



Effects of Authoritative Parental Control on Child Behavior
Author(s): Diana Baumrind
Reviewed work(s):
Source: *Child Development*, Vol. 37, No. 4 (Dec., 1966), pp. 887-907
Published by: Blackwell Publishing on behalf of the Society for Research in Child Development
Stable URL: http://www.jstor.org/stable/1126611
Accessed: 12/07/2012 09:01

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at
http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



Blackwell Publishing and *Society for Research in Child Development* are collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Child Development.*

http://www.jstor.org

EFFECTS OF AUTHORITATIVE PARENTAL CONTROL ON CHILD BEHAVIOR

DIANA BAUMRIND

University of California, Berkeley

Three models of parental control—permissive, authoritarian, and authoritative—are described and contrasted. Pertinent findings concerning the effects on child behavior of component disciplinary practices are reviewed. With these and other findings as the basis for discussion, several propositions concerning the effects on child behavior of parental control variables are critically examined. Finally, the relation between freedom and control is examined and the position defended that authoritative control may effectively generate in the child, behavior which while well socialized is also wilful and independent.

An authority is a person whose expertness befits him to designate a behavioral alternative for another where the alternatives are perceived by both. This neutral definition became infused with the prejudicial connotations appropriate to the authoritarian personality syndrome following Lewin's work with authoritarian, democratic, and laissez faire social climates (Lewin, Lippitt, & White, 1939), and the publication of *The Authoritarian Personality* (Adorno, Frenkel-Brunswik, Levinson, & Sanford, 1950). The introduction of the "authoritarian personality syndrome" into the lexicon of the psychologist, probably by Fromm (1941), provided a convenient label to apply to the controlling parent. Fromm, however, distinguished between rational and inhibiting authority. He used the term "authoritarian personality" to refer to the syndrome in which enactment of the role of inhibiting

---

This review was in part supported by a research grant (MH-03991) from the National Institute of Mental Health, U.S. Public Health Service. Miss Rosamund Gardner helped the author survey the literature. Table 1 has been deposited with the American Documentation Institute. Order Document No. 8975, remitting $1.75 for 35-mm. microfilm or $2.50 for 6×8-in. photo copies. Author's address: Institute of Human Development, 1203 Tolman Hall, University of California, Berkeley, California 94720.

authority, not rational authority, characterizes the individual's interpersonal relations.

The practices favored by American parents to influence the actions and character of their offspring have varied from time to time, 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 had a salutary effect in debunking certain clinically derived notions about the obligatory neurotogenic effects of one or another common child-rearing practices, notions characterized perhaps more by creative flair and inner certitude than demonstrable validity.

The psychoanalytic view that full gratification of infantile sucking, excretory, and genital needs is essential for secure and healthful adult personalities provided a rationale for prolonged breast feeding on self-demand schedules, gradual and late weaning, and late and lenient toilet training. The ideal home or school in the late forties and fifties 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 recent *Redbook* columns (1964——), Spock speaks out more affirmatively for the reinstitution of parental controls and for the inculcation by the parent of ideals and standards.

The vigorous introduction into educational philosophy of permissive and child-centered attitudes began at least 40 years ago (Coriat, 1926; Naumberg, 1928) as a partial outgrowth of the psychoanalytic theory of psychosexual development. The view that the effects on the child of adult authority are inhibiting, neurotogenic, and indefensible ethically is promoted today by articulate spokesmen (Goodman, 1964; Maslow, 1954; Neill, 1964; Rogers, 1960) in the fields of education and child rearing.

While progressivism in American education claims Dewey as its founder, Dewey (1915; Dewey & Dewey, 1916) did not indorse two of the central principles of progressive education introduced by Neill: the freedom of the child to choose to go to class or to stay away, and the notion of enfranchising small children. Dewey's concern about freedom emphasized intellectual exploration and room for diverse interests and gifts in the cur-

riculum and not the right of the individual child to determine his own conduct in the school setting. The correctives introduced by Dewey have become part of the accepted wisdom of the present age, although the child-centered approach, in the extreme form advocated by Neill, has had little permanent effect on public school education (Cremin, 1964, pp. 347–353).

Permissiveness in child rearing, like its counterpart in education, is the antithesis to the thesis that the proper way to train a child is for the parent or teacher to play the role of omniscient interpreter of an omnipotent deity and to insist forcibly, when necessary, that the child conform to absolute rules of conduct. A synthesis of the valid components of that antinomy concerning adult authority is proposed in this paper and referred to as "authoritative control."

PROTOTYPES OF ADULT CONTROL

This section consists of a presentation of three prototypes of adult control, each of which has influenced greatly the child-rearing practices of educators, parents, and child-development experts.

Permissive

The permissive parent attempts to behave in a nonpunitive, acceptant, and affirmative manner toward the child's impulses, desires, and actions. She consults with him about policy decisions and gives explanations for family rules. She makes few demands for household responsibility and orderly behavior. She presents herself to the child as a resource for him to use as he wishes, not as an ideal for him to emulate, nor as an active agent responsible for shaping or altering his ongoing or future behavior. She allows the child to regulate his own activities as much as possible, avoids the exercise of control, and does not encourage him to obey externally defined standards. She attempts to use reason and manipulation, but not overt power, to accomplish her ends.

Lawrence Frank, while affirming the positive value to the individual of adherence to cultural values, drew with some passion the "pathetic picture of individuals who in their early childhood have been unnecessarily deprived, frustrated, and coerced and so have built up a private world which is forever insecure and threatened; hence they must react with resentment and hostility to every experience" (1940, p. 346). He expressed concern for the "young child who is striving to meet the demands made upon him, is under constant tension which is crystallized into a persistent anxiety about his own competence and functional adequacy" (1940, p. 346).

The alternative to adult control, according to Neill, is to permit the child to be self-regulated, free of restraint, and unconcerned about expression of impulse or the effects of his carelessness.

Self-regulation means the right of a baby to live freely, without outside authority in things psychic and somatic. It means that the baby feeds when it is hungry; that it becomes clean in habits only when it wants to; that it is never stormed at nor spanked; that it is always loved and protected [1964, p. 105, italics Neill's].

I believe that to impose anything by authority is wrong. The child should not do anything until he comes to the opinion—his own opinion—that it should be done [1964, p. 114, italics Neill's].

Every child has the right to wear clothes of such a kind that it does not matter a brass farthing if they get messy or not [1964, p. 115].

Furniture to a child is practically nonexistent. So at Summerhill we buy old car seats and old bus seats. And in a month or two they look like wrecks. Every now and again at mealtime, some youngster waiting for his second helping will while away the time by twisting his fork almost into knots [1964, p. 138].

Really, any man or woman who tries to give children freedom should be a millionnaire, for it is not fair that the natural carelessness of children should always be in conflict with the economic factor [1964, p. 139].

Authoritarian

The authoritarian parent attempts to shape, control, and evaluate the behavior and attitudes of the child in accordance with a set standard of conduct, usually an absolute standard, theologically motivated and formulated by a higher authority. She 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 she thinks is right conduct. 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. She regards the preservation of order and traditional structure as a highly valued end in itself. She does not encourage verbal give and take, believing that the child should accept her word for what is right.

Authoritarian control is less consistent with the American ethos than it was in past centuries when parental discipline was directed at teaching the child to do the will of God. The authoritarian parent in a previous era generally felt that her purpose in training her child was to forward not her own desire but the Divine will. In the words of Wesley's mother:

As self-will is the root of all sin and misery, so whatever cherishes this in children insures their after-wretchedness and irreligion; whatever checks and mortifies it promotes their future happiness and piety. This is still more evident, if we further consider, that religion is nothing else than doing the will of God, and not our own: that the one grand impediment to our temporal and eternal happiness being this self-will, no indulgences of it can be trivial, no denial unprofitable. Heaven or hell depends on this alone. So that the parent who studies to subdue it in his child, works together with God in the renewing and saving a soul. The parent who indulges it does the devil's work, makes religion impracticable, salva-

tion unattainable; and does all that in him lies to damn his child, soul and body forever [Susannah Wesley, quoted in Gesell, 1930, pp. 30–31].

Since the impediment to temporal and eternal happiness was thought to be self-will, the authoritarian parent was stern because she cared. Her discipline was strict, consistent, and loving. Thus Mrs. Wesley's rules:

That whoever was charged with a fault, of which they were guilty, if they would ingenously confess it, and promise to amend, should not be beaten. . . . That no child should ever be chid, or beat twice for the same fault; and that if they amended, they should never be upbraided with it afterwards. . . . That every signal act of obedience, especially when it crossed upon their own inclinations, should be always commended, and frequently rewarded, according to the merits of the case. . . . That if ever any child performed an act of obedience, or did anything with intention to please, though the performance was not well, yet the obedience and intention should be kindly accepted; and the child with sweetness directed how to do better for the future [Gesell, 1930, p. 27].

Authoritative

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

Some quotations from Rambusch, in describing the Montessori method, illustrate the way in which authoritative control is used to resolve the antithesis between pleasure and duty, and between freedom and responsibility.

the discipline resides in three areas in a Montessori classroom: it resides in the environment itself which is controlled; in the teacher herself who is controlled and is ready to assume an authoritarian role if it is necessary; and from the very beginning it resides in the children. It is a three-way arrangement, as opposed to certain types of American education in which all of the authority is vested in the teacher, or where, in the caricature of permissive education, all of the authority is vested in the children [1962, pp. 49–50].

When a child has finished his work he is free to put it away, he is free to initiate new work or, in certain instances, he is free to not work. But he is not free to disturb or destroy what others are doing. If the day is arranged in such a way that at a certain time the teacher must demand of the children that they

arbitrarily finish what they are doing—if it is lunch time, or recess or whatever—the child must accommodate himself to the demand of the group. It is largely a question of balance. In a Montessori class the teacher does not delude herself into believing that her manipulation of the children represents their consensus of what they would like to do. If she is manipulating them insofar as she is determining arbitrarily that this must be done at this time, she is cognizant of what she is doing, which the child may or may not be [1962, p. 51].

The importance of the responsibility in selecting matter for the child to learn is placed in the hands of those adults who are aware of what the culture will demand of the child and who are able to "program" learning in such a way that what is suitable for the child's age and stage of development is also learnable and pleasurable to him. Both Dewey and Montessori feel that interest and discipline are connected and not opposed. Dewey himself decried unrestrained freedom of action in speech, in manners, and lack of manners. He was, in fact, critical of all those progressive schools that carried the thing they call freedom nearly to the point of anarchy [1962, p. 63].

A CRITICAL LOOK AT EIGHT PROPOSITIONS CONCERNING THE EFFECTS ON CHILD BEHAVIOR OF DISCIPLINARY TECHNIQUES

The associations between seven dimensions of parental control and manifest behavior of nursery school and school-age children are summarized in Table 1. The effects of infant-care practices have been reviewed elsewhere (Caldwell, 1964; Orlansky, 1949; Stendler, 1950) and are not included.

A review of the literature led to the selection of 12 studies which were particularly relevant to the topic of this paper and had the following methodological characteristics: Data on parents and children were collected independently; data on the children were derived from direct repeated observations in natural or laboratory settings; and parents' scores were based on interview or direct observational data, rather than on personality test scores.

Only findings significant at the .05 level or beyond and concerned with the effects of disciplinary practices are summarized in Table 1. A more detailed review of these 12 studies is on file with the American Documentation Institute.

The subsequent discussion, while relying primarily upon the findings summarized in Table 1, also draws upon additional studies which are relevant to the theses but do not meet the criteria set here for detailed review.

1. Punishment Has Inevitable Harmful Side Effects and Is an Ineffective Means of Controlling Child Behavior

Side effects of punishment.—Punitive, hostile, disaffiliated, self-righteous, and nonempathic disciplinary practices are associated clearly in the

TABLE 1

PARENT CONTROL AND CHILD BEHAVIOR

Dimensions of Parental Control	Relevant Variables	Effects
1. Punitive vs. nonpunitive disciplinary practices: Parent injects threats and hostile remarks into control attempts and makes use of severe punishment, ridicule and strong disapproval to motivate the child to obey	Glueck & Glueck (1950); Physical punishment	Higher in delinquent group
	Sears, Whiting, Nowlis, & Sears (1953); Punitiveness	Associated for boys, with dependence upon peers, and agression; for girls, with dependency
	Bandura & Walters (1959); Nagging and scolding	For fathers, higher in aggressive than control group
	Physical punishment	For fathers, higher in aggressive group
	Punishment for dependence	For mothers, higher in aggressive group
	Punishment for aggression towards other adults	For both parents, higher in aggressive group
	McCord et al. (1961); Punitiveness	Higher in the most aggressive group
	Becker et al. (1962); Physical punishment	For mothers, associated with aggression and conduct problems in boys and girls
	Kagan & Moss (1962); Restrictiveness (defined as punitive)	Associated in boys with passive dependent correlates at early ages changing to hostile, nondependent correlates by adult interview; associated in girls with passive dependent correlates at all ages
2. Use vs. nonuse of withdrawal of love: Child is punished by withholding or withdrawing love as a way of obtaining compliance with a parental directive	Sears et al.; Withdrawal of love	Associated with dependency, and also with high conscience when mother is warm
	Bandura et al.; Withdrawal of love	No difference between aggressive and control groups, but use of this technique correlates with resistiveness in total group
3. Explanations offered and give and take encouraged vs. rigid maintenance of status distinctions: Tolerates dissent, explains policy, uses reason to impel obedience, equalitarian	Baldwin (1948); Democracy	Associated with aggressiveness, fearlessness, playfulness, leadership, and cruelty
	Glueck & Glueck; Reasoning	Higher in nondelinquent group
	Bandura & Walters; Use of reasoning	Higher in control than aggressive group
	Finney (1961); Rigidity	Associated with covert hostility
	Schaefer & Bayley (1963); Equalitarianism	Associated in both sexes with positive, happy, friendly behavior
	Baumrind (in press); Communication	Mature group higher than immature or alienated groups

TABLE 1—*Continued*

PARENT CONTROL AND CHILD BEHAVIOR

Dimensions of Parental Control	Relevant Variables	Effects
4. *High vs. low demands for household responsibilities and orderly behavior:* Makes and enforces demands for socially desirable behavior, personal neatness, orderliness about cleaning up, and sharing in household responsibilities	Glueck & Glueck; Household duties	Higher in nondelinquent group
	Sears et al.; Current frustration	No significant findings for boys or girls
	Bandura & Walters; Demands for achievement	Higher in control than aggressive group
	McCord et al.; Demands for polite, responsible behavior	Higher demands by parents of least hostile children
	Becker et al.; Permissiveness vs. restrictiveness (routines)	No significant findings
5. *Restricts vs. permits autonomy:* Parental prohibitions and restrictions cover many areas of child's life and needs systems	Glueck & Glueck; Control (physical punishment, deprivation of privileges, threatening, etc.)	Generally higher in delinquent group
	Supervision	Higher in nondelinquent group
	Sears et al.; Current frustration: eating and sickness-danger	No significant findings for boys or girls
	Bandura & Walters;	
	Parental restrictions	Higher in aggressive group
	Permissiveness for aggression toward mother	Higher in aggressive group
	McCord et al.;	
	Supervision	Least hostile boys were supervised most
	Control	Most hostile boys were either under or overcontrolled
	Becker et al.; Permissiveness vs. strictness with sex and aggression	No significant findings for maternal strictness; paternal strictness associated with hostile withdrawal and nervous disposition in both sexes
	Schaefer & Bayley; Autonomy (correlations with positive evaluation vary with sex and age of child)	For adolescent boys maternal ratings at 0–3 correlated positively with timidity, inhibition, courtesy, tact; for 10½–12-year boys maternal ratings at 9–14 correlated negatively with friendly, cooperative, interested behavior; for adolescent girls, ratings at 9–14 correlated negatively with defiance, hostility, unpopularity and discontent

6. Uses high- vs. low-power assertion	Hoffman (1960);	
	Initial unqualified power assertion	Associated in middle-class homes with resistance towards teacher
	Reactive unqualified power assertion	For both middle-class and working class youth, associations were with assertiveness and resistance to being dominated; and in working-class youth only, associated with hostility
	Schaefer & Bayley; Wish to control	Unrelated to behavior of boys at any age; associations in adolescent girls were with discontent and turbulence
7. Firm vs. lax control: Enforces rules firmly, can resist child's demands, believes in directing child	Baldwin; Control	Negatively related to quarrelsomeness, resistance and disobedience
	Glueck & Glueck; Firm but kindly discipline	Higher in nondelinquent group
	Watson (1957), Strict vs. permissive parental discipline	
	Psychologists's ratings	Permissive higher than strict group on independence and socialization
	Teacher's ratings	Strict group higher than permissive group on energetic involvement
	Bandura & Walters; Parental demands for obedience	Higher in control than aggressive group
	Finney; Firmness	Associated with conscience development
	McCord et al.; Consistency of parental discipline	Characterized parents of least hostile children
	Baumrind; Parental control	Highest in mature (self-assertive and self-reliant), lowest in immature group

Note.—Prototype defined by dimensions:
Authoritarian model—low 3; high 4, 5, 6, 7, variable 1, 2.
Permissive model —low 1, 4, 5, 6, 7; high 3; variable 2.
Authoritative model—low 1, 2; high 3, 7; moderate 4, 5, 6.

studies reviewed with cognitive and emotional disturbance in the child, including hostile withdrawal, hostile acting out, dependency, personality problems, nervousness, and reduced schoolroom efficiency. There is some evidence that paternal punitiveness, especially in working-class families, is associated with more severe disturbance in the child than maternal punitiveness, perhaps because techniques used by the father—and the working-class father in particular—are harsher.

The clearly detrimental effects of punitiveness, which can scarcely be separated from those of rejection, should not be confused with the effects on the child of particular forms of mild punishment, physical or otherwise. The possibility should be considered that mild punishment may have beneficial side effects, such as the following: (*a*) more rapid re-establishment of affectional involvement on both sides following emotional release, (*b*) high resistance to similar deviation by siblings who vicariously experience punishment, (*c*) emulation of the aggressive parent resulting in prosocial assertive behavior, (*d*) lessening of guilt reactions to transgression, and (*e*) increased ability of the child to endure punishment in the service of a desired end. Punishment which is severe, unjust, ill-timed, and administered by an unloving parent is probably harmful as well as ineffective. Just, mild punishment by a loved and respected parent may not have harmful side effects. It may have, like other forthright uses of power, beneficial side effects.

Effectiveness of punishment.—The proposition that punishment is an extremely ineffective means of controlling human behavior may indeed be a "legend" as Solomon (1964) and Walters, Parke, and Cane (1965) suggest. Under conditions prevailing in the home setting, punishment may be quite effective in helping to accomplish particular objectives.

Punishment has been found to suppress unacceptable responses even when these responses are not eliminated, and so to require continued reinforcement. Parents frequently do not wish to eliminate a response, but wish merely to suppress its occurrence in particular places and for a limited period of time. They are willing and able to continue the process of aversive stimulation as long as is necessary to accomplish these objectives. A procedure which appears ineffective in the laboratory will then be, from the perspective of the parent, quite effective.

The use of nonreward as a substitute for punishment may be less effective than punishment as a way of altering certain behavior under actual conditions prevailing in the home setting. The very presence of the mother may be taken by the child as a tacit approval of his behavior if she merely nonrewards rather than punishes his deviant response (Crandall, 1963; Crandall, Good, & Crandall, 1964; Siegel & Kohn, 1959). Also, many of a child's disapproved acts provide their own reward. Such acts as sneaking sweets and smacking a younger sibling fall into the category of intrinsically rewarding disapproved responses which will not respond to parental non-

reward. In the laboratory, the punishing agent may be avoided by the child and thus lose her power to alter the child's behavior. If the punishing agent is a loved and respected parent, such a side effect of punishment, which would render future punishment less effective, is improbable.

The child may, but need not, overgeneralize an avoidant response to a whole pattern of behavior associated by similarity or contiguity with the punished response. Sharp discrimination can result from consistent, verbally mediated social training in which an undesirable response is punished and a similar or substitute response rewarded concurrently.

Aversive stimuli may be less effective than rewarding stimuli in eliciting desired behavior in an operant conditioning laboratory. However, the conclusion does not follow that punishment, as typically used in the home, is ineffective or that its use could not be made more effective.

It is more reasonable to teach parents who wish to learn to use punishment effectively and humanely how to do so than to preserve the myth that punishment is ineffective or intrinsically harmful. For example, the timing of punishment in relation to a response is one of many controllable determinants of the long-range effectiveness of punishment as a deterent (Aronfreed & Reber, 1965; Walters et al., 1965). Parents can also be taught to accompany punishment with an explanation in which both the change-worthy act, and where possible a more acceptable act, are specified.

2. Close Supervision, High Demands, and Other Manifestations of Parental Authority Provoke Rebelliousness in Children, Particularly at Adolescence

The findings reported here failed to support the common assumption that demands for neatness and orderliness reflect rigid obsessive qualities in the parents and should result in passive-aggressive problems in the child. In fact, Bandura and Walters (1959), Glueck and Glueck (1950), and McCord, McCord, and Howard (1961) found that higher demands were made by the parents of the *least* hostile or delinquent children. Finney (1961) found that, while rigidity was associated with covert hostility in children, firm control was associated with conscience development.

Parents who demand that their child be orderly and assume household responsibilities also seem to provide compatible surroundings conducive to the child's well-being and to involve themselves conscientiously with his welfare. Perhaps that is why such demands are viewed by the child, in most instances studied, as reasonable, and do not tend to provoke rebellion.

Findings from several additional studies suggest that parental demands provoke rebelliousness or antisocial aggression only when the parent is also repressive, hostile, and restrictive. In one study of 211 third graders' attitudes (Hoffman, Rosen, & Lippitt, 1960), the children who described their parents as coercive but also permissive of high autonomy, compared

with the remainder of the sample, were higher in academic success, use of directives, successful influence of peers, group leadership, friendliness, and also conscious experience of hostility. They were striving and aggressive but not rebellious. Sears (1961) found that the antecedents at age 12 of prosocial aggression scores, in maternal interview data obtained when the child was age 5, were high permissiveness for aggression and high punishment. In the Sears study, punishment for aggression appeared to reduce antisocial but increase prosocial aggression, indicating once again that parental authority may stimulate self-assertiveness without concomitant rebellious behavior. Dubin and Dubin (1963) surveyed 25 studies on the authority inception period in socialization. They concluded, speculatively, that the apparent conflict between individuality and conformity is resolved by the imposition of parental authority in complex social relations. This teaches the child about the variable character of social demands and instructs him as to the range of acceptable choices for various situations. By authoritative acts, parents establish for the child the concept of legitimacy and provide a model for the child to emulate. Pikas (1961), in his survey of 656 Swedish adolescents, showed that significant differences occurred in their acceptance of parental authority, depending upon the reason for the directive. Authority which was based on rational concern for the child's welfare was accepted well by the child, while authority which was based on the adult's desire to dominate or exploit the child was rejected. The former, which he calls rational authority, is similar to "authoritative control," and the latter, which he calls inhibiting authority, is similar to "authoritarian control," as these terms are used in this discussion. His results are supported by Middleton and Snell (1963) who found that parental discipline regarded by the child as either very strict or very permissive was associated with lack of closeness between parent and child and with rebellion against the parent's political viewpoints.

A distinction, then, must be made between the effects on the child of unjust, restrictive, subjective authority, when compared to rational, warm, issue-oriented authority. There is considerable evidence that the former but not the latter constellation of practices is associated in the child with negative affect, disaffiliativeness, and rebelliousness.

3. *Firm Parental Control Generates Passivity and Dependence*

Baldwin (1948) found that high control with democracy held constant covaried negatively with prosocial as well as antisocial assertive behavior. However, contrary results have been found in other studies. It would appear that many children react to parental power by resisting the parent's pressure, rather than by being cowed. Hoffman's (1960) results indicate that parental assertiveness and submissiveness in the child are negatively correlated. Sears' (1961) findings on early socialization and later aggression suggest that high punishment for aggression, like "reactive unqualified

power assertion," does not lead to submissive behavior. Baumrind's (1965; in press) results were that parents of the most self-reliant and approach-oriented group of children were rated highest in firm control.

There are individual differences in vigor and reactivity which may alter young children's reactions to parental power. A gentle, sensitive child might well react to high-power directives with passive, dependent responses, whereas an aggressive, vigorous child might react self-assertively or oppositionally, modeling himself after the aggressive parent.

The same parent variables which increase the probability that the child will use the parent as a model should increase the likelihood that firm control will result in assertive behavior. Thus, the controlling parent who is warm, understanding, and autonomy-granting should generate less passivity (as well as as less rebelliousness) than the controlling parent who is cold and restrictive because of the kinds of behavior she will reinforce and the traits she presents as a model.

4. Parental Restrictiveness Decreases Normal Self-assertiveness and buoyancy

The definition of restrictiveness used by different investigators varies greatly. Thus studies differ substantially in the parental correlates of this variable, particularly with hostility. Restrictiveness, when correlated positively with parental hostility (Becker, Peterson, Luria, Shoemaker, & Helmer, 1962; Kagan & Moss, 1962), tends to be associated in the child with passivity, dependence, social withdrawal, and passively expressed hositlity. In studies where restrictiveness is an expression of involvement, antisocial aggression in children and parental restrictiveness seem to be correlated negatively. Bandura and Walters' (1959) findings were that parents of delinquent boys were less, rather than more, restrictive when compared to parents of nondelinquent boys. Findings of Glueck and Glueck (1950) and McCord et al. (1961) were similar. However, the studies reviewed do not suggest that moderate restrictiveness decreases self-assertiveness unless accompanied by parental hostility or overprotectiveness.

When granting autonomy is an indication of detachment rather than warmth, its opposite, restrictiveness is not associated in the child with hostility or passivity. A careful examination of the findings of Schaefer and Bayley (1963) makes the point rather well. The conceptual definition of Schaefer and Bayley's variable "autonomy" (low) is quite similar to that of Kagan and Moss's variable "restrictiveness" (high), but maternal "autonomy" does not covary positively, except for girls at ages 9–14, with maternal warmth (measured by the variable "positive evaluation"). At ages 9–14, for girls, when "autonomy" and "positive evaluation" covary positively (.40), the variable "autonomy" is associated in adolescent girls with popularity, con-

tentment, and low hostility. At 0–3 years, when "autonomy" and "positive evaluation" are somewhat negatively related (−.28), there are no significant associations between the maternal variable "autonomy" and any of the child behavior ratings. For boys also, "autonomy" is correlated negatively (−.07 to −.33) with "positive evaluation." It is interesting, therefore, to note that "autonomy" measured at 0–3 years is associated with timid, inhibited, courteous, and tactful behavior in adolescent boys, and at 9–14 with unfriendly, uncooperative, uninterested behavior, rather than with self-reliance, buoyancy, and self-assertiveness. Maternal "autonomy," as measured by Schaefer and Bayley, seems to reflect detached uninvolvement, except for mothers of girls 9–14, when it is correlated positively with most measures of maternal warmth. The effect on the child covaries with these maternal correlates.

It would appear that no conclusions can be drawn concerning the effects on the child of variables called "autonomy" or "restrictiveness" until correlates with other parent variables, especially hostility, are known.

5. Permissiveness Frees the Child from the Presence and Authority of the Parent

When the child engages in behavior which he has reason to think is unacceptable and an adult is present and noninterfering, does the noninterference of the adult leave the child free to act as he would naturally if he did not have to fear the disapproval of the adult, or does the noninterference of the adult increase the likelihood that such socially disapproved behavior will occur in the future? The former alternative is generally assumed, but the latter appears to be more likely. The parent's nonaction signifies to the child approval of his behavior, not neutrality (Sears, Maccoby, & Levin, 1957, p. 259). In a well-controlled study, Siegel and Kohn (1959) demonstrated that the presence of a permissive adult increased the incidence of aggression shown by nursery school boys to somewhat younger boys.

"Two-thirds of the Ss in the adult-present sessions were more aggressive in the second than in the first session, and all the Ss in the adult-absent sessions were less aggressive in the second than in the first session. This finding is in confirmation of the hypothesis, which was drawn from a consideration of the nature and effects of adult permissiveness with children and of the nature of young children's controls for aggression" (Siegel & Kohn, 1959, pp. 140–141).

Their results, which indicate that the presence of a nonreacting adult affects the child in definite ways, are supported by those of Crandall et al. (1964), in which changes in children's behavior produced by adult nonreaction were greater than those produced by extinction (nonadult nonreaction).

6. Controlling Parents Are Motivated By the Authoritarian Personality Syndrome and Therefore Are Compelled, By Fear of Loss of Control, To Restrict the Child's Self-directed, Autonomous Efforts

While parents motivated by the authoritarian personality syndrome are controlling, it does not follow that the converse is true. Some subgroups of controlling parents permit high autonomy in many areas of the child's life. Lois Hoffman et al. (1960) described a subgroup of parents who were perceived by their children as both coercive and permissive of high autonomy. Martin Hoffman's (1963) findings were that the authoritarian personality syndrome, as measured by a 12-item form of the *F* test, was not related to use of "initial unqualified power assertion" or "reactive unqualified power assertion" for middle-class fathers or mothers or for working-class mothers, although such a relationship did exist for working-class fathers. Power need, as measured by a thematic test, was unrelated for any group to either "initial unqualified power assertion" or "reactive unqualified power assertion." Baumrind (in press) found that, whereas the parents of alienated children tended to use inhibiting control, the parents of exceptionally mature children, who exerted even firmer control, used reason to explain their directives and encouraged independent expression. This latter group of parents did not exhibit the authoritarian personality syndrome. Thus, several investigators have identified subgroups of controlling parents who are not restrictive of children's autonomy or motivated by the authoritarian personality syndrome and have shown that children react differently to firm and repressive control.

It is of interest to evaluate empirically the effects on children of various combinations of extreme scores on these two dimensions, "firm control" and "restricts child's autonomy," rather than to assume that they form a single dimension.

7. Firm Control Inhibits the Child's Creative Thrust

The parent whose orientation is nonpermissive, even when she exerts rational authority and encourages the child to make many of his own decisions, is seeking, by definition, to obtain from the child conformity with parental standards. The parent who exerts authoritative control, as that pattern of child rearing was defined earlier—even if her hope is that as the child grows older she will be able to relinquish contol—does indeed exert vigorous efforts to shape the child's behavior in his early years. To the extent that her policy is effective, the child may argue and test the limits, but he is fundamentally satisfied with his relationship to his parents and does not revolt.

Intellectual endeavors which require solitary effort without concern about social approval or which demand a revolutionary rejection of the

premises established by previous authorities may be initiated less frequently by children who have learned to trust and depend upon their parents' wisdom, to seek their approval, and to accept their authority. There is some indirect evidence to that effect. In one of a series of provocative studies, Bing concluded: "The findings led to the general conclusion that discrepant verbal ability is fostered by a close relationship with a demanding and somewhat intrusive mother, while discrepant nonverbal abilities are enhanced by allowing the child a considerable degree of freedom to experiment on his own" (1963, p. 647). Along similar lines, Getzels and Jackson (1961) found that parents of children whose IQ scores were high but not their creativity scores, when compared to parents of children whose creativity scores were high but not their IQ scores (the lower score was below the top 20 per cent but not actually below the mean), were more authoritative in their discipline and more concerned about intellectual and social achievement than about inner life. Firm, intrusive parents may inhibit nonverbal achievement and enhance achievement in verbal areas.

The child-rearing procedures which generate competence, mental health, and optimism may not be the same as those which give rise to eminence. Thus Eiduson (1962), among others, found that the eminent scientists whom she studied had little contact with their fathers whom they described as rigid and aloof, and remembered their mothers as possessive and aggressive.

8. Similar Patterns of Child Rearing Affect Boys and Girls Differently

Many investigators have concluded that similar parental practices have different effects on boys and girls. Bronfenbrenner (1961, p. 269), for example, suggested that "in the absence of extreme rejection or neglect, both parental affection and authority have differential effects on the development of responsibility in sons and daughters. For boys, it is the absence of sufficient warmth or discipline which more frequently impairs dependability; for girls, it is an overdose of either variable that has deleterious effects." Bayley (1964) offered the hypothesis of genetic sex differences to explain the fact that girls' intelligence scores, unlike boys' scores, show little relation to maternal variables. Sears (1961) suggested that sex differences in antecedents for aggression anxiety might lie in the different dynamic and genetic characteristics of aggression anxiety for boys and girls.

However, it cannot be demonstrated that sex-related differences in the relation between a particular child-rearing variable and a particular child behavior do, in fact, exist, until it can be shown that there are no mean, variance, or covariance differences for boys and girls in either the parent or child variable. Thus, indexes of warmth frequently covary differently with indexes of directiveness or restrictiveness for boys and girls, and this fact may account for many instances of differences in parent-child correlates

which have been interpreted as signifying differential effects of a parental variable on the development of a particular attribute in sons and daughters. In the Schaefer and Bayley study, for example, maternal ratings of "autonomy" at 9–14 years correlated with contrasting attributes for boys and girls. Interpretation of these findings must remain ambiguous because "autonomy" covaried with other maternal variables differently for boys and girls (1963, p. 19). The same kind of question can and should be raised for what, on the face of it, are age-related differences in effects of similar parental variables on child behavior.

There is not enough known about the complex, subtle differences in child-rearing practices to indicate that we have ever succeeded in equating practices for boys and girls. We need an empirical basis for establishing equivalence of patterns of relations among parent variables and among child variables before the problem of sex-related differences in effects of child-rearing patterns can be investigated systematically.

FREEDOM AND CONTROL AS ANTINOMY OR SYNTHESIS

Behavioral scientists and philosophers still dispute vigorously the relation of control to freedom. To an articulate exponent of permissiveness in child rearing such as Neill, freedom for the child means that he has the liberty to do as he pleases without interference from adult guardians and, indeed, with their protection. Hegel, by contrast, defines freedom as the appreciation of necessity. By this he means that man frees himself of the objective world by understanding its nature and controlling his reactions to its attributes. His definition equates the concept of freedom with power to act, rather than absence of external control. To Hegel, the infant is enslaved by virtue of his ignorance, his dependence upon others for sustenance, and his lack of self-control. The experience of infantile omnipotence, if such he has, is based on ignorance and illusion. His is the freedom to be irresponsible, a freedom reserved for the very young child and the incompetent.

The ability to make an autonomous choice includes as a necessary but not sufficient condition that external agents with greater power leave the actor free to formulate, initiate, and complete his action. For a person to behave autonomously, he must accept responsibility for his own behavior, which in turn requires that he believe that the world is orderly and susceptible to rational mastery and that he has or can develop the requisite skills to manage his own affairs.

There may be good reasons for parents concerned with their children's freedom to use direct methods of influence which include cognitive appeal and power, rather than indirect methods such as nurturance withdrawal or guilt induction. In order that a child can learn to direct his energies wilfully and thus feel responsible, he needs practice in choosing a course of action under realistic conditions, conditions which include aversive as well as

gratifying stimulation. In choosing an action for which he can expect punishment and for which he is then punished, he gains important information upon which to base subsequent choices. The less he is manipulated by guilt-inducing techniques of discipline or indirect threats of loss of love which condition his behavior while bypassing his conscious will, the more capable he should become of responsible (i.e., chosen) action. A conditioned reaction of guilt to a particular action limits the individual's freedom to choose that action or to choose an alternative to that action. Nurturance withdrawal by a loving parent has been shown to be a most effective means of producing guilt about wrongdoing and thus conditioned compliance (Hartup, 1958; Hill 1960; Mussen & Rutherford, 1963; Sears, 1961). The manipulation by the parent of the love relation probably poses a greater threat to the child's ability to make a conscious choice than even the use of unqualified power assertion. One may wonder about the limits which early internalization of parental standards imposes upon the development of cognitively directed responsible behavior and individuality in later life. When compliance with parental standards is achieved by use of reason, power, and external reinforcement, it may be possible to obtain obedience and self-correction without stimulating self-punitive reactions. To some extent, the parent's aggressiveness stimulates counteraggression and extrapunitive responses from the child, thus reducing the experience of guilt or early internalization of standards whose moral bases cannot yet be grasped. When the child accepts physical punishment or deprivation of privileges as the price paid for acts of disobedience, he may derive from the interaction greater power to withstand suffering and deprivation in the service of another need or an ideal and, thus, increased freedom to choose among expanded alternatives.

Authoritarian control and permissive noncontrol may both shield the child from the opportunity to engage in vigorous interaction with people. Demands which cannot be met or no demands, suppression of conflict or sidestepping of conflict, refusal to help or too much help, unrealistically high or low standards, all may curb or understimulate the child so that he fails to achieve the knowledge and experience which could realistically reduce his dependence upon the outside world. The authoritarian and the permissive parent may both create, in different ways, a climate in which the child is not desensitized to the anxiety associated with nonconformity. Both models minimize dissent, the former by suppression and the latter by diversion or indulgence. To learn how to dissent, the child may need a strongly held position from which to diverge and then be allowed under some circumstances to pay the price for nonconformity by being punished. Spirited give and take within the home, if accompanied by respect and warmth, may teach the child how to express aggression in self-serving and prosocial causes and to accept the partially unpleasant consequences of such actions.

The body of findings on effects of disciplinary practices as reviewed

and interpreted here give provisional support to the position that authoritative control can achieve responsible conformity with group standards without loss of individual autonomy or self-assertiveness. The hypotheses generated by that position must, of course, be tested empirically with a variety of subgroups. These hypotheses will need to be corrected by the data and adapted to include equivalent parental behaviors, depending upon the characteristics of the subgroup to which they are to be applied.

REFERENCES

Adorno, T. W., Frenkel-Brunswik, Else, Levinson, D. J., & Sanford, R. N. *The authoritarian personality.* New York: Harper, 1950.

Aronfreed, J., & Reber, A. Internalized behavioral suppression and the timing of social punishment. *J. Pers. soc. Psychol.*, 1965, **1**, 3–16.

Baldwin, A. L. Socialization and the parent-child relationship. *Child Develpm.*, 1948, **19**, 127–136.

Bandura, A., & Walters, R. H. *Adolescent aggression.* New York: Ronald, 1959.

Baumrind, Diana. Parental control and parental love. *Children*, 1965, **12**, 230–234.

Baumrind, Diana. Child care practices anteceding three patterns of preschool behavior. *Genet. Psychol. Monogr.*, in press.

Bayley, Nancy, & Schaefer, E. S. Correlations of maternal and child behaviors with the development of mental abilities: data from the Berkeley growth study. *Monogr. Soc. Res. Child Develpm.*, 1964, **29**, No. 6 (Whole No. 97).

Becker, W. C., Peterson, D. R., Luria, Zella, Shoemaker, D. J., & Hellmer, L. A. Relations of factors derived from parent-interview ratings to behavior problems of five-year-olds. *Child Develpm.*, 1962, **33**, 509–535.

Bing, Elizabeth. Effect of childrearing practices on development of differential cognitive abilities. *Child Develpm.*, 1963, **34**, 631–648.

Bronfenbrenner, U. Some familiar antecedents of responsibility and leadership in adolescents. In L. Petrullo and B. M. Bass (Eds.), *Leadership and interpersonal behavior.* New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1961. Pp. 239–271.

Caldwell, Bettye M. The effects of infant care. In M. L. Hoffman and Lois W. Hoffman (Eds.), *Review of child development research.* Vol. **1**. New York: Russell Sage Found., 1964. Pp. 9–87.

Coriat, I. H. The psycho-analytic approach to education. *Progr. Educ.*, 1926, **3**, 19–25.

Crandall, Virginia C. The reinforcement effects of adult reactions and nonreactions on children's achievement expectations. *Child Develpm.*, 1963, **34**, 335–354.

Crandall, Virginia C., Good, Suzanne, & Crandall, V. J. The reinforcement effects of adult reactions and nonreactions on children's achievement expectations: a replication. *Child Develpm.*, 1964, **35**, 485–497.

Cremin, L. A. *The transformation of the school.* New York: Vintage, 1964.

Dewey, J. *Democracy and education.* New York: Macmillan, 1916.

Dewey, J., & Dewey, Evelyn. *Schools of tomorrow.* New York: Dutton, 1915.

Dubin, Elisabeth R., & Dubin, R. The authority inception period in socialization. *Child Develpm.*, 1963, **34**, 885–898.

Eiduson, Bernice T. *Scientists: their psychological world.* New York: Basic Books, 1962.

Finney, J. C. Some maternal influences on children's personality and character. *Genet. Psychol. Monogr.*, 1961, **63**, 199–278.

Frank, L. K. Freedom for the personality. *Psychiatry*, 1940, **3**, 341–349.

Fromm, E. *Escape from freedom.* New York: Farrar & Rinehart, 1941.

Gesell, A. *The guidance of mental growth in infant and child.* New York: Macmillan, 1930.

Getzels, J. W., & Jackson, P. W. Family environment and cognitive style: a study of the sources of highly intelligent and of highly creative adolescents. *Amer. Sociol. Rev.*, 1961, **26**, 351–359.

Glueck, S., & Glueck, Eleanor. *Unraveling juvenile delinquency.* New York: Commonwealth Fund, 1950.

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

Hartup, W. W. Nurturance and nurturance withdrawal in relation to the dependency behavior of pre-school children. *Child Develpm.*, 1958, **29**, 191–201.

Hill, W. F. Learning theory and the acquisition of values. *Psychol. Rev.*, 1960, **67**, 317–331.

Hoffman, Lois, Rosen, S., & Lippitt, R. Parental coerciveness, child autonomy, and child's role at school. *Sociometry*, 1960, **23**, 15–22.

Hoffman, M. L. Power assertion by the parent and its impact on the child. *Child Develpm.*, 1960, **31**, 129–143.

Hoffman, M. L. Personality, family structure, and social class as antecedents of parental power assertion. *Child Develpm.*, 1963, **34**, 869–884.

Kagan, J., & Moss, H. A. *Birth to maturity: a study in psychological development.* New York: Wiley, 1962.

Lewin, K., Lippitt, R., & White, R. K. Patterns of aggressive behavior in experimentally created "social climates." *J. soc. Physcol.*, 1939, **10**, 271–299.

McCord, W., McCord, Joan, & Howard, A. Familial correlates of aggression in nondelinquent male children. *J. abnorm. soc. Psychol.*, 1961, **62**, 79–93.

Maslow, A. H. *Motivation and personality.* New York: Harper, 1954.

Middleton, R., & Snell, P. Political expression of adolescent rebellion. *Amer. J. Sociol.*, 1963, **68**, 527–535.

Mussen, P., & Rutherford, E. Parent-child relations and parental personality in relation to young children's sex-role preferences. *Child Develpm.*, 1963, **34**, 589–607.

Naumburg, Margaret. *The child and the world.* New York: Harcourt, Brace, 1928.

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

Orlansky, H. Infant care and personality. *Psychol. Bull.*, 1949, **46**, 1–48.

Pikas, A. Children's attitudes toward rational versus inhibiting parental authority. *J. abnorm. soc. Psychol.*, 1961, **62**, 315–321.

Rambusch, Nancy M. *Learning how to learn: an American approach to Montessori.* Baltimore: Helicon, 1962.

Rogers, C. R. A therapist's view of personal goals. *Pendle Hill Pamphlet 108.* Wallingford, Pa.: Pendle Hill, 1960.

Schaefer, E. S., & Bayley, Nancy. Maternal behavior, child behavior, and their

intercorrelations from infancy through adolescence. *Monogr. Soc. Res. Child Develpm.*, 1963, **28**, No. 3 (Whole No. 87).

Sears, R. R. Relation of early socialization experiences to aggression in middle childhood. *J. abnorm. soc. Psychol.*, 1961, **63**, 466–492.

Sears, R. R., Maccoby, E. E., & Levin, H. *Patterns of child rearing.* Evanston, Ill.: Row, Peterson, 1957.

Sears, R. R., Whiting, J. W. M., Nowlis, V., & Sears, P. S. Some child rearing antecedents of aggression and dependency in young children. *Genet. Psychol. Monogr.*, 1953, **47**, 135–234.

Siegel, Alberta E., & Kohn, Lynette G. Permissiveness, permission, and aggression: the effects of adult presence or absence on aggression in children's play. *Child Develpm.*, 1959, **30**, 131–141.

Solomon, R. L. Punishment. *Amer. Psychologist*, 1964, **19**, 239–253.

Spock, B. M. *The common sense book of baby and child care.* New York: Duell, Sloan, & Pearce, 1946.

Spock, B. M. *Baby and child care.* (2d ed.) New York: Pocket Books, 1957.

Stendler, Celia B. Sixty years of child training practices. *J. Pediatrics*, 1950, **36**, 122–136.

Walters, R. H., Parke, R. D., & Cane, Valerie A. Timing of punishment and observation of consequences to others as determinants of response inhibition. *J. exp. child Psychol.*, 1965, **2**, 10–30.

Watson, G. Some personality differences in children related to strict or permissive parental discipline. *J. Psychol.*, 1957, **44**, 227–249.