AN ABSTRACT OF THE THESIS OF

Marianne Sue Clausing-Lee for the degree of Doctor of Education in Education presented on April 14, 1992.

Title: A Qualitative Study of Patterns in Attitudes, Values and Behaviors Among Fathers of Gifted and Non-gifted Children in Selected Preschools

Abstract approved: Redacted for Privacy

Dr. Kenneth M. Ahrendt

The purpose of this study was to determine differences in patterns and underlying practices between fathers of gifted and fathers of non-gifted children.

The study included 10 fathers of gifted (FG) children and 10 fathers of non-gifted (FN) children. The children were preschoolers, ages 5-6 years old. Giftedness of the children was determined by scoring at or above the 97th percentile on the Weschler Preschool and Primary Scale of Intelligence-Revised.

Fathers in both groups were interviewed by the researcher using a 119 item protocol, which covered 16 categories. Data analysis revealed differences in parenting patterns between FG and FN in all 16 categories which included:

1. FG read more to their children and chose a greater variety of reading material, and read a higher proportion of non-fiction.

2. FG were more actively involved doing activities and interacting with their children such as building with blocks and Legos and making up nonsense songs, stories, and riddles.

3. More non-gifted children than gifted children frequently watched television. The non-gifted child watched 11 solid days of television more than the gifted child in the course of a year. Cartoons and comedy programs were the typical pattern chosen by children in the non-gifted household; whereas educational programs chosen jointly by the parent and child was the typical pattern in the gifted household.

4. Both groups of fathers used different strategies for helping the child develop interpersonal problem solving techniques for academic, behavior, and discipline problems.

5. FG mentioned that children were encouraged to fulfill household responsibilities because it was their duty. None of the FN encouraged their children to accomplish their household duties because it was their duty.

6. FG frequently took their children to arts activities an often provided their children access to art reproductions, record players, tape recorders, and CD players that FN.

A QUALITATIVE STUDY OF PATTERNS IN ATTITUDES, VALUES AND BEHAVIORS AMONG FATHERS OF GIFTED AND NON-GIFTED CHILDREN IN SELECTED PRESCHOOLS

by

Marianne Sue Clausing-Lee

A THESIS

submitted to

Oregon State University

in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for the
degree of

Doctor of Education

Completed April 14, 1992

Commencement June 1992

APPROVED:

Redacted for Privacy

Associate Professor in charge of major

Redacted for Privacy

Chair, Department of Curriculum and Instruction

Redacted for Privacy

Acting Dean of the College of Education

Redacted for Privacy

Dean of Graduate School

Date thesis is presented April 14, 1992

Typed by Marianne Clausing-Lee for Marianne Clausing-Lee

DEDICATION

There are three special people to whom I would like to dedicate this work.

TO RYAN JAMES LEE AND RACHEL ANN LEE

FOR THE INSPIRATION, TRUTH, BEAUTY, CLARITY, AND LOVE WITH WHICH THEY HAVE ENRICHED MY LIFE

TO DR. KEVIN JAMES LEE

FOR ALWAYS BELIEVEING IN ME
AND FOR THE EXCITEMENT, INSPIRATION, JOY, HUMOR, INSIGHT, PERSPECTIVE, AND LOVE WITH WHICH HE HAS ENRICHED MY LIFE

ACKNOWLEDEGEMENTS

My sincere gratitude and appreciation are extended to Dr. Kenneth Ahrendt, my major professor, for his constant support, advice, wisdom, and interest in my research topic of the forgotten minority, Gifted Children.

In addition, I would like to thank Dr. Carvel Wood, for his unwavering support that I should conduct research and his constant and unwavering knowledge that I would complete my mission on schedule. Thank you to Dr. Edwin Strowbridge for his support of my research and for never wavering from the high standards of quality research. Thank you to Dr. Forrest Gathercoal who guided my understanding of school law and served as a very supportive member of my committee as well as to Dr. Shiao-ling Yu who served so ably and supportively as the Graduate School Representative on my committee.

A very special thank you to Ms. Elizabeth Vaughn-Neely for her expertise, professionalism, kindness, and time in testing the children.

My sincere appreciation and gratitude is extended to Dr. Merle Karnes and Dr. Alan Shwedel for allowing me to use their interview protocol.

And, finally my thanks to all of the Fathers and Children of the study for their willingness to participate in this research so that future generations may enjoy a better world.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

A QUALITATIVE STUDY OF PATTERNS IN ATTITUDES, VALUES AND BEHAVIORS AMONG FATHERS OF GIFTED AND NON-GIFTED CHILDREN IN SELECTED PRESCHOOLS

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

A child's cognitive and emotional growth are often dependent upon parental interaction and involvement. Research has shown that a relationship exists between parental attitudes, values, and behaviors and children's functioning both cognitively and affectively. (Burks, 1928; Dave, 1963; Marjoribanks, 1979; Weiss, 1974).

Hess, Block, Costello, Knowles, and Largen (1971) found that such variables as maternal warmth, parental interest in and acceptance of a child affect a child's emotional and cognitive growth. For example, language development was greatly enhanced when parents included their children in their activities and conversations (Milner, 1951; Dave, 1963; Bing, 1963).

Children seem to internalize their parents' standards of achievement. Rau, Mlodnosky, Anastasiow (1964) found parents' standards of excellence were related to their children's

achievement in school. Similarily, Philips (1987) found that parents exert a powerful influence as a socializer of their children's perceived academic competence. The children's perceived academic competence was influenced more by their parents' ability appraisals and the children's perceptions of these appraisals than by their actual achievement and records.

Studies have reported that parents can be trained to enhance their children's development. Research by Karnes, et. al., 1969; Levenstein, 1970; Weikart and Lambie, 1969; indicates that positive changes in parental behavior enhance the development of young children. Specifically, research by Stokes and Baer (1977) showed that children's learning benefited in transfer and generalization when parents and schools work together.

Handicapped and economically disadvantaged children made much greater progress when their parents were involved in their education (Gray, 1970; Karnes, et al., 1969; Hawkins, 1966; Karnes, et al., 1981; Simmons-Martin, 1981; Schweinhart & Weikart, 1981; Moore, 1981). One example is Headstart which has used parent training as a component of its program for many years (Karnes & Johnson, 1989). Parental involvement often has been the mother in

many studies, leaving the role of the father ignored or underemphasized (Biller, 1971; Lamb, 1975; Lynn, 1974; Nash, 1965).

Research about fathers' interaction and young children has been limited primarily to handicapped children. The Early Childhood Research Institute at the Frank Porter Graham Child Development Center continues to study the role of fathers of young handicapped children through longitudinal family research. The Center attempts to develop strategies to evaluate the quality of home and educational environments as they impact children's learning during progressive stages of child development. Delaney, 1979; Linder and Chitwood, 1984; Markowitz, 1984; Comfort, 1987; and Vadasy, 1986 have also conducted research focused on fathers of the handicapped.

The Fatherhood Project of the Bank Street College of Education in New York City specializes in researching fathers of non-handicapped children and acts as a clearinghouse for information relating to male involvement in childrearing (Klinman, 1983). Radin (1972) explored the father-child interaction and cognitive functioning of four year old boys and found that the IQ of

these Caucasian boys was positively correlated with paternal nurturance and negatively correlated with paternal restrictiveness.

Father-child involvement has been the focus of several recent studies. Fathers who had provided more extensive care to infants in the absence of the working mother had infants who showed higher rates of responding to them and more frequent instances of exploratory behavior than did fathers who did not provide primary care (Pederson, Suwalsky, Cain, & Zaslow, 1987). Bailey (1987) found that the father's attitude toward the child as an infant was the best predictor of his involvement when the child was age five. Riley (1985) found in his study that the number of the father's paid work hours per week was not related to the father's amount of involvement with his six year old child. Father involvement in child rearing had stronger correlates in the two-earner families than in the one paternal earner families (Riley, 1987).

A study by Radin and Greer (1987) determined the effects of paternal unemployment on three to six year old children. Results showed that unemployed men were more involved in child care than working peers but were not more nurturant and did not provide more stimulating activities and resources for the children. McLoyd

(1989) found that fathers who responded to economic loss with increased irritability and pessimism were less nurturant and more punitive and arbitrary in their interactions with the child.

An extensive review of the literature was done in ERIC, Dissertation Abstracts and Psychological Abstracts on Gifted Young Children and Parental Involvement. Unfortunately, there is no similar body of research which focuses on gifted young children and parental involvement. There were five studies found on parents and young gifted children with only one study of fathers of young gifted children.

A study by Karnes and Shwedel (1987) was the only research study specifically related to fathers of young gifted children. More research needs to be undertaken in this area. The styles of parenting attitudes, values, and behaviors among fathers of young gifted children need to be determined.

PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

The purpose of this study was to determine differences in patterns and underlying practices between fathers of gifted and fathers of non-gifted children. The following basic questions were explored:

1. What are the attitudes, values, and behaviors of fathers as they relate to their young gifted child?

2. Are the patterns in attitudes, values, and behaviors of fathers of young gifted children similar or the same as the patterns in attitudes, values, and behaviors of parents of young non-gifted children?

PROCEDURE

According to Yin (1984) a case study is "an empirical inquiry that: investigates a contemporary phenomenon within its real-life context; when the boundaries between the phenomenon and the context are not clearly evident..."

The modified case study method was used to develop this study. The phenomenon is giftedness which is currently thought to be affected by genetic and environmental factors. Prior research cited has indicated that parents play a role in the fostering of educational progress for their children. The role which parents may play in fostering giftedness in their children is of great interest and value to society.

Because this is fundamental research we are not in a position to manipulate variables or indeed say what the variables are at this

point. Yin (1984) states, "the boundaries between phenomenon" (giftedness) "and context" (paternal influence on the expression of giftedness) "are not clearly evident."

LITERATURE

A summary of the five studies on parents and young gifted children provided background literature for understanding some aspects of parental involvement. A study by Moss in 1983, found differences in teaching strategies between mothers of gifted preschoolers and mothers of non-gifted preschoolers. The study analyzed the teaching strategies of mothers of 14 gifted and 14 non-gifted preschoolers. Mothers were individually observed and videotaped as they taught their children three problem solving tasks. The results of the study indicated that: (1) mothers of gifted preschoolers aided their children in structuring the tasks as goal-oriented operations and highlighted perceptual and functional cues to aid the children in problem solving and (2) the mothers of the gifted also encouraged metacognition to a greater extent than did the mothers of the non-gifted.

Lamson (1987) conducted a study to determine the difference between parental attitudes and behaviors in parents of gifted and

non-gifted preschoolers. Forty-six families were studied. The Child Rearing Practices Report (Block, 1965), a testing instrument designed to identify child-rearing attitudes and values, was used to collect data. Analysis of the data indicated seven differences in practices for mothers which were: two factors concerned with child independence, three factors concerned with discipline, and one factor difference each for tolerance of others' beliefs and parental self-sacrifice. Lamson also found that mothers of gifted preschoolers more frequently encouraged uniqueness and independent thinking in the responses of their children. Two differences emerged in the practices of the fathers which were: tolerance of others' beliefs and parental self-sacrifice.

Family environment, in particular the difference in parental roles of parents of gifted children, was the focus of a study by Foxworth (1986) who found that mothers emphasized 7 of 10 subscales on the Family Environment Scale Form much more than fathers. These subscales were: cohesion, expressiveness, intellectual-cultural orientation, active-recreational orientation, moral-religious emphasis, organization, control. She also found that fathers of the gifted children placed greater emphasis on the

subscales of independence, conflict, and achievement orientation than did mothers of the gifted. Foxworth also found that families with gifted children when compared to families with non-gifted children placed greater emphasis on moral-religious grounding, cohesion, control and organization.

Karnes, Shwedel, and Steinberg (1984) analyzed the parenting styles of 20 mothers and fathers of young gifted children and 20 mothers and fathers of young non-gifted children. Each parent was interviewed using a 119 item protocol which contained open-ended and closed-ended items.

Karnes, et. al. found that parents of the gifted engaged their children in school-related activities much more frequently than the parents of the non-gifted and furthermore parents of the gifted read to their children two and a half to three times as long each day as parents of the non-gifted.

Mothers of the gifted were much more likely to encourage love in their child, encourage freedom for their child, and expose their children to many experiences. A majority of parents of gifted children in the Karnes, Shwedel, and Steinberg study felt that they had a great deal of influence on their child's education, interests,

and development. In terms of non-academic skills, parents of the gifted more frequently engaged their children in art activities, and activities such as block building.

An obvious difference between parents of gifted [P(G)] and parents of non-gifted [P(NG)] indicated that P(G) frequently made up songs, rhymes, or nonsense music. They were also much more likely than P(NG) to engage their children in creative verbal activity. Parents of the gifted also seemed to give much more responsibility to children at younger ages. They provided the gifted children with areas of responsibility such as toys, room cleanliness, clothing, personal appearance, and dinner table jobs.

In 1987, Karnes and Shwedel used data from their 1984 study on parents of young gifted children to find out what differences in attitudes and practices existed between fathers of young gifted children and fathers of young non-gifted children. Their 1987 study revealed differences in six broad areas:

1. Parental Involvement: Fathers of the gifted [F(G)] read to their children 21 minutes per day when compared to fathers of the non-gifted [F(NG)] who read 7 minutes per day. F(G) spend less time on their hobbies (2.5 hours per week) than F(NG) (6 hours per week).

F(G) more often reported that they do activities such as movies, sporting events, and the zoo with their children "frequently or as often as possible."

2. Reading Emphasis: Four of the items in the protocol related to reading activities suggest that F(G) emphasized reading activities more often than F(NG). Eighty-nine percent of the F(G) provided a lot of variety in reading materials compared to 50% of the F(NG). F(G) 87% versus F(NG) 50%, "help their child learn to recognize words other than own name." Children were taught sounds of the letters by every F(G) while only 50% of the F(NG) engaged in this activity.

3. Oral Language: The importance of oral language development in father-child interactions was expressed repeatedly from F(G). F(G) felt that oral language is important in teaching children about their environment and world; which included informational and affective aspects; nature, the father's work, and the feelings of others. According to 63% of F(G) their child's vocabulary can be improved by providing activities such as family trips. No F(NG) mentioned this as a way for improving vocabulary.

4. Fine Motor: In fine motor activities such as Lego

construction, F(G) more frequently participated with their children than did F(NG) (57% versus 20%). On the other hand, F(NG) reported having playground equipment at home and mentioned that their children's strengths were in the psychomotor area (100% versus 78%).

5. Self-Esteem: All parents were concerned with their children's self-image. However, the F(G) avoided expressing negative phrases (57% versus 30%) and mentioned an unconditional positive regard for their children (56% versus 20%). All F(G) and 70% of the F(NG) were fascinated or interested by the unusual questions their children asked. Fathers of the gifted indicated that their children were difficult to raise (67% versus 40%).

6. Encouragement of Independence: Both groups felt that as parents they were important to their child's development (F[G]=67%; F[NG]=80%). F(G) encouraged independence more frequently than F(NG). More F(G) wanted their children to be more independent (69% versus 30%) while F(NG) felt their children were too independent (50% versus 22%). To promote independent thinking and problem solving, 56% of the F(G) had their children try to answer their own questions; whereas only 30% of F(NG) used this

strategy.

DEFINITION OF TERMS

Gifted: refers to those persons who have developed high levels of intelligence or who show promise of such development (Clark, 1988)

Giftedness: is a biologically rooted concept, a label for a high level of intelligence that results from the advanced and accelerated integration of functions within the brain, including physical sensing, emotions, cognition, and intuition. Such advanced and accelerated function may be expressed through abilities such as those involved in cognition, creativity, academic aptitude, leadership, or the visual and performing arts. Therefore, with this definition of intelligence, gifted individuals are those who are performing, or who show promise of performing at high levels of intelligence. Because of such advanced or accelerated development, these individuals require services or activities not ordinarily provided by the schools in order to develop their capability more fully. (Clark, 1988)

WPPSI-R: Wechsler Preschool and Primary Scale of Intelligence-Revised

Father: a male, biological parent who is living in the home with the child

Fathers of the Gifted (FG): fathers having a child whose score is in the 97th percentile or higher on the WPPSI-R

Fathers of the Non-gifted (FN): fathers having a child whose score is less than the 97th percentile on the WPPSI-R

Open-ended: having no definite limit of duration or amount in response

Closed-ended: having a limited number of response choices

ASSUMPTIONS

1. Fathers of the gifted and non-gifted children provided valid answers in responding to the interview protocol used in this study.

2. The interview protocol is clear and uniformily understood by all the participating fathers.

3. The WPPSI-R was a valid and reliable instrument to provide mesures of intelligence of the children tested in this study.

4. All fathers and children in the study were treated in the same manner.

LIMITATIONS

1. This qualitative study was limited to fathers of children ages 5-6 years old.

2. The interview protocol was employed to obtain information for the study which acknowledged all of the inherent strengths and weaknesses associated with this technique for data collection.

3. The findings reported in this study are limited to the 20 fathers interviewed.

4. All fathers interviewed in this study were volunteers. Thus, the fathers and their children were a self-selected group.

5. All fathers in this study were Caucasian.

6. There are many factors which may influence giftedness; however, this study only deals with the interactions of the father and the gifted child.

7. The fathers in this study were required to be the biological father living in the home with the child. All of the homes were two-parent homes.

CHAPTER II

PROCEDURES

SUBJECTS

The subjects for this study were the fathers of ten gifted and ten non-gifted children. The children were ages 5-6 years old who had not attended kindergarten. The fathers in the study were required to be the biological father living in the home with the child.

A letter to solicit participation in the research project was delivered to seven Corvallis, Oregon, preschools in June, 1991. (See Appendix A) The goal of the population sampling was to find ten fathers of gifted children and ten fathers of non-gifted children to conform to the population size used in the Karnes and Shwedel study. Seventy-seven letters were distributed and twenty-one fathers agreed to participate.

In July, 1991, all 21 fathers were contacted and 20 fathers were scheduled for interviews and their children were scheduled for testing. Due to an unforeseen family matter, one father was unable to be participate in the study. In order to determine whether or not the fathers were fathers of gifted or non-gifted

children, some test of measurement needed to be administered to the children to determine who was gifted and non-gifted according to Oregon Administrative Rules (OAR) 581-15-830.

OAR 581-15-830 (6) which states that "students selected for programs for the intellectually gifted and academically gifted shall meet at least one of the following eligibility criteria:
(a) Intellectually gifted students perform, or show potential to perform, at or above the 97th percentile on nationally standardized tests. A test of intelligence shall be used as one of the identification measures,..."

Sattler (1990) agrees with the OAR guidelines for selection of gifted students. In his book, Assessment of Children, Sattler states that, "the single best method available for identification of children with superior cognitive abilities is a standardized, individually administered test of intelligence, such as the Stanford-Binet Intelligence Scale: 4th Edition or those in the Wechsler Series." Zigler and Farber (cited in Sattler, 1990) state that a specific IQ level is currently the most adequate index of giftedness.

TEST INSTRUMENT

The test of intelligence chosen for this study was the Wechsler Preschool and Primary Scale of Intelligence-Revised (1989). This test was designed to assess the intelligence of children aged 3 years through 7 years, 3 months. The WPPSI-R has 12 subtests--6 performance and 6 verbal subtests. Two subtests have been designated as optional: Sentences and Animal Pegs. Subtests include:

Performance	Verbal
1. Object Assembly	2. Information
3. Geometric Design	4. Comprehension
5. Block Design	6. Arithmetic
7. Mazes	8. Vocabulary
9. Picture Completion	10. Similarities
11. Animal Pegs	12. Sentences

The numeral next to the subtest indicates the order in which the subtest is administered.

The WPPSI-R has excellent standardization, reliability, and validity (Weschler, 1989). The Weschler tests are considered one of the most important instruments in the field of intelligence

testing of children.

This study had approval from the Human Subjects Department at Oregon State University prior to conducting any research.

In July, 1991, the twenty children were individually administered the WPPSI-R by a trained testing specialist in the State of Oregon, who has tested young children and has administered this test numerous times.

Based on the results of the WPPSI-R, ten children who had a mean score of 141.8 on the total WPPSI-R were classified as gifted. Ten children who had a mean score of 119.6 on the total WPPSI-R were classified as non-gifted. The ninety-seventh percentile was used as the cut score for gifted vs non-gifted.

The mean age of the gifted children was 5 years and 3 months and 5 years and 5 months for the non-gifted. Five children in each group were female and five children in each group were male. Table 1 shows the demographic data of the children.

The WPPSI-R scores of the children determined whether the fathers were fathers of gifted children (FG) or fathers of non-gifted children (FN).

Table 1

Child Data
N=20

Item	Gifted (N=10)	Non-gifted (N=10)
1. Mean age at time of interview	5.39 yrs	5.58 yrs
2. WPPSI-R IQ Score--mean	141.8	119.6
3. Number of Males	5	5
4. Number of Females	5	5
5. Number of only children	2	2
6. Number of first born children	5	2
7. Previous child care experience(s)		
a. Babysitter	5	6
b. Daycare	5	2
c. Nursery school	10	9
d. Playgroup	0	3
e. Sunday School	0	1
8. Number of fathers who feel that child's previous experience(s) in child care settings had a great deal of influence on him/her	9	9
9. Number of children with illnesses other than common colds	0	1

Table 1 continued	Gifted	Non-gifted
10. When sick, number of children who prefer to:		
a. Stay home	7	8
b. Go to school	3	2
11. Father's perception of child's preference for play partners		
a. One special friend	9	4
b. Group	1	4
c. By him/herself	0	2
d. Combination	0	0
12. Father's perception of child's friends' ages		
a. Mostly older	2	4
b. Mostly younger	0	0
c. Mostly same age	6	5
d. Combination of ages	2	1
13. Father's perception of child's friends' gender		
a. Mostly same sex	8	5
b. Combination	2	4
c. Opposite sex	0	1
14. Number of children with a favorite relative	5	5
15. Fathers' perception of child's favorite relative(s)		
a. Maternal grandmother	3	2
b. Paternal grandmother	0	1
c. Maternal grandfather	0	1
d. Paternal grandfather	0	0
e. Cousin	2	0

Table 1 continued	Gifted	Non-gifted
f. Sibling	0	1
g. Don't know or none	5	5
16. Number of children who have lived or visited in a foreign country	3	4
17. Number of children who speak or understand languages other than English	1	0

INTERVIEW PROTOCOL

The interview protocol (Appendix B) was piloted at the University of Illinois and then used for a study with mothers and fathers of gifted and non-gifted young children (Karnes, Shwedel, & Steinberg, 1984). The authors had granted permission to use the protocol in this study. (See Appendix C)

Each father was interviewed individually by the researcher. The location for the interview was chosen by the father, to determine an environment in which each interviewee felt most at ease in answering the questions. Locations for the interviews included: father's home, father's place of employment, and the location where the child was administered the WPPSI-R test. The time of day for the interview was also determined by the father.

The interview protocol contained 119 items and took approximately one to one and a half hours to administer to each father. Of the 119 items, some questions were open-ended while others were closed-ended. This format allowed the researcher to obtain concrete responses while still allowing fathers an opportunity to reflect and expound upon their own approaches to parenting.

The interview protocol was designed to obtain information from 13 broad topical areas: (1) demographic data on the family, (2) background data on the parents and target child, (3) provision of knowledge and skills, (4) provision of non-academic skills (visual and performing arts, psychomotor activities, creativity), (5) exposure beyond the home environment, (6) enhancement of affective development, (7) paternal aspirations for the target child, (8) involvement in the child's schooling, (9) satisfaction with child, (10) independence training, (11) discipline, (12) integration of child within family, (13) responsibilities given to the child.

CODING

After all interviews were compeleted, the data were coded and compiled by the researcher. The data were coded using the protocols' 13 original topic areas. All coding was completed by the researcher to increase internal reliability of the study.

ANALYSIS

The study was analyzed in the following ways. The data were complied and converted to frequencies, medians, and means to identify differences between the two groups of fathers. Question

responses in which 5 or more of the respondents in each group answered in a similar fashion were deemed "typical" responses for that group. This approach and terminology followed the methodology and terminology of Karnes, Shwedel, and Steinberg (1984).

The responses of the fathers of gifted and non-gifted children were then compared to determine if their typical responses were at a variance with one another. In order for further analysis to be required: (1) 5 or more of the fathers needed to give the same response and (2) there needed to be a difference of 2 or more for the same response between groups.

For example, if 7 of F(G) and 2 of F(NG) gave a specific response, it would be included for further analysis. However, if 4 of F(G) and 2 of F(NG) gave a specific response, it would not require further analysis since the response would not be considered typical of either group. In addition, if 6 of F(G) and 5 of F(NG) gave a specific response, further analysis would not be required since the difference between the two groups was not 2 or greater.

The search was for patterns and underlying practices which emerged when comparing the responses of the two groups.

CHAPTER III

ANALYSIS OF DATA

An interview questionnaire was designed to indicate similarities and differences in patterns of parenting for the fathers of the two groups of children: gifted children and non-gifted children. The data are presented in narrative format and are accompanied by tables which summarize the data obtained from the study.

The questionnaire consisted of 119 questions. The questions and responses were designed to be grouped to present meaningful clusters of information in specific areas. The presentation of the data will take a similar format with the responses to groups of questions being presented so as to focus on clusters and patterns of behavior in each of the groups.

The study consisted of 10 fathers of gifted children (as determined by scores the children received on the WPPSI-R) and ten fathers of non-gifted children. The fathers were adminstered the interview protocol and their answers were then tabulated by the researcher.

FAMILY DEMOGRAPHIC DATA

The data in Table 2 indicated that there seemed to be little difference in the demographic data of the families of the gifted and the non-gifted. The groups of fathers were comparable in numerous respects: employment status, occupations, and total mean household incomes. One area of difference between the FG and FN was that of formal education. Seven of the FG had advanced degrees (masters--5; doctorates--2) whereas only two FN had advanced degrees (doctorates--2).

The numbers of families with other children were identical for eight of the ten families in each group. The mean number of siblings per family in each group appeared to be very similar with 1.6 siblings per family in the gifted group and 1.4 siblings per family in the non-gifted group.

The median age of the siblings reflected a difference between the two groups. For families of the gifted children the median age of the siblings was only 3 years old, however for the families of the non-gifted the median age of the siblings was 8 years old. Since the age of the children in the study was between 5 and 6 years old, it would appear that the gifted children were older or

Table 2

Family Demographic Data
N=20

Item	Gifted (N=10)	Non-gifted (N=10)
1. Current employment status		
a. Working full-time	9	10
b. Working part-time	1	0
2. Type of occupation		
a. Engineer	0	2
b. Engineering manager	1	0
c. Computer programmer	0	1
d. University professor	2	2
e. Government employee	1	2
f. Small business manager	1	1
g. Realtor	1	0
h. Business consultant	1	0
i. Illustrator	0	1
j. Media Communications	1	0
k. Laborer	1	0
l. Sales manager	1	1
3. Levels of education attained (Cumulative)		
a. High school	10	10
b. Some college	10	9
c. Undergraduate degree	9	8
d. Master's degree	5	0
e. Doctorate	2	2

Table 2 continued	Gifted	Non-gifted
4. Total household income		
a. $25,000--$40,000	2	2
b. $40,000--$60,000	3	2
c. $60,000--$80,000	2	5
d. $80,000--$100,000	1	1
e. $100,000--and over	1	0
f. Refused	1	0
5. Median household income	$60,000	$65,000
6. Number of families with other children	8	8
7. Median age of siblings	3 yrs	8 yrs
8. Mean number of siblings per family among families with other children	1.6	1.38
9. Number of families with mothers employed outside the home	10	8

earlier in the birth order than their siblings.

BACKGROUND DATA OF THE FATHERS

The data presented in Table 3 show the median age of the fathers in each group was very similar. The median age of the FG was 38.2 years and FN 39.2 years at the time of the interview. All of the fathers in both groups lived with both parents while growing up. Five of the FG were oldest children while only 3 of the FN were oldest children. Three of the FN were the third child while only one of the FG was. None of the FG were youngest children while 2 of the FN were youngest children.

The number of fathers (FG=4; FN=3) who lived or traveled in a foreign country or spoke or understood a foreign language was similar.

Differences between the groups of fathers were noted when the school experiences of the fathers were considered. Six of the fathers of the gifted children stated that they felt their own school experiences were very enjoyable as opposed to only three of the fathers of the non-gifted.

Similarly, six of the fathers of the gifted rated their own school performances as excellent while only two of the fathers of

Table 3

Background Data--Fathers
N=20

Item	Gifted (N=10)	Non-gifted (N=10)
1. Mean age of father at time of interview	38.2 yrs	39.2 yrs
2. Birth order of fathers		
a. first child	5	3
b. second child	2	2
c. third child	1	3
d. fourth child	1	0
e. sixth child	1	0
f. youngest child	0	2
3. Number of fathers who lived with both parents while growing up	10	10
4. Number of fathers who have lived or traveled in a foreign country	9	9
5. Number of fathers who speak or understand a foreign language	4	3
6. Number of fathers who feel their own school experiences were very enjoyable	6	3
7. Number of fathers who rate their own school performance as excellent	6	2
8. Number of fathers with hobbies or avocations	10	10

Table 3 continued	Gifted	Non-gifted
9. Fathers hobbies		
a. Building/Home Improvement/ Repair	4	5
b. Non-competitive sports	5	4
c. Sports	3	2
d. Art	3	1
e. Reading	1	1
f. Gardening/Landscaping	1	1
g. Outdoor activities, camping, fishing	1	1
h. Travel	1	0
i. Photography	1	0
j. Inventing toys	0	1
k. Collecting (cards, stamps)	0	1
l. Genealogy	0	1
m. Cooking	0	1
10. Median amount of time fathers spend on their own hobbies each week	4 hours	4 hours
11. Father's important interests other than job or family		
a. Gardening/landscaping	5	1
b. Reading	5	5
c. Sports	5	3
d. Non-competitive sports	2	3
e. Outdoor activities (camping, fishing)	2	1
f. Building, wood working	2	3
g. Art	2	2
h. Community service	1	2
i. Travel	1	1
j. Computer activity	1	1

Table 3 continued	Gifted	Non-gifted
k. Environment, global issues, religion	1	2
l. Coaching	0	1
m. Educational TV	0	1
n. Genealogy	0	1
12. Number of fathers who have engaged in the following activities:		
a. Written book or article	3	2
b. Interviewed for TV or newspaper	8	7
c. Given speeches or presentations	8	8
13. Number of fathers who feel that their own childhood was very enjoyable	6	5
14. Median number of siblings in father's family	3	3
15. Occupation of father's father		
a. Doctor, lawyer, or other professional	4	4
b. Farmer	0	1
c. Self-employed	2	1
d. Foreman	1	0
e. Laborer	2	4
f. Manager	1	0
16. Occupation of father's mother		
a. Housewife	7	5
b. Nurse, Teacher	3	3
c. Pink collar	0	1
d. Other non-professional	0	1

Table 3 continued	Gifted	Non-gifted
17. Things from father's childhood that affects how he raises his own child now		
a. Loving parents	0	2
b. Loving relatives	0	1
c. Happy childhood	2	2
d. Work ethic	0	1
e. Easy going discipline	1	1
f. Support school and education	1	1
g. Spend time with kids	2	2
h. Explain things	0	1
i. Set boundaries	1	1
j. Parents uninterested	0	1
k. Family importance	2	3
l. Vacations	1	1
m. Dad worked too much	0	2
n. Love of intellectual pursuits	3	1
o. Avoiding yelling at child	0	1
p. Decision making, independence	4	0

the non-gifted rated their own school performance as excellent.

Both groups of fathers engaged in similar activities with comparable numbers in each group who (1) have written a book or article; (2) have been interviewed for TV or newspaper; or (3) have given speeches or presentation.

All of the fathers in both groups had hobbies or avocations and the average amount of time spent on hobbies for both groups was 4 hours per week. As is shown in Table 3, the types of hobbies were very similar in both groups and the numbers of fathers who participated were similar as well considering that the data were obtained from an open-ended question. The interview sought to ascertain what the fathers considered their important interests or activities other than job or family. The results of this open-ended question yielded results which were dissimilar to those of the hobby question in several areas. Five of the FG chose gardening/landscaping as an important interest. Only 1 of the FN indicated that gardening was an important interest (FG=5; FN=1). Sports was an important activity for 5 of the FG while it was an important activity for only 3 of the FN.

A majority of the fathers in each group indicated that they

felt that their childhoods were very enjoyable. The median number of siblings for each group of fathers was identical -- 3 for each group.

The similarities in the occupation of the fathers' fathers were interesting. The only category which had over a 1 frequency difference was that of the laborers. In the case of the grandfathers of the gifted, 2 were laborers while 4 of the grandfathers of the non-gifted were listed as having laborer occupations.

The parallels for the fathers' mothers (grandmothers) were similar with one notable exception. There was a twenty percent difference indicated in the percentage of grandmothers who were housewives. Seven of grandmothers of the gifted were listed as housewives and only five of the grandmothers of the non-gifted were listed as housewives.

There were activities from the childhoods of the fathers which affected how they raised their children. Most of the categories were similar. There were two slight differences between the groups. Three of the FG indicated that their parents' love of intellectual pursuits affected how they raised their child whereas only 1 of the FN said the same. Four of the FG indicated

that they wanted their children to be "involved in decision-making and be independent" and that this desire is reflected in how they are raising their children; while none of the FN indicated that this was a factor affecting how they raised their children.

PROVISIONS OF SCHOOL-RELATED ACTIVITIES

Fathers of both gifted and non-gifted provided a variety of activities to their children which paralleled those provided in school-related settings. These varied in quality and quantity between groups. The data in Table 4 indicates similarities and differences between the groups.

The median ages of the children when the fathers started to read to them was "less than a year in both cases". The length of time spent in reading to the children showed much more variance with FG spending an average of 17 minutes per day while FN spent an average of 10 minutes. This time difference may not seem great, however, but this 7 minutes per day translates to 49 minutes per week and almost 42 hours in the course of a year. The primary reader(s) to the children were both parents in 7 out of 10 cases in both groups. When the fathers read to the child, " both the father and the child" choose the book emerged as a dominant pattern for

Table 4

Provisions of School-Related Activities
N=20

Item	Gifted (N=10)	Non-gifted (N=10)
1. Median age of child when father started reading to child	<1 year	<1 year
2. Median time spent reading to child (currently) per day	17 min.	10 min.
3. Parent that usually reads to child		
a. Mother	3	1
b. Father	0	2
c. Both	7	7
4. When the fathers reads to child, the book to be read is chosen by		
a. Father	0	1
b. Child	5	6
c. Both equally	5	3
5. Kinds of books fathers like to read to child		
a. Non-fiction (science, nature)	7	3
b. Fiction	1	4
c. Chapter books	1	3
d. Fairy tales	2	0
e. Child's dictionary	0	1
f. Good plots and illustrations	2	0
g. What child is interested in	1	1
h. History	2	0
i. Educational	1	0
j. Rhyming	1	0

Table 4 continued	Gifted	Non-gifted
k. Classics	1	1
l. Morals	0	1
m. Sports	0	1
6. Number of fathers who read materials other than books to their child	10	7
7. Kind(s) of other printed material read to child other than books		
a. Magazines	10	5
b. Newspaper, comics	5	5
c. Cereal boxes	1	0
d. Road signs	1	1
e. Catalog	1	0
f. Coloring books	0	1
g. TV guide	0	1
h. Baseball cards	0	1
8. Number of fathers who provide a lot of variety in reading material	7	5
9. Number of fathers who frequently talk about animals	9	7
10. Number of fathers who frequently talk about nature	8	6
11. Number of fathers who frequently play puzzles with child	3	3
12. Median time spent on school-related activities per day	8 min.	8 min.
13. Number of fathers who buy books to help child learn school-related skills	8	9

Table 4 continued	Gifted	Non-gifted
14. Number of fathers who buy games (computer software) to help child learn school-related skills	9	6
15. Number of fathers who make games to help child learn school-related skills	7	7
16. Number of fathers who go to the library with their child	5	5
17. Book selection at the library is made by		
a. Child	3	4
b. Father	0	0
c. Both	2	1
18. Number of fathers who frequently help their child write messages or letters	6	3
19. Number of fathers who frequently help their child write stories	2	2
20. Number of fathers who frequently try to have child answer his/her own questions	6	6
21. Way(s) father tries to have child answer own questions		
a. Ask questions	4	8
b. Problem solve	3	0
c. Backtrack for understanding	2	2
d. Logical deductions	2	2

Table 4 continued	Gifted	Non-gifted
e. Expand	1	0
22. Number of fathers who think that their child is very much aware that questions or problems can have more than one answer or solution	5	3
23. Way(s) father helped child to become aware of multiple solutions or answers		
a. Questions	2	2
b. Explanation	4	3
c. Experimenting	1	1
d. Discuss alternative solutions	4	3
24. Number of fathers who feel that the most responsibility for how much a child learns rests with		
a. Parents	10	10
b. Schools	0	0
c. Both parents and schools equally	0	0
25. Number of fathers who feel that the most responsibility for developing the child's full potential rests with		
a. Parents	10	10
b. Schools	0	0
c. Both parents and schools equally	0	0

Table 4 continued	Gifted	Non-gifted
26. Number of fathers who generally use one or more of the following methods to help their child advance intellectually:		
a. Read books to child	5	6
b. Talk with their child	5	5
c. Listen to their child	3	1
d. Ask their child questions	4	2
e. Encourage language acquisition	2	0
f. Expose their child to new experiences and ideas	5	6
g. Provide opportunities to learn	6	6
h. Follow the child's interests	5	0
27. Number of fathers who helped their child learn the names of color	9	8
28. Number of fathers who helped their child learn the letters of the alphabet	9	10
29. Number of fathers who helped their child learn sounds for the letters	8	8
30. Number of fathers who helped their child learn to count	7	10
31. Number of fathers who helped their child learn to recognize his/ her name	9	10
32. Number of fathers who helped their child learn to recognize word other than own name	10	8

Table 4 continued	Gifted	Non-gifted
33. Number of fathers who encourage child to use correct names or terms for things	9	10
34. Way(s) fathers encourage child to use correct names or terms for things		
a. Repetition	2	2
b. Role model	4	3
c. Provide correct name, correct child	4	6
d. Spell words and give meaning	2	1
35. Number of fathers who helped their child learn to write or print words or letters	9	10
36. Number of fathers who helped their child learn to share and take turns	10	10
37. Way(s) father helped child learn to share and take turns		
a. Interaction with other children	3	4
b. With siblings	3	1
c. Behavior consequences	1	3
d. Modeling and explaining	3	5
e. Rules	3	3
f. Playing games	1	1
g. Father shares with child	2	0
38. Way fathers feel they can help child develop his/her full potential		
a. Set examples	2	1
b. Exposure	4	3

Table 4 continued	Gifted	Non-gifted
c. Instruction	1	1
d. Freedom	1	1
e. Talk, interact with child	1	2
f. Read to child	0	1
g. Be responsive	5	3
h. Encourage love	1	3
i. Encourage positive self-esteem	2	2
j. Guide and discipline	0	3
k. Answer child's questions	0	1
l. Challenge	4	0
m. Respect	0	1
n. Encourage	5	4
39. Way(s) father feels he has most influenced child's learning, interests, and development		
a. Exposing child to things	3	0
b. Explaining things	4	6
c. Cultivating child interest	2	2
d. Providing resources (books, events, outings)	3	2
e. Being curious, adventurous	6	3
f. Using language	2	2
g. Encouraging, praising the child	1	1
h. Using imagination	1	0
i. Physical activities	1	1
j. Spending time together	1	4
k. Providing quality preschool	1	0
l. Promoting self-reliance	0	1
m. Using humor	0	1
n. By being patient with child	0	1
o. Making things fun	0	1

Table 4 continued	Gifted	Non-gifted
40. Father's reaction(s) to child's requests or comments when parent does not understand		
a. Ask for demonstration	0	3
b. Restate for child	2	2
c. Drawing the child out	5	1
d. Ask child to repeat	3	6
e. Ask child to state differently	4	3
f. Ask child to slow down	1	0
g. Tell child that parent doesn't understand	1	1
41. Number of fathers who feel that they have had a great deal of influence on their child's learning, interests, and development	6	6

the FG(5) while it was the case in only 3 of the FN. Another dominant pattern was the child choose the book which was the case in 5 of the FG and 6 of the FN.

The types of books which each group of fathers enjoyed reading to the children showed some differences between groups. The FG mentioned 18 categories of books which they read to their children while the FN mentioned 12. The FG chose non-fiction books (e.g. science, nature) in much greater proportion (FG=7; FN=3) than the FN. Four of the FN liked to chose "fiction" for reading to the child, while only one of the FG made the same category choice. A review of Table 4 indicated that the FG chose "chapter books", "fairy tales" and "good plots and illustrations" and "what the child is interested in". Fathers of gifted children did not mention the category "fiction" in response to the open-ended question.

Differences appeared in how much was read to the child; what was read; and who chose the reading materials. There were also differences in what non-book sources were read to the children. All of the FG read to their children from "sources other books" while only 7 of the FN read to their chidren from non-book sources. A difference was noted in the variety of reading material provided

to the children. The FG(7) indicated that they provided more variety in reading material than FN(5). Futhermore, the FG(10) provided much more reading material from magazine sources than the FN(5). Newspapers were chosen equally by both groups (FG=5; FN=5).

The FG generally provided more school-related activities and materials than the FN. The FG(7) reported that they: provided a lot of variety in reading material; frequently talked about animals (FG=9; FN=7); and frequently talked about nature (FG=8; FN=6).

More directly school-related clusters of experience showed that the median time spent on school-related activities was identical for both groups at 8 minutes per day. The FG(9) stated that they bought games/computer software to help their children with school-related skills, whereas only 6 FN indicated that they bought games/computer software to help their children.

The cluster of questions which related to the fathers helping with direct skill teaching showed interesting differences such as: six of the FG indicated that they helped their children write messages and letters while only 3 of the FN helped their children in the same way.

Responses to the open-ended question gave clues to the philosophy of the fathers and their feelings about their responsibility for learning and education in society. All of the fathers in both groups indicated that "most responsibility for how much a child learns rests with the parents". A similar response was elicited as all 10 of the fathers in both groups indicated that they felt that "most of the responsibility for developing the child's full potential rests with the parents."

Wide differences emerged in the approaches the two groups of fathers used to foster their children's intellectual advancement. More FG asked their children questions than FN (FG=4; FN=2) as a means of advancing their education. A wide difference occurred in following the child's interest as a method of advancing the child intellectually; 5 of the FG followed the child's interests in promoting intellectual advance while none of the FN used this strategy (FG=5;FN=0).

There were differences in the "teaching of word recognition" (other than the child's name) with all 10 of the FG teaching this skill while only 8 of the FN taught this skill. Another difference was noted in teaching counting skills. Seven of the FG

acknowledged teaching their children to count, whereas, all 10 of the FN acknowledged teaching their children to count. Three FG mentioned in the interview that their children knew how to count early on and never needed formal teaching in this area. The fathers were asked through an open-ended question, to name the ways in which they encouraged their children to "use the correct names or terms for things". The responses can be categorized as a) role model the term or name, b) repeat the correct term or name, and c) provide the correct term or name and correct the child. A majority of the FN(6) chose to correct the child; while a minority of the FG(4) chose correction as a strategy. Correction is part of the educational process; however, how a correction is dealt with is important. A parent or teacher can choose to role model and repeat appropriate grammar until the child sees the patterns as normal or he or she can choose to correct those patterns. How corrections are pointed out and how corrections are made are important. The child's self-esteem and feelings toward the home and school may hang in the balance of how skillfully corrections are accomplished.

Responses to the open-ended question of how the fathers helped the child develop his/her potential elicited several

differences. A higher number of the FG(5) reported that they chose "being responsive" as a means of helping their children achieve full potential (FG=5; FN=3). Four of the FG also chose challenging the child as a strategy whereas none of the FN choose that strategy for developing the child's potential. However, FN chose to "guide and discipline" as an alternative whereas none of the FG chose that strategy (FG=0; FN=3).

There were some variations in the fathers' open-ended responses to the ways in which they felt they most influenced their child's learning, interests, and development. Fathers of the gifted mentioned "exposure" in three cases while "exposure" was not mentioned at all by the fathers of the non-gifted (FG=3; FN=0). "Explaining things" was more often chosen by the FN than the FG (FG=4; FN=6). "Being curious, adventurous" was a choice of 6 of the FG and only 3 of the FN. Spending "time together" was mentioned by 4 of the FN and only 1 of the FG.

The researcher must state that open-ended responses should be thought of as point of departure and not a conclusion because they were a function of which and how many strategies the fathers could think of at the time the question was asked and were not

necessarily exhaustive in terms of what the fathers actually used but only exhaustive in what they could recall and generate at the time.

In general, the fathers of the gifted generated and employed a greater number of strategies for dealing with situations when the parent does not understand the child. In terms of differences seen in responses, 5 of the FG indicated "drawing the child out" while only 1 of FN indicated that for a response. Six of the FN indicated that they would "ask the child to repeat" the comment, while only 3 of the FG indicated they used this strategy. The remainder of the responses are indicated in Table 4.

PROVISION OF NON-ACADEMIC SKILLS

Visual and Performing Arts

One of the areas in this cluster of questions dealt with whether or not the father provided exposure to the visual and performing arts. There was little difference between the groups. The FG more frequently engaged in art activities with their children than the FN as is noted in Table 5.

There were many similarities and some differences in looking at the materials to which fathers gave their children free access.

Table 5

Visual and Performing Arts
N=20

Item	Gifted (N=10)	Non-gifted (N=10)
1. Number of fathers who frequently engage in art activities with their child	3	1
2. Number of fathers who frequently engage in music activities with their child	4	2
3. Number of fathers who provide child with free access to the following materials		
a. Arts and crafts	10	10
b. Musical instruments	9	9
c. Record player, compact disc player, tape recorder	10	8
d. Classical records, tapes, compact discs	4	3
e. Popular records, tapes, compact discs	6	7
f. Books with art reproductions	6	4

There was a noticeable difference in providing the children access to tape recorders, record players and compact disc (CD) players. All ten FG provided for access to these tools and only eight of the FN provided this access. The same pattern was true of fathers who provided children with access to books with art reproductions. Six of the FG provided for this access and 4 of the FN provided such access.

Pyschomotor Training

The responses to questions asked about psychomotor training indicated that a greater number of the FN(10) provided for playground equipment at home than FG(8), however there seems to be greater activism in working with psychomotor equipment on the parts of the FG.

For example, there was a gap in the frequency with which the fathers took their children to the playground. The FG frequently took their children to a playground (FG=6) than the FN (FN=3). This gap widened when the question was asked about the fathers who frequently built structures with their children using blocks, Legos, etc.. Six of the FG reported that they frequently participated in building with their children while only 2 of the FN reported such

Table 6

Psychomotor Training
N=20

Item	Gifted (N=10)	Non-gifted (N=10)
1. Number of fathers with playground equipment at home	8	10
2. Number of fathers who frequently take their child to a playground	6	3
3. Number of fathers who frequently play outside with their child	8	7
4. Number of fathers who do the following activities outside with their child		
a. Hide and seek	0	1
b. Sandbox	1	0
c. Ball games	7	
d. Frisbee	2	0
e. Bikes	4	4
f. Swimming	2	0
g. Playground equipment	2	2
h. Garden work	2	4
i. Hikes, walks	5	4
j. Romping (running)	2	1
k. Going to the park	1	2
l. Gymnastics	1	0
m. Pretend	1	0
n. Fishing	0	1
o. Catching bugs	1	2

Table 6 continued	Gifted	Non-gifted
5. Number of fathers who frequently build structures (with blocks, Legos, etc.) with their child	6	2
6. Number of fathers who encourage the child to participate in the following activities to develop different muscles and movement patterns (regardless of the father's participation in the activity)		
a. Playground equipment	2	4
b. Ball games	4	2
c. Skiing	1	1
d. Wrestling	0	3
e. Swimming	3	4
f. Bike rides	1	0
g. Dance/ballet	4	1
h. Gymnastics	3	1
i. Exercises	1	1
j. Soccer	1	1
k. Windsurfing	0	1
l. Running and playing outside	4	3
m. Fine motor	3	1
n. Walks and hikes	1	1
o. Nothing	1	1
p. Don't know	0	1

participation. Table 6 shows the activities generated by the open ended-question and the numbers of fathers in each group who participated in each activity. The greatest discrepency between the groups seems to be in the area of "ball games" which the FG(7) played with the children more often than the FN(4).

There were some differences noted in the psychomotor activities encouraged by each group. Playground equipment was encouraged more by the FN(4) than the FG(2). Ball games were encouraged more by the FG(4) than the FN(2). Wrestling was encouraged by the FN(3) but not by the FG(0). Dance/ballet was encouraged by the FG(4) more than the FN(1). Gymnastics were encouraged more by FG (FG=3; FN=1) as were fine motor activities in the same proportions (FG=3; FN=1).

Creativity

There were a number of questions in the instrument which were designed to elicit the paternal role in creativity. There were differences in the degree of participation in these activities between the groups. For example, 5 of the FG indicated that they frequently played "pretend" or make believe games while only 2 of the FN indicated such play. Also seven of the FG frequently engaged

Table 7

Creativity
N=20

Item	Gifted (N=10)	Non-gifted (N=10)
1. Number of fathers who frequently engage in one or more of the following activities with their child:		
a. Play "pretend" or make-believe games	5	2
b. Make up nonsense songs or rhymes	7	5
c. Embellish familiar stories without using the book	6	3
d. Make up new stories	5	3
2. Number of fathers who feel that exaggeration in young children is a very serious problem	0	0
3. Number of fathers who feel that fabrication in young children is a very serious problem	3	1
4. Number of fathers who feel they can increase a child's level of curiousity	8	10
5. Number of fathers who feel it is very important to try to increase a child's level of curiosity	7	7
6. Number of fathers who do things to increase child's curiosity	9	10

Table 7 continued	Gifted	Non-gifted
7. Number of fathers who do the following to increase child's curiosity		
a. Teaching complex things	5	5
b. Sharing new experiences	4	4
c. Ask questions, discussions	4	2
d. Exploring	4	5
e. Library usage, books	2	2
f. Critical thinking skills	2	0
8. Number of fathers who provide free access to a variety of "junk" materials at home	9	8
9. Number of fathers who buy most of the toys the child plays with or put things together from items around the house		
a. Buy	7	8
b. Put together	1	0
c. Both equally	2	2

in creating nonsense songs or rhymes whereas only 5 of the FN engaged in such activities. Six of the FG "embellished familiar stories without using the book" whereas only 3 of the FN did. Five of the FG reported "making up new stories" while only 3 of the FN reported engaging in this activity.

In response to the question which asked if the fathers felt that they could increase a child's level of curiosity, all 10 of the FN felt that this was possible whereas only 8 FG felt this was possible. Seven of the fathers in each group felt that it was very important to try to increase a child's level of curiosity (FG=7; FN=7). However, 9 of the FG and all 10 of the FN DID THINGS to increase their child's curiosity. Table 7 contains examples of the activities chosen by each group and in what numbers.

EXPOSURE TO THINGS BEYOND THE HOME ENVIRONMENT

Parents can provide stimulation to young minds by providing exposure to various activities, events, materials, and people. One cluster of questions in the research instrument dealt with activities and events to which fathers in both groups exposed their children. With only two exceptions, the results were similar in both groups. These data are displayed in Table 8. The differences

Table 8

Exposure to Things Beyond the Home Environment
N=20

Item	Gifted (N=10)	Non-gifted (N=10)
1. Number of fathers who frequently (or as often as possible) take their child to one or more of the following:		
a. Movies	1	1
b. Dance recitals	1	0
c. Concerts (adult)	1	0
d. Restaurants	8	9
e. Sport events	3	3
f. Camping	1	2
g. Nature walks	6	4
h. Plays (child)	3	2
i. Concerts (child)	1	1
j. Carnivals, circus	6	2
k. Zoo	3	3
l. Art museum	0	1
m. Natural history museum	1	1
2. Reasons why fathers take their children to places, events mentioned		
a. Enjoyment, interest	6	6
b. Learning environment	4	2
c. Family activity	3	2
d. Career related	1	0
3. Number of fathers who prepare child for attending the places or events mentioned	8	9

Table 8 continued	Gifted	Non-gifted
4. Areas in which fathers prepare child for place or event		
a. Maps	1	1
b. Literature, music	2	0
c. Books, tapes	3	0
d. Behavior expectations	3	3
e. Explain events, discussion	4	6
f. Create interest, get excited	0	3
5. Other kinds of trips fathers take child on		
a. Shopping	4	4
b. Oregon coast	5	5
c. Mountains	3	4
d. Camping	1	0
e. Visit friends	2	2
f. Vacations	5	2
g. Visit relatives	8	6
h. Amusement parks	1	0
i. Business trips, meetings	0	2
j. Museum	0	1
k. Restaurant	0	1
6. Number of fathers who see the following as purposes of the trips		
a. Social	5	4
b. Education	3	2
c. Vacation	6	4
d. Relative connection	8	6
e. Family business	0	1

Table 8 continued	Gifted	Non-gifted
7. Areas in which fathers prepare child for the trip		
a. Discussion	8	2
b. Books	3	1
c. Maps	2	1
d. Packing suitcase	3	4
e. Physical rest	1	0
f. Photos	0	1
g. Behavior	0	1
8. Number of fathers who feel that their child learns a great deal from trips such as vacations	8	4
9. Area(s) in which fathers feel their child benefits from trip		
a. Geography, nature	3	4
b. Vocabulary	0	1
c. Curiosity	4	0
d. Social interaction	3	2
e. Exposure to the world	6	5
f. General knowledge	4	2
g. Rules of the road, maps	1	2
h. Preparation, flexibility	2	3
i. Affective, fun with family	1	3
j. Physical skills	1	1
k. Don't know	0	1
10. Number of fathers whose child frequently watches TV	4	7

Table 8 continued	Gifted	Non-gifted
11. The programs the child watches on TV is chosen by		
a. Mother	1	0
b. Father	0	0
c. Child	3	6
d. Parent/child jointly	6	1
e. Sibling	0	2
12. Median amount of time child spends watching TV on weekdays and evenings per day	30 min.	90 min.
13. Median amount of time child spends watching TV on Saturdays	90 min.	105 min.
14. TV programs child watches most often		
a. Cartoons	4	7
b. Seasame Street	5	1
c. Disney Channel	4	5
d. Other educational shows	4	1
e. Sports, news	1	1
f. Family sitcoms	1	6
15. Number of fathers who prohibit their child from watching certain types of television programs	10	10

Table 8 continued	Gifted	Non-gifted
16. Number of fathers who prohibit one or more of the following types of television programs:		
a. Violence	9	8
b. Sex	5	5
c. Nature themes	0	1
d. Ridicule	0	2
e. Horror	4	2
f. Aggressive cartoons	4	3
g. Insanity	0	2
h. News	1	1
i. Wrestling	0	1
j. Adult shows	4	3
k. MTV	0	1
l. Commercial TV	2	0
m. War movies	1	0

were evident in two areas: "nature walks" and "carnivals and circuses". The majority of the FG(6) reported that they frequently exposed their children to "nature walks" while a minority of the FN(4) did so. There was a parallel finding in the case of the frequent exposure to "carnivals and circuses". A majority of the FG(6) responded that they frequently exposed their children to circuses while only 2 of the FN did so.

Another difference needed to be noted. In the frequency of exposure of the child to all the events mentioned in the closed-ended question, it was noted that a greater frequency of event exposure on the part of FG(33) than of the part of the FN(29) to the options provided in the closed-ended question.

Data regarding behavior alone are not as satisfying to a researcher as data concerning behavior coupled with reasoning or motivation for the behavior(s). The instrument went beyond behavior and asked an open-ended question concerning the reasons for exposing their children to things as is indicated in Table 8. The fathers were asked to delineate whether or not they prepared their children for certain events to which they exposed them.

The specifics of the preparation on the part of each of the

groups provided interesting differences. FN(6) reported that they explained/discussed the events with the children prior to attendance whereas fathers of the gifted used literature or music (2), books and tapes (3), and discussion (4) to prepare their children for a specific place or event.

Vacations can be an exposure to new learning experiences, new ideas, new languages, different cultures and values, genealogical heritage, and the stimulation of change and excitement. The research instrument sought to ascertain what proportion of fathers felt that their children learned a great deal from vacations. In this measurement there were noticeable differences between the FG and the FN. FG(8) indicated that they felt that vacations contributed a great deal to their child's learning while the FN(4) did not feel that vacations contributed a great deal to their child's learning.

The questionnaire asked about the areas in which fathers feel their children benefit from the vacation trips. The most disparate result comes in the category of the benefit of enhancing or satisfying the child's curiosity. This perceived vacation benefit of "curiosity" was noted by 4 of the FG but by none of the FN. The

other results seem to be scattered as opposed to clustered and the differences between the groups minimal.

The study considered televison and the effects of television as an element in a child's environment. Taken as a whole, this area was one which showed marked paternal differences between the groups. Four of the FG noted that their children frequently watched television, but a full 7 of the FN noted that their offspring frequently watched television. The amount of time spent watching television also varied markedly. The child of the FG watched thirty minutes of television daily while the child of the FN watched three times as much or 1 hour and 30 minutes of television per day on average.

On Saturdays the median minutes of television watching was much closer, between groups, but non-gifted children watched more television than their gifted counterparts. The average amount of time reported that the gifted children watched TV was 1 hour and 30 minutes and the average amount for the non-gifted was 1 hour and 45 minutes.

The study determined not only how much television was watched quantitatively but also qualitatively what was watched.

All of the fathers in both groups indicated that there were some prohibitions in the programming which the children were allowed to view. There were similarities between what the children were prohibited from watching. Violence was the most frequently prohibited form of television programming. This was followed by sexually-oriented programming which was forbidden in half of the homes in each group.

The person who chooses the programs which the child watched on television varied between these groups. In one case it was the mother alone; in no cases was it the father alone. The child chose the television program in 6 of the cases reported by FN and in only 3 of the cases with FG. Thus, in a majority of the non-gifted homes and in a minority of the gifted homes, the child chose the television programs. In a majority of the homes of the gifted and in a minority of the non-gifted homes, a combination of the parent and child chose the program (FG=6; FN=1). In two homes, a sibling chose the televison program to be watched.

Table 8 reports what television programs were most frequently watched by the child. The highest frequency categories for the gifted were "Sesame Street" (5), "movies/the Disney

Channel" (4) and cartoons (4). For the non-gifted the highest frequency were cartoons (7), "family sitcoms" (6) and the "movies/Disney Channel" (5).

AFFECTIVE--EMOTIONAL UNDERSTANDING, FEELINGS, AND BEHAVIOR

The purpose of certain question clusters was to probe differences in patterns of how the two groups of fathers may have related to their children. Most of the patterns showed similarities, however, there were some differences. These data are displayed in Table 9.

There was a notable difference between FG and FN in the discussion of feelings with their children. Seven of the FG indicated that they frequently talked about feelings with their child and only 5 of the FN frequently talked about feelings with their child (FG=7; FN=5).

There were similarities and differences in the strategies chosen to avoid giving their children poor self-concepts, however the FN(7) chose the open-ended response of "avoiding put downs" (FG=2; FN=7). The FN(4) also chose the response "avoiding negatives", whereas the FG suggested this response only two times. Because of the open-ended nature of this question, the data do not

Table 9

Affective--Emotional Understanding, Feelings, and Behavior
N=20

Item	Gifted (N=10)	Non-gifted (N=10)
1. Number of fathers who frequently talk with their child about other people's motives	5	4
2. Number of fathers who frequently talk about feelings with their child	7	5
3. Thing(s) father does to give child a good self-concept		
a. Physical touching	2	3
b. Positive verbal comments	7	7
c. Support academics	2	0
d. Grooming	1	0
e. Philosophic view of life	1	0
f. Talk about feelings	1	0
g. Unconditional love	2	3
h. Special celebrations	2	0
i. Encouragement	0	3
j. Playing/working together	0	2
k. Being respectful	0	2
4. Thing(s) fathers do to avoid giving child a poor self-concept		
a. Avoid negatives	2	4
b. Avoid put-downs	2	7
c. Avoid physical punishment	1	0
d. Avoid guilt	1	0
e. Avoid comparisons	2	0
f. Avoid being critical	2	3

Table 9 continued	Gifted	Non-gifted
g. Avoid rejection	2	0
h. Avoid public punishment	1	0
i. Avoid mixed-messages	1	0
5. Number of fathers who feel their child is one of the following:		
a. Aggressive	1	0
b. Assertive	9	9
c. Easily taken advantage of	0	1

indicate that FG endorsed "put downs" or "negatives", but they did not chose the words "avoiding put downs" or "avoiding negatives" to express this concept.

Table 9 also illustrates the open-ended responses that the fathers gave in response to the question of what they do to develop a healthy self-concept in their child. "Positive verbal comments" topped the list with a frequency of 7 for each of the groups.

PATERNAL ASPIRATIONS FOR THE CHILD

Table 10 reports results obtained in open-ended responses to what career fathers felt might be appropriate for their child. The FG were more non-committal or "haven't thought about it" than the FN (FG=8; FN=6). Of the fathers who had chosen a career which they felt might be appropriate for their child, two FG planned to encourage their child in this career while only two of the four FN planned to encourage their child in the career they felt might be appropriate for their child.

PATERNAL INVOLVEMENT IN SUBSEQUENT SCHOOLING

The proportion of fathers who want to be involved in the future schooling aspects of their child tended to be low in both groups. The involvement in parent-teacher conferences response

Table 10

Paternal Aspirations for Child
N=20

Item	Gifted (N=10)	Non-gifted (N=10)
1. Father expectations of highest level of schooling to be completed by child		
a. High School	0	1
b. Undergraduate degree	5	5
c. Graduate or professional degree	4	3
d. Don't know or haven't thought about it	1	1
2. Type of elementary school child is likely to attend		
a. Public	8	8
b. Private	1	2
c. Don't know	1	0
3. Type of career(s) which fathers feels might be appropriate for their child		
a. Professional, scientific	1	2
b. Psychomotor (athletic)	0	1
c. Creative, performing arts	2	2
d. Don't know or haven't thought about it	8	6
4. Number of those fathers who feel there is an appropriate career for their child who plan to encourage child interest in that particular career	2	2

received a majority of affirmative responses. These responses are reported in Table 11.

Were there ways in which the fathers thought that attending school might be bad for his child? The answer was "yes" in most cases. The open-ended responses indicated a great deal of similarity in response except for the category of "restrictive, non-challenging". Five of the FG answered that they felt that school might be bad for their child because it may be "restrictive, non-challenging". Only 3 of the FN answered that they had a similar concern.

Another parental involvement question dealt with the median number of books which the fathers in each group had read on child-rearing. The FG had a higher median by 1.5 books (FG=3; FN=1.5). As the data in Table 11 indicates, not only was the quantity of books different, but the type of book chosen was different as well. The FG tended to read in much more depth on certain topics (pediatric medical guide, siblings, toilet training, philosophy of parenthood, etc.), while FN tended to read more general "stage books" which dealt topically with what the child was supposed to be doing at certain stages of life.

Table 11

Paternal Involvement in Subsequent Schooling
N=20

Item	Gifted (N=10)	Non-gifted (N=10)
1. Number of fathers who want to be very much involved in the following aspects of their child's future schooling:		
a. Selection of teachers	2	4
b. Grading or evaluating child's work	2	4
c. Classroom activities (field trips, tutoring, parties, etc.)	2	0
d. Extracurricular activities (orchestra, plays, etc.)	3	2
e. Parent organizations	2	0
f. Parent-teacher conferences	9	9
g. Selection of textbooks	2	2
h. Discipline procedures	4	5
2. Way(s) in which father thinks attending school will be good for his child		
a. Socialization, exposure to new people	7	10
b. Socio-emotional	1	0
c. Structure	2	3
d. Exposure to life	5	7
e. Variety of experience	3	4
f. Academic challenge	4	4

Table 11 continued	Gifted	Non-gifted
3. Way(s) in which father thinks attending school may be bad for his child		
a. No anticipated problems	2	3
b. Restrictive, non-challenging	5	3
c. Boring	3	2
d. Teachers	0	1
e. Peers	2	3
f. Too much pressure	1	1
4. Median number of books read on child-rearing	3	1.5
5. Types of books read by fathers		
a. Developmental stage books	3	5
b. Pediatric medical guide	2	0
c. Parent magazines	1	1
d. Siblings	2	0
e. Toilet training	1	0
f. Discipline	2	1
g. Philosophy of parenthood	7	1
h. Developmental pyschology	1	1

PATERNAL SATISFACTION WITH THE CHILD

The purpose of this section of the instrument was to determine how the groups of fathers felt about their children. These data are reported in Table 12. A number of open and closed-ended questions were used to elicit responses that related to paternal satisfaction with the child. The frequency with which the FG wished to see improvement in their child was 13 while the frequency with which the FN wished to see improvement was 10 which may be indicative of higher or more clearly-defined expectations for the child on the part of the FG.

The perceived "strengths" as well as the "weaknesses" of the children were explored in the study. Table 12 points out the findings in the area of perceived strengths of the child. As opposed to the congrence between the groups, which the study found in the "weakness" area; the "strength area" showed marked contrasts.

The first marked contrast was the "social" area where 7 of the FG saw the "social" area as a distinct strength in their child however, only 3 of the FN seeing "social" as a strength in their child (FG=7; FN=3). Nine of the FG saw their child as intellectual as opposed to 3 of the FN who saw their child as intellectual

Table 12

Paternal Satisfaction with Child
N=20

Item	Gifted (N=10)	Non-gifted (N=10)
1. Areas in which fathers are currently most interested in seeing their child improve		
a. Child is performing adequately	1	1
b. General social emotional	3	2
c. Psychomotor	0	2
d. Academic	2	2
e. Maturity and independence	3	2
f. Risk-taking; persistence	2	0
g. Performing arts	2	1
2. Areas of real strengths and abilities		
a. Social	7	3
b. Intellectual	9	3
c. Psychomotor	2	7
d. Happy disposition	0	2
e. Task persistence	4	3
f. Creative	6	1
g. Independence	1	0
3. Number of fathers who feel child was in any way difficult to raise	3	2
4. Number of fathers who feel child was in any way easy to raise	8	6
5. Number of fathers who feel there may currently be problems for their child	5	2

Table 12 continued	Gifted	Non-gifted
6. Type(s) of possible current problems		
a. Bedtime	1	0
b. Emotional	2	1
c. Social	1	0
d. Overly sensitive	1	0
e. Food (too much sugar)	0	1
f. Vain	1	0
7. Number of fathers who frequently experience one or more of the following reactions when their child asks an unexpected, difficult, or abstract question		
a. Father was interested, fascinated	10	9
b. Father was amused	8	5
c. Father was puzzled	0	1
d. Father felt responsible to answer	10	9
8. Situation(s) in which father feels especially proud of child		
a. All the time	2	2
b. When child feels good about him/herself	1	2
c. When child is affectionate, sociable, sensitive to others	3	2
d. When child is well behaved	2	1
e. When child is clever, curious	2	2
f. When child progresses physically or academically	4	4
g. Independent, self-reliant	4	3
h. When adult receives feedback on child	1	0

Table 12 continued	Gifted	Non-gifted
9. Way(s) father shows that he is pleased about something child has done		
a. Verbal pleasure	7	6
b. Physical affection	7	6
c. Make a big deal of the event	0	4
d. Praise	3	5
e. Display	0	1
f. Talk about event	2	3
g. Reward	0	2
10. Father especially likes his child when the child is		
a. Fair	1	0
b. Achievement oriented	1	1
c. All of the time	4	3
d. Giving father hugs and kisses	2	1
e. Happy	2	0
f. Excited, interested in activity, exploring	3	1
g. Playing together, one on one	3	6
h. Animated	2	0
i. Thoughtful, considerate	2	1
j. Sleeping	0	3
k. Independent	0	1

(FG=9;FN=3). Two of the FG saw their child as having "psychomotor" strength as opposed to 7 of the FN who saw their child as having strength in the "psychomotor" area (FG=2; FN=7). None of the FG and only 2 of the FN mentioned "happy disposition" as a strength in their children (FG=0; FN=2). Creativity too showed sharp contrasts. Six of the FG mentioned "creativity" as a strength in their child while only one of the FN mentioned "creativity" as a strength of their child (FG=6; FN=1).

Though most fathers considered their children easy to raise (Table 12), they did indicate that there were and would be problems for them to work through. More of the FG perceived their child "easy to raise" than did the FN (FG=8; FN=6).

In terms of current "problems" perceived for their child, 5 of the FG indicated that they saw situations the child was working through and only 2 of the FN indicated that they perceived current "problems" for their child. The problems ranged from "bedtime" to "emotional" and are shown in Table 12.

Fathers of both gifted and non-gifted are frequently asked "unexpected, difficult, or abstract questions". The study tried to ascertain how the fathers felt when these occasions arose. As

Table 12 indicates, most of the fathers had similar reactions. Eight of the FG indicated that they were amused when these occasions arose and only 5 of the FN felt amused on these occasions.

The study explored the fathers' level of pride in their children. The ways in which the fathers tried to express their pride were enumerated by the open-ended responses in Table 12. Most of the methods of expression tended to overlap even though some of the sub-categories showed differences. More of the FN(6) mentioned "praise" as a method of indicating pride than the FG(3).

Fathers were also asked the open-ended question of "when they especially like their child". Table 12 gives a synopsis of their responses. It is interesting that the responses range from "all the time" to "when he/she is asleep".

INDEPENDENCE AND FRUSTRATION

How the fathers handled the child's independence and frustration and any differences in patterns are reported in Table 13. Most of the responses were similar in nature, but there were some interesting differences. FN tried to help the child with frustration by attempting to help the child place the frustration

Table 13

Independence and Frustration
N=20

Item	Gifted (N=10)	Non-gifted (N=10)
1. Number of fathers who feel that child frequently relies on parent when he/she could really do it by him/herself	1	1
2. Number of fathers who feel that there are some ways in which their child needs to be more independent	3	3
3. Number of fathers who feel that their child sometimes seems too independent	6	7
4. Number of fathers who feel that their child is frequently frustrated	2	2
5. Response(s) of father to child's frustration:		
a. Calm child	2	1
b. Put into proper perspective	1	5
c. Help, problem solving together	10	6
d. Change task	4	3
e. Provide minimal help	2	1
f. Encourage to try again	2	2

into proper perspective. All 10 of the FG but only 6 of the FN reported that they worked through the problem together.

DISCIPLINE

Discipline was an area of research also covered by the study. These data are reported in Table 14. Although most of the areas were congruent, some of the disparities were worthy of further thought and study. Overall, the FN mentioned more alternatives for punishment than the FG (FN=26; FG=21).

The way in which the fathers punished showed variations worthy of further study. The majority of the fathers in each group used "time out" as the preferred method of punishment. The FN(9) chose it with greater frequency than the FG(7). Gaps in frequency were found in other areas as well. "Spanking" was listed with more frequency by FN(4) than FG(1). "Telling the Child to Stop" was listed by 4 of the FG but by only 1 of the FN. "Warning or scolding" was not listed as an open-ended response at all by FG, whereas it was listed by 4 of the FN. As Table 14 indicates, the remainder of the responses were comparable.

The parental expectations of behaviors which were unacceptable showed similar proportions (Table 14). There was one

Table 14

Discipline
N=20

Item	Gifted (N=10)	Non-gifted (N=10)
1. Number of fathers who feel that it is necessary to discipline or punish child frequently	1	1
2. Way(s) in which father disciplines child		
a. Depends on situation	2	2
b. Time out	7	9
c. Spank	1	4
d. Threaten	1	0
e. Reason with child	3	3
f. Tell child to stop	4	1
g. Raise voice	1	0
h. Warn or scold	0	4
i. Deprive child, lose priviledge	1	2
3. Behavior(s) for which father feels the child must be punished or disciplined		
a. Aggression	3	6
b. Sibling disrespect	3	3
c. Destroying objects	2	3
d. Rudeness, disrespect in general	6	5
e. Disobedient	3	3
f. Not sharing	0	1
g. Unsafe behaviors	5	5
h. Toys not picked up	1	0
i. Tantrums	1	1

Table 14 continued	Gifted	Non-gifted
4. Father's perception of which parent is usually responsible for discipline or punishment		
a. Mother	2	1
b. Father	1	0
c. Both equally	7	9
5. Number of fathers who use any particular moral or ethical principles to give child a sense of "right and wrong"	7	8
6. Type(s) of moral or ethical principles used by parents		
a. Judeo-Christian	0	3
b. Discussion	1	0
c. Golden Rules	4	3
d. Humanistic	2	0
e. Responsibility	1	1

difference, however. Six FN indicated that aggression was something which should be punished. As the responses here were open-ended it is not evident whether the aggressive behaviors were behaviors in the abstract or whether they reflected underlying frequencies of aggression of the children in both groups.

The parental perception of which parent is usually responsible for discipline showed one notable difference. While both groups indicated that both parents were equally responsible for punishment or discipline, the FN showed a higher proportion in this category (FG=7; FN=9). The overwhelming proportion of fathers in each group indicated that they used particular moral or ethical principles to give the child a sense of right and wrong (FG=7; FN=8). When asked more definitively what those guiding principles were, the results were, "The Golden Rule", rather than any religious principles, as the basis for establishing the sense of right and wrong in the child. None of the FG listed any religious guiding principles but 3 of the FN did (FG=0; FN=3).

FAMILIAL INTEGRATION

Table 15 summarizes the responses to the facets of familial integration covered by the research. The vast majority of the

Table 15

Familial Integration
N=20

Item	Gifted (N=10)	Non-gifted (N=10)
1. Number of fathers who feel that it is very important for their child to know about the work they do	4	3
2. Number of fathers who feel that their child knows a lot about their work	3	3
3. Way(s) in which child learned about father's work		
a. Showed or took to work	10	9
b. Talk about work	5	4
c. Child asks about work	2	2
4. Number of fathers who feel that it is very important to include child in decisions which involve the following:		
a. Family in general	6	4
b. Child in particular	9	8
5. Number of fathers who have child participate in the following decisions		
a. Major household purchases	2	2
b. Minor household purchases	5	6
c. Food, the daily menu plan	10	8
d. His/her own clothing	10	9
e. Family vacations	6	5

Table 15 continued	Gifted	Non-gifted
f. Ways to spend his/her leisure time	10	10
g. Routines like bedtime rituals	8	10
h. Decoration and arrangement of his/her own room	10	10
i. Who does certain tasks around the house	7	6
j. Spending money that belongs to him/her	8	8
6. Number of fathers who frequently have child help when they prepare food	2	2
7. Number of fathers who frequently have child help when they build or repair things around the house	3	3

responses were very congruent. An exception to this was the response on inclusion of the child in decision-making. Six FG felt it was very important to include the child in decisions involving the family in general while only 4 of the FN felt such inclusion was important. The study, using closed-ended questions, also sought to determine in which decisions the child participated. Most of the responses were similar but for 2 areas of exception--"menu planning" and "bedtime rituals".

All ten of the FG noted that the children were involved in the daily menu planning. In the area of the bedtime rituals, FN(10) were more flexible to include the child in deciding "routines like bedtime rituals".

THE CHILD'S RESPONSIBILITIES

There were far more parallels than disparities in taking a look at the responsibilities of the children in both groups. Two apparent differences may not be differences after all and need further clarification. Another difference is indicative of a pattern disparity.

More FG in Table 16 indicated that they gave the child responsibility for caring for his/her toys than FN (FG=6; FN=3). On

Table 16

Child's Responsibilities
N=20

Item	Gifted (N=10)	Non-gifted (N=10)
1. Household responsibilities given to child by father		
a. Toys	6	3
b. Room	3	6
c. Clothing	3	3
d. Pets	3	3
e. Self	2	2
f. Table setting, clean up	5	3
g. Food preparation	1	0
h. Bed	2	4
i. Yard work	1	1
j. Dusting	0	1
k. Putting out clean towels	2	1
l. Recycling, garbage	3	1
2. Way(s) father encourages child to fulfill household responsibilities		
a. Punishment	1	0
b. Reward, allowance	4	4
c. Responsibility, Duty	7	0
d. Ask please	1	1
e. Remind	4	4
f. Reinforce via an activity, treat	1	1
g. Praise, positive reinforcement	0	3
h. Lose an activity	0	1
3. Number of fathers who feel that it is very important for child to finish something he/she started	3	1

the other hand, more FN indicated that they gave their child the responsibility for taking care of his/her room in reversed proportions (FN=6; FG=3). As responsibility for the child's room would presumably include responsibility for toys there is a question as to whether there is any pattern disparity. A pattern disparity was found in "table setting and cleaning". Here 5 of the FG indicated that the child was responsible for setting and cleaning the table while only 3 of the FN indicated that such was their pattern (FG=5; FN=3).

The ways in which fathers encouraged children to "fulfill household responsibilities" elicited a number of open-ended responses, which were similar or parallel with one exception--duty. Seven of the FG indicated that household responsibilities were to be fulfilled because of the duty of the child to the family. None of the FN generated a response that the duty of the child was used to encourage fulfillment of household responsibilities (FG=7; FN=0).

CHAPTER IV

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

SUMMARY

The purpose of this study was to determine differences in patterns and practices, if any, between the fathers of gifted children and fathers of non-gifted children. Prior research had lead to the conclusion that the interaction between parent and child had an impact on the child's learning during progressive stages of child development. Prior research had focused on handicapped children and the parents of handicapped children. Only one study of the prior research had focused on the role of the fathers of the gifted alone.

This research sought to answer two questions:

1. What are the attitudes, values, and behaviors of fathers as they relate to their young gifted child?

2. Are the patterns in attitudes, values, and behaviors of fathers of young gifted children similar or the same as the patterns in attitudes, values, and behaviors of parents of young non-gifted children?

Most of the research has been related to the involvement of parents with their handicapped and disadvantaged youngsters

because of federal funding in this area. Even where the research has been noted as "parental involvement", the involvement studied was that of the mother who has always been assumed to be the primary caregiver of the children leaving the role of the father ignored or underemphasized in the research.

The emergence of women in the workforce following World War II; the changes in gender working roles which came about in the 1970's; and the social disintegration of families through the changing mores on divorce, morals, and religion mean that many mothers may not be the primary caregivers for their children as was assumed to be the case in the U.S. prior to the 1970's. In fact they may have as much or less time with the children during the course of the day than the father. Nonetheless, the research still continued to focus on the role of the mother as that of the primary caregiver and primary influencer of the children. Regardless of whether the mother or the father is the primary caregiver, the role the father played in child development and what factors may influence the child's development have not been fully developed.

The role of the father and the possible factors which may influence the child's cognitive potential in gifted and non-gifted

children was the subject of research in the Karnes and Shwedel study which was published in 1987. It would be hoped that the results of that study combined with the results of this study will lead to further work in this area and to the establishment of tangible factors and behavioral practices which can be taught to the parents of both the gifted and non-gifted alike to enhance the cognitive development of all children. Perhaps the dissimilarities in practice found in this fundamental study, will serve as both a catalyst and a springboard to research in this entire area.

Procedures

The subjects of the study were fathers of ten gifted and ten non-gifted children. The children were between the ages of 5 and 6 years who had not attended kindergarten. The fathers in the study were required by definition to be the biological father living in the home with the child. All of the fathers in the study were volunteers whose children were attending area preschools.

The children in the study were tested using the Wechsler Preschool and Primary Scale of Intelligence-Revised (WPPSI-R). "Gifted" was deemed to be at or above the 97th percentile on nationally standardized tests which is the criterion the State of

Oregon uses to define giftedness. The first ten children who were tested and found to fit into each category were selected for the study so as to eliminate any selection bias. Five of the children in each group were male and 5 were female. Thus, the WPPSI-R scores of the children determined whether the fathers were fathers of the gifted or fathers of the non-gifted.

The fathers were then interviewed by the researcher using a protocol developed at the University of Illinois by Karnes, Shwedel, and Steinberg. The protocol consisted of 119 items some of which were open-ended questions and some of which were closed-ended questions. This format allowed the researcher to obtain concrete responses while still allowing the fathers an opportunity to reflect and expound upon their own approaches to parenting.

The interview protocol was designed to obtain information from 13 broad topical areas: (1) demographic data on the family; (2) background data on the fathers and children; (3) provision of knowledge and skills; (4) provision of non-academic skills (visual and performing arts, psychomotor activities, creativity); (5) provision of exposure of the children to things beyond the home environment; (6) enhancement of affective development;

(7) fathers' aspirations for the children; (8) involvement in the childrens' schooling; (9) satisfactions with the children; (10) training of the child for independence; (11) involvement in discipline; (12) integration of the child within the family; (13) responsibilities given the child.

All interviews were conducted by the researcher; coded by the researcher; and compiled by the researcher to increase the internal reliability of the study. All coding and compiling were checked three times.

Analysis

The data were converted to frequencies, medians, and means to identify differences between the groups of fathers. Question responses in which 5 or more of the 10 respondents answered the same way were deemed "typical" for that group. This approach followed the methodology of the Karnes, Shwedel, and Steinberg (1984) research. Analysis was required when one group had a typical response which differed from the other group's response by two or more people.

RESULTS OF THE RESEARCH

On the basis of this procedure, testing, and analysis, the following results were obtained.

Family Demographic Data

The demographics of the two family groups used in this study were similar. The fathers' employment status, occupations (except for one father of a gifted child whose occupation was a laborer), and median household incomes were similar. Eight of the families in each group had other children. The gifted children tended to be the oldest or an older sibling in the family while the non-gifted tended to be younger children. One area of difference between the FG and FN was that of formal education. Seven of the FG had advanced degrees and only two FN had advanced degrees.

Background Data of the Fathers

The background data of the fathers was so homogeneous that it appeared that these fathers were an intentionally matched sample. The median age of the fathers was different by one year. All of the fathers grew up in "intact" families (children who grew up with both parents present in the home). The birth order of the fathers was not consistent between the groups. Five of the FG

were the oldest child and two FG were second children. Thus seven of the ten FG were oldest or second children. The other three were middle children.

Three FN were oldest children and two were second children. Three were middle children and two were youngest children. Most of the FG(6) felt their own experiences were very enjoyable and that their own school performance was excellent. A minority of the FN(3) felt that their own school experiences were very enjoyable and their own performances were excellent (2).

The median time spent on hobbies by the fathers was 4 hours for each group. The median number of siblings in each group of fathers was 3 siblings. A majority of fathers in each group felt that their childhoods were enjoyable.

The occupations of the fathers' fathers (grandfathers of the children) were very similar. The only category which had over a 1 frequency difference was that of the laborer occupation. In the case of the grandfathers of the gifted, 2 were laborers while 4 of the non-gifted grandfathers were listed as having laborer occupations.

The occupations of the mothers of the fathers (grandmothers

of the children) too were very similar with one notable exception. There was a twenty percent difference indicated in the percentage of grandmothers who were housewives. Seven of the grandmothers of the gifted were listed a housewives and only five of the grandmothers of the non-gifted were listed as housewives. Thus, most of the grandmothers in both groups were housewives (FG=7; FN=5). The other three grandmothers of the gifted were nurses or teachers. Of the other 5 grandmothers of the non-gifted, 3 were nurses and teachers and 2 were pink collar and other non-professional.

There was one item of the things from the father's childhood which affected how he raises his child now. Four of the fathers of the gifted and none of the FN indicated (in response to an open-ended question) that they wanted their children to be independent decision makers. Three fathers of the gifted and one father of the non-gifted indicated that their parents' love of intellectual pursuits affected the way they raised their children.

Provisions of School-Related Activities

The fathers of both the gifted and the non-gifted children provided a variety of activities for their children which paralleled

those done in school-related settings. The median time the fathers in both groups spent on school-related activities per day was 8 minutes per day.

1. The FG spent a median amount of 7 minutes more reading to their children per day than the FN. This mere 7 minutes per day amounted to 42.6 hours per year or almost 2 solid days more of reading and exposure to literature for the gifted children.

2. The FG chose a greater variety of reading material to read to their children and they also preferred to read a much higher proportion of non-fiction to their children than did the FN.

3. The FG chose a much higher proportion of magazines to read to their children than did the FN.

4. A much higher proportion of the FG frequently helped their child write messages or letters.

5. The FG used a wider variety of ways to help their child answer his own questions than the FN. The FN asked questions in much higher proportion than the FG and the FN relied primarily on asking questions as their means of helping the child answer his/her own questions.

6. All of the FG helped their children to recognize words

other than their own names but only eight of the ten FN did.

Visual and Performing Arts

1. The FG more frequently took their children to visual and performing arts activites than the FN did.

2. More FG provided their children access to tape recorders, record players, and compact disc (CD) players than FN.

3. FG provided their children access to more books with art reproductions than did the FN.

Psychomotor Training

1. All of the FN provided their children with playground equipment at home but the FG took their children to a playground more often and played more often with their children outside.

2. The FG participated in more outside activities with their children than the FN.

3. The FG built more structures (such as blocks, Legos, etc.) with their children than the FN.

4. The FG encouraged more fine motor activities in their children than did the FN.

Creativity

1. FG played more pretend games and made up more nonsense songs than did the FN.

2. The FG more often made up new stories and embellished stories without using the book more often than the FN.

3. More FN felt that they could increase a child's curiosity level than FG.

4. The FG did more activities to increase the child's curiosity than the FN, despite the fact that more FN than FG felt that the child's curiosity could be increased.

Exposure to Things Beyond the Home Environment

1. The FG exposed their children to many more activities beyond the home environment than did the FN.

2. The FG generated a greater number of reasons for needing to expose the children to things beyond the home environment.

3. The FG seemed to find more purposefulness in providing travel opportunities for the child than the FN.

4. A greater number of FG felt than their child benefited from travel than the FN, but there was no substantial difference between the total number of areas of potential travel benefit generated by

the FG or the FN.

5. Many more non-gifted children than gifted children frequently watched television.

6. The FG reported that the majority of television was chosen jointly by the parent and child. The FN reported that the majority of television was chosen by the child. In only one home of the FN was the television chosen jointly by the parent and child.

7. The median amount of time spent by a gifted child watching television on weekdays and evenings was 30 minutes. The median amount of time spent by the non-gifted child watching television on weekdays and evenings was 90 minutes.

8. The median amount of time spent by a gifted child watching television on Saturdays was 90 minutes. The median amount of time spent by non-gifted children watching television on Saturdays was 105 minutes.

9. In one year, the additional television watched by the non-gifted on weekdays alone was 11 twenty-four hour days or thirty-three eight hour workdays of television more than the gifted.

10. In one year, the additional television viewing time for the non-gifted on Saturdays alone amounted to 13 hours.

11. The non-gifted child would have watched over 11 solid days of television more than his or her gifted counterpart in the course of a year.

12. The gifted child was much more likely to watch educational television shows than the non-gifted child.

13. The non-gifted child was much more likely to watch cartoons than the gifted child.

Affective--Emotional Understanding, Feelings, and Behavior

1. More FG indicated that they frequently talked about feelings with their children than FN.

2. The FN(7) chose the open-ended response of "avoiding put downs" as a strategy chosen to avoid giving their children poor self concepts.

Paternal Aspirations for the Child

1. There were no substantial differences in the educational aspirations for their children between the FG and the FN.

2. There were no substantial differences between the careers the fathers felt might be appropriate for their children between the FG and the FN.

3. Most of the fathers in both groups had not thought about or

did not know what they wanted their children to pursue for a career.

Paternal Involvement in Subsequent Schooling

1. The event that the majority of the fathers in both groups wanted to be involved in was the parent teacher conferences.

2. The fathers of the non-gifted could enumerate more ways in which they felt attending school would be good for their child than the FG.

3. The FG reported reading more books and in more depth on child rearing than the FN.

4. The median number of books read on child rearing by FG was 3 while the median number of books read on child rearing by FN was 1.5.

5. The materials read by the FG on child rearing were more varied than the materials chosen by the FN. The FN tended to choose children's developmental stage books, while the FG chose materials in greater depth such as siblings, pediatric medical guides, and philosophy of parenthood.

Paternal Satisfaction with the Child

1. The FG generally perceived that their children had strengths in the social, intellectual, and creative areas. The FN generally felt that their children had strengths in the psychomotor area.

2. Neither the FG or the FN felt that their children were difficult to raise.

3. A majority of fathers in both groups felt that their child was easy to raise.

4. Half of the FG and a minority of the FN felt that their may currently be problems for their child. The problems mentioned were: bedtime, emotional, social, over sensitivity, too much sugar, and vanity.

5. A much higher portion of the FG than FN were amused when their child asked an unexpected, difficult, or abstract question.

Independence and Frustration

1. All of the FG used the strategy of helping problem solve together with the child while only six of the FN used that strategy.

2. Half of the FN and only one of the FG mentioned "putting the problem into the proper perspective" as a strategy of

responding to the child's frustation.

Discipline

1. More FN mentioned "time out" as a discipline alternative than FG. More FN mentioned "spanking" as an alternative than FG. More FG mentioned "telling the child to stop" as an alternative than the FN.

2. More FN punished their children for aggression than FG.

Familial Integration

1. A majority of FG and a minority of FN felt that it was very important involve the child in decisions involving the family in general.

2. A majority of both FG and FN felt that it was very important to involve the child in decisions which affected the child.

Child's Responsibilities

1. More FG mentioned that they gave their children responsibilities for picking up toys than did the FN.

2. More FN mentioned that they gave their children responsibilities for cleaning their rooms than did the FG.

3. More FG gave their children responsibilitiy for table set up

than did FN.

4. Seven FG mentioned that their children were encouraged to fulfill household responsibilities because it was their duty. None of the FN mentioned that they encouraged their children to accomplish their household duties because it was their duty

CONCLUSIONS

The fathers in the study and the families in the study were well matched groups. Half of the children in each group were boys and half were girls.

The median amount of time spent by the fathers on their hobbies was 4 hours for each group. The median time spent on school-related activities was identical between FG and FN at 8 minutes per day. (Although time spent DOES NOT NECESSARILY EQUAL QUALITY TIME as the study of unemployed fathers (Radin and Greer, 1987) who were the primary caregivers pointed out). Yet, there were differences in the ways these fathers raised their children.

The fathers of the non-gifted had a higher median income and provided more things such a playground equipment for their children. Fathers of the gifted bought more school-related

software than the fathers of the non-gifted. The fathers of the gifted seemed to interact and do more with their children than the fathers of the non-gifted. This level of interaction and involvement seemed to be a consistent throughout the study.

The fathers of the gifted, by design or device, oriented their children to the educational/cognitive aspects of life. The fathers of the gifted enjoyed reading more non-fiction (science and nature, etc.) than the fathers of the non-gifted. They read to their children from a wider range of sources (especially magazines) and on a wider range of topics than the fathers of the non-gifted. They more frequently helped their child write messages and letters, and helped them recognize words other than their names. They were much more likely to talk with their children about nature and animals.

The fathers of the gifted provided their children with access to record players, compact disc (CD) players, and tape recorders more than the fathers of the non-gifted; and were more likely to provide their children with access to books with art reproductions and classical music on records, CD's, and tapes.

While the fathers of the non-gifted were more likely to

provide playground equipment at home for their children, the fathers of the gifted were more likely to engage in public playground play with their children. FG were also more likely to encourage their children to participate in gross motor and fine motor activities. The fathers of the gifted were also more likely to engage in building activities such as Legos with their children.

The fathers of the gifted more frequently engaged in creative activities with their children; such as pretend or make believe games; make up nonsense songs or rhymes; embellish familiar stories without using the book; or make up entirely new stories.

The fathers of the gifted exposed their children to a wider variety of activites--especially circuses and nature walks. The fathers of the gifted had a wider variety of reasons for exposing their children to activities and travel. Furthermore, they felt that their children learn a great deal from trips such as vacations. The fathers of the gifted might prepare their children for the vacation with an educational slant and expectation. Even a ride on a roller coaster can be viewed as just a sensory experience or one can discuss and explore the physical forces which are necessary to upend people and yet not lose them from the cars by the end of the

ride.

Two people may have the same "experience" but each may take different things away from the same event. Some people "get hit on the head" by a falling apple; people the ilk of Sir Isaac Newton, discover the concept of gravity. So too with the groups of fathers. If one approaches vacations from the standpoint that one will learn things and seek out learning experiences; one will learn. If one approaches vacations only from the standpoint that one wants to experience things at a sensory level, one will have that experience. "Seek and ye shall find" may be the dictum which explains the differences between the groups of fathers here.

One of the most significant findings of the research relates to the use of the child's time in two areas-the time the child is read to by the father and the time the child spends watching television. Besides being read to from a wider variety of sources on a wider range of topics, with a greater proportion of non-fiction, gifted children are read to by their fathers for 7 minutes more per day than the non-gifted child. The gifted child is read to by his or her father an average of 60 hours or 2 1/2 days more per year than the non-gifted counterpart.

Fathers of the non-gifted reported that their children watched television one hour per day more than did the gifted children. The choice of the program watched was determined jointly by a parent and child in the homes of the gifted and determined by the child alone in the homes of the non-gifted.

Cartoons were watched most frequently in the homes of the non-gifted; whereas educational programs were watched most frequently in the homes of the gifted.

The study considered television viewing as an element in the child's environment. Taken as a whole, this area showed marked differences between the groups, the child of the FG watched thirty minutes of television daily while the child of the FN watched three times as much or 1 hour and thirty minutes of television per day on average. On Saturdays the level was much closer between the groups. The average for the gifted was one hour and thirty minutes; the average for the non-gifted was one hour and forty-five minutes.

Thus, in one year, the additional television viewed by the non-gifted on weekdays alone was nearly 11 twenty-four hour days or 33 eight hour days of television viewed more than the gifted. This result combined with the fact that the television was most

often chosen by the child and more likely to be cartoon in nature in the home of the non-gifted is a striking difference when compared to the average gifted home where the television is most often jointly chosen by the child and parent and most likely to be educational in nature.

In one year, the additional viewing time in the home of the non-gifted child on Saturdays alone amounted to 13 hours. The non-gifted child would have watched over 11 full days of television more than his or her gifted counterpart in the course of a year.

In the affective area, the fathers of the gifted are more likely to talk about feelings with their child and draw the child out. The fathers of the non-gifted on the other hand mentioned a greater frequency of things which they did to give the child a good self-concept. The fathers of the non-gifted were much more likely to mention "avoiding negatives" and "avoiding put downs" as positive things they did to avoid giving their child a poor self concept.

Having said this about the fathers of the non-gifted; however, one must also compare the responses of the fathers to the open-ended ways in which they encouraged their children to "use the correct names and terms for things". The responses can be

categorized as (a) role model the term name; (b) repeat the correct term name; and (c) provide the correct term name and correct the child. A majority of the FN (6) chose (c) provide the correct name and correct the child. A minority of the FG (4) chose corrrection as a strategy.

Correction is part of the educational process; however, how correction is dealt with is important. A parent or teacher can choose to role model and repeat appropriate grammar or terminology until the child sees the patterns as normal or he/she can choose to correct those patterns. How the correction is pointed out and dealt with have effects on the child's self-esteem. A child's feelings toward school/home and his/her self-esteem can be much affected by how corrections are made. While the FN seem to be more concerned with "avoiding put downs and negatives" in general, than the FG, there was this difference noted between groups in the way academic corrections were handled.

Surprisingly, a minority of fathers in each group, had specific aspirations for their children. Of those who did, the fathers of the gifted were much more likely to encourage their child to pursue that interest than the fathers of the non-gifted.

The fathers of the gifted were less likely to view "socialization/exposure of the child to new people" when the child enters school as a positive event. These same fathers were also less likely to view the "exposure to life" which a child has upon entering school as a benefit to the child. The majority of the fathers of the gifted saw the potential for school to be "restrictive, non-challenging" for their child.

The fathers of the gifted saw their children as having social and intellectual strengths while the fathers of the non-gifted saw their children as strong in psychomotor strength. The fathers of the gifted were more likely to see their child as being easy to raise, but were more likely to see that their child had certain problems (e.g. bedtime, emotional, or social) which the child was working through. The fathers of the gifted were more likely to be amused when their child asked an unexpected, difficult, or abstract question.

In a rather sad commentary on the society in which we live, only two fathers of the gifted and three fathers of the non-gifted mentioned giving "unconditional love" as a means of giving the child a good self concept; and none of the fathers of the gifted and only 2

fathers of the non-gifted mentioned "happy disposition" as real strength or ability in their child.

The fathers of the gifted enumerated more strategies for helping their children deal with frustration. In addition, all of the FG indicated that they intervened and worked with the child to solve the problem together.

The fathers of the non-gifted enumerated more disciplinary alternatives than the fathers of the gifted. The fathers of the gifted felt that rudeness/disrespect was the most frequent behavior meriting punishment while the fathers of the non-gifted felt that aggression was the behavior most frequently meriting punishment. In a finding which was also interesting, in none of the homes of the gifted and only three of the homes of the non-gifted were Judaeo-Christian religious principles the basis of moral and ethical principles used in the homes.

Another significant difference that involved the role of the child in the family was that a large majority of the fathers of the gifted indicated that they encouraged their children to fulfill their household responsibilities because it was their duty. None of the fathers of the non-gifted mentioned duty or responsibility as a

means of encouraging the child to cooperate with household responsibility.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The researcher recommends that the following actions be taken:

1. that all of the potential factors (major differences in behavior between the two groups) be investigated by controlled studies to determine the existence, nature and strength of these variables in enhancing and retarding the process of cognitive growth.

2. that research be done through biological means (genetic computation, neurological activity, muscular activity, etc.) to predict a child's potential at the earliest possible age so that the child can be assisted by parents, society, and schools to achieve that full potential and contribute the fruits of that full potential back to the world.

3. that research be done to determine what years of a child's cognition are most critically impacted by the father's involvement.

4. that research by trained, on-site observers be done to verify actual frequencies, minutes spent, child-rearing

interactions and practices, etc. so that the self-reporting method, used in this study, would be strengthened through verification and more precise data collection.

5. that training processes be set up to train parents, caregivers, and teachers to maximize their enhancing of giftedness or reaching of full potential in children through the variables identified in this study.

6. that much more effort be put forth to teach parents how to enhance their children's self-esteem and research be done to determine the age(s) at which children can be most affected by these factors.

7. that research be conducted in single-parent vs two-parent families to determine the value which the father contributes to the child's cognitive, emotional, and psychomotor growth.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Bailey, N. T. (1987). Infancy to age five:Predicting fathers' involvement. Paper presented at the meeting of the Society for Research in Child Development, Baltimore, MD.

Biller, H. (1971). Father, child and sex role. Lexington, MA: Heath.

Bing, E. (1963). Effects of childrearing practices on development of differential cognitive abilities. Child Development, 34, 631-648.

Block, J. H. (1965). The child-rearing practices report. Unpublished manuscript, University of California, Berkeley.

Burks, B. (1928). The relative influence of nature and nurture upon mental development: A comparative study of parent-foster child resemblance and true parent-true child resemblance. Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, 27, 219-316.

Clark, B. (1988). Growing up gifted. Columbus, OH: Merrill.

Comfort, M. (1987). Differential relationships of parental perceptions to maternal and paternal involvement in play with young high risk and handicapped children. Paper presented at the meeting of the Society for Research in Child Development, Baltimore, MD.

Dave, R. (1963). The identification and measurement of educational process variables that are related to educational achievement. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Chicago.

Delaney, D.W. (1979). Facilitating attachment between fathers and their handicapped infants. Dissertation Abstracts International, 40, 3229-A.

Foxworth, M.D. (1986). Family environment as perceived by parents of gifted children in a southern culture (Doctoral dissertation, University of Southern Mississippi). Dissertation Abstracts International, 47, 4054.

Gray, S. (1970). Home visiting programs for parents of young children. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for the Education of Young Children, Boston, MA.

Hawkins, R., Peterson, R., Schwied, D., & Bijou, S. (1966). Behavior therapy in the home; Amelioration of problem parent-child relations with the parent in a therapeutic role. Journal of Experimental Child Psychology, 4, 99-107.

Hess, R., Block, M., Costello, D., Knowles, R., & Largen, D. (1971). Parent involvement in early education. In E. Grotberg (Ed.), Daycare: Resources for decisions. Washington, D.C.: Office of Economic Opportunity.

Karnes, M.B., Hodgins, A., & Teska, J. (1969). Research and developement program on preschool disadvantaged children: Final report. Contract No. 5-1181, Bureau of Research, Office of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service, No. ED 036 663).

Karnes, M.B., & Johnson, L.J. (1989). Training for staff, parents, and volunteers working with gifted young children, especially those with disabilities and from low-income homes. Young Children, 44(3), 49-56.

Karnes, M.B., & Shwedel, A. M. (1987). Differences in attitudes and practices between fathers of young gifted and fathers of young non-gifted children: A pilot study. Gifted Child Quarterly, 31(2), 79-82.

Karnes, M.B., Shwedel, A.M., Lewis, G., & Esry, R. (1981). Impact of early programming for the handicapped: A follow-up study into the elementary school. Journal of the Division for Early Childhood, 4, 62-78.

Karnes, M.B., Shwedel, A.M., & Steinberg, D.A. (1984). Styles of parenting among parents of young gifted children. Roeper Review, 6(4), 232-235.

Klinman, D.G. (1983). Education for fatherhood: Developing the nurturing potential of boys and men. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Psychological Association, Anaheim, CA.

Lamb, M.E. (1975). Fathers: Forgotten contributors to child development. Human Development, 18(4), 245-266.

Lamson, S.L. (1987). Parenting attitudes and behaviors: A comparison of parents of gifted young children with parents of young children who are not identified as being gifted (Doctoral dissertation, Kent State University). Dissertation Abstracts International, 49, 788.

Levenstein, P. (1970). Cognitive growth in preschoolers through verbal interaction with mothers. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 40, 426-432.

Linder, T.N. & Chitwood, D.G. (1984). The needs of fathers of young handicapped children. Journal of the Division for Early Childhood, 8(2), 133-139.

Lynn, D. B. (1974). The father: His role in child development. Monterey, CA: Brooks/Cole.

Marjoribanks, K. (1979). Families and their learning environments: An empirical analysis. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Markowitz, I. (1984). Participation of fathers in early childhood special education programs: An exploratory study. Journal of the Division for Early Childhood, 8(2), 119-131.

McLoyd, V.C. (1989). Socialization and development in a changing economy: The effects of paternal job and income loss on children. American Osychologist, 44(2), 293-302.

Milner, E. (1951). A study of the relationship between reading readiness in grade one school children and patterns of parent-child interactions. Child Development, 22, 95-112.

Moore, M., Fredericks, B., & Baldwin, V. (1981). The long-range effects of early education on a trainable mentally retarded population. Journal of the Division for Early Childhood, 4, 93-109.

Moss, E.S. (1983). Mothers and gifted preschoolers teaching and learning strategies. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Montreal.

Nash, J. (1965). The father in contemporary culture and current psychological literature. Child Development, 3(6), 261-297.

Pederson, F.A., Suwalsky, J. T., Cain, R.L., & Zaslow, M. J. (1987). Paternal care of infants during maternal separations: Associations with father infant interaction at one year. Psychiatry, 50(3), 103-205.

Phillips, D. A. (1987). Parents as socializers of children's perceived academic competence. Paper presented at the meeting of the Society for Research in Child Development, Baltimore, MD.

Radin, N. (1972). Father-child interaction and the intellectual functioning of four-year-old boys. Developmental Psychology, 6, 353-361.

Radin, N., & Greer, E. (1987). Father unemployment and the young child. Paper presented at the meeting of the Society for Research in Child Development, Baltimore, MD.

Rau, L., Mlodnosky, L., & Anastasiow, N. (1964). Childrearing antecedents of achievement behaviors in second grade boys. (Cooperative Research Project No. 1838). Stanford, CA: Stanford University.

Riley, D. (1985). Survey measurement of father involvement in childrearing: A reliability and validity study. Paper presented at the meeting of the Society for Research in Child Development, Toronto.

Riley, D. (1987). Father involvement with six year olds: Correlates differ by maternal employment status and area of child rearing involvement. Paper presented at the meeting of the Society for Research in Child Development, Baltimore, MD.

Sattler, J.M. (1990). Assessment of children (p. 671). San Diego, CA: Sattler.

Schweinhart, L., & Weikart, D. (1981). Effects of the Perry Preschool Program on youths through age 15. Journal of the Division for Early Childhood, 4, 29-39.

Simmons-Martin, A. (1981). Efficacy report: Early education project. Journal of the Division for Early Childhood, 4, 5-10.

Stokes, T., & Baer, D. (1977). An implicit technology of generalization. Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis, 10, 349-367.

Vadasy, P.F. (1986). Follow-up evaluation of the effects of involvement in the Fathers Program. Topics in Early Childhood Special Education, 6(2), 16-31.

Wechsler, D. (1989). WPPSI-R Manual. San Antonio, TX: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Inc.

Weikert, D., & Lambie, D. (1969). Ypsilanti-Carnegie infant education project progress report. (Department of Research and Development). Ypsilanti, MI: Ypsilanti Public School.

Yin, R.K. (1984). Case study research: Design and methods. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.

APPENDICES

Appendix A

Cover Letter

DEPARTMENT OF
CURRICULUM AND
INSTRUCTION

June 9, 1991

Dear Parents,

We would like your help with an Oregon State University graduate research project. This summer we will be conducting a study that will help educators provide information and programs to parents of preschool children.

The main focus of this research will be on fathers' parenting styles. For this study we need volunteers that are fathers with a boy or girl between the ages of 5 years, 2 months to 6 years. The father needs to be the biological father and living in the home with the child; and it is preferred that the child has not completed kindergarten.

Selected fathers will be interviewed individually for approximately one hour during July or August at a time convenient for them. The questions in the interview are very open ended with no right or wrong answers, and pertain to parenting styles.

Fathers are the main focus of the study; however, we will need to assess children's learning potential so that we may insure a full range of learning potential in the study. The assessment for the children should take approximately 15 minutes. It may be necessary to give a second assessment for some children. This assessment will be completed in July or August at the parent's convenience.

This study is based on a study done ten years ago at the University of Illinois. All data are completely anonymous. All assessment scores of the children and parent responses will remain confidential. This study is being done with approval from the Human Subjects Department at Oregon State University.

Please call if you have any questions about the research study. To complete this research successfully, it is essential that we have at least 60 interested fathers. Marianne Clausing-Lee can be reached at 752-9012 and Dr. Ahrendt can be reached at Oregon State University in the College of Education at 737-3648.

If you are interested in being a participant in the research study, please call Marianne Clausing-Lee or return the attached form on this note to your child's preschool as soon as possible.

Thank you for your time and interest.

Redacted for privacy

Kenneth M. Ahrendt
Chair

Redacted for privacy

Marianne Clausing-Lee
Research Assistant

OREGON
STATE
UNIVERSITY

College of Education
Education Hall 422
Corvallis, Oregon
97331-3502

Telephone
503-737-3648

If you are interested in participating in the study, please complete this page and return it to your child's preschool or mail it to me at the address below as soon as possible. Your cooperation is greatly appreciated. Thank you.

I am interested in participating in the graduate study as a parent and also give my consent for my child to participate.

OREGON
STATE
UNIVERSITY

Parent signature: _____

Date: _____

Parent name: _____

Parent address: _____

Parent telephone: _____

Return to:
Marianne Clausing-Lee
2835 NE Pilkington
Corvallis, OR 97330

OR

your child's preschool

by July 1, 1991, or as soon as possible

Appendix B

Interview Protocol

INTERVIEW FOR FATHERS OF PRESCHOOL CHILDREN

JUNE 1991

In this interview we would like to get a picture of you as a father--of the kinds of things you do with your child, of some things you think are important about raising your child, and some of hopes you have for your child's future. Of course, there are no "right answers" to our questions. We know fathers raise their children in a lot of different ways. We want to find out about how you raise your child. The answers you give will be used to help understand the variety of things parents do with and for their children and how these things may affect children's academic and social development. Everything from the interview is strictly confidential and your name, or your child's name, will never be used in conjunction with the information you provide. A coded number will be used on all materials to maintain confidentiality.

Throughout the interview I will be using the phrase "your child". That means (child's name), your son/daughter who has completed preschool or is currently in preschool. When you answer these questions you should be thinking particularly about your child, (child's name).

The interview takes about one hour to complete. Just sit back and tell me about yourself and (child's name) as I ask you questions.

You are always free to withdraw from the study or not answer any questions if you so choose. If you have any questions for me, please feel free to contact me. Here is the sheet with our names and telephone numbers if you have any questions regarding the study.

Respondent # _____ Time begun _____

Date _____ Interviewer _____

First of all, we'd like to know . . .

1. a. Does your child have books and stories read to him/her?

Yes 1

No *(Skip to Q. 2a)* 0

b. Who usually reads to the child?

Mother 1

Father 2

Other *(Specify)*_____

_____ 3

c. How old was the child when *(read answer from b)* first started reading to him/her?

_____

2. a. How much time do you spend reading to your child? _____

_____

b. When you read to your child, who chooses the books to be read?

Respondent 1

Child 2

Both equally 3

Other *(Specify)* _____

_____ 4

3. a. Do you go to the library with your child?

Yes 1

No *(Skip to Q. 4)* 0

b. Does he/she select his/her own books at the library or do you usually have to help?

He/she selects 1

Respondent selects 2

4. What kinds of books do you like best to read to your child? _____

_____

_____

5. a. Are any other printed materials besides books read to your child?

Yes 1

No *(Skip to Q. 6)* 0

b. What other printed materials? _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

	A lot?	Some?	Only a little?	Almost none?
6. How much variety would you say there is in the things you read to your child . . .	1	2	3	4

	Frequently?	Sometimes?	Seldom?	Never?
7. a. Do you play with puzzles with your child . . .	1	2	3	4
b. Do you talk about animals with your child . . .	1	2	3	4 *(Skip to Q. 8)*

c. What does he/she know about animals? _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

	Frequently?	Sometimes?	Seldom?	Never?
8. Do you talk about nature with your child; for example, trees, flowers, land and water formations, the weather . . .	1	2	3	4

3

9. a. Do you work on school related activities with your child?

Yes 1

No *(Skip to Q. 10)* 0

b. About how much time do you spend working on school related skills with your child? _____

_____

10. Do you ever buy books that help your child learn school related skills (like letters, numbers, counting)?

Yes 1

No 0

11. Do you ever buy games that help your child learn school related skills?

Yes 1

No 0

12. Do you ever <u>make</u> games or materials that help your child learn school related skills?

Yes 1

No 0

13. Do you help your child write . . .

	Frequently?	Sometimes?	Seldom?	Never?
a. messages or letters . . .	1	2	3	4
b. stories . . .	1	2	3	4

14. a. Do you have climbing or playground equipment at home?

Yes 1

No 0

		Frequently?	Sometimes?	Seldom?	Never?
15. a.	Do you take your child to a playground . . .	1	2	3	4
b.	Do you play outside with your child . . .	1	2	3	4

c. What kinds of things do you do outside?

_____

_____

_____

_____

	Frequently?	Sometimes?	Seldom?	Never?
16. Do you build structures out of blocks, legos, boxes, or other materials with your child . . .	1	2	3	4

		Frequently?	Sometimes?	Seldom?	Never?
17. a.	Do you do art activities with your child . . .	1	2	3	4 *(Skip to Q.18a)*

b. What art activities? _____

_____

_____

_____

		Frequently?	Sometimes?	Seldom?	Never?
18. a.	Do you do music activities with your child . . .	1	2	3	4 *(Skip to Q.19a)*

b. What music activities? _____

_____

_____

_____

19. a. Which of these things do you have at home for your child to use *(circle all that apply)*		b. Does your child have free access to *(ask for every circled answer in a)* . . . Yes	No
(1) arts & crafts materials	1	1	0
(2) a variety of junk items	2	1	0
(3) musical instruments	3	1	0
(4) record player, tapes, CD	4	1	0
(5) classical records, tapes, CD	5	1	0
(6) popular records, tapes, CD	6	1	0
(7) books with art reproductions?	7	1	0

20. a. Has your child ever visited or lived in a foreign country?

Yes 1

No *(Skip to Q.21)* 0

b. Which country or countries and how long did he/she spend there?

Country	Length of Time
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

(If more than 5, check) Too many to list 6

6

21. a. Does, or did, your child speak or understand languages other than English?

Yes 1

No *(Skip to Q.22)* 0

b. What languages and how did he/she learn them?

Language	How Learned
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

(If more than 5, check) Too many to list 6

22. a. Do you take your child to . . .

	Frequently?	Sometimes?	Seldom?	Never?
(1) movies	1	2	3	4
(2) plays (adult)	1	2	3	4
(3) dance recitals	1	2	3	4
(4) concerts (adult)	1	2	3	4
(5) restaurants	1	2	3	4
(6) spectator sports events	1	2	3	4
(7) camping	1	2	3	4
(8) on nature walks?	1	2	3	4

b. Considering the frequency or availability of the following, how often do you take your child to . . .

	As often as possible?	Sometimes?	Seldom?	Never?
(1) children's plays	1	2	3	4
(2) children's concerts	1	2	3	4
(3) carnivals, the circus, fairs	1	2	3	4
(4) the zoo	1	2	3	4
(5) art museum	1	2	3	4
(6) natural history museums?	1	2	3	4

c. Why do you take your child to the places or events you mentioned?

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

d. Do you do anything to prepare your child for attending the places or events you mentioned?

Yes 1

No *(Skip to Q.23a)* 0

e. What do you do to prepare your child? _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

8

23. a. Do you take your child on trips <u>other</u> <u>than</u> to places or events we just talked about?

Yes 1

No *(Skip to Q.24a)* 0

b. What kind of trips do you take? What is usually the purpose of the trip and how long is it usually?

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

c. How does your child react to trips and traveling? How do you prepare your child for a trip?

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

d. From the trips you take, do you think your child learns . . .	A great deal?	Something?	Not much?	Nothing at all?
	1	2	3	4 *(Skip to Q.24a)*

e. What do you think he/she learns? _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

24. a. Does your child watch TV . . .	Frequently?	Sometimes?	Seldom?	Never?
	1	2	3	4 *(Skip to Q.25)*

9

b. Who usually chooses the programs your child watches?

Mother 1

Father 2

Child 3

Other *(Specify)* _____

_____ 4

c. About how much time does your child spend watching TV on weekdays and nights? _____

d. About how much time does your child spend watching TV on Saturdays?

_____

e. What are the names of TV programs your child watches most often?

_____

_____

_____

f. Are there any specific TV programs, or types of programs, you do not allow your child to watch?

Yes 1

No *(Skip to Q.25)* 0

g. What are the programs, or types of programs? _____

_____

_____

_____

25. When your child is sick, does he/she prefer to stay home from school or go to school anyway?

Stay home 1

Go to school 2

26. When your child asks an unexpected, difficult, or abstract question, do you feel . . .

	Frequently?	Sometimes?	Seldom?	Never?
(1) interested, fascinated	1	2	3	4
(2) impatient, irritated	1	2	3	4
(3) amused	1	2	3	4
(4) inadequate, puzzled	1	2	3	4
(5) responsible to answer	1	2	3	4

		Frequently?	Sometimes?	Seldom?	Never?
27. a.	Do you try to have your child answer his/her own questions . . .	1	2	3	4 *(Skip to Q.28a)*

b. How do you get him/her to do this? _____

_____

_____

		Very much aware?	Somewhat aware?	Only a little aware?	Not at all aware?
28. a.	How aware is your child that questions or problems have more than one answer or solution . . .	1	2	3	4 *(Skip to Q.29)*

b. What do you do to help him/her become aware of this? _____

_____

_____

29. Would you say you buy most of the things your child plays with or do you and your child put things together from items around the house?

Buy 1

Put together 2

Both equally 3

		Frequently?	Sometimes?	Seldom?	Never?
30. a.	Do you and your child play "pretend" or "make believe" games . . .	1	2	3	4
b.	Do you make up nonsense or silly songs or rhymes with your child . . .	1	2	3	4
c.	Do you relate a familiar story without using a book, structuring it and embellishing it as you go along . . .	1	2	3	4
d.	Do you make up a story to tell your child . . .	1	2	3	4

31. In what area are you most interested in seeing your child improve at this time?

_____

_____

_____

		A lot?	Some?	Only a little?	Almost nothing?
32. a.	How much does your child know about the work you do . . .	1	2	3	4

b. How did he/she learn about your work? _____

_____

_____

_____

		Very important?	Somewhat important?	Not too important?	Not at all important?
c.	How important is it to you that your child know about the work you do? Is it . . .	1	2	3	4

33. a. Have you read books that give information on child raising and development?

Yes 1

No *(Skip to Q.34)* 0

b. Would you name some that have been important to you?

(1) _____

(2) _____

(3) _____

(4) _____

(5) _____

(If more than 5, circle) Too many to list 6

Can't think of any titles 7

34. How far do you expect your child to go in school?

High school 1

Some college 2

Undergraduate degree 3

Graduate degree 4

Professional degree 5

Haven't thought about it 6

Don't care 7

Don't know 8

35. Will your child be most likely to attend . . .

(Read both choices)

	A public school?	or	A private school?
a. for grade school . . .	1		
b. for high school . . .			2

36. Which of these aspects of your child's future schooling would you most want to be involved in . . .

	Want very much to be involved?	Want somewhat to be involved?	Don't care if involved or not?	Don't want to be involved?
(1) selection of your child's teachers . . .	1	2	3	4
(2) grading or evaluation of your child's work . . .	1	2	3	4
(3) classroom activities such as tutoring, parties, field trips . . .	1	2	3	4
(4) extra curricular activities like orchestra, a play . . .	1	2	3	4
(5) parent organizations such as PTA . . .	1	2	3	4
(6) parent-teacher conferences . . .	1	2	3	4
(7) selection of textbooks, workbooks . . .	1	2	3	4
(8) discipline procedures for your child . . .	1	2	3	4

37. a. Overall, who do you think has more responsibility for how much a child learns . . .

parents? 1

or

schools, the education system? 2

b. Overall, who do you think has more responsibility for developing a child's full potential . . .

parents? 1

or

schools, the education system? 2

38. a. Are there any other children in the family besides *(child's name)*?

Yes 1

No *(Skip to Q.39a)* 0

b. What are their ages and sexes?

Age	Sex
___	___
___	___
___	___
___	___
___	___

c. Is *(child's name)* a *(circle all that apply)* . . .

step-child ? 1

adopted child ? 2

foster child ? 3

39. a. How well does *(child's name)* get along with . . .

Ask only if applicable.	Very well?	Well?	Somewhat?	Not at all?
(1) older children in the family . . .	1	2	3	4
(2) younger children in the family . . .	1	2	3	4

b. What do you do when *(child's name)* disagrees with . . .

Ask only if applicable

(1) older children in the family? _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

(2) younger children in the family? _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

40. How important is it for you to include your child in decisions that . . .

	Very Important?	Somewhat Important?	Not too Important?	Not at all Important?
a. affect the family in general . . .	1	2	3	4
b. affect him/her especially . . .	1	2	3	4

If response to Q40a and b are both "Not at all important," skip to Q.41a.

c. Does your child participate in decisions about any of the following . . .

	Yes	No
(1) major household purchases ?	1	0
(2) minor household purchases ?	1	0
(3) food, the daily menu plan ?	1	0
(4) his/her own clothing ?	1	0
(5) family vacations ?	1	0
(6) ways to spend his/her leisure ? time	1	0
(7) routines like bedtime rituals ?	1	0
(8) decoration and arrangement of his/her own room ?	1	0
(9) who will do certain tasks around the house ?	1	0
(10) spending money that belongs to him/her ?	1	0

41. a. Does your child usually prefer to play . . .

with one special friend 1

with a whole group of friends . . 2

by him/herself?. 3

Other *(Specify)* _____

_____ 4

b. Are your child's friends mostly . . .

older than he/she is 1

younger than he/she is 2

the same age as he/she? 3

Other *(Specify)*_____

_____ 4

c. Are your child's friends mostly . . .

the same sex as he/she 1

the opposite sex as he/she? . . . 2

Other *(Specify)*_____

_____ 4

42. Are you *(circle all that apply)* . . .

working full time? 1

working part time? 2

temporarily unemployed, laid off? 3

in school full time? 4

in school part time? 5

keeping house? 6

other? 7

43. Are you employed by *(circle all that apply)* . . .

a private company? 1

the government?

Federal 2

State 3

County 4

Local 5

are you self-employed in your own business, professional practice or farm? 6

or are you working without pay in a family business or farm? 7

44. a. What is your job title? What kind of work do you do? _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

b. What product is made or what service is given by the business, industry, or organization you work for? _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

c. How many hours a week do you usually work at all jobs? _____

45. What is the highest grade in elementary or high school that you finished?

None 00

Elementary 01 02 03 04 05 06 07 08

High School 09 10 11 12

46. Did you get a high school diploma or G.E.D. certificate?

Yes 1

No 0

47. a. Did you ever complete one or more years of college for credit?

Yes 1

No *(Skip to Q.61)* 0

b. How many years did you complete? _____ years.

c. Do you have any college degrees?

Yes 1

No *(Skip to Q.61)* 0

d. What college degrees do you have? *(Circle all that apply.)*

Associate (A.A.) 1

Bachelor's (B.A., B.S., A.B.). . . 2

Master's (M.A., M.S., M.S.W.) . . 3

Doctorate (Ph.D., Ed.D., M.D., J.D.) 4

Other *(Specify)* _____ 5

e. What was your field of study (for your highest degree)? _____

_____

_____

	Very enjoyable?	Somewhat enjoyable?	Not too enjoyable?	Not at all enjoyable?
48. Overall, was your enjoyment of school . . .	1	2	3	4
	An excellent student?	A good student?	A fair student?	A poor student?
49. As a student, would you rate yourself as . . .	1	2	3	4

50. Can you tell me, was your <u>total</u> <u>household</u> income in 1990 . . .

a. Less than $5,000? Yes	1	g. Less than $35,000? Yes .	7
b. Less than $10,000? Yes	2	h. Less than $40,000? Yes .	8
c. Less than $15,000? Yes	3	i. Less than $45,000? Yes .	9
d. Less than $20,000? Yes	4	j. Less than $50,000? Yes .	10
e. Less than $25,000? Yes	5	k. Other . . . . . *Don't know*	*99*
f. Less than $30,000? Yes	6	*Refused*	*99*

51. Generally speaking, would you consider your household today to be . . .

poor ? 1

just able to get along ? 2

comfortable ? 3

prosperous ? 4

rich? 5

52. In what month and year were you born?

Month _____ Year _____

53. a. Have you ever travelled or lived in a foreign country either before or after your child was born?

Yes 1

No *(Skip to Q.54a)*. 0

b. Which country or countries and how long did you live or travel there?

Country	Length of time
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

(If more than 5, check) Too many to list 6

54. a. Do you speak fluently or understand languages other than English?

Yes 1

No *(Skip to Q.55)* 0

b. Which languages do you speak or understand and where did you learn them?

Language	Where learned
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

(If more than 5, check) Too many to list 6

55. Other than your job or family, what important interests do you have in life?

_____

_____

_____

_____

56. a. Do you have any hobbies or avocations?

Yes 1

No *(Skip to Q.57a)* 0

b. What are they? _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

c. How much time a week do you usually spend at your hobbies? _____

_____

22

	Very much aware?	Somewhat aware?	Not too aware?	Not at all aware?
d. How much is your child aware of your interest in these hobbies . . .	1	2	3	4

57. a. Have you ever published any books or articles?

Yes 1

No 0

b. Have you ever been interviewed for newspapers or TV for your work or avocational interests?

Yes 1

No 0

c. Have you ever given speeches, demonstrations, exhibits, or shows?

Yes 1

No 0

58. a. When you were growing up, how many children were in your family?

_____

b. Were you the first child, second child, youngest child . . . ?

_____

	Very enjoyable?	Somewhat enjoyable?	Not too enjoyable?	Not at all enjoyable?
c. Would you say that your own childhood was . . .	1	2	3	4

59. a. With whom did you live while you were growing up (for most of the time before you were 18 years of age)? _____

_____

_____

_____

b. Is *(Are) (he/she/they)* still living?

Yes 1

No 2

c. What kinds of work did *(he/she/they)* do while you were growing up? What was the job title? _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

d. Did *(he/she/they)* ever publish any books or articles?

(for Male)		*(for Female)*	
Yes	1	Yes	1
No	0	No	0
Don't know	8	Don't know	8

e. Was *(were)* *(he/she/they)* ever interviewed for newspapers or TV for work or avocational interests?

(for Male)		*(for Female)*	
Yes	1	Yes	1
No	0	No	0
Don't know	8	Don't know	8

f. Did *(he/she/they)* ever give speeches, demonstrations, exhibits, or shows?

(for Male)		*(for Female)*	
Yes	1	Yes	1
No	0	No	0
Don't know	8	Don't know	8

60. At the time you were growing up, would you say that your family was . . .

poor?	1
just able to get along?	2
comfortable?	3
prosperous?	4
rich?	5

61. What is your racial background?

White/caucasian 1

Black/Negro/Afro-American 2

Oriental. 3

Mexican. 4

Other *(Specify)* _____ 5

62. a. Does your child have a parent who, because of divorce or separation, does not currently live with the child?

Yes 1

No *(Skip to Q.66)* 0

b. Is this the child's . . .

Mother? 1

Father? 2

c. How old was your child when this parent left the household? _____

d. How often does your child visit this parent? _____

_____

_____

	A great deal of influence?	Some influence?	Not much influence?	No influence at all?
e. How much influence do you think this parent has on your child's learning, interests, and development . . .	1	2	3	4

63. a. What type of work does this parent do? What is the job title? ____

_____

_____

_____

_____

	Very much aware?	Somewhat aware?	Not too aware?	Not at all aware?
b. How much is your child aware of this parent's work . . .	1	2	3	4

64. a. Does this parent have any hobbies or interests other than job or family?

Yes 1

No *(Skip to Q.65a)*. 0

Don't know *(Skip to Q.65a)* . . . 8

b. What are these hobbies or interests? _____

_____

_____

	Very much aware?	Somewhat aware?	Not too aware?	Not at all aware?
c. How much is your child aware of this parent's interests . . .	1	2	3	4

65. a. Did this parent ever publish any books or articles?

Yes 1

No 0

Don't know 8

b. Was this parent ever interviewed for newspapers or TV for work or avocational interests?

Yes 1

No 0

Don't know 8

c. Did this parent ever give speeches, demonstrations, exhibits, or shows?

Yes 1

No 0

Don't know 8

66. a. Does your child have a favorite relative?

Yes 1

No *(Skip to Q.67a)* 0

Don't know *(Skip to Q.67a)*. . . . 8

b. How is this person related to your child?

_____

c. What makes you think this is his/her favorite relative? _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

d. What type of work does this relative do? What is the job title?

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

	Very much aware?	Somewhat aware?	Not too aware?	Not at all aware?
e. How much is your child aware of this relative's work . . .	1	2	3	4

67. a. Is your child particularly favored by a relative?

Yes 1

No *(Skip to Q.68a)* 0

Don't know *(Skip to Q.68a)* . . . 8

b. How is this person related to your child? _____

_____

If relative is same person as in Q.66, skip to Q.63.)

c. What makes you think this relative favors the child?

_____

_____

_____

d. What type of work does this relative do? What is the job title?

_____

_____

_____

	Very much aware?	Somewhat aware?	Not too aware?	Not at all aware?
e. How much is your child aware of this relative's work . . .	1	2	3	4

68. a. Has your child ever had any illnesses <u>other</u> <u>than</u> cold, flu, or the usual childhood diseases like mumps, measles, chicken pox?

Yes 1

No *(Skip to Q.69a)* 0

b. What illnesses? _____

_____

_____

_____

c. How long did it take your child to recover? _____

69. a. Does your child have any physical, vision, or hearing handicaps?

Yes 1

No *(Skip to Q.70)* 0

b. How old was your child when you first became aware of the physical handicap(s)? _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

70. In general, what kinds of things do you do to help your child advance intellectually?

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

71. a. Do (or did) you help your child learn the names of colors?

Yes 1

No *(Skip to Q.72a)* 0

b. How do (or did) you help him/her learn color names? _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

72. a. Do (or did) you help your child learn letters of the alphabet?

Yes 1

No *(Skip to Q.73a)* 0

b. How do (or did) you do this? _____

_____

_____

73. a. Do (or did) you help your child learn sounds for the letters?

Yes 1

No *(Skip to Q.74a)* 0

b. How do (or did) you help your child learn sounds for the letters?

_____

_____

_____

_____

74. a. Do (or did) you help your child learn to count?

Yes 1

No *(Skip to Q.75a)* 0

b. How do (or did) you help your child learn to count? _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

c. Can he/she count out a number of objects you give him/her?

Yes 1

No 0

Don't know 8

75. a. Do (or did) you help your child learn to recognize his/her name?

Yes 1

No *(Skip to Q.76a)* 0

b. How do (or did) you help your child learn to recognize his/her name?

_____

_____

_____

76. a. Do (or did) you help your child learn to recognize any other words?

Yes 1

No *(Skip to Q.77a)* 0

b. How did you teach these words to your child? _____

_____

_____

_____

77. a. Do you encourage your child to use correct names or terms for things?

Yes 1

No *(Skip to Q.78a)* 0

b. How do you encourage your child to do this? _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

78. a. Do (or did) you help your child learn to write or print any letters or words?

Yes 1

No *(Skip to Q.79)* 0

b. How do (or did) you help your child learn to write? _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

79. What things do you do to encourage your child to use different muscles and movement patterns?

_____

_____

80. When you don't understand what your child is asking for, or what he/she means when trying to explain something, what do you usually do? _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

		Frequently?	Sometimes?	Seldom?	Never?
81. a.	Does your child help you prepare food . . .	1	2	3	4 *(Skip to Q.82a)*

b. How old was he/she when he/she started helping you prepare food?

_____

		A great deal?	Some-thing?	Not much at all?	Nothing at all?
c.	When preparing food, do you think your child learns . . .	1	2	3	4

d. What does he/she learn? _____

_____

_____

_____

		Frequently?	Sometimes?	Seldom?	Never?
82. a.	Does your child help you repair or build things around the house . . .	1	2	3	4 *(Skip to Q.83a)*

b. How old was he/she when he/she started helping you repair or build things?

_____

	A great deal?	Some-thing?	Not much at all?	Nothing at all?
c. When helping you repair or build things do you think your child learns . . .	1	2	3	4 *(Skip to Q.93a)*

d. What does he/she learn? _____

_____

_____

_____

83. a. What do you usually do or say to discipline or punish your child?

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

	Frequently?	Sometimes?	Seldom?	Never?
b. Is it necessary to discipline or punish your child . . .	1	2	3	4 *(Skip to Q.84a)*

c. What are some behaviors you feel you must punish or discipline for?

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

d. Which parent is usually responsible for discipline or punishment?

Mother 1

Father 2

Both equally 3

Other *(Specify)* _____ 4

	Very serious?	Somewhat serious?	Only a little serious?	Not serious at all?
84. a. How serious do you think exaggeration is in a child the age of yours? Is it . . .	1	2	3	4
b. How serious do you think fabrication is in a child the age of yours? Is it . . .	1	2	3	4

c. Why is exaggeration in a child the age of yours *(read response from a)*?

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

d. Why is fabrication in a child the age of yours *(read response from b)*?

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

85. a. Can a parent increase a child's level of curiosity?

Yes 1

No 0

Don't know 8

		Very important?	Somewhat important?	Not too important?	Not at all important?
b.	How important is it for a parent to try to increase a child's level of curiosity . . .	1	2	3	4

c. Do you do things to increase your child's curiosity?

Yes 1

No *(Skip to Q.86a)* 0

d. What things do you do? _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

86. a. Does your child have any particular responsibilities in helping around the house?

Yes 1

No *(Skip to Q.87a)* 0

b. What responsibilities does he/she have? _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

c. What do you do to encourage him/her to fulfill these responsibilities?

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

		Frequently?	Sometimes?	Seldom?	Never?
87. a.	Do you feel your child relies on you to do something he/she really could do by him/herself . . .	1	2	3	4 *(Skip to Q.88a)*

b. How do you get him/her to do these things on his/her own? _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

88. a. Is there any way in which you feel your child needs to be more independent?

Yes 1

No *(Skip to Q.89a)* 0

b. In what way? _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

c. How will you encourage him/her to become more independent in this?

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

89. a. Does your child ever seem too independent?

Yes 1

No *(Skip to Q.90a)* 0

b. When does he/she seem too independent? _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

c. How do you handle this? _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

		Frequently?	Sometimes?	Seldom?	Never?
90. a.	Does your child get frustrated . . .	1	2	3	4

b. Have you ever seen your child get frustrated when trying to complete a task?

Yes 1

No *(Skip to Q.91a)* 0

c. What tasks seem particularly to frustrate your child? _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

d. What do you do when he/she gets frustrated at a task? _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

		Very Important?	Somewhat Important?	Not Too Important?	Not At All Important?
91. a.	How important do you think it is for your child to finish what he/she starts? Is it . . .	1	2	3	4

b. Why is it *(read response from a)*? _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

92. a. Is it more important for him/her to finish some things than others?

Yes 1

No *(Skip to Q.93)* 0

b. What things and why is it more important to finish these? _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

93. Can you tell me, for each of your children, special interests or abilities they have?

Child's Name	Interests and Abilities

94. a. Was your child previously *(circle all that apply)* . . .

cared for by a babysitter ? 1

attending a day care center ? 2

attending a nursery school (½ day program) ? 3

attending a play group ? 4

attending some other type of early childhood program ? 5

(Specify) _____

_____

_____

b. Between what ages was he/she *(ask for each circled answer in a)* . . .

Between ages: _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

	A Great Deal of Influence?	Some Influence?	Not Much Influence?	No Influence?
c. How much influence on your child's learning, interests, or development do you think this experience had?	1	2	3	4 *(Skip to Q.95a)*

d. How has it <u>most</u> influenced your child's learning, interests, or development?

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

95. a. Has your child ever been <u>raised</u> by an adult other than those we've talked about before in the interview?

Yes 1

No *(Skip to Q.96a)* 0

b. Who was this person and how long was the child under their care?

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

	A great deal of influence?	Some influence?	Not much influence?	No influence at all?
c. How much influence do you <u>think</u> this person had on your child's learning, interests, and development . . .	1	2	3	4

	A great deal of influence?	Some influence?	Not much influence?	No influence at all?
96. a. Overall, how much influence do you think <u>you</u> have had on your child's learning, interests, and development . . .	1	2	3	4

b. How do you feel you have <u>most</u> influenced your child's learning, interests, and development? _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

97. a. What kind of career do you think might be appropriate for your child? _____

_____

_____

Don't know *(Skip to Q.98)* 8

Haven't thought about it *(Skip to Q.98)* 9

b. Why do you think it would be an appropriate career for him/her?

_____

_____

_____

_____

c. Do you intend to encourage his/her interest in this career?

Yes 1

No *(Skip to Q.98)* 0

d. How will you do this? _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

98. What are the <u>most</u> important things you feel you can do to help your child develop to his/her full potential?

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

99. What real strengths and abilities does your child have? _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

100. a. Do you feel you should help your child further develop any of these abilities?

Yes 1

No *(Skip to Q.101a)* 0

b. Which abilities? _____

_____

_____

_____

c. How do you think you can do this? _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

101. a. Would you say your child is in any ways a difficult child to raise?

Yes 1

No *(Skip to Q.102a)* 0

b. In what ways? _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

102. a. Would you say your child is in any ways an easy child to raise?

Yes 1

No *(Skip to Q.103)* 0

b. In what ways? _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

103. Is there anything from <u>your</u> <u>own</u> childhood that affects how you raise your child now? _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

104. a. Is there anything you consider to be a problem <u>for</u> or <u>with</u> your child right now?

Yes 1

No *(Skip to Q.105)* 0

b. Can you tell me more about this? _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

105. Based on what you know about your child's personality today, what do you think may be a problem for him/her . . .

a. in school? _____

_____

_____

_____

b. in life in general? _____

_____

_____

_____

c. *can't think of any problems* 0

106. a. In what ways do you think attending school will be good for your child?

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

b. In what ways do you think attending school may be bad for your child?

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

107. a. Do (or did) you help your child learn to share and take turns?

Yes 1

No *(Skip to Q.108a)* 0

b. How do (or did) you help your child learn to share and take turns?

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

		Frequently?	Sometimes?	Seldom?	Never?
108. a.	Do you talk about motives with your child, about why people do things . . .	1	2	3	4

		Very Important?	Somewhat Important?	Not too Important?	Not at all Important?
b.	How important is this for parents to do . . .	1	2	3	4

c. Why is it *(read answer from b)*? _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

		Frequently?	Sometimes?	Seldom?	Never?
109. a.	Do you talk about feelings with your child . . .	1	2	3	4*(Skip to Q.110a)*

b. How do you help your child to understand others' feelings?

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

c. How do you help your child understand his/her own feelings? _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

		Very Important?	Somewhat Important?	Not Too Important?	Not At all Important?
110. a.	How important is it for parents to help children understand feelings . . .	1	2	3	4

b. Why is it *(read answer from a)*? _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

		Aggressive?	Assertive?	Easily Taken Advantage Of?
111. a.	Do you think of your child as . . .	_____	_____	_____
		1	2	3

b. How do you encourage your child <u>not to</u> be <u>too</u> easily taken advantage of?

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

112. a. Do you use any particular moral or ethical principles to give your child a sense of "right and wrong?"

Yes 1

No *(Skip to c)* 0

b. What are they? _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Ask only if response to Q.112a is "No."

c. How do you give your child a sense of what is "right" and "wrong"?

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

113. In general, how do you show when you are pleased about something your child has done?

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

114. In general, how do you show when you are displeased with something your child has done?

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

115. What are some things you do (or have done) to help your child feel good about him/herself—not just about something he/she has done—but good about him/herself as a person, things that give him/her a good self-concept ?

116. What are some things you try to avoid doing because you feel they might give your child a poor self-concept?

117. Why did you choose *(particular program at* _____*)* for your child?

118. When do you feel especially proud of your child? _____

119. When do you especially like your child? _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Time ended _____

Appendix C

Letter of Permission to Use Protocol

14 Conry Crescent
Boston, MA 02130

December 13, 1991

Ms. Marianne Clausing-Lee
2835 N.E. Pilkington
Corvallis, OR 97330

Dear Ms. Clausing-Lee:

To follow-up to our conversation from last May, as one of the developers of the 'Interview for Parents of Preschool Children' (Karnes, Shwedel, & Steinberg, 1982), I hereby give you written permission to use this interview protocol for your dissertation research. Indeed, I am very pleased to learn that you are using the interview protocol to extend our pilot research about styles of parenting among parents of young gifted children.

I look forward to learning about your results from your interviews. If I can be of any further assistance, please let me know.

Sincerely,
Redacted for privacy

Allan Shwedel, Ph.D.

cc: Dr. Merle B. Karnes