May 10, 1972

To the Graduate Council:

I am submitting herewith a thesis written by Shirley Crouse entitled "Appalachian Mothers' Values and Disciplinary Practices." I recommend that it be accepted for nine quarter hours of credit in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Science, with a major in Child Development and Family Relationships.

Ruth Hightower
Major Professor

We have read this thesis
and recommend its acceptance:

Patricia A. Walker

Arthur E. Grant

Accepted for the Council:

Hilton A. Smith
Vice Chancellor for
Graduate Studies and Research

APPALACHIAN MOTHERS' VALUES AND DISCIPLINARY PRACTICES

A Thesis

Presented to

the Graduate Council of

The University of Tennessee

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Master of Science

---

by

Shirley Crouse

June 1972

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The writer wishes to express her sincere appreciation to Dr. Ruth Highberger, Professor in the Department of Child Development and Family Relationships, for her guidance, encouragement, and help in the preparation of this manuscript. Gratitude is also extended to Dr. Arthur E. Gravatt, Head of the Department of Child Development and Family Relationships, and to Dr. Patricia A. Walker, Assistant Professor in the Department of Curriculum and Instruction, for their helpful suggestions and support throughout the study.

Deep gratitude is also expressed to Mrs. Lois Southworth for her help in securing the data and for her suggestions throughout the study. Sincere appreciation is extended to Mrs. Eugene Albert for her help with the statistical part of the study.

1029869

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to compare the values of a group of lower-class Appalachian mothers for their boys and for their girls. Punishment practices for boys and for girls were also compared. The child's report of punishment was compared with the mother's. It was hypothesized that there would be no difference between the boys' mothers and the girls' mothers in their choice of values for their children on a questionnaire using a list of values adapted from Kohn. It was also hypothesized that there would be no difference between the proportion of boys agreeing with their mothers and the proportion of girls agreeing with their mothers as to frequency of punishment.

The subjects of this study were 37 mothers and their children--20 boys and 17 girls. They were selected from a regional study of the Appalachian area which was begun in 1969 when the children were in the fifth grade. At the time of this study the children were seventh- and eighth-grade students in two schools in Union County, Tennessee. All were from low-income homes.

The mothers responded to a questionnaire administered by an interviewer in their homes. The list of 16 values

parents have for children was adapted from Kohn's list of values. Mothers were to indicate the three values they would most desire for a child the age of their child. They were also asked to tell the reason for which they most often punished their child, the type of punishment used, and how often they punished. The children filled out questionnaires at school giving the reason for which they were most often punished, how they were punished, and how often.

Since the sample was small, Fisher's exact probability test was used to test for a significant difference between the number of boys' mothers and the number of girls' mothers choosing each value. None of the differences reached significance at the .05 level. The hypothesis of no difference between the boys' mothers and the girls' mothers in choice of values failed to be rejected.

To test the hypothesis that there would be no change of values over a two-year period, questionnaires from 1969 were compared with those from 1971. The binomial test for two related samples was used to check for significance of change for each value. One value, "is dependable," was found to reach significance at the .05 level. None of the other value changes reached significance. The

hypothesis of no significant change in mothers' values over a two-year period was rejected.

Fisher's exact test was used to test for a difference between the proportion of boys agreeing with their mothers and the proportion of girls agreeing with their mothers as to frequency of punishment. No significant difference was found. The hypothesis of no difference between the proportion of boys agreeing with their mothers and the proportion of girls agreeing with their mothers concerning frequency of punishment failed to be rejected.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER		PAGE
I.	INTRODUCTION	1
	Statement of the Problem	1
II.	REVIEW OF LITERATURE	3
	Class Differences in Child-Rearing	3
	Class Differences in Values for Children	8
	Discipline Practices of Lower-Class Parents	13
	Discipline Practices as Perceived by Children	18
III.	METHOD AND PROCEDURE	25
	Subjects	25
	Procedure	25
IV.	RESULTS	27
V.	DISCUSSION	37
VI.	SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	46
BIBLIOGRAPHY		49
APPENDIX		54
VITA		57

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE		PAGE
I.	Mothers' Values, by Sex of Child--1971	28
II.	Mothers' Values, by Sex of Child--1969	30
III.	A Comparison of Mothers' and Boys' Reports of Frequency of Punishment	32
IV.	A Comparison of Mothers' and Girls' Reports of Frequency of Punishment	33
V.	A Comparison of Mothers' and Children's Reports of Reasons for Punishment	35
VI.	A Comparison of Mothers' and Children's Reports of Types of Punishment	36

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

In our society there are identifiable class groups which differ in their values, beliefs, and practices of child-rearing. Kohn (22) studied middle-class and working-class parents and found definite differences between the two classes in their values for their children and in their punishment practices. He also found that middle-class mothers showed no distinction between boys and girls in their values or in their punishment practices. But working-class mothers indicated different values for boys and for girls. They also showed different treatment patterns according to sex in their punishment practices.

This study was designed to discover whether Kohn's findings regarding values and punishment practices of the working-class mothers in his sample are similar to those of lower-class mothers in a rural Tennessee county. Knowing mothers' values for their children and the discipline practices they use could help teachers better understand children and why they respond as they do.

Statement of the Problem

The purpose of this study was to compare a group of lower-class mothers' values for boys and for girls as

indicated by responses to a questionnaire. Their punishment practices for boys and for girls were also compared. The children's reports of their parents' punishment practices were considered. The mothers and children were part of a regional study of low-income families.

It was hypothesized that there would be no difference between the boys' mothers and the girls' mothers in their choice of values on the Kohn list of values (22). It was also hypothesized that there would be no significant change in the mothers' values over a two-year period. It was further hypothesized that there would be no difference between the proportion of boys agreeing with their mothers and the proportion of girls agreeing with their mothers as to frequency of punishment.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

In the past 25 years a number of studies have been made comparing child-rearing practices of mothers in the various social classes. Not all studies have agreed, and interesting explanations have been suggested for the inconsistencies. Studies have also focused on the values middle- and lower-class parents hold for their children. These values influence the discipline practices parents use. Most studies of discipline practices have been from the parents' viewpoint, but some studies have been made of how children perceive discipline and how the parents' discipline practices affect the child's perception of the parent.

Class Differences in Child-Rearing

In 1946, Duvall (9) studied the ideologies of parenthood found in mothers' groups in various subcultures in contemporary America. Using 433 mothers in Chicago, she divided them into 24 groups with four social class levels, both Negro and white. She used a questionnaire asking for five things a good mother does and five things a good child does. In general, the good mother was defined as one who "takes care of the child physically" and the

good child as one who "obeys and respects his parents" and "pleases adults" (9). She found that the lower-class, Negro, and experienced mothers were more traditional, and the upper-class, white, and inexperienced mothers were more developmental in approach.

Davis and Havighurst (6) conducted a study in Chicago in the 1940's using 50 mothers in each of four classes: white middle class, white lower class, Negro middle class, and Negro lower class. This study found considerable social class differences in child-rearing practices and found that social class differences were greater than differences between Negroes and whites of the same social class. Middle-class families were more rigorous in their training of children for feeding and cleanliness habits and they usually began training earlier. Middle-class families also placed more emphasis on individual achievement and on early assumption of responsibility for self. They were less permissive than lower-class families in such things as requiring children to take naps and making rules on how early children must be in at night.

A later study was made in the Boston area by Maccoby and Gibbs (26) who interviewed 372 mothers about their methods of child-rearing. The findings of this study were different from those of the preceding studies.

The lower-class mothers were found to be more severe in toilet training and sex training. The upper-class mothers imposed fewer restrictions and demands on their children than the lower-class mothers. Lower-class mothers used "negative" forms of discipline more often, such as physical punishment, ridicule, and taking away privileges. There was no class difference on who cared for or punished children. Lower-class mothers were more critical of their husbands and there was more quarreling between parents over child-rearing practices. In both classes the husbands were inclined to think the wives were not strict enough and the wives thought the husbands were too strict. When education was held constant, significant differences between classes were still found, so social class rather than education seemed to affect child-rearing practices.

Littman et al. (25), in an attempt to reconcile the findings of the Havighurst study and the Maccoby and Gibbs study, interviewed 206 pairs of white parents in Eugene, Oregon. They found no difference between classes in feeding and weaning practices or in techniques of punishment. This study pointed to the absence of any general or profound differences in socialization practices in middle- and lower-class.

In 1953, White (34) studied 74 mothers and 74 children between the ages of two and one-half and five and one-half.

Her study showed more agreement with the Boston study (26) than with the Chicago study (6). The middle-class mothers mentioned getting child-rearing information from child-care experts and from other mothers and friends. Lower-class mothers depended more on their own inclinations and up-bringing. White suggested this as a reason for the change in child-care practices over the decade. As middle-class mothers read of the newer trends in child-rearing practices, they changed their practices and thus became more permissive than the lower-class mothers.

A study by Klatskin in 1952 (21) found that higher-class mothers were less prohibitive than lower-class mothers in discipline. She questioned 229 mothers from four social classes with a questionnaire. The study showed a general trend toward increased leniency in all classes as compared to earlier studies.

Miller and Swanson (27) used entrepreneurial and bureaucratic classification as well as social class in comparing child-rearing practices. The term entrepreneurial was used to refer to the owners of small businesses or farmers. Their children were reared to have self-control and self-reliance. Bureaucratic referred to employment in large organizations. Since success in these organizations depends on training for the job, with not so much risk involved, children of bureaucratic parents were trained

to be accommodative and congenial. Parents in the bureaucratic group used more external punishment such as spanking. When Miller and Swanson (27) interviewed 582 mothers in the Detroit area, they found few differences between middle- and lower-class mothers in child-rearing methods. When they divided the sample between entrepreneurial and bureaucratic, they found the lower-class mothers still did not differ substantially in techniques of child training, but in the middle class, the entrepreneurial mothers were more likely than bureaucratic to emphasize self-control in training children.

Kamii and Radin (20) compared middle-class and lower-lower-class Negro mothers on child-rearing goals and methods. Mothers were asked to choose most important and least important child-rearing goals from a list similar to Kohn's. For the most part, both groups of mothers ranked the child-rearing goals similarly. However, the lower-class mothers were found to be more demanding with their children and to use less positive reinforcement than middle-class mothers. The lower-class mothers were also less responsive to the children in their need for affection.

Brody (2) studied 46 mothers and preschool children in midwestern United States. The mothers were given a questionnaire and also observed in interaction with the child. Responses were not highly differentiated but,

unlike the finding of the Kamii and Radin study (20), lower-class mothers made greater use of reward and punishment and also showed more protectiveness. Middle-class mothers interacted more verbally with children, did more teaching, and used more praise.

Class Differences in Values for Children

Child-rearing practices are influenced by the values parents hold for their children. Several studies have been conducted to determine parent values.

One of the most extensive studies of social class and parental values is that done by Kohn (23) in 1956-1957 in Washington, D. C. The subjects were 400 mothers of fifth-grade children, 200 from the middle class and 200 from the working class. The mothers were interviewed. In every fourth family, the father and child were also interviewed. The parents were asked to choose from a list of 17 values those they thought to be most important for a child the age of their fifth-grade child. It was found that middle- and working-class mothers shared a broadly common set of values, but not identical. Both agreed that happiness, honesty, consideration, obedience, dependability, manners, and self-control are important for both boys and girls. But they differed on the emphasis they placed on particular characteristics. Fewer working-class mothers

regarded happiness as highly desirable for boys. Working-class mothers were more likely to value obedience, while middle-class mothers valued consideration and self-control. Middle-class mothers valued curiosity, while working-class mothers emphasized neatness and cleanliness. Middle-class mothers indicated the same values for boys and girls, but working-class mothers made a distinction between sexes. For boys they desired dependability, school performance, and ambition. For girls they valued happiness, good manners, neatness, and cleanliness.

Fathers' values were found to be similar to those of the mothers except fathers were not so likely to value happiness for their daughters. Middle-class fathers valued consideration, self-control, and dependability. Working-class fathers valued obedience and the ability to defend oneself.

Kohn further examined the responses of the working-class mothers according to income level. He discovered the higher the mother's status, the more she would choose consideration, curiosity, and self-control, and (for boys) happiness. The lower her status the more likelihood she would choose obedience, neatness, and cleanliness. Mothers' values were also related to their own occupational positions and educational attainments. Working-class mothers who held white-collar jobs had values more like middle-class

mothers. Women with more education expressed more middle-class values than women who had gone no further than high school.

To check the adequacy of the list of values, the mothers were questioned as to what they desired most for their child. They mentioned only three qualities not on the list: self-reliance, friendliness, and conformity to sex and age role.

The conclusion of the study was that parents were more likely to give high priority to values that seemed hard to achieve and important because failure to achieve them would affect the child's future adversely. It was assumed that working-class parents valued neatness, obedience, and honesty because these qualities were needed for getting a respectable job. The job would require following directions of someone in authority, thus conforming. Middle-class parents valued inner-control of children because middle-class occupations require a greater degree of self-direction. Thus self-control and consideration were ranked high, as well as curiosity.

Kohn (22) repeated his Washington study in Italy in 1962-1963. Here he used 520 mothers and 341 fathers as closely matched as possible to the subjects in the Washington study. He found the relationship of social class to parental values much the same in both countries.

Johnsen and Leslie (17) criticized several aspects of Kohn's study. They indicated that class differences can be stressed too strongly and that there are differences within the classes as well. The use of socioeconomic position to infer class membership can be questioned. They also questioned Kohn's using significant differences between classes to infer specific emphases within classes. They warned against using individual items as indices of value systems.

Galler (11) studied the influence of social class on children's choices of occupations. She used two groups of children from Chicago schools, a group of upper-middle-class and a group of lower-class. The children filled out an essay form on their choice of an occupation and reasons for the choice. The upper-class children gave an intrinsic reason, or interest in the job itself, as a reason more often than lower-class children, probably because lower-class parents are not so often interested in their work or are less likely to find jobs which interest them. Upper-class boys listed service to others as a reason more than lower-class boys probably because lower-class boys consider service unmanly. Lower-class younger children were more influenced by extrinsic rewards from the job than upper-class younger children, but older children did not show this difference. Upper-middle-class children chose

occupations which have higher social status than did lower-class children. Also the older children tended to choose a greater proportion of higher status jobs than the younger children.

Christopher (4) studied 384 tenth- and eleventh-grade males and females. He hypothesized that academic achievement, assessed by cumulative grade-point averages, was related to the strength of the parent-child relationship and to the child's perceived parental attitudes toward achievement. The hypothesis was accepted for the girls, but the predicted relationship did not hold for the perceived strength of parent-child relationship and academic achievement for boys. Perhaps this was because as a boy enters adolescence he becomes less dependent on the family, but parental values continue to be acknowledged. In contrast, girls continue to have strong attachment to the family.

Rosen (30) studied family size, ordinal position, mother's age, and social class for their impact upon the development of achievement motivation. He used two samples of young boys and their mothers. He found no one factor alone could be isolated as a determinant of achievement motivation, but all were interrelated. However, social class was consistently related to achievement motivation, as upper-class boys had higher motivation scores than lower-class boys.

Joiner et al. (18) made a longitudinal study of 255 males over grades eight, nine, ten, and eleven. They discovered that the perceived expectation of parents and peers had much to do with the educational plans of young people, with the parents' expectations carrying a larger influence than that of peers. It was found that socioeconomic status did not exert a large influence in educational plans of young people.

Discipline Practices of Lower-Class Parents

In addition to values Kohn (22, 24) also examined the discipline practices of parents in his Washington study. To discover under what conditions mothers punish children, mothers were questioned on reactions to eight situations. No differences were found between classes on which parent made decisions or set limits or in frequency of punishment. But there were differences in conditions under which parents resorted to physical punishment. Most mothers reported that when their child misbehaved, their usual response was to ignore it or to admonish him. But if children persisted in wild play, fighting with siblings, or displays of temper, both classes of mothers turned to another form of punishment. Working-class mothers were more likely to punish for son's prolonged loss of temper, while middle-class mothers punished more often for the son's refusing to do as he was told. Working-class mothers were more likely than middle-class

mothers to use physical punishment. They used this type of punishment when sons persisted in wild play or fighting with siblings, or when daughters fought with other children. The more extreme the son's actions, the more likely that the mother would use physical punishment. She was far less likely to punish sons physically for fights with friends and neighbors than for fights with siblings. However, lower-class mothers did not punish sons if it would provoke a disturbance more serious than that already underway. A lower-class mother would more likely punish a son for doing something he was told not to do than for failing to do something he was told to do. Lower-class mothers would often back down rather than make the son do something he did not want to do.

Middle-class mothers appeared to punish or refrain from punishing on the basis of their interpretation of the child's intent. Working-class mothers punished because of the immediate consequences. Middle-class mothers punished daughters on the same basis as sons. Working-class mothers expected more of girls than of boys. In defiant refusal, boys were permitted to have their own way, while the girls were more often punished physically. Girls in working-class families were expected not only to refrain from unacceptable behavior, but to meet positive expectations.

Working-class fathers responded in two ways. If the child's behavior did not compel their attention, they

ignored it. If it was disruptive, they used physical punishment. Middle-class fathers were more likely than mothers to punish sons for fighting with siblings.

The reactions of the parent of both classes to the child's undesirable behavior were consistent with their values. The working class were more interested in consequences because they emphasized obedience and conformity to standards. Middle-class parents were more interested in the child's intent because they emphasized internal standards.

Hoffman (16) studied the impact of power assertion on the child. He used 10 working-class families and 12 middle-class families with a child in nursery school. The parents were asked to describe an interaction with the child the day before the interview. The child was also observed in nursery school for signs of hostility, power assertiveness, and resistance to influence toward the teacher and other children. It was found that working-class fathers used more unqualified power assertion (direct commands, threats, deprivations, and physical force) than middle-class fathers. Working-class mothers used more power assertion only as an initial approach in working with children, not in reaction to children's disobedience. A possible explanation for mothers' differences being less clear-cut than fathers' could be that lower-class mothers have been more influenced by current child-rearing notions.

It was also found that a mother's reactive unqualified power assertion caused children to be more hostile and more assertive to other children and more resistant to teacher's influence attempts. Fathers seemed to have less direct effect on children since mother was usually the one to discipline. But the father could have an indirect effect. Hoffman hypothesized that in the working-class group the authoritarian father manifests his authoritarianism on his wife, who resents it and takes it out on the child in reactive unqualified power assertion.

Sears and his colleagues (32), in their study of 201 middle-class and 178 working-class mothers, found that lower-class mothers were more restrictive and punitive toward aggression in children. They were more severe in their punishment of aggression directed toward themselves. Middle-class mothers imposed fewer restrictions upon their children. Lower-class mothers were more strict about neatness and being quiet in the house. They placed more pressure on their children for school achievement. Sears also found that lower-class mothers used more punishment, mainly of the physical or deprivation of privileges type.

DeCoursey (7), in her study of 20 welfare mothers and 20 middle-class mothers, found the lower-class mothers significantly more punitive. No significant difference was found in permissiveness.

Bayley and Schaefer (1) observed maternal behavior in the Berkeley Growth Study. They found a slight tendency for higher socioeconomic class mothers to be more warm, understanding, and accepting. Lower-class mothers were more controlling, irritable, and punitive.

Bronfenbrenner (3), in a study of adolescents' reports of their parents, found a tendency for each parent to be somewhat more active, firm, and demanding with a child of the same sex and more lenient and indulgent with a child of the opposite sex. This was more marked for lower class than for middle class. The lower the father's education, the more the mother became the authority figure, especially for girls. He found individual differences in severity of discipline to be greatest among lower-class fathers. The lower-class father was most likely to administer corporal punishment to his son.

Heinstein (14), in a recent state-wide survey of child-rearing practices in California, found no significant difference between socioeconomic levels in discipline practices. It was found that the peak of daily punishment occurred between the ages of 18 and 36 months. Half of the mothers in all classes reported using some form of physical punishment as their usual method for preschool children. Males were punished more frequently than females. The mothers were more punitive than fathers with the preschool

children. Mothers punished both sexes alike. Fathers punished girls less than boys, often never punishing girls.

Hervey (15), in another recent study, interviewed 251 women and 185 men on punishment. She found men and women not much different, but men of lower socioeconomic classes tended to be somewhat more severe in their punishment. They punished anti-social and annoying behaviors more severely. Women did not differ in their severity of punishment for morally-intrinsically wrong, anti-social, and annoyance behaviors.

Eron and others (10), in their study of third-grade children and their parents, found that the more punitive fathers had the more aggressive children in school. If both parents were rejecting, the child was highly aggressive.

Discipline Practices as Perceived by Children

Not so much research has been done on the child's perception of his parent's discipline practices. Goldin (12), in his review of the literature on the subject, found that in most studies children perceive both parents favorably, but they perceive mothers as more loving and fathers as more punitive. Either parent may be perceived as controlling. In most studies boys perceive parents as

less loving and more demanding and punitive than do girls. In all but one study it was found that children of lower socioeconomic status as compared to those of middle-class status perceive parents as less accepting.

Kagan's (19) study of 217 children aged six to ten from grades one to three in a school in Columbus, Ohio, agreed with Goldin's general findings. The majority of the children perceived mother as friendlier, less punitive, less dominant, and less threatening than father. The older children were consistently more likely than the younger ones to see the same sex parent as less benevolent and more frustrating.

Hawkes et al. (13) reported a study where the Hawkes-Lewis Scale was given to 730 rural fifth-grade children in Iowa, Ohio, Kansas, and Wisconsin. The majority of the children felt their mothers were much more likely than not to talk over with them the reasons for being punished. The girls felt mothers talked over the reasons for punishment more than boys. The boys felt their parents were stricter with them than did the girls. Both parents were rated favorably in talking over plans with children and in talking over reasons for punishment, but mothers were uniformly rated more favorably than fathers. Children's responses indicated mothers and fathers were about equally likely to punish them for disobeying or become angry while

punishing them. Only about one-fifth indicated they were "seldom" or "never" punished for disobeying parents. When asked about frequency with which parents expressed anger while punishing them, the answer was usually "sometimes."

Droppleman and Schaefer (8) in two studies attempted to discover what differences could be found between mothers and fathers as reported by boys and by girls. They were also interested in what differences are found between boys and girls in their description of each parent. In Study I, they had two groups of subjects, 85 boys and 80 girls from grade seven in a suburban Catholic school. Each child was given a parent behavior inventory describing components of parental nurturance and control. On love, nurturance, or affection, mothers were rated significantly higher than fathers by both boys and girls. Both reported mothers using indirect methods of control more frequently than fathers. There were no significant differences between mothers and fathers on strictness and punishment for either boys or girls. Girls reported receiving more love and affection from both parents than boys. Boys reported more hostile, negative treatment from both parents. Boys also reported more indirect and direct control, particularly from the father. The opposite sex parent was reported as granting more autonomy.

For the second study, 36 boys and 34 girls in grade 11 in an urban mainly Protestant public school were studied. These subjects were given the same inventory. The results of differences between mothers and fathers for both boys and girls were consistent with the results in the first study. But in the second study the boys and girls saw both parents as more similar in the reported qualities.

Bronfenbrenner (3) gave a parent-activity inventory to 192 tenth-grade students from a medium-sized city in upstate New York. The inventory measured 20 different dimensions of parent-child relationships. The mother was found to exceed the father in most areas, not only in the more maternal spheres, but also as the more important source of power, general discipline, demands for achievement, and even rejection. The father surpassed the mother in only two instances, and both of those with sons only. He was the more likely agent of physical punishment and spent time in activities involving skill or competition. The inventory showed girls received more affection, praise, companionship, and protectiveness while the boys received more discipline and negative affect.

Rosen (31) studied some aspects of boys' perceptions of parents. He administered a structured questionnaire to 367 boys, aged nine to eleven, in three Connecticut towns. Social class was determined by Hollingshead Index of Social

Position. Middle-class boys tended to evaluate their parents' ability, performance, and drive more positively than lower-class boys. Middle-class boys also perceived fathers as more successful, ambitious, and smart. The differences between social classes in the perception of the mother were much less marked. Boys in the lower class tended to perceive their parents as less secure than boys in the middle class, and fathers less secure than mothers. The greatest differences were found in the perception of parental acceptance and support. Middle-class boys reported fathers more interested in their performance in school and more responsive to requests for attention. Lower-class mothers were reported as less interested and supportive than middle-class mothers, but the difference was less than with the fathers.

In summary, the review of literature has been primarily concerned with studies relating to child-rearing and discipline practices in different social classes. Davis and Havighurst (6) found the middle-class mothers to be less permissive in their child-rearing practices. Later studies by Maccoby and Gibbs (26), White (34), and Klatskin (21) found the middle-class mothers more permissive and the lower-class restrictive. The change in current child-rearing practices during the 10 years between these groups of studies could account for the differences. Other factors could be geographic location,

cultural background, and other differences in the samples. Littman (25), Kamii and Radin (20), and Brody (2) found no significant differences between lower- and middle-class mothers.

Kohn (22) studied class values and found that middle-class parents value self-directing goals, such as consideration, self-control, and curiosity. Lower-class parents value obedience, neatness, and honesty, qualities needed for the type of job they hold where they must conform to others' standards.

Rosen (30) found that upper-class children have higher achievement motivation than lower-class children. Christopher (4) and Joiner (18) emphasized the importance of parental influence on a child's achievement in school.

Kohn (22) also found a social class difference in discipline practices. Lower-class parents seemed to punish because of immediate consequences due to their emphasis on obedience and conformity. Middle-class parents, because of their emphasis on internal standards, considered the intent of the child. Hoffman (16), Sears (32), DeCoursey (7), Bayley and Schaefer (1), Hervey (15), and Bronfenbrenner (3) all found that lower-class parents tended to be more punitive than middle-class parents.

Kagan (19), Droppleman and Schaefer (8), and Hawkes (13) found children to view the mother as more loving and

the father as more punitive. Droppleman and Schaefer (8), Bronfenbrenner (3), and Hawkes (13) found boys viewing parents as less loving and more punitive than girls. Rosen (31) found middle-class boys viewed parents more positively than lower-class boys with a less marked difference for the mothers than the fathers.

The studies seem to indicate a difference in values of middle- and lower-class parents. Kohn (22) found that lower-class mothers have different values for boys and for girls. They also tend to punish boys differently from girls, expecting more of the girls. The values a mother has seem to influence the discipline practices used. The discipline practices, in turn, have an effect on the child's perception of his parent and on his own value system.

CHAPTER III

METHOD AND PROCEDURE

Subjects

The data used in this study are part of a regional research project, The Education and Vocational Goals of Young People in Three Sub-Cultures in the South. The subjects were a selected sample of 37 mothers and their children, 20 boys and 17 girls, who had been included in the study since its beginning in 1969. At that time the children were in the fifth grade, but at the time of the present study the children were seventh- or eighth-grade students in one of two schools in Union County, Tennessee. Union County was chosen for the regional study to represent rural Appalachia because it is a low income county which has little industry and has no large farming operations. The median family income at the time of the 1960 census was $2,413 according to the Tennessee Statistical Abstract for 1971 (5). Parents with middle-class or higher occupational levels were excluded from the sample. Each child was living with at least his mother at the time of the study.

Procedure

In the spring of 1971, each mother and her child completed comparable questionnaires. The mothers were

interviewed in their homes, and the interviewer filled out the questionnaires. The children filled out questionnaires in a group at school. The mothers' questionnaire included a list of values parents have for children adapted from Kohn's list (22). Each mother was asked to choose the three values she thought most important for a child the age of her child. She was also asked to tell the main reason for which she punished her child, how she punished, and how frequently. The children's questionnaires asked the main reason for which their mother punished them, how she punished, and how frequently.

Similar questionnaires which the mothers had answered in 1969 at the beginning of the study were also examined. Comparisons were made of the mothers' values as indicated on the questionnaires in 1969 and in 1971.

The reasons for punishment were classified under these headings: fighting, disobedience, unacceptable verbal behavior, and failure to take responsibility. The types of punishment were classified as: verbal, physical, and management. Examples of management punishment are taking away privileges or sending the child to his room.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

The purpose of this chapter is to present the results obtained from a study of the questionnaires filled out in 1971 by 37 mothers and their children--20 boys and 17 girls. Each mother was asked to choose from the list of 16 values in Table I the three values she thought were most important for a child the age of her child. The values are listed in Table I according to the frequency of choice, indicating the number and the proportion of mothers choosing each value.

Since the sample was small, the Fisher's exact probability test (33) and appropriate tables (28) were used to test for a significant difference between the number of boys' mothers and the number of girls' mothers choosing each value. None of the differences reached significance at the .05 level. Therefore the hypothesis of no difference between the boys' mothers and the girls' mothers in their choice of values failed to be rejected.

Since there was no significant difference between the proportion of boys' mothers and the proportion of girls' mothers choosing the various values, the proportion of total mothers choosing each value was determined. These

TABLE I

MOTHERS' VALUES, BY SEX OF CHILD--1971

Value	For Boys (N = 20)		For Girls (N = 17)		Combined (N = 37)		95% Confidence Interval
	Number	Proportion	Number	Proportion	Number	Proportion	Combined Group
Is honest	10	.50	8	.47	18	.49	.32 - .67
Is dependable	7	.35	7	.41	14	.38	.23 - .56
Is a good student	5	.25	6	.35	11	.30	.16 - .47
Tries hard to succeed	6	.30	5	.29	11	.30	.16 - .47
Is happy	6	.30	4	.24	10	.27	.14 - .44
Gets along well with other children	6	.30	3	.19	9	.24	.11 - .41
Obeys parents well	4	.20	4	.24	8	.22	.10 - .39
Is interested in why and how things happen	5	.25	2	.12	7	.19	.08 - .36
Is neat and clean	2	.10	4	.24	6	.16	.06 - .32
Has self-control	2	.10	3	.19	5	.14	.04 - .30
Is considerate of others	4	.20	1	.06	5	.14	.04 - .30
Is liked by adults	1	.05	2	.13	3	.08	.02 - .22
Acts in a serious way	1	.05	1	.06	2	.05	.01 - .18
Has good manners	1	.05	1	.06	2	.05	.01 - .18
Is able to defend self	---	---	---	---	---	---	
Is affectionate	---	---	---	---	---	---	

proportions and 95 percent confidence intervals for the true proportions of mothers choosing each value are listed in Table I. The confidence intervals were determined from the Biometrika charts (29) providing confidence limits for p in binomial sampling. Because it was necessary to interpolate between curves for N = 37, the results reported are only approximate.

Since the data were part of a regional study which began in 1969, questionnaires were also available which had been completed in 1969 when the children were in the fifth grade. The values which the mothers chose then were compared with the values chosen two years later. Three boys' mothers did not change their values at all, but no girls' mothers agreed perfectly the second time. Six of the girls' mothers, however, chose two of the same values the second time compared with five of the boys' mothers. Eight girls' mothers and ten boys' mothers made one of the same choices the second time. Only three girls' mothers and two boys' mothers chose completely different values each time.

Table II shows the values chosen from the 1969 questionnaire in order of choice with number and proportion of the 20 boys' and 17 girls' mothers choosing each value. Fisher's exact probability test (28) was used to test for a significant difference between the number of

TABLE II

MOTHERS' VALUES, BY SEX OF CHILD--1969

Value	For Boys (N = 20)		For Girls (N = 17)		Combined (N = 37)		95% Confidence Interval
	Number	Proportion	Number	Proportion	Number	Proportion	Combined Group
Is honest	13	.65	7	.41	20	.54	.37 - .71
Tries hard to succeed	6	.30	8	.47	14	.38	.23 - .57
Obeys parents well	7	.35	7	.41	14	.38	.23 - .57
Gets along well with other children	6	.30	7	.41	13	.35	.20 - .53
Is happy	7	.35	4	.24	11	.30	.16 - .48
Is neat and clean	1	.05	5	.29	6	.16	.06 - .32
Is considerate of others	3	.15	3	.18	6	.16	.06 - .32
Is a good student	3	.15	3	.18	6	.16	.06 - .32
Is interested in why and how things happen	4	.20	2	.12	6	.16	.06 - .32
Is dependable	3	.15	1	.06	4	.11	.03 - .27
Has self-control	3	.15	1	.06	4	.11	.03 - .27
Has good manners	2	.10	1	.06	3	.08	.02 - .22
Is affectionate	1	.05	1	.06	2	.05	.01 - .18
Acts in a serious way	1	.05	---	---	1	.03	.00 - .15
Able to defend self	---	---	1	.06	1	.03	.00 - .15
Is liked by adults	---	---	---	---	---	---	

boys' mothers and the number of girls' mothers choosing each value. Again none of the differences reached significance at the .05 level. The 95 percent confidence intervals for the true proportion of mothers choosing each value were found by use of the Biometrika charts (29).

To discover if there was a significant change over the two-year period in mothers' choices of each item, the binomial test for two related samples (33) was used. One value, "is dependable," was found to reach significance at the .05 level. In 1969 only four mothers chose this value, but in 1971 it was chosen by 14 mothers. It came up from tenth place to second place. None of the other values reached significance. Therefore, the hypothesis of no significant change in mothers' values over the two-year period was rejected.

The mothers and children were asked to indicate the frequency with which punishment was used. Tables III and IV show the answers for the boys and their mothers and the girls and their mothers, respectively. To check the hypothesis that there would be no difference between the proportion of boys agreeing with their mothers and the proportion of girls agreeing with their mothers as to frequency of punishment, the Fisher's exact test (28) was used. Eight boys and three girls agreed with their mothers as to frequency of punishment. There was no

TABLE III

A COMPARISON OF MOTHERS' AND BOYS' REPORTS OF FREQUENCY OF PUNISHMENT

Mother Reports	Boy Reports				Total
	Daily	Weekly	Monthly	Yearly	
Daily		1			
Weekly	1	4	3	3	11
Monthly	1	1	3	2	7
Yearly				1	1
Total	2	6	6	6	20

TABLE IV

A COMPARISON OF MOTHERS' AND GIRLS' REPORTS OF FREQUENCY OF PUNISHMENT

	Girl Reports					
Mother Reports	No Punishment	Daily	Weekly	Monthly	Yearly	Total
No punishment	1		1			2
Daily						0
Weekly			1	5	1	7
Monthly				1	5	6
Yearly				2		2
Total	1	0	2	8	6	17

significant difference between the proportion of boys agreeing with mother and the proportion of girls agreeing with mother. Therefore, the hypothesis of no difference failed to be rejected.

The two sample groups were combined and it was found that 30 percent of the children agreed with their mothers. Using the charts providing confidence limits for p in binomial sampling (29), the 95 percent confidence interval was found to be .16 - .47, giving 95 percent confidence that the true proportion of children agreeing with their mothers is between .16 and .47.

The mothers and children were also asked to indicate the reason for which they punished or were punished most often and also the type of punishment used most often. Table V shows the reasons for punishment, and Table VI shows the type of punishment. The responses of only 19 boys were used here since one of the questionnaire forms was not readable. A study of these tables indicates that there was little agreement between mothers' and children's reports. Nine of the 36 children's reports agreed with their mothers' as to both reason for punishment and type of punishment used. Five of these were boys and four were girls. Three other boys agreed with their mothers on type of punishment only. Two other girls agreed with mothers on reason for punishment only and four other girls agreed with mothers on type of punishment only.

TABLE V

A COMPARISON OF MOTHERS' AND CHILDREN'S REPORTS OF REASONS FOR PUNISHMENT

Reasons for Punishment	Mothers' Report				Children's Report			
	Boys		Girls		Boys		Girls	
	Number	Proportion	Number	Proportion	Number	Proportion	Number	Proportion
Fighting	4	.20	6	.35	5	.26	2	.12
Disobedience	8	.40	3	.18	5	.26	5	.29
Unacceptable verbal behavior	2	.10	5	.29	4	.21	2	.12
Failure to take responsibility	6	.30	1	.06	4	.21	3	.18
No punishment	---	---	2	.12	1	.05	5	.29

TABLE VI

A COMPARISON OF MOTHERS' AND CHILDREN'S REPORTS OF TYPES OF PUNISHMENT

Type of Punishment	Mothers' Report				Children's Report			
	Boys		Girls		Boys		Girls	
	Number	Proportion	Number	Proportion	Number	Proportion	Number	Proportion
Verbal (talk, scold)	6	.30	8	.47	7	.37	7	.44
Physical	1	.05	3	.18	4	.21	3	.19
Management (deprivation, altering situation)	13	.65	4	.23	8	.42	3	.19
No punishment	---	---	2	.12	---	---	3	.19

CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION

This chapter is concerned with discussing further the findings of this study and with comparing these findings with those of Kohn and others. Suggestions for further study will be made.

In the choice of values, honesty outranked the other values in both surveys with a slightly higher proportion in the first survey. Dependability was ranked high more frequently the second time, but was quite far down the list the first time. As noted in the preceding chapter, dependability was the only value in which there was a significant change over the two-year period. A possible reason for the more frequent choice the second time was that as the child grows older he is expected to become more dependable. In examining observed but not significant differences, being a good student was also ranked higher the second time, probably because the child was getting closer to high school. Getting along with other children and obeying parents were ranked lower as compared to 1969 when children were younger.

Kohn (22) found that mothers valued most highly happiness, honesty, consideration, obedience, dependability,

manners, and self-control. Working-class mothers chose obedience and neatness more frequently than middle-class mothers. In his study, honesty was ranked highest with 53 percent which compares quite well with this study. However, some of the other values, such as good manners, consideration, and self-control, were ranked rather low in this study. Obedience was ranked third in the 1969 study, which was the same ranking given by working-class mothers in the Kohn study. Since Kohn's study was done with fifth-grade children, perhaps obedience is more valued at that age than when the child gets into the teenage years. Evidence for this reasoning would be indicated by a drop of obedience to seventh place in 1971. Mothers possibly feel that by the time children reach their teens, their behavior patterns are pretty well set, and therefore mothers are more interested in qualities that will make for success in life.

Kohn also found that working-class mothers chose dependability, school performance, and ambition more often for boys than for girls. This was not found to be true in this study. These three values were given about equal choice for boys and for girls. The only difference was that in 1969, three boys' mothers chose dependability compared to only one girl's mother. Kohn also found that the girls' mothers were more likely to choose happiness,

neatness and cleanliness, and good manners. This held true only for neatness and cleanliness. In fact, in 1969, when the children were in the fifth grade, more boys' mothers than girls' mothers valued good manners and happiness.

That the child is a good student and tries hard to succeed were higher-ranked values in this study than in Kohn's. Kohn's work was done in a city setting and many of his working-class families were Negro. The people of rural Appalachia may have a somewhat different value system. In the opinion of the writer, they have pride, even though they are poor, and they desire that their children do better than their parents. Even though the drop-out rate is high in school, many parents want their children to get good grades. They see getting an education as an important factor in getting a good job. Because of their poverty, it is also important to them that their children try hard to succeed and thus be able to have a better life.

Possibly wording changes influenced results of this study. The list of values for this study was adapted from Kohn's list. Where Kohn worded the value, "that he is ambitious," this study worded it, "tries hard to succeed." The difference in wording might have caused it to be selected more often.

The value choices from this study did not agree with Kohn's in comparisons with values chosen for boys and for girls by working-class mothers. In this study, no significant distinction was found between the sexes, but a larger sample would have to be used to test if Kohn's values would hold for working-class mothers in the Appalachian area. From this study, it would appear that the mothers of Appalachia would not show the distinction between sexes that Kohn observed in the working-class mothers of his city sample. He stated the reason for a distinction between sexes was an emphasis on external standards or behavioral conformity. If the focus is internal dynamics, the same values would apply to boys and girls. It seems the values which were ranked high, especially in 1971, were more internal values such as honesty and working toward success.

One definite agreement between this study and Kohn's can be seen. Both rank honesty as by far the most often chosen value. Kohn observed that mothers in the lowest social stratum are more likely than those in the highest to value honesty (22).

In studying the reasons for punishment, it was noted the mothers most frequently punished their daughters for fighting and unacceptable verbal behavior, while the sons were more often punished for disobedience. A possible

reason would be that fighting and unacceptable verbal behavior are considered more unladylike and would therefore be punished for girls. However, when the children's reports were considered, it was seen that the girls did not list fighting and unacceptable verbal behavior high as reasons for punishment. In fact, they were listed least frequently. Instead disobedience was given most often as the reason for punishment. Perhaps the girls were hesitant to admit acting in these more unladylike ways. This possibility would seem to be strengthened when it is noted that five girls reported no punishment compared to only two mothers reporting no punishment. Girls seem reluctant to admit receiving punishment. Disobedience perhaps seemed a more acceptable reason for being punished. If this was not the reason for the discrepancy, it would seem that mothers need to communicate better with their daughters as to why they are being punished.

Another possible reason why more girls were reported as being punished for fighting than boys might be that this type of behavior is more acceptable in boys. Girls might not necessarily fight more, but parents do not accept this type of behavior from them. Kohn (22) stated that in working-class families, more was expected of girls than of boys.

The boys' reports of reasons for punishment were about equally distributed among the four categories. The only exception was that only one boy reported no punishment. Boys seemed willing to admit they were punished. It was difficult to classify the reasons for punishment. Perhaps behavior a boy might define as becoming angry or unacceptable verbal behavior, a mother might consider to be disobedience. This would explain the mother's more frequent use of disobedience as the reason for punishing the boy.

When the reports on type of punishment were compared, it was observed that for boys the mothers used more management types of behavior, such as taking away privileges. It was surprising that only one boy's mother reported using spanking, while three girls' mothers did. A reason might be the age of the children because twelve- and thirteen-year-old boys are getting rather large to spank. Talking and scolding seemed to be the most common method used by girls' mothers. It was noted that all the boys' mothers used punishment of some type, while two girls' mothers reported never punishing.

In comparing girls' reports with their mothers', there was better agreement on type of punishment than on the reason for punishment. Three girls reported no punishment compared with only two mothers. But five girls

reported no punishment when asked the reason for which they were most often punished. On the question concerning the type of punishment used, two of these girls named a type. These girls appeared reluctant to admit the reason for which they were punished, but did not object to telling how punishment was administered.

Three more boys than mothers listed spanking as the type of punishment used. Also more boys than mothers reported verbal punishment. All the boys admitted to being punished. On the whole the children's reports agreed with the mothers on type of punishment used more than on the reasons for punishment.

A study of the reports on frequency of punishment yielded some interesting observations. Both boys and girls reported punishment as being less frequent than mothers. Most mothers reported punishing weekly, while the children reported it more often as monthly or even yearly. Especially was this true for the girls. The girls and their mothers agreed in that none reported daily punishment. Two mothers reported no punishment, while only one girl reported no punishment. The inconsistency of the girls' reports was noted in that five girls reported no punishment when asked the reason for punishment, only three reported no punishment when asked how they were punished, and only one indicated no punishment when asked about the frequency. Two mothers

reported yearly punishment, but their daughters reported monthly punishment. The six girls reporting yearly punishment were punished monthly or weekly according to mothers. A reason for the inconsistency between mothers' and daughters' reports could be that girls of this age are reluctant to admit that they are punished as often as weekly.

The boys' reports were more consistent with their mothers'. Eight of the 20 agreed with their mothers. Though most of the boys who did not agree with their mothers reported less frequent punishment, two boys reported daily punishment compared to only one report of daily punishment by mother. Boys' mothers reported punishing more frequently than girls' mothers, which would agree with studies by Droppleman and Schaefer (8), Hawkes (13), and Bronfenbrenner (3) which indicated that boys perceive themselves as receiving stricter discipline than girls.

Bronfenbrenner (3), Kagan (19), and Droppleman and Schaefer (8) had reported that the child saw the same-sex parent as more demanding and frustrating and less indulgent than the opposite-sex parent. This did not seem to be indicated by the girls' reports of punishment practices. The girls saw themselves as being punished less often than did their mothers.

The sample was too small to make any generalized conclusions. An interesting further study would be to administer the questionnaire of values to a larger number of Appalachian mothers of seventh- and eighth-grade children to discover whether there is a significant difference between Appalachian mothers' values for boys and for girls. A more comprehensive longitudinal study of discipline practices as perceived by mothers and by children would be interesting to determine how discipline practices change as a child grows older. A study of the Appalachian fathers' values and discipline practices would also be worthwhile.

CHAPTER VI

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The purpose of this study was to compare the values of a group of lower-class Appalachian mothers for their boys and for their girls. Punishment practices for boys and for girls were also compared. The child's report of punishment was compared with the mother's. It was hypothesized that there would be no difference between the boys' mothers and the girls' mothers in their choice of values for their children on a questionnaire using a list of values adapted from Kohn (22). It was also hypothesized that there would be no significant change in values as indicated by the same questionnaire over a two-year period. It was further hypothesized that there would be no difference between the proportion of boys agreeing with their mothers and the proportion of girls agreeing with their mothers as to frequency of punishment.

The subjects of this study were 37 mothers and their children--20 boys and 17 girls. They were selected from a regional study of the Appalachian area which was begun in 1969 when the children were in the fifth grade. At the time of this study the children were seventh- and eighth-grade students in two schools in Union County, Tennessee. All were from low-income homes.

The mothers responded to a questionnaire administered by an interviewer in their homes. The list of 16 values parents have for children was adapted from Kohn's list of values (22). Mothers were to indicate the three values they would most desire for a child the age of their child. They were also asked to tell the reason for which they most often punished their child, the type of punishment used, and how often they punished. The children filled out questionnaires at school giving the reason for which they were most often punished, how they were punished, and how often.

Since the sample was small, Fisher's exact probability test was used to test for a significant difference between the number of boys' mothers and the number of girls' mothers choosing each value. None of the differences reached significance at the .05 level. The hypothesis of no difference between the boys' mothers and the girls' mothers in choice of values failed to be rejected.

To test the hypothesis that there would be no change of values over a two-year period, questionnaires from 1969 were compared with those from 1971. The binomial test for two related samples (33) was used to check for significance of change for each value. One value, "is dependable," was found to reach significance at the .05 level. None of the other value changes reached significance. The hypothesis of no significant change in mothers' values over a two-year period was rejected.

Fisher's exact test was used to test for a difference between the proportion of boys agreeing with their mothers and the proportion of girls agreeing with their mothers as to frequency of punishment. No significant difference was found. The hypothesis of no difference between the proportion of boys agreeing with their mothers and the proportion of girls agreeing with their mothers concerning frequency of punishment failed to be rejected.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Bayley, Nancy, and Earl S. Schaefer. "Relationships Between Socioeconomic Variables and the Behavior of Mothers Toward Young Children," The Journal of Genetic Psychology, 96:61-77, March, 1960.

2. Brody, Grace F. "Socioeconomic Differences in Stated Maternal Child-Rearing Practices and in Observed Maternal Behavior," Journal of Marriage and the Family, 30:4:656-660, November, 1968.

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

4. Christopher, Samuel A. "Parental Relationship and Value Orientation as Factors in Academic Achievement," Personnel and Guidance Journal, 45:921-925, May, 1967.

5. Currence, Mary G. (ed.). Tennessee Statistical Abstract. Knoxville: University of Tennessee, Center for Business and Economic Research, 1971.

6. Davis, Allison, and Robert J. Havighurst. "Social Class and Color Differences in Child Rearing," American Sociological Review, 11:698-710, 1946.

7. DeCoursey, Patricia Shepard. "A Comparison of Disciplinary Practices of Mothers in Two Social Classes in Rural Kentucky." Unpublished Master's thesis, The University of Tennessee, 1968.

8. Droppleman, Leo F., and Earl S. Schaefer. "Boys' and Girls' Reports of Maternal and Paternal Behavior," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 67:648-654, 1963.

9. Duvall, Evelyn Millis. "Conceptions of Parenthood," American Journal of Sociology, 52:193-203, November, 1946.

10. Eron, Leonard D., Thomas J. Banta, Leopold O. Walder, and Jerome H. Laulicht. "Comparison of Data Obtained from Mothers and Fathers on Child-rearing Practices and Their Relation to Child Aggression," Child Development, 32:457-472, 1961

11. Galler, Enid Harris. "Influence of Social Class on Children's Choices of Occupations," Elementary School Journal, 51:439-445, 1951.

12. Goldin, Paul C. "A Review of Children's Reports of Parent Behaviors," Psychological Bulletin, 71:3: 222-236, 1969.

13. Hawkes, Glenn R., Lee G. Burchinal, and Bruce Gardner. "Pre-Adolescents' Views of Some of Their Relations with Their Parents," Child Development, 28:393-399, 1957.

14. Heinstein, Martin. Child Rearing in California: A Study of Mothers with Young Children. ERIC No. ED 020 783. Berkeley: California State Department of Public Health, October, 1965.

15. Hervey, Sarah D. A Note on Punishment Patterns in Parents of Pre-School Children, Report No. 3. ERIC No. ED 001 320. Detroit: Merrill-Palmer Institute, August, 1968.

16. Hoffman, Martin L. "Power Assertion by the Parent and Its Impact on the Child," Child Development, 31:129-143, 1960.

17. Johnsen, Kathryn P., and Gerald R. Leslie. "Methodological Notes on Research in Childrearing and Social Class," Merrill-Palmer Quarterly of Behavior and Development, 11:345-358, October, 1965.

18. Joiner, Lee M., Edsel L. Erickson, and Wilbur B. Brookover. "Socioeconomic Status and Perceived Expectations as Measures of Family Influence," Personnel and Guidance Journal, 47:655-659, March, 1969.

19. Kagan, Jerome. "The Child's Perception of the Parent," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 53:257-258, 1956.

20. Kamii, Constance K., and Norma L. Radin. "Class Differences in the Socialization Practices of Negro Mothers," Journal of Marriage and the Family, 29:302-310, May, 1967.

21. Klatskin, Ethelyn Henry. "Shifts in Child Care Practices in Three Social Classes Under an Infant Care Program of Flexible Methodology," The American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 22:52-61, January, 1952.

22. Kohn, Melvin L. Class and Conformity: A Study in Values. Homewood, Illinois: Dorsey Press, 1969.

23. _____. "Social Class and Parental Values," American Journal of Sociology, 64:337-351, January, 1959.

24. _____. "Social Class and the Exercise of Parental Authority," American Sociological Review, 24:352-366, 1959.

25. Littman, Richard A., Robert C. A. Moore, and John Pierce-Jones. "Social Class Differences in Child Rearing: A Third Community for Comparison with Chicago and Newton," American Sociological Review, 22:694-704, 1957.

26. Maccoby, Eleanor E., and Patricia K. Gibbs. "Methods of Childrearing in Two Social Classes," pp. 380-396 in W. E. Martin and C. B. Stendler (eds.) Readings in Child Development. New York: Harcourt, Brace, 1954.

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

28. Natrella, Mary Gibbons. Experimental Statistics. Washington: United States Department of Commerce, 1963.

29. Pearson, E. S., and H. O. Hartley. Biometrika Tables for Statistics, Volume I. Cambridge: University Press, 1958.

30. Rosen, Bernard C. "Family Structure and Achievement Motivation," American Sociological Review, 26:574-585, 1961.

31. _____. "Social Class and the Child's Perception of the Parent," Child Development, 35:1147-1153, 1964.

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

33. Siegel, Sidney. Nonparametric Statistics for the Behavioral Sciences. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1956.

34. White, Martha Sturm. "Social Class, Child Rearing Practices, and Child Behavior," American Sociological Review, 22:704-712, 1957.

APPENDIX

MOTHER QUESTIONNAIRE FROM REGIONAL STUDY: EDUCATION AND VOCATIONAL GOALS OF YOUNG PEOPLE

This sheet has 16 statements. We will read them through and then I would like you to circle the three (only three) that you think are the most important for a young person the age of your child _____.

1. Gets along well with other children
2. Has good manners
3. Tries hard to succeed
4. Is neat and clean
5. Is liked by adults
6. Acts in a serious way
7. Is able to defend himself or herself
8. Has self-control
9. Is affectionate
10. Is happy
11. Obeys his or her parents well
12. Is honest
13. Is dependable
14. Is considerate of others
15. Is interested in why and how things happen
16. Is a good student

What is the main thing your child does that you punish him or her for?

_____

How do you punish your child for this?_____

How often has this happened during the last year? (Circle one)

1. Almost every day
2. About once a week
3. About once a month
4. Only once or twice during the year

*What is the main thing your child does that you praise him or her for?

_____

*Item not analyzed.

CHILDREN'S QUESTIONNAIRE FROM REGIONAL STUDY: EDUCATION AND VOCATIONAL GOALS OF YOUNG PEOPLE

*1. Since I was here last with this questionnaire, has your mother talked to you about
   a. What kind of job you will have in the future
      _____Yes
      _____No
   b. The amount of education you should have
      _____Yes
      _____No

2. What is the main thing you do that your mother punishes you for?

3. How does she punish you for this?

4. How often has this happened during the last year?
   _____1. Almost every day
   _____2. About once a week
   _____3. About once a month
   _____4. Only once or twice during the year

*5. What is the main thing you do that your mother praises you for?

*Item not analyzed.

VITA

Shirley Crouse was born January 28, 1936, at Smith Center, Kansas. She received a B.A. degree in Education from Sterling College in Sterling, Kansas. After teaching elementary school and kindergarten in Kansas for three years, she went to Red Bird Mission in Beverly, Kentucky, where she taught third and fourth grade for ten years. In 1967 she was elected to Outstanding Young Women of America. She expects to return to Red Bird Mission where she will become the director of a new Early Childhood Development program after completing her Master's degree at The University of Tennessee in June, 1972.