratic and authoritarian group atmosphere. *Univ. Iowa St. Child Welfare*, 16, No 3, 43—195, 1940.
- MacDonald, M. W.* Criminally aggressive behavior in passive, effeminate boys. *Amer. J. Orthopsychiat.* 8, 1938, 70—78.
- Malcove, L.* Margaret E. Fries' research in problems of infancy and childhood. *The Psychoanal. Study of the Child* 1, 1945, 405—414.
- Mark, J. C.* The attitudes of the mothers of male schizophrenics toward child behavior. *J. abn. soc. Psychol.* 48, 1953, 185—198.
- McClelland, D. C.* The achievement motive. Appleton-Century-Crofts: New York 1953.
- McGinnies, R.* Scaling interview data. *Amer. Social. Rev.* 18, 1953, 514—521.
- McNemar, Q.* Opinion-attitude methodology. *Psychol Bull.* 43, 1945, 289—374.
- Milton, G. A.* A factor-analytic study of child-rearing behavior. *Child Developm.* 29, 1958, 381—392.
- Mueller, D. D.* Paternal domination: its influence in child guidance results. *Smith Coll. Stud. in Soc. Work* 15, 1945, 184—215 (quoted in Symonds, 1949).
- Murray, H. A. & Morgan, C. D.* A clinical study of sentiments I & II. *Genet. Psychol. Monog.* 32, 1945, 3—311.
- Newell, H. W.* The psychodynamics of maternal rejection. *Amer. J. Orthopsychiat.* 4, 1934, 387—401.

- Newell, H. W.* A further study of maternal rejection. *Amer. J. Orthopsychiat.* 6, 1936, 576—589.
- Nummenmaa, T.* Lasten kehitystä ja vanhempien kasvatusasenteita koskeva haastattelu sekä siihen liittyvät normit. Dept. Psychol., Institute of Pedagogics, Jyväskylä, Rep. No 22, 1958.
- O'Neil, W. M. & Lewinson, D. J.* A factorial exploration of authoritarianism and some of its ideological concomitants. *J. Pers.* 22, 1954, 449—463.
- Piipari, R.* Vanhempien kasvatusasenteiden vaikutuksesta lasten käyttäytymiseen eräiden testitulosten valossa. Unpublished study, Dept. of Psychol., University of Helsinki, 1954.
- Proshansky, H.* A projective method for the study of attitudes. *J. abn. soc. Psychol.* 38, 1943, 383—395.
- Radke, M. J.* The relation of parental authority to children's behavior and attitudes. Minneapolis, Univ. Minn. Press 1946.
- Ribble, M. A.* Infantile experience in relation to personality development. In: McV. Hunt (ed.), *Personality and the behavior disorders*, vol. II, 621—651, Ronald: New York 1944.
- Roff, M.* A factorial study of the Fels Parent Behavior Scales. *Child Developm.* 20, 1949, 29—45.
- Ross, B. M.* Some traits associated with sibling jealousy in problem children. *Smith Coll. Stud. in Soc. Work* 1, 1931, 364—376 (quoted in J. P. Anderson 1940).
- Rotter, J. P.* *Social learning and clinical psychology*. Prentice-Hall: New York 1954.
- Ruoppila, I.* Unpublished results. Dept. of Psychology, School of Education, Jyväskylä 1959.
- Schaefer, E. S. & Bell, R. Q.* Development of the Parental Attitude Research Instrument. *Child Developm.* 29, 1958, 339—361.
- Sears, R. R. & al.* *Patterns of child rearing*. Row, Paterson & Co.: Evanston, Ill. 1957.
- Sewall, M.* Some causes of jealousy in young children. *Smith Coll. Stud. in Soc. Work* 1, 1930, 6—22 (quoted in J. P. Anderson 1940).
- Sewell, W. H. & al.* Relationships among child-training practices. *Amer. Sociol. Rev.* 20, 1955, 137—148.
- Shane, A.* A study of fifty-four adolescent problem children showing the effects of overprotection. *Smith Coll. Stud. in Soc. Work* 1, 1931, 410 (quoted in J. P. Anderson 1940).
- Shapiro, M. B.* Some correlations of opinions on the upbringing of children. *Brit. J. Psychol.* 43, 1952, 141—149.
- Silberpfenning, J.* Mother types encountered in child guidance clinics. *Amer. J. Orthopsychiat.* 11, 1941, 475—484.
- Shoben, E. J.* The assessment of parental attitudes in relation to child adjustment. *Genet. Psychol. Monog.* 1949, 39, 101—148.
- Stouffer, S. A.* *The American Soldier. IV. Measurement and prediction*. Princeton: Princeton Univ. Press 1949.
- Symonds, P. M.* Some basic concepts in parent-child relationships. *Amer. J. Psychol.* 50, 1937, 195—206.
- Symonds, P. M.* A study of parental acceptance and rejection. *Amer. J. Orthopsychiat.* 8, 1938, 679—688.
- Symonds, P. M.* *Psychology of parent-child relationships*. Appleton Cent.: New York 1939.

- Symonds, P. M.* The dynamics of parent-child relationships, Teach. Coll., Columbia Univ.: New York 1949.
- Takala, A.* Child rearing practices and attitudes in different social environments. Ann. Acad. Paed. Jyväsk. 19, 2, 1960.
- Takala, M.* Studies of psychomotor personality tests I. Ann. Acad. Sci. Fenn. B 81,2, 1953.
- Takala, M. & Määttänen, M.* A comparison of Dutch and Finnish subjects on the Four Picture Test. Dept. of Psychology, School of Education, Res. Rep. 19, 1958.
- Tasola, O.* Unpublished results, Dept. of Psychology, School of Education, Jyväskylä 1959.
- Tynni, H.* Lasten animistisesta ajattelusta, Unpublished study. Dept. of Psychology, School of Education, Jyväskylä 1955.
- Vahervuo, T. & Ahmavaara, Y.* Johdatus faktorianalyysiin. Porvoo—Helsinki: WSOY 1958.
- Watson, G.* A Comparison of the effects of lax versus strict home training. J. soc. Psychol. 5, 1934, 102—105.
- Wittenborn, J. R.* A study of adoptive children. Psychol. Monog. 70: 1—3 1956, 1—115.
- Zilboorg, G.* Paternalistic aggression and individual freedom in the present crisis, Amer. J. Orthopsychiat. 11, 1941, 638—642.
- Zimmermann, A. C.* Parental adjustments and attitudes in relation to the problems of five- and six-year-old children. Smith Coll. Stud. in Soc. Work 1, 1931, 406—407 (quoted in J. P. Anderson 1940).
- Zuckermann, M. & al.* Normative data and factor analysis on the Parental Attitude Research Instrument. J. consult. Psychol. 22, 1958, 165—171.
- Young, K.* Parent-child-relationship — projection of ambition. Family 8, 1927, 67—73 (quoted in Symonds 1949).