DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 201 377

PS 012 0 1

AUTHOR Elardo, Fichand

TITLE Values and Childrearing in the Home and Da are

Center: Lasue for the 1980's

PUB DATE May 80

NOTE 14p. : Per presented at the named Meeting of the

Midwest In Inchological Association (52nd st.

iis, 10, 20 1-3, 1980).

EDRS PRICE MPO!/PC in rost je.

DESCRIPTORS Aggress on: Thild Rearing: Conformity *Da Care:

*Differences: Discipline: *Parent Lole Park School Relation Park Presc ool Education; Racial Mitudes: Religion of Education: Sex Role: *Social enion:

*Teacher - = = Values Education

BSTRACT

Recent stilles maggest that with more all wille hildren in the United that will as being placed in day care denoted amilies are likely to the less powerful as agents and application. In this process and the later that the between staff newest and then the minderling the process of the pocialization are dentified these meas are assumpting, against a maining the maining against a maining that the later of later of the later of later



U.S. DEPARTMEN OF HEALTH EDUCATION IN MELFARE NATIONALIMS TUTE OF ICTUCATION

THE PERSON OR THE MEDIT OF THE PERSON OR THE PERSON OR THE MEDIT OF THE PERSON OR THE PERSON OF THE

to ues and hil rearing in the

home and day here center:

Issue: for the 1980's

R chairu Ellardo

The Louisity of Iowa

Presented at the $52n_{\odot}$ annual meeting

of the Mi. www. rm /sychological

Association, St. Lou t, Misserri, May 1980.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Richard Elardo

TO THE EDUCATIONAL TESUBACES INFORMATION CENTER (EPOL!"



12021084

Abstract

th more and more children in the United States being placed in day care centers, it is likely that families will become less powerful as agents of socialization. In this paper, eight value-laden areas of socialization are examined (discipline, sex-role learning, aggressive behavior, racial tolerance, religion, conformity, academic emphasis, and sex education).

Recommendations for parents and day care workers are offered to encourage dialogue in these areas so as to increase the amount of consistency in childrening between homes and day care centers.



At a recent parent meeting, I asked one of our mothers what she thought of day care. Her response was puzzling and ambivalent. She was grateful to have found a slot for her child in our well-staffed university spensored center; but she commented sadly, "Johnny's first word was "conna'." Donna is the day care teacher's name.

Is this the first step down the road toward the loss of this day care parents' ability to function as the primary agent of socialization for her own child?

In a major review of literature on the effects of day care on children, Bulsky and Steinberg (1978) arrived at two types of conclusions. First, they observed that in studies in which children enrolled in high-quality day care centers were contrasted with home-reared children on measures of intellectual, social, and emotional development, no major differences as a function of the childrearing environment were evident. Second, they noted that many other meaningful questions concerning the broader impact of day care on children and their families have not been asked. These unknowns in the day care equasion included the topics of the present paper: are socialization aims and practices (which are derived from the adults' values) consistent across home and day care environments? If not, how does this inconsistency influence the child's development? And, relatedly, are parents with children in day care as potent as agents of socialization as are parents rearing their children at home?

There have been very few studies addressed to these important issues.

A study by Elardo and Caldwell (1973) arose out of a debate among staff members of Little Rock's Kramer Project (Elardo and Caldwell, 1974). This was a federally funded attempt to offer day care in a public school setting, beginning with infants as young as six months of age. The project staff were primarily white and middle class; the clients were primarily black and poor.



Several staff lamber: lame to me after examining articles by Stroufe (1970) and Grain 197 that the sub-be promoting white, middle-class model of appropriate lamino: transmitting the cultural matterns of the dominant makes as and they questioned the justifia it of such transmissing to yourself lamber of other social and athnic groups.

Other autic ruties are wall of in time (the early 1970's) challed the notion that ald care with remaining alien alues upon the clients (Bee, St. assgrid. We remained after questioning small groups of 1c income mothers with children and after questioning small groups of 1c income mothers with children and in their early intervention programs that differing so call and the action of the argument of the argument of the regarding of which and child care were concerned. For example, Levenstein reported that more to challege, and Medinnus reported that his parents said that they valued mading writing and speaking clearly.

Both Horners (1977) and Weir and Clarke-Stewart (1973) assume that latter belief - must value consciounce rather than dissonance is the more valid portrayal of the relationship between providers and consumers of day consciounce. Fein and Clarke - wart refer to the work of Kohn (1959) in reaching their opinion that

"Evidence and sts that there is a common core of basic human values that all subcultural press embrace. Happiness, honesty, consideration, obesience, dependability, manners, self control, popularity, neatness, and cleanliness are all valued to a greater or lesser extent in all social classes (Fein & Clarke-Stewart, 1973, p. 170)

Butler (1973) asked the question "Early Childhood Education: supplement or threat to the home?" In her opinion, when an early childhood program is



used on values different from those of the a home, a potential threat to the Commily can exit. The primary sources of such a conflict were said to lie pertain conflicting cult man values and classes and religious impups to which teachers as commilies be ... It is often the case that within home, the parent or paralles have net all examined their own values and als, nor those the hol for their chima (a ton, Howe, & Kirachenbaum, 1972). Gecas (1976) s: 210 families in the state of Washington and con-Liuded that some par and ind their socials alion function a difficult one. Trenty-five percent es and 16 percent $\phi \hat{\epsilon}$ husbands said that they frequently worried out heir role as a socialization agent. Gecas found that masbands and wives equally disagreed on the children should be taught, and co what methods we mos uitable. This a highlighted the fact that parents e en find that the own ratue conflicts brought to the surface as they empt to reach classifier dreaming decisions.

Clarke-Stewar 1977; in a review of research on child care in the family, noted that there a differences in parent values and attitudes toward child care that are related to their membership in a cultural group. She pointed out that such differences are unformately not yet clearly articulated in the research literature on child development.

As the result of my experience as director of The University of Iowa's Early Childhood Education Center, which is a day care center in which children from infancy through age 5 attend for 10 hours a day, I have identified staff members and parents. These fall under the headings of: 1) DISCIPLINE,

- 2) SEX ROLE LEARNING, 3) AGGRESSIVE BEHAVIOR, 4) RACIAL TOLERANCE, 5) RELIGION,
- 6) SELF-DIRECTION VS. CONFORMITY, 7) ACADEMIC EMPHASIS, and 8) SEX EDUCATION.

I will now discuss each of these areas and describe the issues involved and cite relevant research when it is available.



AREA

1. Discipline

2. Sex Role Learning

3. Aggressive Behavior

ISSUES

What is the right amount of strictness or permissiveness?

Is physical punishment to be used?

With regard to value conflicts in the area of sex role learning, Rest and Croft (1972) offered the example of a teacher who separated two boys ware were fighting with wooden blocks, sending one boy outside to play ball and another to the housekeeping corner. The latter boy's parents wanted to know we their son was told to play house with the girls - they weren't about to net anyone make a "sissy" of their son.

What are the appropriate set roles for young children to learn? Should boys be allowed to paint their fingernails and try on dresses? Should staff members encourage girls who do not play with trucks and other mechanical objects to do so?

How much aggressive behavior should the staff allow?

STUDIES

Research shows that parents' approaches to discipline are related to their social class. (Deutsch, 1973). Lower class parents more often rely on physical punishment and appeals to power, middle class parents more often rely on verbal reasoning and appeals to the child's sense of justice.

One major finding of the Elardo and Caldwell (1973) study was that the predominately lower-class sample of parents believed that young children should be aggressive and fight at the Center, so that others would not think they were sissies or cowards. The staff did not agree.

4. Racial Tolerance

5. Religion

6. Conformity

Should Center serve as a place to teach children to respect children of other racial backgrounds?

What if certain parents say not to allow their child to play with others of a certain race?

What position should Center take regarding the celebration of religious beliefs other than those represented by the parents?

How independent should children be encouraged to be?

How much of an emphasis on structured, teacher-centered "lessons" should occur at a Center?

Can there be too much "free play?"

Child care workers may perceive their role differently than parents see them. Instead of being a structured, authority figure, child care workers often fuction as facilitators or "helpers."

Should Centers have separate toilet facilities for boys and girls?

Should sexual exploration be encouraged?

7. Academic Emphasis

8. Sex Education

Winetsky (1978) found that middle-class teachers and parents shared a high preference for self-direction on the part of young children, in contrast to the preferences of working-class parents whose behavioral expectations for children emphasized conformity.

Rubenstein and Howes (1979) found that mothers were more restrictive than the child care staff.

Hess, Price, Dickson and Conroy (in press) found that mothers taught in a style that was more direct, demanding and explicit than did preschool teachers.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR PARENTS AND STAFF MEMBERS

Clarke-Stewart (1977) concluded that child care center policies should reflect the cultural identities and values of the parents served, she believes that the implementation of this goal will be difficult. Operationally, what is implied? Clarke-Stewart stated that "this is not to suggest the specific programs or interversions be targeted to particular ethnic groups - that all Afro-American mothers he assigned to model 'A'; while all Greek-American mothers enroll in program 'B'." p. 81

She recommended that a sufficient variety of child care programs be available so parents may choose the arrangement that is most compatiable with their values. Butler (1973) recommended that parents and staff members work together with the child's welfare in mind. Concrete suggestions for resolving social or coltural differences were not offered, nor were examples of much differences toned.

Parallel (1997) studied the interpersonal relationship between 212 parents and 89 caregiver in day care settings in Detroit, using a structured interview technique. His date revealed minimal attempts to coordinate day care children's socialization processes. Powell recommended: 1) that Center provide a specific area of the room for parent/caregiver interaction, 2) that caregiver be trained to work with adults as well as children, and 3) that the term "parent involvement" in day care include more emphasis on interpersonal relations among caregivers and parents.

MY RECOMMENDATION: Parents and staff should use my eight issues and anything they might want to add, as the basis for a meeting to discuss a united approach to childrearing, in which all parties - parents and caregivers, confront, discuss, and attempt to resolve any disagreements regarding childrearing.



RECOMMENDATIONS FOR RESEARCH

Research questions:

Needed are studies on -

- The effects of the parent/caregiver relationship on the development of the child.
- The determinates of parent/caregiver interaction.
- Children's perceptions of the rules of parents and caregivers.
- The degree of value conflict within and between various groups, and on which issues. Also what are the sources of differences between the socialization practices between parents and caregivers?
- What variations exist among various settings preschools, day care centers, family day care home - with regard to their function as socialization settings?

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, I believe that there is no area more important or in more critical need of investigation than that of values and childrearing in the home and day care center.

I hope the 1980's will not only see the wider availability of day care centers, but also a more systematic series of studies related to the issues raised in this paper.

Only then will we remedy our present lack of knowledge about the socialization of our children.



REFERENCES

- Bee, H.L., Streissguth, A., Van Egeren, L.F., Leckie M.S., Nyman B.A.

 Deficits and value judgments: A comment on Sroufe's critique.

 Developmental Psychology, 1970, 2, 146-149.
- Belsky, J. and Steinberg, L.D. The effects of day care: A critical review.

 Child Development, 1978, 49, 929-949.
- Butler, A. Early Childhood education: A perspective on basics.

 Childhood Education, 1973.
- Clarke-Stewart, A. Child care in the family. New York: Academic Press, 1977.
- Deutsch, C. Social class and child development. In B.M. Caldwell and H.N. Ricciuti (Eds.), Review of Child Development Research, Vol. 3 Chicago, Illinois: University of Chicago Press, 1973.
- Elardo, R. and Caldwell, B.M. Value imposition in early education:

 Fact or fancy? Child Care Quarterly, 1973, 2, 6-13.
- Fein, G.G. and Clarke-Stewart, A. <u>Day care in context</u>. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1973.
- Gecas, U. Socialization and child care roles. In F.I. Ney (ed.),

 Role structure and analysis of the family. Beverly Hills, California:

 Sage Publications, 1976.
- Gray, S.W. Ethical issue in research in early childhood intervention.

 <u>Children</u>, 1971, <u>18</u>, 83-89.



- Hess, R.D. and Croft, D.J. <u>Teachers of young children</u>. Boston: Houghton Muffin Company, 1972.
- Horner, W.C. Value imposition in day care: Fact, fancy, or irrelevant?

 Child Care Quarterly, 1977, 6, 18-29.
- Kohn, M.C. Social class and parental values. <u>The American Journal of Sociology</u>, 1955, <u>64</u>, 337-351.
- Medinnus, G.R. Head Start: An examination of the issues. In G.R. Medinnus and R.C. Johnson (Eds.), Child and Adolescent Psychology: A Book of Readings. New York: Wiley & Sons, 1970, 411-421.
- Simon, S.B., Howe, L.W. and Kirschenbaum, H. <u>Values clarification</u>.

 New York: Hart Publishing Company, 1972.
- Sroufe, LA. A methodological and philosophical critique of interventionoriented research. <u>Developmental Psychology</u>, 1970, <u>2</u>, 140-149.
- Winetsky, C.S. A comparison of the expectations of parents and teachers for the behavior of preschool children. Child Development, 1978, 45, 1146-1154.

