

COLLEGE STUDENTS' ATTITUDES CONCERNING
FATHER-SON RELATIONSHIPS

By

ALTHEA MARIE WRIGHT

Bachelor of Science
Oklahoma State University
Stillwater, Oklahoma
1957

Master of Education
West Texas State University
Canyon, Texas
1967

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 EDUCATION
May, 1972

NOV 13 1972

COLLEGE STUDENTS' ATTITUDES CONCERNING
FATHER-SON RELATIONSHIPS

Thesis Approved:

James [unclear]

Thesis Adviser
Rick Stinson

Josephine Toffler

Ware Marsden

A. Stephen Hoggan

D. [unclear]

Dean of the Graduate College

830959

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The investigator is sincerely thankful to Dr. James Walters, Professor, Family Relations and Child Development, for his untiring willingness to be of assistance and guidance, for his outstanding ability to communicate supportiveness, and for his never-ending patience. For these, and the other countless ways in which he imparted his wisdom, the author is eternally grateful.

Recognition and sincere appreciation are also extended to other members of the committee for their cooperation and encouragement. They are Dr. Josephine Hoffer, Head, Family Relations and Child Development; Dr. Nick Stinnett, Associate Professor, Family Relations and Child Development; Dr. Ware Marsden, Professor and Director of Teacher Education; and Dr. Steve Higgins, Associate Professor of Education.

Special recognition is expressed to my husband, Mel, and our two children, Melanie and Lane, for their understanding and patience which has helped to make the attainment of this goal a reality.

This research would not have been possible without the splendid cooperation received from nine institutions of higher education in this country. The cooperating professors and their institutions were: Dr. James Hine, University of Arizona; Dr. Richard Berrett, Fresno State College; Dr. Joseph Rowland, University of Alabama; Dr. Karl King, University of Georgia; Dr. Rebecca M. Smith, University of North Carolina at Greensboro; Dr. Beverly Schmalzried, Stout State University;

Dr. Don Carter, Utah State University; Dr. Joel Moss, Brigham Young University; and Dr. Warren Schumacher, University of Connecticut.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Purpose	1
II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE	6
Influences of Fathers on the Development of Children	6
Father's Influence on Sex-Role Identification. . .	10
Father's Influence on Son's Relationship with Peers.	12
Effects of Parental Control and Personality on Child Behavior and Adjustment	13
Childrearing Environments and Possible Effects on Children.	14
Factors Related to Methods of Control Used	16
Parental Personality Characteristics	18
III. PROCEDURE.	20
Criteria for Selection of Subjects.	20
Measurement of Background Information	20
Measurement of Permissive Attitudes Toward Father-Son Interaction.	21
Description of the Instrument.	21
Administration of the Instruments.	25
Scoring the Instrument	26
Reporting the Analysis to the Cooperating Universities	27
Validity of the Instrument	28
Reliability of the Instrument.	29
Advantage of This Type of Instrument	29
Analysis of Data.	29
IV. RESULTS.	32
Description of the Subjects	32
Background Information	32
Family Relationships Information	35

Chapter	Page
Item Analysis of <u>The Father-Son Interaction Test</u>	38
Percentage of Permissive-Restrictive Responses of Men and Women on <u>The Father-Son Interaction Test</u> . . .	38
Analysis of Data-- <u>Background Information and Family</u> Relationships of the Respondents.	49
Analysis of Data-- <u>Behavior Characteristics</u>	64
 V. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS.	 72
Conclusions	76
 BIBLIOGRAPHY.	 79
APPENDIX A.	84
APPENDIX B.	89
APPENDIX C.	98
APPENDIX D.	100
APPENDIX E.	103
APPENDIX F.	107
APPENDIX G.	115

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
I. Background Characteristics of the Subjects	33
II. Subjects' Ratings of Their Family Relationships.	36
III. Percentage of Permissive-Restrictive Responses of Men and Women on <u>The Father-Son Interaction Test</u>	41
IV. Differences in Responses to <u>The Father-Son Interaction Test</u> Classified According to Age	50
V. Differences in Responses to <u>The Father-Son Interaction Test</u> Classified According to Marital Status	50
VI. Differences in Responses to <u>The Father-Son Interaction Test</u> Classified According to Sex.	51
VII. Differences in Responses to <u>The Father-Son Interaction Test</u> Classified According to Religion	52
VIII. Differences in Responses to <u>The Father-Son Interaction Test</u> Classified According to Size of Community.	52
IX. Differences in Responses to <u>The Father-Son Interaction Test</u> Classified According to the Number of Brothers	53
X. Differences in Responses to <u>The Father-Son Interaction Test</u> Classified According to the Number of Sisters.	54
XI. Differences in Responses to <u>The Father-Son Interaction Test</u> Classified According to Ordinal Position	54
XII. Differences in Responses to <u>The Father-Son Interaction Test</u> Classified According to Socio-Economic Status.	55
XIII. Differences in Responses to <u>The Father-Son Interaction Test</u> Classified According to Father's Education	56
XIV. Differences in Responses to <u>The Father-Son Interaction Test</u> Classified by Age of Father Absence.	56
XV. Differences in Responses to <u>The Father-Son Interaction Test</u> Classified by Reasons for Father Absence	57

Table	Page
XVI. Differences in Responses to <u>The Father-Son Interaction Test</u> Classified by Source of Prevailing Discipline.	58
XVII. Differences in Responses to <u>The Father-Son Interaction Test</u> Classified by Type of Discipline Received From Father.	58
XVIII. Differences in Responses to <u>The Father-Son Interaction Test</u> Classified by Type of Discipline Received From Mother.	59
XIX. Differences in Responses to <u>The Father-Son Interaction Test</u> Classified According to Whether or Not Respondent Would Discipline Like His Father.	60
XX. Differences in Responses to <u>The Father-Son Interaction Test</u> Classified According to Whether or Not Respondent Would Discipline Like His Mother.	60
XXI. Differences in Responses to <u>The Father-Son Interaction Test</u> Classified According to the Degree of Closeness to Father.	61
XXII. Differences in Responses to <u>The Father-Son Interaction Test</u> Classified According to the Degree of Closeness to Mother.	62
XXIII. Differences in Responses to <u>The Father-Son Interaction Test</u> Classified According to the Parent Which was Most Influential.	62
XXIV. Differences in Responses to <u>The Father-Son Interaction Test</u> Classified According to the Degree of Love and Warmth Received From Parents.	63
XXV. Differences in Responses to <u>The Father-Son Interaction Test</u> Classified According to College Grade Point Average.	64
XXVI. Behavior Characteristics of the Subjects	66
XXVII. Differences in Responses to <u>The Father-Son Interaction Test</u> Classified According to the Students' Self-Ratings on Behavior Characteristics	70
XXVIII. Discriminating Items for Women on <u>The Father-Son</u> <u>Interaction Test</u>	108

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Purpose

In American families men are currently assuming an increasing amount of responsibility for the rearing of children. This has come about as a result of many societal changes. In our country we have moved from a relatively simple agrarian society to a more complex industrial society. As a result of this, changes in the conceptions of masculinity, femininity, parenthood, and especially of fatherhood have taken place. Traditionally, the father had been conceptualized as the provider and head of the family group. Waller and Hill (1951) aptly describe the father's traditional role as a parent:

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

A conception of fatherhood which is becoming increasingly accepted has been termed "developmental" (Duvall, 1946; Elder, 1949). This view of the father has been defined best by one of Elder's research subjects:

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

In the most extensive review of the literature on fatherhood to

date, Benson (1968) points out that fatherhood has largely been neglected in social research, and Kagan (1964) concludes that most studies of psychological development report richer data on children than on parents or parent-child interaction and that material on the mother is much more extensive than that on the father. In addition, Peterson, Becker, Hellmer, Shoemaker, and Quay (1959) suggest that the significance of the father in the formation of the child's personality has not received adequate attention. Nash (1965) points out that sociologists and psychologists suggest from their investigations that childrearing in our Western industrial society is decidedly matricentric in its emphasis. Neglect of the father role, he concludes, may have distorted our understanding of the dynamics of development and have adversely affected the rearing of males.

That paternal relationships and paternal deprivation are important aspects of personality development of children is evident from the research which indicates that a significant relationship exists between inadequate paternal relations and/or father-absence and: (a) lack of maturity, (b) sexual adjustment (Winch, 1950), (c) poor sex-role identification (Burton and Whiting, 1961), (d) delinquency (Andry, 1962), (e) aggressive behavior (Sears, Pintler, and Sears, 1946), and (f) dependency (Stolz and collaborators, 1954) among male children.

The purpose of the present study was to assess the attitudes of college students concerning father-son interaction and to examine the relationship of these attitudes to selected psychological and sociological variables which were found to be relevant in the literature. These psychological and sociological variables include selected interpersonal and intrapersonal factors which the literature on parent-child

relationships suggests are important in the personality development of children (Walters and Stinnett, 1971).

Since a large proportion of these youth will become parents within a few years, and since there is evidence (e.g. Radke, 1946; Roy, 1950; and Block, 1955) suggesting that child behavior, in part, reflects parental attitudes toward children, there is a need to assess the attitudes of young men and young women to determine whether, in terms of our present understanding of child growth and development, the attitudes which they hold are conducive to the healthful growth of children. Attitudes toward children, it has been found, can be modified at the college level by planned programs (Walters and Bridges, 1956).

Information gained through this type of investigation would be useful in helping teachers plan the content of courses concerned with education for family life. In order to have maximum effectiveness in this type of family life education, students must be reached early since the manner in which males view father-son interaction is somewhat stabilized by late adolescence (Heath, 1970). Doyle (1968), for example, has found that there is little difference between the responses of male university students and their fathers concerning attitudes toward father-son relationships.

The conceptual framework underlying the present study is essentially interactional for it reflects the system of viewing the personal relationships between family members. The interaction approach to study of the family strives to interpret family phenomena in terms of internal processes such as role playing, status relations, communication problems, decision-making, stress reactions, and socialization processes (Schvaneveldt, 1966).

In this study a detailed investigation was made of the attitudes concerning the interaction of a father and his son. The specific hypotheses which were examined include the following:

1. No significant differences exist in attitudes concerning father-son interaction among respondents classified according to:
 - (a) age, (b) sex, (c) religious affiliation, (d) academic achievement, (e) marital status, (f) number of siblings, (g) ordinal position, (h) social position, (i) father presence or absence, (j) perceived closeness to father, (k) perceived closeness to mother, (l) type of discipline received from mother, (m) type of discipline received from father, (n) size of community in which reared, (o) type of relationship with mother, (p) type of relationship with father, (q) behavior and personality characteristics.
2. No significant differences exist in attitudes concerning father-son interaction among youth:
 - (a) who perceive that their mothers served as the primary source of discipline and youth who perceived that their father served as the primary source of discipline.
 - (b) who, in rearing their children, would utilize a different form of discipline than their father did and youth who would utilize the same type of discipline.
 - (c) who, in rearing their children, would utilize a different form of discipline than their mother did and youth who would utilize the same type of discipline.
 - (d) who believed that their father had the greatest influence

on their lives and youth who believed that their mother had the greatest influence upon their lives.

(e) who classify their home atmosphere as: permissive-little love; permissive-much love; non-permissive-little love; non-permissive-much love.

3. Youth who reveal more permissive attitudes are more likely to come from homes where parents hold more permissive child-rearing attitudes than from homes where parents hold less permissive childrearing attitudes.
 4. Permissive attitudes of youth toward childrearing are independent of selected behavior and personality characteristics.
-

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Influences of Fathers on the Development of Children

Even though there is an increasing recognition of the importance of fathers, research on fatherhood has been limited probably due to the fact that there has been greater emphasis in America on the mother's role in childrearing (Nash, 1965). However, the nature of a child's relationship to his father is of consequence not only in terms of the child's present security, but in terms of his later outlook on life (Bach, 1964).

Most of the research on parent-child relationships has ignored the father. The research which has taken the father into consideration has relied upon the mother's interpretations of the behavior and attitudes of her husband. Comparisons of children from father-present and father-absent homes have indicated that the father's influence on his children's development and adjustment is of considerable importance. Those factors which seem to be most greatly affected by the father are the behavior of sons, their identification with a masculine role, and their adjustment to others.

Limited research has been undertaken in an attempt to determine the effects of father absence upon children, especially boys. In general, the findings reveal that the mother's attitude is significant in determining how children are affected by separation from their fathers.

According to Benson (1968), the wife's reaction to her husband's departure and the reasons why he is gone may influence the child more than the mere fact that he is no longer present in the home. Bach (1964) concluded that children who were separated from their fathers had an effeminized fantasy picture of their fathers which was related to their mothers' attitudes toward their absent husbands, and she communicated this attitude to the children.

Bronfenbrenner (1968) has pointed out that the absence of the father not only affects the behavior of the child directly, but it also influences the mother's behavior in that it tends to make her more over-protective. Sons who were overprotected were dependent, immature, and had problems of identification. A number of investigators have also found that boys from father-absent homes are more dependent and more willing to accept authority from others than are boys from intact homes (Bach, 1964; Stolz, 1954; Lynn and Sawrey, 1959; Bronfenbrenner, 1961; Bronfenbrenner, 1968).

Another important influencing factor in the absence of the father and its effect upon the children has to do with the specific reason for the absence of the father. Illsley and Thompson (1961) found that the father's death had little adverse effect upon children, whereas his absence due to separation or divorce was more detrimental. Bernard (1956) concluded that the entrance of a new parent has more adverse effect after the original parent's death than after divorce.

The age of the child is another important factor in considering the effects of paternal deprivation. Blaine (1963) found that one of the most important and traumatic periods to lose a parent is between the ages of three and six. This conclusion agrees with Sutton-Smith,

Rosenberg, and Landry (1968) who found that father-absence has a depressive effect throughout life, but the greatest effects occur during the early and middle years of childhood. Nash (1965) points out that the preschool period is the most critical for the son's identification with the father and that permanent deficiencies may result if he is not present at this time.

Sibling composition may modify the effects of paternal deprivation according to some authors. Sutton-Smith, Rosenberg, and Landry (1968) found that boys without brothers are more affected by father-absence than those with brothers. They also found that girls with a younger brother are more affected than other girls, and that only girls are affected more than only boys.

The son's aggressive behavior seems to be affected by father absence. Levin and Sears (1956) found that boys whose fathers live at home are more aggressive than boys who come from father-absent homes. This could be due to the fact that the father serves as an aggressive model for his son as is pointed out by Sears (1951).

Behavioral difficulties have also been related to father-absence. Palmer (1960) found that children with behavioral problems were more likely than those without manifest behavioral difficulties to have had extensive separations from their fathers, especially during the preschool years. Lynn and Sawrey (1959) showed that boys whose fathers were away for long periods of time evidenced poorer personality adjustment, greater immaturity, and poorer peer group adjustment than those whose fathers were present. According to Stolz (1954), war-separated children displayed more serious behavior problems, more fears, and more tensions than boys who had not been separated from their fathers. In

addition, there was consistent evidence that the father-separated boys had greater feelings of anxiety.

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

Benson (1968) has emphasized that sex identification may be a problem for the fatherless boy. Boys reared without a father figure often fail to acquire masculine attitudes (Nash, 1965). However, Greenstein (1966) failed to find any significant differences between boys whose fathers were present and father-absent boys in any of the dimensions usually related to sex-typing.

Perhaps the discrepancy in the findings of the two studies above can be explained by a study by Biller (1968) whose results suggest that underlying sex-role orientation is more influenced by father-absence than are the more manifest aspects of masculinity. It appears that a vague or feminine orientation may persist even though a boy becomes masculine in certain aspects of his behavior. Lynn and Sawrey (1959) have pointed out that father-absent boys are insecure in their masculinity which often leads to excessive forms of compensatory behavior. These boys might give the outward appearance of having strong masculine orientations when, in actuality, their masculine performance is not a spontaneous expression of the self.

The evidence seems to indicate that boys without fathers may have greater difficulty in developing a masculine self-concept.

Father's Influence on Sex-Role Identification

The father's function to provide a model of masculinity for his son is one that is easily recognized as one that has received some attention by researchers. Lynn (1966) has made a distinction between identification with the masculine role and identification with one's father. However, as Benson (1968) has pointed out, the identification with one's father inevitably conditions sex-role identification. Even though the child comes into contact with many masculine models, the father will most likely exert a prominent influence on the lives of his own children (Benson, 1968).

Theories of sex-role identification teach us that the most obvious pattern is for the father to be the model of masculinity for his son and for the mother to be the model of femininity for her daughter. However, it has been found that there are many things involved in the process of identification (Mowrer, 1950b; Stoke, 1950; Payne and Mussen, 1956; Kagan, 1958; Mussen and Distler, 1960). Payne and Mussen (1956) found that adolescent boys who were strongly identified with their fathers were more likely to view their father as nurturant and rewarding.

Hetherington and Brackbill (1963) have found that children will identify with the parent whom they consider the most powerful. Slater (1961) reports that a combination of nurturance and firm discipline provides the situation which is most conducive to identification. Mussen and Distler (1960) agreed with this as they found that kindergarten boys identified most intensively with fathers who were viewed as

powerful sources of both reward and punishment. Mussen and Rutherford (1963) also confirmed this finding among the most masculine group of boys in their study.

Johnson (1963) has emphasized the importance of the acquisition of the appropriate sex-role identification of the son, and he pointed out that although boys first identify with their mother, it is the next identification, with the father, that is crucial for appropriate sex-role learning. Benson (1968) emphasizes that even when boys do identify with their mothers, this cross-sex identification does not necessarily account for femininity in boys, but found that effeminacy is more likely to be caused by poor father-son relationship rather than by a strong mother-son bond.

Sopchak (1952) further emphasized the importance of the father as an object of masculine identification when he found that among college students, both male and female, failure to identify with the father was more closely associated with tendencies toward neurotic behavior than failure to identify with the mother. In agreement with this were findings by Osgood, Suci, and Tannenbaum (1957) indicating that normal men identify more with their fathers than their mothers and more with parents than do neurotic men.

Mussen (1961) found adolescent boys who were highly masculine and identified with their fathers to be better adjusted, "more contented, more relaxed, more exuberant, happier, calmer, and smoother in social functioning than boys who were low in masculinity" (p. 23). He also concluded that boys who had favorable relations with their fathers showed strong masculine interests, whereas those whose paternal relationships were less favorable showed more feminine interests.

Benson (1968) concluded that it is likely that children will identify with the same-sex parent if that parent feels reasonably self-confident about his own sexual identity. He also suggested that if the father plays a central role in the family, the son tends to identify with him strongly. Mussen and Distler (1960) concluded that the degree of the son's masculinity is related to the intensity and frequency of his contacts with his father and to the father's participation in child-rearing.

Father's Influence on Son's Relationship With Peers

There is evidence that points to a conclusion that a boy's relationship with his father may influence peer relations. A son's warm companionship with his father was found by Hoffman (1961) to be conducive to good peer adjustment. It is possible that this companionship gives the son a model for interaction with others. Benson (1968) suggested that the father may be of great importance in determining his son's acceptance in the peer group because the father promotes masculine habits that may foster or interfere with his acceptance by other boys.

Helper (1955) observed that boys who conspicuously modeled themselves after their fathers were likely to be rated high in social acceptance and adjustment in high school. Similarly, boys who perceived themselves to be more like their fathers than their mothers were found to be regarded more favorably by their peers (Gray, 1959). Lynn and Sawrey's (1959) findings also emphasize how important the father is to the son; they found that father-absent boys showed deficiencies in their peer adjustment.

Gray (1957) found that boys who were rated high in acceptance by

their peers to be strongly identified with the appropriate sex role. Similarly, Payne and Mussen (1956) observed that boys who were strongly identified with their fathers were calmer and more friendly in their social relationships than were boys who identified less thoroughly with their fathers. Children identifying with supportive parents have been found to be more acceptable to their peers, more self-accepting, and less dependent upon current social relationships (Carlson, 1963). Leiderman (1959) found that boys whose fathers were prestigious models were more secure in their relationships with others. It is fairly evident that a positive attitude toward the parent of the same sex is important for the establishment of warm relationships with peers (Cox, 1962).

Effects of Parental Control and Personality on Child Behavior and Adjustment

Although there are many factors to be considered in examining the parental influence upon children, the degree of restrictiveness or permissiveness in the parent-child relationship is of utmost importance. Another factor to be considered which is also very important is the degree of love and warmth used in the process of dealing with children (Becker et al., 1964). Mowrer (1950a) has concluded that only when discipline is accompanied by love and security in the parent-child relationship can it lead to the capacity for self-discipline.

The personality characteristics of the parents are also influential in determining the behavior and personality of their children. As Radke (1946) has pointed out, what the parent actually is has much more influence upon the child than the specific type of disciplinary tech-

niques he uses. The child learns from his parents not so much by being taught but by being exposed (Radke, 1946).

Childrearing Environments and Possible Effects on Children

Research has been undertaken to determine the effects of varying degrees of parental control and nurturance upon the behavior and personality of children. Baumrind (1967) found children of parents who behaved in the most permissive manner were lacking in self-control and self-reliance. Neither parent of these children demanded much of the child and fathers were found to be weak reinforcing agents. These parents were less involved with their children and used love manipulatively. Bronfenbrenner (1961) concluded that the absence of either sufficient warmth or discipline impairs dependability in children.

Baumrind (1967) found that parents of children who were judged to be socialized and independent represented a more democratic position in their control. They were consistent, loving, conscientious, and secure in relations with their children. Even though they respected the child's independent decisions, the parent demonstrated firm control which was accompanied by clear communication of what was expected of the child. Baumrind and Black (1967) confirm these findings.

Benson (1968) has related self-confidence and independence in children to the degree of nurturance and control which characterizes the father-son relationship. He found that a warm relationship which is characterized by firm control, but not authoritarianism, increases the likelihood that a child will be secure and self-confident without depending on the father for constant guidance. Both the highly permissive and highly restrictive parent appears unattractive to the child in

comparison to the democratic parent (Elder, 1963).

The idea that children must be carefully controlled and indoctrinated has been replaced little by little by the idea that each child should explore and learn as much as possible about himself, which is reflected in a shift toward greater sensitivity to the unique needs of each child (Kell and Aldous, 1960). Parents are no longer encouraged to believe that they can manage their children on the basis of traditional disciplinary dogma and are often told that they should not try (Benson, 1968). There is little evidence to suggest that children appreciate the pressure exerted upon them by demanding parents unless it is moderated by a sustaining and warm relationship (Benson, 1968).

Middleton and Putney (1963) found that the persistence of patriarchy within the family is now often symptomatic of childrearing pathologies. Father-dominated families are currently pictured as a setting for incompetent and dependent boys, but whether strict or permissive, the extremes in parental discipline are associated with the lack of intimacy and confidence between parent and child.

Various findings indicate that children who have achieved appropriate sex-role identification perceive their parents as both highly nurturant and controlling (Mussen and Distler, 1960; Mussen and Rutherford, 1963). Mussen and Distler (1960) found that the fathers of highly masculine boys are affectionate and have considerable power over their sons.

In Baumrind's (1967) study, she found that children of parents who represented the most restrictive attitudes were found to be "less content, more insecure and apprehensive, less affiliative toward peers, and more likely to become hostile or regressive under 'stress' than

were children of the more democratic parents" (p. 81). The parents of these children were found to be less nurturant toward their children and less involved with them. They used firm control and power freely but gave the child little affection and support. They did not encourage the child's expression of disagreement. Similarly, children of those parents who express approval of freedom from parental control have been found to behave more acceptable than do children of parents who approve of strict control in guiding their children (Read, 1945; Radke, 1946).

In addition to the type of control used by parents, another important consideration is the difference of attitudes which the mother and father have. Evidence points to the fact that there seems to be a difference in reasons why fathers and mothers discipline children and the methods which they use. According to Benson (1968) fathers often stress conformity, striving to have their children act like other children, and they more often use coercion and corporal punishment in controlling their children. On the other hand, mothers often view their responsibility as not just to control behavior but to "build character." They tend to use verbal methods of guidance and use reasoning more often.

Factors Related to Methods of Control Used

There seems to be a difference among socio-economic groups in the type of environments which they provide for childrearing. Upper-middle class parents have been found to be more permissive than upper-lower class parents in controlling their children (Maccoby and Gibbs, 1964). Upper-middle class parents use reasoning and praise as methods of guidance more often, whereas upper-lower class parents employ techniques such as physical punishment, deprivation of privileges and ridi-

cule. In both socio-economic classes mentioned above, fathers were found to be stricter than mothers with regard to severity of discipline, demands for obedience, and expectations of self-restraint in the child. According to Benson (1968), lower-class fathers are more punitive toward boys and girls than middle-class fathers.

The difference in the type of occupations in which the parents are involved may partially account for differing attitudes in childrearing. Pearlin and Kohn (1966) suggest that men whose work consists essentially of dealing with things are likely to place high value on obedience in children and to place less value on self-control. On the other hand, men who are involved primarily with ideas tend to stress self-control and do not value obedience very highly. Men who work mainly with people seem to fall somewhere in between. In addition, Hoffman (1963) has suggested that middle-class parents are more likely to be able to express power motives outside the home than are lower-class parents. The home may be the only place where a parent from the lower-class can assert his will.

Family size is another influencing factor in the type of control used within the family. Elder and Bowerman (1963) found that in small families parents tend to employ a greater range of disciplinary techniques and that they used oral methods and verbal reasoning more often. If the parent in the small family is authoritarian, however, the consequences will probably be greatly magnified because parent-child relationships in the small family are more likely to be intense and have deeper emotional implications (Benson, 1968). Benson has also brought out the fact that more is probably expected of each child in a small family.

Elder and Bowerman (1963) found that as family size increases, the father is even more likely to be considered the family spokesman on childrearing matters and to act as the chief disciplinarian, although this seems to be primarily a middle-class rather than a lower-class phenomenon; if the father is present in the lower classes, he is usually an authoritarian type regardless of the size of his family. The father in a large family may be more authoritarian, but his actual leadership is diffused and differentiated. Thus, a "strong" father in the small family may have a greater salutary influence on his children, but potentially he also has a greater harmful effect (Benson, 1968). Because of the number of different relationships found in the large family, the potential level of conflict is heightened. Therefore, these parents are likely to be less flexible and more authoritarian and rely more frequently on strong childrearing methods (Elder and Bowerman, 1963). Benson (1968) concluded that in large families expressions of praise, approval, comfort, and acceptance are likely to be reduced for each child.

Parental Personality Characteristics:

Investigations have been made on the assumption that the personality of the parent will determine, at least in part, the way he guides his children. Block (1955) found that fathers favoring restrictive guidance tended to be constricted, submissive, suggestible individuals with great feelings of personal inadequacy. The fathers who expressed more permissive attitudes toward child guidance appeared to be the more self-reliant and ascendant. They seemed to be able to function more effectively. Block pointed out that although the parent favoring exces-

sive permissiveness was probably not represented in his sample, this parent probably also would be associated with a less than optimal level of personality integration.

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

Becker et al. (1964) found both parents of children with conduct problems to be maladjusted. Although not significant, these results also suggest that healthy adjustment of the father may be even more critical than adjustment of the mother in determining personality problems in children. They concluded that future research should give more consideration to the father's influence in child development.

CHAPTER III

PROCEDURE

Criteria for Selection of Subjects

The sample of 1,236 students who served in this study were selected from university students in four regions of the United States. Institutions included were state-supported colleges and universities with divisions of home economics which were willing to participate in the investigation. The nine institutions included the University of Alabama, University of Georgia, University of North Carolina at Greensboro, Stout State University, University of Connecticut, Fresno State College, University of Arizona, Utah State University, and Brigham Young University. The sample was composed of 316 males and 920 females who were enrolled in marriage and family relationships courses.

Measurement of Background Information

The questionnaire (Appendix A) which was utilized was designed to obtain the following information: (a) age, (b) sex, (c) college major, (d) marital status, (e) nationality, (f) religious preference, (g) size of community for major part of life, (h) number of brothers and sisters, (i) ordinal position in family, (j) socio-economics status, (k) presence or absence of father during childhood, (l) if absent, the reason for his absence, (m) if absent, age of respondent when father was absent, (n) prevailing type of discipline in family, (o) perceived happiness of

childhood relationship with mother and father, (p) perceived influence of mother and father, (q) perceived type of discipline respondent will use in rearing his children, (r) perceived amount of love and warmth received from parents, and (s) information concerning behavior and personality characteristics of the respondent. Questions related to social status were based on the McGuire-White (1955) Index of Social Status (Appendix G).

Measurement of Permissive Attitudes Toward Father-Son Interaction

Description of the Instrument

A filmed instrument entitled The Father-Son Interaction Test developed by Doyle (1968) and modified by Heath (1970) was used in this study. The film consists of eleven scenes, each approximately one minute in length. These scenes include a wide variety of themes in which father and son interact. The same characters play father and son throughout the film and are the only characters in ten of the eleven scenes. Although Scene VIII involves other actors, the father and son are the primary characters.

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

1. Physical properties. Clarity of subjects, correct film and exposure and lighting, and audible sound were considered essential in the selection of the scenes.
2. Behavioral patterns. The filmed action clearly depicted specific types of behavior in each of the scenes.

3. Theme diversity. Each scene presented portrayed different concepts of family life such as responsibility, ego involvement, and pride which were related to the concept of permissive attitudes in father-son relationships.
4. Objectivity. In each scene, no extraneous variables were obvious enough to distract from the primary purpose of that scene.

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

Scene I

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

Scene II

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

Scene III

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

Scene IV

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

Scene V

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

Scene VI

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

Scene VII

Father and son are in the dining room all dressed for dinner. In the son's attempt to reach a mint on the table, he turns over a glass of water.

Scene VIII

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

Scene IX

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

Scene X

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

Scene XI

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

To summarize, the film provided a wide range of themes in which the father and son had opportunities to interact with one another. The father and son were the only characters in ten of the eleven scenes, but they were the primary actors in Scene VIII which also contained other characters.

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

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

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

investigation?

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

In Heath's (1970) study, she utilized a chi-square analysis to determine which items from Doyle's (1968) instrument were appropriate for use with male college and university students. Heath (1970) found that 94 of the total 134 original items discriminated among male college students, thus The Father-Son Interaction Test (Male University Students' Form) resulted. This study utilized Heath's (1970) modified instrument.

A chi-square test was used in the present investigation to determine which items on The Father-Son Interaction Test (Male University Students' Form) were discriminating among females, that is, which items elicited significantly different responses from these subjects who fell into the lower quartile from those whose total scores fell into the upper quartile. A sample of 200 females randomly selected from the total group was used for the item analysis. Of the 94 items initially included on The Father-Son Interaction Test (Male University Students' Form), 77 or 81.91 per cent of the items were found to be significantly discriminating at the .05 level or beyond. The results of the item analysis are presented in Appendix F. Thus, the items were judged to possess sufficient merit for use with females to be utilized in a study of this nature.

Administration of the Instruments

Arrangements were made with professors from other universities and colleges to obtain their cooperation in presenting the film and admin-

istering the questionnaire to college students in their marriage and family relationships classes in departments of home economics throughout the country.

A detailed instruction sheet (see Appendix C), designed by the investigator, was mailed to each participating institution along with the necessary number of information sheets, Father-Son Interaction Test booklets, and IBM answer sheets on which the respondents recorded their responses to the test, and The Father-Son Interaction Film. After the collection of the data was completed, the above materials were returned by mail to the investigator. The time required for the complete administration of The Father-Son Interaction Test and collection of background information is approximately fifty minutes.

These data were collected during the fall and spring semesters of 1970-71 at the nine colleges and universities mentioned previously.

Scoring the Instrument

The four-point scale to which each subject indicated his agreement or disagreement with each of the 94 items was used. The scale included the following categories: Strongly Agree, Mildly Agree, Mildly Disagree, and Strongly Disagree.

The weighting system devised by Doyle (1968) was used to determine the degree of permissiveness of each response. The very permissive response was assigned a value of two; the permissive response was given a value of one; the remaining responses which were not permissive were assigned a value of zero. The permissive score was computed by adding the subscores assigned to each of the responses to the 94 items. The key utilized in scoring each questionnaire is presented in Appendix D.

Since the responses were recorded on IBM answer sheets, it was possible to have them machine-scored at the Bureau of Tests and Measurements, Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, Oklahoma.

Reporting the Analysis to the Cooperating Universities

There were nine colleges and universities participating in this study, but scores received from three of the institutions were used in establishing the percentile norms. Based upon the scores from The Father-Son Interaction Test received from the first three cooperating universities, the University of Alabama, the University of Georgia, and the University of North Carolina at Greensboro, an analysis was made in order to develop percentile norms for the sample. After the percentile norms were developed, the Analysis Sheet (Appendix E) was developed so that information concerning the results of The Father-Son Interaction Test could be reported to each individual student who participated in the study. The Analysis Sheet contained information about the instrument used, a brief review of the most pertinent related literature concerning child guidance, an explanation of permissive and restrictive guidance, a statement concerning the type of guidance which research findings show to be the most desirable, the range of scores possible on this instrument, and a breakdown of the scores into four classifications: permissive, moderately permissive, moderately restrictive, and restrictive. In addition to the above information, the percentile norms established for the sample were included. This information made it possible for each individual student to have a better understanding of his score in terms of others who have taken the same test. In addition to the Analysis Sheets for each student, his own individual score was

recorded on a list and sent to the cooperating professor for distribution.

Validity of the Instrument

In Heath's study (1970), a chi-square analysis was utilized to determine which items on The Father-Son Interaction Test were discriminating, that is, which items elicited significantly different responses from those subjects whose total score fell into the lower quartile and subjects whose score fell into the upper quartile. Of the original 134 items included in Doyle's (1968) instrument, Heath (1970) found 94, or 70 per cent, to be significant at the .05 level or beyond.

In order to determine which items on The Father-Son Interaction Test (Male University Students' Form) were discriminating for female university students, a chi-square analysis was utilized in this study. Of the total 94 items which had been found to be discriminating for male university students by Heath (1970), 77, or 81.91 per cent of these items were found to be discriminating for female university students at the .05 level or beyond. This indicates that this instrument is appropriate for use with women. A detailed statement concerning this analysis is presented in Appendix F.

In the analysis of the data, it was necessary to utilize the same number of items on The Father-Son Interaction Test for both male and female subjects so that the two groups could be compared. The investigator had two alternatives from which to choose in treatment of the data. The first alternative was to exclude all items from The Father-Son Interaction Test which were not discriminating for females, which would mean excluding some seventeen items which had already been found

to be discriminating for males (Heath, 1970). The second alternative was to include all 94 items on The Father-Son Interaction Test which were discriminating for males even though they were not discriminating for female subjects. The investigator chose the second alternative, to include all 94 items of the instrument for the analysis of the data. The inclusion of the 94-item instrument will facilitate comparisons with other studies currently being undertaken in the department in which the instrument developed by Heath (1970) is being utilized.

Reliability of the Instrument

In order to assess the reliability of the instrument, a split-half technique was utilized, and a Spearman r of .99 was obtained in Heath's (1970) analysis.

Advantage of This Type of Instrument

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

Analysis of the Data

The chi-square test was utilized in an item analysis in order to determine the items which significantly differentiated subjects scoring in the upper and lower quartiles on the basis of total scores received on The Father-Son Interaction Test. An analysis of variance for one-way

design was used to examine each of the following hypotheses:

- 1) No significant differences exist in attitudes concerning father-son interaction among respondents classified according to: (a) age, (b) sex, (c) religious affiliation, (d) academic achievement, (e) marital status, (f) number of siblings, (g) ordinal position, (h) social position, (i) father presence or absence, (j) perceived closeness to father, (k) perceived closeness to mother, (l) type of discipline received from mother, (m) type of discipline received from father, (n) size of community in which reared, (o) type of relationship with mother, (p) type of relationship with father, and (q) behavior and personality characteristics.
- 2) No significant differences exist in attitudes concerning father-son interaction among youth:
 - a) who perceive that their mother served as the primary source of discipline and youth who perceived that their father served as the primary source of discipline.
 - b) who, in rearing their children, would utilize a different type of discipline than their father and youth who would utilize the same type of discipline.
 - c) who, in rearing their children, would utilize a different type of discipline than their mother and youth who would utilize the same type of discipline.
 - d) who believed that their father had the greatest influence on their lives and youth who believed that their mother had the greatest influence upon their lives.
 - e) who classify their home atmosphere as: permissive-little

love; permissive-much love; non-permissive-little love; or non-permissive-much love.

- 3) Youth who reveal more permissive attitudes are more likely to come from homes where parents hold more permissive child-rearing attitudes than from homes where parents hold less permissive childrearing attitudes.
- 4) Permissive attitudes of youth toward childrearing are independent of selected behavior and personality characteristics.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

Description of the Subjects

Background Information

A detailed description of the 1,236 subjects who participated in this study is presented in Table I. The sample consisted of 25.58 per cent males and 74.42 per cent females. The majority (51.05%) of the sample fell into the 20 and under age category. There were more respondents (51.01%) who were of the Protestant religion. The greatest majority of the students (86.24%) were single. The highest percentage of the sample (34.77%) had lived in a town of less than 25,000 population. Most of the subjects (71.06%) reported having brothers, and a large percentage also had sisters (69.01%). The highest proportion of the subjects (38.59%) reported being the eldest child in the family. Most of the respondents were classified as lower-middle class (37.62%) as measured by the McGuire-White Index of Socio-economic Status (1955) (Appendix G). Most of the students (64.49%) had a college grade point which was average (2.0-3.0). Those students who had experienced father-absence represented 17.39 per cent of the total sample. Of the 215 students who experienced father-absence, 51.62 per cent of them experienced the absence after the age of six years. In most cases the respondents reported that their fathers were absent from the home because of work

TABLE I
BACKGROUND CHARACTERISTICS OF THE SUBJECTS*

Description	Males		Females		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
<u>Age</u>						
20 or under	56	17.72	575	62.57	631	51.05
21-24	228	72.15	324	35.26	552	44.66
25 and over	32	10.13	20	2.18	52	4.29
<u>Sex</u>						
Male	316	25.58	--	--	316	25.58
Female	--	--	920	74.42	920	74.42
<u>Marital Status</u>						
Single	242	76.58	824	89.57	1066	86.24
Married	71	22.47	90	9.78	161	13.02
Divorced	3	.95	3	.33	6	.00
Separated	0	.00	3	.33	3	.00
<u>Religion</u>						
Protestant	129	40.82	512	55.65	641	51.01
Catholic	33	10.44	101	10.88	134	10.84
Jewish	17	5.38	20	2.17	37	.02
Other	137	43.35	287	31.20	424	34.30
<u>Residence</u>						
Farm or Country	53	16.77	158	17.21	211	17.07
Less than 25,000 population	110	34.81	316	34.42	426	34.77
50,000 to 100,000 population	71	22.47	229	24.95	300	18.52
Over 100,000 population	82	25.95	215	23.42	297	29.64
<u>Family Size</u>						
No brothers	86	27.39	158	17.21	244	19.74
1-2 brothers	177	56.37	521	56.88	698	56.47
3-4 brothers	38	12.10	115	12.55	153	12.37
5 or more than 5	12	3.82	22	2.40	34	.02
No sisters	91	28.98	285	31.15	376	30.42
1-2 sisters	175	55.73	500	54.64	675	54.61
3-4 sisters	41	13.06	104	11.37	145	11.73
5 or more than 5	7	2.23	26	2.84	33	.02

TABLE I (CONTINUED)

Description	Males		Females		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
<u>Family Position</u>						
Oldest child	111	35.13	366	39.83	477	38.59
Second child	108	34.18	315	34.28	423	34.30
Third child	62	19.62	125	13.60	187	15.13
Fourth child	20	6.33	66	7.78	86	6.95
Fifth child	9	2.85	22	2.39	31	2.50
Sixth child	3	1.88	13	1.41	16	1.20
Seventh and beyond	1	1.32	12	1.40	13	1.05
<u>Socio-economic Status</u>						
Upper class	21	6.77	72	8.00	93	7.52
Upper-middle class	93	30.00	267	29.67	360	29.12
Lower-middle class	117	37.74	348	38.67	465	37.62
Upper-lower class	63	20.32	183	20.33	246	19.90
Lower-lower class	16	5.16	30	3.33	46	3.72
<u>Father's Education</u>						
Over 4 years of college	41	13.40	142	15.87	183	14.80
College graduate	42	13.73	129	14.47	171	13.83
1-3 years college	58	18.95	197	22.01	255	20.63
High school graduate	97	31.70	264	29.50	361	29.10
Grades 9-11 completed	32	10.46	80	8.94	112	9.06
Grade 8 completed	20	6.54	50	5.59	70	5.67
Below 8	16	5.22	33	3.69	49	3.96
<u>Father Absence</u>						
Yes	56	17.72	159	17.26	215	17.39
No	260	82.28	761	82.74	1021	82.60
<u>Age of Father Absence</u>						
Before age 6	18	32.14	43	27.04	61	28.37
After age 6	23	41.07	88	55.35	111	51.62
Both before and after age 6	15	25.79	28	17.61	43	20.00
<u>Reasons for Father Absence</u>						
Separation	4	6.56	5	2.92	9	4.18
Divorce	15	24.59	35	20.49	50	23.72
War	7	11.48	24	14.04	31	13.19
Death	9	14.75	25	14.62	34	14.69
Prolonged hospitalization	4	6.56	17	9.94	21	8.25
Other (work)	22	36.07	65	38.01	87	37.04

*N for males = 316; N for females = 920

responsibilities.

Family Relationships Information

In addition to the background information, the questionnaire also contained items which elicited the students' perceptions of their family relationships (Table II). Below are the results of the findings. The greatest proportion of the students (40.78%) reported their prevailing source of discipline to have come equally from their mothers and their fathers. With regard to the type of discipline received from their father, the greatest percentage (49.11%) reported that it was average, rather than restrictive or permissive. Also, most students (57.52%) reported that the discipline received from their mothers was average, not restrictive or permissive. The majority (62.05%) indicated that they would discipline their children in the same manner in which their own fathers had disciplined them. With regard to the discipline received from their mothers, the majority (67.23%) of students indicated that they would discipline their children like their own mothers had disciplined them. With regard to the closeness the student felt to his father, the greatest proportion (43.36%) reported average closeness. More students reported being above average in closeness to their fathers (29.21%) than below average. The majority (48.30%) reported that they were above average in their degree of closeness to their mothers. The evidence seems to point out that in this sample, more students felt a closer relationship with their mothers than they did with their fathers. Most of the students (52.11%) reported that their mothers and fathers equally had influenced their lives. However, more students mentioned their mothers as the most influential parent

TABLE II
SUBJECTS' RATINGS OF THEIR FAMILY RELATIONSHIPS

Description	Males		Females		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
<u>Prevailing Type of Discipline</u>						
Father	117	37.15	170	18.55	287	23.33
Mother	91	28.89	349	38.10	440	35.53
Mother and father equally	107	33.97	397	43.34	504	40.78
<u>Type of Discipline from Father</u>						
Permissive	60	19.10	166	18.20	226	18.28
Average	157	50.00	450	49.34	607	49.11
Restrictive	98	30.89	296	32.46	394	31.86
<u>Type of Discipline from Mother</u>						
Permissive	69	21.91	158	17.27	227	18.52
Average	174	55.24	552	60.33	726	57.52
Restrictive	72	22.86	205	22.86	277	22.41
<u>Type of Discipline Will Use as a Parent</u>						
More permissive than father	79	25.24	213	23.41	292	23.36
Same as father	194	61.98	573	62.97	767	62.05
Less permissive than father	40	12.78	124	13.63	164	13.26
<u>Type of Discipline Will Use as a Parent</u>						
More permissive than mother	64	20.32	170	18.58	234	18.93
Same as mother	189	60.00	642	70.16	831	67.23
Less permissive than mother	62	19.68	103	11.26	165	13.35
<u>Closeness with Father</u>						
Above average	92	29.21	378	41.36	470	38.26
Average	152	48.25	384	42.01	536	43.36
Below average	71	22.54	152	16.63	223	18.04
<u>Closeness with Mother</u>						
Above average	121	38.29	476	51.91	597	48.30
Average	166	52.53	372	40.57	538	43.50
Below average	29	9.18	69	7.52	98	.07

TABLE II (CONTINUED)

Description	Males		Females		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
<u>Most Influencing Parent</u>						
Mother and father equally	148	46.84	505	55.07	653	52.91
Mother	91	28.80	306	33.37	397	32.11
Father	77	24.37	106	11.56	183	14.80
<u>Ratings of Parental Love and Warmth</u>						
Much	250	79.11	777	84.83	1027	83.09
Average	56	17.72	119	12.99	175	14.15
Below Average	10	3.16	20	2.18	30	.01

(32.11%) rather than indicating their fathers as the most influential parent. A majority (83.09%) of the sample reported that they had received much love and warmth from their parents rather than an average amount or little love and warmth.

Item Analysis of The Father-Son Interaction Test

A chi-square test was used in the present investigation to determine which items on The Father-Son Interaction Test (Male University Students' Form) were discriminating among females, that is, which items elicited significantly different responses from those subjects whose total scores fell in the lower quartile from those whose total scores fell in the upper quartile. A sample of 200 females randomly selected from the total group was used for the item analysis. Of the 94 items initially included on The Father-Son Interaction Test (Male University Students' Form), 77 or 81.91 per cent of the items were found to be significantly discriminating at the .05 level or beyond. The results of the item analysis are presented in Appendix F. Thus, the items were judged to possess sufficient merit for use with females in a study of this nature.

Percentage of Permissive-Restrictive Responses of Men and Women on The Father-Son Interaction Test

Included in Table III is a percentage count on how permissively or restrictively students responded on each item of The Father-Son Interaction Test. This analysis included 400 males and females randomly selected from the total group. The selection included 100 males and 100 females from the Western half of the United States and 100 males and

100 females from the Eastern half of the United States.

From Table III, the following conclusions concerning the students' responses to The Father-Son Interaction Test are suggested:

- 1) In Scene II where the father ignored the son's request for his allowance, the majority of the students (89.25%) felt that the father should not have ignored the son, indicating a very permissive response (item 14).
- 2) In Scene IV where the son and father are talking about the son's performance in the baseball game, most of the respondents (88.50%) felt that the father should have encouraged his son more, indicating a very permissive response (item 33).
- 3) In Scene VI where the father insisted upon the son raking the leaves in the yard immediately rather than waiting until a later time, the majority of respondents (78.25%) indicated a restrictive response which seems to imply that they felt the father did have a right to insist upon the son doing the job right away (item 51).
- 4) In Scene VII where the son turned over a glass of water on the dinner table, the majority of the respondents (88.75%) indicated that they felt that the father had done the right thing in not punishing his son for spilling the water. This indicates a very permissive response (item 61).
- 5) In Scene VIII where the father asked the son's opinion of a parent's committee of the Parent Teacher Association and the son gave no response, the majority of the respondents (81.00%) indicated that they felt that the father did the right thing in not asking the son to leave the table. This indicates a very permissive response (item 74).
- 6) In Scene IX where the father came into the room to find the son

studying with the television on and immediately turned it off, the majority of the respondents (83.25%) indicated a restrictive response which implies that they felt the father had a right to turn off the television (item 79).

7) In Scene X where the son got a telephone call and was asked by his father to limit his call to two minutes because he was expecting an important business call was a situation in which the respondents showed no clear-cut opinion as the responses were evenly distributed among the restrictive, moderately permissive, and permissive groups.

8) In Scene XI where the father came into the son's room and objected to the "pin-up" picture which the son was putting up on his wall, the majority (81.00%) of the respondents indicated a restrictive response which implies that they felt the father did have a right in objecting to the son putting up the picture (item 91).

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

TABLE III

PERCENTAGE OF PERMISSIVE-RESTRICTIVE RESPONSES OF MEN AND WOMEN
ON THE FATHER-SON INTERACTION TEST*

Item	Percentage of Responses		
	Restrictive	Moderately Permissive	Very Permissive
SCENE I			
1. The father should have understood the son's difficulty in arising.	17.00	53.00	30.00
2. The father should have realized that his son's reaction was a normal reaction, and he should not have been threatened.	16.50	42.00	41.50
3. The father should have been irritated by the boy's actions.	9.00	30.25	60.75
4. The father should have been more forceful in getting his son out of bed.	10.00	29.25	60.75
5. The father should not have allowed his son to turn over when he called him.	9.75	23.50	66.75
6. The father should be complimented for having given his son this type of help.	51.50	34.25	14.25
7. The father should have shown more concern for his son getting enough rest.	66.25	28.25	5.50
SCENE II			
8. The father should have given his son the money at the first request.	27.00	39.75	33.25
9. The son should not have interrupted his father's activities.	25.25	39.00	35.75
10. The father should have shown more attention to his son.	.50	14.00	85.50

TABLE III (CONTINUED)

Item	Percentage of Responses		
	Restrictive	Moderately Permissive	Very Permissive
11. The father should not have reacted as this father did.	3.75	11.00	85.25
12. The father should have given the money to his son the previous night.	32.75	52.25	15.00
13. The father should have handled the matter satisfactorily.	7.25	11.25	81.50
14. The father should not have ignored his son.	4.50	6.25	89.25
15. The son should not have had to beg for money.	7.00	28.50	64.50
16. The father should have been more concerned with his son's feelings.	2.50	19.50	78.00
17. The father should have responded immediately when his son asked for his allowance.	21.00	44.25	34.75
SCENE III			
18. The father should have been more attentive to the son's conversation.	2.75	25.25	72.00
19. A father should not have had to listen to his son this much during mealtime.	12.00	25.25	62.75
20. The son's actions should not have irritated his father.	16.00	40.00	44.00
21. The father and son should have had a closer relationship.	2.75	22.00	75.25
22. The son should have been able to feel more comfortable with his father.	2.50	14.50	83.00

TABLE III (CONTINUED)

Item	Percentage of Responses		
	Restrictive	Moderately Permissive	Very Permissive
23. The father was right in objecting to his son's slowness in eating.	37.75	31.50	30.75
24. The father should not have been so hasty in scolding his son.	12.00	29.75	58.25
25. The father should have participated in his son's conversation.	1.50	22.50	76.00
26. The son should not have talked so much.	40.00	29.75	30.25
27. The son should not have bothered his father about such unimportant matters.	6.00	18.00	76.00
28. The father should have shown more affection for his son.	4.00	33.75	62.25
29. The father should have shown more interest in his son's activities.	1.25	16.00	82.75
SCENE IV			
30. The son should be able to expect more encouragement from his father.	2.25	9.00	88.75
31. The father should have first mentioned his son's winning run.	1.25	11.75	87.00
32. It is a wise father who gives this kind of help in directing his son's play activities.	13.00	19.00	68.00
33. The father should have encouraged his son more.	.75	10.75	88.50
34. The father should have arrived at a better method of guiding his son.	1.25	10.75	88.00

TABLE III (CONTINUED)

Item	Percentage of Responses		
	Restrictive	Moderately Permissive	Very Permissive
35. The father should have shown more appreciation for his son's achievements.	.55	12.25	87.20
36. The father was too concerned with his son's mistakes.	9.00	22.50	68.50
37. The father should have shown more concern for his son's feelings than for his achievements.	3.75	24.50	71.75
SCENE V			
38. The son should not have reminded the father of his promise.	9.95	23.25	67.00
39. The father should have cancelled his appointment with his son.	24.25	37.25	38.50
40. The father should not have forgotten his promise.	5.00	32.75	62.25
41. The father should have offered to take his son with him.	16.00	37.25	46.75
42. The father should not have offered to call off his business date.	32.75	43.00	24.25
43. The father should have told his son that a business deal was more important.	19.50	32.50	48.00
44. The father should have felt happy that his son wanted to play golf with him.	2.25	28.75	69.00
45. The son should not have expected his father to want to play golf with him.	7.75	24.00	68.25
46. The son should have made his own arrangements for playing golf.	16.00	37.25	46.75

TABLE III (CONTINUED)

Item	Percentage of Responses		
	Restrictive	Moderately Permissive	Very Permissive
47. The father should have shown more affection for his son.	9.50	37.50	53.00
48. The father should have felt obligated to play golf with his son.	30.00	44.00	26.00
SCENE VI			
49. If a son has feelings of resentment, he should express his feelings.	29.50	50.50	20.00
50. The father should have "paddled" his son.	26.75	32.00	41.25
51. The father should have allowed his son to rake the leaves at his convenience.	78.25	16.25	5.50
52. Since the father was so persistent, the son's reaction was appropriate.	75.00	20.25	4.75
53. A son needs a lot of help in learning to assume responsibility for the yard.	31.25	45.25	23.50
54. The father was right in being so persistent.	72.25	18.75	9.00
55. A father should not threaten his son.	29.75	34.25	36.00
56. A father should be able to reason with his son without threatening him.	4.25	23.50	72.25
57. The father should have been more forceful in the beginning.	46.50	33.50	20.00
58. The father should not have become so excited when his son did not obey him.	46.75	35.75	17.50

TABLE III (CONTINUED)

Item	Percentage of Responses		
	Restrictive	Moderately Permissive	Very Permissive
SCENE VII			
59. The father should have insisted that his son clean up the table by himself.	8.00	33.75	58.25
60. The father was too lenient with his son.	4.25	23.50	75.25
61. The father should have punished his son for spilling the water.	2.50	8.75	88.75
62. The father handled the situation satisfactorily.	4.25	20.50	75.25
63. The father should be complimented for having helped his son clean up the table.	13.25	35.25	51.50
64. The father should have objected to his son's carelessness.	20.25	33.00	46.75
65. The son should not have been so concerned with spilling a glass of water.	71.00	25.00	4.00
66. The father should not have been so calm.	3.00	19.00	78.00
SCENE VIII			
67. The father should have been considerate of his son's opinions.	19.50	42.00	38.50
68. A father should never embarrass his son when guests are present.	10.25	29.25	60.50
69. The father should not have been persistent.	16.00	33.00	51.00
70. The father should have tried to understand why his son was not talking.	5.00	35.50	59.50

TABLE III (CONTINUED)

Item	Percentage of Responses		
	Restrictive	Moderately Permissive	Very Permissive
71. The father should have been more persistent.	5.75	22.50	71.75
72. The father should have recognized that the son might not want to participate.	8.00	46.50	45.50
73. The father should have shown more warmth and affection for his son.	21.50	40.25	38.25
74. The son should have been asked to leave the table when he refused to answer his father.	3.75	15.25	81.00
75. The father handled the situation well.	28.50	30.00	41.50
SCENE IX			
76. The father should help his son with his homework whenever asked.	14.50	49.00	36.50
77. The father should have been angry at the son's lack of motivation in doing his homework.	36.50	45.50	18.00
78. The son should have felt free to ask his father for assistance.	1.50	22.25	76.25
79. The father should not have turned off the television.	83.25	13.25	3.50
80. The father should have insisted that his son study at a desk.	42.50	35.50	22.00
81. The father should have helped his son without worrying.	37.25	48.00	14.75
82. The father should not have been so critical of his son's attempts.	34.25	38.25	27.50

TABLE III (CONTINUED)

Item	Percentage of Responses		
	Restrictive	Moderately Permissive	Very Permissive
83. The father should have shown more warmth and affection for his son.	37.75	34.00	28.25
SCENE X			
84. The father should have been more considerate of his son.	44.50	32.00	23.50
85. The father should have shown more force.	10.00	43.75	46.25
86. The son should have been punished.	8.25	35.50	56.25
87. The son should not have accepted his call knowing that his father was expecting a business call.	43.25	35.75	21.00
88. The father should not have allowed his son to accept the call.	8.75	35.25	56.00
89. The father should not have treated his son like a "baby."	35.25	32.00	32.75
90. The father should not have been so impatient.	47.25	28.25	24.50
SCENE XI			
91. A father should have no right to disapprove the type of pictures which his son views.	81.00	14.75	4.25
92. A father should check all magazines his son reads.	15.50	40.50	44.00
93. The father should have talked with his son before disapproving.	8.00	32.25	59.75
94. The father should have been more understanding.	15.75	35.25	49.00
TOTAL	20.68	50.11	29.21

* N = 400

Analysis of Data--Background Information and Family

Relationships of the Respondents

Using the statistical procedures outlined in the preceding chapter, calculations were carried out to determine whether or not significant differences were present among attitudes of youth concerning father-son interaction classified according to: (a) age, (b) sex, (c) religion, (d) academic achievement, (e) marital status, (f) number of siblings, (g) ordinal position, (h) social position, (i) father presence or absence, (j) perceived closeness to father, (k) perceived closeness to mother, (l) type of discipline received from mother, (m) type of discipline received from father, (n) size of community in which reared, (o) type of relationship with mother, and (p) type of relationship with father.

Age. No significant differences were found in students' attitudes toward father-son relationships when their responses were classified according to age. The means and the probability value are presented in Table IV. In this comparison and in the comparisons which follow, an analysis of variance for one-way design was utilized.

Even though the mean score was slightly lower for the older students, all three age groups had mean scores on the test which fell into the moderately permissive classification.

TABLE IV
DIFFERENCES IN RESPONSES TO THE FATHER-SON INTERACTION
TEST CLASSIFIED ACCORDING TO AGE

Groups	N	Mean	F	p
20 or under	631	124.13		
21-24	552	123.22	2.24	n.s.
25 and over	52	118.44		

Marital Status. As reflected in Table V, there were no significant differences in students' attitudes toward father-son relationships when their responses were classified according to marital status.

All three of these groups had mean scores on The Father-Son Interaction Test which fell into the moderately permissive classification.

TABLE V
DIFFERENCES IN RESPONSES TO THE FATHER-SON INTERACTION
TEST CLASSIFIED ACCORDING TO MARITAL STATUS

Groups	N	Mean	F	p
Single	1066	123.13		
Married	161	126.00	2.93	n.s.
Separated or divorced	6	110.83		

Sex. The female subjects in this sample were found to reflect significantly more permissive ($p = .001$) attitudes concerning the father-son relationship based on their scores on The Father-Son Interaction Test, as shown in Table VI.

Although the males were found to be more restrictive than the females, both groups fell within the moderately permissive classification. The tendency for males to be more restrictive than females is a

trend which has been noted in the past research. Maccoby and Gibbs (1964), for example, found that fathers were stricter than mothers with regard to severity of discipline, demands for obedience, and expectations of self-restraint in the child.

TABLE VI
DIFFERENCES IN RESPONSES TO THE FATHER-SON INTERACTION TEST CLASSIFIED ACCORDING TO SEX

Groups	N	Mean	F	p
Male	315	117.08	50.10	.001
Female	920	125.71		

Religion. As shown in Table VII, attitudes toward father-son relationships were found to be significantly related ($p = .001$) to the students' choice of religion.

The respondents who were neither Protestant, Catholic, or Jewish had the most permissive mean score on The Father-Son Interaction Test. The majority of these respondents wrote into the space provided for them on the questionnaire that their religion was Latter Day Saints. This can be explained by the fact that there was a large number of students in the sample from Brigham Young University which is a church-related school for the Latter Day Saints religious group.

All of these groups had mean scores on The Father-Son Interaction Test which placed them in the moderately permissive classification.

TABLE VII

DIFFERENCES IN RESPONSES TO THE FATHER-SON INTERACTION
TEST CLASSIFIED ACCORDING TO RELIGION

Groups	N	Mean	F	p
Protestant	641	121.05		
Catholic	134	122.26		
Jewish	37	123.56	10.48	.001
Other	424	127.58		

Size of Community. There were no significant differences in students' attitudes toward father-son relationships when their responses were classified according to the size of community in which the student had been reared. Results of the comparison are shown in Table VIII.

The mean scores of the groups responding to The Father-Son Interaction Test were similar for all four groups, and each of the groups fell within the moderately permissive classification.

TABLE VIII

DIFFERENCES IN RESPONSES TO THE FATHER-SON INTERACTION
TEST CLASSIFIED ACCORDING TO SIZE OF COMMUNITY

Groups	N	Mean	F	p
On a farm or in the country	211	123.90		
In a community of less than 25,000 population	426	123.10		
In a community of 50,000-100,000 population	300	124.06	.18	n.s.
In a community of over 100,000 population	297	123.33		

Number of Brothers. There were no significant differences in students' attitudes toward father-son relationships when their responses were classified according to how many brothers they had in their family of orientation. Results of this comparison can be seen in Table IX.

All of the groups had mean scores which fell within the moderately permissive classification.

TABLE IX

DIFFERENCES IN RESPONSES TO THE FATHER-SON INTERACTION
TEST CLASSIFIED ACCORDING TO NUMBER OF BROTHERS

Groups	N	Mean	F	p
No brothers	344	123.18		
One or two brothers	698	122.78	2.39	n.s.
Three or four brothers	153	127.15		
Five or more brothers	32	125.75		

Number of Sisters. There were no significant differences in students' attitudes toward father-son relationships when their responses were classified according to the number of sisters which the respondent had in their family of orientation. Mean scores of the groups are presented in Table X.

All four of these groups had mean scores on The Father-Son Interaction Test which fell within the moderately permissive classification.

TABLE X

DIFFERENCES IN RESPONSES TO THE FATHER-SON INTERACTION
TEST CLASSIFIED ACCORDING TO NUMBER OF SISTERS

Groups	N	Mean	F	p
No sisters	376	122.53		
One or two sisters	675	123.34	2.59	n.s.
Three or four sisters	145	126.37		
Five or more sisters	30	129.96		

Ordinal Position. There were no significant differences in students' attitudes toward father-son relationships when their responses were classified according to ordinal position as shown in Table XI.

All of the groups classified according to ordinal position had mean scores on The Father-Son Interaction Test which fell within the moderately permissive classification.

TABLE XI

DIFFERENCES IN RESPONSES TO THE FATHER-SON INTERACTION
TEST CLASSIFIED ACCORDING TO ORDINAL POSITION

Groups	N	Mean	F	p
First	477	123.63		
Second	423	122.75		
Third	187	123.25		
Fourth	86	124.15	.78	n.s.
Fifth	31	129.41		
Sixth	18	125.88		
Seventh	7	129.14		

Socio-economic Status. As shown in Table XII, attitudes toward father-son relationships were found to be significantly related ($p = .01$) to socio-economic status of the students. The mean score for the lower-lower class group was 113.82 while the upper-class group had a more

permissive mean score of 125.86. Research findings show that the trend seems to be for lower-class persons to be more restrictive than are upper-class persons. Maccoby and Gibbs (1964) found that in their study upper-middle class parents were more permissive than upper-lower class parents in controlling their children. However, all of the socioeconomic groups had mean scores which fell within the moderately permissive classification.

TABLE XII

DIFFERENCES IN RESPONSES TO THE FATHER-SON INTERACTION
TEST CLASSIFIED ACCORDING TO SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS

Groups	N	Mean	F	p
Upper-class	93	125.86		
Upper-middle class	360	123.06		
Lower-middle class	465	123.61	3.59	.01
Upper-lower class	246	124.60		
Lower-lower class	46	113.82		

Father's Education. There were no significant differences in students' attitudes toward father-son relationships when their responses were classified according to the educational level of the respondent's father. Mean scores of the different groups compared are presented in Table XIII.

All of the mean scores on The Father-Son Interaction Test in these groups fell within the moderately permissive classification.

TABLE XIII

DIFFERENCES IN RESPONSES TO THE FATHER-SON INTERACTION
TEST CLASSIFIED ACCORDING TO FATHER'S EDUCATION

Groups	N	Mean	F	p
1-4	16	119.31		
5-7	20	122.68		
8	70	127.38		
9-11	112	121.21		
Graduated from high school	361	122.45	1.51	n.s.
Completed 1-3 years of college	255	124.45		
Graduated from a 4-year college	171	121.88		
Over 4 years of college	183	125.62		

Age of Father Absence. There were no significant differences in students' attitudes toward father-son relationships classified according to the age at which the father was absent for a prolonged period. The results of the analysis can be seen in Table XIV.

All three of these groups had mean scores on The Father-Son Interaction Test which placed them into the moderately permissive classification.

TABLE XIV

DIFFERENCES IN RESPONSES TO THE FATHER-SON INTERACTION
TEST CLASSIFIED BY THE AGE OF FATHER ABSENCE

Groups	N	Mean	F	p
Before age 6	61	123.95		
After age 6	111	123.09		
Both before and after age 6	43	120.81	.32	n.s.

Reason for Father Absence. There were no significant differences in the students' attitudes toward father-son relationships classified according to various reasons for father absence. The mean scores of the groups compared are presented in Table XV.

Each of these six groups had mean scores on The Father-Son Interaction Test which fell into the moderately permissive classification.

TABLE XV

DIFFERENCES IN RESPONSES TO THE FATHER-SON INTERACTION TEST
CLASSIFIED BY THE REASONS FOR FATHER ABSENCE

Groups	N	Mean	F	p
Separation	9	119.11		
Divorce	50	119.18		
War	31	126.32		
Death	34	126.14	1.02	n.s.
Prolonged hospitalization	21	118.09		
Other	87	123.13		

Prevailing Source of Discipline. There were no significant differences in students' attitudes toward father-son relationships classified according to the source of prevailing discipline which they received in their families of orientation. The different groups are identified in Table XVI.

The mean scores on The Father-Son Interaction Test for all of those groups classified them as being moderately permissive in their attitudes toward child guidance.

TABLE XVI

DIFFERENCES IN RESPONSES TO THE FATHER-SON INTERACTION TEST
CLASSIFIED BY SOURCE OF PREVAILING DISCIPLINE

Groups	N	Mean	F	p
My father	68	119.33		
My father with help from my mother	219	121.70		
Equally my mother and my father	504	124.62	2.04	n.s.
My mother with help from my father	338	123.41		
My mother	55	126.50		

Type of Discipline Received from Father. There were no significant differences in students' attitudes toward the father-son relationship classified according to the type of discipline which the respondents received from their fathers. The different groups are identified in Table XVII.

All of these groups fell within the moderately permissive classification in their attitudes toward child guidance.

TABLE XVII

DIFFERENCES IN RESPONSES TO THE FATHER-SON INTERACTION TEST
CLASSIFIED BY TYPE OF DISCIPLINE RECEIVED FROM FATHER

Groups	N	Mean	F	p
Very permissive	40	122.32		
Permissive	186	122.51		
Average	607	123.51	.50	n.s.
Strict	338	123.41		
Very strict	55	126.50		

Type of Discipline Received from Mother. There were no significant differences in students' attitudes toward the father-son relationship

classified according to the type of discipline which the respondents received from their mothers. A summary of the results may be viewed in Table XVIII.

All five of the groups had mean scores on The Father-Son Interaction Test which fell within the moderately permissive classification.

TABLE XVIII

DIFFERENCES IN RESPONSES TO THE FATHER-SON INTERACTION TEST
CLASSIFIED BY TYPE OF DISCIPLINE RECEIVED FROM MOTHER

Groups	N	Mean	F	p
Very permissive	27	123.33		
Permissive	200	124.41		
Average	726	122.48	2.12	n.s.
Strict	252	124.59		
Very strict	25	132.12		

Would Discipline Like Father. There were no significant differences in students' attitudes toward the father-son relationship classified according to whether or not the respondent would choose to discipline his own children like he had been disciplined by his father. The results of the analysis can be viewed in Table XIX.

All of these groups had mean scores on The Father-Son Interaction Test which placed them in the moderately permissive classification.

TABLE XIX

DIFFERENCES IN RESPONSES TO THE FATHER-SON INTERACTION TEST
CLASSIFIED ACCORDING TO WHETHER OR NOT RESPONDENT
WOULD DISCIPLINE LIKE HIS FATHER

Groups	N	Mean	F	p
More permissive than your father	292	125.03		
About the same as your father	767	122.94	1.3	n.s.
Less permissive than your father	164	123.08		

Would Discipline Like Mother. There were no significant differences in students' attitudes toward father-son relationships when their responses were classified according to whether or not the respondent would choose to discipline his own children like he had been disciplined by his mother. The results can be viewed in Table XX.

All of these groups had mean scores on The Father-Son Interaction Test which fell within the moderately permissive classification.

TABLE XX

DIFFERENCES IN RESPONSES TO THE FATHER-SON INTERACTION TEST
CLASSIFIED ACCORDING TO WHETHER OR NOT RESPONDENT
WOULD DISCIPLINE LIKE HIS MOTHER

Groups	N	Mean	F	p
More permissive than your mother	234	125.58		
About the same as your mother	831	123.03	1.92	n.s.
Less permissive than your mother	165	122.38		

Closeness to Father. There was a significant difference ($p = .05$) in students' attitudes toward father-son relationships classified according to the degree of closeness which the respondent had with his father. However, the direction is not clear as the mean score for those respondents who felt they had an above average degree of closeness with their father was much the same as the mean score for those who felt they had a below average degree of closeness with their father.

All three of these groups had mean scores on The Father-Son Interaction Test which were in the moderately permissive classification.

TABLE XXI

DIFFERENCES IN RESPONSES TO THE FATHER-SON INTERACTION TEST
CLASSIFIED ACCORDING TO THE DEGREE OF CLOSENESS TO FATHER

Groups	N	Mean	F	p
Above average	470	124.80	3.86	.05
Average	536	121.70		
Below average	223	124.62		

Closeness to Mother. There were significant differences ($p = .001$) in students' attitudes toward father-son relationships classified according to the degree of closeness which the respondent had with his mother. However, the direction is not clear as the mean score for those respondents who indicated they had an above average degree of closeness with their mother was much the same as the mean score for those who felt they had a below average degree of closeness with their mother. The results can be seen in Table XXII.

All of these groups had mean scores on The Father-Son Interaction Test which fell within the moderately permissive classification.

TABLE XXII

DIFFERENCES IN RESPONSES TO THE FATHER-SON INTERACTION TEST
CLASSIFIED ACCORDING TO THE DEGREE OF CLOSENESS TO MOTHER

Groups	N	Mean	F	p
Above average	597	125.53		
Average	538	120.84	9.27	.001
Below average	98	125.44		

Most Influential Parent. The results showed significant differences ($p = .01$) in the students' attitudes toward father-son relationships when their responses were classified according to the parent which most influenced their lives. The mean scores for the group who indicated that their mother and father equally had influenced their lives and also the group who indicated that their mother had most influenced their lives were more permissive than the group which indicated that their father was the person most influencing their lives. In Table XXIII the results of the analysis may be viewed.

All three of these groups had mean scores on The Father-Son Interaction Test which fell within the moderately permissive classification.

TABLE XXIII

DIFFERENCES IN RESPONSES TO THE FATHER-SON INTERACTION TEST
CLASSIFIED ACCORDING TO THE PARENT
WHICH WAS MOST INFLUENTIAL

Groups	N	Mean	F	p
Mother and father equally	653	124.20		
Mother	397	124.25	5.32	.01
Father	183	119.26		

Degree of Love and Warmth. As reflected in Table XXIV, there were no significant differences in students' attitudes toward father-son relationships when their responses were classified according to the degree of love and warmth they received from their parents.

All three of these groups had mean scores on The Father-Son Interaction Test which fell within the moderately permissive classification.

TABLE XXIV

DIFFERENCES IN RESPONSES TO THE FATHER-SON INTERACTION
TEST CLASSIFIED ACCORDING TO THE DEGREE OF LOVE
AND WARMTH RECEIVED FROM PARENTS

Groups	N	Mean	F	p
Much love and warmth	1027	123.45		
Average love and warmth	175	123.02	.52	n.s.
Little love and warmth	30	126.86		

Grade Point Average. Attitudes toward father-son relationships were found to be significantly related ($p = .01$) to the students' self-rating on their college grade point average. Summary of the results may be viewed in Table XXV.

All three of these groups had mean scores on The Father-Son Interaction Test which fell within the moderately permissive classification.

TABLE XXV

DIFFERENCES IN RESPONSES TO THE FATHER-SON INTERACTION TEST
CLASSIFIED ACCORDING TO COLLEGE GRADE POINT AVERAGE*

Groups	N	Mean	F	p
3.0 or above	355	126.51		
2.0 to 3.0	797	122.42	6.40	.01
Below 2.0	79	120.63		

*This is based on a four-point system.

Analysis of Data--Behavior Characteristics

In addition to the background information and the respondents' ratings of their family relationships, the respondents were asked to rate themselves on a number of behavior characteristics. A detailed summary of the results can be seen in Table XXVI.

Accepts Responsibility. Slightly more males (48.57%) rated themselves above average in accepting responsibility. The majority of the female sample (50.49%) rated themselves average on this characteristic. Very few males (5.4%) and females (2.29%) rated themselves below average in acceptance of responsibility. The group of students who rated themselves above average in accepting responsibility had the most permissive mean score on the test.

Careless Rather Than Deliberate. More males (57.01%) and females (50.11%) rated themselves average on this characteristic. The group of students who rated themselves as deliberate rather than careless were found to have the most permissive mean score on the test.

Enjoys Children. A majority of the males in the sample (49.21%) rated themselves above average in enjoyment of children. An even

greater majority of females (60.59%) rated themselves above average in enjoyment of children. Only 6.03 per cent of the males and 5.02 per cent of the females rated themselves below average in enjoyment of children. The group of students who rated themselves above average in enjoyment of children had the most permissive mean score on the test.

Utilizing an analysis of variance for one-way design, attitudes toward father-son relationships were found to be significantly related to the students' self-ratings on the following behavior characteristics: (a) accepts responsibility ($p = .001$), (b) careless rather than deliberate ($p = .01$), with those rating themselves average, and (c) enjoys children ($p = .05$). The results of the analysis can be seen in Table XXVII. All of the other behavior characteristics were not found to be significantly related to attitudes toward father-son relationships. All of the mean scores on The Father-Son Interaction Test for the groups which were classified according to the students' self-ratings on the behavior characteristics are shown in Table XXVII. All of these groups had mean scores on The Father-Son Interaction Test which fell within the moderately permissive classification.

greater majority of females (60.59%) rated themselves above average in enjoyment of children. Only 6.03 per cent of the males and 5.02 per cent of the females rated themselves below average in enjoyment of children. The group of students who rated themselves above average in enjoyment of children had the most permissive mean score on the test.

Utilizing an analysis of variance for one-way design, attitudes toward father-son relationships were found to be significantly related to the students' self-ratings on the following behavior characteristics: (a) accepts responsibility ($p = .001$), (b) careless rather than deliberate ($p = .01$), with those rating themselves average, and (c) enjoys children ($p = .05$). The results of the analysis can be seen in Table XXVII. All of the other behavior characteristics were not found to be significantly related to attitudes toward father-son relationships. All of the mean scores on The Father-Son Interaction Test for the groups which were classified according to the students' self-ratings on the behavior characteristics are shown in Table XXVII. All of these groups had mean scores on The Father-Son Interaction Test which fell within the moderately permissive classification.

TABLE XXVI
BEHAVIOR CHARACTERISTICS OF THE SUBJECTS

Description	Males		Females	
	N	%	N	%
<u>Physically Active, Vigorous</u>				
Above average	160	50.63	244	26.61
Average	144	45.57	600	65.43
Below average	12	3.80	73	7.96
<u>Enjoys Life</u>				
Above average	216	68.57	580	68.32
Average	92	29.21	325	35.48
Below average	7	2.22	11	1.20
<u>Intelligent</u>				
Above average	156	49.52	290	31.96
Average	156	49.52	617	67.43
Below average	3	.95	8	.87
<u>Tense</u>				
Above average	61	19.37	170	18.56
Average	183	58.10	519	56.66
Below average	71	22.54	227	24.78
<u>Easily Pleased</u>				
Above average	101	32.06	406	44.32
Average	178	56.51	462	50.44
Below average	36	11.43	48	5.24
<u>Slow to Get Things Done</u>				
Above average	35	11.11	97	10.58
Average	221	70.16	602	65.65
Below average	59	18.73	218	23.77
<u>Friendly</u>				
Above average	150	47.62	382	41.66
Average	145	46.03	518	56.49
Below average	20	6.35	17	1.85

TABLE XXVI (CONTINUED)

Description	Males		Females	
	N	%	N	%
<u>Accepts Responsibility</u>				
Above average	153	48.57	433	47.22
Average	145	46.03	463	50.49
Below average	17	5.40	21	2.29
<u>Moody</u>				
Above average	64	20.32	166	18.12
Average	177	56.19	517	56.44
Below average	17	5.40	21	2.29
<u>Independent</u>				
Above average	173	54.92	349	38.10
Average	136	43.17	519	56.66
Below average	6	1.90	48	5.24
<u>Acceptance With Peer Group</u>				
Above average	99	31.43	235	25.66
Average	202	64.13	660	72.05
Below average	14	4.44	21	2.29
<u>Nervous</u>				
Above average	55	17.46	186	20.28
Average	166	52.70	439	47.87
Below average	94	29.84	292	31.84
<u>Careless Rather Than Deliberate</u>				
Above average	26	8.28	61	6.66
Average	179	57.01	459	50.11
Below average	109	34.71	396	43.23
<u>Impatient With Others</u>				
Above average	70	22.29	138	15.05
Average	186	59.24	538	58.67
Below average	58	18.47	241	26.28
<u>Cooperative</u>				
Above average	138	43.81	356	38.56
Average	171	54.29	554	60.48
Below average	6	1.90	6	.66

TABLE XXVI (CONTINUED)

Description	Males		Females	
	N	%	N	%
<u>Pleasant</u>				
Above average	116	36.83	321	35.01
Average	191	60.63	592	64.56
Below average	8	2.54	4	.44
<u>Enjoys Children</u>				
Above average	155	49.21	555	60.59
Average	141	44.76	315	34.39
Below average	19	6.03	46	5.02
<u>Do What Others Want You To</u>				
Above average	47	14.92	175	19.10
Average	223	70.79	655	71.51
Below average	45	14.29	86	9.39
<u>Irritable</u>				
Above average	29	9.24	45	4.91
Average	193	61.46	539	58.85
Below average	92	29.30	332	36.24
<u>Mature For Age</u>				
Above average	105	33.33	299	32.61
Average	200	63.49	592	64.56
Below average	10	3.17	26	2.84
<u>Self-reliance</u>				
Above average	151	47.94	334	36.46
Average	161	51.11	555	60.59
Below average	3	.95	27	2.95
<u>Leadership Within The Peer Group</u>				
Above average	98	31.11	206	22.46
Average	199	63.17	601	65.54
Below average	18	5.71	110	12.00
<u>Adjustment To The College Experience</u>				
Above average	121	38.41	321	35.01
Average	187	59.37	573	62.49
Below average	7	2.22	23	2.51

TABLE XXVI (CONTINUED)

Description	Males		Females	
	N	%	N	%
<u>Relationship With Parents</u>				
Above average	136	43.31	518	56.55
Average	149	47.45	344	37.55
Below average	29	9.24	54	5.90

TABLE XXVII

DIFFERENCES IN RESPONSES TO THE FATHER-SON INTERACTION TEST CLASSIFIED ACCORDING TO STUDENTS' SELF-RATINGS ON BEHAVIOR CHARACTERISTICS

Variable	Above Average		Average		Below Average		F	p
	N	M	N	M	N	M		
Physically active, vigorous	404	122.51	744	124.16	85	122.17	1.19	n.s.
Enjoys life	796	124.09	417	122.42	18	122.00	1.11	n.s.
Intelligent	446	123.66	733	123.22	11	135.54	2.29	n.s.
Tense	231	124.81	702	123.59	298	122.28	1.16	n.s.
Easily pleased	507	124.22	640	123.07	84	122.40	.66	n.s.
Slow to get things done	132	121.69	823	123.32	277	124.86	1.33	n.s.
Friendly	532	124.13	663	122.99	37	123.24	.53	n.s.
Accepts responsibility	586	125.57	608	121.92	38	116.65	8.08	.001
Moody	230	122.80	694	123.75	307	123.49	.21	n.s.
Independent	522	123.03	655	123.66	54	126.27	.75	n.s.
Acceptance with peer group	334	124.90	862	123.17	35	118.37	2.30	n.s.
Nervous	241	125.35	605	123.50	386	122.34	1.80	n.s.

TABLE XXVII (CONTINUED)

Variable	Above Average		Average		Below Average		F	p
	N	M	N	M	N	M		
Careless rather than deliberate	87	121.33	638	122.26	505	125.51	4.75	.01
Impatient with others	208	123.39	724	123.46	299	123.73	.02	n.s.
Cooperative	494	124.08	725	123.29	12	114.00	1.76	n.s.
Pleasant	437	124.83	783	122.83	12	118.00	2.06	n.s.
Enjoys children	710	124.58	456	122.39	65	119.20	3.58	.05
Do what others want them to do	222	123.94	878	123.60	131	122.06	.44	n.s.
Irritable	74	127.22	732	122.22	424	124.13	2.67	n.s.
Mature for age	404	124.99	792	122.82	36	121.52	1.90	n.s.
Self-reliance	485	124.17	716	123.04	30	123.90	.50	n.s.
Leadership with the peer group	304	124.82	800	122.90	128	124.00	1.17	n.s.
Adjustment to college	442	125.05	760	122.62	30	122.60	2.30	n.s.
Relationship with parents	654	124.35	493	122.21	83	124.85	1.98	n.s.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The purpose of this research was to study college and university students' attitudes concerning father-son relationships and to relate these attitudes to selected background characteristics and to selected personality characteristics. To achieve this purpose, a filmed instrument designed to assess permissiveness concerning father-son interaction was used, and a questionnaire also was administered in order to obtain information concerning personal characteristics, socio-economic status, family history, and personality characteristics.

The subjects participating in this study were 1,236 male and female college and university students from nine institutions of higher education in the United States. These institutions included the University of Alabama, the University of Georgia, the University of North Carolina at Greensboro, the University of Connecticut, Brigham Young University, Utah State University, Stout State University, Fresno State College, and the University of Arizona. The data were collected from marriage and family life education classes at the respective institutions mentioned above. The collection of data took place during the fall and spring semesters of 1970 and 1971. The majority of students ranged in age 18-25, were single, and of the middle socio-economic class.

The film test which was developed by Doyle (1968) consisted of eleven scenes each approximately one minute in length. The selection of

the scenes was made by a panel of specialists who judged each scene according to the following criteria: Physical properties, behavioral patterns, theme diversity, and objectivity.

After viewing each scene, the subjects responded to 94 structured items in terms of the following scale: Strongly Agree, Mildly Agree, Mildly Disagree, and Strongly Disagree. The items which were developed by Doyle (1968) were judged by a panel of specialists in terms of clarity, specificity, and relevance to the concept under investigation. Once the most permissive response for each item had been selected, a key was developed and used for scoring the responses (Doyle, 1968). The very permissive response was given a value of two; the permissive response was given a value of one; and the remaining responses which were not permissive were given a value of zero.

Of the original 134 items on The Father-Son Interaction Test developed by Doyle (1968), 94 of these items were found to be discriminating for male university students by Heath (1970). Heath utilized a chi-square test to determine which items from the original form of the test elicited significantly different responses from those subjects who fell in the lower quartile from those whose total score fell in the upper quartile. Heath's (1970) modified form of the test for university male students and the eleven scenes from the film involving father-son interaction were used in this research. In order to assess the reliability of the modified form of The Father-Son Interaction Test, a split-half technique was utilized and a Spearman r of .99 was obtained (Heath, 1970).

A chi-square analysis was utilized in order to determine the usefulness of The Father-Son Interaction Test with female university

students. Of Heath's (1970) 94 items, 77 were found to be discriminating, that is, those items which elicited significantly different responses from the subjects who fell in the lower quartile from those whose total scores fell in the upper quartile. These items were found to be significant at the .05 level or beyond. A sample of 200 females randomly selected from the total group of 920 females were used in the item analysis. In order to keep the number of items on The Father-Son Interaction Test the same for both groups, male and female, the entire 94 items were used in the treatment of the data.

The total range of scores possible on The Father-Son Interaction Test are 0-188. The lower score represents the more restrictive end of the scale, and the higher score the more permissive score. The range for this sample of 1,236 college and university students was 52-175. Below are the classifications into which the scores may fall and the scores which represent each classification.

Permissive	142-188
Moderately Permissive	95-141
Moderately Restrictive	48-94
Restrictive	0-47

Analysis of variance for one-way design showed that permissiveness was related to: (a) sex, (b) religious belief, (c) socio-economic status, (d) degree of closeness to father, (e) degree of closeness to mother, (f) selection of most influential parent, and (g) college grade point average. The analysis of variance for one-way design revealed that permissiveness was independent of: (a) age, (b) marital status, (c) size of community, (d) number of brothers, (e) number of sisters, (f) ordinal position, (g) father's educational level, (h) age of father absence, (i) reasons for father absence, (j) type of discipline received from father, (k) type of discipline received from mother, (l) type of

discipline would use as a parent, and (m) degree of parental love and warmth.

An analysis of variance for one-way design determined that permissiveness was related to the following personality characteristics: (a) accepting responsibility, (b) enjoying children, and (c) being deliberate rather than careless. The same analysis showed permissiveness to be independent of: (a) being physically active, vigorous, (b) enjoying life, (c) being intelligent, (d) being tense, (e) being easily pleased, (f) being slow to get things done, (g) being friendly, (h) being moody, (i) being independent, (j) being accepted by the peer group, (k) being nervous, (l) being impatient, (m) being cooperative, (n) being pleasant, (o) doing what others want you to, (p) being irritable, (q) being mature for age, (r) being self-reliant, (s) being a leader in the peer group, (t) adjusting to college, and (u) relationship with parents.

There were no significant differences in attitudes toward father-son relationships between the groups of students who perceived their mother as the primary source of discipline in their family and those who perceived their father as the primary source of discipline.

Another finding revealed no significant differences in attitudes toward father-son relationships among students who, in rearing their children, would discipline like their own father, be more permissive than their own father, or be more restrictive than their own father. The same held true in the examination of the hypothesis concerning the mother. There were no differences in groups who, in rearing their children, would discipline like their own mother, would be more permissive than their own mother, or who would be more restrictive than their mother.

There were significant differences ($p = .01$) in students' attitudes toward father-son relationships among groups classified according to whether they chose their mother as the most influential parent, their mother and father equally as the most influential, or their father as the most influential parent. Those who chose their mother or their mother and father equally as the most influential were significantly more permissive in their attitudes toward father-son relationships.

Students who have more permissive attitudes toward father-son relationships do not necessarily come from homes where the parents hold more permissive childrearing attitudes.

Conclusions

Below are conclusions which can be made from observation of the data in the present study:

- 1) The female subjects had a mean score on The Father-Son Interaction Test of 125.71 compared with the males who had a more restrictive score of 117.08. However, it should be noted that although the females were found to be significantly more permissive than the males, both groups were in the moderately permissive classification according to their mean scores. Baumrind (1967) found children of parents who behaved in the most permissive manner were lacking self-control and self-reliance. She also found children of parents who represented the most restrictive attitudes were found to be "less content, more insecure and apprehensive, less affiliative toward peers, and more likely to become hostile or regressive under 'stress' than were children of more democratic parents" (p. 81). The findings of the present study seemed to indicate that college students tend to be more permissive than restrictive in their

attitudes toward child guidance.

2) In the present study, permissiveness and socio-economic status were related. The higher the socio-economic status, the more permissive the students' attitudes were toward child guidance. This phenomenon is very typical of our society and this has been the pattern found by many other researchers.

3) The fact that the students in the present study who had the most permissive attitudes toward child guidance did not necessarily come from homes where parents hold very permissive childrearing attitudes indicates that the students did not necessarily hold the same attitudes which their parents possessed. Elder (1963) found that both the highly permissive and the highly restrictive parent appears unattractive to the child in in comparison with the democratic parent.

4) America has been noted as a country which tends to be child-oriented. The fact that 83.09 per cent of the total 1,236 college students in this study indicated that they received much love and warmth from their parents supports this idea.

5) Permissiveness toward child guidance was found to be related to enjoyment of children. Many female subjects (60.59%) indicated that they enjoyed children very much. For the male subjects, many (49.21%) also indicated that they enjoyed children more than average.

6) The fact that the respondents in this study were not consistently permissive or restrictive in their attitudes toward father-son relationships indicates that individual attitudes toward child guidance vary depending upon the circumstances of the situation. More research of this type is needed where the responses are elicited in specific situations as The Father-Son Interaction Film made possible. Further study

could be made of situations involving father-daughter interaction, mother-son interaction, husband-wife interaction, and sibling interaction using this same type of film plus pencil-and-paper questionnaire technique.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Andry, Robert G. "Paternal and Maternal Roles and Delinquency." in Deprivation and Maternal Care: A Reassessment of Its Effects, Geneva: World Health Organization, (1962) 31-44.
- Bach, George R. "Father-Fantasies and Father-Typing in Father Separated Children." in Readings in Child Behavior and Development. ed. Celia B. Stendler, New York: Harcourt, Brace, and World, 1964.
- Barker, Gordon H. and William T. Adams. "Comparison of the Delinquencies of Boys and Girls." Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology, and Police Science, LIII (1962), 470-477.
- Baumrind, Diana. "Effects of Authoritative Parental Control on Child Behavior." Child Development, XXXVIII (1966), 887-907.
- Baumrind, Diana. "Child Care Practices Anteceding Three Patterns of Preschool Behavior." Genetic Psychology Monographs, LXXV (1967), 43-88.
- Baumrind, Diana and Allen E. Black. "Socialization Practices Associated with Dimensions of Competence in Preschool Boys and Girls." Child Development, XXXVIII (1967), 291-327.
- Becker, Wesley G., Donald R. Peterson, Leo A. Hellmer, Donald J. Shoemaker, and Henry C. Quay. "Factors in Parental Behavior and Personality as Related to Problem Behavior in Children." in Readings in Child Behavior and Development. ed. Celia B. Stendler. New York: Harcourt, Brace, and World, 1964.
- Benson, Leonard G. Fatherhood: A Sociological Perspective. New York: Random House, 1968.
- Bernard, Jessie. Remarriage. New York: The Dryden Press, 1956.
- Biller, Henry B. "A Note on Father Absence and Masculine Development in Lower Class Negro and White Boys." Child Development, XXXIX (1968), 1003-1006.
- Blaine, Graham B. "The Children of Divorce." The Atlantic Monthly, (1963), 98-101.
- Block, J. "Personality Characteristics Associated with Fathers' Attitudes Toward Child-Rearing." Child Development, XXVI (1955), 41-48.

- Bronfenbrenner, Urie. "Some Familial Antecedents of Responsibility and Leadership." in Leadership and Interpersonal Behavior, eds. Luigi Petrullo and Bernard Bass. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1961.
- Bronfenbrenner, Urie. "The Changing American Child: A Speculative Analysis." in Children: Readings in Behavior and Development, ed. Ellis D. Evans. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1968.
- Burton, R. V. and J. W. Whiting. "The Absent Father: Cross Sex Identity." Merrill-Palmer Quarterly, VII (1961) 85-95.
- Carlson, Rae. "Identification and Personality Structure in Preadolescents." Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, LXVII (1963), 556-573.
- Cox, F. N. "An Assessment of Children's Attitudes Toward Parent Figures." Child Development, XXXIII (1962), 821-830.
- Doyle, Emma Lee. "The Father-Son Interaction Test." Unpublished Doctoral Thesis, Florida State University, 1968.
- Duvall, Evelyn M. "Conceptions of Parenthood." Journal of Sociology, LII (1946), 193-203.
- Elder, Glen H., Jr. "Parental Power Legitimation and Its Effect on the Adolescent." Sociometry, XXVI (1963) 50-65.
- Elder, Glen and Charles E. Bowerman. "Family Structure and Child-Rearing Patterns: The Effect of Family Size and Sex Composition." American Sociological Review, XXVIII (1963), 891-905.
- Elder, Rachel A. "Traditional and Developmental Characteristics of Fatherhood." Marriage and Family Living, XI (1949), 98-100, 106.
- Gray, Susan W. "Masculinity-Femininity in Relation to Anxiety and Social Acceptance." Child Development, XXVIII (1957), 203-214.
- Gray, Susan W. "Perceived Similarity to Parents and Adjustment." Child Development, XXX (1959) 91-107.
- Greenstein, Jules. "Father Characteristics and Sex-Typing." Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, XXXIII (1966), 271-277.
- Heath, Becky Lynne. "College Students' Perceptions Concerning Father-Son Interaction." Unpublished Master's Thesis, Oklahoma State University, 1970.
- Helper, M. M. "Learning Theory and the Self-Concept." Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, LI (1955), 184-194.
- Hetherington, E. M. and Yvonne Brackbill. "Etiology and Covariation of Obstinacy, Orderliness, and Parsimony in Young Children." Child Development, XXXIV (1963), 919-943.

- Hoffman, Lois W. "The Father's Role in the Family and the Child's Peer Group Adjustment." Merrill-Palmer Quarterly, VII (1961), 97-105.
- Hoffman, Martin L. "Personality, Family Structure, and Social Class as Antecedents of Parental Power Assertion." Child Development, XXXIV (1963) 869-884.
- Mussen, Paul H. and Luther Distler. "Child-Rearing Antecedents of Masculine Identification in Kindergarten Boys." Child Development, XXXI (1960) 89-100.
- Mussen, Paul H. and Eldred Rutherford. "Parent-Child Relations and Parental Personality in Relation to Young Children's Sex-Role Preference." Child Development, XXXIV (1963), 589-607.
- Nash, John. "The Father in Contemporary Culture and Current Psychological Literature." Child Development, XXXVI (1965), 261-297.
- Osgood, C., G. Suci and P. H. Tannebaum. The Measurement of Meaning. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1957.
- Palmer, Richard C. "Behavior Problems of Children in Navy Officers' Families." Social Casework, XLI (1960), 177-184.
- Payne, Donald E. and Paul H. Mussen. "Parent-Child Relations and Father Identification Among Adolescent Boys." Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, LII (1956), 358-362.
- Pearlin, Leonard I. and Melvin L. Kohn. "Social Class, Occupation and Parental Values: A Cross-National Study." American Sociological Review, XXXI (1966), 466-479.
- Peterson, D. R., W. C. Becker, L. A. Hellmer, D. J. Shoemaker and H. C. Quay. "Parental Attitudes and Child Adjustment." Child Development, XXX (1959), 119-130.
- Radke, Marian J. The Relation of Parental Authority to Children's Behavior and Attitudes. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1946.
- Read, K. "Parents Expressed Attitudes and Children's Behavior." Journal of Consulting Psychology, IX (1945), 95-100.
- Roy, K. "Parents' Attitudes Toward Their Children." Journal of Home Economics, XLII (1950) 652-653.
- Schvaneveldt, Jay D. "The Interactional Framework in the Study of the Family." in F. Ivan Nye and Felix M. Berardo, Emerging Conceptual Frameworks in Family Analysis. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1966.
- Sears, Pauline S. "Doll-Play Aggression in Normal Young Children: Influence of Sex, Age Sibling Status, and Father's Absence." Psychological Monographs, LXV (1951) no. 6.

- Sears, Robert R., Margaret H. Pintler, and Pauline Sears. "Effects of Father Separation on Preschool Children's Doll Play Aggression." Child Development, XVII (1946) 219-243.
- Slater, Phillip W. "Parental Role Differentiation." American Journal of Sociology, LXVII (1961), 296-308.
- Illsley, Raymond and Barbara Thompson. "Women from Broken Homes." Sociological Review, IX (1961), 27-54.
- Johnson, Miriam M. "Sex-Role Learning in the Nuclear Family." Child Development, XXXIV (1963), 319-333.
- Kagan, Jerome. "The Concept of Identification." Psychological Review, LXV (1958) 296-305.
- Kagan, Jerome. "American Longitudinal Research on Psychological Development." Child Development, XXXV (1964), 1-32.
- Kell, Leone and Joan Aldous. "Trends in Child Care Over Three Generations." Marriage and Family Living, XXII (1960), 176-177.
- Leiderman, Gloria. "Effect of Parental Relationships and Child-Training Practices on Boys' Interaction with Peers." Acta Psychologica, XV (1959), 469-470.
- Levin, H. and R. R. Sears. "Identification with Parents as a Determinate of Doll-Play Aggression." Child Development, XXVII (1956), 135-153.
- Lynn, David B. "The Process of Learning Parental and Sex-Role Identification." Journal of Marriage and the Family, XXVIII (1966), 466-470.
- Lynn, David B. and William L. Sawrey. "The Effects of Father Absence on Norwegian Boys and Girls." Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, LIX (1959), 258-262.
- Maccoby, Eleanor E., Patricia K. Gibbs, and Collaborators. "Methods of Child Rearing in Two Social Classes." in Readings in Child Behavior and Development. ed. Celia B. Stendler, New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, 1964.
- McGuire, C. and C. D. White. "The Measurement of Social Status." Research Paper in Human Development. Austin: University of Texas, (1955) no. 3.
- Middleton, Russell and Snell Putney. "Student Rebellion Against Parental Political Beliefs." Social Forces, XLVI (1963), 377-383.
- Mowrer, O. Hobart. "Discipline and Mental Health." in O. Hobart Mowrer, Learning Theory and Personality Dynamics: Selected Papers. New York: Ronald Press Co., 1950a.

- Mowrer, O. Hobart. "Identification: A Link Between Learning and Theory and Psychotherapy." in O. Hobart Mowrer, Learning Theory and Personality Dynamics: Selected Papers. New York: Ronald Press Co., 1950b.
- Mussen, Paul H. "Some Antecedents and Consequences of Masculine Sex-Typing in Adolescent Boys." Psychological Monographs, LXXV (1961) no. 2.
- Sopchak, Andrew L. "Parental Identification and Tendency Toward Disorders as Measured by the MMPI." Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, XLVII (1952), 159-165.
- Stephens, William N. "Judgements by Social Workers on Boys and Mothers in Fatherless Families." Journal of Genetic Psychology, XCIX (1961), 59-64.
- Stoke, S. M. "An Inquiry Into the Concept of Identification." Journal of Genetic Psychology, LXXI (1950), 163-189.
- Stolz, Lois M. and Collaborators. Father Relations of War-Born Children. Stanford University Press, 1954.
- Sutton-Smith, B., B. G. Rosenberg, and Frank Landry. "Father Absence Effects in Families of Different Sibling Compositions." Child Development, XXXIX (1968), 1213-1221.
- Waller, Willard and Rueben Hill. The Family: A Dynamic Interpretation (Revised) New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1951.
- Walters, James and Barbara Bridges. "Attitudes of Single Men Toward Child Guidance." Journal of Home Economics, XLVIII (1956), 109-113.
- Walters, James and Nick Stinnett. "Parent-Child Relationships: A Decade of Research." Journal of Marriage and the Family, XXXIII (1971), 70-111.
- Winch, R. "Some Data Bearing on the Oedipal Hypothesis." Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, XLV (1950), 481-489.

APPENDIX A

Oklahoma State University
Division of Home Economics

Department of Family Relations
and Child Development

INFORMATION SHEET

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

1. Name _____
 2. Campus address _____
 3. Phone number _____
 4. Major _____

5. Age: _____ 1. 20 or under
 _____ 2. 21-24
 _____ 3. 25 and over

6. Marital status:
 _____ 1. Single
 _____ 2. Married
 _____ 3. Divorced
 _____ 4. Separated
 _____ 5. Widowed

7. Were you born in America?
 _____ 1. Yes
 _____ 2. No

8. Sex
 _____ 1. Male
 _____ 2. Female

9. Religion
 _____ 1. Protestant
 _____ 2. Catholic
 _____ 3. Jewish
 _____ 4. Other

10. For the major part of your life you have lived:
 _____ 1. On a farm or in the country
 _____ 2. In a community of less than 25,000 population
 _____ 3. In a community of 50,000-100,000 population
 _____ 4. In a community of over 100,000 population

11. I have _____ brothers and _____ sisters.

12. I was number 1 2 3 4 5 6 (Circle one).

13. Describe in detail your father's occupation _____

- _____ 14. In school, your father completed grades:
- | | |
|---------------|--|
| _____ 1. None | _____ 6. Graduated from high school |
| _____ 2. 1-4 | _____ 7. Completed 1-3 years of college |
| _____ 3. 5-7 | _____ 8. Graduated from a 4-year college |
| _____ 4. 8 | _____ 9. Over 4 years of college |
| _____ 5. 9-11 | |
- _____ 15. The main source of your family's income is:
- | |
|--|
| _____ 1. Hourly wages, piece work, weekly checks |
| _____ 2. Salary, commissions, monthly checks |
| _____ 3. Profits, royalties, fees from a business or profession |
| _____ 4. Savings and investments, earned by my father or mother |
| _____ 5. Private relief, odd jobs, share cropping, seasonal work |
| _____ 6. Public relief or charity |
- _____ 16. If during your childhood your father was absent from the home for prolonged periods, indicate how old you were when he was gone. _____
- _____ 17. If your father was absent for prolonged periods, indicate the reason for his absence.
- | | |
|---------------------|------------------------------------|
| _____ 1. Separation | _____ 4. Death |
| _____ 2. Divorce | _____ 5. Prolonged hospitalization |
| _____ 3. War | _____ 6. Other |
- _____ 18. In my family, the discipline I received was mainly from:
- | |
|--|
| _____ 1. My father |
| _____ 2. My father with some help from my mother |
| _____ 3. Equally my father and my mother |
| _____ 4. My mother with some help from my father |
| _____ 5. My mother |
- _____ 19. Check the one which most nearly describes the type of discipline you received from your father.
- | | |
|--------------------------|----------------------|
| _____ 1. Very permissive | _____ 4. Strict |
| _____ 2. Permissive | _____ 5. Very strict |
| _____ 3. Average | |
- _____ 20. Check the one which most nearly describes the type of discipline you received from your mother.
- | | |
|--------------------------|----------------------|
| _____ 1. Very permissive | _____ 4. Strict |
| _____ 2. Permissive | _____ 5. Very strict |
| _____ 3. Average | |
- _____ 21. In rearing children of your own, do you believe you will be:
- | |
|--|
| _____ 1. More permissive than your <u>father</u> |
| _____ 2. About the same as your <u>father</u> |
| _____ 3. Less permissive than your <u>father</u> |

- _____ 22. In rearing children of your own, do you believe you will be:
 _____ 1. More permissive than your mother
 _____ 2. About the same as your mother
 _____ 3. Less permissive than your mother
- _____ 23. Which of the following describes the degree of closeness of your relationship with your father during childhood?
 _____ 1. Above average
 _____ 2. Average
 _____ 3. Below average
- _____ 24. Which of the following indicates the degree of closeness of your relationship with your mother during childhood?
 _____ 1. Above average
 _____ 2. Average
 _____ 3. Below average
- _____ 25. Which parent had the greatest influence in determining the kind of person you are?
 _____ 1. Mother and father equally
 _____ 2. Mother
 _____ 3. Father
- _____ 26. How would you rate the love and warmth your parents feel for you?
 _____ 1. Much
 _____ 2. Average
 _____ 3. Little
- _____ 27. What is your cumulative gradepoint average in college?
 _____ 1. 3.0 or above
 _____ 2. 2.0 to 3.0
 _____ 3. Below 2.0

Answer each of the following items with a check in the "Above Average," "Average," or "Below Average" column.

Your behavior and characteristics	Above Average	Average	Below Average
_____ 1. Physically active, vigorous	_____	_____	_____
_____ 2. Enjoys life			
_____ 3. Intelligent			
_____ 4. Tense			
_____ 5. Easily pleased			
_____ 6. Slow to get things done			
_____ 7. Friendly			
_____ 8. Accepts responsibility			
_____ 9. Moody			
_____ 10. Independent			
_____ 11. Acceptance with peer group			
_____ 12. Nervous			
_____ 13. Careless rather than deliberate			
_____ 14. Impatient with others			

	Above Average	Average	Below Average
_____ 15. Cooperative	_____	_____	_____
_____ 16. Pleasant	_____	_____	_____
_____ 17. Enjoys children	_____	_____	_____
_____ 18. Do what others want you to	_____	_____	_____
_____ 19. Irritable	_____	_____	_____
_____ 20. Mature for age	_____	_____	_____
_____ 21. Self-reliance	_____	_____	_____
_____ 22. Leadership within the peer group	_____	_____	_____
_____ 23. Adjustment to the college experience	_____	_____	_____
_____ 24. Relationship with parents	_____	_____	_____

APPENDIX B

THE FATHER-SON INTERACTION TEST

(University Students' Form)

Lee Doyle and Becky Heath

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" and "wrong" answer. This is a test of your feelings and attitudes about what you see in the film.

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

SCENE EXAMPLE

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

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

SCENE 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 understood the son's difficulty in arising. | SA | MA | MD | SD |
| _____ 2. | 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 |
| _____ 3. | The father should have been irritated by the boy's actions. | SA | MA | MD | SD |

- | | | | | | |
|----------|---|----|----|----|----|
| _____ 4. | The father should have been more forceful in getting his son out of bed. | SA | MA | MD | SD |
| _____ 5. | The father should not have allowed his son to turn over when he called him. | SA | MA | MD | SD |
| _____ 6. | The father should be complimented for having given his son this type of help. | SA | MA | MD | SD |
| _____ 7. | 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.

- | | | | | | |
|-----------|--|----|----|----|----|
| _____ 8. | The father should have given his son the money at the first request. | SA | MA | MD | SD |
| _____ 9. | The son should not have interrupted his father's activities. | SA | MA | MD | SD |
| _____ 10. | The father should have shown more attention to his son. | SA | MA | MD | SD |
| _____ 11. | The father should not have reacted as this father did. | SA | MA | MD | SD |
| _____ 12. | The father should have given the money to his son the previous night. | SA | MA | MD | SD |
| _____ 13. | The father handled the matter satisfactorily. | SA | MA | MD | SD |
| _____ 14. | The father should not have ignored his son. | SA | MA | MD | SD |
| _____ 15. | The son should not have had to beg for money. | SA | MA | MD | SD |
| _____ 16. | The father should have been more concerned with his son's feelings. | SA | MA | MD | SD |
| _____ 17. | 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.

- | | | | | | |
|-----------|--|----|----|----|----|
| _____ 18. | The father should have been more attentive to the son's conversation. | SA | MA | MD | SD |
| _____ 19. | A father should not have had to listen to his son this much during mealtime. | SA | MA | MD | SD |
| _____ 20. | The son's actions should not have irritated his father. | SA | MA | MD | SD |
| _____ 21. | The father and son should have had a closer relationship. | SA | MA | MD | SD |
| _____ 22. | The son should have been able to feel more comfortable with his father. | SA | MA | MD | SD |
| _____ 23. | The father was right in objecting to his son's slowness in eating. | SA | MA | MD | SD |
| _____ 24. | The father should not have been so hasty in scolding his son. | SA | MA | MD | SD |
| _____ 25. | The father should have participated in his son's conversation. | SA | MA | MD | SD |
| _____ 26. | The son should not have talked so much. | SA | MA | MD | SD |
| _____ 27. | The son should not have bothered his father about such unimportant matters. | SA | MA | MD | SD |
| _____ 28. | The father should have shown more affection for his son. | SA | MA | MD | SD |
| _____ 29. | The father should have shown more interest in his son's activities. | 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?"

- | | | | | | |
|-------|---|----|----|----|----|
| _____ | 30. The son should be able to expect more encouragement from his father. | SA | MA | MD | SD |
| _____ | 31. The father should have first mentioned his son's winning run. | SA | MA | MD | SD |
| _____ | 32. It is a wise father who gives this kind of help in directing his son's play activities. | SA | MA | MD | SD |
| _____ | 33. The father should have encouraged his son more. | SA | MA | MD | SD |
| _____ | 34. The father should have arrived at a better method of guiding his son. | SA | MA | MD | SD |
| _____ | 35. The father should have shown more appreciation for his son's achievements. | SA | MA | MD | SD |
| _____ | 36. The father was too concerned with his son's mistakes. | SA | MA | MD | SD |
| _____ | 37. The father should have shown more concern for his son's feelings than for his achievements. | 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."

- | | | | | | |
|-------|--|----|----|----|----|
| _____ | 38. The son should not have reminded the father of his promise. | SA | MA | MD | SD |
| _____ | 39. The father should have cancelled his appointment with his son. | SA | MA | MD | SD |
| _____ | 40. The father should not have forgotten his promise. | SA | MA | MD | SD |
| _____ | 41. The father should have offered to take his son with him. | SA | MA | MD | SD |

_____ 42.	The father should not have offered to call off his business date.	SA	MA	MD	SD
_____ 43.	The father should have told his son that a business deal was more important.	SA	MA	MD	SD
_____ 44.	The father should have felt happy that his son wanted to play golf with him.	SA	MA	MD	SD
_____ 45.	The son should not have expected his father to want to play golf with him.	SA	MA	MD	SD
_____ 46.	The son should have made his own arrangements for playing golf.	SA	MA	MD	SD
_____ 47.	The father should have shown more affection for his son.	SA	MA	MD	SD
_____ 48.	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.

_____ 49.	If a son has feelings of resentment, he should express his feelings.	SA	MA	MD	SD
_____ 50.	The father should have "paddled" his son.	SA	MA	MD	SD
_____ 51.	The father should have allowed his son to rake the leaves at his convenience.	SA	MA	MD	SD
_____ 52.	Since the father was so persistent, the son's reaction was appropriate.	SA	MA	MD	SD
_____ 53.	A son needs a lot of help in learning to assume responsibility for the yard.	SA	MA	MD	SD
_____ 54.	The father was right in being so persistent.	SA	MA	MD	SD
_____ 55.	A father should not threaten his son.	SA	MA	MD	SD

- | | | | | | |
|-----------|---|----|----|----|----|
| _____ 56. | A father should be able to reason with his son without threatening him. | SA | MA | MD | SD |
| _____ 57. | The father should have been more forceful in the beginning. | SA | MA | MD | SD |
| _____ 58. | 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 and turns over a glass of water.

- | | | | | | |
|-----------|---|----|----|----|----|
| _____ 59. | The father should have insisted that his son clean up the table by himself. | SA | MA | MD | SD |
| _____ 60. | The father was too lenient with his son. | SA | MA | MD | SD |
| _____ 61. | The father should have punished his son for spilling the water. | SA | MA | MD | SD |
| _____ 62. | The father handled the situation satisfactorily. | SA | MA | MD | SD |
| _____ 63. | The father should be complimented for having helped his son clean up the table. | SA | MA | MD | SD |
| _____ 64. | The father should have objected to his son's carelessness. | SA | MA | MD | SD |
| _____ 65. | The son should not have been so concerned with spilling a glass of water. | SA | MA | MD | SD |
| _____ 66. | The father should not have been so calm. | 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.

- | | | | | | |
|-----------|--|----|----|----|----|
| _____ 67. | The father should have been considerate of his son's opinions. | SA | MA | MD | SD |
|-----------|--|----|----|----|----|

_____ 68.	A father should never embarrass his son when guests are present.	SA	MA	MD	SD
_____ 69.	The father should not have been persistent.	SA	MA	MD	SD
_____ 70.	The father should have tried to understand why his son was not talking.	SA	MA	MD	SD
_____ 71.	The father should have been more persistent.	SA	MA	MD	SD
_____ 72.	The father should have recognized that the son might not want to participate.	SA	MA	MD	SD
_____ 73.	The father should have shown more warmth and affection for his son.	SA	MA	MD	SD
_____ 74.	The son should have been asked to leave the table when he refused to answer his father.	SA	MA	MD	SD
_____ 75.	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.

_____ 76.	The father should help his son with his homework whenever asked.	SA	MA	MD	SD
_____ 77.	The father should have been angry at the son's lack of motivation in doing his homework.	SA	MA	MD	SD
_____ 78.	The son should have felt free to ask his father for assistance.	SA	MA	MD	SD
_____ 79.	The father should not have turned off the television.	SA	MA	MD	SD
_____ 80.	The father should have insisted that his son study at a desk.	SA	MA	MD	SD
_____ 81.	The father should have helped his son without worrying.	SA	MA	MD	SD

_____ 82. The father should not have been so
critical of his son's attempts. SA MA MD SD

_____ 83. 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.

_____ 84. The father should have been more
considerate of his son. SA MA MD SD

_____ 85. The father should have shown more
force. SA MA MD SD

_____ 86. The son should have been punished. SA MA MD SD

_____ 87. The son should not have accepted
his call knowing that his father
was expecting a business call. SA MA MD SD

_____ 88. The father should not have allowed
his son to accept the call.

_____ 89. The father should not have treated
his son like a "baby." SA MA MD SD

_____ 90. The father should not have been so
impatient. 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?"

_____ 91. A father should have no right to
disapprove the type of pictures
which his son views. SA MA MD SD

_____ 92. A father should check all maga-
zines his son reads. SA MA MD SD

_____ 93. The father should have talked
with his son before disapproving. SA MA MD SD

_____ 94. The father should have been more
understanding. SA MA MD SD

APPENDIX C

PROCEDURE FOR THE FATHER-SON INTERACTION RESEARCH

Approximately 10 minutes:

1. Pass out Father-Son Interaction Test booklets, Information Sheets, and IBM answer sheets.
2. Tell students to fill out all three pages of the Information Sheet and the necessary biographical data on the IBM answer sheet.
3. Read the following instructions to the students concerning 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 1 only. These responses are to be recorded on the IBM answer sheet provided. Do not mark on the test booklets as they are to be used again. Be sure to use a lead pencil and not a pen. Notice that the answer sheets have the columns labeled so that there will be no question as to where to record your response on the answer sheet. Also be aware that the numbers on the answer sheet go across and not down. Wait for Scene 2 to be shown and when the projector is stopped, respond to Scene 2 only. When responding to the statements, make sure to 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. If there is any question which you might have concerning the procedure, please let me know. When the testing is completed, please turn in the Father-Son Interaction Test booklet, your Information Sheet, and your IBM answer sheet. All of the information will be kept strictly confidential. You will be sent an interpretation of your individual test score. There are no right or wrong answers."

Remaining 40 minutes:

Show Scene 1 - 2 minutes	Show Scene 7 - 1 minute
Respond to Scene 1 - 2 minutes	Respond to Scene 7 - 2 minutes
Show Scene 2 - 1 minute	Show Scene 8 - 2 minutes
Respond to Scene 2 - 2 minutes	Respond to Scene 8 - 2 minutes
Show Scene 3 - 2 minutes	Show Scene 9 - 2 minutes
Respond to Scene 3 - 3 minutes	Respond to Scene 9 - 2 minutes
Show Scene 4 - 1 minute	Show Scene 10 - 2 minutes
Respond to Scene 4 - 2 minutes	Respond to Scene 10 - 2 minutes
Show Scene 5 - 1 minute	Show Scene 11 - 2 minutes
Respond to Scene 5 - 2 minutes	Respond to Scene 11 - 2 minutes
Show Scene 6 - 1 minute	
Respond to Scene 6 - 2 minutes	

APPENDIX D

KEY FOR THE FATHER-SON INTERACTION TEST

(University Students' Form)

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

	SA	MA	MD	SD		SA	MA	MD	SD
49.	2	1	0	0	74.	0	0	1	2
50.	0	0	1	2	75.	0	0	1	2
51.	2	1	0	0	76.	2	1	0	0
52.	2	1	0	0	77.	0	0	1	2
53.	2	1	0	0	78.	2	1	0	0
54.	0	0	1	2	79.	2	1	0	0
55.	2	1	0	0	80.	0	0	1	2
56.	2	1	0	0	81.	2	1	0	0
57.	0	0	0	2	82.	2	1	0	0
58.	2	1	0	0	83.	2	1	0	0
59.	0	0	1	2	84.	2	1	0	0
60.	0	0	1	2	85.	0	0	1	2
61.	0	0	1	2	86.	0	0	1	2
62.	2	1	0	0	87.	0	0	1	2
63.	2	1	0	0	88.	0	0	1	2
64.	0	0	1	2	89.	2	1	0	0
65.	2	1	0	0	90.	2	1	0	0
66.	0	0	1	2	91.	0	0	1	2
67.	2	1	0	0	92.	0	0	1	2
68.	2	1	0	0	93.	2	1	0	0
69.	2	1	0	0	94.	2	1	0	0
70.	2	1	0	0					
71.	0	0	1	2					
72.	2	1	0	0					
73.	2	1	0	0					

APPENDIX E

ANALYSIS OF FATHER-SON INTERACTION TEST RESULTS

Several weeks ago your class participated in a study of university students concerning father-son interaction. Data are being collected from a sample of a thousand young adults throughout the nation, and you were selected to be a part of the nationwide sample. Your cooperation in this study is deeply appreciated. The study is being conducted by Professors James Walters and Nick Stinnett and by Mrs. Althea Wright of Oklahoma State University, and is being supported by the Oklahoma State University Research Foundation.

The instrument was developed by Professor Emma Lee Doyle of Texas Woman's University who studied father-son relationships, and the form of the instrument which you completed includes those items which were found to differentiate university students holding permissive and restrictive attitudes concerning parent-child interaction. The reliability of the form of the test which you completed is quite high.

For a period of approximately twenty years American investigators in colleges and universities and in the National Institute of Mental Health have been engaged in studies designed to measure parental attitudes toward children. There is an important reason for this concern. One study will serve to illustrate the importance of research in this area: 500 delinquent youth were compared with 500 non-delinquent youth in terms of their medical, psychiatric, psychological, and social histories. Tremendous amounts of data were collected from these thousand youth. Professor Gordon Allport concluded from all of the data obtained, "If I am interpreting the evidence aright, all factors save parental influence fade in importance." Numerous other studies support the conclusion that the impact which parents have on their children serves as a powerful determiner of their children's behavior.

In brief, the evidence suggests that permissive guidance, as contrasted with restrictive guidance, results in more desirable behavior of children.

Professor Diana Baumrind has defined the permissive parent as one who:

attempts to behave in a nonpunitive, acceptant, and affirmative manner toward the child's impulses, desires, and actions.....
allows the child to regulate his own activities as much as possible, avoids the exercise of control, and does not encourage him to obey externally defined standards.

As you look at your score, however, do not be misled by the belief that the relationship is linear between permissive scores on the specific test you completed, the Father-Son Interaction Test, and the desirability of children's behavior. This has yet to be determined. While there is good reason to believe that highly restrictive scores are very likely to reflect attitudes which are not conducive to the healthful growth of children, it does not necessarily follow that the highly permissive scores reflect the best attitudes. Actually, the best scores--in terms

of the welfare of children--are those within the permissive range, we believe, but it is possible that extreme permissiveness is not as desirable as being moderately permissive.

Scores may range from 0 to 188 as follows:

Permissive	142-188
Moderately Permissive	95-141
Moderately Restrictive	48-94
Restrictive	0-47

From the current sample of young adults, we have obtained the following information concerning percentile norms:

Percentile	Men	Women
90	151	164
80	142	157
70	136	144
60	123	137
50	114	131
40	108	125
30	101	118
20	94	110
10	85	104

For example, if your score is at the twentieth percentile, this means that out of every hundred persons taking the test, 80 persons received a higher permissive score than you did. If your score is at the ninetieth percentile, on the other hand, this means that only ten per cent of the group received higher permissive scores than you did. Conversely, if you are at the ninetieth percentile, this also means that nine out of every ten persons received a more restrictive score than you did.

When one compares the percentile norms with the permissive-restrictive continuum, it may be noted that the college educated group reflects fairly permissive attitudes. This supports other evidence that those persons who are of the college group reflect attitudes toward children which tend to be desirable.

1. In general, it would appear that men do not reflect as permissive attitudes as women.
2. It would appear that there is little difference between the attitudes of young adults and parents with older children, suggesting that after age 20 attitudes toward children undergo relatively little change.
3. There is evidence that social class status is related to attitudes toward children: Persons reared in upper-middle and middle-class homes usually reflect more permissive attitudes toward children, while persons reared in lower-class homes usually reflect more restrictive attitudes.

4. Amount of formal education is related to attitudes toward children, with persons of lesser educational backgrounds reflecting more restrictive attitudes.
5. Interestingly, several American investigators, including Professor Urie Bronfenbrenner of Cornell University, have noted that the variability among children can be better explained by differences in the behavior of fathers than mothers, suggesting that fathers may have a greater impact on children in the child-rearing process than mothers.

APPENDIX F

TABLE XXVIII

DISCRIMINATING ITEMS FOR WOMEN ON THE FATHER-SON INTERACTION TEST*

Item	<u>Female Sample</u> Level of Significance
SCENE I	
1. The father should have understood the son's difficulty in arising.	.01
2. The father should have realized that his son's reaction was a normal reaction, and he should not have been threatened.	.05
3. The father should have been irritated by the boy's actions.	n.s.
4. The father should not have been more forceful in getting his son out of bed.	.01
5. The father should not have allowed his son to turn over when he called him.	n.s.
6. The father should be complimented for having given his son this type of help.	n.s.
7. The father should have shown more concern for his son getting enough rest.	n.s.
SCENE II	
8. The father should have given his son the money at the first request.	n.s.
9. The son should not have interrupted his father's activities.	n.s.
10. The father should have shown more attention to his son.	n.s.
11. The father should not have reacted as this father did.	n.s.
12. The father should have given the money to his son the previous night.	.001
13. The father should have handled the matter satisfactorily.	.05

TABLE XXVIII (CONTINUED)

Item	<u>Female Sample</u> Level of Significance
14. The father should not have ignored his son.	n.s.
15. The son should not have had to beg for money.	.001
16. The father should have been more concerned with his son's feelings.	.01
17. The father should have responded immediately when his son asked for his allowance.	.001
SCENE III	
18. The father should have been more attentive to his son's conversation.	.001
19. A father should not have had to listen to his son this much during mealtime.	.001
20. The son's actions should not have irritated his father.	.001
21. The father and son should have had a closer relationship.	.001
22. The son should have been able to feel more comfortable with his father.	.01
23. The father was right in objecting to his son's slowness in eating.	.001
24. The father should not have been so hasty in scolding his son.	.001
25. The father should have participated in his son's conversation.	.05
26. The son should not have talked so much.	.001
27. The son should not have bothered his father about such unimportant matters.	.01

TABLE XXVIII (CONTINUED)

Item	<u>Female Sample</u> Level of Significance
28. The father should have shown more affection for his son.	.001
29. The father should have shown more interest in his son's activities.	.05
SCENE IV	
30. The son should be able to expect more encouragement from his father.	.05
31. The father should have first mentioned his son's winning run.	.01
32. It is a wise father who gives this kind of help in directing his son's play activities.	.001
33. The father should have encouraged his son more.	n.s.
34. The father should have arrived at a better method of guiding his son.	.05
35. The father should have shown more appreciation for his son's achievements.	n.s.
36. The father was too concerned with his son's mistakes.	.001
37. The father should have shown more concern for his son's feelings than for his achievements.	.01
SCENE V	
38. The son should not have reminded the father of his promise.	n.s.
39. The father should have cancelled his appointment with his son.	.05
40. The father should not have forgotten his promise.	.01

TABLE XXVIII (CONTINUED)

Item	<u>Female Sample</u> Level of Significance
41. The father should have offered to take his son with him.	.01
42. The father should not have offered to call off his business date.	.001
43. The father should have told his son that a business deal was more important.	.001
44. The father should have felt happy that his son wanted to play golf with him.	.001
45. The son should not have expected his father to want to play golf with him.	.001
46. The son should have made his own arrangements for playing golf.	.05
47. The father should have shown more affection for his son.	.001
48. The father should have felt obligated to play golf with his son.	.01
SCENE VI	
49. If a son has feelings of resentment, he should express his feelings.	.001
50. The father should have "paddled" his son.	.001
51. The father should have allowed his son to rake the leaves at his convenience.	.05
52. Since the father was so persistent, the son's reaction was appropriate.	.05
53. A son needs a lot of help in learning to assume responsibility for the yard.	n.s.
54. The father was right in being so persistent.	.01

TABLE XXVI (CONTINUED)

Item	<u>Female Sample</u> Level of Significance
55. A father should not threaten his son.	.001
56. A father should be able to reason with his son without threatening him.	.001
57. The father should have been more forceful in the beginning.	.001
58. The father should not have become so excited when his son did not obey him.	.001
SCENE VII	
59. The father should have insisted that his son clean up the table by himself.	.001
60. The father was too lenient with his son.	.001
61. The father should have punished his son for spilling the water.	n.s.
62. The father handled the situation satisfactorily.	n.s.
63. The father should be complimented for having helped his son clean up the table.	.05
64. The father should have objected to his son's carelessness.	.001
65. The son should not have been so concerned with spilling a glass of water.	.05
66. The father should not have been so calm.	.05
SCENE VIII	
67. The father should have been considerate of his son's opinions.	.001
68. A father should never embarrass his son when guests are present.	.001

TABLE XXVIII (CONTINUED)

Item	<u>Female Sample</u> Level of Significance
69. The father should not have been persistent.	.001
70. The father should have tried to understand why his son was not talking.	.001
71. The father should have been more persistent.	.001
72. The father should have recognized that the son might not want to participate.	.001
73. The father should have shown more warmth and affection for his son.	.001
74. The son should have been asked to leave the table when he refused to answer his father.	.001
75. The father handled the situation well.	.001
SCENE IX	
76. The father should help his son with his homework whenever asked.	.001
77. The father should have been angry at the son's lack of motivation in doing his homework.	.001
78. The son should have felt free to ask his father for assistance.	.001
79. The father should not have turned off the television.	.001
80. The father should have insisted that his son study at a desk.	n.s.
81. The father should have helped his son without worrying.	.01

TABLE XXVIII (CONTINUED)

Item	<u>Female Sample</u> Level of Significance
82. The father should not have been so critical of his son's attempts.	.001
83. The father should have shown more warmth and affection for his son.	.001
SCENE X	
84. The father should have been more considerate of his son.	.001
85. The father should have shown more force.	.001
86. The son should have been punished.	.001
87. The son should not have accepted his call knowing that his father was expecting a business call.	n.s.
88. The father should not have allowed his son to accept the call.	.001
89. The father should not have treated his son like a "baby."	.001
90. The father should not have been so impatient.	.001
SCENE XI	
91. A father should have no right to disapprove of the type of pictures which his son views.	.05
92. A father should check all magazines his son reads.	.001
93. The father should have talked with his son before disapproving.	.001
94. The father should have been more understanding.	.001

*N = 400

APPENDIX G

THE MEASUREMENT OF SOCIAL STATUS*

Carson McGuire and George D. White
The University of Texas

* Research Paper in Human Development No. 3 (revised), Department of Educational Psychology, The University of Texas, March, 1955

Indices of social status and family life style are described in the present paper and directions are given for their calculation. An index is simply an empirical construct, derived by a scientist, to estimate values of a variable which is found in the real world. A status index approximates the "position" of a person with regard to one of the frames of reference people employ to place one another: (i) socioeconomic level, (ii) social class participating and reputation, (iii) family or individual life style. (12, pp. 3-32; 5, pp. 199-200)

Human behavior tends to vary somewhat according to status. The relationship between "what one feels, thinks, and does" and "where one fits in," however, is not a direct one. Social roles are a functional aspect of status. Role behaviors appropriate to sex, age-grade, and social status are learned according to place and through time. And there are added learned differences among persons adhering to an ethnic group or a religious sect, or belonging to a color caste which is marked by visibility factors. As a consequence of role experiences according to status, systematic variations in cognitive discriminations, in cathetic attachments, and in value-apprehensions appear and persist unless changed to accompany a shift in status (social mobility). Hence discrepancies in status indicate potential differences in role behaviors and in psychological attributes.

An index is useful in placing subjects in subclasses of sample populations for various kinds of behavior research. Comparisons can be made among the several subsamples in an investigation to determine just what are the probable sources of variation in behavior. In broad terms, the sources of variation can be looked upon as biological discrepancies (age, sex), cultural patterns (life styles, ethnic groups), social characteristics (status, role) and psychological attributes (e.g., motives, attitudes). A number of studies completed at The University of Texas have demonstrated that status classifications are helpful in research (2, 3, 4, 10, 14) and that they clarify much that is involved in work with people.

Status indices, at least the ones described here, are based upon questions commonly asked by people who are seeking to "place" one another. Most persons indirectly "find out about" other people to approximate their social position before interacting with them. Questions such as "What do you do?" "Where do you work?" "Where do you live?" "Where did you go to school?" and "What church do you go to?" are asked in many different ways. The queries usually are designed to fit people into one's status map (14) or system of reference groups (6, pp. 162-163) so as to anticipate how to act toward and about the other person.

Each index depends upon a combination of ratings from three or more scales. To employ an index only three steps are required. First, the individual or the "status parents" of the family to be placed is rated on each component scale. Second, the ratings are multiplied by appropriate weights (determined in previous studies) and the products are summed to secure a total index score. Third, a table for estimating status levels from total index scores is employed for an approximation of either probable social class or life style.

The index of social characteristics, or ISC, has been developed by Warner and his co-workers at Chicago (11, 12). Modifications of the original index have been tested at Texas (2, 3, 12, 14). The total index score usually depends upon ratings for four components: namely, (i) dwelling area, (ii) house type, (iii) occupation, and (iv) source of income. The first two components have to do with where and with whom a person or family chooses to live in the residential areas of a city (14) or a town (2). The last two have to do with socioeconomic status which is translated into social class position of an individual or family when the estimate can be checked by interviewing (7, 14) or by Warner's method of evaluated participation (12).

In Texas, a good deal of work has been done with the standard ISC in a large city, Centex (6, 7, 14) and in a smaller community Textown (2, 7, 8). The standard index of status characteristics can be employed where time is taken to interview and rate the residential areas and to assess the range of dwelling units. Table I shows the standard form of the index. Components to be rated are described in the Appendixes to the paper. Some modifications of the original Warner ISC have been made as a consequence of research experiences.

TABLE I

INDEX OF STATUS CHARACTERISTICS---STANDARD FORM

A. . . Dwelling Area	Rate 1 to 7 on DA scale. . .	Weight- - x 2
H. . . House Type.	Rate 1 to 7 on HT scale. . .	Weight- - x 3
C. . . Occupation.	Rate 1 to 7 on OC scale. . .	Weight- - x 4
D. . . Source of Income. . .	Rate 1 to 7 on SI scale. . .	Weight- - x 2

Weights in a status index always add up to 12. Total index scores range from 12 to 84 when the components are summed. Estimates of status in terms of social class level are made by consulting Table IV.

A modified index of social status, or ISS, is useful when it is not possible to obtain ratings for dwelling area and house type. The index has been employed in studies where people come from a number of communities. Where checks have been made the ISS shows a fairly high correspondence to the ISC and status placements usually are corroborated by interview data. Table II shows the components and the weights employed. The new item is a rating of the education attained by the individual or by the "status parent" of the family to be classified.

TABLE II
INDEX OF SOCIAL STATUS---SHORT FORM

O. . . Occupation.	Rate 1 to 7 on OC scale. . .	Weight- - - x 5
S. . . Source of Income. .	Rate 1 to 7 on SI scale. . .	Weight- - - x 4
E. . . Education	Rate 1 to 7 on ED scale. . .	Weight- - - x 3

The weights sum to 12 and the total index scores can range from 12 (high) to 84 (low) when the component scores are summed. Estimates of status in term of social class participation and reputation are made by consulting the standard conversion table, shown as Table IV in the present report.

An index of value orientations, or IVO, has been constructed to estimate variations in life style of individuals or the "status parent" of a family. A person's way of life--his orientation to the world about him, his behavior and his aspirations, his appreciative and moral standards--does not necessarily correspond to his social status. From original proposals made by McGuire and Martin G. Loeb, a suitable index has been developed and tested at Texas (8). Like other indices, the IVO is an independent empirical construct which approximates certain essential aspects of the reality being studied.

Life styles, in any community, usually can be identified from interview data because informants talk about symbol figures who represent ways of living. A set of symbol figures form a reference group which is said to share value-attitudes or value-orientations in common. The superordinate value orientations, ascribed to the upper class, exert latent control for they often are hidden and only brought into play when necessary. The dominant value-attitudes are the prescribed ones since they are held by the most powerful element in the majority of communities, the upper-middle class. Alternative value orientations are modifications of the dominant ones which are given lower level approval at the "common man level," that is, among some lower-middle and many upper-lower people. Variant life styles are characteristic of ethnic groups or religious sects, where adherence to a tradition brings toleration rather than punishment. Deviant value orientations generally are disapproved or prohibited (as delinquent or criminal) and adherence in the lower-lower element brings non-acceptance the imposition of sanctions. Since there is relationship between status and value orientations, social class terms often are employed to classify life styles but possible discrepancies should be kept in mind. A mobile person--one who changes status upward or downward--always has to learn new value orientations and accomplish a shift in life style.

The index of value orientations, or IVO, depends upon ratings for (i) education, (ii) religious affiliation, (iii) occupation, and (iv) source of income. The first two components assess probable differences in beliefs, attitudes, and values which guide behavior. The last two have to do with the socioeconomic base which make a life style possible.

Table III sets forth the components to be rated along with appropriate weights. The total index score can be employed to estimate probable life style of a subject in terms of symbols of his value orientations, or it can be used to predict possible future life style if aspirations are known.

TABLE III
INDEX OF VALUE ORIENTATIONS

E. . . Education.	Rate 1 to 7 on ED scale. .	Weight- - x 4
R. . . Religious Affiliation. .	Rate 1 to 7 on RA scale. .	Weight- - x 1
O. . . Occupation	Rate 1 to 7 on OC scale. .	Weight- - x 4
S. . . Source of Income	Rate 1 to 7 on SI scale. .	Weight- - x 3

The index can be employed to estimate a past, a present, or an aspired life style of components are rated appropriately. To be comparable to other indices, the weights add to 12 and the total index values can vary from 12 (high) to 84 (low). Life styles can be inferred by entering the contingency table shown as Table IV. Some persons prefer to employ class-typed terms; others, to avoid status terms, can employ life style concepts.

Weights of components in all of the indices have been adjusted so that a common conversion table can be employed. It should be remembered that the predictions of class status or of life style made by using the table are only approximations, probably correct 80 or 90 per cent of the time. To test the correspondence of the construct with reality, a research person can have persons or families placed by Hollingshead's "prestige judge" (4, pp. 25-45) or Warner's "evaluated participation" (12, pp. 36-39, 47-117) procedures. Table IV is a modification of the original conversion table developed by Warner and his associates (12, p. 183). Index scores can be converted into letters to denote relative status level, into social class terms, or into descriptions or probable life style.

TABLE IV
GENERAL CONVERSION TABLE FOR STATUS INDICES

Index Score	Relative Status Level	Social Class Prediction	Break Points and Intervals of Indeterminacy	Life Style*	Intervals Employed in Correlation
12	A ⁺	(UC)			
13-17	A	Upper Class	12--22	Super-ordinate	16 plus
18-22	A-				17-21

(23-24)

TABLE IV (CONTINUED)

Index Score	Relative Status Level	Social Class Prediction	Break Points and Intervals of Indeterminacy	Life Style*	Intervals Employed in Correlation
23-27	B ⁺	(UM)			22-26
28-32	B	Upper-Middle	25--33	Dominant	27-31
33-37	B-		(34-37)	UM	32-36
38-41	C ⁺	(LM)			37-41
42-46	C	Lower-Middle	38--50	Dominant	42-46
47-51	C-		(51-53)	LM	47-51
52-56	D ⁺	(UL)			52-56
57-61	D	Upper-Lower	54--62	Alternate	57-61
62-66	D-		(63-66)		62-66
67-71	E ⁺	(LL)			67-71
72-75	E	Lower-Lower	67--84	Deviant	72-76
76-84	E-				77 minus

* Insufficient research has been done in life styles, or in class-typed value orientations to give precise break-points for conversion of total index scores to classificatory terms. The break-points indicated for approximations of social status, however, may be employed for the symbol persons of the reference groups to which life styles are ascribed appear at different status levels. The intervals of indeterminacy, shown in parentheses, often represent the index scores of persons who are changing status or shifting from one life style to another (mobility).

The indices can be useful in a number of research operations in addition to placing subjects in sample populations. Comparisons between earlier and later indices, or discrepancies between ISC and IVO, often are employed as measures of social mobility. An upward mobile person, for example, always has a higher ISC or IVO than his parents (5, 8). Discrepancies between the indices of a husband and wife could be indicators of conforming, mobile, and divergent families (8). Wherever indices are employed, however, a small subsample should be selected from the larger sample population and focused interviewing should be undertaken to gather data to check the estimates made by the indices.

APPENDIX A

The Rating Scales

TABLE V

(DA) DWELLING AREAS

Rate	Descriptive Bases for Constructing a Scale to be Used in a Community*
1.	Select residential area (or areas) of highest repute in the community. Such an area usually is set apart and does not exist in every community.
2.	Status areas of high repute; homes vary in size but they are set upon well-kept grounds which afford some privacy; only a few highly-valued apartments.
3.	Preferred residential areas where there are few if any pretentious homes but dwellings and grounds have a great deal of care; good apartment buildings.
4.	Average residential neighborhoods with no deterioration; dwellings are relatively small and unpretentious but neat in appearance; "respectable" homes.
5.	Dwelling areas which are beginning to deteriorate; some families "don't know how to take care of their place;" business or industry entering in outside of the neighborhood shopping center which characterizes "3" or "4."
6.	An area which has deteriorated considerably but is not a slum; "run down" and the reputation is "low;" small businesses and industries are interspersed.
7.	Slum area (or areas) of the community; neighborhood is in bad repute, although an occasional dwelling may be well-kept; other homes are "shacks."

* A scale may be constructed and residential areas may be mapped by a committee of local people (2), by comparing "status maps" drawn by local informants (14), or by the procedures employed by Warner et al. in Jonesville (12, pp. 151-154).

TABLE VI

(HT) HOUSE TYPES

Rate	Descriptive Bases for Constructing a Scale to be Used in a Community*
1.	Very large single-family dwellings in excellent repair, surrounded by adequate landscaped grounds which afford privacy; may not be found in every community.
2.	Homes larger than utility demands for the average family, with well-kept lawns and shrubbery; the dwelling or highly-valued apartment is kept in good condition.
3.	More conventional homes adequate for a family and kept in good repair; large apartments in well-kept buildings; grounds are relatively small and well-kept.
4.	Average dwellings and apartments; lawns kept but not landscaped; conventional.
5.	Smaller homes in excellent condition; larger dwelling units in fair condition.
6.	Homes or apartments are "run-down" but not deteriorated beyond repair.
7.	Dwelling units deteriorated beyond repair; all buildings not originally intended for dwellings, shacks, and over-crowded buildings; "unhealthy," "unsafe."
<p>* A research person should be familiar with the range of possible dwelling units and have in mind typical homes or apartments in each category.</p>	

TABLE VII
OCCUPATIONS: LEVELS AND KINDS*

Rate	Professionals	Proprietors	Businessmen	White Collar	Blue Collar	Service	Farm People
1.	Lawyer, judge, physician, engineer, professor, school suptd., <u>et al.</u>	Large businesses valued at \$100,000 or more depending on community.	Top executives, President, <u>et al.</u> of corporations, banks, pub. utilities.	CPA; editor of newspaper, magazine; executive secretary of status org'n.			Gentleman farmer or landowners who do not supervise directly their propert'is.
2.	High school teachers, librarians, and others with 4-year degrees	Business valued at \$50,000 to \$100,000.	Asst., Office, and dept. managers or supervisors; some mnfr's agents.	Accountant; insurance, real estate, stock salesmen; editorial writers.			Land operators who supervise properties and have an active urban life.
3.	Grade school teacher, registered nurse, minister without 4-yr. degree	Business or equity valued from \$10,000 to \$50,000.	Managers of small branches or buyers and salesmen of known mchdse.	Bank clerks, auto salesmen, postal clerks, RR or tel. agent or supvsr.	Small contractor who works at or supervises his jobs.		Farm owners with "hired help;" operators of leased property who supervise.
4.		Business or equity valued from \$5,000 to \$10,000.	(Stenographer, book-keeper; ticket agent, (sales people in dept. (stores, <u>et al.</u>		Foreman; master carpenter, electrician, <u>et al.</u> ; RR. engineer.	Police captain, tailor, railroad conductor, watchmaker, etc.	Small landowner; operators of rented property hiring "hands."
5.		Business or equity valued from \$2,000 to \$5,000.	(Dime store clerks, (grocery clerks; telephone and beauty (operators, <u>et al.</u>		Apprentice to skilled trades; repairmen; med. skilled workers.	Policemen; barbers; practical nurse; brakeman, <u>et al.</u>	Tenants on good farms; foreman; owners of farms who "hire out."
6.		Business or equity valued at less than \$2,000.		(Semi-skilled factory and (production workers; assistants to skilled trade; (warehousemen, watchmen.		Taxi and truck drivers; waiters or waitress; gas stn. attendant.	Sharecroppers; established farm laborers; subs'ce farmers.
7.		"Reputed Lawbreakers"		(Heavy labor; odd-job men; (mine or mill hands; (unskilled workers.		Domestic help; bus boy; scrub-women; janitor's helper.	Migrant workers; "squatters" and "nesters."

*For an original table, consult Warner's revised scale (12, pp. 140-141). Modifications in the present table represent revisions made after interviewing in communities and are "types" to guide other ratings.

TABLE VIII

(SI) SOURCE OF INCOME*

-
1. Inherited saving and investments; "old money" reputed to provide basic income.
 2. Earned wealth; "new money" has provided "transferable" investment income.
 3. Profits, fees, royalties; includes executives who receive a "share of profits."
 4. Salary, commissions, regular income paid on monthly or yearly basis.
 5. Wages on hourly basis; piece-work; weekly checks as distinguished from monthly.
 6. Income from "odd jobs" or private relief; "sharecropping" or seasonal work.
 7. Public relief or charity; non-respectable incomes (reputation).
-

*The kind of income appears to be more important than the amount and, in general, the reputed major source of income is symbolic of placement in the community. In the case of a widow, the SI and OC are that of the deceased husband. Investments, insurance, pensions, security benefits, et al. are rated by the SI which made them possible unless considerable wealth ("1" or "2") is reputed. Other components correct for seeming discrepancies.

TABLE IX

(ED) EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT*

-
1. Completed appropriate graduate work for a recognized profession at highest level; graduate of a generally recognized, high status, four-year college.
 2. Graduate from a four-year college, university, or professional school with a recognized bachelor's degree, including four-year teacher colleges.
 3. Attended college or university for two or more years; junior college graduate; teacher education from a normal school; R.N. from a nursing school.
 4. Graduate from high school or completed equivalent secondary education; includes various kinds of "post-high" business education or trade school study.
 5. Attended high school, completed grade nine, but did not graduate from high school; for persons born prior to 1900, grade eight completed.
 6. Completed grade eight but did not attend beyond grade nine; for persons born prior to 1900, grades four to seven would be equivalent.
 7. Left elementary or junior high school before completing grade eight; for persons born prior to 1900, no education or attendance to grade three.
-

* Actual education attained probably is not as important as the education a person is reputed to have. The same scale is used to rate aspiration.

TABLE X

(RA) RELIGIOUS AFFILIATION

-
-
1. Episcopalian, Congregational, Unitarian; either membership or family affiliation.
 2. Presbyterian, Quaker, Christian Science (rated lower in some communities).
 3. Methodist, Christian Church; "Protestant" or "none" for OC ratings "1," "2," "3."
 4. Baptist, Church of Christ. (In some communities RA "3" and "4" are reversed.)
 5. Roman Catholic, Lutheran. (High status people compensate on OC, SI ratings.)
 6. Jewish and Orthodox Churches. (Compensated by OC, SI, ED ratings.)
 7. Pentacostal, Gospel Tabernacle, Free Methodist, Jehovah Witness; "evangelical" churches; also a rating for "none" when OC ratings are "4" to "7."
-

Correction Factors

When the "Anglo" or "Old Yankee" segment of a community makes a point of separating our minority groups for classifying some of the people in a variant life style, correction factors have to be employed. The correction may be accomplished by adding to the total ISC, ISS, or IVO score the numerical difference between the rating of the majority segment and the minority group in Table IX. Warner accomplishes the same end by alterations in his conversion table (12, pp. 186-199).

TABLE XI

(ET) ETHNIC CORRECTION FACTOR^{*}

-
-
1. "Old American," "Anglo" or "Old Yankee"--names recognized as "American."
 2. Assimilated peoples; families have been more recent immigrants.
 3. French-Canadian or Irish-Catholic groups remaining apart and keeping tradition.
 4. North European Ethnic group or religious sect; e.g., "Norwegian Lutheran."
 5. Southern European Ethnic group or religious group; e.g., "Italian Catholics."
 6. Eastern European or Near-East people--e.g., "Polish Nationalist."
 7. Colored peoples and those treated as color castes by "visibility" factors; "skid row" populations; Orientals in some communities; certain Latin American peoples of reputed "mixed blood" in communities where discrimination is found.
-

^{*} Caste and sect distinctions are included in the table. Jewish families are rated according to the country of origin and not as a group.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Clark, Rodney A., and McGuire, Carson. "Sociographic Analysis of Sociometric Valuations," Child Development, 23 (June, 1952).
2. Griffith, Georgia M. "Adolescent Concerns and Attitudes in Relation to Social Attributes," Unpublished Master's thesis, The University of Texas, 1951.
3. Gross, Lanis D. "Social Attributes and Teacher Valuations of High School Seniors," Unpublished Master's thesis, The University of Texas, 1951.
4. Hollingshead, A. B. Elmtown's Youth. New York: Wiley, 1949.
5. McGuire, Carson. "Social Stratification and Mobility Patterns," Amer. Sociol. Rev., 15 (April, 1950), 195-204.
6. McGuire, Carson. "Family Backgrounds and Community Patterns," Marriage and Family Living, 13 (November, 1951), 160-164.
7. McGuire, Carson. "Family Life in Lower and Middle Class Homes," Marr. and Fam. Liv., 14 (Feb. 1952), 1-6.
8. McGuire, Carson. "Conforming, Mobile, and Divergent Families," Marr. and Fam. Liv., 14 (May, 1952).
9. McGuire, Carson, and Clark, Rodney A. "Age-Mate Acceptance and Indices of Peer Status," Child Dev., 23 (June, 1952). ***Measures of "peer status."
10. Stern, Alfred. "A Study of the Relationship between Social Class Level and Occupational Aspiration Level of Adolescents in Junior High School," Unpublished Master's thesis, The University of Texas, 1950.
11. Warner, W. Lloyd, and Associates. Democracy in Jonesville. New York: Harper '49.
12. Warner, W. L.; Meeker, M.; and Eells, K. Social Class in America. Chicago: Science Research Associates, 1949.
13. Warner, W. L., and McGuire, C. "The Measurement of Social Status for Country People," Working memorandum, The University of Texas, Feb. 1951 (mimeo.).
14. White, George D. "Status Indices and Ecological Areas," Unpublished Master's thesis, The University of Texas, 1950.