

COLLEGE STUDENTS' PERCEPTIONS CONCERNING
FATHER-SON INTERACTION

By

BECKY LYNNE HEATH

Bachelor of Science

Oklahoma State University

Stillwater, Oklahoma

1968

Submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate College
of the Oklahoma State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the Degree of
MASTER OF SCIENCE
May 1970

OKLAHOMA
STATE UNIVERSITY
LIBRARY
OCT 12 1970

COLLEGE STUDENTS' PERCEPTIONS CONCERNING
FATHER-SON INTERACTION

Thesis Approved:

James G. Garton

Thesis Adviser

Nick Stinnatt

Jasminne Hoffer

D. Durban

Dean of the Graduate College

762340

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author is sincerely grateful to Dr. James Walters, Professor, Family Relations and Child Development, whose patient guidance and encouragement were of immeasurable value throughout the study.

Recognition and appreciation are also extended to the following: Dr. Nick Stinnett, Assistant Professor, Family Relations and Child Development, for his encouragement, suggestions, and critical reading of the manuscript; Dr. Josephine Hoffer, Head, Family Relations and Child Development, for her participation as a committee member; Mrs. Floye Ardrey and her students for their cooperation and enthusiastic participation in the study.

A special thanks is extended to Dr. Elizabeth Starkweather, Associate Professor, Family Relations and Child Development, who initially inspired the author to enter the field and to Miss Ann Curd, head teacher, Oklahoma State University Child Development Laboratories, for teaching the author so much about young children.

Special recognition is expressed to my husband, Hank, and to our parents whose support and understanding have made the achievement of this goal a reality.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Purpose	1
Definition	2
II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE	4
Influence of the Father on Son's Development and Adjustment	4
Effects of Paternal Deprivation	5
Father's Influence on Son's Sex-Role Identification	8
Father's Influence on Son's Relation- ship With Peers	10
Effects of Parental Control and Personality on Child Behavior and Adjustment	12
Child-Rearing Environments and Possible Effects on Children	12
Factors Related to Methods of Control Used	15
Parental Personality Characteristics	17
III. PROCEDURE	19
Subjects	19
Measurement of Permissive Attitudes Toward Father-Son Interaction	19
Description of the Instrument	19
Administration	25
Scoring	25
Measurement of Background Variables	25
Analysis of the Data	26
IV. RESULTS	27
<u>The Father-Son Interaction Test</u>	27
The Item Analysis	27
Comparison of Results	39
Relationship Between Scores and Selected Background Variables	52
Summary of Findings.	53

Chapter	Page
V. SUMMARY AND IMPLICATIONS.	55
Implications	57
A SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY	60
APPENDIX A	65
APPENDIX B	79
APPENDIX C	83

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
I. Characteristics of the Subjects	20
II. Discriminating Items on <u>The Father-Son Interaction Test</u>	28
III. Number of Discriminating and Non-Discriminating Items Classified by Scenes	38
IV. Percentage of Responses of Fathers and Male Students on <u>The Father-Son Interaction Test</u>	39
V. Percentage of Responses on <u>The Father-Son Interaction Test</u>	40
VI. Mann-Whitney U Analysis of Test Scores Classified by Selected Background Variables	52
VII. Kruskal-Wallis Analysis of Test Scores Classified by Selected Background Variables	53

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Purpose

Although many factors operate in determining a child's behavior and personality, his relationship with his parents and the general atmosphere in the home would seem to be vitally important. Radke (1946) and Peterson et al. (1959) have indicated that parental influences are crucial to the formation of personality tendencies among children due to the primacy, intimacy, and extensiveness of these contacts. Among parental influences, the combination of the kind and amount of love and warmth and the degree of restrictiveness or permissiveness are extremely important.

As men assume increasing responsibility for child-rearing, the need for more research on the father-child relationship becomes apparent. Benson (1968) pointed out that fatherhood has been greatly neglected in social research. Peterson et al. (1959) also suggested that the significance of the father in the formation of his children's personalities has not received adequate attention. Nash (1965) concluded that the relative neglect of the father may have adversely affected the rearing of males in American society.

Walters and Bridges (1956) have pointed out that little is known about young, unmarried people's attitudes concerning child guidance. There is a particular need for research concerning the attitudes of

male college students since they will soon be fathers. Such information would also be useful in helping teachers plan the content of courses concerned with education for family life.

The purposes of the study were to develop a form of The Father-Son Interaction Test (Doyle, 1968) for male college students utilizing an item analysis, and to examine the responses of the students to this instrument in relation to: (a) socioeconomic status, (b) age, (c) marital status, (d) size of family, (e) position in family, (f) exposure to a family relations course, (g) presence or absence of the father during childhood, (h) residence for major part of life, (i) perceived discipline in family, (j) employment status of mother, and (k) perceived happiness of childhood relationship with parents.

Definition

Baumrind (1966) has described three types of parental control which she has termed permissive, authoritative, and authoritarian. Other authors have used terms such as permissive, democratic and restrictive. Regardless of the terminology employed, parental control may be considered to vary among these three positions.

Baumrind (1966) has given definitions for the three types of parental control. The permissive parent is defined 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 (p. 889).

The parent who represents the middle point on the continuum, or the authoritative parent:

attempts to direct the child's activities in a rational, issue-oriented manner . . . encourages verbal give and take, shares with the child the reasoning behind her policy, and solicits his objections when he refuses to conform. Both autonomous self-will and disciplined conformity are valued . . . exerts firm control at points of parent-child divergence, but does not hem the child in with restrictions . . . uses reason, power, and shaping by regime and reinforcement (p. 891).

The other extreme parental position termed by Baumrind (1966) as authoritarian:

attempts to shape, control, and evaluate the behavior and attitudes of the child in accordance with a set standard of conduct, usually an absolute standard, theologically motivated and formulated by a higher authority . . . values obedience as a virtue and favors punitive, forceful measures to curb self-will at points where the child's actions or beliefs conflicts with what she thinks is the right conduct . . . does not encourage verbal give and take, believing that the child should accept her word for what is right (p. 890).

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Influence of the Father on Son's Development and Adjustment

The nature of a child's relationship to his father is of consequence not only in terms of his present security but also in terms of his later outlook on life (Bach, 1964). Despite the increasing recognition of the importance of the father, research has been limited; this may be partially due to the emphasis in America on the mother's role in child-rearing (Nash, 1965).

Many investigators who have taken the father into consideration have relied on the mother's interpretations of the behavior and attitudes of her husband. Although this method is probably not the most desirable, it has revealed that future studies should place more emphasis on the role of the father in the family. Much information concerning the significance of the father has been obtained through comparison of children from father-present and father-absent homes. These types of investigations, along with those which study the father directly, indicate that the father's influence on his children's development and adjustment is of considerable importance, especially in the areas of his son's behavior, masculine identification, and social adjustment.

Effects of Paternal Deprivation

Numerous studies have been undertaken in an attempt to determine the effects of father absence upon children, especially upon boys. Benson (1968) pointed out that the wife's reaction to her husband's departure and the reasons why he is gone may influence children more than the mere fact that he is not present in the home. Bach (1964) concluded that children who were separated from their fathers had an idealistic and effeminized fantasy picture of him which was related to the mother's attitude toward her absent husband. This attitude, in turn, was communicated to the children.

Bronfenbrenner (1968) has indicated that the absence of the father not only affects the behavior of the child directly but also influences the mother's behavior in the direction of greater overprotection. This conclusion was supported by Tiller (1957) who found that mothers in sailor families, where the father was absent a great deal of time, tended to overprotect the children and that the sons were dependent and immature and had problems of identification. Other investigators also have indicated that boys from father-absent homes are more dependent and more willing to accept authority than those from intact homes (Stolz, 1954; Lynn and Sawrey, 1959; Bronfenbrenner, 1961; Bach, 1964; Bronfenbrenner, 1968).

The reason for the father's absence is another factor which influences the effects of the separation upon children. 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. However, it has been found that the entrance of a new parent has a more adverse effect after the original parent's death

than after divorce (Bernard, 1956).

Another factor influencing the effects of paternal deprivation is the age of the child. Blaine (1963) suggested that one of the most traumatic periods to lose a parent is between the ages of three and six. Sutton-Smith, Rosenberg, and Landy (1968) pointed out that although father-absence has a depressive effect throughout, the greatest effects occur during the early and middle years. Nash (1965) concluded that the preschool period is most critical for identification with the father and that permanent deficiencies may result if he is not present during this time. He suggested that the time of weaning may be crucial for the necessary transfer from mother to father.

Several authors have indicated that the sibling composition may modify the effects of paternal deprivation (Sutton-Smith, Rosenberg, and Landy, 1968). They reported that boys without brothers are more affected than those with brothers, girls with a younger brother are more affected than other girls, and only girls are more affected than only boys.

Levin and Sears (1956) indicated that aggression is one area of behavior that is influenced by father-absence. They found that boys whose fathers live at home are more aggressive than those boys from father-absent homes. This finding may be due to the fact that the father serves as an aggressive model for his son (Sears, 1951).

Benson (1968) has stated that sex identification will pose particular difficulties for the fatherless boy. Nash (1965) similarly concluded that boys reared without a father figure often fail to acquire masculine attitudes. However, Greenstein (1966) failed to find any significant differences between boys whose fathers were present

and father-absent boys in any of the dimensions usually related to sex-typing.

Perhaps this discrepancy might be explained by a study done by Biller (1968). His results suggested 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 indicated 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.

Regardless of the outcome, it would appear that boys without fathers may have greater difficulty in developing appropriate sex-role orientations than boys whose fathers are present in the home. When a boy's father is absent, his opportunities to interact with and imitate males in positions of competence and power are often severely limited, especially during the preschool years (Biller, 1968). Biller has pointed out that in families where the father is absent or ineffectual, the young boy seems to have great difficulty in developing a masculine self-concept.

Behavioral difficulties also have 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 boys whose fathers were present. Stolz (1954) found that 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) have suggested that a relationship exists between paternal deprivation and delinquent behavior. Homes in which the father is absent produce more than their proportion of delinquents, but this is also true of homes where the father is present but fails to function as head of the household (Barker and Adams, 1962). Benson (1968) has suggested that the quality of family life is of greater significance than the formal structure and that some fathers may do their children harm as well as good.

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

One of the most frequently studied and most easily recognized functions of the father is to provide a model of masculinity for his son. Although Lynn (1966) has made a distinction between identification with the masculine role and identification with one's father, Benson (1968) has pointed out the identification with one's father inevitably conditions sex-role identification.) In spite of the fact that masculine models are seen everywhere, the father normally exerts the most prominent influence on the lives of his own children (Benson, 1968).

(Although the theory of identification in which the father is the model of masculinity for his son and the mother is the object of sex-role identification for her daughter is probably the most obvious,

other theories have been proposed also. Several authors have suggested that love and affection are important incentives for identification (Mowrer, 1950b; Stoke, 1950; Payne and Mussen, 1956; Kagan, 1958; Mussen and Distler, 1960). Sears (1953) found that five-year-old boys identified more strongly with the masculine sex-role if the father was warm and affectionate. Payne and Mussen (1956) found that adolescent boys who were strongly identified with their fathers were more likely to view these fathers as highly nurturant and rewarding.

Other investigators have contended that children will identify with that parent whom they consider to be the most powerful (Hetherington and Brackbill, 1963).

Slater (1961) has suggested that it is a combination of both nurturance and firm discipline that is most conducive to identification. This conclusion was supported by Mussen and Distler (1960) who 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.

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

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

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

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 has suggested that if the father plays a central role in the family, the son tends to strongly identify with him. Mussen and Distler (1960) indicated 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 Relationships With Peers

There is considerable evidence that a boy's relationship with his father may influence his peer relations. Hoffman (1961) found that,

for boys, warm companionship with the father was conducive to good peer adjustment. Perhaps this companionship gives the son a model for interaction with others. Benson (1968) concluded 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. Lynn and Sawrey (1959) have indicated that the father is of considerable importance since they found that father-absent boys showed deficiencies in their peer adjustment.

Gray (1957) found boys who were rated high in acceptance by their peers to be strongly identified with the appropriate sex role which is a function of identification with the father. 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 appears that a positive attitude toward the parent of the same sex is important for the establishment of warm relationships with peers (Cox, 1962).

Several authors extend identification with the father to include the boy's direct imitation of his father. They have found that this imitative behavior is important in peer-group adjustment. Helper (1955) observed that high school boys who conspicuously modeled themselves after their fathers were likely to be rated high in social

acceptance. Similarly, boys who perceived themselves to be more like their fathers than their mothers have been found to be regarded more favorably by their peers (Gray, 1959).

Effects of Parental Control and Personality on Child Behavior and Adjustment

Although many factors must be considered in any attempt to determine parental influences upon children, the degree of restrictiveness or permissiveness in the parent-child relationship is vitally important. As Becker (1964) has pointed out, however, the degree of warmth and love must be considered in addition to the type of control used. 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 parent will undoubtedly influence the behavior and personality of his children. As Radke (1946) has pointed out, what the parent is has far more influence upon the child than the specific disciplinary techniques he employs. The child learns from his parents not so much by being taught but by being exposed (Radke, 1946).

Child-Rearing Environments and Possible Effects on Children

Several investigators have attempted 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 to be lacking in self-control and self-reliance. Neither parent of these children demanded much of

the child and the fathers were found to be weak reinforcing agents. These parents appeared to be 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 the children who were judged to be both socialized and independent represented a more democratic position. They were consistent, loving, conscientious, and secure in relations with their children. They respected the child's independent decisions but 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 the characteristics of self-confidence and independence in children to the degree of nurturance and control which characterizes the father-child relationship. He pointed out that a warm relationship that 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 the highly restrictive parent appear unattractive to the child in comparison to the democratic parent (Elder, 1963).

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 fathers of highly masculine boys are affectionate and have considerable power over their sons. Slater (1961) has contended that when the parent is the

source of both nurturance and discipline, the child is more likely to internalize parental values.

In a study conducted by Baumrind (1967), the children of parents who represented the most restrictive attitudes were found to be "less content, more insecure and apprehensive, less affiliative toward peers, and more likely to become hostile or regressive under stress" than were children of the 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 or 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 acceptably than do children of parents who approve of strict control in guiding their children (Read, 1945; Radke, 1946).

In addition to the degree of control used and the warmth of the parent-child relationship, differing attitudes of mother and father must be considered. In general, there seems to be a difference in the reasons why fathers and mothers discipline children and the methods which they employ. Benson (1968) has pointed out that fathers often stress conformity, striving to have their children act like other children. He also has suggested that fathers tend to lean toward coercion and corporal punishment in controlling their children. 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 frequently.

In families where one parent is very permissive and the other is very restrictive in controlling the child, an inconsistent environment

is created which has been associated with difficulties in the healthy adjustment of the child. Read (1945) found that in homes where the attitudes of the parents differed, the children showed more unfavorable than favorable behavior deviations. Kohn and Clausen (1956) found that schizophrenic patients frequently reported that their mothers played a very strong authority role while their fathers were very weak authority figures. Becker et al. (1964) have pointed out that where one parent is lax about discipline and the other is punitive toward the child, conditions are favorable for the development of an aggressive child.

While mothers discipline children of both sexes, the father is more likely to discipline boys and is usually more demanding of boys than girls. (Johnson, 1963). Benson (1968) has pointed out that as children get older, fathers tend to take a more prominent role in disciplining their children, although they may not appear more powerful to the child.

The degree of identification with the parents is one of the factors which influence the effects of parental control upon children. Benson (1968) has concluded that coercive control from a parent with whom the child strongly identifies has a more disturbing impact than this type of control from a neutral or distant parent.

Factors Related to Methods of Control Used

There appears to be a difference in the type of child-rearing environments found among different socioeconomic groups. Maccoby and Gibbs (1964) have indicated that upper-middle class parents are more permissive than the upper-lower class parents in controlling their

children. Upper-middle class parents use reasoning and praise as methods of guiding their children more often than do upper-lower class parents. Techniques such as physical punishment, deprivation of privileges and ridicule were found to be more commonly employed in the upper-lower class. In both classes, fathers were found to be more strict than mothers with regard to severity of discipline, demands for obedience and expectations of self-restraint in the child. Benson (1968) also has pointed out that lower-class fathers are more punitive toward both boys and girls than middle-class fathers.

The difference in the types of occupations engaged in may partially account for differing attitudes toward child-rearing. Pearlin and Kohn (1966) have pointed out 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. Men who work primarily with ideas tend to stress self-control and do not value obedience very highly, and men who work mainly with people are likely 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 may also influence the type of control used in different families. Elder and Bowerman (1963) found that in small families parents tended to employ a greater range of disciplinary techniques and that oral methods and verbal reasoning were used more often. However, should the parent be authoritarian, the consequences will probably be greatly magnified due to the fact that parent-child relationships in the small family are likely to be more intense and have deeper emotional

implications (Benson, 1968). Benson (1968) also has suggested that more is probably expected of each child in a small family.

Due to 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 to rely more frequently on strong child-rearing 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 more self-reliant and ascendant. They seemed to be able to function more effectively. Block pointed out that although the parent favoring excessive 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 the 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 suggested 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

Subjects

The subjects who participated in this research were 148 male college students who were enrolled in the undergraduate course, Home Economics for Men, at Oklahoma State University during the fall semester of 1969. The majority of the subjects ranged in age from 17-22 and were not married. All of the subjects were born in America. In Table I, the distribution of the subjects by age, college major, marital status, socioeconomic status, father's education, residence, family size, and position in family is presented.

Measurement of Permissive Attitudes Toward Father-Son Interaction

Description of the Instrument

A filmed instrument developed by Doyle (1968) entitled The Father-Son Interaction Test was used to measure permissive attitudes related to father-son interaction. The instrument consists of eleven scenes, each of which is about 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.

TABLE I
CHARACTERISTICS OF THE SUBJECTS

Description	N	%
<u>Age</u>		
17-18	46	31.08
19-20	54	36.49
21-22	40	27.03
23 and over	8	5.40
<u>College Major</u>		
Arts and Sciences	30	20.27
Education	4	2.70
Business	82	55.40
Home Economics	3	2.03
Agriculture	11	7.43
General or Undecided	8	5.40
Technical School	10	6.76
<u>Marital Status</u>		
Single	126	85.14
Married	22	14.86
<u>Socioeconomic Status</u>		
Upper Class	7	4.73
Upper-Middle Class	54	36.49
Lower-Middle Class	60	40.54
Upper-Lower Class	25	16.89
Lower-Lower Class	2	1.35
<u>Father's Education</u>		
Over 4 Years College	23	15.54
College Graduate	21	14.19
1-3 Years College	24	16.22
High School Graduate	57	38.51
Grades 9-11 Completed	12	8.11
Grade 8 Completed	9	6.08
Below 8	2	1.35

TABLE I (Continued)

Description	N	%
<u>Residence</u>		
Farm or Country	16	10.81
Less Than 25,000 Population	54	36.49
25,000 to 50,000 Population	32	21.62
50,000 to 100,000 Population	10	6.76
Over 100,000 Population	36	24.32
<u>Family Size</u>		
Only Child	7	4.73
1 Sibling	52	35.14
2 Siblings	51	34.46
3 Siblings	24	16.22
4 Siblings	5	3.38
5 Siblings	5	3.38
Over 5 Siblings	4	2.70
<u>Family Position</u>		
Oldest Child	52	35.14
Middle Child	81	54.73
Youngest Child	9	6.08
No Response	6	4.05

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 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 to awaken him. He calls several times but the son moans and turns over. The son finally reluctantly sits up on the side of the bed.

Scene II

The father is reading the morning newspaper when the son enters the room to ask for his allowance. The father ignores his son's request.

Scene III

Father and son are eating lunch together and have to leave home

at the same time. While relating the details of his week-end trip to the beach, the son does not eat his meal. When it is time for both of them to leave, the father realizes that the son has not even begun to eat.

Scene IV

After the baseball game, the son rushes up to his father pleased that his team had won and that he had made the winning run. The father responds by asking, "What about that 'pop-up fly' you missed?"

Scene V

The father has forgotten a previous promise to play golf with his son and has made a date with his friend to play golf instead. 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 in the yard. He is reluctant and protests that he is tired. The father insists that the lawn should be raked today.

Scene VII

Father and son are in the dining room waiting for dinner. The son reaches for a mint on the table and accidentally turns over a glass of water. The father starts toward the kitchen to get a rag to clean up the water.

Scene VIII

While eating dinner, guests and family are discussing some of the problems which pertain to school and education. The father asks the son what his opinion of the situation is. The son does not respond.

Scene IX

The father enters the son's bedroom and finds him 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 his son.

Scene X

The father is waiting for a business telephone call when the phone rings for the son. The father hands him the phone and tells him not to talk over two minutes. The son talks longer than his time limit.

Scene XI

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

After each scene was viewed the subjects recorded their reactions to a highly structured set of items (Appendix A) 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.

Administration

The Father-Son Interaction Test was administered during the regular class session of Home Economics for Men at Oklahoma State University. Each scene was shown individually and time was allowed for the subjects to respond to an initial item pool consisting of 134 items. The items pertaining to each individual scene were answered immediately after viewing that scene. A sample instrument and score sheet are presented in Appendix A.

Scoring

A four-point scale to which each subject indicated his agreement or disagreement with each of the 134 items was used. The scale included the following categories: Strongly Agree, Mildly Agree, Mildly Disagree, and Strongly Disagree.

A 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 134 items. The key utilized in scoring each questionnaire is presented in Appendix B.

Measurement of Background Variables

In order to obtain information concerning background variables, a questionnaire was administered prior to the presentation of The

Father-Son Interaction Test. Information concerning personal background, socioeconomic status, and family history of the subjects was obtained. Questions related to socioeconomic status were based on the McGuire-White Index of Social Status (Short Form) (1955). A sample information sheet is presented in Appendix C.

Analysis of the Data

The chi-square test was utilized in order to determine the differences between high scoring and low scoring subjects on each of the items on The Father-Son Interaction Test. Scores on The Father-Son Interaction Test and the relationship of these scores to selected background variables were analyzed. A Mann-Whitney U test and the Kruskal-Wallis one-way analysis of variance were used for these analyses.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

The Father-Son Interaction Test

The Item Analysis

A chi-square test was used to determine which items on The Father-Son Interaction Test (Male University Students' Form) were discriminating, that is, which items elicited significantly different responses from those subjects whose total scores fell in the lower quartile and subjects whose total scores fell in the upper quartile. Of the 134 items initially included, 94, or 70 percent, were found to be significant at the .05 level or beyond.

The total score for each subject, which was compared to the background variables, was based upon the discriminating items only. The results of the item analysis are presented in Table II.

Over half of the items in ten of the eleven scenes discriminated between high and low scorers. None of the scenes included less than four discriminating items, and in Scene III all of the items were discriminating. In Table III, the number of discriminating and non-discriminating items for each scene is presented. In order to assess the reliability of the instrument, a split-half technique was utilized, and a Spearman r of .99 was obtained.

TABLE II
DISCRIMINATING ITEMS ON THE FATHER-SON INTERACTION TEST

Item	χ^2	Level of Significance
SCENE I		
1. The son should have awakened immediately when the father called.	3.56	n.s.
2. The father should have ignored the son's resistance.	5.15	n.s.
3. The father should have understood the son's difficulty in arising.	8.81	.05
4. If a father calls his son, he should have to call him only once.	3.39	n.s.
5. This father was taking too much responsibility for awakening his son.	5.13	n.s.
6. The father should have realized that his son's reaction was a normal reaction, and he should not have been threatened.	11.62	.01
7. The father should have "swatted" his son.	3.50	n.s.
8. The father should have been irritated by the boy's actions.	14.53	.001
9. The father should have been more forceful in getting his son out of bed.	31.70	.001
10. The father was doing what any good father should do.	2.64	n.s.
11. The father should not have allowed his son to turn over when he called him.	15.19	.001
12. If the boy did not want to get up, it was probably because he was too tired.	2.54	n.s.
13. The father should be complimented for having given his son this type of help.	6.01	.05
14. The father should have shown more concern for his son getting enough rest.	14.62	.001

TABLE II (Continued)

Item	χ^2	Level of Significance
SCENE II		
15. The father should have given his son the money at the first request.	15.58	.001
16. The son should not have been so persistent.	1.26	n.s.
17. The son should not have interrupted his father's activities.	13.79	.01
18. The father should have shown more attention to his son.	16.41	.001
19. The son should have waited before asking for the money.	0.67	n.s.
20. The son had a right to become angry.	4.09	n.s.
21. The father should not have reacted as this father did.	18.51	.001
22. The father should have given the money to his son the previous night.	6.67	.05
23. The son should not have depended upon his parents for money.	4.88	n.s.
24. The father handled the matter satisfactorily.	22.36	.001
25. The father should not have ignored his son.	8.08	.05
26. The son should not have had to beg for money.	22.27	.001
27. The father should have been more concerned with his son's feelings.	24.67	.001
28. The son should have been more considerate of his father.	0.01	n.s.
29. The father should have responded immediately when his son asked for his allowance.	15.43	.001

TABLE II (Continued)

Item	χ^2	Level of Significance
SCENE III		
30. The father should have been more attentive to the son's conversation.	14.97	.001
31. A father should not have had to listen to his son this much during mealtime.	20.77	.001
32. The son's actions should not have irritated his father.	25.35	.001
33. The father and son should have had a closer relationship.	34.78	.001
34. The son should have been able to feel more comfortable with his father.	18.89	.001
35. The father was right in objecting to his son's slowness in eating.	6.49	.05
36. The father should not have been so hasty in scolding his son.	28.89	.001
37. The father should have participated in his son's conversation.	25.83	.001
38. The son should not have talked so much.	12.72	.01
39. The son should not have bothered his father about such unimportant matters.	30.71	.001
40. The father should have shown more affection for his son.	24.24	.001
41. The father should have shown more interest in his son's activities.	36.69	.001
SCENE IV		
42. The father should have ignored the error which the son made.	3.83	n.s.
43. The son should be able to expect more encouragement from his father.	16.66	.001

TABLE II (Continued)

Item	χ^2	Level of Significance
44. The father should have first mentioned his son's winning run.	13.64	.001
45. The son should not have been so upset by his father's remarks.	2.76	n.s.
46. It is a wise father who gives this kind of help in directing his son's play activities.	8.28	.05
47. The father should have encouraged his son more.	16.62	.001
48. The father should have arrived at a better method of guiding his son.	10.82	.01
49. The father should have shown more appreciation for his son's achievements.	9.24	.01
50. The father was too concerned with his son's mistakes.	10.28	.01
51. The father was wrong in hurting his son's feelings.	3.39	n.s.
52. The father should have shown more concern for his son's feelings than for his achievements.	12.26	.01
53. The father should have praised his son.	5.41	n.s.
SCENE V		
54. The son should not have reminded the father of his promise.	10.94	.01
55. The father should have cancelled his appointment with his son.	6.87	.05
56. The father should not have forgotten his promise.	15.40	.001
57. The father should have offered to take his son with him.	17.58	.001
58. The father should not have offered to call off his business date.	6.12	.05

TABLE II (Continued)

Item	χ^2	Level of Significance
59. The father should have told his son that a business deal was more important.	9.68	.01
60. The son should not have argued with his father.	5.98	n.s.
61. The father should have felt happy that his son wanted to play golf with him.	19.61	.001
62. The son should not have expected his father to want to play golf with him.	16.93	.001
63. The son should have made his own arrangements for playing golf.	19.49	.001
64. The son should have realized that the father had the "last word."	5.45	n.s.
65. The father should have shown more affection for his son.	29.44	.001
66. The father should have felt obligated to play golf with his son.	17.74	.001
SCENE VI		
67. The son should not have shown feelings of resentment toward his father.	3.35	n.s.
68. If a son has feelings of resentment, he should express his feelings.	13.08	.01
69. The father should have "paddled" his son.	23.85	.001
70. The son should have been made to apologize to his father.	4.56	n.s.
71. The father should have allowed his son to rake the leaves at his convenience.	7.30	.01
72. Since the father was so persistent, the son's reaction was appropriate.	5.78	.05
73. A son needs a lot of help in learning to assume responsibility for the yard.	6.99	.05

TABLE II (Continued)

Item	χ^2	Level of Significance
74. The father was right in being so persistent.	10.64	.01
75. A son should never question his father's authority.	1.19	n.s.
76. A father should not threaten his son.	25.53	.001
77. A father should be able to reason with his son without threatening him.	32.86	.001
78. The father should have been more forceful in the beginning.	15.78	.001
79. The father should not have become so excited when his son did not obey him.	21.73	.001
SCENE VII		
80. The father should have insisted that his son clean up the table by himself.	9.45	.01
81. The father was too lenient with his son.	23.40	.001
82. The son should have been more understanding of himself.	2.81	n.s.
83. The son should not have been "fooling around" at the table before the meal.	1.95	n.s.
84. The father should have punished his son for spilling the water.	19.86	.001
85. The father handled the situation satisfactorily.	10.72	.01
86. The father should be complimented for having helped his son clean up the table.	12.59	.01
87. The father should have objected to his son's carelessness.	14.37	.001
88. The son should not have been so concerned with spilling a glass of water.	8.27	.05
89. The father should not have been so calm.	11.45	.001

TABLE II (Continued)

Item	χ^2	Level of Significance
SCENE VIII		
90. The father should have been considerate of his son's opinions.	21.46	.001
91. A father should never embarrass his son when guests are present.	40.17	.001
92. The father should not have been persistent.	28.23	.001
93. The father should have tried to understand why his son was not talking.	47.71	.001
94. The son should have felt that he does not have to participate in the conversation.	0.16	n.s.
95. The father should have been more persistent.	24.40	.001
96. The father should have recognized that the son might not want to participate.	22.88	.001
97. The father should have shown more warmth and affection for his son.	20.51	.001
98. The son should have been asked to leave the table when he refused to answer his father.	24.77	.001
99. The father handled the situation well.	21.53	.001
SCENE IX		
100. The father should help his son with his homework whenever asked.	14.59	.001
101. The father should have been angry at the son's lack of motivation in doing his homework.	8.17	.05
102. The son should have felt free to ask his father for assistance.	12.03	.01
103. The father was right in helping his son to achieve good quality work.	0.54	n.s.

TABLE II (Continued)

Item	χ^2	Level of Significance
104. The father should not have turned off the television.	8.50	.05
105. The father should have insisted that his son study at a desk.	8.07	.05
106. The father should not have assumed that his son could not study with the television going.	5.21	n.s.
107. The father should have allowed his son to do the assignment himself and not worry about making it perfect.	2.86	n.s.
108. The father should have helped his son without worrying.	14.88	.001
109. The father should not have been so critical of his son's attempts.	12.28	.01
110. The father should have shown more warmth and affection for his son.	15.66	.001
SCENE X		
111. The father should have been more considerate of his son.	8.83	.05
112. The father should have shown more force.	23.31	.001
113. The son should have been punished.	24.50	.001
114. The son should not have accepted his call knowing that his father was expecting a business call.	6.04	.05
115. The father should not have allowed his son to accept the call.	31.60	.001
116. The father should not have treated his son like a "baby."	17.16	.001
117. The father should not have been so impatient.	7.73	.05
118. The son should not have been upset.	0.01	n.s.

TABLE II (Continued)

Item	χ^2	Level of Significance
119. The son's actions should not have upset the father.	4.59	n.s.
120. The father should not have expected this much from his son.	1.25	n.s.
SCENE XI		
121. The son should not have had pictures of which his father would disapprove.	1.92	n.s.
122. The father should not have made the son remove the picture.	0.77	n.s.
123. A father should have no right to disapprove the type of pictures which his son views.	4.01	.05
124. The father should not have disapproved.	3.04	n.s.
125. The son should have asked his father's permission before hanging the picture.	1.41	n.s.
126. A father should check all magazines his son reads.	14.91	.001
127. The father should have talked with his son before disapproving.	28.64	.001
128. The father was right in objecting to this kind of behavior.	2.23	n.s.
129. The son should have "stood-up" for his rights.	0.56	n.s.
130. It was the son's own business what pictures he had.	3.65	n.s.
131. The father should not have interfered.	3.34	n.s.
132. The father should have asked his son to keep his picture collection put away.	0.28	n.s.
133. The father should have been more understanding.	13.72	.01

TABLE II (Continued)

Item	χ^2	Level of Significance
134. The father was doing what any good father should do.	0.43	n.s.

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

Scene	Discriminating Items	Non-Discriminating Items	Totals
One	7	7	14
Two	10	5	15
Three	12	0	12
Four	8	4	12
Five	11	2	13
Six	10	3	13
Seven	8	2	10
Eight	9	1	10
Nine	8	3	11
Ten	7	3	10
Eleven	4	10	14
Total	94	40	134

Comparison of Results

A comparison was made of 148 male university students' and 80 fathers' responses to the 94 discriminating items on The Father-Son Interaction Test. Doyle (1968) administered The Father-Son Interaction Test to a group of fathers who had at least one son between the ages of 11 and 16. In this group, it was found that 30 percent displayed restrictive attitudes toward father-son interaction, 32 percent displayed moderately permissive attitudes, and 38 percent displayed very permissive attitudes. In the sample of male college students, 25 percent showed restrictive attitudes, 36 percent showed moderately permissive attitudes, and 39 percent showed very permissive attitudes. A summary of this comparison is presented in Table IV. Table V describes the responses of the college students to each item according to the percentage of restrictive, moderately permissive, and very permissive responses.

TABLE IV
PERCENTAGE OF RESPONSES OF FATHERS AND MALE STUDENTS
ON THE FATHER-SON INTERACTION TEST

Group	Restrictive	Moderately Permissive	Very Permissive
Fathers	29.64	32.34	38.02
Students	24.90	36.53	38.57

TABLE V
 PERCENTAGE OF RESPONSES ON THE FATHER-SON
INTERACTION TEST

Item	Percentage of Responses		
	Restrictive	Moderately Permissive	Very Permissive
SCENE I			
1. The son should have awakened immediately when the father called.	50.00	39.19	10.81
2. The father should have ignored the son's resistance.	63.51	27.03	9.46
3. The father should have understood the son's difficulty in arising.	9.46	42.57	47.97
4. If a father calls his son, he should have to call him only once.	37.84	45.27	16.89
5. This father was taking too much responsibility for awakening his son.	27.03	35.81	37.16
6. The father should have realized that his son's reaction was a normal reaction, and he should not have been threatened.	15.54	37.84	46.62
7. The father should have "swatted" his son.	6.76	27.70	65.54
8. The father should have been irritated by the boy's actions.	10.14	31.76	58.11
9. The father should have been more forceful in getting his son out of bed.	8.78	33.11	58.11
10. The father was doing what any good father should do.	75.00	20.95	4.05
11. The father should not have allowed his son to turn over when he called him.	14.86	50.68	34.46

TABLE V (Continued)

Item	Percentage of Responses		
	Restrictive	Moderately Permissive	Very Permissive
12. If the boy did not want to get up, it was probably because he was too tired.	53.38	36.49	10.14
13. The father should be complimented for having given his son this type of help.	56.76	35.14	8.11
14. The father should have shown more concern for his son getting enough rest.	59.46	33.78	6.76
SCENE II			
15. The father should have given his son the money at the first request.	27.03	47.30	25.68
16. The son should not have been so persistent.	37.84	38.51	23.65
17. The son should not have interrupted his father's activities.	32.43	50.68	16.89
18. The father should have shown more attention to his son.	2.03	22.97	75.00
19. The son should have waited before asking for the money.	51.35	41.22	7.43
20. The son had a right to become angry.	52.03	38.51	9.46
21. The father should not have reacted as this father did.	6.08	27.70	66.22
22. The father should have given the money to his son the previous night.	38.51	50.68	10.81
23. The son should not have depended upon his parents for money.	27.70	47.30	25.00

TABLE V (Continued)

Item	Percentage of Responses		
	Restrictive	Moderately Permissive	Very Permissive
24. The father handled the matter satisfactorily.	2.70	32.43	64.86
25. The father should not have ignored his son.	8.84	14.97	76.19
26. The son should not have had to beg for money.	6.76	39.86	53.38
27. The father should have been more concerned with his son's feelings.	3.38	33.11	63.51
28. The son should have been more considerate of his father.	77.70	20.27	2.03
29. The father should have responded when his son asked for his allowance.	25.68	47.30	27.03
SCENE III			
30. The father should have been more attentive to the son's conversation.	10.81	54.05	35.14
31. A father should not have had to listen to his son this much during mealtime.	24.32	42.57	33.11
32. The son's actions should not have irritated his father.	29.05	47.30	23.65
33. The father and son should have had a closer relationship.	4.73	35.14	60.14
34. The son should have been able to feel more comfortable with his father.	1.35	25.00	73.65
35. The father was right in objecting to his son's slowness in eating.	58.78	24.32	16.89

TABLE V (Continued)

Item	Percentage of Responses		
	Restrictive	Moderately Permissive	Very Permissive
36. The father should not have been so hasty in scolding his son.	22.97	45.27	31.76
37. The father should have participated in his son's conversation.	3.38	47.97	48.65
38. The son should not have talked so much.	66.22	25.00	8.78
39. The son should not have bothered his father about such unimportant matters.	6.08	48.65	45.27
40. The father should have shown more affection for his son.	6.08	48.65	45.27
41. The father should have shown more interest in his son's activities.	1.35	32.43	66.22
SCENE IV			
42. The father should have ignored the error which the son made.	18.24	31.76	50.00
43. The son should be able to expect more encouragement from his father.	3.38	15.54	81.08
44. The father should have first mentioned the son's winning run.	0.00	14.19	85.81
45. The son should not have been so upset by his father's remarks.	37.84	37.16	25.00
46. It is a wise father who gives this kind of help in directing his son's play activities.	10.14	26.35	63.51
47. The father should have encouraged his son more.	0.68	20.95	78.38

TABLE V (Continued)

Item	Percentage of Responses		
	Restrictive	Moderately Permissive	Very Permissive
48. The father should have arrived at a better method of guiding his son.	2.03	16.22	81.76
49. The father should have shown more appreciation for his son's achievement.	0.00	12.84	87.16
50. The father was too concerned with his son's mistakes.	4.05	26.35	69.59
51. The father was wrong in hurting his son's feelings.	4.73	23.65	71.62
52. The father should have shown more concern for his son's feelings than for his achievements.	7.43	38.51	54.05
53. The father should have praised his son.	6.76	45.27	47.97
SCENE V			
54. The son should not have reminded the father of his promise.	19.59	38.51	41.89
55. The father should have cancelled his appointment with his son.	37.16	37.16	25.68
56. The father should not have forgotten his promise.	4.73	29.05	66.22
57. The father should have offered to take his son with him.	20.95	39.86	39.19
58. The father should not have offered to call off his business date.	47.97	41.22	10.81
59. The father should have told his son that a business deal was more important.	36.49	41.22	22.30

TABLE V (Continued)

Item	Percentage of Responses		
	Restrictive	Moderately Permissive	Very Permissive
60. The son should not have argued with his father.	59.46	32.43	8.11
61. The father should have felt happy that his son wanted to play golf with him.	2.70	39.86	57.43
62. The son should not have expected his father to want to play golf with him.	13.51	35.81	50.68
63. The son should have made his own arrangements for playing golf.	13.51	56.08	30.41
64. The son should have realized that the father had the "last word."	63.51	27.03	9.46
65. The father should have shown more affection for his son.	10.14	52.03	37.84
66. The father should have felt obligated to play golf with his son.	29.05	46.62	24.32
SCENE VI			
67. The son should not have shown feelings of resentment toward his father.	87.84	10.14	2.03
68. If a son has feelings of resentment, he should express his feelings.	43.24	47.30	9.46
69. The father should have "paddled" his son.	36.49	41.22	22.30
70. The son should have been made to apologize to his father.	78.38	18.24	3.38
71. The father should have allowed his son to rake the leaves at his convenience.	79.73	18.92	1.35

TABLE V (Continued)

Item	Percentage of Responses		
	Restrictive	Moderately Permissive	Very Permissive
72. Since the father was so persistent, the son's reaction was appropriate.	87.84	9.46	2.70
73. A son needs a lot of help in learning to assume responsibility for the yard.	37.84	39.19	22.97
74. The father was right in being so persistent.	80.41	18.92	0.68
75. A son should never question his father's authority.	60.81	35.81	3.38
76. A father should not threaten his son.	44.59	37.84	17.57
77. A father should be able to reason with his son without threatening him.	3.38	36.49	60.14
78. The father should have been more forceful in the beginning.	49.32	40.54	10.14
79. The father should not have become so excited when his son did not obey him.	45.27	44.59	10.14
SCENE VII			
80. The father should have insisted that his son clean up the table by himself.	8.78	43.24	47.97
81. The father was too lenient with his son.	6.08	32.43	61.49
82. The son should have been more understanding of himself.	34.46	62.16	3.38
83. The son should not have been "fooling around" at the table before the meal.	29.05	48.65	22.30

TABLE V (Continued)

Item	Percentage of Responses		
	Restrictive	Moderately Permissive	Very Permissive
84. The father should have punished his son for spilling the water.	1.35	20.27	78.38
85. The father handled the situation satisfactorily.	2.70	16.22	81.08
86. The father should be complimented for having helped his son clean up the table.	8.11	37.84	54.05
87. The father should have objected to his son's carelessness.	18.24	46.62	35.14
88. The son should not have been so concerned with spilling a glass of water.	66.22	27.70	6.08
89. The father should not have been so calm.	3.38	27.70	68.92
SCENE VIII			
90. The father should have been considerate of his son's opinions.	35.81	49.32	14.86
91. A father should never embarrass his son when guests are present.	16.89	37.84	45.27
92. The father should not have been persistent.	30.41	35.14	34.46
93. The father should have tried to understand why his son was not talking.	8.78	45.27	45.95
94. The son should have felt that he does not have to participate in the conversation.	90.54	7.43	2.03
95. The father should have been more persistent.	8.78	36.49	54.73

TABLE V (Continued)

Item	Percentage of Responses		
	Restrictive	Moderately Permissive	Very Permissive
96. The father should have recognized that his son might not want to participate.	12.16	66.89	20.95
97. The father should have shown more warmth and affection for his son.	35.14	51.35	13.51
98. The son should have been asked to leave the table when he refused to answer his father.	5.14	29.73	64.86
99. The father handled the situation well.	35.14	38.51	26.35
SCENE IX			
100. The father should help his son with his homework whenever asked.	8.11	46.62	45.27
101. The father should have been angry at the son's lack of motivation in doing his homework.	52.03	38.51	9.46
102. The son should have felt free to ask his father for assistance.	0.68	18.92	80.41
103. The father was right in helping his son to achieve good quality work.	16.22	46.62	37.16
104. The father should not have turned off the television.	90.54	6.76	2.70
105. The father should have insisted that his son study at a desk.	53.38	33.11	13.51
106. The father should not have assumed that his son could not study with the television going.	73.65	21.62	4.73

TABLE V (Continued)

Item	Percentage of Responses		
	Restrictive	Moderately Permissive	Very Permissive
107. The father should have allowed his son to do the assignment himself and not worry about making it perfect.	54.05	36.49	9.46
108. The father should have helped his son without worrying.	37.16	48.65	14.19
109. The father should not have been so critical of his son's attempts.	42.57	43.92	13.51
110. The father should have shown more warmth and affection for his son.	47.97	38.51	13.51
SCENE X			
111. The father should have been more considerate of his son.	53.38	39.86	6.76
112. The father should have shown more force.	18.92	56.76	24.32
113. The son should have been punished.	10.14	50.68	39.19
114. The son should not have accepted his call knowing that his father was expecting a business call.	49.32	36.49	14.19
115. The father should not have allowed his son to accept the call.	5.41	47.97	46.62
116. The father should not have treated his son like a "baby."	29.73	45.27	25.00
117. The father should not have been so impatient.	61.22	28.57	10.20
118. The son should not have been upset.	87.16	10.81	2.03

TABLE V (Continued)

Item	Percentage of Responses		
	Restrictive	Moderately Permissive	Very Permissive
119. The son's actions should not have upset the father.	47.97	41.89	10.14
120. The father should not have expected this much from his son.	83.78	14.19	2.03
SCENE XI			
121. The son should not have had pictures of which his father would disapprove.	71.62	24.32	4.05
122. The father should not have made the son remove the picture.	82.43	12.84	4.73
123. A father should have no right to disapprove the type of pictures which his son views.	92.57	4.05	3.38
124. The father should not have disapproved.	81.76	14.86	3.38
125. The son should have asked his father's permission before hanging the picture.	79.73	16.22	4.05
126. A father should check all magazines his son reads.	18.24	37.16	44.59
127. The father should have talked with his son before disapproving.	12.16	41.22	46.62
128. The father was right in objecting to this kind of behavior.	71.73	21.09	7.48
129. The son should have "stood up" for his rights.	72.30	27.03	0.68
130. It was the son's own business what pictures he had.	81.08	14.19	4.73

TABLE V (Continued)

Item	Percentage of Responses		
	Restrictive	Moderately Permissive	Very Permissive
131. The father should not have interfered.	91.22	6.08	2.70
132. The father should have asked his son to keep his picture collection put away.	82.43	12.16	5.41
133. The father should have been more understanding.	18.37	57.14	24.49
134. The father was doing what any good father should do.	66.67	23.13	10.20

Relationship Between Scores and Selected
Background Variables

The Mann-Whitney U Test was used to examine scores on The Father-Son Interaction Test which were classified in terms of: (a) exposure to a family relations course, (b) father absence, and (c) marital status. Permissive attitudes, as reflected by scores on The Father-Son Interaction Test, were unrelated to these background variables. The results of this analysis are presented in Table VI.

TABLE VI

MANN-WHITNEY U ANALYSIS OF TEST SCORES CLASSIFIED BY
SELECTED BACKGROUND VARIABLES

Background Variable	U	Level of Significance
Previous Family Relations Course	1497.00	n.s.
Father Absence	1660.50	n.s.
Marital Status	1202.00	n.s.

The Kruskal-Wallis one-way analysis of variance was used to examine scores on The Father-Son Interaction Test which were classified in terms of: (a) socioeconomic status, (b) age, (c) family size, (d) position in family, (e) perceived happiness of childhood relationship with parents, (f) perceived discipline in family, (g) employment status of mother, and (h) residence for major part of life. None of

these variables were found to be significantly related to permissive attitudes. The results of this analysis are presented in Table VII.

TABLE VII
KRUSKAL-WALLIS ANALYSIS OF TEST SCORES CLASSIFIED
BY SELECTED BACKGROUND VARIABLES

Background Variable	df	H	Level of Significance
Socioeconomic Status	4	3.10	n.s.
Age	3	3.90	n.s.
Family Size	6	12.06	n.s.
Family Position	3	5.84	n.s.
Perceived Happiness in Childhood	4	6.07	n.s.
Perceived Discipline	3	1.86	n.s.
Employment Status of Mother	2	0.11	n.s.
Residence	4	4.43	n.s.

Summary of Findings

In summary, permissive attitudes toward father-son interaction were found to be independent of:

1. Exposure to a family relations course
2. Father absence
3. Marital status of respondents
4. Socioeconomic status

5. Age
6. Family size
7. Position in family
8. Perceived happiness of childhood relationship with parents
9. Perceived discipline in family
10. Employment status of mother
11. Residence

Of the 134 items included on The Father-Son Interaction Test, 94 were found to discriminate between high and low scorers.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY AND IMPLICATIONS

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

The subjects participating in this study were 148 male college students who were enrolled in the undergraduate course, Home Economics for Men, at Oklahoma State University during the fall semester of 1969. The majority of the subjects ranged in age from 17-22, were single, and came from the middle socioeconomic class.

The film test which was developed by Doyle (1968) consisted of 11 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 134 highly 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 the 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 assigned a value of one; the remaining responses which were not permissive were given a value of zero.

The 11 scenes involving father-son interaction and the 134 item scale were used in collecting the data. An item analysis utilizing the chi-square test revealed that 94 of the 134 items on The Father-Son Interaction Test discriminated between the responses of the most permissive and the least permissive subjects. When comparisons were made between Doyle's (1968) group of fathers and the male college students who participated in this study, it was found that their scores were quite similar, suggesting the hypothesis that the manner in which father-son interaction is viewed by males is fairly stabilized by late adolescence. In order to assess the reliability of the instrument, a split-half technique was utilized and a Spearman r of .99 was obtained.

A Mann-Whitney U test revealed that permissive attitudes toward father-son interaction were independent of: (a) exposure to a family relations course, (b) father absence, and (c) marital status.

The Kruskal-Wallis one-way analysis of variance showed that permissiveness was independent of: (a) socioeconomic status, (b) age, (c) family size, (d) position in family, (e) perceived happiness of childhood relationship with parents, (f) perceived discipline in childhood, (g) employment status of mother, and (h) residence for major part of life.

Implications

The data suggest that there is little difference between the responses of male university students and the fathers who served as subjects in the study by Doyle (1968). This finding suggests the hypothesis that the manner in which males view father-son interaction is somewhat stabilized by late adolescence and indicates the possibility that beginning education for family life at an early age may be necessary in order to maximize the effectiveness of this type of education.

The fact that the responses to The Father-Son Interaction Test were unrelated to any of the background factors investigated suggests that perceptions of father-son relations may not necessarily be a direct reflection of the kind of environment to which one is exposed at home. In addition, these perceptions may be a function of learnings gained from observing many father-son relationships. The internalization of the masculine role is not dependent solely upon the son's identification with his father but is also a reflection of his perception of the male role which is learned from many models. Similarly, it may be that whether one approves or disapproves of a permissive role for the father in father-son interaction may be the result of learnings gained from many sources. This is not to suggest that the father does not influence the manner in which his sons perceive father-son relationships, but it acknowledges the possibility that there are other influences which may be equally important.

Such an hypothesis is encouraging as it suggests that individuals who are subjected to harsh, punitive relationships within their families of orientation are not necessarily the victims of their

familial experience in the development of their families of procreation. With increased insight, they may be able to view a pattern of relationships which is different from those they have originally experienced. This suggests further that education may have a positive effect in correcting untoward parental influences, and that significant modifications in responses reflecting perceptions and attitudes of youth are made as a result of their experience beyond their own father-son relationships.

Increasingly, research on adolescents indicates that the peer group exerts an important influence on adolescent values. The data herein reported suggest that permissiveness with respect to father-son relationships is not a function of the background variables measured in the current study but is, apparently, the result of other factors which are, as yet, not clearly understood.

The fact that various sociological factors were found to be unrelated to permissiveness lends support to those studies which concentrate upon psychological variables in an attempt to explain permissive attitudes. Block (1955) has related various personality characteristics to restrictive and permissive attitudes. He 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 more self-reliant and ascendant. They seemed to be able to function more effectively. In addition, Becker et al. (1964) indicate that the healthy adjustment of the parent may be an important factor in the way he guides his children. In future studies, a promising

approach to the discovery of relevant factors contributing to permissiveness may be to relate scores on The Father-Son Interaction Test to personality characteristics of the students.

A SELECTED 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.
- _____. "Child Care Practices Anteceding Three Patterns of Preschool Behavior." Genetic Psychology Monographs, LXXV (1967), 43-88.
- _____ 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.
- _____. "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.
- Carlson, Rae. "Identification and Personality Structure in Pre-Adolescents." Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, LXVII (1963), 566-573.
- 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 Ph.D. Thesis, Florida State University, 1968.
- Elder, Glen H., Jr. "Parental Power Legitimation and Its Effect on the Adolescent." Sociometry, XXVI (1963) 50-65.
- _____. 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.
- Gray, Susan W. "Masculinity-Femininity in Relation to Anxiety and Social Acceptance." Child Development, XXVIII (1957), 203-214.
- _____. "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.
- 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 Obstinance, Orderliness and Parsimony in Young Children." Child Development, XXXIV (1963), 919-943.
- Hoffman, Lois W. "The Father's Role in the Family and the Child's Peer Group Adjustment." Merrill-Palmer Quarterly, VII (1961), 97-105.
- Hoffman, Martin L. "Personality, Family Structure, and Social Class as Antecedents of Parental Power Assertion." Child Development, XXXIV (1963), 869-884.
- Illsey, Raymond and Barbara Thompson. "Women From Broken Homes." Sociological Review, IX (1961), 27-54.

- Johnson, Miriam M. "Sex-Role Learning in the Nuclear Family." Child Development, XXXIV (1963), 319-333.
- Kagan, Jerome. "The Concept of Identification." Psychological Review, LXV (1958), 296-305.
- Kohn, Melvin L. and John A. Clausen. "Parental Authority Behavior and Schizophrenia." American Journal of Orthopsychiatry. XXVI (1956), 297-313.
- 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.
- _____ 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.
- 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 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.
- _____ 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.
- 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.
- _____. "Child-Rearing Factors Related to Playing the Sex-Typed Roles." The American Psychologist, VIII (1953), 431.
- Slater, Phillip E. "Parental Role Differentiation." American Journal of Sociology, LXVII (1961), 296-308.
- Sopchak, Andrew L. "Parental Identification and Tendency Toward Disorders as Measured by the MMPI." Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, XLVII (1952), 159-165.
- Stephens, William N. "Judgements by Social Workers on Boys and Mothers in Fatherless Families." Journal of Genetic Psychology, XCIX (1961), 59-64.
- Stoke, S. M. "An Inquiry Into the Concept of Identification." Journal of Genetic Psychology, LXXI (1950), 163-189.

- Stolz, Lois M. Father Relations of War-Born Children. Stanford, California: Stanford University Press, 1954.
- Sutton-Smith, B., B. G. Rosenberg, and Frank Landy. "Father Absence Effects in Families of Different Sibling Compositions." Child Development, XXXIX (1968), 1213-1221.
- ✓Tiller, P. O. "Father Absence and Personality Development of Children in Sailor Families: A Preliminary Research Report, Part II." in Studies of the Family. Vol. 2. ed. N. Anderson. Goltingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, (1957), 115-137.
- Walters, James and Barbara Bridges. "Attitudes of Single Men Toward Child Guidance." Journal of Home Economics, XLVIII(1956), 109-113.

APPENDIX A

THE FATHER-SON INTERACTION TEST

Emma Lee Doyle

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

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

Your answer to each statement depends on what you see in the film plus what you know generally about father and son behavior. There is no "right" 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 son should have awakened immediately when the father called. | SA | MA | MD | SD |
| 2. The father should have ignored the son's resistance. | SA | MA | MD | SD |
| 3. The father should have understood the son's difficulty in arising. | SA | MA | MD | SD |
| 4. If a father calls his son, he should have to call him only once. | SA | MA | MD | SD |
| 5. This father was taking too much responsibility for awakening his son. | SA | MA | MD | SD |

- | | | | | | |
|-----|--|----|----|----|----|
| 6. | 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 |
| 7. | The father should have "swatted" his son. | SA | MA | MD | SD |
| 8. | The father should have been irritated by the boy's actions. | SA | MA | MD | SD |
| 9. | The father should have been more forceful in getting his son out of bed. | SA | MA | MD | SD |
| 10. | The father was doing what any good father should do. | SA | MA | MD | SD |
| 11. | The father should not have allowed his son to turn over when he called him. | SA | MA | MD | SD |
| 12. | If the boy did not want to get up, it was probably because he was too tired. | SA | MA | MD | SD |
| 13. | The father should be complimented for having given his son this type of help. | SA | MA | MD | SD |
| 14. | 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.

- | | | | | | |
|-----|---|----|----|----|----|
| 15. | The father should have given his son the money at the first request. | SA | MA | MD | SD |
| 16. | The son should not have been so persistent. | SA | MA | MD | SD |
| 17. | The son should not have interrupted his father's activities. | SA | MA | MD | SD |
| 18. | The father should have shown more attention to his son. | SA | MA | MD | SD |
| 19. | The son should have waited before asking for the money. | SA | MA | MD | SD |
| 20. | The son had a right to become angry. | SA | MA | MD | SD |
| 21. | The father should not have reacted as this father did. | SA | MA | MD | SD |
| 22. | The father should have given the money to his son the previous night. | SA | MA | MD | SD |

- | | | | | | |
|-----|--|----|----|----|----|
| 23. | The son should not have depended upon his parents for money. | SA | MA | MD | SD |
| 24. | The father handled the matter satisfactorily. | SA | MA | MD | SD |
| 25. | The father should not have ignored his son. | SA | MA | MD | SD |
| 26. | The son should not have had to beg for money. | SA | MA | MD | SD |
| 27. | The father should have been more concerned with his son's feelings. | SA | MA | MD | SD |
| 28. | The son should have been more considerate of his father. | SA | MA | MD | SD |
| 29. | 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.

- | | | | | | |
|-----|--|----|----|----|----|
| 30. | The father should have been more attentive to the son's conversation. | SA | MA | MD | SD |
| 31. | A father should not have had to listen to his son this much during mealtime. | SA | MA | MD | SD |
| 32. | The son's actions should not have irritated his father. | SA | MA | MD | SD |
| 33. | The father and son should have had a closer relationship. | SA | MA | MD | SD |
| 34. | The son should have been able to feel more comfortable with his father. | SA | MA | MD | SD |
| 35. | The father was right in objecting to his son's slowness in eating. | SA | MA | MD | SD |
| 36. | The father should not have been so hasty in scolding his son. | SA | MA | MD | SD |
| 37. | The father should have participated in his son's conversation. | SA | MA | MD | SD |

- | | | | | | |
|-----|---|----|----|----|----|
| 38. | The son should not have talked so much. | SA | MA | MD | SD |
| 39. | The son should not have bothered his father about such unimportant matters. | SA | MA | MD | SD |
| 40. | The father should have shown more affection for his son. | SA | MA | MD | SD |
| 41. | 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?"

- | | | | | | |
|-----|---|----|----|----|----|
| 42. | The father should have ignored the error which the son made. | SA | MA | MD | SD |
| 43. | The son should be able to expect more encouragement from his father. | SA | MA | MD | SD |
| 44. | The father should have first mentioned his son's winning run. | SA | MA | MD | SD |
| 45. | The son should not have been so upset by his father's remarks. | SA | MA | MD | SD |
| 46. | It is a wise father who gives this kind of help in directing his son's play activities. | SA | MA | MD | SD |
| 47. | The father should have encouraged his son more. | SA | MA | MD | SD |
| 48. | The father should have arrived at a better method of guiding his son. | SA | MA | MD | SD |
| 49. | The father should have shown more appreciation for his son's achievements. | SA | MA | MD | SD |
| 50. | The father was too concerned with his son's mistakes. | SA | MA | MD | SD |
| 51. | The father was wrong in hurting his son's feelings. | SA | MA | MD | SD |
| 52. | The father should have shown more concern for his son's feelings than for his achievements. | SA | MA | MD | SD |
| 53. | The father should have praised his son. | 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?"

- | | | | | | |
|-----|--|----|----|----|----|
| 54. | The son should not have reminded the father of his promise. | SA | MA | MD | SD |
| 55. | The father should have cancelled his appointment with his son. | SA | MA | MD | SD |
| 56. | The father should not have forgotten his promise. | SA | MA | MD | SD |
| 57. | The father should have offered to take his son with him. | SA | MA | MD | SD |
| 58. | The father should not have offered to call off his business date. | SA | MA | MD | SD |
| 59. | The father should have told his son that a business deal was more important. | SA | MA | MD | SD |
| 60. | The son should not have argued with his father. | SA | MA | MD | SD |
| 61. | The father should have felt happy that his son wanted to play golf with him. | SA | MA | MD | SD |
| 62. | The son should not have expected his father to want to play golf with him. | SA | MA | MD | SD |
| 63. | The son should have made his own arrangements for playing golf. | SA | MA | MD | SD |
| 64. | The son should have realized that the father had the "last word." | SA | MA | MD | SD |
| 65. | The father should have shown more affection for his son. | SA | MA | MD | SD |
| 66. | 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.

- | | | | | | |
|-----|---|----|----|----|----|
| 67. | The son should not have shown feelings of resentment toward his father. | SA | MA | MD | SD |
| 68. | If a son has feelings of resentment, he should express his feelings. | SA | MA | MD | SD |
| 69. | The father should have "paddled" his son. | SA | MA | MD | SD |
| 70. | The son should have been made to apologize to his father. | SA | MA | MD | SD |
| 71. | The father should have allowed his son to rake the leaves at his convenience. | SA | MA | MD | SD |
| 72. | Since the father was so persistent, the son's reaction was appropriate. | SA | MA | MD | SD |
| 73. | A son needs a lot of help in learning to assume responsibility for the yard. | SA | MA | MD | SD |
| 74. | The father was right in being so persistent. | SA | MA | MD | SD |
| 75. | A son should never question his father's authority. | SA | MA | MD | SD |
| 76. | A father should not threaten his son. | SA | MA | MD | SD |
| 77. | A father should be able to reason with his son without threatening him. | SA | MA | MD | SD |
| 78. | The father should have been more forceful in the beginning. | SA | MA | MD | SD |
| 79. | 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.

- | | | | | | |
|-----|---|----|----|----|----|
| 80. | The father should have insisted that his son clean up the table by himself. | SA | MA | MD | SD |
| 81. | The father was too lenient with his son. | SA | MA | MD | SD |
| 82. | The son should have been more understanding of himself. | SA | MA | MD | SD |
| 83. | The son should not have been "fooling around" at the table before the meal. | SA | MA | MD | SD |

- | | | | | |
|---|----|----|----|----|
| 84. The father should have punished his son for spilling the water. | SA | MA | MD | SD |
| 85. The father handled the situation satisfactorily. | SA | MA | MD | SD |
| 86. The father should be complimented for having helped his son clean up the table. | SA | MA | MD | SD |
| 87. The father should have objected to his son's carelessness. | SA | MA | MD | SD |
| 88. The son should not have been so concerned with spilling a glass of water. | SA | MA | MD | SD |
| 89. 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.

- | | | | | |
|---|----|----|----|----|
| 90. The father should have been considerate of his son's opinions. | SA | MA | MD | SD |
| 91. A father should never embarrass his son when guests are present. | SA | MA | MD | SD |
| 92. The father should not have been persistent. | SA | MA | MD | SD |
| 93. The father should have tried to understand why his son was not talking. | SA | MA | MD | SD |
| 94. The son should have felt that he does not have to participate in the conversation. | SA | MA | MD | SD |
| 95. The father should have been more persistent. | SA | MA | MD | SD |
| 96. The father should have recognized that the son might not want to participate. | SA | MA | MD | SD |
| 97. The father should have shown more warmth and affection for his son. | SA | MA | MD | SD |
| 98. The son should have been asked to leave the table when he refused to answer his father. | SA | MA | MD | SD |

99. 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.

100. The father should help his son with his homework whenever asked. SA MA MD SD

101. The father should have been angry at the son's lack of motivation in doing his homework. SA MA MD SD

102. The son should have felt free to ask his father for assistance. SA MA MD SD

103. The father was right in helping his son to achieve good quality work. SA MA MD SD

104. The father should not have turned off the television. SA MA MD SD

105. The father should have insisted that his son study at a desk. SA MA MD SD

106. The father should not have assumed that his son could not study with the television going. SA MA MD SD

107. The father should have allowed his son to do the assignment himself and not worry about making it perfect. SA MA MD SD

108. The father should have helped his son without worrying. SA MA MD SD

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

110. 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.

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

- | | | | | | |
|------|--|----|----|----|----|
| 112. | The father should have shown more force. | SA | MA | MD | SD |
| 113. | The son should have been punished. | SA | MA | MD | SD |
| 114. | The son should not have accepted his call knowing that his father was expecting a business call. | SA | MA | MD | SD |
| 115. | The father should not have allowed his son to accept the call. | SA | MA | MD | SD |
| 116. | The father should not have treated his son like a "baby." | SA | MA | MD | SD |
| 117. | The father should not have been so impatient. | SA | MA | MD | SD |
| 118. | The son should not have been upset. | SA | MA | MD | SD |
| 119. | The son's actions should not have upset the father. | SA | MA | MD | SD |
| 120. | The father should not have expected this much from his son. | SA | MA | MD | SD |

SCENE XI

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

- | | | | | | |
|------|---|----|----|----|----|
| 121. | The son should not have had pictures of which his father would disapprove. | SA | MA | MD | SD |
| 122. | The father should not have made the son remove the picture. | SA | MA | MD | SD |
| 123. | A father should have no right to disapprove the type of pictures which his son views. | SA | MA | MD | SD |
| 124. | The father should not have disapproved. | SA | MA | MD | SD |
| 125. | The son should have asked his father's permission before hanging the picture. | SA | MA | MD | SD |
| 126. | A father should check all magazines his son reads. | SA | MA | MD | SD |
| 127. | The father should have talked with his son before disapproving. | SA | MA | MD | SD |

- | | | | | | |
|------|---|----|----|----|----|
| 128. | The father was right in objecting to this kind of behavior. | SA | MA | MD | SD |
| 129. | The son should have "stood-up" for his rights. | SA | MA | MD | SD |
| 130. | It was the son's own business what pictures he had. | SA | MA | MD | SD |
| 131. | The father should not have interfered. | SA | MA | MD | SD |
| 132. | The father should have asked his son to keep his picture collection put away. | SA | MA | MD | SD |
| 133. | The father should have been more understanding. | SA | MA | MD | SD |
| 134. | The father was doing what any good father should do. | SA | MA | MD | SD |

SCORE SHEET

FATHER-SON INTERACTION TEST

Name of Respondent _____

Circle your answer

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

SCORE SHEET (CONTINUED)

49.	SA	MA	MD	SD	75.	SA	MA	MD	SD
50.	SA	MA	MD	SD	76.	SA	MA	MD	SD
51.	SA	MA	MD	SD	77.	SA	MA	MD	SD
52.	SA	MA	MD	SD	78.	SA	MA	MD	SD
53.	SA	MA	MD	SD	79.	SA	MA	MD	SD
54.	SA	MA	MD	SD	80.	SA	MA	MD	SD
55.	SA	MA	MD	SD	81.	SA	MA	MD	SD
56.	SA	MA	MD	SD	82.	SA	MA	MD	SD
57.	SA	MA	MD	SD	83.	SA	MA	MD	SD
58.	SA	MA	MD	SD	84.	SA	MA	MD	SD
59.	SA	MA	MD	SD	85.	SA	MA	MD	SD
60.	SA	MA	MD	SD	86.	SA	MA	MD	SD
61.	SA	MA	MD	SD	87.	SA	MA	MD	SD
62.	SA	MA	MD	SD	88.	SA	MA	MD	SD
63.	SA	MA	MD	SD	89.	SA	MA	MD	SD
64.	SA	MA	MD	SD	90.	SA	MA	MD	SD
65.	SA	MA	MD	SD	91.	SA	MA	MD	SD
66.	SA	MA	MD	SD	92.	SA	MA	MD	SD
67.	SA	MA	MD	SD	93.	SA	MA	MD	SD
68.	SA	MA	MD	SD	94.	SA	MA	MD	SD
69.	SA	MA	MD	SD	95.	SA	MA	MD	SD
70.	SA	MA	MD	SD	96.	SA	MA	MD	SD
71.	SA	MA	MD	SD	97.	SA	MA	MD	SD
72.	SA	MA	MD	SD	98.	SA	MA	MD	SD
73.	SA	MA	MD	SD	99.	SA	MA	MD	SD
74.	SA	MA	MD	SD	100.	SA	MA	MD	SD

SCORE SHEET (CONTINUED)

101.	SA	MA	MD	SD	127.	SA	MA	MD	SD
102.	SA	MA	MD	SD	128.	SA	MA	MD	SD
103.	SA	MA	MD	SD	129.	SA	MA	MD	SD
104.	SA	MA	MD	SD	130.	SA	MA	MD	SD
105.	SA	MA	MD	SD	131.	SA	MA	MD	SD
106.	SA	MA	MD	SD	132.	SA	MA	MD	SD
107.	SA	MA	MD	SD	133.	SA	MA	MD	SD
108.	SA	MA	MD	SD	134.	SA	MA	MD	SD
109.	SA	MA	MD	SD					
110.	SA	MA	MD	SD					
111.	SA	MA	MD	SD					
112.	SA	MA	MD	SD					
113.	SA	MA	MD	SD					
114.	SA	MA	MD	SD					
115.	SA	MA	MD	SD					
116.	SA	MA	MD	SD					
117.	SA	MA	MD	SD					
118.	SA	MA	MD	SD					
119.	SA	MA	MD	SD					
120.	SA	MA	MD	SD					
121.	SA	MA	MD	SD					
122.	SA	MA	MD	SD					
123.	SA	MA	MD	SD					
124.	SA	MA	MD	SD					
125.	SA	MA	MD	SD					
126.	SA	MA	MD	SD					

APPENDIX B

KEY FOR THE FATHER-SON INTERACTION TEST

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

KEY FOR THE FATHER-SON INTERACTION TEST (CONTINUED)

	<u>SA</u>	<u>MA</u>	<u>MD</u>	<u>SD</u>		<u>SA</u>	<u>MA</u>	<u>MD</u>	<u>SD</u>
51.	2	1	0	0	76.	2	1	0	0
52.	2	1	0	0	77.	2	1	0	0
53.	2	1	0	0	78.	0	0	1	2
54.	0	0	1	2	79.	2	1	0	0
55.	0	0	1	2	80.	0	0	1	2
56.	2	1	0	0	81.	0	0	1	2
57.	2	1	0	0	82.	2	1	0	0
58.	0	0	1	2	83.	0	0	1	2
59.	0	0	1	2	84.	0	0	1	2
60.	0	0	1	2	85.	2	1	0	0
61.	2	1	0	0	86.	2	1	0	0
62.	0	0	1	2	87.	0	0	1	2
63.	0	0	1	2	88.	2	1	0	0
64.	0	0	1	2	89.	0	0	1	2
65.	2	1	0	0	90.	2	1	0	0
66.	2	1	0	0	91.	2	1	0	0
67.	0	0	1	2	92.	2	1	0	0
68.	2	1	0	0	93.	2	1	0	0
69.	0	0	1	2	94.	2	1	0	0
70.	0	0	1	2	95.	0	0	1	2
71.	2	1	0	0	96.	2	1	0	0
72.	2	1	0	0	97.	2	1	0	0
73.	2	1	0	0	98.	0	0	1	2
74.	0	0	1	2	99.	0	0	1	2
75.	0	0	1	2	100.	2	1	0	0

KEY FOR THE FATHER-SON INTERACTION TEST (CONTINUED)

	<u>SA</u>	<u>MA</u>	<u>MD</u>	<u>SD</u>		<u>SA</u>	<u>MA</u>	<u>MD</u>	<u>SD</u>
101.	0	0	1	2	126.	0	0	1	2
102.	2	1	0	0	127.	2	1	0	0
103.	2	1	0	0	128.	0	0	1	2
104.	2	1	0	0	129.	2	1	0	0
105.	0	0	1	2	130.	2	1	0	0
106.	2	1	0	0	131.	2	1	0	0
107.	2	1	0	0	132.	0	0	1	2
108.	2	1	0	0	133.	2	1	0	0
109.	2	1	0	0	134.	0	0	1	2
110.	2	1	0	0					
111.	2	1	0	0					
112.	0	0	1	2					
113.	0	0	1	2					
114.	0	0	1	2					
115.	0	0	1	2					
116.	2	1	0	0					
117.	2	1	0	0					
118.	0	0	1	2					
119.	2	1	0	0					
120.	2	1	0	0					
121.	0	0	1	2					
122.	2	1	0	0					
123.	2	1	0	0					
124.	2	1	0	0					
125.	0	0	1	2					

APPENDIX C

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. Stillwater address _____
3. Phone number _____
4. Major _____
5. Age:

_____ 1. 17-18	_____ 4. 23-24
_____ 2. 19-20	_____ 5. 25 and over
_____ 3. 21-22	
6. Marital status:

_____ 1. Single	_____ 4. Separated
_____ 2. Married	_____ 5. Widowed
_____ 3. Divorced	
7. Were you born in America?

_____ 1. Yes
_____ 2. No
8. I have _____ brothers and _____ sisters.
I was number 1 2 3 4 5 6 (Circle one).
9. Have you had a family relations course in high school or college?

_____ 1. Yes
_____ 2. No
10. Describe in detail your father's occupation.

11. In school, your father completed grades:

_____ 1. none	_____ 6. graduated from high school
_____ 2. 1-4	_____ 7. completed 1-3 years college
_____ 3. 5-7	_____ 8. graduated from a 4-year college
_____ 4. 8	_____ 9. over 4 years of college
_____ 5. 9-11	
12. Was your mother employed for the major part of your childhood?

_____ 1. Yes (part-time employment)
_____ 2. Yes (full-time employment)
_____ 3. No

13. If during your childhood, your father was absent from the home for prolonged periods, indicate how old you were when he was gone. _____
14. 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 |
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. inherited savings and investments |
| _____ 6. private relief, odd jobs, share cropping, seasonal work |
| _____ 7. public relief or charity |
16. 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 25,000-50,000 population |
| _____ 4. in a community of 50,000-100,000 population |
| _____ 5. in a community of over 100,000 population |
17. If you live on a farm, please rate your father's occupation:
- | |
|--|
| _____ 1. gentleman farmer or landowner who does not directly supervise his property |
| _____ 2. land operator who supervises his property and has an active urban life |
| _____ 3. farm owner with "hired help" or an operator of leased property who supervises |
| _____ 4. small landowner or an operator of rented property hiring "hands" |
| _____ 5. tenant on a good farm; or a foreman; or an owner of a farm who "hires out" |
| _____ 6. sharecropper; or an established farm laborer; or a subsistence farmer |
| _____ 7. migrant worker; or a "squatter"; or a "nester" |
18. Check the one which most nearly describes the type of discipline you had in your family.
- | | |
|--------------------------|----------------------|
| _____ 1. very permissive | _____ 4. strict |
| _____ 2. permissive | _____ 5. very strict |
| _____ 3. average | |

19. Which of the following indicates your relationship with your parents during childhood?

_____ 1. Very happy

_____ 2. Happy

_____ 3. Undecided

_____ 4. Unhappy

_____ 5. Very unhappy

20. Do you have children of your own?

_____ 1. Yes

_____ 2. No

21. Number of boys _____

Number of girls _____

VITA

Becky Lynne Heath

Candidate for the Degree of
Master of Science

Thesis: COLLEGE STUDENTS' PERCEPTIONS CONCERNING FATHER-SON INTERACTION

Major Field: Family Relations and Child Development

Biographical:

Personal Data: Born in Stillwater, Oklahoma, April 16, 1947, the daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Clifford Thomas. Married Harry E. Heath III, September 4, 1966.

Education: Attended grade school and junior high school in Stillwater, Oklahoma; graduated from Stillwater High School in 1964; received the Bachelor of Science Degree from Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, Oklahoma, with a major in Family Relations and Child Development in July, 1968; completed requirements for the Master of Science Degree in May, 1970.

Professional Experience: Graduate Assistant, Oklahoma State University Child Development Laboratories, 1968-69, 1969-70.

Professional Organizations: Omicron Nu, Phi Upsilon Omicron, Kappa Delta Pi, Phi Kappa Phi.