PERCEIVED FATHERING AND IDENTIFICATION

By

ALAN CARL CAMPBELL

Bachelor of Fine Arts
Stephen F. Austin State University
Nacogdoches, Texas
1978

Master of Divinity
Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary
Fort Worth, Texas
1982

Master of Science
Oklahoma State University
Stillwater, Oklahoma
1986

Submitted to the Faculty of the
Graduate College of the
Oklahoma State University
in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for
the Degree of
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY
July, 1989

PERCEIVED FATHERING AND IDENTIFICATION

Thesis Approved:

Thesis Advisor

Dean of the Graduate College

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The task of writing a thesis belongs to many people, not just to the author listed on the title page. For the past two years, I have been working diligently to complete this work, but the final product could never have happened without the assistance of my committee, friends, and family.

First I wish to acknowledge my committee individually. I wish to express my deep appreciation to Dr. Kathleen McKinney for her keen eye in evaluating research, to Dr. David Lane for his editorial abilities, to Dr. Katye Perry for keeping me on my "statistical toes" to the last minute, and to Dr. Sherry Maxwell for support to get through this project. Last, I wish to thank Dr. Brent Snow for his shoulder when I was discouraged and his sense of humor that made this impossible task possible.

Second I wish to acknowledge the many peers and colleagues, both at the OSU Student Mental Health Clinic and in my classes who have helped with the tedious aspects of doing questionnaire research. Their time and encouragement expedited this study.

Last I wish to thank my family. To my parents, thank you for instilling within me a confidence to complete whatever task that I began. Thank you to my children,

Nathan, Aaron and Logan, for being willing to share their dad during this time. And finally, to my wife Celeste for her unlimited support of me. Thank you for being willing to be a single parent when necessary during this project and for understanding and accepting the changes that I have encountered during this graduate program.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Introduction

Until the early 1950's, the paternal role had been widely neglected in research as well as underestimated in its importance and vitality (Brenton, 1966; Foster, 1964; Rohrer & Edmondson, 1960). Foster (1964) points out that television, as well as other mass media, has portrayed the father as inadequate and unimportant as an influential force in the lives of children. Research has more recently cast a different light on the role of the father as highly influential and important in child development (Biller, 1971; Henderson, 1980; Lamb, 1981; Price-Bonham, Pittman & Welch, 1981; Schalin, 1983).

Parent-child research has largely concentrated on the mother-child relationship. Early researchers who studied familial relationships generally lived in societies where primary responsibility for child-care belonged to the mother (Gorer, 1948; Westermarck, 1921). The studies of Freud also had an impact on the direction of research. The role

of the mother-infant relationship was central to the study of psychopathology.

By the later 1960's, there was a definite trend toward looking more closely at the role of the father. Several reasons have been given for the trend toward father-child studies. Lamb (1981) felt that because mother-infant and mother-child relationships became so extreme and imbalanced that researchers were almost compelled to determine if paternal influences were present within the family structure. Lamb stated other reasons for the onslaught of paternal studies. Because of changing roles in American society, fathers are no longer, if they ever were, content to be "peripheral" figures in relation to their children. Sheehy (1979) conducted a survey that showed an overwhelming majority of young men are desiring to be close to their children. Greater paternal participation in household and childcare duties has also been reported (Baruch & Barnett, 1979; Feshbach, 1980). Several other factors such as the change in the traditional family structure, a more demanding economy, and the "women's movement" have all contributed to the importance of father-child studies.

More central to this study is the focus of research on the father-son relationship. Studies have focused on select paternal variables which correlate with the son's identification or imitation with the father (Bandura &

Walters, 1963; Biller, 1981; Bronfenbrenner, 1958, 1960; Burton & Whiting, 1961; Parsons, 1955; Sears, 1970). Several theories of identification have been proposed to explain how sons identify with their fathers and assure similar characteristics and/or attitudes (Lamb, 1981; Mowrer, 1970). Studies have focused on such areas as sex role development, moral development, achievement and intellectual development, social competence and adjustment (Lamb, 1981).

Paternal nurturance has been identified as an important variable in predicting filial identification. For example, Bandura and Walters (1963) conducted studies with aggressive boys and found that the use of non-nurturant disciplinary methods (i.e, those who employed physical punishment, nagging and scolding and withdrawal of love) were associated with the development of hostility and aggression. Mussen (1967) studies sex-typing as a measure of identification and found that children who perceived their fathers as nurturant were much more likely to be high in masculinity than boys who perceived their fathers as less nurturant. In the same study, sons who perceived their fathers as exhibiting threatening/punitive qualities were lower in masculinity (less identification) than sons who perceived their fathers as exhibiting less threatening/punitive qualities.

Harris and Howard's (1984) study regarding psychological resemblance revealed that both boys and girls claimed more

resemblance to the parent which they perceived as highly involved (interested, affectionate, available, etc.) and highly objective (reasonable, admits when wrong, etc.). Mussen and Rutherford (1963) tested the developmental identification hypothesis. This hypothesis suggests that children identify with the parent who is more warm and affectionate and tend to imitate that parent as a total pattern. An analysis of boy's doll play responses were performed and the results demonstrated that:

> Boys with highly masculine interests told significantly more stores involving father nurturance . . . than boys low in masculinity. These data, then provide further evidence supportive of the developmental hypothesis, showing that young boys are more likely to identify strongly with their fathers, and thus to acquire masculine interests, if they perceive their fathers as highly nurturant and rewarding. (pp. 594-595)

This also supports the findings of Mussen and Distler (1959) and Harris and Howard (1984).

A study by Brook, Whiteman and Scovell (1981) showed that adolescent users of marijuana are less likely to perceive their fathers as affectionate and child-centered. The authors speculated from these results that "boys whose fathers have these qualities are more likely to respond

realistically and adaptively to frustrating situations and therefore do not need to turn to drugs in order to cope with frustration" (p. 84). However, to what extent the marijuana use had on the subject's perceptions of their father, which could confound the results, was not addressed in the study. In contrast, Reuter and Biller (1973) studied the personality adjustment among college males in relation to perceived paternal nurturance and availability. Subjects who were high in both nurturance and availability scored significantly higher ($p < .05$) on the personal adjustment scale. The authors concluded that the combination of paternal nurturance and paternal availability seem to be very important in determining the male's personality adjustment.

Statement of the Problem

The present study examined detailed aspects of how one was fathered and traces the relationship of certain perceived paternal childrearing variables with the son's own perceptions of how they behave as a father. The following question might further clarify the problem of this study:

> What is the relationship between paternal nurturance and sons forming as identification with the father as evidenced by sharing similar attitudes and behaviors regarding childrearing?

There are several reasons why this study is important. First, this study will add to the relatively sparse literature relating to father-son relations. Second, few studies have been conducted which assess adult perceptions of parenting behaviors (Devlin & Cowan, 1985; Hurlburt, 1984) although numerous studies have investigated perceived paternal behaviors by children (Barnett, King, Howard & Dino, 1980; Lamb, 1981; Mussen & Distler, 1959). Third, this study will provide psychologists and other professionals who work with familial systems a better understanding of the importance of paternal nurturance and its relationship to the son.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to demonstrate that perceived paternal nurturance (received from ones' fathers) is a more salient factor than perceived paternal control in the adult sons' identification with their fathers as evidenced by the reported imitation of those behaviors in the fathering of their own sons.

Rationale

The research on paternal nurturance and the developmental identification theory form a basis for this study. The developmental identification hypothesis was

originally formulated by Mowrer (1950) and suggests that human beings emulate the behavior of warm, nurturing and satisfying models. Mussen and Distler (1959) investigated the salience of several theories of identification and found the developmental hypothesis to be the most powerful in regard to filial identification. Bandura and Huston (1961) conducted a study which provided experimental evidence for this theory. The researchers studied twenty nursery school children who experienced a warm nurturing model and a matched group of twenty nursery school children who experienced a nonnurturant model in a controlled situation. The children who experienced the nurturant model imitated her behavior significantly more than those children who had the nonnurturant model. Mussen (1967) also concluded that nurturant, warm, and rewarding relationships with a model do, in fact, foster the child's identification with the model. Moulton, Burnstein, Liberty and Altucher (1966) and Biller (1971, 1981) studied paternal nurturance in the context of sex-role identification and found that sons tend to identify with the warm and nurturing models as suggested by the developmental hypothesis. Although there are some studies which do not support this hypothesis (Bandura & Walters, 1963; Biller, 1969; Parsons, 1955), the bulk of evidence supporting the developmental hypothesis is substantial (Biller & Soloman, 1986; Lamb, 1981).

Paternal nurturance studies as they relate to identification were less prevalent in the 1970's and 1980's. However, paternal nurturance continued to be linked to other prominent areas of filial development (Brook, Whiteman and Scovell, 1981; Devlin & Cowan, 1985; Fry, 1982; Harris & Howard, 1984; MacDonald, 1971; Nowicki & Segal, 1974; Proudian, 1983; Reuter & Biller, 1973). Kimball (1952) and Radin (1972, 1973) also linked paternal nurturance to intellectual functioning, which this study will also address as an added variable of filial identification, but not as an actual antecedent to identification.

Definitions of Terms

Perceived Paternal Cognitive Involvement Received (PCOG)--This will be defined as the score representing the dimension, "Cognitive Involvement" on the Parent Behavior Form (Worrell & Worrell, 1975). This score represents a perceived amount of paternal cognitive involvement received from one's father. It is conceptually defined as the interest and concern one's parent demonstrated in regard to relaying needed information in such areas as reading, current events, educational information, etc.

Perceived Paternal Limit-Setting/Control Received (PC)--This will be defined as the score representing the dimension, "Limit-Setting" on the father form of the Parent Behavior

Form. This score represents a perceived amount of paternal control received from one's father. It is conceptually defined as how one's behavior was regulated and/or managed by one's father when the respondent was a child.

Perceived Paternal Nurturance Received (PN)--This will be defined as the score representing the "Paternal/Rejection Dimension" of the father form of the Parent Behavior Form. This score represents a perceived amount of paternal nurturance received from one's father. It is conceptually defined as the care and training one received as a child which was in a non-threatening and warm manner.

Perceived Paternal Cognitive Involvement Given (PPCOG)--This will be defined as the score representing the dimension "Parental Involvement" on the father form of the Iowa Parent Behavior Inventory (Cause, Clark & Pease, 1976). This score represents a perceived amount of paternal cognitive involvement given to one's son. It is conceptually defined as the interest and concern a parent demonstrates in regard to relaying needed information to their child in such areas as current events, reading, educational information, etc.

Perceived Paternal Limit-Setting/Control Given (PPC)--This will be defined as the score representing the dimension "Limit-Setting" on the father form of the Iowa Parent Behavior Inventory. This score represents a perceived amount

of paternal control given to one's son. It is conceptually defined as regulating and/or managing a child's behavior.

Perceived Paternal Nurturance Given (PPN)--This will be defined as the score representing the dimension "Responsiveness" on the father form of the Iowa Parent Behavior Inventory. This score represents a perceived amount of paternal nurturance given to one's son.

Delimitations of the Study

The scope of the study was delimited by the researcher in a number of ways. First, the study dealt only with father-son variables in an attempt to control other important variables. Therefore, care should be exercised when generalizing the results to other familial roles and systems. Secondly, the study was limited to married males and did not include unmarried males with children. Lastly, the study was limited by persons living in the geographical region of Oklahoma.

Limitations of the Study

The most important limitation of this study is that the study of filial characteristics and its determinants is extremely complex. This study attempted to isolate the father-son dyad and control for a number of variables. Because of the relatively new research regarding father-son

studies, much is not known of its antecedents and consequences.

Brief Overview of Methods

The independent variable of this study was perceived characteristics of how one was fathered. The three characteristics studied were perceived paternal nurturance received (PN), perceived paternal control received (PC), and perceived paternal cognitive involvement received (PCOG). The dependent variable was the perception of how one fathers his own children. The three characteristics studied were perceived paternal nurturance given (PPN), perceived paternal control given (PPC), and perceived paternal cognitive involvement given (PPCOG).

The independent variables (PN, PC, PCOG) were operationally defined by using the Parent Behavior Form (Worrell & Worrell, 1975). The Parent Behavior Form (PBF) consists of 117 items assessing the perceived parent attitudes and childrearing practices and reports adequate reliability and validity. The subjects were asked to provide information for the father only. Reliability scores vary due to factors related to gender of the person completing the PBF. Concurrent validity was reported by the authors of the PBF and a factor analysis was performed on the data. The three factors identified were: Factor 1--warmth rejection

dimension; Factor 2--parental control; and Factor 3--parental cognitive involvement.

The Iowa Parent Behavior Inventory (1976) was used to assess the dependent variables (PPN, PPC, PPCOG). The authors have identified five factors which are measured by the IPBI and their corresponding total reliability estimates (father form only). The three factors used for this study were parental involvement (.843), limit setting (.822), and responsiveness (.810).

The sample for this study was selected to represent a population of married males living in an intact familial relationship with at least one child between the ages of three and nine years of age. Secondary variables controlled for were age, educational level, birth order, and number of siblings.

Summary and Overview of Remaining Chapters

Chapter I introduces the reader to the area of father-son relationship studies, emphasizing the role of paternal nurturance in child development. A rationale was presented regarding expected outcomes of the study and several key terms were defined. A statement of the problem studied was presented and the purpose and objectives were discussed. Delimitations and limitations were presented

which may affect the results or generalizability of the study. The second chapter deals with an historical analysis of father-son studies as they relate to filial identification, the value of perceptions of behavior as a tool for measurement, the role of paternal nurturance and identification, paternal limit-setting (control) and its role in identification, and paternal cognitive involvement as an added variable of filial identification. Chapter III discusses subject selection, procedures, instrumentation, methods, and the analysis of data. Chapter IV presents the data and Chapter V presents a summary of the study as well as conclusions and recommendations for further research.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Introduction

In reviewing the research related to identification and perceived fathering, it is evident that fathers play a specific and important role in the development of their sons. This investigation was designed to extend the current findings to determine the extent to which adult sons imitate their father's parenting behaviors. Similarity in parenting behaviors by the sons suggest identification with the father based upon the father's childrearing behaviors as perceived by the son.

The following review includes a discussion of theoretical perspectives and definitions of identification, paying particular attention to the developmental hypothesis of identification. The review will begin with a discussion of perceived parental behavior. Findings related to perceived fathering in terms of paternal nurturance, control and cognitive involvement will be discussed. A brief summary and conclusion will be provided.

Identification

The theory of psychological identification was first formulated by Freud in 1917. The term, however, was used in many different ways until Freud (1921) proposed the following formal definition of the psychological identification process, "Identification endeavors to mold a person's own ego after the fashion of one that has been taken as a model" (p. 62).

Sears (1957) has defined identification behavior as acting like another person. He goes on to suggest that there are three broad categories which comprise the products of identification. The first are qualities of a person. This would include mannerisms, motives, and temperamental characteristics. The second product of identification are the roles people play. Sears describes these roles as systematized patterns of duties, attitudes, and actions that make up what society has defined as mother, father, husband, wife, etc. The last product mentioned by Sears are demands placed on persons. Sears describes demands as rules or standards of behavior which are superimposed on oneself or others. Examples of these products are sex-typing, self-control, adult role formation, guilt feelings, and various forms of expression of one's conscience (Sears, Rau, and Alpert, 1965).

Mussen (1967) addressed the issue of the difference between imitation and identification. He concluded that it was "difficult to distinguish between imitation and identification theoretically in a rigorous or precise way" (p. 78). Miller and Dollard (1941) saw the desire and impetus for imitation occurring as "a process by which 'matched' or similar acts are evoked in two people and connected to appropriate cues" (p. 10). They concluded that "the evidence seems to show that imitative behavior follows the laws of learning and arises under the social conditions which reward it" (p. 12). This form of imitation later became associated with the work of the Social Learning theorists (Bandura & Walters, 1963).

Mussen (1967) did not advocate that identification is synonymous with imitation, however, and argues for the two concepts to be closely scrutinized. He explained that identification is a type of imitation which is more of an unconscious process. Models were imitated "without any specific guidance, broad patterns of behavior that have not been rewarded directly, even though the model . . . is not present" (pp. 80-81). Other differentiations made between the terms are that identification is more stable and long-lasting than imitation and it relies more heavily on the intimacy and personal attachment to the model being imitated. Bronfenbrenner (1960) also argued for retention of the

concept of identification. He felt identification represented a "total pattern" (p. 27) of imitation of the parent rather than individual and discrete elements of imitation.

Theories of Identification

There are several theories of identification which have been proposed (Bandura & Walters, 1963; Biller, 1981; Freud, 1925; Mowrer, 1950; Mussen, 1967). These theories are concerned with explaining how and why identification with a model occurs, that is, the motivation behind imitation of behavior. Briefly, the main theories will be discussed, with a heavy emphasis on the developmental hypothesis of identification, which was tested in this study.

Freud (1925) formulated the defensive identification hypothesis. Freud's theory is based on an unconscious fear of the son that his father is going to castrate him. This fear is precipitated by the realization of the son that he loves his mother and sees his father as the rival for the mother's love. Realizing that the son could never "win" the mother from such a strong man as the father, the son resolves the Oedipus complex by forming an identification with the father so as not to get hurt by the father. The boy feels if he is like his father, his father will not hurt him; identification with his aggressor occurs (Freud, 1949).

Two other theories which are somewhat related to the Freudian concept of identification is that of Whiting (1960) and Parsons (1954, 1958). Whiting's (1960) status-envy theory states,

> The more a child envies the status of another with respect to the control of a given resource, the more he will covertly practice that role. By covert practice we mean that he will indulge in phantasy in which he sees himself as the envied person, controlling and consuming the valued resources of which he has been deprived (p. 119).

Valued resources can be such things as the love of the parent of the opposite sex, food, water, sex, etc. Essentially, boys envy their model's powers and capabilities over valued resources which they themselves would like to possess. The Parsonian theory is somewhat related to the status-envy theory but emphasizes the power of the father as an important variable in identification. Empirical research has both confirmed (Emmerich, 1959a, 1959b, 1961) and discounted (Maccoby & Jacklin, 1974) this theory. Kagan's theory of identification (1958) is somewhat like that of Whiting. Kagan feels that persons will strive to possesses or command goals and satisfactions that the model possesses. The wish for these possessions is the motivating force behind the identification.

Mowrer (1950) developed and elaborated the hypothesis of developmental identification. Whereas Freud based his theory of identification on fear and hostility toward the father, Mowrer maintains that identification occurs as the result of love, affection, and respect for the father. Mowrer developed this theory as a result of his work with the training of talking birds. In order to teach birds to talk, the trainer must nurture the birds by personally feeding and watering them as well as talking to them. When the bird begins to utter sounds similar to his trainer, the bird is reinforced and rewarded by the trainer. The bird's imitation of the trainer's sounds are mainly facilitated by the close relationship with the trainer.

Mowrer uses this analogy to demonstrate that pleasant, nurturant, and rewarding interactions with the father provide the groundwork for the development of identification. Sears and his colleagues (1957, 1965) suggest that these conditions of nurturance and rewards are not possible without the child being initially dependent on the parent. These authors suggest that a child, in order to assure the love of a parent, will actually begin "to produce bits of the beloved and longed-for parent" (Mowrer, 1950, p. 615).

Mowrer clarifies the distinctions between defensive identification and developmental identification:

It is true that in both developmental and defensive identification the subject is 'frustrated,' but the different nature of the frustration in the two instances is noteworthy. In the one case it arises from a sense of helplessness and loneliness: the parent or parent-person is absent and the infant wishes he were present. In the other case, the frustration arises rather from interference and punishment; the parent or parent-person is present, and the infant wishes he were absent. But the latter wish brings the average child into intolerable conflict: while he hates the parent for his disciplinary actions, he also loves the parent and experiences acute anxiety at the prospect of his really being separated, physically or emotionally, from him (or her). Developmental identification, we may suppose, is a milder and simpler experience than is defensive identification, which has a violent, crisis-like nature. The one is powered mainly by biologically given drives ("fear of loss or love," in the analytic sense) and the other by socially inflicted discomforts ("castration fear," or, less dramatically, simply fear of punishment". The first presumably involves relatively little

> conflict; but in the latter case, conflict and attendant anxiety are outstanding (Mowrer, 1950, p. 572).

As far as the son is concerned, the strength of his identification is directly related to his fear of a loss of his father's love. Biller (1981) states, "The basis for developmental identification is an affectional-emotional link with the parent . . . The identification is supposed to develop out of a nurturant parent-child relationship, and the child becomes dependent on the parent to provide nurturance and affection" (p. 322).

Payne and Mussen (1956) studied parent-child relations and father identification among adolescent boys in an effort to determine the degree to which boys identify with their fathers. They measured the degree of nurturance held by both mother and father to see if boy's identification is facilitated more by the father than the mother. Subjects for this study were 182 boys who were juniors and seniors in high school. The subjects were administered three scales of the California Psychological Inventory, a masculinity and femininity scale, and were asked to project their perceptions of their parents behaviors through the use of five stories dealing with parent-son relations. The results obtained after tetrachoric correlations for extreme groups was employed showed that boys are more likely to identify with

their father when the father was perceived as warm, nurturing and rewarding. The authors concluded that fathers who are the source of many rewards and who had established sound psychological relations with their sons facilitate the boy's identification with them, thus confirming the developmental hypothesis of identification.

A later study by Mussen and Distler (1959) was conducted to test the three theories of identification: defensive identification, developmental identification and the role-playing theory of identification. The authors wanted to know how boys who are strongly identified with their fathers perceived their fathers. Thirty-eight kindergarten-aged (all white) boys were administered a projective instrument to assess sex-role preference. The test assumes the child will project himself onto the 36 picture cards showing a neutral (nonsexed) figure. Subjects were also matched on socio-economic status. The parent-child relations were measured through the use of another projective measure involving doll play. Stories were told using the dolls in such a way that the child could depict either or both parents as nurturant and or punitive. The assumption underlying the doll play is that the boys would reveal their own feelings about their parents' nurturance or punishment. A total nurturance score was also calculated for the parents as a system. Because the distribution of the sample was nonnormal

and small, U-tests were employed to compare rank transformation scores on all doll play scores of subjects scoring high and low on the sex-role preference scale. The two groups of subjects differed significantly in many of their perceptions of their families. Those who were high in masculine identification perceived themselves as receiving more total nurturance. The perceptions of father nurturance for the two groups differed significantly in father nurturant scores but not in mother nurturant or combined nurturant scores. The authors concluded that the only hypothesis confirmed was the developmental hypothesis.

Another test of the developmental hypothesis was conducted by Bandura and Huston (1961). The researchers studied 20 nursery school children who experienced a warm nurturing model and a matched group of 20 nursery school children who experienced a nonnurturant model in a controlled situation. The warm nurturing model talked with the children and acted genuinely interested in what the children were doing. The nonnurturant model, although present, did not act interested or warm, but rather, sat over in a far corner, busy with other tasks. Each model was instructed to lead the children in a game of finding picture stickers in a box and instructed to perform behaviors completely irrelevant to finding the stickers (i.e., climbing over chairs). Those children who had the warm nurturing model imitated her

gestures, her matching, and her remarks to a significantly greater extent than the subjects whose relationships with the model were nonnurturant and distant.

Mussen (1961) conducted a study to determine if boys whose interests are characteristically masculine regard their relationships with their fathers as favorable and rewarding. Several different types of measures (projective, questionnaire, observation) were obtained from 68 boys who were 17 and 18 years of age. The results confirmed Mussen's hypothesis that adolescents with highly sex-typed patterns of interests perceive their relationships with their fathers as more favorable than boys low in masculinity of interests. This supports the developmental hypothesis that nurturance and rewards from fathers tend to help adolescents to identify with their fathers. This study included a longitudinal component as well, assessing the same subjects 16 years later for stability of masculine identification with fathers. The study showed that masculinity of interests and attitudes is relatively stable over time.

Mussen and Rutherford (1963) tested the general validity of the developmental hypothesis as well as its usefulness in understanding the masculinity in young boys. The researchers used 46 middle class boys, who were currently enrolled in the first grade, as subjects for the study. Each subject was administered a sex-role preference instrument, were observed

during structured doll play (this elicited the child's attitudes toward, and perceptions of, his parents) and filled out a list of games and play activities in which they were interested (to determine appropriate sex-typed activities). The authors found that boys with highly masculine interests told significantly more doll stories involving father nurturance than boys who were lower in masculine interests. There was also a tendency for the highly masculine boys to have higher mean father punishment scores. The authors concluded, however, that the evidence in support of the developmental hypothesis was much more impressive than the defensive identification hypothesis. They also suggested that boys who had powerful but nurturing and rewarding fathers were more likely to form masculine and sex-appropriate responses than boys who do not have nurturant but powerful fathers.

Moulton, Burnstein, Liberty and Altucher (1966) extended the previous study by attempting to determine if sex-typing will correspond more closely to the sex of the dominant disciplinarian when the later is also high in affection than when he is low in affection. One hundred and seventy-six undergraduate psychology students responded to a questionnaire which recorded responses to relevant items such as guilt, sex-typing, perceived paternal characteristics, especially affection and dominance in discipline. Using a

chi-square test, the results demonstrated that dominance of a parent was associated with sex-typing. Sons with dominant mothers tended to be more feminine and sons with dominant fathers tended to be more masculine. Subjects sex-typing more closely corresponded to the sex of the dominant disciplinarian when the disciplinarian is high in affection than when he is low. This confirms the conclusions of Mussen and Rutherford (1963).

Biller (1969) conducted a similar study, only he used kindergarten-age boys. The results were parallel to that of Moulton et al. (1966) except that there was also support for the role theory of Parsons (1955) and the social power theory of Bandura and Walters (1963). When perception of father dominance was considered in terms of its components, father dominance in decision-making and competence seemed relatively more important than father dominance in nurturance and limit-setting. This study did not support the developmental hypothesis.

Hetherington and Frankie (1967) investigated the effects of parental dominance, warmth, and conflict on imitation of parents by young boys. Eighty boys of nursery school age (4-6 years old) were each observed on an imitation task where he watched their parents alternately perform four trials in a free-play situation. Lining up golf shots, pulling up a chair, sitting sideways and shooting with two hands in a dart

game were some of the activities in the free play situation. Parents were always absent from the room during the child's test series. The imitation scores were obtained by summing the frequently of responses the child made which were similar to those of a given parent.

In order to assess the parental characteristics, parents were given hypothetical problems and asked how they would respond to them, both individually and corporately. The parents were then separately rated on parental dominance, conflict, and warmth-hostility. A basic ANOVA for the imitation scores were performed. The results showed that parents who were low in warmed were imitated significantly less ($p < .05$) than parents who were high in warmth. The dominant parent was imitated significantly more than the less dominant parent. Also significant was the difference between imitation of a highly warm mother and a highly warm father. This finding suggests that maternal warmth facilitates imitation of the mother to a more significant degree than paternal warmth facilitates imitation of the father. This finding contradicts the result obtained by Mussen and Rutherford (1963). When mothers were dominant, both boys and girls imitated the mother more than the father. Under father dominance, however, boys imitated their fathers and girls continued to imitate their mothers to a significant degree.

The authors concluded that under high conflict, when both parents were low in warmth, there is indeed a significant tendency for both boys and girls to imitate the dominant parent regardless of the sex of the parent. If either the nondominant parent is warm or conflict is reduced, there is a trend toward less imitation of the aggressive dominant parent. This trend does not hold in the case of boys with dominant fathers where the boy's tendency to imitate a dominant father overrides the effects of variations in conflict and warmth.

This study is congruent with those of past studies which have found that both parental power and warmth are salient variables which influence the identification among boys and their fathers (Moulton et al., 1966). The results also seem to suggest that if boys have a choice, they would identify with a nurturant parent, but if they are in situations where they receive little warmth, survival needs take over and identity with the aggressor becomes more pronounced. Most aspects of this study are in agreement with the earlier findings of Mussen and Rutherford (1963) and Mussen and Distler (1959). Proudian (1983) found basically the same results with a sample of Armenian-American adolescents. However, the defensive and status-envy theories were confirmed to a greater extent than the developmental hypothesis.

Bowerman and Bahr (1973) purposed to determine if adolescents identify with parents to a greater degree when conjugal power is perceived as equalitarian and to a lesser degree than when it is seen as mother-dominated. The authors used a large sample of 18,664 white students who were currently in junior high or high school (5,393 junior high males, 5,664 junior high females, 3,755 senior high males, and 3,852 senior high females). Two instruments were administered: one to assess conjugal power and another to assess identification with parents. The results showed that when the conjugal relationship was seen as equalitarian, identification with both parents is clearly higher. Adolescents who perceive their parents as having an equalitarian relationship identify more strongly, on the average, with both parents than do adolescents in mother or father dominated families. Identification with the father is considerably lower than the mother when he is perceived as being less dominant. Although this article does not look specifically at the developmental hypothesis, it seems to suggest that when the persons show respect for each other through equalitarian behaviors, identification is enhanced. This type of relationship seems to suggest a more nurturant environment than that of a dominated relationship.

In summary, several theories of identification were discussed, focusing mainly on the developmental hypothesis of

identification. The literature which was presented in this chapter for review suggests that nurturance is a more dominant factor in the development of filial identification with parents or other models.

Perceived Fathering

This investigation is concerned with three aspects of perceived fathering. Those areas are perceived paternal nurturance, limit-setting/control, and cognitive involvement. Each area will be reviewed and examined in the above order. Preceding this, however, will be a discussion on the validity of using perceived fathering as a measurement rather than actual observed fathering. Evidence will be cited which addresses the use of perceptions of childrearing.

Perceived Fathering as a Measurement

An assumed element of this study is that children learn from their parents through observation, rewards and punishments, and indirect teaching. The parent holds a myriad of responsibilities including caretaker, disciplinarian, teacher, and source of guidance to the outside world.

Approaches toward measuring childrearing influences is quite difficult and often limiting (Yarrow, Scott, and Zahn-Waxler, 1973). The issue to consider is if perceived

fathering by the child is a more relevant indices of parental behavior than the actual behaviors themselves. Human service professionals have argued the premise that, "What matters for behavior and development is the environment as it is perceived rather than how it may exist in 'objective reality'" (Bronfenbrenner, 1979, p. 4). Thomas and Thomas (1928) proposed that, "If men define situations as real, they are real in their consequences" (p. 572).

Inherent in any questionnaire is the possibility of response sets which surely confound results. To by-pass this problem, observational studies have been used. The main negative consequence of this approach is that the vital and ultimately important element of a persons perceptions of a particular situation has been ignored. The definitions of the situation the individual brings to their social encounters and their awareness of each other's definitions has been glossed over. Michaels, Messe and Stollack (1977) present evidence that a person's perceptions are important determinants of a child's sociopsychological development.

Serot and Teevan (1961) produced some indirect evidence which suggested that as children grow older, their perceptions of their parents change. Using the Swanson Child-Parent Relationship Scale (Swanson, 1950), Serot and Teevan found little evidence between perceived parenting behaviors and behaviors reported by the parents themselves.

This demonstrated that the child's view of significant others was different than the parent's view.

Another study by Zucker and Barron (1971) examined past reports of adolescents and their parents regarding childrearing behaviors when the adolescents were young children. The parents and adolescents were asked about their behaviors during the adolescents childhood. The degree of correspondence between the two sets of perceptions were analyzed using two different forms of analyses. There were no significant correlations for most of the scales. The results did show some significant differences, however, in the way the parents saw their behavior and the children saw their parents behavior. Parents reported that they used more principled disciplinary tactics than were reported by the children. The children reported a higher instance of physical punishment, affective punishment, and threats by the father. The authors were led to label this phenomenon of incongruency of perceptions as the mythology of the family. These same results were found by other researchers as well (Michaels et al., 1977).

Other researchers have studied the gender differences which exist in regard to perceptions of parental behavior. Droppleman and Schaefer (1963) reported that boys tend to rate fathers higher on scales which represent negative or aggressive types of involvement, while girls tended to rate

their mothers more negatively. As a general rule, mothers were identified by both sexes as using more covert types of control tactics than the father. Strictness and/or punishment were seen as equal by both genders. A minimal tendency existed for the opposite-sex parent to be reported as using more overt, direct methods of punishment as well as granting more autonomy. The authors concluded that their findings were in agreement with other research in the area regarding gender differences of perceived parenting (Fish & Biller, 1973; Funkenstein, King & Drollette, 1955; Kagan, 1965).

Stinnett, Taylor and Walters (1973) found significant differences between males and females reporting on perceived parenting in the following areas: source of most parental discipline during childhood; degree of praise received during childhood; source of most affection during childhood; degree to which mother found time to do things with the respondent as a child; and the source of greatest parental influence in determining the kind of person the respondent had become. Fathers were seen twice as often by males as being more punishing during childhood. If this is true, then fathers play a more active role in the disciplining of sons than daughters and may point to past research which indicates that fathers are much more involved in the sex-role learning for male offspring than for the female offspring (Goodenough,

1957). The authors concluded that mothers and fathers have different effects on the lives of their sons and daughters. They went on to point out that their research indicated that mothers are more influential than fathers in several areas.

Perceived Paternal Nurturance and Identification

Paternal nurturance has been rigorously studied since the 1950's. After Mowrer's (1950) proposal of the developmental hypothesis, Sears (1953) conducted a study on the childrearing factors related to the playing of sex-typed roles. She purposed to relate paternal nurturance and restrictiveness to the children's free choice of parent roles in permissive doll play. Two-hundred and two boys and 177 girls, all kindergarten age were given two sessions of doll play and scored on the frequency of use of agents for nonagressive behaviors. Scores for antecedent factors were obtained from ratings on interviews with mothers. Their study determined that boys used the father doll more than the girls. Positive choices for the same sex role and avoidance of the opposite sex role are in general associated with antecedent conditions of warmth, permissiveness, and low restrictions. Boys take the mother role most strongly under the following conditions: mother, but not father, is high in warmth; mother is high in sex permissiveness, restrictive of

the child's mobility outside the home, and critical in her evaluation of her husband. One major drawback of this study is that paternal nurturance was measured by an interview with the mother. The father was not included in the study from a measurement standpoint. Essentially, when the father was seen as high in warmth, the sons tended to identify with the father as measured by taking the father role in doll play.

A few years later, Payne and Mussen (1956) studied the degree to which boys identify with their fathers in relation to the degree to which they perceive him as rewarding and warm among adolescent boys. The researchers studied 182 boys who were either junior or seniors in high school. The subjects were measured for identification by the use of three scales on a popular psychological inventory as well as a measure for degree of masculinity and femininity. The adolescents were also given a projective test of five incomplete studies dealing with parent-son relationship situations. It was assumed that the boy's responses would reveal his perceptions of his own experiences with his parents. The adolescents were also rated by teachers on how well they were adjusted. After tetrachoric correlations for extreme groups were run on the data, the authors concluded that boys who perceive their fathers as warm, rewarding, gratifying, and understanding are much more likely to identify with them than boys who did not.

Mussen and Distler (1959) made a similar find with kindergarten-aged boys. In this study, however, doll play was used to discover how the children felt about their fathers and mothers. The study was designed to measure three theories of identification: defensive, developmental, and role-play. The basic question the authors wanted answered was how do boys who are strongly identified with their father perceive their parents? After sex-role preference instruments and doll play interviews were conducted, the authors found that those boys who were high in masculine identity perceived themselves as receiving more total nurturance. The two groups of boys (high and low masculinity) differed significantly on the total nurturance score ($p < .02$) but not in mother nurturance or combined nurturance. This points to the salience of paternal nurturance as a prime factor in boys identification with their fathers. The high and low masculine groups were not significantly different in any of the variables related to perception of the mother. The study confirmed only the developmental hypothesis. A similar finding was found in a later study by Mussen (1961) and Mussen and Rutherford (1963).

Hetherington and Frankie (1967) investigated the effects of parental dominance, warmth, and conflict on imitation of parents by boys and girls. The researchers measured 80 males

and 80 female nursery school and kindergarten children and their parents. Parents were given hypothetical problems and asked how they would respond to them, both individually and corporately. The parents were then rated on parent dominance, conflict, and warmth-hostility. Each child was run on an imitation task where they watched each parent alternately perform four trials in a free-play situation. Some of the free-play included activities such as lining up golf shots and sitting sideways and shooting with two hands in a dart game. Parents were always absent from the room during the child's test series. The imitation scores were obtained by summing the frequency of responses the child made which were similar to those of a given parent.

The results, after a basic ANOVA was computed, showed that parents who were low in warmth were imitated less than parents who were high in warmth ($p < .05$). Boys imitated the father more than the mother. When both parents were low in warmth, boys and girls tended to imitate the dominate parent. The results seem to suggest that if boys have a choice, they would identify with a nurturant parent, but if they are in situations where they receive little warmth, both boys and girls identify with the aggressor as a way of surviving. This study is in agreement with the earlier findings of Mussen and Rutherford (1963) and Mussen and Distler (1959, 1960).

Paternal nurturance and identification studies were less prominent in the 1970's and early 1980's, but paternal nurturance continued to be linked to other areas of child development (Brook, Whiteman & Gordon, 1981; Fry, 1982, 1978; Harris & Howard, 1978, 1984; Jacobs et al., 1972; MacDonald, 1971; Nowicki & Segal, 1974; Radin, 1972, 1973; Reuter & Biller, 1973).

Proudian (1983) conducted a study of perceived parental power and parental identification among Armenian-American adolescents. Forty-seven males and 64 females with a mean age of 17 were administered an instrument measuring parental power (referent, legitimate, and expert) and parental identification. Identification was measured through the use of a checklist. For boys, the correlation of total paternal power and paternal identification was moderate and positive. In this study, there was a tendency for both boys and girls to identify more strongly with the same sex parent who was perceived to have more power. This tends to support a more defensive hypothesis of identification but the authors cautioned the reader against a possible instability in the results due to such a small sample. This finding is in agreement with the previously discussed study by Hetherington and Frankie (1967).

Devlin and Cowan (1985) attempted to directly assess the relationship between homophobia and degree of intimacy

between male best friends. The study measures 130 adult heterosexual male volunteers from California with a mean age of 32.9. The study assessed the degree of homophobia, salient parental variables, sex-role enforcement by the father and degree of intimacy achieved with best friends. An ANOVA of the intimacy scores as a function of homophobia and sex of target person showed significant effects of target person on six of the eight intimacy measures ($p < .000$-$.02$). Thus males expressed more intimacy toward their female other than their male other. After the perceived paternal variables were regressed on the homophobic scale, no significant predictors were found. However, sex-role enforcement did appear indirectly. The study implies that the more masculine sex-role identification achieved by males with their fathers (which is highly influenced by the amount of sex-role enforcement), the more homophobic males tend to be. It follows that if male-male relationships are less intimate with each other as a result of their masculine sex-role enforcement by the father, then, the father-son relationship would also be affected (i.e., less father nurturance, empathy, etc.).

The developmental hypothesis of identification has been clearly validated as a stronger impetus for identification among boys with their fathers. Generally, fathers who are

seen as nurturant and warm are more readily imitated than punitive and controlling fathers.

Perceived Father Control and Identification

Bronson, Katten and Livson (1958) conducted a longitudinal study which focused on the patterns of authority and affection within family systems. The authors wanted to know to what extent do the retrospective assessments of one's parents affect the actual behavior toward their own children as well as measuring their children's perceptions of them. The study used data from a previous longitudinal study. Fifty boys and 50 girls and their parents were selected as subjects from this source of data. The subjects were 76% white, 8% were not native born Americans, 66% of the families were Protestants, 20% were Catholic, and the education level of the fathers and mothers were 11.9 and 11.5, respectively.

The subjects were rated as high or low on authority and affection by a rater who was highly familiar with the case records of all families. Authority was rated by the parent as the amount of control their own parents tried to enforce on them. Affection was rated in a similar fashion. The results showed that fathers remembered their mothers as being significantly more affectionate than their fathers and the fathers were considered to be a greater source of authority. Interrelationships between parents' perceptions and their

behavior toward the child indicated that fathers show a similar tendency to emulate the same-sex parent but, for them, it is in the area of affection that the relationship prevails. This lends support to the developmental hypothesis of identification. Mussen and Rutherford (1963), in a previously discussed study, found that father nurturance was more highly related to a son's identification with their own father than parental factors related to control. However, these researchers also found a tendency for boys with highly masculine interests to perceive their fathers as punitive and threatening. The authors concluded that highly salient paternal variables were powerful fathers with a balanced degree of paternal nurturance.

Moulton et al. (1966) purposed to determine if sex-typing will correspond more closely to the sex of the dominant disciplinarian when the later is also high in affection than when he is low in affection. One hundred and seventy-six undergraduate psychology students were administered a questionnaire which assessed their perceptions of their fathers behavior and the students sex-role preference. A chi-square test showed a significant tendency for sex-typing to correspond to the sex of the dominant disciplinarian. Sons with dominant fathers, tended to be masculine, while sons with dominant mothers tended to be feminine. Subjects' sex-typing corresponded more closely to

the sex of the dominant disciplinarian when the dominant disciplinarian is high in affection than when he is low. This also supports the study of Mussen and Rutherford (1963) and Bronson, Katten and Livson (1958).

In a similar study already discussed (Hetherington & Frankie, 1967), evidence was found which suggested that when children were given the choice between imitating a nurturant parent or a dominant, controlling parent, they tended to imitate the nurturant parent. However, when a nurturant parent was unavailable, children tended to imitate the more dominant parent. This is congruent with other studies measuring control and affection (Mussen & Distler, 1959; Mussen & Rutherford, 1963).

Biller (1969), previously discussed, conducted a study focusing on the role of father dominance and sex-role development. He concluded that when perceptions of father dominance was considered in terms of its components, father dominance in decision-making and competence seemed relatively more important than father dominance in nurturance and limit-setting. He also found that the boys' overall masculine development was significantly and positively related to the father's level of dominance. In fact, a high level of perceived father dominance was related to a high degree with all of the measured aspects of sex-role development.

MacDonald (1977) tested the social power theory of parental identification which suggests that the more parental power each parent is perceived to have, the higher the degree of adolescent identification with that parent. The authors delineated parental power into four major dimensions for each parent: outcome control, referent, legitimate and expert power. The study used a sample of 69 males and 80 females and assessed them on several identification variables. The subjects were college freshman and sophomores who were no older than 20 years of age, unmarried, from intact families, and living at home.

The findings in this study showed that the relationship of perceived power and adolescent's identification is stronger for the opposite-sex parent than for the same-sex parent. The strength of the relationship for the father is of similar magnitude with adolescents of either sex. The authors also found that the relationship for the mother is appreciably stronger for males than females. Males perceived the father as having significantly more total parental power, outcome-control power and expert power than mothers. Both males and females saw no appreciable differences in legitimate power by parent, which contradicts the commonly held belief that fathers are perceived as being more powerful than mothers. After a multiple regression of power variables

on identification was performed, referent power most consistently explains the largest variance in identification with both parents for both sexes. The one variable which is an exception is the salience of paternal expert power for paternal identification of the males. For both males and females, the paternal power variables account for more total variance in paternal identification, .256 and .268, respectively, than do the maternal power variables in maternal identification.

The authors concluded that "a major factor to be considered in the identificatory processes of the adolescent is not so much the cultural definitions of who should have certain types of knowledge or skills as with legitimate power, but the more personal perceptions of who <u>does</u> have the knowledge or skills" (p. 716). Adolescents tend to identify with the parent who is thought to have a more expert role in society. Perceived referent power was seen as having the strongest relationship to the adolescent's parental identification. Referent power is conceptualized as how the parent is perceived as providing guidance and advice which serves as a source of the adolescent's norms, values and attitudes. However, this variable seems to highly correlate with some of the other variables relating to power according to the researchers. In this study, support was found for the social power theory. In a later reexamination, MacDonald

(1980) found very similar results, yet the relationships were weaker. Proudian i(1983), who studied parental identification among Armenian-American adolescents, found that both boys and girls tended to identify more strongly with the same sex parent who was perceived to have more power.

Several theories of identification were discussed. Although some studies point to the saliency of social and paternal power as strong indices of filial identification, most studies have demonstrated that perceived nurturance from one's parent is a major factor in the imitation of that parent's behaviors.

Perceived Father Cognitive Involvement

Studies measuring cognitive involvement in father-son relationships have discovered that parents of high-achievers are more emotionally supportive at home and show more praise, approval, and interest in their children than parents of lower achieving children. Kimball (1952) was one of the first researchers to study the link between father-son variables and scholastic underachievement. The problem of her study was to investigate the relationship between personality factors and scholastic achievement. She expected to find a significantly higher number of the underachievers would reveal an essentially negative relationship with the

father than would be found in the total population. Also, she expected to find that aggressive feelings would be a source of guilt and anxiety more frequently among the underachievers than in the total population. Kimball was also the first to use a sentence completion instrument to assess the father-son relationship. Twenty subjects were used in the study, all were adolescent boys in residence at a preparatory school.

Responses to the sentence completion test were rated as positive, negative, or neutral in regard to father-son relationship qualities based upon the number of responses involving the father relationship. There was an inter-rater agreement on responses of 100% on over-all ratings and 96% agreement on the single items. The results supported the first hypothesis that underachievers rated their relationship significantly poorer than the high-achievers. A similar finding was discovered on the issue of aggression and guilt. This study demonstrates the influence that a poor father-son relationship can have on the cognitive functioning of his son.

Morrow and Wilson (1961) reported data on the family relations of bright high school boys making good grades as compared with bright high school boys making mediocre or poor grades. The authors expected to find the family relations of high-achievers as more emotionally supportive, greater parent

involvement and eqalitarian principles enforces, greater parental nurturance and rewards, less parent domination, more encouragement from parents, and greater harmony at home. The researchers used two equal groups of 48 high school boys of superior intelligence (120 IQ or above). The groups were equal in grade in school, socioeconomic status, and intelligence. Each group contained 19 ninth-graders, 14 tenth-graders, and 15 eleventh-graders. The students' family relations as seen by themselves were evaluated primarily by 16 self-report scales measuring family relations. The students were also asked to provide sociological data on parents' marital status, occupation, and education and on the ages and sexes of their siblings. As hypothesized, high-achievers more often than underachievers described these families as being more involved with each other in healthy activities, as having parents who were more supportive, approving and trusting, affectionate, encouraging with respect to achievement, and relatively nonrestrictive and nonsevere. They also accepted their parents to a greater degree. The two groups did not differ significantly in any of the sociological factors. The study suggested that cognitive success as measured by academic achievement thrives when the parents are seen as supportive, loving, and overall respectful of the child. Also, one of the influential features of parenting was how much the parents were involved

cognitively with the children. This involvement coupled with a high degree of nurturance seems to contribute to the cognitive development of children. A similar finding was reported by Crandall, Dewey, Katkovsky and Preston (1984). Their study used a younger sample of grade-school children.

In a series of studies by Radin (1972, 1973), she studied the specific effects of father-child interactions and the paternal behaviors as antecedents of intellectual functioning in young boys. In the first study, Radin purposed to determine the relationship between paternal childrearing practices, sex-role preference and intellectual functioning of four-year old boys. Her sample was composed of 21 lower-class and 21 middle-class white boys who would enter kindergarten the following year and their fathers. Fathers were interviewed as to their childrearing practices and were rated by two research assistants. After the child's sex-role preference and intelligence were measured, a Pearson product-moment coefficient was computed to determine the relationship between childrearing variables and intellectual functioning and sex-role preference. A regression equation was also used, using the intelligence measure as the dependent variable. A T-test was employed to determine the significant differences between the lower and middle class groups.

The results showed that the sex-role measure was not significantly correlated with intellectual functioning, but the quality of the father-child relationship showed a positive and significant relationship to intellectual functioning. Restrictiveness of the father was negatively correlated with intellectual functioning in the young boys. The author concluded that perhaps the poor intellectual functioning of the boys could provoke a more restrictive relationship with the father. An interesting find was also reported that showed that fathers who make demands upon their son's thinking processes tend to have sons with the greatest intellectual ability. Radin explains this demand, in conjunction with other positive factors may facilitate the child's ability to retrieve and acquire knowledge. The findings of this investigation suggest that fathering is relevant to the child's cognitive functioning, and should not be ignored by those studying the process, or attempting to modify the academic achievement of preschool-aged boys. In a follow-up study by Radin (1973) and her colleagues, Jordan and Epstein (1975), similar results were obtained. The first study added to the prior study by finding that fathers who spent time in fairly academic types of interactions, such as reading to the children, teaching them to count and read, appeared to facilitate the intellectual growth of the young boys.

Kelly and Worrell (1977) studied male and female college students and their perceptions of their own parents behavior in an attempt to link parent behaviors with cognitive functioning. The subjects in this investigation were 181 male and 301 female undergraduate students. The students ACT scores were used as a measure to correlate with parental behaviors. Among the males, ACT scores were positively related to the father's (but not the mothers) reported encouragement of cognitive curiosity and cognitive competence. This indicates that fathers who reinforce the son's inquisitiveness and general cognitive skills, facilitate their cognitive growth. These results are in agreement with the work of Radin (1972, 1973).

Goldstein (1983) studied father absence and cognitive development. The subjects used for the study were 7,049 youth from the age of 6 to 11 years old and 12 to 17 years old. Only black and white families were included in the study. The dependent variables in the study were cognitive skills which measured vocabulary, performance aptitudes as measured by arranging block designs, mathematic skills and reading ability. The independent variables were family type, income, and ethnicity.

After t-tests were performed, the results showed that youths who scored lower on vocabulary had absent fathers. The block design measure did not reach significance ($p < .01$)

when the racial and income groups were examined. Significant increments were found for IQ when white youths' fathers were absent and also were in income level II ($5,000 to $6,999). Reading and arithmetic scores showed a significant increment for black youth whose fathers were absent and in income level II. The authors concluded that the mean differences between youths whose fathers were absent and present were not consistently significant. This finding supports the idea that absence of fathers alone does not impede a child's school achievement or cognitive development.

The studies in this area have clearly demonstrated that fathers who are seen as warm and nurturing tend to have children who succeed academically and cognitively. Conversely, fathers who are seen as punitive and nonrewarding, tend to father children who are less cognitively involved and academically successful.

Summary of Literature Review

Several theories of identification were examined with an emphasis on the developmental hypothesis. This hypothesis has been confirmed in many research studies (Bandura & Huston, 1961; Hetherington & Frankie, 1967; Moulton et al., 1966; Mussen, 1961; Mussen & Distler, 1959; Mussen & Rutherford, 1963; Payne & Mussen, 1956). Essentially, these studies demonstrated that identification between fathers and

sons is facilitated by a warm, nurturing, and rewarding relationship. Some studies were identified which did not confirm the developmental hypothesis (Biller, 1969; Proudian, 1983). These studies tended to support a more defensive identification as proposed by Freud (1925). However, when the two theories were studied in opposition to each other, sons preferred to identify with a nurturant parent (Hetherington & Frankie, 1967; Moulton et al., 1966; Mussen & Distler, 1959).

Perceived fathering as a measure of fathering was discussed. This study affirms the view of Bronfenbrenner (1979) that person's perceptions are their reality, regardless of what actually occurred. Studies have shown that there are differences between the perceptions of parental behavior by children and the behaviors reported by the parents themselves (Zucker & Barron, 1971).

The review of perceived paternal nurturance and its role in the identification process demonstrated that sons are much more likely to identify with a nurturant father (or parent) than a nonnurturant one (Payne & Mussen, 1956) or a dominant one (Hetherington & Frankie, 1967; Moulton et al., 1966; Mussen & Distler, 1959). There is a tendency for boys to identify more strongly with their fathers than with their mothers (Proudian, 1983).

The review of paternal control and identification revealed a strong relationship in relation to filial identification (Biller, 1969; Bronson, Katten & Livson, 1958; MacDonald, 1977, 1980; Mussen & Rutherford, 1963). As noted earlier in this summary, paternal control was not demonstrated as being a more salient factor in filial identification than paternal nurturance.

The literature related to father cognitive involvement demonstrated that fathers play an important role in the cognitive development of their sons (Crandall et al., 1964; Kelly & Worrell, 1977; Kimball, 1952; Morrow & Wilson, 1961; Radin, 1972, 1973). These studies demonstrated that children who have appropriately involved, loving, and rewarding fathers have higher scores on instruments measuring cognition and intelligence.

The conclusions reached from this literature review suggest that paternal nurturance and control are salient factors in the filial identification process, with nurturance being demonstrated as more impressive and potent. These results also suggest the saliency of the developmental hypothesis of identification.

CHAPTER III

METHODS AND PROCEDURES

Subjects

The sample for this study was composed of a total of 90 subjects. All subjects were currently married and living with their spouse. Each subject had at least one male child (biological or adopted) between the ages of three and nine years of age. This age group was necessary to isolate in order to be consistent with the establishment of norms on the Iowa Parent Behavior Inventory. All subjects were obtained from a community situated close to a large state university located in the midwest portion of the United States. Subjects were obtained through use of a special telephone directory which listed the familial make-up as well as the address of the family. Six hundred appropriate families were identified and from that list, 250 families were randomly selected and were mailed a questionnaire packet. Of the randomly selected group, 90 fathers participated in the study by mailing back their questionnaires. This represents a 36% return rate. Although this is a below average return rate,

considering the length of the questionnaire to complete (30 minutes) and the nature of the instruments, this return rate is adequate.

Table 1 gives a description of the 90 subjects which were used for this study. Under the age category, 59 were in their 30's, 19 were in their 20's, and 12 were in their 40's. This shows a large representation of fathers (65.6%) in their 30's which responded to this questionnaire. Most of the subjects were either first born (29%) or second born (35.5%) within their family of origin. This particular sample was highly represented by formally educated persons, with 40% having obtained undergraduate degrees and 38.9% earning graduate degrees. The remaining subjects had obtained either an associate or high school degree. Most of the subjects reported having two children (51.1%), with three-children homes representing 23.3% of the total subject pool. Only 13.4% of these subjects had only one child, while 12.2% of the subjects reported having more than three children living in their household. Most of the subjects were living in intact homes at age 16 (88.9%), while only 7.8% were in single-parent homes, with 3.3% in other types of homes (i.e., living with other relatives).

Insert Table 1 About Here

Instruments

The Iowa Parent Inventory

Crase, Clark and Pease (1976) constructed the Iowa Parent Behavior Inventory (IPBI) as a means of measuring how one perceived themselves as being parented. The first revision of the instrument was developed using a wide "strata of occupational and socioeconomical levels of population" (Crase, Clark & Pease, 1976, p. 6). The second revision, developed in 1975, used a population of subjects who were primarily from a rural background. The instrument included a father and a mother form. For the purposes of the present study, only the father form was used and reported.

The authors of the IPBI purposed to design an instrument which would "help meet the need for parent behavior assessment. Behaviors rather than attitudes are the focus of this inventory" (Crase, Clark & Pease, 1976, p. 3). The authors feel that the parent-child dimensions measured by the IPBI are "salient" according to other researchers in the field of parent-child relationships (Yarrow, 1963).

Validity. The instrument was factor analyzed as a test of its validity in measuring parenting behaviors. The five dimensions revealed by the factor analysis were parental involvement, limit-setting, responsiveness, reasoning guidance, and intimacy. For this study, only parental

involvement, limit-setting, and responsiveness were used in data analysis so as to correspond with the factors of the Parent Behavior Form (Worrell & Worrell, 1975) to be described later. The means and standard deviations for the norm group are listed in Table 2. An exact match of factors is necessary in order to determine the extent of identification between perceived parenting behaviors given and perceived behaviors received by one's father. The following is a description of these dimensions as set forth by the authors in the IPBI manual:

> Parental Involvement--describes a parent who is actively involved with the child. The parent plays with the child, offers suggestions and helps the child with cognitive and physical tasks, involves himself with the child's activities, and facilitates the child's problem-solving.
>
> Limit-Setting--describes a parent who is consistent in setting and enforcing limits. Daily routines are defined. Predictability in limit setting is a characteristic of this parent.
>
> Responsiveness--describes a parent who responds promptly to the child's expressions of need. The parent may interrupt his own behavior to give timely assistance to the child. In this factor, while response time is an important aspect, it also

involves responding to the child's expressed or implied need, regardless of immediacy of expressed need (pp. 10-11).

Insert Table 2 About Here

The instrument is composed of 36 items with each item given a rating in which one is a low score and five is a high score for the characteristic described. Each rating was recorded on the Score Sheet in the Factor Item Raw Score column. The items within each factor were then summed to form the total raw score of that factor. This score was used in analyzing the data. The test took approximately five minutes to administer and was individually and group administered.

Concurrent validity has also been established on the IPBI. Elrod and Crase (1980) used the IPBI in a study designed to assess sex differences in self-esteem and parental behavior. The authors measured 49 boys and 45 girls between the ages of four and five years old and their parents to determine if parents behave differently toward boys than girls, does the difference of treatment, if present, relate to children's self-esteem, and does one sex have higher self-esteem than the other. Children were individually administered a modified version of the Woolner's Preschool Self-Concept Test (Woolner, 1966). The result of the study

indicated that fathers interact more with boys (-0.44 to -0.32, $p > .05$) and mothers interact more with girls (0.32 to 0.52, $p > .05$). However, mothers interacted more with both boys and girls than did the father, although no significant correlations were found between mothers' behaviors and self-esteem of sons. The authors also reported that some mothering behaviors were related to high self-esteem in girls and some fathering behaviors toward boys were related to low self-esteem in boys. Boys had higher self-esteem than girls.

Reliability. The following reliability estimates found in Table 3 were reported for each factor of the IPBI with a sample of 371 subjects. Unique variance refers to that variance which is directly attributable to the particular sample being tested. Table 4 shows the intercorrelation matrix of the items from the IPBI. The total reliability coefficients were computed using the usual Spearman-Brown formula with a sample of 371 fathers. The unique variance reliability coefficients were computed using a variation of the Spearman-Brown formula where the correlations among the items were generated from the loadings on a single factor. These generated correlations were averaged and used in the Spearman-Brown formula.

Insert Table 3 About Here

Insert Table 4 About Here

The Parent Behavior Form

The Parent Behavior Form (Worrell & Worrell, 1975) assesses parent behavior as it relates to perceived parent attitudes and childrearing behaviors. This instrument (see Appendix A) is composed of 117 items that describe the behavior of one's father from the perspective of the respondent. The respondent is asked to rate their fathers as being "like," "somewhat like," or "not like" the parent at the time the respondent was 16 years old. The PBF scales consisted of nine items for each of the following 13 scales: Warmth (W), Active Involvement (AI), Eqalitarianism (E), Cognitive Competence (CC), Lax Control (LC), Conformity (CO), Achievement (AC), Strict Control (SC), Punitive Control (PC), Hostile Control (HC), and Rejection (R). The means and standard deviations for fathers on the Parent Behavior Form are listed in Table 5. These 13 scales were factor analyzed into three parental dimensions: paternal nurturance/ rejection (PN), paternal control (PC), and paternal cognitive involvement (PCOG). The factor structure for males is shown in Table 6.

The scales range roughly on a warmth-rejection dimension and are ordered by the correlation of each scale with the

lead scale Warmth. The range of scores for any one scale extends from a low of 9 to a high of 27. The scales which are higher on the list have a closer correlation with Warmth. Scales which are lower on the list have a negative relationship with Warmth and scales near the middle have low or variable relationships, depending upon the parent being considered.

Insert Table 5 About Here

Insert Table 6 About Here

Reliability. Worrell and Worrell (1975) reported that the PBF is an empirically-derived inventory based on items pre-existing in perceived parent behavior and from clinical research. All items were revised in behavioral terms to describe what the parent actually does. All items were administered to 490 undergraduate students at the University of Kentucky. The Jackson Personality Research Form (PRF) (Jackson, 1967) was used as a criterion instrument with the PBF. The criterion established stated that all items between Jackson's instrument and the PBF that did not correlate with at least two scales of the PBF at the criterion level of $r = +.35$, would be eliminated. Scales were selected according to the resulting clusters, keeping nine items for

each cluster that loaded the highest. The items were labeled on the basis of inspection of the items.

Reliability was assessed by means of Cronbach's coefficient alpha (N = 535). The PBF reports reliability on the various scales ranging from .822 to .937 on the most reliable scale (Warmth) down to .367 to .634 on the least reliable scale (Conformity). Worrell and Worrell (1975) suggested that the Conformity scale be used judiciously. Reliability scores vary due to factors related to gender of the person completing the PBF.

Test-retest correlations (Worrell & Worrell, 1975) for PBF scales have been established using 212 undergraduates from the University of Kentucky. Kelly and Worrell (1978) reported that Kasak (1974), using undergraduate college students (N = 312, males = 202, females = 110) found reliable scores for both males and females and perceived parent behavior. After a two-week interval, subjects were retested. Kelly and Worrell (1978) suggested that the PBF is a reliable instrument for the assessment of perceived parent behavior.

Validity. Kelly and Worrell (1976) administered the Berzins-Welling ANDRO Scale which measures psychological androgyny, and the PBF in a counterbalanced design to 180 male and 300 female undergraduates. Based on gender, subjects were classified into only one of four sex-role categories: masculine, feminine, androgynous, and

undifferentiated. The differences between the parent scales demonstrated that perceived parental affection principally distinguishes male groups, whereas parental cognitive or achievement encouragement and permissiveness differentiate female sex-role categories. The least parental warmth and cognitive involvement consistently were reported by persons labeled as undifferentiated. Identified androgynous persons generally reported the highest parental warmth and cognitive involvement.

Kelly and Worrell (1977) related the parental cognitive behavior scales of the PBF with Jackson's PRF (1967) and subjects American College Testing Program (ACT) scores. The analysis revealed that PRF scales indicative of intellectual orientation and approach to tasks, as well as ACT scores, were related significantly to parental cognitive behaviors.

Kelly and Worrell (1978) have also reported that PBF scales have been related to several other salient areas of human behavior such as locus of control (Hasak, 1974). The results imply that how one was fathered may play a major role in the above mentioned areas.

Kelly (1975) factor analyzed the data from Kelly and Worrell (1976). Three factors were discovered across gender of respondent and gender of parent. Factor 1 is a warmth/ rejection dimension, Factor 2 represents parental control, and Factor 3 reflects parental cognitive involvement. These

principle components form 72.3% to 74.3% of the total variance. These studies land substantial support for the validity of the PBF.

Procedures

Data were collected for this study in the Fall of 1987. All subjects were obtained from a Midwest community in the United States which services a large state college. The subjects were identified through the use of a telephone directory which lists familial composition and addresses. Six-hundred families were obtained which were appropriate for the study. From this pool of possible subjects, 250 persons were randomly selected and a questionnaire packet was sent to them. This packet contained a cover letter, an informed consent letter, a respondent information sheet, a copy of the PBF, a copy of the IPBF, and a stamped return envelope. The potential participants were informed that: (a) this study will be used in dissertation research; (b) the confidentiality of their responses will be carefully observed; (c) participation is voluntary; and (d) feedback on the results of the study is available to them after the study is completed.

The "Respondent Information Sheet" gathered demographic data about each participant (Appendix B). The participants were asked their social security number (used only for

identification purposes), age, number of siblings, education level, marital status, number of biological and/or adopted children living in the same household with the respondent as well as ages of the children, respondent's race, and type of home the respondent was living at age 16 (intact, single parent, foster parent). After participants completed the "Respondent Information Sheet," the PBF and the IPBF were completed. Directions for completion and answer sheets were included. The respondents were also informed that the questionnaires would take about 30 minutes to complete. A self-addressed stamped envelope was included in the packet for easy mailing of the completed questionnaire.

After the packets were mailed, calls by persons not associated with the study were made to each subject encouraging them to complete the questionnaire and to make a commitment to do so. After three weeks, approximately 70 questionnaires had been received. A second phone call was made to those persons who made a commitment to return the questionnaires but had not done so. Within two weeks, 90 questionnaires had been received. All instruments were hand-scored. Three scores were derived from the PBF based upon the three factors previously identified on the PBF (Worrell & Worrell, 1975). A score on each factor was used in the analysis of the data. Three scores from the IPBI were also used based upon the factors previously identified and

discussed (Crase, Clark & Pease, 1976). These scores were also used in the analysis of the data.

Analysis of Data

Simple correlations were run on all of the independent, dependent, and demographic variables. The purpose of this procedure was to see if there were any significant correlations between the demographic and the independent and dependent variables. For each significant correlation, the control variables were partialed from all the independent and dependent variables. If a control variable was found to be important, it was discussed. Assumptions of a simple correlation are a normally distributed population, the sores must be from a genuine interval scale, and the variance in the treatment conditions or groups must be homogeneous. Since there were multiple dependent variables involved, a canonical correlation was employed next. Assumptions for the canonical correlation are normally distributed variables, elimination of multicollinearity and singularity in correlation matrices, and linearity between combination of variables. If there was one significant canonical correlation found, then three multiple regressions were run on each of the dependent variables. Assumptions for the multiple regression statistical technique are normality,

linearity, and homoscedasticity between predicted dependent variable scores and errors of prediction.

In order to determine which parental variables were most salient in terms of predictor and outcome variables, the scores of the IPBI and the PBF were compared. These scores were discussed as to their importance in relation to identification.

Research Questions

Research Question Number One

Does an overall significant relationship exist between how one perceived they were parented by one's father (i.e., the independent variate) and how one perceives they parent their own children (i.e., the dependent variate)?

Research Question Number Two

Does perceived parental nurturance received (PN) from one's father have a stronger relationship to how one parents than perceived paternal control received (PC) from one's father?

Research Question Number Three

Does a significant relationship exist between how one perceived their father was cognitively involved (PCOG) and how one perceives to demonstrate cognitive involvement in their own parenting (PPCOG)?

Summary

Subjects for this study were 90 married fathers. Procedures for the administration of the instruments and collection of data were discussed. The instruments used in this study and subsequently discussed in this chapter include: The Parent Behavior Form and The Iowa Parent Behavior Inventory. A description of the statistical procedures which were used to analyze the data was provided. Hypotheses for the study were stated.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

Presentation of Results

This chapter will deal with the presentation of the results. A brief explanation of the statistical techniques and procedures will be presented as well. The three hypotheses are presented with their corresponding results and detailed tables are presented to facilitate a conceptualization for the results.

In order to see if the demographic variables (age, birth order, number of children, and education level) were statistically significant related to the independent and dependent variable sets, a series of Pearson correlations were performed by using the Systat statistical program (Wilkinson, 1985). As presented in Table 7, the results of these analyses indicated that none of the demographic variables were statistically significantly correlated with the independent and dependent variable sets. Therefore, the demographic variables were not included in the canonical correlation run and no partialing was necessary. Subsequent

to conducting the run, a scatterplot of the residuals was performed. This plot allowed the researcher to observe any abnormalities in the data which may effect interpretation, such as the appearance of outliers or a severely skewed distribution of raw scores. This procedure demonstrated that the multivariate assumptions of linearity and normality were met, with no aberrations detected. Since no aberrations were detected, it was not necessary to alter the data in any way.

Insert Table 7 About Here

In order to test the three hypotheses, a canonical correlation was performed from two sets of variables. One variable set is the independent variable set (i.e., how one perceived themselves as being fathered) and the other is the dependent variable set (i.e., how one perceives themselves as fathering their own children). For this analysis, the variables which comprise the independent variate were operationally defined as perceived paternal nurturance received (PN), perceived paternal control received (PC), and perceived paternal cognitive involvement received (PCOG). The variables which comprise the dependent variate were operationally defined as perceived paternal nurturance given (PPN), perceived paternal control given (PPC), and perceived paternal cognitive involvement given (PPCOG).

Analysis of the canonical variates appear in Table 8. Three canonical roots were extracted in this procedure. The first root was statistically significant at the .05 level. The chi-square test of significance was 17.56, df = 9, $p < .05$ with a canonical R-square (redundant variance shared between the two sets of variables) of .15. The percent of variance which this canonical root accounted for was .39. No subsequent canonical roots were statistically significant. This indicates that the first, and only the first, canonical correlation accounts for the significant linkages between the two sets of variables.

With a cutoff rate of .3 for interpretation, the independent variables relevant in the canonical root are, in order, perceived paternal nurturance received (PN = .99), perceived paternal cognitive involvement received (PCOG = .66) and perceived paternal control received (PC = -.30). Using the .3 rate of cutoff, only PN and PCOG show salience within the independent variate as demonstrating a relationship to how one will father his own children, with PN being the principle variable and PCOG being a secondary variable.

Again, using the .3 cutoff rate, the dependent variables relevant in the canonical root, in order, are paternal cognitive involvement given (PPCOG) as the principle variable (.84) with paternal nurturance given (PN) being a secondary

variable (.61). Paternal control given (PPC) is almost non-existent in the dependent outcome variate (.10), indicating that fathers are not reporting that they are behaving in a controlling manner toward their children, but rather they are principally cognitively involved as well as nurturant. The canonical variates indicate that the perceived paternal nurturance and perceived cognitive involvement received by one's father plays the most important role in how one perceives they father their own children. In this case, fathers reported that they imitated both cognitive involvement and nurturance, but not control.

Insert Table 8 About Here

Research Question Number One

Does an overall significant relationship exist between how one perceived they were parented by one's father (i.e., the independent variate) and how one perceives they parent their own children (i.e., the dependent variate)? As discussed earlier in this chapter, there was an overall significant relationship between how one perceived they were fathered and how they perceive themselves as fathering (chi-square test of significance was 17.56, df = 9, $p < .05$).

Research Question Number Two

Does perceived parental nurturance received (PN) from one's father have a stronger relationship to how one parents than perceived paternal control received (PC) from one's father? Referring again to Table 8, this question was positively affirmed because how one perceived themselves to be nurtured (PN) had the highest canonical loading (.99) of all the variables in the independent variate and was reported to be strongly imitated in the dependent variate (PPN = .61). This demonstrates that the fathers who participated in this study reported that they were very nurturant to their children, suggesting an identification with the way they were fathered. Perceived paternal control (PC) had virtually no relationship (less than .30) to how one perceives that they parent their own children. This sample reports that they are demonstrating more nurturant behaviors than controlling behaviors (PPN = .61; PPC = .10), supporting the developmental theory of identification (Mowrer, 1950).

Research Question Number Three

Does a significant relationship exist between how one perceived their father was cognitively involved (PCOG) and how one perceives to demonstrate cognitive involvement in their own parenting? Table 8 demonstrates this research question was positively affirmed since PCOG was the second

most salient variable in the independent variate with a canonical loading of .66. This variable had the second strongest relationship to how one perceived themselves as fathering their own children. How one perceives themselves as cognitively involved with their own children (PPCOG) represented the strongest loading in the dependent variate (.84), suggesting that this sample reported more cognitive involvement than nurturance or control.

CHAPTER V

DISCUSSIONS, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Review and Summarization

This study was designed to examine detailed aspects of how one was fathered and trace the relationship of how one was fathered with one's perceptions of how they behave as a father. The question this study was designed to address is:

> What is the relationship between perceived paternal nurturance and sons forming an identification with the father as evidenced by sharing similar attitudes and behaviors regarding childrearing?

The purpose of the study was to demonstrate that paternal nurturance is a more salient factor in determining parenting behaviors than paternal control.

An extensive literature review was conducted. This review focused on the examination of the developmental hypothesis, which asserts that identification between fathers and sons is facilitated by a warm, nurturing, and rewarding relationship. Although the review also showed a relationship between paternal control and filial identification, the

evidence of the review was weighted more heavily in favor of the developmental hypothesis as a more potent and impressive factor.

The methods of the study were also discussed. Ninety subjects were obtained from a Midwestern community which services a large state university. Instruments used to collect data were The Parent Behavior Form and The Iowa Parent Behavior Inventory. Information was gathered through the implementation of a mailout questionnaire packet. Statistical analyses used on the data was the multivariate procedure known as canonical correlation. This procedure allows multiple independent and dependent variables to be simultaneously analyzed.

Conclusions, Discussion and Implications of Results

It should be noted that the parenting process is extremely complex with many variables that comprise it's outcome. This study is not attempting to predict how someone may or may not father their children based upon the fathering they received as a child. Rather, this study is interested to see if relationships exist which may help explain how a person parents based upon the parenting one received.

The statistical analyses indicated that the fathers in this sample imitated their own fathers behavior by being both cognitively involved and nurturant. This sample reported very little controlling and/or punitive behaviors as parents as an outcome to how they were parented. Even though controlling behaviors were reported by the sample from their own fathers, they did not report that they were themselves controlling with their own sons. This particular sample imitated behaviors conversely. In the independent variable set, PN (paternal nurturance received) and PCOG (cognitive involvement received) were the two most heavily weighted variables, respectively. Yet, in the dependent variate, PPCOG (paternal cognitive involvement given) and PPN (paternal nurturance given) were the most salient variables, respectively. This indicated that the fathers imitated the cognitive behaviors more strongly than the nurturant behaviors.

This study suggests that how one is fathered effects how one fathers his own children. More specifically, if one receives paternal nurturance as a child, the child may tend to show more paternal nurturance and cognitive involvement with their own sons. The canonical analysis technique used in this study allows the study of parental variables as they occur in real life, that is, as they interact with each other, not in isolation. Therefore, their effects are most

efficiently realized by statistically measuring them together. This is a strong aspect of this study. But even with using this advanced technique, cause and effect cannot empirically be known. Because the canonical correlation technique is a pinnacle technique, no post hoc of follow-up tests are applicable.

This study is relatively unique in that it focuses on the role of paternal nurturance as an identification factor from the viewpoint of adult children. Virtually all of the previous research which focuses on the influence of paternal nurturance was conducted with children as the main target of measurement (Brook, Whiteman & Gordon, 1981; Hetherington & Frankie, 19679; Mussen, 1961; Mussen & Rutherford, 1963; Payne & Mussen, 1956; Proudian, 1983; Sears, 1953). These studies, however, indicated that paternal nurturance was a more salient factor than paternal control in the process of identification.

The findings in this study support Mowrer's developmental hypothesis of identification (1950) which suggests that sons tend to imitate nurturant models rather than controlling and punitive models. The present study demonstrated that perceived paternal nurturance received (how one was fathered) accounted for a large portion (canonical loading = .99) of the variance associated with how adult sons fathered their own children. Although the subjects reported

that their fathers were controlling to a certain extent (PC = .30), they did not report that they imitated these controlling behaviors (perceived paternal control given (PPC) = .10).

Several possibilities exist about the role of paternal nurturance as it relates to filial identification. First, this study suggests that perceived paternal nurturance is indeed a stronger influence on sons than paternal control as suggested by the previously mentioned research. This sample of fathers clearly reported a higher degree of nurturant behaviors (perceived paternal nurturance (PPN) = .61) than perceived paternal control (PPC = .10).

A second possibility to conjecture about the results of this study is that those who chose to participate in the study were highly involved fathers who are highly nurturant and mature as parents. The sample was a highly educated group of fathers (78.9% had at least an undergraduate degree) who were mostly in their 30's (65.6%). Perhaps persons who are in their 30's tend to be more nurturant than a sample of teenaged fathers or even 20 year old fathers based on their increased developmental level of maturity. Persons in this age group may be more resolved about the relationship with their own parents and have less of a need to be controlling with their children.

A last possibility is that the nature of the measurement procedures may account for some of the results. Although perception studies have been validated (Bronfenbrenner, 1979; Meese & Stollack, 1977), research has demonstrated that perceptions about how one was parented can change over time (Serot & Teevan, 1961). As people develop into older adults, they may view their parents (fathers in this case) as being more nurturant and/or controlling than they actually were. This is a basic problem with perception studies in general. As mentioned earlier, the developmental level of the fathers as evidenced by their age may help to explain the increased emphasis on nurturance as well.

It is also interesting to note that, although this sample was a highly educated one, the influence of education on how one was fathered or how one fathered was not statistically significant. Previous studies (Goldstein, 1983; Kimball, 1952; Morrow & Wilson, 1961; Radin, 1972, 1973) suggest that children who excel academically have more supportive and nurturant fathers, yet the education level of the subjects and how the subjects were parented did not reach significance. This finding seems contradictory to the previous studies and is not immediately explicable.

This study has several practical implications. For those persons who are fathers, this study offers a great deal of support for their continued efforts at being an active and

nurturant parent. This study points to the ever-increasing body of material that fathering is a crucial and motivating aspect of a son's life. As the literature review in Chapter II revealed, little research has been done on the actual imitation of behaviors from father to son, especially with adult sons. This study implies that the art of fathering does not go unnoticed by their children. Hopefully, this study is an encouragement to those persons who take their job as a father seriously.

This study also has implications for persons in the service fields, such as psychologists, counselors, social workers, family workers and ministers. This study also points to the long-lasting effects of being a nurturing parent. Evidence presented here suggests that parenting programs which focus on the teaching of nurturant behaviors may have a major impact on the identification factors of male children in terms of future parenting behaviors. This study also suggests that fathers who show nurturing behaviors toward their sons will have a better chance of having their sons imitate these behaviors later on as a parent. Perhaps this study will further encourage counselors of child-abusers, dominating macho-type males, or other ineffectual parenting styles to use a more powerful and long-lasting technique of influencing behavior, that is, the practice of nurturance.

Sociologically, the role of nurturance has traditionally been associated with women. This study lends a great deal of support to the changing values in our society regarding the active role of fathers in the childrearing duties. The fathers of this study not only stressed the importance of cognitive involvement as evidenced by reading to their children or participating in educational activities, but by showing a great deal of nurturing behaviors. This study has given the American male support to be sensitive and nurturing with the increased hope that their sons will respond to this nurturance by first identifying with it, then imitating the nurturance in their own childrearing behaviors.

If indeed fathers do become more nurturant as parents on a macrocosmic level, this will have an impact on the American family and eventually the American society. When the father ceases to be the feared and punitive parent, this role may be transferred to the mother from time to time. From a systemic point of view, the balance of "power" may shift as the couples struggle to create a homeostatic environment, not only at home, but in the workplace as well. Males could conceivably begin fulfilling more traditionally nurturant roles outside the home, such as child-care employees or primary grade school teachers. Males may also see the advantage of being more emotionally supportive with their wives, forcing the male-female intimacy issues into a

direct confrontation. These changes may be seen as threatening to both sexes and will meet with resistance on societal and individual systems of interactions. If credence and support is given, as this study does, to males becoming more nurturant, society will be affected on multiple levels.

Suggestions for Future Research

There are many areas to consider regarding the improvement of this area of research. First, the study of parenting, both from how one was parented and how one parents, is a very complex process. A problem encountered in this research study was a disregard of the maternal influences which may affect how a son parents his own children. This study focused primarily on the father-son dyad. However, the interactions of parenting styles between mothers and fathers needs to be persistently studied as well. The role of both maternal and paternal nurturance as they occur together would be most helpful as this area is further explored. Questions such as "How does the nurturance, control and cognitive involvement of both mother and father interact to influence identification with their children?" would be helpful to explore. Other interactions such as spousal influences or peer influences might also be helpful to explore.

Secondly, factors such as the responsiveness of the child to nurturance would also be helpful to research. The study of the interaction of personality types with parenting styles would be interesting and helpful toward understanding how identification occurs. Associated with this area of emphasis would be the receptibility of particular personality types with the areas of parenting discussed in this study. Do some people more readily respond to parental nurturance than others and what factors are involved with the identification of these behaviors? To what extent is parenting effected by the behavior of the child, with parenting becoming more a reaction to the child? These and other questions regarding the interaction between parent and child would contribute to this and previous research.

Third, a factor which may be related to imitation and identification of behavior which may warrant further study would be the cognitive involvement of parents. This study suggested that if fathers received nurturance, they tended to be more cognitively involved as well as nurturant. This finding may be indicative of this particular population of fathers since this sample was taken from a college community. It is possible that a broader and more diverse population of fathers may yield different results. However, another explanation for the large amount of cognitive involvement demonstrated with this population is that fathers who

received paternal nurturance may experience feelings associated with a greater sense of freedom to make choices with how they will parent their own children. The receiving of nurturance may not only increase a sense of freedom but a sense of accomplishment and increased self-esteem. These factors may contribute to why fathers in this study were so cognitively involved. This area needs further exploration.

Fourth, as is true with many questionnaire studies, this study was limited due to the nature of questionnaires. A problem encountered in this study was finding appropriate instruments in which to measure parenting behaviors. Questionnaire research is the main tool used to assess parenting behaviors, but there are inherent problems associated with this information gathering. The possibility exists that people who respond to parental questionnaires such as was used in this study may be persons who are more interested and involved as parents. There may be a tendency for persons to report themselves more favorably as well. This could bias the results. Ways of conducting this research which minimize bias factors are desperately needed to improve the results of these types of studies. Perhaps setting up situations which allow researchers to actually observe parental behaviors may be areas to explore with future parenting research, although this has inherent problems as well. Researchers interested in the area of

measurement may contribute in the parenting area of study by comparing and contrasting different means of measuring parental behaviors. This would help to support research which used the various techniques of measurement.

A problem encountered with this study which should be avoided is an over-representation of highly educated fathers. Although a random selection was used, the subjects who responded to this questionnaire tended to be persons with at least an undergraduate degree. This may be avoided if the subject pool was obtained from a community which did not service a university. In terms of future research, tapping the more stereotypic, less educated male would be helpful for studying the differences which exist between this population and the population studied in this research. Also, this study sampled a white population and caution in generalizing to other groups is in order. The study of other races and cultures in regard to fathering would contribute to both the common threads which run through all fathering behaviors as well as the diverse differences which exist due to cultural and racial influences.

REFERENCES

Bandura, A., & Huston, A. C. (1961). Identification as a process of incidental learning. Journal of Abnormal Social Psychology, 63, 311-318.

Bandura, A., & Walters, R. H. (1963). Adolescent aggression: A study of the influence of childrearing practices and family interrelationships. New York: Ronald Press.

Barnett, M. A., King, L. M., Howard, J. A., & Dino, G. A. (1980). Empathy in young children: Relation to parent's empathy, affection, and emphasis on the feelings of others. Developmental Psychology, 16(3), 243-244.

Baruch, G. K., & Barnett, R. C. (1979). Father's participation in the care of their preschool children. Unpublished manuscript, Wellesley College.

Biller, H. B. (1969). Father dominance and sex-role development in kindergarten-age boys. Developmental Psychology, 1, 87-94.

Biller, H. B. (1971). Father, child, and sex role: Paternal determinants of personality development. Lexington, Mass.: Heath Lexington Books.

Biller, H. B. (1981). The father and sex-role development. In M. E. Lamb (Ed.), The Role of the Father in Child Development (pp. 319-358). New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Biller, H. B., & Soloman, R. S. (1986). Child maltreatment and paternal deprivation. Lexington, Mass.: Heath Lexington Books.

Bowerman, C. E., & Bahr, S. J. (1973). Conjugal power and adolescent identification with parents. Sociometry, 36(3), 366-377.

Brenton, M. (1966). The American male. New York: Howard-McCann, Inc.

Bronfenbrenner, U. (1958). The study of identification through interpersonal perception. In R. Taqiuri & L. Petrullo (Eds.), Person Perception and Interpersonal Behavior. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Bronfenbrenner, U. (1960). Freudian theories of identification and their derivatives. Child Development, 31, 15-40.

Bronfenbrenner, U. (1979). The ecology of human development: Experiments by nature and design. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Brook, J. S., Whiteman, M., & Scovell, A. (1981). The role of fathers in son's marijuana use. Journal of Genetic Psychology, 138(1), 81-86.

Bronson, W. C., Katten, E. S., & Livson, N. (1958). Patterns of authority and affection in two generations. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 58, 143-152.

Burton, R. V., & Whiting, J. W. M. (1961). The absent father and cross-sex identity. Merrill-Palmer Quarterly, 7, 85-95.

Crandall, V. J., Dewey, R., Katkovsky, W., & Preston, A. (1964). Parent's attitudes and behaviors and grade school children's academic achievements. Journal of Genetic Psychology, 104, 53-66.

Crase, S. J., Clark, S., & Pease, D. (1976). Iowa Parent Behavior Inventory. North Central 124 Regional Research Project, Iowa State University, Home Economics Experiment Station Project No. 2019.

Devlin, P. K. & Cowan, G. A. (1985). Homophobia, perceived fathering, and male intimate relationships. Journal of Personality Assessment, 49, 467-472.

Droppleman, L. F., & Schaefer, E. S. (1963). Boys' and girls reports of maternal and paternal behavior. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 67(6), 648-654.

Elrod, M., & Crase, S. (1980). Sex differences in self-esteem and parental behavior. Psychological Reports, 46, 719-727.

Emmerich, W. (1959a). Parental identification in young children. Genetic Psychology Monographs, 60, 257-308(a).

Emmerich, W. (1959b). Young children's discrimination of parent and child roles. Child Development, 30, 403-419(b).

Emmerich, W. (1961). Family role concepts of children aged six to ten. Child Development, 32, 609-624.

Feshbach, J. B. (1980). The beginnings of fatherhood. Unpublished manuscript, Yale University.

Fish, K. D., & Biller, H. B. (1973). Perceived childhood paternal relationship and college females personal adjustment. Adolescence, 8, 415-420.

Foster, J. E. (1964). Father images: Television and ideal. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 26, 353-355.

Freud, S. (1921). Group psychology and the analysis of the ego. London: Hogarth.

Freud, S. (1925). Mourning and melancholia. In Collected Papers, Vol. IV (pp. 152-170). London: Hogarth.

Freud, S. (1949). The passing of the Oedipus-complex. In Collected Papers, Vol. II (pp. 269-282). London: Hogarth.

Fry, P. S. (1982). Paternal correlates of adolescent's running away behaviors: Implications for adolescent development and consideration for intervention and treatment of adolescent runaways. Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology, 3(4), 347-360.

Funkenstein, D. H., King, S. H., & Drolette, M. E. (1955, June). Perceptions of parents and social attitudes. (Paper presented at the American Psychopathological Society, Los Angeles, California.)

Goldstein, A. A. (1983). Fathers absence and cognitive development of children over a 3-5 year period. Psychological Reports, 52(3), 971-976.

Goodenough, E. W. (1957). Interest in persons as an aspect of sex difference in the early years. Genetic Psychology Monographs, 55, 287-323.

Gorer, G. (1948). The American people: A study of national character. New York: Norton.

Harris, I. D., & Howard K. I. (1978). Phenomenological correlates of perceived quality of parenting: A questionnaire study of high school students. Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 8, 171-180.

Harris, I. D., & Howard, K. I. (1984). On psychological resemblance: A questionnaire study of high school students. Psychiatry, 47(2), 125-134.

Hasak, P. (1974). Relationship between locus of control, parental antecedents, and personality dimensions. (Unpub. Master's thesis, University of Kentucky.)

Henderson, J. (1980). On fathering (The nature and functions of the father role). Canadian Journal of Psychiatry, 25(5), 403-430.

Hetherington, E. M., & Frankie, G. (1967). Effects of parental dominance, warmth, and conflict on imitation in children. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 6, 119-125.

Hurlburt, J. D. (1984). Empathy and perceptions of parent behavior. Unpublished dissertation.

Jackson, D. N. (1967). Personality research form manual. Gosehn, New York: Research Psychologists Press.

Jacob, M. A., Spilken, A. Z., Norman, M. M., Anderson, L., & Rosenheim, E. (1972). Perceptions of faulty parent-child relationships and illness behavior. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 39(1), 49-55.

Jordan, B. E., Radin, N., & Epstein, A. (1975). Paternal behavior and intellectual functioning in preschool boys and girls. Developmental Psychology, 11, 407-408. Transparent Self (pp. 168-172). New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Kagan, J. (1958). The concept of identification. Psychological Review, 65, 296-305.

Kagan, J. (1965). The child's perception of the parent. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 53, 257-258.

Kelly, J. A. (1973). An investigation of several personality and parental correlates to the support or opposition of women's liberation. (Unpublished Master's thesis, University of Kentucky.)

Kelly, J. A. (1975). Parent behavior, personality and cheating. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Kentucky.)

Kelly, J. A., & Worrell, L. (1976). Parent behaviors related to masculine, feminine, and androgynous sex-role orientations. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 44(5), 843-851.

Kelly, J. A., & Worrell, L. (1977). The joint and differential perceived contribution of parents to adolescents' cognitive functioning. Developmental Psychology, 13, 282-283.

Kelly, J. A., & Worrell, L. (1978). Personality characteristics, parent behaviors, and sex of subject in relation to cheating. Journal of Research in Personality, 12, 179-188.

Kimball, B. (1952). The sentence completion technique in a study of scholastic underachievement. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 16, 353-358.

Lamb, M. (1981). The role of the father in child development. New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Maccoby, E. E., & Jacklin, C. N. (1974). The psychology of sex differences. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

MacDonald, A. P., Jr. (1971). Internal-external locus of control: Parental antecedents. Journal of Consulting and CLinical Psychology, 37, 141-147.

MacDonald, G. W. (1977). Parental identification by the adolescent: A social power approach. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 39, 705-719.

MacDonald, G. W. (1980). Parental power and adolescents' parental identification: A reexamination. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 42, 289-296.

Miller, N. E., & Dollard, J. (1941). Social learning and imitation. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Michaels, G. Y., Messe, L. A., & Stollack, G. E. (1977, May). Relationships among children's perceptions of parent behavior, parents' influences of their children's perceptions, and parents' self-perceptions. (Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Midwestern Psychological Association, Chicago, Illinois.) ERIC Document Reproduction Service #ED 145-306

Morrow, W. R., & Wilson, R. R. (1961). Family relations of bright high-achieving and under-achieving high school boys. Child Development, 32, 501-510.

Moulton, P. W., Burnstein, E., Liberty, D., & Altucher, N. (1966). The patterning of parental affection and dominance as a determinant of guilt and sex-typing. Personality and Social Psychology, 4, 356-365.

Mowrer, D. H. (1950). Identification: A link between learning theory and psychotherapy. In O. H. Mowrer (Ed.), Learning Theory and Personality Dynamics. New York: Ronald Press.

Mussen, P. H. (1961). Some antecedents and consequences of masculine sex-typing in adolescent boys. Psychological Monographs, 75, Whole No. 506.

Mussen, P. H. (1967). Early socialization: Learning and identification. In T. M. Newcomb (Ed.), New Directions in Psychology, Vol. 3. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

Mussen, P. H., & Distler, L. (1959). Masculinity, identification, and father-son relationships. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 59, 350-356.

Mussen, P. H., & Rutherford, E. E. (1963). Parent-child relationships and parental personality in relation to young children's sex-role preferences. Child Development, 34, 589-607.

Nowicke, S., & Segal, W. (1974). Perceived parental characteristics, locos of control orientation, and behavioral correlates of local of control. Developmental Psychology, 10(1), 33-37.

Parsons, T. (1954). The father symbol: An appraisal in the light of psychoanalytic and sociological theory. In L. Bryson, L. Finkelstein, R. M. MacIver, & R. McKeon (Eds.), Symbols and Values. New York: Harper & Row.

Parsons, T. (1955). Family structure and the socialization of the child. In T. Parsons, & R. F. Bales (Eds.). Family Socialization and Interaction Process. Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press.

Parsons, T. (1958). Social structure and the development of personality: Freud's contribution to the integration of psychology and sociology. Psychiatry, 21, 321-340.

Payne, D. E., & Mussen, P. H. (1956). Parent-child relations and father identification among adolescent boys. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 52, 358-362.

Price-Bonham, S., Pittman, J. F., & Welch, C. O. (1981). The father role: An update. Infant Mental Health Journal, 2(4), 264-289.

Proudian, A. (1983). Perceived parental power and parental identification among Armenian-American adolescents. Psychological Reports, 53(2), 1101-1102.

Radin, N. (1972). Father-child interaction and the intellectual functioning of four-year-old boys. Developmental Psychology, 6, 353-361.

Radin, N. (1973). Observed paternal behaviors as antecedents of intellectual functioning in young boys. Developmental Psychology, 8, 369-376.

Reuter, M. W., & Biller, H. B. (1973). Perceived paternal nurturance-availability and personality adjustment among college males. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 40, 339-342.

Rohrer, J. H., & Edmonson, M. S. (Eds.). (1960). The Eighth Generation. New York: Harper.

Schalin, L. (1983). Phallic integration and male identity development: Aspects on the importance of the father relation to boys in the latency period. Scandinavian Psychoanalytic Review, 6(1), 21-42.

Sears, P. S. (1953). Childrearing factors related to playing of sex-typed roles. American Psychologist, 8, 431 (Abstract).

Sears, R. R. (1957). Identification as a form of behavioral development. In D. B. Harris (Ed.), The Concept of Development (pp. 149-161). Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Sears, R. R. (1970). Relation of early socialization experiences to self-concept and gender role in middle childhood. Child Development, 41, 267-289.

Sears, R. R., Maccoby, E. E., & Levin, H. (1957). Patterns of childrearing. New York: Harper & Row.

Sears, R. R., Rau, L., & Alpert, R. (1965). Identification and childrearing. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Serot, N. M., & Teevan, R. C. (1961). Perception of the parent-child relationship and its relation to child adjustment. Child Development, 32, 373-378.

Sheehy, G. (1979). Introducing the postponing generation. Esquire, 92(4), 25-33.

Stinnett, N., Taylor, S., & Walters, J. (1973). Parent-child relationships of black and white high school students: A comparison. Journal of Social Psychology, 91(2), 349-350.

Swanson, G. E. (1950). The development of an instrument for rating child-parent relationships. Social Press, 29, 84-90.

Thomas, W. I., & Thomas, D. S. (1928). The child in America: Behavior problems and programs. New York: Knopf.

Westermarck, E. A. (1921). The history of human marriage. New York: Macmillan.

Whiting, J. W. (1960). Resource mediation and learning by identification. In I. Iscoe and H. W. Stevenson (Eds.), Personality Development in Children (pp. 112-126). Austin: University of Texas Press.

Wilkinson, L. (1985). Systat: The system for statistics. Evanston: Systat, Inc.

Woolner, R. B. (1966). Preschool self-concept picture test. Memphis: RKA Publishers.

Worrell, L., & Worrell, J. (1975). The parent behavior form. (Department of Psychology, University of Kentucky, Lexington, Kentucky.)

Yarrow, M. R. (1963). Problems of methods in parent-child research. Child Development, 34, 215-226.

Yarrow, M. R., Scott, P. M., & Zahn, Waxler, C. (1973). Learning concern for others. Developmental Psychology, 8, 240-260.

Zucker, R., & Barron, F. H. (1971, April). Toward a systematic family mythology: The relationship of parents' and adolescents' reports of parent behavior during childhood. (Paper presented at the Eastern Psychological Association, New York, New York.)

APPENDIXES

APPENDIX A

PARENT BEHAVIOR FORM AND SCORING SHEET

FATHER

1. Makes me feel better after talking over my worries with him.
2. Often praises me.
3. Lets me help to decide how to do things we're working on.
4. Really wants me to tell him just how I feel about things.
5. Wants me to know how and why natural things happen in the way they do.
6. Encourages me to develop after school skills and hobbies.
7. Lets me dress in any way I please.
8. Tells me to think and plan before I act.
9. Is unhappy that I'm not better in school than I am.
10. Sees to it that I know exactly what I may or may not do.
11. Insists that I must do exactly as I'm told.
12. It I take someone else's side in an argument, he is cold and distant to me.
13. Thinks I am just someone to "put up with."
14. Is able to make me feel better when I am upset.
15. Believes in showing his love for me.
16. Doesn't get angry if I disagree with his ideas.
17. Likes me to assert my own ideas with him.
18. Likes to discuss current events with me.
19. Provided me with puzzles when I was young.
20. Doesn't tell me what time to be home when I go out.
21. Tells me that good hard work will make life worth while.
22. Says that my teachers often expect too little of me.
23. Wants to know exactly where I am and what I am doing.
24. Believes in having a lot of rules and sticking to them.
25. Says I'm a big problem.
26. Makes me feel I'm not loved.
27. Makes me feel free when I'm with him.
28. Tells me how much he loves me.
29. Allows me to be myself.
30. Likes when I am able to criticize my own or others' ideas effectively.
31. Talks with me about philosophical ideas.
32. Has taken me to look at paintings, sculpture, and architecture.
33. Lets me do anything I like to do.
34. Sees to it that I keep my clothes neat, clean, and in order.
35. Wants me to know a lot of facts regardless of whether or not they have meaning for me.
36. Doesn't let me go places because something might happen to me.
37. Believes that all my bad behavior should be punished in some way.
38. Almost always complains about what I do.
39. Is never interested in meeting or talking with my friends.
40. Comforts me when I'm afraid.
41. Tells me I'm good looking.
42. Doesn't mind if I kid him about things.
43. Wants me to keep an open mind about my own or others' beliefs.

44. Points out the beauties of nature.
45. Has taken me to see a performance in a play or concert.
46. Doesn't pay much attention to my misbehavior.
47. Wants me to have the same religious beliefs as he does.
48. Says he would like to see me enter a profession which requires original thinking.
49. Is always telling me how I should behave.
50. Has more rules than I can remember, so is often punishing me.
51. Tells me I am immature.
52. Doesn't show that he loves me.
53. Cheers me up when I am sad.
54. Says I make him happy.
55. Enjoys it when I bring friends to my home.
56. Is pleased when I bring up original ideas.
57. Talks with me about how things are made.
58. Plays classical music when I am home.
59. Does not insist I obey if I complain or protest.
60. Taught me to believe in God.
61. Wants me to pursue a career in a scientifically related field.
62. Wants to control what ever I do.
63. Sees to it that I obey when he tells me something.
64. Often blows his top when I bother him.
65. Doesn't seem to think of me very often.
66. Has a good time at home with me.
67. Gives me a lot of care and attention.
68. Allows discussion of right and wrong.
69. Likes when I ask questions about all kinds of things.
70. Encourages me to discuss the causes and possible solutions of social, political, economic or international problems.
71. Buys books for me to read.
72. Excuses me bad conduct.
73. Encourages me to pray.
74. Says he would like me to be an important person some day.
75. Keeps reminding me about things I am not allowed to do.
76. Punishes me when I don't obey.
77. Whenever we get into a discussion, he treats me more like a child than an adult.
78. Changes his mind to make things easier for himself.
79. Is easy to talk to.
80. Becomes very involved in my life.
81. Is easy with me.
82. Tells me to stand up for what I believe.
83. Feels I should read as much as possible on my own.
84. Encourages me to be different from other people.
85. Can be talked into things easily.
86. Feels hurt when I don't follow advice.
87. Expects me to be successful in everything I try.
88. Is always getting after me.
89. Believes in punishing me to correct and improve my manners.
90. When I don't do as he wants, says I'm not grateful for all he has done for me.

91. Doesn't get me things unless I ask over and over again.

92. Seems to see my good points more than my faults.

93. Says I'm very good natured.

94. Tries to be a friend rather than a boss.

95. Gives me reasons for rules that he makes.

96. Encourages me to read news periodicals and watch news broadcasts on TV.

97. Requires me to arrive at my own conclusions when I have a problem to solve.

98. Seldom insists that I do anything.

99. Feels hurt by the things I do.

100. Is more concerned with my being bright rather than steady and dependable.

101. Decides what friends I can go around with.

102. Loses his temper with me when I don't help around the house.

103. Tells me of all the things he has done for me.

104. Asks other people what I do away from home.

105. Smiles at me very often.

106. Is always thinking of things that will please me.

107. Tries to treat me as an equal.

108. Trains me to be rational and objective in my thinking.

109. Encourages me to fool around with new ideas even if they turn out to have been a waste of time.

110. Wants me to find out answers for myself.

111. Does not bother to enforce rules.

112. Seems to regret that I am growing up and am spending more time away from home.

113. Prefers me to be good in academic work rather than in sports.

114. Tells me how to spend my free time.

115. Doesn't give me any peace until I do what he says.

116. Is less friendly with me if I don't see things his way.

117. Almost always want to know who phoned me or wrote to me and what they said.

APPENDIX B

RESPONDENT INFORMATION SHEET

RESPONDENT INFORMATION SHEET

This is a study focusing on father-son relationships. Do not put your name or the name of your children on this form. This will insure your anonymity. In the spaces provided below, please indicate your:

1. Social Security Number: _____

2. Age: _____

3. Sibling Information:

   How many brothers do you have? _____
   How many sisters? _____
   Among your siblings, what order were you born? _____

4. Education Level (Check One):

   Did not complete high school _____
   Completed a high school degree _____
   Completed an associates degree _____
   Completed an undergraduate degree _____
   Completed a graduate degree _____

5. Describe Marital Status:

   ___ Married; ___ Separated; ___ Divorced; ___ Widowed

6. If married, are you and your spouse presently living in the same household? Yes ___ No ___

7. List the ages of all of your biological and/or adopted male and female children living in your household.

Males	Females
1.	1.
2.	2.
3.	3.

8. What is your race?

   Black ___ Native American ___ Hispanic ___
   Caucasian ___ Other _____

9. At age 16, in what type of home were you living?

   _____ Intact home (two parents)
   _____ Single parent home
   _____ Foster parent home
   _____ Other (please describe): _____
   _____

10. Have you ever had any formal parenting courses/classes? ___ Yes ___No

Thank you for participating in this research study!

Table 1

Description of Subjects Age, Order of Birth, Education Level, Number of Children, and Home Environment At Age 16

Age		
20-29	30-39	40-49
19 (21.1%)	59 (65.6%)	12 (13.3%)
Range of Ages = 24-46 years of age		

Birth Order				
Only Child	1st Born	2nd Born	3rd Born	Other
2 (2.3%)	26 (28.8%)	32 (35.6%)	19 (21.1%)	11 (12.2%)

Education Level			
High School Only	Associate Degree	Undergraduate Degree	Graduate Degree
15 (16.7%)	4 (4.4%)	36 (40%)	35 (38.9%)

Number of Children			
One Child	Two Children	Three Children	Four or More Children
12 (13.4%)	46 (51.5%)	21 (23.3%)	11 (12.2%)

Home Environment at Age 16		
Intact	Single Parent	Other
80 (88.9%)	7 (7.8%)	3 (3.3%)

Table 2

IPBI Father Form Factor Means and Standard Deviations* for Norm Group (N = 371)

Factor	Items Per Factor	Mean	Standard Deviation
1	7	0.904	4.813
2	9	8.818	5.436
3	7	4.541	4.838
4	10	5.116	5.474
5	3	2.791	2.099

*Means and standard deviations are for the transformed 1 to 99 scale.

Table 3

IPBI Father Form Total Variance and Unique Variance Reliability Estimates

IPBI Father Form Total Variance Reliability Estimates	
Factor One (Parental Involvement)	.843
Factor Two (Limit-Setting)	.822
Factor Three (Responsiveness)	.810
IPBI Father Form Unique Variance Reliability Estimates	
Factor One (Parental Involvement)	.808
Factor Two (Limit-Setting)	.819
Factor Three (Responsiveness)	.783

Table 4

IPBI Father Form Factor Intercorrelations (N = 371)

Factor Number	1	2	3
1	1.000		
2	.255	1.000	
3	.416	.426	1.000

Table 5

Means and Standard Deviations for Fathers on the Parent Behavior Form for Norm Group (N = 83)

Scale	Fathers	
	M	SD
XC	20.33	4.44
AI	18.69	4.47
EG	21.36	3.81
CI	21.88	3.78
CU	18.30	3.91
CC	16.82	3.10
LC	14.43	3.08
CO	18.61	2.98
AC	16.00	3.33
SC	14.99	3.44
PC	16.86	3.48
HC	13.10	4.07
RJ	11.88	3.02
SD	25.20	2.65

Table 6

Parent Behavior Form Factor Structure, Males by Gender of Parent (N = 206)

Father					
Warmth		Control		Cognition	
W	.85	PC	.78	CU	.80
E	.78	SC	.76	CC	.77
AI	.75	CO	.72	AC	.70
CI	.65	HC	.43	CI	.60
CU	.38	LC	-.74		
PC	-.35				
HC	-.77				
R	-.85				
Percent Variance Contributed:					
45.4		28.6		26	

Table 7

Pearson Correlation Matrix (N = 90)

	Age	BO	EDUC	CHLD	PN	PC	PCOG	PPN	PPC	PPCOG
Age	1.000									
Birth Order	0.085	1.000								
Education	0.273	-0.279	1.000							
Children	0.172	0.160	0.122	1.000						
PN[a]	-0.053	-0.088	0.051	0.109	1.000					
PC[b]	0.083	0.077	0.038	0.021	-0.174	1.000				
PCOG[c]	0.034	-0.098	0.156	0.102	0.696*	0.154	1.000			
PPN[d]	0.167	-0.050	0.129	0.061	0.234*	-0.108	0.087	1.000		
PPC[e]	0.159	-0.086	0.195	0.065	0.047	0.042	0.093	0.394*	1.000	
PPCOG[f]	0.032	-0.026	0.167	0.034	0.333*	-0.049	0.294*	0.359*	0.456*	1.000

*$p < .05$.

[a]Paternal nurturance received.

[b]Paternal control received.

[c]Paternal cognitive involvement received.

[d]Paternal nurturance given.

[e]Paternal control given.

[f]Paternal cognitive involvement given.

Table 8

Canonical Loadings, Percent of Variance, and Redundancy Between the Independent Variate (How One Was Fathered) And the Dependent Variate (How One Fathers His Own Children

	Canonical Loading
How One Was Fathered	
Paternal Nurturance Received (PN)	.99
Paternal Control Received (PC)	-.30
Paternal Cognitive Involvement Received (PCOG)	.66
How One Fathers His Own Children	
Paternal Nurturance Given (PPN)	.61
Paternal Control Given (PPC)	.10
Paternal Cognitive Involvement (PPCOG)	.84

Percent of Variance = .39

Redundancy = .15

VITA

Alan Carl Campbell

Candidate for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

Thesis: PERCEIVED FATHERING AND IDENTIFICATION

Major Field: Applied Behavioral Studies

Biographical:

Personal Data: Born in Houston, Texas, March 16, 1956, the son of Derward E. and Betty D. Campbell. Married to Kay Celeste Campbell on May 26, 1979.

Education: Graduated from Galena Park High School, Galena Park, Texas, in May, 1974; received Bachelor of Fine Arts degree from Stephen F. Austin State University in December, 1978; received Master of Divinity degree from Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary in May, 1982; received Master of Science degree from Oklahoma State University in 1986; completed requirements for the Doctor of Philosophy degree at Oklahoma State University in July, 1989.

Professional Experience: Campus Minister, Baptist Student Unit (Texas and Oklahoma), August, 1979, to December, 1985; Instructor, Connors State College, Department of Religious Studies, August, 1982, to May, 1983; Marriage and Family Practicum Student, Oklahoma State University Marriage and Family Clinic, June, 1985, to May, 1986, also from June, 1987, to July, 1988; Teaching Assistant, Department of Applied Behavioral Studies in Education, Oklahoma State University, August, 1986, to July, 1988; Staff Psychologist, Oklahoma State University Hospital and Mental Health Clinic, July, 1986 to June, 1988.