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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The question of how a human animal is transformed into a human being has elicited speculation for centuries, but the study of socialization using the principles of science is a comparatively recent development. Although philosophers, psychologists, and sociologists were involved in these early scientific studies, the major interest in the study of child development began with the growth of experimental psychology. An increasing interest of larger segments of the population was exhibited with the establishment of child-welfare and child-study centers. These action-oriented endeavors added to the momentum of experimental psychology, and the scientific study of child development became a major interest in the behavioral sciences.

Until the late 1940's, the majority of child development studies focused upon such characteristics of children as intelligence and physical growth, and less adequately examined emotional and social aspects of child development. Sewell\(^1\) suggested that four major forces changed the focus of child development studies from individual characteristics

to the emotional and social aspects of socialization. These forces were (1) the psychoanalytic movement, (2) new theories in psychology, (3) the growth of social anthropology, and (4) sociology.

Freudian theory, with its emphasis upon early life experiences as determinants of subsequent personality structure, has been a major force in the development of socialization theory and research. Within the psychoanalytic framework the antecedent-consequent relationship is examined from the perspective of five major behavior systems: (1) anal, (2) oral, (3) aggressive, (4) sexual, and (5) excretory. Child development viewed through the psychoanalytic perspective was, therefore, the first significant step away from the study of intelligence and physical growth. Through the study of various behavior systems and the outcomes which each system implied, a whole new socialization framework was introduced. Because of the nature of the new orientation, emotional and/or social aspects of socialization were given greater emphasis.

Psychologists brought to the field of child development the improving techniques of the experimental method. The scientific study of socialization was introduced, and emphasis focused on the social aspects of socialization. As a result of many empirical studies, new theories, the most important of which were the behavior- and social-learning theories, were developed.
Social anthropologists contributed to the scientific study of the social aspects of child development by accumulating comparative ethnographic data. Scores of detailed studies of other societies suggested that child rearing systems were mechanisms for culture transmission. Social anthropologists suggested that such concepts as "national character" and "modal personality" were but reflections of factors basic to child rearing techniques within a given country. The techniques and contributions of the field of social anthropology added to the shifting focus of studies dealing with child development, from physical toward social variables.

The fourth major force, sociology, dealt with the importance of the social structure in the development of human behavior. Of great importance from the sociologists' perspective was the influence of group membership. Therefore, sociologists focused upon socialization outcomes as they were influenced by membership in voluntary associations, occupational groups, social class membership, etc.

Sewell noted:

The convergence of these forces [i.e., the psychoanalytic movement, new psychological theories, the growth of social anthropology, and the development of sociology] in the early forties to the mid-fifties, with the older developmental emphasis has resulted in a tremendous outpouring of speculative writing, theoretical essays, research articles, and monographs on socialization, most of which have focused on the
intellectual, emotional, and social development of the young child.²

Three major reviews of socialization studies, one by Child³ in 1954, another by Bronfenbrenner⁴ in 1958, and the third by Sewell⁵ in 1963, attempted to bring order to this plethora of literature. The present study is another effort in this direction. Its particular contribution is the presentation of the results of a rigorous and systematic study of the sociological perspective in studies of socialization.

As his major ordering criteria Child employed the behavior systems of psychoanalytic theory in summarizing the literature up until 1954. Specifically, his categories included those studies dealing with anal, oral, excretory, sexual, and aggressive behaviors. Extending these Freudian-derived behavior systems, Child added the categories of dependence, achievement, fear, guilt, identification, and motivation.

Child's review of 124 articles was a major attempt at classifying the increasing number of major scientific

²Ibid., p. 164.
⁵Sewell, pp. 163-181.
studies dealing with socialization. It reflected the dominance of the psychoanalytic perspective at the time of its publication, but it also demonstrated the inadequacies of the psychoanalytic perspective as the basis for the development of an empirically based theory. Child concluded, "In short, the existing body of research findings, while impressive as a whole is not very solid in detail."^6

Bronfenbrenner's review was more limited in scope than Child's. He confined his study to an analysis of the relationship between social class and child-rearing patterns, using seven unpublished manuscripts and nine reports of published research. His major problem was to compare studies which occurred at different times, in different places, and with different goals to see if there were generalizations which could be made regardless of spacial or temporal variables.\(^7\) Although all of the studies showed differences in child rearing patterns between the classes, several demonstrated that religious background, mobility and ethnicity of parents were confounding variables.

Bronfenbrenner concluded that during the twenty-five-year period included in the studies, there was a gradual but major shift from the middle-class restrictiveness of the

\(^6\) Child, p. 688.

\(^7\) The span of time covered by the studies reviewed by Bronfenbrenner was twenty-five years, from 1930 to 1955. The sites of study varied from New Haven, Connecticut, to Palo Alto, California.
1930's and early 1940's to permissiveness in the 1950's. He found evidence that while middle-class mothers were more tolerant of their children's needs, they expected more achievement from children than did their working-class counterparts. Early studies of techniques of discipline demonstrated a basic difference between the social classes. Working-class parents disciplined by use of frequent physical punishment while middle-class parents used what was called "love-oriented techniques," i.e., control gained through the child's fear of loss of love. Studies which occurred during the latter part of the twenty-five-year period, however, caused Bronfenbrenner to suggest that there was no longer a "clear trend in the differential use of love-oriented techniques by the two social classes [i.e., the middle- and working-classes]." 8

Bronfenbrenner suggested that the over-all character of the parent-child relationship had been stereotyped for both of the social classes. He indicated that middle-class parents were seen to be desiring autonomy and responsibility for their children, whereas working-class parents desired for their children what they considered to be the middle-class norms. 9 Bronfenbrenner concluded that, based on the

8 Bronfenbrenner, p. 420.

9 An example of the use of these stereotyped ideas of social classes is seen in the four major articles by Kohn: Melvin Lester Kohn, "Social Class and the Exercise of Parental Authority," American Sociological Review, XXIV
evidence presented in the sixteen studies which he examined, the gap between the two social classes had narrowed with respect to child rearing attitudes and techniques.10

Sewell's 1963 article represents the third of the major analyses of socialization studies. He specifically defined the parameters of his study as excluding "... animal socialization, traditional child development fields such as growth and maturation, language development, and the cross cultural studies of socialization in the personality and cultural tradition."11 Sewell did not state the selective criteria for the studies or journals which he reviewed, nor did he tell how many were considered. Sociological Abstracts noted that he reviewed 125 articles.12 Although Sewell stated that the study covered a five-year period, he did not indicate the dates included, but publication dates of the studies reviewed in his article ranged from 1957 to 1963.


10Bronfenbrenner, p. 411.
11Sewell, p. 165.
Sewell suggested three broad generalizations concerning new developments in socialization theory and research. There was increased concentration upon (1) the social role and social systems approach in the study of socialization, (2) later socialization, and (3) sophistication in the design and execution of research.

Interest in the study of socialization to social roles was evidenced on the part of social psychologists influenced by Mead's symbolic interaction approach. Parsons' focus upon institutionalized roles was also influential in this context.\(^\text{13}\) The type of studies Sewell characterized as exemplifying the social systems approach included studies of the relationship of socialization to social class as well as to such social structures as the family, peer group, school, voluntary association, etc.\(^\text{14}\)


The second major generalization which Sewell suggested was of an "... increased interest in socialization in periods other than childhood."\(^{15}\) He reviewed a number of studies of socialization to adolescent, parental, professional, and old-age roles.\(^{16}\) He viewed the study of later socialization as logical and explained:

... if socialization is role learning—in the sense that it refers to the process by which the individual acquires the skills, knowledge, attitudes, values, and motives necessary for performance of social roles—it follows that in any but the most static societies the individual cannot possibly be prepared during childhood for the complex roles that he will be called upon to play at later periods in his life.\(^{17}\)

Sewell stated that much had been published about adolescent socialization, but studies of adult socialization had not yielded a comparable body of knowledge. "Even on the descriptive level, what is known about adult socialization is rather scant—especially in comparison with what is known on childhood and adolescence."\(^{18}\) Sewell concluded

\(^{15}\)Sewell, p. 173.


\(^{17}\)Sewell, p. 173.

\(^{18}\)Ibid., pp. 175-176.
that studies of adult socialization ", . . . have been quite limited and [are] mainly directed at socialization to old-age roles and to new statuses in institutional settings." 19 Nevertheless, research in later socialization, especially the adolescent period, was becoming an important area in socialization studies.

The third trend which Sewell recognized was that of the ", . . . increased sophistication in the design and execution of research." 20 He noted that more experimental variables were being included in the research designs, with a resulting increase in complexity of design. The structure of experimental designs plus, at times, the use of new statistical procedures he viewed as major steps forward in the study of the socialization process. Sewell concluded his discussion of methodological developments by saying, "Socialization research cannot be said to be as rigorous as that in some other branches of social psychology, but it is becoming increasingly respectable." 21

Significance of This Investigation

The importance of socialization as a substantive area of study is attested to by the fact that it is included in all introductory sociology texts. Furthermore, the professional literature of sociology, psychology, anthropology,

19Ibid., p. 177. 20Ibid., p. 179.
21Ibid., p. 181.
and social psychology includes it as a distinct field of intellectual endeavor. In addition, such action agencies of the federal government as the Office of Economic Opportunity and the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, including the Public Health Service, Office of Education, and Children's Bureau, are deeply involved in problems and processes of child development.

So numerous are published studies of socialization from a variety of sources that many bibliographic aids now include socialization as a distinct heading. Reference aids commonly used in this field are Annual Review of Psychology published by Annual Reviews, Child Development Abstracts and Bibliography published by the Society for Research on Child Development, Psychological Abstracts published by the American Psychological Association, Sociological Abstracts published by Sociological Abstracts, Inc, and Research.


Imposing some sort of ordering criteria upon studies of socialization would further the development of sociology as a science. To be most useful, each study should be related to others or to some general body of theory. Parsons made this point when he observed that sociology tended to ignore the cumulative functions of science. He said:

Compared to the natural sciences the amount of genuine empirical research done in our field is very modest indeed. Even so, it has been fairly substantial. But the most disappointing single thing about it has been the degree to which the results of this work have failed to be cumulative.23

Thus, the primary significance of this inquiry is as a contribution to the continuing effort to categorize socialization studies and thereby to make more useful the accumulation of empirical knowledge in the field. The present study, therefore, represents a systematic and rigorous examination of a limited range of the literature in an attempt to delineate the sociological perspective in the field of socialization. In this respect it differs significantly from the reviews of articles by Child and Bronfenbrenner. As previously indicated, Child's work, though purportedly a complete review of the literature up to 1954, was heavily influenced by the psychoanalytic school and is now, in any

Bronfenbrenner's study brought order to an important research tradition, but was limited in that it dealt exclusively with the relationship of social class and differential child rearing patterns. Furthermore, it was published in 1958 and is now ten years old.

The 1963 review of articles by Sewell was a more sophisticated attempt to bring order to the field of socialization. He, however, apparently operated intuitively in his selection of articles, thus introducing possible bias. Further, one can ask if the trends he identified on this basis are discernible five years later.

Thus, the present study seeks to answer two questions: (1) Are the trends which Sewell identified still discernible when approached in the systematic and rigorous manner proposed in this thesis? (2) What was the direction of sociological studies of socialization in the 1960's?
CHAPTER II

METHODS

The general problem of this thesis was introduced in the preceding chapter. The present section discusses the methods involved and suggests the parameters within which the study took place.

Definition of Variables

Broom and Selznick, in their text for introductory sociology, define socialization as "... the way the culture is transmitted and the individual is fitted into an organized way of life."\(^1\) They further explain, "... socialization has two complementary meanings: The transmission of culture and the development of personality."\(^2\)

A recent dictionary of sociology edited by Mitchell says:

socialization is the life-long process of inculcation whereby an individual learns the principal values and symbols of the social systems in which he participates and the expression of those values in the norms composing the roles he and others enact.\(^3\)

\(^2\)Ibid.
Young and Mack's text, *Systematic Sociology*, describes socialization as:

... the process inducting the individual into the social world. It consists of teaching the person the culture which he must acquire and share, of making him a participating member of society and its various groups, and of persuading him to accept the norms of his society.

Secord and Backman define socialization in their text called *Social Psychology*. They say:

Socialization is an interactional process whereby a person's behavior is modified to conform to expectations held by members of the group to which he belongs. Thus it includes not only the process by which the child gradually acquires the ways of the adults around him, but also the process by which an adult takes on behaviors appropriate to the expectations associated with a new position in a group, an organization or society at large.

Since Brim and Sewell are recognized leaders in the study of socialization, their definitions are especially worthy of consideration. Brim writes:

... socialization is defined as a process of learning through which an individual is prepared, with varying degrees of success, to meet the requirements laid down by other members of society for his behavior in a variety of situations. These requirements are always attached to one or another of the recognized positions or statuses in this society such as husband, son, employee, and adult male.

---


Sewell defines socialization as "... the processes by which individuals selectively acquire the skills, knowledge, attitudes, values, and motives current in the groups of which they are or will become members. ..."\(^7\)

The definition of socialization used in this study is derived from the preceding six. Two aspects of socialization which have been suggested in the previous definitions are: (1) socialization as a process of passing on the culture, and (2) socialization as a process through which the individual incorporates the culture. But of even greater importance is the recurrent theme of normative behavior, particularly in relation to those norms composing the roles which the socializee must learn to play. With the process of role transmission in mind, the following definition is proposed.

Socialization is all of the teaching-learning processes which attempt, either implicitly or explicitly, to change or shape the values, attitudes, or behavior of the socializee, in an effort to reinforce societal patterns or norms (i.e., role behavior.)

The operational definition used in selecting articles for inclusion in this study was the following. Socialization is any process which is directly concerned with role behavior. Therefore, any study which dealt with, or was

phrased in terms of, role behavior was included in the sample.

Time Period

The data included as part of this study were derived from articles appearing in a limited number of major journals during the period from January 1, 1960 until December 31, 1967. This time period was selected to include the years of the 1960's in order to determine the direction of socialization research in this decade.

Journals

Five journals were selected for use in this study. The journals selected as most representative of the child development and socialization literature and presenting a sociological perspective were: American Journal of Sociology, American Sociological Review, Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, Sociometry, and Journal of Marriage

8No attempt was made to evaluate chapters in books or book-length studies, such as Daniel R. Miller and Guy E. Swanson's, The Changing American Parent (New York, 1958).

9A pilot study, "The Thrust of Social Research and the Focus of Social Literature in the Field of Socialization," done in connection with a seminar, was used to determine which journals would be most productive in yielding articles dealing with socialization. Through empirical observation of the occurrence of socialization articles in ten journals, the five most productive (and those most representative of the sociological viewpoint) were chosen for study.

10In 1964 the title of this journal was changed from Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology to Journal of Abnormal Psychology.
and the *Family*. Each was reviewed for articles published within the relevant time period which dealt with, or were directly related to, socialization.

The study was limited to the sociological perspective in the field of socialization. *Sociometry* and the *American Sociological Review* are published by the American Sociological Association, and the *American Journal of Sociology* is published specifically for sociologists. Therefore, all articles dealing with socialization which appeared in these three journals were assumed to have a sociological perspective. Articles appearing in the two interdisciplinary journals were examined more critically for the desired perspective. It was assumed that all members of the American Sociological Association would have a sociological viewpoint concerning socialization. The operational criterion for inclusion of articles dealing with socialization, therefore, became the author(s) membership in the Association. If the author, or any author if more than one was named, was listed in either the *Directory* (American Sociological Association, 1963) or the *Directory, Constitution and Bylaws* (American Sociological Association, 1967), the article was included as part of the present study. Otherwise, the article was omitted.

11Since its title change in 1964, this journal has been called *Journal of Marriage and the Family*. Previously its title was *Marriage and Family Living*. 
Data

The data were collected on four-by-six-inch cards. Five colors of cards were used—one color for each of the journals—in order to separate the cards and facilitate certain aspects of the analysis.

Each card contained information about the article reviewed. This information included (1) title, author, and data relevant to the location of the article, (2) a description of the method(s), including (a) methods through which data were gathered (e.g., questionnaire, interview, participant observation), and (b) description of the sample (e.g., number of cases, sex, age), and (c) how the sample was drawn (from what population and the techniques used—simple random sample, purposive sample, etc.), (3) description of the statistical analysis used (e.g., chi square, percentage, mean), and (4) description of the substantive focus of the report or article. (See Appendix A for an example.)

Content Analysis

The content analysis which was undertaken had three major foci: (1) the stage of socialization in relation to (a) socialization variables and (b) journals in which the articles appeared; (2) the substantive focus of the articles in relation to (a) date of publication, (b) journal in which the article appeared, and (c) stage of socialization; and
(3) an analysis of the statistical methods employed by researchers in relation to (a) date of publication, and (b) journals in which published.

**Purpose**

The primary purpose of the analyses of stages of socialization and statistical usage was to test Sewell's hypotheses. He suggested that there was a trend toward increasing interest in later socialization (i.e., socialization in periods other than childhood), and toward more sophisticated methodological approaches. Two of the major analyses in this paper are, therefore, concerned with assessing Sewell's projections.

A third analysis is concerned with the substantive focus of the articles included as part of this study. The purpose of this analysis is to demonstrate the areas in which most socialization research is being done, to show whether the focus has changed during the eight years of the 1960's, and to examine the relationship of age stages of socialization and substantive area.

**Major Classifications**

*Stages of Socialization.*—The major classifications included as part of the analysis of stages of socialization were the same as those used by Sewell. They included childhood, adolescence, and adulthood.

---

12 College students were defined as adolescents.
Substantive area.—The major substantive areas of community, family, and occupation were borrowed from Brim. Since not all cases would clearly fit into these categories, because frequently the dependent variable would fall into one and an independent variable into another, it was necessary to consider each of the permutations. Therefore, the following categories were used: theory, methodology, self and attitude, self and community, self and family, occupation, family, family and community, and community.

An example of a study included under the heading "theory" was an article entitled, "A Formalized Theory of the Self-Concept." Using the interaction theories of Mead and Cooley as a basis, Kinch suggested seven propositions in attempting to present a theory of the self-concept. His work was clearly theoretical.

Typical of those classified under the methodology heading was an essay entitled, "The Choice of Variables in the Study of Socialization." In this article the major classes of traditionally studied variables were pointed out by Maccoby.


She then suggested variables which had been neglected and to which future research should be directed.

Those studies included in the "Self and . . . ." categories dealt with self concept in relation to other major areas of substantive focus. A case in the "Self and Family" category, for example, was entitled, "Parental Interest and Children's Self-Conceptions."\(^{16}\)

Articles which studied the means through which an individual becomes an efficiently functioning member of an economic unit were considered as occupational socialization. Illustrative of the articles dealing with this category is an article by Evan\(^{17}\) entitled, "Peer-Group Interaction and Organizational Socialization: A Study of Employee Turnover."

Studies of the family dealt with various factors within the family structure which may have affected socialization. An example is the article, "Adjustment of Children in 'Solo' and 'Remarriage' Homes."\(^{18}\)

The substantive area "Community" relates socialization to all extra-familial milieus except occupation. Studies typical of those under this heading are "Institutional and


and Life-Cycle Socialization of College Freshmen,"\(^1\) and "Differential Association and the Rehabilitation of Drug Addicts."\(^2\)

**Statistics.**—The primary statistical classification was in traditional terms. All statistics which were used in the socialization studies were classified as either parametric or nonparametric. Each of these categories was further subdivided into either descriptive or inferential. The four-part classification system, therefore, included the following categories: parametric descriptive, parametric inferential, nonparametric descriptive, and nonparametric inferential.

The term "parametric" was used to designate those statistics which required assumptions about the parameters of the population from which the sample was drawn and about levels of measurement. Siegel delineates the conditions for use of the parametric statistical model:

1. The observations must be independent. That is, the selection of any one case from the population for inclusion in the sample must not bias the chances of any other case for inclusion, and the score which is assigned to any case must not bias the score which is assigned to any other case.
2. The observations must be drawn from normally


distributed populations.
3. These populations must have the same variance (or, in special cases, they must have a known ratio of variances.)
4. The variables involved must have been measured in at least an interval scale, so that it is possible to use the operations of arithmetic (adding, dividing, finding means, etc.) on the scores.
5. The means of these normal and homoscedastic populations must be linear combinations of effects due to columns and/or rows. That is, the effects must be additive.\(^2\)

He concluded that "the meaningfulness of the results of a parametric test depends on the validity of these assumptions."\(^2\)

The category "nonparametric" included those statistics which required fewer and less stringent assumptions than those classified "parametric." Nonparametric statistics have as assumptions (1) that the level of measurement is either nominal, ordinal, interval, or ratio, (2) that there is some underlying continuity to the variable under investigation, and (3) that the observations are independent of each other.\(^3\) Thus parametric statistics, in addition to being without assumptions about normal distribution, require only a nominal level of measurement, although any higher level can also be used.

"Descriptive statistics attempt to condense and summarize data in a clear and convenient form."\(^4\) The

\(^3\)Ibid., p. 31.
\(^4\)Ibid.
summary is a description of certain characteristics of the data under investigation and not an attempt to derive broader generalizations.

Inferential statistics are techniques which are concerned with deriving generalizations about populations rather than about the sample under study. Statistical inference, then, is the logical process by which the investigator judges (with a known degree of probability) (1) the limits within which the parameter lies, if given the statistic, (2) whether two samples come from the same population, and (3) whether a sample comes from a specified population.

**Cross-Classification**

Two of the major cross-classification variables used were year of publication and journal in which the article appeared. The purposes of the analysis by year of publication were to establish trends, to examine the degree of editorial consistency of various journals through time, and to provide a basis for speculation concerning the future focus of socialization studies. Cross-classification by journals facilitated the process of ascertaining the focus of the articles in each journal.

A third cross-classification system, "socialization variables," was used in some instances. It consisted of variables of the following nature: (1) Psychological; (2) Psychological and Social Structure; (3) Social Structure
and Values or Norms; and (4) Cultural. Studies included under the heading "Cultural" were those in which the cultural setting was explicitly used as a variable. An example is the article by Kell and Aldous\textsuperscript{25} entitled, "Trends in Child Care over Three Generations," which attempted, in part, to show the effect of the changing cultural setting on socialization patterns.

The article, "Class Structure, Mobility and Change in Child Rearing," might be considered typical of the studies included in the category "Social Structure and Values or Norms." Since social structural construct was one variable and norms of child rearing was another, the study by Blau\textsuperscript{26} fits into this category.

Included under the heading "Psychological and Social Structure" are studies such as Rosen's, "Family Structure and Achievement Motivation."\textsuperscript{27} Aspects of both a psychological nature (e.g., achievement motivation) and of a social structure pattern (e.g., family structure) are part of every study under this heading.


\textsuperscript{26}Zena Smith Blau, "Class Structure, Mobility and Change in Child Rearing," \textit{Sociometry}, XXVIII (June, 1965), 210-219.

The article, "Unintended Effects of Parental Aspirations: The Case of Children's Cheating," is illustrative of the type of study placed in the "Psychological" category. This study by Pearlin and associates\textsuperscript{28} explored the relationship between psychological factors resulting from early socialization and attitudes toward cheating at a later date. It is, therefore, classified as a "Psychological" study of socialization.

Limitations

This content analysis is limited in two important respects: time and content restrictions. The time period was arbitrarily chosen to include only the years of the 1960's in order to keep the study manageable and to bring up to date previous reviews. The number of journals was also limited for pragmatic reasons.

A final shortcoming is the possibility of personal bias which might be introduced because all classification was done by one judge. Although it is preferable to have at least two judges, this ideal was impractical. This possible source of bias must, therefore, be recognized.

CHAPTER III

RESULTS

General Observations:

Eighty-one articles which met the operational criteria were abstracted. Of these articles sixty-six were empirical studies and fifteen were primarily discursive.

It is of interest to note the publication of a number of studies whose research site was in a geographical location outside of the continental United States. Eight studies (9.9 percent) were done in other countries while 5 compared more than one society. Samples from Brazil, France, Great Britain, India, Israel, Kenya, Okinawa, the Philippines, and West Germany were each included once, and samples from Italy and Mexico were included in two studies.

Inspection of the eighty-one articles showed that 124 people (95 males and 29 females) were authors or coauthors. Thirty-five of the studies were coauthored and 46 were published by researchers publishing alone.¹

Major areas of emphasis in the past have been socialization and its relationship to social class, family

¹Further analysis showed that of the 35 coauthored studies, male-female collaboration occurred in 10 articles. Ten studies were published by women, 6 coauthored and 4 single-authored while males published 61 articles, 19 in collaboration with others and 42 singly. Women are slightly
structure, and achievement motivation. Studies within these areas made up 34.6 percent (28 articles) of all cases in the present study. Studies of family structure were reported in 11 (13.6 percent) of the articles, while social class and achievement motivation were major variables in 9 (11.1 percent) and 8 (9.9 percent), respectively.

Table I summarizes the distribution of articles by year of publication and by journal in which they appeared. Three years, 1961-1963, had a disproportionately large number of articles dealing with socialization. Together these years accounted for 63.4 percent of all cases, with the peak of publication occurring in 1963 when 21 articles appeared. The year 1964 had the fewest articles with only 4 (5.0 percent) studies of socialization published in the 5 journals. The mean number of studies per year was 10.1. The uneven publication pattern is reflected in a standard deviation of 6.03.

More than one of every four articles (25.9 percent) included as part of the present study appeared in Sociometry, while 24.7, 23.5, and 22.2 percent were published in the American Journal of Sociology, American Sociological Review, and the American Journal of Sociology. This last statistic from Alan P. Bates, The Sociological Enterprise (Boston, 1967), p. 131.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year of Publication</th>
<th>American Journal of Sociology</th>
<th>American Sociological Review</th>
<th>Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology</th>
<th>Marriage and Family Living</th>
<th>Sociometry</th>
<th>Total no.</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>23.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1962</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1963</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>25.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1964</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>99.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>percent</td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Error due to rounding.*
and Marriage and Family Living, respectively. Fewer than one in every twenty articles (3.7 percent) appeared in the Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, and none were published in this journal during the last four years included in this study.  

Stages of Socialization

Table II demonstrates the relationship between stages of socialization and selected socialization variables. Two

| TABLE II |
| DISTRIBUTION OF ARTICLES BY STAGES OF SOCIALIZATION AND SOCIALIZATION VARIABLES |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage of Socialization</th>
<th>Psychological</th>
<th>Psychological and Social Structure</th>
<th>Social Structure and Values, Norms</th>
<th>Cultural</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Childhood</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adolescence</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>34.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adulthood</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>31.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>number</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>percent</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>58.0</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Omits articles dealing with theory and methodology.

Although the journals Marriage and Family Living and Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology had name changes in 1964 (see page 17), they will here be referred to by their former names.

Twenty-three studies of socialization were found in
(2.5 percent) of the articles dealt with methodology and 10 (12.3 percent) with theory. These were equally applicable to all stages of socialization and will not be considered in this analysis.

The three major stages of socialization (i.e., childhood, adolescence, and adulthood) are about evenly represented in this eight-year period. The 23 articles classified under childhood account for 33.3 percent of the total, whereas the 24 dealing with adolescence and 22 concerned with adulthood contributed 34.8 and 31.9 percent, respectively.

The most frequently used variables for all stages of socialization were a combination of psychological and social structure. These variables were used in 40 (58.0 percent) of the studies. Those articles which used social structure and values or norms as variables totaled 19 (27.5 percent) and concentration on the cultural variable comprised only 2 articles (2.9 percent) of the total.

Table III demonstrates the relationship between the age graded stages of socialization, socialization variables, and journal of publication. The two general sociological journals, the American Journal of Sociology and the American
TABLE III
DISTRIBUTION OF ARTICLES BY JOURNAL, STAGES OF SOCIALIZATION AND SOCIALIZATION VARIABLES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Socialization variables</th>
<th>American Journal of Sociology</th>
<th>American Sociological Review</th>
<th>Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology</th>
<th>Marriage and Family Living</th>
<th>Sociometry</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>no.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHILDHOOD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>soc. structure</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soc. structure/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>values, norms</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADOLESCENCE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>soc. structure</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soc. structure/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>values, norms</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADULTHOOD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>soc. structure</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soc. structure/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>values, norms</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>99.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Omits articles dealing with theory and methodology.

**Error due to rounding
Sociological Review, emphasized adult socialization. The two interdisciplinary journals contained studies focusing on childhood and were marginally concerned with adolescent socialization but rarely considered the adult field:

Analysis of Substantive Categories
An analysis of the substantive focus of the articles introduces a new facet for discussion. The three following tables show the relationship between the substantive focus of the articles reviewed and other variables.

TABLE IV
DISTRIBUTION OF ARTICLES BY SUBSTANTIVE AREA AND YEAR OF PUBLICATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Substantive area</th>
<th>19</th>
<th>19</th>
<th>19</th>
<th>19</th>
<th>19</th>
<th>19</th>
<th>19</th>
<th>19</th>
<th>60</th>
<th>61</th>
<th>62</th>
<th>63</th>
<th>64</th>
<th>65</th>
<th>66</th>
<th>67</th>
<th>Total number</th>
<th>Total percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>32.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family and Community</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theory</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>...</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self and Community</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self and Attitude</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self and Family</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methodology</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table IV illustrates the number of articles published in each substantive area, presenting the data on a year-by-
year basis. Articles published about the family accounted for 26 (32.1 percent) of all of the studies. The next most frequently occurring area of study was a combination of family and community. There were 13 articles (16.1 percent) in this category. Tying for third rank were studies relating to self and community and those concentrating on theory.

**TABLE V**

**DISTRIBUTION OF ARTICLES BY SUBSTANTIVE AREA AND JOURNALS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Substantive area</th>
<th>American Journal of Sociology</th>
<th>American Sociological Review</th>
<th>Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology</th>
<th>Marriage and Family Living</th>
<th>Sociometry</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family and Community</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theory</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self and Community</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self and Attitude</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self and Family</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methodology</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>20</strong></td>
<td><strong>19</strong></td>
<td><strong>3</strong></td>
<td><strong>18</strong></td>
<td><strong>21</strong></td>
<td><strong>81</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table V shows the relationship between each journal and each of the substantive areas. The *American Journal of*
Sociology more frequently published articles in the areas of community, self and attitude, and theory. Studies of occupational socialization appeared most often in the American Sociological Review. Not suprisingly, *Marriage and Family Living* published the most articles focusing upon the family or the family and community. The largest number of articles in *Sociometry* dealt with self and community.

**TABLE VI**

**DISTRIBUTION OF ARTICLES BY SUBSTANTIVE AREA AND STAGES OF SOCIALIZATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Substantive area</th>
<th>Childhood</th>
<th>Adolescence</th>
<th>Adulthood</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family and Community</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self and Community</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self and Attitude</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self and Family</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>23</strong></td>
<td><strong>24</strong></td>
<td><strong>22</strong></td>
<td><strong>69</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Omits articles dealing with theory and the methodology.

Table VI examines the relationship between age stages and the substantive areas. Articles dealing with the family were most often studied in the context of childhood socialization. Childhood and adolescent socialization were nearly
equally represented in studies focusing on the relationship of family and community. Viewed differently, the family was a central focus of 19 (86.4 percent) of the articles concerning childhood socialization, 13 (54.2 percent) of those concerned with adolescence, and 9 (40.9 percent) of those focusing on adult socialization.

One might infer that adolescence is viewed by researchers as a critical period in the formation of the self-concept, for 10 of the articles (41.7 percent) focusing on the adolescent period investigated some aspect of the self compared to 3 (9.1 percent) in childhood and 4 (18.2 percent) for adults. The foci of studies of adult socialization were community and occupational roles.

Analysis of Methodology

Analysis of the methodology used in the articles will be treated in two sections. The first section will examine sampling techniques and sample size and the second will present an analysis of the statistics used in these studies of socialization.

Samples

Table VII summarizes the sampling techniques. The heading "random selection" includes any studies which employed random procedures at any point in the sampling process. "Total population" implies that a selected total population was the sample. In these studies the target population was
most often chosen on the basis of availability (e.g., bomber crews, seventh graders in Cedar Rapids, Iowa, etc.)

TABLE VII
TYPE AND FREQUENCY OF SAMPLING TECHNIQUES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of sample</th>
<th>Frequency of use</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Random selection</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total population</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>21.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No selection criteria</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>62.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>66*</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Omits all discursive articles.

Examples of studies included in the category "no selection criteria" were those reporting that the subjects were "introductory students willing to take the test" or "any beginning nursing student." 4

About one of every 6 studies used random selection at some point in the sampling procedure. The majority of the studies, however, employed other techniques and on the whole sampling procedures were quite primitive.

The ability to generalize to large populations depends on a random selection procedure. Since fewer than 17 percent of the studies used this type of technique it follows

4Quota, availability and systematic sampling were also included in this category.
that over four-fifths (83.3 percent) of the studies could not with confidence generalize to any population beyond its own sample.

Table VIII shows the size of sample in relation to frequency of use. Sample sizes seemed adequate for studies of socialization. One can speculate that the researchers relied upon large samples to compensate for inadequate and/or uncontrolled sampling procedures.

**TABLE VIII**

**SAMPLE SIZE AND FREQUENCY OF USE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample sizes</th>
<th>Frequency of use</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10-30</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-100</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101-999</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>63.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 1000</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>66</strong>*</td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Omits all discursive articles.

**Statistics**

This section reports the types of statistical techniques employed in studies of socialization. Whether the statistic was correctly employed (i.e., whether the underlying assumptions had been met) is beyond the scope of this paper.
Table IX lists the various statistics and their classification as well as frequency of use. The four most popular statistics were (1) percent and proportion, (2) chi square, (3) mean, and (4) t-tests.

**TABLE IX**

STATISTICS AND THEIR FREQUENCY OF USE IN THE STUDY OF SOCIALIZATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class*</th>
<th>Statistic</th>
<th>Frequency of use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pd</td>
<td>Percent and proportion</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ni</td>
<td>Chi square</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pd</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pi</td>
<td>t-tests</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ni</td>
<td>Analysis of variance</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pi</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ni</td>
<td>Mann-Whitney U-test</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nd</td>
<td>Median</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pd</td>
<td>Pearson product-moment</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pd</td>
<td>Standard deviation</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ni</td>
<td>Wilcoxon assigned ranks</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ni</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nd</td>
<td>Tau C.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pd</td>
<td>Standard score</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ni</td>
<td>Analysis of covariance</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ni</td>
<td>Binomial by Siegel</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nd</td>
<td>D-coefficient</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pi</td>
<td>Parameter of Poisson distribution</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nd</td>
<td>Yule's Q.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pi</td>
<td>Tetrachoric coefficient</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**</td>
<td>Verimax rotation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\*Pd—parametric descriptive, Pi—parametric inferential, Nd—nonparametric descriptive, Ni—nonparametric inferential.

**This statistical technique was a type of factor analysis used to identify variables.

The diversity of statistics is noteworthy. Many of them do not appear in standard statistical textbooks for the social sciences.
The next two tables show the relationship between the four statistical categories (i.e., parametric descriptive, parametric inferential, nonparametric descriptive, and nonparametric inferential) and other variables. Table X relates the type of statistic to the year of publication and

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Statistic</th>
<th>Year of Publication</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19 19 19 19 19 19 19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>60 61 62 63 64 65 66</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>67 67 67 67 67 67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19 19 19 19 19 19 19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>60 61 62 63 64 65 66</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>67 67 67 67 67 67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARAMETRIC</td>
<td>number</td>
<td>percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Descriptive</td>
<td>9 8 11 19 6 3 5 6</td>
<td>67 50.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inferential</td>
<td>2 2 3 1 1 .. 1 2</td>
<td>12 9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NONPARAMETRIC</td>
<td>number</td>
<td>percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Descriptive</td>
<td>1 1 1 1 1 .. 1 1</td>
<td>7 5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inferential</td>
<td>4 9 6 12 4 2 7 3</td>
<td>47 35.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>133*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Omits verimax rotation.

shows a preponderance of parametric statistics. A total of 79 (59.4 percent) of the statistics were parametric compared with 54 (40.6 percent) which were nonparametric, yet parametric statistics are often not suitable to use in studies of socialization because of the level of measurement of the variables. Further, it appears that parametric statistics could not be supported by more than 16.7 percent of the studies since only that number used random techniques at
some point in data gathering. Parametric descriptive statistics accounted for 67 (50.4 percent) of all statistics used in the articles, and parametric inferential statistics were used 12 (9.0 percent) times during the eight year period of the study.

The conclusion from this analysis would not support Sewell's suggestion that methodology was becoming more sophisticated. The results indicate that while more elaborate statistics were used, the methodology may have been inappropriate and inadequate. Also, there was no apparent increase in the use of nonparametric statistics within the time period studied.

Table XI reports the relationship between the type of statistic used and the journal in which the article was published.

Every journal except Marriage and Family Living published studies using parametric statistics more often than nonparametric. Even the articles in Sociometry, a journal which is noted for its methodological orientation, had a preponderance (59.5 percent) of parametric statistics.

When parametric statistics were employed, they were usually (84.8 percent of all cases) descriptive. Nonparametric statistics were used more often for statistical inference. Eighty-seven percent of nonparametric statistics were used in this manner.
TABLE XI
RELATIONSHIP OF PARAMETRIC AND NONPARAMETRIC STATISTICS AND JOURNAL OF PUBLICATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Statistic</th>
<th>American Journal of Sociology</th>
<th>American Sociological Review</th>
<th>Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology</th>
<th>Marriage and Family Living</th>
<th>Sociometry</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PARAMETRIC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Descriptive</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inferential</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NONPARAMETRIC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Descriptive</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inferential</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>133*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Omits verimax rotation.

It appears from grouped data reporting sampling method and statistics that the methodology employed in studies of socialization might be seriously questioned. Since such stringent assumptions underlie the use of parametric statistics (especially level of measurement and normal distribution), it was expected that most studies would use non-parametric statistics.

Although, as noted earlier, no attempt was made to evaluate every article for the appropriateness of the statistic used in each case, this analysis indicates that caution must be exercised in the interpretation of studies in the field.
of socialization. Until the methodology of the researchers becomes more appropriate to the data, the accumulation of "knowledge" will be slow.
CHAPTER IV

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

This thesis has presented a summary of sociological studies of socialization in the 1960's. It has reviewed eighty-one articles which were published between January 1, 1960 and December 31, 1967. The five journals from which these articles were selected were chosen to maximize the number of studies included in the study.

Major analyses included as part of the present study were (1) the study of stages of socialization; (2) an examination of the substantive focus of socialization studies; and (3) an evaluation of the methodology employed, particularly sampling method and statistical techniques.

Conclusions

A major conclusion from the analysis of stages of socialization is that child, adolescent, and adult socialization during the past eight years have received about equal attention. Speculation as to why an increasing number of studies of later socialization have taken place should include the recent emphasis on role theory in this field. Role requirements for individuals in any but the most
simplistic societies are constantly changing. Because of increased emphasis on new roles in later life, studies of role learning have focused upon new age stages and now encompass all major age groupings.

The substantive focus of the articles reviewed was concentrated in one area. Over one-half of the articles had the family as the major focus. It appears that although the focus of studies of socialization has shifted from childhood to later periods, the bulk of interest has not been removed from the family as the most basic socializing agent.

Speculation as to why the family is still the focus of sociological studies of socialization must take into account the theoretical heritage of the symbolic interaction school, particularly that of Cooley and Mead. Cooley, who considered the primary group to be "... fundamental in forming [the] social nature and ideals of the individual," 2 believed that the family was among the most important of all primary groups. The primary group characteristics which are presumably embodied by the family almost certainly form the basic reason that studies have focused on this institution.

Mead 3 elaborated the importance of role taking. Emphasizing play as the means through which children learn

---

1 Sewell, p. 173.


3 George Herbert Mead, Mind, Self and Society, edited by Charles W. Morris (Chicago, 1934).
various social roles and the family as the cradle of personality, his theoretical orientation influenced many investigators. It was in the family context that role playing was learned. In short, the importance of the family in the development of the self-concept and the socialization of the child was a major theme of the influential symbolic interaction theorists. Their influence is still evident.

With increasing emphasis on later stages of socialization, it seems logical to expect that future trends in the sociological study of socialization will increasingly be concerned with other substantive areas in addition to the family. More attention will probably be directed to areas in which role learning is important in adulthood (e.g., socialization to occupational roles and to emerging statuses such as retirement.)

The final conclusion drawn from the present study centers upon methodology. Evaluation of methodology was based on an analysis of the sampling and statistical techniques employed in the original studies. In view of the small number of samples which were randomly drawn (constituting less than seventeen percent of all empirical studies), it appears that actual practices of sampling are lagging behind the current techniques in this field. Even more questionable was the practice of using parametric statistics in the analysis.
of data. Most social data cannot meet the assumptions which these statistics require. The analysis done in this study calls into serious question the appropriate use of statistics in socialization studies. Parametric statistics were most often used for descriptive purposes in these studies, whereas the bulk of nonparametric statistics was inferential.

Comparison

The conclusions of the present study are not wholly congruent with those of Sewell. It was found, as Sewell also indicated, that a large number of studies concerned later socialization. However, Sewell suggested that the majority of these studies dealt with socialization during adolescence. The results of this study indicate that a nearly equal number of articles concerned childhood, adolescence and adulthood.

Finally, these findings do not support Sewell's optimism regarding methodology. Sewell noted an increasing complexity in design of some of the studies which he reviewed and concluded that studies were becoming increasingly sophisticated. Data from the present study indicate that caution is required in evaluating the methodology employed.

\[4\] The assumptions were reviewed on pages 23 and 24.

\[5\] Sewell's major conclusions were reviewed on page 8.

\[6\] See page 9, footnote 18.
in socialization studies in the 1960's. The predominant use of parametric statistics with social data and the crude sampling procedures involved do not seem to support Sewell's optimism.

Recommendations

Recommendations for future research include (1) broadening the sample upon which the study is based; (2) a more sophisticated evaluation of the methodology of the studies reviewed; and (3) the use of a panel of judges to evaluate and categorize each study.

Two major suggestions can be made for broadening the sample. The first recommendation is that the time period include about twenty-five years, instead of the eight years reviewed here. An analysis of this longer time period would enable the investigator to more appropriately speculate about the trends involved in this field. The second recommendation is that the Journal of Social Psychology be substituted for the Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology. The former journal would appear to be more relevant to sociological studies of socialization.

Methodology should also be studied in more detail. Particular attention should be paid to the appropriateness of the statistics employed in light of the sample size, sampling procedure, and level of measurement. In addition, the
number of variables with which each study dealt should also be recorded.

The final recommendation is that a panel of judges assist in the evaluation and categorization of each article. Through use of the consensual panel technique, future research in this area should attempt to eliminate bias, an admitted weakness of the present study.

In conclusion, the results of this study suggest that further investigation and evaluation of studies of socialization should be undertaken. The present study dealt with a limited number of journals during the first eight years of the 1960's in an attempt to ascertain the sociological perspective in the field of socialization. Such periodic evaluations of research are necessary if empirical evidence is to become cumulative.
APPENDIX A

Side 1

Title: "Age Norms, Age Constraints, Vol. 70
and Adult Socialization" mo. yr. May '65
Author: Bernice L. Neugarten, Joan W.
Moore, and John C. Lowe

Method:
A 39-item questionnaire, divided into equal sections about occupational career, family cycle and groupings refering to recreation, appearance and consumption behavior was used.

A quota sample of middle-class respondents was obtained. Class was determined by level of education, occupation, and area of residence. The sample was divided into 50 men and 50 women aged 20-30; 100 men and 100 women aged 30-55; and 50 men and 50 women aged 65 and over. The majority had been married and had children. N=400.

Statistical analysis used: percent
Summary:

It is the opinion of the authors that age related norms, constraints and sanctions are part of the process of socialization in our society. That these are age-related life events is obvious. The process of learning the roles related to age is another facet of socialization.
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