

the contributions of the family to the development of competence in children

Diana Baumrind*

The ideal home or school in the late 1940's and 1950's was organized around unlimited acceptance of the child's current needs for gratification, rather than around preparation for adult life. The child was to be granted maximum freedom of choice and self-expression in both settings. Spock's 1946 edition of *Baby and Child Care* advocated such infant-care practices and the extension into early childhood of lenient disciplinary practices. Yet the avalanche of studies on the effects of infant-care practices did not support the supposed harmful effects of such restraints on the child as scheduled feeding, early weaning, and early toilet training. Indeed, Spock's emphasis altered in the 1957 edition. Comparing the changes in child-rearing practices from 1940 to 1955, he stated that "Since then a great change in attitude has occurred and nowadays there seems to be more chance of a conscientious parent's getting into trouble with permissiveness than strictness" (p. 2). In his *Redbook* columns (beginning in 1964) and his new book entitled *Raising Children in a Difficult Time* (1974), Spock speaks out more affirmatively for the reinstatement of parental controls and for the inculcation by the parent of ideals and standards. The vigorous introduction of permissive and child-centered attitudes into educational philosophy began at least 40 years ago (Coriat 1926 and Naumberg 1928) as an outgrowth of the psychoanalytic theory of psychosexual development. The view that the effects of adult authority on the child are inhibiting, neurotogenic, and ethically indefensible was promoted by such articulate spokesmen as Goodman (1964), Maslow (1954), A. S.

Neill (1964), and Rogers (1960) in the fields of education and child rearing.

The practices favored by American parents for influencing the actions and character of their offspring have varied from time to time in keeping with the predominant view of the child as a refractory savage, a small adult, or an angelic bundle from heaven. These convictions have, for the most part, been based on humanistic or religious values rather than upon scientific findings. Research findings have helped to debunk certain clinically derived notions about the obligatory neurotogenic effects of one or another of the common child-rearing practices, notions characterized perhaps more by creative flair and inner certitude than by demonstrable validity.

My program of research was initiated to investigate the effects of actual patterns of child rearing currently practiced by American parents. For the past 15 years I have supervised a program of research that has as its major objective the identification of effects of alternative patterns of parental authority on the development of instrumental competence in children and adolescents.

The term "instrumental competence" derives from Parsons' (1951) distinction between instrumental and expressive functions. Parsons designates as instrumental those functions:

... oriented to the achievement of a goal which is an anticipated future state of affairs, the attainment of which is felt to promise gratification; a state of affairs which will not come about without the intervention of the actor in the course of events. Such instrumental or goal-orientation introduces an element of discipline, the renunciation of certain immediately potential gratifications, including that to be derived from passively "letting things slide"

*Requests for reprints should be addressed to the author at the Institute of Human Development, University of California at Berkeley, 1203 Tolman Hall, Berkeley, Calif. 94720.

and awaiting the outcome. Such immediate gratifications are renounced in the interest of the prospectively larger gains to be derived from the attainment of the goal, an attainment which is felt to be contingent on fulfillment of certain conditions at intermediate stages of the process. [pp. 48-49]

By expressive functions, Parsons means activities where "the primary orientation is not to the attainment of a goal anticipated for the future, but the organization of the 'flow' of gratifications . . . and of course the warding off of threatened deprivations" (p. 49). Parsons regards expressive functions (such as receptivity, nurturance, and empathy) as traditionally feminine and instrumental functions (such as assertiveness, ambition, self-discipline, and objectivity) as traditionally masculine. As Parsons points out, traditionally masculine qualities—whether one is male or female—further success in competitive achievements; those most able to survive and flourish with the least dependence upon others are those who perform instrumental functions in the most competent manner.

In choosing to study the antecedents of instrumental competence, I have made the assumption that the qualities basic to instrumental competence are and will continue to be of benefit to the individual and the society. I believe that the abilities both to accommodate to social mores and laws and to take self-assertive and autonomous action in opposition to those mores and laws when their legitimacy cannot be defended are essential to healthful, successful functioning of persons of both sexes in any society. Parents differ in the value they place on instrumental competence; these differences are in large part a function of political philosophy. The modern intellectual parent has the difficult task of reconciling opposing values. While the conservative parent can teach the child to conform but not to dissent, and the radical parent can teach his child to dissent but not to conform, the modern intellectual parent must teach the child to discriminate between legitimate and illegitimate authority and to conform to the former and dissent from the latter. This must be done in a society with ill-defined and conflicting values. Because they question the legitimacy of the state's authority, many liberals also question the legitimacy of their own authority. The liberal will ask whether there are any circumstances in which one individual has the right to constrain the activity of another or to shape another's values—even in the parent-child relationship. Parents' political attitudes, particularly those concerning the

relation between freedom and control inevitably affect their philosophy of child rearing.

Studies of Child-Care Practices

In a pilot study (Baumrind 1967), three patterns of child rearing emerged, each associated with an identifiable type of child behavior. These patterns, which were designated authoritative, authoritarian, and permissive, differed primarily in the role that authority played in the parents' thinking and practices. Immediately following this pilot study, a larger study (Baumrind and Black 1967) of linear relations between parent attitudes and child characteristics was conducted with a separate sample. Several years later a large longitudinal study was initiated to investigate more intensively the kinds of relationships revealed in the earlier studies. The preschool phase of this longitudinal study was detailed in a monograph entitled *Current Patterns of Parental Authority* (Baumrind 1971a). The methodological features of this investigation were intended to overcome some of the shortcomings of previous research on socialization effects. Most previous research had relied on retrospective reports and upon ratings with an inadequate data base.

Subjects

Subjects in all three studies were homogeneous in socioeconomic background and education; they came from white, middle class, well-educated, and urbane families. The children who were selected for the core sample all attended nursery schools in or near Berkeley, Calif. Their average age was 4-3/4 years, with no child younger than 3-3/4 years. Their average IQ was 125. All were white. (The data on 16 black families were reported separately; see Baumrind 1972a.) The children from the core sample continue to reside in Berkeley, an area in the forefront of social change. The reader should bear in mind the population sampled; this sample, relative to the general population, is nontraditional, child centered, and rational. Thus, when I speak of "rejecting" parents, I am talking about parents who are less child centered than the rest but not actually neglectful, abusive, or brutal.

Methodology

The methodological features that characterize our program of research are as follows:

- In-depth contact with a large number of families who could be classified as normal (but whose children show a range of competencies and deficiencies that suggest "low risk" and "high risk" personality types).

- Use of both molar ratings and molecular indices. The molar ratings are carefully developed, combined into reliable clusters, and based on at least 25 hours of observation across a range of situational contexts. The molecular measures are related systematically to the molar measures of family communication, guided by theory rather than being merely descriptive, and focused on metacommunication among several family members.

- Use of a longitudinal study format in which the data for each time period are analyzed completely before proceeding to the next period of data collections so that specific hypotheses suggested by findings from earlier time periods can guide the successive stages of data collection and in which the multivariate analyses of the numerous variables focus on configural as well as linear relations among the parent and child variables.

Trait Ratings

Trait ratings are used extensively to assess dispositional tendencies in children. By trait, I mean a relatively enduring characteristic of an individual, manifest within a broad range of circumstances, which can be used to distinguish him from another individual. The construct of a dispositional trait is used to account for continuity and stability within the changing personality (Emmerich 1964); it suggests a generalized structure that renders social stimuli functionally equivalent for the individual, initiating and guiding his adaptive and stylistic behavior at various stages of his development.

For the subject's unique disposition to become manifest, the observer must study him carefully in many situations, and must ask him about the meaning of the observed activity. For example, suppose the observer's task is to rate children on the trait *aggression*. One child is aggressive in the sense that he bullies weaker children but is not aggressive in the sense that he resists domination from stronger children. A second child resists domination by other children and is aggressive only in the presence of bullies and intruders capable of interfering with his ongoing activities. Toward weaker children, he may be protective. A third child is aggressive in most circumstances; he will go after what he wants

whether the other is weaker or stronger, friendly or unfriendly, adult or child. Were each child to be observed in a variety of situations by a highly discriminating observer who asked the child what he felt his behavior meant, the child's behavior might well be reliably predicted as aggressive or bullying or resistant to domination. In an experimental situation or during a brief period of observation, the way these various children discriminate among stimuli might not be noticed—although each child's behavior is probably quite predictable to his agemates, who are attuned to their context by personal needs. It is by the *patterning* of these traits that the uniqueness of each child is captured.

Multiple Stimuli and Behavior Settings

No single research method can assess all aspects of the empirical reality under investigation, and each method has its characteristic strengths and weaknesses. Within the limits of a given budget, however, an attempt can be made to assess numerous aspects of the subject's psychological reality. The characteristics of the subjects interact with those of the behavior setting. Individual observers and investigators screen selectively on the basis of personal preference, training, life history, and theoretical orientations. Hence, a variety of behavior settings are necessary to ensure that no important feature of the subject's psychological world is neglected. The methods used include self-report, interview, observation (both structured and field), and standardized tests. Table 1 summarizes the sample sizes and the kinds of measurements that were made for each of the three studies of preschool children and the followup of the longitudinal study. In addition to the cross-sectional studies with preschool children, we are presently conducting a longitudinal study using families from the last and most extensive of the earlier studies supplemented by an additional 60 families. These children are now 8 to 9 years old and will be studied through secondary school.

Longitudinal Design

A longitudinal design permits a search extending throughout the development of the child for the early family patterns contributing to competence. The use of

Table 1. Data sources and sample sizes.

A. Socialization practices associated with dimensions of competence in preschool boys and girls. ¹ (45 girls, 50 boys)		
Procedure	Involving parent	Involving child
Self-report	None	None
Interview	Child-rearing attitudes and practices	None
Observation		
Structured	None	None
Field	One home visit	3 months of observation at nursery school by psychologist
Standardized tests	None	Stanford-Binet Intelligence Test
B. Child care practices anteceding three patterns of preschool behavior. ² (16 girls, 16 boys)		
Procedure	Involving parent	Involving child
Self-report	None	None
Interview	Child-rearing attitudes and practices	None
Observation		
Structured	Mother teaches child with cuisenaire rods Mother plays with child	3 puzzles of graded difficulty given by psychologist
Field	Two home visits	14 weeks of observation at nursery school by psychologist
Standardized tests	None	Stanford-Binet Intelligence Test
C. Current patterns of parental authority. ³ (60 girls, 74 boys)		
Procedure	Involving parent	Involving child
Self-report	Parent attitude inquiry	None
Interview	Child-rearing practices interview	None
Observation		
Structured	None	Observation of intelligence testing session
Field	Two home visits	Approximately 36 school visits
Standardized tests	None	Stanford-Binet Intelligence Test

¹ Baumrind and Black (1967).² Baumrind (1967).³ Baumrind (1971a).

Table 1. Data sources and sample sizes. (Continued)

D. Current study: Longitudinal followup of past sample plus new subjects.⁴ (46 girls, 58 boys—longitudinal; 34 girls, 22 boys—new)		
Procedure	Involving parent	Involving child
Self-report	Ethical judgment and parental attitudes questionnaire	Internal vs. external locus of control and social desirability questionnaire
Interview	Child-rearing practices and attitude interview	Child identity interview
	Ethical judgment interview	Child moral interview Value of Life film and interview
Observation	Parent teaches Piaget tasks Parent plays with child Family ethical discussion	Observation of intelligence testing session
		Card building
Field	Two home visits	Free play Three school visits
Standardized tests	Witkin Rod and Frame Test Draw Yourself Test	Witkin Rod and Frame Test
		Draw Yourself Test
		Creativity tests
		Test of role-taking ability
		Stanford-Binet Intelligence Test WISC Performance Scales

⁴ Total of 160 subjects.

such a design obviates the need for retrospective reports, which are known to lack the validity of data based on successive observations taking place at crucial periods throughout the subject's childhood and adolescence. In a longitudinal design, pathological and contrast groups can be identified and studied throughout childhood and adolescence. Some contrast groups that require a longitudinal design in a study of the etiology of schizophrenia are:

- A group of children identified as "high risk" at the latency period who do not develop severe pathology in adolescence;
- A group of families in which the parents share with the pathological group certain characteristics hypothesized to be pathogenic (e.g., the stereotypic dominant, overprotective mother and weak father) but where severe pathology is absent in the child in latency and adolescence; and
- A group of children unusually competent through-

out childhood and adolescence included to determine whether there is a constellation of family behaviors that is entirely absent for this group (e.g., neglect) but frequently present in families of pathological groups.

There are several other advantages of a longitudinal design worthy of mention. A longitudinal design permits the investigator to pinpoint a crucial period of development in which one or another form of family interaction is particularly pathogenic (e.g., "double binding" by parents when the child is developing logical operations). Also, direction of cause-effect relationships can be determined more readily with repeated observations over time. Which situational influences are the concomitants or effects of a pathology and which are their antecedents cannot be determined with a cross-sectional design. Given a certain set of correlations across time, it becomes possible to cast alternate explanations concerning antecedent-consequent relations (concerning, let us say, the relationship of maternal overpossessiveness to

withdrawal in the child) as formal hypotheses and to accept the hypothesis that is most tenable after the time dependencies over several observational periods have been considered.

In each of the studies to be discussed, trained observers visited the homes twice from before dinner to the child's bedtime; written records were made of the observations, and each parent was interviewed separately, with the interview tape-recorded. Using this data base, each parent was rated on numerous scales of specific child-rearing techniques that permitted assessment of the degree to which they enforced rules, made demands on the child, used reason when giving directives, and demonstrated intimate communication and warmth. Over a period of 3 to 5 months, one of a team of observers recorded numerous interpersonal episodes for each child as he or she took part in routine nursery school activities. The observer also watched as the child was administered the Stanford-Binet Intelligence Test. From these multiple observations, the observer rated the child on more than 70 scales using the Q-sort method. The Q-sort is a personality inventory in which the judge sorts a series of items into several piles ranging from extremely characteristic to extremely uncharacteristic of the subject. Generally, a forced distribution is used (Block 1961). In these studies, the observer was required to sort the items into a rectangular distribution consisting of nine piles. Ratings were "blind" (i.e., uninfluenced by knowledge of home factors, since different observers visited the home). The interrater reliabilities of these ratings averaged 0.70.

In the preschool period, factor-analytic studies generally yield two fundamental dimensions: 1) behavior that is socialized and responsible at one end and disobedient and unfriendly at the other and 2) behavior that is independent and autonomous at one end and dependent and suggestible at the other. At the early primary school period, a three-dimensional model with two of the dimensions somewhat correlated best describes the data. The first dimension remains fairly well intact but the second becomes differentiated into two, one of which measures social independence and dominance and the second, intellectual creativity and purposiveness. At later ages we expect these dimensions to emerge as three independent factors; that is, social independence and intellectual creativity should become more differentiated as the individual matures and thus should no longer be significantly correlated.

In this presentation, I will first summarize our substantive results for three separate studies with preschool children. Then I will present certain preliminary findings from the core longitudinal sample in which the children average 8-3/4 years. Next I will present certain analyses comparing high and low risk types which were undertaken especially for this paper. I will conclude with a brief presentation of hypotheses concerning the family etiology of schizophrenia.

Parent-Child Relations During the Preschool Period

Socialization Practices Associated with Dimensions of Competence

The objective of this study was to identify parent dimensions and variables associated with instrumental competence in preschool children. A correlational study can postulate the general effect on the child of a theoretically interesting parent dimension. If no effect is observed for a parent variable thought to have a universal linear effect, or if an effect is seen but the direction is opposite to that which would be postulated as universal by a currently popular child-rearing belief or theory, the validity of that belief or theory may properly be questioned.

In this study, subjects were 95 sets of parents and their preschool children. Data were analyzed separately for boys and girls. Behavioral and interview data on parents were derived 1) from home visits, with the data in the form of discrete Home Visit Sequence Analysis (HVSA) variables computed from a molecular analysis of transcripts of the evening home visit and 2) from interviews, with parent interview dimensions arrived at through cluster-analytic techniques. Data on children were derived from prolonged observations in nursery school and structured settings and consist of Q-sort ratings. A child-behavior model (similar in structure to models presented by Schaefer (1961) and Becker and Krug (1964) was developed and its relation to these parent measures was assessed. The names given the Q-sort clusters in the four-cluster solution described in Baumrind and Black (1967, p. 297) were *disaffiliative-affiliative*, *resistive-cooperative*, *independent-dependent*, and *assertive-withdrawn*.

Table 2. Correlation coefficients between parent variables and child-behavior clusters (four-cluster solution).¹

Part A. Girls				
Parent variables	Correlations with child behavior clusters ²			
	Disaffiliative- affiliative	Resistive- cooperative	Independent- dependent	Assertive- withdrawn
Father-interview clusters				
Warmth	- .18	- .22	- .13	.02
Consistent discipline	- .35	- .25	.05	.28
Strictness concerning orderliness09	.27	.25	.08
Punitiveness10	.25	.34	.08
Mother-interview clusters				
Warmth	- .10	.04	.03	.24
Consistent discipline10	.08	.01	.12
Maturity demands20	.24	.15	.09
Punitiveness	- .26	- .12	.09	- .05
Socialization demands	- .12	.05	.29	.38
HVSA variables				
Positive outcome	- .22	- .04	- .09	.16
Accepts power conflict with child	- .21	- .32	- .32	.04
Independence training	- .07	.17	.15	.32
Respects child's decision	- .05	.01	.17	.12
Uses reason to obtain compliance	- .22	- .18	- .05	.30
Encourages verbal give-and-take	- .30	- .29	- .06	.21
Satisfies child	- .06	- .04	- .19	- .20
Uses coercive power12	- .11	- .28	- .42
Takes initiative in control sequences	- .05	.17	.28	.19

¹ Baumrind and Black (1967).

² Significant at $p < .05$ for $r > .30$ for Independent tests.

Table 2 summarizes the relationships between child-rearing dimensions and dimensions measuring competence in boys and girls.

Maturity Demands

The effects of maturity demands on girls were measured by father-interview clusters designated *strictness concerning orderliness* and mother-interview clus-

ters designated *maturity demands* and *socialization demands*. For boys, parent-interview clusters were the same, except that a mother cluster equivalent to socialization demands for girls did not appear. The HVSA variable, *independence training*, was the behavioral measure of maturity demands for both sexes. Maternal socialization demands and independence training were both associated with assertive behavior in girls. The maternal maturity demands cluster was associated with independence and assertiveness in boys. For both

Table 2. Correlation coefficients between parent variables and child-behavior clusters (four-cluster solution). (Continued)

Part B. Boys				
Parent variables	Correlations with child behavior clusters ³			
	Disaffiliative-affiliative	Resistive-cooperative	Independent-dependent	Assertive-withdrawn
Father-interview clusters				
Warmth	-.08	.12	.18	.11
Consistent discipline	-.25	.06	.42	.30
Strictness concerning orderliness	-.21	-.13	-.11	-.09
Punitiveness24	-.02	.02	.01
Mother-interview clusters				
Warmth07	.17	.12	.13
Consistent discipline	-.10	-.05	.04	.05
Maturity demands	-.17	.20	.34	.40
Punitiveness14	-.07	.10	-.13
Restrictiveness06	-.09	-.29	-.08
Encourages independent contacts03	.21	.42	.15
HVSA variables				
Positive outcome	-.18	-.06	.02	.02
Accepts power conflict with child	-.07	.05	.20	.22
Independence training control	-.02	-.11	-.11	.01
Respects child's decisions	-.32	-.28	.14	.40
Uses reason to obtain compliance12	.26	.36	.16
Encourages verbal give-and-take	-.05	.03	.13	.16
Satisfies child	-.17	-.18	.01	.22
Uses coercive power00	-.09	-.27	-.03
Takes initiative in control sequences	-.05	-.11	-.09	.03

³Significant at $p < .05$ for $r > .28$.

boys and girls, then, significant mother-child effects appeared between measures of maturity demands and assertive behavior in the child.

Firm Control

The effects of firm control were measured for both boys and girls by father- and mother-interview clusters designated *consistent discipline* and HVSA variables designated *positive outcome*, *accepts power conflict*, and

takes initiative in control sequences. Paternal consistent discipline was associated in girls with affiliative behavior toward peers. The HVSA variable designated *accepts conflict with child* (which measures the instances in which the parent confronts the child and precipitates conflict) was associated in girls with cooperative behavior with adults but also with dependent behavior. Paternal consistent discipline was associated in boys with independent and assertive behavior. The HVSA variable, *accepts conflict with child*, was associated positively

(though insignificantly) with independent behavior in boys rather than associated negatively as with girls.

Rational Methods of Discipline

The effects of rational methods of discipline were measured by HVSA variables designated *respects child's decision*, *uses reason to obtain compliance*, *encourages verbal give-and-take*, and *uses coercive power* (negative). Assertive behavior in girls was associated positively with *uses reason to obtain compliance* and negatively with *uses coercive power*. Girls whose parents *encourage verbal give-and-take* were affiliative. For boys, *respects child's decision* was associated with affiliative, cooperative, and assertive behavior, while *uses reason to obtain compliance* was associated with independent behavior.

Parental Warmth

The effects of parental warmth for both boys and girls were measured by father and mother interview clusters designated *warmth* and by the HVSA variable designated *satisfies child*. Warmth, as measured by these variables, was not a significant predictor of child behavior for either sex in this study.

Parental Punitiveness

The effects of parental punitiveness for both sexes were measured by father- and mother-interview clusters designated *punitiveness*. Punitiveness in the father correlated negatively with measures of consistency and positively with low self-confidence, suggesting that the punitive father was weak rather than strong. Punitiveness in the father was associated positively with independent behavior in girls but not for boys.

Maternal Restrictiveness

The effects of maternal restrictiveness for boys were measured by two interview clusters for mothers of boys designated *restrictiveness* and *encourages independent contacts*. Both were related significantly to independence in the son, the former negatively and the latter positively.

Summary

In summary, warmth was not linearly related to indices of either social responsibility or independence in boys or girls. The belief that unconditional acceptance

promotes competence—defined either as self-assertiveness and independence or as affiliativeness and cooperativeness—was not supported by these data. In fact, parental practices that were stimulating and to some extent tension producing (e.g., maternal socialization and maturity demands and paternal punitiveness for girls) were associated in the young child with assertiveness. Firm paternal discipline was associated for girls with socially responsible behavior and for boys with independence and self-assertiveness. Consistent discipline and high socialization demands were not characteristics of restrictive or punitive parents. In fact, the opposite was true. Restrictive, nonrational discipline (in contrast to consistent discipline and high maturity demands) was associated with withdrawn, dependent, and disaffiliative behavior in both boys and girls. The use of reason to obtain compliance was significantly associated in the parent with a complex of other parent variables similar to those that define authoritative discipline (i.e., high maturity demands, encouragement of independent contact, and lack of punitiveness), and this may contribute to its associations in the child with independent and socially responsible behavior.

Typological Approach to the Study of Parent-Child Effects

In the studies that follow, a typological approach to data reduction was used to reveal the relations between contrasting configurations of parent variables and child behaviors. It will be seen that the relationship of a particular parent behavior to child behavior depends upon the total configuration of variables. For example, the relation of high parental control to social responsibility and independence in the child depends upon the extent to which the parent also encourages individuality and independence; thus, a distinction is made between the effects on the child of *authoritarian* control and the effects of *authoritative* control, which will be discussed shortly.

First Study

Methods. Subjects were 32 children (aged 3 and 4) selected from among all those enrolled at the Child Study Center, Institute of Human Development, University of California at Berkeley during the fall semester of 1961 (see Baumrind 1967). The selection procedures began with the assessment of all the children in the Child

Study Center on five dimensions intended to measure instrumental competence at ages 3 and 4: self-control, approach-avoidance tendency, self-reliance, vitality (from buoyant to dysphoric), and peer affiliation. Each dimension was illustrated and given concrete meaning for the nursery school teachers by reference to relevant time sample categories and by instances of actual observed behavior. After being observed for 14 weeks, the children were ranked on each dimension by both their nursery school teacher and the observing psychologist. The 52 children who received one of the five highest or the five lowest rankings on at least two of the five dimensions were observed further, individually, in a laboratory setting where they were given some standardized tasks. For example, one task included three puzzles graded in difficulty so that each child experienced easy success, probable success, and certain failure. Their responses to success and failure were observed and rated on the five dimensions by the testing psychologist and by the observing psychologist. In order for a child to remain in the study, the observing and the testing psychologists' ratings of the child in the two settings had to concur. Using these multiple-assessment procedures, three contrasting groups of children were selected, each with a clear-cut, stable pattern of interpersonal attributes.

The three groups of children were selected in order to test a set of hypotheses concerning the interacting effects on child behavior patterns of parental control, parental maturity demands, parent-child communication, and parental nurturance. Pattern 1 contained all children (six girls, seven boys) who were ranked high on vitality (from buoyant to dysphoric), self-reliance, approach-avoidance tendency, and self-control. Pattern 2 contained all children (seven girls, four boys) who ranked low on peer affiliation and vitality and did not rank high on approach-avoidance tendency. Pattern 3 contained all children (three girls, five boys) who ranked low on self-reliance, self-control, and approach-avoidance tendency.

Each of these children was observed interacting with the mother in a 2-hour structured teaching session followed by a play experience in the laboratory setting (see Baumrind 1967a, pp. 68-70, for description of the structured observation). Also, two home visits were made to each family by a psychologist who had not previously rated the child's behavior. These home visits, which were structured identically for each family, took

place during a period from shortly before the dinner hour until just after the child's bedtime. This 2- to 3-hour period is commonly known to produce instances of parent-child divergence and was selected for observation in order to elicit a wide range of critical control interactions under maximum stress. Each mother and father was interviewed separately, and the interviews were tape recorded. Families were rated on a 24-item parent behavior rating scale (PBRS), based in part on the Fels Parent Behavior Rating Scales (Baldwin, Kalhorn, and Breese 1949). These observations and interviews were used to rate each parent's early activities on four dimensions of child-rearing practices selected for their theoretical importance as predictors of competence in preschool children.

At the time this study began, considerable concern about the negative effects of strict discipline on children was being expressed, particularly in the clinical and educational literature (Becker et al. 1962, Goodman 1964, Kagan and Moss 1962, Maslow 1954, Neill 1964, and Rogers 1960). In the study reported here, parental control was defined so that punitiveness and arbitrariness were not components. Thus, the effects on the child of strict, punitive discipline could be distinguished from the effects of discipline that, though equally strict, was neither punitive nor arbitrary.

Results. Pattern 1 children (designated *mature*) had parents who, in comparison with all other parents studied, were both controlling and warm and were rated on all measures as communicating more clearly with their children. Despite parental readiness to use reinforcement, the homes of pattern 1 children, based on the observations, lacked discord and disciplinary friction. According to the interview, these parents used corporal punishment rather than such tactics as ridicule, frightening the child, or withdrawal of love; however, they generally used positive reinforcement rather than negative reinforcement to obtain compliance. Pattern 1 children, subjected to consistent parental pressure for mature and obedient behavior, were both socially responsible and assertive. This combination of high control and positive encouragement of the child's independent strivings was called *authoritative* parental control.

Pattern 2 children (designated *dysphoric* and *dis-affiliated*) had parents who were rated lower on use of rational methods of control and were less nurturant and sympathetic with their children. They were not quite so

controlling as parents of pattern 1 children but, according to interview data, these parents (especially mothers) were inclined to give respect for parental authority and religious belief as reasons for their demands. Unlike parents of pattern 1 children, they did not attempt to convince the child through use of reason to obey a directive; nor did they encourage the child to express himself when he disagreed. The attitudes they expressed to the child were less sympathetic and approving and they more often admitted to frightening the child. These parents, who were detached, controlling, and somewhat cool relative to other parents studied, were called *authoritarian*.

Pattern 3 children (designated *immature*) had parents who, in comparison to parents of pattern 1 children, behaved in a markedly less controlling manner and were not so well organized or so effective in running their households. According to the interviews, they did not feel in control of their child's behavior or feel their influence on the child to be high. Compared to other parents, they made very few demands on their children for mature behavior. Fathers were especially lax. Parents engaged in less independence training, although they granted the child's demands for independence; according to the ratings, they also babied their children more. By comparison with mothers of pattern 1 (mature) children, mothers of pattern 3 (immature) children used withdrawal of love and ridicule—rather than overt power, physical punishment, or reason—to obtain compliance. The major difference between parents of pattern 2 (dysphoric and disaffiliated children) and pattern 3 (immature children) is that the former were more controlling and less warm, while the latter, designated as *permissive*, were less controlling and somewhat warmer (although not so warm as parents of pattern 1 children). The child-rearing styles characterizing the parents of children in each of the three patterns are summarized in table 3.

Second Study

While the methods and variables used in this study are similar to those in study 1 described above, they differ in several important respects: 1) Parent-child relationships for boys and girls are studied separately. 2) Study 2 is longitudinal; the children were first observed in nursery school and are now being studied at ages 8 to 9. 3) The sample is more varied; the children were selected from 13 different nursery schools, including

private and public cooperatives as well as University of California facilities. 4) Patterns of parental authority additional to those observed in study 1 have been identified.

Subjects in study 2 were chosen from children enrolled in the fall of 1967 and in the spring of 1968 in 1 of the 13 nursery schools. Out of this group a final sample was selected that comprised 134 white children and their families and 16 black children and their families.

After the usual period of observation, the observer sorted the 72-item Q-sort into a rectangular distribution consisting of nine piles. Eight items were put into each pile. The items were constructed to measure eight constructs: high vs. low stress tolerance, high vs. low self-confidence, achievement vs. nonachievement orientation, approach-oriented vs. avoidant behavior, autonomous vs. suggestible behavior, rebellious vs. dependable behavior with adults, destructive vs. constructive behavior with peers, and alienated vs. trusting approach to adults and peers. After the children's scores on the items were intercorrelated, seven empirical clusters of items appeared:

1. *Hostile-friendly*. This cluster consists of such traits as understands other children's position, nurturant toward other children, bullies other children, insulting, and selfish.

2. *Resistive-cooperative*. This cluster measures compliance with adult authority and includes such items as obedient, facilitates nursery school routine, tries to evade adult authority, and provocative with adults.

3. *Domineering-tractable*. This cluster means abrasiveness with adults and children in terms of traits such as nonintrusive, hits only in self-defense, does not question adult authority, and timid with other children.

4. *Dominant-submissive*. This cluster measures peer leadership and contains items such as suggestible, plans activities for other children, and individualistic.

5. *Purposive-aimless*. This cluster measures self-directiveness and contains such items as spectator, interesting, arresting child, vacillates and oscillates, and disoriented in his environment.

6. *Achievement oriented-not achievement oriented*. This cluster measures self-directed cognitive effort and contains such items as does not persevere when he encounters frustration, likes to learn new skills, sets himself goals that expand his abilities, and gives his best to work and play.

Table 3. Parental child-rearing dimensions characterizing three patterns of character development in preschool children.

Pattern of character development (child)	Child-rearing dimension (parents)			
	Control	Maturity demands	Communication	Nurturance
Mature-competent	4	4	4	4
Dysphoric-disaffiliative	3	3	2	2
Immature-dependent	1	1	2	3

Note: 4 = High; 3 = Medium-high; 2 = Medium-low; 1 = Low.

7. *Independent-suggestible*. This cluster of theoretical interest overlaps with clusters 3, 4, and 5 above and contains such items as individualistic, stereotyped in his thinking, and suggestible.

Data about family interaction were described in terms of 15 hypothetical constructs, rather than by the 4 used in the first study. Fifty parent behavior rating scales (PBR) were devised to assess the observed and reported behavior of the mother and father separately; 25 additional scales measured the joint influence of the parents.

Each scale is quite specific in its referents, generally referring to behavior that could be observed in the home visit and discussed during the interview. For example, item 78, rated separately for the mother and father, is a 4-point scale and reads:

Disciplines Harshly

1. Discipline or correction is administered in a harsh or frightening manner.
2. Discipline or correction is administered in a nonsupportive manner.
3. Discipline or correction is administered in a supportive manner.
4. Discipline or correction is administered with love and concern.

The joint scales rate behavior that cannot easily be distinguished on the basis of parent responsibility. For example, item 66, also a 4-point scale, reads:

Fixed Bedtime Hour

1. There is a fixed bedtime ritual for the child from which almost no deviation is permitted.
2. Child's bedtime hour is fixed within a narrow limit such as 45 minutes, although the hour may

be changed to accommodate special circumstances.

3. Child has considerable latitude in determining his own bedtime but goes to bed before 8:30 p.m.
4. Child pretty much sets his own bedtime and often goes to bed after 8:30 p.m.

From analysis of the data, five empirical clusters of items emerged for mothers, six for fathers, and five for joint behavior:

Firm enforcement. For each parent an empirical cluster emerged that included such items as cannot be coerced by child, forces confrontation when child disobeys, and willingly exercises power to obtain obedience.

Encourages independence and individuality. This empirical cluster, again common to both parents, contained items such as gives reasons with directives, defines child's individuality clearly, listens to critical comments, and engages in meaningful verbal interaction.

Passive-acceptant. The items in this cluster that emerged for each parent measured parents' reluctance to express anger and avoidance of open confrontation. The parent with high scores on this cluster tended to be mild-mannered and unaggressive. Low scores on this cluster did not signify that the parent was punitive or rejecting.

Rejecting. High scores on this cluster (unlike passive-acceptant) emerging for each parent signified that the parent was cool, inaccessible, and unresponsive and tended to discipline harshly.

Father clusters: 1) Promotes nonconformity and 2) authoritarianism. For the father, two additional clusters emerged that did not have counterparts for mothers. The first, designated *promotes nonconformity*, was composed almost entirely of items originally designed to

measure an emphasis on encouraging individuality and even rebellion in the child. The second, designated *authoritarianism*, was defined primarily by items measuring the father's attempts to promote respect for established authority and the parental role.

Mother cluster: Self-confident, secure, potent parental behavior. Items falling into this cluster were designed to assess flexibility and clarity of the mother's views and her confidence in herself as a parent. A similar cluster did not emerge for fathers.

Five joint PBR clusters. An additional cluster analysis was performed on the 25 items describing the parents' joint conduct. The resulting clusters of items were very close to the original grouping in terms of the hypothetical constructs. These five joint clusters were designated *expect participation in household chores, enrichment of child's environment, directive, discourage emotional dependence, and discourage infantile behavior.*

Four types of families were defined in terms of parental authority on the basis of their patterns of scores on the parent behavior rating clusters. Fifty-four families of white boys and 48 families of white girls were assigned to patterns. Because of the stringent rating criteria, not all families in the study could be assigned. These patterns of parental authority were defined theoretically to produce contrasting groups of families corresponding to more refined definitions of the patterns (authoritative, authoritarian, permissive) described in study 1. We focused on four theoretically interesting patterns, two high on control and two low on control. Those high on control are designated authoritarian and authoritative; those low on control are designated permissive and nonconforming.¹

Type 1: The authoritarian parent. The characteristics of parents of this type are summarized below:

The *Authoritarian* parent values obedience as a virtue and favors punitive, forceful measures to curb self-will at points where the child's actions or beliefs conflict with what he or she thinks is proper conduct. He or she believes in keeping the child in his place, in restricting his autonomy, and in assigning household responsibilities in order to inculcate respect for work. This parent regards the preservation of order and traditional structure as a highly valued end in itself. He or she does not

encourage verbal give and take, believing that the child should accept the parent's word for what is right. [Baumrind 1972b, p. 179]

Parents were assigned to the authoritarian pattern on the basis of having scores high on firm enforcement, low in passive-acceptant, low in encourages independence and individuality, and, for the father, either a very low score on promotes nonconformity or a very high score on authoritarianism.

Type 2: The authoritative parent. Parents of this type can be described as follows:

The *Authoritative* parent attempts to direct the child's activities in a rational, issue-oriented manner. He or she encourages verbal give and take, shares with the child the reasoning behind a policy, and solicits objections when the child refuses to conform. Both autonomous self-will and disciplined conformity are valued by the Authoritative parent. He or she exerts firm control at points of parent-child divergence but does not hem the child in with restrictions. The parent enforces his or her own perspective as an adult but recognizes the child's individual interest and special ways. The Authoritative parent affirms the child's present qualities but also sets standards for future conduct. He or she uses reason, power, and shaping by regime and reinforcement to achieve objectives and does not base his or her decisions on group consensus or the individual child's desires. [Baumrind 1972b, pp. 177-178]

Parents assigned to the Authoritative pattern scored high in firm enforcement and low in passive-acceptant, but, in contrast to authoritarian parents, they also scored high in encourages independence and individuality. Parents who met these criteria actually turned out to be *more* directive and demanding than authoritarian parents.

Type 3: The permissive parent. The qualities of the permissive parent are summarized below:

The *Permissive* prototype of adult control requires of the parent that he or she behave in an affirmative, acceptant, and benign manner toward the child's impulses and actions and that the parent be presented to the child as a resource for him to use as he wishes, but not as an active agent responsible for shaping and altering his ongoing and future behavior. The immediate aim of the ideologically aware Permissive parent is to give the child as much freedom as is consistent with the child's physical survival. Freedom to the Permissive parent means absence of restraint. [Baumrind 1972b, p. 179]

As in study 1, there was no group of parents

¹This particular typology is not empirical, as were the parental clusters derived from the longitudinal study and described just above.

corresponding exactly to the prototypic permissive parent. Many noncontrolling, passive-acceptant parents were also cool or uninvolved. The criteria for assigning parents to this authority pattern were low scores on firm enforcement, high scores on passive-acceptant, low scores on expect participation in household chores, and low scores on directive.

Type 4: The nonconforming parent. The criteria for assignment to the nonconforming pattern (which was originally conceived of as a variant of the permissive pattern) were either that both parents scored very high on encourages independence and individuality or that the father scored very high on promotes nonconformity and very low on authoritarianism. These parents were antiauthoritarian and some were antiauthority, but they did expect participation from the children in household chores and good performance in school. Nonconforming parents were less passive and exerted firmer control than permissive parents.

Results. The results of this study are summarized below by categories:

The ratings of boys and girls with permissive parents differed somewhat. The 14 daughters of permissive parents were not much affected by this style of parental authority, though they were somewhat suggestible and aimless. The boys, however, especially when compared with sons of authoritative parents, were not achievement oriented and tended to be hostile with peers, resistive with adults, and rather aimless. They might be described in the terms of Longstreth (1974) as having unsocialized personality problems.

The distinction between permissive and nonconforming parents, both relatively noncontrolling, was of interest particularly in the case of boys. Sons of nonconforming parents were significantly more achievement oriented and independent than were sons of permissive parents. By contrast, nonconforming parents produced daughters who were less achievement oriented and independent than daughters of permissive parents, although not to a significant degree.

When results for authoritarian parents were examined, the 10 girls tended to be reasonably well socialized but also rather submissive, aimless, and not achievement oriented. The 16 sons of authoritarian parents were rather similar to those of permissive parents. They were, however, somewhat more achievement oriented and independent, while the 10 girls were somewhat less so.

The children of authoritative parents were clearly

the most competent of those already discussed. For the 12 boys, the profile is the exact opposite of that associated with permissive parents. These boys are friendly, cooperative, tractable, and achievement oriented. They were not, however, as dominant and purposive as we might wish. There is some indication that the extremely firm control of the authoritative parents (even when compared with the authoritarian parents) impaired the development of independence in these otherwise competent preschool boys. The seven girls, by contrast, were markedly dominant, purposive, and achievement oriented. While friendly, they were not particularly compliant. Authoritative parents produced the daughters furthest from the feminine stereotype.

*Discussion.*² The imposition of authority, even against the child's will, appears beneficial to the child during the first 6 years—referred to by Dubin and Dubin (1963) as the *authority inception* period. Indeed, power serves to legitimize authority in the mind of the child, to assure the child that his parent has the power to protect him and provide for his needs. The main way in which parents exercise power in the early years is by manipulating the reinforcing and punishing stimuli that affect the child. What makes a parent a successful reinforcing agent or an attractive model for a child to imitate is the possession of effective power to give the child what is needed. The parent has control over resources that the child desires and is willing and able to provide the child with these resources in such a manner and at such a time that the child will be gratified and the whole family benefited. Practically as well as morally, gratification of the child's needs within the realistic economy of the family is a precondition for the effective imposition of parental authority. An exploited child cannot be controlled over a long period of time without rebellion. The parent's ability to gratify the child and to withhold gratification, and to do so on bases that are internally consistent, legitimizes parental authority in the mind of the child.

The contrasting effects of *authority viewed as justified vs. authority viewed as illegitimate* become particularly apparent at adolescence. For example, Pikas (1961), in a survey of 656 Swedish adolescents, showed that significant differences occurred in their acceptance of parental authority, depending on the reason for the directive. Authority that was based on rational concern

² For a more complete discussion of the results, see Baumrind (1971a).

for the child's welfare was well accepted by the child, while authority based on the adult's desire to dominate or exploit the child was rejected. The former, which Pikas calls rational authority, is similar to what we have designated authoritative or firm control, and the latter, which he calls inhibiting authority, is similar to what we are calling restrictive control. His results are supported by Middleton and Putney (1963). These researchers found that parental discipline seen by the child as either very restrictive or very permissive was associated with lack of closeness between parent and child and with rebellion against the parent's political views.

It is important to distinguish between the effects on the child of *authoritative vs. restrictive control*. Restrictive parents cover many areas of the child's life and need systems with extensive proscriptions and prescriptions; they place arbitrary limits upon his autonomous strivings to try out new skills and make decisions for himself. In general, as Becker (1964) indicates, restrictive discipline does appear to lead to "fearful, dependent and submissive behaviors, a dulling of intellectual striving and inhibited hostility" (p. 197). If the child perceives expressions of parental authority as arbitrary and over-protective, that authority may not be accepted; behavioral compliance may be accompanied by immaturity and rebellion. If the child sees parental control as justified in terms of his own welfare, the result may be acceptance of that authority and independence in the child.

The effects of *permissive-indulgent vs. harmonious parental discipline* should also be contrasted. Harmonious parents, unlike permissive-indulgent parents, do not dispense unconditional love, although they do express a high level of unconditional commitment. This interesting pattern of child rearing was identified in study 2. While pattern membership was generally determined by multiple criteria, the eight families placed in the harmonious pattern had but one identifying characteristic in common: The observer assigned to study each of these families would not rate the family on the construct, *firm enforcement*, in each case stating that any rating would be misleading. The parent, while he or she almost never exercised control, seemed to have control in the sense that the child generally took pains to intuit what the parent wanted and to do it.

The atmosphere in these families was characterized by harmony, equanimity, and rationality. While permissive parents avoided exercising control but were angry about not having control, and authoritarian and authori-

tative parents exercised control willingly, harmonious parents seemed neither to exercise control nor to avoid the exercise of control. Instead they focused on achieving a quality of harmony in the home and on developing principles for resolving differences and for balanced living. These parents brought the child up to their level in an interaction but did not reverse roles by acting childishly, as did some permissive parents. Harmonious parents lived parallel to the mainstream rather than in opposition to it.

The effects of harmonious child-rearing patterns on children appeared to be related to sex. The six daughters of harmonious parents were extraordinarily competent and very similar in their scores on the child behavior measures. Their average Stanford-Binet IQ was 136 (that of the entire sample was also high: 128). Compared to girls raised under the other authority patterns, these girls were achievement oriented, friendly, and independent. By contrast, the two boys whose parents were classified as harmonious, while cooperative, were notably submissive, aimless, not achievement oriented, and dependent. The harmonious pattern of child rearing seemed to produce dysfunction in boys, if one can say much about two cases, while the effect in girls was entirely positive (Baumrind 1971b).

Work in Progress with Early Primary School Children

The children from study 2 averaged 8-3/4 years when seen again. An additional 60 families are presently being added to those in the core sample. The core sample comprises 89 nuclear families (38 girls and 51 boys) in which the child resides with both his natural parents and for whom data on both parents are available at the two time periods (time 1 and time 2), plus an additional 13 families disrupted by separation for whom data on at least one parent are available at both time periods. From analyses done with the core sample of nuclear families, there are some preliminary findings, not yet reported elsewhere, which will now be presented.

The data obtained during the child's 9th year, in addition to interview and observational records, include measures of moral judgment, values, internal-external locus of control, and social and sex role attitudes for both the parents and the child, and, for the child only, measures of creativity and cognitive development. (See section entitled "Current Study" in table 1 for a summary of these data sources.) Child ratings on the

Preschool Behavior Q-sort were based on 25 hours of observation, interview, and testing. Parent behavior ratings were based on 30 hours of similar scrutiny.

The findings to be presented are based upon ratings only and will consist of time 2 correlations between parent and child data, time 2 child effects associated with time 1 parent classification, and time 2 risk type comparisons.

Time 2 Correlations between Parent and Child Data

Eight child behavior clusters emerged from a cluster analysis of the child behavior ratings. These were similar for boys and girls, except for cluster C. They defined a three dimensional space of social responsibility, social independence, and cognitive creativity. (See footnote 3 of table 4 for descriptive cluster names.)

Table 4. Significant correlations among parent and child cluster scores at time 2 (nuclear families only).¹

Child clusters ³	Parent clusters ²								
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
A					.35 fog ⁴			.29 mob ⁴	
B	.30 mob .46 fob ⁴				.32 fog		.38 fog	.44 mob .28 fob	
C	.43 mog ⁴								
D		.35 mob			.31 mob		.32 mob .52 fog .29 fob		.35 fog
E							.40 fog		
F	.35 mog	.31 mob			.27 mob		.28 fob .39 mog .39 fog		.34 mog
G	.35 mog	.43 fog	-.27 mob			.37 mog	.32 mog .35 fog		.35 mog .39 fog
H	.33 mog .39 fog	.28 mob		.37 mob .29 fob			.38 fog		

¹ Correlations reported are significant at .05 or better. Study involves 37 girl and parent pairs and 51 boy and parent pairs.

² Parent clusters: A = enforces/does not enforce directives; B = respects/does not respect child's reasoning ability (mother), perceives own and child's individuality and identity clearly/unclearly (father); C = does not/does sex-stereotype (mother), encourages/discourages child's independence (father); D = possesses nontraditional/traditional values (mother), possesses nontraditional and nonsex-stereotypic/traditional and sex-stereotypic values (father); E = supports/rejects child; F = delegates/does not delegate household responsibility to child; G = trains/does not train child cognitively; H = directs/does not direct child's regimen; I = possesses/lacks self-confidence as a parent.

³ Child clusters: A = altruistic/egoistic; B = cooperative/obstructive; C = domineering/submissive (girls), dominant/submissive (boys); D = purposive/aimless; E = challenges self cognitively/avoids cognitive challenge; F = creative and differentiated/stereotyped and undifferentiated; G = socially independent/socially conforming; H = socially confident/withdrawn.

⁴ Fog = correlation between traits of fathers and of girls; mob = correlation between traits of mothers and of boys; fob = correlation between traits of fathers and of boys; mog = correlation between traits of mothers and of girls.

From cluster analyses of the 84 parent behavior scales rated for each parent, 9 clusters emerged. Their names suggest their meanings and, where they exist, mother/father differences. (See footnote 2 of table 4.)

I will begin by summarizing the statistically significant correlations between parent and child cluster scores obtained during the child's 9th year. (See table 4 for a summary of the main relationships between scores in parent clusters and child clusters at time 2. We have not yet analyzed the correlations across time.) Correlations significant at $\leq .05$ in table 4 are summarized here.

At time 1, parental warmth correlated with few indices of child behavior. Warmth has proved more predictive at time 2. For fathers of girls, warmth (E) predicts altruistic and cooperative behavior in the child (A, B), and for mothers of boys, warmth predicts purposive child behavior and creativity (D, F).

Parental practices that are stimulating and demanding (assignment of household chores, training child, and firm enforcement) and parents' self-confidence are associated, as they were at time 1, with assertiveness particularly for girls. For girls, mother's delegation of household responsibilities (F) is associated with the child's social independence (G). Cross-sex and within-sex correlations directed at training the child cognitively (G) are significant in many areas of child behavior. Findings are particularly strong for fathers of girls. For fathers of girls, this cluster is significantly correlated with the cooperative, purposive, challenges self cognitively, and socially confident cluster scores of girls and for both mother and father with scores on girls' creativity and social independence. For both parents of boys, cognitive training is positively associated with purposiveness in boys and for fathers with boys' creativity. Firm discipline (A) continues to have clearly beneficial but somewhat different effects at time 2. For girls, parental firm discipline (A) is associated with socially confident behavior and maternal discipline with both assertive (in fact, domineering) behavior toward peers and creativity and socially independent behavior. Parental firm enforcement is positively related to cooperation with adults in boys. Possesses self-confidence as a parent (I) is associated for father/daughter pairs with purposive and socially independent behavior and for mother/daughter pairs with creative and differentiated and socially independent behaviors.

Parents' willingness to offer justification for directions and to reason with the child continues, as at time

1, to be associated with cognitively creative and socially independent behavior for both sexes. Respect for child's reasoning ability (B) for mother/son pairs is associated with purposive, creative, and socially confident behavior in boys and for father/daughter pairs with socially independent behavior in girls.

Socially confident behavior in boys was associated for both parents with nontraditional values (D), for mothers with respects child's reasoning ability (B), and for fathers with encourages child's independence (C) (but boys' social independence was negatively related to mother's avoidance of sex-stereotype (C)). Girls' social confidence was associated with parental firm discipline (A) and maternal cognitive training (G).

Time 2 Child Effects Associated with Time 1 Parent Classification

Earlier in this paper, I summarized the child effects associated with the patterns of parental authority that emerged when the children were of preschool age. We have just completed preliminary analyses of the effects on the child of those early patterns of socialization now that the child is 8-3/4 years old. Statements concerning stability of child behavior, stability of parent behavior, and stability of parent-child effects will be made. Probabilities associated with statements about high and low cluster scores are from *t*-tests comparing the group under discussion to all others of the same sex in the sample. (See table 5.)

Effects of Permissive Parenting

While at time 1 girls were not much affected by permissive parenting, at time 2 the girls reared permissively tend to be passive and retiring. They are cooperative with adults, submissive, and somewhat socially conforming (probability level of .07) and withdrawn (.08). Sons of permissive parents, who at time 1 were rather irresponsible, aimless, and lacking in achievement orientation, are at time 2 lacking in social responsibility and independence. But because of the small number of subjects and high variance within this group, the differences are not significant. On the average, parents classified as permissive at time 1 would still be classified this way. These parents do not enforce

directives; parents of girls possess low self-confidence and do not direct the child's regimen. Mothers of girls tend not to delegate household responsibilities (.07); mothers of boys tend not to engage in cognitive training (.09). Fathers of boys tend to lack self-confidence as parents (.09).

Effects of Nonconforming Parenting

While at time 1 daughters of nonconforming parents were less achievement oriented and independent than daughters of permissive parents, they are now more so. At time 2, daughters of nonconforming parents are more cooperative with adults and somewhat more altruistic (.06) than other girls. Sons of nonconforming parents are more purposive, creative and differentiated, and socially independent than other boys, as well as somewhat more dominant (.10) and more willing to challenge themselves cognitively (.09). By time 2 their parents are at least as firm enforcers as other parents in the sample. Mothers continue to respect the child's reasoning ability and to be supportive of their daughters. Fathers of girls clearly perceive their own and their child's individuality and identity, and they tend to possess nontraditional and nonsex-stereotypic values (.06). Parents of boys train their child cognitively and fathers encourage the child's independence. With opposite-sex children, nonconforming parents are self-confident. They are the most self-confident parents among all the parent types, although this is not statistically significant for same-sex children. At time 2, these parents seem more warm, rational, and individually oriented than actually "nonconforming."

Effects of Authoritarian Parenting

At time 1, daughters of authoritarian parents were reasonably well socialized, but rather submissive, aimless, and nonachievement oriented. They are now undistinguished from the total sample except for being actually higher in challenges self cognitively. Sons of authoritarian parents at time 1 were rather irresponsible, aimless, and nonachievement oriented. Now they are distinguished only by being somewhat aimless (.07). Authoritarian parents of girls seem in many respects to be opposite of nonconforming parents at time 2: Mothers of girls have little respect for the child's reasoning ability, are nonsupportive, and do not train

their children cognitively; fathers of girls delegate household responsibility to the child and tend to be high in enforcing directives (.09). Both parents of boys are undistinguished from the rest of the sample.

Effects of Authoritative Parenting

At time 1, the children of authoritative parents were clearly the most competent. Daughters were markedly dominant, purposive, and achievement oriented. At time 2, they are domineering, creative and differentiated, and socially confident. At time 1 sons were friendly, cooperative, and achievement oriented, but not as dominant or purposive as we might wish. At time 2, they are altruistic and cooperative. Authoritative mothers of girls at time 2 remain high on respects child's reasoning ability, train child cognitively, and possess self-confidence as a parent. Fathers of girls also tend to train child cognitively (.08). Mothers of boys direct child's regimen and are somewhat high on delegates household responsibility to child. Fathers of boys enforce directives and perceive own and child's individuality and identity clearly.

Hypotheses Concerning the Family's Contributions to the Etiology of Schizophrenic Reactions in Children

Most clinicians agree that schizophrenic reactions are a form of disorganization of the personality, a failure to achieve or maintain ego integration. The critical features of schizophrenic reactions lie in aberrant symbolic processes through which the disturbed person alters internalized representations of reality in order to withdraw from a world grown untenable and from social interactions that precipitate insoluble conflicts for that person. By modifying perceptions of self and others, the distressed individual defends a fortress in which some self-esteem and some consistency in cause-effect relations are possible, even if the consensual logic of the culture must be denied in order to do so.

Adolescence is a particularly stressful period because of added pressures toward the establishment of an identity and of instrumental competencies. Symptoms of severe pathology that earlier were successfully suppressed or denied tend to emerge at this developmental period. Schizophrenic thought processes, such as autistic

Table 5. Time 2 child effects associated with time 1 parent classification.¹

Time 1 parental authority type	Time 2 child Q-sort clusters									
	Altruistic/egoistic	Cooperative/obstructive	Domineering (G)/dominant (B)/submissive	Purposive/aimless	Challenges self cognitively/avoids cognitive challenge	Creative & differentiated/stererotyped & undifferentiated	Socially independent/ socially con-forming	Socially confident/withdrawn		
Permissive girls (n = 10)										
M ²	48.7	55.4 ³	42.3 ³	45.6	46.6	46.0	44.5	44.2		
SD ²	8.1	7.1	9.3	9.9	12.1	11.2	9.7	10.5		
Permissive boys (n = 7)										
M	42.0	45.7	48.4	47.5	46.3	44.0	46.3	46.0		
SD	11.0	10.7	10.2	13.6	10.8	12.5	7.3	10.5		
Nonconforming girls (n = 6)										
M	54.6	55.0 ³	49.0	51.9	54.1	49.3	55.2	49.3		
SD	6.8	4.3	6.5	11.4	9.2	13.0	9.3	8.4		
Nonconforming boys (n = 4)										
M	49.0	49.8	56.7	63.0 ³	58.1	59.3 ³	59.3 ³	53.7		
SD	10.1	1.9	2.5	2.8	9.4	7.2	4.4	6.1		
Authoritarian girls (n = 6)										
M	47.1	47.3	54.1	51.7	56.4 ³	54.5	51.8	51.1		
SD	11.9	12.7	12.0	9.6	6.2	9.9	11.0	4.8		
Authoritarian boys (n = 12)										
M	49.6	48.7	53.2	47.1	48.7	48.6	48.5	52.6		
SD	10.3	11.6	10.4	8.6	10.6	10.5	9.3	8.7		
Authoritative girls (n = 7)										
M	50.1	47.8	57.2 ³	53.3	50.2	55.0 ³	51.9	57.9 ³		
SD	15.8	10.9	3.4	8.7	8.5	5.1	8.7	9.5		

Authoritative boys (n = 12)									
M	55.2 ³	55.1 ³	52.1	53.0	54.1	53.5	53.8	52.9	
SD	5.9	6.2	9.4	8.0	8.9	9.1	7.6	10.5	
All girls (n = 34)									
M	49.1	50.4	50.0	49.4	50.1	49.6	49.8	49.5	
SD	10.2	10.1	10.6	10.6	10.3	10.9	10.2	10.2	
All boys (n = 38)									
M	49.3	49.8	52.3	50.8	50.8	50.3	50.8	51.0	
SD	9.9	9.9	9.5	9.9	10.2	10.8	8.7	9.6	

¹Total sample includes all subjects typed at time 1 for whom data are available at time 2 and whose original families are still intact.

²M = mean; SD = standard deviation.

³Mean of the child cluster type is significantly different from the mean of the rest of the total sample of the same sex at .05 or better.

logic, object inconstancy, or disassociation, interfere noticeably with school performance in high school and cannot be overlooked by adult authorities. The distressed adolescent's social adaptation is drastically impaired by excessive impulsivity, intolerance of frustration, and inability to role play effectively.

While genetic and biochemical causes for schizophrenic reactions are generally acknowledged, parental eccentricities and abnormalities are also known to accompany the constellation of symptoms just described, even when these symptoms do not assume psychotic proportions. We have postulated that various parental styles of child rearing that are neither abnormal nor eccentric may also predispose a child to such symptoms. As explained at the outset of this article, our decision to study the antecedents of instrumental competence was based, and continues to be, on the assumption that qualities basic to instrumental competence are essential to the health and successful functioning of the individual. Conversely, a lack of these qualities may result in poor adjustment and functioning and low self-esteem. We are further assuming that the various parental styles we have identified might be predictive of a child's risk of the extreme maladjustment and withdrawal of schizophrenia.

Time 2 Risk Type Comparisons

Using the parent PBR cluster scores discussed above, we correlated these scores with degrees of instrumental competence in the children in our current sample; that is, all subjects typed at time 1 for whom data are available at time 2 and whose original families are still intact. The correlations were done separately for mothers and fathers. Characteristics of types of children and parents and comparisons of these types are the result of planned comparison by *t*-tests of the equality of means of the two groups under consideration at any given time. As is shown in table 6, we arrived at three main categories of risk for the children based on instrumental competence: low risk; high risk, avoidant; and high risk, irresponsible.

Low Risk Group

For both boys and girls, an empirical type was identified, characterized by high scores on all child

Table 6. Time 2 parent PBR cluster scores associated with child schizophrenic risk types.

Risk type	Mother PBR clusters								
	Enforces directives	Respects child's reasoning ability	Does not sex-stereotype	Possesses nontraditional values	Supports child	Delegates household responsibility to child	Trains child cognitively	Directs child's regimen	Possesses self-confidence as a parent
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
Low risk girls (n = 12)									
M ¹	57.5 ²	55.5 ²	49.8	49.5	51.3	54.5 ²	57.8 ²	57.8	57.8 ²
SD ¹	8.1	9.4	10.2	11.1	12.5	7.2	7.5	8.9	7.4
Low risk boys (n = 16)									
M	50.1	52.8	48.3	50.3	52.6	49.4	51.0	50.4 ²	47.4
SD	9.0	8.8	9.7	10.6	7.2	9.6	10.2	7.2	10.9
High risk, avoidant girls (n = 9)									
M	45.1 ³	45.0 ³	53.0	52.8	46.9	46.5	49.6	53.1	46.5 ³
SD	8.3	10.6	12.0	10.1	11.6	11.2	4.7	9.2	10.5
Peer independent (n = 4)									
M	52.2	50.1	62.1 ²	56.9	47.9	51.5	47.8	56.5	51.4
SD	3.9	9.1	10.4	9.9	9.5	9.1	3.7	1.6	7.9
Peer conforming (n = 5)									
M	39.5 ^{2,3}	40.8 ³	45.7	49.5	46.1	42.4 ³	51.0	50.3	42.6 ^{2,3}
SD	6.0	10.7	7.6	9.9	14.1	11.9	5.3	12.1	11.4
High risk, avoidant boys (n = 6)									
M	47.2	46.4	49.2	49.1	49.8	52.4	47.8	43.2	49.5
SD	8.8	8.7	7.1	7.6	11.2	12.5	8.8	6.9	13.1
High risk, irresponsible girls (n = 5)									
M	49.2	45.5	48.8	50.0	44.7	46.4	50.7	50.1	51.9
SD	12.6	15.9	13.1	6.7	6.9	11.8	10.9	13.1	7.6
High risk, irresponsible boys (n = 12)									
M	46.3	52.0	54.0	51.8	49.9	49.4	51.1	42.5 ^{2,3}	47.4
SD	6.4	7.7	7.2	6.5	6.9	11.2	8.8	11.2	10.0

¹ M = mean; SD = standard deviation. Across-sex means are standardized to 50 and standard deviations to 10.

² Mean of type is significantly different from the mean of the rest of the total sample of the same sex at .05 or better.

³ Mean of type is significantly different from the mean of low risk children of the same sex at .05 or better.

Note: Characterizations of types of children and parents and comparisons of these types are the result of planned comparisons by *t*-tests of the equality of means of the two groups under consideration at any given time. Statements are significant at $p < .05$ unless otherwise noted.

Peer independent (<i>n</i> = 4)									
M	43.6	49.7	51.2	47.6	46.6	50.3	49.5	39.6 ³	47.0
SD	7.1	12.1	6.7	3.7	7.5	11.0	8.2	15.0	12.8
Peer conforming (<i>n</i> = 8)									
M	47.6	53.1	55.3	53.9	51.5	49.0	51.9	43.9	47.6
SD	6.1	5.3	7.4	6.8	6.4	12.1	11.5	9.6	9.4
<hr/>									
All girls (<i>n</i> = 38)									
M	49.3	49.6	50.3	50.7	49.6	48.9	52.0	51.4	50.8
SD	11.1	11.7	11.4	9.5	10.7	9.5	9.8	13.0	9.9
<hr/>									
All boys (<i>n</i> = 51)									
M	50.5	50.3	49.8	49.4	50.3	50.8	48.5	48.0	49.4
SD	9.3	8.8	9.1	10.5	9.6	10.5	10.1	9.8	10.2
<hr/>									
Father PBR clusters									
Risk type	Enforces directives	Perceives own & child's individ. & ident. clearly	Encourages child's independence	Possesses nontrad. & nonsex-stereotypic values	Supports child	Delegates household responsibility to child	Trains child cognitively	Directs child's regimen	Possesses self-confidence as a parent
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
<hr/>									
Low risk girls (<i>n</i> = 12)									
M	54.0	55.5	47.1	50.7	54.4	52.3	58.7	55.5	56.4
SD	8.4	8.7	12.5	11.5	9.4	9.1	8.0	10.3	6.1
<hr/>									
Low risk boys (<i>n</i> = 16)									
M	52.3	51.9	50.2	47.7	50.9	47.3	50.6	50.1	48.5
SD	9.4	8.8	10.9	12.4	9.9	10.2	9.5	8.7	13.3
<hr/>									
High risk, avoidant girls (<i>n</i> = 9)									
M	48.6	49.5	43.0	52.9	51.1	43.6 ³	48.0 ³	51.9	55.1
SD	12.0	10.6	8.0	10.0	11.2	9.4	6.8	9.8	5.4
Peer independent (<i>n</i> = 4)									
M	51.2	59.2 ²	44.0	60.2	56.6	46.3	49.7	61.1 ²	57.0
SD	9.1	6.4	6.4	8.2	3.0	14.3	4.0	7.2	7.5
Peer conforming (<i>n</i> = 5)									
M	42.9	41.8 ³	42.3	47.0	48.7	41.5 ³	46.7 ³	44.8 ³	53.6
SD	13.8	5.1	9.8	7.2	13.8	3.5	8.8	1.8	2.9
<hr/>									
High risk, avoidant boys (<i>n</i> = 6)									
M	45.1	48.7	50.9	47.5	52.3	51.0	48.7	50.3	45.4
SD	8.7	12.9	9.0	5.6	4.1	11.0	6.0	3.2	8.7
<hr/>									

Table 6. Time 2 parent PBR cluster scores associated with child schizophrenic risk types. (Continued)

Risk type	Father PBR clusters								
	Enforces directives	Perceives own & child's individ. & ident. clearly	Encourages child's independence	Possesses nontrad. & nonsax-stereotypic values	Supports child	Delegates household responsibility to child	Trains child cognitively	Directs child's regimen	Possesses self-confidence as a parent
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
High risk, irresponsible girls (n = 5)									
M	49.7	45.0	44.9	49.9	50.7	49.4	53.2	45.8	51.6
SD	5.1	18.5	13.6	12.8	8.6	3.7	11.6	13.1	5.8
High risk, irresponsible boys (n = 12)									
M	47.5	46.5 ^{2,3}	54.6	50.8	47.5	51.7	48.4	46.4	45.7
SD	6.9	9.4	6.6	5.3	7.1	10.5	10.0	11.2	9.0
Peer independent (n = 4)									
M	50.5	38.5 ^{2,3}	53.4	46.0	41.2	53.0	48.0	45.4	40.2
SD	7.6	7.5	6.1	5.0	4.1	13.5	10.4	14.5	11.3
Peer conforming (n = 8)									
M	46.0	50.5	55.3	53.2	50.7	51.1	48.7	47.0	48.4
SD	6.5	7.6	7.2	3.6	6.1	9.6	10.5	10.2	6.8
All girls (n = 38)									
M	49.2	50.0	47.2	50.9	51.0	50.6	52.3	51.0	53.3
SD	11.3	11.5	10.9	10.7	10.6	10.2	10.6	10.8	7.1
All boys (n = 51)									
M	50.6	50.0	52.1	49.3	49.2	50.5	48.3	49.2	47.6
SD	9.1	9.0	8.9	9.6	9.7	10.6	9.3	9.5	11.3

behavior clusters that signified that these children—designated *low risk*—were altruistic to peers, socially independent and confident, purposive, creative and differentiated, and willing to challenge themselves cognitively. In addition, boys were cooperative with adults and dominant, and girls were somewhat domineering (.10).

The child-rearing practices associated with these high levels of instrumental competence differed for boys and girls in that parents' socialization practices were mostly normative for the sample of low risk boys while for girls they were distinctive. The exceptions for low risk boys

were that their mothers appeared somewhat directive (H-.08)—by virtue of the lack of directiveness in the mothers of high risk boys—and that the fathers were somewhat more perceptive of their individuality and identity (B-.12). Parents of low risk girls, however, were clearly firm guides to their daughters. They gave their daughters cognitive training (G) and directed the child's regimen (H-.05 mother, .13 father). Their mothers delegated responsibility to them in the household (F) and enforced directives (A), and their fathers tended to do both, but not significantly. Fathers perceived their own and their daughters' individuality and identity

clearly (B). Their mothers, apparently aware of the success of their child-rearing efforts, possessed self-confidence as parents (I). They respected their daughters' reasoning ability (B) as well. Parents were as supportive (E) and conforming (D) as the average parent. Why are there different patterns of child rearing associated with instrumental competence (low risk behavior) for boys and for girls in this analysis? A plausible hypothesis is that peer group pressure and societal expectations will produce instrumentally competent behavior in boys without special parental action since such behavior is regarded as "normal" for latency-age boys, while high instrumental competence (independence and assertiveness) is not "normal" for girls. Parents of girls must press demands for logical thinking and assumption of responsibility since peers and teachers fail to make these demands on girls as they routinely do on boys.

High Risk, Avoidant Group

We designated as high risk, avoidant children those who were withdrawn. The girls in this type were also stereotyped and undifferentiated compared to the rest of the girls in the sample. Two high risk, avoidant types emerged for girls, differing from each other in that a *peer-independent* group was socially independent compared to the rest of the sample while the other group was *peer conforming* in that they scored low on the social independence cluster. The peer-independent group was extremely stereotyped and undifferentiated, aimless, and even more withdrawn (.06) than the peer-conforming girls. These girls seemed to be independent of their peer group more from lack of contact than from a positive sense of individuality and independence.

There is some evidence that part of the difficulties with peer interaction of peer-independent girls may have been due to unsureness about their sex roles, which they might have tried to compensate for by conforming to a feminine stereotype. They were more compliant with adult authority than any other risk type (mean = 55) although the differences were not significant. Their mothers were extreme in their rejection of sex stereotyping for either themselves or their children (C), an emphasis that has consistently been shown to backfire in our studies. Their fathers were highly controlling of their daughters' regimens (H) but below average on delegating household responsibility; this appeared to reflect a lack

of confidence in their daughters' competence despite the high value they placed on perceiving their own and their daughters' individuality and identity clearly (B). They were also highly supportive (E). Both parents trained their daughters cognitively less than parents of low risk girls. These girls may not have been provided with strong role models and seemed overprotected.

The peer-conforming girls avoided cognitive challenges, in addition to being socially withdrawn. Their parents seemed unable to function affirmatively as parents. They did not delegate household responsibility (F-.09 mother, .05 father). Mothers were lax in enforcing directives (A), tended not to respect their daughters' reasoning ability (B-.11), and had less self-confidence as parents (I) than parents of low risk girls. Their fathers perceived their own and the child's individuality and identity unclearly (B) and did not direct the child's regimen (H). They did not do as much cognitive training (G) as fathers of low risk girls. It would appear that the parents of "peer conforming-avoidant" girls provided their daughters with little motivation to develop competence.

One high risk, avoidant type emerged for boys. In addition to being withdrawn, they were submissive, aimless, stereotyped and undifferentiated, and socially dependent, avoided cognitive challenge, and tended to be egoistic (.06) in comparison to the rest of the sample. They were obstructive in comparison to the low risk boys. Surprisingly, their parents showed few significant child-rearing differences from the rest of the sample as a whole, although the fathers supported the child (E) more than those of other boys and, compared to fathers of low risk boys, were less firm enforcers (A-.12), while the mothers directed the boys' regimens somewhat less than mothers of low risk boys (H-.06).

High Risk, Irresponsible Group

We designated as high risk, irresponsible those children who were egoistic in their lack of altruistic concern for peers. Girls were socially conforming and tended to be somewhat creative and differentiated (.10). They were aimless and withdrawn in relation to low risk girls. The parents of high risk, irresponsible girls did not differ significantly from the sample as a whole.

Two high risk, irresponsible types emerged for boys. Like the girls "avoidant" subtypes, one group was *peer independent* and the other *peer conforming*. The peer-

independent group scored quite high on challenges self cognitively, while the peer-conforming group scored low. The peer-conforming boys were also extremely obstructive toward adults and socially confident. (The peer-independent boys tended in that direction, but not significantly.)

Peer-independent boys were more dominant than the sample as a whole, but not significantly more so than low risk boys. They were also creative and differentiated. Their mothers were less firm enforcers (A) than mothers of other boys. Their fathers were extremely unclear about perceiving their own and the child's individuality and identity (B) and strongly rejected the child (E). Father/son conflict was apparent. By rejecting his son emotionally and, perhaps competitively, the father denied the boy's actual abilities and individuality. The son was egoistic and dominant, generalizing from his contentious relationship with the father and asserting himself with his peer group since he could not do so at home.

Mothers of peer-conforming boys did not sex-stereotype (C) and tended to possess nontraditional values (D—.06). Their fathers possessed nontraditional and nonsex-stereotypic values (D) and were somewhat less firm enforcers (A—.07) than fathers of low risk boys.

Summary

A general summary of our findings is as follows: **Parental behaviors that put consistent pressure on children to test their limits, cognitively and socially, while supporting their efforts with praise and encouragement, produce high levels of instrumental competence.** Parents who behave in this way encourage their children to probe reality and to meet life head on, thus facilitating their development of instrumental competencies. Parents who are consistent and who successfully enforce their directives provide the young child with the necessary structure to facilitate effective functioning and clear thinking. By keeping the channels of **communication open** and by **using reason** when the child balks, the parent alerts the child to the possibility of being an effective agent of change. These are the processes by which shared foci of attention are established and maintained among family members in authoritative families; they may well explain the generally

positive effects in our sample of the high parental control of authoritative parents.

More specifically I would like to offer the following hypotheses relevant to the family etiology of schizophrenia:

- Extremely competent children, whom we have postulated as being at low risk for schizophrenia, are never products of homes in which both parents demonstrate extreme noninvolvement in caretaking (i.e., where they neglect both their control and support functions). However, many children from such neglectful homes do not show psychotic, delinquent, or extremely neurotic behavior **despite their adverse family conditions.**

- Instrumental competence in children, particularly in girls, is facilitated by firm parental control. (In none of the high risk groups did either parent enforce directives to an extent above the mean; in the low risk group of girls, however, mothers were firm enforcers and both parents were directive and delegated household responsibilities.)

- **Marked nontraditionality or actively nonconforming attitudes in parents seem to be associated with compliant and withdrawn rather than independent behavior, particularly in girls.** (Note time 1 effects on girls of the nonconforming pattern of parental authority and the nontraditionality of parents of peer-independent girls in the high risk, avoidant group and peer-conforming boys in the high risk, irresponsible group.)

- **Parental warmth is not linearly related to instrumentally competent (low risk) behavior, particularly in girls.** (Note that contrary to generally held views, paternal punitiveness was positively associated with independence in girls in the **preschool studies** and that fathers of peer independent girls in the high risk, avoidant group were highly supportive.)

- Willingness to train the child cognitively is very highly associated with outstanding competence in the child. (Note the positive effects of rational methods of discipline in the preschool studies and the consistently positive effects of training the child cognitively at time 2.)

References

Baldwin, A. L.; Kalthorn, J.; and Breese, F. H. The appraisal of parent behavior. *Psychological Monographs*, 63(4, whole no. 299), 1949.

Baumrind, D. Child care practices anteceding three patterns of preschool behavior. *Genetic Psychology Monographs*, 75:43-88, 1967.

Baumrind, D. Current patterns of parental authority. *Developmental Psychology Monographs*, 4(1, Part 2), 1971a.

Baumrind, D. Harmonious parents and their preschool children. *Developmental Psychology*, 4:99-102, 1971b.

Baumrind, D. An exploratory study of socialization effects on black children: Some black-white comparisons. *Child Development*, 43:261-267, 1972a.

Baumrind, D. From each according to her ability. *School Review*, 80:161-197, 1972b.

Baumrind, D., and Black, A. E. Socialization practices associated with dimensions of competence in preschool boys and girls. *Child Development*, 38:291-327, 1967.

Becker, W. C. Consequences of different kinds of parental discipline. In: Hoffman, M. L., and Hoffman, L. W., eds. *Review of Child Development Research*. Vol. 1. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1964. pp. 169-208.

Becker, W. C., and Krug, R. S. A circumplex model for social behavior in children. *Child Development*, 35:371-396, 1964.

Becker, W. C.; Peterson, D. C.; Luria, Z.; Shoemaker, D. J.; and Hellmer, L. A. Relations of factors derived from parent-interview ratings to behavior problems of five-year-olds. *Child Development*, 33:509-535, 1962.

Block, J. *The Q-sort Method in Personality Assessment and Psychiatric Research*. Springfield, Ill.: Charles C Thomas, Publisher, 1961.

Coriat, I. H. The psycho-analytic approach to education. *Progressive Education*, 3:19-25, 1926.

Dubin, E. R., and Dubin, R. The authority inception period in socialization. *Child Development*, 34:885-898, 1963.

Emmerich, W. Continuity and stability in early social development. *Child Development*, 35:311-332, 1964.

Goodman, P. *Compulsory Mis-education*. New York: Horizon Press, 1964.

Kagan, J., and Moss, H. A. *Birth to Maturity: A Study in Psychological Development*. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1962.

Longstreth, L. E. *Psychological Development of the Child*. 2d ed. New York: The Ronald Press Company, 1974.

Maslow, A. H. *Motivation and Personality*. New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1954.

Middleton, R., and Putney, S. Political expression of adolescent rebellion. *American Journal of Sociology*, 68:527-535, 1963.

Naumburg, M. *The Child and the World*. New York: Harcourt, Brace, 1928.

Neill, A. S. *Summerhill*. New York: Hart Publishing Co., Inc., 1964.

Parsons, T. *The Social System*. New York: The Free Press, 1951.

Pikas, A. Children's attitudes toward rational versus inhibiting parental authority. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 62:315-321, 1961.

Rogers, C. R. *A Therapist's View of Personal Goals*. Pendle Hill Pamphlet 108. Wallingford, Pa.: Pendle Hill, 1960.

Schaefer, E. S. Converging conceptual models for maternal behavior and for child behavior. In: Glidewell, J. C., ed. *Parental Attitudes and Child Behavior*. Springfield, Ill.: Charles C Thomas, Publisher, 1961.

Spock, B. M. *The Common Sense Book of Baby and Child Care*. New York: Duell, Sloan, and Pearce, 1946.

Spock, B. M. *Baby and Child Care*. 2d ed. New York: Pocket Books, 1957.

Spock, B. M. *Raising Children in a Difficult Time*. New York: W. W. Norton & Company, Inc., 1974.

Acknowledgment

The program of research discussed in this paper is supported by the Grant Foundation, Inc., and the National Institute of Child Health and Development under Research Grant HD-02228.

The Author

Diana Baumrind, Ph.D., is a Research Psychologist, Institute of Human Development, and Principal Investigator, Family Socialization and Developmental Competence Project, University of California at Berkeley.