

THE ROLE OF VALUE TRAINING IN PARENTING

Paul W. Robinson and Daniel C. Hyde
Brigham Young University

Humanistic views on values and parenting differ greatly from those proposed by the American family system. Humanists support the idea of relative values, claiming no one set of values can be correct. Furthermore, humanistic parenting principles condemn teaching specific values to children. Instead, humanists propose that children should decide their own values, leaving parents to play a supportive role in this process. Humanists condemn religious values claiming them to be unscientific. A closer look at the logic and research behind Humanist claims reveals that they are neither supported nor founded upon scientific evidence. Many of the ideas proposed by humanistic individuals are actually found to contribute to socially irresponsible behavior. However, many of the principles supported by the American family system are validated by scientific research, as well as promote socially desirable behavior. While Humanists have proposed their view in opposition to established religious principles, they have not developed a better road to child development.

Introduction

We make choices based on what we deem important. It is no wonder that humans have been debating values for thousands of years. In 1776, the founding fathers and governmental leaders of The United States of America established a value system in accordance with religious principles. The American family system, as outlined by religion and supported by Americans, advocates absolute moral values and a hierarchical family system. Furthermore, it supports a directive style of parenting in which parents teach values to children.

The American family system thrived for over one hundred years, remaining virtually unaltered. It was not until the early 1900's that this system began to receive criticism. In an attempt to advance scientifically, humanistic-oriented individuals proposed different views in respect to values and parenting. They believed that religion was based on myth and illusion whereas humanistic principles were more scientific. They claimed that the certain moral values advocated by religion were unnecessary and even detrimental. They downplayed parents presiding in the home and supported a democratic family system in which all have equal say.

This paper first presents the basic ideas of humanistic values and parenting. The humanistic position, which may vary according to individual interpretation, is generally defined, drawing from some of the most prominent and influential humanists in the field. The view presented is not aimed at humanism on an individual level, but the trends that have arisen from humanist oriented mental health professionals. Although the mental health profession has advocated humanistic parenting approaches over more traditional, religious based methods, this paper argues that humanistic claims dealing with values and parenting are not founded nor supported by empirical evidence. The purpose of this paper is to encourage those in the behavioral and social sciences to take a closer look at these principles, their origins, and the effectiveness of each in producing psychologically well, socially responsible, children and adults.

Humanism and Values

Humanists argue that values are relative; what one person declares as a set of values is as good as the declaration of the next person's set of values. Isaac Asimov (1989), former president of the American Humanist Association, commented on the idea of relative moral values by stating, "There is no behavior we ought to interfere with" (p. 8). Instead of declaring an outlined set of moral values, as proposed by the American family system, humanism declares a state of relativity in relation to values. Each individual is encouraged to develop her or his own set of values.

The Humanist Manifesto I and II, published in 1933 and 1973 respectively, were documents designed to define the humanistic position. The Humanist Manifesto II declared, "We affirm that moral values derive their source from human experience. Ethics is autonomous and situational, needing no theological or ideological sanction" (p. 17). Moral values, as stated, are developed by the individual. Religion and other institutions which define sets of absolute moral values are criticized by humanists. Paul Kurtz, a prominent humanist and publisher of the manifestos, coined the term "eupraxophy," meaning a non-religious, scientific and philosophic approach to good life practices, to explain the humanist position (Kurtz, 1989).

Humanistic-oriented individuals believe that religion is based on myth whereas humanism is more scientifically sound. Sigmund Freud, described by biographer Peter Gay as the most distinguished twentieth century representative of secular humanism (Gay, 1985), wrote a significant amount concerning religion. Freud claimed religion was based on "myth and illusion." He also claimed religion was oppositional to science and predicted that civilized societies would eventually abandon religion because of scientific advancements. He described religion as "neurotic" and an "intellectual weakness" (Freud, 1927). Freud's ideas are further supported by another statement in the Humanist Manifesto II:

As in 1933, humanists still believe that traditional theism...is an unproved and outmoded faith (p. 13)...Any account of nature should pass the tests of scientific evidence, in our judgment, the dogmas and myths of traditional religions do not do so....We begin with humans not God, nature not deity. (p. 16)

Humanists are against religious principles, arguing that they lack scientific validation and that they are based on myths and illusions. They claim that truth can only be found within the individual and therefore everyone must decide their own set of values, no matter what they are.

Humanistic Parenting and Values

Parallel to the idea that values should originate from the individual, humanists also prescribe to the idea that children should develop their own set of values rather than being taught certain values. Values clarification is a common idea supported by humanistic-oriented individuals. Values clarification arose from curriculum projects of the 1960's which aimed at teaching individuals how to develop their own values as opposed to parents teaching specific values. A strong proponent and advocate of values clarification, Louis Rath, rejected the idea of universal morals and traditional methods of teaching values. He proposed that children should be taught how to make informed choices instead of being taught what choices to make. He claimed this would lead to enhanced rationality, thoughtfulness, and respect for others (Lewy, 1996). He states that those that do not have a clear and logically thought out set of values will experience poor psychosocial development. No one set of values can be indoctrinated but one must decide individually what is good and bad. The acceptance of one set of values, without personal exploration, reasoning, or logic, leads to values disturbances or poor psychosocial development. Consequently, he claims that many of the behavior problems that exist in schools today are due to value disturbances (Rath, Harmin, & Simon, 1966).

The idea that children must decide their own set of values is also found in other humanistic parenting concepts. This idea is clearly demonstrated in the book *Parent Effectiveness Training (PET)* by Thomas Gordon (1970). Gordon based PET on the ideas of his mentor Carl Rogers. Rogers, a once faithful Christian, renounced Christian beliefs and values and supported a humanistic outlook on life. Rogers' humanistic ideas are clearly evident in Gordon's writings.

Gordon, who refers to his work as "humanistic philosophy" (Gordon, 1975, p. XV), claims parents teaching certain values imposes a false authority on the child, taking away from his or her personal freedom. If parents would like to pass on beliefs or values they are to live their lives how they would want their children to live. Some of the main guidelines to parents outlined by Gordon (1970) include:

- § Be a consultant to your child
- § Be an example
- § Never use authority to impose beliefs and values
- § Let your children make their own decisions
- § Do not invade personal freedom and rights of the child by enforcing your values
- § Learn to accept what you can not change

Gordon also claims that guiding or directing children threatens their independence. The use of rewards and punishments to teach children values is discouraged, claiming that behavior patterns are not taught to children but they are learned through the child's experience. Gordon states that parents are not justified in using authority over their children by claiming they are wiser or more experienced, or have a right to use authority. "Parents have superior wisdom? No, not about many things concerning their children" (Gordon, 1975, p. 228).

Gordon points out another important humanistic parenting principle, the democratic family system. A democratic family system, where all have equal say and authority, is advocated by humanists as the superior arrangement in the home. Children are given the same say in the family as the parents. Gordon states that even very young children should not be guided by parents. He states:

Furthermore, parents of very young children often think that just because these children are dependent on adults for many of their needs, infants and toddlers have very little capacity to work out their own solutions to problems they encounter early in life. This too, just isn't so. (p. 95)

According to Gordon, all children, including infants and toddlers, should be given freedom to decide what is good and what is bad.

Gordon further defines his stance on values and parenting in a later section entitled, "Can I teach my values?" (p. 273) He states, "There are some behaviors of children that parents simply may not be able to change. The only alternative is to accept this fact" (p. 278). Some of the behaviors in which parents do not have authority to interfere with include sexual activity, using the family car, smoking, hair length, dress, alcohol and drug use. Instead of using authority to teach values to children, parents are instructed to accept what they can not change.

Alfred Adler, whose parents were strong advocates of democratic socialism, was also a strong proponent of humanism and humanistic parenting principles. He believed that education was the responsibility of the state and not the parents. He stated, "Parents are neither good psychologists nor good teachers" (Adler, 1927, p. 279). Furthermore he supported the idea of equal say and authority in the home by commenting:

Education in the home therefore commits the gravest of psychological errors in inoculating children with the false idea that they must be superior to everyone else and consider themselves better than all other human beings. Any organization of the family, which is based upon the idea of leadership of the father, cannot be separated from this thought. (p. 280)

Systematic Training for Effective Parenting, written by Dinkmeyer and McKay (1976), was based on Adlerian concepts. The main ideas of STEP follow the same outline as the previously mentioned humanistic parenting principles.

- § Democratic family system

§ Non-punishment approach

§ Supportive parenting

According to humanistic parenting philosophy, many of the principles outlined by the American Family System have negative side effects on children. The use of authority, punishment, and directive parenting have all been claimed to cause poor psychosocial development and low self-esteem in children. PET lists thirty-five negative side effects associated with the parental use of power. They include:

Resistance, defiance, rebellion, negativism, resentment anger, hostility, aggression, retaliation, striking back, lying, hiding feelings, blaming others, tattling, cheating, dominating, bossing, bullying, needing to win, hating to lose, forming alliances, organizing against parents, submission, obedience, compliance, apple polishing, courting favor, conformity, lack of creativity, fear of trying something new, requiring prior assurance of success, withdrawing, escaping, fantasizing, regression (Gordon, 1970, p. 175).

In summary, humanists support a relative stance on values. They believe that each individual must decide what is right and what is wrong. They dismiss religion and its absolute stance on values, claiming that it is based on myth. Not only do they claim that religion is unscientific, but insist on the use of science to validate claims and theories. A democratic family system is proposed in which all have equal say. Parental use of authority and power is strongly discouraged, as well as the use of punishment, in teaching children values. Parents are believed not to be necessarily wiser or know more than children. Furthermore, they support the idea that parents should play a supportive role in the child's acquisition of values. Children, even at a very young age, are believed to possess the ability to decide on values and morality. The American family system, consisting of presiding, directing parents, is said to have many negative side effects, avoidable upon implementation of humanistic parenting philosophies.

A Critical Examination of Humanistic Parenting Principles

When the Humanistic views are examined, they tend to differ greatly from those supported by the American family system. A closer look at the research and background of these theories reveals that, although they may sound enticing and liberating, they are neither supported by scientific evidence nor easy to defend.

As mentioned earlier, humanists consider values relative. This is contrary to the American family system which advocates an absolute set of moral values. While hypothetically it might be nice to proclaim a relative view on values, stating that one person's beliefs are just as good and valid as the next person's, in all reality it does not work out so well. Guenter Lewy (1996), an agnostic who has written much on the importance of religion stated, "It is meritorious to tolerate diversity in social arrangements, but destructive to attribute equal value to them all" (p. 31). A logical examination of the concept reveals weakness in relative reasoning.

Following a relative line of reasoning, one set of values is as good as the next. If this were true, there should be no problem with those who choose to value religious principles. People could practice and believe anything and everything they felt correct, and this would be correct. This concept sounds intriguing until applied to a more extreme example. Consider the ideas of Adolph Hitler. In a world of relativity, his views are as good as the next. If he chooses to believe that his is the superior race and those of the Jewish faith are inferior, it is up to him. If his personal experience has led him to believe the only moral thing to do is to exterminate the Jewish race because of their inferiority; that is acceptable. Relativity, by definition, not only encourages acceptance of liberating beliefs, but those of persecution, hatred, and discrimination.

Humanists claim relativity and then generally define good and bad behaviors. The Humanist Manifesto II declares, "We affirm that moral values derive their source from human experience. Ethics is autonomous and situational, needing no theological or ideological sanction" (p.17). This statement exposes Humanists' bias

against religion, contradicting their claim of relativity. The same document states, “We believe in maximum individual autonomy consonant with social responsibility” (p. 16). This claim of limits on individual autonomy is never realized. Humanists tend to support very radical issues, considered by most to be socially irresponsible, confusing the matter even more. The Humanist Manifesto II calls for an array of socially irresponsible behaviors such as sexual promiscuity, euthanasia, and suicide. “Short of harming others or compelling them to do likewise, individuals should be permitted to express their sexual proclivities and pursue life-styles as they desire” (p. 18).

Sexual promiscuity is a strong point of interest among humanists. Such topics as sexual infidelity to spouses, free intercourse for everyone, and all and every kind of sexual relationship is supported. Marty Klein, a humanistic oriented sex therapist states, “Pornography has become the symbol of ‘bad’ sex because it depicts sex without love or meaning. But what’s wrong with ‘meaningless’ sex if both partners agree to it? It is time, emotionally, and spiritually, to just say yes” (Lewy, 1996, p. 34). John Harris, a well-known philosopher and advocate of the secular humanist movement stated, “I know of no evidence for the harmful effects of bestiality, but any that there may be would have to be worse than depriving animal lovers of sexual release...The same holds true for necrophilia [sexual intercourse with a dead body], as long as the dead person has agreed to this in advance, and the same for fetishism, incest, and sodomy” (Lewy, 1996, p. 34). He states that just because a normal person might see it as disgusting, it should not be considered immoral. The humanist rule of thumb is “if it feels good, do it.” Although this might be the ultimate in personal freedom, this mentality not only leads to personal problems but social problems as well. Teenage and unwanted pregnancy, AIDS and other sexually transmitted diseases, divorce, and stress of family members are just a few of the adverse effects of this type of behavior.

Humanists push for other socially irresponsible behaviors as well as sexual freedom. The Humanist (1990) refers to drugs as a “natural part of our body,” and claims that “In a sense, the war on drugs is a war against ourselves, a denial of our very virtue” (Lewy, 1996, p. 35). Prometheus Books, headed by Paul Kurtz, publisher of the Humanist Manifestos, also publishes titles regarding the forgery of the Old Testament, sadomasochism, the next sexual revolution, and guides to sexually explicit material. The X-Rated Videotape Star Index, which features 17,000 pornographic movies, is also published by Prometheus Books and is described as the most complete index of adult entertainment ever (Lewy, 1996). Although people may have the right to believe in these things, one might be hesitant to let their child adopt such behaviors. It is easy but painful to imagine the results of these values replacing the ones on which this nation was founded. However, humanists regard most religious values as negative, yet do not define which aspects. Some contradictory and somewhat confusing statements of the Humanist Manifesto II include:

§ We affirm a set of common principles that can serve as a basis for united action.

§ Any account of nature should pass the test of scientific evidence; in our judgment, the dogmas and myths of traditional religions do not do so.

§ We appreciate the need to preserve the best ethical teachings in the religious traditions of humankind, many of which we share in common. (p. 16)

§ We affirm that moral values derive their source from human experience. Ethics is autonomous and situational, needing no theological or ideological sanction. (p. 17)

Another common theme in all humanist literature is that of ambiguity. Humanist claim relativity yet practice a form of absoluteness and at the same time can not decide on a set of common principles to guide them. Paul Kurtz (1969) stated that Humanists have yet to, “define what their values are or to see how they apply to the concrete problems of life” (p. 13). He reiterated this comment in 1994 by adding, “We do not have a comprehensive theory at present” (p. 32). Later in the same document Kurtz states, “The humanist life stance has a clearly developed conception of what ‘good practice’ and ‘right conduct’ are” (p. 39). There clearly exists a prob-

lem in the formation of humanistic principles.

In the overall unsuccessful attempt to define Humanism, Humanists do clearly define religious principles as unscientific, while claiming humanistic principles to be scientifically sound. "Myth," as defined by Webster (1995), is "a fictitious person, thing, or happening" (p. 451); and "illusion" is "a mistaken perception or belief" (p. 345). Although Humanists claim their principles to be more scientific, the evidence supports the idea that these claims are based on theoretical speculation, or myth and illusion.

Freud's theories are a great example of principles based on speculation alone. Concepts such as the Oedipus complex, penis envy, and dream interpretation are not backed by any scientific evidence. In reference to Freud's parenting principles, much research has been done, attempting to validate his claims. In 1959, Benjamin Spock attempted to validate Freudian parenting methods through scientific methods. He recruited 21 families expecting their first child to receive psychoanalytic therapy twice a month for six years. These families were followed for thirteen years. He hypothesized that these children, whose parents received therapy, would be able to avoid many of the complexes explained by Freudian theory. His results showed children in his study had just as many problems as other children and in some cases even more severe problems (Torrey, 1992). He also found it impossible to predict which children would experience social problems later in life based on early parent-child interactions, a fundamental aspect of Freudian philosophy (Nichols & Robinson, 2002). This example illustrates a trend of scientifically unsupported parenting practices supported by humanists.

PET and STEP have both been examined and found not to be supported by any empirical evidence as well (Rinn & Markle, 1977; Dembo, Sweitzer, & Lauritzen, 1985; Lipton, 1975). When specific behavior change procedures advocated by PET and STEP are looked at, they are found to be ineffective and unsupported by research as well (Weber, Crawford, Roff, & Robinson, 1983). Clearly the evidence points towards humanistic parenting principles as being based on myth and illusions. Freud, Alder, Rogers, Gordon, and others involved in the formation of these ideas conducted little if any research to come up with these ideas, but based them on theoretical speculation.

While humanistic ideas on parenting are found to be based on theoretical speculation, the American family system, so harshly criticized by humanists, can be scientifically validated. When the issue of religion and the effect it has on behavior in adolescents is examined, a clear relationship is found. First proposed scientifically by Durkheim (1915), religion was seen as a construct that led to socially desirable behavior. Throughout the twentieth century religion has repeatedly been found to have an inverse relationship to juvenile delinquency (Burkett & White; Higgins & Albrecht, 1977; Albrecht, Stan, Chadwick, & Alcorn, 1977; Linden & Lurie, 1977; Jensen & Erickson, 1979; Stark, Doyle, & Kent, 1982; Chadwick & Top, 1993).

Not only is juvenile delinquency deterred by religion, but adult crime as well. Ellis (1985) reviewed 56 studies dealing with this issue and found a strong inverse relationship between the two. Although the definitions of crime and religiosity varied greatly, he stated that those who attend church regularly commit significantly fewer crimes (Lewy, 1996). Other large scale studies have been carried on the issue, finding similar results (Stark et al, 1980; Bainbridge, 1989; Stack & Kanavy, 1983). It appears that the American family system, which advocates absolute religious-based moral values, is supported by scientific evidence as reducing socially irresponsible behavior.

Religion has been and continues to be supported by citizens nationwide. Religion and the values associated with it were of key importance to the establishment of The United States of America. In his farewell address, George Washington stated:

Of all the dispositions and habits which lead to political prosperity, religion and morality are indispensable supports. In vain would be the man that claims the tribute of patriotism who should labor to subvert these great pillars of human happiness. (Barton, 2002, p. 319).

The men who settled, organized, and founded this country were firm supporters of religious principles. Not only was a religious based moral code endorsed by the founding fathers, it is supported by a majority of Americans today. Lewy (1996) reveals in his book *Why American Needs Religion* that, according to a 1993 Gallup poll, 88% of Americans regard religion as very important or somewhat important. Although polls do not show a commitment or level of religiosity, Lewy comments, they do show trends. A comprehensive study done in 1989-1990, also cited by Lewy, concluded that 86.5% of the American population claimed to be Christians. The same poll found only .02 % claimed to be humanists. Even among those that do not claim a religion, many report belief in religious principles. In another poll cited by Lewy, of those that attended a church one time or less each year, 60% of inactive Protestants, 53% of inactive Catholics, and 40% with no religious preference believed in life after death. A 1988 Gallup poll stated that 72% of inactive church-goers believed in Jesus Christ and his teachings.

Although most percentages have fallen some in the last half a century, they still represent very large number of individuals with a religious/Christian orientation to life, including parenting issues. Most Americans favor strong family ties, welcome more respect for authority, while they favor a decline in sexual freedom and marijuana use (Lewy, 1996). Lewy concludes his analysis of a secular America by stating, "In certain ways, America today is a more secular society than it was several generations ago, yet their prediction of a linear progression toward increasing secularization is unsupported by the evidence available" (p. 80). A majority of Americans still hold the belief in a traditional/religious based lifestyle that was the basis of the founding of their country, and that was advocated by people in ancient times.

Specifically on the issue of values and parenting, the humanist position clearly contradicts the American family system. They believe that values should be decided by the child rather than taught by the parent. Gordon (1970) has stated that small children, even infants and toddlers, should have the right to make their own decisions. He also proclaimed that parents are not necessarily wiser than their children, have no right to justify teaching values because they know what is best, or because of personal experience. He claims that doing so robs the child of personal freedom and causes emotional damage. One might wonder if a young child is just as capable of making decisions as an experienced adult. According to humanistic principles, past experience is irrelevant. If this is true we can not learn from our past mistakes and correct decisions or those of others. This view denies the importance of history to our advancement. Gordon provides no evidence for his statements leading the reader to assume that this, like other humanistic principles, is based on speculation alone.

The American family system advocates setting limits for children by teaching certain moral values. It also supports accountability and consequences for ones' actions. Parents use punishment when a child behaves outside the guidelines previously set. This is contrary to the humanist belief that the use of rewards and punishments is detrimental to children. One of the most common claims is that it causes aggression in children. From a sample of 379 families, Sears, Maccoby, and Levin (1957) reported a higher correlation between aggression in children and permissive parenting than between children's aggression and the use of physical punishment. Bandura and Walters (1959) replicated the study both parenting styles related to aggression. McCord and McCord (1959) reviewed the study of 650 youth and found that the Freudian approach to does not reduce aggression or delinquency. Dembo et al. (1985) analyzed three factors of prior humanistic parenting system studies including: the ability to produce behavior change in children; the ability to cause a change in parental attitudes about parenting; and changes in the child's self-esteem as a result of implementing the system. They found no significant change in parental attitudes, behavior change, or self-esteem in children.

Not only has punishment not been found to be detrimental to children, it has been shown to be an effective method for behavior change. Thousands of studies have been conducted on the use of punishment and its effectiveness. The research is conclusive that punishment is an effective method for behavior change and promotes pro-social behavior (Axelrod & Apsche, 1983; Azrin & Holz, 1966; Walters & Grusec, 1977). The American family system, backed by religious principles, supports the use of rewards and punishments to teach certain values to children. The humanistic view teaches parents to avoid punishing children, and instead sup-

porting them in whatever decisions they make. Punishment is found to be an effective method, while non-punishing, permissive methods are not.

Humanistic parenting, which can be defined as permissive, has also been shown to be highly correlated with juvenile delinquency. Motivated by the rise in juvenile delinquency in the 1920's, Glueck and Glueck (1950) conducted what is considered the most extensive study on juvenile delinquency ever. Over several decades they tracked 1000 boys, half of which were delinquent. They examined close to 200 different variables and their relationship to delinquency. They reported that 56.8% of boys in detention centers came from homes with lax or permissive parenting; whereas, only 4.4% came from a home with an overly strict mothers. In addition, they found that delinquent youth in their study were less likely to attend church than were non-delinquent youth. McCord and McCord (1959) also found that delinquent boys were twice as likely to come from the permissive parenting environments. From the information provided, a permissive parenting style, advocated by humanists, shows strong correlations with delinquent children.

Conclusion

Through this examination, it has become clear that humanistic views differ greatly from those proposed by the American family system. Humanistic philosophy argues for relativity with respect to values. They claim religion, which advocates an absolute set of values, to be ineffective. In addition, they propose that parents should let children decide their own values. The family is seen as a democratic system, where all have equal say. Parents are warned against the use of authority and punishment on the grounds that these behaviors are damaging to their children. When the scientific evidence is examined, humanistic beliefs concerning values and parenting do not stand their ground. While humanists claim to be scientific, a majority of their major theories are not based on science at all. However, many aspects of the American family system have been found to be supported by scientific evidence as effective parenting methods. Religious-based parenting has been found to be inversely related to delinquency and criminal behavior, while humanistic or permissive parenting has been shown to be linked to delinquent behavior. In addition to delinquent behavior, humanists support other radical behaviors as well.

Substantial evidence has been presented as to the weaknesses of humanistic parenting.

These findings, research, and commentary on humanistic parenting and values is aimed at informing the reader on the subject of teaching values to children. Although humanists claim that parents should let children decide their own values, as opposed to teaching them specific values, scientific evidence does not support this idea as an effective parenting method. Humanistic claims that religion and its parenting principles are detrimental to children has simply not been founded nor supported by research.

This paper is an attempt to broaden the views of mental health professionals, educators, and parents as to the background and evidence behind these claims. It brings to light the idea that many of the parenting principles so highly regarded by psychology are not supported by research or scientific evidence, but based on theoretical speculation. It hints as to dangers of this type of thinking. As the behavioral sciences push for a more scientific orientation to the study of human behavior, we predict a closer approximation to the basic principles presented by the American family system.

References

- Adler, A. (1927). *Understanding Human Nature*. Garden City, NY: Star Books.
- Albrecht, S.L., Chadwick, B.A., & Alcorn, D.S. (1977). Religiosity and deviance: Application of an attitude-behavior contingent consistency model. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 16, 263-274.
- Asimov, I. (1989). The never-ending fight. *The Humanist*, March/April, 7-8.
- Axelrod, S. & Apsche, J. (1983). *Effects of Punishment on Human Behavior*. New York: Academic Press.
- Azrin, N.H. & Holz, W.C. (1966). Punishment. In W.K. Hong's (Ed.) *Operant Behavior: Areas of Research and Application*. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts.
- Bainbridge, W. (1989). The religious ecology of deviance. *American Sociological Review*, 54, 292.
- Bandura, A. & Walters, R. H. (1959). *Adolescent Aggression*. New York: The Ronald Press.
- Barton, D. (2002). *Original Intent*. Aledo, TX: Wallbuilder Press.
- Burkett, S.R., & White, M. (1974). Hellfire and delinquency: Another look. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 13, 455-462.
- Chadwick, B.A., & Top, B.L. (1993). Religiosity and delinquency among LDS adolescents. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 32, 51-67.
- Dembo, M.H., Sweitzer, M., & Lauritzen, P. (1985). An evaluation of group parent education: Behavioral, PET, and Adlerian programs. *Review of Educational Research*, 55, 155-200.
- Dinkmeyer, D. & McKay, G.D. (1976). *Systematic Training for Effective Parenting*. Circle Pines, MN: American Guidance Service.
- Durkeim, E. (1915). *The elementary forms of the religious life* (Swain, J.W., Trans.). New York: Free Press.
- Ellis, L. & Peterson, J. (1996). Crime and religion: An international comparison among thirteen industrial nations. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 20, 761-768.
- Ellis, L. (1985). Religiosity and criminality: Evidence and explanations of complex relationships. *Social Perspectives*, 28, 513.
- Freud, S. (1927). *Future of an Illusion*. in Strachey, J. (Ed. and Trans.), *Standard edition of the complete psychological works of Sigmund Freud*. London: Hogarth Press, 1962.
- Gay, P. (1985). *Freud for Historians*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Glueck, S. & Glueck, E. (1950). *Unraveling Juvenile Delinquency*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Gordon, T. (1975). *Parent Effectiveness Training*. New York: Plume Books.
- Gordon, T. (1970). *Parent Effectiveness Training*. New York: Peter H. Wyden.
- Higgins, P.C., & Albrecht, G.L. (1977). Hellfire and delinquency revisited. *Social Forces*, 55, 952-958.

- Jensen, G. F. & Erickson, M. L. (1979). The religious factor and delinquency: Another look at the hellfire hypothesis. In *The Religious Dimension*. Wuthnow, R. (Ed.). New York: Academic Press.
- Kurtz, P. (1994). *Living without Religion: Eupraxophy*. Buffalo, N.Y. Prometheus Books.
- Kurtz, P. (1989). *Eupraxophy: Living without Religion*. Buffalo, NY: Prometheus Books.
- Kurtz, P. (Ed.). (1973). *Humanist Manifestos I and II*. Buffalo, NY: Prometheus Books.
- Kurtz, P. (1969). *Moral Problems in Contemporary Society: Essays in Humanistic Ethics*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Lewy, G. (1996). *Why America Needs Religion*. Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans.
- Linden, R. & Lurrie, R. (1977). Religiosity and drug use: A test of social control theory. *Canadian Journal of Criminology*, 19, 346-355.
- Lipton, D., Martinson, R., & Wilks, J. (1975). *The Effectiveness of Correctional Treatment: A survey of treatment evaluation studies*. New York: Praeger.
- McCord, W. & McCord, J. (1959). *Origins of Crime: A new evaluation of the Cambridge— Somerville study*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Nichols, M. & Robinson, P.W. (2002, February). An historical, empirical look at Sigmund Freud and Benjamin Spock's parenting ideas, claims, and promises. Paper presented at the American Association of Behavioral and Social Sciences National Convention, Las Vegas, Nevada.
- Raths, L.E., Harmin, M., & Simon, S.B. (1966). *Values and Teaching*. Columbus, OH: Charles E. Merrill.
- Rinn, R.C., & Markle, A. (1977). Parent Effectiveness Training: A review. *Psychological Reports*, 41, 95-109.
- Sears, R. R., Maccodby, E. E., & Levin, H. (1957). *Patterns of Childrearing*. Evanston, IL: Row, Peterson, and Co.
- Stack, S. & Kanavy, M. (1983). The effect of religion on forcible rape. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 22, 68.
- Stark, R., Kent, L., & Doyle, D.P. (1982). Religion and delinquency: The ecology of a 'lost' relationship. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 19, 4-24.
- Stark, R., Doyle, D.P., & Kent, L. (1980). Rediscovering moral communities: Church membership and crime. In *Understanding Crime*. Hirschi, T. & Gottfredson, M. (Ed.). Beverly Hills: Sage.
- The New American Webster Handy College Dictionary (3rd ed.). (1995). New York: Signet.
- Torrey, E.F. (1992). *Freudian Fraud*. New York: Harper Collins Publishers.
- Walters, G. C. & Grusec, J. E. (1977). *Punishment*. San Francisco: Freeman.
- Weber, W.A., Roff, L.A., Crawford, J. & Robinson, C. (1983). *Classroom Management: Review of the Teacher Education and Research Literature*. Princeton: Educational Testing Service.