



<http://www.diva-portal.org>

Preprint

This is the submitted version of a paper published in *Journal of Marriage and Family*.

Citation for the original published paper (version of record):

Trifan, T., Stattin, H., Tilton-Weaver, L. (2014)

Have authoritarian parenting practices and roles changed in the last 50 years?.

Journal of Marriage and Family, 76(4): 744-761

<http://dx.doi.org/DOI: 10.1111/jomf.12124>

Access to the published version may require subscription.

N.B. When citing this work, cite the original published paper.

Permanent link to this version:

<http://urn.kb.se/resolve?urn=urn:nbn:se:oru:diva-38574>



Have Authoritarian Parenting Practices and Roles Changed in The Last Fifty Years?

Journal:	<i>Journal of Marriage and Family</i>
Manuscript ID:	JMF-2013-3545-MS.R1
Manuscript Type:	Original Manuscript
Keywords:	Parenting < Parenting and Parenthood, Parent-child relations < Parenting < Parenting and Parenthood, Family roles < Gender, Cohort < Social Context, Child discipline/guidance < Parenting < Parenting and Parenthood

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

Review

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Running head: AUTHORITARIAN PARENTING IN THE LAST FIFTY YEARS

Have Authoritarian Parenting Practices and Roles Changed in The Last Fifty Years?

For Peer Review

Abstract

This study examined changes in authoritarian parenting practices and family roles in Sweden over the last 50 years. Data came from three cohorts (1958, 1981, and 2011) of young to middle adults living in a suburb of Stockholm who answered questions about how they were raised ($N_{1958}=385$, $N_{1981}=207$, $N_{2011}=457$). Results showed a dramatic decrease in parents' directive control. Also, over time, parents increasingly allowed children to express anger toward them. Parents' roles changed from stereotyped versions of fathers as decision-makers and mothers as caregivers to both parents sharing decisions and garnering respect from children. Overall, results suggest that authoritarian parenting practices have declined dramatically and moved towards more egalitarian family environments. These changes in parental practices and parental roles were more pronounced between the last two cohorts.

Keywords: child discipline/ guidance; cohort; gender; family roles; parent-child relations; parenting

Have Authoritarian Parenting Practices Declined in The Last Fifty Years?

Western societies have been changing rapidly over the last 50 years. The social and economic conditions for families today differ substantially from the conditions of families living several decades ago. Also, social policies about families have changed. The question is whether there has also been a clear trend in the way parents raise their children. Is parenting today fundamentally different from what it was some generations ago? In this study, we focus on parenting practices typically associated with authoritarian parenting, such as directiveness (Robinson, Mandleco, Olsen, & Hart, 1995); harsh parenting practices (Amato & Fowler, 2002); strictness, punitiveness, and constraining the expression of negative emotion (Schaefer & Bell 1958). We also look at how parental roles associated with authoritarian ideals have changed. In this study we examine how these aspects of authoritarian parenting have changed over the last 50 years.

Authoritarian parenting was the first parenting style to be described. The first systematic studies on authoritarian parenting date from the late 1940s (e.g. Baldwin, 1948), whereas references to other parenting styles started to appear at least a decade later (Baumrind, 1966). It is also the type of parenting most likely to have changed in the last 50 years, because the practices associated with authoritarian parenting style reflect, at the family level, a traditional hierarchical structure common to many societies during the first half of the 20th century. That is, in hierarchical structures people in positions of authority expect obedience and unquestioning acceptance of their authority (see Durrant, Rose-Krasnor, & Broberg, 2003, Gadlin, 1978). Disobedience is met with punishment. During the latter half of the 20th century, western societies started changing from hierarchical organization toward more egalitarian structures (see Oppenheimer, 2004). In keeping with studies showing that harsh parenting practices have

1
2
3
4 negative effects on children's development (e.g., Baumrind, 1966; Straus & Paschall, 2009),
5
6 many authoritarian practices are now regulated. For example, the use of corporal punishment is
7
8 banned in some countries (United Nations, 2011). These developments towards egalitarianism in
9
10 society and acknowledgement of children's rights make it plausible that parents' use of practices
11
12 associated with the authoritarian parenting style have also changed. With more than 70 years of
13
14 research examining their effects on child development and legislation regulating some of these
15
16 practices, the authoritarian parenting practices based on control are ideal candidates for studying
17
18 parenting trends in the second half of the 20th century.
19
20
21

22
23 In light of how parenting is embedded in culture and time, it is surprising that changes in
24
25 parenting have not been the subject of much research. There are few studies focusing on changes
26
27 in parenting practices over time. Those that exist suggest that there have been improvements in
28
29 parenting and family life over time. For example, middle-aged adults born in Britain in 1958 felt
30
31 emotionally closer to their parents than those born in 1946 (Ferri & Smith, 2003). Similarly,
32
33 adolescents in a 2006 UK cohort reported that their parents showed more interest in them, were
34
35 more inclined to listen to their ideas, and spent more time with them than adolescents from a
36
37 1986 cohort (Nuffield Foundation, 2009; Scott, Collishaw, Gardner, & Maughan, 2009). This
38
39 evidence suggests that parenting practices have become more child-centered. Still, the evidence
40
41 covers less than three decades and involves rather positive parenting practices (i.e., affection,
42
43 interest, time spent together). Further, the use of positive parenting practices does not negate the
44
45 use of strict, punitive parenting practices, as they are two separate constructs (e.g., Amato &
46
47 Fowler, 2002). Thus, the aforementioned studies do not address whether harsh parenting
48
49 associated with the authoritarian style has declined.
50
51
52
53
54

55
56 Research on intergenerational transmission of parenting also offers information about
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 changes in parenting practices. Intergenerational studies suggest that there have been shifts away
5
6 from authoritarianism over generations in the same families. For example, in a study of two
7
8 generations of Australians, parents in the second generation perceived themselves as less
9
10 authoritarian than their parents (Campbell & Gilmore, 2007). In a generational comparison of
11
12 Korean fathers, Jung and Sterling Honig (2000) found shifts toward more democratic parenting.
13
14 In line with these declines in authoritarian parenting, a study of two generations in the US found
15
16 that both men and women from the younger generation reported more positive feelings toward
17
18 their children than their parents did (Thornberry, Freeman-Gallant, Lizotte, Krohn, & Smith,
19
20 2003). Overall, these studies suggest that the use of authoritarian parenting practices has
21
22 decreased with successive generations. Nevertheless, this is only indirect evidence of how
23
24 authoritarian parenting might have changed within the greater community. That is, changes
25
26 associated with generational transmissions within families do not mean that mean-level changes
27
28 between families have occurred (see Bronfenbrenner, 1986; Straus, 2010). Further, family
29
30 members share an environment and have a common genetic background. The shared features
31
32 between parents and children often mean that the estimates of parenting over generations within
33
34 families are more stable than estimates of change within the larger population. There are also
35
36 other methodological limitations that limit generalizability. The most evident issues are small
37
38 sample sizes (Jung & Sterling Honig, 2000), the use of clinical samples (Thornberry et al., 2003),
39
40 and the use of single reporters for information on both generations (Campbell & Gilmore, 2007).
41
42 The above-mentioned studies, then, provide evidence of a shift away from authoritarianism
43
44 within the family over generations, but these findings cannot be generalized to the societal level.
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52

53 The comparison of the frequency of harsh disciplinary practices over time provides more
54
55 direct evidence about historical trends in authoritarian parenting, because research has associated
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 these practices with an authoritarian parenting style (e.g., Baumrind, 1966; Brenner & Fox, 1999;
5
6 Robinson et al., 1995). Many studies on parents' disciplinary practices have focused on physical
7
8 punishment, one of the hallmarks of authoritarian parenting (e.g., Baumrind, 1991; Conrade &
9
10 Ho, 2001; Russell, Aloa, Feder, Glover, Miller, & Palmer, 1998). Research examining cohort
11
12 differences suggests that in many countries the attractiveness of physical punishment has waned
13
14 (Bussmann, Erthal, & Schroth, in press; Zolotor, Theodore, Runyan, Chang, & Laskey, 2011). In
15
16 Sweden, where the first laws banning physical punishment were enacted, the use of physical
17
18 punishment appears to have declined (Durrant et al., 2003). Studies examining parenting in the
19
20 1950s and the '60s reported that at least a third of parents used more severe forms of physical
21
22 punishment, such as beatings (Stattin, Janson, Klackenberg-Larsson, & Magnusson, 1995). This
23
24 percentage has been considerably lower in more recent research (e. g., under 5% in 2007;
25
26 Bussman et al., in press). Rates of physical punishment have also dropped in countries where
27
28 there has been no legislation banning its use (Bussman et al., in press; Straus, 2010). In light of
29
30 these findings, it seems that parents' use of physical punishment, one of the characteristics of the
31
32 control dimension in authoritarian parenting, has become less frequent over the last fifty years.
33
34 Although these studies offer a clear view of changes in the use of physical punishment, they are
35
36 limited to only one type of authoritarian parenting practices, and do not show whether there are
37
38 changes in the other trademark features of authoritarian parenting.
39
40
41
42
43
44
45

46
47 Taken together, existing research offers little direct evidence of how parenting practices
48
49 based on directive control have changed over time, and the picture is not entirely conclusive due
50
51 to methodological problems. Even in cohort studies, which provide direct evidence of changes
52
53 in the use of authoritarian practices, the information is limited to rates of physical punishment
54
55 (e.g., Durrant et al., 2003; Straus, 2010), requiring an inference that other features of
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 authoritarian parenting practices have declined as well. No study, to our knowledge, has
5
6 explicitly focused on trends in authoritarian parenting practices, using the same measures over
7
8 time, and assessing a range of authoritarian practices over longer periods of time. Answering
9
10 this question is important, because it can help us understand the temporal changes in parenting
11
12 practices, which might raise further questions about the role of society and laws in shaping them.
13
14

15
16 A thorough analysis of the changes in authoritarian practices cannot be completed
17
18 without taking into account the changes in the distribution of parental roles in the family. The
19
20 two concepts, parental practices and parental roles, are both influenced by societal norms and
21
22 laws. Both contribute to children's adjustment (e.g., Baumrind, 1966; Strauss & Paschall, 2009;
23
24 Hofferth & Goldscheider, 2010). An authoritarian parenting style is expected in a more
25
26 traditional family (see Durant et al., 2003, Gadlin, 1978), where the roles are more rigid than in
27
28 more democratic families. The two concepts are connected and researchers have raised the issue
29
30 of changing roles to explain changes in parenting (e.g., Hofferth & Goldscheider, 2010; Sarkadi,
31
32 Kristiansson, Oberklaid & Bremberg, 2008). No research, to our knowledge, has directly
33
34 examined changes in both parental roles and parental practices in the same family. Having a
35
36 clear idea of what changes, parental practices or parental roles, is important for understanding the
37
38 influence of society and laws over family life.
39
40
41
42
43

44 To fill these gaps, we examined how authoritarian parenting practices and parental roles
45
46 have changed over the last 50 years in Sweden. We used the hallmark practices of the control
47
48 dimension of the authoritarian parenting style, because its outcomes have been amply researched
49
50 and its practices have been subjected to legal and societal regulations. Moreover, in the last few
51
52 decades there has been an increasing emphasis on egalitarianism and democratizing the
53
54 institutions throughout European societies. Therefore, it is reasonable to think that such trends
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 towards egalitarianism and democracy might also be reflected at the family level. It is also
5
6 reasonable to think the trend toward egalitarianism and democracy might have influenced family
7
8 roles, challenging the traditional authority of the father specific to hierarchical societies. In our
9
10 study, we used retrospective reports from adults in the same community who were assessed as
11
12 three cohorts: a 1958 cohort, a 1981 cohort, and a 2011 cohort.
13
14

15
16 In addition to examining adults' perceptions of their parents' use of authoritarian
17
18 practices and the distribution of parental roles in the family, we also explored the ways in which
19
20 participants' gender shaped these perceptions. Most of the studies of parenting styles and
21
22 practices, especially those that have focused on the ways parents discipline children, have shown
23
24 that parenting differs as a function of both parents' and children's gender (Russel et al., 1998,
25
26 Conrade & Ho, 2001, Stattin et al., 1995). Traditionally, mothers and fathers' roles reflected
27
28 different aspects of authoritarianism, with fathers making decisions, directing the family, and
29
30 requiring obedience and respect of the child, and mothers providing children with nurturance and
31
32 support, but delegating punishment to fathers (Hosley & Montemayor, 1997; Michael, 1987;
33
34 Nelson, Padilla-Walker, Christensen, Evans, & Carroll, 2011; Russell et al., 1998). Indeed, in
35
36 past research, children and adults have perceived fathers as more authoritarian than mothers
37
38 (Campbell & Gilmore, 2007, Conrade & Ho, 2001, Hosley & Montemayor, 1997, Lewis, 1981;
39
40 Russell et al., 1998). With respect to gender differences in children's experiences of
41
42 authoritarian parenting, sons have reportedly been more likely to be the targets of authoritarian
43
44 practices than girls (Conrade & Ho, 2001; Nelson et al., 2011; Russell et al., 1998). If
45
46 authoritarian parenting has really changed, we should also see changes in the gender-stereotyped
47
48 parenting roles and gender-typed discipline practices as well. Thus, we examined gender issues
49
50 in authoritarian parenting both in terms of parents' roles and in parenting boys versus girls.
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

METHOD

Participants

The present study examined three cohorts of adults living in Solna, a suburb of Stockholm, Sweden. They were assessed in 1958, 1981, and 2011, respectively. The first two cohorts were part of a longitudinal study, the Solna Study, which started in 1955 at the Clinic for the Study of Children's Development and Health at the Karolinska Hospital, Stockholm. The goal of the original study was to map the physical and mental development of children in a normative sample (see Karlberg, Klackenberg, Klackenberg-Larsson, Lichtenstein, Stensson, & Svennberg, 1968). Researchers asked every fourth pregnant woman who visited the prenatal clinic in Solna for routine checkups between December 1955 and April 1958 whether they wished to participate in a long-term study. Only 3% of the women refused. A pilot group of 29 mothers and their children selected from private obstetricians clientele was added (Karlberg et al., 1968). The total sample included in the study was 212 children (122 boys and 90 girls) and their parents. The sample was representative for the Stockholm area. A more detailed description of the sample can be found elsewhere (Klackenberg, Karlberg, Klackenberg-Larsson, Lichtenstein, Stensson & Svennberg, 1968). In Sweden all pregnant women, irrespective of their socio-economic background, are granted free routine checks to specialists. Most of the births in 1958 (98.5 %) took place in a hospital (Statistics Sweden, 1960).

The first cohort (labeled the 1958 cohort) consisted of the parents of the 212 children who participated in the longitudinal Solna Study. When their children were three or four years old, 385 of these parents participated in the data collection used in this study. The sample of parents included 202 women (*M* age 30.25 years) and 183 men (*M* age 34.15 years). Most participants (93.2%) were born in Sweden, with the remainder being born in other Nordic

1
2
3
4 countries. When the children were three years old, 91% of the couples were married. About
5
6 98% of the men and 19.3% of the women were employed full-time during the first three years of
7
8 their children's lives. All participants had finished at least compulsory basic school, and 22% of
9
10 the men and 14% of the women had attended university. For most of the women, this was their
11
12 first child (41.6%) or second (44.6%). The taxable income and the socioeconomic status of the
13
14 participants in this cohort were close to the average of the Swedish population in general
15
16 (Karlberg et al., 1968) and similar to the distribution of socio-economic conditions within the
17
18 Stockholm area (see Karlberg et al., 1968; Klackenberg, 1968). In short, our first cohort
19
20 consisted of 385 middle-class adults, almost all of Swedish origin, who answered questions
21
22 about their own upbringing when their children reached age three or four.
23
24
25
26

27 The second cohort (labeled the 1981 cohort) included the children of the 1958 cohort.
28
29 When they were 25 years old, they answered the same questions their parents had answered 23
30
31 years earlier. Of the 212 children recruited in 1958, almost 98% ($n = 207$; 121 men and 86
32
33 women) still lived in Sweden in 1981 and consented to participate. From this sample, 151
34
35 participants (87 men and 65 women) answered the questions regarding their parents' practices.
36
37 By this time, all of them had finished middle school, 80% had finished high school, and 22% had
38
39 finished at least one semester of university studies. Almost a quarter, 25.4 %, of the participants
40
41 had children at the time of data collection. For 75% of them, this was their first child. Almost
42
43 80% of the young adults were working full-time, with the remaining 20% still studying.
44
45
46
47

48 The third cohort, labeled the 2011 cohort, was comprised of 457 parents identified by
49
50 Statistics Sweden as living in Solna and having three-year-old children. Questionnaires were
51
52 sent to the parents by mail. Sixty percent of the target sample ($N = 606$) filled out the
53
54 questionnaires and sent them back. From the completed questionnaires, we selected participants
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 who were born in Sweden or other Nordic countries ($N = 457$). We considered this selection
5
6 necessary to make accurate comparisons with the previous two cohorts, where all were born in
7
8 Sweden or in other Nordic countries. The average age for the selected sample was 35.40 years
9
10 for women and 38.02 years for men. More than half of the participants (59.7%) were married
11
12 and 32.4% were cohabiting. Fewer than 2% of the people were single parents with sole custody.
13
14 For more than half of the participants (62%), the child in the study was their second child and for
15
16 24% of them this was their first child. The education level, the household income, and the
17
18 unemployment of this sample were about the same as for the Stockholm area as a whole
19
20 (Statistics Sweden, 2010). Participants in this cohort were slightly better educated and had
21
22 higher incomes than the general population of Sweden. With only one exception, all the people
23
24 in this cohort had finished high school and more than half of them (53.8%) had more than three
25
26 years of college or university. Almost 88% of the participants had household incomes above the
27
28 Swedish average household income in 2010 (about 29,000 – 38,000 Swedish Crowns per month
29
30 according to Statistics Sweden), with more than half of them reporting household incomes of
31
32 more than 50,000 Crowns per month. Only 3% of the participants lived in households in which
33
34 the main income source was unemployment benefits. According to Statistics Sweden, the
35
36 unemployment rate for this area in 2010 was lower than the national level of 8.4%, but at the
37
38 same level (7.1%) as the Stockholm area.

39 40 41 42 43 44 45 46 *Procedures*

47
48 The participants from the first two cohorts were from the longitudinal Solna Study. The
49
50 men and women from the first cohort answered questionnaires at the clinic when their children
51
52 were three or four years of age; their children, the 1981 cohort, answered the questions at the
53
54 clinic when they reached age 25. The participants in the 2011 cohort responded to questionnaires
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 sent to them by mail. For the first two cohorts, the incentives were travel expenses to the clinic
5
6 and a printed photograph of the child taken by the investigators at each measurement to monitor
7
8 the physical growth of the children (Karlberg et al., 1968). For the last cohort, the incentive was
9
10 a certificate for groceries worth 250 Swedish Crowns (\approx \$36).

13 *Measures*

14
15 We used two groups of measures to capture authoritarian practices: parents' use of
16
17 directive control and the distribution of parental roles in the family. Concerning the first group
18
19 of measures, we focused not on the parental style in itself, but on parental practices associated
20
21 with it, because parenting practices are more sensitive to social influence (Darling & Steinberg,
22
23 1993). Authoritarian parents expect unquestioning obedience from their children, offer clear
24
25 rules, and tend to punish children harshly when they disobey (Baumrind, 1991; Maccoby &
26
27 Martin, 1983).
28
29
30
31

32 *Directive control.* Directive control was measured with questions tapping four control
33
34 practices most frequently encountered in the literature on authoritarian parenting: demanding
35
36 obedience, physical punishment, restricting children's expressions of anger, and strictness.
37
38

39 *Demanding obedience.* We measured demanding obedience with the question "Did your
40
41 mother/father/parents always demand obedience from you?" with two response options: *yes (at*
42
43 *least one of the parents always demanded obedience)* and *not always*. This question was asked
44
45 for "parents" in the 1958 and 2011 cohorts, but asked separately for mothers and fathers in the
46
47 1981 cohort. To equalize the measures, the responses in 1981 were recoded to match those of the
48
49 other cohorts: the value two was assigned if one or both parents always demanded obedience
50
51 from their children, and one was assigned when neither parent always required obedience.
52
53
54

55
56 *Physical punishment.* As an indicator of physical punishment, we used the question:
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 “Were you slapped as a child?” The responses for this question were *never* (1), *rarely* (2), or
5
6 *often* (3). Because this item was asked separately for mothers and fathers in the 1981 cohort, we
7
8 also recoded these responses. For the first and last cohorts, the value one was assigned to the
9
10 responses *never* and *rarely*, whereas the value two was assigned to *often*. For the 1981 cohort,
11
12 the value two, meaning *often* was assigned if one or both of the parents slapped often. All other
13
14 combinations were assigned the value of one. Thus, the responses were recoded such that
15
16 participants who reported being slapped often by one or both parents were assigned value two
17
18 and all other reports were assigned value one.
19
20
21

22
23 *Restricting children’s expressions of anger.* One retrospective item was used. “Were you
24
25 allowed to show anger toward your parents” gauged whether participants’ angry responses were
26
27 restricted during childhood. Participants answered *yes* (1) or *no* (2).
28
29

30
31 *Strictness.* One item, “How strict was your father [mother],” tapped fathers’ and mothers’
32
33 strictness, with response options ranging from *very strict* (strict requirements of obedience and
34
35 behavior) (5) to *quite mild, without punishments or harsh demands* (1). This item was available
36
37 only for the last two cohorts and was asked separately for mothers and fathers.
38

39
40 *The distribution of roles in the family.* To capture potential shifts over time toward more
41
42 democratic approaches of family roles, we used three questions. The participants were asked:
43
44 “Who made decisions at home,” “Who did you respect most,” and “Who did you turn to the
45
46 most?” For the first two questions, participants could indicate that either the *mother* alone (1),
47
48 *father* alone (2), or *both* (3) made decisions and were respected by them during childhood. For
49
50 the last question, participants were given three options: *mother* only (1), *father* only (2), or *both*
51
52 (3) were the person(s) they turned to for support.
53
54

55
56 The validities of these retrospective measures were established in a previous study
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 (Stattin et al., 1995), in which the second cohort's retrospective reports of parental discipline
5
6 were compared with the first cohort's (i.e., their parents') prospective reports. The results
7
8 showed significant associations over time between parental reports of disciplinary practices at
9
10 different ages of their child (from 6 months until age 16) and child's retrospective reports during
11
12 young adulthood (Stattin et al., 1995). The associations ranged between .18 and .54, with higher
13
14 correlation coefficients for reports on parental use of physical punishment in early adolescence
15
16 for both genders. The associations remained significant irrespective of the child's gender and
17
18 irrespective of the distance in time between parents' and children's reports (Stattin et al., 1995).
19
20
21

22
23 *Socio-demographic measures.* The young adults reported their ages and education levels
24
25 for 1958, 1981 and 2011 cohorts. They also reported information regarding their socioeconomic
26
27 status for both 1958 and 2011 cohorts. The latter was calculated using the Graffar scale for the
28
29 1958 cohort (see Karlberg et al., 1968) and by creating a SES index from the available data on
30
31 income, education, economic strains, and dwelling, for the 2011 cohort. The Graffar scale is an
32
33 extended measure of socio-economic class, and includes five criteria: occupation, education,
34
35 income, dwelling, and type of neighborhood (see Graffar & Corbier, 1972; Klackenberg et al.,
36
37 1968). Each criterion is evaluated on a 5-point scale, and a total score is computed. Higher SES
38
39 index scores, or Graffar scale scores indicate higher socio-economic status.
40
41
42
43

44 *Data Analysis*

45
46 Binomial logistic, ordinary least squares regression (OLS), and multinomial logistic
47
48 regressions were used to examine cohort and gender differences in directive control and
49
50 distribution of roles in the family. We used hierarchical models, first testing for cohort effects,
51
52 followed by gender differences, with a final step including the interaction between cohort and
53
54 gender. To examine changes in parenting and parental roles across all three cohorts, we followed
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 the recommendations for examining more than g-1 comparisons (Cohen & Cohen, 1983;
5
6 Pedhazur, 1997). Specifically, we effect-coded cohort, where the 1958 cohort served as a
7
8 baseline (assigned -1 for both coded vectors) and the 1981 and 2011 cohorts were the alternatives
9
10 (alternating assignment of 1 and 0 in the two coded vectors). According to Pedhazur (1997), the
11
12 procedures for testing more than g-1 differences require this coding and a significant omnibus
13
14 test (e.g., F test or χ^2 test for the combination of effect codes), signifying the presence of at least
15
16 one significant difference. When there is a significant omnibus F test or χ^2 , probing can then be
17
18 accomplished with a variety of comparisons. We were interested in only three comparisons: the
19
20 first to the second and last cohorts, and the second to the last cohort. To probe these differences
21
22 we used two sets of dummy coded vectors. The first set compared the 1958 cohort (assigned 0)
23
24 to the 1981 and 2011 cohorts (alternating assignment of 1 and 0). The second set compared the
25
26 1981 cohort to the 2011 and 1958 cohorts. Although the second coded vector in this set is
27
28 needed to complete the g-1 codes, it is redundant with the first set of comparisons, so it was not
29
30 reported. To adjust for the inflation of Type I error created by the post-hoc testing, we used a
31
32 Bonferonni adjustment, setting the alpha level at 0.0167. Men were the comparison group for
33
34 gender. We probed interactions by separately analyzing gender differences in each cohort. For
35
36 expressing the likelihood of change in parenting practices and parental roles, we used the
37
38 Exp(B), the exponential regression coefficient or the Odds Ratio. We controlled for age and
39
40 education in all our analyses.
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

48
49 Missing data varied between .02 and 11.4 percent in the 1958 cohort, between 0.01 and
50
51 4.5 percent in the 1981 cohort, and between .02 and 3.72 percent in the 2011 cohort. We created
52
53 dummy codes for each of the study variables, indicating missingness, and regressed this type of
54
55 data collection, age, and gender on these dummy codes. After correcting the alpha for multiple
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 tests, only one significant difference emerged: the participants filling out questionnaires at the
5
6 clinic had more missingness on the question about which parent they turned to when distressed
7
8 than those filling out questionnaires at home.
9

10 11 RESULTS

12
13 Before analyzing the changes in harsh parenting and parental roles over time, we looked
14
15 at how the socio-demographic aspects were associated with our measures in each cohort. Table 1
16
17 shows the correlations between our measures of authoritarian control and the socio-demographic
18
19 variables, and the mean differences in socio-demographics for parental roles. Due to the very
20
21 low variance in age and socio-economic status in the 1981 cohort, we decided not to include the
22
23 associations between the socio-demographic measures and the directive control measures in our
24
25 results. The correlations and the mean differences were computed separately for the 1958 and
26
27 2011 cohorts. We calculated only the cross-sectional correlations and mean-differences, because
28
29 changes over time in income and socio-economic status make comparisons across cohorts
30
31 difficult to interpret. In the 1958 cohort, age was positively associated with parents demanding
32
33 obedience, and the father making household decisions. In the 2011 cohort, age was positively
34
35 associated with maternal and paternal strictness. Higher education was only associated with both
36
37 parents being viewed as the main supporter in the 2011 cohort, rather than mother only. High
38
39 social class in the 1958 cohort correlated with parents demanding obedience. In the 2011 cohort,
40
41 high SES was associated with being allowed to show anger, parents demanding obedience, not
42
43 being slapped, paternal strictness, the father being viewed as the respected authority, and with
44
45 both parents being viewed as supportive, rather than mother or father only. Overall, most of the
46
47 correlations and mean differences in Table 1 were low, and only a minority reached statistical
48
49 significance.
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 We ran the regression models, with and without controlling for age and education. The
5
6 controls were added to partially account for the influence of income, because income, education,
7
8 and age are related. However, because the estimates (i.e., regression coefficients, odd ratios, and
9
10 significance levels) from the models without age and education did not differ from the regression
11
12 estimates from the models controlling for age and education, we have reported only the models
13
14 without these controls. We also ran the regression analyses using both the original and the
15
16 recoded obedience demands and slapping variables, to insure that our recoding had not affected
17
18 the results. The estimates (i.e., regression coefficients, odd ratios, and significance levels) seen
19
20 in the analyses with the recoded variables were the same as those found in the regressions with
21
22 the original variables.
23
24
25
26

27 *Time Trends in Authoritarian Parenting Practices*

28
29
30 Did parents' directive control and the distribution of parental roles in the family, as
31
32 perceived by young to middle adults, change over the 50 years covered in this study? To answer
33
34 this question, we used stepwise logistic regression models predicting the various indicators of
35
36 directive control and distribution of roles in the family from cohort, gender, and the cohort by
37
38 gender interactions. The results, which are shown in the first columns of Table 2 and Table 3,
39
40 suggest that the answer is yes, as all cohort effects were significant.
41
42
43

44 *Directive control.* We first tested whether there were any significant differences between
45
46 cohorts in *directive control* by regressing each of the directive control measures on cohort
47
48 (represented by the two effect codes). When the Chi-square tests were significant, meaning that
49
50 inserting cohort as a predictor of directive control practices did improve the model, we
51
52 proceeded with the post-hoc analyses in order to see between which cohorts did the differences
53
54 in directive practices appear. Looking first at the regression results for demanding obedience, the
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 Chi-square test was significant, $\chi^2_{(df=2)} = 169.64, p < .001$. As shown in Table 2, probing using
5
6 dummy coded cohort (2011 versus 1958) was significant, and suggested that the 2011 cohort
7
8 participants were less likely to having experienced their parents' demanding obedience from
9
10 them, compared to the participants from the 1958 cohort (OR = 0.19). However, there were no
11
12 significant differences in obedience demands between the participants from the 1958 cohort and
13
14 the participants from the 1981 cohort. Post-hoc analyses showed also that the greatest drops
15
16 were between reports in 1981 and 2011. Participants from the 2011 cohort were less likely to
17
18 have experienced parents demanding obedience from them than the participants from the 1981
19
20 cohort (OR = 0.15). Over 53 years, these differences translate into an 81% decrease in the
21
22 probability that parents would demand obedience, and over 30 years this translates into 85%
23
24 decrease in the probability of being demanded obedience by parents. The raw percentages are
25
26 shown in Table 4. Whereas 66% of the 1958 cohort and 71% of the 1981 cohort reported their
27
28 parents always demanded obedience from them, only 28% of participants in the 2011 cohort
29
30 experienced the same.
31
32
33
34
35

36
37 Looking next at physical punishment (slapping), cohort differences were evident, $\chi^2_{(df=2)}$
38
39 = 89.30, $p < .001$. Post-hoc probing showed that, over time, the 2011 cohort participants were
40
41 less likely to report being slapped during childhood compared to the participants in the 1958
42
43 cohort (OR = 0.07). There were no significant differences between participants from the 1958
44
45 cohort and those from the 1981 cohort in their reports on physical punishment. However,
46
47 participants from the 2011 cohort were less likely to report they were slapped during childhood
48
49 than the participants in the 1981 cohort (OR = 0.08). This means there was a 93% decrease in
50
51 the likelihood of being slapped by their parents over the 53 years studied, and a 92% decrease in
52
53 the likelihood of being slapped over the 30 years between the last two cohorts. Table 4 shows
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 that 20% and 18% of the adults in the 1958 and 1981 cohorts remembered that their parents had
5
6 slapped them, whereas only 2% in the 2011 cohort remembered the same. It should be added
7
8 that only a minority, 17% of the adults in the 1958 cohort, said their parents never had slapped
9
10 them. By contrast, a majority in the 2011 cohort, 77% reported that their parents never had
11
12 slapped them.
13
14

15
16 With respect to the participants' retrospective reports on parents' restrictions of
17
18 expressing anger, the regression showed significant change across cohorts, $\chi^2_{(df=2)} = 176.42, p <$
19
20 $.001$. Post-hoc analyses showed that, compared to the 1958 cohort, both 1981 and 2011 cohort
21
22 participants differed in the way they recollected their parents allowing them to show anger. The
23
24 2011 participants were 8.8 times more likely to report they were allowed to show anger
25
26 compared to the 1958 participants. In other words, the likelihood of having had parents who did
27
28 not allow expressions of anger toward them decreased. However, the change went in the
29
30 opposite direction when comparing the first two cohorts: participants from the 1981 cohort were
31
32 3 times more likely to report their parents did not allow them to show anger compared to the
33
34 1958 participants. As the post-hoc analyses also showed, the decreasing trend in the restriction
35
36 of emotions found between the 1958 and the 2011 cohorts was also found between the last two
37
38 cohorts. Participants from the 2011 cohort were 2.94 times more likely to have been allowed the
39
40 expression of emotions by their parents compared to the 1981 cohort participants, meaning a
41
42 194% increase in being allowed to show anger between 1981 and 2011. It can be seen in Table 4
43
44 that the greatest difference was between the 1981 and 2011 cohorts, from 72% participants in
45
46 1981 remembering they were not allowed to show anger, to only 11% in 2011 reporting their
47
48 parents restricted their expression of negative emotions. Overall, then, expressions of anger
49
50 toward parents became more acceptable.
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 Concerning parental strictness, this form of authoritarian behavior dropped significantly.
5
6 For fathers' strictness, the results of the OLS regression models suggested that the participants
7
8 from the 2011 cohort were less likely to report their father as strict, compared to participants
9
10 from the 1981 cohort. In other words, the likelihood of fathers being very strict was reduced
11
12 between 1981 and 2011. The time trend, then, was an overall reduction in fathers' strictness. As
13
14 shown in Table 4, a majority (52%) of the adults in the 1981 cohort, compared to a minority
15
16 (17%) of the cohort 2012 adults, viewed their fathers as strict.
17
18
19

20
21 With regard to mothers' strictness, similar trends were seen (see Table 2). Participants in
22
23 1981 were less likely than participants in the 1958 cohort to report their mothers as strict. This
24
25 means there were substantial reductions from 1981 to 2011 in maternal strictness. As reported in
26
27 Table 4, the percentage of adults who experienced their mothers as strict in the 1981 cohort
28
29 (42%) was almost four times higher than the percentage of adults in the 2011 cohort having
30
31 experienced the same (11%).
32
33

34
35 To summarize, in comparison to how young adults perceived their parents' directive
36
37 control 30 to 50 years ago, the parents of young adults in 2011 were perceived as demanding less
38
39 obedience, slapping their children less, allowing their children to express more anger toward
40
41 them, and being less strict. These results show a clear decline in the use of directive control.
42
43

44 *Distribution of roles and responsibilities in the family.* We expected changes in the
45
46 tendency for fathers to be seen as authoritarians and mothers as caregivers, toward viewing
47
48 fathers as less authoritarian, sharing household decision-making, and both parents garnering
49
50 respect from their children. As shown in Table 3, these expectations were largely confirmed.
51
52

53
54 Regarding household decisions, there were again significant differences across cohorts,
55
56 $\chi^2_{(df=4)} = 113.02, p < .001$. Post-hoc analyses showed that, compared to the 1958 participants,
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 the 2011 cohort participants were 3.86 times more likely to report that their mothers, rather than
5
6 fathers, made decisions in the households. Similarly, over the studied period, participants were
7
8 5.18 times more likely to report that both mothers and fathers made decisions in the household
9
10 together, rather than fathers alone (see Table 3). In other words, there was an increase over time
11
12 in the likelihood of mothers and both mothers and fathers making household decisions, rather
13
14 than fathers alone, with slightly higher odds for both parents making decisions. Post-hoc
15
16 analyses also showed this trend to be stronger between the last two cohorts, rather than between
17
18 the first two. Participants from the 2011 cohort were 3.44 times more likely, and 6.42 times more
19
20 likely to state that their mothers and, respectively both parents made decisions at home,
21
22 compared to the 1981 cohort. The shifts away from fathers making most of the decisions to both
23
24 mothers and fathers making household decisions can be seen in Table 4. The biggest changes
25
26 can be seen in the decreasing percentage of people reporting fathers alone made decisions (e.g.,
27
28 from 77% in 1981 to 33% in 2011), and in the increasing percentage of people reporting both
29
30 parents made decisions in the household (from 5% in 1981 to 48% in 2011).
31
32
33
34
35

36
37 Regarding which parent was most respected, again there were significant differences
38
39 across cohorts, $\chi^2_{(df=4)} = 225.95, p < .001$. Post-hoc analyses showed that comparing fathers and
40
41 both parents being respected, over the 53 years period participants were 10.27 times more likely
42
43 to report both parents as being respected (see Table 3). This means there was a substantial
44
45 increase over time in the likelihood that *both* parents would garner respect. There were no
46
47 significant differences between the 1958 and 1981 cohort in which parent was most respected.
48
49 Post-hoc analyses also showed these differences to prevail when comparing the 2011 cohort with
50
51 the 1981 cohort (OR = 20.49 for both parents garnering respect). These results suggest that over
52
53 time (see Table 4), participants shifted from primarily declaring they respected their fathers (44
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 and 77% of the 1958 and 1981 cohort participants, versus only 14% of the 2012 cohort
5
6 participants), to reporting they respected both their mothers and fathers (30 and 25% of the
7
8 participants in the 1958 and 1981 cohorts versus 51% of the participants in the 2011 cohort).
9

10
11 The tests examining cohort differences in which parent was viewed as providing support
12
13 were also significant, $\chi^2_{(df=4)} = 33.97, p < .001$ (see Table 3). Post-hoc analyses showed that,
14
15 when comparing fathers with both parents being viewed as supportive, participants from the
16
17 2011 cohort were 2.47 times more likely to report both parents as supportive, compared to
18
19 participants from the 1958 cohort. Although there were no differences between the first two
20
21 cohorts, post-hoc analyses showed participants from the 2011 cohort to be 5.05 times more likely
22
23 to turn to both parents for support, compared to participants from the 1981 cohort. Overall, the
24
25 percentages shifted, with increased numbers reporting that they turned to both parents when
26
27 distressed. Nevertheless, mothers remained the parent viewed as most supportive. This can be
28
29 seen clearly in Table 4, where more than 60% of the people in each cohort viewed their mother
30
31 as the parent providing support.
32
33
34
35
36

37 Because the first two cohorts were related to each other, we tested whether their
38
39 nonindependence might have affected the results. By using a planned sampling, we extracted
40
41 samples from the 1958 ($n = 136, 48\%$ males) and 1981 ($n = 69, 58\%$ males) cohorts making sure
42
43 not include members from the same family over the two cohorts. Every third participant, by
44
45 rotation, was selected. For the first cohort, gender also was used for stratification. We then
46
47 repeated all the previous analyses using these samples, comparing the original to the new results.
48
49 We found no significant differences in the directions of estimates or their levels of significance.
50
51 We conclude that the dependencies between the first two cohorts did not significantly influence
52
53 our results.
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 *Gender Differences in Directive Control, Distribution of Parental Roles in the Family*
5

6 Given previous studies have shown that women and men tend to report differently on
7 their parents' disciplining practices, with men reporting harsher parental treatments, we asked
8 whether there were gender differences in reported parental directive control, and distribution of
9 parental roles in the family. Therefore, we modeled the linear effects of cohort and gender on
10 parental practices and parental roles. The results for the linear effects of gender are shown in
11 Table 2 for directive control measures, and Table 3 for father as authoritarian figures, under the
12 column headed Step 2, on the row labeled gender. In a third step, we also modeled the
13 interaction between cohort and gender in order to see whether the gender differences in parental
14 directive control and distribution of parental roles in the family are the same for all cohorts, or if
15 they differ between cohorts.
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29

30 Overall, we found gender effects for all the measures of distribution of parental roles in
31 the family, but none for directive control. Compared with men, women were 1.60 times more
32 likely to report that their mothers, rather than their fathers, made decisions. Similarly, regarding
33 which parent was most respected, women were 1.45 times more likely than men to report that
34 their mothers garnered their respect most. Moreover, for both the comparisons of father with
35 mother and father with both parents being viewed as supportive, gender was a significant
36 predictor. Women were 0.67 and 0.57 times as likely as men to report turning to their mothers or
37 to both parents rather than turning to their fathers for support. This means that compared to
38 men, women were more likely to ask their fathers, rather than their mothers or both parents for
39 support. As these results show, men and women tended to answer rather differently on
40 perceived maternal and paternal roles, irrespective of the cohort. In addition, the shift toward
41 more egalitarian mothers' and fathers' roles was more evident in women's views than in men's,
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 and these gender differences were found in all cohorts.
5

6 DISCUSSION 7

8
9 In this study we examined how authoritarian parenting practices based on control and the
10 distribution of parents' roles in the family changed over the last 53 years in Sweden. The results
11 reveal that some important changes have taken place in the way parents raise their children.
12
13

14 First, directive control has almost disappeared. In the last generation we examined, few of the
15 adults sampled remembered being parented in a way that restricted their behavior or their
16 feelings. Few reported being slapped with any regularity. By comparison, more than half of the
17 young adults in the 1958 and 1981 cohorts remembered their parents as demanding obedience
18 and constraining their emotions. In addition to dramatic declines in directive control, the gender-
19 stereotyped roles of yesterday's parents have also changed. In the 2011 cohort, young adults
20 reported fathers and mothers shared authority. Although the 2011 cohort relied on their mothers
21 almost as much as the young adults of the 1958 cohort, fathers were increasingly viewed as
22 sources of support. These results are consistent with what has been found for shorter intervals of
23 history (Campbell & Gilmore, 2007, Jung & Sterling Honig, 2000). Although other studies have
24 shown decreases in punitive practices (Durrant et al., 2003, Straus, 2010) or changes in parenting
25 roles (Ferri & Smith, 2003), this study showed that both parenting practices based on punitive
26 and directive control and the distribution of parenting roles changed simultaneously. Taken
27 together, the evidence converges to suggest that contemporary parents are more flexible and
28 democratic than parents in past generations.
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49

50
51 Most of the changes in parents' use of directive control occurred between the time that
52 the second and the third cohorts were parented—roughly from the mid-1950s to the beginning of
53 the 21st century. We expected the changes to be more continuous because there was extensive
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 emphasis on equality and children's rights in Swedish society during this time (for a review, see
5
6 Ahlberg, Roman, & Duncan, 2008). There are three possible explanations, albeit post hoc, that
7
8 come to mind. One is that the pattern is due to the first two cohorts being from the same family.
9
10 We ruled this out, however, given that this is not typical of intergenerational studies, where
11
12 significant differences have been found between parents and children in the way they raised their
13
14 offspring (see Campbell & Gilmore, 2007; Jung & Sterling Honig, 2000). Another possibility is
15
16 that the second cohort, directly affected by laws enacting bans on corporal punishment in 1979
17
18 (see Ahlberg, Roman, & Duncan, 2008 for a review), interpreted their parents' behavior more
19
20 harshly than the previous generation. A final possibility is that the reports of the second cohort
21
22 are accurate, and that like many people who find their behaviors restricted, their parents
23
24 encountered psychological reactance (i.e., strong negative feelings when choice is restricted,
25
26 Brehm & Brehm, 1981) and did not easily give up the right to discipline their children as they
27
28 saw fit. Nonetheless, the overall picture suggests that authoritarian practices in Sweden have
29
30 indeed declined.
31
32
33
34
35

36
37 Although we did not directly examine why these trends have occurred, there are several
38
39 plausible explanations. Regarding drops in punitive and directive control, the enactment of laws
40
41 banning corporal punishment and legislation ratifying and enforcing the Convention on the
42
43 Rights of the Child are likely sources of changes in parenting in Sweden. In addition, there have
44
45 been dramatic changes in education, with contemporary emphasis on providing free higher
46
47 education to any resident who qualifies. In a similar manner, there have been legislation changes
48
49 and changes in social attitudes that likely promote more democratic and egalitarian practices,
50
51 including increases in maternal employment, laws promoting gender equality, laws and policies
52
53 promoting joint care (e.g., liberal maternal and paternal maternity leaves), and emphasis on
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 democracy at work, in the home, and in the school. Given the links between higher education
5
6 and less harsh discipline (Simons, Whitbeck, Conger, & Wu, 1991), between both parents' being
7
8 employed and paternal involvement (Hofferth & Goldscheider, 2010), and between policies
9
10 promoting equality and fathers' involvement in childcare (Sarkadi, Kristiansson, Oberklaid, &
11
12 Bremberg, 2008), the changes in parenting practices and roles that were observed in this study
13
14 make sense. An amalgamation of political, legal, economic, and social factors has opened the
15
16 way for reducing authoritarian practices and creating the means for fathers to become more
17
18 involved in their children's upbringing and for mothers to share power in the family. Although
19
20 we cannot directly link the social changes occurring during the time that we have studied to
21
22 declines in authoritarian practices based on directive control and gender-stereotyped roles, the
23
24 changes in parenting are not surprising. They are, nonetheless, striking.

25
26
27
28
29
30 The differences between men's and women's reports in the current study were similar to
31
32 those found previously (Starrels, 1994). Women were more likely than men to report that their
33
34 mothers made household decisions and were most respected. In addition to these differences,
35
36 women viewed their mothers as important household authorities. These findings are in line with
37
38 the literature on differences in socialization due to child's gender. As previous studies have
39
40 shown, mothers tended to be more sensitive towards daughters, than towards sons (Bornstein,
41
42 Putnick, Heslington, Gini, Suwalsky, & Venuti, 2008; Cassano & Zeman, 2010). Also as shown
43
44 previously, fathers allocate more time and financial rewards to sons, than to daughters (see
45
46 Starrels, 1994). Thus, children see as household authority the parent they have a stronger
47
48 relationship with, who offers instrumental support, or with whom they can identify (e.g.,
49
50 Starrels). Overall, the gender differences in adults' retrospective reports of parental roles found
51
52 here converge with previous studies.
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Limitations & Strengths

There are several limitations that should be considered. First, we used single-item measures of parenting practices, rather than the multi-item measures traditionally used to measure the authoritarian parenting style. We chose to use individual items, however, so that we could capture a finer picture of which practices have changed and to ensure the equivalence of measures across cohorts. By using the same questions, we ensured comparability between cohorts, but we still have to take into account that the meaning of words might have changed over time. Second, the reports were retrospective. We examined whether factors influencing attitudes may reveal biases evident in retrospective reports. It might be, for example, that retrospective reports reflect current attitudes more than actual parenting behaviors. Prior comparison of the 1981 cohort's reports of their parents' behaviors with the 1958 cohort's self-reports established the validity of the retrospective reports on parents' discipline behaviors (Stattin et al., 1995), providing some confidence that the reports are informed by actual parenting behaviors. The question remains, though, whether the changes in laws and societal views on discipline practices influenced reports through affecting participants' attitudes. The reports from the 1981 cohort coincide with these changes; laws enacted in the 1950s and 60s went into effect when they were being parented. There is no evidence, however, that they under-reported their parents' behavior, as they reported harsher parenting than their parents. It might be that awareness of the laws *increased* reporting, but one would think this would also be true of the 2011 cohort, who also experienced societal pressure to recognize the rights of children. If this is the case, then we can conclude that both the latter cohorts reported more in comparison to the first cohort. This does not, however, negate an overall trend toward less authoritarian practices. Given the young age of the second cohort, and the first two cohorts being related, readers might

1
2
3
4 also think that differences in the reports could be artifacts of the design and cohort composition.
5
6 We ruled these out, through analysis controlling age and education, as well as target analysis
7
8 examining whether the dependencies in the first two cohorts shaped the results. Still, we are
9
10 confident that the overall drop in authoritarian parenting practices and parental roles hold,
11
12 representing important social change.
13
14

15
16 Other issues that we were not able to fully address include questions about the
17
18 generalizability of these findings. Due to the composition of the first two cohorts, we had to
19
20 exclude participants born outside of the Nordic countries. Although the Nordic countries have
21
22 distinct cultural practices, it is not unreasonable to think that similar changes could occur in
23
24 similar cultures if the same social, economic, legal, and political changes have occurred. The
25
26 available evidence suggests that, at least in some aspects, such as harsh discipline, they may be
27
28 quite generalizable to other Western countries. Other studies (Bussmann et al., in press; Durrant
29
30 et al., 2003; Straus, 2010) have found decreased support for physical punishment in Sweden, and
31
32 similar results have emerged in other countries that have laws against physical punishment, but
33
34 also in countries that have not legally banned physical punishment (Bussmann et al., in press).
35
36 Therefore, this seems to be a trend in Western society, and not just a localized event. Other
37
38 potential moderating conditions also need to be addressed. We were not able to directly examine
39
40 whether birth order or family type (e.g., biological, step-parent, reconstituted family, same-
41
42 gender parents, etc.) affected the results. These potential moderators await testing in countries
43
44 with similar cultural and social change conditions.
45
46
47
48
49

50
51 Our study also had some important strengths. These include a long span of time (over
52
53 half a century), multiple indicators of the control dimension of authoritarian parenting,
54
55 community samples, and large sample sizes in all three cohorts. We used the same measures for
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 all three cohorts, which is an aspect rarely encountered in previous research. Due to the long
5
6 span of the study, we were able to cover a period of time with fundamental legislative changes
7
8 regarding family life and parenting. Our focus on authoritarian parenting practices was strategic,
9
10 given the legislation aimed at reducing them and research suggesting that parenting practices, as
11
12 opposed to styles, are more sensitive to social influence (Darling & Steinberg, 1993).
13
14

15 *Implications for practice*

16
17
18 The results of this study showed a strong decrease in the authoritarian parenting practices
19
20 that are most often associated with negative developmental outcomes. One might ask how youth
21
22 mental health and problem behavior have changed during the same time. Studies on trends in the
23
24 mental health of youth found that internalizing and externalizing problems have risen in the
25
26 recent decades (e.g., Collishaw, Goodman, Pickles, & Maughan, 2007). One might think these
27
28 trends are inconsistent with our findings. In our opinion the lack of corresponding increases in
29
30 children's adjustment does not cancel the positive effects the change in parenting brings to
31
32 children. We argue quite to the contrary, as other changes are likely to be responsible for
33
34 increases in reported problems, such as increased sensitivity to and recognition of emotional
35
36 problems, as well as more resources, awareness, and knowledge in detecting mental health
37
38 problems. In light of these other changes, it is still reasonable to suggest that practitioners should
39
40 be apprised of these changes, as recent generations seem to have greater parenting resources than
41
42 past generations, in that families seem to be more democratic and flexible, with higher levels of
43
44 education, and with an increased involvement from fathers. These resources are social capital
45
46 that can be used to offset social changes that might be responsible for children's and adolescents'
47
48 problems.
49
50
51
52
53
54

55 *Conclusions and Future Directions*

1
2
3
4 This study provided evidence that the trends in authoritarian parenting practices and
5
6 parents' roles seen in studies of shorter periods of time hold for longer periods of time.
7
8 Authoritarian parenting in Sweden is on the decline. The next step is to determine how these
9
10 changes are linked to children's health and well-being over time. It will also be important to
11
12 determine in what ways other parenting practices have changed and to determine the best way to
13
14 support optimal parenting. The current picture of declines in harsh and punitive parenting, as
15
16 well as in gender-stereotypes parenting roles, suggests that there is room for optimism.
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

REFERENCES

- 1
2
3
4
5
6 Ahlberg, J., Roman, C., Duncan, S. (2008). Actualizing the “democratic family”? Swedish policy
7
8 rhetoric versus family. *Social Politics* 15, 79-100. doi: 10.1093/sp/jxn003
9
10
11 Alwin, D.F. (1997). Parental socialization in historical perspective. In C. D. Ryff & M. Mailick
12
13 Seltzer (Eds.), *The parental experience in midlife* (pp. 105 - 167). Chicago: The
14
15 University of Chicago Press.
16
17
18 Amato, F. R. & Fowler, F. (2002). Parenting practices, child adjustment, and family diversity.
19
20 *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 64, 703-716. doi: 10.1111/j.1741-3737.2002.00703.x
21
22
23 Baldwin, A.L. (1948). Socialization and the parent-child relationship. *Child Development*, 19,
24
25 127-136. Retrieved from: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1125710>
26
27
28 Baumrind, D. (1966). Effects of authoritative parental control on child behavior. *Child*
29
30 *Development*, 37, 887-907. Retrieved from: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1126611>
31
32
33 Baumrind, D. (1991). The influence of parenting style on adolescent competence and substance
34
35 use. *Journal of Early Adolescence*, 11, 56–95. doi: 10.1177/0272431691111004
36
37
38 Bornstein, M. H., Putnick, D. L., Heslington, M., Gini, M., Suwalsky, J. T. D., & Venuti, P.
39
40 (2008). Mother-child emotional availability in ecological perspective: Three countries,
41
42 two regions, two genders. *Developmental Psychology*, 44, 666-680. doi: 10.1037/0012-
43
44 1649.44.3.666
45
46
47 Brehm, S. S., & Brehm, J.W. (1981). *Psychological reactance: A theory of freedom and control*.
48
49 New York: Academic Press.
50
51
52 Brenner, V., & Fox, R. A. (1999). An Empirically Derived Classification of Parenting Practices.
53
54 *Journal Of Genetic Psychology*, 160, 343. doi: 10.1080/00221329909595404
55
56
57 Bronfenbrenner, U. (1986). Ecology of the family as a context for human development: Research
58
59
60

- 1
2
3
4 perspectives. *Developmental Psychology*, 22, 723-742. doi: 10.1037/0012-1649.22.6.723
- 5
6 Bussmann, K.-D., Erthal, C., & Schroth, A. (in press). The effect of banning corporal punishment
7
8 in Europe: A five-nation comparison. In J. Durrant, & A. B. Smith (Eds.), *A safer world*
9
10 *for children: Global progress towards ending physical punishment*. London: Sage.
- 11
12
13 Campbell, J. & Gilmore, L. (2007). Intergenerational continuities and discontinuities in parenting
14
15 styles. *Australian Journal of Psychology*, 59, 140-150. doi: 10.1080/00049530701449471
- 16
17
18 Cassano, M. C., & Zeman, J. L. (2010). Parental socialization of sadness regulation in middle
19
20 childhood: The role of expectations and gender. *Developmental Psychology*, 46, 1214-
21
22 1226. doi: 10.1037/a0019851
- 23
24
25 Cohen, J. & Cohen, P. (1983). *Applied multiple regression/correlation analysis for the*
26
27 *behavioral sciences*. Hillsdale, N.J: L. Erlbaum Associates.
- 28
29
30 Collishaw, S., Goodman, R., Pickles, A., & Maughan, B. (2007). Modelling the contribution of
31
32 changes in family life to time trends in adolescent conduct problems. *Social Science &*
33
34 *Medicine*, 65, 2576-2587. doi: 10.1016/j.socscimed.2007.06.010
- 35
36
37 Conrade, G., & Ho, R. (2001). Differential parenting styles for fathers and mothers: Differential
38
39 treatment for sons and daughters. *Australian Journal of Psychology*, 53, 29-35. Retrieved
40
41 from: <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1080/00049530108255119/pdf>
- 42
43
44 Dallaire, D. H., Pineda, A. Q., Cole, D. A., Ciesla, J. A., Jacquez, F., LaGrange, B., & Bruce, A.
45
46 E. (2006). Relation of positive and negative parenting to children's depressive symptoms.
47
48 *Journal of Clinical Child and Adolescent Psychology*, 35, 313 – 322. doi:
49
50 10.1207/s15374424jccp3502_15
- 51
52
53 Darling, N. & Steinberg, L. (1993). Parenting style as context: An integrative model.
54
55
56 *Psychological Bulletin*, 113, 487-496. doi: 10.1037/0033-2909.113.3.487
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 Durrant, J. E., Rose-Krasnor, L., & Broberg, A. G. (2003). Physical punishment and maternal
5 beliefs in Sweden and Canada. *Journal of Comparative Family Studies*, 34, 586-604.

6
7 Retrieved from: [http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=afh&](http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=afh&AN=10904497&site=ehost-live)
8
9 AN=10904497&site=ehost-live
10

11
12
13 Ferri, E. & Smith, K. (2003). Family life. In E. Ferri, J. Bynner & M. Wadsworth (Eds.),
14
15 *Changing Britain, changing lives* (pp. 140-147). London: Institute of Education.

16
17
18 Gadlin, H. (1978). Child discipline and the pursuit of the self: an historical interpretation. In H.
19
20 W. Reese & L. P. Lipsitt (Eds.), *Advances in child development and behaviour* (Vol. 12,
21
22 pp. 231-261). New York: Academic Press.

23
24
25 Graffar, M. & Corbier, J. (1972). Contribution to the study of the influence of socio-economic
26
27 conditions on the growth and development of the child. *Early Child Development and*
28
29 *Care*, 1, 141-179. doi:10.1080/0300443720010201
30
31

32
33 Hofferth, S. & Goldscheider, F. (2010). Does change in young men's employment influence
34
35 fathering? *Family Relations*, 59, 479-493. doi: 10.1111/j.1741-3729.2010.00617.x
36
37

38
39 Hosley, C. A., & Montemayor, R. (1997). Fathers and adolescents. The role of the father in child
40
41 development. In M. E. Lamb (Ed), *The role of the father in child development* (3rd ed.)
42
43 (pp. 162-178). Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons.

44
45 Jung, K. & Sterling Honig, A. (2000). Intergenerational comparisons of paternal Korean child
46
47 rearing practices and attitudes. *Early Child Development and Care*, 165, 59-84. doi:
48
49 10.1080/0300443001650105
50

51
52 Karlberg, P., Klackenberg, G., Klackenberg-Larsson, I., Lichtenstein, H., Stensson, J., &
53
54 Svennberg, I. (1968). The development of children in a Swedish urban community. A
55
56 prospective longitudinal study - I. Introduction, design and aims of the study. Description
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 of the sample. *Acta Paediatrica*, 57(Issue Supplement S187), 9-28. doi: 10.1111/j.1651-
5 2227.1968.tb06039.x
6
7

8 Klackenberg, G., Karlberg, P., Klackenberg-Larsson, I., Lichtenstein, H., Stensson, J., &
9
10 Svennberg, I. (1968). The development of children in a Swedish urban community. A
11
12 prospective longitudinal study – II. The social background and its changes during the
13
14 children's first three years of life. *Acta Paediatrica*, 57(Issue Supplement S187), 28-47.
15
16 doi: 10.1111/j.1651-2227.1968.tb06040.x
17
18

19
20 Lewis, C. C. (1981). The effects of parental firm control: A reinterpretation of findings.
21
22 *Psychological Bulletin*, 90, 547-563. doi: 10.1037/0033-2909.90.3.547
23
24

25 Maccoby, E. E., & Martin, J. A. (1983). Socialization in the context of the family: Parent-child
26
27 interaction. In P. H. Mussen (Series Ed.) & E. M. Hetherington (Vol. Ed.), *Handbook of*
28
29 *child psychology: Vol. 4. Socialization, personality, and social development* (4th ed., pp.
30
31 1-101). New York, NY: Wiley.
32
33

34 Michael, S. (1987). Are sons and daughters treated more differently by fathers than by mothers?
35
36 *Developmental Review*, 7, 183-209. doi: 10.1016/0273-2297(87)90012-8
37
38

39 Nelson, L., Padilla-Walker, L., Christensen, K., Evans, C., & Carroll, J. (2011). Parenting in
40
41 emerging adulthood: an examination of parenting clusters and correlates. *Journal of*
42
43 *Youth and Adolescence*, 40, 730-743. doi: 10.1007/s10964-010-9584-8
44
45

46 Nuffield Foundation (2009). *Time trends in parenting and outcomes for young people*. London,
47
48 Nuffield Foundation. Retrieved from: [http://www.nuffieldfoundation.org/publications-](http://www.nuffieldfoundation.org/publications-and-resources)
49
50 [and-resources](http://www.nuffieldfoundation.org/publications-and-resources)
51
52

53 Oppenheimer, L. (2004). Perception of individualism in Dutch society: a developmental
54
55 approach. *International Journal of Behavioral Development*, 28, 336-346. doi:
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 10.1080/01650250444000009
5

6 Pampel, F. C. (2000). *Logistic regression: A primer*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

7
8 Pedhazur, E.J. (1997). *Multiple regression in behavioral research: Explanation and prediction*.

9
10 South Melbourne, Vic.: Wadsworth/Thomson Learning.

11
12
13 Robinson, C. C., Mandelco, B., Frost Olsen, S., & Hart, C. H. (1995). Authoritative,

14
15 authoritarian, and permissive parenting practices: development of a new measure.

16
17 *Psychological Reports*, 77, 819-830. doi: 10.2466/pr0.1995.77.3.819

18
19
20 Russell, A., Aloa, V., Feder, T., Glover, A., Miller, H., & Palmer, G. (1998). Sex-based

21
22 differences in parenting styles in a sample with preschool children. *Australian Journal of*

23
24 *Psychology*, 50, 89-99. doi: 10.1080/00049539808257539

25
26
27 Sarkadi, A., Kristiansson, R., Oberklaid, F., & Bremberg, S. (2008). Fathers' involvement and

28
29 children's developmental outcomes: a systematic review of longitudinal studies. *Acta*

30
31 *Paediatrica*, 97, 153-158. doi: 10.1111/j.1651-2227.2007.00572.x

32
33
34 Schaefer, E. S. & Bell, R. Q. (1958). Development of a parental attitude research instrument.

35
36
37 *Child Development*, 29, 339-361. Retrieved from: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1126348>

38
39 Schofer, E. & Meyer, J.W. (2005). The worldwide expansion of higher education in the twentieth

40
41 century. *American Sociological Review*, 70, 898-920. doi: 10.1177/000312240507000602

42
43
44 Scott, J., Collishaw, S., Gardner, F., & Maughan, B. (2009). Can changes in parenting explain the

45
46 rise UK adolescent problem behaviour? *Annual Meeting of the American Sociological*

47
48 *Association*. San Francisco, CA: American Sociological Association.

49
50
51 Simons, R. L., Whitbeck, L. B., Conger, R. D., & Wu, C. (1991). Intergenerational transmission

52
53 of harsh parenting. *Developmental Psychology*, 27, 159-171. doi: 10.1037/0012-

54
55 1649.27.1.159
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 Starrels, M. E. (1994). Gender differences in parent-child relations. *Journal of Family Issues*, 1,
5
6 148-165. doi: 10.1177/019251394015001007
7

8
9 Statistics Sweden (2010):

10
11 <http://www.ssd.scb.se/databaser/makro/MainTable.asp?yp=qmnggr&xu=>
12
13 [91506001&omradekod=NR&omradetext=National+accounts&lang=2&langdb=2](http://www.ssd.scb.se/databaser/makro/MainTable.asp?yp=qmnggr&xu=91506001&omradekod=NR&omradetext=National+accounts&lang=2&langdb=2)
14

15
16 Statistics Sweden (1960):

17
18 http://www.scb.se/Grupp/Hitta_statistik/Historisk_statistik/_Dokument/Statistisk%20%C
19
20 [3%A5rsbok%201914-2001/Statistisk%20arsbok%20for%20Sverige%201960.pdf](http://www.scb.se/Grupp/Hitta_statistik/Historisk_statistik/_Dokument/Statistisk%20%C3%A5rsbok%201914-2001/Statistisk%20arsbok%20for%20Sverige%201960.pdf)
21

22
23 Stattin, H., Janson, H., Klackenber-Larsson, I., & Magnusson, D. (1995). Corporal punishment
24
25 in everyday life: An intergenerational perspective. In J. McCord (Ed.), *Coercion and*
26
27 *punishment in long-term perspectives* (pp. 315-347). New York, NY: Cambridge
28
29 University Press.
30

31
32 Straus, M. A. (2010). Prevalence, societal causes, and trends in corporal punishment by parents
33
34 in world perspective. *Law and Contemporary Problems*, 73(2), 1-30. Retrieved from:
35
36 <http://www.law.duke.edu/journals/lcp>.
37

38
39 Straus, M. A. & Paschall, M. J. (2009). Corporal punishment by mothers and development of
40
41 children's cognitive ability: A longitudinal study of two nationally representative age
42
43 cohorts. *Journal of Aggression Maltreatment and Trauma*, 18, 459-483. doi:
44
45 10.1080/10926770903035168
46
47

48
49 Thornberry, T. P., Freeman-Gallant, A., Lizotte, A.J., Krohn, M.D., & Smith, C.A. (2003).
50
51 Linked lives: The intergenerational transmission of antisocial behavior. *Journal of*
52
53 *Abnormal Child Psychology*, 31, 171-184. doi: 10.1023/A:1022574208366
54

55
56 United Nations: http://treaties.un.org/Pages/ViewDetails.aspx?src=TREATY&mtdsg_no=IV-
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 11&chapter=4&lang=en
5

6 Zolotor, A. J., Theodore, A. D., Runyan, D.K., Chang, J.J., & Laskey, A.L. (2011). Corporal
7
8 punishment and physical abuse: population-based trends for three-to-11-year-old children
9
10 in the United States. *Child Abuse Review*, 20, 57-66. doi: 10.1002/car.1128
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

For Peer Review

Table 1

Correlations between age, education, SES and the measures of the retrospective parental behaviour (Spearman's rho) and mean differences in socio-demographics for parental roles during childhood (ANOVA).

	1958 cohort (n = 385)			2011 cohort (n = 457)		
	Age	Education	Social class (Graffar)	Age	Education	SES
Directive Control						
Demanding obedience	.16 ***	.02	-.10 *	.08	.07	.12 *
Slapping	-.03	-.07	.06	.03	-.05	-.11 *
Not allowed show anger	-.09	.04	.02	-.05	.05	-.16 **
Maternal strictness				.12 *	.02	.04
Paternal strictness				.13 ***	.09	.15 **
Fathers as authoritarian figures						
Made household decisions		*				
Mother	31.58	0.03	-0.04	36.00	-0.01	-0.04
Equal	31.24	-0.12	0.10	36.69	0.03	0.06
Father	33.07	0.08	-0.07	37.66	-0.07	-0.11
Respected						*
Mother	31.11	-0.01	0.06	36.10	-0.19	-0.17 ^a
Equal	32.14	-0.24	0.21	36.31	0.06	-0.06 ^{ab}
Father	32.55	0.06	-0.07	37.15	-0.01	0.18 ^b
Supported child					*	*
Mother	32.65	0.00	-0.03	36.30	-0.09 ^a	-0.09 ^a
Both	31.24	0.05	-0.10	37.09	0.16 ^a	0.22 ^b

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49

Father	34.10	-0.13	0.12	37.47	0.11	0.13 ^{ab}
--------	-------	-------	------	-------	------	--------------------

Note: All the Likert-type measures are coded from the lowest to the highest level. For the relationship between the socio-demographic variables and fathers as authoritarian figures measures we used ANOVA tests. In these analyses the values for education and SES were standardized, to ease interpretation.

p* < .05. *p* < .01. ****p* < .001.

For Peer Review

Table 2

Slopes (Standard Errors) from Logistic and OLS Regression Models Predicting Directive Control from Cohort and Gender

Logistic regressions		Step 1				Step 2			
		Predictors	B (SE)	Wald test	Odds Ratio	B (SE)	Wald test	Odds Ratio	
Directive control									
Demanding obedience		`81 vs. `58	0.24 (.21)	1.28	1.27	.24 (.21)	1.30	1.27	
		`11 vs. `58	-1.67 (.15)	122.40 ***	0.19	-1.67 (.15)	122.42 ***	0.19	
		Gender	-	-	-	0.03 (.14)	0.04	0.97	
		R ²	.21			.21			
Slapping		`81 vs. `58	-0.11 (.25)	0.91	0.90	-0.10 (.25)	0.15	0.91	
		`11 vs. `58	-2.61 (.38)	46.35 ***	0.07	-2.61 (.38)	47.45 ***	0.07	
		Gender	-	-	-	0.12 (.21)	0.34	0.88	
		R ²	.17			.17			
Not allowed to show anger		`81 vs. `58	-1.10 (.21)	27.35 ***	0.33	-1.08 (.21)	26.24 ***	0.34	
		`11 vs. `58	2.18 (.18)	146.47 ***	8.82	2.18 (.18)	146.97 ***	8.90	
		Gender	-	-	-	-0.22 (.15)	2.10	1.25	
		R ²	.23			.24			
OLS regressions									
			Step 1			Step 2			
			B (SE)	β	<i>t</i>	B (SE)	β	<i>t</i>	
Paternal strictness		`11 vs. `81	-0.48 (.07)	-0.27 ***	-6.87	-0.49 (.07)	-0.28 ***	-6.97	
		Gender				0.08 (.06)	-0.05	-1.30	
		R ²	.07			.08			
Maternal strictness		`11 vs. `81	-0.47 (.06)	-0.28 ***	-7.16	-0.49 (.06)	-0.28 ***	-7.21	
		Gender				0.05 (.06)	-0.03	-0.88	
		R ²	.08			.08			

Note: Samples sizes were 836 to 991 for analyses with reports for both parents' practices. A significant level for the odds-ratios

means the value 1 is not included in the confidence interval. For the nominal regressions, PseudoR² using Nagelkerke's formula is

provided for the full models. Men are the comparison group for gender

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$.

For Peer Review

Table 3

Slopes (Standard Errors) from Nominal Regression Models Predicting Fathers as Authoritarian Figures from Cohort and Gender

Predictors	Step 1			Step 2			
	B (SE)	Wald test	Odds Ratio	B (SE)	Wald test	Odds Ratio	
Fathers as authoritarian figures							
Made household decisions							
Father vs. Mother	`81 vs. `58	0.11 (.23)	0.25	1.12	0.16 (.23)	0.46	1.17
	`11 vs. `58	1.35 (.19)	48.64 ***	3.86	1.35 (.19)	48.03 ***	3.85
	Gender	-	-	-	0.47 (.17)	7.63 **	0.62
Father vs. Equal	`81 vs. `58	-0.21 (.24)	0.81	0.86	-0.20 (.24)	0.71	0.82
	`11 vs. `58	1.64 (.18)	78.74 ***	5.18	1.64 (.18)	78.57 ***	5.17
	Gender	-	-	-	0.14 (.16)	0.79	0.86
R ²	.12			.13			
Respected							
Father vs. Mother	`81 vs. `58	-0.42 (.25)	2.88	0.66	-0.38 (.25)	2.38	0.68
	`11 vs. `58	0.38 (.18)	4.37	1.47	0.37 (.18)	4.12 *	1.45
	Gender	-	-	-	0.42 (.17)	6.20 *	0.65
Father vs. Equal	`81 vs. `58	-0.69 (.41)	2.87	0.50	-0.68 (.41)	2.81	0.50
	`11 vs. `58	2.33 (.21)	124.29 ***	10.27	2.33 (.21)	124.06 ***	10.25
	Gender	-	-	-	0.07 (.17)	0.18	0.93
R ²	.24			.25			
Supported child							
Father vs. Mother	`81 vs. `58	0.02 (.26)	0.01	0.93	-0.01 (.26)	0.00	0.96
	`11 vs. `58	0.31 (.21)	2.20	1.34	0.32 (.21)	2.35	1.38
	Gender	-	-	-	-0.39 (.19)	4.08 *	1.45
Father vs. Both	`81 vs. `58	-0.71 (.38)	3.44	0.49	-0.76 (.38)	3.90 *	0.46
	`11 vs. `58	0.96 (.25)	13.25 ***	2.47	0.92 (.25)	13.63 ***	2.51
	Gender	-	-	-	-0.55 (.23)	5.79 *	1.74
R ²	.04			.05			

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49

Note: Samples sizes were 836 to 991 for analyses with reports for both parents' practices. A significant level for the odds-ratios means the value 1 is not included in the confidence interval. For the nominal regressions, Pseudo R^2 using Nagelkerke's formula is provided for the full models. Men are the comparison group for gender.

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$.

For Peer Review

Table 4

Parental practices and Parental roles as a Percentage of the Sample

	Cohort		
	1958 (<i>n</i> = 385)	1981 (<i>n</i> = 207)	2011 (<i>n</i> = 457)
Directive Control			
Demanding obedience			
One or both parents always demanded	66	71	28
Mother / father ^a		56 / 63 ^a	
Did not always demand obedience	44	29	72
Mother / father ^a		44 / 37 ^a	
Slapping			
Often slapped	20	18	2
Mother / father ^a		11 / 12 ^a	
Rarely or never slapped	80	82	98
Rarely slapped ^a	63 ^a	41 ^a	25 ^a
Mother / father ^a		61 / 57 ^a	
Never ^a	17 ^a	41 ^a	73 ^a
Mother / father ^a		27 / 32 ^a	
Not allowed show anger			
Not allowed anger	46	72	11
Allowed anger	54	28	89
Paternal strictness			
Strict		52	17
Neither strict nor mild		23	43
Mild		26	40
Maternal strictness			
Strict		42	11
Neither strict nor mild		28	45
Mild		30	45
Fathers as authoritarian figures			
Made household decisions			
Father	67	77	33
Both	9	5	48
Mother	24	18	19
Respected			
Father	44	45	14
Equal	30	25	51
Mother	27	31	34
Supported child			
Father	17	19	12
Both	17	9	28
Mother	66	72	60

Note: Percentages are included for both original and recoded obedience and slapping

variables. ^aPercentages of parental demands of obedience and slapping for the original items, for mothers (left) and for fathers (right).