Parents' Values Socialization in Contemporary Chile: How do Social Class and Parents' Religion Shape How They Raise their Children?[1]

EDUARDO SANTANDER RAMÍREZ (lead author)
Independent researcher at the Centro de Estudios de Investigación sobre Familia, Universidad Finis Terrae
efsantan@uc.cl

LLARELA BERRÍOS
Research Associate at the Escuela de Educación Parvularia, Universidad Finis Terrae
lberrios@uft.cl

PATRICIA SOTO DE LA CRUZ
Director of the Escuela de Educación Parvularia, Universidad Finis Terrae
psoto@uft.cl

MARIELA AVENDAÑO CASSASA
Scholar at the Escuela de Educación Parvularia, Universidad Finis Terrae
mavendanoc@uft.cl

Abstract. This study aims to assess the relationship between the variables of social class and religion in parental preferences regarding values socialization in contemporary Chile. Employing data from the 5th Metropolitan Survey of Family and Education, logistic models were estimated that show that upper class families tend to favor more symbolic-relational values such as good manners and respect for others, while lower classes privilege social promotion values such as hard work and thrift. Parents who identify as evangelical Christians, on the other hand, place a firm emphasis on values such as religious belief.

Keywords: family; values; socialization; Chile.

Introduction

Research on intergenerational values transmission during the family social-ization process has played a central role in studies on family psychology and sociology, since it allows for an expansion of into the processes of reproduc-tion of status and social mobility within the family (Kohn, Slomcynski, & Schoenbach, 1985; Yi, Chang, & Chang, 2004). These values have been defined as the objectives and aspirations that parents have for their offspring, both in the short and the long term (Lasker & Lasker, 1991). Such objec-tives are translated into systematic child-raising or concrete socialization strategies that attempt to shape the behavior of sons and daughters in the direction that parents value according to their personality and which they consider as positive for their children's social integration and development (Ramírez, 2005, p. 167).

There is considerable empirical evidence to demonstrate that social strat-ification has an effect on parents' value socialization preferences for their children (Hadjar, Baier, & Boehnke, 2008; Kohn, 1969; Kohn *et al.*, 1985; Kohn & Schooler, 1983; Xiao, 1999). According to the classical sociolog-ical tradition, the family operates as an agent of cultural reproduction, in which values are tacitly acquired in a process of transmission that assures the perpetuation of the social group and the conservation of status and privilege (Bernstein, 1973; Bourdieu, 1998). That is, the values that parents prefer to transmit to their children are neither random nor rationalized, but rather are socially constructed, as a function of the internalization of the social structure and the social division of labor during the socialization of the individual.

On the other hand, studies also note that the values that parents want to inculcate in their children during their education and formation have an effect on their later development and success in the paths they follow throughout their lives (Hitlin, 2006). The World Values Survey (WVS) was pioneering in this regard when, starting in 1991, it included a question about the values that people would like their children to learn. Studies show that the values preferred most frequently are good manners, hard work, independence, responsibility, and tolerance (Rabusicova & Rabusic, 2001, p. 127).

Studies have also found that the values that parents seek to transmit to their children reveal differentiated attitudes to culture, the world of work, or interaction with peers (Xiao, 1999). Some studies find that while mid-dle-class families put considerable emphasis on values such as independence and autonomy, working-class parents attach more importance to socializing their children in obedience or hard work (Spade, 1991; Tudge et al., 2000).

Meanwhile, Catholic parents opt for modes of socialization based on conformity and good manners (Lanski, 1961).

Chile, for its part, has been characterized as a highly segregated country, with strong endogenous reproduction of class and social privilege (Larrañaga & Rodríguez, 2015; Repetto, 2016). This leads to the hypothesis that families adapt patterns of socialization of values that are functional for the conservation of status – in the case of upper class families – or social advancement in the case of lower class families. Still, thus far there is little research related to this hypothesis in Chile. Ortega, Vidal, and Zapata (2009), in a qualitative study of communes living in extreme poverty, find that families living there strongly emphasize values associated with work, responsibility, and economic concerns. These values have been reinforced by the strong penetration of Pentecostalism among working urban classes (Valenzuela, Bargsted, & Somma, 2013).

Upper-class Chilean families, on the other hand, are inclined to transmit values associated with economic success and display of social prestige as well as those associated with Catholic morality, austerity, and social and family responsibilities. These socialization strategies allow the Chilean upper class to mobilize dynamics of distinction and closure sustained through socialization, in a "virtuous code" that shapes a kind of values-based identity (Giesen, 2010; Thumala, 2007). Nevertheless, there is little empirical evidence of how the social stratification of families shapes values socialization, beyond schooling preferences or educational strategies (Gubbins, 2014).

This purpose of this study is to evaluate the effect of a set of social variables on parents' values socialization preferences for their children, employing a sample of 1,005 parents and guardians whose children attend elementary or high school in the Metropolitan Region of Santiago. Twelve logistic regression models were estimated to evaluate the effect of socio-economic group and religious affiliation variables on the type of values that these parents and guardians seek to transmit to their offspring.

1. Reference Framework

Socialization—understood as the process of inculcation whereby children learn a wide repertoire of norms, values, and behaviors characteristic of the culture of a society (Servat, 2008), and which characterize their style of adaptation to their environment—has been the subject of extensive theoretical discussion in sociology and developmental psychology. This process of transmission of cultural contents within the family has been demonstrated to have a strong association with the individual's psychological development, resilience, and prospects of professional success, as well as with the func-

tioning of society (Danioni, Rosnati, & Varni, 2017; Schönpflug, 2009). Indeed, during so-called "primary socialization," children internalize and codify symbolic systems from their objective world through their interactions with "significant others" (Berger & Luckmann, 1968). Because they cannot chose their "significant others" (particularly their parents), they are led to an identification that is almost automatic, with a strong emotional charge, in which the world they perceive is not one among many but "the world" (the only one that exists and which can be conceived of) (Simkin & Becerra, 2013, p. 127).

The processes of intrafamilial value transmission have been discussed and problematized from two perspectives. The first argues that there is a continuum between the parents' values and those that they seek to pass on to their offspring (Trommsdorff, 2009); this is called the "fax" model (Strauss, 1992). According to this view, there is a strong correlation between the structure of values within families and the structure that parents want their sons and daughters to learn (Whitbeck & Gecas, 1988; Trommsdorff, 2009; Knafo & Schwartz, 2001). In turn, the second perspective argues that parents filter the values in which they wish to socialize their sons and daughters in order to maximize their adaptation to society in order to enhance their level of functional integration (Youniss, 1994). This means that there is no absolute congruity between what parents profess as socialization values and what they think would be best for their children, since the values that parents learned may no longer be useful in new social and cultural contexts or new trends in the world of work and production (Aylwin, 1984; Kuczynski, Marshall, & Schell, 1997; Knafo & Galanski, 2008). One criticism of these models stems from the observation that the processes of values transmission do not operate on a *tabula rasa* but are essentially bidirectional and, therefore, include a space for negotiation and even resistance (Kuczynski et al., 1997; Pinquart & Silbereisen, 2002). Consequently, the value transmission process is not encapsulated solely within the family but is also mediated by the different contexts of significative development and areas of social interaction in which children and adolescents participate (Boehnke, 2001; Roest, Dubas, & Gerris, 2009), following an ecological model of socialization and learning of norms and cultural contents (Bronfenbrenner, 1987).

In classical sociological theory, there is a long tradition of demonstrating the relationship between the variables of social origin and values socialization preferences. According to Bourdieu (1998), for example, the family transmits and reinforces a framework of practices, representations, and social dispositions—*habitus*—toward culture and the world of work, which are a reflection of the individual's social position in the social space and which

mobilize different strategies of social reproduction or group perpetuation. For Bernstein (1973), on the other hand, families transmit a set of principles for social relations, rules of recognition, and communications practices—a "sociolinguistic code"—that is acquired in a tacit and informal manner during socialization processes, and results from an internalization of the distribution of power and social control in the individual's experience. This sociolinguistic code operates by regulating the practices and social relations of the individual, in which, ultimately, the process of cultural transmission of social class differences or the relative position in the structure of the social division of labor is deployed (Bernstein, 1990).

One of the first studies to link social class with parental socialization style was that of Melvin Kohn (1969). In his study of 400 households in Washington, D.C., in the United States, he found that parents from both lower- and middle-class homes considered the most important values in which to socialize their children to be happiness, honesty, consideration for others, and obedience. Nevertheless, these two types of families differed in how they ranked these values in terms of importance. While middle-class families emphasized self-control and curiosity, their lower-class peers put more importance on the values of obedience, respect for parental authority, and good manners (Kohn, 1969). Kohn himself, together with researchers in Poland, analyzed the relationship between social stratification and parental preference variables in the values socialization of their children, and the results were similar. Indeed, those parents with jobs that allowed them to exercise their own initiative and judgement, generally professionals from the upper class or the bourgeoisie, sought to socialize their sons and daughters in the values of autonomy, discipline, and leadership (Kohn et al., 1985). To theoretically encapsulate these differences by social class, Villaroel (1990) defines two patterns of family socialization: "repressive socialization," oriented toward conformity, respect for authority, and obedience, which occurs primarily in the lower class; and "participatory socialization," which unfolds primarily in the middle- and upper-classes and is characterized by the promotion of values such as creativity, reflection, and autonomous exploration. Both patterns are apparent in specific forms of organization of roles within the family: in repressive socialization, family achieve cohesion and unity primarily through the functional complementarity of traditional cultural roles (the father as a provider and the mother as a housewife); while in the participatory socialization model, family members are organized according to more flexible and negotiated patterns, determined more by the personal abilities and inclinations of each member than by the impositions of a cultural system of division of family roles (Rodríguez, 2007).

Chile has been described as a country with high levels of socioeconomic inequality, which is evident in indicators of residential segregation (Sabatini, Cáceres, & Cerda, 2001; Agostini, Hojman, Román, & Valenzuela, 2016), distribution of income (Larrañaga & Rodríguez, 2015), and inequality in the school system (Bellei, 2013). Data provided by the World Bank indicate that Chile has the most unequal economy of all the OECD countries, with a Gini coefficient that is considerably higher than the other OECD countries but close to those of Paraguay, Rwanda, and Swaziland. This is explained by the fact that a large percentage of all income in Chile goes into the hands of the wealthiest households (Repetto, 2016, p. 80). On the other hand, qualitative evidence shows that the Chilean upper class mobilizes various mechanisms of social distinction to protect the exclusivity and the perpetuation of the group. One of these mechanisms is Catholicism. In effect, the Chilean elite is characterized by its extreme Catholic morality and a conservative and virtuous lifestyle intended to demonstrate a superior morality, inherited from the colonial regime (Giesen, 2010, pp. 27-28). The committed Catholicism of the Chilean upper class has been linked to its membership of and sympathy for movements such as the Opus Dei and the Legion of Christ, which are distinctive for their virtuous and pious combination of economic success and Catholic doctrine (Thumala, 2007). Qualitative evidence indicates that the Chilean upper class seeks to mark itself apart from the rest of society by socializing their offspring in what Giesen (2010) calls a "virtuous code," characterized by values such as family responsibility, Catholic morality, elegance, and support for others. Moya and Hernández (2014) hypothesize that one of the most powerful symbolic mechanisms of social closing employed by the upper class is socialization in the moral values of classical Catholicism, oriented toward the development of virtue, self-control, spirituality, and happiness. These values tend to be institutionally legitimated through the rationale of school selection and, in general, in educational and academic socialization strategies, which ultimately shapes the Chilean elite's cultural identity or ethos (Thumala, 2007).

On the other hand, there has been a systematic expansion of Pentecostalism among Chilean popular sectors, especially in urban areas. This movement identifies itself with moral regeneration and a return to traditional values of good conduct in the face of alcoholism, drug consumption, urban violence, and extreme poverty. In contrast to the Catholicism that the Chilean upper class employs as a method for social closing, Pentecostal expansion takes place "within more open structures of inclusion and lay

participation"[2] (Valenzuela, Bargsted, & Somma, 2013, p. 10). In this framework, the Pentecostal narrative seeks to reestablish "true Christian values" within the family: social solidarity, appreciation of the value of work, and brotherhood (Fediakova, 2002).

Research in Chile has not focused on the question of how variables related to the social stratification of families influence their values socialization preferences. Generally, studies have concentrated on the impact of family socialization on behaviors such as alcohol or drug consumption (Florenzano, Sotomayor, & Otava, 2001), family participation in the schooling of their children (Gubbins & Otero, 2016), and the impact of social class on cognitive or academic socialization strategies (Gubbins, 2014).

This study proposes the following hypotheses:

(1) Hypothesis 1: Upper- and middle-class families, in comparison to lower classes, prefer to transfer more symbolic socialization values such as imagination, autonomy, respect for others, and generosity.

(2) Hypothesis 2: Lower-class families, in comparison to higher classes, prefer to transmit more materialistic social values such as thrift, independence, and hard work.

(3) Hypothesis 3: Families that identify with the evangelicalism, in comparison to those who identify with other religious groups, prefer to transmit socialization values based on belief in a religious faith.

In this way, this study seeks to problematize the influence of socioeconomic group and religious affiliation variables on the socialization preferences of parents and guardians for their school-age children. It is hoped that this study will contribute to the creation of a broader area of study related to intra-family mechanisms of reproduction of inequality in Chile.

2. Methodology

Sample

The data employed are from the 5th Metropolitan Family and Education Survey (V Encuesta Metropolitana de Familia y Educación) administered by the Centro de Estudios e Investigación sobre Familia at the Universidad Finis Terrae in 2015. The target population includes individuals aged 18 or older who normally reside in private housing in the communes of the Metropolitan Region, specifically the Province of Santiago, and who are the

---

2   All translations from Spanish are by *Apuntes*.

parents or guardians of at least one elementary or high school student in their household. The survey design was multistage probabilistic, stratified by communes, with proportional allocation. A structured questionnaire was administered to 1,065 individuals representative of the target population. Information was collected from 34 communes in the Metropolitan Region. The margin of error was 3.0%, considering maximum variance and a confidence level of 95%. Data from the survey are provided in Table 1.

Table 1
Characteristics of the sample

Socioeconomic level	Upper	30%
	Middle	40.1%
	Low	29.9%
Religious affiliation	Catholic	64.5%
	Evangelical/Protestant	20.3%
	Atheist/agnostic/none	15.3%
Sex	Male	21.9%
	Female	78.9%
Age	18-35 years old	41.4%
	35-50 years old	41.5%
	over 50 years old	17.1%
Marital status	Single	32.1%
	Married/cohabiting	58.3%
	Separated/divorced	9.7%

Compiled by authors.

Methods

For the descriptive analysis, chi-squared coefficients of association between variables related to preferences for values socialization and the independent variables: socioeconomic group and religious affiliation. In the second step, 12 binary logistic regression models with dependent variables (of values) and an interaction effect were estimated. Odds ratio (OR) was used to interpret the regression models. The data were statistically analyzed using SPSS software, version 24.

Variables

For the logistic regression models, the dependent variables were 12 dummy variables related to whether the parents mentioned or did not mention the following values when asked "what qualities or values do you think are

especially important to teach at home?": (1) good manners, (2) independence, (3) hard work, (4) responsibility, (5) imagination, (6) tolerance of others, (7) thrift, (8) persistence, (9) religious faith, (10) generosity, (11) respect for others, and (12) obedience. The independent variables were socioeconomic status and the dummy variable was religious affiliation. Socio-demographic controls included the variables of sex, age, and marital status. Table 2 describes the variables used in this study. It also includes an interaction effect: high socioeconomic status and Catholicism.

Table 2
Variables used in this study

Type	Variable	Attribute
Dependent		
Parental preferences for values socialization	Twelve dummy variables related to the qualities or values that parents consider especially important to teach at home	Not mentioned Mention
Independent		
Proxy for status	Socioeconomic level (SES)	Upper Middle Low (reference)
Religious affiliation	Identification with religious belief	Catholic Evangelical/Protestant None/agnostic/atheist (reference)
Socio-demographic controls		
Sex	Sex of parent/ guardian	Male (reference) Female
Marital status	Marital status of parent/ guardian	Single (reference) Married or cohabiting Separated or divorced
Age	Age range of parent/guardian	1. 18-35 years old (reference) 2. 36-50 years old 3. Over 50 years old

Compiled by authors.

3. Results

The relationship between socioeconomic status and parental preferences for values socialization

Table 3 shows the relationship between the type of values or qualities that parents consider most important when socializing their children

and socioeconomic status. Looking at the totals, it can be seen that the five values mentioned most often are, in descending order, responsibility (mentioned by 61.6%), good manners (52.7%), hard work (49%), respect for others (48.2%), and independence (43.8%). In turn, the chi-squared coefficient indicates statistically significant bivariate associations between socioeconomic status and the values of good manners (p<0.01), hard work (p<0.01), thrift (p<0.01), persistence (p<0.01), religious faith (p<0.01), respect for others (p<0.01), generosity (p<0.1), independence (p<0.1), and imagination (p<0.05).

Between socioeconomic levels, statistical differences were found in the mentions of each one of the values. For example, the value of good manners was mentioned more by the middle-class group (61.3%) than by the upper-class group (49.6%) and the lower-class group (44.1%). Hard work was strongly preferred by the lower-class group (57.3%), without statistical differences from the upper-class group (48.6%) but with a difference from the middle-class group (43.2%). The same pattern is repeated for thrift (39.2% of parents in the lower-class group mention this compared to 28.5% of the parents from the middle-class group), and for persistence (42.8% in the lower-class group versus 33.6% in the middle-class group).

The value of religious faith was mentioned most often by families from the lower-class group (32.8%), marking a significant difference from the middle class (19.5%) and also from the upper class group (20.2%). The value of respect for others was preferred more by middle-class families (54.7%) and upper-class families (48.8%), compared to those from the lower-class group (38.8%).

There were no statistically significant differences by socioeconomic level for the values of tolerance of others, obedience, and responsibility.

The relationship between religious affiliation and parental preferences for values socialization

Table 4 shows the relationship between the values or qualities that parents consider most important when socializing their children, and religious affiliation. In general, there are statistically significant relationships between the variables of independence (p<0.01) and imagination (p<0.05) and religious affiliation. Among the different types of religious affiliation, Catholic parents were found to emphatically promote the value of independence (47.6% mentioned it), and there is a statistical difference (p<0.05) from peers who identify with evangelicalism/Protestantism (33.4%) but not with parents who stated they have no religious affiliation or are atheists or agnostic (40.9% mentioned this value). At the same time, 33.7% of parents who identified

as evangelical/Protestant mentioned the importance of imagination as a socialization value in comparison to 24.8% of Catholic parents, a statistically significant difference (p<0.05). No statistically significant differences by religious affiliation were found in relation to the values of good manners, hard work, generosity, religious faith, thrift, persistence, obedience, respect for others, or obedience.

Table 3
Parental values socialization preferences by socioeconomic status (N=1065)

		Socioeconomic status			Total
		Upper	Medium	Lower	
Good manners***	Not mentioned	50.4%	38.7%	55.9%	47.3%
	Mentioned	49.6%a	61.3%b	44.1%a	52.7%
Independence*	Not mentioned	51.0%	58.1%	58.7%	56.2%
	Mentioned	49.0%a	41.9%a	41.3%a	43.8%
Hard work***	Not mentioned	51.4%	56.8%	42.7%	51.0%
	Mentioned	48.6%a,b	43.2%a	57.3%b	49.0%
Responsibility	Not mentioned	37.0%	36.0%	43.1%	38.4%
	Mentioned	63.0%a	64.0%a	56.9%a	61.6%
Imagination**	Not mentioned	73.1%	77.1%	68.6%	73.4%
	Mentioned	26.9%a,b	22.9%a	31.4%b	26.6%
Respect for others	Not mentioned	69.1%	65.7%	65.2%	66.6%
	Mentioned	30.9%a	34.3%a	34.8%a	33.4%
Thrift***	Not mentioned	68.9%	71.5%	60.8%	67.5%
	Mentioned	31.1%a,b	28.5%a	39.2%b	32.5%
Persistence***	Not mentioned	53.8%	66.4%	57.2%	59.9%
	Mentioned	46.2%a	33.6%b	42.8%a	40.1%
Religious belief***	Not mentioned	79.8%	80.5%	67.2%	76.3%
	Mentioned	20.2%a	19.5%a	32.8%b	23.7%
Generosity*	Not mentioned	76.3%	76.8%	69.7%	74.5%
	Mentioned	23.7%a	23.2%a	30.3%a	25.5%
Respect for others***	Not mentioned	51.2%a	45.3%a	61.2%b	51.8%
	Mentioned	48.8%a	54.7%a	38.8%b	48.2%
Obedience	Not mentioned	75.3%	75.9%	80.8%	77.2%
	Mentioned	24.7%a	24.1%a	19.2%a	22.8%

Notes:
The asterisks indicate chi-square tests of association. *** = p<0.01; ** = p<0.05, * = p<0.1.
Bonferroni tests were carried out for statistical comparisons using column proportions. The letters in subscript indicate significant differences of p<0.05.
Compiled by authors.

Table 4
Parental values socialization preferences by religious affiliation (N=964)

		Religious affiliation			Total
		Catholic	Atheist/ agnostic/ none	Evangelical/ Protestant	
Good manners	Not mentioned	48.7%	47.3%	49.2%	48.6%
	Mentioned	51.3%a	52.7%a	50.8%a	51.4%
Independence***	Not mentioned	51.4%	59.1%	66.6%	55.7%
	Mentioned	48.6%a	40.9%a,b	33.4%b	44.3%
Hard work	Not mentioned	48.2%	54.6%	54.4%	50.4%
	Mentioned	51.8%a	45.4%a	45.6%a	49.6%
Responsibility	Not mentioned	36.4%	43.4%	42.6%	38.7%
	Mentioned	63.6%a	56.6%a	57.4%a	61.3%
Imagination**	Not mentioned	75.2%	74.9%	66.3%	73.3%
	Mentioned	24.8%a	25.1%a,b	33.7%b	26.7%
Respect for others	Not mentioned	66.3%	66.0%	68.5%	66.7%
	Mentioned	33.7%a	34.0%a	31.5%a	33.3%
Thrift	Not mentioned	67.0%	64.7%	70.6%	67.4%
	Mentioned	33.0%a	35.3%a	29.4%a	32.6%
Perseverance	Not mentioned	60.2%	55.5%	57.9%	59.0%
	Mentioned	39.8%a	44.5%a	42.1%a	41.0%
Religious faith	Not mentioned	76.5%	77.9%	70.1%	75.5%
	Mentioned	23.5%a	22.1%a	29.9%a	24.5%
Generosity	Not mentioned	74.5%	70.9%	73.8%	73.8%
	Mentioned	25.5%a	29.1%a	26.2%a	26.2%
Respect for others	Not mentioned	52.5%	52.4%	52.4%	52.5%
	Mentioned	47.5%a	47.6%a	47.6%a	47.5%
Obedience	Not mentioned	78.8%	73.3%	74.6%	77.1%
	Mentioned	21.2%a	26.7%a	25.4%a	22.9%

Notes:
Parents who professed a religious faith other than Catholic, none, atheist, agnostic, evangelical or Protestant were excluded.
The asterisks indicate chi-squared tests of association. *** = p<0.01; ** = p<0.05, * = p<0.1.
Bonferroni tests were carried out for statistical comparisons using column proportions. The letters in subscript indicate significant differences of p<0.05.
Compiled by authors.

Parents' Values Socialization in Contemporary Chile: How do Social Class and Parents' Religion Shape How They Raise their Children?

Table 5
Logistic regression models that predict the odds ratio of mentioning a value or quality as most important for socializing their children
(N=1.065)

| | | Models | | | | | | | | | | | |
		(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)
SES	Upper**	1.7**	1.2	0.4***	1.0	1.2	1.0	0.4***	0.8	0.5**	0.8	1.8**	1.6*
	Middle	2.0***	1.0	0.5***	1.4**	0.6**	0.9	0.6***	0.7**	0.5***	0.7**	1.9***	1.4
Religious affiliation	Catholic	1.0	1.5**	1.0	0.9	1.4	1.1	0.8	0.8	1.3	1.1	1.0	0.8
	Evang./Prot.	0.8	0.8	0.9	0.9	1.6**	0.9	0.8	1.1	1.7**	1.1	1.0	1.1
	Upper*Catholic	0.6*	1.1	2.1***	1.8**	0.4***	0.7	2.1**	1.9**	1.0	0.8	0.8	0.8
Gender	Female	0.9	0.9	0.9	1.3	1.0	0.9	1.4**	0.9	1.1	1.0	1.1	0.9
Age range	35-50	1.0	0.8	1.0	1.4**	0.7*	0.8	0.8	1.1	1.2	0.7***	0.9	1.0
	Over 50	0.9	0.7**	0.9	1.4*	0.5***	0.9	0.9	0.9	0.8	0.8	1.1	1.7**
Marital status	Separated	1.1	1.1	1.1	1.4	0.8	1.5	1.2	0.9	0.6	0.7	1.4	0.5**
	Married/coh.	0.8**	0.9	1.1	1.1	0.9	1.0	0.9	1.0	0.7*	1.3	1.1	1.2
Constant		1.0	0.8	1.5	0.9	0.5	0.6	0.7	0.9	0.4	0.5	0.6	0.2
R2 Nagelkerke		0.04	0.03	0.04	0.03	0.05	0.01	0.03	0.03	0.05	0.03	0.03	0.03

Notes:
The asterisks indicate hypothesis tests. *** = p<0.01; ** = p<0.05, * = p<0.1.
Model (1) good manners, (2) independence, (3) hard work, (4) responsibility, (5) imagination, (6) respect for others, (7) thrift, (8) persistence, (9) religious belief, (10) generosity, (11) respect for others, (12) obedience.
Compiled by authors.

Analysis of the model of influence of religious affiliations with socio-economic status on parental preferences in values socialization

The statistically significant effects demonstrate that the odds of considering good manners as a desirable socialization value according to SES are 70% higher for the upper class than for the lower class (p<0.01), while in the case of the value of respect for others the odds are 80% higher (p<0.05) for the upper versus the lower class. On the other hand, the value of hard work is strongly emphasized by lower class respondents: the odds of mentioning hard work were 150% higher for the lower class than for the upper class (p<0.01) and 100% higher for the middle class compared to the lower class (p<0.01). The same pattern is repeated for the value of thrift: the odds of mentioning this value as desirable in the socialization of their children are 150% higher for the lower class than for the upper class (p<0.01). Middle-class respondents put a high value on good manners (the odds are 100% higher than those of the lower class), responsibility (with odds 40% higher than those of the lower class) and respect for others (with odds 90% higher than those of the lower class). The religious faith socialization value is mentioned statistically more often by lower-class respondents than those from the upper class (odds 100% higher, p<0.05), and by the middle class (odds 100% higher, p<0.01).

In terms of the multiplier effect, the odds of parents who are upper class and Catholic mentioning thrift as an intergenerational socialization value are 110% higher than those of lower-class parents who profess no religion, or are atheists or agnostic (p<0.05). The same is true of in the case of the hard work value, in which the odds are also 100% higher (p<0.01).

Responsibility is also frequently mentioned by upper-class Catholic families: the odds of their mentioning this value are 80% higher than those of lower-class parents who profess no religion, or are atheist or agnostic (p<0.05).

Religious affiliation, in general, has few significant statistical effects in and of itself. For Catholic parents, the odds of mentioning the value of independence are 50% higher compared with those who do not identify with any religion, or are atheists or agnostic (p<0.05). The evangelicals in the sample stressed the value of religious faith. The odds of this value being mentioned when the parents identify as evangelical/Protestant are 70% higher compared to those who do not identify with any religion, or are atheists or agnostic (p<0.05).

In relation to the controls used, the women who answered the survey placed a high value on being economical as a socialization value: the odds are 40% higher in comparison to men, while obedience is highly appreciated

by parents who were older: the odds are 70% higher than parents between 18 and 35 years old (p<0.05).

Finally, the interactive effect demonstrates that good manners is more valued by lower-class parents with no religious affiliation (odds were 67% higher) than Catholic upper-class parents (p<0.1).

4. Discussion and conclusions

The family is an agent of socialization and cultural reproduction par excellence since primary socialization takes place within it, characterized by the internalization of symbolic codes and psychological-emotional identification with significant others (Berger & Luckmann, 1968).

The objective of this study is to evaluate the effect of social class and religious affiliation variables on parental preferences regarding values socialization in contemporary Chile. Empirical studies have reported that the type of values that parents seek to transmit to their children are associated with their relative socioeconomic status. Parents from the lowest socioeconomic levels tend to privilege socialization spaces based on social advancement: hard work, thrift, perseverance, and good behavior (Xiao, 1999; Tudge *et al.*, 2000). Differences based on social class have been theoretically explained by two different models of socialization: the "repressive socialization" model, mostly employed by lower classes and focused primarily on obedience and conformity with norms; and a "participatory socialization" model employed by upper classes, oriented toward the development of creativity, originality, and autonomous thinking on the part of the child (Villarroel, 1990).

Chile provides a good case study since it is considered to be a society with high economic inequality with an asymmetric structure of opportunities according to social origin (Larrañaga & Rodríguez, 2015; Repetto, 2016). However, the large majority of studies have focused on the effect of social class on processes of secondary socialization, i.e., socialization in schools (see, for example, Bellei, 2013; Gubbins, 2014, 2016), but for the case of Chile there are no quantitative empirical studies on the effect of social status variables on intergenerational values transmission preferences in the family socialization space.

At the same time, Chile has seen a large expansion of religious denominations that are strongly identified with a specific social class: Pentecostal evangelism among urban popular classes (Valenzuela *et al.*, 2013) and more radical forms of Catholicism among the upper classes, associated with the sanctification of daily life (Thumala, 2007).

This study provides evidence to support the hypothesis that social class does have an effect on parental values socialization preferences and provides

partial evidence for the case of religious affiliation. The hypothesis is proven since upper-class families tend to emphasize more symbolic and relational values such as good manners and respect for others, while lower classes emphasize the transmission of qualities useful for social mobility such as hard work and thrift (Villarroel, 1990). Nevertheless, these differences tend to fade when a multiplier effect of class and religion is taken into account. For example, upper-class Catholics did emphasize the value of hard work, thrift, and persistence, which suggests a special constellation of values for these types of families in Chile. One explanation for this result can be found in Thumala's (2007) analysis of Chilean Catholic upper classes who, in their structure of value socialization, mix economic success, morality, and the obeying of rules, thereby echoing the values favored by the lower classes.

On the other hand and controlling for other variables from complete logistic models, parents who identify with evangelicalism mobilize strong values such as religious faith. There is an interactive effect between social class and religious affiliation: upper class Catholic families, in comparison to those from the lower class who have no religious affiliation, or are atheists or agnostic, favor values such as hard work, responsibility, thrift, and persistence. The middle classes, on the other hand, strongly emphasize a more hybrid set of values which include good manners, responsibility, and respect for others.

One of the limitations of this study has to do with the characteristics of the unit of analysis, which took into consideration the preferences of parents and guardians of children of all school ages, ranging between 5 years of age (kindergarten) and 22 (in the case of high-school students who were repeating courses). The evidence suggests that primary socialization strategies employed by parents differ in their scope and character according to their children's age and stage of psychoevolutionary development, as well as the significative contexts of ecosystemic interactions (Ramírez, 2005). In particular, parents seem inclined to adopt a pattern of socialization more centered on discipline and setting limits when their children are younger (Hoffman, 1976; Baumrind, 1973), or on the development of compassion and prudence (Wray-Lake, Flanagan & Maggs, 2012).

The general purpose of this study was to contribute empirical evidence to the broad field of study about intrafamily mechanisms of reproduction inequality, and, in particular, to original and explorative studies on the social predictors of parents' socialization preferences for their children in contemporary Chile.

References

Agostini, C., Hojman, D., Román, A., & Valenzuela, L. (2016). Segregación residencial
de ingresos en el Gran Santiago, 1992-2002: una estimación robusta. *EURE (Santiago)*, *42*(127), 159-184. doi: 10.4067/S0250-71612016000300007

Aylwin, D. (1984). Trends in parental socialization values: Detroit, 1958-1983. *American
Journal of Sociology*, *90*(2), 359-382.

Baumrind, D. (1973). The development of instrumental competence through socialization. In A. D. Pick (Ed.), *Minnesota Symposia on Child Psychology* (pp. 3-46). Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Bellei, C. (2013). El estudio de la segregación socioeconómica y académica de la educación
chilena. *Estudios Pedagógicos, 39*(1), 325-345.

Berger, P., & Luckman, T. (1968). *La construcción social de la realidad*. Buenos Aires: Amorrortu.

Bernstein, B. (1973). *Class, codes and control. Vol. 1.* London: Routledge.

Bernstein, B. (1990). *Class, codes and control: The structuring of pedagogic siscourse*. London:
Routledge.

Boehnke, K. (2001). Parent-offspring value transmission in a societal context. *Journal of
Cross-Cultural Psychology*, *32*, 241-255.

Bourdieu, P. (1998). *Capital cultural, escuela y espacio social*. Mexico City: Siglo XXI.

Bronfenbrenner, U. (1987). *The ecology of human development*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard
University Press.

Danioni, F., Rosnati, R., & Barni, D. (2017). Transmitting sport values: The importance
of parental involvement in children's sport activity. *Europe's Journal of Psychology,
13*(1), 75-92.

Durkheim, E. (1976). *Educación como socialización*. Salamanca: Sígueme.

Fediakova, E. (2002). Separatismo o participación: evangélicos chilenos frente a la política.
Revista de Ciencia Política, XXI(2), 32-45.

Florenzano R., Sotomayor, P., & Otava, M. (2001). Estudio comparativo del rol de la
socialización familiar y factores de personalidad en las farmacodependencias juveniles. *Revista Chilena de Pediatría, 72*(3), 219-233.

Giesen, E. (2010). *Sobre la elite chilena y sus prácticas de cierre social*. Santiago: Universidad
de Chile.

Gubbins, V. (2014). Estrategias educativas de familias de clase alta. *Revista Mexicana de
Investigación Educativa, 19*(63), 1069-1089.

Gubbins, V., & Otero, G. (2016). Efecto de la rendición de cuentas de las escuelas chilenas
sobre la participación de padres. *Revista de Educación, 372*, 9-34.

Hadjar, A., Baier, D., & Boehnke, K. (2008). The socialization of hierarchic self-interest:
Value socialization in the family. *Young, 16*(3), 279-301.

Hitlin, S. (2006). Parental influences on children's values and aspirations: Bridging two
theories of social class and socialization. *Sociological Perspectives, 49*(1), 25-46.

Hoffman, M. (1976). *Parental discipline and moral internalization*. Ann Arbor: University
of Michigan.

Knafo, A., & Galansky, N. (2008). The influence of children on their parents' values. *Social
and Personality Psychology Compass, 2*(3), 1143-1161.

Knafo, A., & Schwartz, S. H. (2001). Value socialization in families of Israeli-born and Soviet-born adolescents in Israel. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 32*(2), 213-228.

Kohn, M. (1969). *Class and conformity: A study in values.* Chicago: The University of Chicago Press Books.

Kohn, M., & Schooler, C. (1983). *Work and personality: An inquiry into the impact of social stratification.* Ablex Publishing Corporation.

Kohn, M., Slomcynski, K., & Schoenbach, C. (1985). Social stratification and the transmission of values in the family: A cross-national assessment. *Sociological Forum, 1*(1), 73-102.

Kuczynski, L., Marshall, S., & Schell, K. (1997). Value socialization in a bidirectional context. In J. E. Grusec & L. Kuczynski (Eds.), *Parenting and children's internalization of values: A handbook of contemporary theory* (pp. 23-50). New York: Wiley.

Larrañaga, O., & Rodríguez, M. E. (March 2015). *Desigualdad de ingresos y pobreza en Chile, 1990 a 2013.* Working Document, PNUD.

Lasker, A., & Lasker, J. (1991). Do they want their children to be like them? Parental heritage and Jewish identity. *Contemporary Jewry, 12*(1), 109-126.

Lenski, G. (1961). *The religious factor.* Garden City, New York: DoubleDay.

Moya, C., & Hernández, J. (2014). El rol de los colegios de elite en la reproducción inter-generacional de la elite chilena. *Revista Austral de Ciencias Sociales, 26,* 59-82.

Ortega, F., Vidal, C., & Zapata, F. (2009). *Sistema de creencias y valores de familias en contexto de extrema pobreza.* Santiago: Universidad Academia Humanismo Cristiano.

Pinquart, M., & Silbereisen, R. K. (2002). Changes in adolescents' and mothers' autonomy and connectedness in conflict discussions: An observation study. *Journal of Adolescence, 25*(5), 509-22.

Rabusicova, M., & Rabusic, L. (2001). Which qualities should children be encouraged to learn at home? *Czech Sociological Review, 9*(1), 123-142.

Ramírez, M. A. (2005). Padres y desarrollo de los niños: prácticas de crianza. *Estudios Pedagógicos, XXI*(2), 167-177.

Repetto, A. (2016). Crecimiento, pobreza y desigualdad: la vía chilena. *Economía y Política, 3*(1), 71-101.

Rodríguez, A. (2007). Principales modelos de socialización familiar. *Foro de Educación, 9,* 91-97.

Roest, A. M. C., Dubas, J. S., & Gerris, J. R. M. (2009). Value transmissions between fathers, mothers, and adolescent and emerging adult children: The role of the family climate. *Journal of Family Psychology, 23*(2), 146-155.

Sabatini, F., Cáceres, G., & Cerda, J. (2001). Segregación residencial en las principales ciudades chilenas: tendencias de las tres últimas décadas y posibles cursos de acción. *Revista EURE – Revista de Estudios Urbano Regionales, 27*(82), 21-42.

Schönpflug, U. (2009). Theory and research in cultural transmission: A short history. En U. Schönpflug (Ed.), *Cultural transmission* (pp. 9-30). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Servat, B. (2008). *Sociología para educadores: fundamentos para el análisis de hechos socioeducativos.* Santiago: Ediciones UC.

Simkin, H., & Becerra, G. (2013). El proceso de socialización. Apuntes para su exploración en el campo psicosocial. *Ciencia, Docencia y Tecnología, 14*(47), 119-142.

Spade, J. (1991). Occupational structure and men's and women's parental values. *Journal of Family Issues*, *12*, 343-360.

Strauss, C. (1992). Models and motives. In R. G. D'Andrade & C. Strauss (Eds.), *Human motives and cultural models* (pp. 1-20). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Thumala, M. (2007). *Riqueza y piedad: el catolicismo de la elite económica chilena.* Santiago: Random House Mondadori.

Trommsdorff, G. (2009). Intergenerational relations and cultural transmission. In U. Schönpflug (Ed.), *Cultural transmission. Psychological, developmental, social, and methodological aspects* (pp. 126-160). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Tudge, J., Hogan, D., Szhkova, I., Kulakova, A. N., & Etz, K. (2000). Parents' child-rearing values and beliefs in the United States and Russia: The impact of culture and social class. *Infant and Child Development*, *9*, 105-121.

Valenzuela, E., Bargsted, M., & Somma, N. (2013). ¿En qué creen los chilenos? Naturaleza y alcance del cambio religioso en Chile. *Temas de la Agenda Pública, 59*, 1-20.

Villarroel, G. (1990). Modos de socialización familiar y sus efectos en el niño. *Revista de Estudios Pedagógicos, 16.* Chile: Universidad Austral.

Whitbeck, L. B., & Gecas, V. (1988). Value attributions and value transmission between parents and children. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, *50*(3), 829-840.

Wray-Lake, L., Flanagan, C. A., & Maggs, J. L. (2012). Socialization in context: Exploring longitudinal correlates of mothers' value messages of compassion and caution. *Developmental Psychology*, *48*(1), 250-256.

Xiao, H. (1999). Independence and obedience: An analysis of child socialization values in the United States and China. *Journal of Comparative Family Studies*, *XXX*(4), 641-656.

Yi, C., Chang, C., & Chang, Y. (2004). The intergenerational transmission of family values: A comparison between teenagers and parents in Taiwan. *Journal of Comparative Family Studies*, *35*(4), 523-545.

Youniss, J. (1994). Rearing children for society. En J. G. Smetana (Ed.), *Beliefs about parenting: Origins and developmental implications. New direction for child development.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.