The purpose of this exploratory study was to develop hypotheses about the relationships between nurturance in fathers to their small children and independent variables thought to be associated with fathers' nurturance. A second purpose was to attempt to clarify the father role in contemporary American society.

The literature of child development and psychology reveals that fathers have been thought to be unimportant in childrearing and inaccessible for research. They have been considered unimportant when compared with the mother and also weak when compared with fathers of the past. Fathers were considered inaccessible for research apparently because researchers were unwilling to adapt their schedules to those of fathers. Mothers who work full time are inaccessible for similar reasons.

The information for this study was collected through interviews with a stratified random sample of 42 fathers. As preparation, the literature of child development, child psychology,
family studies, sociology, anthropology, psychoanalysis, and social work was reviewed for information on the relationships between fathers and their small children. Seven specialists were interviewed for their observations, ideas, opinions, and insights about fathers and small children based on their working experience. Insight-stimulating examples from the investigator's observations and experiences were analyzed to suggest areas to be covered in the study. A pilot study served as a pretest of the interview schedule developed to collect the data for the study.

Fathers' nurturance was measured by the Fathers' Nurturance Scales (FaNS) developed for this study to measure aspects of caretaking activities, play, and emotional investment of fathers. Social class, the primary independent variable of interest, was measured by an index of self-direction in occupation, developed from ideas of Kohn (1969). Authoritarianism, the other principal variable of interest, was measured by the Traditional Family Ideology Scale (TFI) (Levinson and Huffman, 1955).

The data were analyzed by a multiple regression program which constructed a model of significant independent variables associated with the dependent variable, Y (FaNS). The independent variables found significant, in order of their "importance" in contributing to the "explanation" of the variation in the FaNS scores were: How closely fathers felt they were supervised on the job, age of child, employment of mothers, fathers' work with data, people, and things, time spent with child, age of father, and authoritarianism. The
computer model thus produced a "type" of father which could be predicted to be nurturant to his small children (ages one to five). This father would be a man with a job in which he felt he was not closely supervised, with a child between one and two years of age, whose wife works full time, spends 50 or more hours in an average week with his child, is between 26 and 30 years of age, and who is "authoritarian" as measured by the TFI. An unexpected finding was that the more nurturant fathers were authoritarian. One hypothesis was proposed on the basis of the fathers' occupational conditions. Speculative interpretations of the relationships between the independent variables making up the predictive model and the dependent variable, Y (FaNS), were offered.

This study did not substantiate the assumptions found in the literature that fathers are unimportant in childrearing and inaccessible for research. In the regions surveyed in this study, no fathers were found inaccessible, nor were there any fathers who thought they were unimportant in childrearing. Neglect of fathers in research suggested to be part of neglect of many important areas in family study, perhaps due to over-simplified interpretations of family life by some students working in the field.
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Students unfamiliar with American contemporary culture might conclude from reading the scientific literature in the field of family relations that fathers play little or no part in childrearing (Ross, 1964). The cultural philosophy of child care adopted by many present day American psychologists and social science researchers has led to the general neglect of fathers. The majority of psychologists have not considered fathers to be important in childrearing (Nash, 1965). Stolz (1967) voiced their apparent belief that "fathers are inaccessible for research and unimportant in childrearing" (p. 303). The explanation of this ignominious treatment of fathers, and the peculiar belief of students of family relations that fathers are unimportant in childbearing, may have to await analysis by the cultural historian.¹

Any notion, however, that this sentiment is a new one must be tempered by comments in the literature from the 1830's through the 1860's. There one finds comments such as this: "the role of the father received little attention, in contrast to the role of the mother ... fathers had little to do with children" (Sunley,

1955, p. 152). Even then, his functions in the family were said to be "declining".

Although the neglect of fathers in parent-child relations is frequently acknowledged (Nash, 1965; Bossard and Boll, 1960; Layman, 1961; Martin and Stendler, 1954; Taconis, 1969), it is usually rationalized by attributing the neglect to the assumptions that fathers are less accessible for research and study than mothers, and that the conceptual frameworks used in childrearing research do not emphasize the importance of the father (Tallman, 1965). Sometimes it is apparently assumed that fathers are included in studies of parents (Layman, 1961; Rosenthal, Ni, Finkelstein and Berkwits, 1962), but data usually come from mothers (Pedersen and Robson, 1969). The meaning of the phrase, "fathers unimportant in childrearing" has, however, been left unclarified. Possible meanings will be examined later.

Bronfenbrenner (1958) has summarized the major changes in parental behavior over the years 1932-1957:

1. Greater permissiveness toward the child's spontaneous desires,
2. Freer expression of affection,
3. Increased reliance on indirect "psychological" techniques of discipline versus direct methods, and
4. A narrowing of the gap between social classes in their patterns of child rearing in the direction of what are predominately middle class values and techniques.
He later (1961) added a fifth trend, based on the materials of Bronson, Katten and Livson (1959); the "relative position of the father vis-a-vis the mother shifting with the former becoming increasingly more affectionate and less authoritarian, and the latter becoming relatively more important as the agent of discipline, especially for boys" (p. 349).

Little has been added in the literature to clarify the fifth trend. Casual observation of, and conversations with, young fathers in 1972 alerts us to one theme suggested in Bronfenbrenner's work - the increased expression of affection and interest in young children by fathers. This can often be seen in public as well as in the privacy of their own homes. There has been little research, however, based on an exploration of the meaning of fathers becoming "more affectionate and less authoritarian".

**Purpose of the Study**

The purpose here is to examine relationships between the nurturant activities and attitudes of fathers toward their small children and the fathers' social class position and authoritarian behavior patterns. This will be done by comparing a sample of "middle-class" fathers with a sample of "working-class" fathers on the Fathers' Nurturance Scales (hereafter referred to as FaNS). The relationship between authoritarianism as measured by the "Traditional Family Ideology" scale of Levinson and Huffman (1955), and fathers' expression of nurturance (measured by FaNS) will also
be examined to determine the relationship between those two variables. Since this is an exploratory study, the data are not used to test formally derived hypotheses. Instead, the data are used to develop hypotheses regarding associations between fathers' nurturant activities and attitudes in relation to their small children and the independent variables.

A secondary aim is to explore fathers' nurturant activities and attitudes in the context of the father role in contemporary American society. The review of the literature covers the father role as well as the concept of nurturance in relation to fathers.

Assumptions made in the scientific literature are the subject of critical analysis, and some ideas about the changing roles of men and women, fathers and mothers, are scrutinized. Since "father" role is reciprocal to "mother" role, it is necessary to examine some of the assumptions made in the scientific literature regarding mothers as well as fathers.

Section I
Review of Literature

What have students and researchers in the field of family relations meant by the assumption that fathers are unimportant in childrearing? This assumption is widely used in two different contexts, viz., (1) fathers are unimportant in childrearing when compared with mothers, and (2) fathers are unimportant in childrearing when compared with fathers of the past.
The second context, fathers unimportant in childrearing when compared with fathers of the past, has been a popular theme in both the scientific literature of childrearing and in popular literature. A cultural anthropologist wrote that "In no other societies is the father as vestigial as in the U.S." (Gorer, 1948, p. 54). Father has become a "court jester" according to LeMasters (1971), an "imp of fun" (Henry, 1963), he has "abdicated" (LeMasters, 1971), defaulted in his responsibility (English, 1954) and has been "dethroned" (von der Heydt, 1964). The assumption has been widely held that the American father no longer has the authority and responsibility which he had in the past (Mogey, 1957). Clearly, more research by cultural historians is needed. There is some evidence which suggests that the "authoritarian father of the past" never existed in America in the past three centuries (Bennis and Slater, 1968). Goode (1971) suggests that the "picture that has been handed down to us — of the autocratic, all powerful, remote Victorian father — is essentially a portrait of the English upper-middle class and upper-class father. We have no reason to suppose that the authoritarian father was typical in ordinary American farm families in the past, and certainly it has not been an accurate picture of the urban lower-class father in recent times or even over the past half-century" (p. 4). The net effect of assumptions from the literature suggests that fathers were more powerful family members in the past, were more authoritarian, and that they have lost their authority and they are no longer as
important to the family as they were in the past. Since the available evidence is sparse and conflicting, we can only conclude that there are a number of different interpretations of the father's role in the past, and that much more work needs to be done in this area before the assumption that fathers of the past were unimportant in childrearing can be evaluated with any accuracy.

The assumption that fathers are unimportant in childrearing when compared with mothers is generally found in the psychology and child development literature. Here research emphasis has been on maternal influences on the child, and until very recent years, no studies are to be found in the literature dealing with father-infant or father-small child interaction. In the latest edition of Carmichael's Manual of Child Psychology (1970), a compendium of the latest research in child psychology, there are six brief references to fathers in the index of volume two; altogether there are in the two volumes of this work two thousand three hundred and ninety-one pages.

In the psychological and child development literature, fathers have been thought to have little or no direct influence on the infant and small child. Typical comments from the literature include: "the early influence of the father is exerted through the mother" (Meerloo, 1968, p. 103); "the father's psychological role functions through the mother toward the infant in the early days and weeks of life" (English, 1954, p. 325). "Father's influence ... is indirect and mediated by the mother" (Martin and Stendler,
Bartemeier (1953) commented that the father influences the child indirectly, while Parsons (1964) spoke of the "solitary dyadic group formed by the child's early attachment to his mother (in which) ... father plays a minimal role" (p. 526).

Sociologists, in another context, have supported the notion of fathers' indirect influence, i.e., "father's role is seen as affecting the socialization of the child by influencing the family system rather than simply directly affecting the child" (Tallman, 1965, p. 37). Assumptions in the literature on maternal deprivation have also perpetuated the notion of distance between fathers and their infants and small children. Father plays "second fiddle", and his "value increases only as the child becomes more able to stand alone" (Bowlby, 1952, p. 13). Bowlby further suggests that father's use is to provide emotional and economic support to the mother.

The literature of attachment further supports the view that father and his infant or small child lack intimate contact. The assumptions have been made that the initial, intense attachment made to the mother or mother-substitute must become firmly established before the infant is able to gradually form other attachments, and, the other ties are assumed to be subsidiary in intensity to the mother attachment. These assumptions are challenged by Schaffer and Emerson's work.
That attachments are, for intrinsic reasons, initially confined to one object, that subsequent attachments are formed only gradually after the first relationship has become firmly established, and that these other attachments are always subsidiary in intensity compared with that to the mother -- these are all assumptions that are widely and firmly held, despite the fact that no empirical studies have concerned themselves with this point (1964, p. 70).

Another notion expressed is that fathers are unimportant in childrearing when compared with mothers because they are assumed to spend so much less time with their children. Fathers are supposedly so involved in their main activity of economic provision for the family that they have little or no time left to spend with their children. Therefore, it has been concluded that father has "delegated his place in childrearing to mother" (Nash, 1965, p. 292). His main tie to the family is as a liaison between the family sub-system and the outside world (Parsons and Bales, 1955); he is "the bridge to the vast world outside" (Meerloo, 1968, p. 102) and a "link between the private life of the family and the public arena of achieved status" (McKinley, 1964, p. 5). The cultural stereotype of the contemporary American father is that of having turned over "all parental responsibility to the mother except the learned one of providing support" (Rubenstein and Levitt, 1957, p. 18).

Still another argument of the unimportance of fathers when compared with mothers stems from the comparison of cultural assumptions regarding masculinity and femininity in American society. The cultural stereotype of masculinity which sees males as sexually active, athletic, independent, dominant, courageous, and competitive
precludes the idea that males can be nurturant, warm, tender and gentle in the way that females are assumed to be. Bartemeier reported that "a loving and gentle father is consciously or unconsciously looked upon as a psychological failure in the sense that he isn't really a he-man" (1953, p. 380). Fathers are said to be excluded from nurturant activities in relation to their infants and small children in the first few years of life; fathers "cannot help tenderly and pleasurably with the tasks of the first two or three years" of the child's life (Dicks, 1967, p. 723). The male is said to have no talent for nurture (Brenton, 1966).

The net effect of the arguments that fathers are comparatively unimportant in childrearing in contrast to mothers is that fathers have little or nothing to do with childrearing (Jordan, 1962). Implicit in the assumptions involving comparisons between mothers and fathers, and in the cultural stereotypes about masculinity and femininity, is the notion that the infant and small child receives all, or most, of her or his nurturance, warmth, tenderness and gentle care from the mother.

The meaning of the word nurturance is difficult to pin down in terms of what is found in the child development and psychology literature. The word nurturance is often used interchangeably with warmth (Payne and Mussen, 1956; Maccoby, 1961), positive affect or affection (Mussen and Distler, 1959; Hoffman, 1961; Mussen and Rutherford, 1963), affectionate (Mussen and Distler, 1959); but in none of the studies is it defined, although Maccoby (1961) pointed
out that the word warmth may have different meaning in relation to children of different ages. When the child is an infant, or is very small, "warmth is likely to mean the contact comfort that Harlow has described" (Maccoby, 1961, p. 364). Casler (1965) suggests that "mothering" a very small child or infant may mean "touching", i.e., physical contact of a gentle or tender nature. Warmth or nurturance as implying touching, cuddling, cradling, handling, holding and carrying the infant or small child, i.e., physical contact which is gentle and tender, may also be features of "paternal" behaviors (Mitchell, 1969; Benedek, 1970; Itani, 1963). In studies where the variable warmth has been used with father-child data, it has usually been in connection with school age or older children; rarely has it been used with preschoolers (Baumrind, 1965). Studies of father-child interaction, where children were school age or older include Bronson, Katten and Livson (1959), Mussen and Distler (1959), Hoffman (1961), and Mussen and Rutherford (1963). Few attempts have been made to investigate warmth or nurturance in the father-infant or father-small child dyad; where there have been such studies, the data came from mothers (Senn and Hartford, 1968; Pedersen and Robson, 1969).

Why has warmth been thought to be an important variable? Hoffman (1961) suggested that warmth from fathers is an important factor which leads a child (particularly a boy) to a "feeling of being loved and accepted" (p. 103). Maccoby (1961) concluded that "warmth ... occupies a central role in socialization studies in
its relationship to other measures of child-training variables" (p. 363). Factor analyses which Maccoby checked showed warmth emerging as a fairly clear factor. She also pointed out that psychodynamic theorists believe warmth is important

... because of its role in producing identification. But the laboratory learning theorists can acknowledge its importance for another very simple reason. Before a parent can socialize a child, he must have established a relationship with the child such that the child will stay in the vicinity of the parent and orient himself toward the parent. A warm parent keeps the child responsive to his directions by providing an atmosphere in which the child has continuous expectations that good things will happen to him, if he stays near his parent and responds to his parent's wishes. Fear of punishment can also make the child attentive to the parent, of course, but it establishes as well the conflicting motivation to escape out of reach of the punisher (Maccoby, 1961, p. 364).

On the other hand, Nash (1965) in his review of the literature on fathers in contemporary culture, observed that the "father who shows tenderness and nurturance towards children is regarded as effeminate" (p. 263), while Bartemeier (1953) concluded that "loving almost means being soft. Being gentle and kind almost means being a sissy" (p. 280).

It remained for Baumrind and Black (1967) to recognize that the "warmth factor tends to be a rather global construct including such diverse variables as use of reasoning, success of enforcement policy, and nonpunitive attitudes" (p. 319). Baumrind (1965) therefore described what she called parental nurturance as the "pre-dilection of the parent to perform the caretaking functions. Nurturance is composed of warmth and involvement. By warmth is
meant the parent's personal love and compassion for the child expressed by sensory stimulation of the child, verbal approval, and tenderness of expression. By involvement is meant identification by the parent with the behavior and feelings of the child, her pride and pleasure in the child's accomplishments, and her conscientious protection of the child's welfare" (p. 231). (Note the use of "her" to refer to parent!) Baumrind (1967) later added "touch" to her definition of warmth, within the overall description of parental nurturance.

In this study, nurturance is taken to mean essentially what Pederson and Robson (1969) have described as nurturant involvement, a combination of caretaking activities, investment, and play activities. Investment, in Pedersen and Robson's terms, is similar to Baumrind's (1965) warmth factor in parental nurturance, described above.

Studies involving warmth or nurturance have usually attempted to indicate social class differences in the expression of warmth, i.e., middle-class parents are thought to be warmer than working-class parents (Becker, 1964). Working-class children suffer from lack of love (Lipset, 1960). However, Senn and Hartford (1968) in an in-depth study of eight families which they considered "average" (two who identified themselves with upper-middle-class orientations, three with middle-middle class, and three with working-class orientations), noted no particular association of class to nurturant or warm behavior of the fathers with their first infant (up to two years of age).
Authoritarianism is also thought to be negatively related to warmth in parents (Baumrind, 1965; Block, 1955). Some sociologists believe that working-class parents are authoritarian (Lipset, 1960; McKinley, 1964); they associate childrearing practices which include physical punishment, "lack of love, and a general atmosphere of tension and aggression from early childhood" with working-class parents (Lipset, 1960, p. 114). The authoritarian family pattern concept of a working-class father is one who would "rather not be bothered with his children" (Handel, 1970, p. 99). This picture of working-class authoritarian family patterns has apparently been the outgrowth of sociological studies in which a "social structural explanation of why the authoritarian response occurs in the lower classes" is given (McKinley, 1964, p. 89), as opposed to a psychological explanation of authoritarian personality (Levinson and Huffman, 1955). This sociological explanation, advocated particularly by Lipset and McKinley, sees the lower- and working-class life conditions providing a milieu in which fathers are distant and severe and have little contact with their children, particularly their infants and small children. "The lower-class child will tend to have a minimum contact with father . . . the mother-child relationship is a strong one in the lower-class families, at least during early childhood" (Ritchie and Koller, 1964, p. 58).

In contrast to Lipset's and McKinley's sociological explanation of authoritarianism as an outgrowth of class conditions, psychologists see authoritarianism as a personality variable.
Block (1955), working with a sample of military officers, found that fathers who expressed restrictive attitudes toward child-rearing were almost prototypes of what has been labelled the authoritarian personality by Adorno, Frenkel-Brunswik, Levinson and Sanford (1950). Baumrind (1966) sees authoritarian parents as detached and controlling, and somewhat less warm than other parents; Hoffman (1963) found authoritarian parents "show little empathy for the child and little consideration for his feelings" (p. 870).

Both the sociological and psychological explanations, however, do concur in the association of authoritarianism in parents with lack of warmth. Moreover, many studies involved in this area of research have implied that children raised by authoritarian parents compared unfavorably with children whose parents were more permissive and democratic (Gibson, 1968; Baumrind, 1966; Hart, 1967).

A third possible explanation for the variation in occurrence of expression of warmth by fathers to children is a cultural one. Anthropologists have indicated that various types of behaviors are often a matter of cultural variation, e.g., what may be considered "masculine" in one culture may be considered "feminine" in another (Mead, 1935). Malinowski (1927) pointed out that fathers' expression of tender and affectionate feelings in relation to their children depended upon cultural prescription. The Trobriand Islands' fathers Malinowski studied lavished tender care on their infants and small children, since it was considered the mother's husband's duty (whether he was the biological father or not) to
tend the infant and small child just as the mother might do.

Although the early and mid-twentieth century American male cultural stereotype appears to have been that described by Bartemeier (1953), i.e., that loving and gentle behavior on the part of fathers was not part of the masculine ideal, there is some evidence that this image may have been changing as early as 1957. In a representative sample taken for a national survey of the mental health of the American people (data collected in 1957) Gurin, Veroff and Feld (1960) reported that what concerned fathers most were their feelings of inadequacy experienced as a result of not having a warm relationship with their children, and, in addition, they had guilt feelings over not having enough time to spend with their children.

Margaret Mead has suggested that the confusion is not so much over a change in father's role in recent years, but rather that it is over the difference between being "masculine and being a man".

Masculinity is that part of a male's behavior which distinguishes him from a female -- in his sex relations, in fighting and in sport. Stress on masculinity means stress on not being a woman. But manhood is that part of a male's behavior which makes him a responsible human being, able to control his sexuality, bridle his aggression, protect and provide for his wife and children and make some positive contribution to this world. If taking care of children is seen as playing a woman's part, being a sucker, being dominated by women, it will be looked at one way. If it is seen as an extension of manhood, as an exercise of strength, imagination and tenderness it will be looked at the other way (Mead, 1959, p. 67).
If, in Mead's terms, a change is taking place in which males are becoming more concerned with manhood in place of masculinity, this might account for the observed behavior of young fathers performing nurturant activities in relation to their small children.

The literature of childrearing has neglected another possible explanation for nurturance in fathers; namely, that there is a factor of "fathering", which perhaps varies as much in humans as it is reported to vary in nonhuman primates (Mitchell, 1969; Kaufman, 1970). When the concept of "mothering" gains support from the work of Harlow (1958; 1959) it seems reasonable to suggest that support for the concept of "fathering" (or, "paternalistic behaviors"), found in the psychology literature, be recognized (Mitchell, 1969). Other support for the notion of "fathering" as an inherent response of males comes from psychobiologic sources, e.g., "fatherliness is an instinctually rooted character trend which enables the father to act toward his child or all children with immediate empathic responsiveness" (Benedek, 1970, p. 175). Although Mead (1971) denied a "fathering instinct" in men, she suggests that "men have an innate response to the helplessness of very young human beings. The father who sees a great deal of his child - or any child - during its early weeks of life seems to respond with a deep and continuing tender interest" (p. 38).

Fathers' expression of nurturance to their infants and small children, then, may be related to one or more of four possible explanations, according to the literature: (1) as a concomitant of
class conditions, i.e., the milieu of life conditions in the middle-
class make it more likely that fathers may express warmth or
nurturance to their infants and small children than do the life
conditions of the working-class; (2) as a condition of "authoritarianism" in fathers, i.e., those fathers considered to have the
"authoritarian personality", or to be "authoritarian" by reason of
class position, are less likely to express nurturance than fathers
who are not authoritarian; (3) it may be that the expression of
nurturance by fathers to their infants and small children is
a cultural trend, which, since the 1950's is finding more acceptance
among fathers regardless of class membership or authoritarian
ideology; or (4) fathers may behave with "empathic responsiveness"
in relation to their small children as an "instinctually rooted
character trend" (Benedek, 1970).

This study is primarily concerned with the first explanation,
and additionally with the second. Specifically, the focus of
attention is on fathers' nurturant attitudes and activities in
relation to their small children as related to social class membership,
with fathers' nurturant attitudes and activities in relation
to authoritarianism a secondary interest.

In addition to the assumption that fathers are unimportant in
childrearing, (prevalent as we have seen in the literature of
psychology and child development) is the assumption that fathers
are inaccessible for research. There appears to be no explana-
tion for this assumption; those who have decided to include fathers
in their research have not reported difficulty in so doing (Engvall,
1954; Eron, Banta, Walder and Laulicht, 1961; Hoffman, 1961; Stolz, 1967). This study explores some dimensions of this assumption.

Section II
The Model

A model can be useful as a basis for suggesting what information needs to be collected, as well as providing guidelines for interpretations of the information collected. A model can be utilized as a framework within which to examine and analyze questions of interest. For the purposes of this study, the model selected provides a means by which aspects of the father role in contemporary American society are examined to see whether there is an association between variables such as social class membership and authoritarian patterns of behavior and fathers' expressions of nurturance to their small children. The model helps define the questions considered in this study and defines terms and specifications of the father role which, it is hoped, may enable the investigator to better understand a seemingly confused and ill-defined area within the study of parent-child relations.

Part of the difficulty in assessing the father role in contemporary American society has been the lack of a model which differentiates between what fathers do indirectly for their children (i.e., their occupational roles make them important as economic providers) and what they do in direct interaction with their children. Father as "head-of-the-family", in which his major contribution is through material provision by way of his occupational
capacity and where he is a liaison between the family and the "outside" world (Parsons, 1964), has occupied a large portion of sociologists' attention, and this has generally been assumed to be the most important aspect of the father role. In his occupational role, however, father is in indirect relation to his child, since in this role he is making economic provision for himself as well as the rest of the family and performs this role generally outside the home. His direct interaction with his child is quite a different aspect of his father role and may include attitudes and behaviors different from those he performs in his role as economic provider.

To overcome difficulties in conceptualizing the father role, while allowing for the examination of the combination of "father-as-economic-provider" and dyadic father-child interaction, a new model is needed. Goodenough (1965) provides materials for a model which helps organize the data by distinguishing between father's duty as economic provider and father's privilege to be "nurturant".

Goodenough's model suggests that a male takes on a specific social identity when he becomes a father. In assuming this social identity he also assumes "statuses" associated with this new social identity which may be identified as combinations of rights, duties, and privileges. There are expectations associated with each specific social status which a man is expected to perform in accordance with certain limits of behavior in the father role.
One of these expectations is that fathers provide for their children in accordance with duties prescribed by the society in which they live. "A social identity is an aspect of self that makes a difference in how one's rights and duties distribute to specific others" (Goodenough, 1965, p. 3). "Status" refers to combinations of rights and duties for any social identity; i.e., "formal properties of statuses involve what legal theorists call rights, duties, privileges, powers, liabilities, and immunities" (Goodenough, 1965, p. 2). Furthermore, "rights and their duty counterparts serve to define boundaries within which the parties to social relationships are expected to confine their behavior. Privileges relate to the areas of option within these boundaries" (Goodenough, 1965, p. 3).

Part of a father's duty in contemporary American society is to make economic provision for his children (Parsons and Bales, 1955). From the perspective of the model, father's occupational activity is part of his status in his social identity as father, i.e., it is his duty to provide his child with economic support. On the other hand, whether he is stern, indulgent, gentle, tender, loving, or harsh is a matter, not of duty, but of privilege or option (providing he is not abusive or neglectful to the point of being reprimanded by society for his behavior). If he is indulgent this is part of his personal identity but it may not be the "norm" for fathers to be indulgent. Whether he is indulgent or stern will be evident in his performance with his child.
Role, according to Goodenough, is the aggregate of the composite statuses of the social identity "father" similar to what Merton (1957) has called a "role-set" so that when speaking of the "father-role" all aspects of a father's relationship to his child can be included, with the implicit recognition that there is a variety of statuses comprising the father role, i.e., rights, duties and privileges.

Goodenough's model also provides for investigating attitudes and beliefs as compared to actual performance. In terms of the model, fathers' attitudes and beliefs reflect their understanding of father role norms or expectations. Fathers' reported behaviors may be expected to reflect their understanding of their privileges, or fathers' optative personal styles relating to their children.

While providing for a comparison of fathers' attitudes and beliefs in relation to nurturant activities, Goodenough's model does not provide an explanation of possible differences in fathers' attitudes and beliefs as well as their behaviors with regard to the expression of nurturance to their small children. It is an assumption of this study that social class makes a difference in the way fathers express nurturance in relation to their small children. A few studies have suggested that middle-class fathers are "warmer" than are working class fathers (Becker, 1964; Mitchell, 1950); and it was suggested in Gurin, Veroff and Feld's (1960) data from the Americans view their mental health survey that having a warm relationship with his child is now valued and desired by many fathers.
Kohn (1969) provides evidence that "values and orientations" are different for middle-class fathers than they are for working-class fathers, and that these "values and orientations" do influence their attitudes and behaviors toward their children.

These values and orientations are different, says Kohn, because the occupational conditions under which fathers work facilitate or preclude the exercise of self-direction in work. Characteristics of self-direction include an interest in how and why things happen, good sense and sound judgment, responsibility, self-reliance, the ability to face facts squarely, and the ability to do well under pressure. Being able to exercise these characteristics is more valued at higher class levels. Conformity, on the other hand, is more valued at lower class levels. This relates, says Kohn, to men's occupations:

the higher men's social class, the more importance they attach to how interesting the work is, the amount of freedom you have, the chance to help people, and the chance to use your abilities. The lower their class position, the more importance they attach to pay, fringe benefits, the supervisor, co-workers, the hours of work, how tiring the work is, job security, and not being under too much pressure (Kohn, 1969, p. 76).

In addition, men of higher social class see society differently than do men of lower social class. Working-class men will be more likely to see the wisdom of following the dictates of authority whereas men of higher social class tend to see that responsible individual action is practical for them. Kohn further shows that
men's occupations tend to promote either self-direction or conformity, and that middle-class men are more likely to be in occupations which allow for the exercise of self-direction than are working-class men. Working-class men are more likely to find themselves in occupations in which the exercise of self-direction is precluded.

Another important facet of social class position is education, and the cumulative effects of education and occupational position are the best indicators of social class (Kohn, 1969).

Values and orientations, then, may be different for men in different social classes and these values and orientations in turn influence their attitudes and behaviors in relation to their children (Kohn, 1969). One of the indices of the relationship between social class and social orientation is what Kohn calls "authoritarian conservatism", which seems roughly equivalent to what is called "authoritarianism" in this study. "Authoritarian conservatism", in Kohn's terms, is an index of a person's definition of what is socially acceptable. "At one extreme, rigid conformance to the dictates of authority and intolerance of nonconformity; at the other extreme, open-mindedness" (Kohn, 1969, p. 79).

For the purposes of this study, it is assumed that middle-class men, whose occupations are likely to offer opportunities for "self-direction", will be more nurturant to their small children than will working-class men. The use of initiative, thought and judgment on the job gives men the feeling that they have some control over their lives, and this orientation is carried through into their relations
with their children. In addition, middle-class jobs involve work with people where interpersonal relationships are important. Since men value for their children what they value for themselves, they will value the ability to get along with others. Middle-class parents "tend to feel a greater obligation to be supportive of their children" (Handel, 1970, p. 99). This supportiveness may be translated into "nurturance" toward small children, therefore in this study it is assumed that middle-class men will value nurturance in relation to their small children as part of training for future competency in interpersonal relationships.

A further assumption is that working-class fathers tend to be more authoritarian than middle-class fathers. Kohn has indicated that authoritarian patterns of behavior are associated with rigid adherence to conformity, which is in turn associated with occupational conditions many working-class men experience.

Through the use of the model outlined above, information will be sought to specify two aspects of fathers' activities in relation to their small children. What fathers should do, i.e., what the expectations of the father role in contemporary American society are, will be tapped by an attitude scale; and what fathers report they actually do, i.e., their personal styles or privilege, will be measured by a behavior scale. Two independent variables, social class and authoritarianism, will be examined in relation to the attitudes and behaviors reported by the fathers. In addition, other independent variables thought to be associated with fathers'
attitudes and behaviors toward their small children will be explored.

Data generated from the information obtained through interviews with fathers will provide bases for the development of hypotheses, which, in turn, may suggest avenues for research into the area of father-small child relations.
CHAPTER II
RESEARCH DESIGN AND PROCEDURE

INTRODUCTION

Selltiz, Jahoda, Deutsch and Cook (1959) have suggested that the use of the exploratory type of research design is appropriate when there is incomplete knowledge of a subject, and that "exploratory research is necessary to obtain experience that will be helpful in formulating relevant hypotheses for more definite investigation . . . in cases of problems about which little knowledge is available, an exploratory study is usually most appropriate" (Selltiz et al., 1959, p. 52). The specific purposes of this study coincide with the rationale and functions outlined by Selltiz et al. for doing an exploratory study, i.e., the first purpose is to develop hypotheses about fathers' nurturant attitudes and activities in relation to their small children, and a second purpose is to "clarify concepts" about the father role in contemporary U.S. society.

In general, research design should provide for the collection of relevant evidence to fulfill the requirements of the research study in the most expeditious manner. "A research design is the arrangement of conditions for collection and analysis of data in a manner that aims to combine relevance to the research purpose with economy in procedure . . . (In exploratory studies, the broad research purpose is) to gain familiarity with a phenomenon or to achieve new insights into it, often in order to formulate a more precise research problem or to develop hypotheses" (Selltiz et al.,
1959, p. 50). However, the limitations of exploratory research impose certain restrictions on the investigation. Since exploratory research does not call for manipulating or assigning subjects or treatments, i.e., manipulating or assigning subjects or treatments in exploratory research is not possible, therefore there can be no "true" experiment (Kerlinger, 1964). The independent variables, in this case social class position and authoritarian behavior patterns, are not under the control of the investigator; they have already occurred prior to the time of the research. They can be measured, however, by the use, in the case of social class, of the Hollingshead two-factor index (Hollingshead, 1957), and in the case of "authoritarianism" by the Traditional Family Ideology scale (TFI) developed by Levinson and Huffman (1955). In addition, there are a number of variables thought to be associated with fathers' nurturance that can be controlled statistically. In order for the investigator to have control over possible effects of other variables thought to be associated with fathers' nurturant attitudes and activities in relation to his small children the following variables were selected to be examined in this study: the fathers' age, education, income, religious preference and associations, and his time involvement with the child; age and sex of child, number of children in the family and employment of the wife/mother.

Three preliminary steps in the research process which an exploratory study can profit from, according to Sellitz et al. (1959), are (1) a careful review of the literature in the area of interest,
(2) an "experience survey" which may help to obtain insights into relationships between or among variables, and (3) the analysis of "insight-stimulating" examples. The literature in parent-child relations reveals that little is known of the relationship of parental values to social class (Kohn, 1969), that "the studies reported in the literature on parent-child relationships present chaotic and contradictory results" (Radke, 1946), and that "the research literature too often gives the appearance of a confusing array of discrete studies which do not add up to anything useful" (Hoffman and Hoffman, 1964, p. 1). To add to the confusion, fathers have usually been excluded from research involving parent and small child or infant, so that the end result is considerable disagreement over, and limited conceptualization of, the content of the father role in contemporary American society. From the review of the literature, it seems clear that clarification of the conceptualization of the father role and clearer definition of this area of father-small child relations is needed.

For this study, a selected sample of people working in diversified areas of parent-child relationships was interviewed. The interviews with these specialists also served as a pre-test of parts of the interview schedule developed for use with the main sample fathers. But my interest was initially triggered by four examples of what Selltiz et al (1959) have called "insight-stimulating" experiences. One was the observation, beginning in the early 1960's,
that young fathers seemed to be engaging in many activities with their infants and small children in public - one saw them in the shopping centers, at concerts, strolling in the parks, carrying, holding, feeding, talking with, cooing over, and cuddling their infants and small children with no apparent discomfort or embarrassment.

The second example was my experience with a young working-class man who brought wood to my home for a number of years. He labors in a mill, and sells wood to private customers as a means of stretching his income. When I met him, his first child was a baby, and I was struck by the fact that he often had the baby with him when he came to deliver wood, and exhibited the most tender and solicitous behavior to this child. That continued as long as I knew him, a period of about four years. I questioned what I had read in the literature about working-class fathers.

My third and fourth experiences were in my own family. My father was an extremely warm and nurturant person, in my memory, and seemed to have no hesitation in expressing his feelings to me in public or in private. Since he was born in 1883, he might be considered a "father of the past", but certainly did not fit the image of the "authoritarian father of the past". Perhaps he was unusual, but I also observed my friends' fathers behaving this way. Perhaps the most important example of my own experience which served as "insight-stimulating" was the development of my own son's socialization into fatherhood. He had maintained
a reluctance about having a child for a number of years, but after he became a father, he developed a warmth and nurturance for his son which surprised everyone. My own guess is that he became socialized into nurturant fatherhood by responding to his small son. I wondered then whether (since men have little or no preparation for fatherhood) they learn to be fathers by responding to the day-by-day encounters they have with their infants and small children.

My own experience, then, from the four examples outlined above, served to make me question the assumptions in the childrearing literature which promote the idea that fathers are unimportant in childrearing. Also, the more I talked with young fathers about themselves and their relationships with their infants and small children, the more I wondered whether they were really "inaccessible for research". My experience indicated that fathers surveyed in this study seemed accessible, and some even expressed indignation over the neglect of fathers in research. They felt very important in the lives of their infants and small children. For these reasons, I decided that any data on a study of fathers must come from the fathers themselves.

The data, then, were obtained from interviews with fathers themselves. The importance of collecting data from fathers about their own activities and attitudes, rather than having it come from other sources, has been pointed out by Layman (1961), and Stolz (1966). Different family members describe very different "realities" in talking about their family life (Goode, 1971; Stolz, 1966; Laing, 1971). One of the few articles about father-infant interaction which
recently appeared in a professional journal stated, "it causes me
great embarrassment to report that the actual data on father
participation were secured by interviewing the mothers" (Pedersen
and Robson, 1969). The reason given for the failure to obtain the
data from the fathers was that researchers would not, or did not,
organize their work schedules to coincide with the availability of
the fathers!

For the purposes of this study, it was decided to conduct
interviews with fathers in their own homes. The home interview,
rather than a mail questionnaire, was selected as the method for
the collection of data, partly because of the length of the inter-
view schedule and partly because it was felt desirable to talk
informally with fathers after the conclusion of the formal portion
of the interview schedule to get their views on matters not covered
in the formal section.

While it is usually possible to sample a larger group by the
use of a mail questionnaire, the rate of return, even for relatively
simple questionnaires, is usually low. In this case, where the
interview schedule was fairly lengthy and dealing with a new area
of investigation, it was felt that home interviews would probably
yield the most data, and the more accurate data, than a mail question-
naire would. In this I was guided by the advice of the statistician
consulted for this study, Dr. Dave Faulkenberry, who had had experi-
ence with mail questionnaires and had found that even with simple,
short questionnaires, the rate of return was very poor.
The overall design of the study called for (1) a careful review of the literature in the field of father-child relations; (2) an experience survey; (3) analysis of "insight-stimulating" examples; (4) the development of an interview schedule which would be pretested in (5) a pilot study and then (6) utilized in interviewing a stratified random sample of fathers in Albany, Oregon, and a convenience sample of young fathers in Ellensburg, Washington. The review of the literature is found in Chapter I.

The Experience Survey

Expert practitioners in the field of parent-child relations may have knowledge which has not yet found its way into written form (Selltiz et al., 1959). People working daily in related fields of family relations, i.e., social workers, mental health workers, pediatricians, teachers, and others often have experience and information which could provide important ideas and suggestions for helping investigators develop questions for interview schedules, for pointing out important areas to cover, for clues, ideas and suggestions regarding fathers and their small children in contemporary American society based on their observations of father-small child interaction and work with families in general.

For this study, seven "experts" in a variety of fields related to father-child relations were interviewed informally and in depth. At the time the interview was scheduled by phone, an explanation was given of what the specialist would be asked to discuss so
that she or he would have time to think about the subject before being interviewed. All of these specialists seemed more than willing to discuss fathers and children, and in fact many commented that they had never before been asked to discuss fathers and children and felt that it was about time that research was directed to this area. In many cases, it meant taking time out of very busy schedules for these people, but for the most part they expressed interest in and pleasure at the idea that this area of father-child relations was to be explored.

The specialists were from a diversity of fields, including a pediatrician, a juvenile probation officer with the city-county government, a mental health specialist, a children's librarian in a large public library, a college teacher of Child Development with thirty-five years experience in the field, a social psychologist specializing in Child Psychology who is himself a young father, and a human development-anthropologist specialist who had recently worked with Robert LeVine of the University of Chicago on a study of father-child relations in Nigeria and on work with Lawrence Kohlberg on moral development in children, doing field work in Yucatan and Quintana Roo in Mexico with parents and children. The specialists' combined backgrounds seemed representative of many differing types of experience which could give insights and suggestions about the areas I wished to explore.

The specialists were asked to comment on their observations and experiences with fathers in relation to infants and small
children. Their observations were solicited concerning (a) shifts and changes in father-child relations from the recent past to the present, (b) differences in fathers' behaviors toward infants and small children which might be due to social class membership, (c) what factors they saw influencing father-small child relations at the present time, (d) areas where there is "trouble" in father-small child relations, and (e) what they thought might be other crucial areas to explore. Finally, the specialists were asked to go over the questionnaire which had been devised to tap fathers' nurturant attitudes and behaviors and to make suggestions for improvement in the questionnaire. For names and positions of the specialists see Appendix A.

Considering the wide diversity of the backgrounds of the specialists as well as differences in age and experience, it was surprising that there was so much agreement on the various areas explored. All of the specialists agreed that fathers' public interaction with their infants and small children is more observable now than in the recent past. It began in the mid-1960's and has grown increasingly in the past five or more years. The pediatrician commented that fathers were bringing their infants and small children to the well-baby clinic, as well as often being the ones to bring their small children into the office for regular appointments, either with the mother, or alone with the child. Formerly, only mothers came with infants and children.
The children's librarian observed that more fathers are coming to the library with their small children. The children's library has a play area which delights small children, and young fathers are often observed sitting and reading or watching while their small children play. Fathers also help small children pick out books, and often accompany the children to the special story hour that the library provides for the very young. Fathers are often seen sitting in the big comfortable chairs with the child on their laps reading to the child. The librarian commented that she felt that one of the changes she has observed over a period of about fifteen years as a children's librarian is that fathers now seem comfortable in displaying a very protective attitude toward their small children. She interprets this attitude as one of interest in and concern for the child. The college teacher of Child Development also commented on this - that young fathers seem at ease in expressing their feelings of protectiveness, wanting to comfort the child when the child is distressed or upset, and feeling comfortable about carrying, hugging or cuddling child when it is appropriate.

The pediatrician mentioned the importance of bedtime as a time for fathers to spend time with their children. (Here he said he was partly speaking from his own experience as a father of four children.) Bedtime is an ideal time, he suggested, for father to read to the child, hold her or him, talk with her or him while putting to bed. He also felt that it is important for fathers to
feel comfortable about getting down on the floor and playing with the child at the child's level. The interest of the father in the child he saw as crucial. Father is important in the family because he "sets the tone" of the family, according to the pediatrician. Where father is interested in his family, and particularly in his child, children are better adjusted, the pediatrician suggested.

The juvenile probation officer concurred with many of the pediatrician's ideas. He suggested that where fathers are absent or where they are drunks or on dope, children often exhibit maladaptive behavior, and from his experience, children under these conditions get no nurturance from the father. However, he commented that where working-class families are intact, he has found that the fathers are likely to be very nurturant to their children.

All the specialists agreed that, either from observation or from inferences that they have made in the course of working with families, fathers appear to be taking much more part in the daily activities of their infants and small children than they did formerly. Fathers are taking care of the children more than they used to, in many cases doing all of the caretaking activities with their small children that used to be associated with "mothering". The social psychologist, himself a young father, saw fathers taking much more interest in their children, doing a great deal of babysitting, engaging in much more activity with their children than either his father or his friends' fathers did when he was growing up in the 1950's. This young man came from a working-class family
where, although his father was always good to the children, he never did the kinds of things with them which this young man now does with his child.

The mental health worker saw father as the "key figure" in the family. His experience in dealing with problems of fathers' fears of being ineffective as a parent have led him to see that a child can be a threat to a vulnerable father. If the father is not fearful, however, he tends to be loving and caring toward his child. The mental health specialist also felt that fathers who are fearful tend to be authoritarian, perhaps as a response to fear, or as a way of overcoming fear. Many fathers, he said, expressed concern over their relationships with their children. Where there are marriage problems, then there are usually problems with the children.

The pediatrician commented that the personality of the child seems to have a great deal to do with how fathers respond to their children. He also observed that fathers seem to be more involved with their small children now that they were in the recent past. The juvenile probation officer (also himself a father) remarked that he has observed children in the stores and at recreational events with their fathers much more now than in the recent past.

Several of the specialists commented on the tremendous importance of the father's own father in influencing his relationships with his child. The experience the father had had in his own early family life, and his memories of his own father are extremely
important, according to many of the specialists.

The mental health specialist suggested that the nature of social class is shifting. He no longer sees a sharp delineation between the behaviors of working-class fathers in comparison with middle-class fathers. He suggested that the values of fathers in relation to their small children are similar in the two social classes now.

All of the specialists agreed that they saw the "traditional" view of masculinity, i.e., men as tough, aggressive, unable to show their feelings, etc., as on the way out. Several mentioned that they believed that the old traditional views of masculinity are softening into concerns about manhood in the way that Margaret Mead has talked about it (1959). The specialists see this change in perceptions of masculinity as part of the change in sex roles now taking place. Men are now helping with all kinds of household chores, taking care of the children, and in general doing many of the same activities that women have traditionally been thought to do. In the view of several of the specialists, fathers are less afraid to express concern for their children, and as they engage in more interaction with their children, they develop more interest and see the child in a new light - as a human being and not "just a child".

The human development-anthropologist specialist concurred with the other specialists in their observations regarding the changing roles of men and women in contemporary American society and the
concerns of fathers with their children. Her work with Robert LeVine of the University of Chicago on the Yoruba tribe in Nigeria, and her work with Lawrence Kohlberg of Harvard University in Yucatan and Quintana Roo, has pointed up the differences between the "traditional" and "modern" views of father-child relations.

The observations, insights, and suggestions of the specialists provided a variety of views of the father-child relationship in contemporary American society as well as views of changes in the family of today.

The specialists reviewed the questions in the interview schedule to be used to collect data from fathers themselves regarding their nurturant attitudes and behaviors in relation to their small children. By-products of the experience survey included suggestions from the specialists for hypotheses and help in synthesizing insights regarding the areas in which these specialists have had such widely differing experiences, coming from such a variety of backgrounds.

Procedure

The first step in preparation for interviewing the fathers was the construction of an interview schedule to be used to collect the data. Questions covering five types of information were included: (1) a questionnaire to elicit responses from the fathers regarding their "nurturant" attitudes and behaviors in relation to their small children; (2) background characteristics of fathers,
including age of father, age of child, sex of child, number of children in the family, fathers' religious preference and associations, income, education, employment condition of wife/mother, and other variables thought to be related to father's expression of nurturance to his small child; (3) responses to a scale selected to attempt to measure fathers' authoritarianism (the Traditional Family Ideology scale); (4) questions to attempt to tap the aspect of social class which Kohn (1969) considers critical (an index of "self-direction in occupation"); and (5) some informal questions to elicit information about father's relationship to his small child not covered in the formal part of the interview schedule. For the completed interview schedule see Appendix B.

The interview schedule was developed from information assembled from the review of the literature in the field of parent-child relations, from discussion with the specialists, from analysis of observations and thoughts about fathers and their small children, and from discussions with young fathers themselves about various aspects of fathering. The conclusions of reviews of literature, such as those of Nash (1965) and Stolz (1966) that social scientists have thought fathers to be unimportant in childrearing and inaccessible for research did not seem to be born out by the observations and experience of the investigator.

The part of the interview schedule designed to measure fathers' nurturance to their small children was a questionnaire called the
Fathers' Nurturance Scale (FaNS), which consists of two parts, an attitude scale and a behavior scale. Since there is no existing measure of attitudes and behaviors relating to fathers' interaction with their small children with regard to nurturant activities, FaNS was developed specifically for this study. The first part of FaNS, the attitude scale (called "fathers' attitudes toward nurturance" scale, and referred to hereafter as FAN) asks for reports of fathers' attitudes concerning beliefs about norms and expectations for nurturant father activities in relation to their small children. In terms of Goodenough's model, discussed earlier, "duties" or expectations of the social identity "father" in contemporary American society may be identified by this measure. The second part of FaNS, the behavior scale (Fathers' nurturant behaviors scale, FaNB) requests responses from fathers as to what they actually do in relation to their small children. In terms of the Goodenough model, this section includes the optative aspect of the status "father". A father's "privilege" is to behave in a nurturant manner or not according to his personal style.

Ideas for the items developed for FaNS came from observations of young fathers and their small children, seen both in public places and in private homes, mostly during the end of the 1960's and early 1970's. These ideas gained support after reading the Pedersen and Robson (1969) article, where fathers were studied in relation to their first-born infants. Some of the measures that Pedersen and Robson used were similar to the ones the
investigator had selected as being descriptive of nurturance, i.e., caretaking, investment, and play. What Pedersen and Robson called nurturant involvement was a combination of three aspects of nurturance including caretaking, which involved such activities as feeding the baby, changing diapers, bathing, dressing; investment which included "especially positive affective or emotional involvement" (Pedersen and Robson, 1969, p. 468); and play, which included "roughhouse", active play, as well as gentle, subdued or cautious play.

Since this study is concerned with small children, ages one to five, rather than infants, (as in the Pedersen and Robson study) the caretaking activities thought to be relevant were: helping the child with dressing or undressing, putting child to bed, holding and carrying child when child wants to be held or carried, giving baths, helping with eating - all "helping" activities. The play aspect of nurturance involves keeping watch over child when he/she is playing, taking child on outings for play purposes, quiet play, letting child be a "helper" to father, and playing "sound-touch" games with child. The investment aspect of nurturance involves tender and protective feelings for the child, need to comfort, and concern for the well-being of the small child.

It is hoped that these three aspects of nurturance might tap what Bronfenbrenner (1961) may have had in mind when he referred to a trend in which fathers seemed to be taking on some of the nurturant and affectional functions traditionally associated with
the maternal role. Pedersen and Robson remarked (1969) that "father-presence seems to imply some functional relevance to child development, although we actually know very little about relationships with children - particularly in the early years" (p. 466). The three aspects of nurturance selected for the FaNS scales also have elements of "contact comfort" (Maccoby, 1961) which may be an important aspect of "nurturance".

A pool of items was developed to attempt to tap the three aspects of nurturance (caretaking, play and investment). The items were discussed with three different groups of young fathers in Corvallis, Albany, and Newport, Oregon, as well as with the specialists consulted in the experience survey. Six items were finally selected from the pool to represent each of the three areas of concern; i.e., caretaking, play and investment. The same 18 questions were rephrased to elicit behavioral responses. The questions were then tested on the three groups of young fathers and referred again to some of the specialists in the experience survey. In addition, wording and content of the questions in the scale were discussed with a specialist who had had experience working on questionnaires.

The FaNS was devised, then, to attempt to measure "nurturance" in fathers in relation to their small children. The FaNS scores are the dependent variable, Y, for this study.

Reliability on the FaNS was established from the responses of the fathers in the pilot study. Reliability, using the split-half method, showed $r_{xx} = .95$ for the scores in the pilot study.
The split-half method can be used when only one test form is available, with two scores obtained from it by subdivision of the items. "The single test form is administered, its items are in some manner divided so as to form two half-tests, and the scores on these half-tests are correlated. Then the Spearman-Brown Prophecy Formula is applied,

\[ 2r_{xx} = \frac{2r_{xx}}{1 + r_{xx}} \]

with the correlation between the half-tests used as \( r_{xx} \). The resulting value of \( 2r_{xx} \) is then assumed to be the correlation which would have been obtained between scores on two full test forms had such been available" (Walker and Lev, 1953, p. 310).

The validity of the FaNS will be discussed in Chapter IV. At this point, it can be noted that validation of attitude scales is extremely difficult, since "at present, there is no way to make sure that an attitude scale is valid" (Oppenheim, 1966, p. 122).

**Selection of Related Variables**

The second part of the interview schedule is composed of questions designed to gain information about variables thought to be related to fathers' nurturance in relation to their small children. The selection of these variables was based on information from the literature as well as an analysis of present father-child activities. Variables selected were the age of the father, the age and sex of the child, the number of children in the family, the father's religious affiliation and associations, father's
educational background and income, employment conditions of wife/mother, time spent with child by father, authoritarianism, self-direction in occupation, and one question at the end of this section (which was not coded and analyzed) having to do with thoughts about the father's father. The information from this last question is discussed in Chapter V.

Age of fathers

Since this study limits itself to the relationship of young fathers to small children between the ages of one and five, fathers in the age group under 35 were selected, since it is thought that these fathers are most likely to have small children.

If it is true, as Ryder (1965) has suggested, that in times of rapid social change "men resemble the times more than they do their fathers" (p. 853) then it may be that the younger the fathers, the more they will have been affected by the changes of the 1960's, one of which appears to be the more open expression of feelings. For the purposes of this study, the fathers' ages were divided into four groups (1) under 21, (2) 21-25, (3) 26-30, and (4) 31-35. Data on the fathers' ages is found in Table 1, below. Coding instructions for the interviewer are found in the Coder's Instruction Sheet, Appendix C.
TABLE 1

Age of fathers and age of children.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age of Child</th>
<th>Age of fathers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Under 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Age of Child**

Fathers and infants or small children have not been studied until very recently. Most studies have used children age five or older, and no studies are found in the literature where fathers and small children are dealt with exclusively or where the data come from the fathers. "... by and large systematic study of this variable (age of child) has not been undertaken" (Becker, 1964, p. 172). However, there are indications that the age of the child is important; for example, in their study of attachment, Schaffer and Emerson indicate that their analyses show strikingly that fathers play an important part in the very young child's life.

Of three infants who, in the first lunar month following onset, selected people other than the mother, two chose the father as the sole attachment object (the third, whose mother had a full-time job, chose the grandmother who looked after
him most of the day). Twenty-seven percent of the whole group, moreover, chose father as an attachment object jointly with other objects in this first month. This proportion increases rapidly with age, so that by 18 months 75 percent of the sample showed attachments directed at the father, including 4 percent for whom father was the only attachment object (Schaffer and Emerson, 1964, p. 32).

After 18 months of age, there was a tendency for other people to emerge as principal objects of attachment. "Once again the important role played by fathers is emphasized: Of all the instances in which individuals other than the mother were found to be principal objects (either solely or jointly with the mother), 62 percent referred to fathers, 23 percent to grandparents, and 15 percent to other people. At 18 months father was chosen as sole principal object by 16 percent of the subjects that showed specific attachments at that age and joint principal object by another 18 percent" (Schaffer and Emerson, 1964, p. 33).

Not only have fathers been neglected in research, but "developmental theory has generally little to say regarding the impact of the father on early child development" (Pedersen and Robson, 1969, p. 466). In their study, Pedersen and Robson were looking at 9-1/2 month old infants and, although their data came from the mothers, they concluded that "we have a distinct impression that the majority of these fathers were highly involved with their first-born child" (Pedersen and Robson, 1964, p. 471). Senn and Hartford (1968) also found fathers to be highly involved, although in varying degrees, with their small children. Here again the data came from mothers. Recently, in a
report of Milton Kotelchuck's research on the infant's tie to his father, using infants aged six months to 21 months, it was demonstrated that infants respond similarly to fathers and mothers when confronted with the departure of the parents from a room. "The child's comfort with either parent and the similarity of her responses to their departure and arrivals was significant . . . the child's response to the father was . . . like the child's response to the mother" (Gornick, 1974, p. 112).

Despite what some of the literature has said about father-child or father-infant relationships (e.g., "It is only later that he plays a direct role as a father to his child" (Milloy, 1959, p. 31); the husband does not understand children (von Mering, 1959); father is a "rather distant figure" (Martin and Stendler, 1954, p. 368)), it is an assumption of this study that fathers are involved with their small children, and that age may be an important variable. Five age groups were designated, (1) one to two, (2) two to three, (3) three to four, (4) four to five, and (5) 5 to 5 years, 11 months. The distribution of ages of children as related to ages of fathers is found in Table 1.

Sex of child

A number of studies have dealt with the differential treatment accorded children by parents on the basis of sex of child, but these studies have usually involved older children. There is little in the literature concerned with fathers and small children, and what
few studies there are provide contradictory evidence. Becker (1964) states, "To date, only a small beginning in research on (the issue of sex differences) has been undertaken" (p. 172).

In a study of the relationship between adult nurturance and dependency and performance of the preschool child, DiBartolo and Vinacke (1969) found no sex differences. They had expected to find sex differences in "performance and dependency behavior as a function of the level of nurturance and nurturant versus nurturant-deprivation conditions" (p. 247) with four year old subjects, but did not. Pedersen and Robson (1969) found no sex differences on their three measures of "nurturant involvement" with the 9-1/2 month old infants they studied; Senn and Hartford (1968) found no sex differences in treatment of infants and small children by the parents in eight families they studied. Rebelsky and Hanks (1971), however, in a study of fathers' verbal interaction with infants in the first three months of the infants' lives, found that "fathers seem to behave differently toward male and female infants" (p. 66). It seemed advisable to include the variable, sex of the child, to see whether it would be significant in this study.

Number of children

Nothing was found in the literature to suggest a relationship between the effect of the number of small children in the family and fathers' nurturance. Does having a second child (or third and so on) influence a father toward more nurturance or less nurturance?
Number of children is included as a variable in this study as a matter of interest.

Education

Education is not only an important determinant of social class position (Kohn, 1969) but may be an important factor in involvement in parenthood. Gurin, Veroff and Feld (1960) found that the more educated people are the more personally they are involved in parenthood and the more likely that they will see children as a primary source of happiness. Education influences values and orientations which are very important in how parents treat their children (Kohn, 1969). The questions on education in the interview schedule request information regarding the fathers' level of education: college plus, college or university graduation, some college, high school graduation, some high school, junior high school, or less than seven years of school.

Religion

It is often assumed that people's religious views influence their perceptions and values of family life (Lenski, 1961). Among Catholics, for example, the unorthodox tend to value training in obedience in their children. It is not, however, just the religious affiliation which is important, according to Lenski. "Associational involvement" may be of greater importance. Lenski's data supported his hypothesis that involvement in the Catholic church and subcommunity were both
correlated with a preference for relatives over friends. The assumption is that the more one associates with those of like religious persuasion, the more one is reinforced in his values and beliefs. In the interview schedule fathers are asked for their religious affiliation and to respond to four questions designed to tap associational involvement, as suggested by Lenski (1961).

**Employment of wife/mother**

Whether or not the wife/mother in the family is employed may be a very important variable in relation to fathers' nurturance to their small children. It may be that when mother works, father does more babysitting, takes part more in the children's activities, in general has more involvement in a child's life, and therefore has more opportunity to be nurturant to his child. Blood (1965) found that husbands of working mothers do more household chores and take more responsibility for the care of children than do husbands of wives who do not work. Senn and Hartford (1968) reported that when mothers are not particularly nurturant to their infants and small children, fathers take over this function. Other studies have supported the view that the sharing of domestic tasks is greater when both husband and wife are employed, that the role of the father may be significantly altered when the mother works (Powell, 1961) and that fathers are expected to give about the same amount of attention as working mothers to the rearing of the children. How much of the
increased participation of fathers in household tasks is due to the employment of mothers is unclear. For example, Christopherson (1956) found an increasing participation even in the 1950's by husbands in such routine household matters as feeding the children, whether the mother was working or not. The interview schedule calls for the fathers to report whether or not wife/mother works and if she does, does she work regularly full time, regularly part time, or only off and on?

**Time father spends with child**

Another independent variable thought to be important for this study was the amount of time that fathers spend with their small children. Gurin, Veroff and Feld (1960) reported that they found a "recent cultural admonition directed toward the men" (p. 136) to spend more time with their children. Indeed, they found that a major source of father's guilt was not spending enough time with his child. In a novel by Nevil Shute (1958), the father says, "If possible I like to be at home in the late afternoons because of reading to the kids before they go to bed. One sees so little of them, otherwise. I like to help them making models, dressing dolls, and all that sort of things" (p. 4).

Fathers were asked three questions in the interview schedule involving (a) the amount of time spent with the child when father is at home, (b) the amount of time the child is around when father is at home, and (c) an estimate of the number of actual hours spent with the child in an average week.
Income

Income is usually included as one of the indices of social class (Kohn, 1969) and may be related to fathers' nurturance to their small children. In this study, fathers were asked to identify their income from their jobs, rather than the combined family income. Kohn reported that although "family income seems the more appropriate measure of family status", analysis of father's (or head of household) income yields almost identical results (Kohn, 1969, p. 133). Fathers were asked to report their income in one of five possible categories, (1) under $4,000 a year; (2) from $4,000 to $7,000 a year; (3) from $7,000 to $11,000 a year, (4) from $11,000 to $15,000 a year, and (5) over $15,000 per year.

Fathers' experience with own fathers

A last question in this section, the importance of which had been suggested in the interviews with the specialists, was about the fathers' fathers. This question was not used in the analysis, but produced some interesting comments from the fathers and some interesting reactions. The question was asked, Thinking of your own father, do you think that the way you see being a father has been influenced by your own experiences? A probe asked, Do you think that the way your father treated you had an influence on the way you treat your child? This question is discussed in Chapter V.

Table 2 below shows some of the background characteristics of the fathers in the main sample.
TABLE 2

Background characteristics of fathers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Working-class</th>
<th>Middle-class</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N-22</td>
<td>N-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex of child</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious affiliation of father</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protestant</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholic</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College plus</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of university</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some college</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school graduation</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some high school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$15,000 a year or over</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$11,000 to $14,999</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$7,000 to $10,999</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$4,000 to $6,999</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under $4,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of children in family</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than two</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wife/mother employed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, regularly full time</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, regularly part time</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off and on</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Authoritarianism

In the next section of the interview schedule, a measure thought to tap "authoritarianism" was administered. Authoritarianism was one of the two independent variables which this study emphasized as being possibly related to fathers' nurturance to their small children. The Traditional Family Ideology scale (TFI) devised by Levinson and Huffman (1955) was selected to measure "authoritarianism". The TFI samples aspects of authoritarianism which relate to family values, and those items referring to child-rearing orientation have been found to be particularly discriminating. A short form consisting of 12 items has been found to be nearly as valid and reliable as the long form of 50 items. It was the short form which was administered to the fathers. The reliability of the TFI "for the 12-item form, corrected split-half reliability was .92, and test-retest reliability after a six-week interval was .93" (Shaw and Wright, 1967, p. 67). The TFI was validated by comparison with the E and F scales; "average correlations between scores on the short form (TFI) and E and F scores were .64 and .67 respectively" (Shaw and Wright, 1967, p. 67).

The TFI, with scoring directions for the fathers, is shown in Appendix B. Responses are based on "strongly agree, mildly agree, agree, disagree, mildly disagree, and strongly disagree". Coding of the TFI is included in Appendix C.
Self-direction in occupation

The fourth section of the interview schedule is a group of 14 questions creating an "index of self-direction in occupation" to tap those dimensions of men's jobs which are important in differentiating aspects of social class crucial in influencing men's values and orientations (Kohn, 1969). Values and orientations regarding childrearing are critically important for fathers' behaviors toward their children. Men in the middle-class have different values and orientations than do men in the working-class because, according to Kohn, their occupations allow for more self-direction. In Kohn's view, the critical aspect of social class is the degree to which an occupation provides for "self-direction", since self-direction means more autonomy and freedom, highly valued in American contemporary society (Sennett and Cobb, 1972; Kohn, 1969).

The 14 questions which comprise the index of self-direction were taken from Kohn's (1969) questionnaire to tap four major areas which Kohn feels are crucial to assess self-direction in occupation. These areas of importance are (a) whether a man works with data, people or things, (b) how closely he feels he is supervised in his job, (c) how complex he perceives his work to be, and (d) how self-reliant he judges himself to be. The questions which make up the "index of self-direction" are found on the ninth and tenth pages of the interview schedule (Appendix B).
The interview schedule, then, consists of the FaNS, background characteristics of fathers, the TFI, and the index of self-direction in occupation. In addition, it seemed advisable, after the formal interview was concluded, to try to get the fathers to discuss informally some of their feelings and thoughts about fatherhood. Notes were not taken of this portion so that fathers would be more relaxed. After the interviewer left, notes were to be jotted down. Questions raised included: As an infant, was the baby "good", irritable, colicky, good-tempered, jolly (or whatever)? If the child had been of a different sex, would this have made a difference in father's feelings toward the child? Would he have answered questions differently during the interview had the child been of different sex? Did father enjoy his fatherhood? How does he really feel about being a father? What's really important about being a father? What's the most important thing that fathers do? Do you think it's a good idea to have children when you're very young? Soon after you're married? How did you feel about it when you first found out you were going to be a father? Did you want to have the child?

This informal, unstructured portion of the interview schedule was not coded or analyzed, but it provided some interesting speculations about research on fathers which will be discussed in Chapter IV, Discussion of the findings.

The interview schedule was tried out on three groups of young fathers in Corvallis, Albany, and Newport, Oregon. There were six young fathers all between the ages of 21 and 35, who had small
children five years of age or younger, in each of the three groups. They were interviewed in some cases separately, in some cases in groups of two or three. They were asked to assess the clarity of questions, suitability of the questions for the purposes of the study, and whether they thought the length of the interview schedule was alright. While this testing of the interview schedule was going on, contacts were made with fathers who were willing to be included in a pilot study to formally test the interview schedule before it could be used with the main sample.

The interview schedule in its entirety is found in Appendix B.

The pilot study

In the design of an exploratory study, the pilot study is an essential and crucial early step. As Moser (1971) suggests, the pilot interviews are a sort of dress rehearsal for the main event, and may provide guidance for the investigator as to the adequacy of the questionnaire, the suitability of the method of collecting data, the variability within the population to be surveyed, the non-response rate to be expected, the efficiency of the instructions, and the general briefing of the interviewer. Although the pilot study deals with a biased sample, the fathers in the pilot survey were selected so that they were representative, on surface characteristics at least, of the general population. The criteria for selection of the fathers for the pilot study were: Not older than 35; with focus child between one and five years of age (if
more than one child, the oldest child is the focus child). In
addition, the focus child should have no prior school experience
to insure similarity of children in this regard. These were the
same criteria used later in the selection of the main sample.

Pretests or pilot interviews should be in the form of personal
interviews, and a "valuable part of the pretest interview is dis-
cussion of the questions with respondents after they have answered
them. The respondent may be asked what the question meant to him,
what difficulties he experienced in replying, what further ideas
he had that were not brought out by the question, how he would ask
the questions" (Selltiz et al., 1959, p. 551).

In this study, the interview schedule was administered to eight
fathers meeting the criteria for selection, and on surface character-
istics, thought to be similar to the stratified random sample to be
selected for the main interviews. The fathers resided in Oregon and
Washington; residence or geographical location was not considered to
be of importance. A rough estimate of social class was ascertained
on the basis of occupation and education, utilizing the Hollingshead
Index. Four of the fathers were considered to be "working-class" and
four, "middle-class" on the basis of the two-factor Hollingshead
Index.

The Hollingshead Index is a measure to determine social class
position using the two measures of education and occupation. Levels
of occupations and education are given a scale score of one to seven,
then multiplied by factor weights of seven for occupation and four
for education. Adding the products of this combination yields an Index of Social Position score, which can range from a low of 11 to a high of 77. Hollingshead grouped scores into five classes to show social position (Hollingshead, 1957):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social class</th>
<th>Range of computed scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I Upper</td>
<td>11-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>18-27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>28-43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>44-60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V Lower</td>
<td>61-77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The fathers in the pilot group fell into the following categories: the four working-class fathers were in social class IV (according to the Hollingshead Index) with scores of 47, 51, 58, and 51; the middle-class fathers fell into social classes I and II, with scores of 22, 18, 18, and 11.

After the formal interview was completed with the fathers in the pilot group, they were asked for their comments and criticisms, particularly with regard to the questionnaire, FaNS, and the order in which the parts of the interview were arranged. There was a question in the investigator's mind as to the suitability of some of the questions for children at the extremes of the age range, i.e., would questions suitable for two year olds also be suitable for five year olds? The ages of the focus children of the fathers in the pilot study ranged between two and five, but several of the fathers had, in addition, smaller children between the ages of one and two. The consensus of these fathers was that the questions would be
applicable to children from one to two but not to infants under age one. The fathers in the pilot study thought that the arrangement of the sections of the interview schedule had been ordered suitably.

The formal part of the interview schedule took about 45 minutes to administer. Pilot study fathers were willing to spend extra time after completion of the formal part of the interview schedule to discuss it. The discussion included the interview schedule as a whole, the FaNS, and the informal questions devised for the very last part of the interview. Most fathers volunteered that it was about time someone took an interest in fathers, and were much interested in what the study was all about. Mothers were very much interested as well, and if they were at home wanted to hear all about it. They often wanted to participate by taking the TFI and comparing their scores with their husbands' scores. An interesting sidelight was that all of the fathers seemed comfortable about having the interview take place while the child was around. None of the pilot study fathers asked the interviewer to come at a time when the child would be napping or in bed for the night. Two of the fathers were baby-sitting at the time of the interview, and so could be observed in interaction with their children.

As a result of the pilot study, some minor changes were made in the questionnaire and in the interview schedule.
During the time the pilot study was in progress, the interviewer was being trained by the investigator. The interviewer, who was to conduct the main interviews in the sample, was apprised in detail of the purpose and nature of the study, read the investigator's proposal and discussed it at length, and observed the investigator during the last four pilot interviews. The last two pilot interviews were administered by the interviewer-in-training for practice. Questions that arose during the pilot study interviews were discussed immediately following the interview. The interview schedule was followed quite closely, although wording could be flexible in some places. Particular attention was paid to questions of interpretation that might come up during the course of the interview. Each section of the interview schedule was gone over carefully to make sure that the interviewer clearly understood it.

The interviewer was chosen on the basis of the following qualifications: His familiarity with Albany, Oregon, where the main interviews were to be conducted; his interest in the study; his understanding of and interest in class differences; his availability; that he is himself a young father; and his experiences in interviewing. He had just completed a large scale political survey of Linn County (in which Albany is situated) and felt that because of his background (from a working-class family but having attended the University of Oregon he felt he had acquired
an understanding of middle-class values and orientations) he could be at ease with both working-class and middle-class people. He does not identify himself, he says, with either class. By temperament and personality he is not overly friendly, but friendly enough to present himself well and people who recommended him vouched for his integrity, conscientiousness and honesty. (In November, 1974, he was elected to the post of Linn County Commissioner, the youngest person ever to be elected to that position.)

The decision to employ an interviewer to conduct the main interviews in Albany was based on two concerns; one, that of the time involved, and two, that it was felt that fathers would feel more at ease with, and respond better to, a young man more like themselves. Webb, Campbell, Schwartz, and Sechrest (1966) have commented that "it is old news that the characteristics of the interviewer can contribute a substantial amount of variance to a set of findings . . . (it has been) reported that the age of the interviewer produced a bias, with a number of 'unacceptable' (to the experimenter) answers higher when questions were posed by younger interviewers" (p. 21). In this study it was felt that the age of the interviewer was perhaps a plus, since he is, in surface characteristics at least, much like the people to be interviewed and probably could establish better rapport with the fathers than could the investigator (an older female).

The interviewer recorded the fathers' responses to the questions in the interview schedule on a Coder's data sheet, a copy of which is found in Appendix C.
The sample

A stratified random sample of fathers in Albany, Oregon, was interviewed to obtain the data for this study. The interviews took place in the fall of 1972. Albany, Oregon, was selected partly because of its proximity to Corvallis, where the investigator was working at Oregon State University, and partly because of the existence of a city directory which gives information satisfying the criteria for selection of the sample, viz., heads of households, address of residence, spouse's name and employment, occupation of head of household and place of employment, and names and ages of children. Since the criteria for selection of fathers were that they were to be from intact families, employed, with the oldest child no more than five, the sample could be selected with a fair amount of accuracy, just from the information given in the city directory.

The city directory used was the 1972 Johnson Albany, Oregon, city directory, based on 1970 census data.

"A stratified sample divides the population into homogenous subparts (strata) - such as men and women, old and young, etc. - and takes a random sample of each stratum. This usually reduces the variation in the population, and thus allows a smaller sample size" (Backstrom, 1963, p. 27). The original stratified random sample for this study consisted of 49 fathers drawn on the basis of the criteria listed above, using the 1972 Albany city directory. Names were picked from every third page of the directory (each
page had between two to six families which fit the criteria). A die was rolled to get a random number between one and six, and that father appearing on the page holding the number of the die which came up was selected, i.e., if the die rolled three, then the third father who fit the criteria on that page became part of the sample. The pages of the directory and the die numbers are listed in Appendix D.

If a page did not list a sufficient number of names, the page following was used. Of the original sample of 49, 21 were interviewed. Many families had moved from the time the census was taken in 1970 until the time of the interviews, two years later. When it was found that a family had moved, the next family fitting the criteria on the page from which the original family had been selected was used. This method maintains the randomness of the sample and is logical because the original family would not have been chosen had it been known that they had moved. Six of the original sample were not used, since the sample was filled before they were to be interviewed. The sample size which had been decided on was 40 fathers, half to be working-class and half middle-class. Three additional fathers were added to the original 40 to insure that at least 20 each of working-class and middle-class fathers would be included. The final selection included 21 middle-class and 22 working-class fathers for which there are data. However, one of the middle-class fathers was dropped after the interview schedules were reviewed because he had failed to complete part of the interview schedule;
the interviewer reported that he was the only father who was uncooperative. This left 20 middle-class and 22 working-class fathers for the sample, or a total of 42.

At the time of the interview, the interviewer made a rough estimate of social class based on the two-factor Hollingshead Index. The interviewer had been briefed on the details of the Hollingshead Index so that he was able to make fairly accurate judgments as to the class position of the father at the time of the interview. Table 3 shows the social class position of the fathers in the Albany sample rated by the Hollingshead Index.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social class</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I Upper</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Classes I, II, and III are deemed to be "middle-class" while classes IV and V are considered "working-class".

An additional criterion for the fathers was age, which could not be determined until the time of the interview. Fortunately,
none of the interviews had to be discarded or terminated because fathers did not fit the selection criteria.

The criteria for selection of the fathers in the main sample were specifically: (1) that fathers should not be over age 35, with (2) focus child between the ages of one and five and not in school (nursery or public), (3) that father be employed and (4) from an "intact" family. The reasons for these criteria were that the study was interested in "young" fathers, and the limit of 35 years of age was arbitrarily set as designating a "young" father; his child should be a small child, taken to mean aged one to five (one father was included whose child was just a week or two short of age one); if there was more than one child in the family, the oldest should be the focus child. The employment of the father is necessary in that part of the study is concerned with the effects of fathers' occupations on their nurturance to their small children. The father should be in an "intact" family, since in this study one of the independent variables considered important is whether the wife/mother works, therefore both parents are needed.

The interviewer was refused five times, twice because of being mistaken for an insurance or encyclopedia salesman (they use a similar line about wanting to talk about the family) and three times because the father said he was too busy (even when the interviewer offered to return at a more convenient time). However, on the basis of surface characteristics, the fathers who refused appeared to be similar to those who were interviewed. When a father refused, the interviewer picked the next name on the page of the city directory from which the
original name had been selected, thereby partially preserving the randomness of the sample.

The main interviews with the Albany sample were conducted during a two week period in September, 1972. No father refused to answer any of the questions, but most would neither comment further about their relationship with their fathers nor continue after the interviewer indicated that the formal interview was completed. Later, it was necessary to discard one interview, since the father had not filled out the TFI.

In addition to the main interviews in Albany, Oregon, a convenience sample of ten fathers in Ellensburg, Washington was interviewed in the fall of 1972. Although the data from these interviews were not analyzed, they provided interesting comparisons which will be discussed in Chapter V.

Coding

The questions in the interview schedule were mostly closed questions and could be precoded. "A closed question is one in which the respondent is offered a choice of alternative replies" (Oppenheim, 1966, p. 40). The only open or free-answer question which was coded and analyzed was question 13 in the "index of self-direction in occupation", on the tenth page of the interview schedule. In this question the respondent was asked "What is a complete job"? Responses were coded according to Kohn's (1969) suggestions.
The questions were precoded, i.e., answers or categories were ready prior to the administration of the interview schedule. Coding procedures are explained in the Coder's Instruction sheet, Appendix C. Included with the Coder's Instruction sheet is the "coder's data sheet" which the interviewer used to record answers during the interviews. Questions which were not precoded or analyzed were question number eight in the section on the background characteristics of fathers (the question about the fathers' fathers) and questions numbered one, two, and eight through eleven in the "index of self-direction in occupation". Question number one, however, was used in the computation of the Hollingshead two-factor index.

Question number eight in the section on the background characteristics of fathers, asking fathers about their own fathers, is discussed in Chapter V.

Along with the investigator, three graduate students in Family Studies at Central Washington State College, Ellensburg, Washington, with backgrounds in research methods and psychology, served as coders of the interview schedule. Since most of the questions were precoded and offered no difficulty in having numerical values assigned to them, the coders checked the precoded questions for accuracy. Coding reliability was established on two of the questions: (1) religious associations (from the section on background characteristics of the fathers) and (2) "What is a complete job?" (number 13 in the section, "index of self-direction in occupation"). The four coders worked together on these two questions. There were problems of
interpretation of responses to both questions, therefore the necessity for the reliability check.

A formula which has been used to establish reliability on observational instruments (Heyns and Zander, 1953) was used to establish interjudge reliability on the basis of a three out of four agreements:

\[
\text{Interjudge reliability} = \frac{\text{no. of agreements}}{\text{no. of agreements plus disagreements}} \times 100
\]

Interjudge reliability for the two questions examined, religious associations and "What is a complete job" was 90 percent. Table 12 in Appendix E shows the raw data for the 42 fathers in the main sample.

Analysis of data

A multiple regression approach to the analysis of the data in this study was used to attempt to identify groups of variables which best "explain" the fathers' responses to the nurturance scales. The use of a multiple regression approach was facilitated by the recent development by the Department of Statistics at Oregon State University of a computer program, the REGRESS subsystem of the Statistical Interactive Programming System (*SIPS), which was used in the analysis of the data for this study. The goal of the REGRESS subsystem of *SIPS is to provide a model specifying those variables which, when taken together, account for a large portion of the variation in the fathers' nurturance scores.
Summary

A stratified random sample of fathers was interviewed to obtain the data of interest for this study. Data were collected through the use of an interview schedule, the first part of which, the FaNS, served as the dependent variable. Questions designed to gain information regarding other variables thought to be related to fathers' nurturance to their small children made up the remainder of the interview schedule. The questions in the interview schedule were based on information obtained from (a) a sample of specialists, (b) a review of the literature, (c) analysis of "insight-stimulating" examples, and (d) discussions with young fathers themselves.

The independent variables of interest in this study were authoritarianism, as measured by the TFI; "social class" as measured by an "index of self-direction in occupation" and by the Hollingshead Index; and selected variables such as the age, education, religious affiliation and associations, income of the fathers, age and sex of the child, number of children in the family, employment status of the wife/mother, and the time involvement of the father with his child. A pilot study served as a pretest of the interview schedule.

The data for the study were analyzed by a multiple regression approach facilitated by the availability of a computer program, the REGRESS subsystem of *SIPS, through the Department of Statistics of Oregon State University.
CHAPTER III

ANALYSIS OF DATA

Data analyzed for this study consisted of: (1) the Fathers' Nurturance scales, which were designed to elicit responses from fathers about their nurturant attitudes and behaviors toward their small children by requiring them to respond with one of four possible answers; (2) the short-form Traditional Ideology scale, a scale of twelve questions thought to tap responses measuring "authoritarianism", to which fathers could give one of six possible replies to each item; (3) background information about such items as education, income, religious preference and associations, sex of child, age of child, age of father, number of children in the family, time spent with child at home, employment condition of wife/mother; and (4) information regarding fathers' occupational conditions. The full description of the interview schedule, the sample, and the collection of the data is found in Chapter II.

To study the relationship between fathers' nurturance as measured by the Fathers' Nurturance scales and the other variables thought to be associated with nurturance in fathers, a multiple regression approach was used. Fortunately, the Department of Statistics at Oregon State University has recently developed a computer program for multiple regression analysis called Statistical Interactive Programming System (hereafter referred to as *SIPS), an explanation of which is available in the department's technical
The Oregon State University computer program of *SIPS which provides for multiple regression analysis is called the REGRESS subsystem; in this instance, the ultimate goal is to provide a model specifying those variables which, when taken together, account for a large portion of the variance of the fathers' nurturance scores.

The great advantage of the REGRESS subsystem technique is that it allows for tests of variables one at a time given other variables...
in the model, i.e., tests are conditional in that the effect of adding a variable to the model with the variables already in the model being held constant can be tested. Combinations of variables can thus be examined and these combinations may reveal correlations which the use of simple correlational techniques would not pick up. The REGRESS subsystem of *SIPS allows for each variable to be tested against all other variables, significant variables are retained in the model, and those significant independent variables thus retained in the model become the bank of variables which are the foundation for the construction of the model, mentioned earlier as the "goal" of the REGRESS subsystem. When this combination of variables results in a significant reduction of the unexplained variance in the dependent variable, then the investigator can be confident that independent variables are being successfully identified in association with the dependent variable. In the case of the present study, the model which the REGRESS subsystem constructed identified fourteen variables associated with the dependent variable (the FaNS scales), providing "explanation" for a large portion of the variance in the FaNS scores.

The independent variables found significantly associated with nurturance in fathers in this study (as measured by the FaNS scales) were the age of the father, the age of the child, the time involvement of the father with his child, the employment of the mother, some occupational conditions of the fathers' jobs, and "authoritarianism" of the father as measured by the TFI.
The ultimate goal, then, of testing variables in this manner is to construct a model which can specify those variables which account for maximum variance in the dependent variable. For the purpose of this exploratory study, the model identifies those variables which account for a large portion of the variance in the FaNS scores; the information thus obtained can, in turn, be utilized to suggest hypotheses of relationships among or between variables used in this study which are associated with fathers' nurturance in relation to their small children.

The next step in the REGRESS subsystem of *SIPS is explained by Guthrie, Avery and Avery (1973):

Most of the computations in multiple regression analysis are concerned with the study of residuals, the difference between the observed values of the dependent variable and their estimates derived from inserting the values of the independent variables in the regression model. The residual variability is the sum of the squares of these values. For a regression model to have a good 'fit', the residual variability should be small relative to the total variability of the dependent variable (p. 48).

Table 4 shows the "Observations, fitted values, and residuals" for the data in this study.

The observations in the first column in Table 4 are the averages of the fathers' attitude and behavior scales combined. The attitude and behavior scores were highly correlated and separate analyses using each of these as a dependent variable did not show any better relationship to the independent variables than using the combined score.
**TABLE 4**

Observations, fitted values, and residuals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Observed Y</th>
<th>Predicted Y</th>
<th>Residual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>1.888</td>
<td>-.0589</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.111</td>
<td>.0883</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>2.103</td>
<td>.2466</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.913</td>
<td>-.1138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.586</td>
<td>.132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.523</td>
<td>-.0230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.608</td>
<td>-.0082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.674</td>
<td>-.2748</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>1.587</td>
<td>-.0371</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.899</td>
<td>.1007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.730</td>
<td>.2690</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.316</td>
<td>.1839</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.582</td>
<td>.1173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.076</td>
<td>.1236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.541</td>
<td>-.2417</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.653</td>
<td>.0466</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.808</td>
<td>.0918</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.548</td>
<td>-.1482</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>1.956</td>
<td>.1430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.758</td>
<td>.0414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.682</td>
<td>.1174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.997</td>
<td>.0020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.333</td>
<td>.2661</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.849</td>
<td>-.3494</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.959</td>
<td>-.2597</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.203</td>
<td>-.0033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.036</td>
<td>-.0362</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.369</td>
<td>.0304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.130</td>
<td>-.1004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.758</td>
<td>.2417</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.784</td>
<td>-.0842</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.853</td>
<td>-.1538</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.577</td>
<td>.2226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>2.113</td>
<td>-.2132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>2.074</td>
<td>-.0240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>1.438</td>
<td>-.3886</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.093</td>
<td>.1064</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.251</td>
<td>-.1517</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.877</td>
<td>.0226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.679</td>
<td>.1207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.854</td>
<td>-.2543</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.540</td>
<td>.2595</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The fitted values, $\hat{Y}$, column two in Table 4, are the estimates of the observed values derived from inserting the values of the independent variables in the regression model. The residual values reflect the difference between the observed value ($Y$) and the predicted values. The analysis of variance conducted on the residuals indicated that the residual variability is small relative to the total variability of the observed values, indicating that the regression model has a good "fit".

Once these computations are in the model, the REGRESS subsystem calls for the model to be printed. The model for the data in this study is shown in Table 5.

**TABLE 5**

The Model

\[
Y(1) = 2.8909E-00 -5.5353E-03 X(5)
\]
\[
-3.3364E-01 X(6) -3.6316E-01 X(7)
\]
\[
-3.3293E-01 X(8) -2.5387E-01 X(9)
\]
\[
-1.0500E-02 X(10) -1.0480E-01 X(11)
\]
\[
-3.1218E-01 X(23) -2.3530E-01 X(24)
\]
\[
-1.2847E-01 X(28) -2.6188E-01 X(31)
\]
\[
+9.1847E-02 X(36) -2.5516E-01 X(39)
\]
\[
+5.1269E-02 X(40)
\]

In the model, $Y(1)$ is the dependent variable, the Father's Nurturance Scales (FaNS); 2.8909 is the regression of the $Y$ on the variable 0, the constant variable. The independent variable $X(5)$ is the TFI; $X(6)$ and $X(7)$ are variables associated with age of father; $X(8)$, $X(9)$, $X(10)$ and $X(11)$ are variables associated with age of child; $X(23)$ and $X(24)$ are variables related to the working status of the wife; $X(28)$, $X(31)$ and $X(36)$ are variables related to occupational conditions of the fathers' jobs; and, $X(39)$ and $X(40)$
are the variables associated with the fathers' time involvement with their children.

In multiple regression analysis, the coefficients of the association between Y and specific Xs are not, taken separately, of particular significance. What is of significance is the pattern which the coefficients reveal. The pattern revealed in this study suggests a "type" of father which can be "predicted" on the basis of the particular combination of independent variables; viz., three variables relating to occupational conditions (closeness of supervision and work with data, people, and things); age of child, employment status of wife/mother; time involvement of father with child; and authoritarianism.

The cut-off criterion for the inclusion of independent variables in the model was this: When the addition of an independent variable did not result in significant reduction of the unexplained variance in the dependent variable (Y), it was not included. The test used to determine the significance of the variable was the F test. "Inclusion of the parameter F in the chain of REGRESS commands requests the 'entering F value for all variables as they are added to the regression model'" (Guthrie, Avery and Avery, 1973, p. 48).

Table 6 below shows the order of importance of the groups of variables in the study by significance levels.
TABLE 6
Order of importance of variables by significance level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>d.f.</th>
<th>F value</th>
<th>Approximate significance level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X(36) Closeness of supervision</td>
<td>1, 27</td>
<td>19.3841</td>
<td>&lt; .01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X(31) #6, closeness of supervision</td>
<td>1, 27</td>
<td>16.1851</td>
<td>&lt; .01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X(8-11) age of child</td>
<td>4, 27</td>
<td>4.1560</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X(23,24) mother works</td>
<td>2, 27</td>
<td>3.4924</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X(28) work with data, people or things</td>
<td>1, 27</td>
<td>4.2309</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X(39,40) time involvement</td>
<td>2, 27</td>
<td>3.3430</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X(6,7) age of father</td>
<td>2, 27</td>
<td>2.8328</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X(5) TFI</td>
<td>1, 27</td>
<td>2.3640</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The variable, X(36), which represents the composite score of the four questions which made up the "closeness of supervision" section in the index of self-direction in occupation, contributes the greatest amount to the "explanation" of the variation in the FaNS scores. X(31), which is question number six within the composite X(36), is the second "best" contributor to the "explanation" of the variation in the FaNS scores. That means that if X(36) and X(31) were missing from the analysis, a large portion of the $R^2$ would be lost. Regression coefficients for X(36) and X(31) are +.091847 and -.26188, respectively.
The other variables contributing to the "explanation" of the variation in the dependent variable Y (the FaNS scores) are shown in Table 6 in order of their importance, by significance level.

The last step in the REGRESS subsystem of *SIPS calls for an analysis of variance to be performed. In general, the "objective of analysis of variance is to locate important Xs in a study and to determine how they interact and affect the response" (Mendenhall, 1967, p. 269). Having calculated the residuals (column 3, Table 4), using the fitted equation and the observed points, the regression analysis of variance is as follows:

\[
\begin{array}{lcc}
\text{Source} & \text{DF} & \text{Sum of Squares} & \text{Mean Square} \\
\hline
\text{Total} & 41 & 4.06764048E 00 & 9.92107433E-02 \\
\text{Regression} & 14 & 2.82274829E 00 & 2.01624878E-01 \\
\text{Residual} & 27 & 1.24489219E 00 & 4.61071181E-02 \\
\hline
R Squared & = & .69395226 \\
\end{array}
\]

The REGRESS subsystem commands "AVTABLE" when the analysis of variance is desired. This command includes the request for the multiple correlation coefficient, \( R^2 \).
The square of the multiple correlation coefficient, $R^2$ is defined as . . . 

$$R^2 = \frac{\text{Sum of squares due to regression}}{\text{Total (corrected) sum of squares}}$$

It is often stated as a percentage, $100R^2$. The larger it is, the better the fitted equation explains the variation in the data (Draper and Smith, 1966, p. 117).

$R^2$ for the data in this study, (.69395226), indicates that about 70 percent of the variance in the dependent variable $Y$ (the FaNS scores) can be "explained" by the independent variables which were found significant for this study.

Summary

A multiple regression approach applied through the Oregon State University computer program, the REGRESS subsystem of *SIPS, developed through the Department of Statistics at OSU, was used to analyze the data of this study. The REGRESS subsystem allows independent variables to be tested one at a time given other variables in the model so that all possible significant independent variables may be included to help "explain" the variance in the dependent variable, the FaNS scores. The REGRESS subsystem is a useful tool, since it can provide a method for examining and testing independent variables thought to be associated with a dependent variable. The resulting model constructed by the use of the REGRESS subsystem may be helpful in predicting which independent variables may be associated with fathers' nurturance to their small children, for example.
CHAPTER IV

DISCUSSION OF THE FINDINGS

Data from the interview schedules of a stratified random sample of fathers were analyzed by the REGRESS subsystem of the *SIPS computer program. The purpose of obtaining the data was to develop hypotheses regarding independent variables related to Y, the dependent variable (FaNS). For this study, the measurement obtained as the score of FaNS is used as the definition of "nurturance" which includes aspects of parental involvement such as caretaking, play, and investment. The data were analyzed by the multiple regression approach, which permits the exploration of relationships between a particular X (independent variable) and Y (dependent variable) while "averaging out" or "holding constant" all other independent variables. The F statistic was used to indicate the significance level of the test of each independent variable, i.e., the amount of variability being accounted for by that factor. The major advantage which accrues from the use of multiple regression is that significant relationships between Xs and Y are revealed which would not be apparent using other, less sophisticated, methods of analysis of data. A further advantage of multiple regression analysis is that it permits the calculation of the portion of variation in Y which is "explained" by all of the independent variables combined.

In this study, the use of the REGRESS subsystem of *SIPS provided for the construction of a model which identified significant variables associated with nurturance in fathers. In the model, the
numerical values of the significant variables are called the multiple regression coefficients. The coefficients indicate the correlation measuring the association between X and Y, and the measurement of the amount of change in Y which can be predicted when a unit change is made in X (Draper and Smith, 1966).

The multiple regression coefficients are obtained by "dividing the standard deviation of Y by the standard deviation of X and multiplying the quotient by the coefficient of correlation" (Theodorson and Theodorson, 1969, p. 341). The coefficient of correlation, \( R^2 \), is computed from the analysis of variance. \( R^2 \) for this study was .69395226, which means that the significant independent variables "explained" approximately 70 percent of the variation in the FaNS scores.

The variables contributing the greatest amount of the "explanation" in the variation in the dependent variable, Y, (the FaNS scores), were X(36), representing the composite of the four questions relating to closeness of supervision in the index of self-direction in occupation, and X(31), question number six within the composite X(36).
Closeness of supervision was one of the important conditions of men's occupations which Kohn (1969) associated with "self-direction in occupation". Men who are closely supervised, says Kohn, cannot exercise initiative, thought, and judgment in their work. They have little control over their work. Interpersonal relationships are not inherently important to their work. On the other hand, men whose occupations are generally thought of as "middle-class", in which they can exercise initiative, thought, and judgment, and feel that they have control over how they live their lives, have "self-direction" in their jobs, according to Kohn. Working with people makes men aware of the importance of interpersonal relationships. Men value for their children what they value for themselves, argues Kohn, and they will therefore value the development in their children of competencies in dealing with people. Men in "middle-class" occupations who value their own "self-direction", in Kohn's terms, will value the ability to get along well with people, since this is important in their jobs, and in turn, they will value this for their children. Since values and orientations affect how men behave in relation to their children, we would expect them to treat their children in such a way as to want to develop in them the ability to get along well with others. It is suggested here that this would tend to make fathers "supportive" of their children, and this might be translated into "nurturance" in relation to their small children. Closeness of supervision, one of the important aspects of "self-direction in occupation", is
particularly related to nurturance in fathers.

Conditions of occupations make a great difference in how men feel about themselves. When a man is closely supervised in his work, when he is just taking orders, he feels he is not really alive, almost ceases to exist in the present (Sennett and Cobb, 1972). "The more a person is on the receiving end of orders ... the more the person's got to think he or she is really somewhere else in order to keep up self-respect" (p. 94) ... how much a person has to take orders comes to represent inversely how much ability he has at work, for the more talent a person has, the more freedom, the more independence he ought to have in his job" (p. 95).

Working-class men, in jobs that are closely supervised, feel they have little control over their work, or over their lives in general. Sennett and Cobb (1972) have further shown how working-class men tend to be demanding and to put pressure on their kids to be unlike them, because they want them to rise in the world, i.e., they want their kids to better themselves by getting out of the working-class and into the middle-class. Working-class men see that middle-class men seem to be able to acquire the power to make wide choices denied to those in the working-class and that a key to middle-class attainment is in the "arts of rational control" (Sennett and Cobb, 1972, p. 128). The hidden psychological dimensions of the differences in the way men treat their children may then stem from how men themselves are treated on the job. If they feel that they are able to use their abilities, exercise initiative, thought,
and judgment, have some control over the conditions of work, are respected for what they do with their minds, and generally feel competent in dealing with other people, then all this will be reflected in their treatment of their children. Feeling self-confident on the job may spill over into "benevolence" to the family and the desire to help one's children have the kind of life in which one feels one has some rational control over what happens in one's life.

If men's values and orientations are reflected in their treatment of their children, as Kohn (1969) has suggested, and if men value for their children what they value for themselves, then men may see being nurturant to their children as a means of helping their children learn how to get along well with others, learn the arts of rational control, and learn how to acquire the power to make wide choices (Sennett and Cobb, 1972). Middle-class fathers, without being conscious of it, may feel that they have something important to contribute to their children even at an early age, whereas working-class fathers' concerns are centered more on the children at a later age, when they can put pressure on the kids to better themselves by getting a good education and associating with the "right" peers. Perhaps this is why sociologists have suggested that working-class men are not much interested in the early stages of a young child's life (Handel, 1970).

The interpretation of the relationship between closeness of supervision and nurturance is speculative, since there are no guide-
lines in the social science literature. It seems logical, however, that how men feel about themselves as a result of conditions of work would carry over into their family relationships, as Kohn has suggested. Fathers who have "good" experiences in their work, where they are not closely supervised, feel they have some control over their lives, and exercise competencies in interpersonal relationships, will want all these things for their children and will feel that part of their responsibility as father is to impart to their children what they feel is important for them to learn and know for the future. Middle-class fathers may feel that it is never too early to begin to influence their children, which could translate itself into "caretaking" activities with their small children. Play, feelings, concern for the child, and taking over the care of the child at an early age could well have meaning for fathers who value the "arts of rational control". Working-class fathers, on the other hand, who see life conditions in terms of their job (where they have little control and little freedom) want their children to do better than they did and will therefore be interested in putting pressure on their kids to "better" themselves, rather than in being nurturant to their children.

The second group of variables contributing a large amount to the variation in the FaNS scores was the group associated with the age of the child, X(8), X(9), X(10) and X(11). A trend is indicated that shows the younger the child (the age category, one to two year olds) the more nurturant the father will be. Table 8 shows by means
of the multiple regression coefficients, the direction of the relationship between nurturance and age of child.

TABLE 8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Regression coefficients (age against nurturance)</th>
<th>Direction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X(8)</td>
<td>1 to 2 year olds (N=11)</td>
<td>-.33293</td>
<td>The younger the child, the more nurturant father will be</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X(9)</td>
<td>2 to 3 year olds (N=5)</td>
<td>-.25387</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X(10)</td>
<td>3 to 4 year olds (N=10)</td>
<td>-.01050</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X(11)</td>
<td>4 to 5 year olds (N=8)</td>
<td>-.10480</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Becker (1964) has written of age of child as a variable in research, "... by and large, systematic study of this variable has not been undertaken" (p. 172). Ten years later, this is still true. Senn and Hartford (1968), in their study of eight families with a first born child, suggested that there is great variability in the responses of fathers to their infants and small children.

For some fathers positive interaction with the child in play or child-care activity began at birth, for others it came only after the child had achieved a certain degree of independence and had grown out of the infant stage. The extent of physical care and responsibility for the child was minimal with certain fathers and greater for others. Significantly, even the most forbidding fathers sometimes behaved in a way that indicated positive feelings and acceptance of the new third member of the family, and all fathers were involved to some degree in interaction with their children. By the end of the second year seven of the eight fathers were involved to a considerable degree with their children. The
ways in which this interaction was experienced, however, were highly varied (Senn and Hartford, 1968, p. 502).

Nothing in the literature of child development or child psychology provides an interpretation as to why fathers should be more nurturant to their small children at the one to two year old stage than at later stages. Since children are beginning to walk and get around, perhaps fathers feel particularly protective at this stage. Perhaps the explanation lies in the response of the father as the toddler comes to father to be picked up. At this stage the toddler initiates action toward those in her/his environment. Kids have an appeal at this age which is hard to resist; they are learning to say their first words, they are curious, they reach out for attention, and they are "cute". Parents are proud when kids begin to master speech, become secure in walking and running and develop all manner of skills. Perhaps fathers express less nurturance as children grow older because they become more independent and require less nurturing. The meaning of nurturance may change as children grow older (Maccoby, 1961). Further interpretation of the relationship between age of child and fathers' nurturance will have to await more study in this area. The speculative interpretation suggested here is based partly on recent observations of my own grandchildren.

The third group of variables contributing to the "explanation" of the variation in the FaNS are the variables associated with employment of wife/mother. A trend is indicated by the strength of the regression coefficients, as shown in Table 9.
TABLE 9

Employment of mothers and fathers' nurturance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Employment condition of mothers</th>
<th>Regression coefficient</th>
<th>Direction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X(23)</td>
<td>Mothers work full time (N=7)</td>
<td>-.31218</td>
<td>Fathers' nurturance increases with full employment of mothers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X(24)</td>
<td>Mothers work regularly part time or off and on (N=3)</td>
<td>-.23530</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For this sample, there were 32 wives who did not work. The relationship between mothers' working and fathers' nurturance was a linear one - the more fully mothers are employed, the more nurturant the fathers. The mean nurturance score for the fathers whose wives did not work was higher (less nurturant) than that of fathers whose wives worked.

Most studies of the presumed effects of mothers' employment have been directed to effects on children rather than effects on fathers' relationships to their children as a result of mothers' employment. Husbands are more inclined, however, to help out with domestic chores when the wife works full time than when she works only part time (Benson, 1968). "The sharing of domestic tasks by husbands and wives is not only more frequent but usually a more congenial occurrence when both are employed" (Benson, 1968, p. 302). Husbands whose wives work full time are more equalitarian in the area of child rearing, decision making and recreation roles (than
they are with regard to certain household tasks and financial matters) (Dyer and Urban, 1958). Again, the opportunity to be nurturant may be important here. Fathers whose wives work full time may do more baby-sitting, taking care of the small children, sharing more in caretaking activities, get in the habit of taking over when mother is gone, etc. Fathers are often surprised that they can enjoy their small children. Greenacre's study of Charles Darwin points up the surprised response of the father when he discovers the enjoyment of his infant. "He seemed surprised at his own feelings for a young baby. He wrote a friend: 'He is so charming that I cannot pretend to any modesty. I defy anyone to flatter us on our baby, for I defy anyone to say anything in its praise of which we are not fully conscious . . . I had not the smallest conception that there was so much in a five-month-old baby. You will perceive by this that I have a full degree of paternal fervor'" (Greenacre, 1963, p. 110). The interpretation of the meaning of the relationship of the full time working mothers to fathers' nurturance must be speculative at this time, but it seems logical to suggest that there is more opportunity for fathers to be nurturant when their wives work than when their wives are not working. Few households can afford either live-in governesses or a great deal of money on hourly baby-sitting, so fathers are pressed into service as baby-sitters. Another factor to be considered is that husband-fathers whose wives work regularly may be more "middle-class" (egalitarian) in their general attitudes. Thus, they in a sense, "allow" their wives to work. Men
who "allow" wives with small children to work may be especially "liberal" and "egalitarian" and more likely to be nurturant anyway.

The fifth most important of the significant variables contributing to the "explanation" of the variation in the FaNS scores is the question dealing with whether father works with data, people, or things (from the index of self-direction in occupation in the interview schedule). Kohn (1969) has concluded that men who work with data have the greatest amount of self-direction in their jobs; they do work which

in its very substance, requires initiative, thought, and independent judgment. Work with data or with people is more likely to require initiative, thought and judgment than is work with things. Complex work with data or with people - synthesizing or coordinating data, teaching or negotiating with people - is especially likely to require initiative, thought and judgment. Thus, occupational self-direction is most probable when men spend more substantial amount of their working time doing complex work with data or with people. (Kohn, 1969, p. 140).

From Kohn's work, one would expect that work with data and people would make men more aware of the importance of interpersonal relationships, which in turn would be reflected in the way men treat their children. It would seem logical to suggest that when men value for their children what they value for themselves, they will want their children to develop the ability to get along well with others. On the basis of Kohn's arguments, a positive relationship between fathers' nurturance and work with data and people would be the logical expectation. In this study, however, the regression coefficient of X(28), -.12847 , indicates that there
is a tendency for fathers who work with people and things to be
gently more nurturant than fathers who work with data. But
since there were only four fathers in the sample who classified
themselves as working essentially with data, and since the mean
nurturance scores of fathers who work with people are almost
identical with the mean nurturance scores of fathers who work
with things (1.78 and 1.77 respectively), the relationship between
working with data, people and things and nurturance, although
statistically significant, is uninterpretable in this study. Work
with data, people and things is somehow involved with fathers' nur-
turance, but due to the nature of the sampling, it is difficult to
see how to interpret the relationship indicated by the negative slope
of the regression coefficient.

Since each of the dimensions of "self-direction in occupation"
is independent of the others, according to Kohn, the failure of this
study to find a significant relationship between the other parts of
the index of self-direction in occupation and Y does not in any way
affect or invalidate the significance of the relationships of the
two dimensions for which there were statistically significant relation-
ships. In this study, then, two important aspects of what Kohn
called "self-direction in occupation", viz., the closeness of super-
vision that men feel on the job, and work with data, people or things,
were significantly related to the dependent variable, Y, the FaNS.
In terms of the statistical model used to analyze the data, fathers
who perceive themselves as not closely supervised in their jobs
were predicted to be more nurturant to their small children than fathers who perceive themselves to be closely supervised in their jobs. Jobs in which men do not feel themselves to be closely supervised are usually thought of as being "middle-class".

Two variables related to the time involvement of the fathers with their small children contributed to the "explanation" of the variation in the FaNS scores. Both the amount of the time that the child is around when father is at home (regression coefficient, \(-0.25516\)) and the estimate of the number of hours in an average week that the father spends with the child (regression coefficient, \(0.051269\)) were significantly related to fathers' nurturance.

If the child is around a great deal when father is home, he has more opportunity to be nurturant. The question arises, does father arrange to be at home when child is around or does this just happen? Since this is not known, one can only speculate that the opportunity presents itself for fathers to be nurturant the more they are at home when the child is around. Presumably, fathers could arrange not to be at home when the child is around if they did not want interaction with the child.

The other variable, the estimate of number of hours in an average week that father spends with the child reveals that the greater the number of hours that fathers spend with their children the more nurturant they are. Again, the more hours fathers spend with their children, the more opportunity they have to be nurturant; on the other
hand, it may be that fathers who are nurturant enjoy spending time with their children—so it becomes a chicken and egg problem. Which comes first?

Pedersen and Robson (1969), in their data on interactions of fathers with their nine and one half month old infants, reported that fathers spent a mean time of eight hours a week in play and a mean time of 26 hours per week in the home when the baby is awake (range, 5-47 hours). Gurin, Veroff and Feld (1960), in the national survey on mental health, reported that fathers' major source of guilt feelings was their failure to spend enough time with their children. They concluded that "to spend more time with the child is a recent cultural admonition directed toward the men" (p. 136).

It may be that Albany fathers, not having great distances to commute to work (all of them worked in the Albany-Corvallis area), have more time to spend with their children than those fathers who spend hours commuting each day.

Table 10, below, shows the estimated hours per average week that Albany fathers reported they spend with their children.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of fathers</th>
<th>Estimated hours per week spend with child</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>50 hours per week or more</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>40-49 hours per week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>30-39 hours per week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>20-29 hours per week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Less than 20 hours</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The interpretation given to the significant relationship between fathers' time involvement with their small children and nurturance is that fathers who have the opportunity of being nurturant, since their children are around when father is at home, and have the time, since they do not have to spend large amounts of time commuting (for example) will be the more nurturant fathers. This is consistent with the findings of Pedersen and Robson (1969) and with the reports of Gurin, Veroff and Feld (1960).

The variables dealing with age of father, X(6) and X(7), also contributed to the "explanation" of the variation in the FaNS scores. X(6) represented the age category 21-25 years of age, and X(7) the age category 26-30 years of age. The trend suggested by the strength of the coefficients is shown in Table 11.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Age category</th>
<th>Regression coefficient</th>
<th>Direction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X(6)</td>
<td>21-25 years old</td>
<td>-.33364</td>
<td>On the basis of the two age categories, the older fathers are the more nurturant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X(7)</td>
<td>26-30 years old</td>
<td>-.36316</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recently, a study was reported by Nydegger at the University of California at Berkeley of fathers in their late 30's and 40's (Newsline, 1974). "Nydegger found that it was the early (young) fathers who felt 'role strains and discomfort' about parenthood.
The late (older) fathers 'were significantly more self-possessed and comfortable . . . they saw the role less as that of teacher of skills or problem solver, still less that of buddy. Parenthood to these men was something like a benevolent trusteeship, their function being one of promoting the autonomous development of their children, rather than shaping them" (p. 26). Nydegger wanted to test stereotypes about older fathers (e.g., he doesn't have energy to join in games, he's set in his ways, etc.) which she challenged. Her findings lend some support to the findings of this study, although she was dealing with fathers in their late 30's and early 40's in comparison with a 24-30 year old group. In this study, on the basis of the findings, we can say only that the older category of fathers (the 26-30 age group) is more nurturant than the 21-25 year old category.

A speculative view of why the older fathers (up to age 30) turned out to be more nurturant might be that men who become fathers in their mid- or late twenties are more mature, more sure that they want children, and, as Gurin, Veroff and Feld (1960) reported, "The older a person is, the more positive in his general orientation to the life changes accompanying parenthood" (p. 136). Inspection of the raw data reveals that the mean nurturance (FaNS) score for fathers 21-25 years of age was only slightly higher than for fathers 26-30 years of age. (The lower the score, the more nurturant the father). However, there were six fathers over 30 years of age included in the analysis. The mean nurturance score for the over-30 fathers was higher (less nurturant) than for the other fathers. Thus, for this sample, the relationship between age and nurturance seems to be
curvilinear; nurturance increases slightly moving from 21-30 years of age but then declines for fathers over 30 years of age. It does not seem feasible to attempt interpretation of this apparent curvilinear relationship.

The independent variable which contributed the least to the "explanation" of the variation in the FaNS (Y) was X(5), "authoritarianism" as measured by the TFI. The regression coefficient for X(5) was -.005353. An unexpected finding was that the relationship is in the opposite direction from what the sociological literature leads one to expect. Lipset (1960) and McKinley (1964) in particular, had suggested that authoritarian fathers were less likely to be warm and nurturant than were non-authoritarian fathers. This assumption was also found in the literature on child development and psychology in the work of Becker (1964), Baumrind (1965), Block (1955), and Handel (1970).

Lipset's arguments, influential in the sociological literature, linked authoritarianism with "lack of love" in the relationships of parent to child. Lipset claimed that "authoritarian predispositions" are reinforced by the "authoritarian family patterns" of the lower class. "The lower-class individual is likely to have been exposed to punishment, lack of love, and a general atmosphere of tension and aggression since early childhood" (p. 114). McKinley (1964) wrote that "lower class fathers are more distant and severe" (p. 101).

There are two arguments, however, which challenge these views. Zeitlin (1967) countered that
This view is based on several undemonstrated and perhaps unwarranted assumptions about the nature of the 'evidence' used to illustrate the alleged authoritarian patterns of working class families. A great deal of consistency and reliability in the studies of working-class life has been assumed; yet the findings of these studies have been far from consistent. The reader should refer to Urie Bronfenbrenner's comprehensive review of studies on childrearing patterns in the United States, for example, on which Lipset leans so heavily. There, one of the central and unexplained questions raised by the review was why, until about 25 years ago, the vast majority of studies on class family patterns suggested that the middle-class family was comparatively authoritarian and rigid compared with the working class' freer and less compulsive concern with discipline, toilet training, neatness, etc. . . Eclectic selection of such 'evidence' could certainly make a good case for 'middle class authoritarianism'". (p. 628)

Sennett and Cobb (1972) have suggested that the meaning of "authoritarianism" as it relates to working class people has been misunderstood because hidden psychological dimensions have not been considered. "To call the pressure working-class fathers put on their kids 'authoritarian' is misleading in that the father doesn't ask the child to take the parents' lives as a model, but as a warn-ing" (p. 128). Working-class fathers see

the whole point of sacrificing for their children to be that the children will become unlike them-selves; through education and the right kind of peer associations, the kids will learn the arts of rational control and acquire the power to make wide choices which in sum should make the kids better armed, less vulnerable in coping with the world than the fathers are" (p. 128).

Working-class fathers are trying, say Sennett and Cobb, "not to create a web of stability in the home, but to spur the children to develop themselves, so that they will enter a social life higher than
their own" (p. 130). What looks like "authoritarian" behavior on the part of working-class fathers is, in Sennett and Cobb's view, a desire and demand that their kids be different than they are, i.e., become educated and get out of the working-class.

Although for "sheer quantity of research and wealth of findings, few areas within the behavioral sciences can rival the study of authoritarianism" (Kirscht and Dillehay, 1967, p. xi) it remains a complex concept over which there is still a great deal of disagreement and controversy.

Baumrind (1966) has suggested that "authoritarian" parents are not necessarily cold and unloving. In an earlier generation of parents, the "authoritarian parent was stern because she cared. Her discipline was strict, consistent and loving" (p. 891). Benevolent parents are often autocratic, according to Hunt (1970). This pattern may be similar to that of the Montessori teaching methods where, in a Montessori classroom, discipline resides "in the teacher herself, who is controlled and is ready to assume an authoritarian role if it is necessary" (Rambusch, 1962, p. 49).

In this study, "authoritarianism" was measured by the Traditional Family Ideology scale developed by Levinson and Huffman (1955) to measure what they called the autocratic extreme of "ideological orientations regarding family structure and functioning" (p. 251). At the time the scale was devised (in the mid-50's) there was great interest in the "authoritarian dimension of personality" brought on by the popularity of the work of Adorno and others (1950). Levinson and
Huffman (1955) wanted to see whether the scale they developed would show a relationship between the authoritarian dimension of personality and what they called "traditional family ideology".

The autocratic extreme is represented by various forms of 'traditional family ideology' - viewpoints which involve an hierarchial conception of familial relationships, emphasis on disciplines in child-rearing, sharp dichotomization of sex roles, and the like. The democratic orientations tend to decentralize authority within the family, to seek greater equality in husband-wife and parent-child relationships, and to maximize individual self-determination. The terms 'democratic' and 'autocratic' refer not to a simple dichotomy but to antipodes of a broad and internally complex continuum" (p. 251).

The scale purports to analyze family ideology at two levels. On the institutional level the family is analyzed in terms of "(a) the male roles of 'husband' and 'father' (with special reference to the definition of 'masculinity'), (b) the female role of 'wife' and 'mother', (with special reference to the definition of 'femininity'); (c) husband-wife and parent-child relationships, with attention to problems of authority and the distribution of power and responsibility; specific child-rearing practices and attitudes, and (d) general values, expectations and moral pressures" (Levinson and Huffman, 1955, p. 242). The second level of analysis of family ideology thought to be measured by the scale is the psychological level in which the "chief personality characteristics expressed in the autocratic and democratic orientations as these are currently manifested in the realm of family ideology" (p. 253) are thought to be tapped.

From reading the sociological literature, as well as the child development and psychology literature, one would expect that
"authoritarianism" as measured by the TFI would not be positively related to nurturance in fathers as measured by FaNS. Until recently, most studies suggested that warmth and nurturance were not likely to be found associated with authoritarianism. In this study, however, the model showed a statistically significant but weak relationship between X(5) and Y, in a direction which means that the more authoritarian the father is, the more likely he will be nurturant.

The TFI responses of the fathers who had high scores (indicating the presence of "authoritarianism") were broken down to see whether there was a pattern which could account for the high scores. High positive responses on four of the statements in the TFI seemed to account for the high scores. Fathers with high scores responded with positive agreements on these four statements:

A child should not be allowed to talk back to his parents, or else he will lose respect for them;

Some equality in marriage is a good thing, but by and large the husband ought to have the main say-so in family matters;

It goes against nature to place women in positions of authority over men;

The family is a sacred institution, divinely ordained.

To check on this pattern, I reviewed more than 200 TFIs given to college students at Central Washington State College in Ellensburg, Washington during 1972 and 1973, to see whether the pattern found in the Albany, Oregon, fathers' TFIs would be revealed in the college students' responses. The same pattern appeared - those who had high scores on the TFI did so because of consistent, positive
agreement on the same four questions as the Albany fathers had agreed on. This raises the issue of what the TFI is really measuring.

It appears that what is being measured is an adherence to the traditional Western Christian belief system (Reiber, 1966). The Western Christian conceptual framework assumes that children owe unquestioning obedience and loyalty to their parents and that "The family was ordained by God at the time of creation and was supported by Jesus" (Reiber, 1966, p. 304). In the traditional Western Christian view, the father is master of the household, protector, and provider. Malinowski (1927) was made aware of this in his studies of the Trobriand Islanders, where he found no ideal of paternity amongst the natives who had a strong matrilineal society. Malinowski found that the ideal of paternity was advocated by the Christian teachers, but the natives, without a concept of the male role in reproduction and with a matrilineal organization of their society, could not grasp the meaning of the idea that father was supposed to be the head of the family, the head of the household, or that the male should be "dominant". In their families, this was not so.

The whole Christian morality, moreover, is strongly associated with the institution of a patrilineal, and patriarchal family, with the father as progenitor and master of the household. In short, the religion whose dogmatic essence is based on the sacredness of the Father to Son relationship, and whose morals stand or fall with a strong patriarchal family, must obviously proceed by making the paternal relation strong and firm, by first showing that it has a natural foundation. Thus, I discovered - only during my third expedition to New Guinea -
that the natives had been somewhat exasperated by having preached at them what seemed to them an absurdity, and by finding me, so 'unmissionary' as a rule, engaged in the same futile argument (Malinowski, 1927, p. 59).

If, as father, the traditional Western Christian is protector, provider, and authority then as husband he expects to be the dominant head of the household (Brenton, 1966). What it appears is being measured by the TFI in this study is an adherence to the traditional Western Christian morality.

The difficulties of using the TFI to measure "authoritarianism" are now apparent. The meaning of the statements in the TFI were perhaps best understood and agreed with by those fathers who adhere to a traditional Western Christian belief system in which father is head of the household, protector, provider, and stern but benevolent to his children. If this is what one believes "authoritarianism" to be, then it can be said that indeed the TFI measures it.

One can only speculate on the meaning of the statistically significant relationship between the TFI and FaNS scores. It appears that what is being measured in the TFI is the respondents' adherence to the "traditional Western Christian" morality with its beliefs in male dominance, ideal of children's obedience to the parent, sacredness of the family, and submission of the wife to the authority of the husband. But, like the Montessori teacher, the father is likely to be benevolent, kind, and loving as well. It may be that this combination of beliefs and ideals is what the TFI is measuring (but is this "authoritarianism"?). This combination of ideals and beliefs can logically be related to fathers' nurturance; since FaNS measures aspects of caretaking activities, play, and investment.
Perhaps the "benevolent despot" image which emerges from analysis of the TFI is also related to what Bronfenbrenner meant when he wrote: "In addition, though the middle class father typically has a warmer relationship with the child, he is also likely to have more authority and status in family affairs" (1958, p. 422). In the same vein, Baumrind and Black (1967) found in their study that "firm demanding behavior on the part of the parent was not associated in the parent with punitiveness or lack of warmth. The opposite was true" (p. 325). "These parents balanced high nurturance with high control and high demands with clear communication about what was required of the child" (Baumrind and Black, 1967, p. 326).

The combination of the independent variables found to have a statistically significant relationship to the FaNS scores, provides a pattern of conditions associated with fathers' nurturance. Fathers whose jobs are not closely supervised, who have a child between the ages of one and two, whose wife works full time, who spend 50 or more hours in an average week with their small children, who is between 26 and 30 years of age, and who is "authoritarian", are the fathers who will be most likely to be nurturant in relation to their small children. Of course, there is the remaining 30 percent of the variation in the FaNS scores which is unexplained, but according to the model developed by the computer program, the REGRESS sub-system of *SIPS, about 70 percent of the variation in the FaNS scores can be "explained" by the independent variables explored in this study.
Statement of Hypothesis

One of the main purposes of the study was to develop hypotheses which might be tested in further research. On the basis of the findings of this study, one hypothesis is proposed.

Finding 1: Certain conditions associated with fathers' occupations, age of child, employment status of wife/mother, time involvement of father with child, age of father, and authoritarianism (as measured by the TFI) are related to fathers' nurturance to his small children.

In order to do justice to the technique of data analysis used in this study, only one "major finding" is listed. The strength of the REGRESS subsystem of the *SIPS program is its ability to reveal patterns and combinations of independent variables related to the dependent variable. Thus, it is the combination of the independent variables which is of crucial interest. However, since the independent variables relating to "closeness of supervision" had far and away the most statistically significant relationship to nurturance, a special set of assumptions and an hypothesis is developed for those variables and other variables relating to fathers' occupation.

Assumptions:

1. "Work is a crucial facet of life for most American males, providing income and an important aspect of "status"."

2. Social conditions encountered in work influence worldview. Specifically:
a. Middle-class jobs involve less close supervision of the worker than do working-class jobs. Thus, middle-class jobs both allow and require more worker self-direction than do working-class jobs. People who experience self-direction are more likely to believe that their personal efforts can "make a difference", including efforts to influence other people.

3. Parents deal with and try to socialize their children in such a way as to prepare the child to survive and succeed in the world as they see it. Therefore:

Hypothesis 1: Occupational conditions will influence fathers' interaction with their small children and the more the chance for self-direction in work the greater the nurturance of the father.

The pattern of independent variables found to be significantly related to nurturance in this study suggest that fathers' nurturance is a complex combination of (a) world-view and (b) practical circumstances of life. The independent variables relating to closeness of supervision on the job, work with data, people, or things and "authoritarianism" suggest that whether men see the world as "malleable" or "rigid" influences their tendency toward nurturance; i.e., this is the ideology or belief component. But human behavior is influenced not only by perception of the world but also by the concrete circumstances and conditions of life. The independent variables relating to age of child and mothers' employment seem to enter in here. A
man with nurturant tendencies but who has no small children has no
opportunity for display of nurturance and no chance to cultivate it.
But a man disposed toward nurturance who has a small, dependent child
whose mother is absent some of the time has maximum chance to be
nurturant. Thus, the practical circumstances component.

It is recognized, of course, that the world-view and practical
circumstances interact and may reinforce one another. As suggested
earlier, fathers may discover that children can be a delight and
that nurturance is fun. But such a discovery is likely to come only
through actual experience necessitated by circumstance.

The time involvement variable may be, in part, a statistical
artifact. It will be recalled that the FaNS total score was used
to represent Y, the dependent variable, in this study. The justifi-
cation for use of the total score was the extremely high correlation
between the attitude and behavior subscale scores. Thus, for
fathers to attain a FaNS score indicating high nurturance required
that they spend time being nurturant rather than just thinking about
it.

The "age of father" variable is an enigma. The curvilinear
relationship between age and nurturance is impossible to interpret
closely given the available data. Perhaps age is involved in both
the ideology and practical circumstances components.

Perhaps the major import of this study, then, is that fathers'
occupational conditions (especially "closeness of supervision"),
age of child, mothers' employment (or general availability to the
child), age of father, time involvement of father with child, and
"authoritarianism" are identified as factors that ought to be taken into account in any attempt to explain and predict nurturance of fathers toward their children. There may, of course, be other variables related to fathers' nurturance which were not included in this study.

Summary

The interpretations of the findings of this study must be speculative. Little is found in the literature of child development or child psychology dealing with the variables used in this study in relation to nurturance.

The major concern of the study was to examine the relationship between social class and fathers' nurturance. Rather than define social class solely in terms of an index such as the Hollingshead index of social position (1957) which does not explain what it is about social class that makes a difference in men's behaviors to their small children, this study used an index of self-direction in occupation, developed from questions extracted from Kohn's (1969) questionnaire. Fathers who see themselves as being not closely supervised were more nurturant than fathers who perceive themselves to be closely supervised. This item is associated with middle-class occupations, i.e., fathers who perceive themselves as not closely supervised are usually in middle-class occupations. Therefore, fathers who are in "middle-class" occupations as defined by the index of self-direction in occupation developed for this study, are more likely to be nurturant to their small children.
An unexpected finding was that fathers who are "authoritarian" as measured by the TFI are more likely to be nurturant than fathers who are not authoritarian. The meaning of the TFI was examined, and possible explanation for the relationship between authoritarianism and fathers' nurturance was suggested in an interpretation of the TFI as measuring an adherence to the traditional Western Christian morality, which has as a component the ideal of the father as protector, provider, head of the household, and benevolent trustee of the family members.

Other variables found significantly related to fathers' nurturance to their small children included age of the child, age of the father, employment status of wife/mother, and fathers' time involvement with his small children. Speculative analyses of the meaning and interpretations of these relationships were given, since few guidelines are found in the literature of child development or child psychology.

The purpose of exploratory study is to develop hypotheses for future research. On the basis of the findings of this study, one major hypothesis was proposed. The other purpose of exploratory research, to clarify concepts, will be discussed in the conclusions of the study.
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Summary

The purpose of this exploratory study was to develop hypotheses about the relationships between nurturance in fathers to their small children and independent variables thought to be associated with fathers' nurturance. The independent variables selected were social class and authoritarianism, age of child, age of father, sex of child, religious affiliation and associations, employment of mothers, education and income of fathers, and time involvement of fathers with their small children. Of those, the ones which were significantly associated with nurturance were: social class as measured by an index of self-direction in occupation (closeness of supervision and work with data, things and people), age of child, employment of mother, the time father was involved with his small children, age of father, and authoritarianism.

A second purpose was to attempt to clarify the father role in contemporary American society. What does it mean to be a father in today's society? What do fathers think about fatherhood? What do they actually do as fathers? Students of family relations have largely neglected fathers in their research, and little is known of the relationship of fathers to their small children. A model borrowed from Goodenough (1965) suggests that there are two important aspects of the father role: (1) what fathers think they should do, what they
are expected to do as fathers, what is included in their duties and obligations as father; and (2) what they actually do; this, according to Goodenough, is a matter of "privilege" or personal style. Most sociologists have emphasized the father as the breadwinner and as a liaison between the family and the larger society.

The literature of child development and psychology reveals that fathers have been thought to be unimportant in childrearing and inaccessible for research. They have been considered unimportant compared with the mother and also weak when compared with fathers of the past. Historical models are mythical idealizations of the Victorian father (Goode, 1971), or of the American upper-class father of the mid-1800's (Sennett, 1970). Neither was typical, so far as historians can tell on the basis of limited information, of the American father (Bennis and Slater, 1968).

Fathers were considered inaccessible for research apparently because researchers were unwilling to adapt their schedules to those of fathers. Mothers who work full time are inaccessible for similar reasons.

The information for this study was collected in the fall of 1972 through interviews with 42 subjects in a stratified random sample of fathers in Albany, Oregon. As preparation, the literature of child development, child psychology, family studies, family history, sociology, anthropology, psychoanalysis, and social work was reviewed for information on the relationships between fathers and their small children. An experience survey was conducted by interviewing seven specialists
for their observations, ideas, opinions, and insights about fathers and small children based on their working experience. Insight-stimulating examples were analyzed to suggest areas to be covered in the study and direction for the course of the study.

Young fathers helped to develop an interview schedule and also helped to select items from a list of statements relating to caretaking, play, and investment which ultimately made up the Fathers' Nurturance Scales (FaNS), the instrument developed to measure fathers' nurturance to their small children. The interview schedule was tested in a pilot study. Reliability was established on the FaNS. Finally, coders checked items in the interview schedule and ran reliability checks on selected items.

The data collected from the primary interviews were analyzed by a multiple regression approach, the REGRESS subsystem of *SIPS, a computer program developed by the Statistics department of Oregon State University. The analysis revealed that about 70 percent of the variation in the FaNS scores was explained by the following independent variables: How closely fathers feel themselves to be supervised in their jobs, the age of the child, the employment of the mother, whether the father works with data, people, or things, the time the father spent with his child, the age of the father, and authoritarianism. The "importance" of these variables, by significance level, indicated that they contributed to the explanation of the variation in the FaNS scores in this order: Closeness of supervision fathers experience in their work, age of child, employment of mother, father's work with data, things, or people, time spent with child, age of father, and
authoritarianism as measured by the TFI. This means that "closeness of supervision" contributed the most to the "explanation" of the variation in the FaNS scores, while the variable making the least contribution was the TFI, the measure of authoritarianism. The computer model produced a "type" of father who could be predicted to be nurturant to his small child. This father would be a man with a job in which he was not closely supervised, with a child between one and two years of age, whose wife works full time, who spends 50 or more hours in an average week with his child, who is between 26 and 30 years of age, and who is "authoritarian" as measured by the TFI.

The principal concerns of this study, social class and authoritarianism as related to nurturance in fathers of small children, were measured on two scales: authoritarianism by the Traditional Family Ideology scale (TFI), and social class by those aspects of men's jobs which Kohn (1969) found to be related to men's values and orientations. Fathers' values and orientations are influential in behavior toward their children, and the conditions of their jobs influence their values and orientations.

The job conditions usually found in middle-class occupations allow for more self-direction than do the conditions of working-class jobs. Kohn argues that self-direction in occupation is related to whether males work with data, people, or things, and to how closely they consider themselves to be supervised. Men in middle-class occupations usually have more opportunity for self-direction. Males
who are self-directed have warmer relationships with their children. In this sense, middle-class men whose occupations allow for self-direction will be more nurturant to their small children.

A specific hypothesis relating to fathers' occupation was proposed.

A second purpose was to clarify the role of the father in contemporary American society. This study does not substantiate the assumptions that fathers are unimportant in childrearing and inaccessible for research. The interviewer experienced little difficulty in interviewing fathers. Many males expressed indignation that fathers had been neglected in research. The fathers among the group of specialists interviewed for the experience survey were more than willing to give time from busy schedules to talk with me about fathers and their small children. The young fathers I talked with in Corvallis, Albany, and Newport, Oregon, were interested in helping me develop the interview schedule and talk about their fathering and the fathers in the pilot study also gave many hours in responding to the interview schedules, and talking over many aspects of fathering. I did not find any instances where fathers were inaccessible, nor did I find any fathers who thought they were unimportant in childrearing.
The standard literature reveals that the neglect of fathers in family studies is simply part of an overall neglect of many aspects of family life. There is a considerable literature on fathers - the real problem is that it has been largely neglected. Benson (1968), a sociologist, has an excellent bibliography of many sociological sources, but there are many other important studies that he does not list. Sociologists have claimed that the study of the family is their province (Christensen, 1964), but their work reveals a limited view. They think primarily in terms of the sociology of the family, not the family per se. What really happens in families - the joy and the terror - has been obscured by what Rodman (1970) has called a "rosy simplicity" which avoids the realities - and the creativity - of love, sex, violence, conflict, and hope. They all abound in family life (Goode, 1971a; Steinmetz and Straus, 1974).

The sentimental, idealized model of the family purveyed in many family relations classes in high schools and colleges is based on what ought to be, according to some academics, rather than what is. It took doctors to make the public aware of child abuse. American society pays lip service to a concern for children but as Bronfenbrenner has pointed out (1972), the 1970 White House Conference on children indicted the nation for vast neglect. "Our national rhetoric notwithstanding, the actual patterns of life in America today are such that children and families come last" (1972, p. xi). American stands thirteenth among the nations of the world in combating infant mortality.
The "battered" child, once thought of as a rare phenomenon, "has now been documented as a national problem" (Bronfenbrenner, 1972, p. xii) cutting across all class lines.

Parenthood is likewise neglected. Hardly any information is available on the motivation for parenthood. Education for parenthood is only now drawing attention through the Office of Child Development's recent efforts to create a program in the high schools. Part of the difficulty has been in the conceptualization of areas constituting family study. Much of the research on socialization, for example, has tended to interpret parental behavior solely as an instrumental process in preparing the child for an adult future (Clark and Martin, 1966). Recent criticisms of research in child development are detailed in Yarrow, Campbell, and Burton (1968), White (1969) and Schaffer and Emerson (1964); and assumptions about mothers are being reevaluated in the light of new information on child abusers. Many past analyses of mothers and fathers are based on the biases of the social scientists rather than on evidence.

The acceptance of the concept of mothering by social scientists reflects their own satisfaction with the status quo. The inability of social scientists to explore or to advocate alternatives to current child-rearing practices is due to their biased conceptions of what should be studied and to their unwillingness to advocate social change (Wortis, 1971, p. 739).

Often the research literature reflects the idea of regularity of parental behavior; it "underestimates the potential for parental irrationality" (Skolnick, 1974, p. 329). "The realities of modern
parenthood, especially motherhood, are considerably less idyllic than the myth portrays them" (Skolnick, 1974, p. 331).

Reasons for the "bad press" for fathers will have to await the diagnosis of the cultural historian. "Father is losing ground", reports a prominent sociologist noted for his work on parents (Father is, 1973, p. 16). Emphasis on the father of the past is part of the idealized image of the stereotyped family of the past. "In the days of unquestioned male sovereignty, (father) had dispensed and received attention regally at the head of the family table" (Filene, 1974, p. 18). But the patriarch was also a child, blending dominance with dependence. Men were dependent on the "home as the cornerstone of social order, as the nursery of morality, and as the measure of their own achievement in the world" (Filene, 1974, p. 16). The "masculine mystique" is the nostalgic view of father as the "patriarch of the breakfast table, as breadwinner in the marketplace, as roughrider on the range" (Filene, 1974, p. 12).

Richard Sennett has written that the notion of the authoritarian father-centered rule of the household came from the upper-class father of about the time of the Civil War. He was the ruler, the lawgiver, and the children treated him not with easy familiarity, but with trembling respect. The instrument of the father's power in the family was the church; his leadership in the church was a sign of his own virtue, and his family was expected to obey him since it was he who voiced and embodied the laws of religion (Sennett, 1970, p. 18).
The notion that fathers were not nurturant perhaps came from the "masculine mystique", the stereotype of father as stern, distant, tough, aggressive in the world outside the family - an assumption apparently accepted by social scientists without any evidence as to what fathers were really like. Perhaps in the future, fathers' nurturance should be examined in the new breed of fathers which is rapidly increasing. Bachelor fathers, scarce a few years ago (at least to public knowledge) are now reported to be almost 400,000 strong, and this is just a report of newly divorced fathers who have taken custody of their children. Women are running away from home, children and husbands at an ever increasing rate. Ed Goldfader, an investigator in New York City who searches for runaways, reported that in 1969 only two percent of his quarry was female, in mid-1974 the figure increased to 56 percent. Many more men will join the trend toward bachelor fatherhood; "Which they surely will, for even as the divorce rate has soared to record heights (in the first nine months of 1973, there was one divorce for each 2.56 marriages), the number of divorced people who remarry is leveling off dramatically - and as society is structured today, one of the parents has got to take the kids; considering the newly outspoken reluctance on the part of many women to be tied to the home, that parent is as likely to be Dad as Mom" (Peer, 1974, p. 143).

A father's personal style or "privilege", in Goodenough's (1965) terms, is difficult to assess in research which deals with statistical averages. Research like that of Sennett and Cobb (1972) on social stratification may be more meaningful in these beginning stages of
study on fathers. Sennett and Cobb reported on a series of conversations with working-class men where they attempted to get at the hidden psychological dimensions of social class. This led them to see that

both sides in the argument about workers, rebellion, and culture think more simplistically about workers than workers think about themselves. The complexity of working-class consciousness demands of the listener a fresh theory to explain what he is hearing, a theory that, in this book, involves speculation and generalization far beyond the boundaries of the conversations themselves (1972, p. 10).

Research on fathers in the future will need to find ways of getting at the "hidden psychological dimensions" if the complexities of father behavior are to be tapped.

An interesting spin-off of this study came about as a result of giving a modified version of the FaNS to several sections of men in a "homemaking for men" class and to about 500 other students, men and women, young and old, at Central Washington State College in Ellensburg, Washington, over a period of two years. Without exception, the scores from each group were almost identical with those of the main sample of fathers in Albany, Oregon, and with those of the fathers in the convenience sample in Ellensburg, Washington. Although this does not constitute proof of validity for the FaNS, it does suggest that people other than fathers agree with the fathers' assessment of what fathers should do in relation to their small children. My hunch is that any group taking the modified form of FaNS would have much the same scores, and that this is a cultural change which has now permeated the U.S. society of the present. A copy of the modified FaNS
appears in Appendix F.

Further research on fathers and small children should probably take into account developmental and normative-descriptive data on small children available in the child development literature. The significant relationship between age of child and fathers' nurturance suggests an area for future research; i.e., characteristics of the child are probably as important an influence on nurturance as characteristics of the father.

In retrospect, the decision to have a young father do the interviewing of the main stratified random sample in Albany, Oregon, was a good one. In the pilot study and in the convenience sample of 10 fathers in Ellensburg, Washington, fathers were contacted ahead of time so that they were somewhat prepared, and they were either young fathers of my acquaintance or friends of mutual friends so that I did not go cold to any of the interviews which I conducted. The Albany interviewer, of course, did go cold to all interviews. Despite that, he reported that he found it easy to talk with fathers about their children and what they did with them. He always asked to talk with the husband and explained to the wife what he was doing and why. In contrast to the pilot study fathers and the Ellensburg sample, fathers in the main interviews would not, by and large, comment on their relationships with their fathers, or continue in informal discussion after the formal portion of the interview was over. Apparently it takes a more personal relationship between interviewer and respondent to get respondents to talk about their feelings about fatherhood, their own fathers, and other
more intimate details of their family life. The interviewer reported that most of the fathers seemed relieved when the interview was over and that they didn't appreciate having their minds picked about their jobs. Others have reported also that men are reluctant to talk about their jobs since it seems to carry the connotation of "griping", which is thought to be unmanly (Brenton, 1966).

The interviewer commented that he thought, in general, that working-class men are more family centered than middle-class men. Working-class men work at a job only for money and spend the remainder of their time at home or in more family-oriented activities. This was in agreement with comments from some of the specialists in the experience survey who remarked on the home-orientation of working-class men they knew. This should alert researchers to the suspicion that the complexities of differences between working-class men and middle-class men have not yet been unravelled.

The interviewer also observed that the time of year in which research is carried out may have an effect on the results. In the Albany area, had we waited another two weeks, we might have found many fathers gone - the hunting season would have started. Such local, idiosyncratic items must be taken into account. All things considered, the interviewer felt that the time we chose to interview the fathers (the latter part of September and the first week in October) was probably the best.

Other recent events which need to be investigated for a fuller understanding of fathers in contemporary U.S. society are the recent
legal changes which are reflecting changes in fathers' status, e.g., courts are redefining the legal relationship between the father of an illegitimate child and his offspring (Courts Redefining, 1972, p. C6; Supposed Father, 1973, p. A3; The Issue, 1972). Divorced fathers are seeking custody of their children more and more (Divorced Father, 1974, p. G2), and fathers are beginning to ask for "paternity leave" from their jobs for the period of time when birth occurs and the days or weeks following (Paternity Leave, 1974, p. D2).

It seems obvious that in any study of fathers in the future, the data ought to come from the fathers themselves. Certainly it would be interesting to compare fathers' and mothers' responses to any item dealing with family life. In retrospect, it would have been easy to let the mother take the modified FaNS, except that the idea did not occur to me until after the main interviews were already completed. Any study of family life would, of course, benefit from getting responses from all members of the family. Far too often in the past, mothers have been interviewed about fathers' behaviors in relation to the children, and often the use of the word "parent" has really meant "mother". Also,

the Kohn and Carroll study alerts us to the rather considerable differences in the conclusions one would draw about families, depending upon the source of data . . . (an) interesting observation . . . was that mothers' reports concerning the fathers' role in socialization differed for two groups of their subjects. Namely, mothers who knew that the father and child were also to be interviewed gave more favorable reports concerning the father than did mothers who knew that they alone were to be interviewed (Yarrow, 1963, p. 219).
That fathers and mothers see family behavior quite differently has also been reported by Eron et al. (1961) and Stolz (1967).

The use of the computer program applied to the data in this study should be investigated further as a means of looking at combinations of independent variables in association with a dependent variable. Any statistical method, of course, has its limitations, and students need to be aware of the limitation of any method chosen to analyze data.

Many thorny problems remain unsolved as a result of this study. A study such as this must alert any investigator to consider the statement of Milton Kotelchuck of Harvard who says that we are just beginning to discover how little we really do know about human relations (Gornick, 1974). Jerome Kagan, returning from his field studies in Guatemala, remarked that he felt he had to start all over again and reconsider his ideas on developmental theory (1973).

Questions from this study which remain include, What is "nurturance"? Has it been defined satisfactorily in this study? How can one tell whether fathers' responses to his child are related to the wife/mother's influence? Is it true that men resemble the times more than they do their fathers? (Ryder, 1965). Is Orville Brim correct when he says there is no such thing as a warm (or nurturant) person - there is only role-specific behavior? (Maccoby, 1961).
What of the 30 percent of the variation in the FaNS scores which was not "explained" by the significant independent variables in this study? What might account for that 30 percent and how important might that factor or those factors be which account for the missing 30 percent?

As a result of this exploratory study, it seems quite clear to me that fathers see themselves as being very important in childrearing and certainly fathers encountered during the course of this research were not inaccessible. However, it is recognized that the small sample which served as a basis for this study does not permit confident generalizations about accessibility of fathers.
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APPENDICES
APPENDIX A

NAMES AND POSITIONS OF SPECIALISTS IN EXPERIENCE SURVEY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Victor Bogart</td>
<td>Mental Health Specialist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Corvallis, Oregon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Inez Campbell</td>
<td>Children's librarian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Corvallis, Oregon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Ajax Moody</td>
<td>Juvenile Probation Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Corvallis, Oregon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Darren Newtonson</td>
<td>University of Virginia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Charlottesville, Virginia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Constance F. Owen</td>
<td>Human development specialist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Seattle, Washington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Miriam Wiggenhorn</td>
<td>Oregon State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Corvallis, Oregon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Eldon Younger</td>
<td>The Corvallis Clinic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Corvallis, Oregon</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX B

Interviewer's instructions

Follow the interview schedule for introduction, what to do if you are refused.

The Attitude scale - hand father a copy of the scale; record his responses on the Coder's data sheet. Read it over with him if this seems appropriate. While he is answering, have Card #1 where he can see it easily, in case he wants to refer to answers. The card numbers are in bold type in the left hand column of the interview schedule.

Discuss with father any question he does not understand.

Be sure you have the cards in order before you go into the interview; also have your coder's data sheet ready, the three scales, some extra sheets of all these items, in case you need them.
Interview schedule

Hello, I'm ____________ (show credential if asked for) and I'm interviewing fathers for a study being done through the Family Life Department at Oregon State University. (If asked, say that you are interviewing for me.) Would you be willing to talk with me and answer some questions about being a father? (If father refuses, try to get the reason for the refusal; try to find out the father's age, age of child, number of children in the family, father's occupation.)

If father agrees, explain that studies are usually done on mothers and children, but seldom on fathers. We'd like to try to get some information about the kinds of things fathers do nowadays with their small children.

1. We got your name from the City Directory, and according to it (a) you have ____ child(ren), named (b) _____. (If there are two children or more, ask the father to direct his replies in terms of the oldest child.) Record answers to a and b on Coder's data sheet.

First I'd like to ask you some questions about what you think you as a father should do (what you ought to do) with ____ (name of child). We're not asking here what you actually do - that will come later - but rather what you think you should do, as a father. These questions can all be answered with these replies (SHOW CARD #1), "Strongly agree, mildly agree, mildly disagree, strongly disagree".

2. Proceed with attitude questionnaire.
Now I'd like to ask you the same questions but worded so that you can reply in terms of what you actually do. These questions can be answered with the replies, "Very often, often, sometimes, never". (SHOW CARD #2).

3. Proceed with behavior scale.
FATHERS' ATTITUDES TOWARD NURTURANCE

Attitudes - what as a father you think or believe you should do in your role of father

Answer the question by replying with one of these four answers: Strongly agree; mildly agree; mildly disagree; strongly disagree

You should help your child dress and undress (change diaper if small).

You should put your child to bed for nap or at night.

You should hold your child when she/he wants to be held.

You should carry your child when she/he wants to be carried.

You should give your child a bath.

You should help your child with eating when she/he needs help (give bottle when very small)

You should play gentle roughhouse with your child; e.g., get down on the floor and play horsie, romp.

You should watch over, or play with, your child when she/he is doing things like running around, playing ball, riding trike, climbing (whatever is appropriate for age).

You should take your child on outings such as to the park to swing or play in the sandbox, on the jungle jim, or on a picnic (whatever is appropriate for age).

You should spend time with your child in quiet play such as reading, working puzzles, making models, dressing dolls (whatever is appropriate for age).

You should let your child be a "helper" to you; e.g., bringing your slippers to you, your paper to you, helping in the yard, watering the lawn and plants, in the shop (whatever is appropriate for age).

You should play simple "sound-touch" games with your child; i.e., "patty-cake", peek-a-boo (whatever is appropriate for age).

You should feel that it's OK to hug and kiss your child even in public.
You should just naturally feel tender and protective about your child.

You should comfort your child when she/he needs comforting (falls down, has minor hurts, has feelings hurt, doesn't feel well).

You should spend time just sitting and holding your child.

You should get a good feeling when your child comes running (or crawling) to you.

You should be concerned that your child might get hurt (hurt self or be hurt when playing, by being hit by other kids, etc.).
Behaviors - what you actually do with your child.

Answer the question by replying with one of these four answers:

**Very often; Often; Sometimes; Never**

I help my child dress and undress (change diaper, if appropriate).

I put my child to bed at night or down for nap.

I give my child her/his bath.

I hold my child when she/he wants to be held.

I carry my child when she/he wants to be carried.

I help my child with eating when she/he needs help. (or wants help).

I play gentle roughhouse with my child; I get down on the floor and play horsie or romp.

I watch my child or play with her/him when she/he is riding trike, playing outdoors, climbing, playing ball, running around, etc.

I take my child on outings such as to the park to swing or play in the sand-box, on the jungle jim, or on a picnic.

I help my child when she/he is working puzzles, dressing dolls, making models; or, I read to my child when she/he wants to be read to.

I let my child be a "helper" to me in the yard, watering the lawn, doing simple chores around the house, in the shop (whatever is appropriate to age).

I play "sound-touch" games such as "patty-cake" or peek-a-boo (whatever is appropriate to age).

I hug and kiss my child even in public.

I just naturally feel tender and protective about my child.

I sit and hold my child.
I comfort my child when she/he needs comforting (comes to me for comforting, e.g., after falling down, doesn't feel well, etc.).

I get a good feeling when my child comes running to me (or crawling).

I am concerned that my child might get hurt, fall, get hurt while playing with other kids. (Worry-concern).

Now, I'd like to ask you a few questions about your background.

1. To which age group do you belong?
   (a) under 21
   (b) 21-25
   (c) 26-30
   (d) 31-35
   (circle)

2. Children. (a) focus child's name (b) age (sex) F M
   (d) age of second child F M
   (e) age of third child F M

3. Religion
   (a) Protestant, specify denomination
   (b) Catholic
   (c) Jewish
   (d) Other, specify
   (e) None

1. How much of your social spare time do you spend with other people whose religious beliefs are the same as yours?
   (a) Most
   (b) Quite a bit
   (c) Very little
   (d) None

   Probe: Are most of your closest friends of the same religious beliefs?
   (a) Yes, Most
   (b) Quite a few
   (c) Not many
   (d) None

2. Do you spend a lot of social time with your relatives?
   (a) Yes, a lot
   (c) Not much
   (b) Some
   (d) None

   Probe: Do your relatives have the same religious beliefs that you do?
   (a) Yes, most do
   (b) Some do
   (c) Few do
   (d) No
4. Education
   (a) College plus
   (c) Some college
   (e) Some high school
   (g) Seven years or less

   (b) College or university graduate
   (d) High school graduate
   (f) Junior high graduate

5. Income
   (a) Under $4,000 a year
   (c) $7,000 to 10,999
   (e) Over $15,000 a year

   (b) $4,000 to $6,999
   (d) $11,000 to $15,000

6. Does your wife work?
   (a) Yes, regularly full time
   (c) Off and on
   (d) No

   (b) Yes, regularly part time

7. When you are home, how much time do you spend with your child?
   (a) Most
   (c) Not much

   (b) Quite a lot
   (d) Almost none

   Probe: When you are at home, how much of the time is the child around?
   (a) Most
   (c) Little

   (b) Quite a lot
   (d) Very little

   Probe: Could you give an estimate of the number of hours you spend with your child in an average week?

8. Thinking of your own father, do you think that the way you see being a father has been influenced by your own experience?
   Probe: Do you think that the way your father treated you has had an influence on the way you treat your child?

Now just for a change I'll ask you to fill out this questionnaire which is a little different. This one was made up by some people who wanted to ask some general questions about how you feel about some family matters. You can mark your answers just to the left of the questionnaire. (Respond to any questions father might have about the scale.) Hand father the TFI sheet.

TFI SCALE

This is a study of what the general public thinks about a number of social questions. The best answer to each statement below is your personal opinion. We have tried to cover many different points of view. You may find yourself agreeing strongly with some of the statements, disagreeing just as strongly with others, and perhaps uncertain about others. Whether you agree or disagree with any statement, you can be sure that many other people feel the same way that you do.
Mark each statement in the left margin according to how much you agree or disagree with it. Please mark every one. Write in +1, +2, +3, or -1, -2, -3, depending on how you feel in each case.

+1: I agree a little  
+2: I agree pretty much  
+3: I agree very much

-1: I disagree a little  
-2: I disagree pretty much  
-3: I disagree very much

A child should not be allowed to talk back to his parents, or else he will lose respect for them.

There is a lot of evidence such as the Kinsey Report which shows us we have to crack down harder on young people to save our moral standards.

There is hardly anything lower than a person who does not feel a great love, gratitude, and respect for his parents.

A woman whose children are messy or rowdy has failed in her duties as a mother.

If children are told too much about sex, they are likely to go too far in experimenting with it.

A child who is unusual in any way should be encouraged to be more like other children.

Women who want to remove the word obey from the marriage service don't understand what it means to be a wife.

Some equality in marriage is a good thing, but by and large the husband ought to have the main say-so in family matters.

A man can scarcely maintain respect for his fiancee if they have sexual relations before they are married.

It goes against nature to place women in positions of authority over men.

The most important qualities of a real man are strength of will and determined ambition.

The family is a sacred institution, divinely ordained.
Next I'd like to ask you some questions about your work (job).

1. What does your work consist of? (What do you do in your job?)

2. Do you work for others or for yourself?

3. We'd like to know how you spend your working time; about how much of your time would you say you spend
   (a) Reading and writing (using any type of written material, letters, memos, blueprints, books, files, dictating, etc.) (percent of time, 0, 10, 20, 30, 40, 50, 60, 70, 80, 90, 100)
   (b) Working with your hands (using tools, machines, repairing machines, moving furniture, etc.) (percent of time, 0, 10, 20, 30, 40, 50, 60, 70, 80, 90, 100)
   (c) Dealing with people (conversations necessary to job, selling, advising clients, talking to boss, etc.) (percent of time, 0, 10, 20, 30, 40, 50, 60, 70, 80, 90, 100)
   1) Percent of time spent on (a), (b), (c)
   2) (a), (b), or (c) then is most important for your job
   3) The second most important would be (a), (b), or (c)?
   4) If two are of equal importance, which ones?

4. Of all the persons above you in the job (firm, organization, department), who has the most control over what you actually do on the job? (a) Is he the man immediately above you, (b) the man above him, (c) someone higher still, or (d) someone in another chain of command?

5. How closely does he supervise you - (a) does he decide what you do and how you do it? (b) does he decide what you do but let you decide how you do it? (c) do you have some freedom in deciding both what you do and how you do it? (d) or are you your own boss so long as you stay within the general policies of the firm (organization, department)?

6. When he wants you to do something, (a) does he usually just tell you to do it, (b) does he usually discuss it with you, or (c) is it about half and half. (If respondent says that he knows what to do, so boss doesn't have to tell him, check and then ask: How about when something unusual comes up?)

7. How free do you feel to disagree with him - (a) completely free, (b) largely but not completely, (c) moderately, (d) not particularly, (e) or not at all free?
8. Are there any employees of the (firm, organization, department) who are under you, either because they are directly under you or because they are under people you supervise? (If no, skip questions 9, 10, and 11.)

9. Altogether, how many employees are under you?

10. How many of these directly under you, with nobody in between?

11. How important is it for doing your job well that you get on well personally with the people under you - (a) is it absolutely necessary, (b) is it very important, (c) fairly important, (d) or not particularly important?

12. Does your work involve doing the same thing in the same way repeatedly, (b) the same kind of thing in a number of different ways, or (c) a number of different kinds of things? If different kinds of things: (1) When you begin your day's work, can you predict what kinds of things are going to happen on the job that day, or (2) is it a job in which you can't tell what may come up?

13. What it takes to do a complete job varies a great deal from occupation to occupation. To a worker on an assembly line a complete job may be to tighten two or three bolts; to an auto mechanic a complete job is to repair a car; to a coal miner, a complete job may be to load 18 tons. (a) What do you ordinarily think of as a complete job in your occupation? (Probe: What do you have to do in order to feel that you've finished a piece of work?) Second Probe: Do you ever feel that you've finished? (At what point?)

(b) How long does it take you to do a complete job? (If it varies, what is the range of variation?)

14. I'm going to show you a list of things that people may have to do on different jobs. (a) Which three of these are most necessary for doing your job well? (b) Which one is most necessary of all? (c) Which three do you think would be the least important? (d) and which of the three is the least important of all?
   1. Make a good impression on others
   2. Have a good memory
   3. Think quickly
   4. Organize things systematically
   5. Think up new ways of doing things
   6. Plan ahead
   7. Handle people well
8. Obey the rules
9. Do heavy work
10. Stick to a job until it's finished
11. Work accurately
12. Communicate clearly
13. Do what you're told
14. Move quickly

At the end of the formal interview section, ask if the focus child was "good" as a baby, or was she/he colicky, irritable, cried a lot, hyperactive (use this term only when appropriate)?

If there is more than one child, ask: If you were asked these questions in relation to your second child, do you think you would answer differently?

   Probe: Why? Because child is of different sex? Different disposition? Better looking?

Informal questioning section

   After the end of the formal interview section, put papers away, settle back and relax and ask informally about father's "real" feelings about his fatherhood, e.g., what do you really think about being a father? How do you really feel about it? (Is it too much responsibility? Too hard? Enjoyable?)

   How long had you been married when you had your first child? Do you think it's a good idea to wait for several years after marriage before having children? Do you think having children is probably the main point of marriage? How important is it to marriage to have children? How important is it to be a "good" father?
Anything that can be elicited from the fathers about the above, or, (and, in addition) about their own fathers, fine -- let the father talk as freely as he will, try to remember whatever he says, and write it down as quickly as possible after leaving the interview.

PILOT STUDY -- Ask for comments about the order of the interview -- was it OK? Have they suggestions for additions, changes?
APPENDIX C

Coder's Instruction Sheet

Coding for the attitude scale:

Strongly agree 1
Mildly agree 2
Mildly disagree 3
Strongly disagree 4

Coding for the Behavior scale:

Very often 1
Often 2
Sometimes 3
Never 4

Question number 1, page 5 of the interview schedule

Age of father:
Under 21 1
21-25 2
26-30 3
31-35 4

Question number 2, page 5 of interview schedule

Age of focus child, sex of focus child, and age and sex of other children in the family

(a) age of focus child
1-2 1
2-3 2
3-4 3
4-5 4
5-6 5

(b) Sex of focus child
female 1
male 2

(c) age and sex of other children in the family
(code only for number of children in family)
1 1
2 2
3 or more 3

Question number 3, Religious affiliation and associations

(a) Religious affiliation
Protestant 1
Catholic 2
Jewish 3
Other 4
None 5
(b) Religious associations

Spends most or quite a lot of time with friends and relatives who have same religious beliefs 1

Spends most or quite a lot of time with friends OR relatives with same religious beliefs 2

Spends some or quite a bit of time with friends and relatives who have same religious beliefs 3

Spends some or quite a bit of time with friends OR relatives who have same religious beliefs 4

Spends little or no time with friends and relatives with same religious beliefs. 5

Spends little or no time with friends OR relatives with same religious beliefs. 6

Question number 4, page 7 of interview schedule

Education

College plus 1
College degree 2
Some college 3
High School graduation 4
Some high school 5
Junior high graduate 6
7th grade or less 7

Question number 5, page 7

Income

Under $4,000 a year 1
$4,000 to $6,999 2
$7,000 to $10,999 3
$11,000 to $14,000 4
Over $15,000 5

Question number 6, page 7

Wife's employment

Yes, regularly full time 1
Yes, regularly part time 2
Yes, off and on 3
No 4
Question number 7, page 7

Father's time involvement with child
a. (a) Most 1
   (b) Quite a lot 2
   (c) Not much 3
   (d) Almost none 4

b. (a) Most of the time 1
   (b) Quite a lot 2
   (c) Not much 3
   (d) Almost none 4

c. Number of hours per week (average) estimate of time spent with child
   50 hours or more 1
   40-49 hours 2
   30-39 3
   20-29 4
   Less than 20 hours 5

Question 8, page 7, not coded

Page eight of the interview schedule

The Traditional Family Ideology Scale (TFI)

+3  7
+2  6
+1  5
0   4
-1  3
-2  2
-3  1

The individual's total scale score is the sum of his item scores.

"When the total score is divided by 12 (the total scores can fall between 12 and 84) we obtain the mean score per item on a 1-7 scale. For convenience in comparing scores from scales differing in length, we shall use the mean per item, multiplied by 10." (Levinson and Huffman, 1955, p. 258).
SELF-DIRECTION IN OCCUPATION (From Interview Schedule, Job Questions, Page 9)

The LOWER the score, the higher the value of self-direction

(3) Work with data, people or things
1 = Work with data is most important aspect of job, or, spends most time working with data.
2 = Work with people is most important aspect of job, or, spends most time working with people.
3 = Work with things is most important aspect of job, or, spends most time working with things.

Closeness of supervision, questions 4 through 7

(4) 1 = d (someone in another chain of command)
2 = c ("someone higher still")
3 = b ("man above him")
4 = a (man immediately above you)

(5) 1 = d (you are your own boss, etc.)
2 = c (have some freedom, etc.)
3 = b (boss decides what you do, but lets you decide how etc.)
4 = a (boss decides what you do and how you do it)

(6) 1 = a (a) (usually just tells you to do it; when something unusual comes up, you make your own decisions)
2 = a (c) (tells you to do it, then half and half)
3 = a (b), or c (tells you to do it, but, call in and discuss etc.; half and half)
4 = b (discusses it with you)

(7) 1 = a (completely free)
2 = b (largely but not completely)
3 = c (moderately)
4 = d (not particularly)
5 = e (not at all free)

COMPLEXITY OF ORGANIZATION OF WORK, Questions 12 and 13

(12) 1 = c, 1 (number of different things, can predict what will happen on job that day)
2 = c, 2 (number of different things, can't tell what may come up)
3 = b (same kind of thing in number of different ways)
4 = a (same thing in same way repeatedly)
(13) What is a complete job?

1 = "no such thing as a complete job", "never happened", "continuous", "work never finished", etc.
2 = define a job in terms of its intrinsic properties, e.g.,
a solution to a particular problem or the production of some object.
3 = define a job in terms of a given quantity of product,
e.g., a quota, 3 lbs., 6 ft., 16 tons; "when a job is done",
etc.
4 = amount of work that can be done in a given amount of time,
an hour, a day, a week, a semester, or a season.

(14) "Self reliance"

1 = 5 most important, 8 or 13 or both least important
2 = 5 most important, no mention of 8 or 13 least important/
   8 or 13 or both least important, no mention of 5 as most
   important
3 = Mention none of following - 8, 5, or 13; or, conflict of
   5, 8, or 13
4 = 8 and/or 13 - most important/or, 5 - least important
5 = 8 and/or 13 most important, 5 least important
CODER'S DATA SHEET

Page 1

Children's Names
1. (a) ______
   (b) ______

2. FNS ATTITUDES
   Code
   1-strongly agree
   2- mildly agree
   3-mildly disagree
   4-strongly disagree

A. 1. ______
   2. ______
   3. ______
   4. ______
   5. ______
   6. ______

B. 1. ______
   2. ______
   3. ______
   4. ______
   5. ______
   6. ______

C. 1. ______
   2. ______
   3. ______
   4. ______
   5. ______
   6. ______

FNS BEHAVIOR
   Code
   1-very often
   2-often
   3-sometimes
   4-never

A. 1. ______
   2. ______
   3. ______
   4. ______
   5. ______
   6. ______

Page 6

1. Age, under 21
   21-25, 26-30, 31-35

2. Children's names, age
   (a) ______ M F
   (b) ______ M F
   (c) ______ M F
   (d) ______ M F

3. a b c d e
   If a ______
   (1) a b c d
   PROBE: a b c d
   (2) a b c d
   PROBE: a b c d

4. a b c d e f g

5. a b c d e

6. YES NO
   If YES: a b c

7. (a) a b c d
   (b) a b c d
   (d) ______ hours

8. YES NO
   YES NO
   Comments:

Page 9

1. Job description
   2. Others __ Self __

3. (a) (1) %
   (2) %
   (3) %
   (b)(1) (2) (3)
   (c)(1) (2) (3)
   (d)(1) (2) (3)

4. a b c d

5. a b c d

6. a b c d

7. a b c d e

Page 10

8. YES NO
   If NO, skip 9, 10, and 11

9. ______

10. ______

11. a b c d

12. a b c
   If c, then (d)
   1. 2.

13. (a) what is complete job?
   (b) How long?

14. (a) ______
    (b) ______
    (c) ______
    (d) ______

   Good, Bad, or Normal Baby? If more than one child, would treat others different?
APPENDIX D

Page numbers of the 1972 Johnson City Directory (Albany, Oregon)
and die numbers used to draw the main sample.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page 135 Die #3</th>
<th>Page 183 Die #1</th>
<th>Page 231 Die #1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>138 #5</td>
<td>186 #6</td>
<td>234 #6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>141 #2</td>
<td>189 #5</td>
<td>237 #2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>144 #3</td>
<td>192 #3</td>
<td>240 #3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>147 #5</td>
<td>195 #2</td>
<td>243 #4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150 #3</td>
<td>198 #3</td>
<td>246 #1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>153 #6</td>
<td>201 #5</td>
<td>249 #2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>156 #6</td>
<td>204 #4</td>
<td>252 #6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>159 #5</td>
<td>207 #1</td>
<td>255 #6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>162 #5</td>
<td>210 #1</td>
<td>258 #3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>165 #3</td>
<td>213 #3</td>
<td>261 #4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>168 #1</td>
<td>216 #5</td>
<td>264 #5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171 #2</td>
<td>219 #5</td>
<td>267 #4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>174 #6</td>
<td>222 #5</td>
<td>270 #1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>177 #6</td>
<td>225 #2</td>
<td>273 #1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180 #3</td>
<td>228 #5</td>
<td>277 #3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>280 #2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 12
Coding of the raw data for the 42 fathers in the main sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Fam. Age</th>
<th>Attitude</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Marital Status</th>
<th>No. of Children</th>
<th>Appt.</th>
<th>Mailing</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Self-Employment in Agriculture</th>
<th>HDL</th>
<th>LDL</th>
<th>VLDL</th>
<th>Age of Father</th>
<th>Age of Child</th>
<th>Income</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

APPENDIX E
### TABLE 13

Examples of coding of raw data for computer program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.55</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.66</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.77</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>8.88</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>9.99</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>9.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*See data code

** Variables, number, computer model

*** Dropped from sample

---
APPENDIX F

The Modified FaNS

FATHERS’ NURTURANCE SCALE

Score: 1 - Strongly agree; 2 - Mildly agree; 3 - Mildly disagree; 4 - Strongly disagree

In relation to their small children, fathers should:

_____ Help them dress and undress
_____ Put them to bed for a nap or at night
_____ Hold them when they want to be held
_____ Carry them when they want to be carried
_____ Give them baths
_____ Help them with eating if they want help
_____ Play gentle rough-house; i.e., get down on the floor and romp or play horsie.
_____ Watch over, or play with them when they are actively playing about, e.g., playing ball, running, climbing, riding trike
_____ Take them on outings - to the park to swing, play in the sandbox or on the jungle jim, on picnics, to the store, etc.
_____ Spend time with them in quiet play (reading, working puzzles, making models, dressing dolls, etc.)
_____ Let children be "helpers" to them ("help" with chores around the house, in the yard or shop, etc.)
_____ Play simple "sound-touch" games with them ("Patty-cake", peek-a-boo)
_____ Feel it's OK to hug and kiss children even in public
_____ Just naturally feel tender and protective toward them
_____ Comfort them when child needs comforting - falls down, gets minor hurts, has feelings hurt, etc.
_____ Spend time just sitting and holding small child
_____ Get a good feeling when their small child comes running to them
_____ Feel concern or even worry that child might get hurt while out playing with other kids, etc.