

FATHERS' ATTITUDES CONCERNING
FATHER-SON INTERACTION

By

STEPHEN GARLAND PENUEL

//

Bachelor of Science

Oklahoma State University

Stillwater, Oklahoma

1971

Submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate College
of the Oklahoma State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the Degree of
MASTER OF SCIENCE
July, 1972

FEB 7 1973

FATHERS' ATTITUDES CONCERNING
FATHER-SON INTERACTION

Thesis Approved:

Thesis Adviser

Dean of the Graduate College

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Sincere appreciation is extended to the following: Dr. James Walters, Professor of Family Relations and Child Development for his patient direction of the thesis; Dr. Nick Stinnett, Associate Professor, Family Relations and Child Development, for his encouragement, suggestions, and critical reading of the manuscript; Dr. Althea Wright, Assistant Professor of Family Relations and Child Development, for her assistance and support in providing constructive criticism and cooperation; and Dr. Josephine Hoffer, Associate Professor of Family Relations and Child Development, for her counseling and advice.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Purpose	2
II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE	4
Influence of the Father on Son's Development and Adjustment	4
Effects of Paternal Deprivation	4
Father's Influence on Son's Sex-Role Identification	8
Father's Influence on Son's Relationships With Peers	10
Effects of Parental Control and Personality on Child Behavior and Adjustment	10
Child-Rearing Environments and Possible Effects on Children	11
Factors Related to Methods of Control Used	13
Parental Personality Characteristics	15
III. PROCEDURE	17
Subjects	17
Description of Instruments	17
Background Information Sheet	17
Edwards Personality Preference Scale	17
<u>The Father-Son Interaction Test</u>	18
Administration of Instruments	22
Scoring the Instrument	23
IV. RESULTS	24
Description of the Subjects	24
Background Information	24
Family Relationships Information	24
Personality Needs Information	28
Percentage of Permissive-Restrictive Responses on <u>The Father-Son Interaction Test</u>	30
Analysis of Data	37

Chapter	Page
V. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	44
Conclusions	45
SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY	47
APPENDIX A	52
APPENDIX B	56
APPENDIX C	59
APPENDIX D	64

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
I. Background Characteristics of the Subjects	25
II. Subjects' Rating of Their Family Relationships	26
III. Subjects' Rating on Basic Personality Needs	29
IV. Percentage of Permissive-Restrictive Responses on <u>The Father-Son Interaction Test</u>	31
V. Average Percentage of Permissive-Restrictive Responses on <u>The Father-Son Interaction Test</u> in Current Study and Doyle's Study (1968)	36
VI. Differences in Responses to <u>The Father-Son Interaction Test</u> Classified According to Selected Background Characteristics and Personality Needs	38

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Traditionally, the concept of the father has been that of provider and head of the family group. Waller and Hill (1951) have aptly described his role as a parent:

Because the father knew what the child should become, he did not seek to understand the child as an individual; he prescribed the activities which were for the child's good, and he placed emphasis on giving things to and doing things for the child. He was interested in the child's accepting and attaining goals established exclusively by himself, and he found satisfaction in the child's owing him a debt which could be best repaid by obedience and by bringing honor to the family. (Waller and Hill, 1951, p. 411)

However, today, in American families as a result of many societal changes, there have been changes in the conceptions of masculinity, femininity, parenthood, and especially fatherhood. This particular change in the conceptualization of fatherhood has been labeled as developmental in nature (Duvall, 1946; Elder, 1949). This view has best been defined as follows:

A good father is interested in what his child does, helps his child to be interested in what the father does, and wants to help the child attain his goals. (Waller and Hill, 1951, p. 415)

Historically, there have been only two areas which have received research attention with respect to the role of fathering: (a) the effects of the father-son relationship on masculine development; and (b) the effects of father-absence on sex-role identification in boys and on

family functioning. Nash (1965) concludes that neglect of the father role may have distorted our understanding of the dynamics of development and have adversely affected the rearing of males. Since ~~Kagan~~ (1964) has reported that studies of psychological development are richer in data with regard to children rather than parents or parent-child interaction and that within the available literature, the mother is more extensively researched, the proposed study will deal with the father. As men assume increasing responsibility for child-rearing, the need for more research on the father-child relationship becomes apparent.

Radke (1946) and Peterson, Becker, Hellmer, Shoemaker and Quay (1959) have indicated that parental influences are crucial to the formation of personality tendencies among children due to the primacy, intimacy, and extensiveness of these contacts. That paternal relationships and paternal deprivation are important aspects of personality development of children is evident from the research which indicates that a significant relationship exists between inadequate paternal relations and/or father-absence and: (a) lack of maturity, (b) sexual adjustment (Winch, 1950), (c) poor sex-role identification (Burton and Whiting, 1961), (d) delinquency (Andry, 1962), (e) aggressive behavior (Sears, Pintler, and Sears, 1946), and (f) dependency (Stolz and collaborators, 1954) among male children.

Purpose

The purpose of the present study is to assess the attitudes of fathers concerning father-son interaction and to examine the relationship of these attitudes to selected background characteristics. Walters and Stinnett (1971) have pointed out that paternal acceptance, warmth

and support are positively related to the emotional, social, and intellectual development of children. Without acceptance, warmth and love a child's positive self-concept, emotional and social development can be negatively affected by parents who are extremely restrictive, authoritarian, and punitive.

The proposed study is based upon an interactional framework. This type of conceptual framework views the personal relationship between family members. The interaction approach to study of the family strives to interpret family phenomena in terms of internal processes such as role playing, status relations, communication problems, decision making, stress reactions, and socialization processes (Schvaneveldt, 1966).

The following hypotheses will be examined: Permissive attitudes of fathers concerning father-son interaction are independent of: (a) age, (b) number of children, (c) level of education, (d) social class, (e) source of income, (f) agent of discipline, (g) type of father's discipline, (h) type of mother's discipline, (i) closeness to father, (j) closeness to mother, (k) parental influence, (l) father's love for respondents, (m) mother's love for respondents, (n) happiness of childhood, (o) closeness to their own children, (p) freedom allowed their own children, and (q) selected personality needs.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Influence of the Father on Son's Development and Adjustment

There is a growing recognition of the importance of the parent-child relationship. Bach (1964) has pointed out that the nature of the relationship between the child and the father is of consequence not only in terms of the child's present security, but in terms of the child's later outlook on life. Despite this increasing insight into paternal importance, researchers have noted that relatively little extensive research has been done in this area in comparison to those studies concerning the mother's role (Nash, 1965; Benson, 1968; Doyle, 1968; Heath, 1970; Biller, 1970). Nash (1965) believes that this neglect has had a distortive effect on the American understanding of male development and rearing. However, what limited research that has been undertaken has been concentrated in the area of the effect of paternal deprivation upon children.

Effects of Paternal Deprivation

The research concerning the impact of paternal deprivation upon children has indicated the correlation of several factors. Benson (1968) has shown that the wife's reaction to her husband's departure and the reasons why he is gone may actually influence the child more

than the mere fact that he is no longer present in the home. According to Bach (1964), children who were separated from their fathers had an idealized, as well as effeminized, fantasy picture of him. Furthermore, this attitude was related to the mother's attitude toward the absent husband which she, in turn, had communicated to the children. Consequently, Bronfenbrenner (1968) has pointed out that not only does father-absence have a direct effect on children, but there is the indirect effect of the mother's resultant behavior from the husband's departure. Often, the mother tends to become overprotective. Several investigators have noted that boys from father-absent homes are more dependent, as well as more willing to accept authority from others than boys from homes that are intact (Stolz, 1954; Lynn and Sawrey, 1959; Bronfenbrenner, 1961; Bach, 1964; Bronfenbrenner, 1968). Thus, it appears that paternal deprivation affects children's consequent behavior.

Several of the factors which appear to have an impact on children from homes where the father is absent are the nature of the separation (Hoffman, 1961), the age of the child (Langer and Michael, 1963), and the sibling composition (Sutton-Smith, Rosenberg, and Landry, 1968). With respect to the specific reason for the absence of the father, Illsley and Thompson (1961) have found that the father's death had little adverse effect upon children, whereas his absence due to separation or divorce was more detrimental. However, Bernard (1956) reported that the entrance of a new parent has a more adverse effect after the original parent's death than the divorce itself.

The child's age is another factor to be considered in examining the resulting effect of paternal deprivation. One of the most traumatic periods to lose a parent, Blaine (1963) suggests, is between the ages of

three and six. This finding agrees with Sutton-Smith, Rosenberg, and Landry (1968) who found that although father-absence has a depressive effect throughout life, the greatest effects occur during the early and middle years of childhood. Since the preschool period is very important for the son's identification with the father, lasting deficiencies may result if the father is absent at this time (Nash, 1965).

Also, the sibling composition of the child is a factor that works in the modification of the effect of paternal deprivation. Sutton-Smith, Rosenberg, and Landry (1968) reported that boys without brothers are more affected by father-absence than those with brothers, that girls with a younger brother are more affected than other girls, and that only girls are affected more than only boys.

As one begins to examine the ramifications of father-absence upon children, it is apparent that not only are there several factors operating in the situation, but that there are varied consequences which, within themselves, are multi-faceted. The available research indicates that father-absence seems to affect the son's aggressiveness. Levin and Sears (1956) indicated that boys whose fathers live at home are more aggressive than boys from father-absent homes. This finding could be due to the fact that the father serves as an aggressive model for his son (Sears, 1951).

Sex-identification will also pose particular difficulties for the fatherless boy (Benson, 1968). Nash (1965) has stated that boys reared without a father-figure often fail to acquire masculine attitudes. However, Greenstein (1966) failed to find any significant differences between boys whose fathers were present and father-absent boys in any of the dimensions usually related to sex-typing. Perhaps this discrepancy

might be explained by a study by Biller (1960) whose results suggest that the underlying sex-role orientation is influenced more by father-absence than are the more manifest aspects of masculinity. It appears that a vague or feminine orientation may persist even though a boy becomes masculine in certain aspects of his behavior. Lynn and Sawrey (1959) have pointed out that father-absent boys are insecure in their masculinity which often leads to excessive forms of compensatory behavior. These boys might give the outward appearance of having strong masculine orientations when, in actuality, their masculinity performance is not a spontaneous expression of the self. The evidence does seem to indicate that boys without fathers may have greater difficulty in developing a masculine self-concept. Biller (1968) has pointed out that when a boy's father is absent, his opportunities to interact with and imitate males in positions of competence and power are often severely limited, especially during the preschool years.

Stephens (1961) and Andry (1962) have indicated that a relationship exists between paternal deprivation and delinquent behavior. Barker and Adams (1962) found that homes where the father is absent produce more than their proportion of delinquents but this is also true of homes where the father is present but fails to function as head of the household. Nevertheless, the quality of life is of greater significance than formal structure and some fathers may do their children harm as well as good (Benson, 1968).

Behavioral difficulties have also been related to father-absence. Palmer (1960) found that children with behavioral problems were more likely than those without manifest behavioral difficulties to have had extensive separations from their fathers, especially during the

preschool years. Stolz (1964) indicated that war-separated children displayed more serious behavior problems, more fears and more tensions than boys who had been separated from their fathers. Finally, according to Lynn and Sawrey (1959) it was found that boys whose fathers were away for long periods of time evidenced poorer personality adjustment, greater immaturity, and poorer peer group adjustment than those whose fathers were present.

Father's Influence on Son's Sex-Role Identification

One of the most easily recognized functions and probably most frequently studied functions of the father is the masculinity model he provides for his son. Despite the distinction Lynn (1966) has made between identification with the masculine role and identification with one's father, Benson (1968) has pointed out that the identification with one's father conditions sex-role identification, and that although masculine models are seen everywhere, the father will most likely exert the most prominent influence on the lives of his own children.

The importance of the father as an object of masculine identification has been emphasized by Sopchak (1952) who found that among male college students, failure to identify with the father was more closely associated with trends toward abnormality than was failure to identify with the mother. In addition, several other studies indicated that normal men identify more with their fathers than their mothers and more with both parents than do neurotic men (Osgood, Suci, Tannebaum, 1957).

Mussen (1961) found adolescent boys who were highly masculine and identified closely with their fathers to be better adjusted, "more contented, more relaxed, more exuberant, happier, calmer, and smoother in

social functioning" than boys who were low in masculinity (p. 23). Furthermore, he concluded that boys who had favorable relations with their fathers showed strong masculine interests, whereas those whose paternal relationships were less favorable showed more feminine interests. The father's importance in the son's appropriate sex-role identification has also been emphasized by Johnson (1963) who has pointed out that although boys initially identify with their mother, it is their identification with their father that is crucial in appropriate sex-role learning. Consequently, Benson (1968) has concluded that effeminacy is more likely to be the result of a poor father-son relationship than of a strong mother-son bond.

Although theories of sex-role identification teach us that the most obvious pattern is for the father to be the model of masculinity for his son and for the mother to be the model of femininity for her daughter, some researchers suggest that love and affection are important incentives for this identification (Mowrer, 1950b; Stoke, 1950; Payne and Mussen, 1956; Kagan, 1958; Mussen and Distler, 1960). Payne and Mussen (1956) found that adolescent boys who strongly identified with their fathers were more likely to view their fathers as nurturant and rewarding. However, Slater (1961) has suggested that a combination of firm discipline and nurturance will be most conducive to identification. This concept is supported by Hetherington and Brackbill (1963) who found that children will identify with the parent whom they consider the most powerful. Furthermore, Mussen and Distler (1960) found that kindergarten boys identified most intensively with fathers who were viewed as powerful sources of both reward and punishment.

Finally, Benson (1968) concludes that if the father plays a central role in the family and feels reasonably self-confident about his own sexual identity, then the son tends to strongly identify with him. That the degree of the son's masculinity is related to the intensity and frequency of his contacts with his father as well as to the father's participation in child-rearing has also been pointed out by Mussen and Distler (1960).

Father's Influence on Son's Relationships With Peers

Considerable evidence indicates that the father-son relationship may influence the boy's peer relations. Benson (1968) has suggested the father may be of great importance in determining his son's acceptance in the peer group because the father promotes masculine habits that may foster or interfere with the son's acceptance by other boys. Boys who were rated high in acceptance by their peers were found to be strongly identified with the appropriate sex role which is a function of identification with the father (Gray, 1957). Cox (1962) indicates that a positive attitude toward the parent of the same sex is important for the establishment of warm relationships with peers. Also, in this respect, Carlson (1963) found that children who identified with supportive parents were not only more acceptable to their peers but were more self-accepting and less dependent upon current social relationships.

Effects of Parental Control and Personality on Child Behavior and Adjustment

Of the many factors that must be considered in examining parental influence on children, the degree of restrictiveness or permissiveness

in the parent-child relationship is very important. However, Becker (1964) has also indicated that the degree of warmth and love used in dealing with children is vitally important in the kind of influence a parent has on a child. Mowrer (1950a) has pointed out that only when discipline is accompanied by love and security in the parent-child relationship can it lead to the capacity for self-discipline.

The parent's personality characteristics undoubtedly influence both the behavior and the personality of their children. Radke (1940) has indicated that what the parent is has far more influence upon the child than the specific type of discipline he uses. She concludes that the child learns from his parents not so much by being taught but by being exposed.

Child-Rearing Environments and Possible Effects on Children

Several researchers have attempted to investigate the effects of varying degrees of parental control and nurturance upon the behavior and personality of children. Baumrind (1967) found that parents of children who were judged to be socialized and independent represented a more democratic position in their control. They were loving, conscientious, consistent, and secure in their relations with their children. Furthermore, Baumrind (1967) found that the children of parents who represented the most restrictive attitudes were found to be "less content, more insecure and apprehensive, less affiliative toward peers, and more likely to become hostile or regressive under stress" than were children of the democratic parents (p. 81). The parents of these children were found to be less nurturant toward their children and less involved with them. Elder (1968) points out that both the highly permissive and highly

restrictive parent appear unattractive to the child in comparison to the democratic parent.

Benson (1968) has related independence and self-confidence in children to the degree of nurturance and control which characterizes the father-son relationship. He pointed out that a warm father-son relationship was characterized by firm control, but not authoritarianism, and that this type of relationship increased the likelihood that a child would become secure and self-confident without depending on the father for constant guidance. Kell and Aldous (1960) have concluded that the idea that children must be carefully controlled and indoctrinated has been replaced little by little by the idea that each child should explore and learn as much as possible about himself. They believe that this is reflected in a shift toward greater sensitivity to the unique needs of each child.

Various findings indicate that children who have achieved appropriate sex-role identification perceive their parents as both highly nurturant and controlling (Mussen and Distler, 1960; Mussen and Rutherford, 1963). When the parent is the source of both nurturance and discipline, Slater (1961) has contended that the child will be more likely to internalize parental values. Mussen and Distler (1960) found that the fathers of highly masculine boys were affectionate and had considerable power over their sons.

In addition to the type of control used by parents and the warmth of the parent-child relationship, differing attitudes of both the mother and father must be considered. Generally, research points out that there seems to be a difference in the reasons why fathers and mothers discipline children and the methods which they employ. According to

Benson (1968), fathers often stress conformity, striving to have their children act like other children. He also indicated that these same fathers often use coercion and corporal punishment in controlling their children. To "build character" is the way mothers often view their responsibility instead of simply controlling the child's behavior. Therefore, they tend to use verbal methods of guidance and use reasoning more often than coercion and corporal punishment.

An inconsistent environment is created where one parent is very permissive and the other is very restrictive in controlling the child. It was found that in homes where the attitudes of the parents differed, the children showed more unfavorable behavior (Read, 1965).

Factors Related to Methods of Control Used

The socio-economic group to which one belongs affects the type of environment provided for child-rearing. Maccoby and Gibbs (1964) found that upper-middle class parents are more permissive than the upper-lower class parents in controlling their children, and that upper-middle class parents use reasoning and praise as methods of guiding their children more often than do upper-lower class parents. On the other hand, upper-lower class parents employed techniques such as physical punishment, deprivation of privileges and ridicule. Nevertheless, in both of these socio-economic classes, fathers were found to be more strict with regard to severity of discipline, and in their demands for obedience and expectations of self-restraint in the child. However, Benson (1968) has indicated that lower-class fathers are more punitive toward both boys and girls than are middle-class fathers.

Hoffman (1963) has suggested that middle-class parents are more likely to be able to express power motives outside the home than are lower-class parents. In fact, the home may be the only place where a parent from the lower-class can assert his will. In addition, Pearlin and Kohn (1966) have indicated that men whose work consists essentially in dealing with things are likely to place high value on obedience in children and to place less value on self-control. However, they found that men who work primarily with ideas tend to stress self-control. Also, these men do not value obedience highly. Finally, men who work mainly with people were found likely to fall somewhere in between the two above mentioned groups.

Another influencing factor on the type of control used in different families is family size. For instance, in small families, it was found that parents tended to employ a greater range of disciplinary techniques and tended to use oral methods and verbal reasoning in discipline more often than parents in larger families (Elder and Bowerman, 1963). However, if the parent in the small family is authoritarian, then the consequences will probably be greatly magnified due to the fact that parent-child relationships in the small family are likely to be more intense and have deeper emotional implications (Benson, 1968). Benson has also suggested that more is probably expected of each child in a small family. Furthermore, he has indicated that although a "strong" father in the small family may have a greater salutary influence on his children, the father also has potentially a greater harmful effect. Even though the father in a larger family may be more authoritarian, his actual leadership is diffused and differentiated. Elder and Bowerman (1963) have pointed out that because of the different relationships

found in the large family, the potential level of conflict is heightened. Consequently, these parents are likely to be less flexible and more authoritarian and to rely more frequently on strong child-rearing methods. Therefore, Benson (1968) concluded that in large families expressions of praise, approval, comfort, and acceptance are likely to be reduced for each child.

Parental Personality Characteristics

The assumption that the parent's personality determines, at least in part, the way he guides his children has been the basis of several investigations. Block (1955) found that the fathers who expressed more permissive attitudes toward child guidance appeared to be more self-reliant and ascendant. They also seemed to be able to function more effectively. On the other hand, he found that fathers who favored restrictive guidance tended to be constricted, submissive, suggestible individuals with great feelings of personal inadequacy. Although the parent favoring excessive permissiveness was probably not represented in Block's sample, he pointed out that this parent probably also would be associated with a less than optimal level of personality integration.

In addition, the parents' personality characteristics have been related directly to the behavioral and personality adjustment of their children. Peterson et al. (1959) found that both mothers and fathers of problem children were less well adjusted and sociable than parents in the non-clinic group. The clinic parents were also more autocratic and experienced more disciplinary disagreement.

Becker et al. (1964) found, when examining children with conduct problems, that their parents were maladjusted. They, furthermore,

pointed out that, although these results were not significant, they suggest that the healthy adjustment of the father may be even more critical than the mother's adjustment in determining personality problems in children. They concluded that future research should give more consideration to the father's influence in child development.

CHAPTER III

PROCEDURE

Subjects

The subjects who participated in this research were 50 males who were members of the Kiwanis Club in Pauls Valley, Oklahoma, during the spring of 1972. This sample consisted primarily of middle-class men of which a majority were between the ages of 25 and 55. All of the subjects were American born, Caucasian, and the father of a son.

Description of Instruments

Background Information Sheet

The background information sheet (Appendix A) which was utilized was designed to obtain the following information: (a) age, (b) number of children, (c) level of education, (d) social class, (d) source of income, (f) agent of discipline, (g) type of father's discipline, (h) type of mother's discipline, (i) closeness to father, (j) closeness to mother, (k) parental influence, (l) father's love for respondent, (m) mother's love for respondent, (n) happiness of childhood, (o) closeness to their children, and (p) freedom allowed their children.

Edwards Personality Preference Scale

The Edwards Personality Preference Scale (EPPS) was used in the

study. The test consists of a 15 item scale designed to measure the following needs: (a) achievement, (b) deference, (c) order, (d) exhibition, (e) autonomy, (f) affiliation, (g) intraception, (h) succorance, (i) dominance, (j) abasement, (k) nurturance, (l) change, (m) endurance, (n) sex, and (o) aggression.

Each of the 15 items in the scale is characterized by ten numerical degrees of response ranging from one to ten. The answers were scored so that the highest level of need was given the highest score and the lowest level of need was given the lowest score. For purpose of analysis, the ten degrees of responses were collapsed into five responses. Appendix B contains the scale used in the study.

As an indication of validity, the EPPS was compared with projective tests and other personality inventories, such as the Thematic Apperception Test (TAT) and various modifications of it, as well as the Adjective Check List. The studies of self-ratings generally find moderate relationships between the EPPS and self-ratings. As an example, in Q-type analysis, the means of the EPPS scores and corresponding self-ratings correlated .56 (Korman, 1962).

On the test-retest reliability estimates, based on one-week interval, the median is .79. On the split-half reliability coefficients, the median is .78 (Edwards, 1959).

The Edwards Personal Preference Scale as used in this study is a modification of the original EPPS as used by Constantine and Constantine (1971).

The Father-Son Interaction Test

The Father-Son Interaction Test, a filmed instrument developed by

Doyle (1968) was used in the study. The test consists of 28 statements to which respondents indicate whether they "strongly agree," "mildly agree," "mildly disagree," or "strongly disagree" after having observed a scene in the film. The film consists of selected scenes, each approximately one minute in length and which include a wide variety of themes showing father-son interaction. The same characters play father and son throughout the film. Although Scene VIII involves other actors, the father and son are the primary characters. The advantage of the motion picture technique, according to Doyle (1968), as compared with the traditional questionnaire is that it provides the respondents with sufficient information to respond to a specific situation.

Twelve scenes were originally filmed and developed by Doyle (1968) and eleven were selected and used in the completed filmed instrument. The eleven scenes utilized were selected according to the following criteria (Doyle, 1968).

1. Physical properties. Clarity of subjects, correct film and exposure and lighting, and audible sound were considered essential in the selection of the scenes.
2. Behavioral patterns. The filmed action clearly depicted specific types of behavior in each of the scenes.
3. Theme diversity. Each scene presented portrayed different concepts of family life such as responsibility, ego involvement, and pride.
4. Objectivity. In each scene, no extraneous variables were obvious enough to distract from the primary purpose of that scene.

In testing fathers, Doyle (1968) found that Scenes I and VII were not significantly discriminating in eliciting differential responses from permissive and non-permissive fathers.

The following is a description of each of the nine scenes.

Scene II

The second scene opens with the father reading the morning newspaper. The son enters the room and asks for his allowance.

Scene III

Father and son are having lunch together and have to leave home at the same time. The son is eager to share his week-end trip to the beach with his father. The son is so busy relating the details of the trip that he fails to eat his meal. The father has been very quiet during the meal, and when it is time for both of them to leave, he realizes that the son has not even begun to eat.

Scene IV

The afternoon baseball game is over. The son rushes up to the father, pleased that their team won and that he had made the winning run. The father's comment was, "What about that 'pop-up fly' you missed?"

Scene V

Previously, the father has promised that he would give his son a golf lesson. The father forgot his promise and made a date with a friend to play golf. The son reminds him of the promise. The scene ends when the father says, "Well, I guess I could call Fred."

Scene VI

The son has been told that he is to rake the leaves to help prepare the lawn for spring cleaning. He has agreed, but he is tired. The

father insists that the lawn be raked today. The son is very reluctant, but the father persists.

Scene VIII

The family and guests are having dinner and are discussing some of the problems which pertain to school and education. During the dinner the son has remained very quiet. In the process of the discussion, the father turns to the son and asks him his opinion of the situation.

Scene IX

The father enters the son's bedroom and finds him with opened books, but the son is watching television rather than doing his homework. When confronted with the question as to "Why?", the son complains that he does not know what the teacher wants. The father takes the notebook and begins to work the problems for the son.

Scene X

The father is waiting for a business telephone call. The phone rings and the call is for the son. The father places a two-minute time limit on the son's conversation. The son talks longer than the time limit.

Scene XI

The father enters the son's bedroom just as the son is putting up a "pin-up" picture of a woman on his wall. The entrance of the father surprises the son. The father says to the son, "What's going on in here?"

After each scene was viewed, the subjects recorded their reactions to a highly structured set of items (Appendix C) which allowed for a latitude of reactions and contained four-point scales reflecting permissive attitudes toward father-son interaction.

The scale items were originally developed by Doyle (1968) and were rated and judged for validity by a panel composed of specialists in child development, psychology, and home and family life. An original pool of 180 items was submitted to the judges, who rated each item in terms of the following criteria:

1. Does the item possess sufficient clarity?
2. Is the item sufficiently specific?
3. Is the item significantly related to the concept under investigation?

The final selection of the 134 items was based on the decision of the judges, and as a result of an item analysis.

A chi square analysis was used by Doyle (1968) to determine which items were discriminating on The Father-Son Interaction Test. Of the original 134 items in the instrument, Doyle (1968) found 28 items to be significant at the .05 level or beyond. These were retained in the instrument which was administered to the subjects in the sample.

In order to assess the reliability of the responses of the subjects who participated in the present study, a split-half technique was utilized, and a Spearman r of .62 was obtained.

Administration of Instruments

The background information sheet and The Father-Son Interaction Test were administered as part of the program for the weekly noon meeting of the Pauls Valley Kiwanis Club. The subjects were first informed about the importance of research on fatherhood, and then were asked to answer the background information sheet. Following this procedure, each scene of The Father-Son Interaction Test was shown individually and time

was allowed for the subjects to respond to the instrument.

Scoring the Instrument

The four-point scale to which each subject indicated his agreement or disagreement with each of the 28 items was used. The scale included the following categories: Strongly Agree, Mildly Agree, Mildly Disagree, and Strongly Disagree.

The weighting system devised by Doyle (1968) was used to determine the degree of permissiveness of each response. The very permissive response was assigned a value of two; the permissive response was given a value of one; the remaining responses which were not permissive were assigned a value of zero. The permissive score was computed by adding the subscores assigned to each of the responses to the 28 items. The key utilized in scoring each questionnaire is presented in Appendix D.

The specific advantage of a motion picture instrument is that it presents to the respondents considerable information about the father and the son involved, and the specific conditions under which their responses are being evoked. Too often in traditional paper-and-pencil questionnaires, the reactions of the respondents are dependent upon conditions, e.g., age and sex of children, which are not specified.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

Description of the Subjects

Background Information

A detailed description of the 50 subjects who participated in this study is presented in Table I. The majority (82.00%) of the sample were 25 to 55 years of age. Nearly all of the respondents (97.00%) had four or fewer children. The greatest percentage of the subjects (34.00%) had done some graduate work with respect to educational background. Most of the respondents were classified as upper-middle class (58.00%) as measured by the McGuire-White Index of Social Status (1955).

Family Relationships Information

In addition to the background information, the questionnaire also contained items which elicited the students' perceptions of their family relationships. In Table II are the results of the findings. A total of 42.00% of the subjects reported their prevailing source of discipline to have come from their fathers. With regard to the type of discipline received from their father, the greatest percentage (60.00%) reported that it was average, rather than restrictive or permissive. Also, most respondents (60.00%) reported that the discipline received from their mothers was average, not restrictive or permissive. With regard to the

TABLE I
BACKGROUND CHARACTERISTICS OF THE SUBJECTS*

Description	Total	
	N	%
<u>Age</u>		
24 or Under	0	0.00
25 - 39	21	42.00
40 - 55	20	40.00
56 or Over	9	18.00
<u>Number of Children**</u>		
1 - 2	24	48.98
3 - 4	24	48.98
5 and Over	1	2.04
<u>Education (Grades Completed)</u>		
11 or Under	1	2.00
High School Graduate	8	16.00
Some College	12	24.00
College Graduate	12	24.00
Graduate Work	17	34.00
<u>Socio-Economic Status</u>		
Upper Class	11	22.00
Upper-Middle Class	29	58.00
Lower-Middle Class	10	20.00
Upper-Lower Class	0	0.00
Lower-Lower Class	0	0.00

* N = 50

** Only 49 fathers responded

TABLE II
 SUBJECTS' RATING OF THEIR FAMILY RELATIONSHIPS*

Description	Total	
	N	%
<u>Prevailing Source of Discipline</u>		
Father	21	42.00
Mother	14	28.00
Father and Mother Equally	15	30.00
<u>Type of Discipline From Father</u>		
Permissive	4	8.00
Average	30	60.00
Restrictive	16	32.00
<u>Type of Discipline From Mother</u>		
Permissive	9	18.00
Average	30	60.00
Restrictive	11	22.00
<u>Closeness With Father</u>		
Above Average	11	22.00
Average	30	60.00
Below Average	9	18.00
<u>Closeness With Mother</u>		
Above Average	19	38.00
Average	27	54.00
Below Average	4	8.00
<u>Most Influencing Parent</u>		
Father	11	22.00
Mother	14	28.00
Father and Mother Equally	25	50.00
<u>Love Felt From Father</u>		
Above Average	33	66.00
Average	17	34.00
Below Average	0	0.00
<u>Love Felt From Mother</u>		
Above Average	38	76.00
Average	11	22.00
Below Average	1	2.00

TABLE II (Continued)

Description	Total	
	N	%
<u>Childhood Happiness</u>		
Above Average	37	74.00
Average	11	22.00
Below Average	2	4.00
<u>Closeness With Own Children</u>		
Above Average	38	76.00
Average	11	22.00
Below Average	1	2.00
<u>Freedom Allowed Own Children</u>		
Above Average	22	44.00
Average	25	50.00
Below Average	3	6.00

* N = 50

closeness the subject felt to his father, the greatest proportion (60.00%) reported average closeness. More subjects reported being above average in closeness to their fathers (22.00%) than below average. The majority (54.00%) also reported that they were average in their degree of closeness to their mothers. Again more respondents reported being above average in closeness to their mothers (38.00%) than below average. Most of the subjects (50.00%) reported that their mothers and fathers equally had influenced their lives. However, more subjects mentioned their mothers as the most influential parent (28.00%) rather than indicating their fathers as the most influential parent. With regard to the amount of love received from their fathers, a majority of the subjects (66.00%) responded to the category, above average. Similarly, a majority (76.00%) believed they had received an above average amount of love from their mothers. Most of the respondents (74.00%) indicated they had had a happy childhood. With respect to their own children, the subjects responded that the degree of closeness was above average. The greatest proportion of the subjects indicated that the freedom they allowed their children was average.

Personality Needs Information

In addition to the background information and the respondents' ratings of their family relationships, the respondents were asked to rate themselves on a number of basic personality needs on a scale from 1 to 5. A detailed summary of the results can be seen in Table III. On the scale used, 1 represented the lowest level of the need, while 5 represented the highest level of the need.

TABLE III
 SUBJECTS' RATING ON BASIC PERSONALITY NEEDS*

Description	Level of Need**				
	1 %	2 %	3 %	4 %	5 %
Achievement	0.00	6.00	14.00	42.00	38.00
Deference	16.00	28.00	42.00	8.00	6.00
Order	2.00	8.00	28.00	30.00	32.00
Exhibition	12.00	22.00	50.00	12.00	4.00
Autonomy	0.00	18.00	36.00	30.00	16.00
Affiliation	6.00	20.00	32.00	26.00	16.00
Intracception	0.00	2.00	28.00	44.00	26.00
Succorance	4.00	20.00	52.00	18.00	6.00
Dominance	2.00	12.00	28.00	36.00	22.00
Abasement	20.00	32.00	34.00	12.00	2.00
Nurturance	2.00	14.00	30.00	36.00	18.00
Change	2.00	14.00	34.00	38.00	12.00
Endurance	0.00	14.00	20.00	42.00	24.00
Sex	2.00	6.00	42.00	38.00	12.00
Aggressive***	4.08	30.61	48.98	12.24	4.08

* N = 50

** Scale 1 - 5: 1 represents lowest level of the need; 5 represents highest level of the need

*** Only 49 fathers responded

The respondents rated the following as above average personality needs: achievement (80.00%), intraception (70.00%), endurance (66.00%), order (62.00%), dominance (58.00%), sex, (50.00%), change (50.00%), autonomy (46.00%), nurturance (44.00%), and affiliation (42.00%).

These fathers rated the following personality needs as average: succorance (52.00%), exhibition (50.00%), and aggression (48.98%).

Also, they rated the following as below average: abasement (52.00%) and deference (44.00%).

Percentage of Permissive-Restrictive Responses

on The Father-Son Interaction Test

Included in Table IV are data concerning how permissively or restrictively the fathers responded on each item of The Father-Son Interaction Test. From Table IV, the following conclusions concerning the fathers' responses to The Father-Son Interaction Test are suggested:

- (a) In Scene II where the father ignored the son's request for his allowance, 50.00% of the fathers indicated that the father should not have ignored the son, indicating a moderately permissive response (item 1) and an additional 42.00% of the fathers responded very permissively.
- (b) In Scene V where the father had forgotten he had promised to play golf with his son and had made another appointment with a friend, most of the respondents (52.00%) responded that the father should have offered to take his son with him. This type of response reflected a very permissive attitude (item 12).

TABLE IV
 PERCENTAGE OF PERMISSIVE-RESTRICTIVE RESPONSES
 ON THE FATHER-SON INTERACTION TEST**

Item	Percentage of Responses		
	Restrictive	Moderately Permissive	Very Permissive
SCENE II			
1. The son had a right to become angry.	8.00	50.00	42.00
2. The father should have given the money to his son the previous night.	14.00	44.00	42.00
3. The father should have responded immediately when his son asked him for his allowance.	12.00	40.00	48.00
SCENE III			
4. A father should not have had to listen to his son this much during mealtime.	20.00	44.00	36.00
5. The son's actions should not have irritated his father.	24.00	44.00	32.00
6. The father was right in objecting to his son's slowness in eating.	56.00	30.00	14.00
7. The father should not have been so hasty in scolding his son.	16.00	48.00	36.00
8. The son should not have talked so much.	42.00	38.00	20.00
9. The father should have shown affection for his son.	8.00	42.00	50.00

TABLE IV (Continued)

Item	Percentage of Responses		
	Restrictive	Moderately Permissive	Very Permissive
SCENE IV			
10. The father should have ignored the error which the son made.	18.00	34.00	48.00
11. The son should not have been so upset by his father's remarks.	46.00	36.00	18.00
SCENE V			
12. The father should have offered to take his son with him.	26.00	22.00	52.00
13. The father should have told his son that a business deal was more important.	34.00	38.00	28.00
14. The father should have felt obligated to play golf with his son.	14.00	38.00	48.00
SCENE VI			
15. The father should have "paddled" his son.	76.00	20.00	4.00
16. The father should not have become so excited when his son did not obey him.	68.00	26.00	6.00
SCENE VIII			
17. The father should not have been persistent.	68.00	22.00	10.00

TABLE IV (Continued)

Item	Percentage of Responses		
	Restrictive	Moderately Permissive	Very Permissive
18. The father should have shown more warmth and affection for his son.	28.00	44.00	28.00
19. The father handled the situation well.	24.00	44.00	32.00
SCENE IX			
20. The father should have insisted that his son study at a desk.	68.00	28.00	4.00
21. The father should not have assumed that his son could not study with the television going.	64.00	30.00	6.00
22. The father should have allowed his son to do the assignment himself and not worry about making it perfect.	28.00	50.00	22.00
23. The father should have shown more warmth and affection for his son.	44.00	40.00	16.00
SCENE X			
24. The son should have been punished.	30.00	42.00	28.00
25. The son's actions should not have upset the father.	44.00	48.00	8.00
26. The father should not have expected this much from his son.	68.00	24.00	8.00

TABLE IV (Continued)

Item	Percentage of Responses		
	Restrictive	Moderately Permissive	Very Permissive
SCENE XI			
27. The son should not have had pictures of which his father would disapprove.	82.00	18.00	0.00
28. The father was right in objecting to this kind of behavior.	76.00	22.00	2.00
AVERAGES	39.50	35.93	24.21

- (c) In Scene VI where the father insisted upon the son raking the leaves in the yard immediately rather than waiting until a later time, the majority of the respondents (76.00%) indicated a restrictive response by saying the father should have "paddled" his son (item 15).
- (d) In Scene XI where the father came into the son's room and objected to the "pin-up" picture which the son was putting up on his wall, the majority (82.00%) of the respondents indicated a restrictive response which implies that the son should not have had pictures of which his father would disapprove (item 27).

The results of the responses to The Father-Son Interaction Test indicated that there were certain situations of father-son interaction which elicited restrictive responses while some of the other situations elicited very permissive responses. This seems to indicate that most individuals are not consistently permissive or restrictive in their attitudes, but that the circumstances of the situation determine the way they feel. An individual's attitude toward child guidance may also be influenced by his values, standards, and his own background of experience. As will be noted in Table IV, 39.50% of the responses were restrictive, 35.93% were moderately permissive, and 24.21% of the responses were very permissive.

In Doyle's study (1968), 44.20% of the responses were restrictive, 31.25% of the responses were moderately permissive, and 24.55% of the responses were very permissive. From an examination of Table V, a comparison of the average percentage of permissive-restrictive responses

on The Father-Son Interaction Test in the current study and Doyle's study (1968) can be made. The greatest percentage of responses in both studies, 39.50% and 44.20%, were restrictive. Although the greatest percentage of restrictive responses (44.20%) were found in Doyle's study (1968), the greatest percentage of moderately permissive responses (35.93%) was found in the current study. Only 31.25% of the responses were moderately permissive in Doyle's study (1968). Also, 24.21% of the responses in the current study and 24.55% of the responses in Doyle's study (1968) were very permissive. Very permissive responses represented the smallest percentage of responses in both studies.

TABLE V

AVERAGE PERCENTAGE OF PERMISSIVE-RESTRICTIVE RESPONSES
ON THE FATHER-SON INTERACTION TEST IN CURRENT
STUDY AND DOYLE'S STUDY (1968)

Variable	Fathers [*]	Fathers ^{**}
	%	%
Restrictive	39.50	44.20
Moderately Permissive	35.93	31.25
Very Permissive	24.21	24.55

*Fathers - current study

**Fathers - Doyle's study (1968)

Analysis of Data

Utilizing a Kruskal-Wallis one-way analysis of variance to examine differences in fathers' attitudes concerning father-son interaction, it was found, as shown in Table VI, that fathers' attitudes were not significantly related to: (a) age, (b) number of children, (c) level of education, (d) social class, (e) source of income, (f) agent of discipline, (g) type of father's discipline, (h) type of mother's discipline, (i) closeness to father, (j) closeness to mother, (k) parental influence, (l) father's love for respondent, (m) mother's love for respondent, (n) happiness of childhood, (o) closeness to their children, and (p) the freedom allowed their children.

In addition, fathers' attitudes were not significantly related to these personality needs: (a) achievement, (b) deference, (c) order, (d) exhibition, (e) autonomy, (f) affiliation, (g) intraception, (h) succorance, (i) dominance, (j) abasement, (k) nurturance, (l) change, (m) endurance, (n) sex, and (o) aggression (Table VI).

TABLE VI
 DIFFERENCES IN RESPONSES TO THE FATHER-SON INTERACTION TEST
 CLASSIFIED ACCORDING TO SELECTED BACKGROUND
 CHARACTERISTICS AND PERSONALITY NEEDS

Groups	N	Mean	F	p
<u>Age</u>				
24 or Under	0	0.00		
25 - 39	21	24.50		
40 - 55	20	27.92	1.052	n.s.
56 or Over	9	22.44		
<u>Number of Children</u>				
1 - 2	24	24.00		
3 - 4	24	26.40	0.792	n.s.
5 and Over	1	15.50		
<u>Level of Education</u>				
11 or Under	1	41.50		
High School Graduate	8	27.00		
Some College	12	20.75	2.753	n.s.
College Graduate	12	27.17		
Graduate Work	17	26.03		
<u>Socio-Economic Status</u>				
Upper Class	11	17.32		
Upper-Middle Class	29	28.48	4.703	n.s.
Lower-Middle Class	10	25.85		
<u>Source of Income</u>				
Wages, Hourly Wages, Piece Work, Weekly Checks	4	15.88		
Salary, Monthly Checks	25	28.74		
Profits or Fees From Business or Profession	21	23.48	3.396	n.s.
Savings and Investments	0	0.00		
Inherited Savings and Investments	0	0.00		
<u>Agent of Discipline</u>				
My Father	9	24.67		
My Father With Some Help From my Mother	12	20.58		
Equally my Father and my Mother	15	27.67	3.967	n.s.

TABLE VI (Continued)

Groups	N	Mean	F	p
<u>Agent of Discipline</u> (Continued)				
My Mother With Some Help				
From my Father	12	30.08		
My Mother	2	15.00		
<u>Type of Father's Discipline</u>				
Very Permissive	1	34.00		
Permissive	3	43.00		
Average	30	22.73	8.545	n.s.
Strict	15	28.40		
Very Strict	1	4.00		
<u>Type of Mother's Discipline</u>				
Very Permissive	0	0.00		
Permissive	9	34.67		
Average	30	23.35	4.367	n.s.
Strict	11	23.86		
Very Strict	0	0.00		
<u>Closeness to Father</u>				
Above Average	11	19.14		
Average	30	28.88	4.247	n.s.
Below Average	9	22.00		
<u>Closeness to Mother</u>				
Above Average	19	27.16		
Average	27	24.69	0.438	n.s.
Below Average	4	23.13		
<u>Parental Influence</u>				
Mother and Father				
Equally	25	24.40		
Mother	14	24.29	1.091	n.s.
Father	11	29.55		
<u>Love Felt From Father</u>				
Very Much	19	24.39		
Above Average	14	23.25		
Average	17	28.59	1.210	n.s.

TABLE VI (Continued)

Groups	N	Mean	F	p
<u>Love Felt From Father</u> (Continued)				
Below Average	0	0.00		
Very Little	0	0.00		
<u>Love Felt From Mother</u>				
Very Much	27	24.00		
Above Average	11	27.64		
Average	11	25.95	1.215	n.s.
Below Average	1	37.50		
Very Little	0	0.00		
<u>Childhood Happiness</u>				
Very Happy	19	21.87		
Somewhat Above Average	18	29.72		
Average	11	28.14	6.122	n.s.
Somewhat Below Average	2	7.50		
Very Unhappy	0	0.00		
<u>Closeness With Own Children</u>				
Very Close	17	19.74		
Above Average	21	27.60		
Average	11	31.32	5.335	n.s.
Below Average	1	15.50		
Very Distant	0	0.00		
<u>Freedom Allowed Own Children</u>				
Very Much	4	14.63		
Above Average	18	29.83		
Average	25	25.26	5.117	n.s.
Below Average	3	16.00		
Very Little	0	0.00		
<u>Achievement</u>				
1	0	0.00		
2	3	24.67		
3	7	25.71	0.886	n.s.
4	21	27.57		
5	19	23.26		

TABLE VI (Continued)

Groups	N	Mean	F	p
<u>Deference</u>				
1	8	26.25		
2	14	24.46		
3	21	25.45	3.710	n.s.
4	4	17.88		
5	3	38.83		
<u>Order</u>				
1	1	27.00		
2	4	26.25		
3	14	22.68	0.760	n.s.
4	15	26.20		
5	16	27.03		
<u>Exhibition</u>				
1	6	20.67		
2	11	24.82		
3	25	26.92	3.438	n.s.
4	6	20.92		
5	2	39.75		
<u>Autonomy</u>				
1	0	0.00		
2	9	24.94		
3	18	23.53	1.948	n.s.
4	15	24.77		
5	8	31.94		
<u>Affiliation</u>				
1	3	20.83		
2	10	27.05		
3	16	24.56	0.588	n.s.
4	13	25.54		
5	8	27.13		
<u>Intraception</u>				
1	0	0.00		
2	1	27.00		
3	14	23.43	0.410	n.s.
4	22	26.07		
5	13	26.65		

TABLE VI (Continued)

Groups	N	Mean	F	p
<u>Succorance</u>				
1	2	23.50		
2	10	19.25		
3	26	27.75	2.664	n.s.
4	9	25.28		
5	3	28.83		
<u>Dominance</u>				
1	1	15.50		
2	6	17.33		
3	14	28.82	3.120	n.s.
4	18	26.03		
5	11	25.77		
<u>Abasement</u>				
1	10	21.85		
2	16	27.69		
3	17	23.59	4.191	n.s.
4	6	27.08		
5	1	50.00		
<u>Nurturance</u>				
1	1	15.50		
2	7	26.43		
3	15	22.37	2.711	n.s.
4	18	29.42		
5	9	23.28		
<u>Change</u>				
1	1	20.00		
2	7	19.36		
3	17	25.41	1.914	n.s.
4	19	27.13		
5	6	28.67		
<u>Endurance</u>				
1	0	0.00		
2	7	20.14		
3	10	27.50	1.186	n.s.
4	21	25.90		
5	12	26.25		

TABLE VI (Continued)

Groups	N	Mean	F	p
<u>Sex</u>				
1	1	15.50		
2	3	28.50		
3	4	23.93	2.456	n.s.
4	19	28.79		
5	6	20.75		
<u>Aggression</u>				
1	2	29.25		
2	15	21.13		
3	24	27.27	4.521	n.s.
4	6	29.08		
5	2	10.25		

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The purpose of this research was to assess the attitudes of fathers concerning father-son interaction and to examine the relationship of these attitudes to selected background characteristics and to selected personality needs. To achieve this purpose, a filmed instrument designed to assess permissiveness concerning father-son interaction was used, and a questionnaire also was administered in order to obtain information concerning personal characteristics, socio-economic status, family history, and personality needs.

The subjects participating in this study were 50 fathers who were members of the Kiwanis Club in Pauls Valley, Oklahoma. The data were collected at the weekly noon meeting during the spring of 1972. The majority of the men ranged in age from 25 to 55 and all of the subjects were American born, Caucasian, and the father of a son.

The film test which was developed by Doyle (1968) consisted of nine scenes each approximately one minute in length. The selection of the scenes was made by a panel of specialists who judged each scene according to the following criteria: physical properties, behavioral patterns, theme diversity, and objectivity.

After viewing each scene, the subjects responded to 28 structured items in terms of the following scale: Strongly Agree, Mildly Agree, Mildly Disagree, and Strongly Disagree. The items which were developed

by Doyle (1968) were judged by a panel of specialists in terms of clarity, specificity, and relevance to the concept under investigation. Once the most permissive response for each item had been selected, a key was developed and used for scoring the responses (Doyle, 1968). The very permissive response was given a value of two; the permissive response was given a value of one; and the remaining responses which were not permissive were given a value of zero.

The analysis of variance for one-way design revealed that permissiveness was independent of: (a) age, (b) number of children, (c) level of education, (d) social class, (e) source of income, (f) agent of discipline, (g) type of father's discipline, (h) type of mother's discipline, (i) closeness to father, (j) closeness to mother, (k) parental influence, (l) father's love for respondent, (m) mother's love for respondent, (n) happiness of childhood, (o) closeness to their children, and (p) the freedom allowed their children.

The same analysis showed permissiveness to be independent of the following personality needs: (a) achievement, (b) deference, (c) order, (d) exhibition, (e) autonomy, (f) affiliation, (g) intraception, (h) succorance, (i) dominance, (j) abasement, (k) nurturance, (l) change, (m) endurance, (n) sex, and (o) aggression.

Conclusions

- (1) The findings of the present study seemed to indicate that fathers tend to be more permissive than restrictive in their attitudes toward child guidance.
- (2) The fact that the respondents in this study were not consistently permissive or restrictive in their attitudes

toward father-son relationships indicates that individual attitudes toward child guidance vary depending upon the circumstances of the situation.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Andry, Robert G. "Paternal and Maternal Roles and Delinquency." Deprivation and Maternal Care: A Reassessment of Its Effects, Geneva: World Health Organization (1962), 31-44.
- 7 X Bach, George R. "Father-Fantasies and Father-Typing in Father Separated Children." Readings in Child Behavior and Development, ed. Celia B. Stendler. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, 1964.
- Barker, Gordon H., and William T. Adams. "Comparison of the Delinquencies of Boys and Girls." Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology, and Police Science, LIII (1962), 470-477.
- Baumrind, Diana. "Child Care Practices Antecedent Three Patterns of Preschool Behavior." Genetic Psychology Monographs, LXXV (1967), 43-88.
- Becker, Wesley G., Donald R. Peterson, Leo A. Hellmer, Donald J. Shoemaker, and Henry C. Quay. "Factors in Parental Behavior and Personality As Related to Problem Behavior in Children." Readings in Child Behavior and Development, ed. Cecilia B. Stendler. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, 1964.
- Benson, Leonard G. Fatherhood: A Sociological Perspective. New York: Random House, 1968.
- Bernard, Jessie. Remarriage. New York: The Dryden Press, 1956.
- Biller, Henry B. "A Note on Father Absence and Masculine Development in Lower Class Negro and White Boys." Child Development, XXXIX (1968), 1003-1006.
- Blaine, Graham B. "The Children of Divorce." The Atlantic Monthly (1963), 98-101.
- Block, J. "Personality Characteristics Associated With Fathers' Attitudes Toward Child-Rearing." Child Development, XXVI (1955), 41-48.
- Bronfenbrenner, Urie. "Some Familial Antecedents of Responsibility and Leadership." Leadership and Interpersonal Behavior, eds. Luigi Petrullo and Bernard Bass. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1961.

- II
- Bronfenbrenner, Urie. "The Changing American Child: A Speculative Analysis." Children: Readings in Behavior and Development, ed. Ellis D. Evans. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1968.
- Burton, R. V., and J. W. Whiting. "The Absent Father: Cross Sex Identity." Merrill-Palmer Quarterly, VII (1961), 85-95.
- Carlson, Rae. "Identification and Personality Structure in Pre-Adolescents." Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, LXVII (1963), 566-573.
- Constantine, Larry, and Joan M. Constantine. "Sexual Aspects of Multilateral Relations." Child Development, XXXIII (1962), 821-830.
- Cox, F. N. "An Assessment of Children's Attitudes Toward Parent Figures." Child Development, XXXIII (1962), 821-830.
- Doyle, Emma Lee. "The Father-Son Interaction Test." Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis, Florida State University, 1968.
- Duvall, Evelyn M. "Conceptions of Parenthood." Journal of Sociology, LII (1946), 193-203.
- Edwards, Allen L. Edwards Personal Preference Schedule. New York: Psychological Corporation, 1959.
- Elder, Glen H., Jr. "Parental Power Legitimation and Its Effect on the Adolescent." Sociometry, XXVII (1963), 891-905.
- _____ and Charles E. Bowerman. "Family Structure and Child-Rearing Patterns: The Effect of Family Size and Sex Composition." American Sociological Review, XXVIII (1963), 891-905.
- Elder, Rachel A. "Traditional and Developmental Characteristics of Fatherhood." Marriage and Family Living, XI (1949), 98-100, 106.
- Gray, Susan W. "Masculinity-Femininity in Relation to Anxiety and Social Acceptance." Child Development, XXVIII (1957), 203-214.
- Greenstein, Jules. "Father Characteristics and Sex-Typing." Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, XXXIII (1966), 271-277.
- Heath, Becky Lynne. "College Students' Perceptions Concerning Father-Son Interaction." Unpublished Master's Thesis, Oklahoma State University, 1970.
- Hetherington, E. M., and Yvonne Brackbill. "Etiology and Covariation of Obstinance, Orderliness, and Parsimony in Young Children." Child Development, XXXIV (1963), 919-943.
- Hoffman, Lois W. "The Father's Role in the Family and the Child's Peer Group Adjustment." Merrill-Palmer Quarterly, VII (1961), 97-105.

- X Illsey, Raymond, and Barbara Thompson. "Women From Broken Homes." Sociological Review, IX (1961), 27-54.
- Johnson, Miriam M. "Sex-Role Learning in the Nuclear Family." Child Development, XXXIV (1963), 319-333.
- Kagan, Jerome. "The Concept of Identification." Psychological Review, LXV (1958), 296-305.
- Kell, Leone, and Joan Aldous. "Trends in Child Care Over Three Generations." Marriage and Family Living, XXII (1960), 176-177.
- Korman, Maurice, and Francis Coltharp. "Transparency in the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule." Journal of Consulting Psychology, Vol. 26 (August, 1962), 379-382.
- X Langer, Thomas S., and Stanley T. Michael. Life Stress and Mental Health. New York: Free Press, 1963.
- Levin, H., and R. R. Sears. "Identification With Parents As a Determinate of Doll-Play Aggression." Child Development, XXVII (1956), 135-153.
- Lynn, David B. "The Process of Learning Parental and Sex-Role Identification." Journal of Marriage and the Family, XXVIII (1966), 466-470.
- _____, and William L. Sawrey. "The Effects of Father Absence on Norwegian Boys and Girls." Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, LIX (1959), 258-262.
- Maccoby, Eleanor E., Patricia K. Gibbs, and Collaborators. "Methods of Child Rearing in Two Social Classes." Readings in Child Behavior and Development, ed. Celia B. Stendler. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, 1964.
- McGuire, C., and C. D. White. "The Measurement of Social Status." Research Paper in Human Development. Austin: University of Texas (1955) no. 3.
- Mowrer, O. Hobart. "Discipline and Mental Health." O. Hobart Mowrer, Learning Theory and Personality Dynamics: Selected Papers. New York: Ronald Press Co., 1950a.
- _____. "Identification: A Link Between Learning Theory and Psychotherapy." O. Hobart Mowrer, Learning Theory and Personality Dynamics: Selected Papers. New York: Ronald Press Co., 1950b.
- Mussen, Paul H. "Some Antecedents and Consequences of Masculine Sex-Typing in Adolescent Boys." Psychological Monographs, LXXV (1961) no. 2.

- Mussen, Paul H., and Luther Distler. "Child-Rearing Antecedents of Masculine Identification in Kindergarten Boys." Child Development, XXXI (1960), 89-100.
- _____, and Eldred Rutherford. "Parent-Child Relations and Parental Personality in Relation to Young Children's Sex-Role Preference." Child Development, XXXIV (1963), 589-607.
- Nash, John. "The Father in Contemporary Culture and Current Psychological Literature." Child Development, XXXVI (1965), 261-297.
- Osgood, C., G. Suci, and P. H. Tannebaum. The Measurement of Meaning. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1957.
- Palmer, Richard C. "Behavior Problems of Children in Navy Officers' Families." Social Casework, XLI (1960), 177-184.
- Payne, Donald E., and Paul H. Mussen. "Parent-Child Relations and Father Identification Among Adolescent Boys." Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, LII (1956), 358-362.
- Pearlin, Leonard I., and Melvin L. Kohn. "Social Class, Occupation and Parental Values: A Cross-National Study." American Sociological Review, XXXI (1966), 466-479.
- Peterson, D. R., W. C. Becker, L. A. Hellmer, D. J. Shoemaker, and H. C. Quay. "Parental Attitudes and Child Adjustment." Child Development, XXX (1959), 119-130.
- Radke, Marian J. The Relation of Parental Authority to Children's Behavior and Attitudes. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1946.
- Read, K. "Parents Expressed Attitudes and Children's Behavior." Journal of Consulting Psychology, IX (1945), 95-100.
- Schvaneveldt, Jay D. "The Interactional Framework in the Study of the Family." F. Ivan Nye and Felix M. Berardo, Emerging Conceptual Frameworks in Family Analysis. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1966.
- Sears, Pauline S. "Doll-Play Aggression in Normal Young Children: Influence of Sex, Age Sibling Status, and Father's Absence." Psychological Monographs, LXV (1951) no. 6.
- Sears, Robert R., Margaret H. Pintler, and Pauline Sears. "Effects of Father Separation on Preschool Children's Doll Play Aggression." Child Development, XVII (1946), 219-243.
- Slater, Phillip W. "Parental Role Differentiation." American Journal of Sociology, LXVII (1961), 296-308.

- Sopchak, Andrew L. "Parental Identification and Tendency Toward Disorders As Measured by the MMPI." Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, XLVII (1952), 159-165.
- Stephens, William N. "Judgements by Social Workers on Boys and Mothers in Fatherless Families." Journal of Genetic Psychology, XCIX (1961), 59-64.
- Stoke, S. M. "An Inquiry Into the Concept of Identification." Journal of Genetic Psychology, LXXI (1950), 163-189.
- Stolz, Lois M. Father Relations of War-Born Children. Stanford, California: Stanford University Press, 1954.
- Sutton-Smith, B., B. G. Rosenberg, and Frank Landry. "Father Absence Effects in Families of Different Sibling Compositions." Child Development, XXXIX (1968), 1213-1221.
- Waller, Willard, and Rueben Hill. The Family: A Dynamic Interpretation. (Revised) New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1951.
- Walters, James, and Nick Stinnett. "Parent-Child Relationships: A Decade of Research." Journal of Marriage and the Family, XXXIII (1971), 70-111.
- Winch, R. "Some Data Bearing on the Oedipal Hypothesis." Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, XLV (1950), 481-489.

APPENDIX A

INFORMATION SHEET

Please answer the following questions as accurately as you can. It is important that you answer ALL questions which are appropriate. Your identity and your answers will be kept strictly confidential. Your cooperation in this research project is greatly appreciated.

1. Age?
 - A. 24 or under
 - B. 25 - 39
 - C. 40 - 55
 - D. 56 or over

2. Were you born in the United States of America?
 - A. Yes
 - B. No

3. What is your race?
 - A. White
 - B. Black
 - C. Indian
 - D. Other

4. Are you the father of a son?
 - A. Yes
 - B. No

5. How many children do you have?
 - A. 1 - 2
 - B. 3 - 4
 - C. 5 and over

6. In school, I completed grades:
 - A. 11 or under
 - B. High school graduate
 - C. Some college
 - D. College graduate
 - E. Graduate work

7. My occupation (work) is:
(Describe in detail) _____

8. The main source of our family's income is:
 - A. Wages, hourly wages, piece work, weekly checks
 - B. Salary, monthly checks
 - C. Profits or fees from business or profession
 - D. Savings and investments
 - E. Inherited savings and investments

9. In my family, the discipline I received was mainly from:
- A. My father
 - B. My father with some help from my mother
 - C. Equally my father and my mother
 - D. My mother with some help from my father
 - E. My mother
10. Check the answer which most nearly describes the type of discipline you received from your father.
- A. Very permissive
 - B. Permissive
 - C. Average
 - D. Strict
 - E. Very strict
11. Check the answer which most nearly describes the type of discipline you received from your mother.
- A. Very permissive
 - B. Permissive
 - C. Average
 - D. Strict
 - E. Very strict
12. Which of the following describes the degree of closeness of your relationship with your father during childhood?
- A. Above average
 - B. Average
 - C. Below average
13. Which of the following describes the degree of closeness of your relationship with your mother during childhood?
- A. Above average
 - B. Average
 - C. Below average
14. Which parent had the greatest influence in determining the kind of person you are?
- A. Mother and father equally
 - B. Mother
 - C. Father
15. In the home in which I was reared, I feel that I was loved by my father:
- A. Very much
 - B. Above average
 - C. Average
 - D. Below average
 - E. Very little

16. In the home in which I was reared, I feel that I was loved by my mother:

- A. Very much
- B. Above average
- C. Average
- D. Below average
- E. Very little

17. With respect to happiness, I consider my own childhood to have been:

- A. Very happy
- B. Somewhat above average
- C. Average
- D. Somewhat below average
- E. Very unhappy

18. I would rate the degree of closeness that I have with my children as:

- A. Very close
- B. Above average
- C. Average
- D. Below average
- E. Very distant

19. How much freedom do you allow your children?

- A. Very much
- B. Above average
- C. Average
- D. Below average
- E. Very little

APPENDIX B

Following are fifteen basic, normal personality needs that everyone has in varying degrees. In themselves, none of the needs is either good or bad. They are simply the needs that motivate and influence behavior. Each of these fifteen needs is described below in brief, general terms.

We are interested in how you see yourself in terms of the degree to which you have these needs. This should be what you feel most accurately describes your present level which you feel you should have or the level which you want to have.

Score yourself on each of the needs. For scoring, use the 1 to 5 point scale to the right of each need. Circle the point on the scale which best describes your level of that need. Keep in mind that 1 represents the lowest level of the need, while 5 represents the highest level of the need.

NEED FOR -	DESCRIPTION OF NEEDS	YOUR LEVEL OF NEED
_____ 20.	ACHIEVEMENT--ambition, to succeed, to do one's best, to accomplish something of great significance.	<u>1 2 3 4 5</u>
_____ 21.	DEFERENCE--dependence, to follow orders (and others), to conform, to be conventional.	<u>1 2 3 4 5</u>
_____ 22.	ORDER--neatness, to have organization, be systematic, and plan in advance; orderly schedule.	<u>1 2 3 4 5</u>
_____ 23.	EXHIBITION--attention, to be the center of things, to be noticed, to talk about oneself.	<u>1 2 3 4 5</u>
_____ 24.	AUTONOMY--independence, to be free in decisions and actions; to be nonconforming without obligations.	<u>1 2 3 4 5</u>
_____ 25.	AFFILIATION--need for people, friends, groups, to form strong attachments.	<u>1 2 3 4 5</u>
_____ 26.	INTRACPTION--need to know, to understand-- what and why, to analyze and empathize.	<u>1 2 3 4 5</u>
_____ 27.	SUCCORANCE--to <u>receive</u> help, encouragement, sympathy, kindness from others.	<u>1 2 3 4 5</u>
_____ 28.	DOMINANCE--to be a leader, to lead, direct and supervise, to persuade and influence others.	<u>1 2 3 4 5</u>

	DESCRIPTION OF NEEDS	YOUR LEVEL OF NEED
NEED FOR -		
_____ 29.	ABASEMENT--conscience, to feel guilty and accept blame; to confess wrongs, admit inferiority.	<u>1 2 3 4 5</u>
_____ 30.	NURTURANCE--to give help, sympathy, kindness to others, to be generous.	<u>1 2 3 4 5</u>
_____ 31.	CHANGE--variety, novelty; to experiment, try new things, experience change in routine.	<u>1 2 3 4 5</u>
_____ 32.	ENDURANCE--perseverance, tenacity; to finish what is started, to stick to something even if unsuccessful.	<u>1 2 3 4 5</u>
_____ 33.	SEX--need for opposite sex, for sexual activities; to do things involving sex.	<u>1 2 3 4 5</u>
_____ 34.	AGGRESSION--to attack contrary view, to criticize, to tell what one thinks of others.	<u>1 2 3 4 5</u>

APPENDIX C

THE FATHER-SON INTERACTION TEST

The statements below are related to the behavior which you will see in each scene. After viewing the scene, you are to answer each statement which pertains to that scene. You are to answer each statement in terms of one of four categories:

SA	MA	MD	SD
Strongly	Mildly	Mildly	Strongly
Agree	Agree	Disagree	Disagree

Your answer to each statement depends on what you see in the film plus what you know generally about father and son behavior. There is no "right" and "wrong" answer. This is a test of your feelings and attitudes about what you see in the film.

Please answer each statement by circling your choice to each statement. Circle only one answer for each statement. Please answer every statement.

 SCENE EXAMPLE

Suppose the scene showed a son who is 14 years old. His father will not allow him to use his shop tools.

- | | | | | |
|---|----|----|----|----|
| 1. The son should not be allowed to use his father's tools. | SA | MA | MD | SD |
| 2. The father was wrong in not allowing his son to use his tools. | SA | MA | MD | SD |

SCENE II

Scene II opens with the father reading the morning newspaper. The son enters the room and asks for his allowance.

- | | | | | |
|---|----|----|----|----|
| 1. The son had a right to become angry. | SA | MA | MD | SD |
| 2. The father should have given the money to his son the previous night. | SA | MA | MD | SD |
| 3. The father should have responded immediately when his son asked him for his allowance. | SA | MA | MD | SD |

SCENE III

Father and son are having lunch together and have to leave home at the same time. The son is eager to share his weekend trip to the beach with his dad. While relating the details of the trip, the son does not eat his meal. The father has been very quiet during the meal, and when it is time for both of them to leave, he realizes that the son has not even begun to eat.

- | | | | | | |
|----|--|----|----|----|----|
| 4. | A father should not have had to listen to his son this much during mealtime. | SA | MA | MD | SD |
| 5. | The son's actions should not have irritated his father. | SA | MA | MD | SD |
| 6. | The father was right in objecting to his son's slowness in eating. | SA | MA | MD | SD |
| 7. | The father should not have been so hasty in scolding his son. | SA | MA | MD | SD |
| 8. | The son should not have talked so much. | SA | MA | MD | SD |
| 9. | The father should have shown affection for his son. | SA | MA | MD | SD |

SCENE IV

The afternoon baseball game is over. The son rushes up to the father, pleased that their team had won and that he had made the winning run. The father asks, "What about that 'pop-up fly' you missed?"

- | | | | | | |
|-----|--|----|----|----|----|
| 10. | The father should have ignored the error which the son made. | SA | MA | MD | SD |
| 11. | The son should not have been so upset by his father's remarks. | SA | MA | MD | SD |

SCENE V

Previously, the father had promised that he would give the son a golf lesson. The father forgot his promise and made a date with a friend to play golf. He is reminded by his son of the promise. The scene ends when the father says, "Well, I guess I could call Fred?"

- | | | | | | |
|-----|--|----|----|----|----|
| 12. | The father should have offered to take his son with him. | SA | MA | MD | SD |
| 13. | The father should have told his son that a business deal was more important. | SA | MA | MD | SD |

14. The father should have felt obligated to play golf with his son.

SA MA MD SD

SCENE VI

The son has been told that he is to rake the leaves to help prepare the lawn for spring cleaning. He has agreed, but he is tired. The father insists that the lawn should be raked today. The son is very reluctant, but the father persists.

15. The father should have "paddled" his son.

SA MA MD SD

16. The father should not have become so excited when his son did not obey him.

SA MA MD SD

SCENE VIII

Dinner is served and guests and family are discussing some of the problems which pertain to school and education. The son has remained very quiet during most of the dinner. Sometime during the discussion, the father turns to the son and asks him what is his opinion of the situation.

17. The father should not have been persistent.

SA MA MD SD

18. The father should have shown more warmth and affection for his son.

SA MA MD SD

19. The father handled the situation well.

SA MA MD SD

SCENE IX

The father enters the son's bedroom and finds him with opened books but watching television instead of doing his homework. When confronted with the question as to "Why?", the son complains that he does not know what the teacher wants. The father takes the notebook and begins to work out the problems for the son.

20. The father should have insisted that his son study at a desk.

SA MA MD SD

21. The father should not have assumed that his son could not study with the television going.

SA MA MD SD

22. The father should have allowed his son to do the assignment himself and not worry about making it perfect.

SA MA MD SD

23. The father should have shown more warmth and affection for his son. SA MA MD SD

SCENE X

The father is waiting for a business telephone call. The phone rings and the call is for the son. The father gives his son a two minute limit. The son talks longer than his time limit.

24. The son should have been punished. SA MA MD SD
25. The son's actions should not have upset the father. SA MA MD SD
26. The father should not have expected this much from his son. SA MA MD SD

SCENE XI

The father enters the son's bedroom as the son is hanging a "pin-up" picture of a woman on his wall. The son is surprised at the entrance of his father. The father says to the son, "What is going on in here?"

27. The son should not have had pictures of which his father would disapprove. SA MA MD SD
28. The father was right in objecting to this kind of behavior. SA MA MD SD

APPENDIX D

KEY FOR THE FATHER-SON INTERACTION TEST
(Fathers' Form)

	SA	MA	MD	SD		SA	MA	MD	SD
1.	2	1	0	0	15.	0	0	1	2
2.	2	1	0	0	16.	2	1	0	0
3.	2	1	0	0	17.	0	0	1	2
4.	0	0	1	2	18.	2	1	0	0
5.	2	1	0	0	19.	0	0	1	2
6.	0	0	1	2	20.	0	0	1	2
7.	2	1	0	0	21.	2	1	0	0
8.	0	0	1	2	22.	2	1	0	0
9.	2	1	0	0	23.	2	1	0	0
10.	2	1	0	0	24.	0	0	1	2
11.	0	0	1	2	25.	2	1	0	0
12.	2	1	0	0	26.	2	1	0	0
13.	0	0	1	2	27.	0	0	1	2
14.	2	1	0	0	28.	0	0	1	2

VITA

Stephen Garland Penuel

Candidate for the Degree of

Master of Science

Thesis: FATHERS' ATTITUDES CONCERNING FATHER-SON INTERACTION

Major Field: Family Relations and Child Development

Biographical:

Personal Data: Born in Pauls Valley, Oklahoma, June 1, 1949, the son of Mr. and Mrs. N. E. Penuel.

Education: Attended grade school and junior high school in Pauls Valley, Oklahoma; graduated from Pauls Valley High School in 1967; received the Bachelor of Science degree from Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, Oklahoma, with a major in Sociology in May, 1971; completed requirements for the Master of Science degree in July, 1972.

Professional Experience: Graduate Research Assistant, Department of Family Relations and Child Development, Oklahoma State University, September, 1971, to May, 1972.

Professional Organizations: Phi Kappa Phi, Alpha Kappa Delta, Oklahoma Health and Welfare Association.