

ADOLESCENT PERCEPTIONS OF
FATHER-SON INTERACTION

By

DEANNA R. WRIGHT TATE,
"/"/

Bachelor of Science

Oklahoma College of Liberal Arts

Chickasha, Oklahoma

1967

Submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate College
of the Oklahoma State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the Degree of
Master of Science
May, 1971

OKLAHOMA
STATE UNIVERSITY
LIBRARY
AUG 12 1971

ADOLESCENT PERCEPTIONS OF
FATHER-SON INTERACTION

Thesis Approved:

James Jackson
Thesis Adviser
Nick Stinnett
Frances Stromberg
D. D. Auburn
Dean of the Graduate College

788800

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author is indebted to Dr. James Walters, Professor, Family Relations and Child Development, for his ceaseless encouragement and valuable guidance throughout the course of graduate study and completion of this research.

Appreciation is also extended to Dr. Nick Stinnett, Associate Professor, Family Relations and Child Development, and Dr. Frances Stromberg, Associate Professor, Family Relations and Child Development, for their encouragement, suggestions, and comments in the critical reading of the manuscript. Their efforts have been most helpful.

Special thanks are extended to the staff and faculty of Edmond High School, and particularly Mr. Bill Martin, Principal, for permission to conduct testing in the school. Appreciation is expressed to Mrs. Willie Warren, Mr. Sam Sullivan, and Mrs. Cheryl Apple, faculty members, for the use of their classrooms and for their assistance in test administration; and especially to all the students who participated in the study. Without the willing responses of these students, the study could never have been undertaken.

Finally, an expression of appreciation must be extended to my husband, Ronald, and my son, Roger, whose patience, understanding, encouragement, and sacrifices have been so vital to the realization of this goal.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Purpose	3
II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE	5
Historical Perspective.	5
The Father-Child Relationship in the Family	6
Effects of Father Absence	8
Social Class and Child-Rearing.	9
Parental Behavior and Personality Characteristics	11
Conclusion.	15
III. PROCEDURE.	17
Description of Subjects	17
Measurement of Permissive Attitudes toward Father-Son Interaction.	18
Measurement of Background Variables	21
Administration of the Instruments	22
Analysis of the Data.	23
IV. RESULTS.	24
The Father-Son Interaction Test	24
The Item Analysis	24
Comparison of Responses	31
Relationship Between Scores and Selected Background Variables.	36
Relationship Between Scores and Selected Personality Characteristics	39
Summary of Findings	42
V. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS.	44
SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY	48
APPENDIX A.	52
APPENDIX B.	58
APPENDIX C.	60
APPENDIX D.	64

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
I. Characteristics of the Subjects	19
II. Discriminating Items on <u>The Father-Son Interaction Test</u> .	25
III. Number of Discriminating and Non-Discriminating Items Classified by Scenes.	30
IV. Percentage of Responses to Discriminating Items on <u>The Father-Son Interaction Test</u>	32
V. Kruskal-Wallis Analysis (H-Scores) of Permissive Attitudes; All Respondents Combined	36
VI. Kruskal-Wallis Analysis (H-Scores) of Permissive Attitudes Classified According to Sex	37
VII. Kruskal-Wallis Analysis (H-Scores) of Permissive Attitudes Classified by Selected Personality Characteristics	41

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

There are probably no interests more universal to parents than the subjects of child-rearing and family interaction. Any study of the psychological and sociological literature would indicate that family life researchers share this interest. Of special interest is the manner in which attitudes concerning behavior are transmitted from one generation to the next. The extent of diversity in the social structure in the United States makes it difficult to isolate the factors which are of primary significance. Not only do patterns of interaction and child-rearing differ from family to family; they also differ within the family depending upon the sex of the parent and the sex of the child.

Scholars, laymen, and researchers alike have long acknowledged the importance of the mothering role in the healthy development of children. This belief is widely supported by empirical evidence. Such interest in the mother as the primary source of parent-child interaction is only to be expected, since historically, she has been the parent who has provided nurturance, care, and emotional support. The father has been primarily considered in terms of his role as economic provider and as disciplinarian. However, because of a merging of male and female family responsibilities today, fathers find their function within the family much broader than previously was true.

More leisure time, more working wives, and a more equalitarian family structure are some of the reasons fathers have had increased contact with their children. The father's presence in the family has taken on increased importance, especially in the middle class, which comprises a majority of Americans. Whereas mothers formerly made the majority of the decisions concerning child-rearing methods, the techniques to be employed today are more likely to result from cooperative decision-making of both mother and father. In order to accomplish this, husbands and wives must resolve differences in opinion concerning methods to use and how restrictive or permissive parents should be with their children. Sons, because they are expected to identify with, and in some cases emulate their fathers, are especially likely to be affected by the father's increased importance in the child-rearing process.

Only recently have researchers become concerned with the limited amount of empirical evidence concerning the father role. Benson (1968) discusses this inadequacy at length in his book Fatherhood. Part of the reason for such a paucity of knowledge can be attributed to the fact that few research instruments have been developed which probe into the unique interaction which the father shares with his children. A promising technique developed by Doyle (1968) is a research instrument called The Father-Son Interaction Test which combines the use of a motion picture film in conjunction with a paper-and-pencil questionnaire. The test is designed to measure the intensity of restrictive and permissive attitudes in relation to father-son interaction. A restrictive attitude may be defined as that attitude toward father-son interaction which allows a minimum of flex-

ibility in possible behaviors. A permissive attitude tolerates many behaviors and allows flexibility and individual choice of behavior.

Purpose

It was the purpose of this study to investigate the permissive attitudes of adolescent girls and boys concerning father-son interaction, and to relate such attitudes to selected personality and background factors which might account for attitudes concerning father-son interaction. Since this age group is rapidly approaching the age of parenthood themselves, it was hoped this study would contribute to the body of knowledge available on this important topic. Better understanding should eventually enable parents to improve their ability to relate to their children.

Doyle's instrument, The Father-Son Interaction Test, was administered to determine those permissive attitudes relating to father-son interaction which were held by the individuals tested. These attitudes were related to variables suggested by the psychological and sociological literature as being possibly significant in explaining attitudes of adolescent girls and boys concerning a father's interaction with his son.

The specific hypotheses examined were the following:

1. There is no significant difference in permissive attitudes toward father-son interaction as expressed by adolescent boys and adolescent girls.
2. Permissive attitudes concerning father-son interaction of adolescent girls and of adolescent boys are independent of: (a) age, (b) type of present parenting, (c) agent of discipline, (d) type of discipline from the father, (e) type of discipline from the mother, (f) perceived closeness to the father, (g) perceived closeness to the mother, (h) degree of parental influence, (i) perceived closeness to the peer group,

(j) amount of time spent with the father, (k) agreement with the discipline method of the father, (l) agreement with the discipline method of the mother, and (m) behavior and personality characteristics.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Historical Perspective

Child-rearing practices have undergone considerable change over the decades. Sunley (1955) analyzed child-rearing practices from the years 1820-1860 and discovered that the most prevalent philosophy of the period was the idea of infant depravity. This philosophy held that when the infant was born, he was filled with sin and evil which was subdued by exacting complete submission and total obedience. The father was almost totally absent from the child-rearing process. According to Miller and Swanson (1958) many of these ideas were described a hundred or more years before the period from 1820 to 1860 and persisted without serious challenge until the middle of the 1930's still with practically no reference made to the father and child-rearing.

Studies beginning with the early 1940's indicate that there are social class differences in child-rearing methods. However, there is disagreement as to the direction of these differences. Some sources found that middle-class parents, especially mothers, were more rigid and demanding in child-rearing techniques than were lower-class parents (Davis and Havighurst, 1946). Other studies carried out in the 1950's found either the opposite to be the case or no significant differences between the two classes (Sears, Maccoby, and Levin, 1957,

and Davis and Havighurst, 1955). Hypotheses concerning this discrepancy fall into two types: (1) those which say that no change had occurred and that differences could be attributed to incomparability of the studies and (2) those which maintained that a real change had occurred. In a longitudinal study of child-rearing practices between the years 1932 and 1957, Bronfenbrenner (1958) concluded that an actual change in class patterns of child-rearing practices had occurred and that this change took place around the beginning of the 1940's with middle-class mothers becoming more permissive at that time. He makes the general observation that during this period parent-child relationships in the middle class are consistently reported as more acceptant and equalitarian, while those in the lower class are oriented toward maintaining order and obedience. The trend has been toward increased permissiveness until the past few years. Recently, child-rearing literature has indicated a return to firmer discipline. More recently, Gordon (1968) finds that the trend toward greater restrictiveness in child-rearing is indicated in popular periodicals.

Although these studies seldom specifically mention the father role, there is little reason to believe that these views on child-rearing were not shared by fathers in relation to the amount of time spent in interaction with their children.

The Father-Child Relationship in the Family

Social and economic changes in the Western Culture have brought about the possibility of increased time spent with the children by the father. Gardner (1947) found that fathers spent more recreational time with the daughters than with the sons. Both girls and boys

reported that they wished the father would show more love.

Many other factors seem to affect the relationships between a father and his children. Elder and Bowerman (1963) found that as family size increases parents are likely to be less flexible and more authoritarian, and to rely more frequently on strong child-rearing controls. The child is expected to assume a passive role more often, especially in relations with the father. Expressions of praise, comfort, and acceptance are likely to be reduced in frequency for each child.

Information in studies on identification is probably the most plentiful of any factor in the area under consideration by researchers. Two representative studies in this group are Mussen and Distler (1959) and Mussen and Distler (1960). These two studies both indicate the best masculine identification is made when the boys view their fathers as powerful sources of both reward and punishment. These fathers are more influential in determining child-rearing policies. The climate in the homes is in general relatively permissive, and non-punitive. Boys high in masculinity tend also to be high in conscience development. In a related study, Payne and Mussen (1956) found a significant relationship between high father identification and perception of the father as a highly rewarding, affectionate person. Likewise, Sears (1953) discovered in doll play that boys used the father doll more than girls did, and that positive choices for the same sex role are associated with warmth, permissiveness, and low restrictions.

In a study of schizophrenic patients by Kohn and Clausen (1956), the patients indicated that more frequently the mothers played a

strong authority role and the fathers a very weak authority role. In the male child, this suggests the likelihood that he experiences difficulty in establishing a male identification and in regarding himself as adequate in the performance of the male role.

That the quality of father-son interaction is of considerable importance is reflected in the research by Andry (1960) on delinquent boys. His findings were as follows: (a) delinquent boys felt inadequate love was given by their fathers, (b) that especially their fathers were embarrassed to show open affection for them, (c) that they had a tendency to be embarrassed to show affection for their parents, (d) that they tended to feel parental hostility toward them, and (e) that they tended to identify with their fathers less than non-delinquents. Andry says:

Thus the prime differentiating feature between delinquents and non-delinquents, as far as parental role playing is concerned, is the delinquents' perception of their father's role as being negative (p. 350).

Effects of Father Absence

Logic would indicate that if an adequate adult model is so important in the identification process, father absence would be particularly detrimental for boys. However, this does not appear to be the case. Greenstein (1966), in his study of father-characteristics and sex-typing, failed to find any significant differences between father absent and father present boys in any of the dimensions usually related to sex-typing. In their study of family influences and the father role, Peck and Richek (1964) quoted a study which concluded that among the group of 205 boys whose fathers had been absent, many of the effects often presumed to result from this absence could be

attributed to parental characteristics. Kopf (1970) discovered that the mother's attitude and behavior was crucial to the son's school adjustment in father-absent homes. Prior father-son relationship had no significance upon his adjustment.

Reasons for lack of confirmation of the belief in the detrimental effects of father absence may be explained in various ways. Barclay and Cusumano (1967) believe that the absence of an adequate male model within the family forces the male child to identify with male models in the external environment. Another possible explanation is that of Colley (1959) who states:

Even in a father's absence, an appropriately identified mother will respond to a boy "as if" he were a male and will expect him to treat her as a male would treat a female. ..Her interpretive approval or disapproval of his play with other male children...also serve to let him know what she expects of a male with male interactions (pp. 173-174).

This research seems to indicate that the parents' personalities and how they relate to their children is more important than the mere fact of father presence or father absence in the home.

Social Class and Child-Rearing

Social class is an often studied variable in research on child-rearing practices, but again research has focused on the mothering role. However, an understanding of the effects of social class is essential to an understanding of the father role.

Little research has been conducted concerning upper-class families, consequently little is known concerning this group. In comparison the lower and middle-class parent has been well characterized.

Miller and Swanson and collaborators (1960) state that the mid-

middle-class parent values formal education, rationality, a reputation for controlled behavior, hard work, responsibility and saving. He is an internally controlled being and, in turn, tries to pass along these internalized controls to his children. The middle-class culture is achievement motivated and future oriented.

Rosen (1964) found that middle-class boys tended to evaluate their parent's ability, performance, and drive more positively than did boys in the lower class. Middle-class fathers were more apt to be perceived as successful, ambitious, and smart. Boys in the lower class tended to perceive their parents as less secure than boys in the middle class. Middle-class boys were more likely than lower-class boys to report fathers who were interested in their school performance and more responsive to bids for attention.

Maccoby and Gibbs (1964) summarized the differences in upper-middle and upper-lower class methods of child-rearing as follows:

1. No significant differences in infant feeding practices.
2. Upper-lower class mothers more severe in toilet training and sex training.
3. Upper-middle class parents allow more freedom of expression of aggression toward parents.
4. Upper-lower class parents employ physical punishment, deprivation of privileges, and ridicule as controlling techniques. Upper-middle class parents use reasoning, praise, and withdrawal of love.
5. Upper-middle class mothers are warmer and more demonstrative toward children.
6. Upper-middle class husband-wife relation is one of more mutual affection and respect. Upper-lower class wives are more critical of husbands, and parents disagree more about the children.
7. No differences between classes in the extent of involvement of the father in child-rearing.
8. Upper-middle class mothers tend to be more permissive and less severe in their child-training than the upper-lower class mothers (pp. 286-287).

Lower-class characteristics differ considerably from those of the middle class. For instance, the lower-class citizen is usually

more oriented to the present than to the future. He values holding a job more than he does securing a formal education. He takes pride in his physical prowess. If his mother works, the son of the blue-collar worker may remain unsupervised by a responsible adult for much of the day (Miller and Swanson, 1958). These authors report that the lower-class mother is more likely to use physical punishment than psychological methods of discipline; therefore, it would be expected that her children would be more likely to give direct expression to aggression.

Kamarovsky (1967) found that in the lower class, the goals of child-rearing generally have moral connotations, for example, respectability, honesty, living a decent life, being a good citizen, and Christian. They want their children to be successful, but success is defined as a respectable job, a house, a neighborhood slightly above themselves in social status. Working class parents emphasized "traditional" values of obedience, neatness, and respect for adults. They want the child to conform to externally-imposed standards.

Parental Behavior and Personality Characteristics

An understanding of parental behavior and husband-wife interaction is vital to the understanding of the personalities of children. The child's personality is not the result of any one relationship, but it is influenced by the total complex of interpersonal relationships within the family.

In studying the personality characteristics of parents, Becker and others (1964) discovered that:

In families with conduct-problem children, both parents are maladjusted, give vent to unbridled emotions, and

tend to be arbitrary with the child. In addition, the mother tended to be active, dictatorial, thwarting, and suggesting, whereas the father tended not to enforce regulations (p. 299).

Becker says that the shy, sensitive child is often the product of a maladjusted, thwarting father.

Baumrind and Black (1967) discovered findings which dispel many previously held assumptions concerning child-rearing techniques. They found that placing demands on the child for self-control or encouraging independent action and decision-making facilitated responsible, independent behavior. Firm discipline in the home did not produce conforming or dependent behavior, but had an opposite effect, especially for boys. Firm, demanding parental behavior was not associated with punitiveness or lack of warmth. Just the opposite was true. These parents balanced high nurturance with high control and high demands with clear communication about what was required of the child.

Berkowitz (1964) noted that training for independence is important in the development of the achievement motive. Middle-class mothers of boys with high achievement motivation encouraged their sons to attain independent mastery in the area of leadership and initiative rather than just independence in activities related to caretaking. He goes on to say that parental indulgence or carelessness produced weak achievement needs in boys.

In considering the characteristic of achievement, Bartlett and Smith (1968) found that boys with a high need for achievement were more often first-born, had mothers who expressed disappointment with unsatisfactory behavior, and had mothers who were less nurturant.

Peck and Richek (1964) report that amoral children had chaotically inconsistent and rejecting families; expedient children had len-

ient but inconsistent family discipline, conforming children had consistent, severe, autocratic family discipline as did irrational-conscientious children; and rational-altruistic children had consistent, loving, truthful, and relatively democratic family treatment.

Aggression and aggressive models were examined by Bandura, Ross, and Ross (1961), who discovered that children exposed to aggressive models reproduced a good deal of aggression resembling that of the models. Imitation was found to be differentially influenced by sex of the model with boys showing more aggression than girls following exposure to the male model.

Rutherford and Mussen (1968) in studying the quality of generosity found that compared to a control group, generous boys viewed their fathers as warmer and more sympathetic. These boys were also rated as kinder, less hostile, and less competitive.

Siegelman (1966) found that extroverted children described loving mothers and fathers, while introverted children depicted rejecting parents. He reports that a relationship between rejecting parents and aggressiveness is seen for fathers and not for mothers. Fathers and mothers of dependent children were described as punishing and non-loving.

Baumrind (1966) in a study of parental control methods reported the following major conclusions:

- a. Direct methods of influence and power on the part of the parents, rather than nurturance withdrawal help the child learn to direct his energies willfully and feel responsible.
- b. When a child chooses an action for which he can expect punishment, and for which he is then punished, he gains important information upon which to base subsequent choices.
- c. Conscious control on the part of the parent, exerting power without bypassing the child's conscious will by

guilt-inducing techniques make the child more capable of becoming responsible and independent (pp. 903-904).

Parke (1967) and Hartup (1958) both found that nurturance withdrawal is more effective than continued nurturance in achieving compliance to demands of authority, although it produces more guilt feelings. Further collaboration is found in Bronfenbrenner (1961), who maintains that middle-class children excel those in the lower class in self-control, achievement, responsibility, leadership, popularity, and adjustment in general. This, he believes, is due to more effective socialization techniques (love-oriented nurturance withdrawal). It is the absence of sufficient warmth or discipline which more frequently impairs dependability. Boys tend to be more responsible when the father is the principal agent of discipline.

Although the effectiveness of nurturance withdrawal as a controlling technique is acknowledged, Baumrind (1966) questions the wisdom of its use. She feels that non-punitive discipline should include cognitive appeal and power, so that the child can learn to direct his energies willfully and so that he can feel responsible without running the risk of stimulating future self-punitive reactions.

Investigating parental interest and children's self-conceptions, Rosenberg (1963) found that parental disinterest is associated with lower self-esteem in the child. Students who report punitive responses tend to have lower self-esteem than those who report supportive responses, but students who report indifferent responses have lower self-esteem than either of these groups. Apparently this lack of love seems to represent the most extreme form of rejection.

Bronfenbrenner (1968) speculates as to the differential effects of discipline on children when he says:

Girls are rated by teachers to be more responsible; boys rated higher on leadership. In the realm of parental behavior, girls receive more affection, praise, and companionship, boys more physical punishment and achievement demands. A surprising finding was that such discipline with affection facilitated psychological functioning in boys, but impeded it in girls...with girls more susceptible to the influence of overprotection and boys to the detrimental effects of insufficient parental discipline and support (p. 98).

This differential treatment may be quite desirable when one considers that the goals of child-rearing in personality traits differ for the masculine and feminine roles. Bronfenbrenner observes that differential treatment operates at a minimum in the upper-middle class. With an increase in socioeconomic class, punishment drops off for boys, and indulgence and protectiveness decrease for girls.

Conclusion

The most intense period for parent-child conflict appears to be during the early stages of adolescence, perhaps at the age of thirteen or fourteen, according to Hurlock (1959). Because adolescents are attempting to establish themselves apart from their parents, doing things with parents and complying with their parents' wishes achieves low priority for them.

Benson (1968) characterizes the ideal relationship as follows:

An ideal relationship between parent and child would provide the basis for a lifelong bond between them without sacrificing the identity of the child or his ability to explore life for himself...A warm relationship between father and child, laced with parental firmness but not authoritarianism, increases the chances that the child will find a sense of security and self-confidence without becoming dependent upon his father for constant guidance (p. 187).

It seems reasonable to believe that although studies of the father role are insufficient in number and scope, there is enough evidence of the importance of father-son interaction to place this

subject in a position of prime importance. The present study is designed to contribute to the findings in this most vital area.

CHAPTER III

PROCEDURE

Description of Subjects

Subjects were 91 adolescent boys and 100 adolescent girls who were enrolled in social studies classes at Edmond High School in Edmond, Oklahoma in February, 1971. These subjects were chosen to participate in this study on the basis of availability and willingness to participate in the research. Several control factors were operating to insure that students assigned to social studies classes were representative of the total adolescent population in this locale.

These control factors were as follows:

1. All high school students in the community attend one municipal high school.
2. All high school students are required to complete one course in social studies in order to graduate.
3. Enrollment in all courses is carried out by computer, which eliminates discriminatory selection of teachers; therefore, no teacher receives a disproportionate share of slow learners, disadvantaged students, or gifted students.
4. According to information collected by the school administration and personnel, residents of the Edmond Public School District are predominately from the middle and upper-middle socioeconomic group. There is a very low percentage of disadvantaged or wealthy families in the school district. Therefore, both the community and the student body are quite homogeneous.

The majority of the participants were between 14 and 16 years of age.

All were American-born and were living with a parent or parents. In

Table I, the distribution of the subjects by age, family size, family position, and father absence is presented.

Measurement of Permissive Attitudes toward Father-Son Interaction

Description of the Instrument

The instrument used to measure permissive attitudes of adolescent girls and adolescent boys was The Father-Son Interaction Test developed by Doyle (1968). The instrument consists of two parts:

1. A sixteen millimeter filmed representation of eleven situations involving father and son.
2. A paper-and-pencil questionnaire to determine attitudes of permissiveness(Appendix A).

Complete descriptions of these two follow.

The Filmed Instrument

The instrument consists of eleven scenes each of approximately one minute duration. They are separated by a segment of blank film. An introductory scene used for instructional purposes precedes the actual test. The following is a description of each of the eleven scenes.

Scene I

The father is awakening his son.

Scene II

The son requests his allowance from his father as his father reads the newspaper.

Scene III

The father and his son are having lunch together with the son talking to his father rather than eating his lunch.

TABLE I
CHARACTERISTICS OF THE SUBJECTS

Description	N	%
<u>Age</u>		
14-15	81	42.40
16-17	102	53.40
18 and over	8	4.20
Total	191	100.00
<u>Family Size</u>		
Only Child	4	2.09
1 Sibling	55	28.80
2 Siblings	61	31.94
3 Siblings	40	20.94
4 Siblings	14	7.33
5 Siblings	10	5.24
Over 5 Siblings	7	3.66
Total	191	100.00
<u>Family Position</u>		
Oldest Child	72	37.70
Middle Child	63	32.98
Youngest Child	55	28.80
No Response	1	.52
Total	191	100.00
<u>Father Absence</u>		
Never Absent	147	76.95
From 0-6 Years of Age	10	5.24
After 6 Years of Age	26	13.61
Both Before and After Age 6	8	4.20
Total	191	100.00
<u>Reasons For Absence*</u>		
Separation	2	4.55
Divorce	14	31.82
Military Service	5	11.36
Death	11	25.00
Work	11	25.00
Other	1	2.27
Total	44	100.00

*For those who listed an absence.

Scene IV

Father comments on his son's participation in a baseball game which the son's team has just won.

Scene V

Father has forgotten his promise to take his son to play golf with him.

Scene VI

The son is reluctant to complete the lawn raking he has agreed to do.

Scene VII

Son turns over a glass of water on the dinner table.

Scene VIII

During a family dinner with guests, the father attempts to draw his son into the conversation.

Scene IX

Father finds that his son has been watching television and has not completed his homework.

Scene X

Son exceeds his time limits on a telephone call.

Scene XI

Father catches his son in the process of putting up a "pin-up" picture on his bedroom wall.

The Questionnaire

After each scene of the film was shown the film was stopped and respondents were given time to answer a set of questions concerning the scene just completed (Appendix A). The responses were structured into four possible levels of agreement to disagreement to provide some latitude of choice. The choices ranged from restrictive to permissive on each item. Each possible response to an item was assigned a numerical value according to a weighting system devised by Doyle

(1968) for these items. A total score was calculated by adding the subscores assigned to the responses on all the separate items. Only those items were utilized which Doyle (1968) found to discriminate between high and low scoring respondents. The total number of items for the eleven scenes was fifty-six. A key was used to score the items after the completion of test administration (Appendix B). Responses were marked on standardized computer score sheets so that responses could be scored mechanically.

Measurement of Background Variables

Information Sheet

Before the presentation of the film test, each subject completed an information sheet (Appendix C) which included personal data, family history, and a self-analysis of personality characteristics. Twenty-five personality characteristics were evaluated by the subject in terms of three categories: Almost Always, Sometimes, and Seldom. On all characteristics except those numbered 4, 8, 11, and 15, Almost Always responses were, for the purposes of the study, considered above average responses; Sometimes as average responses; and Seldom as below average responses. These four items (4, 8, 11, and 15) were reversed to help prevent position set by respondents. The personality self-analysis was adapted from the Teacher Rating Scale developed by Borgatta and Fanchel (1963).

The personal data and family history on the information sheet were adapted from Doyle (1968) but revised and expanded to include additional information suggested by the psychological and sociological literature as important.

It was believed that more honest responses to both the questionnaire and the information sheet would be given if the respondent was aware that his responses were anonymous. Therefore, no name or other specifically identifying information was requested on any form. However, it was necessary to be able to pair each respondent's answer sheet to his information sheet. Therefore, each information sheet was assigned a number from a random number table. Odd numbers were assigned to those information sheets given to male respondents. Even numbers were assigned to the information sheets given to female respondents. To each information sheet was attached an answer sheet which had the corresponding number entered in the name blank. Male information sheets were printed on green paper and female information sheets were printed on yellow paper. In all other respects the information sheets were identical.

Administration of the Instruments

Test administration occurred in a regularly-scheduled fifty-five minute social studies class period. The experimenter furnished all testing equipment and supplies, and Edmond High School furnished the use of a sixteen millimeter projector and screen. The regularly assigned teacher assisted with distribution of materials. Subjects participating in the study were informed that the purpose of the study was to see how adolescents feel toward father-son interaction and that the study was being conducted through the Family Relations and Child Development Department of the Division of Home Economics of Oklahoma State University.

After informing the subjects that the numbers appearing on the

information sheet were in no particular sequence and that their responses were anonymous, the appropriate information sheets were distributed. Subjects completed the information sheets prior to test administration. Questions were answered as they occurred.

After completion of these sheets, detailed instructions for taking The Father-Son Interaction Test were given (Appendix D). The film was then shown, one scene at a time. Respondents were allowed ample time to respond to the questions concerning each scene, immediately following the screening. When all scenes were completed and all items answered, materials were collected.

Analysis of the Data

Each item consisted of four possible responses; Strongly Agree, Mildly Agree, Mildly Disagree, and Strongly Disagree, which range from non-permissive to permissive. Each possible response was assigned a numerical value based on a weighting system devised by Doyle (1968). Very permissive responses were assigned a value of two; moderately permissive responses a value of one; and the other non-permissive responses a value of zero. A total score was calculated by adding the subscores assigned to the subjects' responses on all the separate items.

The chi-square test was utilized to determine the differences between high scoring and low scoring subjects on each of the fifty-six items on The Father-Son Interaction Test. Scores based on the discriminating items only were computed. The relationship of these scores to selected background and personality variables were analyzed, utilizing the Kruskal-Wallis one-way analysis of variance.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

The Father-Son Interaction Test

The Item Analysis

Of the 134 items in the original form of The Father-Son Interaction Test, Doyle (1968) found 56 items which significantly discriminated between high and low scoring respondents. This 56 item form of the original test was designated Form B for the purposes of this study. A chi-square test was used to determine which items on The Father-Son Interaction Test (Form B) were discriminating with this sample, that is, which items elicited significantly different responses from those subjects whose total scores fell in the lower quartile and subjects whose total scores fell in the upper quartile. Of the 56 items initially included, 39, or 69.64 per cent, were found to be significant at the .05 level or beyond.

The total score for each subject, which was compared to the background variables and personality characteristics, was based upon the discriminating items only. The results of the item analysis are presented in Table II. In Table III, the number of discriminating and non-discriminating items for each scene is presented.

TABLE II
DISCRIMINATING ITEMS ON THE FATHER-SON INTERACTION TEST

Item	χ^2	Level of Significance
SCENE I		
1. The father should have realized that his son's reaction was a normal reaction, and he should not have been threatened.	2.27	n.s.
2. The father was doing what any good father should do.	13.89	.001
3. The father should not have allowed his son to turn over when he called him.	.64	n.s.
4. The father should have shown more concern for his son getting enough rest.	4.17	.05
SCENE II		
5. The son should not have interrupted his father's activities.	9.34	.01
6. The son had a right to become angry.	7.60	.01
7. The father should have given the money to his son the previous night.	1.52	n.s.
8. The father should have responded immediately when his son asked for his allowance.	4.04	.05
SCENE III		
9. A father should not have had to listen to his son this much during mealtime.	3.83	n.s.
10. The son's actions should not have irritated his father.	1.81	n.s.
11. The father was right in objecting to his son's slowness in eating.	8.86	.01
12. The father should not have been so hasty in scolding his son.	.51	n.s.

TABLE II (Continued)

Item	χ^2	Level of Significance
13. The son should not have talked so much.	8.54	.01
14. The son should not have bothered his father about such unimportant matters.	2.46	n.s.
15. The father should have shown more affection to his son.	5.03	.05
SCENE IV		
16. The father should have ignored the error which the son made.	5.35	.05
17. The son should not have been so upset by his father's remarks.	5.06	.05
18. It is a wise father who gives this kind of help in directing his son's play activities.	10.31	.01
SCENE V		
19. The father should have offered to take his son with him.	0.00	n.s.
20. The father should have told his son that a business deal was more important.	8.49	.01
21. The son should not have expected his father to want to play golf with him.	.0021	n.s.
22. The son should have made his own arrangements for playing golf.	.81	n.s.
23. The father should have felt obligated to play golf with his son.	2.11	n.s.
SCENE VI		
24. The father should have "paddled" his son.	8.22	.01
25. The father should have allowed his son to rake the leaves at his convenience.	12.49	.001

TABLE II (Continued)

Item	χ^2	Level of Significance
26. The father was right in being so persistent.	4.38	.05
27. A father should not threaten his son.	12.09	.001
28. The father should have been more forceful in the beginning.	.39	n.s.
29. The father should not have become so excited when his son did not obey him.	10.69	.01
SCENE VII		
30. The father should have objected to his son's carelessness.	4.94	.05
SCENE VIII		
31. The father should have been considerate of his son's opinions.	7.26	.01
32. The father should not have been persistent.	12.51	.001
33. The son should have felt that he does not have to participate in the conversation.	1.24	n.s.
34. The father should have shown more warmth and affection for his son.	11.38	.001
35. The father handled the situation well.	14.46	.001
SCENE IX		
36. The father should help his son with his homework whenever asked.	6.18	.05
37. The father should have been angry at the son's lack of motivation in doing his homework.	8.33	.01
38. The father was right in helping his son to achieve good quality work.	1.29	n.s.
39. The father should have insisted that his son study at a desk.	6.00	.05

TABLE II (Continued)

Item	χ^2	Level of Significance
40. The father should not have assumed that his son could not study with the television going.	3.07	n.s.
41. The father should have allowed his son to do the assignment himself and worry about making it perfect.	2.40	n.s.
42. The father should have helped his son without worrying.	7.04	.01
43. The father should have shown more warmth and affection for his son.	15.10	.001
SCENE X		
44. The father should have shown more force.	19.49	.001
45. The son should have been punished.	12.04	.001
46. The father should not have treated his son like a "baby".	6.24	.05
47. The father should not have been so impatient.	24.43	.001
48. The son's actions should not have upset the father.	14.11	.001
49. The father should not have expected this much from his son.	6.27	.05
SCENE XI		
50. The son should not have had pictures of which his father would disapprove.	18.45	.001
51. A father should check all magazines his son reads.	1.10	n.s.
52. The father was right in objecting to this kind of behavior.	18.77	.001
53. The son should have "stood-up" for his rights.	15.44	.001

TABLE II (Continued)

Item	χ^2	Level of Significance
54. It was the son's own business what pictures he had.	22.84	.001
55. The father should not have interfered.	22.13	.001
56. The father should have been more understanding.	16.51	.001

TABLE III
NUMBER OF DISCRIMINATING AND NON-DISCRIMINATING
ITEMS CLASSIFIED BY SCENES

Scene	Discriminating Items	Non-Discriminating Items	Totals
One	2	2	4
Two	3	1	4
Three	3	4	7
Four	3	0	3
Five	1	4	5
Six	5	1	6
Seven	1	0	1
Eight	4	1	5
Nine	5	3	8
Ten	6	0	6
Eleven	<u>6</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>7</u>
Total	39	17	56

Comparison of Responses

A comparison was made of the thirty-nine discriminating items on The Father-Son Interaction Test for the adolescent girls and adolescent boys separately. Restrictive, moderately permissive, and very permissive responses were compared for percentage of responses on each discriminating item.

This comparison indicated that attitudes were for the most part parallel for males and females. That is, when the greatest percentage of males indicated a restrictive response, the females did likewise. Both groups tended toward very permissive responses on the same items and toward restrictive responses on the same items. Generally, the adolescent girls exhibited greater permissiveness than males. The only items which elicited more restrictive responses by girls than boys were the items in Scene I and in Scene IX. Scene I dealt with arising promptly from bed in the morning after being called, and Scene IX dealt with doing homework promptly and without assistance. Comparisons of responses on each discriminating item are given in detail in Table IV.

TABLE IV
PERCENTAGES OF RESPONSES TO DISCRIMINATING ITEMS
ON THE FATHER-SON INTERACTION TEST

Item	<u>Percentage of Responses</u>					
	Restrictive		Moderately Permissive		Very Permissive	
	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female
SCENE I						
The father was doing what any good father should do.	65.16	68.00	22.47	16.00	12.36	16.00
The father should have shown more concern for his son getting enough rest.	51.65	54.00	36.26	28.00	12.09	18.00
SCENE II						
The son should not have interrupted his father's activities.	23.33	22.00	44.44	27.00	32.22	48.00
The son had a right to become angry.	29.67	16.00	29.67	34.00	40.66	50.00
The father should have responded immediately when his son asked for his allowance.	26.38	17.00	47.25	35.00	26.37	48.00
SCENE III						
The father was right in objecting to his son's slowness in eating.	42.22	45.00	31.11	23.00	26.67	30.00
The son should not have talked so much.	52.75	61.00	31.87	18.00	15.38	19.00
The father should have shown more affection to his son.	13.19	9.00	42.86	27.00	43.96	64.00
SCENE IV						
The father should have ignored the error which the son made.	18.68	9.00	30.77	33.00	50.55	58.00
The son should not have been so upset by his father's remarks.	54.95	46.00	23.08	23.00	21.98	30.00

TABLE IV (Continued)

Item	<u>Percentage of Responses</u>					
	Restrictive		Moderately Permissive		Very Permissive	
	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female
It is a wise father who gives this kind of help in directing his son's play activities.	34.83	22.00	26.97	29.00	38.20	47.00
SCENE V						
The father should have told his son that a business deal was more important.	28.57	20.00	40.66	34.00	30.77	44.00
SCENE VI						
The father should have "paddled" his son.	59.09	39.00	21.59	31.00	19.32	30.00
The father should have allowed his son to rake the leaves at his convenience.	71.11	65.00	18.89	28.00	10.00	6.00
The father was right in being so persistent.	83.51	78.00	12.09	18.00	4.40	4.00
A father should not threaten his son.	53.33	43.00	22.22	36.00	24.44	21.00
The father should not have become so excited when his son did not obey him.	62.22	51.00	24.44	40.00	13.33	9.00
SCENE VII						
The father should have objected to his son's carelessness.	22.47	15.00	33.71	14.00	43.82	70.00
SCENE VIII						
The father should have been considerate of his son's opinion.	32.96	27.00	36.26	32.00	30.77	40.00
The father should not have been persistent.	37.37	27.00	35.16	28.00	27.47	44.00

TABLE IV (Continued)

Item	<u>Percentage of Responses</u>					
	Restrictive		Moderately		Very	
	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female
The father should have shown more warmth and affection for his son.	35.17	32.00	48.35	37.00	16.48	31.00
The father handled the situation well.	33.71	27.00	31.46	23.00	34.83	50.00
SCENE IX						
The father should help his son with his homework whenever asked.	8.89	11.00	30.00	38.00	61.11	51.00
The father should have been angry at the son's lack of motivation in doing his homework.	48.89	51.00	31.11	35.00	20.00	13.00
The father should have insisted that his son study at a desk.	43.33	50.00	31.11	22.00	25.56	27.00
The father should have helped his son without worrying.	45.06	50.00	43.96	38.00	10.99	12.00
The father should have shown more warmth and affection for his son.	43.96	49.00	37.36	37.00	18.68	14.00
SCENE X						
The father should have shown more force.	34.44	22.00	33.33	34.00	32.22	43.00
The son should have been punished.	15.55	9.00	36.67	22.00	47.78	68.00
The father should not have treated his son like a "baby".	28.57	28.00	28.57	34.00	42.86	38.00
The father should not have been so impatient.	38.46	32.00	28.57	35.00	32.97	33.00
The son's actions should not have upset the father.	35.16	33.00	35.16	39.00	29.67	28.00

TABLE IV (Continued)

Item	<u>Percentage of Responses</u>					
	Restrictive		Moderately Permissive		Very Permissive	
	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female
The father should not have expected this much from his son.	61.11	61.00	20.00	27.00	18.89	12.00
SCENE XI						
The son should not have had pictures of which his father would disapprove.	50.55	53.00	19.78	23.00	29.67	23.00
The father was right in objecting to this kind of behavior.	63.73	52.00	20.88	23.00	15.38	24.00
The son should have "stood-up" for his rights.	41.76	32.00	34.07	36.00	24.18	31.00
It was the son's own business what pictures he had.	46.15	37.00	35.16	33.00	18.68	30.00
The father should not have interfered.	63.74	49.00	24.18	28.00	12.09	23.00
The father should have been more understanding.	25.28	16.00	32.97	35.00	41.76	47.00

Relationship Between Scores and Selected Background Variables

The Kruskal-Wallis one-way analysis of variance was used to examine scores of respondents on The Father-Son Interaction Test which were classified according to age and type of parenting; that is, mother and father, mother only, and father only. Utilizing the same analysis males' and females' scores were examined separately in terms of: (a) agent of discipline, (b) type of discipline from father, (c) type of discipline from mother, (d) permissiveness with own children compared to father, (e) permissiveness with own children compared to mother, (f) closeness to father, (g) closeness to mother, (h) parent providing the greatest influence, (i) amount of time spent with father, and (j) closeness to peer group. The results of these analyses are presented in Table V and Table VI.

TABLE V

KRUSKAL-WALLIS ANALYSIS (H-SCORES) OF PERMISSIVE
ATTITUDES; ALL RESPONDENTS COMBINED

Background Variable	H	Level of Significance
Age	0.404	n.s.
Type of Parenting	2.616	n.s.

TABLE VI
KRUSKAL-WALLIS ANALYSIS (H-SCORES) OF PERMISSIVE
ATTITUDES CLASSIFIED ACCORDING TO SEX

Background Variable	Male H-Score	Level of Significance	Female H-Score	Level of Significance
Agent of Discipline	5.359	n.s.	3.309	n.s.
Type of Discipline from Father	11.187	.05	0.222	n.s.
Type of Discipline from Mother	18.138	.01	3.275	n.s.
Permissiveness with Own Children Compared to Father	7.584	.05	4.270	n.s.
Permissiveness with Own Children Compared to Mother	5.030	n.s.	1.311	n.s.
Closeness to Father	7.766	.05	1.225	n.s.
Closeness to Mother	2.500	n.s.	0.640	n.s.
Parent Providing Greatest Influence	2.569	n.s.	0.645	n.s.
Time Spent by Father with Respondent	1.350	n.s.	0.061	n.s.
Closeness to Friends	5.018	n.s.	5.703	n.s.

Those variables which were found to be significant at the .05 level or beyond were then subjected to the Mann-Whitney U Test to determine the particular relationships between categories within the variable which accounted for this significance.

The type of discipline received from the father was found to be significant for boys at the .05 level. Those boys who reported very permissive discipline from their fathers reflected higher scores on The Father-Son Interaction Test indicating significantly more permissive attitudes toward father-son interaction than either the group which had experienced permissive discipline ($p=.05$) or the group which had experienced strict discipline from the father ($p=.05$). The group which had experienced an average degree of permissiveness in their rearing exhibited more permissive attitudes toward father-son interaction than the strict group ($p=.05$) also. However, the group which reported very strict rearing had significantly more permissive attitudes than even the permissive group ($p=.05$). The very strict group was exceeded in permissiveness by only the very permissively reared group.

The type of discipline received from the mother was found to be significant for boys at the .01 level. Higher permissiveness scores were obtained by those boys reared very permissively by their mothers than those reared permissively ($p=.01$), with average permissiveness ($p=.001$), or strictly ($p=.05$). Those reared permissively exhibited more permissive attitudes toward father-son interaction than those who experienced an average amount of permissiveness in their rearing ($p=.05$).

Permissiveness as a parent compared to the father was found to

have a significant relationship to permissive attitudes for boys ($p=.05$). The relationship indicated that those boys who would rear their own children with greater permissiveness than they have experienced from their fathers exhibited higher permissiveness scores than those who would rear their own children with the same degree of permissiveness as they have received from their fathers ($p=.05$).

Closeness to the father was significantly related to permissive attitudes on the part of adolescent boys ($p=.05$). Study of this relationship indicates that those boys who report average closeness to their fathers exhibit significantly more permissive attitudes toward father-son interaction than those who report above average closeness with their fathers.

It is necessary to note that none of these factors were significantly related to permissive attitudes for girls. Permissive attitudes for both boys and girls were independent of all other background factors.

Relationship Between Scores and Selected Personality Characteristics

The Kruskal-Wallis one-way analysis of variance was also used to examine scores of all respondents combined on The Father-Son Interaction Test which were classified in terms of the personality characteristics of: (a) carelessness, (b) aggressiveness, (c) physical activeness, (d) calmness, (e) popularity, (f) sense of responsibility, (g) competence, (h) initiative, (i) generosity, (j) self-reliance, (k) self-control, (l) compliance, (m) decisiveness, (n) honesty, (o) dependability, (p) kindness and affection, (q) extroversion, (r) self-esteem, (s) shy sensitivity, (t) cooperativeness,

(u) sex role acceptance, (v) leadership, (w) conformity, (x) self-fulfillment, and (y) achievement motivation. The results of these analyses are presented in Table VII.

The item on the personality self-analysis which was found to be significant at the .05 level or beyond utilizing the Kruskal-Wallis one-way analysis of variance was then subjected to the Mann-Whitney U Test to determine the particular relationships between categories within the variable which accounted for this significance.

Personal assessment of one's popularity was the only personality variable found to be significantly related to permissive attitudes ($p=.05$). The Mann-Whitney U Test determined that those respondents who rated themselves below average in popularity had significantly higher permissiveness ratings than those who rated themselves as being average in popularity ($p=.05$).

No other personality characteristics were significantly related to the permissive attitudes held by adolescent boys and adolescent girls concerning father-son interaction.

TABLE VII
 KRUSKAL-WALLIS ANALYSIS (H-SCORES) OF PERMISSIVE ATTITUDES
 CLASSIFIED BY SELECTED PERSONALITY CHARACTERISTICS

Personality Characteristic	H	Level of Significance
Carelessness	0.696	n.s.
Aggressiveness	2.782	n.s.
Physical Activeness	3.905	n.s.
Calmness	2.077	n.s.
Popularity	6.229	.05
Sense of Responsibility	2.443	n.s.
Competence	0.410	n.s.
Initiative	0.242	n.s.
Generosity	2.862	n.s.
Self-Reliance	0.490	n.s.
Self-Control	2.431	n.s.
Compliance	1.544	n.s.
Decisiveness	0.890	n.s.
Honesty	4.190	n.s.
Dependability	1.050	n.s.
Kindness and Affection	4.865	n.s.
Extroversion	4.767	n.s.
Self-Esteem	1.530	n.s.
Shy Sensitivity	5.084	n.s.
Cooperativeness	2.689	n.s.
Sex Role Acceptance	5.224	n.s.
Leadership	4.462	n.s.

TABLE VII (Continued)

Personality Characteristic	H	Level of Significance
Conformity	0.473	n.s.
Self-Fulfillment	0.617	n.s.
Achievement Motivation	3.111	n.s.

Summary of Findings

In summary, the following relationships between permissive attitudes concerning father-son interaction were found:

1. There was no significant difference in the permissive attitudes toward father-son interaction as expressed by adolescent boys and adolescent girls.
2. Permissive attitudes concerning father-son interaction as expressed by adolescent boys and adolescent girls were independent of: (a) age, (b) type of present parenting, (c) agent of discipline, (d) agreement with the discipline method of the mother, (e) closeness to mother, (f) degree of parental influence, (g) time spent with the father, and (h) closeness to peer group.
3. Permissive attitudes concerning father-son interaction as expressed by adolescent girls were independent of: (a) type of discipline received from father and mother, (b) agreement with the discipline method of the father, and (c) closeness to the father.
4. Permissive attitudes concerning father-son interaction as expressed by adolescent boys and adolescent girls were independent of the personality characteristics of: (a) carelessness, (b) aggressiveness, (c) physical activeness, (d) calmness, (e) sense of responsibility, (f) competence, (g) initiative, (h) generosity, (i) self-reliance, (j) self-control, (k) compliance, (l) decisiveness, (m) honesty, (n) dependability, (o) kindness and affection, (p) extroversion, (q) self-

esteem, (r) shy sensitivity, (s) cooperativeness, (t) sex role acceptance, (u) leadership, (v) conformity, (w) self-fulfillment, and (x) achievement motivation.

5. Permissive attitudes concerning father-son interaction as expressed by adolescent boys were significantly related to: (a) type of discipline received from the father, (b) type of discipline received from the mother, (c) agreement with the discipline method of the father, and (d) closeness to the father.
6. Permissive attitudes concerning father-son interaction as expressed by adolescent boys and adolescent girls were significantly related to self-perceptions of popularity.

Of the fifty-six items included on The Father-Son Interaction Test, thirty-nine were found to discriminate between high and low scoring respondents.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The purpose of this research was to examine the permissive attitudes of adolescent girls and boys concerning father-son interaction, and to relate these attitudes to selected background factors and personality characteristics. A filmed instrument, The Father-Son Interaction Test (Doyle, 1968), assessed permissiveness and a questionnaire provided background information on 191 adolescent boys and girls.

An item analysis utilizing the chi-square test revealed that 39 items discriminated between high and low scoring respondents on The Father-Son Interaction Test. Percentages of male and female responses were compared on those 39 items in terms of restrictive, moderately permissive, and very permissive responses. Male and female percentages in each category were very similar with girls tending to exhibit more permissive responses than boys. Girls showed more restrictive responses than boys only in relation to compliance with the routine of arising from bed when called, and prompt completion of school work. These comparisons suggested the idea that girls tend to be more sympathetic toward sons in interaction with their fathers than the boys are, and that girls value compliance to routine and doing a thorough and conscientious job on school work more than boys value these things. This provides possibilities for further research.

The Kruskal-Wallis one-way analysis of variance indicated a relationship between boys' permissive attitudes and the factors of: (a) type of discipline from the father and from the mother, (b) agreement with the discipline method of the father, and (c) closeness to the father.

A Mann-Whitney U Test indicated that the more permissively a boy was reared by his father and mother, the more permissive his attitudes toward father-son interaction with the exception of the group reared very strictly by their fathers. Rather than having restrictive attitudes toward father-son interaction as would be expected, the group reared very strictly by their fathers indicated permissive attitudes exceeded only by the very permissively reared group. Evidently this group experiences a reaction to the discipline method of their fathers, and adopt a different attitude altogether than that which they have experienced. The prevalent assumption that children reared very permissively will then rear their children strictly does not appear to be supported by this research.

Permissiveness as a parent compared to the father is related to permissive attitudes. That is, those boys who would rear their own children with greater permissiveness than they have experienced from their fathers exhibited greater permissiveness than those who would emulate their fathers. It appears that the continuing trend for these boys is greater permissiveness in future generations. An interesting study would be to continue measurement of the perceptions of such a group of adolescent boys longitudinally to see if as parents they carry out these avowed desires.

Closeness to fathers by adolescent boys appears to have a point

of diminishing returns in relation to permissive attitudes concerning father-son interaction. Those boys who indicated only average closeness to their fathers expressed more permissive attitudes than those with above average closeness to their fathers. Perhaps a very close father-son relationship is indicative of a dependency relationship which interferes with the adolescent boy making independent judgments as to what he feels would be an appropriate response when a father and son are presented in the film test in conflict. It may also be that the very close relationship produces a situation whereby the adolescent boy who has experienced this close relationship feels such close identification with his father that he would feel guilt at expressing a viewpoint which would appear to be in opposition to the father's point of view in responding to The Father-Son Interaction Test. In other words, he may not be quite so much a "free agent" as his counterpart who has not experienced such a close relationship.

Permissive attitudes of both boys and girls combined are related to their self-perceptions of their own popularity. Those adolescents who rated themselves below average in popularity expressed more permissive attitudes toward father-son interaction than those who rated themselves average in popularity. A plausible explanation might be that for this group, permissive responses may be an expression of disinterest in interpersonal relationships in general, rather than an expression of conviction that permissiveness is the most meaningful approach to father-son interaction. It may be that they are expressing passiveness and lack of commitment to relationships with people, be they fathers or mothers, friends, or siblings. This supposition is one which needs to be subjected to empirical testing.

It would be challenging to study whether for fathers, very permissive attitudes toward father-son interaction are the results of a conviction that this is the best procedure for child-rearing, or perhaps instead represent a lack of commitment, an evasion, of the responsibilities of the fathering role.

It seems apparent that the adolescent girl, who will in the future be the mother of sons, is not a disinterested party on the subject of how fathers and sons ought to interact. Her feelings will have to be unified with those of her husband, because she too affects how the son relates to his father. The findings indicate that much more research must follow before authorities begin to understand father-son interaction.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Andry, Robert. "Parental Affection and Delinquency." The Sociology of Crime and Delinquency. Eds. Marvin Wolfgang, Leonard Savitz, and Norman Johnston. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1962, pp. 342-352.
- Bandura, Albert, Dorothea Ross, and Sheila Ross. "Transmission of Aggression Through Imitation of Aggressive Models." Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, LXIII (1961), 575-582.
- Barclay, Allan, and Donald Cumusano. "Father Absence, Cross-Sex Identity, and Field-Dependent Behavior in Male Adolescents." Child Development, XXXVIII (March, 1967), 243-249.
- Bartlett, Edward, and Charles Smith. "Child-Rearing Practices, Birth Order, and the Development of Achievement Related Motives." Children: Readings in Behavior and Development. Ed. Ellis Evans. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, Inc., 1968, pp. 56-57.
- Baumrind, Diana. "Effects of Authoritative Parental Control on Child Behavior." Child Development, XXXVII (December, 1966), 887-907.
- Baumrind, Diana, and Allen Black. "Socialization Practices Associated with Dimensions of Competence in Preschool Boys and Girls." Child Development, XXXVIII (June, 1967), 291-327.
- Becker, Wesley. "Consequences of Parental Discipline." Review of Developmental Research. Ed. Martin Hoffman and Lois Hoffman. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1964, pp. 169-208.
- Becker, Wesley, Donald Peterson, Leo Hellmer, Donald Shoemaker, and Henry Quay. "Factors in Parental Behavior and Personality as Related to Problem Behavior in Children." Readings in Child Behavior and Development. Ed. Celia Stendler. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, 1964, pp. 288-300.
- Benson, Leonard. Fatherhood: A Sociological Perspective. New York: Random House, 1968.
- Berkowitz, Leonard. The Development of Motives and Values in the Child. New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1964.
- Borgatta, Edgar, and David Fanchel. "A Study of Behavior Disorders of Children in Residential Treatment Centers." Journal of Psychological Studies, XXIV (1963), 1-23.

- Bronfenbrenner, Urie. "Socialization and Social Class Through Time and Space." Readings in Social Psychology. Eds. Eleanor Maccoby, Theodore Newcomb, and Eugene Hartley. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1958, pp. 400-425.
- Bronfenbrenner, Urie. "Some Familial Antecedents of Responsibility and Leadership in Adolescents." Leadership and Interpersonal Behavior. Eds. Luigi Petrullo and Bernard Bass. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1961, pp. 239-269.
- Bronfenbrenner, Urie. "The Changing American Child--A Speculative Analysis." Children: Readings in Behavior and Development. Ed. Ellis Evans. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, Inc., 1968, pp. 93-105.
- Colley, Thomas. "The Nature and Origins of Psychological Sexual Identity." Psychological Review, LXVI (1959), 165-177.
- Davis, Allison, and Robert Havighurst. "Social Class and Color Differences in Child-Rearing." American Sociological Review, XI (December, 1946), 698-710.
- Davis, Allison, and Robert Havighurst. "A Comparison of the Chicago and Harvard Studies of Social Class Differences in Child-Rearing." American Sociological Review, XX (1955), 438-442.
- Doyle, Emma. "The Father-Son Interaction Test." (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Florida State University, 1968).
- Elder, Glen, and Charles Bowerman. "Family Structure and Child-Rearing Patterns; The Effect of Family Size and Sex Composition." American Sociological Review, XXVIII (1963), 891-905.
- Gardner, Luella. "An Analysis of Children's Attitudes Toward Fathers." The Journal of Genetic Psychology, LXX (1947), 3-28.
- Gordon, Micheal. "Infant Care Revisited." Journal of Marriage and the Family, XXX (November, 1968), 578-583.
- Greenstein, Jules. "Father Characteristics and Sex Typing." Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, XXXIII (March, 1966), 271-277.
- Hartup, William. "Nurturance and Nurturance-Withdrawal in Relation to the Dependency Behavior in Preschool Children." Readings in Child Behavior and Development. Ed. Celia Stendler. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, 1964, pp. 224-231.
- Hurlock, Elizabeth. Developmental Psychology. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1959.
- Kamarovsky, Mirra. Blue-Collar Marriage. New York: Vintage Books, 1967.

- Kohn, Melvin, and John Clausen. "Parental Authority Behavior and Schizophrenia." American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, XXXVI (1956), 297-313.
- Kopf, Kathryn. "Family Variables and School Adjustment of Eighth Grade Father-Absent Boys." The Family Coordinator, XIX (April, 1970), 145-150.
- Maccoby, Eleanor, Patricia Gibbs, and Collaborators. "Methods of Child Rearing in Two Social Classes." Readings in Child Behavior and Development. Ed. Celia Stendler. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, 1964, pp. 272-288.
- Miller, Daniel, and Guy Swanson. The Changing American Parent. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1958.
- Miller, Daniel, Guy Swanson, and Collaborators. Inner Conflict and Defense. New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1960.
- Mussen, Paul, and Luther Distler. "Child-Rearing Antecedents of Masculine Identification in Kindergarten Boys." Child Development, XXXI (1960), 89-100.
- Mussen, Paul, and Luther Distler. "Masculinity, Identification, and Father-Son Relationships." Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, LIX (November, 1959), 350-356.
- Parke, Ross. "Nurturance, Nurturance Withdrawal, and Resistance to Deviation." Child Development, XXXVIII (December, 1967), 1101-1110.
- Payne, Donald, and Paul Mussen. "Parent-Child Relations and Father Identification Among Adolescent Boys." Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, LII (1956), 358-362.
- Peck, Robert, and Herbert Richek. "Personality and Social Development: Family Influences; Role of Fathers." Review of Educational Research, XXXIV (December, 1964), 574-587.
- Rosen, Bernard. "Social Class and the Child's Perception of the Parent." Child Development, XXXV (December, 1964), 1147-1153.
- Rosenberg, Morris. "Parental Interest and Children's Self-Conceptions." Sociometry, XXVI (March, 1963), 35-49.
- Rutherford, Eldred, and Paul Mussen. "Generosity in Nursery School Boys." Child Development, XXXIX (September, 1968), 755-765.
- Sears, Pauline. "Child-Rearing Factors Related to Playing the Sex-Typed Roles." (abstract). The American Psychologist, VIII (1953), 431.
- Sears, Robert, Eleanor Maccoby, and Harry Levin. Patterns of Child Rearing. Evanston: Row, Peterson, and Company, 1957.

Siegelman, Marvin. "Loving and Punishing Parental Behavior and Introversion Tendencies in Sons." Child Development, XXXVII (December, 1966), 985-992.

Sunley, Robert. "Early Nineteen-Century American Literature on Child Rearing." Childhood in Contemporary Cultures. Eds. Margaret Mead and Martha Wolfstein. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1955.

APPENDIX A

THE FATHER-SON INTERACTION TEST (Form B)

Emma Lee Doyle

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

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

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

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

SCENE EXAMPLE

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

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

SCENE I

The father enters the son's bedroom to awaken him. The son moans and turns over; the father calls him several times. The son finally sits up on the side of the bed.

- | | | | | |
|---|----|----|----|----|
| 1. The father should have realized that his son's reaction was a normal reaction, and he should not have been threatened. | SA | MA | MD | SD |
| 2. The father was doing what any good father should do. | SA | MA | MD | SD |
| 3. The father should not have allowed his son to turn over when he called him. | SA | MA | MD | SD |
| 4. The father should have shown more concern for his son getting enough rest. | SA | MA | MD | SD |

SCENE II

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

- | | | | | |
|---|----|----|----|----|
| 5. The son should not have interrupted his father's activities. | SA | MA | MD | SD |
| 6. The son had a right to become angry. | SA | MA | MD | SD |
| 7. The father should have given the money to his son the previous night. | SA | MA | MD | SD |
| 8. The father should have responded immediately when his son asked for his allowance. | SA | MA | MD | SD |

SCENE III

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

- | | | | | |
|---|----|----|----|----|
| 9. A father should not have had to listen to his son this much during mealtime. | SA | MA | MD | SD |
| 10. The son's actions should not have irritated his father. | SA | MA | MD | SD |
| 11. The father was right in objecting to his son's slowness in eating. | SA | MA | MD | SD |
| 12. The father should not have been so hasty in scolding his son. | SA | MA | MD | SD |
| 13. The son should not have talked so much. | SA | MA | MD | SD |
| 14. The son should not have bothered his father about such unimportant matters. | SA | MA | MD | SD |
| 15. The father should have shown more affection to his son. | SA | MA | MD | SD |

SCENE IV

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

- | | | | | |
|--|----|----|----|----|
| 16. The father should have ignored the error which the son made. | SA | MA | MD | SD |
|--|----|----|----|----|

17. The son should not have been so upset by his father's remarks. SA MA MD SD

18. It is a wise father who gives this kind of help in directing his son's play activities. SA MA MD SD

SCENE V

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

19. The father should have offered to take his son with him. SA MA MD SD

20. The father should have told his son that a business deal was more important. SA MA MD SD

21. The son should not have expected his father to want to play golf with him. SA MA MD SD

22. The son should have made his own arrangements for playing golf. SA MA MD SD

23. The father should have felt obligated to play golf with his son. SA MA MD SD

SCENE VI

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

24. The father should have "paddled" his son. SA MA MD SD

25. The father should have allowed his son to rake the leaves at his convenience. SA MA MD SD

26. The father was right in being so persistent. SA MA MD SD

27. A father should not threaten his son. SA MA MD SD

28. The father should have been more forceful in the beginning. SA MA MD SD

29. The father should not have become so excited when his son did not obey him. SA MA MD SD

SCENE VII

Father and son are dressed for dinner and are in the dining room. The son reaches for a mint on the table over a glass of water.

30. The father should have objected to his son's carelessness. SA MA MD SD

SCENE VIII

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

31. The father should have been considerate of his son's opinions. SA MA MD SD
32. The father should not have been persistent. SA MA MD SD
33. The son should have felt that he does not have to participate in the conversation. SA MA MD SD
34. The father should have shown more warmth and affection for his son. SA MA MD SD
35. The father handled the situation well. SA MA MD SD

SCENE IX

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

36. The father should help his son with his homework whenever asked. SA MA MD SD
37. The father should have been angry at the son's lack of motivation in doing his homework. SA MA MD SD
38. The father was right in helping his son to achieve good quality work. SA MA MD SD
39. The father should have insisted that his son study at a desk. SA MA MD SD
40. The father should not have assumed that his son could not study with the television going. SA MA MD SD

41. The father should have allowed his son to do the assignment himself and worry about making it perfect. SA MA MD SD
42. The father should have helped his son without worrying. SA MA MD SD
43. The father should have shown more warmth and affection for his son. SA MA MD SD

SCENE X

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

44. The father should have shown more force. SA MA MD SD
45. The son should have been punished. SA MA MD SD
46. The father should not have treated his son like a "baby". SA MA MD SD
47. The father should not have been so impatient. SA MA MD SD
48. The son's actions should not have upset the father. SA MA MD SD
49. The father should not have expected this much from his son. SA MA MD SD

SCENE XI

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

50. The son should not have had pictures of which his father would disapprove. SA MA MD SD
51. A father should check all magazines his son reads. SA MA MD SD
52. The father was right in objecting to this kind of behavior. SA MA MD SD
53. The son should have "stood-up" for his rights. SA MA MD SD
54. It was the son's own business what pictures he had. SA MA MD SD
55. The father should not have interfered. SA MA MD SD
56. The father should have been more understanding. SA MA MD SD

APPENDIX B

KEY FOR THE FATHER-SON INTERACTION TEST

<u>SA</u>	<u>MA</u>	<u>MD</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>SA</u>	<u>MA</u>	<u>MD</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>SA</u>	<u>MA</u>	<u>MD</u>	<u>SD</u>
1. 2	1	0	0	24. 0	0	1	2	47. 2	1	0	0
2. 0	0	1	2	25. 2	1	0	0	48. 2	1	0	0
3. 0	0	1	2	26. 0	0	1	2	49. 2	1	0	0
4. 2	1	0	0	27. 2	1	0	0	50. 0	0	1	2
5. 0	0	1	2	28. 0	0	1	2	51. 0	0	1	2
6. 2	1	0	0	29. 2	1	0	0	52. 0	0	1	2
7. 2	1	0	0	30. 0	0	1	2	53. 2	1	0	0
8. 2	1	0	0	31. 2	1	0	0	54. 2	1	0	0
9. 0	0	1	2	32. 2	1	0	0	55. 2	1	0	0
10. 2	1	0	0	33. 2	1	0	0	56. 2	1	0	0
11. 0	0	1	2	34. 2	1	0	0				
12. 2	1	0	0	35. 0	0	1	2				
13. 0	0	1	2	36. 2	1	0	0				
14. 0	0	1	2	37. 0	0	1	2				
15. 2	1	0	0	38. 2	1	0	0				
16. 2	1	0	0	39. 0	0	1	2				
17. 0	0	1	2	40. 2	1	0	0				
18. 0	0	1	2	41. 2	1	0	0				
19. 2	1	0	0	42. 2	1	0	0				
20. 0	0	1	2	43. 2	1	0	0				
21. 2	1	0	0	44. 0	0	1	2				
22. 0	0	1	2	45. 0	0	1	2				
23. 2	1	0	0	46. 2	1	0	0				

APPENDIX C

INFORMATION SHEET

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

1. Number _____
2. Age: 14-15
 16-17
 18 and over
3. I am presently living with:
 Father and mother Father and step-mother
 Father alone Mother and step-father
 Mother alone Other _____
4. Were you born in the USA?
 Yes
 No
5. Number of brothers _____
 Number of sisters _____
6. I was number 1 2 3 4 5 6 (Circle one).
7. If during your childhood, your father was absent from the home for prolonged periods, indicate how old you were when he was gone. _____
8. If your father was absent for prolonged periods, indicate the reason for his absence.
 Separation Death
 Divorce Prolonged Hospitalization
 Military Service Work Reasons
 Other _____
9. In my family, the discipline I receive is mainly from:
 My father
 My father with some help from my mother
 Equally my father and my mother
 My mother with some help from my father
 My mother
10. Check the answer which most nearly describes the type of discipline you received from your father.
 Very permissive Strict
 Permissive Very strict
 Average

11. Check the answer which most nearly describes the type of discipline you received from your mother.
- | | |
|--|--------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Very Permissive | <input type="checkbox"/> Strict |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Permissive | <input type="checkbox"/> Very Strict |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Average | |
12. In rearing children of your own, do you believe you will be:
- | |
|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> More permissive than your father. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> About the same as your father. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less permissive than your father. |
13. In rearing children of your own, do you believe you will be:
- | |
|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> More permissive than your mother. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> About the same as your mother. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less permissive than your mother. |
14. Which of the following describes the degree of closeness of your relationship with your father during childhood?
- | |
|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Above Average |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Average |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Below Average |
15. Which of the following describes the degree of closeness of your relationship with your mother during childhood?
- | |
|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Above Average |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Average |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Below Average |
16. Which parent had the greatest influence in determining the kind of person you are?
- | |
|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Mother and father equally |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Mother |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Father |
17. In terms of amount of time, do believe your father spent:
- | |
|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> More time with you than the average father. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> An average amount of time with you. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less time with you than the average father. |
18. Which of the following describes the degree of closeness to friends your own age?
- | |
|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Very Close |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Above Average |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Average |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Below Average |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Distant |

Answer each item with a check in the column which most nearly describes you.

<u>Behavior and Characteristics</u>	<u>Almost Always</u>	<u>Sometimes</u>	<u>Seldom</u>
1. I am careless rather than deliberate.	_____	_____	_____
2. I am hostilely aggressive.	_____	_____	_____
3. I am physically active.	_____	_____	_____
4. I am nervous and tense.	_____	_____	_____
5. I am well-liked.	_____	_____	_____
6. I can be counted on to do what I say I will.	_____	_____	_____
7. Things I undertake turn out well.	_____	_____	_____
8. I need to be pushed to do things.	_____	_____	_____
9. I am generous.	_____	_____	_____
10. I am self-reliant.	_____	_____	_____
11. I am moody and emotional.	_____	_____	_____
12. I do what I am told.	_____	_____	_____
13. I make decisions easily and stick to them.	_____	_____	_____
14. I am honest.	_____	_____	_____
15. I am unpredictable.	_____	_____	_____
16. I am kind and affectionate.	_____	_____	_____
17. I am outgoing.	_____	_____	_____
18. I like the way that I am.	_____	_____	_____
19. I am shy and sensitive.	_____	_____	_____
20. I am cooperative.	_____	_____	_____
21. I like being the sex I am.	_____	_____	_____
22. I like to take charge of a situation.	_____	_____	_____
23. I choose to be like those around me.	_____	_____	_____
24. I have fulfilled my goals in life.	_____	_____	_____
25. I desire to achieve.	_____	_____	_____

APPENDIX D

INSTRUCTIONS FOR THE FATHER-SON INTERACTION TEST

The Father-Son Interaction Test is a series of scenes on film in which a father and son interact with each other. The first scene will be shown and the projector will be stopped. Immediately you are to respond to the statements pertaining to Scene I only. These responses are to be recorded on the computer answer sheet provided by filling in the area between the broken lines on one of the responses for each item. Do not mark on the test booklets as they are to be used again. Be sure to use the lead pencil provided, not a pen. If you wish to change a response, be sure to erase the first mark completely.

Look at the top of the test booklet. See the SA, MA, MD, and SD? SA means Strongly Agree; MA means Mildly Agree; MD means Mildly Disagree; and SD means Strongly Disagree. Notice that the answer sheets have the columns labeled SA, MA, MD, and SD so that there will be no question as to where to mark your response on the answer sheet. Mark the response which most nearly expresses your attitude. Also notice that numbers of the answer sheet go across the page, not down.

Wait for Scene II to be shown and when the projector is stopped, respond to Scene II only. When responding to the statements, check the following page to be sure you have included all statements for that scene. This same procedure is to be used throughout the eleven scenes. Do you have any questions? When testing is completed, place the answer sheet inside the information sheet and hold all materials until they are collected. All the information and answers are confidential. There are no right or wrong answers. Respond to the statements the way you really feel.

VITA

Deanna R. Wright Tate

Candidate for the Degree of

Master of Science

Thesis: ADOLESCENT PERCEPTIONS OF FATHER-SON INTERACTION

Major Field: Family Relations and Child Development

Biographical:

Personal Data: Born in Lawton, Oklahoma, September 23, 1943, the daughter of Mr. and Mrs. J. C. Wright. Married Ronald A. Tate, September 28, 1962. Son, Roger, born 1963.

Education: Graduated from Lawton High School, Lawton, Oklahoma in May, 1961; attended Cameron State College in 1961-1962, 1964-1965, graduating with an Associate in Arts degree in Home Economics in May, 1965; received the Bachelor of Science degree from Oklahoma College of Liberal Arts in March, 1967, with a major in Vocational Home Economics Education; completed requirements for the Master of Science Degree in May, 1971.

Professional Experience: Substitute teacher, Lawton Public Schools, Spring, 1967; Vocational Home Economics Teacher and Department Chairman, Edmond High School, Edmond, Oklahoma from 1967-1970.

Professional Organizations: Omicron Nu, American Home Economics Association, Oklahoma Home Economics Association, National Council on Family Relations, Oklahoma Association of Children under Six, National Education Association, Oklahoma Education Association.