



OVERDUE FINES:

25¢ per day per item

RETURNING LIBRARY MATERIALS:

Place in book return to remove
charge from circulation records

~~APR 18 '81~~ 113

JAN 1 0 1996

~~JUN 16 '81~~ 158

336

~~FEB 05 '85~~

~~15 R002~~

~~DEC 20 '85~~

~~APR 11 '83~~

~~AUG 21 '86~~

7 206

014121

ABSTRACT

FATHER ABSENCE DURING CHILDHOOD, MATERIAL ATTITUDES TOWARD MEN, AND THE SEX-ROLE DEVELOPMENT OF MALE COLLEGE STUDENTS

By

Hugh Edward Jones

The purpose of the present investigation was to examine the effect of the mothers' attitudes toward men upon the masculine development of young adult males whose fathers had been absent during part of their childhood. The underlying theoretical position of the study is that the male child learns to be masculine through identifying with his father. It is further assumed that the masculine development of the child depends upon the presence of the father in the family.

The following four hypotheses were formulated: (1) Attitudes of mothers of father-absent subjects toward men are positively related to the masculinity of sex-role orientation of their sons; (2) father-absent subjects have a significantly lower mean masculinity of sex-role orientation score than father-present subjects; (3) subjects who became father-absent during the period from birth to their fifth birthday have a significantly lower mean masculinity of sex-role orientation score than subjects who became father-absent after

their fifth birthday, and (4) a significantly greater number of father-absent subjects as compared to father-present show the typically feminine pattern of intellectual functioning (verbal score higher than mathematical score).

Subjects of the study were 60 male undergraduate students at Michigan State University. Thirty of the subjects were from homes where the father had been consistently present, and thirty were from homes where the father had been absent due to divorce or separation for at least two years before the subject reached age 12. These groups were matched with respect to age, socio-economic status, number of siblings, race, and grade point average.

A list of Semantic-Differential rating scales consisting of 24 items with a high loading on the Evaluative Factor were used to assess mothers' attitudes toward men. The measures of masculinity of sex-role orientation included the Franck Drawing Completion Test, a projective technique in which the subject is asked to complete 36 drawings, and an adapted version of the Berdie Femininity Adjective Check List. The Henmon-Nelson Test of Mental Ability was used to test intellectual functioning. A Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient was used to analyze statistically the relationship between maternal attitude and masculinity while t tests were used to compare masculinity scores of father-present with father-absent subjects and early father-absent subjects with late father-absent subjects. The Chi-square test was used to

compare the frequency of occurrence in each group of the masculine and feminine patterns of intellectual functioning.

The first hypothesis of the study that positive maternal attitudes toward men would relate positively to masculine development of father-absent sons was not supported. In fact, there was a trend in the opposite direction. With the Franck Drawing Completion Test, marginal support was found for the hypotheses related to differences in masculinity of father-present and father-absent subjects and early father-absent and late-father-absent subjects. There was strong replication of previously published findings that early father-absent subjects differ significantly with respect to masculinity from father-present subjects while late father-absent subjects do not. The Adjective Check List did not discriminate between the father-present and father-absent groups. The prediction that more father-absent subjects would show the typically feminine pattern of intellectual functioning was not supported.

Additional findings include the following: (1) Mothers of father-absent subjects rated men significantly lower than did mothers of father-present subjects, and (2) Father absent subjects did not appear to be intellectually impaired by the absence of a father. Late father-absent subjects achieved significantly greater verbal and mathematical aptitude scores than did father-present and early father-absent subjects while early father-absent and father-present subjects demonstrated

almost equal achievement in these areas. With respect to father-absent subjects, it was found that the presence of an older brother was related to increased masculinity, but the presence of a stepfather functioned in the opposite direction.

It was concluded that the failure of the present study to more strongly replicate previous findings may be related to problems of theory and instrumentation. Implications of the findings were discussed and suggestions for future research made.

FATHER ABSENCE DURING CHILDHOOD, MATERNAL
ATTITUDES TOWARD MEN, AND THE SEX-ROLE
DEVELOPMENT OF MALE COLLEGE STUDENTS

By

Hugh Edward Jones

A DISSERTATION

Submitted to
Michigan State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Department of Psychology

1975

To Vernell, Gilbert, and Derrick,
for their love, support, and great
patience during my years as a "pro-
fessional student"

To Levite and Ever Lee Jones, who,
though they had little formal edu-
cation themselves, taught me its
value and sacrificed that I might
attain my educational goals

To Frances Broadhurst, whose friend-
ship and encouragement throughout
the years has been a source of great
inspiration

To the memory of Dr. Martin Luther
King, Jr., the Great Dreamer of our
day from whom I caught a glimpse of
the vision

"Free at last! Free at last!
Thank God Almighty, I'm free at
last!"

Martin L. King, Jr.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The completion of this manuscript represents the cumulative efforts of a number of people. I am especially grateful to Dr. Albert Rabin who has served both as my academic adviser and my dissertation chairman. His encouragement, guidance, ready availability, and confidence in my abilities have facilitated the completion of this undertaking. I would also like to express my gratitude to Dr. Gilbert DeRath, Dr. Gordon Williams, and Dr. Lawrence Messé, members of the committee, who offered valuable suggestions and assistance. A special thanks to Dr. Lucy Ferguson who participated in the early formulation of the study.

In many respects this has been a family and community project. My good friends, Dr. Lee June and his wife, Shirley, spent many hours scoring the Adjective Check List protocols. They have also been a consistent source of support and encouragement. My brother, Herbert Jones, and Barbara Boles, assumed responsibility for scoring the Semantic-Differential which, because of experimentation with a number of scoring techniques, proved to be a difficult task. My brother-in-law, John Thomas, has been faithful throughout the course of this research in lending a hand whenever I needed it. Others who have offered their assistance include my friends, Donald Casterline and Joseph Etua, and my brothers-in-law, David and

Matthew Thomas. My thanks to each of these persons for the contributions they have made. A special thanks to my beloved friends, Jack and Mary Ellen Lothamer, for their efforts in scoring the projective measure. Their hard work and patience during the difficult task of establishing reliability and judging drawing-completion protocols are greatly appreciated.

I also wish to thank Dr. Gerald Rosenbaum and my fellow psychology interns at Lafayette Clinic who offered helpful suggestions in analyzing and presenting the data. Dr. David Lachar and Mr. William Berman, also of the Lafayette Clinic, offered valuable statistical assistance for which I am extremely grateful.

I owe a special word of thanks to my friend, Mrs. Betty Uphaus, whose eager anticipation of typing this manuscript was a strong motivational factor to my getting it done.

A special word of thanks is due to my wife, Vernell, who has not only provided moral support but has actively participated in various aspects of this research, and to my youngsters, Gilbert and Derrick, and Pascal, for their encouragement and understanding during the preparation of this thesis.

Finally, I would like to thank my relatives and friends who have encouraged and nurtured me. I am especially grateful for all Black people of the past and the present, whose blood, sweat, and tears, have made this opportunity available to me. I trust I can be worthy of their sacrifices, and that I will utilize my skills to bring about justice, healing, and reconciliation.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES	vii
LIST OF APPENDICES	ix
INTRODUCTION	1
REVIEW OF LITERATURE	3
Freudian Theory	3
Status Envy Theory	4
Learning Theory	4
Role Theory	5
Aspects of Sex-Role Development	6
Sex-Role Orientation	6
Sex-Role Preference	7
Sex-Role Adoption	7
Effects of Father Absence upon Sex-Role Development	8
The Mother-Son Relationship and Father Absence.	12
STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM	18
HYPOTHESES	19
METHOD AND PROCEDURE	21
Description of Instruments	21
Family Background Questionnaire	21
Henmon-Nelson Test of Mental Ability	21
Measurements of Sex-Role Orientation	22
Franck Drawing Completion Test.	23
Femininity Adjective Check List	25
Semantic Differential	31
Subjects	34
Procedure	37
STATISTICAL TREATMENT OF THE DATA.	39
RESULTS.	41
Hypotheses	41
Additional Results	49

	Page
DISCUSSION	52
The Findings	52
Additional Findings	57
An Unrelated, Incidental Finding	59
Theory and Design	60
Measurement Techniques	64
Measurement of Maternal Attitude	64
Measurement of Masculinity of Sex-Role Orientation	65
Subject Variables	67
Suggestions for Future Research	70
SUMMARY.	73
APPENDICES	77
BIBLIOGRAPHY	92

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Adjectives checked significantly more by females	28
2. Adjectives checked significantly more by males	29
3. Characteristics of subjects--age, ordinal position, number of siblings, grade point average	36
4. Subjects' ages at fathers' departures.	36
5. Correlation between attitudes of mothers toward men and their sons' masculinity score (Adjective Check List)	42
6. Correlation between attitudes of mothers toward men and their sons' masculinity score (Adjective Check List--masculine adjectives only)	42
7. Correlation between attitudes of mothers toward men and their sons' masculinity score (Franck Drawing Completion Test)	43
8. A comparison of masculinity scores for father-absent and father-present subjects	44
9. A comparison of masculinity scores for early father-absent and late father-absent subjects	45
10. A comparison of masculinity scores for early father-absent, late father-absent, and father-present subjects (Franck Drawing Completion Test).	45
11. A comparison of the incidence of masculine and feminine cognitive patterns in father-absent and father-present subjects	46
12. Mean verbal and mathematical scores on Henmon-Nelson Test of Mental Ability	48

Table	Page
13. A comparison of attitudes toward men scores (Semantic Differential) of mothers of father-absent subjects and father-present subjects	50
14. Comparison of attitudes toward men scores (Semantic Differential) of mothers of father-absent subjects who remarried and those who did not remarry	50
15. Comparison of masculinity scores of father- absent subjects with older brothers and without older brothers (Franck Drawing Completion Test)	51
16. Comparison of masculinity scores of father- absent subjects with stepfathers and with- out stepfathers (Franck Drawing Completion Test)	51

LIST OF APPENDICES

APPENDIX	Page
A. Family Background Questionnaire	77
B. Responses of Males and Females to Femininity Adjective Check List--Michigan State University--1974	81
C. Femininity Adjective Check List--University of Minnesota--1955	85
D. Letter to Mothers	86
E. Directions for Semantic Differential . . .	87
F. Semantic Differential Rating Scale	89
G. Advertisement	90
H. Information Regarding Study and Informed Consent	91

INTRODUCTION

Considerable attention has been given to the importance of the mother-child relationship in personality development with comparatively little exploration of the impact of the father-child relationship upon personality development. Mothers in western industrial society have been seen as meeting the expressive needs of the family while the father's role has been that of meeting instrumental needs--providing economically for the family. Until recent years, in western society childrearing has been seen as the mother's responsibility with the father playing an insignificant role in socializing the child (Gorer, 1948). An underlying thought has been that men are not particularly interested in assuming childrearing responsibilities. "Fathering" has not been seen as an essential masculine role function whereas mothering has been considered an important aspect of the feminine role. In their review of family research between 1929-1956, Peterson and his collaborators (1959) found only eleven (11) articles pertaining to the father-child relationship but 160 dealing with the mother-child relationship. Nash's (1965) review of nineteenth century child-rearing literature demonstrates the lack of recognition of the father's role.

The increasing prevalence of fatherless families and the concomitant social, economic, and psychological problems

experienced by such families has stimulated considerable interest in the father's role. Wynn (1964) points out that the fatherless family is a source of concern in many industrialized countries. Recent reports (Herzog & Sudia, 1970) suggest that more than ten percent of the children in the United States--more than six million--live in fatherless families. Such families are especially prevalent in lower-class black communities (Moynihan, 1965).

In terms of psychological impact, there is considerable evidence that boys from fatherless homes tend to be more feminine in their sex-role orientation than boys from homes where the father is present. (Burton & Whiting, 1960; Heatherington, 1966; Leichthy, 1960; Winch, 1949). While the father's role in the masculine development of the male is of greater importance than that of the mother (Biller & Borstelmann, 1967), there is some evidence that the mother-son relationship can have either a positive or negative effect on the personality development of a boy from a fatherless home (Hilgard, Neuman, & Fisk, 1960; McCord et al., 1962; Pedersen, 1966). The mother's attitude toward masculinity and men could possibly affect the way she interacts with her son and thus affect aspects of his sex-role development. The present study represents an attempt to examine the effect of the mother's attitude toward men on her father-absent son's sex role development.

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Biller and Borstelmann (1967), in their review of the literature on masculine development discuss four theories (or hypotheses as they prefer to call them): Freudian theory, status-envy theory, learning theory, and role theory. Concurring with Bronfenbrenner (1960), they consider the latter three theories to be derivatives of Freudian theory.

Freudian Theory

Freudian (1950, 1955) theory considers the child's relationship with both parents to be an important determinant of sex-role development. During the Oedipal period, ages 3 to 5 years, the male child, wanting complete possession of his mother, begins to see the father as his aggressive competitor. Being small, weak, and helpless, the child fears that his physically powerful father will castrate him. In order to allay the castration anxiety, the boy resolves the Oedipus Complex by identifying with the aggressive father and repressing his sexual feelings for his mother. The boy then learns to be masculine through identifying with the father. According to Bronfenbrenner (1960), Freud, in his latter writings, discusses "an identification of an affectionate sort" between the boy and his father and suggests that this affectionate dependency on the father may facilitate the boy's

identification with him (Bronfenbrenner, 1960, p. 20).

Status Envy Theory

Whiting's (1959) status envy theory of identification postulates that a boy will learn to be masculine only if he perceives his father (or a father surrogate) as the primary consumer of valued resources. Biller and Borstelmann (1967) indicate that this theory can be seen as an extension of the Freudian conception of identification with the aggressor since "identification with the aggressor is the outcome of a rivalrous interaction between the child and the parent who occupies an envied status" (Bandura & Walters, 1963, p. 94).

Learning Theory

Mowrer (1950), utilizing the works of Sigmund and Anna Freud on identification, attempts to reformulate their theory into learning theory concepts. He distinguishes two mechanisms of identification, developmental and defensive. Defensive identification is similar to Freud's concept of identification with the aggressor while developmental identification is similar to anacletic identification, a Freudian concept used to explain how girls, fearing loss of love, identify with the mother.

Although Mowrer does not rule out the possibility that identification with the aggressor plays some part in masculine development, he does stress the importance of developmental identification in the sex-role development of both boys and girls. Mowrer postulates that the basis for developmental

identification is an affectional link between the parent and child motivating the child to imitate the behaviors of the parent as a way of avoiding the feeling of loss of love when the parent withholds rewards or is absent. Similar to Freudian theory, Mowrer considers the boy's initial identification to be a non-sex typed one with mother, but around age four the father becomes a greater source of reinforcement and the boy, imitating the father, becomes masculine. Similar viewpoints are expressed by other learning theorists (Sears, 1957; Stokes, 1950) who consider masculine development to be positively related to the degree of warmth and affection the father shows his son or conversely, the amount of love and respect the son has for his father.

Role Theory

Role theory, combining aspects of both Freudian and learning theory, postulates that a boy will identify with the person who is most powerful in interacting with him--who has greater control over rewards and punishments. Proponents of this theory include Brim (1955), Cottrell (1942), and Parsons (1955). Bronfenbrenner (1960) indicates that the only novel conception of role theory as presented by Parsons is that "the child identifies not with the parent as a total person, but with the reciprocal role relationship that is functioning for the child at a particular time" (Bronfenbrenner, 1960, p. 32). In Parson's view, the boy identifies with the father's instrumental role, thus becoming masculine.

As Biller and Borstelmann (1967) indicate, all of these theories stress the importance of the father-son relationship and the son imitating the father, although they have different emphasis. Freudian theory views the father as basically threatening and punitive; status-envy theory, as primary consumer of resources; learning theory, as affectionate and reinforcing; and role theory, as controller of resources. From each of these theoretical perspectives, a boy from a fatherless home would be expected to experience some difficulty in masculine development.

Aspects of Sex-Role Development

Attempts at conceptualizing different aspects of sex-role development have been made by Brown (1956), Cooley (1959), Fenichel (1945), Lynn (1959, 1962), and Miller and Swanson et al., (1960). Lynn (1959) discussed three related aspects of sex-role development: sex-role preference, sex-role adoption, and sex-role identification. Based on these earlier conceptualizations, Biller and Borstelmann (1967) described the following three aspects of sex role:

1. Sex-role orientation is part of one's self-concept--how he views himself--in that it is a person's own conscious and/or unconscious evaluation or perception of his masculinity and/or femininity. According to Biller and Borstelmann, a boy's sex-role orientation develops between ages one and three when he begins to discriminate himself as a male and to view himself positively. Perceiving himself as more similar to his father

than his mother seems to be especially important. Thus the availability of a father or other significant older male as a discriminable male object is an important prerequisite for the development of a masculine sex-role orientation. Biller (1971a) equates the concept of sex-role orientation with Kagan's (1964) concept of sex-role identity.

2. Sex-role preference "refers to an individual's relative desire to adhere to cultural prescriptions and proscriptions of the masculine and feminine role" (Biller and Borstelmann, 1967, p. 260). While sex-role orientation involves one's perception of himself, sex-role preference relates to his evaluation of certain opportunities available in his environment. This involves discrimination between socially-defined symbols of representations of sex-role and relates to preferences for certain attitudes, roles, and activities (Biller, 1971a). For the male child, the task involves developing interests in activities, toys, etc. that are considered sex appropriate.

3. Sex-role adoption relates to the way others in a society view a person's behavior in terms of masculinity and femininity. This judgment is made on the basis on an individual's publicly observable behavior, especially in social contexts. Biller (1971a) contends that sex-role adoption has many facets and warns against the danger of simply equating it with a particular behavior such as physical aggression. In assessing masculinity of adoption, he feels that one should consider "the degree of the individual's assertiveness, competitiveness, independence, and activity directed toward physical prowess and

mastery of his environment..." (Biller, 1971a) p. 9). Passivity, timidity, and dependency are behaviors which he associates with an unmasculine adoption. In contrast to sex-role orientation which is related to the individual's view of himself, sex-role adoption pertains to the way a person is perceived by other members of his society (Biller, 1971a).

Effects of Father Absence upon Sex-Role Development

A number of writers (Biller and Borstelmann, 1967; Biller, 1970; Burton and Whiting, 1961; Nash, 1965) consider the primary effect of father absence to be the retardation or distortion of normal sex-role development in boys. Utilizing theories of identification, these writers assume that the father's presence is critical in the boy's sex-role development. According to their view, a boy learns to be masculine by identifying with the father and imitating his behavior. Biller and Borstelmann (1967) present considerable evidence of the importance of the father-son relationship in masculine development. They consider a warm relationship with a masculine father to be a highly significant factor in a boy's sex-role development.

In one of the earliest studies of father absence, Sears, Pintler, and Sears (1946) examined the effects of father absence upon the aggressive behavior of three to five year old pre-school children as reflected in doll play. They found that father absent boys manifested less doll play aggression than father-present boys. Stolz and her collaborators (1954) found that 4-8 year old boys who were separated from their fathers

during the first two years of their life (due to military service) were generally regarded by their fathers as "sissies." They also found that these boys were less assertively aggressive and independent in their peer relations than boys who had not been separated from their fathers. Data in this study were collected through interviews with both parents, observation of the children in social activities with peers and adult leaders, and observation of the children in projective play activities.

In a study of four-and-five year old disadvantaged black children, Santrock (1970) found that father-absent boys exhibited less masculine and more dependent behavior in standardized doll play situations than did father-present boys. The two groups did not differ, however, in the amount of physical aggression. Maternal interviews also revealed that the father-absent boys were less aggressive as well as less masculine and more dependent than the father-present boys.

A number of studies indicate that boys who have been separated from their fathers during the pre-school years, even after the father returns, continue to be less masculine than boys whose fathers have been consistently present. Carlsmith (1964) found that among middle and upper class high school males, early father absence was related to the patterning of the College Board Aptitude scores. Contrasting the usual male pattern of math score higher than verbal score, the pattern of the father-absent subjects was more frequently the same as the female pattern: verbal score higher than math score.

Leichty (1960) studied male college students whose fathers were absent due to military service when the boys were between the ages of three to five and a matched group whose fathers were present. On the Blacky Pictures, fewer of the father-absent students said "Blacky" would like to pattern himself after his father, more often choosing "mother" or "Tippy," a sibling. This item was conceived as a projective indication of underlying sex-role orientation, the father-absent males being presumably less masculine. Biller (1970) suggests that it would be helpful to know how many of the father-absent boys in this study chose Tippy, the sibling, because this identification could also be indicative of masculine sex-role orientation.

Comparisons of the human figure drawings of father-absent and father-present boys have been made in a number of studies. Phelan (1964) found a higher rate of father absence among elementary school-age boys who drew a female first as compared to those who drew a male first. Biller (1968a) found that father-absent kindergarten boys as compared to father-present boys were significantly less likely to draw a male first or to clearly differentiate their male and female drawings. Other studies have failed to find the predicted relationship between father absence and figure drawings (Domini, 1967; Lawton & Sechrest, 1962; Tiller, 1958).

There is some evidence that there is a differential effect of father absence upon the boy's sex-role development dependent upon the age at which the absence occurs. Father absence before the age of 4 or 5 has a profound effect upon masculine

development. Heatherington (1966) found that 9-12 year old father-absent boys whose fathers left in the first four years showed considerable disruption of sex-typed behaviors while those whose fathers left after age five did not differ significantly in these behaviors from father-present youngsters. Boys who were father-absent before age four were rated by male recreation directors as more dependent, less aggressive, and as engaging in fewer physical contact games. Biller (1969a) reported similar findings. He found that father-absent five year old boys had significantly less masculine sex-role orientation (fantasy game measure) and sex-role preferences (game choices) than did father-present boys. Age differences in onset of father absence were noted, however, in that boys who became father absent before the age of four had significantly less masculine sex-role orientations than those who became father absent in their fifth year. Research by Money (1965) and Hampson (1965) also indicates that the first two or three years of life are crucial in the development of one's sex-role orientation.

Biller suggests that different aspects of sex role may not be affected in the same way by father absence. His (1968b) study of six-year-old lower class boys and of five-year-old boys (1969b) indicate that sex-role orientation (as measured by the It Scale for Children) is more affected by father absence than sex-role preference (asking the boys to name the boys they like) or sex role adoption (as rated by teachers).

There is considerable evidence (Greenstein, 1966; Miller, 1961) that there is relatively little difference among lower class adolescent father-absent and father-present boys with respect to sex role development. This may be attributed in part to earlier peer identification.

Nash (1965) and Steimel (1960) among others suggest that masculinity is related to the general amount of contact boys have with adult males. Brothers, uncles, grandparents, neighbors, teachers, and other adult males may play an important role. There is evidence that boys with brothers are more masculine than boys with sisters, especially in two-child families where the children are close in age (Biller, 1968a; Sutton-Smith, Roberts, & Rosenberg, 1964). Biller (1968a) has demonstrated that the presence of an older brother lessens the effects of father absence, but it does not completely compensate for the presence of a father, a more important factor in masculine sex-role development.

The Mother-Son Relationship and Father Absence

There is considerable evidence (Grunebaum et al., 1962; Helper, 1955; Sears, 1953) that in intact homes maternal attitudes toward the father are important in the personality development of the children. In a study of boys who were academic underachievers, Grunebaum et al. found that the mother's perceptions of their husbands as inadequate and incompetent was a contributing factor. Pauline Sears (1953) reported that kindergarten boys who adopted a feminine rather than a masculine

role in doll play had mothers who were critical of their husbands.

Biller (1971b) suggests that the mother-son relationship can have either a positive or a negative effect on the father-absent boy's sex-role and personality development. Bach (1946) reported that mothers may mediate the father's absence to the child through "father-typing." He defined "father-typing" as the personality characterizations of the father that mothers represent to the child, e.g., "Your father is a hard and mean man;" "Your father is kind and generous." Bach was able to show differences in young children's father fantasies as a function of father-typing. McCord, McCord, and Thurber (1962) found that the presence of a disturbed or rejecting mother was related to various behavior problems (sexual anxiety, regressive behavior, and criminal acts) in father-absent boys, but such problems were less frequent among boys whose mothers were apparently well-adjusted.

Pedersen's (1966) study of military families presents evidence suggesting that psychologically healthy mothers may be able to counteract the effects of father-absence. Mothers of a group of emotionally disturbed 11 to 15 year old boys were found to be significantly more disturbed (as measured by the MMPI) than mothers of a similar group of non-disturbed children. Both the disturbed and non-disturbed groups had experienced relatively extensive father absence, but it was only in the disturbed group that degree of father absence was related to level of maladjustment (as measured by the Rogers

Scale of Adjustment).

Biller (1971b) emphasizes the importance of the mother describing the absent father's masculinity in positive terms, i.e. general competence, strength, and physical competency. He warns that depreciation of the father's masculinity might cause the child to act in an unmasculine manner. Biller writes:

"It is assumed that the mother can, by reinforcing specific responses and expecting masculine behavior, increase the boy's perception of the incentive value of the masculine role. This, in turn, would seem to promote a positive view of males as salient and powerful, thus motivating the boy to imitate their behavior." (Biller, 1971, p. 236).

Biller (1971b) and others (Dai, 1953; Kardiner & Ovesey, 1951) are especially critical of lower class black matriarchal families where, they maintain, maleness and masculinity have relatively low value. Commenting on the lower-class black matriarchal family, Kardiner and Ovesey state, "The greatest damage to the group as a whole is done by the injury in the boy's mental life to his parental ideal. He never hears the father's role lauded--only condemned" (1951, p. 347). There is considerable evidence suggesting that lower-class father-absent black males suffer more than father-absent whites in terms of their sex-role orientations (Barclay & Cusumano, 1967; Biller, 1968b). One could argue, however, that the stereotype view of masculine sex-role orientation as defined by the predominant white culture is inappropriate for blacks. A redefinition of masculinity from the perspective of the black experience thus may be indicated. In addition, the generalization

that lower class black women present men so negatively is a questionable one that may be based more upon racial bias and stereotypes than upon empirical data.

The mother's feelings about masculinity and men in general can greatly influence the mother-son relationship and may determine in part, how the mother responds to her son's masculine strivings. Biller (1971b) postulates the following: "The degree to which a mother perceives her son as similar to his father is related to the boy's behavioral and physical characteristics as well as to particular maternal attitudes" (p. 229). That is, if the son either strongly resembles or is perceived by the mother as resembling the father behaviorally and physically, the mother would be more likely to expect his behavior to approximate that of the father than if there were little father-son resemblance.

The mother's attitude toward the absent father can be influenced considerably by the reason for his absence. Benson (1968) found that it was easier for a mother to talk positively about a husband who had died than one who had deserted her. It becomes difficult for the mother to present the father positively in light of the conflict and competition concerning the children that often is associated with divorce or separation.

Among the factors that affect the extent of the influence of maternal attitudes toward the absent father are the father-child relationship prior to father absence and the child's age when the father leaves. Biller, (1971a) provides the following

example: "...the father-absent boy who has had a positive relationship with his father up until ten years of age is less likely to be influenced by negative maternal views concerning the father than the boy who was paternally deprived even before his father's absence." (Biller, 1971a p. 84)

Biller (1971a) contends that a mother can facilitate her son's sex-role development by having a positive attitude toward the absent father and males in general, and by consistently encouraging masculine behavior in her son. Parental reactions to aggressive and assertive behavior have been found to influence the personality development of boys from intact homes. Sears, Alpert, and Rau (1965) found that parents who permitted and accepted aggressive and assertive behavior in their preschool-age sons had highly masculine sons. In contrast, restrictive, autocratic parents produced sons who were passive, conforming, and dependent.

With father-absent boys, maternal encouragement of masculine behavior appears to be particularly important. In a study of kindergarten boys, Biller (1969b) assessed maternal encouragement of masculine behavior with a multiple choice questionnaire. He found maternal encouragement of masculine behavior to be significantly related to the father-absent boy's masculinity which was assessed by a game preference measure and a multidimensional rating scale completed by teachers. Father-absent boys whose mothers accepted reinforced assertive, independent, and aggressive behavior were more masculine than

father-absent boys whose mothers discouraged these behaviors. Maternal encouragement for masculine behavior was not significantly related to masculine development of father-present boys.

In a later study, Biller and Bahm (1971) found that the degree of perceived maternal encouragement for masculine behavior was highly related to the masculinity of junior high school boys who had been father-absent since before the age of five. A Q-sort procedure was used to assess perceived maternal encouragement for aggressive behavior while an adjective check list was used to assess their masculinity. Those boys who perceived their mothers as encouraging assertive and aggressive behavior had much more masculine self-concepts than those who perceived their mothers as discouraging such behavior.

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

Although previous research has demonstrated that the mother-son relationship can have either a positive or negative effect upon the boy's sex role and personality development (Biller, 1970), and there have been some data suggesting that the mother's attitude toward the absent father may affect the personality development of males, to date there has been no systematic, empirical investigation of how the mother's attitude toward the father affects the sex-role development of the male child. This is the problem to which the present study addresses itself. However, rather than looking specifically at how the mother feels toward the absent father, the decision has been made to assess how the mother feels about men in general. We can assume that the mother's attitude toward men is a reflection of her attitude toward her son's father. It is felt that participants in the study will be less threatened by and more open in sharing their feelings about "men in general" than they would in responding specifically to questions about their husbands or ex-husbands.

Biller (1970) in his overview of previous research on fatherless boys, suggests that sex-role orientation, rather than sex-role preference or sex-role adoption, is most affected by father absence. Sex-role orientation has been defined as part of one's self-concept--one's conscious or unconscious

perception of his masculinity or femininity. Following Biller's suggestion, in this study, we shall examine specifically the impact of the mother's attitude toward men upon the sex-role orientation of father-absent males.

HYPOTHESES

Biller (1969b) found that in father-absent families, mothers who accepted and reinforced aggressive and assertive behavior appeared to have much more masculine sons than mothers who discouraged such behavior. Similarly, it seems reasonable to assume that the mother's attitude toward men in general and masculinity could affect the sex-role development of her son. One would expect that a mother could facilitate her father-absent son's sex-role development by having a positive attitude toward men. In all likelihood, such a mother would encourage her son's masculine strivings such as assertiveness, aggressiveness, and independence. On the other hand, it might be expected that a mother who had negative attitudes toward men would discourage such masculine behaviors.

Hypothesis I: Attitudes of mothers of father absent subjects towards men will be positively related to the masculinity of sex-role orientation of their sons.

Biller's reviews (1970, 1971a) present considerable evidence that the sex-role development of boys from fatherless homes is disrupted.

Hypothesis II: Father-absent subjects will have a significantly lower mean masculinity of sex-role orientation score than father present subjects.

As indicated in the review of the literature, father absence before the age of four or five appears to have a profound effect upon masculine development (Biller, 1970). The following hypothesis basically replicates the work of Heatherington (1966), Biller (1969b), and Biller and Bahm (1971).

Hypothesis III: Subjects who became father-absent during the period from birth to their fifth birthday have a significantly lower mean masculinity of sex-role orientation score than subjects who became father-absent after their fifth birthday.

Carlsmith (1964) found that early and long separation from the father results in greater ability in verbal areas than in mathematics while no separation produced relatively greater ability in mathematics. She also found that late, brief separations often produced an extreme elevation in mathematical ability, but this finding was not as reliable as her earlier finding. Based on Carlsmith's findings, the following prediction was made:

Hypothesis IV: A significantly greater number of father-absent subjects as compared to father-present show the typically feminine pattern of intellectual functioning, (verbal score higher than mathematics score).

METHOD

Description of Instruments

Family Background Questionnaire

Biller (1970) found that a number of factors such as grade level, age, social class, age at which father absence began, and sibling distribution could contribute to differences in sex-role development. Therefore, in the present study an attempt was made to control such variables by matching father-absent and father-present groups as closely as possible. A Family Background Questionnaire (Appendix A) developed by this investigator was administered to all participants in the study as a means of assessing some of these variables.

Henmon-Nelson Tests of Mental Ability

Intelligence level has also been reported by Biller (1970) as a variable affecting sex-role development. In the present study university grade point averages were used as a means of matching father-absent and father-present groups on this variable. In order to test hypothesis four regarding the differential patterning of verbal and quantitative scores for father-absent and father-present subjects, the Henmon-Nelson Tests of Mental Ability, College Level--Form B was used. This test yields both a Quantitative and a Verbal score as well as a

total IQ score.

The Henmon-Nelson contains 100 items arranged in order of increasing difficulty. The College Level form is designed for use with students from the freshman year of college through the first year of graduate school. The test is appropriate for group administration with instructions given only once at the beginning of the 40-minute testing period. A self-marking answer sheet with a carbon panel that transfers students' answers to a scoring page inside the answer sheet was used. The carbon mark for a correct response falls within a printed box located on the scoring page; all carbon marks falling outside the boxes are incorrect.

The Henmon-Nelson IQ scores correlate highly with achievement test scores and teachers' grades. "The median coefficient for total achievement battery scores versus IQ is .79 (range .64 to .85). Average grades and IQ produced a median r of .60 with a range of .09 to .74" (Lefever, 1959, p. 342). The ease of administration and scoring, the appropriateness for group administration, and the fact that the test yields both verbal and quantitative scores made it very attractive for the purposes of this study.

Measurements of Sex-Role Orientation

An important dimension of sex-role development is sex-role orientation, one's perception of his own relative masculinity or femininity. Although a necessary concept, sex-role orientation has proven to be difficult to define and to measure

(Biller, 1971a). Self-descriptive techniques such as adjective check lists appear to be a particularly appropriate way of measuring self-perceptions of masculinity-femininity (Biller and Bahm, 1970; Heilbrun, 1965). Biller (1971a) writes, "... sex-role orientation is not easily measurable in many individuals because of their defensiveness and/or adherence to social expectations. Thus, special indirect or projective situations (such as drawings, fantasy, play, and TAT-like responses) have often been used so that the individual may express sex-role inclinations which might otherwise be constrained by social and conscious self-expectations" (Biller, 1971a) p. 10).

Two measures, one projective and one direct, of sex-role orientation were utilized in this study: the Franck Drawing Completion Test and the Femininity Adjective Check List.

1. Franck Drawing Completion Test

The Franck Drawing Completion Test contains thirty-six simple geometric figures which the subject elaborates in any manner he wishes. Criteria for analyzing both style and content of drawings have been developed by Franck.

In their pretest, Franck and Rosen (1949) found that men were more likely to expand the area of the original figure, to close objects that were open, to draw angular shapes, protrusions, and unsupported lines. Women, on the other hand, tended to elaborate internal spaces and to draw open objects--rounded and blunted shapes, and supported lines. They also found that men tended to draw "active" objects such as

automobiles and fountains that filled most of the drawing space while women drew passive objects such as furniture and interiors of homes. Norms for citizens of eight countries are cited in Franck's scoring manual. In each sample, the groups of men differed significantly from and in the same direction from the groups of women. After training, scoring differences between scorers were low with the reliability coefficients ranging from .84 to .90.

Franck's test has been used successfully in measuring sex-role orientation by Miller and Swanson (1960) and Biller and Barry (1971). The fact that it is not significantly related to the following verbal tests of masculinity and femininity: the Terman-miles Attitude Interest Analysis Test (1936), the M-F scale of the MMPI (1943), and the M-F scale of the Strong Vocational Interest Blank (1945) suggests that it measures something other than attitudes and interests--conscious sex identity. Franck and Rosen (1949) also contend that their Drawing Completion Test also has the advantage of being relatively unrelated to the experience of the two sexes.

In the present study, two raters* were trained to score the Franck Drawing Completion Test. Based on a well-defined scoring system developed by Franck, each drawing was scored either masculine or feminine. After the training period, the raters were asked to score three sets of five tests not used in the study. The percentage of agreement between them was 83, 84, and 86 respectively on the three trials with a mean

*These raters were Jack and Mary Ellen Lothamer.

agreement of 84.3. The subjects' drawings were subsequently randomly distributed to them, and they were not aware of any demographic information about the subjects. The score derived indicates the number of drawings completed in the masculine and in the feminine manner and could range from 0 to 36 in either direction. The masculine score was interpreted as a measure of masculinity of sex-role orientation.

2. Femininity Adjective Check List

The "Femininity Adjective Check List" developed by Ralph Berdie (1959) is the second measure of sex-role orientation used in the present study. Berdie developed the list by reviewing Gough's Adjective Check List (Gough, 1955) and other adjectives that had been found to be related to masculinity/femininity scores on the Strong Vocational Interest Blank, the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory, and the California Psychological Inventory. The Check List contained 148 adjectives including the following: active, assertive, athletic, curious, emotional, foresighted, independent, nervous, sensitive, submissive, tough, warm, and worried.

The Femininity Adjective Check List was standardized on a sample of 600 students who were asked to complete the check list in the summer of 1955 prior to their matriculation as freshmen at the University of Minnesota. The standardization sample included 200 women freshmen in the College of Science, Literature, and the Arts (SLA), 200 male freshmen from the same college, and 200 male freshmen from the Institute of

Technology (IT). The 200 SLA men and the 200 IT men were divided randomly into two groups of 100, with 100 of the SLA men and 100 of the IT men being included in the standardization groups. The other male groups were considered the non-standardization groups. Thus the 100 SLA men and the 100 IT men were combined and compared to the 200 SLA women. These subjects were given the list five times with different instructions. Initially, they were instructed to check those adjectives which they thought applied to themselves. In analyzing item response frequencies on these self-descriptions for the male and female groups, 15 items were found to be checked more by men than by women at the .05 level of significance, and 46 items were checked significantly more often by the women. Thus, 61 of the 148 items significantly differentiated the male and female groups.

The scoring scale adopted gives positive weights of one to the 46 items checked significantly more often by females and a negative weight of one to the items checked significantly more often by males. (See Appendix C for differentiating adjectives). The scores, therefore, could possibly range from 46--the most feminine score to -15, the most masculine score. The scale is called a "femininity scale" rather than a "masculinity scale" since most of the items which determine the score are items which are marked more characteristically by women than by men.

For the standardization group, the mean score for the 200

SLA women was 16.7, and the mean scores for the male groups were 7.9 for SLA men and 7.7 for IT men. The women's scores ranged from 0 to 31 while the scores of the men ranged from -6 to 28. In 1957, another group of entering freshmen were tested, and the women received a mean score of 15.6 while the SLA men received a mean score of 9.1 and the IT men, a mean score of 8.1. A group of 43 homosexual men tested in 1957 received a mean score of 18.9.

Berdie (1959) reports high test-retest reliability ($r=.81$) and higher inter-scale correlations which suggest that the scale is reliable enough for the kinds of group research for which it was developed. Correlations between the Check List and the masculinity scores on the Strong Blank and the MMPI are positive and statistically significant.

Since a number of social and political changes have taken place which could possibly have affected how masculinity and femininity are defined since the Femininity Adjective Check List was standardized in 1955, the decision was made to establish more contemporary norms by administering the instrument to students currently enrolled at Michigan State University. The Check List was administered to 130 male and 160 female undergraduate students in introductory psychology courses. Of the 148 adjectives on the Check List, 21 were found to be checked significantly more at the .05 level by men and 13 were checked significantly more by women. Table I lists the adjectives checked more by males while Table II lists those checked significantly more by females.

TABLE I

Adjectives checked significantly more by females

Adjective	Males (n=130)	Females (n=160)	Chi-Square
1. Affectionate	87	135	12.17*
2. Cheerful	71	106	4.08***
3. Curious	87	125	4.58***
4. Determined	67	110	8.93*
5. Emotional	61	111	14.98*
6. Feminine	2	117	151.91*
7. Flirtatious	25	55	9.16*
8. Gentle	84	115	43.08*
9. Graceful	17	51	14.12*
10. Sensitive	87	139	16.60*
11. Sentimental	69	119	14.28*
12. Gracious	35	72	10.07*
13. Submissive	13	33	6.07**

* $p < .01$
 ** $p < .02$
 *** $p < .05$

TABLE II

Adjectives checked significantly more by males

Adjective	Males (n=130)	Females (n=160)	Chi-Square
1. Athletic	77	52	20.75*
2. Clever	66	54	8.56*
3. Distrustful	35	20	9.71*
4. Enterprising	41	28	7.80*
5. Foresighted	59	45	9.29*
6. Insightful	65	59	5.05***
7. Logical	100	92	12.09*
8. Masculine	90	1	156.78*
9. Methodical	43	33	5.75**
10. Rational	102	103	6.87*
11. Reckless	13	6	4.58***
12. Rough	20	6	11.90*
13. Self-controlled	84	82	5.23***
14. Sharp-witted	40	30	5.66**
15. Straightforward	80	73	7.29*
16. Suspicious	50	39	6.69*
17. Shrewd	27	11	7.64*
18. Tough	29	9	8.57*
19. Unaffected	16	9	4.05***
20. Unemotional	17	6	7.43*
21. Virile	44	3	53.99*

*p<.01
 **p<.02
 ***p<.05

It is interesting to note that now only 34 adjectives differentiate males and females whereas in Berdie's study there were 61. In Berdie's study, 46 adjectives were checked significantly more by females while only 13 were checked significantly more by them in the present study. In Berdie's study, 15 adjectives were checked significantly more by males, but that number increased to 21 in the present study.

The Femininity Adjective Check List was chosen for use in the present study because it provides an easily obtainable index of psychological masculinity and femininity; it is easily administered and scored, and because it has been demonstrated to have some internal validity and to be reliable. The score derived by each subject was considered as a "masculinity of sex-role orientation" score.

In the present study the Adjective Check List was scored by assigning a positive weight of one to each adjective checked in the masculine direction. That is, a positive weight of one was assigned to each of the 21 masculine adjectives checked and to each of the 13 feminine adjectives not checked. No score was assigned to feminine adjectives that were checked. The scores, therefore, could range from 0--no adjectives checked in the masculine direction--to 34--all adjectives checked in the masculine direction. In addition, the check list was scored also for number of masculine adjectives checked, number of feminine adjectives checked, and by Berdie's system described above. The score derived by each subject was

considered as a "masculinity of sex-role orientation" score.

Semantic Differential

It has been demonstrated that the mother's evaluation of the father is of critical significance in the personality development of boys from fatherless homes (Biller, 1971). Bach (1946), Diamond (1957), and Neubauer (1960) present clinical cases that dramatically illustrate the way in which a mother's consistent negative comments about the absent father can cause the son to develop a negative self-concept and maladaptive behavior. In the present study, it was hypothesized specifically that the mother's attitude toward men was related to the development of her son's sex-role orientation. The Semantic Differential (Osgood, 1952) was used to assess the mother's attitude toward men. A list of semantic differential scales (Appendix F) with detailed instructions (Appendix E) and an accompanying cover letter (Appendix D) explaining the purpose of the study was mailed to the mother of each participant. The Semantic Differential was also administered to the subjects themselves as a safeguard in the event that the return rate from mothers had been unsatisfactory. Subjects were instructed to respond as they thought their mothers would.

The Semantic Differential was developed initially by Osgood (1952) as a technique for measuring the meaning of concepts, but it has also proved to be a valuable tool in personality research (Osgood et al., 1957). The Semantic Differential is essentially a combination of controlled association and scaling procedure. In the present study, for example,

the mother of each subject was provided with the concepts "men" and "women" which she was asked to evaluate on a set of bipolar adjectival scales. She was asked to indicate for each item (pairing of a concept with a scale) the direction of her association and its intensity on a seven point scale. Although the study required only the mothers' attitudes toward men, it was the thinking of the writer that mothers would feel more comfortable about rating both "men" and "women" rather than rating only "men." Having them rate both groups also made the purpose of the study less obvious. The scales for "men" and "women" were counterbalanced in order to prevent position set.

In factor analyzing Semantic Differential data, Osgood et al., (1957) found three major factors: (1) Activity, (2) Evaluation, and (3) Potency. For the purpose of measuring the mother's attitude toward men, twenty-four scales with a high loading on Osgood's Evaluation factor were selected. Since all of the scales represent the same factor, they were alternated in a polarity direction (e.g. fair--unfair but worthless--valuable) as suggested by Osgood et al., (1957) as a way of preventing the formation of position preferences. The concept to be rated appeared at the top of the page.

Each of the positions on the Semantic Differential scale was assigned a digit of +3 to -3 with the positive values assigned to a positive judgment, a negative value assigned to a negative judgment, and zero assigned to a neutral judgment. For example:

Fair $\overline{+3}$: $\overline{+2}$: $\overline{+1}$: $\overline{0}$: $\overline{-1}$: $\overline{-2}$: $\overline{-3}$: Unfair

Use of the neutral position was discouraged unless absolutely necessary.

Since there were 24 scales on which judgments were to be made, a subject's score could range from +72--all positives--to -72--all negatives. The score derived from this instrument was considered as reflecting the mother's attitude toward men.

Subjects

Subjects of the study were a group of sixty (60) undergraduate students at Michigan State University. Thirty of the subjects were from homes where the father had been consistently present while the other 30 were from homes where, due to divorce or separation, the father was out of the home for at least two years before they were age 12. All of the father-present and approximately one-half of the father-absent subjects were enrolled in introductory psychology courses and volunteered to participate in the study in order to fulfill the research participation requirement for these courses. These students signed up on sheets provided by the investigator to indicate their interest in the study. The complete battery of tests was administered to approximately 120 students who volunteered for the study. Subsequent examination of the data revealed that about 30 of them did not meet the criteria for the study. Therefore letters were sent to the mothers of ninety of these students--70 father present and 20 father-absent. Sixty-two of the letters sent to the mothers of father-present boys were returned while all 20 of those sent to mothers of father-absent boys were returned.

The other 20 father-absent boys responded to a classified ad placed in the university newspaper (See Appendix G). A total of 23 subjects were recruited through the ad, but only 18 mothers returned the rating scales. Thus, there was a total of 38 complete protocols for father-absent subjects.

Of these, eight were eliminated for various reasons including the following: (1) father's absence was due to circumstances other than divorce or separation (usually death); (2) father left after the son was age 12, and (3) there was not a two-year period during which no adult male figure was in the home.

The father-absent and father-present groups were matched closely for race, socio-economic status, age, number of siblings, grade point average. (See Table 3) The father-present group ranged in age from 17 to 23 with a mean age of 19.66 while the father-absent group ranged from 17 to 29 with a mean age of 20.16. The mean grade point average was 2.89 for the father-present group and 2.91 for the father-absent group. The father-present group had an average of 2.5 siblings while the mean number of siblings for the father-absent groups was 2.2.

The father-absent group was subdivided into two groups, early father-absent (N=14) and late father absent (N=16). The early father-absent group ranged in age from 6 months to 5 years (mean + 2.25 years) when their fathers left the family. The late father-absent group ranged from 5 years to 12 years with a mean of 8.35 years. (See Table 4) Of the father-absent subjects, 13 came from homes where the mother had remarried. For those from homes where the mother had remarried, the average length of father-absence was 4.5 years. Sixteen of the fathers had remarried.

TABLE 3

Characteristics of Subjects--Age, Ordinal
Position, Number of Siblings, Grade Point Average*

	<u>Father-Present</u>	<u>Father-Absent</u>
Mean Age	19.66	20.16
Mean Number of Siblings	2.5	2.2
Oldest Child	8	6
Only Child	2	5
Second or Third Child	17	15
Fourth Child or More	3	4
Mean Grade Point Average	2.89	2.91

*No significant differences

TABLE 4

Subjects' Ages at Fathers' Departures

	<u>N</u>	<u>Range</u>	<u>Mean</u>
Early Father Absence	14	6 mos.-5 years	2.25 years
Late Father Absence	16	5-12 years	8.35 years

Procedure

Several one and one-half hour testing sessions were held. During the initial part of the sessions, subjects were given a written explanation of the purpose of the study and a statement of informed consent (Appendix H) which they were asked to read and to sign before they were allowed to participate in the study. They were informed of the need to assess their mother's attitudes toward "men" and "women." A copy of the letter that would be sent to parents and a copy of the form she would be asked to respond to were shown to potential participants.

The following battery of tests were administered during the sessions: (1) Family Background Questionnaire; (2) Henmon-Nelson Test of Mental Ability; (3) Femininity Adjective Check List, and (4) the Semantic Differential. Standardized instructions were used with the Henmon-Nelson. On the Femininity Adjective Check List, subjects were asked to check those adjectives which applied to themselves while on the Semantic Differential they were asked to rate men and women on the various scales as they thought their mothers would.

A letter explaining the study (Appendix I) and copies of the Semantic Differential along with a stamped, self-addressed envelope were mailed to the mother of each person participating in the study. They were encouraged to complete and to return the forms immediately. If letters were not returned within three weeks of the mailing date, a follow-up letter was sent. Each Semantic Differential sent was coded with numbers so that

the investigator could identify them without the respondent's signature.

Based on the information gained from the Family Background Questionnaire, subjects meeting the aforementioned criteria for father-absence were identified. They were closely matched for age, grade level, I.Q., social class, and sibling distribution with a father-present group.

STATISTICAL TREATMENT OF THE DATA

Since Hypothesis 1 predicted that there would be a relationship between maternal attitude and masculinity of sex-role orientation, a Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient (r) was used to test this hypothesis.

The t ratio or Student's t was used to test Hypothesis 2 related to mean differences in masculinity of sex-role orientation scores of father-absent and father-present subjects. It was also used with Hypothesis 3 where mean scores of early father-absent and late father-absent subjects were compared. This statistical procedure is especially appropriate in a study such as the present one where N 's are small. Because both hypotheses were directional, one tailed tests were utilized.

Chi-square (χ^2) was used to analyze Hypothesis 4 related to frequency of the typically masculine pattern of intellectual functioning, math higher than verbal, as compared with the typically feminine pattern, verbal higher than math. Justification of this test was based on the dichotomous nature of the data, and because it is a non-parametric statistical technique.

A chance probability level of .10 was selected as appropriate for the discussion of these data. Generally the .05 level is interpreted as an appropriate "significance" cut-off for research, but because of the preliminary nature of the

data, it was the investigator's judgment that the .10 level should be employed. Any findings must be interpreted cautiously.

RESULTS

Hypothesis I:

Hypothesis 1 predicted that there would be a positive relationship between the attitudes of mothers of father-absent subjects toward men and the masculinity of sex-role orientation of their sons. This hypothesis was not supported either with the Franck Drawing Completion Test or with the Adjective Check List. In fact, on both measures the results were in the opposite direction to what had been predicted. A negative relationship between positive maternal attitude toward men and masculinity of sex-role orientation was found for father-absent subjects. In the regular scoring of the Adjective Check List (scoring in the masculine direction), a Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient of $-.27$ was obtained. (See Table 5) This value is almost significant at the $.10$ level of confidence. When scoring the Adjective Check List for the number of masculine adjectives checked, a correlation coefficient of $-.31$ which is significant beyond the $.10$ level of confidence was produced. (Table 6)

TABLE 5

Correlation between Attitudes of
Mothers toward Men and Their Sons'
Masculinity Score (Adjective Check List)

	<u>N</u>	<u>r</u>	<u>P</u>
Father-Absent	30	-.27	N.S.
Father-Present	30	.05	N.S.
Total	60	-.08	N.S.

TABLE 6

Correlation between Attitudes of Mothers toward
Men and Their Sons' Masculinity Score (Adjective
Check List-Masculine Adjectives Only)

	<u>N</u>	<u>r</u>	<u>P</u>
Father-Absent	30	-.31	p<.10*
Father-Present	30	-.002	N.S.
Total	60	-.15	N.S.

Similarly, with the Franck, Drawing Completion Test, a correlation of -.21 was obtained, indicating a negative relationship (though not statistically significant) between maternal attitude and masculinity of sex-role orientation.

*Two-tailed t test

TABLE 7

Correlation between Attitudes of Mothers
toward Men and Their Sons' Masculinity
Score (Franck Drawing Completion Test)

	<u>N</u>	<u>r</u>	<u>P</u>
Father-Absent	30	-.21	N.S.
Father-Present	30	.29	p<.10
Total	60	.09	N.S.

It is interesting to note that with the Adjective Check List the correlation coefficient with the Semantic Differential for the father-present subjects is miniscule ($\underline{r} = .05$ and $.002$) indicating almost no relationship while with the Franck, there is a marginally significant positive relation between maternal attitude and masculinity of sex-role orientation ($\underline{r} = .29$, $p < .10$).

The coefficient of correlation between the Adjective Check List and the Franck is .287 which is slightly above the .10 level of confidence.

Hypothesis II:

It was hypothesized that father-absent subjects would have a significantly lower mean masculinity of sex-role orientation score than father-present subjects. Although the mean scores were in the predicted direction for both the Franck and the Adjective Check List (Table 8, the difference reached statistical significance only for the Franck. A one-tailed \underline{t}

test of the Franck means produced a value of 1.414 which is significant beyond the .10 level of confidence. Thus, hypothesis two was marginally confirmed with the Franck. On the other hand, with the Adjective Check List a statistically insignificant t value of .689 was obtained.

TABLE 8

A Comparison of Masculinity Scores
for Father-Absent (FA) and
Father-Present (FP) Subjects

	<u>FP</u>	<u>FA</u>	<u>t</u>	<u>P</u>
Franck	19.96	18.56	1.414	$p < .10$
Adjective Check List	13.83	13.26	.689	N.S.

Hypothesis III

In hypothesis 3 it was postulated that subjects who became father-absent before age 5 would have a significantly lower mean masculinity of sex-role orientation score than subjects who became father-absent after their fifth birthday. With the Franck, there was a trend in support of this hypothesis which was marginally significant. A one-tailed t test produced a value of 1.278 which is significant slightly above the .10 level of confidence ($p < .11$). (Table 9) In contrast, with the Adjective Check List the means were almost equal with the early father-absent subjects' score being slightly higher than that of the late father-absent.

TABLE 9

A Comparison of Masculinity Scores
for Early Father-Absent (EFA) and
Late Father-Absent (LFA) Subjects

	<u>EFA</u>	<u>LFA</u>	<u>t</u>	<u>P</u>
Franck	17.6	19.4	1.278	p<.11
Adjective Check List	14.0	13.8	.140	N.S.

The data also indicate (Table 10) that with the Franck, early father-absent subjects had a significantly lower ($t = 2.33$; $p < .01$) masculinity score than father-present subjects while late father-absent subjects did not differ significantly from father-present subjects. ($t = .44$, $p = n.s.$) Both t -tests were one-tailed since the hypothesis was directional.

TABLE 10

A Comparison of Masculinity Scores for Early
Father-Absent (EFA), Late Father-Absent, and
Father-Present (FP) Subjects (Franck Drawing Completion Test)

<u>Father-Present</u>	<u>Early Father-Absent</u>	<u>t</u>	<u>P</u>
19.96	17.6	2.33	$p < .01$
<u>Father-Present</u>	<u>Late Father Absent</u>		
19.96	19.4	.44	N.S.

Hypothesis IV:

Hypothesis 4 stated that more of the father-absent subjects would show the more typically feminine pattern of intellectual functioning with verbal score higher than mathematics

score than would father-present subjects. This hypothesis was not supported as demonstrated in Table 11. In fact, a larger number of the father-present subjects (N=18) showed the more feminine pattern than did father-absent subjects (N=14).

TABLE 11
A Comparison of the Incidence of Masculine
and Feminine Cognitive Patterns in Father-Absent
and Father-Present Subjects

	Verbal Higher than Math (Feminine)	Math Higher than Verbal (Masculine)	Chi Square	P
Father Absent	14	16	N.C.*	
Father Present	<u>18</u>	<u>12</u>		
Total	32	28		
Early Father Absent	8	6	1.16	N.S.
Late Father Absent	<u>6</u>	<u>10</u>		
Total	14	16		
Early Father Absent	8	6	.0315	N.S.
Father Present	<u>18</u>	<u>12</u>		
Total	26	18		
Late Father Absent	6	10	2.12	N.S.
Father Present	<u>18</u>	<u>12</u>		
Total	24	22		

*Not computed, frequencies in wrong direction

Since Carlesmith (1964) suggests that early and long father-absence is more associated with the typically feminine

pattern than late, brief separations, the data were further analyzed to determine whether those who had become father-absent before age five showed this pattern significantly more than those who became father-absent after age 5. Table 11 shows that the data are in the predicted direction, but the obtained chi-square of 1.16 is not significant. Table 11 also shows that neither the early father-absent nor the late father-absent group showed this pattern significantly more than the father-present group.

Table 12 demonstrates that only father-present and early father-absent subjects had sizable differences in their mean verbal and math scores with verbal higher than math. The difference for the total father absent group was negligible (-.27) while the late father-absent had math slightly higher than verbal (1.25). Although not statistically significant, what is striking is the difference in the mean math and verbal scores for the father-present and father-absent groups. The mean math score for the father-present subjects is 73.62 while it is 78.59 for the father-absent group. Similarly, the mean verbal score for the father-present subjects is 75.82 while it is 78.87 for the father-absent subjects. Differences between mean math and verbal scores for the early father-absent and late father-absent subjects are considerable but reach statistical significance only for the math scores ($t = 1.665$; $p < .05$). Late father-absent subjects also differ

TABLE 12
Mean Verbal and Mathematical Scores on Henmon-Nelson
Test of Mental Ability

	<u>Father-Present</u>	<u>Father-Absent</u>	<u>t</u>	<u>P</u>
Math	73.62	78.59	1.045	N.S.
Verbal	<u>75.82</u>	<u>78.86</u>	.632	N.S.
Math minus Verbal	-2.2*	-.27*		
	<u>Early Father-Absent</u>	<u>Late Father-Absent</u>		
Math	73.71	83.13	1.665	p<.05**
Verbal	<u>75.64</u>	<u>81.88</u>	.901	N.S.
Math minus Verbal	-1.93*	1.25*		
	<u>Father-Present</u>	<u>Early Father-Absent</u>		
Math	73.62	73.71	.017	N.S.
Verbal	<u>75.82</u>	<u>75.64</u>	.030	
Math minus Verbal	-2.2*	-1.93*		
	<u>Father-Present</u>	<u>Late Father-Absent</u>		
Math	73.62	83.13	1.701	p<.10***
Verbal	<u>75.82</u>	<u>81.88</u>	1.049	N.S.
Math Minus Verbal	-2.2*	1.25*		

*No significant difference.

**One-tailed t test

***Two-tailed t test

significantly from father-present subjects in math. Early father-absent and father-present performed almost identically in both areas. Late father-absent subjects received the highest scores in verbal as well as mathematical aptitude.

Additional Results

An interesting finding in the study is the difference in the mean scores on the Semantic Differential of the mothers of father-absent subjects as compared to those of father-present subjects. Table 13 shows that the mean score for mothers of father-absent subjects is 20.9 while the mean score for mothers of father-present subjects is 37.8. A t score of 3.577 was obtained with a probability beyond the .001 level of confidence. These data suggest that mothers who had divorced or separated from their husbands at some point were much more negative about men than mothers whose marriages had remained intact.

TABLE 13

A Comparison of Attitude Toward Men Scores
(Semantic Differential) of Mothers of Father-Absent
Subjects and Father-Present Subjects

	<u>N</u>	<u>Range</u>	<u>Mean Score</u>	<u>t</u>	<u>P</u>
Father-Absent	30	-24 to 60	20.9	3.557	p<.001*
Father-Present	30	5 to 72	37.8		

*Two-tailed t test.

In order to ascertain whether the attitudes toward men of the mothers of father-absent subjects were affected by their subsequent experiences with men, the mean scores of those who had been remarried and those who had remained single were obtained (Table 14). These data indicate that women who had subsequently remarried rated men less positively ($\bar{x}=16.3$) than women who had remained unmarried ($\bar{x}=21.4$), but this difference was not statistically significant.

TABLE 14

Comparison of Attitudes Toward Men Scores
(Semantic-Differential) of Mothers of Father-Absent
Subjects Who Remarried and Those Who Did Not Remarry

	<u>N</u>	<u>Range</u>	<u>Mean Score</u>	<u>t</u>	<u>P</u>
Remarried	14*	-21 to 47	16.3	.681	N.S.
Not Remarried	16	-24 to 60	21.4		

*Two of the 14 mothers who remarried were subsequently divorced from their second husbands. One of the mothers had been married 6 times.

Since the presence of an older brother or a stepfather could potentially affect the masculine development of father-absent subjects, comparisons of father-absent subjects with and without older brothers and with and without stepfathers were made. Table 15 shows that subjects with older brothers received a higher mean Franck masculinity score than subjects without older brothers ($t = 1.596$ $p < .12$). However, as demonstrated in Table 16, father-absent subjects with stepfathers obtained a lower mean masculinity score on the Franck

than subjects without stepfathers ($t = 1.723$ $p < .10$)

TABLE 15

Comparison of Masculinity Scores of Father-Absent
Subjects with Older Brothers and without Older
Brothers (Franck Drawing Completion Test)

	<u>N</u>	<u>Mean Score</u>	<u>t</u>	<u>P</u>
Older Brother	12	20	1.596	$p < .12^*$
No Older Brother	18	17.6		

TABLE 16

Comparison of Masculinity Scores of Father-Absent
Subjects with Stepfathers and without Stepfathers
(Franck Drawing Completion Test)

	<u>N</u>	<u>Mean Score</u>	<u>t</u>	<u>P</u>
Stepfather	14	17.3	1.723	$p < .10^*$
No Stepfather	16	19.6		

*Two-tailed t tests

DISCUSSION

The purpose of the present study was to examine the effect of the mother's attitude toward men upon the sex-role orientation of young male adults whose fathers had been absent from the home due to divorce or separation for a period of at least two years during their pre-adolescence. Two of the four hypotheses were marginally supported by the data. A review of the results and their implications follows. Theoretical variables of design and sample, and directions for future research will also be discussed.

The Findings

Hypothesis 1 that there would be a positive relationship between the attitudes of mothers of father-absent subjects toward men and the sex-role orientation of their sons was not corroborated by this research. In fact, the data indicate a negative relationship between maternal attitude and masculinity of sex-role orientation of the son. This finding is consistent with both measures of sex-role orientation, the Adjective Check List and the Franck Drawing Completion Test. Because the support for the negative relationship of these variables is marginal (See Tables 6 and 7), one can question the degree of conclusiveness of the data. This is a curious phenomena in light of the clinical findings

(Diamond, 1957; Neubauer, 1960) which suggest that father-absent boys whose mothers are negative toward men are less masculine than those whose mothers regard men positively. The following speculations are offered as possible reasons a father-absent subject's masculinity of self-concept would increase as a function of the mother's negative attitude toward men. One could hypothesize that instead of incorporating the mother's negative view of men, as had been the theoretical assumption of this study, because of her negative view of men, a father-absent son would find it difficult to identify with his mother and would thus be more likely than a father-absent male whose mother was positive, to seek out male models with whom to identify. Another possibility is that a mother with negative attitudes toward men could communicate the message "You have to be more of a man than your father was!" to her son, thus facilitating his development of a more masculine self-concept.

Biller (1971a) indicates that maternal overprotection frequently is a concomitant of father absence. This overprotection stifles a boy's strivings for competence and independence. It seems reasonable to assume that mothers who are negative toward men would be less likely to overprotect their sons, allowing them the freedom to develop independence and to identify with male models who may be available. Stendler (1954) found that many first graders who were rated as overdependent by their teachers came from families where the father

was absent. Biller (1971a) also suggests that maternal over-protection of a father-absent boy can contribute to passivity in peer interactions, whereas the father-absent boy whose mother may be rejecting or indifferent is more likely to seek peer acceptance. Among lower class father-absent boys, the gang becomes an avenue through which his needs for affection and attention are satisfied.

A factor which may have contributed to the negative finding regarding maternal attitude and the son's masculinity is the fact that college students, for whom peer identification is very likely more important than father identification, served as subjects for the study. It must be kept in mind, however, that the foregoing explanations are highly speculative and based on marginal trends in the data.

The finding regarding the relationship between maternal attitude and masculinity of sex-role orientation of father-present subjects is contradictory. With the Adjective Check List, the evidence suggests no relationship, which is consistent with Biller's (1971a) contention that in the father-present home the mother's evaluation of the father is not as crucial to the son's masculine development because the model is available. However, with the Franck, there is a marginally significant positive relationship between maternal attitude and masculinity of sex-role orientation. These apparently contradictory findings may be related to problems with the instruments which will be discussed later.

Hypothesis 2 that father-absent subjects would have a significantly lower mean masculinity of sex-role orientation score than father-present subjects, was marginally supported by the Franck but was not supported by the Adjective Check List. The failure of the present data to more strongly support this well-established finding is related to the aforementioned problems with the measuring instruments of sex-role orientation as well as to other methodological difficulties which will subsequently be discussed in detail.

Hypothesis 3 which postulated that early father-absent boys would have significantly lower mean masculinity of sex-role orientation score than late father-absent boys received marginal support from the Franck, but was not supported by the Adjective Check List. As with Hypothesis 2, the failure of the current research to more strongly replicate this finding which has received considerable support in the literature (Heatherington, 1966; Biller and Bahm, 1971) is very likely related to methodological problems.

A number of studies have demonstrated that early father-absent boys are consistently less masculine than father-present boys, but these differences have not been found in comparing late father-absent boys with father-present boys. Biller and Bahm (1971), in a study of junior high school boys, found that those who became father-absent before age five were less masculine on an adjective check list measure of masculinity of self-concept than father-present subjects. This

finding is replicated with the Franck in the present study, for early father-absent subjects differed significantly (See Table 10) from father-present subjects while the mean score for the late father-absent group was not significantly different from that of father-present subjects.

It was predicted in Hypothesis 4 that a significant number more father-absent subjects than father-present subjects would show the alleged "typically feminine" pattern of cognitive functioning (verbal higher than math) than father-present subjects. This hypothesis was not confirmed. In fact, more father-present subjects showed this pattern than father-absent subjects. Since Carlesmith (1964) reported that this pattern was especially related to early, long separations from the father, the data were analyzed further to determine whether early father-absent subjects showed this pattern significantly more than late father-absent subjects. Table 11 shows that this pattern was seen more in early father-absent subjects than in late father-absent subjects, but the difference is not statistically significant. Similarly, there was no statistically significant difference between the frequency of this pattern with early or late father-absent subjects as compared to father-present subjects.

An examination of mean Quantitative and Verbal scores (Table 12) reveals that father-absent subjects generally scored higher (though not statistically significant) than father-present subjects. Late father-absent subjects received the highest scores on both the Verbal and Quantitative measures,

differing significantly in math from the early father-absent and father-present subjects. It is not clear why the late father-absent group surpassed the other groups. One possibility to be considered is that it is related to the selection procedure in which many father-absent subjects were recruited through an advertisement in the university newspaper. In some respects, this may be less of a random selection than with the father-present subjects who were obtained through the human subject pool. However, the fact that approximately an equal number of early father-absent subjects were recruited through the advertisement argues against this possibility since early father-absent subjects scored considerably lower than late father-absent subjects.

Additional Findings

The statistically significant difference in the Semantic-Differential ratings of men by mothers of father-absent subjects as compared to those of father-present subjects was an interesting additional finding of the present research. Women whose husbands had been absent due to divorce or separation rated men significantly lower than women who had not experienced such a separation. The ratings of the women who had been divorced or separated ranged from -24 to 60 with a mean of 20.9 while the ratings of women who had not been divorced or separated ranged from 5 to 72 with a mean of 37.8. A question to consider is whether the divorced or separated women's lower ratings of men reflect an attitude that developed

as a result of the divorce or separation (an effect of the divorce) or whether, in fact, it was their original attitude which may have contributed to the marital difficulty that led to the divorce (a cause of the divorce).

In addition to the finding that mothers of father-absent subjects differed significantly from mothers of father-present subjects in their ratings of men, it was also found that among the mothers of father-absent subjects, those who had remarried rated men considerably lower than those who had not remarried. In at least two cases, multiple marriages were reported for the mothers. Although the writer had previously assumed that women who remarried would feel more positively toward men, it seems reasonable that women who had not remarried and thus had not had their negative views of men continuously reinforced, would be likely to feel more positively toward men. An important factor for which we do not have data is an understanding of why these mothers have remained unmarried. Is it for religious or ethical reasons? Do they think it's best for the children? Has the opportunity for marriage been available to them? Thus, the failure to remarry may be related to a number of variables other than attitudes toward men. One could speculate that those who did remarry may have consciously chosen "losers" who would reinforce their negative feelings about men.

Another interesting finding of the present study is that among college students, father-absent subjects do not appear to be intellectually impaired by the lack of a paternal figure.

Father-absent subjects achieved higher mean verbal and quantitative aptitude scores on the Henmon-Nelson Test of Mental Ability than did father-present subjects. This is contradictory to the findings of a number of investigators (Sutherland, 1930; Sutton-Smith, Rosenberg, and Landy, 1968) that the father-absent child suffers intellectual deficits. Sutherland (1930), in a study of Scottish children, found that father-absent subjects scored significantly lower on an intelligence test than father-present subjects. Maxwell (1961), using a group of 8 to 13 year old children referred to a British psychiatric clinic, found that those children whose fathers had been absent since age five performed below their age norms on a number of tests. The deficits seen in these children were in the areas of social knowledge, perception of details, and verbal skills. It is interesting to note that children who became father-absent before age 5 did not differ significantly from the age norms. In contrast, Sutton-Smith, Rosenberg, and Landy (1968) found that males who became father-absent early in life were more likely to have lower college aptitude scores than father-present males.

An Unrelated, Incidental Finding

A finding which is not directly related to the problem addressed in the study is the Adjective Check List change in women's self-descriptions since 1955 (See Appendix B for Adjectives which discriminated women in 1955). When Berdie

(1959) developed the Check List, 46 adjectives were checked significantly more by women whereas in the present sample only 13 were checked significantly more by women. Among the adjectives which no longer discriminate men and women are self-hatred ones such as obnoxious, selfish, impulsive, nervous, shallow, shy, thoughtless, and worried. It is interesting to note that neither "dependent" nor "aggressive" were among the current adjectives that discriminated males and females. With females, "dependent" has been replaced by "determined." Whereas 15 adjectives were endorsed significantly more by men in 1955, in the current data, 20 are endorsed significantly more by men. The additional ones include clever, distrustful, logical, rational, unaffected, and unemotional, all of which are compatible with those which were endorsed significantly more by males in 1955 and again in 1974--athletic, foresighted, masculine, rough, shrewd, suspicious, tough, and virile. Thus, the self-descriptions of men did not change significantly.

Theory and Design

It was the theoretical assumption of this study that boys learn to be masculine by identifying with their fathers. Thus, the father-son relationship was seen as critical in masculine development, and it was assumed that a boy whose father was absent for a prolonged period during childhood would not be as masculine as a boy whose father was present.

Since there was some marginal support of the hypothesis related to the disrupted masculine development of father-absent subjects, it is felt that the theoretical base is valid. However, because the support is marginal, an examination of theory is indicated. It appears that the difficulty with the theory lies not with its general premise (and thus does not need complete revision) but with the fact that it is too broad in assuming that father-absent boys would naturally be less masculine than father-present boys without delineating other variables that might effect masculine development. There is evidence that father presence alone does not insure that a boy will develop a masculine concept and that father-absence per se does not necessarily mean that a boy will develop an inadequate masculine self-concept. The following are empirical data and a theoretical explanation which may account for the failure of the current data to more strongly support the predictions.

Biller (1971a) identified several characteristics of fathers that are conducive to the development of a positive masculine self-concept in their sons including paternal masculinity, paternal nurturance, paternal limit-setting, and paternal power. Biller (1968a) found the quality of the father-son relationship to be more important than the amount of time the father spends at home. A number of studies (Hartup, 1962; Kohlberg & Zigler, 1967) suggest that the degree to which the father exhibits masculine behaviors is a critical factor in the father-present boy's masculine development. Bronfenbrenner

(1958) found that adolescent boys who were low in masculinity came from homes where the father assumed a traditionally feminine role. Kagan (1958) found that over 40 percent of boys rated low in aggression by their teachers, as compared to only about 10 percent of those rated high in aggression, viewed their mothers as being the "boss at home."

A warm, nurturant father appears to be able to facilitate his son's masculine development. Pauline Sears (1953) found that boys who assumed the father role in doll play activities tended to have warm, affectionate fathers. Mussen (1961) found that adolescent boys with masculine interests on the Strong Vocational Interest Blank, described their fathers as more nurturant and positive than did boys with unmasculine interests.

Several researchers have presented findings which suggest that paternal limit setting is related to masculine development. Altucher (1957) found that more high masculine adolescent boys as compared to low masculinity ones, said their fathers set limits for them. Similar results with male college students were reported by Moulton et al. (1966), however, there have been some contradictory findings regarding paternal limit setting. Mussen and Distler (1959) found that kindergarten boys who showed highly masculine projective sex-role behavior perceived their fathers as more punitive than did boys who were low in masculinity. A similar trend was reported by Mussen and Rutherford (1963) with first grade boys. In each

of these studies, however, perceiving the father as nurturant was related to high masculinity.

Perceiving the father as powerful appears to be a factor contributing to masculine development. Mussen and Distler (1959) found that boys whose projective sex-role play was highly masculine perceived their fathers as more "powerful" than did boys who were low in masculinity.

These data suggest that a number of factors are involved in masculine development, which if taken separately, would not insure that a boy would become masculine. What seems to be critical is a warm relationship with a masculine father. Boys whose fathers are passive, ineffectual, or punitive will be less masculine than boys whose fathers are nurturant and play a decisive role in the family. Therefore, the theoretical assumption that father-present subjects will be more masculine than father-absent subjects is questionable to the extent that it fails to account for variables described above which can affect the masculine development of the father-present subject and other variables (See Review of Literature) which affect the masculine development of father-absent subjects. The present research design is deficient to the extent that it failed to take into account some of these critical variables.

Measurement Techniques

Measurement of Maternal Attitude

The Semantic-Differential is a flexible instrument which has much support as a measuring device (Osgood et al., 1957). In the present study which used all adjectives with a high loading on the Evaluative factor, there may have been a tendency for subjects to respond in the socially desirable direction. However, the fact that there was a wide range in the scores with mothers of father-absent subjects differing significantly from mothers of father-present subjects in their ratings suggests that there was variability in the patterns of response and argues against the reasoning that the results were significantly influenced by "social desirability."

A limitation of the present design in which only maternal attitudes was measured in the absence of a behavioral reference point with which to compare subjects. Does the fact that a mother rates men positively necessarily mean that she presents men positively to her son or reinforce his masculine strivings for independence, assertiveness, and mastery? The attitudinal information would be much more meaningful if we had time-samples of the mother's actual interaction with her son in a natural setting or in a structured setting where the interaction would focus around men in general or around the father.

Measurement of Masculinity of Sex-Role Orientation

The masculinity of sex-role orientation scores obtained from the Adjective Check List and the Franck Drawing Completion Test played a major role in the failure of the current research to more strongly replicate findings that have been previously obtained. In evaluating the results, there are two possible approaches to understanding the negative findings and the marginal nature of the positive findings. First, it can be assumed that the instruments are invalid measures of sex-role orientation that were not significantly discriminative to test these hypotheses. Second, it can be assumed that the instruments are valid measures, but the theoretical basis is questionable. Father presence may no longer be as important as it once was.

The first option is to assume that the measures are invalid. This is a tenable interpretation in light of the low, statistically insignificant correlation between the instruments and, in some cases, the contradictory information obtained from the two measures. For example, with the Adjective Check List there was no correlation between maternal attitude and the masculinity of father-present subjects while with the Franck there was a marginally significant positive relationship.

Another argument for the invalidity of the Adjective Check List is the fact that regardless of which norms were used, the results were insignificant and inconsistent. The

only marginally significant result obtained from the Adjective Check List was the negative correlation with maternal attitude. Also, that was the only point at which it was consistent with the Franck. In all of the other analyses, the Adjective Check List failed to discriminate control and experimental groups.

The Franck Drawing Completion Test appears to be slightly more valid than the Adjective Check List in that it gave marginal support to predictions regarding differences between father-absent and father-present subjects and between early father-absent subjects and late father-absent subjects. However, this support in both cases was not substantial enough to warrant certainty of its validity.

The second alternative interpretation of the fact that the results did not confirm some of the predictions is that the measures are valid. The failure to replicate previous findings more strongly may be due to the fact that childbearing and socialization practices have changed considerably since many of the studies regarding the differences in masculinity of father-present and father-absent subjects were done. Now, other socializing agents have a much greater impact upon personality development including mass media--especially television. Previously, parents, especially the mother, assumed the major responsibility for the socialization of the child, however, that pattern has begun to change with school and other social institutions participating much more in the socialization of the child as increasingly both parents become involved in the work force.

In addition to possible differences in socialization practices that might have contributed to the present results, the theoretical limitations discussed previously are applicable. Father presence itself may no longer be a critical variable in masculine development. What is critical is the nature of the father's interaction with his son. A strict, warm, masculine father appears to be able to facilitate masculine development. In the United States, most boys are father-absent to the extent that most fathers are away from home a substantial amount of the day due to their work, and many, when not at work, interact minimally with their children. Thus, the lack of availability of the father of father-present subjects could also be a contributing factor to the marginal differences in masculinity of the two groups evidenced in the current results.

Subject Variables

There is a strong possibility that subject variables, not controlled or accounted for, affected the data so that predictions were not confirmed. On the Henmon-Nelson, especially, variations in motivation and test-taking attitudes may have contributed to the failure to confirm the hypothesis related to differences in cognitive styles of father-absent and father-present subjects. Although an attempt was made to match subjects on a number of crucial variables that have been found to affect the masculinity of father-absent and

father-present subjects including age, race, grade, intelligence, sibling distribution, and socio-economic status, there were undoubtedly some imperfect matchings due to the limited pool from which choices could be made. There were also some other critical variables which were not controlled.

The availability of father surrogates was a variable not controlled in the present study. The criterion upon which father absence was based was that the father had to be out of the home for at least two years before the subject was age 12 with no other adult male living in the home. A brother, uncle, grandfather, teacher, male neighbor, or scout leader may provide a masculine model for a father-absent boy. Nash (1965) found that masculinity was related to the general amount of contact boys have with adult males. Santrock (1970), in interviewing mothers, found that father-absent boys who had a father-substitute were less dependent than father-absent boys with no father-substitute. The results of the present study indicate that father-absent boys with older brothers were more masculine than those without older brothers. This finding has been previously obtained by a number of investigators (Santrock, 1970; Sutton-Smith, Rosenberg, and Landy, 1968). Biller (1968a) found, however, that while the presence of a male sibling may lessen the effects of father absence, it does not completely compensate for the lack of a father with respect to the boy's masculine development. The present findings show that boys with stepfathers, in contrast to what might have been predicted, have lower mean masculinity scores

than boys with stepfathers. This lower masculinity score for boys with stepfathers may be related to the fact that, in some cases, stepfathers are rejecting of their stepsons, and, even if the stepfather is accepting, the son may reject him, resenting his relationship with the mother.

Another important variable that influences sex role development which was not controlled in the present study is the subject's peer group interaction. Biller (1971a) maintains, "The masculine role model provided by the peer group can be particularly influential for the paternally deprived boy" (p. 17). In lower class neighborhoods, peer modeling seems to be especially significant. Adolescent gangs provide the lower class father-absent boy with substitute masculine models (Miller, 1958).

A final limitation of the present sample relates to the failure to assess father availability of the father-present subjects. Father-present subjects whose had low available fathers would not be expected to differ significantly in terms of masculinity than father-absent subjects. In the present study, all that is really known about the father-present subjects in terms of family interaction is that the parents are married to each other and living together. We know nothing of the nature of the interaction of the parents with each other or with the child. It would have also been helpful to have known what the father-absent subjects relationship with their fathers had been prior to his departure or what their

subsequent relationships with stepfathers or the mother's boyfriends had been.

Suggestions for Future Research

The hypothesized relationship between maternal attitude toward men and the sex-role development of father-absent (and father-present) males needs further investigation. Because of the marginal nature of the negative relationship found in the present study, it is difficult to draw strong conclusions.

Instead of focusing on attitudes, it might be productive if future research would attempt to secure a more meaningful sample of maternal behavior and to determine the kinds of maternal behavior and the aspects of the mother-son relationship which affect the sex-role development of the father-absent son (Biller, 1971a). Considerable knowledge had been derived from attitude investigations, however, attitudes remain difficult to measure. Part of this difficulty is related to the multi-level nature of attitudes and the tendency of some respondents to deny their attitudes or to answer in the socially desirable directions. Thus, information obtained from questionnaires may be inaccurate appraisals of the respondents' thinking, but even if it is a fairly accurate assessment, it may not reflect their behavior. For example, in the present study, it does not necessarily follow that women who rate men positively value masculinity and present men positively to their sons. Projective play situations in

which the mother and the son interact around a doll family stimulus or having the mother respond to thematic materials aimed at eliciting feelings about the father or men in general may be possible ways of assessing the mother's evaluation of men. Such techniques may be used in conjunction with other attitudinal measures as the Semantic Differential.

One of the strongest criticisms of father-absence studies (Biller, 1971a) is the tendency to treat father-absent and father-present children as if they were a homogeneous group. Future studies should carefully match subjects on such variables as sociocultural background, intelligence, and on the quality of the mother-son relationship. As indicated previously, in the present study, little is known about the mother-son interactions of either the father-absent or father-present group. With the father-present subjects, information about the nature of the father-son relationship is critical as well as information about the relationship between the parents. Future studies should attempt to identify father-present subjects who are from homes where the father is warm and nurturant, masculine, and a salient figure in the family.

The impact of father surrogates and peer group interactions are fruitful areas of further research. These are variables which have been found to affect masculine development and should be controlled in matching father-absent and father-present subjects. Additional research comparing the masculine development of father-absent boys with father-

present boys from low father availability and high father availability families is an area of potentially productive research.

SUMMARY

The purpose of the present investigation was to examine the effect of the mothers' attitudes toward men upon the masculine development of young adult males whose fathers had been absent during part of their childhood. The underlying theoretical position of the study is that the male child learns to be masculine through identifying with his father. It is further assumed that the masculine development of the child depends upon the presence of the father in the family.

The following four hypotheses were formulated: (1) Attitudes of mothers of father-absent subjects toward men are positively related to the masculinity of sex-role orientation of their sons; (2) father-absent subjects have a significantly lower mean masculinity of sex-role orientation score than father-present subjects; (3) subjects who became father-absent during the period from birth to their fifth birthday have a significantly lower mean masculinity of sex-role orientation score than subjects who became father-absent after their fifth birthday, and (4) a significantly greater number of father-absent subjects as compared to father-present show the typically feminine pattern of intellectual functioning (verbal score higher than mathematical score).

Subjects of the study were 60 male undergraduate students at Michigan State University. Thirty of the subjects were

from homes where the father had been consistently present, and thirty were from homes where the father had been absent due to divorce or separation for at least two years before the subject reached age 12. These groups were matched with respect to age, socio-economic status, number of siblings, race, and grade point average.

A list of Semantic-Differential rating scales consisting of 24 items with a high loading on the Evaluative Factor were used to assess mothers' attitudes toward men. The measures of masculinity of sex-role orientation included the Franck Drawing Completion Test, a projective technique in which the subject is asked to complete 36 drawings, and an adapted version of the Berdie Femininity Adjective Check List. The Henmon-Nelson Test of Mental Ability was used to test intellectual functioning. A pearson product-moment correlation coefficient was used to analyze statistically the relationship between maternal attitude and masculinity while t tests were used to compare masculinity scores of father-present with father-absent subjects and early father-absent subjects with late father-absent subjects. The Chi-square test was used to compare the frequency of occurrence in each group of the masculine and feminine patterns of intellectual functioning.

The first hypothesis of the study that positive maternal attitudes toward men would relate positively to masculine development of father-absent sons was not supported. In fact,

there was a trend in the opposite direction. With the Franck Drawing Completion Test, marginal support was found for the hypotheses related to differences in masculinity of father-present and father-absent subjects and early father-absent and late father-absent subjects. There was strong replication of previously published findings that early father-absent subjects differ significantly with respect to masculinity from father-present subjects while late father-absent subjects do not. The Adjective Check List did not discriminate between the father-present and father-absent groups. The prediction that more father-absent subjects would show the typically feminine pattern of intellectual functioning was not supported.

Additional findings include the following: (1) Mothers of father-absent subjects rated men significantly lower than did mothers of father-present subjects, and (2) Father-absent subjects did not appear to be intellectually impaired by the absence of a father. Late father-absent subjects achieved significantly greater verbal and mathematical aptitude scores than did father-present and early father-absent subjects while early father-absent and father-present subjects demonstrated almost equal achievement in these areas. With respect to father-absent subjects, it was found that the presence of an older brother was related to increased masculinity, but the presence of a stepfather functioned in the opposite direction.

It was concluded that the failure of the present study to

more strongly replicate previous findings may be related to problems of theory and instrumentation. Implications of the findings were discussed and suggestions for future research made.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

FAMILY BACKGROUND QUESTIONNAIRE

FAMILY BACKGROUND QUESTIONNAIRE

Instructions:

The following information will be used as a means of determining which persons meet the criteria for inclusion in the study and of separating participants into similar groupings. All of the information you provide on this questionnaire will be held confidential and in publishing the data, only numbers and percentages will be used with your anonymity being preserved.

At the end of the questionnaire you will be asked to list your mother's name and address so that we may send her the same rating scales on "men" and "women" that you have been asked to fill out. You will also find attached to this questionnaire a copy of the cover letter that will accompany the forms that will be sent to your mother. If you have questions about this procedure, please feel free to discuss them with the experimenter.

Please answer all questions that apply. Thank you very much for your cooperation.

1. Name _____ 2. Age _____ 3. Date of Birth _____

4. Place of Birth _____
State _____ Country _____

5. Have you ever lived outside U.S.A.? _____ How long? _____

Your age then _____

6. Year in College: ___ Fresh. ___ Soph. ___ Jun. ___ Senior ___ Graduate

7. Grade Point Average _____

8. Marital Status: ___ Single ___ Married ___ Divorced/Sep. ___ Widowed

9. Race or Ethnic Group:

_____ White

_____ Chicano

_____ Black

_____ American Indian

_____ Oriental

_____ Other (Explain)

Family Background Questionnaire --2

10. Marital Status of Parents:

Mother (Check all that apply)☐ Divorced or Separated☐ Married to your father☐ Remarried (year remarried _____)☐ Widowed (year husband died _____)☐ Single (never married)☐ Other (Explain)Father (Check all that apply)☐ Divorced or Separated☐ Married to your mother☐ Remarried (year remarried _____)☐ Widowed (year wife died _____)☐ Single (never Married)☐ Other (Explain)

11. If parents are divorced or separated answer the following. (If parents are not divorced or separated, go on to item 12).

A. How old were you when your parents became divorced or separated? _____

B. With which parent did you live following the divorce or separation?

_____ mother _____ father

C. How often did you have contact with the other parent (parent with whom you did not live) following the divorce or separation?

_____ daily _____ weekly _____ monthly _____ every 3 months

_____ every 6 months _____ once a year _____ other (Explain)

D. If either mother and/or father are remarried, how old were you when remarriage occurred?

Mother: Your Age _____ Father: Your Age _____

Family Background Questionnaire—3

12. Father's Occupation _____ (Please be specific)

13. Mother's Occupation _____

14. Father's Education— (Mark last grade completed)

_____ 4-8 _____ 9-11 _____ Completed High School _____ Some College

_____ Bachelors degree _____ Some Graduate Work _____ Masters degree

_____ Doctorate degree

15. Mother's Education— (Mark last grade completed)

_____ 4-8 _____ 9-11 _____ Completed High School _____ Some College

_____ Bachelors degree _____ Some Graduate Work _____ Masters degree

_____ Doctorate degree

16. Sex and ages of your brothers and sisters: (oldest to youngest)

1. Sex _____ M _____ F Age _____

2. Sex _____ M _____ F Age _____

3. Sex _____ M _____ F Age _____

4. Sex _____ M _____ F Age _____

5. Sex _____ M _____ F Age _____

6. Sex _____ M _____ F Age _____

7. Sex _____ M _____ F Age _____

(If you need additional space, please use back of this page)

17. If your parents are married to each other, please answer the following questions. DO NOT ANSWER IF YOUR PARENTS ARE DIVORCED OR SEPARATED.

A. Was your father in the home all the time (except for short trips away for no more than two weeks at a time for vacation or business purposes) when you were growing up?

_____ yes _____ no _____

Please explain if your answer to the above is NO.

Family Background Questionnaire--4

17. B. If your father was not in the home consistently, how old were you when he left home?

Age _____

- C. How much contact did you have with your father after he left home?

_____ daily _____ weekly _____ monthly _____ every 3 months

_____ every 6 months _____ once a year _____ other (Explain)

18. Mother's name and address (so we can forward rating form to her)

Name _____

Address _____
street

City _____ State _____ Zip _____

APPENDIX B

RESPONSES OF MALES AND FEMALES TO
FEMININITY ADJECTIVE CHECK LIST--
MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY--1974

RESPONSES OF MALES AND FEMALES TO FEMININITY
ADJECTIVE CHECK LIST--MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY--1974

<u>ADJECTIVE</u>	<u>MALES</u> <u>n=130</u>	<u>FEMALES</u> <u>n=160</u>	<u>Chi Square</u>
1. Active	100	108	3.14
2. Aggressive	44	42	0.98
3. Alert	81	94	0.38
4. Affectionate	87	135	12.17*
5. Ambitious	76	92	0.03
6. Anxious	59	87	2.32
7. Argumentative	43	58	0.32
8. Appreciative	105	121	1.10
9. Artistic	36	60	3.12
10. Assertive	36	41	0.16
11. Athletic	77	52	20.75*
12. Autocratic	18	15	1.42
13. Boisterous	19	23	0.003
14. Bold	23	23	0.59
15. Calm	76	80	2.42
16. Capable	104	127	0.02
17. Cautious	90	111	0.0007
18. Charming	38	53	.50
19. Cheerful	71	106	4.08***
20. Civilized	90	111	0.0007
21. Clear-thinking	83	89	2.008
22. Clever	66	54	8.56*
23. Coarse	9	5	2.25
24. Cold	17	11	3.16
25. Commonplace	18	15	1.42
26. Complicated	68	89	0.32
27. Confident	69	67	3.61
28. Conscientious	83	111	0.99
29. Conservative	46	71	2.41
30. Considerate	96	133	3.72
31. Contented	45	62	0.53
32. Conventional	21	31	0.51
33. Cool	30	35	0.06
34. Courageous	32	31	1.16
35. Cruel	7	6	0.45
36. Curious	87	125	4.58***
37. Demanding	50	61	0.0034
38. Dependent	32	54	2.87
39. Determined	67	110	8.93*
40. Distrustful	35	20	9.71*

RESPONSES OF MALES AND FEMALES TO FEMININITY ADJECTIVE
CHECK LIST--MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY--1974 (cont'd)

ADJECTIVE	MALES n=130	FEMALES n=160	Chi Square
41. Dominant	30	34	0.14
42. Dreamy	47	71	2.01
43. Effeminate	3	8	1.42
44. Emotional	61	111	14.98*
45. Enterprising	41	28	7.80*
46. Fair-Minded	83	109	0.59
47. Feminine	2	117	151.91*
48. Flirtatious	24	55	9.16*
49. Forceful	24	23	0.88
50. Foresighted	59	45	9.29*
51. Fussy	32	55	3.25
52. Gentle	115	84	43.08*
53. Graceful	17	51	14.12*
54. Gracious	35	72	10.07*
55. Greedy	14	15	0.15
56. Hasty	23	25	0.22
57. Helpful	93	128	2.83
58. Hostile	7	6	0.37
59. Humorous	86	89	3.32
60. Imaginative	86	90	2.95
61. Impatient	53	83	3.55
62. Impulsive	49	65	0.26
63. Independent	85	103	0.03
64. Industrious	52	53	1.47
65. Initiative	49	48	1.91
66. Insightful	65	59	5.05*
67. Intelligent	98	129	1.16
68. Interests-Narrow	18	14	1.77
69. Interests-Wide	93	129	3.30
70. Intolerant	9	11	0.0002
71. Jolly	32	41	0.04
72. Kind	98	117	0.19
73. Leisurely	70	78	0.74
74. Logical	100	92	12.09*
75. Luxury-loving	63	62	2.76
76. Mannerly	59	79	0.46
77. Masculine	90	1	156.78*
78. Mature	103	120	0.72
79. Methodical	43	33	5.75**
80. Mild	44	41	2.34
81. Moderate	56	52	3.43
82. Modest	55	68	0.0010
83. Nervous	53	73	0.69
84. Noisy	10	8	0.90
85. Obnoxious	4	6	0.10

RESPONSES OF MALES AND FEMALES TO FEMININITY ADJECTIVE
CHECK LIST--MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY--1974 (cont'd)

<u>ADJECTIVE</u>	<u>MALES</u> <u>n=130</u>	<u>FEMALES</u> <u>n=160</u>	<u>Chi Square</u>
86. Organized	58	88	3.09
87. Outgoing	51	66	0.12
88. Out-of-doors	74	81	1.14
89. Outspoken	35	41	0.06
90. Painstaking	14	17	0.0015
91. Patient	64	74	0.26
92. Peaceable	86	89	3.32
93. Persevering	45	54	0.02
94. Planful	37	60	2.63
95. Precise	38	49	0.07
96. Progressive	57	71	0.01
97. Rational	102	103	6.87*
98. Reckless	13	6	4.58***
99. Refined	31	36	0.07
100. Resentful	16	31	2.64
101. Reserved	56	69	0.00
102. Restless	46	61	0.23
103. Robust	24	17	3.63
104. Rough	20	6	11.89*
105. Rude	7	5	0.92
106. Self-centered	33	34	0.70
107. Self-controlled	84	82	5.23***
108. Selfish	18	28	0.71
109. Sensitive	87	139	16.60*
110. Sentimental	69	119	14.27*
111. Serious	94	106	1.23
112. Shallow	2	3	0.05
113. Sharp-witted	40	30	5.66**
114. Shrewd	27	11	7.64*
115. Shy	59	63	1.06
116. Simple	29	49	2.52
117. Sincere	100	133	1.74
118. Slow	16	21	0.04
119. Soft-hearted	68	98	2.34
120. Spontaneous	48	68	0.93
121. Steady	43	54	0.01
122. Stolid	9	7	0.89
123. Straight-forward	80	73	7.29*
124. Strong	54	56	1.30
125. Submissive	13	33	6.07**
126. Suspicious	50	39	6.69*
127. Sympathetic	85	118	2.39
128. Tactful	61	65	1.16
129. Temperamental	40	50	0.01

RESPONSES OF MALES AND FEMALES TO FEMININITY ADJECTIVE
 CHECK LIST--MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY--1974 (cont'd)

<u>ADJECTIVE</u>	<u>MALES</u> <u>n=130</u>	<u>FEMALES</u> <u>n=160</u>	<u>Chi Square</u>
130. Tense	36	48	0.18
131. Thorough	46	45	1.75
132. Thoughtful	86	122	3.60
133. Thoughtless	3	7	0.92
134. Timid	19	26	0.15
135. Tolerant	80	92	0.48
136. Tough	21	9	8.57*
137. Trusting	74	89	0.05
138. Unaffected	16	9	4.05***
139. Unambitious	7	10	0.03
140. Understanding	91	120	0.90
141. Unemotional	17	6	7.42*
142. Unkind	3	4	0.01
143. Versatile	73	80	1.09
144. Vigorous	44	40	2.73
145. Virile	44	3	53.98*
146. Warm	79	113	3.11
147. Weak	4	12	2.69
148. Worried	41	59	0.90

*p<.01

**p<.02

***p<.05

APPENDIX C

FEMININITY ADJECTIVE CHECK LIST

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

1955

FEMININITY ADJECTIVE CHECK LIST

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

1955

Feminine Adjectives

Affectionate
Appreciative
Artistic
Charming
Cheerful
Complicated
Curious
Dependent
Dreamy
Effeminate
Emotional
Feminine
Flirtatious
Graceful
Gracious
Humorous
Impulsive
Kind
Mannerly
Modest
Nervous
Obnoxious
Outgoing
Outspoken
Refined
Restless
Selfish
Sensitive
Sentimental
Serious
Shallow
Shy
Sincere
Slow
Soft-Hearted
Spontaneous
Submissive
Sympathetic
Temperamental
Thoughtless
Tolerant
Trusting
Unaffected
Understanding
Warm
Worried

Masculine Adjectives

Aggressive
Athletic
Calm
Cautious
Cool
Foresighted
Interests Wide
Masculine
Wild
Out-of-Doors
Rough
Shrewd
Suspicious
Tough
Virile

APPENDIX D
LETTER TO MOTHERS

Department of Psychology
Olds Hall, Room 109
Michigan State University
East Lansing, Michigan 48824

Dear Parent:

Your son has agreed to participate in a research project for his psychology course in which we are studying the attitudes of sons and their mothers towards men and women. Your son has read this letter and is aware that it is being sent to you. We are hopeful that you will be willing to assist us in this project by completing the enclosed rating forms. In all likelihood, you will be able to complete the forms in five minutes or less.

Please read the instructions carefully before you respond to the forms. After you have completed them, please enclose both pages in the enclosed, stamped, self-addressed envelope and return immediately. We would like to have all of the forms returned before the end of the term. It is not necessary for you to sign your response as we are interested only in categorizing responses by numbers and percentages. The information you provide will be held confidential.

Thank you very much for your cooperation. If you have questions about the project, please feel free to contact us.

Sincerely,

Hugh E. Jones, M.A.
Doctoral Candidate
Department of Psychology

A. I. Rabin, Ph.D.
Professor
Department of Psychology

APPENDIX E
DIRECTIONS FOR SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL

DIRECTIONS FOR SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL

DIRECTIONS

The purpose of this study is to secure your impressions about men and women in general by having you judge them against a series of descriptive scales. In responding to the scale, please make your judgments on the basis of what these things mean to you. You are to rate these concepts on each of these scales in order.

Here is how you are to use these scales:

If you feel that the concept at the top of the page is very closely related to one end of the scale, you should place your check mark as follows:

Fair x : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : Unfair

Fair ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : x : Unfair

If you feel that the concept is quite closely related to one or the other end of the scale (but not extremely), you should place your check-mark as follows:

Fair ____ : x : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : Unfair

Fair ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : Unfair

If the concept seems only slightly related to one side as opposed to the other side (but is not really neutral), then you should check as follows:

Fair ____ : ____ : x : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : Unfair

Fair ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : x : ____ : ____ : Unfair

If you consider the concept to be neutral on the scale, both sides of the scale equally associated with the concept, or if the scale is completely irrelevant, unrelated to the concept, then you should place your check mark in the middle space:

Fair ____ : ____ : ____ : x : ____ : ____ : ____ : Unfair

Please remember to

- (1) be sure to check every scale for each concept.
- (2) never put more than one check mark on a single scale.

DIRECTIONS FOR SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL (continued)

Although some items may be similar, they are all different. Make each item a separate and independent judgment. Work at fairly high speed throughout this test. Do not worry or puzzle over individual items. It is your first impression which is important here.

Thank you very much for your cooperation.

Please Note. Although the middle space indicates that both sides are equally characteristic of a concept or that the scale is irrelevant, you are requested not to use it unless absolutely necessary.

APPENDIX F
SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL RATING SCALE

SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL RATING SCALE

Please rate

Men

Sociable	___	:	___	:	___	:	___	:	___	:	___	:	___	:	___	:	Unsociable
Unselfish	___	:	___	:	___	:	___	:	___	:	___	:	___	:	___	:	Selfish
Bad	___	:	___	:	___	:	___	:	___	:	___	:	___	:	___	:	Good
Strong	___	:	___	:	___	:	___	:	___	:	___	:	___	:	___	:	Weak
Cruel	___	:	___	:	___	:	___	:	___	:	___	:	___	:	___	:	Kind
Grateful	___	:	___	:	___	:	___	:	___	:	___	:	___	:	___	:	Ungrateful
Quarrelsome	___	:	___	:	___	:	___	:	___	:	___	:	___	:	___	:	Congenial
Perfect	___	:	___	:	___	:	___	:	___	:	___	:	___	:	___	:	Imperfect
Dirty	___	:	___	:	___	:	___	:	___	:	___	:	___	:	___	:	Clean
Graceful	___	:	___	:	___	:	___	:	___	:	___	:	___	:	___	:	Awkward
Ugly	___	:	___	:	___	:	___	:	___	:	___	:	___	:	___	:	Beautiful
Radiant	___	:	___	:	___	:	___	:	___	:	___	:	___	:	___	:	Shaded
Painful	___	:	___	:	___	:	___	:	___	:	___	:	___	:	___	:	Pleasurable
Successful	___	:	___	:	___	:	___	:	___	:	___	:	___	:	___	:	Unsuccessful
Low	___	:	___	:	___	:	___	:	___	:	___	:	___	:	___	:	High
Happy	___	:	___	:	___	:	___	:	___	:	___	:	___	:	___	:	Sad
Meaningful	___	:	___	:	___	:	___	:	___	:	___	:	___	:	___	:	Meaningless
Worthless	___	:	___	:	___	:	___	:	___	:	___	:	___	:	___	:	Valuable
Progressive	___	:	___	:	___	:	___	:	___	:	___	:	___	:	___	:	Regressive
Dishonest	___	:	___	:	___	:	___	:	___	:	___	:	___	:	___	:	Honest
Positive	___	:	___	:	___	:	___	:	___	:	___	:	___	:	___	:	Negative
Disreputable	___	:	___	:	___	:	___	:	___	:	___	:	___	:	___	:	Reputable
Believing	___	:	___	:	___	:	___	:	___	:	___	:	___	:	___	:	Skeptical
Foolish	___	:	___	:	___	:	___	:	___	:	___	:	___	:	___	:	Wise

APPENDIX G
ADVERTISEMENT

ADVERTISEMENT

WANTED
for
PSYCHOLOGY STUDY

Male students who lived with mothers
alone at least 2 years before age 12
following a divorce or separation.
Please come to Olds Hall 203 --
Wednesday, October 23 at 6 or 7:30 p.m.
or call Hugh Jones, 882-5806 to arrange
for 1-1/4 hour testing session. Par-
ticipants will be paid \$3.00.

APPENDIX H
INFORMATION REGARDING STUDY
and
INFORMED CONSENT

INFORMATION REGARDING STUDY

The purpose of this study is to assess the impact of various kinds of family backgrounds and parental attitudes upon personality development. One of the specific variables we will be examining is attitudes towards men and women. Since we consider your participation in the study as a learning experience for you, the following provisions have been made for you to obtain feedback about the study: (1) A meeting will be held toward the end of Spring quarter to let you know where I am in regards to the study. Since I do not expect to complete analyzation of the data prior to the end of the term, the information you will receive at this meeting will be necessarily somewhat inconclusive, therefore, a second provision has been made. (2) When the data analyses is complete, written feedback will be made available for those requesting it. If you would like written feedback, please write your name and the address where you can be contacted late summer or early fall, 1975, in the space provided below.

Name _____

Address _____

Number

Street

City

State

Zip

Family Attitudes Study

Student Number _____

INFORMED CONSENT

I, _____, have been presented
(your name, PRINT)

with adequate information about my participation in this research, and in light of this information, I am freely volunteering to participate. I understand that the confidentiality of information I provide will be protected and that my anonymity as a participant will be preserved in any presentation or publication of this research. I further understand that a cover letter and rating forms which I have examined may be mailed to my mother or my maternal surrogate.

Date _____

Signature _____

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Altucher, N. "Conflict in Sex Identification in Boys." Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of Michigan, 1957.
- Anastasi, Anne. Psychological Testing (3rd ed.). London: MacMillan, 1968.
- Bach, G. R. "Father-Fantasies and Father-Typing in Father-Separated Children," Child Development, 1946, 17, 63-80.
- Bandura, A. & Walters, R. H. Social Learning and Personality Development. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1963,
- Barclay, A. G. & Cusmano, D. "Father-Absence, Cross, Sex Identity, and Field Dependent Behavior in Male Adolescents." Child Development, 1967, 38, 243-250
- Berdie, R. F. "A Femininity Adjective Check List," Journal of Applied Psychology, 1959, 43, 327-333.
- Biller, H. B. "A Multiaspect Investigation of Masculine Development in Kindergarten age Boys." Genetic Psychology Monographs, 1968, 76, 89-139. (a)
- Biller, H. B. "A Note on Father Absence and Masculine Development in Young Lower-Class Negro and White Boys." Child Development, 1968, 39, 1003-1006. (b)
- Biller, H. B. "Father Absence, Maternal Encouragement and Sex Role Development in Kindergarten Age Boys," Child Development, 1969, 40, 539-546. (a)
- Biller, H. B. "Father Dominance and Sex-Role Development in Kindergarten-Age Boys," Developmental Psychology, 1969, 1, 87-94. (b)
- Biller, H. B. "Father Absence and the Personality Development of the Male Child," Developmental Psychology, 1970, 2, 181-201.
- Biller, H. B. Father, Child, and Sex Role, Lexington, Mass.: D. C. Heath and Company, 1971. (a)

- Biller, H. B. "The Mother-Child Relationship and the Father Absent Boy's Personality Development," Merrill Palmer Quarterly, 1971, 17, 227-241. (b)
- Biller, H. B. and Bahm, R. "Father Absence, Perceived Maternal Behavior, and Masculinity of Self-Concept among Junior High School Boys," Developmental Psychology, 1971, 4, 178-181.
- Biller, H. B. and Borstelmann, L. J. "Masculine Development: An Integrative Review," Merrill-Palmer Quarterly, 1967, 13, 253-294.
- Block, J. The Q-Sort Method in Personality Assessment and Psychiatric Research. Springfield, Ill.: Charles C. Thomas, 1961.
- Brim, O. G. "Family Structure and Sex-Role Learning by Children: A Further Analysis of Helen Koch's Data," Sociometry, 1958, 21, 1-16.
- Bronfenbrenner, U. "Freudian Theories of Identification and Their Derivatives." Child Development, 1960, 31, 15-40.
- Bronfenbrenner, U. "The Study of Identification Through Interpersonal Perception." In R. Tagiuri & L. Petrullo (Eds.) Person Perception and Interpersonal Behavior. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1958, 110-130.
- Brown, D. G. "Sex-Role Preference in Young Children." Psychological Monograph, 1956, 70, No. 14 (Whole No. 421).
- Burton, R. V. and Whiting, J. W. M. "The Absent Father and Cross-Sex Identity," Merrill Palmer Quarterly, 1961, 7, 85-95.
- Carlsmith, L. "Effects of Early Father-Absence on Scholastic Aptitude," Harvard Educational Review, 1964, 34, 3-21.
- Cooley, T. "The Nature and Origin of Psychological Sexual Identity," Psychological Review, 1959, 66, 165-177.
- Cottrell, L. S. "The Adjustment of the Individual to his Age and Sex Roles," American Sociology Review, 1942, 7, 617-620.
- Dai, B. "Some Problems of Personality Development among Negro Children." In C. Kluckhohn, H. A. Murray, & D. M. Schneider (Eds.), Personality in Nature, Society, and Culture. New York: Knopf, 1953.
- Diamond, S. Personality and Temperament. New York: Harper and Row, 1957.

- Domini, G. P. "An Evaluation of Sex-Role Identification among Father-Absent and Father-Present Boys," Psychology, 1967, 4, 13-16.
- Fenichel, O. The Psychoanalytic Theory of Neurosis. New York: Norton, 1945.
- Freud, S. "Some Psychological Consequences of the Anatomical Distinction between the Sexes." In Collected Papers, Vol. V. London, Hogarth Press, 1950, 186-197.
- Freud, S. "Group Psychology and the Analysis of the Ego." In J. Strachey (Ed.), The Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud Vol. I. London, Hogarth Press, 1955, 69-143.
- Gorer, G. The American People: A Study of National Character. New York: Norton, 1948.
- Gough, H. G. Reference Handbook for the Gough Adjective Checklist. Berkeley: University of California, Inst. of Personality Assessment Research, 1955.
- Gough, H. G. The Adjective Check List. Palo Alto: Consulting Psychologists Press, 1952.
- Greenstein, J. M. "Father Characteristics and Sex-Typing," Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1966, 3, 271-277.
- Grunebaum, M. G., Hurwitz, I., Prentice, N. M., and Sperry, B. M. "Fathers of Sons with Primary Neurotic Learning Inhibition," American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 1962, 32, 462-463.
- Hampson, J. L. "Determinants of Psychosexual Orientation." In F. A. Beach (Ed.), Sex and Behavior, New York: Wiley, 1965.
- Hartrup, W. W. "Some Correlates of Parental Imitation in Young Children." Child Development, 1962, 33, 85-96.
- Helper, M. M. "Learning Theory and the Self-Concept," Journal of Abnormal Social Psychology, 1955, 51, 184-194.
- Hetherington, E. M. "Effects of Paternal Absence on Sex-Typed Behaviors in Negro and White Pre-adolescent Males," Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1966, 4, 87-91.
- Herzog, E. and Sudia, C. E. Boys in Fatherless Families. Washington: U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Office of Child Development, Children's Bureau, 1970.

- Hilgard, J. R., Neuman, M. F., & Fisk, F. "Strength of Adult Ego Following Bereavement," American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 1960, 30, 788-198.
- Itkin, W. "Some Relationships between Intra-Family Attitudes and Preparental Attitudes Toward Children," Journal of Genetic Psychology, 1952, 80, 221-252.
- Jenkin, N. & Vroegh, K. "Contemporary Concepts of Masculinity and Femininity," Institute for Juvenile Research Reports, 1964, 1, No. 5.
- Kagan, J. "The Concept of Identification." Psychological Review, 1958, 65, 296-305.
- Kagan, J. "Acquisition and Significance of Sex Typing and Sex-Role Identity. In M. L. Hoffman & L. W. Hoffman (Eds.) Review of Child Development Research, Vol. 1. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1964, 137-167.
- Kardiner, A., & Ovesey, L. The Mark of Oppression. New York: Norton, 1951.
- Kohlberg, L. & Zigler, E. "The Impact of Cognitive Maturity on the Development of Sex-Role Attitudes in the Years Four - Eight. Genetic Psychology Monographs, 1967, 75, 89-165.
- Lawton, M. J. & Sechrest, L. "Figure Drawings by Young Boys from Father-Present and Father-Absent Homes," Journal of Clinical Psychology, 1962, 18, 304-305.
- Lefever, D. W. "Review of the Henmon-Nelson Tests of Mental Ability." In Buros, O. K. (Ed.), The Fifth Mental Measurements Yearbook. Highland Park, New Jersey: Gryphon Press, 1959, 342.
- Leichty, M. M. "The Effect of Father-Absence during Early Childhood Upon the Oedipal Situation as Reflected in Young Adults, Merrill Palmer Quarterly, 1960, 6, 212-217.
- Lynn, D. B. "A Note on Sex Difference in the Development of Masculine and Feminine Identification," Psychological Review, 1959, 66, 126-135.
- Lynn, D. B. "Sex Role and Parental Identification," Child Development, 1962, 33, 555-569.
- Maxwell, A. E. "Discrepancies between the Pattern of Abilities for Normal and Neurotic Children. Journal of Mental Science, 1961, 107, 300-307.

- McCord, J., McCord, W. & Thurber, E. "Some Effects of Paternal Absence on Male Children," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1962, 64, 361-369.
- Miller, B. "Effects of Father Absence and Mother Evaluation of Father on the Socialization of Adolescent Boys," Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Columbia University, 1961.
- Miller, D. R. & Swanson, G. E. et al., Inner Conflict and Defense. New York: Holt, 1960.
- Miller, W. B. "Lower-class Culture as a Generating Milieu of Gang Delinquency," Journal of Social Issues, 1958, 14, 5-19.
- Money, J. "Psychosexual Differentiation." In J. Money (Ed.), Sex Research: New Developments, New York: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston, 1965.
- Moulton, P. W. et al., "The Patterning of Parental Affection and Dominance as a Determinant of Guilt and Sex Typing." Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1966, 4, 363-365.
- Mowrer, O. H. "Identification: A Link between Learning Theory and Psychotherapy. In Learning Theory and Personality Dynamics, New York: Ronald Press, 1950, 573-616.
- Moynihan, D. P. The Negro Family: The Case for National Action. Washington, D. C.: United States Department of Labor, 1965.
- Mussen, P. H. "Some Antecedents and Consequences of Masculine Sex-Typing in Adolescent Boys." Psychological Monographs, 1961, 75, No. 2 (Whole No. 506).
- Mussen, P. H. and Distler, L. "Child-rearing Antecedents of Masculine Identification in Kindergarten Boys." Child Development, 1960, 31, 89-100.
- Mussen, P. H. & Rutherford, E. "Parent-child Relationships and Parental Personality in Relation to Young Children's Sex-Role Preferences." Child Development, 1963, 34, 589-607.
- Nash, J. "The Father in Contemporary Culture and Current Psychological Literature." Child Development, 1965, 36, 261-297.
- Neubauer, P. B. "The One-Parent Child and His Oedipal Development," Psychoanalytic Studies of the Child, 1960, 15, 286-309.

- Oppenheim, A. N. Questionnaire Design and Attitude Measurement. New York: Basic Books, 1966.
- Osgood, C. E. et al., The Measurement of Meaning. Urbana, Ill.: University of Illinois Press, 1957.
- Osgood, C. E. "The Nature and Measurement of Meaning." Psychological Bulletin, 1952, 49, 197-237.
- Parsons, T. "Family Structure and the Socialization of the Child." In T. Parsons & R. F. Bales (Eds.), Family Socialization and Interaction Process. Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press, 1958, 35-131.
- Pedersen, F. A. "Relationships between Father-Absence and Emotional Disturbance in Male Military Dependents," Merrill Palmer Quarterly, 1966, 12, 321-331.
- Phelan, H. M. "The Incidence and Possible Significance of the Drawing of Female Figures by Sixth-Grade Boys in Response to the Draw-A-Person Test," Psychiatric Quarterly, 1964, 38, 1-16.
- Rosenkrantz, P., Vogel, Bee, H., Broverman, I., and Broverman, D. M. "Sex-Role Stereotypes and Self-Concepts in College Students," Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1968, 32, 287-295.
- Sanford, N. "The Dynamics of Identification," Psychological Review, 1955, 62, 106-118.
- Santrock, J. W. "Paternal Absence, Sex-Typing, and Identification," Developmental Psychology, 1970, 2, 264-272.
- Sears, Pauline S. "Child-Rearing Factors Related to Playing of Sex-Typed Roles," American Psychologist, 1953, 8, 431 (Abstract).
- Sears, Pauline S. "Doll Play Aggression in Normal Young Children: Influence of Age, Sex, Sibling Status, Father's Absence," Psychological Monograph, 1951, 65, No. 6 (Whole No. 323).
- Sears, R. R. "Identification as a Form of Behavior Development." In D. B. Harris (Ed.), The Concept of Development. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1957, 149-161.
- Sears, R. R., Maccoby, E. E., and Levin, H. Patterns of Child Rearing. Evanston, Ill.: Row, Peterson, 1957.

- Sears, R. R., Pintler, M. H. & Sears, P. S. "Effects of Father Separation on Preschool Children's Doll Play Aggression, Child Development, 1946, 17, 219-243.
- Sears, R. R., Rau, L., & Alpert, R. Identification and Child Rearing. Stanford, California: Stanford University Press, 1965.
- Shaw, M. E. & Wright, J. M. Scales for the Measurement of Attitudes. New York: McGraw Hill, 1967.
- Shoben, E. J. "The Assessment of Parental Attitudes in Relation to Child Adjustment," Genetic Psychology Monograph, 1949, 39, 103-148.
- Snider, J. G. & Osgood, C. E. Semantic Differential Technique, A Sourcebook, Chicago: Aldine Publishing Company, 1969.
- Steimel, R. J. "Childhood Experiences and Masculinity-Femininity Scores," Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1960, 7, 212-217.
- Stendler, C. B. "Possible Causes of Overdependency in Young Children." Child Development, 1954, 25, 125-146.
- Stoke, S. M. "An Inquiry into the Concept of Identification." Journal of Genetic Psychology, 1950, 76, 164-184.
- Stolz, L. M. et al., Father Relations of War Born Children. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1964.
- Sutherland, H.E.G. "The Relationship between I.Q. and Size of Family in the Case of Fatherless Children. Journal of Genetic Psychology, 1930, 38, 161-170.
- Sutton-Smith, B., Roberts, J. M. & Rosenberg, B. G. "Sibling Associations and Role Involvement," Merrill Palmer Quarterly, 1964, 10, 25-38.
- Sutton-Smith, B., Rosenberg, B. G., and Landy, F. "Father-Absence Effects in Families of Different Sibling Compositions." Child Development, 1968, 38, 1213-1221.
- Tiller, P. O. "Father-Absence and Personality Development of Children in Sailor Families," Nordisk Psychologi Monograph Series, 1958, 9, 1-48.
- Whiting, J. W. M. "Sorcery, Sin, and the Superego: A Cross-Cultural Study of Some Mechanisms of Social Control." In M. R. Jones (Ed.), Nebraska Symposium on Motivation, 1959, Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1959, 174-195.

Winch, R. F. Identification and Its Familial Determinants.
New York: Bobbs-Merrill, 1962.

Wynn, M. Fatherless Families. London: Michael Joseph, 1964.

MICHIGAN STATE UNIV. LIBRARIES



31293101528085