

THE IMPACT OF FATHERS
ON DELINQUENT MALES

By

RICHARD MELVIN SMITH

Bachelor of Science
Brigham Young University
Provo, Utah
1967

Master of Science
Brigham Young University
Provo, Utah
1969

Submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate College
of the Oklahoma State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the Degree of
DOCTOR OF EDUCATION
May, 1974

MAR 14 1975

THE IMPACT OF FATHERS
ON DELINQUENT MALES

Thesis Approved:

James Hartman

Thesis Adviser
Nick Stinnett

Josephine Zoffer

Thomas W. Cannon

N. N. Durbin

Dean of the Graduate College

902237
ii

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The investigator is sincerely grateful to Dr. James Walters, Professor, Family Relations and Child Development, for his continual support and encouragement in the creation and completion of this study. His untiring willingness to be of guidance and assistance through each phase in the development of the study will be ever appreciated.

Recognition and sincere appreciation are also extended to other members of the committee for their cooperation and encouragement. They are Dr. Josephine Hoffer, Head, Family Relations and Child Development; Dr. Nick Stinnett, Associate Professor, Family Relations and Child Development; and to Dr. Thomas Karman, Assistant Professor, Higher Education, is extended an especial appreciation for his editorial corrections and suggestions which greatly improved the text of the dissertation.

This research would not have been possible without the kind cooperation of the staff of the Oklahoma Department of Social and Rehabilitative Services; of Mr. Richard Watts, Principal, Guthrie High School at Guthrie, Oklahoma; and Mr. Gene Hartshell, Principal, Yukon High School at Yukon, Oklahoma, from whom the sample population was taken for this study.

Grateful appreciation and sincere thanks goes to the investigator's dear wife, Kathryn, without whom none of this would have transpired. She provided support, encouragement editing, and her

typing abilities to make the project a success. To my two lovely daughters, Kristyne and Tarrisé, I express my appreciation for their patience during this time of paternal deprivation.

Deep love and eternal gratitude are expressed to my honorable parents, Grace Meldrum and Collins De Witt Smith, for the guidance and parental support they provided me throughout my life. It was largely due to the value they placed upon the acquisition of a meaningful education which inspired me to pursue the present degree.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. INTRODUCTION.....	1
Purpose.....	1
Father's Influence on Socialization.....	2
Anomie.....	5
II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE.....	9
Paternal Influence on the Development of Male Children.....	9
Effects of Father-Absence on Delinquency.....	12
Father's Influence on Son's Peer Relations.....	21
Effects of Personality Characteristics of Parents.....	22
III. PROCEDURE.....	24
Criteria for the Selection of Subjects.....	24
The Instruments.....	25
Background Information.....	25
<u>Lie Scale</u>	25
<u>Attitudes Toward Parents Scale (Form F)</u>	26
<u>The Anomie Scale</u>	28
<u>The Father Identification Scale</u>	29
Administration of the Instrument.....	30
Analysis of the Data.....	30
IV. FINDINGS.....	31
Findings.....	31
Family Relationships Information.....	31
Summary of Responses to the <u>Attitudes Toward Parents Scale (Form E)</u>	37
Section II.....	55
Section III.....	56
Examination of the Hypotheses.....	56
Masculinity of the Father.....	57
Physical Punishment.....	60
Closeness to the Father.....	62
Father's Love.....	63
Amount of Time Spent With Their Fathers.....	64
Parent Who Exerted the Greatest Influence.....	65
Parent Who Guided the Family.....	66

Chapter	Page
Agent of Discipline.....	68
Whom the Respondent Lived With.....	68
Childhood Happiness.....	70
Race.....	71
Age.....	71
V. DISCUSSION.....	89
VI, SUMMARY.....	94
Conclusions.....	101
Methodological Limitations of the Research.....	102
Implications for Further Research.....	102
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	105
APPENDIX A.....	114
APPENDIX B.....	122
APPENDIX C.....	124
APPENDIX D.....	126
APPENDIX E.....	128

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
I. Background Characteristics of the Subjects.....	32
II. Subjects' Ratings of Their Family Relationships.....	33
III. Responses to Itkin's <u>Attitudes Toward Parents Scale</u> (<u>Form F</u>) Section I.....	38
IV. Responses to Itkin's <u>Attitudes Toward Parents Scale</u> (<u>Form F</u>) Section I.....	41
V. Responses to Itkin's <u>Attitudes Toward Parents Scale</u> (<u>Form F</u>) Section II.....	43
VI. Responses to Itkin's <u>Attitudes Toward Parents Scale</u> (<u>Form F</u>) Section III.....	47
VII. Kruskal-Wallis One-Way Analysis of Variance of Itkin's Scale Scores Classified According to Ratings of Delinquents and Non-Delinquents Concerning Their Fathers.....	55
VIII. Kruskal-Wallis One-Way Analysis of Variance of Itkin's Scale Scores Classified According to Ratings of Delinquents and Non-Delinquents With Respect to Their Anomie Responses.....	73
IX. Non-Black Responses to the <u>Anomie Scale</u>	74
X. Black Responses to the <u>Anomie Scale</u>	75
XI. Kruskal-Wallis One-Way Analysis of Variance of Itkin's Scale Scores Classified According to Ratings of Delinquents and Non-Delinquents Concerning Father Identification.....	78
XII. Black Responses to the <u>Father Identification Scale</u>	79
XIII. Non-Black Responses to the <u>Father Identification Scale</u> ..	80
XIV. Chi Square Values Reflecting Differences in Responses of Delinquents and Non-Delinquents.....	85

Table	Page
XV. Mann-Whitney U Scores Reflecting Differences in Responses of Delinquents and Non-Delinquents.....	88

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Purpose

Many researchers have come to regard parental deprivation as one of the main causes, if not the prime cause, for delinquent behavior in males (Andry, 1960; Bowlby, 1947; Grygier, Chesley and Tutors, 1969). Theoretically, parental deprivation may be classed as maternal, paternal, or dual parental. However, in the development of basic theory and research, consideration has been given primarily to maternal deprivation, while little attention has been given to the other two kinds of deprivation (Grygier, Chesley and Tutors, 1969).

Since Bowlby's work in 1952, researchers have regarded maternal deprivation as being of primary etiological importance in the fields of delinquency and psychopathology (Andry, 1960; Benson, 1968). The major emphasis has been on the intimate, loving, emotionally satisfying relationship between the child and the mother (Andry 1960; Bowlby, 1951; Grygier, et al., 1969; Peterson, Becker, Hellmer, Shoemaker, and Quay, 1959). The theory, in spite of its usefulness, can be criticized partly because it undermines the development of the theory based on interacting multicausation, and partly because it gives inadequate recognition of the importance of the father, who may be even more important than the mother in preventing delinquency in males

(Andry, 1960; Grygier et al., 1969; Peterson et al., 1959; Benson, 1958; and Nash, 1965).

Studies of the father and his functions in the family have remained largely unexplored by research, but the literature which is available indicates that an "inadequate father image seems more likely to contribute to delinquency than a faulty mother image" (Grygier et al., 1969). Evidence suggests that the growing male needs an adequate father figure with whom to identify, and from whom to learn an acceptable and appropriate pattern of social and sexual behavior. Through this identification process with an adult male, the young male learns how to temper and exercise his feelings of love and aggression. When a healthy father image is lacking, the child finds it difficult to define for himself a proper social and sexual role (Grygier, et al., 1969; and Benson, 1968).

Father's Influence on Socialization

The role of the father in the socialization of the child in the nuclear family is significant since he is ordinarily the only adult male with whom the child can establish stable daily interaction. Most theories of socialization postulate that it is from this interaction that the child internalizes the male role, either directly, as in the case of a boy, or as a counter role in the case of a girl (Thomes, 1968). Socialization, then, becomes an orderly progression of changes to achieve the norms of society. Parsons and Bales (1960) stressed that the foundation for socialized achievements was the way in which the nuclear family teaches the child to control his emotions, establish the desired relationship between the child and his environment,

and aid in the proper sex-role identification. Parsons and Bales conceived not only of a hierarchy of social systems and roles graduating the individual from infancy to adulthood, but of a continual inward flow of shaping forces on the family as well. These forces are then transferred to the child. Thus, each member of the family, i.e., father, mother, brother, sister, contributes to the ultimate socialization of the child, as do his peers and the greater society.

McCord, McCord and Zola (1959) believe that the nature of the parental model determines the content of the child's conscience. The values of the society in which one lives are also filtered and transmitted through the parents. As a child observes his parents, he normally assumes that their behavior is appropriate for imitation; consequently, he assimilates their attitudes as his own. These investigators further indicate that if a boy's father is punitive or cruel, the child becomes more aggressive. If the father is gentle and restrained, he provides an example of kindness for assimilation. If the father rejects the standards of society and exhibits anti-social behavior, the son also tends to reject the standards of society to which he should submit. McCord, McCord and Howard (1961) found that non-aggressive boys were more frequently reared by non-aggressive fathers who responded to crisis in a realistic manner and assumed the role of leader in the family. It appears that these boys were provided parental models of responsibility and apparently possess stronger control over behavioral responses. This consequently reduces delinquent acts. The aggressive boys were found to lack such a paternal model of control, which contributed to their unrestrained behavior. Research by Bronfenbrenner (1958), Kagan, Hoshen and Watson (1961),

Mowrer (1950), Payne and Mussen (1956), Stokes (1954), and Nash (1954) indicates that affection is necessary for the child to identify with his parents. In addition, these researchers have found that affection from the parents is also necessary for the socialization of the child. When neither parent loves the child, the incentive for socialization is lacking; consequently the child receives no reward for modifying his behavior to conform to the demands of society (Parsons, 1947). If one parent is loving, the child may exchange conforming behavior for parental affection, resulting in temporary socialization. However, McCord, McCord and Zola believe that if a child is rejected by his parents, he will usually become rebellious, aggressive, insecure, and ultimately criminal (1959).

In his analysis of family behavior, Parsons (1955) believes that there are two basic functions of the nuclear family. The first is the primary socialization of children so that they can truly become members of the society in which they live. The second is the stabilization of the adult personalities of the population of the society, which can be achieved through observation, imitation and identification within the family system. Parsons further describes the nuclear family as being an extremely specialized agency which performs "root functions" for the society. However, he suggests that these two functional aspects of the nuclear family are geared more directly to the maintenance of the personality and only indirectly to the maintenance of of society. Ogburn (1929) and Burgess and Locke (1945) support this view of contemporary family interaction in the American society.

Pleasant or satisfying experiences within a family increase the intensity of the family relationships leading to a greater probability

of the perpetuation of the same types of relations (Stanfield, 1966). Warm, cordial and friendly relations on the part of the father are more often associated with non-delinquency than with delinquency (Cavan, 1962). The rejecting, punitive, and threatening parent tends to undermine the boy's conception of himself as a person of worth and significance, thus contributing to his asocial behavior. Hostile parents imply to the child that the world is a dangerous, disapproving and hostile environment. It appears that this negative setting serves to arouse the aggressive tendencies in a child if he is to survive in the unfriendly world in which he lives (McCord, McCord and Howard, 1961). Thus, the perpetuation of negative or asocial behavior appears to be primarily achieved by example.

Some critics may hasten to point out that the parents' behavior and the child's aggression are produced by common genetic factors in the family, and that the apparent environmental relationships are merely manifestations of this genetic connection. However, in light of both the research which has been done on parental deprivation and its effects on the child and also the dearth of definitive genetic evidence, it appears reasonable to view a genetic connection as a rather remote possibility (McCord, McCord and Howard, 1961).

Anomie

To define the concept of anomie has resulted in numerous attempts at meanings and definitions (Jaffe, 1969). For the purpose of this study, it will be defined as normlessness, or a state or condition in which there is confusion or absence of consensus about behavioral norms and values among primary group members. MacIver (1950) suggests that

there are three types of normless individuals in society: those living only in the present as a result of having lost their value system; those bent on the pursuit of means and of power, living without benefit of ethical goals; and those who live in the insecure world of the hopelessly disoriented.

In determining the etiological contributors of anomie, one finds a close relationship to delinquency. Many criminologists believe the lack of norms, the problem of social marginality, and the confusion about value systems are relevant for understanding delinquency proneness, although the cause and effect relationships appear to be elusive and frequently unclear (Jaffe, 1969).

Few researchers have investigated the relationship between values and delinquency by means of experimental design (Jaffe, 1969). Beeler (1953) found some evidence that inconsistent value patterns on the part of parents were a significant factor in producing impulsive children. Jaffe (1969) found that another outcome of value confusion is sex-role disorientation. Where there is conflict of values between the mother and the father, the child is torn between them with the problem of attempting to interiorize a stable sexual identification. Jaffe believes that when family discord is present, there is a great deal of vacillation between parents for identification. A significant finding of Jaffe's was that delinquent males actually identified with their fathers, while non-delinquent males identified with their mothers.

A review of the research to date indicates that a definite lack of knowledge exists concerning the influence a father has on his son, especially the attitudes, values and expectations that are transmitted, if at all, from the father to the son. Additionally, the present

literature fails to provide insight into paternal influence toward or away from delinquency.

While the literature indicates specific behaviors and values to be of primary importance to personality development and socialization, little research has been attempted to determine which if any of the father's behaviors, attitudes, or values contribute to delinquent behavior in male offspring.

The purpose of the present study was to determine what perceptions non-delinquent and delinquent male adolescents had of their fathers, and to examine the relationship of these perceptions and attitudes to selected psychological and sociological variables which were found to be relevant in the literature. The selection of the sociological and psychological variables in both interpersonal and intrapersonal interaction were important in the development of personality in a child.

In this study, a detailed investigation was made of the perceptions that delinquent and non-delinquent male adolescents had of their fathers. The specific hypotheses which were examined were:

Hypothesis 1: No statistically significant differences exist among the perceptions of adolescent males, within delinquent and non-delinquent groups concerning their fathers, when classified according to: (a) degree of perceived masculinity of the father or father surrogate; (b) type of punishment used by the father; (c) perceived closeness to the father; (d) father's love of respondent; (e) amount of time the father desired to spend with the respondent; (f) parent who influenced the respondent the most; (g) parent who guided the family; (h) agent of discipline; (i) degree of self-perceived masculinity; (j) parents' marital status; (k) with whom the respondent had resided

primarily; (l) father's educational level; (m) perceived childhood happiness; (n) age; and (o) race.

Hypothesis 2: No statistically significant differences exist among the perceptions of adolescent males within the delinquent and non-delinquent groups concerning their fathers when classified according to their anomie responses.

Hypothesis 3: No statistically significant differences exist among the perceptions of adolescent males within the delinquent and non-delinquent groups concerning their fathers when classified according to their identification with their fathers.

Hypothesis 4: No statistically significant differences exist between delinquents and non-delinquents with respect to: (a) degree of perceived masculinity of the father or father surrogate; (b) type of punishment used by the father; (c) perceived closeness to the father; (d) father's love of the respondent; (e) amount of time the father desired to spend with the respondent; (f) parent who influenced the respondent the most; (g) parent who guided the family; (h) agent of discipline; (i) degree of self-perceived masculinity; (j) parents' marital status; (k) with whom the respondent resided primarily; (l) father's educational level; (m) perceived childhood happiness; (n) age; and (o) race.

Hypothesis 5: No statistically significant differences exist between delinquents and non-delinquents with respect to: (a) perceptions of their fathers; (b) anomie; and (c) identification with their fathers.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Paternal Influence on the Development of Male Children

Although a significant amount of research has been completed on mother-child relationships, there is an equally urgent need to examine other heretofore unstudied social factors, including paternal influence in offspring's personality adjustment (Bowlby, 1957; Peterson, Becker, Hellmer, Shoemaker, and Quay, 1959; Benson, 1968; Andry, 1962; Nash, 1965; Bach, 1946; and Warren, 1957). The need to study fathers as crucial contributors to the developing personalities of their children is vital in understanding the etiology of delinquent behavior.

Much of the research on parent-child relationships has neglected the father, and the limited research which has taken the father into consideration has relied primarily upon the mother's perception and interpretation of the behavior and attitudes of her husband (Wright, 1972; Andry, 1960). Research involving comparisons of children from father-present and father-absent homes has shown that the paternal influence on the child's development and adjustment is important in terms of the son's identification with a masculine role, the son's adjustment to others, and the son's disposition toward delinquency (Burton and Whiting, 1961; Nash, 1954; Andry, 1960; Bach, 1946; Lynn and Sawrey, 1959; Sears, Pintler and Sears, 1946; Peterson et al.,

1959; Grygier et al., 1969; Gold, 1963; Chinn, 1938; Chilton and Markle, 1972).

Although research concerning the effects of father-absence on children, and especially on male children, is limited, findings indicate that the mother's attitudes and behavior are significant factors in determining how children will be affected by the absence of their fathers. Benson (1968) postulates that the mother's reaction to and the reasons for her husband's absence may have more influence on the child than the fact that the father is no longer in the home.

The mother's reaction to the departure of the father may cause her behavior to change to the extent that she becomes over-protective (Bronfenbrenner, 1968). Over-protection in male children is associated with dependency (Fitts and Hammer, 1969), immaturity (Wright, 1972), poor self-concept (Amos, 1963), impulsiveness (Hoffman, 1961), selfishness (Devereux, Bronfenbrenner, and Suci, 1962), serious problems in sex-role identification (Grygier, et al., 1969), aggression (Hess and Handel, 1956), and delinquency (Nye and Wattenburg, 1947; Andry, 1960; Bandura and Walters, 1958; Stolz, 1954; Bronfenbrenner, 1961; Sears et al., 1946; McCord, McCord and Zola, 1959; and Andry, 1962).

The age of the child is an important factor in considering the effects of paternal deprivation, i.e., the father being either absent or non-functioning in the home. Blaine (1963), Sutton-Smith, Rosenberg and Landry (1968) and Nash (1965) found that the preschool age, from three to six years, is the most critical period for son's development and his identification with his father, and that permanent deficiencies may result if the father is not present in the home during this time in the child's life.

That the son's aggressive behavior is affected by father absence is indicated in the research that the male requires an adequate father-model with whom to identify and from whom he can learn acceptable and appropriate patterns of social and sexual behavior (Levin and Sears, 1956; Hess and Handel, 1956; Grygier et al., 1969; Sears and Levin, 1957; Medinnus, 1965; and McCord, McCord and Howard, 1957). It is through this identification process that the son learns how to temper his feelings of love and of aggression (Lynn, 1962). When an appropriate father image is not present, the child finds it difficult to define for himself proper methods of expressing his aggression. The research further indicates that non-aggressive boys are more frequently reared in situations where the father is present and provides a mediating model (McCord and Howard, 1967; Bach, 1946; and Bandura, Ross and Ross, 1961).

A number of researchers (Sears, Pintler and Sears, 1947; Lynn and Sawrey, 1959; Palmer, 1969; Stolz, 1954; Andry, 1960; Medinnus, 1965; and Shore, 1971) have found that boys whose fathers were either absent or away from home for long periods of time manifested greater behavioral problems than did boys whose fathers were present. Among the behavioral problems that were found to occur more frequently in boys whose fathers were absent, were poor personality adjustment, greater anxiety, greater immaturity, poorer peer group adjustment, more fears, more tensions, and more antisocial behavior. In addition, Amos (1967) found that the self-concept of sons was also negatively affected by father absence. This finding has also been confirmed in general cross-cultural studies (Kim, 1967; Fitts and Hammer, 1969; Deitch, 1959; Atchison, 1958; and Lefeber, 1965).

Effects of Father-Absence on Delinquency

If viewed symptomatically, all delinquent behavior, whatever specific form it may take, has the common denominator of maladaptation to the demands of society (Glueck, and Glueck, 1959). There are innumerable varieties of youthful misbehavior which might be considered delinquent depending upon the family, community, social status, and inclination of the court (Block and Flynn, 1956; Hirschi, 1969). The Gluecks (1950) conclude that any child who commits even a minor act in violation of the law is technically a delinquent. The legal definition of this term is frequently as varied and diverse as are the communities which make up society. One need only examine the concept of delinquency that has developed along with our statutory codes. For example, unlike the criminal statutes which define specific types of behavior as criminal, there is little clarity about the precise nature of youthful offenses legally considered delinquent (Bloch and Flynn, 1956; Glueck and Glueck, 1950; and Cohen, 1955).

It may be that the lack of a consistent definition of delinquency has led to a paucity of both empirical studies and theoretical constructs that link paternal behavior with delinquency. Nye (1958) and Hirschi (1969) believe that the father's behavior may be more significantly related to the causation of delinquency than is the behavior of the mother. Grygier, Chesley and Tutors (1969) report that the image the father portrays to his children may be a more important factor in the causation of delinquency than the image of the mother. Andry (1960) believes that the role of the father in the stimulation of delinquency has long been ignored by researchers.

Although Andry does not advocate that the role of the mother be ingored, he does recommend that greater recognition and emphasis be given to the role of the father in contributing to delinquency.

Andry (1957, 1960, 1962), Stephens (1961), and Bach (1946) have found that a significant relationship exists between paternal deprivation and delinquent or anti-social behavior. Where father-absence occurred in the home, there was also a higher proportion of delinquents, especially among male children. Bandura and Walters (1958) indicate that a severe break in father-son relationships is associated with a higher rate of delinquency. Glueck and Glueck (1937) found in their study that as many as 60 percent of the delinquents had been deprived of a father or father substitute for long periods of time, especially during the early years of life. More recently, Warren and Palmer (1965) found that 98 percent of the delinquents they studied had no father or father substitute, while only 17 percent had no mother or mother substitute.

In studies of non-functioning fathers, i.e., fathers who are physically present in the home but fail to function as the head of the household, Barker and Adams (1962) found that a higher rate of delinquency was associated with the non-functioning father than with the functioning father. Gordon (1962) and Nye (1957) found the non-functioning father's sons to be overtly aggressive and anti-social. In studies of absent fathers and non-functioning fathers, Clausen (1961) found that the non-functioning father produced a higher proportion of delinquents, drug addicts, unwed mothers, prostitutes, and more cases of psychosomatic illnesses than father-absent families. Therefore,

Benson (1968) believes that non-functional fathers who remain in the home may actually cause a great deal of damage in the development of their children.

In an investigation of the reasons for the high correlation of father-absence and delinquency, Kravaceus et al. (1959) concluded that anti-social or delinquent behavior in young males was the result of sex-role anxiety. The anxiety over appropriate sex-role behavior is derived from the unstable and derogatory father image presented in the home, either by the absence of the father or through continual devaluation of adult males by adult females (McCord, McCord and Zola, 1959). Benson (1968) and Cavan (1962) conclude that an important factor is the quality of family life, rather than merely the presence of both parents.

Boys who have grown up in father-present-and-functioning homes have usually developed better self-concepts (Cavan, 1962), are more secure in their interaction with others (Benson, 1968), are more calm and friendly in interpersonal relations (Payne and Mussen, 1956), are more stable (Nye, 1962), are more accepting of authority (Bieri and Lobeck, 1959), adjust to their peers more easily (Gray, 1957), have better self-concepts (Maxwell, Dales, and Walters, 1969), and are more independent than are boys who are paternally deprived. Aggressive boys appear to come from backgrounds of paternal deprivation, as well as from parentally deprived homes (McCord, McCord and Howard, 1961). Parsons (1947) maintains that structured patterns of aggression in childhood are linked to later patterns of aggression within the social structure because of the unavailability of other sources of frustration release. Reckless, Dinitz and Kay (1957) report that the non-delinquent child is insulated from delinquent temptations because he had developed

a high self-regard as a result of supportive reinforcement from family members and significant others. It appears that a positive self-concept is based on favorable socialization and the expectation of future successes. The delinquent, however, has experienced failure and consequently maintains lower self-esteem in anticipation of future failures which results in aggressive and deviant acts.

Fathers' Influence on Sex-Role Identification

Lynn (1962) explains sex-role identification as the internalization of the role considered appropriate to a given sex and as the unconscious assimilation of the reactions of that parent. Theoretically, then, an individual might be well identified with the appropriate sex role generally, yet poorly identified with his same sex parent (Lynn, 1962).

Sex-role identification theories point out that the father is the most obvious model of masculinity for his son, while the mother serves as the model of femininity for her daughter. One must realize, however, that the process of identification is complex and varies among individuals (Mowrer, 1959; Kagan, 1958). Cottrell (1947) points out how importantly a clearly defined, consistent presentation of the role can affect the assimilation of that role.

Research emphasizes the importance of the acquisition of the appropriate sex-role identification of the son. Boys apparently first identify with their mother, and later with their father in the development of appropriate sex roles (Johnson, 1963). Benson (1968) stresses that even if a boy does identify more with his mother than with his father, such a cross-sex identification does not necessarily explain femininity in the boy. Effeminacy is more likely to be caused by poor

father-son relationships, rather than by a strong mother-son relationship.

Researchers have recognized the father's function of providing a model of masculinity for his son (Wright, 1972). Lynn (1962) cautions that there is a difference between identification with one's father and adequate identification with the masculine role. Benson (1968) points out that the identification with one's father inevitably conditions the son's sex-role identification. Benson further indicates that even though the child may come into contact with many masculine models, the father will exert the prominent influence on the foundation of role adaptation in his children.

Both theory and research indicate that sex-role identification will pose particular difficulties for the fatherless boy (Winch, 1950). Nash (1965), in testing young boys, found that those who were reared for the first five years of their lives without a father figure frequently failed to acquire the masculine attitudes held by most other boys. Stephens (1961) found a greater frequency of femininity in sons from the father-absent families with definite feminine-like fantasy lives. Bieri (1960) found that fatherless boys generally tend to describe themselves as being similar to their mothers and to characterize men as being dominated by women. Maccoby (1962) found that boys who had been fatherless between the age of one and five performed better on verbal rather than analytical tests while boys with fathers during that period normally performed better on the analytical tests. In verbal testing father-absent boys using a problem-solving test in which boys normally do better than girls, Milton (1957) found that father-absent boys scored poorly compared with boys who had fathers. Mischel (1961)

found a significantly higher proportion of father-absent boys to be more impulsive and chose immediate gratification over delayed rewards.

In a study of adolescent boys, Mussen (1961) found that boys who were highly masculine and strongly identified with their fathers were more contented, better adjusted, happier, more exuberant and better able to cope with social interaction than were boys who were low in masculinity and identified poorly with their fathers. Mussen concluded that boys who had favorable relationships with their fathers also exhibited stronger masculine interests than did those boys whose paternal relationships were less favorable. In addition, Carlson (1963) found that the boys who had poor paternal relationships also exhibited more feminine interests than did those boys who had good paternal relationships.

Whiting, Kluckholm and Anthony (1958) have provided cross-cultural evidence that a strong primary identification with the mother--which if not transferred to the father--will create a "persisting estrangement" in the father-son relationship. They found that in cultures where there is a strong primary attachment to the mothers, certain specific institutional arrangements are found which are intended to reduce male sexual anxieties. They conclude that a strong early primary attachment to the mother will generally produce sexual insecurity in males. Benson (1968) concludes that helping the child transfer from the stage of maternal management of his affairs to self-management becomes a critical role for the father, a task that the weak father performs poorly.

It has been found that children will identify more readily with the parent they perceive as being more powerful (Hetherington and Brackbill,

1963). In a study of kindergarten boys, Mussen and Distler (1959) found that those who identified more strongly with their fathers also viewed their fathers as being powerful sources of both reward and punishment. Slater (1961) also found that a combination of affection and firm discipline were most conducive to paternal identification. Eisenberg (1957) found that of one hundred autistic children, eighty-five had fathers who were cold, rigid, and unaffectionate in their relations with the members of their families.

The importance of the father-son relationship in relation to delinquency and its prevention has been shown by various investigators. Aichhorn (1936), Menaker (1939) and Slauson (1943) found that when a positive stable father-son relationship could be established, the delinquent was more likely to be rehabilitated than were delinquents with a poor paternal relationship. It was concluded that the relationship between the delinquent and his father produced an emotional bond which provided the basis for the eventual extinction of anti-social acts. It further aided the delinquent in his process of socialization and his ultimate return to society as a productive citizen.

In their research on father-son interaction, McCord, McCord and Howard (1961) and Cohen (1955) found that paternal rejection is not only one of the most significant contributors to delinquent behavior, but it is also devastating to the son's self-concept. Through years of research, the Gluecks (1950) have found that paternal rejection is so important that it can be used as a variable to predict delinquent behavior. The young boy who is constantly subjected to paternal rejection and derision has little chance of developing a self-concept strong

enough both to assume an adequate masculine role and to develop an adequate sex-role identification.

The actual relationship between self-concept and delinquent behavior has not been fully explored, even though it appears worthy of attention (Amos, 1963). Theoretically, a realistic self-concept should aid young people in avoiding delinquency, while unreal or exaggerated concepts of self may actually assist in the development of a delinquent individual. The child who is without a realistic self-concept is less well qualified to resist the poor environment, poor companions, and poor family life than is a child with a "healthy" and more realistic self-concept. Deitche (1959), Atchison (1958), Lefebber (1965), and Kim (1968), in cross-cultural studies of delinquents, found that delinquents from various cultures do not have positive self-concepts. Consequently, they are continually striving to prove themselves to those around them through anti-social behavior.

Additional research has found that a child's opinion and acceptance of himself are positively related to the opinion and acceptance his parents have of him (Maxwell, Dales and Walters, 1969). Cavan (1962) found that the father will normally pass on to his sons the same self-concept and role of the adult male which he himself possesses. Jourard and Remy (1955) demonstrated that the self-regard and adjustment of a child are significantly related to the feelings of his parents. Becker and associates (1964) found that a positive relationship between the parents' self-concept and the behavior problems of their children. Bowlby (1950) found that unstable parents who do not want their child may provide the factors necessary to precipitate delinquency. The

Gluecks (1970) found that their worst delinquents came from homes where the family lacked strong self-concepts.

The personality characteristics of parents are influential in determining the behavior and personality of their children (Aberle and Naegele, 1952). Radke (1946) points out that the type of behavior exhibited by the parent actually has more influence on the child than the type of discipline used. The research by Bandura, Ross and Ross (1961) supports this conclusion by showing that highly aggressive children had been exposed to highly aggressive models. Becker and associates (1964) suggest that the healthy self-concept of the father may be even more critical than that of the mother in determining the types of personality problems of the children.

Andry (1960) found that one group of delinquents he studied believed that their mothers were embarrassed to show open affection, while the vast majority of the non-delinquents did not feel this way about their mothers. Andry also found that the majority of the delinquents thought that their fathers were embarrassed to show open affection whereas the majority of the non-delinquents felt that just the opposite was true of their fathers. More than half of the delinquents stated that they were also embarrassed to show open affection for their parents, while the greater majority of the non-delinquents were not embarrassed to show open affection for their parents.

In a study of self-dislike, Brodbeck and Perlmutter (1954) found that self-dislike in children was the result of conflicting parent-child relationships. It has also been found that boys who suffer from self-devaluation uniformly have a lower sense of worth as a person and

as a family. Cavan (1960) also found that well-adjusted fathers had better parent-child communication than did poorly adjusted ones.

Fathers' Influence on Sons' Peer Relations

In his research, Benson (1968) has found that the father is of importance in determining the son's acceptance in the peer group because he promotes the masculine habits that enhance or interfere with his peer-group acceptance. Carlson (1963) concluded that children who identified with their parents were more readily acceptable to their peers as well as being more self-accepting and less dependent upon social relationships than children who failed to identify with their parents.

Helper (1955) noted that boys who made a conscious effort to model themselves after their fathers were generally rated high in peer social acceptance and adjustment. A son's warm relationship with his father was found by Hoffman (1961) to be conducive to good peer adjustment. In working with boys who perceived themselves to be more like their fathers than their mothers, Gray (1959) was able to find a correlation with good peer-group acceptance.

Mussen (1956) and Gray (1959) found that boys who were identified with their fathers were also found to be "better adjusted and more smooth" in social functioning. The findings of Lynn and Sawrey (1959) show that poor father-son relations are related to poor peer acceptance and adjustment. Aberle and Naegele (1952) found that boys whose fathers were pleased with them performed better in school and were more emotionally stable. A positive attitude toward the parent of the same sex is

important for the establishment of acceptable relationships with one's peers (Cox, 1962).

Effects of Personality Characteristics of Parents

Investigators have assumed that the personality of the parent will, in part, determine not only the manner in which he teaches his child, but also the subsequent development of the child. Parents who are rejecting, emotionally unstable, and cold do not provide either adequate or proper discipline for their children (Becker, Peterson, Hellmer, Shoemaker, and Quay, 1964). In a study of personality characteristics in fathers, Block (1955) found that the fathers who preferred restrictive methods of discipline were suspicious, constricted, and submissive. Fathers who were more permissive in their methods of child guidance were found to be more self-confident, self-reliant and dominant. However, Block cautions that his sample did not contain the highly permissive parent, who he suggested might also produce personality inadequacies.

In a study of parental attitudes and child adjustment, Peterson et al. (1959) found that children who had adjustment problems had parents who were not well-adjusted and who were less sociable than parents whose children had no major adjustment problems. Baumrind (1967) found that children of parents who were less affectionate and minimally involved with their children were also likely to behave less acceptably while with their peers. The children of these parents were found to be more insecure, apprehensive, expressive of negative behavior, and more likely to become hostile in stressful situations.

Another factor related to parent-child relationships and listed by some investigators as closely related to anti-social behavior is that of discipline. Slater (1961) suggests that discipline and nurturance are positively related to good behavioral adjustment in children. Shore (1971) believes that disciplinary techniques within a family lead to the development or lack of development of self-discipline within the individual. The Gluecks (1950) list discipline by the father, supervision by the mother, affection from both, and cohesiveness of the family as most important for predicting future delinquent behavior.

In their study of delinquency, the McCords (1956) found that consistent discipline, whether punitive or love-oriented, tended to prevent criminality. However, erratic punitive punishment was correlated with every type of crime. In a study of the effects of parental discipline, Bandura and Walters (1959) also found erratic discipline to be related to delinquent behavior.

In summary, it is evident that fathers significantly influence the development of children in self-concept, assertive behavior, personality adjustment, peer acceptance, socialization, delinquency, sex-role identification, anomie, and emotional stability. The need to study fathers as crucial contributors to the developing personalities and socialization of their children is vital in understanding the etiology of delinquent behavior.

CHAPTER III

PROCEDURE

Criteria for Selection of Subjects

The sample for this study was composed of 330 ninth-through-twelfth grade male students enrolled in two high schools in central Oklahoma and a state boys school for delinquent youth in Oklahoma during March of 1974. The respondents ranged from 14 to 18 years of age, with a mean age of 16.5 years. The sample was divided into two primary groups: (1) delinquents who were incarcerated at a state boys school; and (2) non-delinquents who were enrolled in two public high schools. It was assumed that the vast majority of the youth who were not incarcerated were non-delinquents.

The number of respondents from the delinquent group was 156. However, there were three reasons for which questionnaires were eliminated: (1) respondents who before the age of eight had never lived with either their father or with another adult male; (2) respondents who did not complete the questionnaire; and (3) respondents who falsified their answers, as determined by responses to a Lie Scale. After elimination of questionnaires for one or more of these three reasons, the delinquent sample was reduced to 118. The number of respondents in the non-delinquent sample was 354. After elimination of the unusable questionnaires, the non-delinquent sample was reduced to 212 with the

major cause of elimination being incompleting questionnaires. All of the respondents used in this study were born in the United States.

The Instruments

Background Information

The questionnaire (see Appendix A) utilized was designed to obtain the following information: (a) age; (b) race; (c) degree of perceived masculinity of the father or father figure; (d) type of physical punishment used by the father; (e) perceived closeness to the father; (f) father's love of respondent; (g) amount of time the father desired to spend with the respondent; (h) parental influence; (i) which parent guided the family; (j) agent of discipline; (k) degree of self-perceived masculinity; (l) parents' marital status; (m) with whom the respondent had resided primarily; (n) childhood happiness; (o) the father's educational level; (p) personal anomie; and (q) parental identification.

Lie Scale

A Lie Scale was developed to eliminate from the study those subjects who responded in a highly conventional manner and who apparently attempted to falsify their responses by selecting alternatives which they felt were socially desirable. Five questions or statements were used for this purpose. They were:

- (a) I have never had any reason to be angry with either of my parents.
- (b) There are times when my parents do things that make me unhappy.
- (c) I have never done anything which I was ashamed of.

(d) Sometimes I can't help worrying, even though I know it doesn't do any good.

(e) I am constantly amazed at how well my parents understand me.

These items were randomly placed throughout the information section of the questionnaire. Respondents who falsified a favorable answer on three or more of the items had their questionnaires excluded from the analysis of the data. The rationale underlying this procedure rested on the assumption that if falsifying occurred on these items, falsifying could have occurred on the major items of the instrument. These questions were selected after a careful review of the literature on conventionality of responses on questionnaires and lie scales.

Attitudes Toward Parents Scale (Form F)

The instrument, Attitudes Toward Parents Scale (Form F), was developed by Itkin (1952) as part of a battery of scales to measure attitudes related to the family. It consisted of 34 items: 11 were true-false-undecided; seven were multiple choice; and 16 were personality traits. The true-false-undecided questions were rated on a three-point scale, i.e., 4, 3, 2, (see Appendix C), the multiple choice items were rated on a five-point scale, i.e., 5, 4, 3, 2, 1 (see Appendix C), and the personality traits were rated on a five-point scale, i.e., 5, 4, 3, 2, 1 (see Appendix C) from "possesses to a very great degree" to "possesses to a very slight degree or not at all." This rating scale was designed and established by Itkin (1952 and 1955) who has discussed its reliability (.96) and validity elsewhere.

The respondent's attitude score was the sum of the values for each item selected. The theoretical scores could have ranged from a low of

34 points to a high of 154 points. A high score indicated a favorable attitude toward the respondent's father.

The weighting system devised by Itkin (1952) was used to determine the respondent's attitude toward his father or father surrogate for each response. Responses to the true-false-undecided questions which were adjudged to be favorable were given a value of four; the undecided response was given a value of three while the unfavorable response was given a value of two. Responses to the multiple choice questions which were adjudged to be very favorable were assigned a value of five; those which were favorable responses were assigned a value of four; those responses which were deemed neutral or average were given a value of three; those responses which were unfavorable were given a value of two; the remaining responses which were very unfavorable were assigned a value of one. The personality traits were rated on a five-point scale from "possesses to a very great degree" to "possesses to a very slight degree or not at all." The value of five was assigned to the very favorable response, while the value of one was assigned to the very unfavorable response.

The attitude score was calculated by summing the values assigned to each of the responses to the 34 items. The key utilized in scoring each questionnaire is the number in each response blank of the questionnaire (see Appendix B). Since the responses were recorded on IBM scan cards, it was possible to have them scored at the Computer Center, Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, Oklahoma.

In a study of Oklahoma youth, utilizing Itkin's Attitudes Toward Parents Scale (Form F), Towrey (1972) undertook an item analysis of the responses of 227 youth, and it was found that Itkin's Attitudes Toward

Parents Scale (Form F) significantly differentiated between those subjects who scored in the upper quartile from those subjects who scored in the lower quartile on the basis of total scores. All items were found to be significantly discriminating at the .001 level, suggesting its usefulness with adolescents of the age groups represented in the present study.

Itkin's Attitudes Toward Parents Scale (Form F) was grammatically modified specifically for the delinquent youth after consultation with the officials at the state boys school. Items which contained words which were deemed too difficult for some of the delinquent subjects were modified slightly. One multiple choice question was eliminated from the test instrument. These changes were not deemed significant enough to affect the validity or reliability of the instrument.

The Anomie Scale

An Anomie Scale was developed because of the suggested relevance of anomie to delinquency as indicated in the literature. Since existing measures of anomie did not appear to be suitable for the sample utilized, following a careful review of the literature, an anomie scale was developed containing the following items:

- (a) Do you feel that you have control over what is going to happen to you during your life?
- (b) Do you feel that there is someone outside your family you can count on when you really need help?
- (c) Do you feel that your life is meaningless and a waste of time?
- (d) Do you have specific goals that you are working for in life?
- (e) Do you feel that you have never succeeded at anything?

When an item analysis was undertaken, utilizing X^2 , to determine whether these items discriminated criteria groups composed of high scoring youth, Q1, and low scoring youth, Q4, all of the items proved to be statistically significant beyond the .001 level, indicating their usefulness in a study of this nature (see Appendix D).

The Father Identification Scale

A Father Identification Scale was developed because of the relevance of father identification to delinquency as indicated in the literature. Because existing measures of father identification did not appear to be suitable for the respondents utilized, following a careful review of the literature, a father identification scale was developed containing the following items:

- (1) You have just won a trip to Hawaii for you and one of your parents. Which one will you choose to take?
- (2) You have been falsely accused of stealing money. Which parent will you go to for help?
- (3) If you were sad, which of your parents would you go to to cheer you up?
- (4) If you had just had a fight with your best friend, which of your parents would you tell?
- (5) If you got V. D., which of your parents would you ask for advice?
- (6) Who would you rather discuss your problems with?

When an item analysis was undertaken, utilizing X^2 , to determine whether these items discriminated between criteria groups composed of high scoring youth, Q1, and low scoring youth, Q4, all of the items were

found to be statistically significant beyond the .001 level, indicating their usefulness in a study of this nature (see Appendix E).

Administration of the Instrument

When the cooperation of the principal was received, the school was sent the appropriate number of questionnaires and a set of instructions (see Appendix B) designed by the investigator. After the questionnaire was administered to the subjects, during their English classes, the instrument was collected by the investigator. These data were collected during the first and third weeks of March, 1974, at the three institutions previously mentioned.

Analysis of the Data

In this study, the Kruskal-Wallis one-way analysis of variance was used to examine hypotheses involving comparisons of three or more independent groups. When a significant difference was found among the groups, a Mann-Whitney U test was then used to compare each of the groups with the others. Chi-Square analyses were utilized whenever comparisons were made involving nominal level data.

CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS

A description of the background characteristics of the 330 respondents is presented in Table I. The all-male sample consisted of 57 blacks and 273 non-blacks. The non-black portion of the sample contained 27 of American Indian descent and two of Latin descent. The majority (67.8%) of the sample was classified as non-delinquent. In using the father's educational level as a measure of social class, the majority of the respondents was classed as lower middle class or below.¹

Family Relationships Information

In addition to the background information, the questionnaire also contained items concerning the respondents' perceptions of their family relationships (see Table II). The following are the major differences of the subjects' responses. The majority of the black (70.4%) and non-black (44.7%) delinquents indicated that their fathers were very highly masculine, while the majority of the non-delinquent

¹Because of the high relationship ($r = .85$) between the level of father education and social status as measured by the McGuire-White (1958) Measurement of Social Status, it was decided to use the level of father education as a round measure of social class. Respondents frequently provided insufficient information concerning the exact nature of their father's occupation and insufficient information concerning the source of income of the family to make an accurate social status classification possible.

TABLE I

BACKGROUND CHARACTERISTICS OF THE SUBJECTS

	Delinquent				Non-Delinquent				
	Black N = 28		Non-black N = 90		Black N = 29		Non-Black N = 183		
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	
<u>Age</u>									
14-16	14	50.0	49	54.4	19	65.5	104	57.8	
17-18	14	50.0	41	45.6	10	34.5	76	4.2	
<u>Father's Education</u>									
Below grade 8	8	33.3	40	51.3	10	34.5	38	21.6	
Grades 9-12 or Highschool graduate	14	58.3	24	30.8	14	48.3	99	56.3	
1-3 years college or College graduate	2	8.3	14	17.9	5	17.2	39	22.2	
<u>Father Absence</u>									
Yes	25	100	84	100	29	100	170	96.6	
No	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	7	4.0	
<u>Parent's Marital Status</u>									
Married and living									
Together	12	44.4	45	52.9	23	85.2	143	80.8	
Separated or divorced	11	40.7	29	34.1	2	7.4	27	15.3	
One or both dead	4	14.8	11	12.9	2	7.4	7	4.0	

TABLE II
SUBJECTS' RATINGS OF THEIR FAMILY RELATIONSHIPS

Description	Delinquents				Non-Delinquents			
	N = 118				N = 212			
	Black		Non-Black		Black		Non-Black	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<u>Masculinity of Father</u>								
Very high	19	17.4	42	44.7	15	51.7	49	27.1
Above average	3	11.1	17	19.3	9	31.0	60	33.1
Average or below	5	18.5	29	33.0	5	17.2	72	39.8
<u>Masculinity of Respondent</u>								
Very high	11	39.3	9	10.2	13	44.8	25	13.7
Above average	6	21.4	10	11.4	7	24.1	36	19.8
Average or below	11	39.3	69	74.4	9	31.0	121	66.5
<u>Type of Physical Punishment by Father</u>								
None	10	37.5	31	34.8	18	62.1	63	34.6
Moderate spanking	14	50.0	35	39.3	5	17.2	79	43.4
Beating	4	14.3	23	25.8	6	33.3	40	22.0
<u>Type of Physical Punishment by Mother</u>								
None	12	42.9	47	52.8	13	44.8	89	48.9
Moderate spanking	10	35.7	34	38.2	11	37.9	74	40.7
Beating	6	21.4	8	9.0	5	17.2	19	10.4
<u>Childhood Happiness</u>								
Very happy	9	32.1	20	22.5	12	41.1	54	29.7
Above average	3	10.7	7	7.9	6	20.7	44	24.2
Average or below	16	57.1	62	69.7	11	37.9	84	46.2
<u>Head of the Family</u>								
Father	9	32.1	33	37.1	10	34.5	72	39.8
Mother and Father	9	32.1	37	41.6	16	55.2	92	50.8
Mother	10	35.7	19	21.3	3	10.3	17	9.4

TABLE II (CONTINUED)

Description	Delinquents				Non-Delinquents			
	N = 118		N = 118		N = 212		N = 212	
	Black N	Non-Black %	Black N	Non-Black %	Black N	Non-Black %	Black N	Non-Black %
<u>Main Source of Discipline</u>								
Father	10	37.0	63	70.0	16	55.2	142	78.9
Mother	15	55.6	23	25.6	12	41.4	34	18.9
Other	2	7.4	4	4.4	1	3.4	4	2.2
<u>Most Influencing Parent</u>								
Mother and Father equally	13	46.4	38	44.7	16	55.2	94	51.9
Mother	14	50.0	24	28.2	12	41.4	30	16.6
Father	1	3.6	23	27.1	1	3.4	57	31.5
<u>Father's Discipline</u>								
Fair	15	58.6	47	52.8	19	65.5	105	58.7
Too soft	5	17.9	16	18.0	3	10.3	20	11.2
Too hard or incon- sistent	8	28.6	26	29.2	7	24.1	54	30.2
<u>Father's Love to Respondent</u>								
Very much	14	50.0	46	51.7	18	62.1	83	45.6
Above average	0	0.0	11	12.4	6	20.7	41	22.5
Average or below	14	50.0	32	36.0	5	17.2	58	31.9
<u>Mother's Love to Respondent</u>								
Very much	4	14.3	11	12.4	5	17.2	12	6.7
Above average	14	50.0	44	99.2	17	58.6	92	51.4
Average or below	10	35.7	34	38.2	7	24.1	75	41.9

blacks (51.7%) indicated that their fathers were very highly masculine. However, the major proportion of the non-black non-delinquents (39.8%) indicated that their fathers were of average masculinity or below.

An equal number of black delinquents (39.3%) rated themselves as very highly masculine and average or below in masculinity (39.3%). The majority of the non-black delinquents (74.4%) rated themselves average or below average in masculinity. The greatest proportion of the black non-delinquents (44.8%) indicated that they were of very high masculinity, while the majority of the non-black non-delinquents (66.5%) indicated that they were of average or below in masculinity.

The type of physical punishment usually received from their fathers was classified as moderate spanking by the major proportion of the black delinquents (50.0%) and the non-black delinquents (38.9%). The majority of the non-delinquent blacks (62.1%) indicated that their fathers did not physically punish them, while the greatest proportion of the non-black non-delinquents (43.1%) indicated that they received moderate spanking from their fathers.

The type of physical punishment that the major proportion of the black (42.9%) and non-black delinquents (52.2%) received from their mothers was none, while 35 percent of the black delinquents and 39 percent of the non-black delinquents indicated that they usually received a moderate spanking from their mothers. The largest proportion of the black non-delinquents (44.8%) and non-black non-delinquents (49.2%) indicated that they received no physical punishment from their mothers, while 38 percent of the black non-delinquents and 40 percent of the non-black non-delinquents reported that they usually received a moderate spanking from their mothers.

The majority of both black (57.1%) and non-black (67.7%) delinquents indicated that their childhood happiness had been average or below. The major proportion of black non-delinquents (41.4%) indicated that their childhood had been above average in happiness, while the major proportion of the non-black non-delinquents (46.2%) indicated that their childhood had been average or below in happiness.

A nearly equal distribution of the black delinquents was found as to who guided the family, with the largest proportion (35.7%) indicating that their mother guided the family. The major proportion of the non-black delinquents (41.6%) indicated that their mother and father equally guided the family. The majority of both the black (55.2%) and non-black (50.8%) non-delinquents indicated that their father and mother guided the family.

The majority of the black delinquents (55.6%) indicated that the primary agent of discipline in their home was their mother. The majority of the non-black delinquents (70.0%) indicated that fathers were the main source of discipline. The majority of both the black (55.2%) and non-black (78.9%) non-delinquents said that their father was the main source of discipline.

The majority of the black delinquents (50.0%) indicated that their mother had been the parent of major influence in their lives, while the major proportion of the non-black delinquents (44.7%) indicated that their mother and father equally had been of influence. The majority of both black (55.2%) and non-black (51.9%) non-delinquents reported that their mother and father had been of equal influence in their lives.

The majority of both black (58.6%) and non-black (52.2%) delinquents indicated that their father's discipline of them had been fair.

The black delinquents were equally split as to how much their father loved them, with 50 percent indicating very much and 50 percent indicating average or below. The majority of the non-black delinquents (62.9%) indicated that they were loved very much by their fathers. The majority of the black non-delinquents (62.1%) reported that they were very much loved by their fathers, while the major proportion of the non-black non-delinquents (45.6%) indicated that they were loved very much by their fathers.

The major proportion of both black (50.0%) and non-black (49.2%) delinquents indicated that they were loved by their mothers above average. The majority of both black (58.6%) and non-black (51.8%) non-delinquents reported that they were loved by their mothers above average.

The major proportion of both black (50.0%) and non-black (50.0%) delinquents indicated they knew what punishment would result in their home for wrong doing. The majority of the black (58.6%) and non-black non-delinquents (50.8%) also indicated they knew what punishment they would receive in their homes for wrong doing.

Summary of Responses to the Attitudes

Toward Parents Scale (Form F)

Section I

The subjects' responses to the modification of Itkin's Attitudes Toward Parents Scale (Form F) are presented in Tables III, IV, V, and VI. The majority of the subjects (delinquent and non-delinquent) responded true to the following items:

"I would consider myself very close to my father."

TABLE III

RESPONSES TO ITKIN'S ATTITUDES TOWARD PARENTS
SCALE (FORM F) SECTION I

Item	Black Delinquents						Black Non-Delinquents					
	True		N = 28 Undecided		False		True		N = 29 Undecided		False	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1. I consider myself very close to my father.	12	42.86	7	25.00	9	32.14	13	44.83	7	31.03	9	24.14
2. My father generally has good reasons for any requests he might make.	18	64.29	5	17.86	22	75.86	2	6.90	5	17.24	5	17.24
3. I would like to be the same kind of parent that my father has been.	9	32.14	10	35.71	9	31.03	3	10.34	17	58.62	17	58.62
4. I believe that my father doesn't know how much I can do.	17	60.71	6	21.43	5	17.86	17	58.62	2	6.90	10	34.48
5. I believe that my father finds fault with me more than I deserve, he never seems to like anything I do.	5	17.86	5	17.86	18	64.29	6	20.69	4	13.79	19	65.52

TABLE III (CONTINUED)

	Black Delinquents N = 28						Black Non-Delinquents N = 29					
	<u>True</u>		<u>Undecided</u>		<u>False</u>		<u>True</u>		<u>Undecided</u>		<u>False</u>	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
6. I believe that my father has little respect for my opinions.	10	35.71	5	17.86	13	46.43	8	27.59	3	10.34	18	62.07
7. In my estimation, my father is not greatly interested in whether or not I have friends.	7	25.00	5	17.86	16	57.14	5	17.24	6	20.69	18	62.07
8. In my judgment, my father did not treat me fairly when I was young.	7	25.00	6	21.43	15	53.57	4	13.79	0	0.0	25	86.21
9. I believe that my father is one of the best persons I know.	17	60.71	4	14.29	7	25.00	19	65.52	3	10.34	7	24.14
10. My father has been one of the best friends I have ever had.	15	53.57	8	28.57	5	17.86	16	55.17	5	17.24	8	27.59

TABLE III (CONTINUED)

Item	Black Delinquents						Black Non-Delinquents					
	N = 28						N = 29					
	<u>True</u>		<u>Undecided</u>		<u>False</u>		<u>True</u>		<u>Undecided</u>		<u>False</u>	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
11. My father considers the rearing of his children his most important job in life.	14	50.00	6	21.43	8	28.57	16	55.17	4	13.79	9	31.03

TABLE IV
 RESPONSES TO ITKIN'S ATTITUDES TOWARD PARENTS
SCALE (FORM F) SECTION I

Item	Non-Black Delinquents N = 90						Non-Black Non-Delinquents N = 183					
	<u>True</u>		<u>Undecided</u>		<u>False</u>		<u>True</u>		<u>Undecided</u>		<u>False</u>	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1. I consider myself very close to my father.	54	60.00	20	22.22	16	17.78	100	54.64	49	26.78	34	18.58
2. My father generally has good reasons for any requests he might make.	65	72.22	10	11.11	15	16.67	133	72.62	28	15.30	21	11.48
3. I would like to be the same kind of parent my father has been.	39	43.33	11	12.22	40	44.44	65	35.52	57	31.15	61	33.33
4. I believe that my father does not know how much I can do.	38	42.22	17	18.89	35	38.89	85	46.45	44	24.04	54	29.51
5. I believe my father finds fault with me more than I deserve, he never seems to like anything I do.	27	30.00	12	13.33	51	56.67	56	30.60	42	22.95	84	45.90

TABLE IV (CONTINUED)

Item	Non-Black Delinquents						Non-Black Non-Delinquents					
			N = 90						N = 183			
	<u>True</u>		<u>Undecided</u>		<u>False</u>		<u>True</u>		<u>Undecided</u>		<u>False</u>	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
6. I believe that my father has little respect for my opinions.	30	33.33	21	13.33	39	43.33	54	29.51	50	27.32	79	43.17
7. In my estimation, my father is not greatly interested in whether or not I have friends.	23	25.56	15	16.67	52	57.78	36	19.67	48	26.23	99	54.10
8. In my judgment, my father did not treat me fairly when I was young.	24	26.67	13	14.44	53	58.89	19	10.38	52	28.52	111	60.66
9. I believe that my father is one of the best persons I know.	56	62.22	13	14.44	21	23.33	109	59.56	45	24.59	29	15.85
10. My father has been one of the best friends I have.	50	55.56	15	16.67	25	27.78	87	47.54	49	26.78	46	25.14
11. My father considers the rearing of his children his most important job in life.	50	55.56	14	15.56	16	28.89	111	60.66	40	21.86	32	17.49

TABLE V
 RESPONSES TO ITKIN'S ATTITUDES TOWARD PARENTS
SCALE (FORM F) SECTION II

Item	Black N = 57				Non-Black N = 273			
	Delinquent		Non-Delinquent		Delinquent		Non-Delinquent	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1. My father takes interest in everything that concerns his children:								
Takes a very great interest	10	35.71	16	55.17	49	54.44	78	42.62
Takes a moderate interest	8	28.57	9	31.03	13	14.44	57	31.15
Takes average interest	1	3.57	1	3.45	14	15.56	32	17.49
Takes little interest	3	10.71	0	0.0	10	11.11	9	4.92
Takes no interest	6	21.43	3	10.34	4	4.44	7	3.83
2. I get along with my father:								
Very well	11	39.29	9	31.03	45	50.00	51	27.87
Well	6	21.43	14	48.28	13	14.44	70	38.25
Fairly well	6	21.43	4	13.79	17	18.89	38	20.77
Not very well	2	7.14	1	3.45	9	10.00	14	7.65

TABLE V (CONTINUED)

Item	Black				Non-Black			
	N = 57		N = 273		N = 273		N = 273	
	Delinquent N	%	Non-Delinquent N	%	Delinquent N	%	Non-Delinquent N	%
Not at all	3	10.71	1	3.45	6	6.67	10	5.46
3. I trust my father enough to:								
Feel free to ask him personal questions	11	39.29	9	32.03	42	46.67	42	22.95
Often ask him personal questions	3	10.71	5	17.24	8	8.89	25	13.66
Sometimes ask him personal questions	6	21.43	6	20.69	16	17.78	51	27.87
Rarely if ever ask him personal questions	2	7.14	3	10.34	15	16.67	39	21.31
Wouldn't think of asking him any personal questions	6	21.43	6	20.69	9	10.00	26	14.21
4. Check which of the following best describes your feelings for your father:								
I like my father very much	16	57.14	14	48.28	59	65.56	99	54.10
I like my father	6	21.43	12	41.38	8	8.89	54	29.51
I neither like nor dislike my father	4	14.29	2	6.90	17	18.89	18	9.84
I dislike my father	0	0.00	0	0.00	4	4.44	3	1.64

TABLE V (CONTINUED)

Item	Black				Non-Delinquent			
	N = 57		N = 273		N = 273		N = 273	
	Delinquent N	%	Non-Delinquent N	%	Delinquent N	%	Non-Delinquent N	%
I dislike my father very much	2	7.14	1	3.45	2	2.22	9	4.92
5. Check whichever of the following descriptions most nearly fits your father:								
Is always critical of his children	6	21.43	9	31.03	22	24.44	30	16.39
Is sometimes critical of his children	7	25.00	6	20.69	15	16.67	59	32.24
Is not very critical of his children	5	17.86	4	13.79	14	15.56	20	10.93
Sometimes shows pleasure at what his children do	5	17.86	4	13.79	19	21.11	33	18.03
Very often shows pleasure	5	17.86	6	20.69	20	22.22	41	22.40
6. My father does little things for his children to show affection or consideration.								
Never does	6	21.43	1	3.45	10	11.11	8	4.37
Seldom does	3	10.71	4	13.79	10	11.11	23	12.57
Sometimes does	7	25.00	9	31.03	24	26.67	59	32.24

TABLE V (CONTINUED)

Item	Black				Non-Delinquent			
	N = 57		N = 273		N = 273		N = 273	
	Delinquent N	%	Non-Delinquent N	%	Delinquent N	%	Non-Delinquent N	%
Often does	4	14.29	10	34.48	24	26.67	58	31.69
Is always doing	8	28.57	5	17.24	22	24.44	35	19.13
7. In my opinion, my father:								
wants his children around all the time	8	28.57	5	17.24	27	30.00	27	14.75
Wants to spend some of his time with them	12	42.86	20	68.97	39	43.53	102	55.74
Likes to spend a little of his time	6	21.43	4	13.79	21	23.33	43	23.50
Does not like to spend time	1	3.57	0	0.00	1	1.11	8	4.37
Dislikes very much spending any time	1	3.57	0	0.00	2	2.22	3	1.64

TABLE VI

RESPONSES TO ITKIN'S ATTITUDES TOWARD PARENTS
SCALE (FORM F) SECTION III

Trait	Black N = 57				Non-Black N = 273			
	Delinquent		Non-Delinquent		Delinquent		Non-Delinquent	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1. <u>Fair</u>								
Very great degree	11	39.29	12	41.38	49	54.44	50	27.32
Greater than average degree	7	25.00	13	44.83	19	21.11	81	44.26
Average degree	3	10.71	3	10.34	18	20.00	33	18.08
Less than average degree	3	10.71	0	0.00	4	4.44	10	5.46
Very slight degree or not at all	4	14.29	1	3.45	0	0.00	9	4.92
2. <u>Selfish</u>								
Very great degree	3	10.71	2	6.90	6	6.67	8	4.37
Greater than average degree	3	10.71	6	20.69	4	4.44	22	12.02
Average degree	4	14.29	6	20.69	12	13.33	23	12.57
Less than average degree	6	21.43	6	20.69	16	17.78	52	28.42

TABLE VI (CONTINUED)

Trait	Black N = 57				Non-Black N = 273			
	Delinquent		Non-Delinquent		Delinquent		Non-Delinquent	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Very slight degree or not at all	12	42.86	9	31.03	52	57.78	78	42.62
3. <u>Helpful</u>								
Very great degree	3	10.71	4	13.79	7	7.78	13	7.10
Greater than average degree	3	10.71	8	27.59	9	10.00	28	15.30
Average degree	10	35.71	6	20.69	23	25.56	46	25.14
Less than average degree	2	7.14	1	3.45	20	22.22	33	18.03
Very slight degree or not at all	10	35.71	10	34.48	31	34.44	63	34.43
4. <u>Sarcastic</u>								
Very great degree	10	35.71	5	17.24	30	33.33	35	19.13
Greater than average degree	6	21.43	11	37.93	24	26.67	64	34.97
Average degree	8	28.57	9	31.03	18	20.00	57	31.15
Less than average degree	2	7.14	3	10.34	10	11.11	16	8.74
Very slight degree or not at all	2	7.14	1	3.45	8	8.89	11	6.01

TABLE VI (CONTINUED)

Trait	Black N = 57				Non-Black N = 273			
	Delinquent		Non-Delinquent		Delinquent		Non-Delinquent	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
5. <u>Considerate</u>								
Very great degree	10	35.71	12	41.38	48	53.33	76	41.53
Greater than average degree	6	21.43	14	48.28	22	24.44	67	36.61
Average degree	8	28.57	9	31.03	9	10.00	20	10.93
Less than average degree	5	17.86	2	6.90	5	5.56	12	6.56
Very slight degree or not at all	3	10.71	0	0.00	6	6.67	8	4.37
6. <u>Bossy</u>								
Very great degree	2	7.14	3	10.34	6	6.67	19	10.38
Greater than average degree	3	10.71	7	24.14	5	5.56	30	16.34
Average degree	10	35.71	6	20.69	23	25.56	40	21.86
Less than average degree	6	21.43	9	31.03	25	27.78	45	24.59
Very slight degree or not at all	7	25.00	4	13.79	31	34.44	49	26.78

TABLE VI (CONTINUED)

Trait	Black N = 57				Non-Black N = 273				
	Delinquent		Non-Delinquent		Delinquent		Non-Delinquent		
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	
7. <u>Agreeable</u>									
Very great degree	5	17.86	7	24.14	31	34.44	59	32.24	
Greater than average degree	7	25.00	15	51.72	28	31.11	76	41.53	
Average degree	8	28.57	4	13.79	22	42.44	30	16.39	
Less than average degree	2	7.14	0	0.00	6	6.67	14	7.65	
Very slight degree or not at all	6	21.43	3	10.34	3	3.33	4	2.19	
8. <u>Kind</u>									
Very great degree	3	10.71	8	27.59	16	17.78	40	21.86	
Greater than average degree	2	7.14	5	17.24	13	14.44	44	24.04	
Average degree	10	35.71	6	20.69	15	16.67	45	24.59	
Less than average degree	5	17.86	6	20.69	28	31.11	35	19.13	
Very slight degree or not at all	8	28.57	4	13.79	18	20.00	19	10.38	

TABLE VI (CONTINUED)

Trait	Black N = 57				Non-Black N = 273			
	Delinquent		Non-Delinquent		Delinquent		Non-Delinquent	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
9. <u>Envious</u>								
Very great degree	5	17.86	7	24.14	32	35.56	35	19.13
Greater than average degree	11	39.29	9	31.03	21	23.33	72	39.34
Average degree	8	28.57	8	27.59	19	21.11	52	28.42
Less than average degree	1	3.57	3	10.34	16	17.78	8	4.37
Very slight degree or not at all	1	10.71	2	6.90	2	2.22	8	4.37
10. <u>Affectionate</u>								
Very great degree	9	32.14	12	41.38	42	46.67	55	30.05
Greater than average degree	9	32.14	10	34.48	17	18.89	75	40.98
Average degree	7	25.00	3	10.34	24	26.67	42	22.95
Less than average degree	0	0.00	2	6.90	6	6.67	7	3.83
Very slight degree or not at all	3	10.71	2	6.90	1	1.11	4	2.19

TABLE VI (CONTINUED)

Trait	Black N = 57				Non-Black N = 273			
	Delinquent		Non-Delinquent		Delinquent		Non-Delinquent	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
11. <u>Understanding</u>								
Very great degree	9	32.14	11	37.93	36	40.00	47	25.68
Greater than average degree	8	28.57	14	48.28	17	18.89	57	31.15
Average degree	6	21.43	1	3.45	18	20.00	51	27.87
Less than average degree	2	7.14	2	6.90	15	16.67	20	10.93
Very slight degree or not at all	3	10.71	1	3.45	4	4.44	8	4.37
12. <u>Cold</u>								
Very great degree	2	7.14	3	10.34	4	4.44	9	4.92
Greater than average degree	6	21.43	1	3.45	10	11.11	24	13.11
Average degree	3	10.71	11	37.93	14	15.56	29	15.85
Less than average degree	6	21.43	6	20.69	22	24.44	34	18.58
Very slight degree or not at all	11	39.29	8	27.59	40	44.44	87	47.54

TABLE VI (CONTINUED)

Trait	Black N = 57				Non-Black N = 273			
	Delinquent N	%	Non-Delinquent N	%	Delinquent N	%	Non-Delinquent N	%
13. <u>Suspicious</u>								
Very great degree	4	14.29	6	20.69	12	13.33	21	11.48
Greater than average degree	5	17.86	6	20.69	13	14.44	31	16.94
Average degree	7	25.00	7	24.14	22	24.44	51	28.96
Less than average degree	4	14.29	4	13.79	21	23.33	48	26.23
Very slight degree or not at all	8	28.57	6	20.69	22	24.44	30	16.39
14. <u>Sympathetic</u>								
Very great degree	4	14.29	7	24.14	20	22.22	27	14.75
Greater than average degree	4	14.29	11	37.93	22	24.44	59	32.24
Average degree	13	46.43	5	17.24	23	25.56	52	28.42
Less than average degree	3	10.71	2	6.90	17	18.89	28	15.30
Very slight degree or not at all	4	14.29	4	13.79	8	8.89	17	9.29

TABLE VI (CONTINUED)

Trait	Black N = 57				Non-Black N = 273			
	Delinquent		Non-Delinquent		Delinquent		Non-Delinquent	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
15. Courteous								
Very great degree	5	17.86	11	37.93	28	31.11	50	27.32
Greater than average degree	11	39.29	11	37.93	22	24.44	61	33.33
Average degree	9	32.14	4	13.79	21	23.33	46	35.14
Less than average degree	0	0.00	0	0.00	13	14.44	15	8.20
Very slight degree or not at all	3	10.71	3	10.34	6	6.67	11	6.01
16. Trustful								
Very great degree	8	28.57	15	51.72	47	52.22	78	42.62
Greater than average degree	12	42.86	6	20.69	11	12.22	57	31.15
Average degree	3	10.71	6	20.69	16	17.78	29	15.85
Less than average degree	2	7.14	1	3.45	10	11.11	6	3.28
Very slight degree or not at all	3	10.71	1	3.45	6	6.67	13	7.10

"My father generally has good reasons for any request he might make."

"I believe that my father is one of the best persons I know."

"My father considers the rearing of his children the most important job in his life."

"My father is one of the best friends I have ever had."

The majority of the subjects (delinquent and non-delinquent) responded false to the following items:

"I would like to be the same kind of parent that my father has been."

"I believe that my father finds fault with me more often than I deserve, he never seems to like anything I do."

"I believe that my father has little respect for my opinions."

"In my estimation, my father is not greatly interested in whether or not I have friends."

"In my judgment, my father did not treat me fairly when I was young."

Section II

The majority of the subjects responded that their father took "a very great interest in everything that concerns his children." Most delinquents indicated that they got along with their fathers "very well," while most of the non-delinquents responded that they got along "well" with their fathers. Most of the non-black non-delinquents indicated that they trusted their father enough to "sometimes ask him personal questions," while most of the black non-delinquents indicated that they trusted him enough to "feel free to ask him personal

questions." The majority of the subjects responded "I like my father very much."

Section III

The fathers were generally rated by both delinquents and non-delinquents as fair, unselfish, sarcastic, considerate, somewhat bossy, agreeable, affectionate, understanding, not cold, not suspicious, sympathetic, courteous, and trustful. However, the fathers were rated by both delinquents and non-delinquents as not helpful more than helpful, unkind more than kind, and envious more than not envious.

Examination of the Hypotheses

Hypothesis 1: No statistically significant differences exist among the perceptions of adolescent males, within delinquent and non-delinquent groups concerning their fathers, when classified according to: (a) degree of perceived masculinity of the father or father surrogate; (b) type of punishment used by the father; (c) perceived closeness to the father; (d) father's love of the respondent; (e) amount of time the father desired to spend with the respondent; (f) parent who influenced the respondent the most; (g) parent who guided the family; (h) agent of discipline; (i) degree of self-perceived masculinity; (j) parents' marital status; (k) with whom the respondent resided primarily; (l) father's educational level; (m) perceived childhood happiness; (n) age; and (o) race.

The Kruskal-Wallis one-way analysis of variance was utilized to examine the respondents' perceptions of their fathers. Those variables which were found to be significant at the .05 level or

beyond were then subjected to the Mann-Whitney U test in order to determine the relationships between categories within the variable which accounted for the significance. The results of these analyses are found in Table VII.

Masculinity of the Father

The degree of masculinity that the total group of respondents perceived in their fathers was found to be significantly related to their perceptions of their fathers ($p = .001$). Those respondents (delinquent and non-delinquent) who perceived their fathers as being very highly masculine, on a scale ranging from very highly masculine to very low masculinity, reflected the most favorable perceptions of their fathers. The delinquents who indicated that their fathers were very highly masculine reflected significantly more favorable perceptions of their fathers than did the group who marked their fathers highly masculine ($p = .01$) or the group who indicated their fathers to be of very low masculinity ($p = .001$).

The delinquents who responded that their father was highly masculine reflected significantly more favorable perceptions of their fathers than did those who indicated their fathers to be of very low masculinity ($p = .01$). The group which indicated their fathers were of average masculinity reflected more favorable perceptions than did the group who indicated their fathers were of very low masculinity ($p = .001$). The respondents whose fathers were of low masculinity reflected significantly more favorable perceptions of their fathers than did the group which indicated their fathers to be of very low masculinity ($p = .001$).

TABLE VII

KRUSKAL-WALLIS ONE-WAY ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE
OF ITKIN'S SCALE SCORES CLASSIFIED ACCORD-
ING TO RATINGS OF DELINQUENTS AND
NON-DELINQUENTS CONCERNING
THEIR FATHERS

Background Variable	Delinquent H-Score	Level of Significance	Non-Delinquent H-Score	Level of Significance
1. Degree of masculinity of the father	24.63	.001	27.01	.001
2. Type of physical punishment from the father.	19.76	.001	13.53	.01
3. Closeness to the father.	57.53	.001	69.71	.001
4. Perceived amount of father love.	59.84	.001	71.93	.001
5. Amount of time spent with the father.	44.10	.001	70.37	.001
6. Parent providing the greatest influence.	19.15	.001	18.04	.001
7. Parent who guides the family.	16.89	.001	19.64	.001
8. Agent of discipline	9.06	.05	5.12	.05
9. Degree of masculinity of respondent	0.58	NS.	5.48	NS.

TABLE VII (CONTINUED)

Background Variable	Delinquent H-Score	Level of Significance	Non-Delinquent H-Score	Level of Significance
10. Parents' marital status	4.77	NS	5.94	NS
11. Lived mainly with	12.33	.01	6.31	.05
12. Father's educational level	1.75	NS	4.49	NS
13. Perceived childhood happiness	13.47	.01	72.29	.001

The non-delinquents who reported that their fathers were very highly masculine reflected significantly more favorable perceptions of their fathers than did the group who reported their fathers to be of average masculinity ($p = .001$) or the group which reported their fathers to be of low masculinity ($p = .001$), or the group who reported their fathers to be of very low masculinity ($p = .05$).

The non-delinquents who reported their fathers as being highly masculine reflected significantly more favorable perceptions of their fathers than did the group who reported their fathers to be of average masculinity ($p = .05$) or the group who reported their fathers to be of very low masculinity ($p = .01$). The non-delinquents who reported that their fathers were of average masculinity reflected significantly more favorable perceptions of their fathers than did either the group who reported that their fathers were of low masculinity ($p = .001$) or the group who reported their fathers to be of very low masculinity ($p = .05$). The non-delinquents who reported their fathers as being of low masculinity reflected significantly more favorable perceptions of their fathers than did those who reported their fathers to be of very low masculinity ($p = .01$).

The current findings on masculinity support the findings of Wright (1972), Lynn (1962), Benson (1968), Mussen (1961) and Carlson (1963) in that those respondents who perceived their fathers to be very highly masculine also had a better relationship with their fathers and exhibited more masculine interests.

Physical Punishment

The type of physical punishment used by fathers rated on a

scale from none to injury-causing beating was found to be significantly related to the respondent's perceptions of his father ($p = .001$ for delinquents and $.01$ for non-delinquents). The delinquents who indicated that no punishment was the norm reflected significantly more favorable perceptions of their fathers than did the group who indicated that a beating was normal ($p = .01$), or the group who indicated a severe beating was normal ($p = .05$), or the group who indicated injury causing beating was normally received ($p = .01$). The delinquents who reported receiving beating reflected significantly more favorable perceptions of their fathers than did those who reported receiving severe beating ($p = .001$). Those delinquents who reported receiving severe beatings reflected significantly more favorable perceptions of their fathers than did the group who reported receiving injury causing beatings ($p = .01$).

The non-delinquents who reported that their fathers did not usually punish them reflected significantly more favorable perceptions of their fathers than did the group which reported receiving beatings ($p = .01$) or the group which reported receiving severe beatings ($p = .01$). The respondents who reported receiving moderate spankings reflected significantly more favorable perceptions of their fathers than did either the group who reported receiving beatings ($p = .01$) or the group who indicated receiving severe beatings ($p = .01$). The group of non-delinquents who reported receiving beatings reflected significantly more favorable perceptions than did those who reported receiving injury causing beatings ($p = .001$).

The current findings on discipline support the findings of McCord, McCord and Zola (1959) in that those respondents who were

punished less severely had more positive perceptions of their fathers. However, in the present study, there was no evidence which suggested that delinquents were more severely punished than were non-delinquents.

Closeness to the Father

Closeness to their fathers was found to be significantly related to perceptions of fathers ($p = .001$). The delinquents who indicated that they were very close to their fathers reflected significantly more favorable perceptions of their fathers than did the ones who were uncertain ($p = .001$) or who indicated that they were not close to their fathers ($p = .001$). Those who were uncertain reflected significantly more favorable perceptions of their fathers than did the group who reported they were not close to their fathers ($p = .001$).

The non-delinquents who reported that they were very close to their fathers reflected significantly more favorable perceptions' of their fathers than did either the group who reported they were uncertain ($p = .001$) or the group who stated they were not close to their fathers ($p = .001$). The group of non-delinquents who indicated they were uncertain of their closeness to their fathers reflected significantly more favorable perceptions of their fathers than did the group who reported they were not close to their fathers ($p = .01$).

The current findings on closeness of sons to fathers support the findings of Mussen (1956) and Gray (1959) in that those respondents who perceived of themselves as being close to their fathers also reflected more positive perceptions of their fathers.

Father's Love

The degree that the respondents believed they were loved by their fathers was found to be significantly related to their perceptions of their fathers ($p = .001$). The delinquents who indicated they were loved very much by their fathers reflected significantly more favorable perceptions of their fathers than did those who reported average love ($p = .001$), or those who reported below average love ($p = .001$), or those who reported no love ($p = .001$). The delinquents who reported that they were loved above average reflected significantly more favorable perceptions of their fathers than did those who indicated average ($p = .01$), or below average ($p = .001$), or that they were not loved at all ($p = .001$). The delinquents who reported they were loved an average amount reflected significantly more favorable perceptions of their fathers than did either those who indicated below average love ($p = .001$) or those who reported no love ($p = .01$). Those respondents who reported that they were loved below average reflected significantly less favorable perceptions than did those who reported being not loved ($p = .001$).

While this difference is in the opposite direction of what would be expected, the difference may be readily explained in terms of the sample size: only 14 respondents indicated that they were loved below average, and only seven respondents reported they were not loved. It is clear that the sample size may not have permitted an adequate test of the hypothesis and that conclusions should be reserved concerning the validity of this finding until a more adequate testing of the hypothesis can be undertaken.

The non-delinquents who reported being loved very much reflected significantly more favorable perceptions of their fathers than did those

who indicated they were loved above average ($p = .001$), or average ($p = .001$), or below average ($p = .001$), or not at all ($p = .001$). The delinquents who reported being loved above average reflected more favorable perceptions of their fathers than those who indicated either below average ($p = .001$) or not at all ($p = .01$). The non-delinquents who reported being loved an average amount by their fathers reflected significantly more favorable perceptions of their fathers than did either those who reported being loved below average or not at all ($p = .05$). Those non-delinquents who reported that they were loved below average reflected significantly more favorable perceptions of their fathers than did those who indicated they were not loved ($p = .001$).

Amount of Time Spent With Their Fathers

The amount of time the respondents indicated that their fathers liked to spend with them was significantly related to attitudes toward fathers ($p = .001$). The delinquents who reported that their fathers liked to have them around all of the time reflected significantly more favorable perceptions of their fathers than did those who indicated their fathers liked to spend some time with them ($p = .05$) or that their father disliked very much spending any time with them ($p = .01$). The group of delinquents who reported that their fathers liked to spend some time with them reflected significantly more favorable perceptions of their fathers than did those who reported that their fathers liked to spend little time ($p = .001$), or those who responded that their father did not like to spend time with them ($p = .05$), or disliked very much spending any time with them ($p = .01$). The delinquents who reported

that their fathers liked to spend a little time with them reflected significantly more favorable perceptions of their fathers than did those who reported their fathers disliked very much spending any time with them ($p = .01$). Those delinquents who reported that their fathers did not like to spend time with them reflected significantly more favorable perceptions of their fathers than did the group whose fathers disliked very much spending time with them ($p = .05$).

The non-delinquents who indicated that their fathers liked to have them around all of the time reflected significantly more favorable perceptions of their fathers than did those who indicated that their fathers liked to spend some time with them ($p = .01$), or a little time ($p = .001$), or disliked spending time ($p = .001$), or disliked very much spending any time ($p = .01$) with them. The group of non-delinquents who reported that their fathers liked to spend some time with them reflected significantly more favorable perceptions of their fathers than did those who reported that their fathers liked to spend a little time ($p = .001$), or disliked spending time ($p = .001$), or disliked very much spending any time ($p = .01$). Those non-delinquents who reported that their fathers disliked spending time with them reflected significantly more favorable perceptions of their fathers than did those whose fathers disliked very much spending time with them ($p = .001$).

Parent Who Exerted the Greatest Influence

The parent who had the greatest influence on the respondent was found to be significantly related to his perception of his father ($p = .001$). The delinquents who reported that they had been influenced by

their father and their mother equally reflected significantly more favorable perceptions of their fathers than did those who indicated that their mother had provided the most influence ($p = .001$). The delinquents who reported that their mother only had been most influential reflected significantly less favorable perceptions of their fathers than did those who reported their father as being the most influential ($p = .01$) in their lives.

The non-delinquents who reported that they had been influenced equally by their mother and father reflected significantly more favorable perceptions of their fathers than did those who reported their mother only as being most influential ($p = .001$). The group of non-delinquents who reported their mother as being most influential reflected significantly less favorable perceptions of their fathers than did those who reported their father only as being more influential ($p = .01$).

Parent Who Guided the Family

The parent who guided the family was found to be significantly related to adolescents' perceptions of their fathers ($p = .001$). The delinquents who reported that only their fathers guided the family reflected significantly more favorable perceptions of their fathers than did the group which indicated only their mother guided the family ($p = .05$). The group who reported that their father guided the family with some help from their mother reflected significantly more favorable perceptions of their fathers than did those who reported their mother guided the family with some help from the father ($p = .01$), or their mother only guided the family ($p = .01$). The delinquents

who reported that their mother and father equally guided the family reflected significantly more favorable perceptions of their fathers than did those who reported mothers guided with some help from the fathers ($p = .01$) or that their mother only guided the family ($p = .001$). The group who indicated that their mother guided the family with some help from their father reflected significantly more favorable perceptions of their fathers than did those whose mothers only guided the family ($p = .001$).

The non-delinquents who reported that their father only guided the family reflected significantly less favorable perceptions of their fathers than did the group who reported that their fathers and mothers guided the family equally ($p = .05$). The non-delinquents who reported that their father only guided the family reflected significantly more favorable perceptions of their fathers than did the group who responded that their mother guided the family with some help from the father ($p = .001$), or the group who indicated that their mother only guided the family ($p = .001$). The non-delinquents who reported that their fathers guided the family with some help from their mothers reflected significantly more favorable perceptions of their fathers than did those who reported their mother only guided the family ($p = .001$). The group who indicated that their father and mother equally guided the family reflected significantly more favorable perceptions of their fathers than did the group which reported that their mother only guided the family ($p = .001$). The group who indicated that their mother guided the family with some help from their father reflected significantly more favorable perceptions of their fathers than did those whose mothers only guided the family ($p = .001$).

Agent of Discipline

The agent of discipline was found to be significantly related to the respondents' perceptions of their fathers ($p = .05$ for delinquents). The delinquents who reported that their fathers were the disciplinarians reflected significantly more favorable perceptions of their fathers than did those who reported that their mothers were the disciplinarians ($p = .05$). The group who indicated that their fathers with some help from their mothers provided the discipline reflected significantly more favorable perceptions of their fathers than did those who indicated that their mother was the disciplinarian ($p = .01$). The group who reported that their mother with some help from their father provided the discipline reflected significantly more favorable perceptions of their fathers than did those whose mother was the disciplinarian ($p = .01$).

With Whom the Respondent Lived

Whom the respondent had primarily lived with while growing up was found to be significantly related to the perceptions the respondents had of their fathers ($p = .01$ for the delinquents and $p = .05$ for the non-delinquents). The delinquents who indicated that they had primarily lived with their mothers reflected significantly less favorable perceptions of their fathers than did those who had lived mainly with their mother and father ($p = .05$), or with their grandfather ($p = .001$), or with their father only ($p = .05$), or with someone other than the parents ($p = .05$). The group which reported they had lived mostly with mother and father reflected significantly more

favorable perceptions of their fathers than did the group which reported having lived mainly with their grandfather ($p = .01$). The group who indicated that they had lived mainly with their father reflected significantly more favorable perceptions of their fathers than did the group that had lived mainly with their grandfather ($p = .001$). The delinquents who reported that they lived mainly with their grandfathers reflected significantly less favorable perceptions of their fathers than did those who had lived with someone outside the immediate family ($p = .05$).

The non-delinquents who reported that they had lived mainly with their mother reflected significantly more favorable perceptions of their fathers than did those who reported having lived mainly with their fathers ($p = .001$), or grandfathers ($p = .01$), or persons other than immediate family ($p = .001$). Those who reported that they had lived mainly with their mother and father reflected significantly more favorable perceptions of their fathers than did those who indicated that they had lived mainly with their fathers ($p = .05$), or grandfathers ($p = .05$). The group who reported that they had lived with their father reflected significantly more favorable perceptions of their fathers than did those who had lived mainly with their grandfathers ($p = .001$), but this same group which had lived mainly with their fathers reflected significantly less favorable perceptions of their fathers than did the group which lived with a person other than the immediate family ($p = .001$). The non-delinquents who had lived mainly with their grandfathers reflected significantly less favorable perceptions of their fathers than did those who had lived mainly with a person other than the immediate family ($p = .001$).

Childhood Happiness

The degree of childhood happiness of the respondents was found to be significantly related to perceptions of fathers for non-delinquents ($p = .001$) and for delinquents ($p = .01$). The delinquents who reported that their childhood had been very happy reflected significantly more favorable perceptions of their fathers than did those who reported that their childhood had been above average in happiness ($p = .05$), or average in happiness ($p = .001$), or below average in happiness ($p = .01$). The delinquents who reported above average happiness in their childhood reflected significantly more favorable perceptions of their fathers than did those who had experienced a very unhappy childhood ($p = .001$).

The non-delinquents who reported that their childhood had been very happy reflected significantly more favorable perceptions of their fathers than did those who reported their childhood happiness to have been above average ($p = .001$), or average ($p = .001$), or below average ($p = .001$), or very unhappy ($p = .001$). The group who reported that their childhood happiness had been above average reflected significantly more favorable perceptions of their fathers than did the groups who reported their childhood happiness to be below average ($p = .001$) or very unhappy ($p = .01$). The group who reported their childhood happiness to be average reflected significantly more favorable perceptions of their fathers than did the groups who reported either below average happiness ($p = .001$) or very unhappy ($p = .01$).

Race

Utilizing a Mann-Whitney U test, the race of the respondents was found to be significantly related to their perceptions of their fathers for delinquents ($p = .05$). The delinquents who reported that they were black reflected significantly less favorable perceptions of their fathers than did those who reported that they were non-black ($p = .05$). This relationship was not observed for non-delinquents.

Age

The delinquents who indicated that they were 14 years of age reflected significantly more favorable perceptions of their fathers than did either the group 15 years of age ($p = .05$) or 18 years of age ($p = .001$). The 15 year old delinquents reflected significantly less favorable perceptions of their fathers than did the 18 year old delinquents ($p = .001$). This relationship was not observed for non-delinquents.

Thus, on the basis of the evidence obtained in the present study, one of the hypotheses is rejected i.e., that which states that both delinquent and non-delinquent adolescents' perceptions of their fathers are not significantly related to: (a) degree of perceived masculinity of the father or father surrogate; (b) type of punishment used by the father; (c) perceived closeness to the father; (d) father's love of the respondent; (e) amount of time the father desired to spend with the respondent; (f) parent who influenced the respondent the most; (g) parent who guided the family; (h) agent of discipline; (i) whom the respondent had resided with primarily; (j) perceived childhood happiness; (k) age; and (l) race.

The hypothesis is held tenable that both delinquent and non-delinquent adolescents' perceptions of their fathers are not significantly related to: (a) degree of masculinity of the respondent; (b) parent's marital status; and (c) fathers' educational level.

Thus, the patterns of relationships between the adolescents' perceptions of their fathers and the background factors examined were similar for both delinquents and non-delinquents. There were two exceptions, however, race and age. Black delinquents reflected significantly less favorable perceptions of their fathers than non-black youth. This was not observed to be true for non-delinquents. Younger delinquents reflected significantly more favorable perceptions of their fathers than older delinquents. Age was unrelated to adolescents' perceptions of their fathers among the non-delinquents.

Hypothesis 2: No statistically significant differences exist among the perceptions of adolescent males within the delinquent and non-delinquent groups concerning their fathers when classified according to their anomie.

The results of these analyses are presented in Tables VIII, IX, and X. The Kruskal-Wallis one-way analysis of variance was utilized in examining the respondents' perceptions of their fathers in relation to the anomie questions. Those items which revealed significant H values were then subjected to the Mann-Whitney U test to determine the relationships between the categories to the variable which accounted for the significance.

Whether or not the respondents believed there was someone outside the family that they could count on was found to be significantly related to their perceptions of their fathers ($p = .05$) for

TABLE VIII

KRUSKAL-WALLIS ONE-WAY ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE
 OF ITKIN'S SCALE SCORES CLASSIFIED ACCORD-
 ING TO RATINGS OF DELINQUENTS AND NON-
 DELINQUENTS WITH RESPECT TO THEIR
 ANOMIE RESPONSES

Background Variable	Delinquent H-Score	Level of Significance	Non-Delinquent H-Score	Level of Significance
1. Do you feel you have no control over what is going to happen to you during your life?	3.35	NS	4.24	NS
2. Do you feel that there is someone outside your family you can count on when you really need help?	0.49	NS	7.61	.05
3. Do you feel your life is meaningless and a waste of time?	2.43	NS	9.90	.01
4. Do you have specific goals you are working for in life?	3.93	NS	18.50	.001
5. Do you feel that you have <u>never</u> succeeded at anything?	1.15	NS	6.71	.01

TABLE IX

NON-BLACK RESPONSES TO THE ANOMIE SCALE

Item	Delinquent N = 90						Non-Delinquent N = 183					
	<u>Yes</u>		<u>No</u>		<u>Undecided</u>		<u>Yes</u>		<u>No</u>		<u>Undecided</u>	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1. Do you feel that you have no control over what is going to happen to you?	47	52.22	16	17.78	26	28.89	98	53.55	29	15.85	55	30.05
2. Do you feel that there is someone you can count on outside your family when you need help?	74	82.22	15	16.67	0	0.0	139	75.96	39	21.31	0	0.0
3. Do you feel that your life is meaningless and a waste?	13	14.44	65	72.22	12	13.33	15	8.20	145	79.23	23	12.57
4. Do you have specific goals you are working for in life?	63	70.00	12	13.33	15	16.67	139	75.96	21	11.48	22	12.02
5. Do you feel that you have <u>never</u> succeeded at anything?	20	22.22	64	71.11	6	6.67	22	12.02	150	81.97	11	6.01

TABLE X

BLACK RESPONSES TO THE ANOMIE SCALE

Item	Delinquent N = 28						Non-Delinquent N = 29					
	<u>Yes</u>		<u>No</u>		<u>Undecided</u>		<u>Yes</u>		<u>No</u>		<u>Undecided</u>	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1. Do you feel that you have no control over what is going to happen to you?	13	46.43	5	17.86	10	35.71	16	55.17	7	24.24	6	20.69
2. Do you feel that there is someone you can count on outside your family when you need help?	23	82.14	5	17.86	0	0.0	20	68.97	8	27.59	0	0.0
3. Do you feel your life is meaningless and a waste?	4	14.29	23	82.14	1	3.57	2	6.90	24	82.76	3	10.34
4. Do you have specific goals you are working for in life?	17	60.71	5	17.86	6	21.43	23	79.31	3	10.34	2	6.90
5. Do you feel that you have <u>never</u> succeeded in anything?	5	17.86	23	82.14	0	0.0	5	17.24	23	79.31	1	3.45

non-delinquents. The non-delinquents who responded that they did have someone outside their family to rely on reflected significantly more favorable perceptions of their fathers than did those who did not have someone outside their family to rely on ($p = .01$). This factor was not found to be significantly related to the delinquents' perceptions of their fathers.

Whether or not the non-delinquents believed that their life was meaningless was found to be significantly related to their perceptions of their fathers ($p = .01$). The group of non-delinquents who reported that they believed life was meaningless reflected significantly less favorable perceptions of their fathers than did the group which indicated it believed life was meaningful ($p = .05$). The group of non-delinquents who indicated that they were uncertain as to whether life was meaningful reflected significantly less favorable perceptions of their fathers than did the group who indicated that they believed life was meaningful ($p = .01$). This factor was not observed to be significant regarding delinquents' perceptions of their fathers.

Whether or not a respondent had goals in life was found to be significantly related to his perceptions of his father ($p = .001$) for non-delinquents. The group who indicated that it did have goals in life reflected significantly more favorable perceptions of their fathers than did those who were undecided of their goals ($p = .001$) or those who indicated they had no goals in life ($p = .001$). This factor was not found to be significantly related to delinquents' perceptions of their fathers.

Whether or not the respondent had ever succeeded at anything in

life was found to be significantly related to his perceptions of his father ($p = .05$). The non-delinquents who responded that they had succeeded at something reflected significantly more favorable perceptions of their fathers than did those who indicated that they had not succeeded at anything ($p = .01$). This variable was not found to be significantly related to delinquents' perceptions of their fathers.

Thus, from the evidence obtained, the hypothesis was rejected that the non-delinquents' perception of their fathers are not significantly related to their feelings of anomie. In the delinquents, however, the hypothesis is held tenable.

Hypothesis 3: No statistically significant differences exist among the perceptions of adolescents within the delinquent and non-delinquent-groups concerning their fathers when classified according to their identification with their fathers.

The results of these analyses are presented in Tables XI, XII, and XIII. The Kruskal-Wallis one-way analysis of variance was utilized in examining perceptions of the respondents toward their fathers. Those variables which were found to be significant at the .05 level or beyond were then subjected to the Mann-Whitney U test to determine the relationships between the responses to the variable which accounted for the significance.

The person the respondent would choose to take on a trip to Hawaii was found to be significantly related to his perceptions of his father ($p = .05$ for delinquents and $p = .01$ for non-delinquents). The group of delinquents who indicated they would take their fathers to Hawaii reflected significantly more favorable perceptions of their fathers

TABLE XI

KRUSKAL-WALLIS ONE-WAY ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE
OF ITKIN'S SCALE SCORES CLASSIFIED ACCORD-
ING TO RATINGS OF DELINQUENTS AND
NON-DELINQUENTS CONCERNING
FATHER IDENTIFICATION

Item	Delinquent H-Score	Level of Significance	Non-Delinquent H-Score	Level of Significance
1. You have just won a trip to Hawaii for you and one of your parents. Which one will you choose to take?	6.43	.05	10.10	.01
2. You have been falsely accused of stealing money. Which parent will you go to ask for help?	33.49	.001	39.04	.001
3. If you were sad, which parent would you go to to cheer you up?	21.40	.001	26.69	.001
4. If you had a fight with a friend, which parent would you tell?	25.77	.001	8.61	.05
5. If you got V. D., which parent would you ask for advice?	22.75	.001	24.58	.001
6. Whom would you rather discuss your problems with?	23.84	.001	27.52	.001

TABLE XII

BLACK RESPONSES TO THE FATHER
IDENTIFICATION SCALE

Item	Delinquent N = 28						Non-Delinquent N = 29					
	<u>Mother</u>		<u>Father</u>		<u>Neither</u>		<u>Mother</u>		<u>Father</u>		<u>Neither</u>	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1. You have just won a trip to Hawaii for you and one of your parents. Which will you take?	17	60.71	5	17.86	6	21.43	13	44.83	10	34.48	6	20.69
2. You have been falsely accused of stealing money. Which parent will you go to for help?	16	57.14	6	21.43	6	21.43	13	44.83	10	34.48	6	20.69
3. If you were sad, which parent would you go to to cheer you?	12	42.86	3	10.71	13	46.43	10	34.48	4	13.79	15	51.72
4. If you just had a fight with your best friend, which parent would you tell?	5	17.86	5	17.86	18	64.29	8	27.59	6	20.68	25	51.72
5. If you got V.D., which of your parents would you ask for advice?	9	32.14	8	28.57	11	39.29	5	17.24	15	51.72	9	31.03
6. Whom would you rather discuss your problems with?	7	25.00	12	42.86	9	32.14	8	27.59	8	27.59	13	44.83

TABLE XIII

NON-BLACK RESPONSES TO THE FATHER
IDENTIFICATION SCALE

Item	Delinquent N = 90						Non-Delinquent N = 183					
	<u>Mother</u>		<u>Father</u>		<u>Neither</u>		<u>Mother</u>		<u>Father</u>		<u>Neither</u>	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1. You have just won a trip to Hawaii for you and one of your parents. Which will you take?	34	37.78	26	28.89	30	33.33	49	26.78	53	28.96	81	44.26
2. You have been falsely accused of stealing money. Which parent will you go to for help?	28	31.11	44	48.89	18	20.00	50	27.32	98	53.55	35	19.13
3. If you were sad, which parent would you go to to cheer you?	33	36.67	22	24.44	35	38.89	77	42.02	26	14.21	80	43.72
4. If you had just had a fight with your best friend, which parent would you tell?	14	15.56	27	30.00	49	54.44	47	25.68	32	17.49	104	56.83
5. If you got V. D., which of your parents would you ask for advice?	12	13.33	37	41.11	41	45.56	21	11.48	36	19.67	126	68.85
6. Whom would you rather discuss your problems with?	28	31.11	33	36.67	29	32.22	42	22.95	72	39.34	69	37.70

than did the group who indicated that they would take their mother ($p = .05$) or those who would take some other person ($p = .01$). The group of non-delinquents who indicated that they would take their fathers to Hawaii reflected significantly more favorable perceptions of their fathers than did the group who indicated that they would take some other person ($p = .001$).

The parent the respondent would go to for help when accused of stealing money was found to be significantly related to his perceptions of his father ($p = .001$ for both delinquents and non-delinquents). The group of delinquents who indicated that they would go to their fathers for help reflected significantly more favorable perceptions of their fathers than did those who would go to their mothers for help ($p = .001$) or to some other person for help ($p = .001$). The non-delinquent group who indicated that they would go to their fathers for help reflected significantly more favorable perceptions of their fathers than did those who would go to their mothers ($p = .001$) or to some other person ($p = .001$). The group of non-delinquents who reported that they would go to some other person for help reflected significantly less favorable perceptions of their fathers than did those who would go to their mothers ($p = .05$).

The parent whom the respondent would turn to when sad was found to be significantly related to their perceptions of their fathers ($p = .001$ for both delinquents and non-delinquents). The delinquents who indicated that they would go to their fathers to cheer them up when they were sad reflected significantly more favorable perceptions of their fathers than did those groups which indicated that they would go to their mothers ($p = .001$) or to someone else ($p = .001$). The

delinquents who indicated that they would go to their mothers reflected significantly more favorable perceptions of their fathers than did the group who indicated that they would go to some other person ($p = .05$).

The non-delinquents who reported that they would go to someone other than their parents reflected significantly less favorable perceptions of their fathers than did the group who indicated they would go to their mothers ($p = .001$) or the group who indicated they would go to their fathers ($p = .001$).

The person the respondent would tell if he had just had a fight with his best friend was found to be significantly related to his perceptions of his father ($p = .001$ for delinquents and $p = .05$ for non-delinquents). The delinquents who reported that they would go to their fathers if they had just had a fight with their best friend reflected significantly more favorable perceptions of their fathers than did the group who reported they would seek out their mothers ($p = .01$) or some other person ($p = .001$).

The non-delinquents who responded that they would go to their fathers if they had just had a fight with their best friend reflected significantly more favorable perceptions of their fathers than did either those who responded that they would go to their mothers ($p = .05$) or those who responded that they would go to some other person than their parents ($p = .01$).

The person the respondents would go to for advice about controlling venereal disease was found to be significantly related to their perceptions of their fathers ($p = .001$ for both delinquents and non-delinquents). The delinquents who indicated that they would go to their fathers for advice if they contracted venereal disease reflected

significantly more favorable perceptions of their fathers than those who indicated they would go to their mothers ($p = .01$) or those who indicated they would go to some other person than their parents ($p = .001$).

The non-delinquents who reported that they would go to their fathers for advice if they contracted venereal disease reflected significantly more favorable perceptions of their fathers than did those who reported they would go to their mothers ($p = .001$) or those who reported they would go to some other person than their parents ($p = .001$).

The person with whom the respondent indicated that he would like to discuss his problems was found to be significantly related to his perceptions of his father ($p = .001$ for delinquents and non-delinquents). The delinquents who responded that they would quite frequently turn to their fathers to discuss their problems reflected significantly more favorable perceptions of their fathers than did those who responded that they would go to some other person than their parents ($p = .001$). Those delinquents who indicated that they would go to their mothers to discuss their problems reflected significantly more favorable perceptions of their fathers than did those who indicated that they would go to neither parent ($p = .05$).

The non-delinquents who reported that they would go to their fathers to discuss their problems reflected significantly more favorable perceptions of their fathers than did either the group who indicated that they would go to their mothers ($p = .001$) or the group who reported that they would go to some other person than their parents ($p = .001$).

Thus, from the evidence obtained, the hypothesis is rejected for both delinquents and non-delinquents which states that their perceptions of their fathers are not significantly related to their identification with their fathers.

Hypothesis 4: No statistically significant differences exist between delinquent and non-delinquent adolescent males with respect to:
(a) degree of perceived masculinity of the father or father surrogate;
(b) type of punishment used by the father; (c) perceived closeness to the father; (d) father's love of respondent; (e) amount of time the father desired to spend with the respondent; (f) parent who influenced the respondent the most; (g) parent who guided the family; (h) agent of discipline; (i) degree of self-perceived masculinity; (j) parents' marital status; (k) whom the respondent had resided with primarily; (l) father's educational level; (m) perceived childhood happiness; (n) age; and (o) race.

In the previous analyses of responses of delinquent and non-delinquent adolescent males, only intra-group comparisons were made. That is, controlling for delinquency and non-delinquency--as measured by the criterion variable of incarceration--responses were analyzed in terms of the independent-dependent variables, e.g. educational level of the father in relation to the respondent's perceptions of his father.

In Hypothesis 4, comparisons were made between delinquent and non-delinquent groups without regard to control of subsidiary variables (see Table XIV). The analysis of the data revealed that delinquents and non-delinquents differed significantly with respect to: (a) perceived masculinity of the father or father surrogate ($p = .001$),

TABLE XIV
 CHI SQUARE VALUES REFLECTING
 DIFFERENCES IN RESPONSES
 OF DELINQUENTS AND
 NON-DELINQUENTS

Variable	N	df	χ^2	p
Masculinity of father	325	2	17.42	.001
Type of punishment used by the father	328	2	0.36	NS
Closeness to the father	329	2	0.85	NS
Father's love	328	2	9.25	.01
Amount of time father desired to spend with respondent	328	2	1.61	NS
Parent who influenced respondent the most	323	2	7.46	.05
Parent who guided the family	327	2	14.22	.001
Agent of discipline	326	2	6.70	.05
Respondent's masculinity	327	2	2.45	NS
Parents' marital status	316	2	32.50	.001
Whom the respondent re- sided with	327	2	28.62	.001
Father's educational level	307	2	17.76	.001
Childhood happiness	328	2	17.22	.001
Age	327	1	0.92	NS
Race	326	3	32.47	.001

with delinquents being significantly more apt than non-delinquents to indicate that they perceived their father as being very highly masculine; (b) perceptions of their father's love ($p = .01$), with non-delinquents being significantly more apt than delinquents to reflect favorable perceptions of their fathers' love; (c) perceptions concerning which parent had the greater influence on them ($p = .05$) with delinquents being significantly more apt than non-delinquents to indicate that their mothers had influenced them the most; (d) perceptions concerning the parent who guided the family ($p = .001$), with delinquents being significantly more apt than non-delinquents to indicate that their mothers primarily had guided the family; (e) perceptions concerning which parent had primarily provided the discipline ($p = .05$), with delinquents being significantly more apt than non-delinquents to indicate that their mothers were primarily the disciplinarians in the family; (f) parent's marital status ($p = .001$), with delinquents being significantly more apt than non-delinquents to come from broken homes; (g) whom the respondent had lived with primarily ($p = .001$), with the non-delinquents being significantly more apt to indicate that they had lived with their grandfathers or fathers rather than their mothers; (h) childhood happiness ($p = .001$), with non-delinquents being significantly more apt than delinquents to reflect greater happiness in childhood; (i) race ($p = .001$), with the delinquent group having a significantly greater percentage of blacks than would be expected by chance.

The delinquents and non-delinquents did not differ significantly with respect to: (a) type of punishment used by their father; (b) closeness to their fathers; (c) amount of time their fathers wished to spend with them; (d) perceptions of their own masculinity; and (e) age.

On the basis of the evidence obtained, as reflected in Table XIV, partial support for the hypothesis was obtained.

Hypothesis 5: No statistically significant differences exist between delinquents and non-delinquents with respect to: (a) perceptions of their fathers; (b) anomie; and (c) identification with their fathers.

Responses of delinquents and non-delinquents, as presented in Table XV, reflect no significant differences between groups with respect to their perceptions of their fathers or identification with their fathers. However, a significant difference was observed with respect to feelings of anomie, with non-delinquents reflecting less difficulty with respect to the feelings of anomie than delinquents.

Thus, on the basis of the evidence obtained and reported in Table XV, the hypothesis that no significant differences exist between delinquents and non-delinquents with respect to anomie was rejected, but it was held tenable for their perceptions of their fathers and for their father identification.

TABLE XV
 MANN-WHITNEY U SCORES REFLECTING DIFFERENCES
 IN RESPONSES OF DELINQUENTS AND
 NON-DELINQUENTS

Variable	Delinquent	Non-Delinquent	Z	p
	N	N		
Perceptions of father	118	212	1.00	NS
Anomie	118	212	1.92	>.05
Father Identification	118	212	.93	NS

CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION

As the literature on delinquency suggests, the etiology of delinquent behavior is difficult to discover. All of the studies on delinquency, however, suggest the importance of the relationships which exist in the home. The present study also emphasizes the importance of family relationships in the development of delinquency.

Historically, the roles of mothers have been examined in far greater detail in studies of children because it has been assumed that mothers exert a greater influence than fathers in the development of children. As the recent decade review of research on parent-child relationships by Walters and Stinnett (1971) suggests, however, this traditional view is being challenged, and an increasing number of studies are focusing on the roles which fathers assume in guiding children. In general, the studies point to the fact that the father has a far greater impact on his children than is commonly believed.

Several of the comparisons made in the present study failed to yield anticipated significant differences between delinquent and non-delinquent youth. An important point to remember is that youth often respond in terms of their perceptions of reality, however unrealistic their perceptions may be. For all practical purposes, an adolescent who perceives that his father does not love him, even though he does, may stimulate as much conflict in a relationship with his father as an

adolescent who has a father who truly rejects him.

The results of the present study emphasize the importance of a father-son relationship which is characterized by love and which contributes to the son developing positive perceptions of his father. This study also indicates that lack of love from the father is associated with delinquency.

The finding that the most positive perceptions of fathers were expressed by adolescents who believed their fathers loved them is consistent with other research indicating that affection is necessary for paternal identification (Bronfenbrenner, 1958; Mowrer, 1950; Payne and Mussen, 1956; Stokes, 1954; and Nash, 1954). A related finding was that delinquent youth were significantly less likely to perceive of their fathers as loving them. A lack of parental affection may contribute to socialization difficulties for the child. It has been suggested by Parsons (1947) that if neither parent loves the child, the incentive for socialization is lacking. Consequently the child receives no reward for conforming to acceptable social behavior and may as a result be more inclined to engage in anti-social behaviors. Cavan (1962) reported that warm, supportive responses from the father are more often associated with non-delinquency.

Based on the findings of this study, it appears that differences exist between the perceptions of delinquent and non-delinquent youth concerning their fathers. The delinquent youth generally perceived of their fathers as less loving, less supportive and less interested in them. As in other studies, delinquency was found to be associated with broken homes.

These findings point to the importance of the creation of families

characterized by stability, security, and loving relationships. They not only corroborate the growing body of evidence suggesting the importance of fathers in the development of their sons but also stimulate a question concerning the wisdom of developing curricula in home economics at the secondary level which is primarily designed for young women. If home economics is to be responsive to the needs of families, it should consider thoughtfully its responsibility in preparing men as well as women for their roles as parents.

Another major finding of this study was the emergence of a pattern of high mother-involvement and limited father-involvement. The delinquent youth reported significantly more often that their mother: (a) had been the parent who had been most influencing in their lives; (b) most often guided the family; and (c) most often provided the discipline. This pattern of high mother-involvement appears to be directly related to the fact that the delinquents were significantly more likely to come from broken homes. This suggests that the fathers of delinquents are less involved in the lives of their sons than are the fathers of non-delinquents. It is also possible that minimal involvement of the father with his son may be a contributing factor to delinquency.

The literature indicates that those young males who do not have an adequate male model (Winch, 1950; Nash, 1965; and Stephens, 1961) or who have poor paternal relationships (Mussen, 1961) acquire more feminine interests (Bieri, 1960) than do males who have an adequate male model and good paternal relationships. Consequently, the deprived youth views himself as less masculine than does the youth who has a male model and a good paternal relationship. In an attempt to prove his masculinity and hide his feelings of femininity, the youth who is deprived of a male

model and good paternal relationships becomes overtly aggressive, even to the point of anti-social behavior (Deitche, 1959; Atchison, 1958; Lefeber, 1965; and Kim, 1968). Thus, delinquency appears to be related to the mother-dominated home and to the non-functioning father, i.e. a father who is unwilling or unable to function as the head of the family and/or to establish warm friendly relations with his son.

Feelings of anomie were more common among delinquent youth than non-delinquent youth ($p > .05$). This finding supports the view of many criminologists that the lack of norms, the problem of social marginality, and the confusion about value systems are important for understanding delinquency proneness (Jaffe, 1969).

Perhaps the finding that feelings of anomie were more common among delinquents than non-delinquents is related to the finding that delinquents reported less happiness in childhood and also to the finding that delinquents were significantly more likely to come from broken homes. It is possible that the youth from broken homes may have witnessed a great deal of strife and conflict of values between the parents. Such family discord may have confused the delinquent youth in establishing a stable identification. This possibility is related to the report of Jaffe (1969) that when family discord and conflict of values between parents is present, the child often vacillates between the parents for identification and may become frustrated and confused in his attempt to interiorize a stable identification. It appears that such a child might also develop feelings of anomie.

The present finding that delinquents experienced feelings of anomie to a significantly greater degree than did non-delinquents suggests that there is something in the family life of delinquents which contributes

to feelings of anomie which may in turn contribute to delinquency. It can only be speculated as to what these contributing factors are at the present time, however, this certainly presents opportunity for future research.

CHAPTER VI

SUMMARY

The purpose of this research was to investigate whether there were statistically significant differences in the way delinquents and non-delinquents perceived their fathers. This was done in an attempt to determine which if any of the fathers' behaviors or values might be clearly related to delinquent behavior in male offspring. Differences in these attitudes were also examined in relation to various background factors and family relationships.

Specifically, the hypotheses examined comprised the following:

Hypothesis 1: No statistically significant differences exist among the perceptions of adolescent males, within delinquent and non-delinquent groups, concerning their fathers when classified according to: (a) degree of perceived masculinity of the father or father surrogate; (b) type of punishment used by the father; (c) perceived closeness to the fathers; (d) father's love of respondent; (e) amount of time the father desired to spend with the respondent; (f) parent who influenced the respondent the most; (g) parent who guided the family; (h) agent of discipline; (i) degree of self-perceived masculinity; (j) parents' marital status; (k) with whom the respondent had resided primarily; (l) father's educational level; (m) perceived childhood happiness; (n) age; and (o) race.

Hypothesis 2: No statistically significant differences exist among

the perceptions of adolescent males within the delinquent and non-delinquent groups concerning their fathers when classified according to their Anomie Responses.

Hypothesis 3: No statistically significant differences exist among the perceptions of adolescent males within the delinquent and non-delinquent groups concerning their fathers when classified according to their identification with their fathers.

Hypothesis 4: No statistically significant differences exist between delinquents and non-delinquents with respect to: (a) degree of perceived masculinity of the father or father surrogate; (b) type of punishment used by the father; (c) perceived closeness to the father; (d) father's love of respondent; (e) amount of time the father desired to spend with the respondent; (f) parent who influenced the respondent the most; (g) parent who guided the family; (h) agent of discipline; (i) degree of self-perceived masculinity; (j) parents' marital status; (k) with whom the respondent resided primarily; (l) father's educational level; (m) perceived childhood happiness; (n) age; and (o) race.

Hypothesis 5: No statistically significant differences exist between delinquents and non-delinquents with respect to: (a) perceptions of their fathers; (b) anomie; and (c) identification with their fathers.

The sample was composed of 330 ninth-through-twelfth grade male students enrolled in two high schools in central Oklahoma and a state boys school for delinquent youth in Oklahoma during March of 1974. The students were between 14 and 18 years of age, with a mean age of 16.5 years. The questionnaire administered to the subjects consisted of an information sheet for securing information concerning their backgrounds and family relationships, a modification of Itkin's Attitudes Toward

Parents Scale (Form F), designed to measure perceptions of fathers, an Anomie Scale, and a Father Identification Scale.

On the basis of the statistical analysis of the data utilizing the Kruskal-Wallis one-way analysis of variance test and the Mann-Whitney U test, hypothesis 1 was rejected in that the perceptions of adolescent males, within delinquent and non-delinquent groups, concerning their fathers did differ significantly in relation to:

- (a) masculinity of the father, with more positive attitudes being reflected by sons with more masculine fathers;
- (b) type of physical punishment, with more positive attitudes being reflected by sons who experienced less severe physical punishment;
- (c) closeness to the father, with more positive attitudes being reflected by sons who believed they were close to their fathers;
- (d) love from father, with more positive attitudes being reflected by sons who believed they were loved by their fathers;
- (e) amount of time spent with the father, with more positive attitudes being reflected by sons whose fathers spent more time with them;
- (f) the parent of greatest influence, with more positive attitudes reflected by sons whose father and mother equally provided the greatest influence and with the least positive attitudes being reflected by sons whose mothers provided the greatest influence;
- (g) parent who guided the family, with more positive attitudes reflected by sons whose fathers and mothers equally guided

the family and with the least positive attitudes being reflected by sons who lived in a family guided mainly by the mother;

- (h) agent of discipline, with more positive attitudes reflected by sons who received their discipline mainly from their fathers and with the least positive attitudes toward fathers being reflected by sons who received their discipline mainly from the mother;
- (i) person or parent primarily resided with, with more positive perceptions reflected by sons who had lived primarily with both parents and with the least favorable responses being provided by sons who had lived primarily with their mother; and
- (j) childhood happiness, as perceived by the respondent, with more positive perceptions reflected by sons who had experienced happy childhoods and with the least favorable responses reflected by sons who had not experienced happy childhoods.

Hypothesis 1 was held tenable in that the delinquent and non-delinquent adolescents' perceptions of their fathers were not significantly related to:

- (a) degree of self-perceived masculinity of the respondent;
- (b) parents' marital status at the time of testing; or
- (c) fathers' educational level.

Thus the patterns of relationships between the adolescents perceptions of their fathers and the background factors examined were similar for both delinquents and non-delinquents. There were, however, two exceptions: race and age. Black delinquents reflected significantly less favorable perceptions of their fathers than did non-black

delinquents. This was not true for non-delinquents. Younger delinquents reflected significantly more favorable perceptions of their fathers than did older delinquents. Age was found to be unrelated to non-delinquents' perceptions of their fathers.

In general, the differences in the background factors related to delinquency or non-delinquency which were most apparent were that a greater proportion of the non-delinquents than delinquents lived in homes that were run by both parents, experienced a childhood of average happiness, were of average closeness to mothers, received their discipline from their fathers more than from their mothers, were influenced by both parents equally, were loved by their father very much, considered their father to be of average masculinity, had parents who were married and living together, and had fathers who had graduated from high school.

In contrast, a greater proportion of the delinquents than non-delinquents lived in homes run by the mother, experienced a childhood of average happiness, were very close to their mothers, were disciplined by their mothers, were influenced by their mothers, were loved above average by their fathers, considered their fathers to be very highly masculine, more frequently lived with their grandfathers, had parents who were divorced or separated, and had fathers who had completed eight years or less schooling. In each of these variables there were significant differences between delinquent and non-delinquent subjects.

On the basis of the statistical analysis of the data utilizing the Kruskal-Wallis one-way analysis of variance test and the Mann-Whitney U test, hypothesis 2 was rejected in that the perceptions which non-delinquent adolescent males had regarding their fathers did differ

significantly according to their anomie responses. Specifically, the differences were related to:

- (a) having someone outside the family to count on, with more positive perceptions regarding fathers being reflected by sons who believed there were people outside the home they could count on;
- (b) believing life is meaningless, with more positive perceptions of fathers being reflected by sons who believed that life was meaningful;
- (c) having specific goals in life, with more positive perceptions reflected by those who had specific goals; and
- (d) having succeeded, with more positive perceptions reflected by those who had succeeded at something according to their perceptions.

An item concerning being in control of one's life was not significantly related to the perceptions non-delinquents had of their fathers. However, hypothesis 2 was held tenable for the delinquent group in that the perceptions of their fathers did not significantly differ in relation to anomie.

From the evidence obtained, it would appear that anomie is significantly related to delinquency, although anomie was not found to be related to delinquents' perceptions of their fathers. Thus, other factors must account for the relationship between anomie and delinquency.

On the basis of the statistical analysis of the data utilizing the Kruskal-Wallis one-way analysis of variance test and the Mann-Whitney U test, hypothesis 3 is rejected in that the perceptions of adolescent males within the delinquent and non-delinquent groups concerning their

fathers did differ according to the degree to which they identified with their fathers. Specifically, those delinquents and non-delinquents who indicated that they would select their father over their mother for a trip to Hawaii reflected significantly more favorable perceptions of their fathers than did those who would select their mother or some other person.

On the basis of the statistical analysis of the data utilizing a Chi Square test, hypothesis 4 was rejected in that significant differences existed between delinquents and non-delinquents with respect to:

- (a) masculinity of the father, with more delinquents indicating their father to be very highly masculine;
- (b) father's love, with non-delinquents believing that they were loved by their fathers to a greater degree;
- (c) parent who influenced the respondent more, with delinquents more frequently indicating their mothers influenced them;
- (d) parent who guided the family, with delinquents indicating their mothers guided the family;
- (e) agent of discipline, with delinquents more frequently indicating their mother was the disciplinarian;
- (f) parents' marital status, with delinquents more frequently coming from broken homes;
- (g) whom the respondent had resided with primarily, with delinquents more frequently living with their mothers;
- (h) father's educational level, with fathers of non-delinquents achieving a higher level of education;
- (i) childhood happiness, with delinquents reflecting less; and
- (j) race, with blacks being more likely to be delinquent.

Hypothesis 4 was held tenable for the type of punishment used, closeness to father, amount of time the father spent with the respondent, respondent's masculinity, and the age of the respondent.

On the basis of the statistical analysis of the data utilizing a Mann-Whitney U test, hypothesis 5 was held tenable in that no significant differences were found between delinquents and non-delinquents with respect to (a) perceptions of their fathers and (b) identification with their fathers. However, in view of the analysis, one variable of hypothesis 5 was rejected since a difference was found to exist between delinquents and non-delinquents with respect to anomie. The delinquent group reflected a higher degree of anomie than did the non-delinquent group.

Conclusions

Conclusions which may be drawn from this study are that delinquency is associated with: (a) lack of a warm, loving, supportive relationship with the father; (b) minimal paternal involvement with children; (c) high maternal involvement in the lives of youth; (d) broken homes; and (e) feelings of anomie. Further, it appears from the results of this study that factors which may serve to insulate youth from delinquency are: (a) a stable unbroken home, characterized by loving, supportive parent-child relationships; (b) a father who has a high degree of positive involvement with his son; (c) a family life which contributes to a minimal degree of anomie and provides the child with a sense of purpose, direction and belonging; and (d) a father who provides a stable model for emulation by his male offspring.

From the evidence obtained, fathers appear to be significant

contributors to the development of offspring who are capable of adapting and adjusting to society. The father also serves to provide a model after which a son may mold his behavior. Thus it would appear that fathers who are involved with their offspring in a warm, friendly, cordial relationship are vital in the child's life for the prevention of anti-social behavior.

Methodological Limitations of the Research

The methodological limitations of this study include: (a) the small sample which restricted the degree to which the results can be generalized and which limited the extent of statistical analysis; (b) the sample was geographically limited to the state of Oklahoma; (c) variable control was limited due to small sample size, i.e., no specific control of the duration of father-absence could be made, nor could an accurate assessment of socio-economic status be made; (d) the following variables were not measured in the test instrument: 1) quality of the relationship with the mother; 2) quality of the relationship between the parents; 3) the type of offense committed by the delinquent; and (e) no method of eliminating delinquent respondents' questionnaires from the non-delinquent group.

Implications For Further Research

Because of the limited number of delinquents who participated in the study, it is proposed that this research be extended to include larger samples of delinquent males in order to obtain a more accurate test of the hypotheses examined. For example, in the current samples of non-delinquents, perceptions of fathers were found to be significantly

related to feelings of anomie. For the delinquents, however, the hypothesis was not rejected. Yet, in light of earlier research, it is possible that failure to reject the hypothesis was a function of the limited size of the sample. This hypothesis clearly warrants further examination in delinquent groups.

Study should be made of the effects of fathers in relation to the specific crimes which their children commit. In the present study this was not possible because permission could not be obtained to elicit the nature of the offense for which the youths were incarcerated. It is quite possible that different relationships with fathers, e.g., cruel versus ignoring, may lead to different kinds of anti-social behavior, e.g., crimes against property versus crimes against persons.

A study of the perceptions which the delinquent's father has toward the delinquent's paternal grandfather could provide evidence of a possible etiological source of delinquency. Additionally, a study should include an investigation of the father's delinquent behavior and the perceptions the father has of his son in order to determine a possible relationship between the father's perception of his son and the son's self-concept.

The whole spectrum of background variables needs to be reassessed in order to discover promising leads. From the present investigation, it would appear that the backgrounds of delinquents and non-delinquents are more similar than dissimilar.

The impact of the peer group on the development of delinquency in relation to familial variables warrants consideration. It is important to know what kinds of relationships within the family serve to protect youth from the adverse effects of their peers' influence. Because of

the impact which delinquency has on families, society, and the individual himself, delinquency research warrants the attention of specialists from a variety of fields in order to determine the etiological factors contributing to non-normative behaviors which result in incarceration.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Aberle, David F. and Kaspar Naegele. "Middle Class Fathers' Occupational Role and Attitude Toward Children." American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, XXII (1952), 366-378.
- Ackerson, L. Children's Behavior Problems. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1942.
- Aichhorn, A. Verwahrloste Jugend. Vienna English Translation. London: Putnam, 1936.
- Amos, William E. Delinquency Prevention: Theory and Practice. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall, 1967.
- Amos, William E. Counselling the Disadvantaged Youth. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall, 1968.
- Andry, Robert G. "Faulty Parental and Maternal-Child Relationships, Affection and Delinquency." British Journal of Delinquency, VIII (1957), 34-38.
- Andry, Robert G. Delinquency and Parental Pathology. Springfield, Ill.: Charles Thomas, 1960.
- Andry, Robert G. "Parent and Maternal Roles and Delinquency." in Deprivation and Maternal Care: A Reassessment of Its Effects, Geneva: World Health Organization, (1962), 31-44.
- Andry, Robert G. "Parental Affection and Delinquency." The Sociology of Crime and Delinquency. Eds. Marvin Wolfgang, Leonard Savitz, and Norman Johnston. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1962.
- Bach, George R. "Father Fantasies and Father Typing in Father-Separated Children." Child Development, XVII (1946), 63-80.
- Bandura, Albert, Dorothea Ross and Ross. "Transmission of Aggression Through Imitation of Aggressive Models," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, LXIII (1961), 575-582.
- Bandura, Albert and Richard H. Walters. "Dependency Conflicts in Aggressive Delinquency." Journal of Social Issues, XIV (1958), 52-65.

- Barker, Gordon H. and William T. Adams. "Comparison of the Delinquency of Boys and Girls." Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology, and Police Science, LIII (1962), 470-477.
- Bartemier, Leo. "The Contributions of the Father to the Mental Health of the Family." American Journal of Psychiatry, CX (1953), 277-280.
- Baumrind, Diana. "Child Care Practices Antecedent Three Patterns of Preschool Behavior." Genetic Psychology Monographs, LXXV (1967), 43-88.
- Becker, Wesley G., Donald R. Peterson, Leo Hellmer, Donald J. Shoemaker and Herbert C. Quay. "Factors in Parental Behavior in Children." in Readings in Child Behavior Development, Ed. Celia B. Stendler. New York: Harcourt, Brace, and World, 1964.
- Beeler, S. "Angry Girls: Behavior Control by Girls in Latency." Smith College Studies in Social Work, XXIII (1953), 205-226.
- Benson, Leonard. Fatherhood: A Sociological Perspective. New York: Random House, 1968.
- Bieri, James. "Parental Identification, Acceptance of Authority and Within-Sex Differences in Cognitive Behavior." Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, LX (1960), 76-79.
- Bieri, James and Robin Lobeck. "Acceptance of Authority and Parental Identification." Journal of Personality, XXVII (1959), 74-87.
- Blaine, Graham B. "The Children of Divorce." The Atlantic Monthly, (1963), 98-101.
- Bloch, Herbert A. and Frank T. Flynn. Delinquency: The Juvenile Offender in America Today. New York: Random House, 1956.
- Block, J. "Personality Characteristics Associated with Fathers' Attitudes Toward Child-Rearing." Child Development, XXVI (1955), 41-48.
- Bowlby, John. Forty-Four Juvenile Thieves: Their Characters and Home Life. London: Bailliere, Tural and Cox, 1947.
- Bowlby, John. "Research into the Origins of Delinquent Behavior." British Medical Journal, I (1950), 570-573.
- Bowlby, John. "Maternal Care and Mental Health." Bulletin, Geneva: World Health Organization Monographs, III (1951), 355-364.

- Brodbeck, A. and H. V. Perlmutter. "Self-Dislike as a Determinant of Marked Ingroup-Outgroup Preferences." Journal of Psychology, XXXVIII (1954), 271-280.
- Bronfenbrenner, Urie. "Socialization and the Social Class Through Time and Space." in Readings in Social Psychology. Eds. Eleanor Maccoby, Theodore Newcomb, and Eugene Hartley, New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1958.
- Bronfenbrenner, Urie. "Some Familial Antecedents of Responsibility and Leadership in Adolescents." Leadership and Interpersonal Behavior. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1961.
- Bronfenbrenner, Urie. "The Changing American Child: A Speculative Analysis." Children: Readings in Behavior and Development. Ed. Elles Evans, New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1968.
- Burgess, Ernest W. and Harvey J. Locke. From Institution to Companionship. New York: American Book, 1945.
- Burton, Roger V. and W. Whiting. "The Absent Father and Cross-Sex Identity." Merrill-Palmer Quarterly, VII (1961), 85-95.
- Carlson, Rae. "Identification and Personality Structure in Preadolescents." Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, LXVII (1963), 556-573.
- Cavan, Ruth S. Juvenile Delinquency. Philadelphia and New York: J. B. Lippincott Co., 1962.
- Chilton, Roland and Gerard Markle. "Family Disruption and Delinquent Conduct." American Sociological Review, XXVII (1962), 93-99.
- Chinn, W. L. "A Brief Survey of Nearly One Thousand Juvenile Delinquents." British Journal of Educational Psychology, VIII (1938), 78-85.
- Clausen, John A. "Drug Addiction." in Contemporary Social Problems, Eds. Robert K. Merton and Robert A. Nesbitt. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, 1961.
- Cohen, Albert K. Delinquent Boys: The Culture of the Gang. New York: Free Press, 1955.
- Cottrell, Leonard S. "Adjustment of the Individual to His Age and Sex Roles." in Readings in Social Psychology. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1947.
- Cox, F. N. "An Assessment of Children's Attitudes Toward Parent Figures." Child Development, XXXIII (1962), 821-830.

- Deitche, J. H. "The Performance of Delinquent Boys and Non-Delinquent Boys on the Tennessee Department of Mental Health Self-Concept Scale." (Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Indiana University, 1959.)
- Devereux, Edward, Urie Bronfenbrenner, and George J. Suci. "Patterns of Parental Behavior in the United States and the Federal Republic of Germany: A Cross-National Comparison." International Social Science Journal, XIV (1962), 488-506.
- Eisenburg, L. "The Fathers of Autistic Children." American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, XXVII (1957), 715-725.
- Fitts, William and William J. Hamner. The Self-Concept of Delinquency. Nashville; Marshall and Bruce Co., 1969.
- Glueck, Sheldon and Eleanor Glueck. Unravelling Juvenile Delinquency. New York: The Commonwealth Fund, 1937.
- Glueck, Sheldon and Eleanor Glueck. Toward A Typology of Juvenile Offenders. New York: Grune and Stratton, 1970.
- Gold, Martin. Status Forces in Delinquent Boys. Ann Arbor: Institute For Social Research, University of Michigan, 1963.
- Gordon, Ira J. Human Development From Birth to Adolescence. New York: Harper and Row, 1962.
- Gray, Susan W. "Masculinity-Femininity in Relation to Anxiety and Social Acceptance." Child Development, XXVIII (1957), 203-214.
- Gray, Susan W. "Perceived Similarity to Parents and Adjustment." Child Development, XX (1959), 91-107.
- Grygier, T., J. Chesley, and Wilson E. Tutters. "Parental Deprivation: A Study of Delinquent Children." British Journal of Criminology, IX (1969), 209-253.
- Helper, M. M. "Learning Theory and the Self-Concept." Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, LI (1955), 184-194.
- Hess, Robert D. and Gerald Handel. "Patterns of Aggression in Parents and Their Children." Journal of Genetic Psychology, LVI (1956), 199-212.
- Hetherington, E. M. and Yvonne Brackbill. "Etiology and Covariation of Obstinacy, Orderliness, and Parsimony in Young Children." Child Development, XXXIV (1963), 919-943.
- Hirschi, Travis. Causes of Delinquency. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1969.

- Hoffman, Lois Wladis. "The Father's Role in the Family and the Child's Peer-Group Adjustment." Merrill-Palmer Quarterly, VII (1961), 97-105.
- Itkin, William. "Some Relationships Between Intra-Family Attitudes and Pre-Parental Attitudes Toward Children." Journal of Genetic Psychology, LXXX (1952), 221-252.
- Itkin, William. "Relationship Between Attitudes Toward Parents and Parents' Attitudes Toward Children." Journal of Genetic Psychology, LXXXVI (1955), 339-352.
- Jaffe, Eliezer D. "Family Anomie and Delinquency: Development of the Concept and Some Empirical Findings." British Journal of Criminology, IX (1969), 376-388.
- Johnson, Miriam M. "Sex-Role Learning in the Nuclear Family." Child Development, XXXIV (1963), 319-333.
- Jourard, S. M. and R. M. Remy. "Perceived Parent Attitudes, The Self, and Security." Journal Consulting Psychology, XIX (1955), 364-375.
- Kagan, Jerome. "The Concept of Identification." Psychological Review, LXV (1958), 296-305.
- Kagan, Jerome, B. Hoshen, and S. Watson. "The Child's Symbolic Conceptualization of the Parents." Child Development, XXXII (1961), 625-634.
- Kim, Y. K. "A Comparison of the Self-Concept of Delinquent and Non-Delinquent Boys." (Unpublished Masters Thesis, Seole National University, Seole, Korea, 1967).
- Kravaceus, William C., Walter B. Miller, Milton L. Barron, Edward M. Daniels, Preston A. McLendon and Benjamin A. Thompson, Delinquent Behavior: Culture and the Individual. Washington: D. C.: National Education Association, 1959.
- Lefebver, J. A. "The Delinquent's Self-Concept." (Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of Southern California, 1965).
- Levin, Harry and Robert R. Sears. "Identification With Parents As Determinate of Doll-Play Aggression." Child Development, XXVII (1956), 135-153.
- Lynn, David B. "Sex-Role and Parental Identification." Child Development, XXXIII (1962), 555-564.
- Lynn, David B. and W. L. Sawrey. "The Effects of Father-Absence on Norwegian Boys and Girls." Child Development, LIX (1959) 258.

- Maccoby, Eleanor. "Differential Cognitive Abilities." Washington, D.C.: Office of Education, Cooperative Research Project 1040, 1962.
- MacIver, R. The Ramparts We Guard. New York: MacMillan Co., 1950.
- Maxwell, Joseph W., Ruth J. Dales, and James Walters. "The Relationship of Family Adjustment to the Self-Concept of Lower Class Adolescent Males." Factors Related to Educational and Occupational Aspirations of Adolescent Males From Culturally Deprived Families. Ed. Ruth J. Dales and James Walters, Washington, D.C.: United States Department H. E. W. Project Number 50197, 1969.
- McCord, William and Joan McCord. "Effects of Parental Role Model on Criminality." Journal of Social Issues, XIV (1958), 66-75.
- McCord, William, Joan McCord and A. Howard. "Familial Correlates of Aggression in Non-Delinquent Male Children." Readings in the Psychology of Parent-Child Relations. Ed. Gene R. Medinnus, New York: J. Wiley and Sons Inc., 1961.
- McCord, William, Joan McCord and Irving K. Zola. Origins of Crime. New York: Columbia Press, 1959.
- McGuire, Carson and George D. White. "The Measurement of Social Status." Research Paper in Human Development. Austin: University of Texas, (1955), No. 3.
- Medinnus, Gene R. "Delinquents' Perceptions of Their Parents." Journal of Consulting Psychology, XXIX (1965), 592-593.
- Menaker, E. "The Neurotic Stealing Symptom." American Journal Orthopsychiatry, XI (1939), 368.
- Milton, G. A. "The Effects of Sex-Role Identification Upon Problem-Solving Skills." Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, LV (1957), 208-212.
- Mischel, Walter. "Father-Absence and Delay of Gratification: Cross-Cultural Comparisons." Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, LXIII (1961), 116-124.
- Mowrer, O. Hobart. Identification: A Link Between Learning Theory and Psycho-Therapy. New York: Ronald, 1950.
- Mussen, Paul H. "Some Antecedents and Consequences of Masculine Sex-Typing in Adolescent Boys." Psychological Monographs, LXXV (1961), No. 2.
- Mussen, Paul H. and Luther Distler. "Masculinity Identification and Father-Son Relationships." Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, LIX (1959), 350-356.

- Nash, John. "Critical Periods in Human Development." Bulletin Maritime Psychological Association, (1954), 18-22.
- Nash, John. "The Father in Contemporary Culture and Current Psychological Literature." Child Development, XXXVI (1965), 261-297.
- Nye, Ivan F. "Adolescent-Parent Adjustment: Age, Sex, Sibling Number, Broken Homes, and Employed Mothers as Variables." Marriage and Family Living, (XIV (1952), 327-332.
- Ogburn, William F. "The Changing Family." Publication of the American Sociological Society, XXIII (1929), 124-133.
- Palmer, Richard C. "Behavior Problems of Children in Navy Officers' Families." Social Casework, XLI (1960), 177-184.
- Parsons, Talcott. "Certain Primary Sources and Patterns of Aggression in the Social Structure of the Western World." Psychiatry, X (1947), 167-181.
- Parsons, Talcott and Robert F. Bales. Family Socialization and Interaction Process, Glencoe, Illinois: Free Press, 1955.
- Payne, Donald E. and Paul H. Mussen. "Parent-Child Relations and Father Identification Among Adolescent Boys." Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, LII (1956), 338-362.
- Peterson, Donald R., Wesley C. Becker, Leo A. Hellmer, Donald J. Shoemaker and Herbert C. Quay. "Parental Attitudes and Child Adjustment." Child Development, XXX (1959), 119-130.
- Radke, Marian J. The Relation of Parental Attitudes to Children's Behavior and Attitudes. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1946.
- Reckless, Walter C., Simon Dinitz and B. Kay. "The Self-Concept as an Insulator Against Delinquency." American Sociological Review, XXII (1957), 566-570.
- Sears, Robert R., Eleanor E. Maccoby, and Harry Levin. Patterns of Child Rearing. Evanston, Illinois: Row Peterson, 1957.
- Sears, Robert R., Margaret H. Pintler, and Pauline S. Sears. "The Effect of Father Separation on Pre-School Children's Doll-Play Aggression." Child Development, XVII (1946), 219-243.
- Shore, M. F. "Psychological Theories of the Causes of Anti-Social Behavior." Crime and Delinquency, XVII (1971), 456-468.
- Siegel, Sidney. Non-Parametric Statistics for the Behavioral Sciences. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1956.

- Slater, Phillip W. "Parental Role Differentiation." American Journal of Sociology, LXVII (1961), 296-308.
- Slauson, S.R. An Introduction to Group Therapy. New York: Commonwealth, 1943.
- Sopchak, Andrew L. "Parental Identification and Tendency Toward Disorders as Measured by the MMPI." Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, XLVII (1952), 159-165.
- Stanfield, Robert E. "The Interaction of Family Variables and Gang Variables in the Etiology of Delinquency." Social Problems, XIII (1966), 411-417.
- Stephens, William N. "Judgments 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." in Readings in Child Development. Eds. W. E. Marlin and C. B. Stendler. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, 1954.
- Stolz, Lois M. and Collaborators. Father Relations of War-Born Children. Redwood City: Stanford University Press, 1954.
- Sutton-Smith, B., B. G. Rosenberg, and Frank Landry. "Father-Absence Effects in Families of Different Sibling Compositions." Child Development, XXXIX (1968), 1213-1221.
- Thomes, Mary M. "Children With Absent Fathers." Journal of Marriage and the Family, XXXI (1968), 89-96.
- Towrey, Judy C. "Adolescents' Perceptions Concerning Relationships With Their Fathers." (Unpublished Masters Thesis, Oklahoma State University, 1971).
- Walters, James and Nick Stinnett. "Parent-Child Relationships: A Decade Review of Research." Journal of Marriage and the Family, XXXIII (1971), 80-103.
- Warren, Marguerite Q. and T. B. Palmer. "Community Treatment Project: An Evaluation of Community Treatment of Delinquents." Los Angeles: California Youth Authority and the National Institute of Mental Health, CTP Research Report No. 6, 1965.
- Warren, W. "Conduct Disorders in Children." British Journal of Delinquency, I (1957), 164.
- Whiting, J. W., F. R. Kluckholm, and A. Anthony. "The Function of Male Initiation Ceremonies at Puberty." in Readings in Social Psychology, Eds. E.E. Maccoby, T.M. Newcomb, and E. L. Hartley. New York: Henry Holt, 1958.

Winch, Robert. "Some Data Bearing on the Oedipal Hypothesis."
Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, XLV (1950).

Wright, Althea M. "College Students' Attitudes Concerning Father-Son Relationships." (Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Oklahoma State University, 1972.)

APPENDIX A

In growing up, if your father was absent from the home for long periods of time, please mark the age at which he first left your home.

- a. 1-3 years
- b. 4-5 years
- c. 6-7 years
- d. 8 and over
- e. was never present
- f. was always present

If your father was absent for long periods of time, please mark the reason from the following:

- a. separation
- b. divorce
- c. war
- d. desertion
- e. death
- f. long sickness
- g. other (reason) _____

Describe what your father actually does at work? _____

In school, your father completed grades:

- a. none
- b. 1-4 years
- c. 5-8 years
- d. 9-11 years
- e. graduated from high school
- f. completed 1-3 years of college
- g. graduated from a 4-year college
- h. completed over 4 years of college

How many years of schooling have you completed? _____

1. Your present age is _____
Place of birth _____

2. Your race:

- a. Black
- b. Indian
- c. Latin
- d. White
- e. Other _____

3. The main source of your family's income is:

- a. hourly wages, piece work, weekly wages
- b. salary, commissions, monthly checks
- c. savings and investments, earned by my father or mother
- d. profits from a business
- e. welfare, odd jobs, share cropping, seasonal work, charity

4. In my own family, my:

- a. father runs the family with no help from my mother
- b. father runs the family with some help from my mother
- c. mother and father run the family equally
- d. mother runs the family with some help from my father
- e. mother runs the family with no help from my father

5. In growing up, I have been been:

- a. very happy
- b. somewhat above average in happiness
- c. average in happiness
- d. somewhat below average in happiness
- e. very unhappy

6. I have never had any reason to be angry with either of my parents.

True _____ False _____

7. In growing up, have you and your mother been:

- a. very close
- b. above average in closeness
- c. average in closeness
- d. below average
- e. very much below average

8. In my family, the discipline I received was mainly from:

- a. my father
- b. my father with some help from my mother
- c. my mother with some help from my father
- d. my mother
- e. other (relationship) _____

9. Which best describes the type of physical punishment you usually received from your father?

- a. none
- b. moderate spanking
- c. beating
- d. severe beating or whipping (with belt, stick etc.)
- e. injury-causing beating (broken bones, knocked-out teeth)

10. My mother has always tried to give me everything I wanted.

True _____ False _____

11. Which best describes the type of physical punishment you usually receive from your mother?

- a. none
- b. moderate spanking
- c. beating
- d. severe beating (with belt, stick etc.)
- e. injury-causing beatings (with broken bones, knocked-out teeth, etc.)

12. Which parent had the greatest influence in your life?

- a. mother and father equally
- b. mother
- c. father

13. In my home, I feel that I am loved by my father;

- a. very much
- b. above average
- c. average
- d. below average
- e. not at all

14. In my home, I feel that I am loved by my mother:

- a. very much
- b. above average
- c. average
- d. below average
- e. not at all

15. I would consider my father:

- a. very highly masculine (manlike)
- b. highly masculine
- c. of average masculinity
- d. of low masculinity
- e. of very low masculinity

16. There are times when my parents do things that make me unhappy or angry.

True _____ False _____

17. I would consider myself:

- a. very highly masculine
- b. highly masculine
- c. of average masculinity
- d. of low masculinity
- e. of very low masculinity

18. While growing up, I have lived mostly with my:

- a. mother
 b. father and mother
 c. father
 d. grandfather
 e. other (relationship) _____

19. Which would describe your father's discipline to you?

- a. fair
 b. too soft most of the time
 c. too hard most of the time
 d. too inconsistent (I never knew what he would do)

20. I have never done anything I was ashamed of.

True _____ False _____

21. When I do something wrong at home, I:

- a. know that I will not be punished for it
 b. can usually figure out in advance what will happen to me
 c. am not sure what will happen
 d. am afraid of the punishment

22. Do you feel that you have control over what is going to happen to you during your life?

Yes _____ No _____ Undecided _____

23. Do you feel that there is someone you can count on outside your family?

Yes _____ No _____ Undecided _____

24. Do you feel that your life is meaningless and a waste of time?

Yes _____ No _____ Undecided _____

25. Do you have specific goals that you are working for in life?

Yes _____ No _____ Undecided _____

26. Do you feel that you have never succeeded at anything?

Yes _____ No _____ Undecided _____

27. You have just won a trip to Hawaii for you and one of your parents. Which one will you choose to take?

Mother _____ Father _____ Neither _____

28. You've been falsely accused of stealing money. Which parent will you go to ask for help?

Mother _____ Father _____ Neither _____

29. If you were sad, which parent would you go to to cheer you up?

Mother _____ Father _____ Neither _____

30. If you had just had a fight with your best friend, which of your parents would you tell?

Mother _____ Father _____ Neither _____

31. Sometimes I can't help worrying, even though I know it doesn't do any good.

True _____ False _____

32. If you got V. D., which of your parents would you ask for help?

Mother _____ Father _____ Neither _____

33. Whom would you rather discuss your problems with?

Mother _____ Father _____ Neither _____

34. My parents are presently:

- _____ a. married and living together
- _____ b. separated
- _____ c. divorced
- _____ d. one or both dead

35. I am constantly amazed at how well my parents understand me.

True _____ False _____

Following is a list of statements which might be answered as true, false, or not certain. Mark the one which best fits you. Circle T for true, F for false, and ? for uncertain.

- T ? F 36. I consider myself to be very close to my father.
- T ? F 37. My father generally has good reasons for any requests he might make.
- T ? F 38. I would like to be the same kind of a parent that my father has been.
- T ? F 39. I believe that my father doesn't know how much I can do.

- T ? F 40. I believe my father finds fault me more often than I deserve, he never seems to like anything I do.
- T ? F 41. I believe my father has little respect for my opinions.
- T ? F 42. In my estimation, my father is not greatly interested in whether or not I have friends.
- T ? F 43. In my judgment, my father did not treat me fairly when I was young.
- T ? F 44. I believe my father is one of the best persons I know.
- T ? F 45. My father has been one of the best friends I have ever had.
- T ? F 46. My father considers the rearing of his children his most important job in life.

Check whichever one of the five choices listed below most closely describes your own opinion or feeling.

47. My father...

- _____ a. takes a very great interest in everything that concerns his children
- _____ b. takes a moderate amount of interest in things which concern his children
- _____ c. takes average interest in things which concern his children
- _____ d. takes little interest in things which concern his children
- _____ e. takes no interest in things which concern his children

48. I get along with my father...

- _____ a. very well
- _____ b. well
- _____ c. fairly well
- _____ d. not very well
- _____ e. not at all

49. I trust my father enough to...

- _____ a. feel free to ask him personal questions
- _____ b. often ask him personal questions
- _____ c. sometimes ask him personal questions
- _____ d. rarely if ever ask him personal questions
- _____ e. wouldn't think of asking him any personal questions

50. Check whichever of the following terms best describes your feeling toward your father...

- a. I like my father very much
- b. I like my father
- c. I neither like nor dislike my father
- d. I dislike my father
- e. I dislike my father very much

51. Check whichever of the following descriptions most nearly fits your father...

- a. is always critical of his children
- b. is sometimes critical of his children
- c. is not very critical of his children
- d. sometimes shows pleasure at what his children do
- e. very often shows pleasure at what his children do

52. My father...

- a. never does little things for his children to show affection or consideration
- b. seldom does little things for his children to show affection or consideration
- c. sometimes does little things for his children to show affection or consideration
- d. often does little things to show affection or consideration for his children
- e. is always doing little things to show affection or consideration for his children

53. In my opinion, my father...

- a. is so attached to his children that he wants to have them around all of the time
- b. enjoys spending some of his time with his children
- c. likes to spend a little of his time with his children
- d. doesn't like to spend time with his children
- e. dislikes very much spending any of his time with his children

The following is a list of characteristics of people. Compare your father to the item and circle the letter which represents him best. Mark according to how much he has: A= very much; B = above average; C = average; D = less than average; E = very little or none.

- | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|-----|--------------|---|---|---|---|---|-----|---------------|
| A | B | C | D | E | 55. | Fair | A | B | C | D | E | 63. | Agreeable |
| A | B | C | D | E | 56. | Selfish | A | B | C | D | E | 64. | Kind |
| A | B | C | D | E | 57. | Envious | A | B | C | D | E | 65. | Understanding |
| A | B | C | D | E | 58. | Affectionate | A | B | C | D | E | 66. | Cold |
| A | B | C | D | E | 59. | Helpful | A | B | C | D | E | 67. | Suspicious |
| A | B | C | D | E | 60. | Sarcastic | A | B | C | D | E | 68. | Sympathetic |
| A | B | C | D | E | 61. | Considerate | A | B | C | D | E | 69. | Courteous |
| A | B | C | D | E | 62. | Bossy | A | B | C | D | E | 70. | Trustful |

APPENDIX B

TO BE READ TO THE YOUNG MEN TAKING THE QUESTIONNAIRE

Gentlemen:

This questionnaire has no right or wrong answers. It is designed to try to determine your relationship with your parents, or with those who raised you. The purpose of this research is to try and provide some solutions to some types of family problems, and to help persons like yourselves to enjoy life with a few less difficulties. I would ask you to teach me about yourself by answering the questions as honestly and accurately as possible. Your answers will be kept strictly confidential. I very much appreciate your time and help in this important work.

Thank-you,

Richard Smith

INSTRUCTIONS

Please check the answer which you feel best fits you. If you do not have a father, but lived with your grandfather or uncle, use him as your father in answering these questions. In other words, use the adult male with whom you have lived most of your life to represent your father as far as the questions for this questionnaire are concerned. Please answer as carefully and accurately as you can. If you have questions, please ask your instructor. Again I thank you for your cooperation. Please mark all questions.

APPENDIX G

SCORING KEY FOR ITKIN'S ATTITUDES TOWARD
PARENT'S SCALE (FORM F)

	T	?	F		A	B	C	D	E		
1.	4	3	2								
2.	4	3	2	20.	1	2	3	4	5		
3.	4	3	2	21.	5	4	3	2	1		
4.	4	3	2	22.	1	2	3	4	5		
5.	2	3	4	23.	5	4	3	2	1		
6.	2	3	4	24.	1	2	3	4	5		
7.	2	3	4	25.	5	4	3	2	1		
8.	2	3	4	26.	5	4	3	2	1		
9.	4	3	2	27.	1	2	3	4	5		
10.	4	3	2	28.	5	4	3	2	1		
11.	4	3	2	29.	5	4	3	2	1		
	A	B	C	D	E	30.	1	2	3	4	5
12.	5	4	3	2	1	31.	1	2	3	4	5
13.	5	4	3	2	1	32.	5	4	3	2	1
14.	5	4	3	2	1	33.	5	4	3	2	1
15.	5	4	3	2	1	34.	5	4	3	2	1
16.	1	2	3	4	5						
17.	1	2	3	4	5						
18.	5	4	3	2	1						
19.	5	4	3	2	1						

APPENDIX D

APPENDIX E

FATHER IDENTIFICATION SCALE

1. You have just won a trip to Hawaii for you and one of your parents. Which parent will you choose to take?
Mother _____ Father _____ Neither _____
2. You've been falsely accused of stealing money. Which parent will you go to for help?
Mother _____ Father _____ Neither _____
3. If you were sad, which of your parents would you go to to cheer you up?
Mother _____ Father _____ Neither _____
4. If you had just had a fight with your best friend, which of your parents would you tell?
Mother _____ Father _____ Neither _____
5. If you got V. D., which of your parents would you go to to ask for advice?
Mother _____ Father _____ Neither _____
6. Who would you rather discuss your problems with?
Mother _____ Father _____ Neither _____

VITA

Richard Melvin Smith

Candidate for the Degree of

Doctor of Education

Thesis: THE IMPACT OF FATHERS ON DELINQUENT MALES

Major Field: Higher Education

Minor Field: Family Relations and Child Development

Biographical:

Personal Data: Born in Salt Lake City, Utah, July 27, 1943, the son of Mr. and Mrs. Collins Dewitt Smith. Married Kathryn Schlendorf, December 14, 1967, and is the father of two daughters, Kristyne Grace and Tarrisse Kaye.

Education: Attended elementary school, junior high school and high school in Kaysville, Utah. Graduated from Davis High School in 1961; received Bachelor of Science degree from Brigham Young University, May 1967, with a major in Child Development and Family Relations; received Master of Science degree from Brigham Young University, May, 1969, with a major in Child Development and Family Relations; completed requirements for the Doctor of Education degree at Oklahoma State University, May, 1974.

Professional Experience: Two years as a graduate teaching assistant at Brigham Young University in the Department of Child Development and Family Relations, 1967-1969; Three years in the United States Navy as a Naval Officer trained as a jet pilot from 1969 to 1972, and also serving as Education Officer for his squadron, 1971-1972.

Professional Organizations: Phi Upsilon Omicron, and Omicron Nu, The American Home Economics Association and National Council on Family Relations.

Awards Received: Graduate Excellence Award, fall semester, 1972, Oklahoma State University; Graduate Excellence Award, spring semester, 1973, Oklahoma State University.