

JYVÄSKYLÄN KASVATUSOPILLISEN KORKEAKOULUN JULKAISUJA XIX  
ACTA ACADEMIAE PAEDAGOGICAE JYVÄSKYLÄENSIS XIX

---

**CHILD-REARING PRACTICES  
AND ATTITUDES AS MEASURED  
BY DIFFERENT TECHNIQUES**

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

**BY  
MARTTI TAKALA, TAPIO NUMMENMAA,  
AND URPO KAURAŃNE**

**II. CHILD-REARING PRACTICES  
AND ATTITUDES IN DIFFERENT SOCIAL  
ENVIRONMENTS**

**BY  
ANNIKA TAKALA**

**CENTRE FOR EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH, JYVÄSKYLÄ**

**JYVÄSKYLÄ 1960  
JYVÄSKYLÄN KASVATUSOPILLISEN KORKEAKOULUN JA  
JYVÄSKYLÄN YLIOPISTOYHDISTYKSEN KUSTANTAMA**

JYVÄSKYLÄN KASVATUSOPILLISEN KORKEAKOULUN JULKAISUJA XIX  
ACTA ACADEMIAE PAEDAGOGICAE JYVÄSKYLÄENSIS XIX

# CHILD-REARING PRACTICES AND ATTITUDES AS MEASURED BY DIFFERENT TECHNIQUES

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

BY  
MARTTI TAKALA, TAPIO NUMMENMAA,  
AND URPO KAURANNE

II. CHILD-REARING PRACTICES  
AND ATTITUDES IN DIFFERENT SOCIAL  
ENVIRONMENTS

BY  
ANNIKA TAKALA

CENTRE FOR EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH, JYVÄSKYLÄ

JYVÄSKYLÄN KASVATUSOPILLISEN KORKEAKOULUN  
JA JYVÄSKYLÄN YLIOPISTOYHDISTYKSEN KUSTANTAMA

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:978-951-39-8600-1  
ISBN 978-951-39-8600-1 (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 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.

### *I. 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—Brunswick*, 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 extrapunitive. 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 threats 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:  $+0.64$ , replication study was made of three questions concerning the child's early health, but one of these differed from those given above. Reliability:  $+0.79$ .

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

		Chi <sup>2</sup>		
		1	2	3
Item Number				
	1		4.47	7.11
P %	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 <sup>2</sup>		
		1	2	3
Item Number				
	1		10.06	46.23
P %	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*

Item Number	Chi <sup>2</sup>	
	1	2
1		78.06
P % 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*

Item Number	Chi <sup>2</sup>				
	1	2	3	4	5
1		37.85		13.91	61.11
2	0.1		28.54	46.51	231.96
P % 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*

		Chi <sup>2</sup>	
Item Number		1	2
	1		20.34
P %	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 <sup>2</sup>							
Item	Number	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
			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.			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<sup>2</sup>

Item Number	1	2	3	4	5
1	1	14.6	9.8	10.9	9.0
2			12.5	23.5	56.4
P % 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*

		Chi <sup>2</sup>								
Item Number		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
P %	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
	5	n.s.		n.s.	1		19.10	21.49	26.66	16.92
	6	n.s.		n.s.	0.1	0.1		12.58	52.43	11.70
	7	0.1	2			0.1	2		14.49	
	8	0.1	0.1	10		0.1	0.1	5		119.55
	9	5	0.1		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 strength 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 <sup>2</sup>	I	II	III	h <sup>2</sup>
	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 light rays 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:  $+ .92$ . 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:  $\pm .90$ .

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 <sup>2</sup>	I	II	III	IV	V	h <sup>2</sup>
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					
	II	III	IV	V	h <sup>2</sup>	I	II	III	IV	V	h <sup>2</sup>	
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	06	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 <sup>2</sup>
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 Attitude Test	I	Authoritarian	-31	13	26	08	05	19
	I	Harmony	62	19	16	-10	-06	46
Ratings	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 <sup>2</sup>
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 Attitude Test	I	Authoritarian	-02	-28	33	08	-02	19
	I	Harmony	-01	21	-32	28	-48	46
Ratings	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 ratingscales. 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: II. 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 childrens' 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. I 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' reseach 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 kasvatuserätyksiä 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 kasvatuserätyksiä 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).

II. CHILD-REARING PRACTICES  
AND ATTITUDES IN DIFFERENT SOCIAL  
ENVIRONMENTS

BY

ANNIKA TAKALA

CENTRE FOR EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH, JYVÄSKYLÄ

JYVÄSKYLÄ 1960

## CONTENTS

I. Introduction .....	81
II. Survey of the Results of Earlier Investigations .....	82
1. Differences in the Goals of Child Rearing in Different Social Classes ..	82
2. Training Methods and the Social Class .....	82
3. The Methods of Infant Care and Child Training Applied to Different Spheres of Activity in Relation to Social Class .....	84
4. Discussion .....	86
III. The Problems and General Hypotheses of the Present Investigation ..	88
1. The Problems .....	88
2. General Hypotheses .....	89
IV. Method .....	90
1. Sample .....	90
2. The Research Communities .....	92
3. Method of Determining Socio-Economic Level .....	95
4. The Techniques Employed in the Measurement of Child-Rearing Atti- tudes and Practices .....	98
V. Relationship Between Social Status and Child-Rearing Attitudes and Practices .....	100
1. Child-Rearing Preference Questionnaire .....	100
2. Projective Attitude Test .....	107
3. Rating Scales of Parental Attitudes .....	108
4. Child-Rearing Practices Interview .....	111
A. The Clusters Relating to the Gratification of the Basic Physical Needs	111
B. The Parent-Child Relationship Clusters .....	116
C. Isolated Items .....	121
5. Differences Between the Socio-Economic Classes in the Separate Communities .....	125
VI. The Relations of Child-Rearing Attitudes and Practices to the Community .....	126
1. Child-Rearing Preference Questionnaire .....	127
2. Projective Attitude Test .....	129
3. Rating Scales of Parental Attitudes .....	129
4. Child-Rearing Practices Interview .....	129
A. The Clusters Relating to the Gratification of the Basic Physical Needs	129
B. The Parent-Child Relationship Clusters .....	130
VII. Relationship Between Sex of the Child and the Parents' Attitudes and Practices .....	132

VIII. Relationship Between the Size of Family and the Parents' Attitudes and Practices .....	133
1. Child-Rearing Preference Questionnaire .....	133
2. Projective Attitude Test .....	133
3. Rating Scales of Parental Attitudes .....	134
4. Child-Rearing Practices Interview .....	134
IX. Results of the Factor Analysis of Different Techniques .....	135
X. Discussion and Summary .....	136
1. General Results .....	136
2. The Relationship Between the Factor Results and Social Variables ..	139
Appendix I .....	142
References .....	152

## I. INTRODUCTION

When variations in child-rearing practices within any particular society are considered in relation to social class, three kinds of differences should be noted.

First, to what extent do various social classes have different goals for rearing children. The difference in goal implies that the parents possess different values and have differing opinions concerning the kind of adult community members should make.

In the second place, to what extent do the different social classes use different methods to attain their respective goals.

It is not always easy to differentiate these two points from each other. Since one is not aware of all values and opinions consciously, they cannot all be formulated verbally. Relevant information concerning them may be obtained by studying the child-rearing practices and by noting which kinds of child behaviour are rewarded and which punished.

The third point relates to the extent to which the results of child training differ, or how great are the differences between the personalities and behaviour of the children of the different social classes.

Most investigations have been confined to the first two questions. But some studies have tried to discover the deviations between the children either by analysing the latter on the basis of parent interviews or on the basis of notations and ratings made by observers (e.g. *Balwin & al.* 1945, *Sears & al.* 1957).

The methods of child rearing differ from each other in certain general features which appear in the most diverse possible situations and in connection with different aspects of child behaviour. One such general difference is whether the child's development is directed mainly by restriction of the environmental stimuli or by the reinforcement of particular patterns of the child's behaviour. Furthermore, the reinforcement may occur by means of reward and punishment or rely chiefly on either of these.

In addition, the methods of child rearing differ in specific features, which apply only to a particular aspect of child behaviour. If, for instance toilet training is under consideration, the problems and practices differ somewhat from those concerning restriction of the child's sexual curiosity. In the majority of investigations a number of different spheres of activity have been chosen, — the most obvious needs of the specific age level of the children under investigation and the problem of their gratification: How the environment has reacted to these needs in order to bring them under adequate control?

## II. SURVEY OF THE RESULTS OF EARLIER INVESTIGATIONS

### 1. Differences in the Goals of Child Rearing in Different Social Classes

*Davis* found (1943) that the ideal of the middle class is the esteemed adult, »poor but honest». The ideal of the lower class is the »unsocialized» adult. An adult conforming to the middle-class standards has good manners and controls his aggressions without open outburst. Success in school is considered important by the middle-class families, but not by the lower class. Also *Davis & Havighurst* (1946) and *Ericson* (1947) verified that the value of achievement was emphasized more strongly by middle class than by the lower class. *Davis* (1943) stated that the middle class side with the teachers, the church, and their own social circle. As a result middle-class children receive emotional rewards in school, while on the other hand lower-class children are subject to humiliation and punishment at school, because their own homes have accepted and approved the cultural standards of the lower class. In contrast, *Sears & al.* (1957) reported: »The working-class parents did not take school achievement lightly, they were emphatically interested in having their children do well in school and placed much more pressure on their children than did the middle-class families.»

### 2. Training Methods and the Social Class

*Davis* (1943) found that the usual means of discipline employed by the lower class is severe punishment, which is often physical. The prevailing notion is that children should be beaten to facilitate learning. The child is seldom rewarded for good behaviour. He learns to receive as well as to give blows without provoking anxiety. The middle-class

children are seldom physically punished, the punishment usually being the deprivation of some privilege. For economic reasons the lower class is unable to use this means of control. An efficient disciplinary measure of the middle class is the loss of parental approval if the child does not behave well. *Sears & al.* (1957) did not obtain any differences on this point, but found that the use of physical punishment and ridicule was more common in the working class.

The establishment of emotional bond between parent and child is found more frequently among the higher social groups (*Pipping & al.* 1954, *Baldwin & al.* 1945, *Sears & al.* 1957). The parents' emotional warmth is reflected in the way they treat their children. Rejection of the child was infrequent, and those reported, were found more often among the working class (*Sears & al.* 1957).

The typical child-rearing technique of the middle class consists in continuous and close supervision, the children's play and free-time activities being guided, their playmates selected, and the children prevented from associating with lower-class children. In the upper social class there is an even more pronounced effort to control matters pertaining to the child's experience. Also according to *Davis* (1943) and *Ericson* (1947), the activities of middle-class children are more closely supervised. *Davis* (1955) reported that the lower-class children go to the movies more frequently, and *Davis & Havighurst* (1949) that the middle-class children on the average come home earlier in the evening.

All these cases have been cited from reports made of the American cultural scene. In so far as interview methods used with adolescents have indicated, in Germany the relationship between control policies and socio-economic level differ somewhat. In the upper social class appear fewer external restrictions, prohibitions, and authoritarian attitudes (*Pipping & al.* 1954). Instead, internal techniques of control are emphasized. *Sears & al.* (1957) reported that in America at present restrictions are also used somewhat more frequently by working-class parents.

Similarly, different investigators are at variance with regard to the »severity» of training. *Ericson* (1947) stated that the middle-class families place more exacting demands on their children and that training is begun earlier. As might be expected, *Davis & Havighurst* (1949) found that the middle class obviously adopts a policy of greater restriction of stimulation, which causes more frustrations than is the case in the lower class. Furthermore, they have generalized their results, stating that the middle-class training is more likely to make



a child »an orderly, conscientious, responsible and tame person». *Williams & Scott* (1953) in a study performed among negroes observed that an attitude of permissiveness was more frequently found in the lower socio-economic groups, as exemplified by the mothers' being more lenient as to breast feeding, toilet training and discipline, while in the higher socio-economic groups there was more rigidity in regard to routine restriction of bodily and social contacts and exploration of the environment. On the other hand, *White* (1955) disputed the opinions frequently expressed in the literature to this effect. He stated that middle-class parents are more permissive in conflicts with their children and less stern than lower class in enforcing their demands. Aggressiveness toward parents is more frequently tolerated among the middle-class than in lower-class families. It appears, also, in the latest investigation by *Sears & al.* (1957) that several features of child training related to the dimension of strictness are more frequently encountered in the working class than in the middle class (severity of toilet training, more punishment and scolding for accidents, more »shaming», punishment and irritation for dependency, non-permissiveness of aggression towards parents, non-permissiveness of sex play, etc.). According to *Pipping & al.* (1954) the child's needs are less restricted in the higher social groups, but the moral restrictions imposed upon him at a later age are more severe.

*Davis* (1943) noted differences in respect to the father's role in the training and control of the children. Among middle-class people (negroes) the father is an important factor, while the lower-class families are less stable and among these, therefore, the mother-child relationship becomes more significant and enduring. In her comparative study of different cultures *Mead* (1949) found that the more unstable the family is as a social institution, the more important is the mother-child relationship. The significance of relationship between father and child is related to the permanence and organisation of the social conditions.

### **3. The Methods of Infant Care and Child Training Applied to Different Spheres of Activity in Relation to Social Class**

*Breast-feeding.* *Davis & Havighurst* (1949) reported that lower-class mothers breast-feed their babies more frequently and longer than the middle-class mothers usually do. *Ericson* (1947), also, found that breast-feeding is less frequent in the middle class.

*Feeding.* *Davis* stated that among the coloured, the early control of feeding habits is the same in the lower and middle classes. *Davis & Havighurst* (1946) found that the training in this sphere is more severe in the middle-class families, while *Sears & al.* (1957) brought out the opposite. According to *Davis* (1955), the lower-class children are given food between regular mealtimes more often than the children of the middle class.

*Sleeping.* *Davis & Havighurst* (1949) confirmed that the middle-class children were older when they stopped having day-time naps.

*Toilet training, bladder and bowel control.* *Davis* (1943) reported that the different social class groups showed no difference in training for early bowel control. According to *Ericson* (1947), toilet training is begun earlier among the middle class, although it by no means leads to earlier results. By contrast, *White's* results (1955) indicated that the training might be less severe in middle-class families. *Davis & Havighurst* (1948) verified that the beginning of bowel and bladder training as well as its successful termination in relation to social class was complex. The results were opposite for the whites in comparison to the negroes. Again, *Sears & al.* (1957) did not observe any differences in the time it was begun, but the training succeeded a few months earlier for the working class than for the middle class.

*Sex.* According to *Davis* (1943), there is no difference in the attitudes of the lower and middle classes to early masturbation. But in respect to later sex education there are noticeable differences. The lower-class children may be warned not to experiment sexually; since the parents do not shun sexuality, the children do not learn to do so. On the contrary the middle-class parents usually are silent concerning the whole matter, since in their opinion sex is something dangerous and terrible. As a result of this attitude the children too, develop sex anxiety. *Davis* (1955) found that the middle-class children were newer allowed to talk about sex, but among the lower class it was not forbidden. According to *Sears & al.* (1957) the social classes differ greatly in regard to sex permissiveness. Among the middle class there is much more tolerance to indications of early masturbation or social sex play, and less pressure for modesty. They state: »Within these eastern metropolitan communities, sex training was much more severe among poorly educated, working-class families.» Thus, the reports differ sharply from each other.

*Religion.* *Davis* (1943) found that the coloured middle-class training includes regular sunday school and church attendance and night prayers. The lower-class families either do not belong to a church or attend spasmodically.

#### 4. Discussion

In comparing investigations performed in different social milieus in child-rearing patterns between the social classes, the question arises to what extent is it possible to divide the populations into similar social-class groups. What does, for instance, «middle class» mean when applied to American whites, American negroes, Finnish urban and rural environment etc.

*Davis'* (1943) investigation was performed among negroes. The differences which he observed between the lower and middle classes were in many respects similar to those reported by later investigators. Later *Davis & Havighurst* (1946) studied the differences in child-rearing practices between the lower and middle classes in both coloured and white sub-groups. This investigation revealed only slight differences between the two races. On the other hand, it was found that the differences between the lower and middle classes were more or less the same among the negroes as among the whites.

The main practical result of these investigations as well as that of certain others seems to have been the criticism of the «more severe» child-rearing policies of the middle class, which restrict the child's impulses and produce marked frustration and anxiety. This has been emphasized in a large number of the mental hygiene papers.

*Whiting & Child* (1953) confirmed on the basis of comparative investigations the «severity» of American infant training as compared with that of other nations. In later investigations (*White* 1955, *Sears & al.* 1957) opposing views have been reported, which show middle-class practices more favorably. Comparisons of the «best» child-training methods of different social groups are rather futile, if one studies only particular aspects of child-training, as for instance, the extent to which the child is permitted to learn to derive pleasure from the gratification of his bodily needs, or the extent to which the training is essentially authoritative or democratic.

When the results of different investigations seem to deviate, there are two basic factors which may account for this, and should be considered before the reason is placed elsewhere.

1. The social classes for which the same names have been used in different investigations are not comparable. In different communities it may be quite impossible to find any comparable standards. Hence, the differing results.

*Davis* (1943) described the coloured lower class as follows: The mar-

riages are unstable, the parents separated several times during the childhood of their youngsters, both husband and wife frequently indulge illicit relationships, fighting with fist or knife is common in the majority of the homes and neighbourhoods, and gambling is approved. One-fourth to one-third of all children are born out of wedlock. Delinquency is much more frequent than in the middle class, and poor school performance is the rule. But in the investigation by *Sears & al.* (1957), for instance, the »working class» includes a group »from unskilled laborers to self-employed plumbers and carpenters, the largest group being relatively skilled workers who were not self-employed.»

In the present investigation, the lowest social group (unskilled workers) cannot be compared with either of the above-mentioned groups. It would have been necessary to select the research population differently, in order to obtain a group from the lowest occupational level which would have corresponded in its asocial traits to *Davis'* lower class. Although the families were unselected not one would have fit *Davis'* description. For this reason one would have predicted that the differences observed between the social groups would be slighter than in some of the previous investigations.

2. The child-rearing methods are subject to changes (*Stendler* 1950, *Wolfenstein* 1953). Research results differ depending on how the timing of the investigation relates to the current mode of child rearing. *Klat-skin* (1952) found that suggestions which apply to particular areas of training, such as self-demand feeding, beginning toilet training, etc., effect results. Practices change in the direction of the suggestions. By contrast, more general suggestions may be stubbornly resisted.

If the cause of the changes is to be found in the industrialization and urbanization of the society, different research results are obtained depending on how the investigation coincides the change process. In the present study no attempt was made, nor was it possible, to analyse differences which might be due to such change processes. If the change is in the direction of new enlightenment, it may be presumed that more rapid advances are made in the urban rather than the rural areas, and in the higher rather than the lower social groups. One could expect this to be true of the initial stages of the change. When the change has run its course, observable, difference may no longer exist between different groups. *Hoeflin* (1954), for instance, found that in a certain rural community there were no differences between the families of different socio-economic levels to the degree recommended child-rearing practices had been adopted.

In addition to such fundamental factors, there are a variety of methodological factors which possibly influence results, but which cannot be analysed here. The age level of the children at the time of the investigation may further influence results. For instance *Baldwin* (1949) has shown that the parental attitudes usually undergo a change with increase in the age of the children. The changes vary with the different social groups, but further information on this point is lacking. If the interview questions concern circumstances of the earliest periods of the child's life, the answers may reflect not only what was actually done at that time, but also what is acceptable currently.

On the whole, the relationship between social classes and educational ideals, attitudes and methods of child rearing are necessarily very complex. Conclusions of causal relationships have been premature, although they have been drawn from studies, whose ultimate purpose was practical. Social class correlates with many other social factors which may be related more directly. Among these can be listed family size, urban/rural environment, educational level, etc. In previous investigations relatively narrow subgroups have been studied, and generalization of the results was not possible. With the exception of the study by *Sears & al.* (1957), no attempts have been made to control other factors related to social class. Consequently, it is not surprising that differing results have been obtained.

### III. THE PROBLEMS AND GENERAL HYPOTHESES OF THE PRESENT INVESTIGATION

#### 1. The Problems

The main purpose of this investigation was to find out how parental child-rearing attitudes and methods are related first to socio-economic status of the family, and secondly to community in which the family lives.

In order to study the relationship between socio-economic status and child-rearing attitudes and methods, boys and girls of the same age were selected from homes representing different socio-economic levels. The research population and the classification on a socio-economic base are presented in detail later.

In order to discover how child-rearing attitudes and practices are related to the type of community in which the family lives, the investi-

gation was performed in four communities: A city, a small town, an industrial centre in a rural district, and a rural community differed from each other markedly. The families represented approximately the different socio-economic levels of each community.

In addition to the above mentioned social variables the effect of family size and the effect of the sex of the child on the child-rearing attitudes and practices were included. It is a well known fact that family size is related to social status in that the larger the average size of the family the lower the social status. Equally well established is the fact that the largest families are found in the poorest and most remote areas. Therefore, it is important to know what differences in child-rearing attitudes and practices between different socio-economic levels and different communities are related to differences in the average family size.

The research sample was too small to permit studying separately and in detail the influence of other factors related to socio-economic status, for instance, the educational level of the parents.

## **2. General Hypotheses**

1. Due to living arrangements, the families of the lower class have less possibilities of choosing between different practices in child care and training. The gratification of the basic needs of life is of primary importance. On the higher socio-economic levels the possibilities for choice increase. The gratification of the basic needs assumes secondary importance and the parents become more interested in using practices which are most beneficial for the child's development along the lines which they consider ideal. It was therefore assumed that the fundamental «principles» in child care and training are more common in the upper social class and the parents' behaviour toward their children is more guided by these principles than in the lower class.

2. The upper social classes which are more interested in using the «right» methods in child care and training, are more frequently in contact with the current new theories of the specialists in child training. (To some extent this may be explained by the fact that the specialists usually seem to be interested in the problems of middle and upper class training.)

3. When the gratification of the basic needs becomes of secondary importance on the higher socio-economic levels, the interaction between the members of the family becomes of value in itself. It was thus

assumed that the communication between the parents and their children (both emotional and non-emotional, verbal as well as non-verbal communication) would increase as the socio-economic level of the family rises.

4. It was assumed that the Child-Rearing Preference Questionnaire would separate the social classes more effectively than the Child-Rearing Practice Interview for the following reasons: The preference (fixed alternative) questionnaire deals with principles of child rearing. General ideals expressed verbally are tied to the linguistic development and use of abstract concepts. They are apparently closely associated with other verbalized goals, ideals and principles prevailing in a particular social class. On the other hand, one could presume that an open-end-question interview which is directed at the child-rearing practices which the parents report to be followed in every-day life and which is concerned with the parent-child relationship as well as with the parents' perception of their children, would not separate the social classes as effectively.

In a similar way, it seems reasonable to expect that the abstract verbalized concepts would reveal more clearcut differences between the extreme social classes than the questions concerning their application to practical matters.

The more special hypotheses of the present investigation have been made on the basis of the results of previous investigations reported in the survey. They will be presented separately in connection with the special problems dealt with in this investigation.

#### IV. METHOD

##### 1. The Sample

The parents to be interviewed were selected on the basis of their children. The fourth graders in the primary schools were selected, who were with a few exceptions, 10—11 years old. At this school level the Finnish children have not yet passed to the secondary level. This grade therefore gives an unselected group of children from all social levels.

For practical reasons the entire school classes were chosen as the »units» of the present investigation, although their size varied in the different communities. (Psychodiagnostic investigations were performed on the children, but the results of these will be presented

separately.) It was necessary to have several school classes in order that a total of 80—90 cases could be studied in each community. The proportion of boys and girls was about equal. The total sample consisted of 334 children. The distribution of the different communities appears in Table 1.

Table 1.

*The Distribution of Subjects According to Sex and Community Sex and Community*

Community	Sex		Total
	Boys	Girls	
Helsinki	45	37	82
Jyväskylä	40	41	81
Inkeroinen	39	39	78
Kiuruvesi	48	46	94
Total	172	163	335

The research communities were chosen on the basis of differing of each other and representing different types of communities in the country, Helsinki for a big city, Jyväskylä for a smaller town, Inkeroinen for an industrial community in the rural area, and Kiuruvesi for a remote, typically rural district. In these four communities, which will be described in detail in the next section, the classes were selected on the following basis. At Kiuruvesi fifty per cent of the sample consisted of children from the central village, fifty per cent from the more remote small villages. At Inkeroinen the total sample consisted of children from the industrial community itself. Because at Jyväskylä but particularly in Helsinki the people of different socio-economic levels to some extent live in different areas, the schools were selected representing neither extreme end of the scale, but including children from different social groups.

Only the mothers were interviewed. A similar investigation has been performed later (*Turunen 1959*) to determine the extent to which mothers and fathers give the same answers to interview questions of the Child-Rearing Preference Questionnaire. Their answers correlated  $+ .49$  on the average, and no systematic deviations were found. In a recent study by *Leton (1958)* using a similar method, the parents' answers were essentially the same.

In Helsinki, Inkeroinen and Kiuruvesi the interviewer was a member of the community, who had been specially trained. At Jyväskylä the



interviews were made by the same person as at Kiuruvesi. A single prearranged interview was made at each home. The method has been described in detail in a separate paper by *M. Takala, Nummenmaa & Kauranne* (1960).

## 2. The Research Communities\*

*Helsinki*. Largest city and capital, land area 162 sq.km., population 426.000, population density about 2.500 per sq.km. It is the cultural centre of the country, the largest university and the majority of institutions of higher learning being there. It is the most important industrial and business centre of the country. Those born in Helsinki are in minority, the majority of the population having come from elsewhere.

Of the population about 39 per cent are in industry, 18 per cent in business, 9 per cent in transportation, 16 per cent in community and business services. There is, therefore, a far higher business and various services percentage than there is in the other three research communities or in the entire country on the average.

Size of the family is noticeably smaller than the average size for the whole country. The total number of persons per 100 families is 310; the number of children under 18 years old is 99. The proportion of large families (6 or more children) is only 0,5 per cent of all families with children; the number of children under 18 years is 175 per 100 families with children.

To a noticeable degree administration and business have invaded the centre of the city, more and more families are constantly moving to the periphery. To some extent, people of different socio-economic levels live in different areas. There are some »slum-areas», some industrial workers' areas, and some wealthy areas. The differences between the different parts of the city are probably less marked than they are in most other cities.

There are 76 primary schools in Helsinki, attended by 35.500 children. None live far from school.

\* The data on the research communities have mainly been obtained from the Statistical Yearbook of Finland and from the Official Finnish Statistics. They refer mainly to the years 1956 and 1957. The data concerning the occupational fields and social conditions of the population are derived from Population Census of 1950. The housing data reflect the post-war conditions and therefore are essentially out-of-date owing to the recent, rapid increase in building activity. The investigation was made during 1955.

Housing: In 1950 the number of inhabitants per 100 rooms was 157. All had electricity and 82 per cent had running water.

The rate of delinquency is higher than for the other research communities. In 1957, the crime rate per 100 persons recorded by the police was 15.

*Jyväskylä.* The town is situated in central Finland and has an area of 30 sq. km. Its population is 35.000 with a population density of about 1.200 persons per sq.km. It ranks ninth in size for Finnish towns.

The town is characterized by being partly a wood- and metal industrial centre, partly an important educational centre. It is the site of the first Finnish language secondary schools in the country since teaching in Finnish was begun there. A university college is also located there.

About 56 per cent of the population gain their livelihood from industry, 14 per cent from business, 9 per cent from the transportation and 9 per cent from community and business services.

The size of the families is somewhat smaller, and the number of children somewhat lower than the average for the country as a whole. Per 100 families there are 348 persons and 131 children under 18 years of age. Of all families with children, the proportion of large families (at least 6 children) is 1.4 per cent; the number of children under 18 years old is 198 per 100 families with children.

There are 7 primary schools at Jyväskylä within short distance from the home which are attended by 4.100 children. The number of secondary schools is 6.

Housing: In 1950 there were 156 persons per 100 rooms. All homes had electricity, and 48 per cent had running water.

The delinquency rate is higher than that for the rural communities, but lower than that for Helsinki. The crime rate recorded by the police is about 8 per 100 persons.

*Inkeroinen.* The industrial community of Inkeroinen is a part of Sippola commune, which has a total population of 16.200 persons and an area of 568 sq.km. The population density is 29 per sq.km.

Of the whole population of the commune of Sippola 32 per cent gain their livelihood from agriculture and forestry, being chiefly small farmers. The industry is concentrated to three industrial localities, one of which is the research community of Inkeroinen. Of the whole population for this commune, 47.5 per cent gain their livelihood from industry, while 5 per cent each from business and transportation.

In the commune of Sippola the average family size approximates the mean of the entire country. There are 365 persons and 140 children

under 18 years old per 100 families. The proportion of large families, as defined above, is about 2 per cent of all the families with children, and there are 212 children under 18 years old per 100 families with children.

In 1950 there were 133 persons per 100 rooms. There was electricity in 92 per cent of all homes, and running water in 14 per cent.

The commune of Sippola has 22 primary schools with a total of 2.300 pupils. About one-tenth of these live at a distance of more than 3 km. from school.

The industrial community of Inkeroinen is built up around a large paper mill employing 1.360 people. Since the whole population of Inkeroinen is about 3.700, a considerable proportion of the population is employed by the paper mill. A smaller proportion is employed by the railway and buss services. For this industrial area there are three primary schools, one accredited secondary school and a short term vocational type institute. In the latter, the student body comes from the nearby countryside.

Housing conditions are typical for this kind of community, the industrial workers and staff living in houses of their own or in 4 to 5 unit apartment houses.

Obviously a greater proportion of the industrial locality is connected with industry than the figures for the entire commune of Sippola indicate. In the school chosen for this research, a sample totalling 154 children was collected from 5 different classes of the school. The distribution by occupation of the fathers shows the approximate distribution for Inkeroinen (Table 2).

T a b l e 2.

*Distribution of Occupations at Inkeroinen*

Professionals (university training), business directors	5.8 per cent
Clerical occupations, foremen etc.	9.7 »
Skilled workers etc.	72.1 »
Unskilled workers	12.3 »

For the entire commune of Sippola the delinquency rate of 4 per 100 persons is lower than for the towns investigated, but somewhat higher than for Kiuruvesi. Unfortunately no separate data are available for Inkeroinen.

*Kiuruvesi.* Area 1.330 sq.km., population 16.400. The commune covers a large area with only 12 inhabitants per sq.km. Large bodies

of water help to increase the scattering and sparcity of the inhabitations. Kiuruvesi is a rural district, its inhabitants being predominantly small farmers. Seventy four per cent of the population obtain its livelihood from farming and forestry. About 67 per cent of the farms have an area of less than 5 hectares (about 12 acres). About 11 per cent of the population are in industry and 4 per cent in business.

The average family size is larger than in the other communities studied. There are 430 persons and 186 children under 18 years old per 100 families. In the commune of Kiuruvesi the average family size is larger than for the whole country. About 7 per cent of all families with children are what have been designated as large families, and the number of children under 18 yrs old is 263 per 100 families with children.

Kiuruvesi has 41 primary schools. Except in the central village, the number of pupils in each school is very small. Despite the large number of schools, more than one-fourth of the 2.800 pupils live at a distance of more than 3 km. from the school. There is one secondary school.

In the remote villages of Kiuruvesi the standard of living is relatively low. The housing conditions are also poorer than in the other research communities. In 1950 there were 193 persons per 100 rooms, electricity in only 23 per cent and running water in 4 per cent of the homes.

The delinquency rate is lower than for the other research communities, only 2 crimes per 100 persons being recorded.

For the last hundred years Kiuruvesi has been the centre of a vigorous religious movement, which has given religion an unusually dominant role, which is reflected in the general church attendance and religious meetings. This religious movement has influenced the thinking of even those who have been apart from it. At Kiuruvesi the political extreme left has had very numerous adherents, more than one-third of the votes at the parliament elections in 1954 being cast in their favour.

In order that the above comparisons might be more meaningful some averages for the whole country will be given in Table 3.

### **3. Method of Determining Socio-Economic Level**

The so-called occupational hierarchy was chosen as a basis for the socio-economic classification. It reflects the esteem in which the representatives of different occupations are held in a community. This method of classification makes it difficult to distinguish between cor-

Table 3.

*Comparisons Between Research Communities and the Entire Country*

	Helsinki	Jyväskylä	Inkeroinen (Sippola)	Kiuruvesi	Entire Country
Resident Population per sqkm	2.662	1.149	29	12	13
Livelihood (in Per Cent)					
— Farming and Forestry			32*)	74	42
— Industry	39	56	48*)	11	29
— Business	18	14	5	4	7
— Transportation	9	9	5		6
— Community and Business Services	16	9			7
— Personal Services					3
Persons per 100 Families	310	348	365	430	372
Children under 18 years per 100 Families	99	131	140	186	144
Children under 18 years per 100 Families with Children	175	198	212	263	224

\*) The percentages refer to the entire commune of Sippola. At Inkeroinen the approximate percentage of persons who gain their livelihood from industry is 80.

responding hierarchic levels of essentially different occupations. In many classifications the divisions are made whereby attention is, in addition, paid to the differences in occupational field, for instance, farmers are put in one entity, businessmen in another, and professional people in still another. In a study of child-rearing attitudes such a classification did not seem appropriate. Nor was a sharp distinction between »intellectual» and »non-intellectual» workers deemed useful, since it is obvious that the two may place at the same point on a given level of an occupational hierarchy scale. In the present investigation both businessmen and land owners were included in the same hierarchic scale with members of other occupations. In this respect such a policy may form a clear exception to the usual system of classification in that a businessman and land owner could be placed in the highest socio-economic group. The reasons for adopting this policy were the following.

»Big» land owners (»big farmers») and »big» businessmen are often given the same commissions of trust as other members of the highest socio-economic group in the community.

In the community they often move in the same social circles as the

other members of the highest socio-economic group, and one criteria of social class is that individuals belonging to the same class associate or can associate with each other.

They often identify themselves with the highest social class.

Their social attitudes (e.g. political attitudes) are akin to those of the professional group.

On the basis of the occupation of the individual who supports the family investigated the families were classified in four socio-economic groups.

I. Individuals with university training (professional), for instance lawyer, doctor, economist, engineer, clergyman, teacher with academic degree, etc. Land owners with over 50 hectares of cultivated land (plus forest, usually 100—1.000 hectares) and with at least agricultural vocational training or unusual communal commissions of trust. Owners or managers of large corporations; by »large» is meant firms with branch establishments, department stores, or wholesale dealers, and industrial establishments divided in units with their own managers.

II. Individuals in »intellectual» work without university training, e.g. clerks; independent business-men and land owners who do not qualify for Group I. The educational level of most of this group is usually grade-school (4+5 years) with vocational school or college training. In this group belong, for instance, trained technicians, foremen, building contractors, shop managers, custom-house, post- and railway-officials, hospital nurses, etc.

III. Skilled workers and a large proportion of those employed in the so-called service occupation. Their educational background is primary school (7 or 8 years) and vocational school, or they have acquired specialized occupational skill on the job. Examples of this group are: salesmen, police-men, custom-house workers, railway workers, janitors, postmen, caretakers, turners, filers, carpenters. The corresponding level for the agricultural class is represented by small farmers, by which in this study is meant a farmer who cannot maintain a family on the produce from his land and forest alone, but from time to time has to supplement his income from other work (as for instance winter work in the forests which is very common in Finland).

IV. Unskilled workers. Workers without occupational-school training or without permanent, specialized jobs requiring training; they work in the building business, in industries, in the field and in the forests.

The distribution of the research population in the four research communities according to socio-economic level as described above is shown in Table 4.

Table 4.

*The Distribution of Subjects According to Social Class*

Community	Social Class			
	I	II	III	IV
Helsinki	27	14	27	14
Jyväskylä	12	31	23	15
Inkeroinen	6	17	33	22
Kiuruvesi	9	29	42	14

#### 4. The Techniques Employed in the Measurement of Child-Rearing Attitudes and Practices

In this investigation parental attitudes and methods of child-rearing were measured by four different techniques. It was hypothesized that the obtained results would not yield high correlations but that they would, therefore, depend to a relatively high degree on the technique employed. This presumption was based on the fact that in psychological examinations results obtained by direct and indirect measures usually have shown little correspondence, although the study had been directed toward variables which had similar labelings. By contrast, some sociological investigations have stated either explicitly or implicitly, that different techniques yield essentially similar results, and for the time being many comparisons have not been made between them (e.g. *Campbell* 1951).

The four techniques employed have been described in detail in a paper on the methodological results (*M. Takala, Nummenmaa & Kauranne* 1960). In the following they are given in a summarized form.

1. Orally presented Questionnaire of Child-Rearing Preferences. Each item presents two (occasionally three) alternate basic ways of reacting in a particular training situation. The respondent has to indicate which method he considered best.

2. The Projective Attitude Test is a variation of Rosenzweig's Picture Frustration Study (Children's Form). The original cartoon words have been changed. In each of the 12 depicted situations a conflict between an adult and a child has arisen. The child frustrates the adult

by finding fault with him, by open defiance, etc. The mothers were asked to indicate how the adult should handle the depicted situation.

3. Rating of Parent Behaviour. Of the rating variables developed by the Fels Institute, 13 were chosen which did not correlate highly with each other and could, therefore, be rated more or less independently. These were rated by the interviewers.

4. Child-Rearing Practices Interview. Open-ended questions were used in the interview. The first part presented relatively neutral areas concerning the child's development, from which the interviewer gradually proceeded to questions relating to training practices.

By correlating the scores of the replies obtained by these four techniques, related items and clusters were discovered. For each technique clusters were detected, which were labelled and considered as general attitude variables. As far as possible these variables were interpreted and named to indicate the trait that was common to all the items of the cluster. The different techniques yielded some variables which were given the same type of names, yet produced low intercorrelations. Some of the correlations failed to be significant, although the reliability of the variables was satisfactory. In the Projective Attitude Test the range of the items was limited, and therefore, only two attitude variables were found. A scale analysis was performed on the items of the Child-Rearing Preference Questionnaire which served as a basis for the final identification of the variables. Some of the items in the Child-Rearing Practices Interview did not fit into any of the detected clusters. One might presuppose that if one had added to the interview a number of different questions, at least some of the questions which now remained isolated would have fit into some of the clusters. On the other hand, it is possible that the latter were related to a special aspect of child training in which the practice is probably dependent on very specific external information, without implying any basic change of general attitudes which would continue to be reflected in different types of situations.

The results will be presented separately for each of the four techniques employed. Thus, the techniques concerned with attitudes will be dealt with first, and the technique which included questions concerning both training practices and facts relating to the development of the child, last.

Those items in the Child-Rearing Practices Interview which on the basis of correlations did not fit into any of the general attitude variables will be discussed in connection with the general variables with which



by their content they are most closely connected. Finally, some of the remaining, isolated items, which could not be fitted in any of the attitudes or practices, will be listed.

The relationship between attitudes and socio-economic background will be examined by combined groups of the four research communities. Then the results for the different communities will be briefly analysed separately in order to discover to what degree the differences in child-rearing attitudes hold between the social-class groups in the different research communities. If this should be the case, then the classification of the homes into the same social-class groups in industrial and agricultural communities has been properly conceived in this study, and the differences in child-rearing practices and attitudes are dependent not only on occupations, but also on social stratification. If, on the other hand, the results for the four communities differ, this should indicate that socio-economic level by itself is not the significant factor in differing child-rearing attitudes and practices.

The results of the differences in child-rearing attitudes and practices between communities of different types as well as other controlled factors investigated, the size of the family and the sex of the child are presented separately.

## V. RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SOCIAL STATUS AND CHILD-REARING ATTITUDES AND PRACTICES

### 1. Child-Rearing Preference Questionnaire

The questions in the preference questionnaire formed five scales. Each one will be presented separately, with a brief description of the area of concern and the empirical results as related to the social status of the family.

#### a. *Rational vs. Non-Rational Explanation*

The items on the scale dealt with the explanations given by parents concerning the basic events of life (birth, death) and the natural phenomena which concern children (thunder, lightning). In addition, they included situations, which may be dangerous for the child. The child can be warned either by giving him the facts or by creating animistic beings he should fear.

It was assumed that following factors will influence the kind of information given to the child:

1. The number of traditional explanations given to children is large. Some of them are very old, magical and animistic and may reflect the thinking of our primitive ancestors. It was expected that these have been better reserved in the rural than in the urban areas. If tradition cannot be relied upon when things of this nature have to be explained to the child, one would assume that the parents provide factual information in so far as they are able. The hypothesis was, accordingly, advanced that rational explanations are less common in rural than in urban environments. (The results on this point are reported on p. 117).

2. Parents who themselves are well-informed may consider it important to transmit such knowledge and thus stimulate the intellectual development of their children more than less-informed parents. The hypothesis was presented that rational explanations are more common in the upper than in the lower social classes.

3. Matter-of-fact attitudes are regarded more masculine and emotional attitudes more feminine according to the cultural patterning of sex roles. The parents can be affected by these »stereotypes» when explaining things to their sons and daughters, and — perhaps unconsciously — guide the boy more toward an matter-of-fact attitude, the girl toward an emotional attitude. It was hypothesized that boys are more often given rational explanations than girls. (The results of this point are reported on p. 122)

The individual numerical results for this as well as other variables to be discussed later appear in Appendix I.

The results (Table 5) show that the score obtained on the scale of rational explanations is significantly related to the social status of the parents ( $P < .01$ ). The lowest social class differed most clearly from all the others since the least value was placed on factual information by them. The upper class also differed from the rest in that they considered factual information very important. According to this scale results for the two middle groups were very similar.

There is thus a marked difference in the way the children at the opposite ends of the social scale are given information by their parents. The children of the upper class are amply provided with the type of information which is not only supplied by but considered to be of primary importance by the school.

The present study corroborated the findings of previous investi-

gations that the average school achievement of the upper class children was above average. (The correlation between social status and school success was +. 32.) During the interview it was ascertained whether the child could read when he began school. Percentage of children who could read before beginning school were: 24 — 10 — 12 — 10 from the upper to the lower social class. This result, too, confirms the hypothesis made that the upper class considers the transmission of information to their children more important than do the parents of all the other classes.

On the basis of this study one is not able to account completely for the factors which may possibly be effecting the rational explanation scale. But considering that both the lowest and the highest social-class divisions differed from the middle groups it seems probable that the value placed on information and the attempt to increase a child's information accounts for the difference found between the groups. That factual information is entirely beneficial from the standpoint of child development is a widely held concept of the upper class. Because of this premise they do not consider the possibility that the child assumes an adult way of thinking too early with a resultant loss in the development of originality in thinking and imagination.

#### b. *Fostering of Independence*

The items of this scale measure the extent to which the child is trained early to assume responsibility, to care for himself and to take on his share of common household tasks.

It was assumed, that the fostering of independence will be influenced by following factors:

If the parents have much work and little time to care for the children and are not able to pay for help in the home, the children are forced to assume early independence. It is known that the parents in rural areas have more work to do in the home than parents in urban areas. On basis of this fact the hypothesis was made that rural children are more early fostered to independence than urban children (see results on p. 118).

On the basis of everyday experience it might be assumed that people living in deprived circumstances are inclined to let their children be free of responsibility relatively long believing that »they will later have more than their share of work«. In upper-class families the mothers

or hired »mother-substitutes» perhaps attend so much to the needs of the children that the conditions under which the child lives may impede rather than promote the development of independence. What is needed under these circumstances is deliberate planning so that the child may become independent. The hypothesis was presented that upper-class families more often than lower-class families deliberately foster their children to early independence.

The results (Table 6) support the hypothesis. The child's assumption of early independence correlated significantly ( $P < .01$ ) with social status in that the higher social level of the parents, the more frequent were the expressed desires for early independence. This result may be combined with a result for a single question in the interview.

In the Child-Rearing Practices Interview it was ascertained whether work was given to the child as the need for it arose or whether specified tasks were assigned to him. The former alternative implies the use of the child as supplementary labour-force, while the latter stresses systematic training for work. On the basis of the hypothesis stated above it was expected that systematic training for work is more common among the upper class. The results indicate that in regard to the amount of this kind of systematic training the highest social class differed from each remaining three groups significantly ( $\text{Chi}^2 = 9.28$ ,  $P < .05$ ). No significant differences were found between these three groups themselves.

The remaining scales are connected with the »authoritarian» vs. »democratic» pattern of child rearing. In the analysis of the results the parental attitudes reflecting traditional »authoritarian» attitude were found to show the following three attitudes: Punitive-Aggressive, Domineering-Directive, and Respect Demanding Attitude (*M. Takala & al.* 1960).

### c. *The Punitive-Aggressive Attitude*

This scale includes views of the extent to which youth today is more forward than previously, the extent to which children should be reared by severe punishment and criticism instead of explanation and direction to desirable activity, and the extent to which fondling is regarded as undesirable coddling of the child.

It was assumed that several reasons may account for such punitive-aggressive attitudes.

The aggressive attitude may result from strong frustrations which the children cause to the adults in such environments where the rearing of children is difficult. The hypothesis was made that the aggressive-punitive attitude would be more common at the lowest social level, where the income is undependable and irregular, and more common in urban than rural environment. (As to the second part of the hypothesis, see the results on p. 118).

According to the investigations cited in the introduction (e.g. *Davis* 1939), aggressive behaviour is approved more often by the lowest social class than the middle-class. If various forms of aggressive behaviour are regarded acceptable, adults are more likely to react to frustrations by being aggressive toward their children. In an environment where aggressiveness in general is disapproved and its manifestations kept under control, there seems to be less reason for expecting the preference for aggressive methods of child rearing. Thus, if this factor is contributing to the punitive-aggressive parental attitude, it would be predicted that the lowest social class, in particular, will differ from the others.

During the last twenty years the specialists in child rearing have emphasized the significance of the so-called positive sanctions, stating that the reward for good behaviour in the form of approval and recognition is preferable to punishment of misdeeds. More frequently the upper social classes are in contact with the current new theories of child rearing and these may influence at least those attitudes which come out in the preference questionnaire. In so far as parent guidance has a lowering affect on the aggressive-punitive attitude, it might be expected that the upper social class would differ from the other groups with regard to the most recent viewpoints.

The distribution of the punitive-aggressive attitudes (Table 7) in the four social groups of the present investigation did not differ significantly from chance ( $P < .40$ ). But when the upper class is compared with all the others the aggressive attitude is significantly less common in the upper class ( $\text{Chi}^2 = 3.88$ ,  $P < .05$ ). Thus the results do not confirm the first and second hypothesis. The »frustrations of child-rearing» or general acceptance of aggressive behaviour seem not to be conducive to an aggressive-punitive attitude. The third hypothesis is confirmed to some extent: It seems probable that the essential factor

is the greater familiarity of the upper class with those non-aggressive reinforcements which influence the child's development and which have been accepted as preferable to punishment alone. According to the present results, the lowest class does not form a separate group differing from the others which would basically accept a more aggressive-punitive attitude on the part of parents toward children.

d. *The Domineering-Directive Attitude*

The scale includes items concerned with the extent to which children should conform to the will of the adult. The scale items also present the problem whether it is better to stop sex play by frightening the child sufficiently or to guide him to other spheres of activity.

In the United States there has been a strong trend in favour of the democratic pattern of child-rearing, which has reflected the democratic ideology of the nation. Chiefly through the influence of the mental hygiene movement this tendency also has been felt in Finland during the last 10 or 15 years.

An essential feature in the democratic method of child-rearing is that instead of teaching the child to respond to the will and demands of the adult, the aim is to develop an ability to recognize the demands of various situations in social living and to meet these demands.

It was assumed that two factors could be conducive to the domineering-directive attitude:

Among the lower social classes the parents make less plans for long range training. (See the general hypotheses of the investigation.) When either conflicts between adults and children or undesirable incidents arise, the measure employed gives an instantaneous solution, the child having to conform to the demands of the adult. Upper-class parents probably have more motivation for considering the kind of discipline to use — if not before, at least after the incident.

Frightening of the child is somehow effective in situations in which there is no possibility for exerting consistent control on children and their activities. If the child is made to fear for example sex play, then the adult is not required to exert further control. The control of children's activities is preferred by upper-class families.

The hypothesis was stated that domineering-directive methods would be more common in lower-class families, where the parents seek an instantaneous solution to the conflicts with children.

The hypothesis was that the domineering-directive attitude, which

included frightening of the child as a means of control, would be more common in the lower-class families, where consistent control on children's activities is less common.

The results (Table 8) confirmed the hypothesis being made: The higher the social class, the less frequently the domineering-directive attitude was encountered ( $P < .001$ ).

The first general hypothesis of the investigation (see p. 79) was confirmed by these results.

#### e. *The Respect-Demanding Attitude*

The items of this scale relate to the question of whether children should be taught to respect certain authority figures as father, teacher, and minister because of their position, or whether they are expected to honour individuals in authority only if they are personally respectable.

The authority figures may be considered to represent control and norms of the community, and a respectful vs. rebellious attitude toward them reveals something about the extent to which the individual accepts the right of the community to control and restrict the behaviour of its members. If the lowest social class in »unsocialized» (as according to the results of e.g. *Davis* 1943), the lower-class members may be expected more often to be critical towards the authority figures and the demand for respect is likely to be less common among lower-class families than in the other social groups.

On the other hand, one would not expect upper-class parents to be very prone to demand esteem for the authority figure itself irrespective of the personality qualities. Upper-class individuals either are themselves or are closely associated with authority figures, and they cannot very well emphasize the demand for respect for authority since in so many instances they would be demanding it for themselves. Hence, it was assumed that on the respect-demanding scale the two extreme social class groups would differ from the two middle groups in the same direction, although for different reasons.

The results (Table 9) indicate that there was a trend toward agreement with the expectation. The distribution shows that the two middle groups had somewhat greater demands for respect than the two extreme groups, although the difference is not statistically significant ( $P < .40$ ).

This finding is interesting in that it would be one of the few instances in which the two extreme groups differed in the same direction from the two middle groups. Additional question revealing the basis for demand for respect would have been necessary, however, in order to disclose the significance of this difference and to discover the factors determining the attitudes of the social classes.

## 2. Projective Attitude Test

The responses were scored on only two dimensions relating to authoritarian attitude and to aggressiveness. They correlated highly with each other, since the scores were obtained from the same replies. Authoritarian attitude implies that the parents reply to the child was aggressive in the usual meaning of the word.

It cannot be taken for granted that an indirect method would yield the same results as a direct technique. The responses obtained by an indirect method might be less reliable. The replies are given without much hesitation, more spontaneously. When an indirect method is used, the amount of conscious control exerted is different in different individuals. (On the relationship between direct and indirect methods, see *M. Takala & al.* 1960.) It was not possible to venture any predictions concerning the extent to which the control of the replies decreases in any social class when a direct technique is exchanged for an indirect one.

### a. *Authoritarian Attitude*

It was expected that the social groups would differ in regard to the authoritative attitude measured by a projective test in the same direction as they differed in regard to the corresponding attitude of the preference questionnaire, the domineering-directive attitude.

The results (Table 10) are in agreement with the expectation. The distribution of the scores in the authoritarian attitude in the social groups indicate the same tendency as was found for the domineering-directive scale, though the difference is not statistically significant ( $P < .20$ ). The two lowest classes were similar to each other on both authoritarian and domineering-directive attitude and differed from the two upper classes which were less authoritarian and less do-



mineering-directive and very much alike on these attitudes. The difference between the two highest and two lowest classes was statistically significant ( $\text{Chi}^2 = 4.55$ ,  $P < .05$ ).

#### b. *Aggressive Attitude*

It was expected that the social groups would differ in regard to aggressiveness in the same direction as they differed in regard to the punitive-aggressive parental attitude (p. 94). The distribution of the scores (Table 11) of the different social groups on the aggressiveness was nearly random ( $P < .30$ ), but the upper social class differed from others in that it registered lower on the aggressiveness, while the results of the other three groups were very similar. The difference, however, is not statistically significant ( $P < .10$ ). Since, however, the tendency was in the same direction in both cases the results may be considered to confirm each other.

Thus, the results of the projective attitude test also supports the assumption that the differences between the social classes in regard to aggressive attitude toward the child does not seem caused by either aggressiveness due to frustrations of adult life or a general approval or disapproval of aggressive behaviour, since in that case the distinction probably would not be between the highest social group and the others but between the lowest group and the others. The assumption that these differences are mainly due to the upper-class parents being better acquainted with non-aggressive methods of child training is supported.

### **3. Rating Scales of Parental Attitudes**

The interviewers rated a total of 13 traits. The results for two of the communities investigated were subjected to separate factor analyses which in both cases yielded almost completely corresponding factors, totalling four. (With regard to details, the reader is referred to the article by *M. Takala & al.* 1960). The four factors were interpreted Child-Parent Harmony, Assumption of Parents Role, Emotionality and Permissiveness. Two traits, Acceleration and Severity of restrictions remained relatively isolated outside the factors.

Subjective influences may have played a part in the rating procedure. Differences between the individual interviewers may have influenced the results. In comparing the social classes it is possible that the inter-

viewers who themselves would have been placed in the upper social classes, were more alert in observing traits with a positive value in these groups. This might be especially true in regard to the first factor of the ratings, Child-Parent Harmony.

a. *Child-Parent Harmony*

This factor consists of the following rating variables: Harmony in the home, acceptance of the child, explaining of the child-rearing policy to the child.

On the basis of the general hypothesis of the investigation (p. 79) it was expected that harmonious child-parent relations would be more common in the upper social classes. The results confirm the hypothesis (Table 12). The two lower socio-economic groups differed significantly from the two upper groups in having low harmony scores ( $P < .01$ ). This result seems to be related to the differences obtained by other methods in this investigation. An aggressive-punitive attitude toward the child was found to be less frequent in the upper social classes (see Child-Rearing Preference Questionnaire, p. 94, and Projective Attitude Test, p. 98). As will be reported later, expression of affection was more frequent in the upper class (Child-Rearing Practices Interview).

b. *Assumption of Parents' Role and Consistency of Training*

This factor consists of two kinds of rating variables. Consistency of training purposes was rated on the basis of the extent to which the reactions of the parents toward their child were planned and deliberate as opposed to being impulsive responses of the moment. Assumption of parents' role was rated by the extent to which conflict situations were handled maturely by them rather than »on the same level« as the child in regard to control of behaviour.

On the basis of the general hypothesis of the investigation it was expected that the assumption of the parents' role and consistency of training would be more frequent in the upper social classes.

The results confirm the hypothesis (Table 13). The higher the socio-economic status of the family, the more frequent was the assumption of the parents' role and the consistency of the training ( $P < .001$ ). The difference between the extreme groups is very great, while the two middle groups do not differ much from each other.

It was assumed that the parents' adult role would create a respect-

ful attitude towards adults in children, while the lack of it would create disrespectful attitude in children making necessary the use of disciplinary techniques which »respected» parents never need. Therefore it was expected that there would be a negative correlation between the assumption of the parents' role and the domineering-directive attitude. The correlations between these clusters are not significant. But the results concerning social class differences are in the expected direction. The domineering-directive attitude is least prevalent in the upper social class, where assumption of the parents' role and the consistency of training occurs more frequently. In the lower social groups, where the latter attitude is less common, the domineering-directive attitude was most prevalent.

It appears that in the popular sources on child rearing the different aspects of »authority» have often been confused. These sources have sometimes recommended democratic methods and criticized authoritarian attitudes, at the same time failing to emphasize consistency of training and respect for parents (based on the greater self-control of the parent, not on domination). If a »democratic» pattern lacks these traits, the result is a laissez-faire policy. Some conservative writers like to emphasize that »children must have an authority». By »authority» they may mean an adult who creates an respectful attitude in the child by his greater self-control or by »authority» also can be meant an adult who is using domineering-directive methods in controlling the child. The latter is an »authority» which deserves criticism, the former is not.

### c. *Emotionality*

This factor involves the emotional versus the rational approach in child-rearing practices. It proved to be independent of social status (Table 14).

### d. *Permissiveness*

This factor consists of ratings on acceptance and indulgence of the child. This factor is related to social status to some extent (Table 15,  $P < .05$ ), the lowest social class being rated as the least permissive, the second class as the most permissive.

e. *Acceleration*

This point involves only one rating trait, not a combined variable. It was found that the two higher social classes significantly more often than the two lower classes deliberately tried to promote the child's development (Table 16,  $P < .001$ ). The result shows the same trend as the results obtained in the Child-Rearing Preference Questionnaire regarding fostering of independence (p. 93).

f. *Severity of Restrictions and Punishment*

This rating variable, too, is isolated from the factors. The results (Table 17) show that it is independent of social status ( $P < .90$ ), just as the cluster »severity» of the Child-Rearing Practices Interview, but that it differs from the result on the variables of the same type on the Preference Questionnaire (punitive-aggressive parental attitude) and the Projective Test (aggressiveness), which both proved to be dependent on social status.

#### 4. **Child-Rearing Practices Interview**

In the item analysis of the open-end question interview eleven clusters were obtained, which were described in the methodological report of this investigation (*M. Takala & al.* 1960). Five clusters related to the child's gratification of basic physical needs (physical well-being, feeding habits, sleeping habits, toilet training). The remaining six clusters relate to the parent-child relationship, i.e. to the amount and nature of the interaction between them.

##### A. *THE CLUSTERS RELATING TO THE GRATIFICATION OF THE BASIC PHYSICAL NEEDS*

It was assumed (see the general hypotheses, p. 79) that parents' acknowledged aims in child care increase with rise in socio-economic level. When the obtaining of one's daily bread is uncertain and just supplying the bare necessities for the child means an added burden of the parents, one cannot be concerned with the potential effect of the living arrangements on his development. Only when the basic needs

have been gratified and have assumed secondary importance, can one weigh, which practices are soundest, most preferable or most beneficial for the child's development. The families belonging to the lowest socio-economic group simply have very little choice, at higher socio-economic levels parents have more possibilities to choose between different practices. The hypothesis was that fundamental «principles» in child care are more common in the upper social classes. On the other hand, it was known that planned child care information spreads everywhere and has a levelling effect on the differences between the social classes, particularly in respect to questions of fundamental importance in child care.

a. *The Child's Health During Infancy*

The cluster related to the child's physical condition immediately after birth, to his health status in the first year and whether or not he was easily cared for during that period. There was a tendency toward good early health being connected with high social status, but the difference was not statistically significant (Table 18,  $P < .20$ ). But when the three highest groups are combined, the lowest class differs significantly from them in that the child's health during infancy has more often been poor in the lowest class ( $\text{Chi} = 5.24$ ,  $P < .05$ ).

b. *The Child's Later Health*

No significant correlation was obtained between the scores for the later health and the family's social status (Table 19,  $P < .30$ ), nor did this estimate correlate highly with the early health. It should be noted that this later health evaluation was based on approximately nine years. Because of this evaluations had very different bases: One mother may have had the last year or two in mind, while another may have had the entire period in mind. However the reliability of the «early health» and «later health» clusters proved to be satisfactory, i.e. about .70. Thus the low correlation between these two health-clusters cannot be explained on the basis of low reliability of the estimations.

c. *Feeding Habits*

The items of the cluster indicate the parents' estimates of the child's appetite and their reaction to the child's feeding habits. These two items proved to be related since parents who think that their child has

normal or good appetite usually do not exert any pressure on the child to eat while parents who consider their child's appetite to be poor often report that they try to persuade or press the child to eat. The pressure to eat may of itself have a deleterious effect on the child's appetite. On the other hand, if the child's appetite is poor, this causes the parents to try to control the amount the child eats.

The assumption was that in an environment, in which frustration due to lack of food does occur or may occur, poor appetite would be less frequently encountered than in an environment where the child often has no conception that food ever could be lacking.

It was thus expected that poor appetite would be less common in the lower than upper social classes.

The scores of the appetite index do not differentiate the social-class groups (Table 20). Even when the two lowest and the two highest classes are combined, the difference between the scores for the groups thus obtained is not statistically significant ( $\text{Chi}^2 = 2.56$ ,  $P < .20$ ).

The results of two interview questions related to feeding, which because of low correlations remained outside this cluster, will be presented in this connection.

The first is whether the child is permitted to eat between meals.

One would hypothesize that this should happen more often in the lower-class families for the following reasons.

Whether the child eats between meals apparently reflects the regularity of the family's eating schedule. If meals are served when the mother can spare time for cooking, it is almost inevitable that the child has snacks.

One of the central points in the child-training advice from the nineteen-twenties to the forties has been scheduling. It may be assumed that this was influential first among upper-class families. In the course of time it may have filtered down to the lower class and had a leveling effect on class differences.

Eating between meals probably occurs if frustrations due to lack of food exist in the child's environment. *Honigman* (1955) stated that in the lowest social class one encounters anxiety of this type, another manifestation being excessive eating when money is available. Similar observations have been made, for instance, by social workers.

The results are as expected. The lower classes differed from the other classes in the greater frequency of eating between meals ( $\text{Chi}^2 = 20.00$ ,  $P < .001$ ). The two middle groups did not differ much from each other, but in the highest group eating between meals clearly was permitted less frequently.

The second interview question in regard to feeding dealt with breast-feeding and weaning. According to the results obtained elsewhere (e.g. by *Davis & Havighurst, 1949*), breast-feeding is more common in the lower social classes. The strong propaganda in the infant-care advice for breast-feeding may have had a levelling effect on the differences in this respect. It was expected, however, that breast-feeding would be more common in the lower social classes even in Finland.

The period of breast-feeding proved in the present investigation to be related to social status as predicted: the higher the status, the earlier was the weaning ( $\text{Chi}^2=18.64$ ,  $P<.01$ ).

#### *d. Toilet Training and Toilet Habits*

In previous investigations the findings on the relationship between toilet training and social status have not been clearcut. It has also been seen that the time when training is begun may not be related to social status in the same way as the time when training is completed.

One may assume that the relationship between beginning training early and its completion varies in different groups according to the extent of variation in the requirements for cleanliness. If the variation in these demands is great in any one group, it may be expected that the children in whose homes cleanliness is considered important (and toilet training begun early) achieve completion of toilet training earlier than those whose parents are not much concerned about the whole matter.

Analysis of the toilet training and toilet habits cluster shows that the early initiation of toilet training was positively correlated with early achievement of control. This could be interpreted to mean that in the present population late completion of toilet training is attributable to absence of pressure in this area.

Toilet training was not significantly related to social status (Table 21,  $P < .50$ ). In this respect practices proved to be more or less uniform in the different social classes. It is possible that this finding is the result of the influences attributable to the network of child care centres throughout the country, which have from the nineteen-twenties to the forties followed a fairly consistent policy of recommending early and regular toilet training.

#### *e. Sleeping Habits*

This cluster is concerned with child's going to bed willingly and falling asleep easily.

Two hypotheses were made about factors causing sleeping problems. First, scarcity of space in lower socio-economic levels makes it difficult to train children in regular sleeping habits. Thus it could be expected that sleeping problems were more common in the lower-class than in the upper-class families.

On the other hand, at higher socio-economic levels problems may arise in that the parents have higher aspirations concerning regular bed time rules, which sometimes rouses a spirit of opposition in the children. If this were the cause of sleeping difficulties, one would expect to encounter more difficulties in the upper than in the lower social classes.

The results show that the degree of sleeping difficulties was equally great in the different social classes (Table 22).

In connection with the sleeping habits cluster responses to question concerning the hour of retiring, which remained outside this cluster because of low correlations, will be discussed.

One question of the interview was whether the children went to bed at the same time as the parents or at different hours. One predicted that the higher the social status, the more likely the hours would differ, the latter having a schedule which was considered appropriate for them (see the general hypotheses on p. 79).

The results were as expected (Table 23). The higher the social status of the family, the greater the differentiation between adults' and childrens' bedtime, ( $P < .001$ ). The two lower classes approximate to each other and differ from the two higher classes, which again approximate to each other.

The interview also revealed that in the higher social classes the child more often had his own bed, while in the lower classes more than one person could sleep in the same bed.

Another question referred to the amount of washing demanded of the child. From the practical reality viewpoint, one would have predicted that the parents' emphasis on cleanliness would increase as a function of social class. The possibility for having hot water available increases with better living standards. It was also assumed (see the general hypotheses on p. 79) that when the immediate, basic needs are satisfied, the level of aspiration in regard to cleanliness rises and cleanliness for its own sake is sought.

The results are as expected. Children belonging to the higher socio-economic classes are more apt to wash both in the morning and evening (Table 24,  $P < .02$ ). Washing only in the morning, which implies that



the children go to bed unwashed in the evening and that the washing which is done is limited to the face and hands, is more general among lower-class families.

In summary, the results relating to the gratification of a child's basic physical needs in general confirm the hypothesis being made (p. 79). The amount of acknowledged principles of child care increases with rise in socioeconomic level. Such fundamental principles affecting the practices in the upper social classes are regularity, cleanliness and differentiation between the living routine of adults and children.

### *B. THE PARENT-CHILD RELATIONSHIP CLUSTERS*

Three of these clusters concern the mother's rating of the child's personality traits. A mother's ratings of her child's personality traits are not independent of the nature of the relationship prevailing between her and her child. Especially with respect to traits connected with moral standards, the ratings are likely to disclose a great deal about the relationship. During the interview the mothers were questioned about their perceptions of their children being industrious and tidy. Usually diligence and cleanliness are regarded in a positive light, while laziness and dirtiness are considered undesirable. In addition, an inquiry was made concerning the degree of reserve and fearfulness shown by the child.

Three clusters were found: satisfaction with the child's achievement, the child's fears and the child's open-mindedness vs. reserve.

#### *a. Parental Satisfaction with the Child's Achievements*

The interview schedule included items involving two very divergent areas of the child's behaviour, which, however, proved to be related to each other. The mother was asked, if she considered the child to be sufficiently neat, sufficiently industrious, and to do his best in school. Since these areas of behaviour are far removed from each other, the cluster may be assumed to reflect satisfaction or dissatisfaction of a more general character. Within the framework of this investigation it was not possible, however, to state how general this attitude under consideration was.

The presumption was that the higher social-class groups would make greater demands concerning their children's achievements in school

and neatness. According to the obtained results, parental satisfaction in these areas is not related to socio-economic status (Table 25,  $P < .30$ ). On the other hand, school achievement of the lower-class children was poorer (p. 92). When the degree of parental satisfaction was the same, this means that the standards set in the lower class in regard to school achievement were somewhat lower. Probably the standards set by the lower class in regard to cleanliness are somewhat lower, but it cannot be stated on the basis of this investigation. In any case it was found that the children in the different social-class groups were equally well able to meet the standards for neatness and industry. It would be necessary in later studies to differentiate more clearly the standards set by the parents and parental satisfaction with the child's achievement.

b. *The Child's Fears*

The cluster includes several items relating to the different fears the child possesses as well as the mother's general evaluation of the child's fearfulness.

The hypothesis was that the child's fearfulness is related to factors which cannot be explained by social status and this was borne out by the results. The child's fearfulness was not significantly related to the socio-economic background (Table 26,  $P < .90$ ).

c. *The Child's Open-Mindedness vs. Reserve (Reticence of the Child)*

The structure of the cluster shows that the ratings of the child's personality traits are related to the nature of the interaction existing between parent and child. A child who is described by his mother as open-minded, relates his school experiences to his parents. Also he spontaneously confesses to his parents about breaking rules and when questioned, admits his guilt. He shows remorse over his bad behaviour. By contrast, a child who is considered reserved by his mother does not talk with his parents about his school experiences. Neither does he spontaneously confess to misdeeds, nor does he readily admit his guilt when questioned. He does not seem to be too concerned about his bad behaviour. The trait measured by the cluster might be called an integrated conscience (confession of guilt, remorse for bad behaviour), as reflected in the child's behaviour. An integrated conscience thus seems to be dependent on a close and free parent-child relationship,

which is reflected also in that the things which happen to the child are to a certain extent shared by parent and child.

Talking about school events was assumed to be related to the parental attitude toward school. On the basis of what is known about the difference existing between the social classes, the prediction was that in the lowest social class, where the attitude toward school is probably least positive, the children would least frequently bring up their school experiences. On the basis of previous investigations it was presumed that an integrated conscience (which correlated with talking about school) would be encountered more frequently in the upper classes. *Sears & al.* (1957), for instance, found that the child training of the lower class was less likely to produce feelings of guilt than that of the middle class. The hypothesis, thus, was that the child's open-minded behaviour would be more common in the upper than lower classes.

However, contrary to prediction this cluster proved to be independent of social status (Table 27,  $P < .60$ ).

Summarizing the conclusions drawn from the trait clusters none of the child's personality traits measured by them was significantly related to social status. The presumptions made on the basis of previous investigations of the social class differences were not confirmed. In particular, it is significant that the lowest social group of the present study did not differ from the others with regard to the »integrated conscience» as reflected in the child's behaviour.

The three remaining clusters in the Child-Rearing Practices Interview which can be interpreted in light of the interaction between parent and child are: Demands for Obedience and Severity of Punishment, Physical Expression of Affection and »Democratic Interaction».

#### *d. Demand for Obedience and Severity of Punishment*

The interrelationships in the cluster show that the child's personality traits are related to the nature of the interaction between the child and his parent. A child who is considered by his mother to be obedient and who accepts punishment well is disciplined by lenient methods. He has no marked fear of punishment and to him the father is not a more frightening figure than the mother. By contrast, a child who is perceived as disobedient by his parents and who defies and resists punishment is disciplined severely. He has developed a pronounced fear of punishment and the father is more frightening figure to him

than the mother. The cluster thus implies that parents train obedient children in a forbearing manner and disobedient children by harsh methods. In addition, the structure of the cluster shows that the severity of punishment is related to masculine authority. On the basis of this study no conclusions can be made as to which factor is causative, but usually the relationship is circular in matters like this. For practical purposes it is not basically important which is the causative factor, what is important is the circular nature of the relationship once established.

During the last fifty years, specialists in child training in this country have recommended avoiding severe punishment. On this basis it was assumed that harsh discipline has been used less frequently in the higher social classes, (see general hypotheses, p. 79).

The results, however, did not confirm the assumption. Demand for obedience and severity of punishment was not related to social status. The proportions of obedient children leniently disciplined and disobedient children severely punished, was about the same in the different social classes (Table 28,  $P < .50$ ).

The item pertaining to the time when physical punishment was begun remained outside the cluster. *Whiting & Child* (1953) mention that severity of training is associated with early instigation of disciplinary techniques. The correlation in the present study was so low that this item could not be included in the severity cluster. Neither did the age when physical punishment was begun show any significant relationship to the socio-economic status of the family.

#### e. *Physical Expression of Affection*

The items belonging to this cluster dealt with whether the child may still sit in the parents' lap, whether he likes to be fondled, whether, when younger, he used to come into the parents' bed, and whether he revealed his plan for the future to his parents. The content of the last-mentioned item differs from the others in the cluster, but it did not correlate strongly with the items in the »openmindedness» cluster, either, as might have been expected.

It was predicted that as the socio-economic level rises and the immediate, basic needs are satisfied, the relationship between people become more empathetic, and this would be reflected in the physical demonstrations of affection between parents and children. In addition, on the basis of common experience the conclusion has been made that

the people of the lower-classes are more reluctant to show, and more ashamed of demonstrating affection than the people in the higher social classes.

The results are in the expected direction. With respect to the amount of physical expression of affection the two lower social-class groups are alike in the lack of such displays while the two higher groups both exhibit more physical expression of affection, similar to one another (Table 29,  $P < .20$ ). The difference is statistically significant when the two upper groups and the two lower groups are combined ( $\text{Chi}^2 = 5,54$ ,  $P < .02$ ).

f. *»Democratic Interaction»*

One fundamental difference between the authoritarian and the democratic patterns of child rearing is the adjustment to the needs of the child. The adherents to the democratic method try to recognize the child's needs and to satisfy them reasonably. The adherents to the authoritarian pattern are more governed by the needs of the adults.

This cluster includes items on sex information, regular allowances and the parents' and children's apologizing mutually.

The hypothesis was that democratic interaction would be more common in the upper social classes. In Finland those advocating the «new» methods have emphasized the importance of considering the child's needs, and it was assumed that the upper classes would more often be familiar with new techniques. It might also be more easy to pay attention to the children's needs in an environment where no worries for the necessities of life exist.

The results confirmed the hypothesis. The higher the socio-economic status, the more «democratic» was the parent-child interaction (Table 30,  $p < .001$ ).

It is obvious that giving regular allowances for economic reasons is related to social status, but along with this there is a recognition and approval of the child's needs.

The children of the higher social classes received sex information more frequently than those of the lower. This is in part, at least, attributable to the fact that in the higher groups the children seldom receive sex information any other way and therefore the need for direct information arises.

Apologizing between parents and children was commoner in the higher social classes. In this respect, too, the members of the upper

class family are more considerate of each other. The fact that the parents sometimes apologize to their children implies a recognition of the child as a person. On this basis the belonging of apologizing to the »democratic« interaction cluster seems logical.

An interview item involving the use of reasoning with children about restrictions remained outside the cluster. It was hypothesized that the use of reasoning would be more frequent in the higher social classes, where the parents would more often tend to formulate general child-rearing principles and be more able to express them verbally. The results confirm the hypothesis. The higher the social status, the more frequently were the restrictions coupled with reasoning ( $\text{Chi}^2 = 21.93$ ,  $P < .001$ ).

### C. ISOLATED ITEMS

Of the 142 items of the child-rearing practices interview about 50 per cent belonged to one of the clusters. The results on the items which did not belong to any cluster, will be presented only if they revealed any differences between the socio-economic classes.

#### a. *The Income Level of the Family and the Use of Hired Help in the Household*

These questions were included to check the social status. It is to be expected that as the social level rises, the economic situation of the family improves and the possibilities of obtaining hired help for the household increase. If, on the other hand, the differences between the social classes had proved to be insignificant on this dimension, it might have been assumed that the results were influenced by a strongly subjective factor. In this case the respondent would have rated their income to their own social class and not to the whole population.

The results were as expected. The higher the social status, the more often was the economic situation of the family reported to be good and the more frequent was the use of hired help by the household ( $\text{Chi}^2 = 19.58$ ,  $P < .001$ ;  $\text{Chi}^2 = 13.89$ ,  $P < .01$ ). Since the correlation between economic situation reported and social status was not very high, it would seem that the subjective rating was influenced by the frame of reference of the respondents' social class.

### b. *Fear of Accidents*

Upper-class families have greater possibilities for providing separate quarters for the children as well as constant supervision. It was expected that in an environment in which the mothers have fewer resources for supervising the children, the anxiety created by the fear of accidents would be greater. On the other hand, the fact that the upper classes supervise their children more closely, might have an opposite effect.

The former hypothesis was confirmed by the results. The mothers in the highest social groups had less fear of accidents happening to their children ( $\text{Chi}^2=8.91$ ;  $P < .05$ ). Only the highest social class differs from the others, the three others being alike in this respect.

### c. *Religious Instruction*

Those who have broken off from the established church of Finland, belong to the working class or to the intellectuals more often than to the other groups. On this base it was assumed that religious training would be emphasized by the middle social classes and particularly by the higher of the two middle groups.

The results revealed, however, that there is a linear correlation between social status and the amount of religious instruction given (Table 31,  $P < .02$ ). An explanation for this may be that a conservative and traditional attitude correlates positively with religious attitude (e.g. *Eysenck*, 1954). In the upper social classes some kind of religious instruction is more often regarded as a part of »good» child training, irrespective of whether the parents themselves may have religious affiliation.

### d. *Differentiation of Feminine and Masculine Roles*

The following questions were brought up in the interview: Does the mother approve of girls' fighting, climbing trees and taking part in boys' play. Is it acceptable for boys to cry, to be afraid and to play with dolls, when younger?

The disappearance of the differences between masculine and feminine roles is a sign of degeneration. Investigations on sex have shown that homosexuality is more common in the upper social classes (e.g. *Kinsey*, 1948). Hence it was hypothesized that the lower social classes will distinguish the behaviour suitable for boys and that for girls more pre-

cisely and that, by and large, the differentiation of the sex roles will be sharper in the lower than upper social classes.

The hypothesis was confirmed in the case of the girls (Table 32,  $P < .001$ ), but not in the case of the boys. Masculine behaviour in the girls was the more frequently approved the higher the social status. Approval of feminine behaviour of boys was not related to the social status of the family.

The interview also determined whether the father participated in child care. According to the results, the restrictions of child care to the mother only is not significantly related to social status.

#### *e. Protecting the Child from Bad Company and Undesirable Habits*

On the basis of the studies cited in the introduction the hypothesis was made that the lowest social class would not make as great an effort to protect their children against undesirable influences as the higher social classes.

Enquiry was made in the interview as to whether the child had had good companions or those who introduced him to bad habits and games. Contrary to the expectation, this point did not differentiate the social classes. The mothers in all groups mentioned equally often that the child had had friends who had taught him bad habits.

It was also determined whether it had been necessary to forbid the child from association with certain friends. The results were in sharp contrast to the prediction. The children in the lowest social class had been forbidden to associate with certain friends significantly more often than in the other groups ( $\text{Chi}^2 = 4.26, P < .05$ ). This result shows that the unskilled workers (the lowest class of the present study) by no means correspond to the «unsocialized» lower class described in other investigations, in which the parents make no effort to break their children's bad habits. Only a small proportion of the lowest-class families of the present investigation seem to fit this description and belong to a «lower-lower» class. The greater proportion of the lowest class (the «upper-lower» class) resembled the higher social groups in that they try to protect their children from the influence of the children from the «very lowest class» (lower-lower class). This protection is pronounced and more conspicuous in the lowest class than in the other social classes, which keep the lower-lower class at a great distance.

The three higher social groups did not differ in the amount of anxiety



attached to the fact that their children might be influenced by bad companions.

Next it was determined whether the child had learned how to swear from his companions, and what the parents' attitude toward this had been. In the lowest socio-economic class the children had learned swearing significantly more often than in the three higher social classes, ( $\text{Chi}^2=6.30, P < .025$ ). The children in this group had also been more often forbidden to swear ( $\text{Chi}^2 = 4.68, P < .05$ ). Again, the result shows that the mothers in the lowest class do not approve bad habits which deviate from the accepted norms of the society, but try to eradicate them from their children. On the other hand, their children more often possessed friends who swore.

As indicated above, it is obvious that the higher social-class children have relatively few opportunities to come into contact with lower-lower class children. The problems stemming from bad company and bad habits seem to be most acute in upper-lower class families which possess the same standards as the upper social classes, but in practice run into more difficulties in trying to protect their children.

#### *f. Encouragement and Direction of the Child's Activities*

The interviewers asked whether the child brought his friends home. On the basis of previous studies it was expected that in the upper class families the home would more often be the centre for children's activities with their friends, because the families then have greater opportunities for supervising the children's activities, which has been found to be a typical middle- and upper-class technique of child rearing. In addition, the housing provides greater space in the upper social classes.

The results bear out this prediction. The highest social class differed significantly from the other three ( $\text{Chi}^2 = 11.13, P < .02$ ) in the frequency with which the children brought their friends home.

In those cases where the children brought their friends home, it was determined whether or not the mother found this to be a nuisance. On this point the social classes differed somewhat from each other ( $\text{Chi}^2 = 8.81, P < .05$ ). In the higher social class groups the mothers whose children brought their friends home tolerated the resulting inconvenience somewhat better.

With regard to spare time activities three categories were noted without being further analysed: home chores, play and sports, and special interests. The expectation was that the lower class children

would have to help at home more frequently and that the higher class children would have more opportunities for sports and special interests. The results bore out the prediction. Sports and special interests were reported by the two higher social groups to a significantly greater extent ( $\text{Chi}^2=20.13$ ;  $P < .01$ ). In the two lower social groups the children performed more household tasks during their spare time.

### **5. Differences Between the Socio-Economic Classes in the Separate Communities**

The differences between the socio-economic classes discussed in the foregoing refer to the pooled sample, comprised of children from the four communities. Since community and social status were not independent of each other (in the cities, a larger proportion of the sample belonged to the higher classes than in the rural communities), it is possible that the obtained differences might be due to differences between the communities and particularly to a difference between rural and urban environments.

It seemed especially important to investigate whether the social classes at Kiuruvesi differed from each other in the same way as in the other communities. (The land-owners were included in the same hierarchic scale with members of other occupations for reasons, which are given on p. 85 ff.) If the results differed significantly for Kiuruvesi, this would cast doubt on the justification for pooling the results as has been done in the treatment of the whole material.

The number of variables on which the social classes in the entire study differed significantly, totalled 30. For these variables, the differences between the social classes were also calculated separately by community. The direction of the difference in social classes of the single community was classified as being:

- a) in the same direction as in the pooled material (at the 20 per cent level of confidence),
- b) random, showing no tendency,
- c) in the opposite direction to that of the pooled material (at the 20 per cent level of confidence).

In the different communities the results on the 30 variables were as follows:

Helsinki: The distribution of 28 variables was in the same direction as in the pooled material, while the distribution of the remaining two was random.

Jyväskylä: The distribution of 22 variables was in the same direction as in the pooled material, while no tendency was observed in 8.

Kiuruvesi: The distribution of 22 variables was in the same direction as in the whole material. In 7 variables no tendency was observed, and the result of one variable was contrary to the result in the pooled material (although only at the 10 per cent level).

Inkeroinen: The distribution of 18 variables was in the same direction as in the whole material, while 10 were random and the result on 2 variables was contrary to that of the pooled sample (although in neither case at the 5 per cent level of significance).

According to these results, the differences between people of different socio-economic classes are greatest for Helsinki. It is characteristic of cities that the different social classes live in separate parts of the town. Therefore it seems natural that the differences between the social classes with respect to child-rearing attitudes and practices were more pronounced in Helsinki than in the other communities studied. Jyväskylä and Kiuruvesi are very close to each other in regard to the amount of differences observed. Since Kiuruvesi does not differ from the other communities, and since the present socio-economic group classification yielded approximately the same differences in child-rearing attitudes and practices between social classes as in the other communities, it may be concluded that the incorporation of the rural population into the same hierarchy as the representatives for other occupations was purposeful.

The differences were slightest at Inkeroinen, which seems to be the most homogenous of the present research communities, because it is a new industrial community.

Summarizing, in this investigation the differences in child-rearing attitudes and practices between the social classes were found to be greatest in a big city and slightest in an industrial community. Since the research population is too small to be representative, it is not possible to make any generalizations.

## VI. THE RELATIONS OF CHILD-REARING ATTITUDES AND PRACTICES TO THE COMMUNITY

The research populations were chosen to permit an analysis of the change in child-rearing attitudes encountered going from a pure and relatively isolated rural environment to an industrial community or a city. The sample is not sufficiently large, however, to allow more

detailed comparisons between the different environments and there is not an adequate basis for generalizations, since some results may pertain to a certain community alone and be dependent on special conditions. The rural area was represented by only one community, which may not be representative of the whole country, it was chosen more with a view to focussing on a community which to a great extent is influenced by tradition and isolated from external influences. The research populations cannot be regarded as being representative, especially in the case of the big communities. In Helsinki, about 30 per cent of the families belonged to the highest social class and about 10 per cent to the lowest, whereas at Kiuruvesi the opposite was true.

From the standpoint of the purpose of this investigation the most significant results were those which revealed differences between the communities but did not separate the different socio-economic classes from each other, or separated them opposite to what would be anticipated on the basis of the correlation between community and social status. Similarly, from the viewpoint of generalization such results were particularly valuable which revealed a linear relationship with the remote rural and the city environment dimensions. For this reason the community of Kiuruvesi was further divided into two, namely, the church village itself and the remote villages, the latter being to a considerable extent isolated.

The differences between the communities were scored for the same clusters and scales as in the foregoing, and they are presented in the same order. By contrast, the differences between the communities were not scored for the separate items in the Child-Rearing Practices Interview.

## **1. Child-Rearing Preference Questionnaire**

### *a. Rational vs. Magical or Emotional Explanation*

The results confirmed the hypothesis (see p. 91) that magical and emotional explanations are more often preferred in the rural communities than in the towns. The difference (Table 33) was highly significant ( $P < .001$ ). The towns of Helsinki and Jyväskylä differed clearly from the other communities in that the mothers more often preferred giving rational explanations; neither differing from each other in this respect. Kiuruvesi and Inkeroinen did not differ from each other as clearly as might have been expected. In examining the individual items it was

revealed that, at Kiuruvesi, magical beings such as water-spirits goblins etc., were used in the explanations.

The distribution of this variable shows that magical or emotional manner of explaining is commoner in rural environments than in towns. That Inkeroinen did not differ clearly from Kiuruvesi may be explainable on the basis that a large portion of the population of Inkeroinen has come from the surrounding rural parish and still preserves its traditional method of explanation. The differences between the communities were not those which might have been anticipated from the distribution of social status of the communities. Hence, the differences on this point must be accounted for by the difference between rural and urban environments.

#### *b. Fostering of Independence*

As stated before (p. 92) it was assumed that early independence would be encouraged more frequently in rural environments, because the wide range of parents' activities makes it necessary for the children to learn to take care of themselves at an early age.

The results bear out the hypothesis (Table 34). At Kiuruvesi, independence was stressed more than in the other communities. In this respect Inkeroinen approximated to the towns more closely. The difference between the communities is statistically significant ( $P < .01$ ). Since on the basis of a social-class differentiation one would have been lead to expect Kiuruvesi, and particularly its remote villages to foster independence less, the result indicates very significantly that a rural environment encourages independence considerably earlier than the urban environment.

#### *c. The Punitive-Aggressive Attitude*

The hypothesis (p. 94) was presented that the aggressive-punitive attitude would be less common in rural than urban environments, because it is easier to rear children in a rural environment and the adults, thus, are less frustrated by difficulties in supporting a child.

The results (Table 35) show that the other communities did not differ much from each other, but aggressive training methods were preferred less frequently at Kiuruvesi than in the other communities ( $P < .05$ ).

This finding seems to confirm the hypothesis to some extent. More evidence is, however, necessary in this regard.

#### d. *The Domineering-Directive Attitude*

Kiuruvesi and Inkeroinen scored highest on the domineering-directive attitude scale (Table 36) and they differed significantly from the urban populations ( $P < .01$ ). Jyväskylä and Helsinki were not differentiated from each other. The direction of the difference was what was to be expected from the distribution of social status in these communities. Therefore the results do not justify conclusions about differences of rural and urban environment in regard to the domineering-directive attitude.

#### e. *The Respect-Demanding Attitude*

This variable did not indicate any clear relation to community other than what can be expected from the distribution of social status in the communities investigated (Table 37). Of the scales of this investigation this one was weakest in regard to the reliability, which fact may explain the outcome.

### 2. Projective Attitude Test

The two variables of the projective attitude test, authoritarian and aggressive attitudes, did not separate the communities significantly from each other ( $\text{Chi}^2 = 6.04$ ;  $P < .20$ ;  $\text{Chi}^2 = 6.17$ ;  $P < .20$ ).

### 3. Rating Scales of Parental Attitudes

Since the ratings were made by different persons in the different communities, a comparison of the communities would turn out to be an analysis of the mean values for subjective ratings. For this reason studying the rating variables by community was not decided on.

### 4. Child Rearing Practices Interview

#### A. *THE CLUSTERS RELATING TO THE GRATIFICATION OF THE BASIC PHYSICAL NEEDS*

- a. *The Child's Health During Infancy*
- b. *The Child's Later Health*
- c. *Feeding Habits*

No clear relationships were indicated between health and feeding clusters and community ( $P < .30$ ,  $P < .05$ ,  $P < .30$ ).

d. *Toilet Training and Toilet Habits*

Both the beginning and completion of toilet training were earliest in the urban environment (Table 38,  $P < .01$ ). The remote Kiuruvesi villages were the most retarded in this respect. Inkeroinen was closer to the rural than to the urban communities. In the urban environments some pressure was exerted, for toilet training was begun earlier than results could be expected. On the other hand, in the remote Kiuruvesi villages there were instances when it was not begun until the child was almost two years of age.

e. *Sleeping Habits*

In the discussion of social classes, sleep problems were placed with housing conditions, difficult living conditions being more likely to cause sleep problems. Since the most primitive housing conditions were encountered in the remote villages of Kiuruvesi, it was expected that sleep problems would there be more common than elsewhere. The results were as expected (Table 39,  $P < .001$ ). The greatest number of problems existed in the remote villages of Kiuruvesi. Sleeping problems were fewest at Jyväskylä, while their number was greater at Helsinki. The difference between these communities may be attributable to the greater number of external stimuli and greater restlessness of life in a big city.

**B. THE PARENT-CHILD RELATIONSHIP CLUSTERS**

a. *Parental Satisfaction with the Child's Achievement*

Satisfaction with the child's achievements was most general at Jyväskylä and Kiuruvesi, and least in Helsinki and Inkeroinen ( $\text{Chi}^2 = 11.32$ ,  $P < .05$ ).

b. *The Child's Fears*

This cluster was not related to community ( $\text{Chi}^2 = 4.44$ ,  $P < .50$ ).

c. *The Child's Open-Mindedness vs. Reserve*

This cluster was not significantly related to community. A tendency seemed to be indicated that Kiuruvesi had a greater number

of reserved children than the other communities ( $\text{Chi}^2 = 8.96, P < .10$ ). This may be explained by the fact that families with a large number of children are more common at Kiuruvesi and as will be shown later (p. 124), children in large families are more reserved than in small families.

d. *Demands for Obedience and Severity of Punishment*

It was expected that severe punishments would be less common at Kiuruvesi in agreement with the findings on the punitive-aggressive attitude of the Child-Rearing Preferences Questionnaire (p. 118). The results were as expected (Table 40). The mothers at Kiuruvesi reported seldom to use severe punishments, the situation being similar at Jyväskylä. The difference is significant ( $P < .01$ ). Since no differences relating to social status were observed on demands for obedience and severity of punishment, the difference must be related to community. It may be assumed that in a relatively stable environment other means of controlling the children's behaviour exist than the use of punishment, while in a rapidly changing environment the parents can control their children's behaviour less by other methods than by using severe discipline.

e. *Physical Expression of Affection*

Expressions of affection were found least in the remote villages of Kiuruvesi and most in Helsinki (Table 41,  $P < .05$ ).

f. *»Democratic Interaction»*

The least interaction was observed in the remote Kiuruvesi villages and the most in the towns (Table 42). The difference is very sharp ( $P < .001$ ).

Summarizing, it may be stated that in the rural environment recognition of the child's needs and demonstration of affection occur less often, and children probably are more frequently reserved than in the urban environments. In this respect the parent-child relations in rural environments have developed least along the lines usually considered as ideal in democratic society. On the other hand, aggressive-punitive trends which usually are associated with authoritarian child-training policies, were less usual in the rural than in the urban communities.



It has been assumed (*Folsom 1943, Homans 1950*) that as the community becomes more and more industrialized and the family loses many of the functions it has in an agricultural society, the significance of the emotional bonds between family members increases. In addition, the significance of the human relations may increase when the emotional bonds of man towards nature decrease. The results of this investigation seem to confirm this assumption.

## VII. RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SEX OF THE CHILD AND PARENTS' ATTITUDES AND PRACTICES

All the cluster variables of the present study were correlated with the sex of the child. It was expected that the differences found would reflect the cultural patterning of feminine and masculine roles.

The reported practices and attitudes were, as a rule, rather independent of sex. Statistically significant relationships were revealed in the following variables (Table 43):

### 1. *Child-Rearing Preference Questionnaire.*

Rational explanation was preferred for sons and non-rational for daughters, as expected (see p. 91).

### 2. *Child-Rearing Practices Interview.*

Toilet training was reported to begin earlier and to be more successful among the daughters.

Parental satisfaction with the child's achievements was more common in regard to the daughters.

The daughters were more often considered to have fears than the sons.

Physical demonstrations of affection occurred more often between daughters and parents than between sons and parents.

»Democratic interaction« was more frequent between daughters and parents than between sons and parents.

As expected, the differences are all connected with sex typing. The reported practices and attitudes express the expectations of the parents concerning the development of girls and boys. Girls are expected to be more diligent and cleaner than the boys. Expressions of emotions, attachment or timidity, are acceptable for girls.

The most interesting difference was that rational explanation was considered more suitable in boys' training while non-rational (emotional or magical) kinds of explanation was preferred more often for girls.

The parents apparently tend to direct the daughters' attitude toward environment to be more emotional and the sons' attitude to be more realistic.

In addition, it may be pointed out that no similar differences were found in the »authoritarian attitudes» (punitive-aggressive, domineering-directive, respect-demanding) or fostering to independence.

## VIII. RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE SIZE OF FAMILY AND THE PARENTS' ATTITUDES AND PRACTICES

As is generally known, the size of family correlates with social status. In the present study the tetrachoric correlation between the size of family and social status was  $-.26$ . Therefore, it was necessary to check, whether the differences found between social classes in child-rearing attitudes and practices could be explained on the basis of family size. The relationship between the size of family and the cluster variables was computed for the total experimental group as well as for each social class separately.

Several cluster variables were found to be dependent of the size of family.

### 1. Child-Rearing Preference Questionnaire

Rational explanations were given more often in small families, non-rational more often in large families ( $P < .05$ ). This difference corresponds to the difference between the social classes. It could be explained on the basis that large families are more frequent among lower social classes, which, partly due to lack of knowledge, prefer non-rational explanations.

Fostering of independence is not related to family size in the total experimental group. However, within the group of skilled workers (3rd class) a significant relationship was found: the greater the number of children, the earlier the fostering to independence ( $\text{Chi}^2 = 5.13$ ,  $P < .05$ ).

The three »authoritarian attitudes» (punitive-aggressive, domineering-directive, respect-demanding) were not significantly related to the size of family.

### 2. Projective Attitude Test

The attitudes of the projective attitude test were not related to the size of family.

### 3. Rating Scales of Parental Attitudes

Both rating clusters which were independent of the social status, *viz.* Emotionality and Permissiveness, were connected with the number of children in the family. In small families the parents are more rational, in large families emotions aroused by single situations determine their practices more frequently ( $\text{Chi}^2 = 9.09$ ,  $P < .01$ ). Permissiveness in child rearing is greater in small families in which the parents have opportunity to consider all the child's wishes, protect and help them ( $\text{Chi}^2 = 7.30$ ,  $P < .01$ ). In large families the protection and helping of children cannot be emphasized to the same extent as in small families.

Assumption of parents' role and consistency of training is connected with the size of family as well as with social status for it is greater in small families in a way corresponding to higher social classes ( $\text{Chi}^2 = 5.16$ ,  $P < .05$ ).

Child-Parent Harmony, Acceleration, and Severity of Restrictions and Punishment were not related to the size of family.

### 4. Child-Rearing Practices Interview

Satisfaction of basic physical needs was statistically independent of the size of family, except for the second highest social class in which toilet training was begun and completed later in the large families.

The child's fears and the severity of punishment were not related to the size of family.

In the small families children were found to be less reticent ( $P < .05$ ), and expressions of affection were more frequent ( $P < .05$ ), and there was more democratic interaction between parent and child ( $P < .001$ ). A similar tendency was found within each social class. However, it was statistically significant only for the group of skilled workers in each cluster.

Satisfaction with the child's performance occurred more often among large families ( $P < .05$ ). On the other hand, school achievement of children in large families was poorer ( $P < .05$ ). Therefore, it seems probable that the parents have lower level of aspiration in large families.

The relationship between the size of family and attitude and child-rearing practice variables was computed separately for each social class in order to determine, whether any part of the variation of these variables could be reduced to the size of family alone. In general, a

similar tendency in regard to family size differences was found in each social class, but the differences were statistically significant only for the total group and for the group of skilled workers (3rd class). It may be concluded that the differences reported are caused by the number of children, irrespective of social status. It is possible, however, that the number of children has the greatest effect on parental attitudes and practices in the groups of skilled workers. The conflict between ideals and external limitations caused by children might be strongest within this group.

## IX. RESULTS OF THE FACTOR ANALYSIS OF DIFFERENT TECHNIQUES

The clusters of the present study were factor analyzed and five factors were extracted (*M. Takala & al.* 1960). Variables related to physical needs did not correlate with other clusters, and they were excluded from the analysis. In the discussion of present results, they are treated as one cluster. Thus, the following six factors may be presented as results of the factor analysis of different techniques which were used for measuring the parental attitudes and child-rearing practices in the present investigation:

1. The parent's acceptance of the child, satisfaction with the child's achievements.
2. Verbal and non-verbal communication between parent and child. The factor is most strongly loaded by the following variables: physical expression of affection, »democratic interaction«, rational vs. magical or emotional explanations.
3. Authoritarian vs. democratic principles in child-rearing. This factor includes punitive-aggressive, domineering-directive, and respect-demanding attitudes.
4. Planning and consistency in child training. This factor is most strongly loaded by the variables assumption of parents' role and consistency of training, and interest in promoting the child's development (acceleration).
5. Stability and harmony of family life is mainly concerned with the number of conflicts between family members as well as with emotionality.
6. The care of the child's physical needs.

## X. DISCUSSION AND SUMMARY

### 1. General Results

The present investigation was planned as a methodological study as well as an analysis of empirical facts. The results obtained by various methods differ from each other in many respects. In the future this type of study should be divided so that sharper distinctions could be made between child-rearing goals, parental attitudes, and training practices. It proved to be very difficult to separate the parents' ideals or norms from their actual behaviour, since, on the one hand, standards impinge upon the methods practised, and, on the other hand, parents' practices influence what they report to be their standards. Notwithstanding the fact that these problems are as yet far from being disentangled, it seems possible to attempt a coherent interpretation of the results, since the relationships found between variables and environmental factors were very consistent.

#### *a. Verification of the General Hypotheses of the Investigation*

1. The first hypothesis seems to be confirmed by the results. In the upper classes child training is guided by more consistent principles. The higher the socio-economic status of the family, the more frequent was the assumption of parents' role and consistency of training. The parents' reactions toward their children were more often impulsive responses of the moment in the lower- than in the upper-class families.

In the differences in child-care practices a similar trend is reflected. The higher the socio-economic status of the family, the greater the extent to which parents try to use methods which benefit the child's development. They try to be consistent in following such principles of child care as regularity, cleanliness, and differentiation of the child's schedule from that of the adults.

The existence of general principles in child care and training can be explained by two factors.

A certain degree of abstract thinking and a relatively high level of verbal development is required to formulate general principles. For this reason the parents' behaviour toward their children can be guided more by such general principles in the higher social classes.

In addition, the economic level of the family can be assumed to be relevant. In an environment where the gratification of the basic needs is of secondary importance and the standard of living is high

enough to allow a choice among various practices, the parents choose methods which seem to be most appropriate from the viewpoint of child care and training. On the other hand, in an environment in which the daily living is a problem and in which the mothers have their hands full performing the most essential tasks involved in running a home, they resort to procedures that get them through for the moment, somehow or other, and they have little opportunity for choice.

For instance, in the highest socio-economic class the mothers may believe that a child should never be left playing outdoors without supervision even for an instant. The wife of a farm labourer cannot subscribe to this. If she did, she would never manage all her various tasks.

Generally, then, the upper socio-economic classes can »afford to« follow fixed principles in their child rearing, while lower-class parents are forced by necessity to react inconsistently. When such a pattern of behaviour is forced by circumstances, it might be transferred later to situations in which it is no longer necessary, but rather the convenience of the parents dictate the methods. This is less likely to happen in an environment in which planned action normally is the rule.

2. The second hypothesis also seems to be confirmed to some extent by the results. The punitive-aggressive attitude was less common and »democratic interaction« more common in the upper than in the lower social classes. In Finland the specialists in child training advocating the »new« methods in child training, have emphasized the significance of the so-called positive sanctions in controlling the child's behaviour and the importance of considering the child's needs. On the other hand, it can be expected that planned child-care information which spreads everywhere has a levelling effect on the differences between the social classes. This can be the reason for the fact that toilet training habits were not related to social status.

3. The results show that the amount of communication between parent and child increases as the socio-economic level rises. (See results on p. 110).

4. The Child-Rearing Preference Questionnaire differentiated the social classes more clearly than the Child-Rearing Practices Interview. All clusters of the preference questionnaire yielded differences between the social classes, some of them statistically very significant.

*b. Comparison of the Present Results with Those of Previous Investigators*

One of the most striking differences between the results of this study and those of previous studies is that the »unsocialized» lower class failed to emerge. *Davis* (1943) described the lower-lower class as a class in which standards of child rearing differ definitely from the middle and upper classes in that behaviour which is not accepted by the rest of the society is approved. Child training is not oriented toward conformance with the standards set by the larger society.

In the present investigation, the goals of child rearing were not analyzed separately to such a degree as might have been desirable. On the other hand, indirect information on this point was obtained by the Child-Rearing Preference Questionnaire and the Child-Rearing Practices Interview. Originally, the last question in the latter was: »What kind of man/woman would you like your child to become?» In an later stage this question was omitted, however, because the answer almost invariably was: »Honest, of course». This was also the case in the lowest socio-economic class. As did mothers of the upper classes, the mothers of the lowest class were anxious to guard their children against bad company and undesirable habits, but it presented a greater problem to them. Obviously these children come into contact more often with the children of the »unsocialized» group, whose company was deemed undesirable. The present investigation does not provide a basis for deciding how an »unsocialized» lower-class group should be collected, but it is clear it is not identical or similar with a group of unskilled workers (forest and farm labourers, unskilled workers in the building and other industries), although *Davis'* and *Havighurst's* results have often been interpreted in this way.

In this study respect for tradition and authority figures occurred to a lesser degree in the lowest but also in the highest social class. Thus, the lowest class failed to be isolated from the others in this respect also.

The lowest social class was found to differ from the upper classes in a »healthy» sense in that »masculine» behaviour in girls was more strongly disapproved in the lower-class families. The disappearance of the difference between masculine and feminine behaviour is considered a sign of »degeneration» and is commoner in the upper social classes.

## 2. The Relationship Between the Factor Results and Social Variables

The relations of the final factors of parental attitudes and practices (*M. Takala & others*, 1960, presented on p. 125) to environmental factors will be discussed separately for each factor.

### *a. The Parent's Acceptance of the Child*

The amount of satisfaction with the child's achievements did not differentiate the social classes. On the other hand, school achievement of the lower-class children was poorer. The standards set by lower-class parents in regard to school achievement were thus somewhat lower.

The amount of satisfaction with the child's achievements was related to the size of the family. Satisfaction increased with the increasing number of children in the family. It was also shown that school achievement was related to size of family. The smaller the family, the better the child's school achievement. Accordingly, the parents in the larger families are satisfied with poorer school achievement than are the parents in smaller families.

The other variables loaded in this factor were not related to social class. Physical punishment which was negatively loaded in this factor, was used less extensively in rural environments. A stable environment ruled by traditions seems to need punishment less as a technique of discipline than does an urban environment.

### *b. Verbal and Non-Verbal Communication Between Parent and Child*

Increased communication between parent and child, more attention to subtler needs of the child, more significant interaction and emotional bonds, more frequent expression of affection, and preference for rational explanations were positively correlated to elevation of social class and degree of industrialization of environment.

The quality of communication between parent and child was also related to the sex of the child. The parent's attitudes and practices express their concept of masculine and feminine behaviour. Demonstrations of affection and »democratic interaction» were more frequent between parents and daughters than between parents and sons. In addition, the parents tried to foster a matter-of-fact attitude towards the world in their sons by giving them more rational explanations, while they were inclined to prefer emotional and phantasy explanations for their daughters.



*c. Authoritarian vs. Democratic Principles in Child Rearing*

The domineering-directive attitude was more common in the lower social classes as well in the rural environments. On the other hand, the aggressive-punitive attitude did not differentiate the social classes and environments in the same direction. (Usually it is expected that the domineering-directive attitude and the punitive-aggressive attitude correlate positively with each other.) The punitive-aggressive attitude occurred less commonly in the highest social class, but more frequently in the urban environment.

*d. Planning and Consistency in Child Training*

The variable most highly loaded on this factor was measured by rating to what extent the parents succeed in maintaining the adult role, especially in conflict situations, and the amount of mature self-control demonstrated. This behaviour was correlated with the following variables: consistency of the parents' attitudes toward the child, interest in promoting the child's development, fostering early independence (sense of responsibility for themselves and for common tasks). It seems obvious that the parents' adult role creates a respectful attitude towards adults in children, while the lack of the same creates a disrespectful attitude in children making necessary the use of such disciplinary techniques which respected parents need not use. It also seems obvious that when the parents succeed in developing a sense of responsibility in the children, strict means of discipline are not needed. Therefore, it may be expected that there would be a negative correlation between planning and consistency in child training, and a domineering-directive attitude. The correlations between these clusters are not, however, significant. But the results concerning social class differences are in the expected direction. The domineering-directive attitude is least prevalent in the upper social class, where planning and consistency in child training occur more frequently.

It appears that in the popular sources on child rearing the different aspects of »authority» have been often confused. These sources have sometimes recommended democratic methods and criticized authoritarian attitudes but at the same time failing to emphasize that consistency of training, and respect for parents (based on greater self-control of the parent, not on domineering,) and the fostering of the child's responsibility should be a part of the »democratic» method. If a »democratic» pattern lacks these traits, the result is a »laissez-faire» situation.

*e. Stability and Harmony of Family Life*

According to the ratings harmony was more frequent in the upper social classes. The rating of emotionality was negatively loaded in this factor. Emotionality was shown to be independent of the social status but correlated positively with the number of children in the family. In large families the child-rearing policies seem to be more affected by the moods of the parents as well as by accidental factors than in small families.

*f. The Care of the Child's Physical Needs*

Satisfaction of physical needs was shown to be related to social status, except for toilet training. Toilet training clearly differentiated rural and urban environment. It was begun and also completed later in the rural environment. In the lower social classes and in the more remote rural villages, sleeping difficulties occurred more often. These differences seemed to be caused mainly by differences in living conditions.

These results describe some of the differences which exist between social classes in Finland to-day. It seems that the variation of child-care practices is to a large extent determined by external or environmental factors. The correlations between the child-care practices and parental attitudes were found to be negligible. This fact may be due to the heterogeneity of the sample. In a more homogenous sample, chosen from a higher living standard, a greater portion of the variation of procedures might be reduced to parental attitudes. The generalizations made in explaining the development of personality in regard to relationships between parental attitudes and the child's development, seem not to be equally valid for different social groups. More research in this area is needed.

## Appendix I

Table 5.

*Relationship Between Social Status and Rational vs. Non-Rational Explanation Scale (Child-Rearing Preference Questionnaire)*

Social status	I	II	III	IV *)	
**)					
Rational explanations	47	62	91	37	$\chi^2 = 15.16$
Non-rational explanations	6	28	32	28	$p < .01$

Table 6.

*Relationship Between Social Status and Fostering of Independence Scale (Child-Rearing Preference Questionnaire)*

Social status	I	II	III	IV	
Early independence	29	38	51	14	$\chi^2 = 14.33$
Late independence	24	52	72	51	$p < .01$

Table 7.

*Relationship Between Social Status and Punitive-Aggressive Attitude Scale (Child-Rearing Preference Questionnaire)*

Social status	I	II	III	IV	
Punitive attitude	15	37	53	27	$\chi^2 = 3.59$
Non-punitive attitude	38	53	70	38	$p < .40$

Table 8.

*Relationship Between Social Status and Domineering-Directive Attitude Scale (Child-Rearing Preference Questionnaire)*

Social status	I	II	III	IV	
Domineering attitude	10	39	63	38	$\chi^2 = 21.30$
Non-domineering attitude	43	51	60	27	$p < .001$

\*) I—IV from the highest to the lowest social class

\*\*\*) Scale scores have been dichotomized

Table 9.

*Relationship Between Social Status and Respect-Demanding Attitude Scale (Child-Rearing Preference Questionnaire)*

Social status		II	III	IV	
Respect demanding attitude	25	51	75	34	$X^2 = 3.27$
Non respect demanding attitude	28	39	48	31	$p < .40$

Table 10.

*Relationship Between Social Status and Authoritarian Attitude (Projective Attitude Test)*

Social status		I	II	III	IV	
Authoritarian attitude	31	56	90	46		$X^2 = 4.71$
Non-authoritarian attitude	21	34	33	19		$p < .20$

Table 11.

*Relationship Between Social Status and Aggressive Attitude (Projective Attitude Test)*

Social status		I	II	III	IV	
Aggressive attitude	28	62	81	44		$X^2 = 3.72$
Non-aggressive attitude	24	28	42	21		$p < .30$

Table 12.

*Relationship Between Social Status and Child-Parent Harmony (Rating Scales of Parental Attitudes)*

Social status		I	II	III	IV	
Child-parent harmony	29	36	41	16		$X^2 = 12.78$
Child-parent disharmony	23	54	82	48		$p < .01$

Table 13.

*Relationship Between Social Status and Assumption of Parents' Role and Consistency of Training (Rating Scales of Parental Attitudes)*

Social status		I	II	III	IV	
Consistency of training	50	72	98	42		$X^2 = 16.59$
Inconsistency of training	2	18	25	22		$p < .001$

Table 14.

*Relationship Between Social Status and Emotionality (Rating Scales of Parental Attitudes)*

Social status	I	II	III	IV	
Emotional attitude	32	62	95	46	$\chi^2 = 5.26$
Non-emotional attitude	20	28	28	16	$p < .20$

Table 15.

*Relationship Between Social Status and Permissiveness (Rating Scales of Parental Attitudes)*

Social status	I	II	III	IV	
Permissive attitude	10	29	26	7	$\chi^2 = 10.36$
Non-permissive attitude	42	61	97	57	$p < .05$

Table 16.

*Relationship Between Social Status and Acceleration (Rating Scales of Parental Attitudes)*

Social status	I	II	III	IV	
Acceleration	41	68	67	25	$\chi^2 = 30.05$
Non-acceleration	11	22	56	39	$p < .001$

Table 17.

*Relationship Between Social Status and Severity of Restrictions and Punishment (Rating Scales of Parental Attitudes)*

Social status	I	II	III	IV	
Severity	21	34	42	22	$\chi^2 = .80$
Non-severity	31	56	81	42	$p < .90$

Table 18.

*Relationship Between Social Status and the Child's Health During Infancy (Child-Rearing Practices Interview)*

Social status	I	II	III	IV	
Poor health	16	32	44	32	$\chi^2 = 5.82$
Good health	38	59	81	33	$p = .20$

Table 19.

*Relationship Between Social Status and the Child's Later Health (Child-Rearing Practices Interview)*

Social status	I	II	III	IV	
Poor health	26	33	46	20	$\chi^2 = 4.03$
Good health	28	58	79	45	$p < .30$

Table 20.

*Relationship Between Social Status and Feeding Habits (Child-Rearing Practices Interview)*

Social status	I	II	III	IV	
Good appetite	30	55	87	41	$\chi^2 = 3.83$
Poor appetite	24	36	38	24	$p < .30$

Table 21.

*Relationship Between Social Status and Toilet Training and Toilet Habits (Child-Rearing Practices Interview)*

Social status	I	II	III	IV	
Early	23	35	43	19	$\chi^2 = 2.72$
Late	31	56	82	46	$p < .30$

Table 22.

*Relationship Between Social Status and Sleeping Habits (Child-Rearing Practices Interview)*

Social status	I	II	III	IV	
Difficulties	17	25	50	22	$\chi^2 = 3.93$
No difficulties	37	66	75	43	$p < .30$

Table 23.

*Relationship Between Social Status and Differentiation between Adult's and Childrens' Bedtime (Child-Rearing Practices Interview)*

Social status	I	II	III	IV	
Bedtimes differing	49	81	75	37	$\chi^2 = 25.74$
Bedtimes same	5	20	50	28	$p < .001$

Table 24.

*Relationship Between Social Status and Amount of Washing Demanded of the Child (Child-Rearing Practices Interview)*

Social status	I	II	III	IV	
Washing in the morning	7	32	46	22	$\chi^2 = 15.93$
Washing in the evening	27	34	33	19	$p < .02$
Washing both in the morning and evening	19	24	44	24	

Table 25.

*Relationship Between Social Status and Parental Satisfaction with the Child's Achievements (Child-Rearing Practices Interview)*

Social status	I	II	III	IV	
Low satisfaction	12	28	37	25	$\chi^2 = 3.70$
High satisfaction	42	63	88	40	$p < .30$

Table 26.

*Relationship Between Social Status and the Child's Fears (Child-Rearing Practices Interview)*

Social status	I	II	III	IV	
Child fearful	16	26	37	23	$\chi^2 = .95$
Child not fearful	38	65	88	42	$p < .90$

Table 27.

*Relationship Between Social Status and the Child's Openmindedness vs. Reserve (Child-Rearing Practices Interview)*

Social status	I	II	III	IV	
Child open-minded	39	57	78	40	$\chi^2 = 1.97$
Child reserved	15	34	47	25	$p < .60$

Table 28.

*Relationship Between Social Status and Demand for Obedience and Severity of Punishment (Child-Rearing Practices Interview)*

Social status	I	II	III	IV	
High demands	18	24	32	23	$\chi^2 = 2.84$
Slight demands	36	67	93	42	$p < .50$

Table 29.

*Relationship Between Social Status and Physical Expression of Affection  
(Child-Rearing Practices Interview)*

Social status	I	II	III	IV	
Few expressions of affection	9	19	39	18	$X^2 = 5.48$
Several expressions of affection	45	72	86	47	$p < .20$

Table 30.

*Relationship Between Social Status and »Democratic Interaction« (Child-Rearing Practices Interview)*

Social status	I	II	III	IV	
Interaction democratic	47	62	65	40	$X^2 = 21.11$
Interaction not democratic	7	29	60	25	$p < .001$

Table 31.

*Relationship Between Social Status and Religious Instruction (Child-Rearing Practices Interview)*

Social status	I	II	III	IV	
Much religious instruction	16	17	22	12	
Some religious instruction	27	55	71	29	$X^2 = 15.60$
No religious instruction	2	15	17	16	$p < .02$

Table 32.

*Relationship Between Social Status and Differentiation of Feminine and Masculine Roles (Child-Rearing Practices Interview)*

Social status	I	II	III	IV	
Strong differentiation	13	37	73	37	
Neutral attitude	2	5	9	4	$X^2 = 30.54$
No differentiation	38	32	38	19	$p < .001$



Table 33.

*Relationship Between Community and Rational vs. Non-Rational Explanation Scale (Child-Rearing Preference Questionnaire)*

Community	Helsinki	Jyväskylä	Inkeröinen	Kiuruvesi <sub>c</sub>	Kiuruvesi <sub>r</sub>	
Rational explanations	66	68	53	27	23	$X^2 = 30.02$
Non-rational explanations	12	13	25	19	25	$p < .001$

Table 34.

*Relationship Between Community and Fostering of Independence Scale (Child-Rearing Preference Questionnaire)*

Community	Helsinki	Jyväskylä	Inkeröinen	Kiuruvesi <sub>c</sub>	Kiuruvesi <sub>r</sub>	
Early independence	27	30	22	24	29	$X^2 = 17.09$
Late independence	51	51	56	22	19	$p < .01$

Table 35.

*Relationship between Community and Punitive-Aggressive Attitude Scale (Child-Rearing Preference Questionnaire)*

Community	Helsinki	Jyväskylä	Inkeröinen	Kiuruvesi <sub>c</sub>	Kiuruvesi <sub>r</sub>	
Punitive-attitude	39	34	33	11	15	$X^2 =$
Non-punitive attitude	39	47	45	35	33	$p < .05$

\*) the church village is indicated by Kiuruvesi<sub>c</sub> and the remote villages by Kiuruvesi<sub>r</sub>.

Table 36.

*Relationship Between Community and Domineering-Directive Attitude Scale (Child-Rearing Preference Questionnaire)*

Community	Helsinki	Jyväskylä	Inkeroinen	Kiuruvesi <sub>c</sub>	Kiuruvesi <sub>r</sub>	
Domineering attitude	29	26	47	23	25	$X^2 = 16.11$
Non domineering attitude	49	55	31	23	23	$p < .01$

Table 37.

*Relationship Between Community and Respect-Demanding Attitude Scale (Child-Rearing Preference Questionnaire)*

Community	Helsinki	Jyväskylä	Inkeroinen	Kiuruvesi <sub>c</sub>	Kiuruvesi <sub>r</sub>	
Respect demanding attitude	28	38	31	29	20	$X = 9.80$
Non respect demanding attitude	50	43	47	17	28	$p < .05$

Table 38.

*Relationship Between Community and Toilet Training and Toilet Habits (Child-Rearing Practices Interview)*

Community	Helsinki	Jyväskylä	Inkeroinen	Kiuruvesi <sub>c</sub>	Kiuruvesi <sub>r</sub>	
Early training	35	34	18	23	10	$X^2 = 17.16$
Late training	47	47	60	23	38	$p < .01$

Table 39.

*Relationship Between Community and Sleeping Habits (Child-Rearing Practices Interview)*

Community	Helsinki	Jyväskylä	Inkeroinen	Kiuruvesi <sub>c</sub>	Kiuruvesi <sub>r</sub>	
Difficulties	31	13	26	18	26	$X^2 = 19.77$
No difficulties	51	68	52	28	22	$p < .001$

Table 40.

*Relationship Between Community and Demands for Obedience and Severity of Punishment (Child-Rearing Practices Interview)*

Community	Helsinki	Jyväskylä	Inkeroinen	Kiuruvesi <sub>c</sub>	Kiuruvesi <sub>r</sub>	
High demands	33	14	29	13	8	$X^2 = 16.51$
Slight demands	49	67	49	33	40	$p < .01$

Table 41.

*Relationship Between Community and Physical Expression of Affection (Child-Rearing Practices Interview)*

Community	Helsinki	Jyväskylä	Inkeroinen	Kiuruvesi <sub>c</sub>	Kiuruvesi <sub>r</sub>	
Few expressions of affection	16	18	17	13	21	$X^2 = 11.19$
Several expressions of affection	66	63	61	33	27	$p < .05$

Table 42.

*Relationship Between Community and «Democratic Interaction» (Child-Rearing Practices Interview)*

Community	Helsinki	Jyväskylä	Inkeroinen	Kiuruvesi <sub>c</sub>	Kiuruvesi <sub>r</sub>	
Interaction democratic	61	60	52	25	16	$X^2 = 30.13$
Interaction not democratic	21	21	26	21	32	$p < .001$

Table 43.

*Parents' Attitudes and Practices Related to the Sex of the Child*

Sex of the child			Tetrachoric correlation
	Girls	Boys	
Rational explanations given to the child			
Non-rational explanations given to the child	57	37	
	103	134	.26
Toilet training early	71	49	
Toilet training late	92	123	.30
Parental satisfaction with the child's achievement	135	98	
Parental dissatisfaction with the child's achievement	28	74	.38
Child fearful	66	36	
Child fearless	97	136	.38
Few expressions of affection between parent and child	109	135	
Several expressions of affection between parent and child	54	37	.21
Interaction between parent and child democratic	116	99	
Interaction between parent and child not democratic	47	73	.24

## REFERENCES

- Baldwin, A. I. & al.* Patterns of parent behavior. *Psychol. Monog.* 58:3, 1945.
- Baldwin, A. L. & al.* The appraisal of parent behavior. *Psychol. Monor.* 63:4, 1949.
- Campbell, D. T.* The indirect assessment of social attitudes. *Psychol. Bull.* 47, 1950, 15—38.
- Davis, W. A.* Child training and social class. In Barker, R. G. & al. (eds.), *Child behavior and development*. McGraw-Hill: New York 1943.
- Davis, W. A.* Child rearing in the class structure of American society. In Sussman (ed.), *Sourcebook in marriage and family*. Cambridge, Mass. 1955.
- Davis, W. A. & Dollard, J.* *Children of bondage*. Amer. Council of Education: Washington, D. C. 1940.
- Davis, W. A. & Havighurst, R. J.* Social class and color differences in child rearing. *Amer. Social. Rev.* 11, 1946, 698—710.
- Davis, R. J. & Havighurst, R. J.* Social class and color differences in child rearing. In Kluckholm, G. & Murray, H. A. (eds.) *Personality in nature, society, and culture*. Knopf: New York 1948.
- Ericson, M. G.* Child rearing and social status. *Amer. J. Sociol.* 52, 1946, 190—192.
- Eysenck, H. J.* *The psychology of politics*. Routledge & Kegan Paul: London 1954.
- Folsom, J. K.* *The family and democratic society*. Wiley: New York 1943.
- Hoeflin, R.* Child rearing practices and child care resources used by Ohio farm families with preschool children. *J. genet. Psychol.* 84, 1954 271—297.
- Homans, G. C.* *The human group*. Routledge & Kegan Paul: London 1951.
- Honigman, J. J.* *Culture and personality*. Harper: New York 1954.
- Kinsey, A. C. & al.* *The sexual behavior in the human male*. Saunders: New York 1948.
- Klatskin, E. H.* Shifts in child care practices in three social classes under an infant care program of flexible methodology. *Amer. J. Orthopsychiat.* 22, 1952, 52—61.
- Leton, D. A.* A study of the validity of parent attitude measurement. *Child Developm.* 29, 1958, 515—520.
- Mead, M.* *Male and female*. Morrow: New York 1950.
- Pipping, K. & al.* *Gespräche mit der Deutschen Jugend*. *Soc. Sci. Fenn.* 20, 1956.
- Sears, R. R. & al.* *Patterns of child rearing*. Row. Peterson & Co.: Evanston 1957.
- Stendler, C. B.* Sixty years of child-training practices. *J. Pediatrics* 36, 1950, 122—136.
- Takala, M., Nummenmaa, T. & Kauranne, U.* Child rearing attitudes and practices; a methodological study. *Ann. Acad. Paed. Jyväskylä.* 19, 1, 1960.
- Turunen, O.* Vanhempien kasvatusasenteiden vastaavuudesta. Unpublished study. Dept. of Psychology, School of Education, Jyväskylä, 1959.
- White, M. S.* Effects of social class position on child-rearing practices and child behavior. *Amer. Psychologist* 10, 1955, 440.
- Whiting, J. W. M. & Child, I. L.* *Child training and personality*. Yale Univ. Press: New Haven 1953.
- Williams, J. R. & Scott, R. B.* Growth and development of Negro infants IV. Motor development and its relationship to child rearing practices in two groups of Negro infants. *Child Developm.* 24, 1953, 103—121.
- Wolfenstein, M.* Trends in infant care. *Amer. J. Orthopsychiat.* 23, 1953, 120—130.