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INTRODUCTION

After years of neglect, benign and otherwise, the poor child has come to the forefront of research in education. The national conscience is twinging and the rush for remediation is on. Studies focusing on the poor child are abundant and a thorough review of the literature would be exhausting, as well as futile. It would be futile because the literature on the poor child tends to lack imagination and illustrates and unwillingness to test out a variety of interpretations. The literature tends to present a hit-and-run approach to the learning problems of the poor. It seems that researchers and educators are trying to find a one-shot method for dealing with poor children's problems based on preconceived notions of the origins of the problems. Interpretations of poor children's performance are made, new methods implemented, outcomes reported, but no consistent progress seems to be made. Research and replication based on alternative theoretical foundations is necessary. The aim of this paper is to integrate three of the images of the poor child and his performance that have emerged from the recent literature.

Out of such a synthesis it is hoped that a new, more realistic, image of the poor child will emerge and provide the basis for a new theoretical foundation.

The topics of poverty, child development and intervention programs have generated an enormous literature in the last decade or so. Though this literature illustrates a variety of approaches and is based on a variety of data, the great majority of the writings utilize essentially the same interpretations and produce the same image of the poor child: he has failed to make the same general developmental advances accomplished successfully by his middle-class counterpart. The dominance of the deprivation theory in the interpretation of poor children's school performance is almost unquestioned and is certainly the most commonly used one. The theory influences most of the interpretive writing on poor children and almost all of the empirical reports.

A relatively rare counter-theme recently developing is the argument that growing up poor does develop useful skills and encourages certain kinds of talent. Since this point of view is held by comparatively few writers, it therefore may be unnoticed by people who should be aware that there may be alternative interpretations of poor children's school performance.
The purpose of this paper is to review a representative sampling of writings illustrating the two general themes already outlined. Though these themes appear to be opposed and even irreconcilable, a few recent papers and research reports may provide interpretations that synthesize the contending images of poor children. Criticism of past work and a review of the more recent synthesizing point of view will make up the final section.

IMAGES OF THE POOR CHILD AS DEPRIVED

Obviously not all writers who adhere to the general theory of deprivation agree on all the particulars: some stress economic forces as a cause of deprivation; others would emphasize a rural background; the rest would blame the quantity and quality of interaction in the home. Despite the disagreement on the specifics, the image of the child generated by these writers is one of deficiencies. They imply and sometimes specifically outline, a common view of the poor child and of the mechanisms affecting his performance in school and in the job market.

There is perhaps no more succinct statement concerning the lack of "socially useful" skills among the "disadvantaged child" than the one made by Havighurst in 1964:

There is substantial doubt that the socially disadvantaged children in our big cities have any positive qualities of potential value in urban society in which they are systematically better than the children of families who participate fully in the mass cultures. . . . As a group they are inferior in tests of spacial perception, for example, as well as in tests of vocabulary and arithmetic. (Havighurst 1964, pp. 28-29)

The author does concede that "the difference between the socially disadvantaged and the mass culture is less on tests of certain non-verbal skills than on tests of more verbal and abstract abilities" (Havighurst 1964:29).

The image of the poor child is developed more specifically and at greater length by Bereiter, Engleman, & colleagues:

From our earlier work in teaching concrete logical operations it became evident that culturally deprived children do not think at an immature level: many of them do not think at all. That is, they do not show any of the mediating processes which we ordinarily identify with thinking. They cannot hold onto questions while searching for an answer. They cannot compare perceptions in any reliable fashion. They are oblivious of even the most extreme discrepancies between their actions and statements as they follow one another in a series. . . . They cannot give explanations at all, nor do they seem to have any idea of what it is to explain an event. The question and answer process which is the core of orderly thinking is completely foreign to most of them. (Bereiter et al 1966:107)

The authors maintain further that the language of the "culturally deprived" child is not merely an underdeveloped version of standard English, "but is basically a non-logical mode of expressive behavior" (Bereiter 1966:112). These descriptions of the poor child, of his lack of abilities, and his deficiencies in elementary skills provide the basis for the major authors' much publicized academically oriented pre-school.

The previous statement describing the weakness of poor children's speech agrees with the descriptions developed by the British sociolinguist Bernstein.

(1) Short, grammatically simple, often unfinished sentences with a poor syntactical form stressing the active voice.

(2) Simple and repetitive use of conjunctions (so, then, because).

(3) Little use of subordinate clauses to break down the initial categories of the dominant subject.
(4) Inability to hold a formal subject through a speech sequence; thus a dislocated informational content is facilitated.

(5) Rigid and limited use of adjectives and adverbs.

(6) Constraint on the self-reference pronoun; frequent use of the personal pronoun.

(7) Frequent use of statements where reason and conclusion are confounded to produce a categoric statement.

(8) A large number of statements/phrases which signal a requirement for the previous speech sequence to be reinforced: i.e., “Wouldn’t it? You see? You know?” etc. This process is termed “sympathetic circularity.”

(9) Individual selection from a group of idiomatic phrases or sequences will frequently occur.

(10) The individual qualification is implicit in the sentence organization; it is the language of implicit meaning. (Bernstein 1961, 1960)

Bernstein does not use the same words that Bereiter uses to describe this language pattern. That he agrees with much of what Bereiter says is strongly implied by the term he uses to describe this language pattern: The restricted code.

The experiments carried out by Martin Deutsch and his associates have led them to develop the concept of sensory deprivation. He finds poor children to have inferior auditory and visual discrimination, time judgement, sense of number, and other basic concepts. In other papers he described what he calls a severe and general language impoverishment (Deutsch 1965, 1963).

The broad picture of the child as drawn by these authors is one of deficiencies and failures. The poor child lacks a variety of skills because he has failed to develop as quickly or as well as the better-off child. It should be emphasized that the image of the poor child under the theory of deprivation is a relative one: he fails to grasp or to utilize skills or knowledge that is assumed to be firmly within the capabilities of the average middle class youth of the same age.

The basis for these deficiencies is strongly implied and often discussed by the authors mentioned in this paper and the many others who share a similar view of the poor child. To paraphrase the authors as concisely as possible the origins of deprivation stem from the home. The quality and quantity of interaction in the typical economically poor urban milieu retards the development of critical skills and abilities. The quality of verbal and non-verbal interaction is such that logical operations, questioning, listening, seeing, judging, scheduling and so on are not practiced or encouraged. The material and objects available in the home for the child to manipulate and perceive are felt to be few and to lack in sensory variety. Crowded conditions, noise, and the lack of organization in the home are felt to be the causes of disabilities labeled sensory deprivation.

Such an image of poor children is built on school grades, drop-out rates, and most often, performance on standard tests of intelligence or achievement. It seems that this image is most popular because it has the weight of empirical evidence on its side. As Havighurst (1964) points out, there is an impressive array of data that appears to indicate that the poor child cannot perform up to the standard of his better off counterpart. The finding that poor, and often minority, children score one standard deviation below the mean on standard I.Q. tests is nearly universal (Carlson & Henderson 1950; Jensen 1961, 1969; Pasamanick 1951; Shuey 1966).

**IMAGES OF THE POOR CHILD AS ABLE**

A few writers on the topic relevant to this paper appear to work from assumptions which are rather different than the ones used by the deprivation theorists. Though they do
not say so in so many words they seem to feel
that the simple fact of growing up in a poor
and difficult environment is evidence that the
child has acquired some competencies. We
should recognize these skills and attempt to
build upon them in the school situation.

One of the earliest and most influential
proponents of this view of the poor child is
Frank Riessman. In *The Culturally Deprived
Child* he argues that poor children have a
distinctive learning style and termed it a
"concrete learning style." Such a mode of
learning is quite different from the learning
habits of the middle-class child and the
practices typically found in public schools;
hence, the failure of poor children to perform
"adequately." Riessman concedes that the
children he calls disadvantaged or lower class
may be retarded in reading, knowing how to
ask and answer questions, and what he terms
general school know-how. The author argues,
however, that emphasizing the weaknesses of
the poor child obscures the real skills and
potentials that he has. The school, according
to Riessman, actively fails the physically
oriented slow learner by not utilizing his
concrete learning style and physical interest as
one avenue to abstract thinking. He suggests
using activity involvement, for example role
playing, as a general constructive response to
poor or disadvantaged children (*Riessman
1962, 1961*).

Two other images of the poor child agree in
general with Riessman, but where he supplies
some plan of action (no matter how vague)
the other two authors merely attempt to
catalogue the skills and strengths of the
child. It is made clear that if we are to
succeed in changing these children, we have to
build on what strengths they have.
Furthermore, it seems that "the key issue in
looking at the strengths of the inner city child
is the importance of not confusing difference
with defect" (*Eisenberg 1967:85*).

These strengths can be described as deriving
from the impoverished environment in which
poor children grow up. Such skills may be
labeled Practical Knowledge or simply more
experience with the seamy side of life.

Their understandings are more often
economic than aesthetic. Their interests
are less concerned with romantic love
than with the duties, difficulties, and
conflicts of life in a family which is trying
to survive in adversity. (*McCreary
1966:49*)

Other kinds of strengths are described in the
following way:

(1) **Strong In-Group Feelings:** One
cultural strand of working-class existence
which is powerfully reinforced by the life
experience of socially disadvantaged
youths is an impulse toward mutual aid,
fellow feeling, or reciprocity. Those on
the bottom or those who have been
driven into a corner by economic
depreivation or ethnic discrimination and
injustice, sharing adversity and
misfortune with others, are likely to learn
to share also their resources of a material
and spiritual nature. (*Ibid, 50*)

(2) **Self-Reliance and Autonomy:**
Independence and self-sufficiency,
associated with the realistic if sometimes
harsh life experiences of such youth make
for a maturity and responsibility
frequently found with these individuals.
Such independence can often lead to
clashes when school personnel attempt to
control poor children and get them to act
like other children. (*Ibid, 51*)

(3) **Physically and Visually Oriented:**
The style of the inner city children is
physical and visual. To engage these
children in watching a movie, or a class
play where they act it out, or a
role-playing exercise where they pretend
to be the storekeeper and customers will
teach them how to behave. There is much
greater likelihood of getting the children
to be able to give verbal descriptions of
what happened than if you simply
challenged the children with a verbal
stimulus. (*Eisenberg 1967:83*)

(4) **Externally Oriented:** These children
are externally oriented rather than
introspective. Questions about how
people feel and think are less meaningful to them than questions about what people do. *(Ibid, 84)*

In addition these writers tend to agree that the poor child learns concretely and has a physical oriented learning style similar to Riessman's outline.

The image derived from these writings [see also Glatt 1965] on the child living in economically deprived conditions differs in important respects from the image presented in the first section of this paper. The first group of authors emphasized deficiencies; the second skills and abilities. The difference could be thought of as only differences emphasis or priorities; the first group tend to emphasize things that have to be done, the deficiencies that have to be made up; the second group focuses on the skills children have and that can be built upon in the school or intervention program context. However, this description of the differences between the two sets of writers obscures some fundamental differences in starting points and end results. Those authors whose work fits under the deprivation heading tend to see poor children as collections of deficiencies, who react to their environment at a low, intuitive level. These children are seen as little more than animals, illogical, uncommunicative, and with little or none of the intellectual apparatus which characterizes the rest of us humans. Intervention programs, special classes in the public schools have as their job doing what the home and parents have failed to do. School, according to the deprivation theorists, must often originate the cognitive structures that are assumed not to exist.

The second set of authors present an image that is more humane, human, right-feeling, and based on much weaker evidence. It strikes us as a more realistic view of the child to hold that he has both strengths and weaknesses, although it may be that few of the strengths and most of the weaknesses are precisely in those activity areas rewarded or punished by school and middle-class society. Economic deprivation, growing up poor, may result in the weakening of the development of certain types of intellectual abilities. Such disabilities may be irreversible or they may not. However, to assume that growing up poor robs one of basic logical skills such as speech is to provide evidence of selective blindness on the part of some authors.

Nevertheless, those writers who argue that surviving in the harsh environment of poverty develops some abilities base their contentions mostly on intuition and guess. Some of the abilities appear to constitute very good guesses, some appear to be derived from the author's own misperceptions of what it means to be poor. *(Glatt, 1965)*

Indeed, reading some of this material easily gives the impression that the writers believe there is something precious in being poor; an impression that does damage to the validity of their major point that poor children do learn some skills. We are faced with the dilemma of wanting to believe the second image on emotional grounds but have to believe the first because all of the "hard" evidence seems to support the deprivation theory. Fortunately some recent research appears to provide a third image of the poor child and it is to this alternative that we turn.

**SITUATIONAL BIASES AND COPING SKILLS**

Recent research indicates that some measure of synthesizing can now be introduced which will give a fairer and more useful image of the poor child. In the fundamentally important area of language, Labov has reinterpreted

*As an example of the authors cited in the second section of this paper maintain that deprivation somehow intensifies cooperation among the poor. That may occur, but so might it encourage selfishness in using up the little you have before someone else takes it away. The latter mode of behavior seems to prevail among Black male floaters in Washington, D.C., see Elliot Liebow, *Tally's Corner*, Boston: Little, Brown and Co., 1967; Zahava D. Blum & Peter H. Rossi," in *On Understanding Poverty*, ed. by Daniel P. Maynihan, New York: Basic Books, 1969, pp. 343-397.*
some of the findings and analysis. He states that the

...linguistic behavior reported by Bereiter is merely the product of a defensive posture which children adopt in an alien and threatening situation. Such behavior can be produced at will in any group of children and can be altered by changing the relevant sociolinguistic variables. (Labov 1969:1)

In other words, Labov does not necessarily take issue with the results of interviews with poor children or other methods of getting language samples from them; he does argue that the data derived from such situations is typically misinterpreted. He maintains that asymmetrical situations in which a large, controlling adult runs an interview with a small, controlled child, a situation “where anything he says can literally be held against him” (Labov 1966:6) results in the child avoiding saying anything. Furthermore, “if one takes this interview as a measure of the verbal capacity of the child, it must be his capacity to defend himself in a hostile and threatening situation” (Labov 1969:6).

The bulk of Labov’s report details the initial, non-verbal performances of Black children in the interview situation. Slowly, by altering the symmetry of the interview setting (interviewer sitting on the floor with the child, “rapping” with him in dialect, and allowing the child to bring his best friend to the session) a much fuller and richer sampling of the child’s language repertory was gained. Labov goes on to analyze the interview data and to make a strong argument that such speech is a flexible and logical mode of communication. He generalized from the interview material:

One can now transfer this demonstration of the socio-linguistic control of speech to the other test situations— including I.Q. and reading tests in school. The power relationships in a one-to-one confrontation between adult and child are too asymmetrical. This does not mean that some Negro children will not talk a great deal when alone with an adult, or that an adult cannot get close to any child. It means that the social situation is the most powerful determinant of verbal behavior and that an adult must enter in the right social relation with a child if he wants to find out what a child can do: that is just what many teachers cannot do. (Labov 1969:11)

Houston in the examination of some of the assumptions [the author refers to them as “myths”] concerning the language of poor children agrees with the preceding points. She concurs with Labov on the crucial role of sociolinguistic variables in the speech performance of children:

To be sure, lack of reinforcement for linguistic behavior must have an effect on the young child. Most probably, it is effective in limiting the use of language in non-reinforcing contexts. (Houston 1971:950)

More specifically the author cites some research she did among Black children in northern Florida. Two registers or ranges of language styles which have in common their appropriateness to a given situation or environment were found among these children.

These registers were termed by us the School and Non-school registers, because the first appeared primarily in school settings and with teachers and the second in other settings. However, the school register also was used with all persons perceived by the children as in authority over them or studying them in any way... and in formal and constrained situations... One may note that the characteristics of the School register include most of the observations given... as indications of disadvantaged nonfluency. It should be added that the content expressed in this register tends to be rather limited and non-revelatory of the children’s attitudes, feelings and ideas. (Houston 1971:952-53)

The situational variation in use of language, switching of registers and of styles within
registers, may be a specific instance of what has been referred to in another report as "coping" or "survival" skills (Bachelor et al. 1970). Language itself is not a skill but is more in the nature of an innate property of the organism (Lenneberg 1964, 1966; Chamsky 1965); but, the collecting, interpreting of cues, and reacting to them linguistically can be seen as a skill—one so securely internalized as to be used unconsciously. And, coping skills means those sensitivities to cues and modes of reacting to them which has allowed the child growing up in poverty to survive physically and psychically.

The research done at the child development centers of the Albuquerque Comprehensive Child Care and Development Project infer something of the existence of survival skills. It was found that among approximately 75 children aged two years six months to five years eleven months the mean scores on the Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test (PPVT) were just about one standard deviation below the national mean. (The mean IQ score for the sample was 84.9.) The mean IQ scores obtained from a sub-sample of 25 children on the Wechsler Pre-school and Primary Scale of Intelligence (WPPSI) was 85.16. By contrast, the mean Social Quotient (SQ) for these children was more than one standard deviation above the national mean on the Vineland Scale of Social Maturity (VSMS). The VSMS is an observer scored test which attempts to measure a child's independence from adult help by means of items asking whether or not a child can perform a given task, i.e., feed himself, dress himself, take trips alone and so on (Bachelor et al. 1970).

The depressed scores of these children on the PPVT and WPPSI may illustrate the impact of the sociolinguistic variables discussed by Labov and Houston. Scores on the VSMS, however, may be interpreted as signifying the children's early acquisition of skills necessary to cope with a poverty environment, in this instance the early development of independence. If such coping skills are encouraged in a poverty milieu, the VSMS is, at best, a very limited sampling of such behavior since it concentrates on at-home activities. The poor child usually enters the street or peer group environment at a very early age (as compared to middle-class children); perhaps there is large component of street skills or abilities to deal with the environment outside the home within any set of coping or survival skills. The work at the Child Development Project is now concentrated on specifying situational factors influencing performance and coping or survival skills.

A final consideration in developing a realistic image of the poor child comes from basic research in psychology and deals specifically with children's imagery and learning of paired-associate (PA) words. It has been found that in a sample of 432 children, grades 1, 3, and 6 in schools stratified by socio-economic characteristics, low strata children performed on the PA experiment just as well as the high strata children. This finding contradicted the author's hypothesis that since low strata children should also show less learning facilitation when compared to high strata children in the PA experiment. The authors discussed the findings in this manner:

The relatively high degree of learning proficiency observed among children from low strata schools is at once the most puzzling and most promising aspect of the present results ... The teachers of the children from the low strata schools corroborated the simplistic inference indicated by standardized test performance in describing their students as being slow to learn and difficult to teach ... A more likely interpretation of the discrepancy is that it occurs because of pronounced differences between the conditions of learning that are characteristic of the laboratory ... three ends of such differences may be distinguished. First, greater control of the focus of the child's attention is achieved in the laboratory than in the classroom ... Second, the requirements of the child's task are explicitly detailed to a much greater extent in the laboratory than in the classroom. Third, in the laboratory case, the information necessary for the child to make a judgment about the adequacy of
his performance is inherent in the learning materials themselves, whereas in the classroom such information is typically made available only in the teacher’s reaction to the child’s behavior and not within the boundaries of the task itself. (Rohwer et al 1968:29-30)

In another place the major writer calls attention to findings that there are apparently differing developmental trends in children’s use of imagery in learning between middle-class and lower-class Black children (Rohwer 1970:401). These developmental variations in imagery could be attributed to sociolinguistic variables due to the manner in which the experiments were carried out. However, it is just as plausible to maintain that the necessity of responding to quite different environments influences the development of different mnemonic and learning structures at different times among poor and not-so-poor children.

The image of the poor child which appears to be emerging from the literature just discussed is more human, but it is still obscure in several crucial areas. It is clear that the poor child is not the retarded little beast some imply he is. He appears to have decided linguistic and behavioral skills, though in many respects it is very hard to describe them yet with any precision. From this review of more balanced, although inferential and heuristic, studies it appears that the core of the problem is the inferior school performance of the poor child can be relieved by getting the child to perform better in school situations, on the one hand, and on the other of getting the schools and teachers to see that their image of poor children is all too often punitive and obtuse.

CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS:

Where do we go from here? Common sense dictates that something must be done to or for or with the poor child in order to place him on a competitive level with his middle class counterpart. The writers feel that two channels for change are available: changing the schools and development of new pre-school or intervention programs.

Pre-school or intervention programs are probably the easiest route, because they remove remediation and prevention from the schools. Ideally, intervention programs prepare the child to be assimilated into an ongoing system. Intervention programs are too new to have documented their successes; only their failings are documented.

Head Start critics are abundant (Cawley 1968; Cicerelli 1969; Coleman 1966; Jensen 1969; Kean 1970; Osborn 1969; Shore 1971; Van 1971). But, even a cursory look at the literature reveals that the criticisms leveled are as inconclusive as the praise given these programs. As with most innovations, only time will accurately pinpoint their specific strengths and weaknesses, and as for the battles presently being waged for and against such programs, they are probably very healthy for academics, in general. As is evidenced in the first section of this paper, the view of the poor child has been far too complacent, far too pejorative. Authorities on deprivation assumed that deficiencies are cumulative; a child from a poor background entered school at a slight disadvantage and underwent a steady decline. By the sixth grade he was as much as three years behind his grade level. But what of the benefits of intervention programs? Could they not also be cumulative? It is not inconceivable that lower class children helped by their coping skills and a kick-off from a properly articulated intervention program, could enter school at a slight disadvantage and begin a steady incline; by sixth grade they could be two or three years ahead of grade level (Strickland 1971:7). Granted, the assumption is tenuous, but maybe not altogether unwarranted. As with any assumption, time will tell; it is the hope of these writers that intervention programs will not be cast aside until such time as enough hard data can be generated to either prove or disprove their merits.

For now, intervention programs may be justified on the grounds that since generally they aren’t subject to any of the public school red tape, they are an excellent proving ground for innovations in both child and teacher
training. They have opened communications between home and school. They provide jobs, dignity, and money for residents of poor neighborhoods and therefore prop up the economy while freeing parents for work and leisure. Their medical services and meals enable the child to learn better or at least live a more comfortable life. Perhaps these are reasons enough to silence critics until data is available. Arthur Jensen (1969) says that intervention programs are not useful, because they do not raise IQ substantially; their only benefit to the child is in raising his grade point average. It is the opinion of these writers that better grades are justification enough for continuance of these programs, since grades bear same positive relationship to success in employment.

Changing the schools is a knotty problem. The concept of school is deceptive; school exists as a separate entity capable of working changes upon those who enter, but generally incapable of change within itself. As people have accepted IQ scores as the only valid assessment of intelligence, so they accept the school as the only place one can learn; it is looked upon as the supreme holder of knowledge. Anyone who fails to learn is deficient, or defective. But schools are now the subject of serious scrutiny. Educators are aware that IQ's are not the only measure of intelligence. Intelligence, aptitude, learning, call it what you may, is nothing more than behaving efficiently in a particular situation (Maslow 1944). For the poor child the intelligence test may not be a justifiable situation for measuring the efficiency of behaving; the school may also be the incorrect situation for judging the learning abilities of poor children.

Issue can be taken with the deprivation theorists and the school on two levels. First, it must be shown that IQ and achievement tests, and the masses of data generated through their use, somehow do not measure skills and competencies of poor children validly or that tests do not take in all the socially useful skills developed in children. Arthur Jensen (1961) clearly demonstrated that although intelligence tests aptly identified middle class children of high and low ability, they were inefficient in categorizing the intellectual capacities of poor children. Other studies of this kind have been mentioned in sections II and III; more are needed. We speak of beginning the educational process “where the child is at.” More investigation into the strengths of poor children may reveal where the “AT” is really at (Sears 1966:7).

Secondly, failure in the public school is seen by the deprivation theorists as originating largely outside the school and in the home. The child entering school from a poor home is seen as disadvantaged because he has not been taught certain things in the home. The public schools may not succeed in helping this child, but such failure is after the fact. Such reasoning is dangerous... “because it diverts attention from the real defects of our educational system to the imaginary defects of the child” (Labov 1969:2). We feel that if the school fails it is because it does not recognize the child’s needs and respond to them. Schools for poor children should begin at different developmentally earlier points than they do for the typical middle-class child. Whether or not the poor child can or will ever catch up is not an issue dealt with very often, but when it is, the conclusions are usually pessimistic. But, deprivation theorists and the schools cannot be blamed entirely. Pessimism is usually the easiest way out. An optimistic view of the poor child’s future may cost time, money, and will involve a serious rocking of the boat.

Regardless of the formidable odds, these writers would like to present some suggestions for changing schools. To begin, we must rid ourselves of the missionary zeal with which we attack poor children. No, not everyone should nor wants to be WASP. Secondly, we must not delude ourselves by thinking that poverty is precious or charming. One the contrary, the poor “trip” is a “bummer.” Thirdly, we must examine what happens in the schools that causes poor children to fail. Surely, the high drop out rate must indicate that schools are also failing. Along these lines Labov states:

Before we impose middle class verbal
style on children from other cultural groups, we should find out how much of this is useful for the main work of analyzing and generalizing, and how much is mere stylistic—or even dysfunctional. In high school and college middle class children spontaneously complicate their syntax to the point that instructors despair of getting them to make their language simpler and clearer. In every learned journal one can find examples of jargon and empty elaboration—and complaints about it. Is the 'elaborated code' of Bernstein really so flexible, detailed and subtle as some psychologists believe? Is it not also turgid, redundant, and empty? Is it not simply an elaborated style, rather than a superior code or system.

Our work in the speech community makes it painfully obvious that in many ways working-class speakers are more effective narrators, reasoners, and debaters than middle-class speakers who temporized, qualify, and lose their argument in a mass of irrelevant detail. Many academic writers try to rid themselves of that part of middle-class style that is empty pretension, and keep that part that is needed for precision. But the average middle-class speaker that we encounter makes no such effort; he is enmeshed in verbiage the victim of sociolinguistic factors beyond his control.* (Labov 1969:12)

Susan Houston (1971) refers to school and home registers of language. Both are now incorporated at the university level; perhaps they should be allowed to function interchangeably in the elementary classroom. Critics would say that poor children only use a restrictive code and are therefore non-verbal. But, the reader is asked to think: what code, restrictive or elaborated, do teachers use when addressing poor children (Hess 1970)?

Developmental psychology as proposed by Erickson points out that children between the ages of roughly 6 - 11 are characterized by feelings of industry versus inferiority.† At these ages there is marked competition for excellence and status permeated by the dread of failure. Although, success is not always necessary to reduce the feelings of inferiority, the child must be made to know that his efforts are appreciated and respected. This can probably be best accomplished by reducing comparisons among peers such as eliminating grades and tracking. As schools are now, they only seem to increase the poor child’s feeling of inferiority.

As the final, and perhaps most simplistic suggestion, we should like to suggest that poor children are a dilemma to the schools because they are ambiguous. They do not conform to the means of prediction and control used on middle-class children. Poor children do not look, smell, talk, act, or think like middle-class children. They are indeed confusing because the trained incapacity so prevalent in the schools is inappropriate in the light of the changed situation, i.e., poor children (Merton 1964). Perhaps the easiest method of guaranteeing success for poor children is to throw out the old rules, accept their ambiguity, and let the children lead the teachers in the learning process.

*Perhaps the authors should give thought to this allegation?

†Personal communications: S. Roll, Dept. of Psyc. UNM.
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INTRODUCTION

Being a fully competent member of society includes a recognition of the meaning of membership and competency. This reflexiveness takes the form of a sense of what a member must possess and who is to be allowed to participate in particular social situations.\(^1\)

Alternately, knowledge of what it means to be a non-member is part of the general role of a member. These rules or constitutive norms of social life are acquired relatively early in life.

Violations of these norms of social identity is one of the major concerns in E. Goffman's *Stigma*. Every transgression of these norms in the form of a discrediting discrepancy between an actor's virtual and actual identity calls into question the validity of these rules, since those who cannot sustain competency may still seek to do so.\(^2\) Then the everyday grounds for judging others and oneself are made problematic, since actors are uncertain about the kinds of claims that might be made by both the discrepant and the conventional individuals.

These "primal scenes" of social life, as Goffman observes, are often filled with embarrassment, awkwardness and confusion. These encounters threaten the "normal" person's belief in the culture in two ways. First, the one to one correspondence of the social and the natural order or the correspondence between the way things are anticipated and the way they actually turn out, is called into question. Secondly, if he continues to consider the discrepant person as not being incompetent, he calls into question the everyday grounds for judgement of normalcy, including his own.

Despite these initial uncertainties, the appearance of such strains are manageable within the social and cultural order. Once

---


\(^2\) Ibid., 5.
societally designated agents redefine the discrepant actor as being outside the conventional social order, the everyday grounds for the judgement of identity are confirmed, thereby restoring the members' belief in the cultural formulae.3

Moreover, the removal of uncertainty allows the stigmatized actor to continue his membership in the social order, albeit in a radically different role.4,5

To illustrate: once an actor has acquired a spoiled identity, as Goffman notes, he finds that later encounters in his career as a stigmatized person have a typified quality.6 He builds models of others' responses to himself and creates his own self-typifications (i.e., models of his own responses to others.)7 Thus, when performance deviates from the norms, ritualization of the event enables both the normal and stigmatized to overcome a major threat to organized social life: the inability of the culture to sustain predictability in social interaction.

The process of recognition and acceptance of stigma reveals the problem of articulation between culture and social structure in the following ways: (1) how society manages to restore the credibility of the culture through the victimization of someone who was previously regarded as a competent member of the social order, and (2) how this victimization is controlled in its intensity and scope so that the stigmatized person and the normal individual are able to establish new typifications.

In some cases the stigma attributed to the person results from intentional violations of cultural prescriptions or proscriptions. In such situations, legitimate justifications for terminating relations with the stigmatized individual are readily available and can be invoked by the morally upright. The certainty of the cultural formulae is not called into question so long as punishment is employed to restore belief in the security that norms provide as symbols of social order.8

More interesting for the examination of our problem are cases involving individuals who became stigmatized even though they followed the cultural recipes. The problem of involuntary deviance threatens the certainty of the culture, since obedience is rewarded with disappointment and derogation.

The diagnosis of permanent disability in a child provides a situation which illustrates the fully social character of the recognition and acceptance of stigma and thereby the reduction of uncertainty.9 The responses

3 The encounters where individuals are conferred their stigmatized status have been called "degradation ceremonies" by H. Garfinkel, Conditions of successful degradation ceremonies, American Journal of Sociology 61 (1956).

4 In turn, the primacy of the cultural order is recognized by the stigmatized as well as the normal. For example, one can suggest that perhaps normal actors who acquire a stigma late in life know its meaning too well to accept it without seeking to deny it first. Hence, the need for ritualization to confirm the most dread of perceptions. In a sociological sense, "facts" are given an objective character in these performances. See Goffman, op. cit., 32-34, on the "Moral Career" of the Stigmatized.


7 A Schutz has called these constructs "course-of-action types." He writes that "we implicate the more or less anonymous actors a set of supposedly invariant motives which govern their actions. This set is itself a construct of typical expectations of the Other's behavior. . ." Moreover, "in typifying the Other's behavior I am typifying my own which is interrelated with his. . ." Collected Papers, vol. 1, The Problem of Social Reality (The Hague, Martinus Nijhoff, 1962) 19,25.


9 H. Kelman found this event to be "stigma-producing" in his study titled, Mothers' perceptions of the effects of non-institutional mongoloid children upon their families (Ph.D. diss., New York University, 1959) 53.
reported in this paper are derived from interviews with 103 mothers of mentally retarded children who were asked to relate their early experiences concerning the discovery of their children's condition. In these cases medical personnel were the agents who confirmed the discrepancy from normality, thus bestowing a stigmatized status upon the child and a "courtesy stigma" upon the parent.

The acquisition of a "courtesy stigma" meant a stripping away of various justifications the women had employed to continue regarding themselves as mothers of normal children.

In order for mothers of mentally retarded children to realize that their offspring were not the same as other children, they had to become aware that the signs they observed indicated permanent disability. Whatever their nature, respondents first considered these discrepancies to be temporary.

Recognition of their meaning was beyond the scope of the mothers' original expectations about parenthood. Women are prepared during pregnancy to anticipate a normal child and may well believe they have one for some time after he is born.

Until the child was diagnosed by a physician as mentally retarded, the respondents did not consider their situation to be different from that of other mothers. When the child was defined as retarded, mothers responded emotionally to a new meaning applied to an on-going situation. While still performing the same tasks as mothers of "normal" children, they had to respond to many expectations which were largely irrelevant to these activities; for example, they had to tell others about the child's condition and seek help at specialized clinics and agencies. A redefinition of their role as mothers was encouraged by the actions and attitudes of the respondents' families, friends and neighbors.

RECOGNITION

While often it was the mother of the retarded child who first perceived that her baby was somehow different, the discrepancy between her institutionalized role and actual behavior did not become apparent until the child was diagnosed as mentally retarded. The mother of a mongoloid girl illustrates the initial ambiguity of the situation:

Interviewer: When did you feel that your child was different?

Respondent: A couple of days old. I noticed it in the hospital.

Interviewer: Was it something about her behavior or the way she looked?

Respondent: She looked. In the face.

Interviewer: What did you do then?

Respondent: I tried to put it out of my mind. I thought I was imagining things. But you see, she didn't cry at

10 The adaptations of mothers of mentally retarded children were studied through interviews with 103 women, the majority of whose children were moderately retarded and almost all of whom lived at home. The schedule was concerned with: (1) how mothers learned their children were retarded, (2) their perspective on the child, (3) the extent of interaction with similarly situated others, (4) the condition of the child, and (5) the background characteristics of the mother and family. For a full report of the results of this project, see A. Birenbaum, Non-Institutionalized roles and role formation: a study of mothers of mentally retarded children (Ph.D. diss., Columbia University, 1968).

11 Goffman makes the point that those related to stigmatized actors via specified role relationships receive a stigma of a different kind and of diminished intensity. The problems of managing a spoiled identity based on a "courtesy stigma" are not radically different from those with stigmas based on "soiled biographies." See Stigma, p.30.

12 F. Davis, in Passage Through Crises (Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill, 1963) presents similar findings on the recognition and defining experiences of the families of polio victims. See especially chapter 2, The Crises experience, 20-23.
all. She made a certain face—she screwed up her face like another child would cry, but no sound came. And I could see the expression on her face. I knew nothing about this condition, but I just saw it.

In almost two-thirds of the cases, the discovery of these signs was made by the mothers who mentioned two major cues as the initial sources of awareness that their children were different:

(1) The failure of the child to develop according to expectations about maturation, such as not sitting up at the appropriate age, and

(2) an unusual physical appearance, such as slanted eyes in the case of a child who is mongoloid.

While the degree of anxiety expressed upon discovery of early signs varied, most mothers attributed the child’s condition to the routine uncertainties of child development:

Interviewer: When did you feel that your child was different?

Respondent: It was almost from the beginning when the child, the infant, usually starts to do things, he was late in everything. So that we felt originally that since there were no other signs of anything wrong, a lot of children are late walking. So that we really didn’t—he was a happy infant, so we never really paid too much attention. We just felt, well, he’s just late.

Attribution of these discrepancies to routine variations in child development was enhanced by the fact that they were most often noticed when the retardate was six months of age or younger, a time when children show wide differences in maturation.\(^\text{13}\)

Despite the perception of “something different,” few mothers at this point believed their children were not “normal.” Since the discrepancies were manifested by the absence of achievement, rather than the presence of specifiable symptoms of illness, many mothers considered them to be transitory aspects of maturation. While over half the sample did seek the services of the attending pediatrician for an investigation of the child’s symptoms, only nine respondents were so concerned about these signs of mental retardation that they immediately sought a comprehensive evaluation of the child at a clinic or hospital. Almost one-third of the women either took no action at the time the cues were first noticed, or waited until the child’s scheduled examination to discuss the matter with their pediatrician. In general, it can be said that recognition of the discrepancy between the child’s expected and actual behavior was insufficient to bring about a redefinition of the child and accordingly of the mother’s role.

**DIAGNOSIS BY PHYSICIANS**

The initial diagnoses by the members of the medical profession in response to the parents’ concern about their children’s condition were often indefinite and uncertain; occasionally they were wrong. In half the cases the attending physician said that the child was “slow” or that he was not sure what was wrong with the patient. Doctors were able to diagnose the children as mentally retarded and specify the cause in only a little over one-third of the cases. Furthermore it would be noted that few mothers were given any advice at all about what they should do for their children. Thus the initial examination usually increased the parents’ concern about what they observed in their children rather than providing a definite answer.

Many mothers were dissatisfied with the results of the initial examination. Afterwards 46% of the respondents went to a diagnostic clinic, a neurologist or another pediatrician without the recommendation of the attending physician.

---

\(^{13}\) The importance of poor school performance as an indicator of mild retardation was minimized in this study because of the prevalence of moderately retarded children in the sample. IQ data were available for only 52 retarded children of the mothers interviewed, over 60% of whom had scores below 52. See Birenbaum, op. cit., p. 303.
Although mothers became aware of the possibility that their children might be retarded during their quest for a satisfactory evaluation, most respondents described the experience of receiving the diagnosis of definite mental retardation as traumatic.\textsuperscript{14} It was at this point that the facts of "difference" in the child were given a stigma-generating character, initiating the social transformation of the child and other members of the family.

Interviewer: How did you feel at the time the doctor talked to you?

Respondent: I was completely devastated. It was traumatic.

Interviewer: What were you thinking? Do you remember?

Respondent: I'm sure I was in a state of shock. I remember breaking out in a cold sweat and of course first thinking it wasn't true-he was wrong. I guess I must have run the gamut of emotions. Because I remember coming-well, all I could say is at that moment and for a few days afterwards certainly, I was in a state of shock. I remember my husband thought, who may or may not have suspected. I don't think so, because neither one of us had been married before. We had married late in life and we were very excited about this. And he said to me, well is she any less precious today than she was yesterday? You know, having known. And my reaction was, yes. I had the reaction (that) because she wasn't normal I couldn't love her, and I contemplated suicide. I contemplated drowning her.

Other respondents used a variety of metaphor to express the idea of "shock" in their reaction to the diagnosis:

Interviewer: How did you feel at the time (when the doctor told you the child was retarded)?

Respondent: I think I was very numb. My whole world was numb.

Interviewer: What do you mean, you were very numb? What were you thinking at the time?

Respondent: That my dreams and all my ideas had just died.

Interviewer: How did you feel at the time, when they told you?

Respondent: Oh, how did I feel? What do I have to tell you? Very bad. And I still feel sick. That's about it.

Interviewer: What you thinking at the time? Do you remember?

Respondent: As any mother thinks. You know, heartbroken, that's all.

\textsuperscript{14} It is possible that the extent of the initial trauma was due to the setting in which the mothers were told of their children's retardation. In over 70% of the cases on which data were available, respondents were alone with the doctor when the final diagnosis was presented. This nonchalant treatment of the situation may have increased the shock experienced by the mother. Since her husband was not asked to accompany her to the consultation, she probably expected that (a) no final evaluation would be given at this visit, (b) the evaluation would be of relatively minor impact on the child and the family, or (c) the physician would diagnose the child as normal. In the event of any of these anticipations, the mother would not be emotionally prepared for a definition of the child as mentally retarded.
Interestingly none of the respondents described their earlier experiences of recognizing differentness in their children in such dramatic terms. It was only when they received the final diagnosis that the facts of retardation were invested with meaning for them; and one aspect of this meaning was some loss of social competency on the part of the parents. Through their reactions to the news, the women were already performing their new role as mothers of retarded children. At the same time, by responding "as any mother would feel," they were reaffirming their questioned membership in the conventional social order. In so doing, they also reaffirmed their own belief in the cultural order, a prime commitment for those who wish to remain in the social order. Paradoxically, they were able to maintain some membership by recognizing their discrepancy. By receiving the courtesy stigma in a conventional way, they avoided further discreditation.

**THE RESPONSE OF FAMILY, FRIENDS & NEIGHBORS**

Once the diagnosis was accepted as final, parents were faced with the problem of notifying others of the child's condition. It was at this stage that respondents were compelled to establish new typifications in all their relationships, and then that it became clear to them that their new identity included a courtesy stigma.

While mothers, according to their accounts, did not evade telling their husbands and immediate families of the diagnosis, they found it more difficult to relate the news to friends and extended kin. Less than half of the respondents said they were able to tell their relatives and friends directly that the child was mentally retarded, and over 20% said they could not tell them right away. More than a fourth of the women did not make direct explanations, since they felt that friends and relatives either surmised the nature of the child's condition or were aware of its seriousness because of the mother's frequent visits to doctors.

As long as knowledge of the child's condition remained within the immediate family, the definition was private and had few consequences for ongoing interaction with friends and relatives. Making the knowledge available to people outside of the immediate family forced others to abandon their prior typifications about the child and his parents. They were expected to take the new definition into account in their relations with the afflicted family.

At the same time the retardate's parents were expected to accept demonstrations of support. Respondents said that friends and relatives reacted to the news that the child was retarded with gestures of support in 60% of the cases where such data were available. None of the women said friends and relatives were hostile toward the family at the time they were informed about the child's condition, although in 27 cases they were described as shocked and disbeliefing. The mother of an infant mongoloid girl here describes the elaborate expressions of support received by her family; the mother lived in a student housing unit, a relatively self-contained community where communication among members was frequent:

**Respondent:** At the beginning there was quite a feeling at the Seminary of solidarity behind us. A lot of people came to visit us and brought food and clothes. I wrote 75 thank you notes for her. We didn't keep it any secret around here.

Supportive responses indicate to the parents that they are still accepted as members of the conventional social order despite the abnormality of their children, and are thus conducive to the maintenance of the family's membership in social circles within the community. In addition such responses are

---

15 Although the mothers of retarded children perceived interaction with relatives, friends and neighbors to be strained, relationships were usually redefined rather than terminated. See Birenbaum, op. cit., chapter 5, Participation in the conventional social order, 92-135, especially 102-15.
probably a factor in discouraging early placement of the child in a state training school or private residence.

Most important, others directly encourage the mother to learn her new role. Personnel at diagnostic clinics, friends, and relatives provide her with contacts, leads and literature concerning the nature of disability and existing organizations where information and services can be obtained.16

Respondents indicated that they were expected to become acquainted with the field of mental retardation and to learn how to be the parent of a retarded child. In fact, this was an enforced aspect of role performance, as demonstrated by the following incident where a mother was sanctioned by her neighbors for her failure to perform according to their expectations:

Interviewer: How did you break the news to your relatives and friends?

Respondent: As far as friends go, I felt, let them not know. It will be better for the child. Although evidently a few people in the building suspected something, and I was barraged with a series—believe it or not—anonymous mail, where if the Association for Retarded Children were having a benefit of some kind, they would pick out the clipping. And every time the word "retarded" appeared, they would underline it.

Thus, in various ways, mothers were constrained to seek help through the specialized facilities for mentally retarded children, which made possible a redefinition of the situation from an unexpected uncertainty to a manageable problem. In so doing they were able to regard their role as mothers as retarded children as extensions of the generic role of mother rather than as opprobrious alternatives.

CONCLUSION

Transition from the normal motherhood role to that of mother of a retarded child was activated by the impact of defining the child as retarded. Prior to the diagnosis of mental retardation, the behavioral and physical symptoms of the child were not considered by the mothers to be signs of a permanent condition. They were not harbingers of disability until invested with meaning by a person legitimated to interpret them.

When performing the role of a parent of a normal, temporarily sick child, the mother sought an accurate diagnosis of the child’s condition, preferably in conventional terms. After he was diagnosed as mentally retarded, the child was regarded as permanently impaired and as qualitatively different from "normal" children. Normative expectations of medical aid were rendered inapplicable when the mother learned that treatment would not remedy the condition.

At this point the recipes she had learned in order to handle the anticipated problems of parenthood were ineffective and the mother did not know what to expect from her child. Despite initial uncertainty she was able to acquire the knowledge and ability to raise a mentally retarded child and to manage the strained interactions between her now discredited self and others in the community.17

The process of recognition and acceptance of stigma reveals an underlying restoration of the cultural and social order. If we go beyond the immediate drama of disappointment and derogation, in which the mentally retarded child and his parents are the central

16 The importance of such organizations as The Association for the Help of Retarded Children is discussed in Birenbaum, op. cit., chapter 4, A New location in the social order, 63-91.

17 See Kelman, op. cit.; F. Schonell & B. Watts, A First survey of the effects of a subnormal child on the family unit, American Journal of Mental Deficiency 61 (1956) 217; and E. Kramm, Families of Mongoloid Children Bulletin no. 401-1963 (Washington, DC: The Children's Bureau, 1963) 39; for similar findings, although somewhat more quantitative, on changes in relationships between the mother or a retarded child and relatives, friends and neighbors.
protagonists, there lies the general uncertainty created by their situation. Retardation is not predictable according to the culture and appears among competent members of the society who have performed their pre-parental and early parental roles in conformity to the rules.

Such an anomalous situation cannot remain unnoticed. Conventional actors reaffirm their belief in the cultural formulae by proferring a stigma which redefines those discrepant individuals’ past and future performances as no longer accountable to that set of rules. The stigmatized are “removed” from the conventional social order, and in so doing, the conventional members re-establish the primacy of such cultural directives as “competent parents produce competent offspring.” Abnormality, in itself, so long as it is recognized as being outside the conventional social order, does not threaten the members’ belief in the cultural formulae. More importantly, it confirms them as everyday grounds for the judgment of normalcy.

The reaffirmation of the validity of the cultural order does not end with conventional members of society. Stigma profferment not only offers the mothers a new identification; they accept it because their belief in the cultural formulae has been threatened.

Still it must be remembered that mothers of retarded children rarely for sake their membership in the conventional social order. By definition, they bear a courtesy stigma, the result of a continuous relationship with their fully stigmatized children. At the same time, they have continuous relationships with fully normal members of the social order (often, among them, being a mother to a normal child.)

The person in such a situation has many responsibilities within the conventional social order with which greater stigmatization might interfere. Not unimportant among them is one of coordinator and interpreter of the universe of mental retardation to the conventional world, and of the conventional world to the retarded. In being so constrained by their dual membership, mothers often seek to convey the image that the uncertainty created by the presence of a retarded child in the home and community is transformable into a manageable problem. To the extent that mothers are able to appear as “models of adjustment” to their situation, the family unity remains integrated within the community. Thus both the social and cultural order are maintained in spite of unanticipated events.
CHILDHOOD AS A CONVERSATION OF GESTURES

YOUNG CHILDREN, it is conventionally assumed, remain incompetent participants in social interaction until they have mastered the intricacies of adult speech. This conception of the child is embedded in the works of Piaget (1968) who has asserted that until approximately seven, children engage in open monologues with one another—they are incapable of aligning their actions with others. Cooley (1908) set the emergence of social self-directed behavior at the point of correct pronoun usage. Allport (1961) argued that social behavior coincides with an understanding of the personal name.

These and other theorists have assumed a rather special view of language, seeing it as a set of more or less significant gestures, the use of which calls forth in both speaker and listener approximately the same response. In addition, judgements about the “social qualities” of any behavior sequence have been assessed from the perspective of the adult. This dual focus on adult conceptions of language and social behavior has created a rather narrow view of childhood in general and language and social behavior in particular. In this essay I shall propose that it is possible to view early childhood (approximately 8 to 24 months) as a complex social order, a social order that demands for its maintenance a set of coherent symbols, gestures and languages. These languages are developed through interaction between child and parent. I know of no unit of early childhood conduct that cannot be easily matched with taken-for-granted adultlike behavior. Although resting on different motivational, meaning, and interactional structures, children engage in behavior which is every bit as humanly social as the sequences of actions routinely undertaken by “normal” functioning adults.¹

¹ In part I borrow this assumption from Goffman (1967:147) who asserts in his analysis of mental illness that:

I know of no psychotic misconduct that cannot be matched precisely in everyday life by the conduct of persons who are not psychologically ill nor considered to be so.
My intention is to revise current sociological conceptions of childhood, language, and social behavior by drawing on field observations of one, two, three and four year olds in family, pre-school and recreational settings.2

LANGUAGE AS A SET OF INDICATIVE GESTURES

As noted above, students of early childhood have traditionally employed an adult conception of language. By stressing the function and importance of personal pronouns, the sequencing of vocal utterances into subject-object patterns, the rate of verb acquisition, and the sheer quantity of understood or vocalized words, investigators have overlooked a number of nuances of early childhood speech. (For reviews see Grinshaw 1969: 312-21; Gunperz 1967: 219-31). On the basis of these formal attributes of speech, investigators have concluded that young children are egocentric in their thought patterns.

By examining only spoken and verbalized speech, investigators have tended to give scant attention to the silent gestural components of language. It is a central thesis of this discussion that early childhood speech, indeed speech at any age level, cannot be understood without first taking serious account of these silent gestural aspects of language.

Another important bias has shaped the study of language. This has been the tendency to view language as either caused by attributes of social structure, or to view it as an independent variable which shapes variations in social structures (Grinshaw 1969: 312-21). Although evidence can be gathered to support both views, neither does justice to the interactional qualities of language. It is appropriate to view language as a situated production which varies by the definitions given objects, selves, others, time-place, and the social relationship between speakers. Seen in this light, language becomes a complex gestural system which is created and maintained through symbolic interaction. Its sheer existence serves to give social groups means by which insiders and outsiders can be identified, labeled and acted towards. Its organization into what may be termed “language communities” gives all members of that community routine and consensual grounds for ongoing action.

Embedded within any language structure are a set of rules concerning how words and thoughts are put together. Additionally, all language structures mirror, if not create, interactional rules of conduct. Thus honorific systems of exchange both inform and dictate to their users how persons in varying statuses (rich-poor, educated-uneducated, clerk-customer, child-adult) are to be spoken to and hence treated. Language brings persons together and at the same time separates them from one another. In this way a civil interactional order is maintained. Entry into any language system demands that one play by these rules. That he speak when spoken to and that he replies “on topic”—in short, that he make himself available for interaction in ways prescribed by his society’s, group’s or relationship’s etiquette and language rules. I shall show shortly how aspects of adult society are peculiarly present in the world of young children. Failing to enter the adults’ language community, the young child creates his own world of symbols and meanings. This world is created in concert with adults, namely parents, and if peers and siblings are present, with them, too. This language system leads to recurrent violations of adult etiquette and consequently has misled previous investigators into assuming that young children are “asocial” interactants.

Before turning to alternative conceptions of social behavior, it is necessary to offer an expanded conception of language. Mead’s (1934) terms, significant gesture and conversation of gestures, provide this conception. Rather than focusing on the sequence of vocal utterances within

2 I have described one of these research settings in my “The Genesis of Self in Early Childhood.” Sociological Quarterly, 13 (Spring 1972). This is a racially mixed preschool that accommodates approximately 100 three and four year old children. My observations on two year olds also come from a racially mixed preschool that accommodates 50 children under a parent cooperative system. My observations on children under the age of two years come from my own two daughters.
CONCEPTIONS OF NORMAL SOCIAL CONDUCT

Students of everyday interaction, especially Goffman (1963) and Garfinkel (1967), have deduced a number of taken-for-granted features of routine adult conduct. Interaction is temporally sequenced and spatially bound. It involves negotiations between interacting selves. Talk is its central feature and talk or conversation often ignores actions and objects that are only tacitly recognized. Objects are assigned meanings that hold for the occasion of interaction. When in one another's presence interactants are expected to maintain a mutual openness of speech, body alignment, and eye contact. They are expected to orient themselves to the utterances and actions of their fellow participants. Consensually defined roles will be worked out by each partner along mutually accommodative lines. Embarrassing attributes of speech, action, or dress are expected to be ignored or suspended from consideration. Mood, affect, and involvement must also be controlled. Emotions must not get out of hand. Their presence is expected to lie inside the private dialogue each person has within himself. Emotions are not to be acted out.

If there is a single theme uniting these conceptions of social behavior, it is that social conduct involves interacting selves capable of conversing within consensually defined language systems. This cannot be disputed. The error is to assume that adult conceptions of language and social behavior provide the grounds for evaluating what is or is not language and social behavior. My thesis thus appears. Children are social interactants far before the appearance of systematic pronoun usage – even before names are fully understood. They are social interactants initially because they are treated as valued social objects by their socializing agents (parents, siblings, peers). Suited out with the barest of neurological equipment, infants are immediately transformed from the status of "thing" to the role of self or social being. This fact can only be grasped by following the unfolding trajectory of experiences and actions of the very young child. The clue to the emergence of social, self-directed behavior in young children comes from their evolving gestural systems.

Language as a set of indicative gestures becomes the medium through which normal everyday social conduct appears. Modifications of taken-for-granted language structures signal the appearance of unique social worlds where new and different forms of thought, action, and conduct are sanctioned. Childhood becomes a negotiated world of thought and action that rests on a special system of indicative gestures. It is a conversation of gestures. This language is alien to all persons who have not aided in its production.

3 I am indebted to Herbert Blumer for this concept and view of language.

4 This assertion requires a defense of my methods of observation and analysis. In my studies of young children I have acted as a participant in their world. In the preschool I sit and have juice with them, help them repair their toys and converse when they desire interaction. With my daughters I have been an active participant in the creation and validation of their language system. I am of the opinion that the most valued sociological observations come from those situations where the researcher enters into and grasps the languages of those he studies. This demands attempts at "insider" research. The measure of my success can only be tested by future researchers. This position leads to the argument that the language of young children (indeed of all people) is alien to the outsider who has not participated in that languages' production.
I turn now to the distinguishing features of early childhood speech and language. I shall indicate how routine aspects of adult speech and social conduct become problematic and differentially defined features of the child's world. In this analysis the perspective of the child and the adult will be alternatively stressed. If I have erred, it is because I have attempted to enter the child's world and view adults from his point of view. Taken on their own grounds, children are engaged in serious action—not play, "asocial," non-person, or unserious conduct as so many have assumed.

**THE LANGUAGE & CONDUCT OF YOUNG CHILDREN**

The following features are crucial for an understanding of early childhood speech. It is important to underscore the fact that these features have meaning only within the expanded conception of language offered earlier, that is as a set of indicative gestures.

First, it will be found that the same word (baby, mommy, bow wow) can cover and, to the outsider, blur the meaning given several distinct objects, moods, and relationships. But while the same word appears to be incorrectly employed, its "in context" meaning appears when followed by a set of body gestures. Two examples from the actions of early pre-school children illustrate this. The author's oldest daughter (25 months old) employs the word baby as a designation of her younger sister (12 months old). The word baby, however, refers to other objects and actions. Baby can mean a doll, any small child seen on the street, or the child's actions when she sees herself acting as a baby. Of most importance are those utterances of "baby" when her sister is not present. To an outsider such statements lack meaning. The actions her sister (baby) would take towards a problematic object, however, can be best indicated by employing the word baby. This utterance thus designates the actions the speaker would not take toward the object (a drink, ashtray, etc.). When accompanied by a shake of the head, hands or arms, this interpretation is easily grasped by her sister and parents. This interpretation is situated and has reference only within the biographical history of the speaker and listener. It is a consensual gesture for the family which represents a distinct language community.

This example highlights the historical and biographical components of early childhood speech. I wish to stress another aspect of this first feature—the apparent indiscriminate use of words. The meaning of any utterance can only be understood by grasping the character of the actions taken toward the designated object. Speech is embedded in action. Two boys (three/two and one half years old) were talking and looking at a pair of caged rabbits at their pre-school. The following conversation and sequence of actions was recorded:

The two boys, T and J, go over to the rabbit cage and begin pointing at the rabbits saying, "Mommy, mommy, daddy, daddy!" T points to the water bottle several times and says, "Mommy, mommy!" The instructor (C) comes up and says, "Oh, it's empty; let's go fill it. Would you like to go get some water for it?"—never designating a boy by name or gesture. T leaves and returns with a filled bottle. C places the water bottle in the cage and says to T, "How would you like to put this away?"—only pointing and not referring to it by name, "and then we'll go get some lettuce!" T removes his jacket (the it) and puts in in his locker. T and J cross the room, get the lettuce, and on returning says, "Habit, habit!"—for rabbit. They go to the cage and begin stuffing lettuce in it. A fight ensues (with no spoken words) over who is going to close the door to the cage. Finally, C tells them how it is done and she closes it.

The episode ends at this point. C leaves the room and T and J go off to play records. There are several features in this example which defy understanding until the actions and utterances of T, J and C are seen within their relational and interactional context. The initial utterances of "Mommy" and "Daddy" display an early grasp of sex differences in animals. It is clear the reference was made to the rabbits. However of first hearing this
speech sequence, I was baffled because I knew the children's parents were not at the preschool that morning. I attempted to locate a mother and father near the rabbit cage. There were none. The utterances only had meaning with respect to the rabbits.

A second important feature of this episode was T pointing to the water bottle in the cage and repeating the word mommy. He felt the mother rabbit needed water but the water bottle was empty. An observer farther than five feet from the cage would have made no sense of this statement. The word mommy accompanied by a gesture designating the water bottle filled out a proposed action sequence. It is important to note that this entire conversation of gestures was immediately understandable to the instructor. She was a part of the interaction. When C suggested that the water bottle be filled, she made no reference to either boy, yet T left with the bottle. To understand this action, the relationship between the boys had to be known. In their friendship, T was the leader and J the follower. It was obvious to both boys that if the bottle was to be filled, T would do it.

Then T removed his jacket at C's suggestion, the word jacket was not mentioned. It was pointed to—another instance of a word given meaning by an accompanying gesture.

The word "habbit" at this point in the episode (which lasted two minutes) was of course clear. Just as "mommy" and "daddy" can now be given correct meaning, there are two kinds of "habbits." The rabbit episode was consensually ended upon the closing of the cage door. At this point, J attempted to assert himself and to close the cage door. After all, T had gone for water. C entered the episode once again and successfully brought it to a negotiated conclusion. She closed the door.

I offer this extended discussion of the "habbit" episode to point out the significance of silent gestures, special words, social relationships, and on-going action for the young child's speech. I am convinced that these features are not unique to early language usage.

This first feature of the young child's speech, the use of gestures to precisely designate a particular object within a broad class of objects, is to be distinguished if only slightly from the second characteristic: the use of gestures to give an unclearly enunciated word precise meaning. The vocal utterances of young children are often slurred. For the adult accustomed to clearly enunciated words with proper emphasis on syllables, vowels and consonants, this early speech is often uninterpretable. Once again the young child struggles to communicate his thoughts through silent gestures. The sound "jewoush" may designate "juice." It is given additional and clarified meaning by bringing saliva to the lips. Saliva designates the middle phase of the social act the child wishes to carry out toward the object—that is, to procure juice and drink it.

Similar gestural differentiations are produced for discriminations between other liquids (milk, coke, water). In each case, saliva will be brought to the lips but then accompanied by pointing to the location of the desired liquid: for milk by pointing to the refrigerator, for coke by pointing to the upper shelf of the cupboard, and so on. This clarifying function of the gesture refers to the child's relational network where in a negotiated meaning for juice or other liquids has been settled upon. For the gesture to have meaning, it must be acted on by the parent in a way that complements the child's intentions. If it is not, the act is blocked. Frustrated, the child searches for another gesture or utterance. In the last resort the most significant gesture of all—the cry—will be called forth.

Third, words and gestures are employed by the young child to designate situational ownership of some object or set of objects crucial to an ongoing line of action. This feature of early childhood speech is centrally important because self declarations (the objectification of self) are made even though personal pronouns and names are not present in the child's vocabulary. Mead, although never setting precise ages, asserted that for the child to be social, and hence to have a self, he had to grasp the ongoing character of another's actions. Of crucial importance was the fact that the child had to be able to view
his actions from the stance of another person or object. This perception leads to the "objectification" of self and others—a necessary condition for all human, self directed social behavior. It is my thesis that young children objectify the self through non-verbal actions taken towards their valued social objects. These objects can range from dolls, blankets, special pieces of clothing or dress to themselves, siblings and parents. The eyes and hands are especially crucial in this early phase of self objectification. The child communicates who he is toward a valued non-verbal actions taken toward their valued definitions of the situation.

A peculiar mixture of repressive and restitutive justice underlies the young child's attempts at self objectification. When a valued object has been stolen or removed by a sibling or peer, an immediate response is demanded. If the valued object is not returned or substituted by one equally valued, the thief (villain) must be punished and the victim rewarded, if only in the name of justice. This is most evident in the actions of one and two year olds. A young child, perhaps playing with a favored blanket, has the blanket stolen by a sibling. If it cannot be returned by the child's own efforts, then what began as a simple game (the tease) becomes transformed into the "moral" arena of sacred selves. The baby's self has been challenged. A petition to higher authority is immediately called for. A deviant act has occurred. A cry, simultaneously joined by flailing arms and legs, announces the offense to the broader interactional community. The villain cannot escape. He has been publicly labeled by the offender. The system of justice now swings into force. Put on the spot, the parent or preschool instructor has no alternative but to intervene. Several options are available. Repressive justice in the form of a spanking or verbal sanctioning can be employed. Restitutive justice can be attempted. The victim can perhaps be assured by the proffering of an equally valued object. The villain can be persuaded to give up the object—without force. Depending on the severity of the offense, a negotiated settlement is most likely. The offender will be reprimanded, the offended soothed or cooled out.

However, the possibility always remains that a 'scene' will be created. Scenes can be created by one or both parties. In such instances all sense of justice collapses. The selves of all persons (offender, offended, instructor, parent, the watching audience) are collectively challenged. Children are adept at producing scenes. The following two episodes show how the offender (villain) can turn events around to make himself the victim—in this case, a victim of the "insensitive" instructor. The scene is the preschool. The participants: a four year old male, a three year old male playmate, the instructor of the school. K is the offender, A is the offended, and M the instructor.5

K and A were playing together in the corner by the stacked toys. A had a plastic banana that K wanted. K tried to take the banana from A and in so doing knocked A down and A immediately began to cry. M appeared and attempted to mediate and smooth things over, but as she approached, K backed off. She attempted to assure him that she regarded the incident as an accident and that she wasn't going to "hit him." He continued to avoid her and backed off. M made a last attempt to approach K, but he ran upstairs to the upper level of the dollhouse and sat on the corner of the bed. He sat with his arms folded for one or two minutes. Then pushing the incident from his mind, he began to amuse himself by making faces in the mirror. Two minutes elapsed during which time A went off to play, banana in hand, placated and soothed by the teacher's attention. K then ventured down the stairs, attracted by activities of

5 I am indebted to John Skelton for the following episode.
two girls playing at the foot of the dollhouse. M was standing in the middle of the room with her back to K. As K reached the foot of the stairs, M turned around quite suddenly. K's reactions were swift. He ran up the stairs again with the teacher calling after him.

(Second Scene) Some fifteen minutes later, K became involved in another scene. He approached the large "rocker toy" in the outer play area and jumped on the middle section as two girls were quietly rocking. The girls immediately jumped off and ran inside. K ran after them and yelled, with a noticeable lack of anger, "I'll get you guys!" He chases them inside and then out into the playground again. Giving up the chase, K entered the workshop; but as soon as the two girls returned to the rocking toy, he once again jumped on the middle section and violently pitched the rocker back and forth. Coming outside, M walked over to K and said, "I'm sorry K, but that's too dangerous." "No!" shouted K, and once again ran away from M.

K's actions were quite deliberate. In both scenes he refused to take the blame. He would not accept the instructor's definition of the situation. It was not an accident. He would not assume the villain role. Through his actions he refused the scheme of restitutive justice. The judge (M) and the victims (A and the two girls) became the offenders or villains. K emerged in both episodes (at least in his own mind) as the offended party. In both instances, his attempts at self objectification had been challenged. Through a silent dialogue, punctuated by a few short phrases, his definition of self and situation came forth.

**SELF OBJECTIFICATION, NORMAL TROUBLES, & TOTAL INSTITUTIONS**

It is necessary to digress and note how the recurrent efforts of the child to objectify self and others led to what parents call normal problems or normal trouble (Sudnow 1965:255-76; Canon 1966:18,67). Produced in scenes, normal trouble represents any situation where the child calls attention to himself and by direct implication involves the parent in that action. Embarrassment is the outcome (Gross & Stone 1963:1-15). These actions are problematic only when parent and child (1) find themselves in public behavior settings (stores, sidewalks, restaurants, hotels) or (2) encounter a private behavior setting (the home) that is transformed because of the appearance of guests or outsiders into a public setting. In both situations the parent is held accountable for the child's "sociable" conduct—the child is expected to complement the parent's line of action by acting properly. When the parent fails to do so, the self is challenged—the parent has failed to produce a child who will not create scenes. These scenes range from outright screaming tantrums to refusals to walk or sit in a stroller, messing with display items, demanding food in the grocery store, wetting or messing diapers, asking to go to the bathroom that's unavailable, talking or jabbering loudly to everyone within distance, throwing items on floor or sidewalk. The list of causing scenes is endless. Children are skilled at producing novel variations on normal problems. A parent may feel that a child is toilet trained only to discover that he always demands to go to the bathroom in the grocery store. Food may be purchased immediately upon entry into a store and then refused. Distracting items may be brought by the parent and these also rejected.

A constant accommodative tension underlies the parents' attempts to soothe the child's efforts at self objectification. Tension appears simply because the child is constantly changing and testing out or trying on new self conceptions. Each of these conceptions has the potential of creating scenes in public places.

Paradoxically, the persons who staff and enter public establishments develop a remarkably tolerant attitude toward the normal troubles of parents and children. As long as valued

---

6 Research should be conducted into those situations where children are explicitly denied entry. Initial observations indicate that theatres, and certain classes of bars are two settings where children are excluded by law or convention.
items are not destroyed or if parents can demonstrate their ability to pay for such destruction, these scenes are smiled upon and accepted.

They appear to be accepted for two reasons. First, all persons who have had children or who look favorably upon them can locate in their own biographies situations where a child embarrassed them. It is part of the problems of being a parent. Second, children tend to be viewed as “non-accountable” social interactants (Goffman 1959:151-53; 1963:125-26). Since they lack language ability, real selves, and an understanding of right and proper interaction rules, children can be (1) approached by anyone at any time, (2) spoken in front of as if they were not present, and (3) used as “bridges” to their masters (parents) much as dogs and other domesticated animals (Goffman 1963:126).

Placed in a “profaned” or “non-person” category, little children are viewed as “unaccountable” objects. But if they are not held accountable for their actions, the parents certainly are. And here lies a curious interactional paradox: sacred persons (adults who are parents) produce profane objects (children). This view of children is embedded in socialization theories of childhood and operationalized in preschool and elementary school settings. It leads to the existence of total institutions which control the child’s every movement from the moment of waking to going to sleep at night.7 His food, entertainment items, dress, speech, toilet patterns, and sexual life are under constant surveilance. Although in sheer numbers children cannot be regarded as a minority group, in all other respects, and not withstanding the remarkable folklore defining childhood as bliss and happiness, they are treated as members of a biologically inferior class.

The foregoing remarks were meant to suggest that young children actively reject their status. Their efforts at self objectification represent continual demands for “accountability” and acceptance as full-fledged persons. Their languages offer the most strategic means for obtaining this status.

I turn to the fourth distinguishing feature of this language.

The cry, yowl, and scream probably represent the most significant gesture of young children and their caretakers. Yet these utterances are given diverse interpretations just as the smile, giggle, coo and laugh are differently defined. There is an important difference between these two utterances. The cry is likely to provoke immediate action; the laugh is not. The cry, however, is a complex sound which is clustered into several categories: expressions of pain, anger, hunger, comfort, danger. Each of these categories have subdivisions. Pain can mean wet diapers, stuck with a pin, teething, a fall, or confrontations with a dangerous object (a light bulb, a hot stove). Hunger can represent boredom or habit (feeding at a set time). The definition of danger is most likely to arise when the child is out of the adult’s field of vision. In this case immediate physical action is called for. This is seldom the case with the other meanings given the cry. The meaning of the cry, however, arises out of the parent and child’s ongoing sequence of actions. Its meaning is also couched in the definitions parents tend to attribute to their children (trouble-makers, teases, crybabies). Of interest is that fact that the cry represents the one utterance of the child that is likely to produce adult attention. As such, it becomes a central component of the child’s speech and it is continually employed in those situations where the self is threatened or where demands are not met.

In the preschool the cry becomes an effective means of calling attention to claims that are not met by other children. It is also utilized to bring the instructor running when the child perceives that he has been improperly treated by another. The following example illustrates how the cry acts as a petition to higher authorities when a deviant or hostile act has occurred. Once again the relational context of
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7 Aries, 1962 offers relevant historical evidence suggesting that this view of child production is only a recent phenomena in western cultures.
the interaction must be understood. Two girls, E (two years old) and R (eight months), have been playing together all morning, alternating between the roles of mother and baby. They have excluded B from their activity. The scene opens with E and R playing the roles of mother and baby in the lower level of the doll house:

E gets the stroller and R climbs in it for a ride. E (mother) gets a blanket for R (baby) and pushes the stroller in front of the mirror. She gives R a kiss on the cheek and B comes running up holding a ribbon in his hand. He makes a "mock" hitting action with his ribbon at E. E says, "Leave us alone!" B persists in waving his ribbon at her. E looks around for the instructor; locating her, E begins to cry. The instructor comes up; B runs upstairs away from her. The instructor asks B, "Was it an accident, B?" "No!" he answers. "No!!" the instructor replies, "Don't you love me anymore, B?"

The episode ends here, E and R go on playing in the stroller, satisfied that B has been reprimanded by the instructor.

Fifth, gestures and words take on special meaning for children as they create personal relationships. There is often an attempt to produce special words that outsiders cannot understand. This special word or phrase, when followed by a special set of actions, sets the new relational partners off from all others.

Two girls had suddenly discovered one another at the preschool. Within one hour they had developed the following word and set of actions to designate their friendship.

T and A (the new friends) come in from the outside singing, "Manu-buck, manu-buck, manu-buck." Swinging their arms in unison to the rhythm of their new word, they come over and sit down for juice and crackers. Two mothers ask them what they are saying. The girls ignore them and suddenly switch their new word from "manu-buck" to "manubuck." One mother attempts to decipher the word by breaking it down into "Manu" and "buck." She fails to make sense of it. Another mother remarks that her children once made up a word. T and A now stop and say with precision and clarity, "Buck-manual." (Manual is the name of one of the preschool instructors). The word is now understood. The mothers are comforted and T and A continue singing their word.

Words such as "buckmanu" are common and are not unlike the following: "off you," "reds," "biker," "fox," "spaced." These are common among various adolescent and adult minority subcultures. They are plainly neologisms. They lack consensual meaning within adult or outsider speech communities. Indeed they resist outsider interpretations. This is their explicit function. In many respects the language of early childhood can only be understood as a complex set of ever changing and evolving neologisms. As the child progressively moves into the adult's world of speech, these phrases are dropped and replaced by even more subtle indicators of group and relational membership. These neologisms are more than spoken words. They are nests of tightly woven verbal and non-verbal gestures.

Sixth, in the early stages of word acquisition, there is little differentiation between the utterance of a word and the actions designated by the word. In short, the overt
and covert act are merged and collectively made public, a feature of speech differentially displayed in adulthood. Symbols as Mead remarked (1934: 146-47) are universals. Their use telescopes the emergence of a proposed act. By combining the languages of verbal speech and the language of the hands, young children attempt to insure that their listeners and viewers will understand the proposed act. This merging of the covert and overt act frequently leads children to rehearse and take to completion the proposed act. Children then are continually producing solo acts. Words such as “bye-bye” are often accompanied by a waving of the arms and on occasion the preparation for actual leave-taking.

This attribute of early word usage vividly highlights the function of words and gestures for adults. For while adults seldom speak without gesturing, their use of words merely signals a proposed act. Conversation and not immediate overt physical movement is the usual outcome. The phrase, “Shall we leave,” may be followed by ten minutes of conversation during which elaborate leave-taking rituals are employed to release interactants from one another’s presence. The child is much more likely to follow his utterance with immediate action. The leave-taking ritual is not employed. It remains for future research to identify the points in the life-cycle where gestures funnel into spoken words and conversation. In this instance I am proposing research on the problem of how the covert act remains covert.

The child’s use of gestures to fill out and complement their interpretations of a word, object, or proposed action insures for them that their listeners understand what is vocalized. This line of action serves another function. If carried far enough it provokes adults into acting on the child’s declaration of intent. Until the adult, or listener is brought into the proposed action sequence a one-sided social act is produced. For a joint action to emerge the adult must act on the child’s proposals.

If a child says goodbye, waves goodbye, possibilities appear. The adult can be gently coerced into going bye-bye. This action reinforces the child’s gestural system and sense of autonomy. On the other hand the gesture can be exposed as a fiction by explaining that it is impossible to go bye-bye at the present time. In this case the child’s, not the adult’s (as in the former case) line of action is diverted.

A large proportion of early child-parent interactions fall into this coercive-diversionary category. Indeed one of the problematic features of child production (for parents) is the creation of an interactive relationship with the child wherein the parent does not have to give in more than he (she) wants to. Two broad categories of children are thus produced: spoiled brats (those who always get their way) and docile, shy weaklings. The normative structure of American middle-class family life calls for a child somewhere in the middle. Socialization strategies in the family and school are in part aimed at such productions.

There is another problem with this tendency for children to act out their proposed actions. This is the separation of fact from fantasy. The reinforcement of a child’s gestural system can lead to a language that (for the parent-child interactions tends toward continual renegotiations this is often no problem. But on occasion it can be. Children who move completely into their own gestural system may be labeled autistic or retarded. Thus necessitating the creation of special actions and institutions for their care and treatment.

On other occasions the problem is less severe. It is simply troublesome for the parent to have to act on the child’s symbol system. This is most evident in the world of dolls—those objects contributed by adults for child’s play. It is one thing to call a doll a baby. But it is another to demand that the doll be changed, given a special bed, fed special foods, and rocked to sleep.

Paradoxically adults contribute to childhood fantasy. This appears to be related to the
conception of children noted earlier. That is their similarity with other domesticated animals. An examination of the literature afforded children between the ages of two and four reveals one noticeable feature. The most frequently discussed object is either the animal, or the doll. Since both objects are nonhuman in nature the meanings given them by adults and children tend to reinforce the nonreal and fantasy features of childhood. The following interaction between three two year old children and a mother at a preschool illustrates how adults participate in the creation of childhood fantasy.

L, a small boy, attempts to climb into a highchair in the play area of the preschool. A mother (M) comes up and says “No, L, that’s for little babies and dolls, not for big boys like you, not big boys.” L makes three attempts to climb into the highchair and each time the mother repeats her previous statement. Finally she places a doll in the chair and L begins playing around the highchair. Two girls come up and begin fixing breakfast for themselves and the doll. The mother cautions them that the baby must wear a bib if it is going to have breakfast. The mother then puts a bib on the doll, and sets a bowl of oatmeal on the doll’s plate. The two girls begin feeding the doll oatmeal. In the meantime S (a boy) comes over with a pair of high heeled shoes on. They keep falling off and the mother leaves the doll (for a moment) and helps S with his high heels.

The girls decide that the baby is full, and the mother assists them in taking off the bib, changing the baby’s diapers and preparing her for a nap.

We have in this episode the social construction of “irreality.” Dolls cannot eat oatmeal and children know it. Yet the mother persisted in acting on the doll as a human object. There is an additional motive underlying these adult constructions of childhood fantasy. Childhood is seen as a period of bliss, happiness and laughter. Children are not to be troubled with the problems of everyday adult life. It is not surprising, therefore, that children have been regarded by some (Aries 1962:68; Stone 1965:28) as forming “the most conservative of societies.” My observations lead to the opposite conclusion. Although the myths, stories, tales, and toys of childhood remain remarkably stable across generations, (Opie & Opie 1959) this stability is contributed by adults who pass on the myths, stories and tales from their childhood to their own children. Stability is also produced in the marketplace. The toy market is based on what sells and there is little feedback from children and their parents to the manufacturers of toys and books. (See Ball, 1967: 447-58) It is adults, then, who are fanciful and conservative in their actions toward children.

SUMMARY & DISCUSSION

These remarks were intended to challenge the conventional conception of childhood, language and social behavior. An effort was made to take the role of the young child and present the world as he sees it through his evolving gestural and language system. A view of language consistent with the proposals of Mead was offered. As a set of indicative gestures, the language and speech of early childhood was seen to involve several distinguishing features. These included the use of special gestures to clarify ambiguous words and situational ownership of objects. The cry as a universal symbol in childhood was noted as were the problems surrounding the young child’s attempts at self-objectification. It was argued that the self of the young child emerges even before adult language is understood. The self of the child simultaneously emerges with the differentiation of self from others. The role of the eyes and hands in this period of self-development was also stressed. The importance of biographical, historical and relational contexts in early speech were discussed. It was seen that special words are created as children enter into new social relationships. The family as a speech, and language community was also treated. The role of adults in childhood fantasy was examined.
Making Society Real

Childhood socialization has received little sociological attention. It is conventionally assumed that children, once grasping adult language, move rather systematically into the roles, values and perspectives of adulthood. Socialization thus becomes the inculcation of adult values into the child’s personality.

I should like to propose another concept of socialization. Many have remarked that socialization is never ending—it proceeds throughout the life cycle. Yet this assumption has seldom been taken seriously. My research suggests that socialization is but one aspect of the process by which interactants (of any age) attempt to make society real through the process of self-objectification. At the heart of socialization and the role-taking process lies a bundle of special symbols, gestures and nested languages. These languages are lodged in social selves and they become the medium for interaction. Socialization research must be directed to the many language and gestural communities that make up any society. It is here that selves, personalities, roles and perspectives are created. From this stance society emerges as a negotiated social order. It is an ongoing network of lodged selves, symbols and objects. No object carries intrinsic meaning. Interactants must settle for themselves what languages and meanings they are going to employ as they go about their daily routines.

Early childhood represents one of the most problematic periods of socialization—for both the parent and child. Society as the parent and child know it is under constant revision. This suggests that the child’s control over the parent becomes a direct function of the complexity of his indicative gestural system and the degree of consensuality assigned that system by adults. The child’s contributions to the social world of family and school life is similarly a direct function of these two processes. It is here, in the interactions between children and parents, that society appears. Each family, as a distinct community, creates its version of right, of proper conduct—its version of what society is and ought to be.

The study of how children are treated by parents, peers, siblings and instructors reveals what is problematic for adults. Thus, prior research on young children which has stressed the acquisition of language, and the rate of learning simply suggests that for those investigators the most problematic features of adulthood are language and knowledge.

My evidence suggests that a completely different set of problems confront parents as they produce children. These problems involve the control of normal trouble and the legislation of a system of justice, sanctions and rewards.

Problems not treated in this essay include invasions of privacy in childhood, and the play of young children. Nor have I offered evidence from other cultures and groups where children are seen as different kinds of objects (Mead & Wolfenstein 1955). If childhood is seen as a complex status passage, comparative research into other cultures, groups and societies must be conducted. The circumstances under which children are produced must be examined. (Glaser & Strauss 1970) This suggests comparative research into situations where children are produced in solitary nuclear families, in groups of siblings, or in the absence of parents. Those cultures where children are seen as “young adults”, and not unaccountable objects would also be studied. It would be expected that the languages, symbols, gestures and selves of children would vary by the situation of production. That is, the meaning of an object resides, in large part, in the interactions brought to it. A child, then, is a complex social object. The meanings brought to it will be reflected in its actions. I have attempted to show that American middle class children resist the definitions brought to them by parents, instructors and social scientists.
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A COMPARISON OF RACIAL PREFERENCE IN YOUNG BLACK & MEXICAN AMERICAN CHILDREN: 
A Preliminary View

INTRODUCTION

Beginning with the work of Clark & Clark (1958) scholars have consistently found that black children preferred a white image or model and rejected a black image or model when given a choice between a white doll or picture and a black one on questions such as, "which was the nice doll", "which looked bad", "which they would like to play with," and "which doll was the nice color."

For the last thirty-five years some scholars have documented the persistent presence of this basic pattern of racial preference among black children regardless of sex, social background, skin color, and to a lesser extent age differences, are socialized to choose in a certain predictable way when given a choice of selecting either a black or white image on such questions as mentioned above (Asher & Allen 1969; Goodman 1952; Helgerson 1943; Moreland 1962; Trager & Radke 1950; Stevenson & Steward 1958). For example, Clark & Clark (1958) reported that 59 percent of their 253 subjects, all of which were black children three to seven years old, preferred the white doll over the black doll when asked which was the “nice doll.” Only 38 percent chose the black doll as the “nice doll.” On the other question designed to elicit preference behavior, the subjects were asked which of the two dolls “looks bad.” Of the 253 subjects, 59 percent selected the black doll and 17 percent chose the white doll as the one that looked bad. The investigations by Goodman (1952), Radke et al (1949), Landreth & Johnson (1953), Morland (1958), and Trager & Radke (1950) offer additional support to the observation that black children prefer the symbols of another racial group over the symbols of their own racial group.

The works of Goodman (1952), Stevenson & Steward (1958), and Morland (1962) provide further insight into how widespread this pattern of preference for white over black is among black children. Of the 104 black and white children studied by Goodman, some 84 percent of the black subjects, as compared to only 56 percent of the white children, showed a preference for persons of the opposite racial group. During her study, children were asked which doll or storybook characters they liked.
and would like to be with. The responses that were given emerge into a consistent preference pattern for white. Stevenson & Stewart recorded similar findings among their three-to-seven-year old Texas children. In a more recent report by Morland (1962), of 407 preschool-age southern children, using a picture technique to obtain measures of racial preference, it was found that a greater proportion of black children were attracted to whites than whites to blacks. Approximately 60 percent of the black children and only about 10 percent of the white children preferred to play with children of the other race; the corresponding figures for preference for one's own racial group were 18 percent and 72 percent, respectively.

In summary, these studies indicate that minority children tend to show signs of a negative reaction formation to their minority status by preferring the image of the dominant race.

Despite the sizable amount of research literature on the racial preference of black (and white) children, there has been a lack of investigation on the racial preference of America's second largest minority group, the Mexican American child. As a consequence, very little is known about their pattern of racial preference. Further, there has been no empirical comparison between the black and Mexican American child on the question of whether both groups reject their own image for the image of the majority, or whether there are important differences between these two groups in their respective patterns of racial preference.

The purpose of this study is to explore and compare the patterns of racial preference of contemporary young black and Chicano children age five through seven years from working class social backgrounds. This comparison should provide some insight into the way different minority groups react to their minority status.

A secondary purpose of this study is to explore the question: To what extent do black and Chicano children reflect an awareness of and conformity to the values and goals of strong racial pride, black and brown are beautiful, and sense of peoplehood of the current civil rights movements of their respective communities? It is assumed that to some extent children's patterns of racial preference are indicators of their perceptions and conformity to institutionalized social values that are part of their community structure.

METHODOLOGY

The methodology used for this study was a modification of the procedures developed and used by the Clarks (1958). They utilized a technique which they called the Doll Test. The present study will use the modified version of the same technique and procedures.

Subjects

Two hundred and thirty-eight black and Mexican American children from the Detroit and Los Angeles Metropolitan areas formed the total number of subjects interviewed and reported on in this study. These children ranged in age from five to seven years. All of the children were interviewed from a total of five private and public elementary schools. Three of the schools were located in areas that served black families from lower socio-economic backgrounds, while the other two schools were in areas that served Mexican American families from lower socio-economic backgrounds. All of the children who were present on the days of testing were interviewed. The only criteria for selection were willingness to be interviewed and age of the subject. There is no claim that the subjects reported on here are representative of all the black and Mexican American children within the five to seven year age range in the Detroit and Los Angeles Metropolitan areas. The children reported on in this study were interviewed during March, April, May and June 1971.

Data-Collection Instruments

The measuring instruments consisted of two different sets of dolls about which structured questions were asked. The first set of dolls was a modification and extension of the kind used and described by Clark & Clark (1958),
and were designed to measure the nature of the black child's pattern of racial preference. This set of dolls contained four different dolls. Two were brown in color with black hair. The other two were pink in skin color with yellow hair. The four dolls were alike in every respect, except for skin and hair colors, and were positioned side by side on a table. The position of the dolls was changed for each subject. For example, a Negro doll would be presented in the first position on the table for one subject. It would then be alternated to the second position for the next subject. This set of dolls was shown to both male and female subjects.

The second set of dolls was also a modification of the type used and reported on by the Clarks (1958). In this set of dolls there were four dolls: two were pink with yellow hair and two were brownish-red with black hair. The last two dolls were picked to represent an image of a Mexican American. This set of dolls was shown to Mexican American subjects, both males and females.

Data-Collection Procedures

The interviewers for this study were graduate and undergraduate college students hired and trained by the author. The data reported on in this study for black subjects was collected by one black interviewer and the data for Mexican American subjects was collected by one Mexican American interviewer.

Prior to conducting an interview, interviewers visited their assigned school for a day or two in order to become acquainted with the subjects and vice versa. On visitation days, interviewers were introduced as persons (by first name only) who had a new game and who had come to play the game with all of the boys and girls. But before the interviewers would play the new game, they wanted to spend some time making friends with everyone.

On the day that interviewing was to commence, the teacher explained that each subject would get an opportunity to go into the game room with the interviewer where they would play the new game. Also, the procedure for going to and from the game room was explained. Subjects were told that each one would get about ten minutes to play the game, and that only one at a time could play the game.

Interviewers would open the conversation with the following phrase: “Hi. What is your name? I am (first name only). I have a new game I would like for you to play with me. The game is a dollatory game. First, I will show you some dolls and tell you a short story about the dolls. When I finish the story I want you to tell me something about the doll. Okay? Are you ready to play the game with me?” The subject was then shown the series of dolls. The interviewer would place the dolls in front of the subject and read a short structure question depicting the dolls. The story would end with a question for the subject to answer. The subject could answer by pointing to one of the four dolls or by saying, “the black one, the white one, or the Mexican one.” For example, a representative question was: “One of these dolls is a very nice doll. Whenever Mary goes to play with her, she always smiles and says, Hello. What doll do you think is the nice doll?” The subject’s choice was recorded for that question and was then asked another question until all the questions were given.

RESULTS

Racial Preference Among Black & Mexican American Subjects & Age Differences

Tables 1, 2 and 3 show the patterns of racial preferences for blacks and Chicanos at each of three age levels. Table 1 shows that the Chicano subjects at age five had a slightly stronger preference for the doll of their own racial group than the black subjects had for the doll of their racial group. The Chicano subjects selected the Chicano doll as the one they wanted to “play with” over the white doll by a margin of 67 percent to 33 percent. They picked in favor of the Chicano doll as the “nice color,” by a vote of 64 percent, and
they also chose the white doll as the one who “looks bad” by a vote of 55 percent. It was only on the test item “nice color” that these five-year-old subjects did not show evidence of a clear preference for the doll representing their own racial group.

The black subjects at this same age level showed a strong racial preference for the white doll on all four preference items. These subjects favored the white doll over the black for a playmate by a margin of 75 percent to 25 percent. Sixty-nine percent of them picked the white doll as the “nice doll,” 81 percent chose the black doll as the doll that “looks bad,” and 59 percent selected the white doll as the one that was a “nice color.”

Table 2 presents the racial patterns for the six-year-olds. Among the black subjects, the direction of racial preference was totally aimed at the white doll. These subjects preferred the white doll for a playmate by 86 percent, picked the white doll as the “nice doll” by 100 percent, selected the black doll as the one that “looks bad” by 100 percent, and favored the white doll as the one with the “nice color” by 72 percent.

At the same age level, the Chicano subjects’ racial preference was largely in the direction of the doll of their own racial group. Eighty percent of these subjects preferred the Chicano doll over the white for a playmate, 60 percent picked the Chicano doll as the “nice doll,” and 60 percent selected the white doll as the one that “looks bad.” It was only on the preference item “nice color,” that these subjects reversed the direction of their racial preference and moved in favor of the white doll by a vote of 80 percent.

The patterns of racial preference for the seven-year-old subjects are shown in Table 3. At age seven the black subjects begin to show a stronger racial preference for the doll representing their own racial group. They prefer the black doll for a playmate over the white by a margin of 60 percent to 40 percent and they selected the black doll as the one with the “nice color” by 78 percent over the white doll. However, these subjects still favored the white doll as the “nice doll” over the black one by a vote of 60 percent to 40 percent. They also picked the black doll as the one that “looks bad” by a large margin of 87 percent out of 100 percent.

For the Chicano subjects at age seven, preference for the doll of their own racial group declines. The majority of these subjects preferred the Chicano doll for a playmate by a vote of 60 percent. This was the only item that they showed a majority preference for with the Chicano doll. On the preference item “nice doll,” 60 percent selected the white doll while 90 percent picked the same doll for having a “nice color.” For the item “looks bad,” just as many subjects selected the Chicano doll as did those who selected the white one.

In summary, it appears that with increased age the black subjects moved from a total preference for the white doll to a medium preference for the black doll. Thus, age seems to influence these children’s preference in a direction that is more supportive of the in-group.

However, for the Chicano subjects just the reverse seems to be true. With increased age, these subjects showed a weaker preference for the Chicano doll, and a stronger preference for the doll not of their racial group, the white doll.

Racial Preference Among Black & Mexican American Subjects & Sex Differences

Table 4 shows the patterns of racial preference for both black and Chicano subjects by sex classifications. On three out of four preference items, the male Chicano subjects expressed a stronger racial preference for the doll representing their racial group than their black counterparts. A majority of these Chicano subjects selected the Chicano doll over the white doll on preference items “play with” (69 percent), “nice doll” (54 percent), and they picked the white doll as the one that “looks bad” (65 percent). It was only on preference item “nice color” that the Chicano males chose in favor of the white doll (54 percent). The black male subjects picked in favor of the white doll on every preference item: “play with” (53 percent), “nice doll”
Among the female subjects, Chicano girls showed a stronger racial preference for their own race than did the black girls. A majority of the Chicano girls picked in favor of the Chicano doll over the white doll on preference items “play with” (66 percent), “looks bad” (35 percent), and “nice color” (64 percent). The white doll was favored as the “nice doll” by 51 percent. The black girls selected the white doll over the black doll on items “play with” (78 percent), “nice color” (87 percent), and “looks bad” (0 percent). They only expressed a strong preference for the black doll on one item, “nice color.” On this item, they picked in favor of the black doll by 67 percent.

In summary, Chicano males and females showed a stronger racial preference for the symbol of their own race than black males and females. Black males seem to have the weakest level of racial preference for their own race, with the black females next in own group racial preference. Chicano females are stronger in their show of racial preference for their own group than both black males and females, but are not as strong as the Chicano male in racial preference.

**DISCUSSION & IMPLICATIONS**

The findings of this study revealed some important differences between the patterns of racial preference among black and Chicano children age five to seven years. For the most part black children showed a weaker racial preference for the black doll or image of their own race than Chicano children did for the Chicano doll or image of their own race.

Taken separately, the findings on each group support some and contradict some current ideas and research findings. For example, in general, the findings of this study on the racial preference among black children supported the findings of previous investigators that young black children display a strong preference for white images and weak preference for black images, and black children tend to increase their racial preference for black symbols as age advances (Ammons 1950; Asker & Allen 1969; Clark & Clark 1939, 1939, 1940, 1955, 1958, 1963; Goodman 1964; Morland 1962; Trager 1950).

The findings of this study on racial preference among Chicano subjects were not consistent with some of the ideas advanced in the limited literature on the Chicano people. For instance, several investigators have commented on “clannishness” or strong in-group ties of the Chicano community (Kramer 1970; Moore 1970). Mexican Americans are characterized as people who stick together and don’t want anything to do with other Americans. Further, Mexican Americans are described as having a fierce sense of racial pride that exists independently of their minority status and remains intact in the face of continued exploitation and exclusion. Perhaps the most appropriate term for this form of ethnocentricism is the concept of “La Raza.” The word can be narrowly translated as “the race,” but its implications are far more complex than that among Mexican Americans. It has come to represent the notion that one is born into being Mexican and cannot escape the collective fate of all Mexicans. Around the concept of “La Raza” there has developed a strong sense of group identification which will supposedly cause most Mexican Americans to prefer personal and social associations with fellow ethnics of their own group (Broom & Shevky 1952; Heller 1966; Kramer 1970; Madsen 1964; Moore 1970; Simmons 1964).

The data reported in this study does not confirm the presence of the above mentioned ethnocentric characteristics among Mexican American children. The children interviewed for this study did not show a strong sense of racial preference. They showed a stronger sense of racial preference for their own group than did the black children interviewed in the same study, but they did not show as strong a sense of loyalty or preference as the concept of “La Raza” would have predicted. Also these children did not display as strong a sense of group pride as the notion of “clannishness” would dictate.

Taken collectively, one interpretation of these basic findings might be that the effects of
American society on these young children has manifested itself differently with these two groups of children. For example, American society as it operates now and in the past, stresses that racial differences are very important and that being white is preferable to being black or brown. Growing up under such social conditions, these young black and Chicano children probably directly and indirectly perceive, conform, and learn to prefer and identify with the cultural values and race of the dominant group. For instance, in the case of the black child, perception of and conformity to the values of the white society tends to affect his racial preference more than it does his Chicano counter-part. Among these black children, perceiving, learning, and conforming to white values leads to a low preference for their own racial group when given a choice between black and white. More specifically, many white and non-white Americans accept that part of the American culture that Citron (1969) has labeled the “Rightness of Whiteness” value orientation. An essential part of this value orientation defines all things white as good, nice, beautiful, and right, and everything dark or black as bad, dirty, ugly, and wrong. Internalization of this form of cultural racism may be influencing some of these black children toward developing a bias or preference for whites.

In the case of the Chicano child, perception of and conformity to the “Rightness of Whiteness” value orientation tends to weaken their racial preference but not as much as the case among black children. This may be due to the fact that the differences in skin color is less for the Chicano child than for the black. Also, the differences in hair texture and appearance between the Chicano and white child are not significant. The close similarity in physical appearances, along with the acceptance of “Rightness of Whiteness” value orientation may influence these children in ways not reported on here. Areas like racial self-identification and racial self-esteem may be influenced more than racial preference.

The results of this study on the patterns of racial preference and racial self-identification among black and Chicano children suggest that the respective efforts of the civil rights movements of the past 15 years to increase racial pride, racial identity, and a strong sense of peoplehood among black and Chicano Americans have not been successful at the lower age range. It appears that the values and goals of the respective civil rights movements have not, as of yet, been institutionalized as race and community values to be passed from one generation to the next through the process of childhood socialization. From the responses of the children interviewed and reported on above, it seems that they were not perceiving or conforming to the spoken values and goals of the movements.

The fact that these children showed such strong preferences for white at all ages suggests that during their early socialization experiences they are learning and accepting a value orientation which evaluates white more positively than black or brown. The potential importance of this form of early learning on the development of these children’s later socialization has been outlined by Brim (1966). He has suggested: (1) the potency and durability of learning that occurs during early childhood is due to the frequency of learning situations, their primacy in the career of the organism, and the intensity of the rewards and punishments administered; (2) that which is learned in childhood is difficult to change because much of it has been learned under conditions of partial reinforcement; (3) it is during this early period of socialization that the bulk of the unconscious material of personality is accumulated and this is inaccessible to change; (4) the limits of socialization in later life are set by the biological capacities of an individual and by the effects of earlier learning or the lack of certain aspects of learning.

With the knowledge of the importance of the early years for learning and the data from the present study, parents, community leaders, and school personnel may want to re-examine the possibilities for value instruction in the early years of childhood. The school is a developmental socialization system (Wheeler 1966), and as such might be instrumental in building or where necessary rebuilding the values which are more conducive to good health in minority children.

(Tables Follow)
TABLE 1
Racial Preference on Both Black and Mexican-American Subjects at Age Five Years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subjects</th>
<th>Choices</th>
<th>Test Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Play With % (N)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>Black Doll</td>
<td>25 (8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>White Doll</td>
<td>75 (24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100 (32)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexican-American</td>
<td>Mexican-American Doll</td>
<td>67 (26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>White Doll</td>
<td>33 (14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100 (42)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N = 32 for Blacks and 46 for Mexican-Americans.
Table 2
Racial Preference of Both Black and Mexican-American Subjects at Age Six Years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subjects</th>
<th>Choices</th>
<th>Play With % (N)</th>
<th>Nice Doll % (N)</th>
<th>Looks Bad % (N)</th>
<th>Nice Color % (N)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>Black Doll</td>
<td>14 (3)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>100 (21)</td>
<td>28 (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>White Doll</td>
<td>86 (18)</td>
<td>100 (21)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>72 (15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100 (21)</td>
<td>100 (21)</td>
<td>100 (21)</td>
<td>100 (21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexican-American</td>
<td>Mexican-American</td>
<td>80 (8)</td>
<td>60 (6)</td>
<td>40 (4)</td>
<td>20 (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doll</td>
<td>Doll</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>White Doll</td>
<td>20 (2)</td>
<td>40 (4)</td>
<td>60 (6)</td>
<td>80 (8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100 (10)</td>
<td>100 (10)</td>
<td>100 (10)</td>
<td>100 (10)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N = 21 for Blacks and 10 for Mexican-Americans.
### Table 3

Racial Preference of Both Black and Mexican-American Subjects at Age Seven Years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subjects</th>
<th>Choices</th>
<th>Test Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Play With %</td>
<td>Nice Doll %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(N)</td>
<td>(N)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Black</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Doll</td>
<td>60 (14)</td>
<td>40 (9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Doll</td>
<td>40 (9)</td>
<td>60 (14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mexican-American</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexican-American Doll</td>
<td>60 (6)</td>
<td>40 (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Doll</td>
<td>40 (4)</td>
<td>60 (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100 (10)</td>
<td>100 (10)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N = 23 for Blacks and 10 for Mexican-Americans.
Table 4

Racial Preference of Black Male-Female And Mexican-American Male-Female Subjects on Four Preference Test Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test Item and Choices</th>
<th>Subjects</th>
<th>Mexican-American Male % (N)</th>
<th>Mexican-American Female % (N)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Black Male % (N)</td>
<td>Black Female % (N)</td>
<td>Play With Mexican-American Doll % (N)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Play With</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Doll</td>
<td>47 (14)</td>
<td>22 (10)</td>
<td>69 (18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Doll</td>
<td>53 (16)</td>
<td>78 (36)</td>
<td>31 (8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nice Doll</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Doll</td>
<td>39 (11)</td>
<td>13 (6)</td>
<td>54 (14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Doll</td>
<td>63 (19)</td>
<td>87 (40)</td>
<td>46 (12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Looks Bad</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Doll</td>
<td>86 (26)</td>
<td>100 (46)</td>
<td>35 (9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Doll</td>
<td>14 (4)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>65 (17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nice Color</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Doll</td>
<td>47 (14)</td>
<td>67 (31)</td>
<td>46 (12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Doll</td>
<td>52 (16)</td>
<td>39 (15)</td>
<td>54 (14)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N = 76 Blacks and 62 Mexican-Americans.
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Over the past decade in the United States, there has been developing among young people a culture with values and norms that appear as marked departures from those of the larger society. These changes surfaced and received considerable publicity in the 1950's with the Beats and were carried forth in the 1960's by both hippies and activists. Hippies have more or less withdrawn from American society and appear currently to be engaged in a variety of trial and error attempts to develop alternatives to existing values and institutions, while activists are working in various capacities toward changing traditional society (Rosnak 1969, esp. Ch 2). Both categories are working to establish options to the values and life styles of contemporary American society and with some exceptions, the objectives for each are quite similar.

As a population cohort, these people have recently begun to establish families of their own and many are in various stages of attempting to transmit these alternative values to their offspring. This study is primarily concerned with a descriptive analysis of this socialization process from the perspectives of counter culture parents.¹ Focus is on certain life style value orientations as a context for child rearing and on child rearing practices and goals.

The counter culture, like the culture of the dominant society, is not homogeneous; rather, it includes numerous diverse elements and styles. With respect to family organization, distinctions can be drawn between individuals living in communal fashion and those maintaining no essential commitments beyond the immediate nuclear family. While life style and value differences between the two are no doubt observable, the existence of an ethic and perspective common to the counter culture (Roszak 1969:1-83) suggests that perhaps there are more similarities than differences, at least on basic issues such as child rearing.

This study dealt exclusively with counter culture families living in noncommunal settings although view on communal living arrangements were discussed with

¹The terms “hippie” and “counter culture adherent” are used interchangeably throughout this paper.
respondents. Decisions to concentrate on families in non-communal situations were based on estimates that this category presently includes the vast majority of counter culture adherents and that at this point in time, the possibility seems remote that communal systems will become a dominant mode of counter culture family organization. If the counter culture endures, it will likely do so in the context of varying degrees of contact with the larger society and apart from the cultural isolation that a relatively autonomous commune might provide. This would seem to pose a variety of problems for parents attempting to rear children according to alternative or possibly deviant values. Thus, a second research concern was to investigate some problems and consequences of contacts with the dominant society. At several points in the analysis respondents' views are compared with recollections and perceptions of their own experiences in their families of orientation.

PROCEDURES

Data were obtained from a nonrandom selection of counter culture families through "focused interviews" (Merton, 1956) constructed to obtain respondents' views on values in relation to life style, socialization goals and child rearing practices. There were twenty-six respondents comprising thirteen families which were defined to include one adult male, one adult female and at least one child.

Families were identified and contacted with the help of peer informants familiar with counter culture "communities" in specific areas of Pennsylvania. Other persons known to be involved in the life of these communities were also asked to comment on the extent to which potential study families were considered "members" of the counter culture, hippies or "freaks." Consensus among their peers that the individuals in particular families did in fact belong to the counter culture was a main criterion for including those families in the study. Study families also served as informants and suggested contacting other families for possible inclusion in the study.

Other criteria used to identify and select families for study were: (1) self-identification as counter culture adherents (pre-interview criterion); and (2) identification with counter culture values (post-interview criterion). Potential respondents were contacted and questioned concerning their awareness of an commitment to counter culture life styles. Decisions to interview them were based upon their professed identity with these alternative norms. Post-interview decisions to include particular families in the study were predicated on responses to a general checklist of counter culture values and attributes incorporated in the interview guide. These included: (1) life style values such as "doing your own thing," tolerance for individual differences (the right of others to do their own thing), learning and knowing through direct personal experience, developing intimate primary relationships with others, encouraging free and open expression of emotions, negating competition and material acquisition and irrelevant or rebellious attitudes toward conventional society; and (2) stereotyped normative patterns such as drug use, strong interest in rock music, use of "health foods," interest in astrology and the occult, distinctive clothing styles and for males long hair, beards and mustaches. All thirteen families interviewed expressed support for all or most of these ideas and values and were retained for further study.3

3While a more precise method of determining who belongs to the counter culture might be desirable, the very nature of the counter culture value system would seem to render this impossible. There are no formalized entrance requirements and no recognized set of attributes or behaviors that would positively identify one as a member or nonmember. Within the counter culture there are references to the "straight" society or "square" world but there seems to be little set agreement on what this comprises or who is "straight" and who is "hip." At present, it seems, one can be "hip" in more or less degree, a notion explicit in hippie typologies developed by Howard (1969), Yablonsky (1968) and Simmon & Trout (1967:27-32). Variability was also found among

2"Freak" is another term for hippie. Unlike the designation hippie, which is seen as an invention of the mass media (or at least promulgated by them for "negative" reasons) the word freak is viewed as an in-group invention conneting affection. It is also used to denote obsessions or addictions to a variety of things: food, drugs (e.g., "speed freak"), activities, etc.
Although an interview guide was used to insure that all topics were covered, the questioning was kept relatively informal and unstructured, a style that is in keeping with counter culture values that question nearly all forms of structured activities. Respondents preferred to “rap” (i.e., engage in a face-to-face, give and take kind of communication where individuals “really” express the way they feel and because of the relatively unstructured format, interviews took the form of “rap sessions” concerning their values, family and children. Pursuing the topics that interested them most, all respondents appeared to talk openly and willingly and frequently volunteered the required information without being asked. All interviews were recorded on tapes in respondents’ homes. Major areas discussed in the interviews centered on general life style values and how they related to family and children, marital and family role structure, the family in relation to the larger society, socialization goals and child rearing philosophies, approaches and methods. Interview data were supplemented by observations made in the home and subsequent conversations with about half of the respondents.

CHARACTERISTICS OF RESPONDENTS

For the most part, respondents fit the recent descriptions of counter culture adherents reported in both popular and social science literature. Typically, they were from relatively affluent, socially privileged homes. Most were reared in what they characterized as a fairly permissive and liberal atmosphere where parents were described as showing too little concern and interest in the lives of their children (Keniston 1969:32).

In general, respondents were from suburban or small urban areas in Pennsylvania, their fathers were likely to be in white collar occupations and their religious background typically was Protestant. Most were between the ages of twenty and twenty-four, had received some college training in nontechnical and nonbusiness fields, and had educational aspirations beyond the undergraduate college degree level (Table 1).

SOCIALIZATION GOALS

Socialization goals may be viewed as attempts on the part of parents to inculcate in their children qualities and characteristics that they value and view as desirable. They are idealized conceptions of the kind of person they would like their child to be and the values they would like him to internalize. Goals also imply that those professing them have some sense of how they might be attained which respondents claimed, centered on teaching by example, on practicing what is preached, on not doing what you don’t want your child to do. Also stressed was the idea that child rearing was not a process that could be separated from other events and behaviors within the home, rather, it was part of the business of living in a family situation.

Major socialization goals for counter culture parents included at least the following:

(1) Development of the child’s creative potential to its fullest (self-actualization).
(2) Development of self confidence, a positive self-image and independence at an early age.
(3) A sense of responsibility to self and others (not hurting others).
(4) Openness to change and experimentation.
(5) An ability to relate interpersonally with others in an open and honest way (no “game-playing”), especially with parents.
(6) Tolerance and appreciation of individual differences and the rights of others.
(7) Attitudes of cooperation and sharing.
(8) An appreciation that life should be lived to its fullest.
(9) Openness toward sex and sexuality and an appreciation of it as a normal human activity.
(10) Respect for the family and parental values (not obedience).

(11) A questioning stance toward all norms, rules and authority.

(12) A capacity to express emotions openly and freely.

(13) Strong commitments to peace and nonviolence.

Notable qualities not mentioned were obedience, respect for authority, a work ethic, religious commitments, competitiveness and success in the traditional sense of achieving wealth and prestige. In fact, most of these were devalued, especially obedience to rules that “don’t make sense” and work where the prevailing attitude was “if it doesn’t feel good, don’t do it.” Also devalued was following the advice of “experts” in relation to child rearing. The manner in which parents went about child rearing was seen to stem from their own personal experiences and self-understanding, “common sense” and “just being in tune with the child’s needs.”

The family was seen as providing a “nurturing environment” for the individual child and adult, while the nuclear family was described by most as an environment in which the individual could develop his emotional, creative and intellectual potential. Self development within the counter culture involves “doing your own thing,” while being a member of a family group necessarily involves duties and responsibilities. This would seem to involve a conflict between individual autonomy and family responsibilities. To the extent that conflict was present, it was dealt with by emphasizing the developmental potential for the individual as a family member rather than its limiting aspects. While recognizing that marital and parental roles impose certain duties, most respondents seemed to feel that these roles also opened avenues for new experiences and facilitated development of the individual and thus they perceived no real conflict for themselves.

All parents recognized that there was likely a divergence between these ideals and the realities of their situation, due in part from their rejection of many dominant cultural values and practices while remaining involved with the general social structure through which they are expressed and realized. Achievement of these ideals was also inhibited by the fact that respondents were socialized by different standards and values and only in relatively recent years had they adopted counter culture values and norms. This inhibiting effect of parental and societal values, norms and beliefs passed on to respondents from their families of orientation, peers and society were referred to as “hang-ups” which they were attempting to overcome and prevent passing on to their children.

CHILD REARING PRACTICES

Running throughout discussions of child rearing practices were several key themes centering on the human need to receive and give love and affection in an open and uninhibited way, active involvement of both parents in the life of the family (especially in child care and rearing) and relating to the child as a unique individual with rights of his own, especially the right to order his own environment (permissiveness). All respondents claimed to be strongly committed to these three ideas. They are examined below in relation to respondents' own views and the perceived practices of their parents.

PARENTAL AFFECTION AND INVOLVEMENT

While professing commitment to affection and involvement, many respondents also claimed that this was not the case for their own parents and their own childhood experiences. On the contrary, no respondent described their own relationships with their parents, either as a child or an adult, as being characterized by open displays of love and affection and it was on this dimension that they saw themselves diverging widely from the values and practices of their parents. Whether or not their parents were affectionate toward them is not at issue. The important point seems to be that respondents
perceived affection to be lacking and in the context of their own families claimed to be encouraging openness in displaying emotions, especially love and caring.

This strong emphasis on openly displaying affection was closely linked to parental involvement in the child rearing process. While all respondents stressed involvement of both parents, most also made special mention of the father's role in socialization and the desirability of the male parent taking an active part in the family, home and child rearing. While parental involvement in the socialization process was seen to have positive consequences for the children providing them with role models and a sense of belonging as well as values and guidelines for behavior, it was also related to fulfillment of individual companionship needs. All respondents considered companionship an important family function and in contrasting their views with those of their parents claimed that this was another area where they were doing things differently.

Their parents were frequently described as "too busy" to become involved in family activities. It was generally recognized that this was usually a result of involvement with activity related to their fathers' occupation, a perception that reinforced a desire on their part to work only at jobs that permitted the individual freedom to devote time and energy to the family. Similar views were expressed regarding females both in relation to work outside the home and household chores. While there was a desire expressed to include family members in most of one's activities, employment, school and/or other interests necessitated that time be spent apart from the family. Thus, the companionship function, as it is in most family situations, was closely linked to the amount of free time available, especially for father in relation to their job demands. However, all individuals professed a commitment to working out a life style that would permit maximum amounts of time to be devoted to family activities.

For the most part, companionship revolved about recreational activities that were developed and carried out primarily by the family as a unit rather than in those provided by other units in society or ones in which members engaged as individuals. Activities mentioned by respondents were those which minimized monetary cost and maximized involvement and being together. These activities included: "doing things around the home" (e.g., playing musical instruments, watching television, having friends visit, "making things," playing games), traveling, camping, picnicking, visiting friends, walking and hiking, bicycling and attending auctions. Companionship was claimed by all to be an important family function through which members could provide one another with mutual affection and a sense of belonging.

PERMISSIVENESS

Sixteen respondents described their parents as permissive and ten as strict in relation to the establishment of rules and their enforcement. On the other hand, all respondents voiced commitments to permissiveness in relation to their own children. The ten that described their parents as strict registered strong dissatisfaction with this approach and were determined not to subject their children to inflexible rules of conduct. As many put it, "You make rules when you're uptight about things and there are just not that many things that put us uptight." Most rules seemed to pertain to avoiding situations that would place the child in obvious physical danger (e.g., playing in areas where there was heavy automobile traffic).

This was also generally true for the other sixteen persons. Their dissatisfactions with parental approaches to child rearing did not include permissiveness. They would retain this approach and if anything permit their children even greater latitudes. But they emphasized permissiveness only as it was also accompanied by parental involvement (companionship) in the socialization process and by open displays of love and affection on the part of the parent toward the child. Without involvement and affection, it was recognized that permissiveness is likely to be construed by the child as not caring on the part of the parent or as was the case with a
number of respondents, the freedom permitted them as children came to be defined as benefitting the parents rather than themselves. As one person put it, "They [his parents] gave us a lot of freedom. They were permissive as hell. But it was all a lot of crap. It just gave them the time to do their money making, social climbing thing." All respondents seemed committed to avoiding similar definitions of the situation on the part of their children. This was to be accomplished through child rearing approaches that stress affection and involvement as well as permissiveness. These points in turn suggest the following hypothesis: permissive approaches to child rearing, unless perceived by children to be accompanied by appropriate parental involvement and sufficient affection, will come to be defined as: (1) not caring on the part of parents and/or (2) to the advantage of (i.e., freedom for) the parents rather than the child.

In a similar vein, parental involvement in the life of the child was viewed as positive only as it was also accompanied by affection and permissiveness. This point was emphasized especially by eight females who described their parents as having been "involved" in their upbringing (no males described their parents in this manner). Four of these women said that parental involvement was accompanied by permissiveness and four claimed that strict rules were enforced and parental authority emphasized. Each reflected negatively on their experiences. Where parental involvement was accompanied by permissiveness and affection was lacking, the involvement was seen as superficial. Where involvement was not accompanied by permissiveness, it was judged as parental domination. Similar thoughts and agreements were voiced by most other respondents as these issues were discussed. These views suggest that specific child rearing practices are not perceived in an isolated way; nor is it likely that they can be divorced from the values implicit in them. Whatever approaches to socialization parents utilize, it seems likely that the child experiences them in a context and does not react to them apart from that context. In would also appear that children perceive, interpret and evaluate parental practices according to their own needs and desires (e.g., affection, freedom) rather than in terms of parental intentions and wishes.

In relation to permissiveness, all parents claimed to be willing to grant their children the freedom to develop and define their own values and way of life. Since they felt that they had redefined the culture of their parents and peers, they saw no alternative but to permit their children the same autonomy. Most expressed hopes that some degree of continuity would be established between the generations but recognized the possibility that their children might develop an entirely unique or different culture or might return to the way of life of the "straight" society. Parental views on this matter were summed up generally by the idea that their children's lives were their own, that "they have to do their thing just as we did ours."

The values of counter culture American youth have been the subject of numerous recent studies, essays and books (Berger 1967, 1971; Brown 1969; Carey 1968; Davis 1967; Dworkin 1969; Flacks 1967, 1971; Gouldner 1970; Hopkins 1968; Howard 1969; Keniston 1965, 1968; Nisbet 1969; Roszak 1969; Simmon & Trout 1967; Simmons & Winogard 1968, Suchman 1968; Toynbee 1968; Yablonsky 1968). Their views on American society and its institutions are well documented and in the main are characterized by varying degrees of estrangement from the dominant culture accompanied by a disengagement or refusal to participate in mainstream institutions. In more or less degree, but without exception, the twenty-six individuals included in the present study manifested all or most of the commitments and dissatisfactions typically associated with people of the counter culture. Some of them are reiterated here as they related to family life and child rearing.

Conflicts resulting from contact with mainstream institutions was apparent in varying degrees but seemed to pose problems only as it affected the family situation and in
resolving differences there was general agreement that some compromises were more tolerable than others. Where concessions were tolerable or did not seem to be required, conflicts were defined as “minor hassles” or simple harassment. Where they involved important values and principles, conflict was defined as serious and led frequently to speculation about the possibility of “dropping out” which usually meant subsistence farming on a rural commune.

Minor hassles typically included harrassment over hair and clothing styles, displaying such things as peace symbols and drug use (especially marijuana). Frequently, these problems required little or no adjustment in respondents’ life styles. Marijuana use, because it is illegal, was an exception. All respondents defined it as legitimate and used it regularly which necessitated taking certain precautions including concealing their activity from the children. Their main concern was not over precautions as such, but over the limited breach in interpersonal openness between parent and child in order to protect the parent from possible detection and prosecution.

Serious conflict resulted from the structure and nature of the larger society and posed problems about which respondents as individuals could do little other than protest or withdraw. These included most of the values and practices usually associated with counter culture opposition: war, violence, military conscription and spending, prejudice, discrimination and the structure of opportunity, public education and the nature of work and the economy.

A majority of respondents in one form or another had been involved in organized political protests aimed at change while four persons had been active in Students for a Democratic Society. All had withdrawn from these activities agreeing that it was a waste of time in that “nothing was accomplished.” Underlying discussions of political involvement as a way of instituting change was a pervasive sense of frustration and powerlessness. The general attitude was “who needs it” coupled with a belief that “the most effective kind of politics is your own life style,” by which was meant that change would occur as individuals altered their values and behavior (Rosak 1969:168). All respondents were committed to this idea and in varying degrees claimed to be practicing it in their individual lives and particularly in relation to their families.

Although they admitted to being “political drop-outs,” they did not see themselves as less active or radical with respect to commitments to change. Rather, according to their discussions, it seems that their radicalism had shifted to a personal and family level where there was an attempt to structure relationships in terms of counter culture values and in opposition to many values perceived to be operative in the dominant culture. Thus, the changes that could not be implemented in the larger society could be accomplished within the home and family. Satisfactions in the short run stemmed from a personally rewarding life style and in the long run from expectations that the children would be both cause and effect of similar life style shifts throughout society. There was not always a perceived connection between the parents’ past frustration in bringing about change and the hopes expressed for the children.

**DILEMMAS OVER EDUCATION AND WORK**

All parents saw the possibility of serious conflicts developing over the education of their children and in relation to earning a livelihood. In each of these areas, contact with the larger society could not be avoided and compromises were inevitable. The compromises, in turn, involved some basic principles and central values on which respondents were reluctant to give ground.

In relation to education, the conflict was similar to that faced by the Amish when confronted with compulsory school attendance for their children in non-Amish schools (Hostetler 1970: 193-208). As with the Amish, counter culture parents viewed the culture of the public schools along with its
teaching methods and subject matter as inimical to their own values and positively dysfunctional to the kind of society in which they wished to live and help create for their children. Specific criticism centered on artificially compartmentalized learning, required conformity, mass nature of education, crowded classrooms, preaching “blanket patriotism,” failure to stimulate creativity, overly structured learning situations, failure to emphasize the arts and overemphasis on authority and competition. In short, virtually all of the central values of American public education outlined by Williams (1970:334f) were attacked except the creed of democratic values. A number of respondents voiced approval of the emphasis placed in public education on teaching democratic ideals but claimed that either the values could not be learned because they were taught by authoritarian methods or if they were learned the school undermined its credibility in that it did not practice what it preached.

Estrangement from American public education was virtually total but as only one of the families had a school-aged child, the problem was not yet a reality for most parents and few had come up with any concrete ways of dealing with it other than simply complying with the law. For most, the obvious alternatives were unrealistic, e.g., developing private or alternative schools, moving to areas where the public schools were in keeping with their values. Although the Amish have been successful in establishing “alternative” schools for themselves in some places, one can only speculate on whether similar developments will occur on a large scale among people of the counter culture.

Because some suitable options were available, conflict over earning a living posed less of a dilemma. While a few persons were considering subsistence farming as an alternative to working in jobs that were linked fast to the American economy, most were resigned to working for wages, salaries or profits. However, an acceptable job had to meet certain criteria, the most important being that it offered the individual sufficient freedom and personal autonomy. Corporate, bureaucratic positions were rejected out of hand while most gravitated or aspired to teaching positions or self-employment which included careers in music, art, the professions and retail businesses such as restaurants, “head shops” and art galleries.

The potential for conflict did not stem from work itself but from the nature of work in the American economy. First, it was perceived that the wage and salary structure virtually forces males to become full time breadwinners in the family, a role that most of them did not want because it limited their freedom and took them out of the home. It also inhibited any attempt to develop equalitarian roles within the family thus driving them into a traditional division of labor where females assume homemaker tasks and males become wage earners. This produces the conditions for the second dilemma in that males are consequently limited with regard to taking an active part in child care and rearing. There was a general recognition that work in the context of the American economy was basically incompatible with their ideas on family structure, roles and relationships, a factor that led to searches for occupations that would permit them the time and freedom to become more involved with home and family.

Issues such as education and earning a living led all respondents at one time or another to consider communal living and a more or less complete withdrawal from contact with the larger society. Three females had rejected the idea on the grounds that there would be “too many constraints.” All others were still considering the possibility, six of them to the point of making plans and inquiries into acquiring land. Communes were envisioned as “real communities” where inhabitants could structure their own lives and institutions and negatively valued social pressures would be minimal.

DISCUSSION

The counter culture family paralleled closely in form and function the companionship family discussed by Burgess and Locke (1945). The
companionship family, hypothesized as an emergent form, signaled "a transition from an institution with family behavior controlled by the mores, public opinion and law to...family behavior arising from the mutual affection and consensus of its members" (Burgess & Locke 1945:26). Although precise measurement of the extent of this shift was not possible within the present study, the counter culture family appears to be striving to reach the companionship ideal. This conclusion seems valid in all respects except in the area of family functions. While the companionship family as an ideal type permits society to assume responsibility for economic, educational, recreational, religious and productive functions, the noncommunal counter culture family has recognized a need and in some instances is moving to assume greater control in these areas. Thus, it appears to be diverging from the companionship-institutional continuum as described by Burgess and Locke to an entirely different dimension. This divergence appears to be a result of a recognition that American social institutions are mutually supportive, closely interrelated and increasingly organized around utilitarian norms. These factors interact to create a social situation incompatible with the companionship family ideal. The ideal has not yet become part of the institutionalized structure of the larger society and those seeking to realize it in their daily lives are faced with the task of altering their relationship to mainstream institutions by assuming some of the tasks ordinarily performed by them.

Counter culture parents recognized the family's potential for creating changes in society and discussed socialization as an important change inducing process. The family was viewed largely as an independent rather than dependent variable instituting basic value changes to which the larger society would eventually be compelled to respond. However, specific child rearing practices did not appear to differ greatly from trends described by several writers as emerging among middle class parents in general "toward modes of responses involving greater toleration of the child's impulses and desires, freer expression of affection, and increased reliance on 'psychological' methods of discipline" as well as shifts in the role of fathers as providers of affection (Bronfenbrenner 1961:6). From respondents' perspectives, they were closer to achieving this than most other American families. However, because of the similarities noted, questions must be raised concerning the extent and nature of these changes and differences vis-a-vis shifts in family form and function that are already in process.

But from another perspective, counter culture respondents recognized the pervasiveness of norms such as utility, rationality and impersonality while they approached child rearing with personal and expressive values. Values provide an important context for the development of specific child rearing processes and "the child's acquaintance with the values implicit in various socialization practices may be more important than the manifest content he learns from these activities" (Inkeles 1961:624). If this is true, then the values held by children of the counter culture should in some degree reflect their parents' opposition to dominant values and institutions in American society.

(Table Follows)
Table 1. Summary of Selected Social and Personal Characteristics and Backgrounds of Counter Culture Adherents by Sex of Respondent.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics and Backgrounds</th>
<th>Males (N=13)</th>
<th>Females (N=13)</th>
<th>Total (N=26)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 - 24</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>53.8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 - 29</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 and Over</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Residence for Most of Life</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cities Over 250,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cities Under 250,000</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>38.5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburbs</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>30.8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Areas</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fathers' Occupation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Collar*</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>61.5</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue Collar**</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>38.5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Religion of Family of Orientation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protestant</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>61.5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholic</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School Degree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some College</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>38.5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Degree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working Toward or Completed Advanced Degree</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>46.1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Field of Study (N=16)</strong>***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>33.4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Science</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Science</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number, Age and Sex of Children (N=19)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - 4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>44.5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Includes: professional, semiprofessional, proprietors, managers and officials.

**Includes: foremen, craftsmen and laborers.

***Includes those holding or working toward college degrees both undergraduate and advanced.
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Birth order as an important variable was given considerable emphasis by Alfred Adler. However, it was not until Schachter's (1959) work some thirty-two years later that birth order began to receive extensive attention from behavioral scientists in their research. At least two attempts at systematic reviews of the research findings have been made (Sampson 1965; Warren 1966). Sampson theorizes that "ordinal position creates a particular kind of sociological environment and a set of psychological experiences that are assumed to lead to the development of patterns of personality and behavior" (Sampson 1965:179-180).

SOCIOLOGICAL NEGLECT OF BIRTH ORDER

With the central emphasis upon "sociological environment," it might be assumed that sociologists have been active theorists and researchers in the study of birth order. Such is not the case. A breakdown of the number of works which have appeared in journals on the subject of birth order shows that a majority have been written by and for psychologists. This is evidenced in Table I which shows that 57 percent (107) of the articles on birth order appear in "psychological" journals. Furthermore a majority of the articles published in "social psychological" journals are authored by psychologists. Thus it can be seen that the psychologically oriented journals have produced as much as 80 percent of the birth order articles.

In the present review of the birth order publications (1955-1969) we have examined the authors' fields of specialization and training. Of the sixty-nine listings we have located, there is a total of ninety-eight authors (a biography of the 69 items is available from the authors). Table II shows the breakdown of authors where membership in the American Psychological and Sociological Associations or in a particular psychology or sociology department was taken as the indicator of field of specialization or training. It is again apparent that the greatest interest in birth order phenomena is taken by psychologists.

Up to the present at least, sociologists have neglected the "sociological environment" as it is associated with birth order. This is not meant to be an original observation by the present...
authors. As late as 1967 Kammeyer noted as his "major point...that there has been no systematic consideration of the interpretative theoretical connections between birth order and its correlates" (Kammeyer 1967:72). Kammeyer was evidently not aware of Sampson's 1965 work as he does not incorporate it into his own analysis (Kammeyer 1967:80f), but had he done so he would have had to admit that the psychologists at least had begun to make significant contributions in the area. Sociologists, in general, have remained silent.

BIRTH ORDER & FAMILY SOCIOLOGISTS: THEORY & MEASUREMENT

Most authors writing about birth order indicate that the "sociological environment" is important to an understanding and explanation of the birth order phenomena is the family environment. Realizing that "sociological environment" in this context nearly always equals "family variables," it might be expected that family researchers and theorists would be at the forefront of birth order research. We are able to find little support for this view, however. None of the works cited in Warren's review were published in "family" journals. Sampson's review (1965) contained one (0.8%) article which could be classified as appearing in a "family" journal. In our own review of materials published since Sampson, we find only seven (1.1%) articles appearing in "family journals" (either the Journal of Marriage & the Family or Family Process).

Although we have found little attention paid to the birth order phenomena by family sociologists, our analysis of studies which use family variables in an attempted explanation of the phenomena produces a very different picture with family variables occupying a very prominent place.

Ten of the sixty-nine works considered are basically research reports which only note certain findings with regard to birth order and offer no explanation of them. Of the fifty-nine remaining works, fifty-three (90%) are committed in some way to family variables for an explanation of their findings. Examples of such explanations range from an author making an original statement holding certain family variables, e.g., parent-child interaction, as explanatory to one citing an earlier work where family variables were employed for explanatory purposes. (Schachter's 1959 work has become a particularly popular reference.) The apparent conclusion is that to those who have studied the birth order phenomena, family structure and interaction are highly relevant explanatory variables even if family sociologists are not investigating them.

Our analysis of which studies measure the family variables that they postulate as explanatory yields quite disappointing results. Of the fifty-three works employing family variables for explanatory purposes, 55 percent (29) did not measure any family variables. Concerning the remaining twenty-four works, 79 percent (19) of these measured only demographic or descriptive-type variables, such as family size, distance between siblings, and sex of siblings. Even though these are family variables, they are not usually those which are specifically used by the authors for explanatory purposes. Thus, only 9.5 percent (5) of the total of fifty-three works which use family variables as explanatory actually measured family variables indicated by their theories, such as, amount of parent-child interaction and parents' attitudes about children and child-rearing. While such family variables have been theoretically inferred, they have, for the most part, not been measured. Identification of the variables is insufficient; their measurement is a necessity.

Our review, then, leads us to ask why sociologists, especially family sociologists, have neglected the birth order phenomena and why measurement of family variables has been so inadequate. It appears to us that one of the reasons family variables have not been measured is precisely because family sociologists have not been doing the research. The psychologists doing the research are generally more interested in something other than family structure and interaction and have been content to make inferences about the relationship between the family variables and the dependent variables under study. It appears
to us that one of the reasons why sociologists have neglected the birth order area is because of the tendency among family researchers and theorists to view the family as essentially a "dependent variable" phenomenon.

This "dependent variable" approach tends to lead both researcher and theorist to seek and explain the variation in family patterns rather than the consequences of those variations. Perhaps one of the clearest statements of this traditional approach is evidenced in Hill's precise delimitation of the word "family" in family theory:

What about the "family" part of family theory? . . . In this overview, interest remains more frequently with the family phenomenon as a consequent, rather than as a determinant. The theory discussed is more concerned about family behavior as a dependent variable to be explained, rather than as a determinant of personality development, social change, or community disorganization, important though these latter issues may be to other social scientists (Hill 1966:10-11).

It is recognized that by underscoring the need for family sociologists to do research in the area of ordinal position we are departing from the traditional view of what constitutes family research and theory. But what we are asserting is not that family researchers and theorists drop the "dependent variable" approach but that they so define their interests and concerns as to include both "dependent" and "independent" analyses. In short, it seems to us that if, in fact, differential structural and interactional characteristics of the family are producing various consequences in individual characteristics, then family sociologists should be in the forefront of this research and theory endeavor and that it should not be left to other social scientists. We see the emphasis upon family as independent variable equally essential if family theory is to be generated. Family theory could then lead to explanations of both individual variations as well as social change at the macroscopic level.

In light of the above discussion, we first propose for family sociologists an increased emphasis on generating theory in the area of birth order by employing family variables as independent explanatory variables. First, family theorists must specify in their theories what aspects of the "sociological environment" are producing the effects associated with birth order position. This is viewed as no small task! Secondly, we propose that researchers not fail to measure such variables. A final task which must be carried out involves the operationalization of birth order itself. In our review we have continually found "only" children lumped together with "first-born" or authors placing "last born" together with all "middle born" children into something called later born. There may be times when a "theory" dictates that all birth order positions need not be analyzed separately; but we strongly suggest "separate analysis" as a general rule to be followed at both the theoretical and empirical levels.

**BIRTH ORDER & CONFORMITY: A THEORETICAL FORMULATION**

That which follows is offered as a first step in the direction of better theory and subsequent research that we are proposing. Our review has produced two "correlates" of birth order which have received repeated attention in the published research. These are conformity and achievement. We have chosen to work with birth order and conformity as we believe conformity to be a more relevant sociological variable than achievement. The former more often implies a sociological setting, e.g., conformity to expectations of significant others, while the latter is often conceptualized as a "need" existing within the individual.

According to the approach we have suggested, the first step is to identify that part of the "sociological environment" i.e., family, which is related to the birth order phenomenon, i.e., conformity. We take as axiomatic the sociological proposition that recurring patterns of behavior, such as various types of conformity, arise out of the repeated participation in stable interactional systems. We conceptualize the family as consisting of at least three interactional systems: (1) the Conjugal system of interaction between
husband and wife, (2) the Parental system of interaction between parent and child, and (3) the Sibling system of interaction between children in the family.

We theorize that the most important interaction systems within the family related to the birth order phenomena are two: Parental and Sibling. This will ultimately reduce to an empirical question since some researchers maintain that characteristics of the conjugal dyad may have an effect upon child characteristics independent of parent-child interaction (Elder 1965; Bronfenbrenner 1961). Merely having identified the important gross interactional systems is not enough. The theorist must then attempt to identify the variables within each system which he sees operating in the causal nexus.

Within the Parental interaction system a number of variables could be indicated—parents' control of child behavior, children's attitudes toward parents, etc. We postulate, however, that the most important variable within this interactional system is that of parental "support" for the child. "Support" is here defined as that quality of the interaction which is perceived by the parent and child as establishing a positive affective relationship (modified from Straus 1964). Straus argues that support is one of the "most central" family variables to emerge from research findings. The senior author's own research (Thomas 1971) underscores the importance of this variable in understanding parent-child relationships.

Within the Sibling interaction system we could postulate a number of important variables, such as children's attitudes toward each other, amount of child-child interaction, etc. Unfortunately the Sibling interaction system has not been extensively researched (Irish 1964). We theorize, however, that "responsibility", the degree to which any one child is accountable for the proper behavior of his siblings, will be the most important variable within this system.

Among the various works on birth order and conformity a number of different definitions have been used for "conformity". As the dependent variable, "conformity" is here defined as the tendency of self to comply with others attitudes and expectations in any interactional sequence.

We may now offer two basic propositions which identify the nature of the theorized relationships among the three variables:

1) The greater the amount of support in the parental interaction system, the greater the conformity of the child to the expectations of the parent.

2) The greater the responsibility for the behavior of siblings, the greater the conformity to the expectations of the parent.

Previous research has shown support to be positively related to conformity (Thomas 1971). This relationship appears to be especially strong when conformity means complying with parental expectations. Rosen (1964:66) and Maccoby (1968:248) both maintain that acceptance of parental values is repeatedly found to be associated with high emotional support or warmth from parents. We know of only one work (Reiss 1967), however, which uses the concept of "responsibility" as we wish to employ it. Reiss' finding was that, in our terms, oldest children tend to conform most and only children tend to conform least. His explanation was that in "a sense the only child is the exact opposite of the oldest child; the former has no responsibility whatsoever for other siblings, and the latter has the most such responsibility" (Reiss 1967:154). We believe that, when adequately researched, "responsibility" will prove to be one of the most important variables of the Sibling interactional system.

We can proceed to indicate the relationship theorized between the various variables and birth control by explicating two assumptions in our conceptualization of "responsibility". The first is that parents expect older children to be responsible for the behavior of younger siblings. To see that younger siblings behave properly, i.e., according to parental expectations, the older sibling must identify with and take the role of his parents. Our
second assumption is that this leads to his own internalization of parental expectations and his conformity to them.

Having identified the important variables in the Parental and Sibling interactional systems, we may now consider the possible consequences for the birth order positions. We offer four hypothetical statements, one for each of the four birth order positions: oldest, middle, youngest, and only. The first three of these are conceptualized in a three-child family.

The Oldest Child: The first-born will receive high support from his parents and will have the highest degree of responsibility for his siblings; therefore, the firstborn will clearly be the highest in patterns of conformity to parental expectations.

The Middle Child: Both parental support and responsibility for the younger siblings' behavior will be lower for the middle child than for the first; therefore, he will be less conforming than the first-born to parental expectations.

The Youngest Child: Parental support will be higher for the youngest child than for the oldest. By definition, the youngest has no responsibility for younger siblings, therefore, in the three-child family, the youngest child will be lowest in conformity to parental expectations.

The Only Child: Only children face a unique situation since they have no siblings younger or older. Nevertheless, their situation can be likened to that of the "youngest" child with regard to the variables under investigation; that is, only children receive high support but have no responsibility for younger siblings; therefore, only children will be lower in conformity than either first or middle born children.

We can further clarify these hypothesized relationships by considering a quantification of the variables as is depicted in Table III. For the sake of the example, "support" and "responsibility" are ranked from low (zero) to high (five) and "conformity" is shown to be the additive effect of these and may range from zero to ten. From this table it is evident that one clear-cut distinction that can be made is that first-borns are hypothesized to be highest in "conformity". This has received some support in the literature (Kammeyer 1966; Reiss 1967; Rhine 1966; Smith & Goodchild 1963). With regard to the other birth order positions, the findings are equivocal but we feel this may be due to the poor operationalization of ordinal position characteristic of much of the research.

The importance of the above type of theorizing is not limited to the possibility of the postulated relationships holding when research is finally carried out, but also stems from the fact that the researcher-theorist is now in a position to test the adequacy of his model. It should be stressed that an adequate test cannot be made by merely measuring the degree of conformity of each of the birth order positions. The researcher must measure the family variables in order to affirm the postulated links between them, the birth order position and the dependent variable (conformity). This is precisely what most of the research done by non-family sociologists has failed to do. Once initial research is carried out where family variables are measured, other variables could be added such as social class to see if the relationships between birth order and conformity holds across social class since SES is already known to be related to patterns of conformity (Kohn 1969).

SUMMARY

A review of the birth order research shows that sociologists and especially family sociologists have neglected the area. The research clearly indicates, however, that family variables are highly relevant in most proffered explanations of birth order findings, but that these same family variables are seldom if ever measured. The traditional view of "family" as a "dependent variable" phenomenon is seen as related to both the failure of family sociologists to enter this area of research as well as failure to measure family variables. Finally a theoretical formulation of birth order and conformity is
given as an example of the type of theorizing suggested where the relationships between various family variables are identified and hypotheses for four birth order positions are generated.

(Tables Follow)
Table I

Percent of Birth Order Articles
Published in Professional Journals by Discipline*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Psychological</th>
<th>Social Psychological</th>
<th>Sociological</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>TOTALS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sampson**</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N = 70</td>
<td>N = 33</td>
<td>N = 13</td>
<td>N = 11</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas and</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calonico***</td>
<td>N = 37</td>
<td>N = 15</td>
<td>N = 9</td>
<td>N = 2</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N = 107</td>
<td>N = 48</td>
<td>N = 22</td>
<td>N = 13</td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*"Psychological" journals include all journals where some variation of the work "psychology", other than "social psychology", appear, e.g., Journal of General Psychology, Psychological Bulletin, etc., plus Child Development, American Journal of Mental Deficiency, and Journal of Personality.


**Sampson's review includes articles up to 1965.

***Thomas and Calonico's review includes articles from 1965 through 1969.
Table II

Percent of Birth Order Publications* by Author's Specialization (1965-1969)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Specialization</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Psychologist</td>
<td>73.4%</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociologist</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Publications include articles, books, and doctoral dissertations.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount of Support Received from Parents</th>
<th>Amount of Responsibility for Siblings' Behavior</th>
<th>Amount of Conformity to Parental Expectations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oldest</td>
<td>4 +</td>
<td>5 =</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>3 +</td>
<td>4 =</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youngest</td>
<td>5 +</td>
<td>0 =</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only</td>
<td>5 +</td>
<td>0 =</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table III

Hypothesized Quantification of Support, Responsibility and Conformity for Each Birth Order Position


KAMMEYER, K. Birth order as a research variable. Social Forces 46 (1967) 71-80.


ROSEN, B. Family structure & value transmission. Merrill-Palmer Quarterly of Behavioral Development 10 (January 1964) 59-76.
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