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ABSTRACT

The association between father-son relationship quality, gender role stress, relationship satisfaction, and parental behaviors was investigated by surveying 53 men aged 25-60 years old who were in romantic relationships and were fathers to sons at least 5-years-old using an on-line survey. Correlations and ordinary least squares regressions were run. Whereas there were no correlations between the whole variables, there were associations found between many subscales of these variables. Father-son relationship quality was associated with performance failure (gender role stress subscale). However, it was not associated with relationship satisfaction or parental behaviors. The subscales emotional inexpressiveness and intellectual inferiority were both associated with several relationship satisfaction subscales. Masculine gender role stress was significantly correlated with harsh punishment.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

The relationship a boy has with his father is one of the most influential male-male relationships that he will have in his lifetime. The father-son relationship impacts various facets of the boys’ development such as problem solving ability (Jones, 2004), emotional health, sexual attitudes, communication behaviors and even their relationships with their own sons (Floyd & Morman, 2003). Themes surrounding father-son relationships are among the oldest in the field of psychology. The German psychologist Sigmund Freud wrote that the loss of a father could be “the single greatest loss a person can experience” (Jones, 2004). According to Freud, the father fills the role of protector, nurturer, and “God-like” figure. Shortly after Freud’s studies, Dorothy Burlingham and Anna Freud continued exploring the psychoanalytic view of the father-son relationship testing the sons of absent WWII soldiers (Jones, 2004). Burlingham and Freud found that the boys often created their own fantasy father figure in place of their actual fathers. They concluded that the boys idealized their fathers and believed in these fantasy figures in order to fill the developmental need for a father. This line of thinking of fathers as filling an inherently necessary role permeated the next six decades of research on the father’s role in child development (Jones, 2004).

The father-son relationship is essential in the son’s development of a masculine identity (Osherson, 2004). Warmth and nurturance communicated from father to son are associated with positive psychological outcomes in the son (Marrocco, 2002). Since masculinity is a psychological concept that a father models for his son (Misler, 2004), father-son relationship quality should be associated with masculine gender role stress. If
a father does not communicate expressively and remain involved in the son’s life, the son’s gender developmental process will create stress for the son (Marrocco, 2002; Patton, 2003).

This stress is referred to in the research as gender role stress. Since it is a father who often models the definition of masculinity to his son, the nature of the father-son relationship is inherently related to the amount of stress the son experiences concerning his own gender identity and possible role confusion. If the relationship between a father and his son is open, warm, and guiding, the father will be more available and more explicitly model the concept of manhood for the son. Therefore, the son will gain a deeper understanding of what his family and society expect from him and struggle less with grasping the social construct of masculinity. Since the father-son relationship later impacts the target son’s relationship with his own son (Floyd & Morman, 2003), the father-son relationship quality and gender role stress should both impact the target son’s own parenting behaviors. It also stands to reason that, since gender role stress is related to domestic violence (Cohn & Zeichner, 2006; Jakupcak, Lisak, & Roemer, 2002; Schwartz, Waldo, & Daniel, 2005), it would also be related to relationship satisfaction in general.
CHAPTER 2
LITERATURE REVIEW

Definition of Terms

- Father-Son Relationship Quality: the participant’s perception of his relationship with his own father during adolescence.
- Gender Role Stress: Stress caused by a sense of physical inadequacy, emotional inexpressiveness, subordination to women, intellectual inferiority, and performance failure.
- Parenting Behaviors: The amount of Positive Involvement (making time for the child, showing interest), Monitoring (supervision of the activities of the child), Rules (teaching the child appropriate behavior), Discipline (punishment for misbehavior), Inconsistent Discipline (punishment in an inconsistent way), Harsh Punishment (corporal punishment and verbal blaming), Ignoring (neglecting unwanted behavior), Positive Reinforcement (rewarding good behavior of the child), Problem Solving (solving problems together with the child), and Autonomy (stimulating autonomous behavior of the child) a father administers to his son.
- Relationship Satisfaction: A participant’s evaluation of his quality of relationship based on, (1) salutary recognition, acknowledging the partner, (2) small talk, engaging the partner in “everyday” conversation, (3) ego-building comments, praising the partner, (4) expanding memories, reminiscing about times shared together, (5) exciting activities, engaging in mutually interesting activities, and (6) feedback, mutual honesty including encouragement and correction.
Fathers and Their Distinct Role in Parenthood

Parental involvement is a strong indicator of positive psychological outcomes in children. It has long been established that parents who show a combination of strong supervision and positive involvement help to protect adolescents against delinquent outcomes (Chung, & Steinberg, 2006; Furstenberg, Cook, Eccles, Elder, & Sameroff, 1999; Gordan-Smith, Tolan, & Henry, 2000) and that low parental support is associated with antisocial behaviors (Dishion, Duncan, Eddy, & Fagot, 1994; Patterson, & Stouthamer-Loeber, 1984; Stoolmiller, 1994).

Fathers play a distinct role in the lives of their children since mothers and fathers seem to engage in different types of interactions with their children (Bowlby, 1969; Lamb & Oppenheim, 1989). According to Bowlby (1969), fathers place an emphasis on play, mentorship, and encouragement in the face of challenges. Fathers who lend sensitive support for their children’s autonomous exploration in the preschool years make a larger unique contribution to the prediction of the child’s emotional security at age 16, more so than a mother’s support (Grossman, Grossman, Fremmer-Bombik, Kindler, Scheuerer-Englisch, & Zimmermann, 2002). “Given this role of father as mentor, play partner, and the one who encourages the child to meet challenges, fathers’ relationships with children may be particularly important in supporting their competent forays into the world outside the family” (Cox, 2004, p. 629).

A father’s behavior is predictive of competence both within and outside the family above and beyond the mother-child relationship (Cox, 2004). Bisnaire, Firestone, and Rynard (1990) found that well-adjusted children spend significantly more time with
their fathers compared to less well-adjusted children. The literature shows that the role of a father in a child’s life is undeniable.

**Gender Role Stress**

Strong gender-role identification is a necessary ingredient for healthy personal adjustment (Eisler, Skidmore, & Ward, 1988). However, gender-role stereotypes have the potential of producing significant stress for those who do not conform to them (Franks & Rothblum, 1983; Pleck, 1981; Stewart & Lykes, 1985). Men and women are exposed to fundamentally different types of stressors and therefore learn to cope with these events in a gender-determined manner (e.g. Bem, 1981). Masculinity is defined as those characteristics that are socially desirable for most men (Spence & Helmreich, 1978) such as autonomy, self-confidence, assertiveness, and instrumentality (Eisler et al., 1988). Men are more likely to identify with the masculine gender role than are women. Those men who experience difficulty in living up to the demands of the male role experience will rate higher in masculine gender role stress. Fischer and Good (1998) found that men rate their relationships with their parents as more secure, positive, and conflict free if they report less gender role conflict and gender role stress. Gender Role Stress is defined as stress caused by a dissonance between the set of gender role expectations the man holds and his assessment of his role performance (Schaub & Williams, 2007). The expectations produced by gender role stress are a sense of physical inadequacy, emotional inexpressiveness, subordination to women, intellectual inferiority, and performance failure (Moore & Stuart, 2004). In large enough amounts, these stressors may cause an effectual masculine identity crisis for the man whose performance does not measure up to his own expectations of how a masculine man interacts with others.
Gender is a social construct that aids in shaping our world views (Schaub et al., 2007). A man’s concept of his own masculine gender or his masculine ideology serves as a social reference for his behavior. However, adherence to this ideology may cause harm to both himself and others (Jakupak et al., 2002). Masculine attitudes include the need to be powerful, dominant, and respected and, therefore, adhering to these attitudes is associated with supporting the use of aggression in order to gain social status. Holding these attitudes also predisposes men to engage in behaviors viewed as consistent with these masculine attitudes such as being dominant, competitive, and physically strong (Cohn et al., 2006). Masculine gender role stress arises when there are discrepancies between a man’s self-concept and society’s norms regarding gendered behavior (Schaub et al., 2007). Kupers (2005) labeled the extreme adherence to masculine gendered behavior as “toxic masculinity.” The conflict caused by a discrepancy between self-concept and norms may actually limit the fulfillment of the man’s potential and restrict him as he becomes trapped in living up to the socially constructed ideology of masculinity (Schaub et al., 2007).

Therefore it should come as no surprise that Thompkins and Rando (2003) found that there is a positive relationship between masculine gender role stress and shame. These men also self-identify themselves as susceptible to stress in gender situations (Eisler, Franchina, Moore, Honeycutt, & Rhatigan, 2000). The fear of violating these masculine gender norms is likely to prevent men from expressing emotions (Jakupcak, Osborne, Michael, Cook, & McFall, 2006) or seeking help from others (Lane & Addis, 2005). This often leads men with highly masculine ideology to perceive their own problems more negatively than those with less severely gendered ideology (Magovcevic
& Addis, 2005). Men high in masculine gender role stress report more negative attributions, negative affect, and endorse more verbal aggression towards women who pose a threat to the traditional gender roles (Franchina, Eisler, & Moore, 2001). They are also more likely to tolerate sexual harassment (Kearney, Rochlen, & King, 2004) and engage in substance abuse (Blazina & Watkins, 1996; Liu & Iwamoto, 2007).

The attitudes and behaviors associated with masculine gender role stress affect the individual’s thoughts about himself and his interactions with others. Nonconformity to the male gender role can create negative consequences to the individual’s self-esteem and produce psychological distress (Jakupcak et al., 2002; Liu, Rochlen, & Mohr, 2005; Pleck, 1995). When interacting with others, masculine gender role stress can adversely affect a man’s relationships. Men with less gender role stress report closer attachments to both parents (DeFranc & Mahalik, 2002), increased relationship satisfaction and higher intimacy levels (Pleck, 1995; Sharpe & Heppner, 1991). High levels of gender role stress negatively affect family contexts and work environments as well (Pleck 1981; Pleck 1995).

**Adult Relationship Satisfaction**

Conventional wisdom asserts that “self-love is necessary to love another” (Murray, Rose, Holmes, Derrick, Podchaski, Bellavin, et al., 2005). Those with low self-esteem report less satisfaction with and less love for their partner (Murray, Holmes, & Griffin, 2000; Murray, Homes, Griffin, Bellavia, & Rose, 2001). Such difficulties seem to arise because people with low self-esteem have troubles finding the sense of felt security in a partner’s continued positive regard and love necessary to risk feelings of closeness and attachment (Murray, Rose, Bellavia, Holmes, & Kusche, 2002).
Relationship satisfaction is usually measured using attachment theory (e.g. Sumer & Cozzarelli, 2004; Treboux, Crowell, & Waters, 2004) which focuses on how early interactions with significant others exert an influence on the ways adults behave, think, and feel in their intimate relationships. These early specific representations generalize to other relationships as well. However, it is theorized that while an individual may have an insecure attachment, he or she may perceive a romantic relationship positively because it is the most secure relationship they have yet experienced. Therefore, adult romantic relationship satisfaction may also be measured behaviorally (Shumway & Wampler, 2002). A man’s evaluation of his quality of relationship may be based on salutary recognition (acknowledging the partner), small talk (engaging the partner in “everyday” conversation), ego-building comments (praising the partner), expanding memories (reminiscing about times shared together), exciting activities (engaging in mutually interesting activities), and feedback (mutual honesty including encouragement and correction) (Shumway et al., 2002). These behaviors are gender neutral and reflect the degree of satisfaction in the relationship.

**Parental Behaviors**

Parenting style, a pattern of attitudes that parents express toward their children, has been found to be related to academic achievement, psychosocial functioning, substance abuse, and mortality (Punamaki, Qouta, & El Sarraj, 1997). Once again, when referring to parenting behaviors, family scientists are usually alluding to the parenting attachment styles of authoritative, authoritarian, and permissive parenting (Ainsworth, 1964; Neal & Frick-Horbury, 2002). However, parenting can also be measured in a behavioral context.
Schaefer and Bell (1958) developed the first parental behaviors scale focusing solely on the mother’s role in shaping her child. Several family scientists (Reid, Patterson & Snyder, 2002; Van Leeuwen & Veermulst, 2004) have recently based their research on the hypothesis that parenting practices of both parents can “mediate the relationships between child adjustment and family background contexts” (Van Leeuwen & Veermulst, 2004, p. 284). Parenting often functions as both a risk factor and a protective factor. Monitoring, discipline, positive reinforcement, problem solving, and parental involvement have all shown import in producing positive child outcomes (Patterson, Reid, & Dishion, 1992). Clear risk factors for later delinquency are lack of supervision, rejection, harsh discipline, and limited parental involvement (Deater-Deckard, Dodge, Bates, & Pettit, 1998; Farrington, 1995; Loeber, 1990). In their study parental behaviors include both positive and negative behaviors: positive parenting, monitoring, rule instruction, the presence discipline, inconsistent discipline, harsh punishment, ignoring, material rewarding, and autonomy granting a father administers to his son.

Theory

There are three theories used in this study to explain the expected relationships between the independent, dependent, and moderator variables. Symbolic Interaction Theory helped explain the expected relationships between father-son relationship quality (independent variable) and the dependent and moderator variables (Figure 1). Men’s Relational Theory aided in explaining the expected relationship between father-son relationship quality and gender role stress. Finally, Self-in-Relation Theory helped
explain the expected relationship between father-son relationship quality and the outcomes variables of adult relationship satisfaction and parenting behaviors.

*Symbolic Interaction.* Symbolic interaction theory is extremely helpful in understanding the process by which boys form their sense of identity, which refers to self-meanings in roles. A role is a set of shared norms applied to the occupants of social positions because it focuses on the connection between symbols (shared meanings) and interactions with others. It aids family scientists in understanding how humans create symbolic worlds and how these worlds shape human behavior (LaRossa & Reitzes, 1993). Symbolic interaction posits that human beings act toward things on the basis of meanings they have developed. Meaning arises in the interaction between people. These meanings are handled in and modified through an interpretive process used by the person in dealing with things he or she encounters. Individuals are not born with a sense of self but develop self concepts through self interaction (LaRossa et al, 1993).

The masculine gender is a social concept with the symbolic meaning of strength, competitiveness, autonomy, self-confidence, assertiveness, and instrumentality. The meaning that a man places upon his masculinity is modeled for his son and becomes a shared family meaning surrounding gender, particularly the male gender. The son then continues to develop his own self concept as he interacts with others and himself in his male role.

In this study, the meaning of masculinity and the stress caused by dissonance between role expectations a man holds for himself and his role performance are thought to be intertwined with his relationship with his father. The interaction from father to son is thought to act as the catalyst to a healthy set of identity meanings including gender
identity, romantic relationship identity, and parental identity. Therefore, if the data collected shows a significant relationship between the father-son relationship quality and the three dependent variables (gender role stress, relationship satisfaction, and parental behaviors), then this will support symbolic interaction theory. Also, the relationship between father-son relationship quality and the two dependent variables of relationship satisfaction and parental behaviors will remain significant even when controlling for gender role stress as a moderating variable.

**Men’s Relational Theory.** A father-figure is particularly important for the development of his son’s sense of gendered self. Chodorow (1978) writes that a male identification figure is necessary concerning males’ identity configuration. According to Men’s Relational Theory (Patton, 2003), a father’s involvement with his son is significant for a son’s development and is predictive of positive psychological outcomes. A father’s expressiveness, positive affect, and his communication with his son are the positive behaviors that aid in the son’s healthy development. Without warm and open communication between a father and son, a young man may become confused as he develops his gendered sense of self.

If Men’s Relational Theory holds true, a warm and open father-son relationship will show a significant negative association with gender role stress. The measure utilized in the current study evaluates the expressiveness and communication that this theory emphasizes as essential to a boy’s gender identity formation. Therefore, without this positive interaction from father to son, the dissonance between gender role expectation and role performance will cause high amounts of stress. Conversely, a high degree of
warmth and openness in the father-son relationship will act as a buffer against masculine gender role stress when the son matures.

*Self-in-Relation Theory.* Self-in-Relation theory is a theory that has developed from a feminist theoretical perspective. While it was originally developed to explain the process by which women develop their sense-of-self through relationships with other women, the notion of self-in-relation also involves an important shift in the emphasis from separation to connection as the basis for self-experience and self-development (Manhal-Baugus, 1998). The assumption is that the self is organized and developed through practice with others where the goal is the increasing development of mutually empathic relationships. Boys and men form more rigid boundaries between the self and others (Allen, & Stoltenberg, 1995) and therefore the idea of separation and individuation is specifically reflective of healthy male development. Men’s gender roles are defined by achievement whereas women’s roles are defined by relationships (Creedy, Nizette, & Henderson, 1998). Marrocco (2002) applied self-in-relation theory with three assertions: (a) boys receive their gendered sense of self from their fathers, (b) a father’s empathy aids in the son’s developmental process, and (c) warmth and nurturance are associated with positive psychological outcomes. Therefore, without the warmth and openness in the father-son relationship that Men’s Relational Theory asserts is so imperative in gender identity formation, a young man may also struggle in forming a meaningful relationship with himself and others.

This theory is helpful in predicting the relationship between father-son relationship quality and the two relational outcomes of adult relationship satisfaction and parenting behaviors. The warmth and nurturance experienced in the father-son
relationship lays the ground work for the son’s future relationships. The father teaches the son how to relate to others as a man and as a family member. If Men’s Relational Theory is supported and the relationship between father and son is open, warm, and guiding, the son’s adult relationship satisfaction should be high and the parental behaviors he uses with his own son will be positive. Equally so, if this theory is supported and father-son relationship quality is low, the son’s adult relationship satisfaction should be low and the parental behaviors he uses with his own son will be mainly negative in nature.

Summary

Father-son relationship quality is essential for a son’s healthy development of identity. The father models through his actions and communications with his son what it means to be a masculine man. The son then, in turn, internalizes these meanings of masculinity and creates a sense of gendered self. The son continues to process these meanings of gendered self and adopts a set of role expectations. If his perception of his role performance matches this set of role expectations, he has a low level of gender role stress (see Figure 1). However, if there is dissonance between the son’s internalized role expectations and his perceived role performance, then there will be a high degree of gender role stress. A high degree of gender role stress is theorized to cause low adult relationship satisfaction and negative parental behaviors in the son. Low levels of gender role stress should predict high adult relationship satisfaction and positive parental behaviors.

Modeling is a significant component of Symbolic Interaction Theory. This suggests that there are possible extraneous variables in this concept model. The father’s
modeling of his own parental behaviors may influence the target son’s parental behaviors towards his own son. Also, the parents’ relationship may create a model for the son’s adult romantic relationships and affect his own adult relationship satisfaction.

It is well documented in family studies research that parents pass down many social constructs including gender identity. The quality of the father-son relationship may therefore affect the confusion surrounding this gender identity and be associated with gender identity stress or masculine gender role stress. Most research on masculine gender role stress is based upon the investigation of destructive behavior such as substance abuse and domestic violence. However, stress surrounding a masculine identity and failure to perform accordingly may affect a man's familial relationship in less severe manifestations such as relationship satisfaction and parenting behaviors. This study is meant to explore the relationships between father-son relationship quality, masculine gender role stress, adult relationship satisfaction, and parenting behaviors. The researcher expects to find that father-son relationship quality is negatively associated with masculine gender role stress, positively associated with adult relationship satisfaction, and positively associated with positive parenting behaviors. It is also expected that masculine gender role stress will be negatively associated with adult relationship satisfaction and positively associated with negative parenting behaviors.
Figure 1
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CHAPTER 3
CURRENT STUDY

Purpose of the Current Study

The purpose of this study is to examine father-son relationship quality and its correlation with gender role stress. This study also analyzes whether the father-son relationship is associated with the son’s adult relationship satisfaction and parental behaviors. The relationships between gender role stress and the two outcomes (adult relationship satisfaction and parental behaviors) are also examined.

Research Questions

1. Is Father-Son Relationship Quality negatively associated with Gender Role Stress?

2. Is Father-Son Relationship Quality positively associated with Adult Relationship Satisfaction?

3. Is the association between Father-Son Relationship Quality and Adult Relationship Satisfaction moderated by gender role stress?

4. Is the Father-Son Relationship Quality positively associated with Parental Behaviors including positive parenting, monitoring, rules, discipline, material rewarding, and autonomy granting?

5. Is the association between Father-Son Relationship Quality and Parental Behaviors moderated by Gender Role Stress?

6. Is Gender Role Stress negatively associated with Adult Relationship Satisfaction?

7. Is Gender Role Stress associated with negative parental behaviors including inconsistent discipline, harsh punishment, and ignoring?
8. Does the relationship between the Father-Son Relationship Quality and Parenting Behaviors remain significant when controlling for social desirability?
CHAPTER 4

METHODS

Participants

A convenience sample was drawn from a protestant men’s organization in the Metro-Atlanta area. Those members were subsequently encouraged to pass that survey link on to anyone they thought would be interested in participating. The participants were adult men aged 25 to 60 who were both in a committed romantic relationship and had one or more sons who are at least 5-years-old. The son may be biological, adopted, or a step-child. However, the participant must be considered the primary father-figure by the son and must have had a self-defined relationship with his own father-figure (biological, adopted, or step-father).

This sample consists of 53 men with a mean age of 48.91 years and a mean of 1.29 marriages. Of the 53 participants, 50 are currently married, 1 cohabitating, 1 dating in a committed relationship, and 1 did not answer the question. They have a mean of 2.48 children (ranging 1 to 4) and a mean of 1.63 sons (ranging 1 to 4) with the target son being a mean age of 14.47 years (ranging 5 to 38). Fifty of the participants are the biological fathers to their target sons, 1 is the step-father, and 1 is unspecified. The step-father has been married for 22.5 years, his step-son is 28 years old, and he has been the son’s primary father-figure for 23.5 years. 52 reported themselves as being Caucasian and 1 as Asian. On a scale from 1 (not at all religious) to 7 (extremely religious), the participants report themselves to be a mean of 5.4. Only 39 of the 53 participants completed the study in its entirety.
The participants completed a scale measuring their compliance to social desirability. When controlling for the variable of social desirability, none of the correlations between the other variables being tested were affected. Therefore, while the participants are fairly religious, they did not complete any of the measures with the goal of being socially desirable. Rather, they completed the measures honestly and in a way that was true to the way they act in their own lives.

*Measures*

Father-Son relationship quality is measured using the Parent-Adolescent Relationship Quality Scale. Masculine Gender Role Stress Scale is used to assess the participant’s gender role stress. The Couple Behavior Report measures the participant’s relationship satisfaction. The Ghent Parental Behavior Scale measures both negative and positive parenting behaviors.

*Parent-Adolescent Relationship Quality Scale.* This scale measuring general quality of the relationship between a father and adolescent son was administered to the fathers in retrospect (see Appendix A). It is a brief 6-item scale with each item ranging from 1 (*Almost never*) to 5 (*very much*) and accurately measures the father’s perception of his relationship with his own father during his adolescence. Moller and Stattin (2001) found an alpha value of .92 for their scale (not retrospective).

This measure was aggregated over several years and the scores were averaged over the ages involved. The average year-to-year correlations were used as measures of stability. The measure was also tested on a simple random sample of 212 participants born between 1955 and 1958 in a suburb of Stockholm, Sweden. Although the demographics of these participants were checked for their representativeness in Sweden,
it is not yet tested as to the validity of this scale in America. Validity was not overtly addressed in the Moller and Stattin (2001) study.

**Masculine Gender Role Stress Scale.** The MGRS Scale (Eisler & Skidmore, 1987) is a 40-item self-report inventory that measures the degree to which men appraise how stressful or threatening specific situations are for them. Responses on each item range from 0 (*not at all stressful*) to 5 (*extremely stressful*) and are summed for a total possible score of 200 (see Appendix B). Factor analysis conducted by Eisler and Skidmore revealed that MGRS items cluster around the following dimensions: Physical Inadequacy, Emotional Inexpressiveness, Subordination to Women, Intellectual Inferiority, and Performance Failure.

Although internal validity was not addressed by Moore and Stuart (2004), they examined reliability by administering the measure to 80 undergraduate psychology students with a mean age of 19.4 years (SD=1.16). The participants were 80% Caucasian and reported 100% single marital status. The MGRS Scale yields adequate test–retest reliability ($r = .93$), and the measure has high internal consistency ($\alpha = .90$; Moore & Stuart, 2004). Further research is needed in order to test this measure on other populations.

**Couple Behavior Report.** This 36-item scale consists of six 6-item scales (see Appendix C) measuring (a) salutary recognition, acknowledging the partner, (b) small talk, engaging the partner in “everyday” conversation, (c) ego-building comments, praising the partner, (d) expanding memories, reminiscing about times shared together, (e) exciting activities, engaging in mutually interesting activities, and (f) feedback,
mutual honesty including encouragement and correction. This scale is brief and it predicts other relationship satisfaction measures.

In Shumway and Wampler’s (2002) measure development study, couples with distressed relationships scored significantly lower on the CBR than those in non-distressed couples, F(1, 128)=92.80, p < .001. This demonstrates that the items measure the construct they are meant to measure. In order to assess criterion validity, the total CBR score was also used to predict attachment in the Adult Attachment Scale. An ANOVA indicated that the attachment groups were significantly different in CBR scores, F(2,130)=9.72, p < .001.

Shumway and Wampler did not conduct a simple random sample. Their sample was a convenience sample consisting of 60 participants from the campus MFT clinic and 250 participants from the community EAP clinic. These couples over represent those in long-term marriages committed to staying together ("86.4% married/remarried” p. 314). In order to obtain content validity, an expert panel of faculty and doctoral students evaluated an original scale of 55 items on their relevance to the six scales. The revised 36 items were administered to 211 undergraduate students in order to confirm these items. The effect of gender and ethnicity were also investigated. There were no significant gender or ethnicity differences in CBP score. However, only Anglo and Hispanic participants were tested. Further research is needed in order to test whether scores differ among other ethnic groups such as Asian-Americans and African-Americans. The alpha score for the entire scale is .98 and is no smaller than .83 for each individual scale (Shumway & Wampler, 2002).
Ghent Parental Behavior Scale. The Ghent Parental Behavior Scale (GPBS; Van Leeuwen, 1999; Van Leeuwen & Vermulst, 2004) was developed in Belgium and based upon social learning theories (see Appendix D). The original version (Van Leeuwen, 1999) was written in Flemish and consisted of 30 experimental items. In 2004, Van Leeuwen and Vermulst combined these 30 items with 25 new items and assigned them each item to one of the ten scales: Positive Involvement (making time for the child, showing interest), Monitoring (supervision of the activities of the child), Rules (teaching the child appropriate behavior), Discipline (punishment of the child when it misbehaves), Inconsistent Discipline (punishment in an inconsistent way), Harsh Punishment (corporal punishment and verbal blaming), Ignoring (neglecting unwanted behavior), Positive Reinforcement (rewarding good behavior of the child), Problem Solving (solving problems together with the child), and Autonomy (stimulating autonomous behavior of the child). The categories of problem solving, positive reinforcement, and positive involvement were not found to be “retrievable” (Van Leeuwen & Vermulst, 2004, p. 286) using factor analysis and were combined into one category labeled Positive Parenting.

The authors checked parenting behaviors against parental stress as a criterion variable. They found that increasing parental stress is related to decreased positive parenting \((r = -.35, p \leq .001)\), rules \((r = -.20, p \leq .001)\), and autonomy \((r = -.14, p \leq .001)\) and increased inconsistent discipline \((r = .26, p \leq .001)\), harsh punishing \((r = .15, p \leq .001)\), ignoring \((r = .23, p \leq .001)\), and discipline \((r = .13, p \leq .01)\). All of these factors can be subdivided into two categories of Support and Control. Cronbach’s alphas for the Support dimension (with 21 items) varies between .86 and .90 and for the Negative Control dimension (14 items) between .80 and .87.
The authors still view this measure as an instrument “in progress.” It has only been administered to a Belgian population. However, the validity and reliability in Belgium are promising and it deserves to be tested in the newer English version. However, some of the words have been changed by the current study researcher to account for better cultural understanding.

*Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale (short form).* Due to the religious population from which this sample is drawn, the survey also includes the M-C SDS short form (Zook & Sipps, 1985). It is important to be certain that participants are answering sensitive items regarding the father-son relationship and gender role stress truthfully instead of in a manner that the participants may believe a “good Christian” should answer. The Original scale (Crowne & Marlowe, 1960) includes 33 true/false questions with 15 reverse scored items. This measure is particularly desirable due to its measurement of social desirability excluding maladjustment or psychopathology. One of Crowne and Marlowe’s (1960) objectives in developing this scale was to assess everyday stressors as opposed to uniquely pathological ones. Each of the items is scored with a point if answered in a socially desirable manner (see Appendix E). One such question is, “I’m always willing to admit it when I make a mistake.” An answer of “true” would receive a point whereas an answer of “false” would receive no point. The possible scores range from 0 to 10. For the reverse scored items (such as “I sometimes try to get even rather than forgive and forget.”) an answer of “false” would receive a point whereas an answer of “true” would not.

Crowne and Marlowe compiled a number of previously developed scales and asked faculty and graduate students from the Department of Psychology at Ohio State
University to rate the items on cultural approval and minimalism of pathology or abnormal implications. This process revealed 36 items with unanimous agreement and another 11 items with 90% agreement. These 47 items were then presented to an additional ten judges (consisting of faculty and graduate students) who were asked to rate them on a 5-point likert scale ranging from extremely well-adjusted (1) to extremely maladjusted (5). They found a mean rating for all the items in the M-C SDS to be 2.8 which indicates the questions neither implying extreme well-adjustment or extreme maladjustment.

The internal consistency coefficient using Kuder-Richardson formula 20 is $\alpha = .88$. The test-retest correlation is $\alpha = .89$. The M-C SDS is also highly correlated with the Edwards SDS (Edwards, 1957; $r = .35, p<.01$) and significantly correlated with the MMPI Lie scale (Meehl & Hathaway, 1946; $r = .54, p \leq .01$). Although this is an older form of measurement, most research today is still conducted using the M-C SDS scale (i.e., Carrere, Buehlman, Gottman, Coan, & Ruckstuhl, 2000).

**Procedure**

An on-line survey link with an explanation of the project was e-mailed to the listserve of that group. The e-mail also requested that the participants pass the link on to anyone who may be interested in participating. Men interested in participating were asked to log on to the www.surveymonkey.com link and complete the survey. After reading consent form and continuing the survey in consent, the participants filled out demographic information questions (see Appendix F) and the five scales: Moller Parent-Adolescent Relationship Quality Scale, Masculine Gender Role Stress Scale, Couple Behavior Report, Ghent Parental Behavior Scale, and Marlowe-Crowne Social
Desirability Scale. The Moller Parent-Adolescent Relationship Quality Scale was filled out retrospectively whereas the other three scales are based upon the present.

It is possible that filling out the retrospective measure on Parent-Adolescent Relationship Quality may have conjured up negative thoughts, feelings, and memories. The participants were informed of this possibility on the consent form and could choose not to participate. If these negative thoughts, feelings, or memories did arise, the participants were provided with counseling contact information. The participants also had the chance to a drawing for a $75 gift certificate to Long Horn Steak House. It was the thought of the researcher that the certificate to this family restaurant would encourage fathers to participate. The men e-mailed the researcher with their contact information if they chose to participate in the drawing.

**Analyses**

Correlations and regressions were conducted for research questions one through eight. There were some missing data with which to contend. If more than ten percent of the data from a particular measure were left unanswered, then that measure was not scored. However, if less than ten percent of the data were left unanswered, then those values were calculated using the other data within that measure. This procedure is referred to as mean substitution and considered to be a more conservative method of replacing missing data since it does not change the mean of that variable (Rothman, 1989). The measures placed earlier within the overall survey were completed by a larger sample than measures placed later on in the survey. There were no missing data for the Parent-Adolescent Relationship Quality Scale. Missing data within the Masculine Gender Role Stress Scale were calculated within the subscales. If an item was left
unanswered within the Physical Inadequacy subscale, the mean of the other items within that scale was calculated and replaced the missing data item. The same was done for Emotional Inexpressiveness, Subordination to Women, Intellectual Inferiority, and Performance Failure. Missing data within the Couple Behavior Report and the Ghent Parental Behavior Scale were also replaced by the mean of the subscales. There were no missing data for the Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale.
CHAPTER 5

RESULTS

Analysis consisted of correlations and ordinary least square regressions in order to account for the moderating variable of gender role stress. All correlations are presented in Tables 1 through 5. In order for a correlation coefficient to be considered significant in this study, it must have a $p$ value of less than .05. The ordinary least squares regression analysis tested whether there was a moderating effect between the variables. A moderator may be either a categorical or continuous variable that influences the relationship between an independent and dependent variable (Baron & Kenny, 1986). The moderator variable influences both the direction and strength of the relationship. For this study the moderating analyses looked at the influence gender role stress had on the relationship between father-son relationship quality and the dependent variables. For example, it was expected that there would be a positive relationship between father-son relationship quality and adult relationship satisfaction. However, high gender role stress experienced by the participant, if a moderator variable, should affect the significance of the relationship between father-son relationship quality and adult relationship satisfaction. According to the regression method laid out by Baron and Kenny (1986), the researcher ran the regression adding an interaction term formed by multiplying the independent variable by the potential moderator. If the interaction terms are significant, then a moderating relationship is established.

Father-Son Relationship Quality and Gender Role Stress

A correlation coefficient of -.0223 (n.s.) was computed between father-son relationship quality and gender role stress. Although, the correlation between father-son
relationship quality and gender role stress was not significant, correlation analyses between father-son relationship quality and the subscales of gender role stress were also conducted (see Table 1). There is a significant correlation between father-son relationship quality and performance failure.

**Father-Son Relationship Quality and Adult Relationship Satisfaction**

The correlation coefficient was computed between father-son relationship quality and adult relationship satisfaction. The results of the correlation analysis demonstrate that $r = .165$, n.s. This correlation is not significant. Correlation analyses between father-son relationship quality and the subscales of adult relationship satisfaction were also conducted but none were significant (see Table 2).

**Father-Son Relationship Quality and Adult Relationship Satisfaction Moderated by Gender Role Stress**

An ordinary least squares regression analysis was conducted to evaluate whether father-son relationship quality predicted the adult relationship satisfaction with the gender role stress as a moderator. The goal was to determine whether father-son relationship quality and adult relationship satisfaction remained correlated when factoring in gender role stress. The 95% confidence interval was -.042 to .008. The correlation between these variables was $r = .267$ and approximately 7.1% of the variance of adult relationship satisfaction was accounted for by father-son relationship quality moderated by gender role stress.

**Father-Son Relationship Quality and Positive Parenting Behaviors**

The correlation coefficient of 0.127 (n.s.) was computed between father-son relationship quality and positive parenting behaviors. Correlation analyses between
father-son relationship quality and the subscales of positive parenting behaviors were also conducted but none of those correlations were significant either (see Table 3).

**Father-Son Relationship Quality and Positive Parenting Behaviors Moderated by Gender Role Stress**

An ordinary least squares regression analysis was conducted to evaluate whether father-son relationship quality predicted positive parenting behaviors with the gender role stress as a moderator. The 95% confidence interval was -.019 to .001. The correlation between these variables was $r = .305$ and approximately 9.3% of the variance of positive parenting behaviors is accounted for by father-son relationship quality moderated by gender role stress.

**Gender Role Stress and Adult Relationship Satisfaction**

The correlation coefficient of -0.245 (n.s.) was computed between gender role stress and adult relationship satisfaction. Although the correlation was not significant, correlation analyses between the subscales of gender role stress and the subscales of adult relationship satisfaction were also conducted (Table 4). There were significant correlations between emotional inexpressiveness and expanding memories, exciting activities, feedback, and small-talk. There were also significant correlations between intellectual inferiority and expanding memories and small-talk.

**Gender Role Stress and Negative Parenting Behaviors**

The correlation coefficient of -0.117 (n.s.) was computed between gender role stress and negative parenting behaviors. Although, the correlation was not significant, correlation analyses between the gender role stress and the subscales of negative
parenting behaviors were also conducted (see Table 5). There was a significant correlation between gender role stress and harsh punishment.

_Father-Son Relationship Quality and Positive Parenting Behaviors Controlled for Social Desirability_

A partial correlation coefficient was computed between father-son relationship quality and positive parenting behaviors controlling for social desirability. The results of the correlation analysis demonstrated that $r = .133, n.s.$, which confirms that social desirability was not a significant factor in the participant’s answers.
CHAPTER 6
DISCUSSION

Although no correlations between the variables in the research questions were significant, several significant correlations between subscales within those variables were statistically significant. For example, the correlations between father-son relationship quality and the subscale of performance failure was significant. This suggests that, although there is no association between the overall closeness between a fathers and sons and the uniquely masculine stressors that sons experience, there is a negative relationship between the closeness of fathers and sons and the stress experienced by sons due to perceived performance failure. Those participants with relationships with their fathers that were closer and more open during their teenage years were less likely to feel the pressure and stress of performance failure.

Similarly, several of the subscales have significant correlations. Emotional inexpressiveness is significantly correlated with expanding memories, exciting activities, feedback, and small-talk. The subscale of gender role stress also approaches near significance with ego-building comments. These correlations are between a stress surrounding emotional inexpressiveness and the couple behaviors that involve communication skills. Intellectual inferiority is significantly correlated with expanding memories and small-talk. It also nears significance in its correlation with salutary recognition.

No significant correlation was found between gender role stress and negative parenting behaviors. However, there was a significant correlation between gender role stress and harsh punishment. Participants who experience high levels of stress due to
uniquely masculine stressors are more likely to report engaging in harsh punishment behaviors with their own sons. There was no significant correlation between gender role stress and adult relationship satisfaction.

In this study, there was no significant direct correlation between father-son relationship quality and adult relationship satisfaction. Therefore, the father-son relationship quality continues to have no relationship with adult relationship satisfaction when accounting for gender role stress as a moderating variable.

There was no significant correlation found between father-son relationship quality and positive parenting behaviors. Therefore, the father-son relationship quality has no relationship with positive parenting behaviors when accounting for gender role stress as a moderating variable.

Although there were no significant correlations between any of the scales, there are some conclusions that may be drawn when considering the partial correlation between father-son relationship quality and positive parenting behaviors when controlling for social desirability. Since the non-significant correlation of these variables did not even approach significance, it is unlikely that the participants were influenced by social desirability when filling out this study.

*Study Findings in Relation to Previous Research*

The findings of this study only loosely support the previous research conducted in this field of study. As previously written, Marroco (2002) have found that warmth and nurturance communicated from father to son is associated with positive psychological outcomes. Floyd and Mormon (2003) also have found that the father-son relationship later impacts the target son’s relationship with his own son. Therefore, there should be
significant direct correlations between the father-son relationship quality scale (which measures the warmth and openness of the given relationship) and the two dependent variables of adult relationship satisfaction and parenting behaviors. This study has not served to support those previous findings. However, Cox (2004) did assert that a father’s relationship with his children is particularly important in supporting the children’s competence in the world outside of the family. Perhaps, due to the limitations of this study, this relationship was not strong enough to be detected, but would appear if those limitations were addressed in future research.

Although the findings of this study do not lend support for previous research showing correlations between father-son relationship quality and a son’s later family relationships, they do support research that has examined gender role stress. Fischer and Good (1998) find that men rate their relationships with their parents as more secure, positive, and conflict free if they report less gender role stress. In this study, there was no direct correlation between father-son relationship quality and gender role stress as a whole. However, there was a strong negative correlation between father-son relationship quality and stress surrounding the subscale of performance failure. Therefore, the higher quality the father-son relationship, the less stress a son experiences due to his own performance failure.

Certain aspects (i.e. subscales) of gender role stress are also strongly correlated with adult relationship satisfaction and negative parenting behaviors. The strong correlations between emotional inexpressiveness and intellectual inferiority and several aspects of adult relationship satisfaction (expanding memories, exciting activities, feedback, and small-talk) aids in further supporting Pleck (1995) and Sharpe, and
Heppner’s (1991) findings that men with less gender role stress experience increased relationship satisfaction and higher intimacy levels. Men who feel less threatened by expressing emotions and being seen as intellectually inferior are more satisfied in their communications with their romantic partners. This supports Murray et al.’s (2002) assertion that people with low self-esteem have trouble finding the sense of felt security in a partner’s continued positive regard and love necessary to risk feelings of closeness and attachment. Concerning parenting behaviors, the participants of this study who experience higher levels of gender role stress also engage in more harsh punishment practices while parenting their own sons. This also supports Pleck’s (1981; 1995) findings that gender role stress negatively affects family contexts.

Theory

In order for this study to support Symbolic Interaction theory, there would need to have been strong correlations between father-son relationship quality and all three dependent variables. Since father-son relationship quality was correlated with the performance failure aspect of gender role stress, the theory that a father models the meaning of masculinity for the son is partially supported. However, there was no clear correlation between father-son relationship quality and adult relationship satisfaction or positive parenting behaviors. Therefore, the tenets of symbolic interaction theory are only a partially supported by this study’s findings.

Men’s Relational theory was the basis for the hypothesis that father-son relationship quality is related to gender role stress. According to this theory, a father’s involvement with his son is significant for a son’s development and is predictive of positive psychological outcomes. Since the men in this study whose father-son
relationship was higher in both warmth and openness report less stress surrounding performance failure, this theory is partially supported.

Self-in-Relation theory asserts that people create a sense of self based upon their interactions with themselves and others. Specifically, in this study, it is used to assert that a father teaches the son how to relate to others as a man and as a family member. Since there were no correlations between father-son relationship quality and the two outcome variables (adult relationship satisfaction and parenting behaviors), this theory is not supported in this study.

Limitations

Because the sample for this study was drawn from a church organization in a traditional southern town, the subjects consist of protestant, mainly Caucasian, middle class sample. Therefore, the findings are limited to applying to similar populations. Also, since neither the subjects’ fathers nor their sons provided data, only the perception of a middle-aged cohort is being represented. Therefore, there is no way to generalize the findings to younger or older cohorts. Since this is a snowballed convenience sample, those who are highly invested enough in the institution to read the newsletter and feel invested in furthering research and education are over represented. Volunteers tend to have characteristics that differ from the general population as well. There may be characteristics of those who did not volunteer to participate in research that would change the results. Also, the Parent-Adolescent Relationship Quality Scale was not originally created as a retrospective measure. This may affect the results of that scale since the measure is filled out retrospectively in this study. Although the scale has high reliability and validity as a measure of a relationship in the present, it may not remain so when filled
out later on after time and subsequent experiences and interactions may have warped the participants’ memories of the adolescent relationship.

Power and effect size due to a small sample are the most significant limitations of this study. The original goal of the researcher was to achieve a power of .8 and a medium effect size. This would require a sample of 84 participants (Whitley, 2002). Since only 39 participants completed the study in its entirety, the study has a power of about .9 and could detect only a large effect. If this study were to be conducted again with a larger sample, the correlations may have been significant.

The sample size for this study is greatly affected by the limitations placed upon the target population by the researcher. Since the participants are required to be men 25-60 who had a relationship with their own fathers during their teenage years, are in a committed romantic relationship, and have a son at least 5 years old, many men who were willing to participate could not. If a man’s father died when he was 10 years old, is not in a relationship, or is 61 years old himself, he did not qualify. Future research may rectify this by either conducting a longitudinal study or evaluating all three generations involved.

The length of the survey also affected the sample size. Since there are several variables involved and each variable consists of several survey items, many participants did not fully complete the entire 149 item survey. This may have been due to personal time constraints or fatigue. Either way, the order of measure placement within the survey affected which measures were completed by more participants than other measures. Therefore, the father-son relationship quality variable has a largest sample size and the social desirability scale has the smallest. And since the sample size affects an analysis
reaching significance, the measure placement of the various variables also affects whether or not a correlation reaches significance. Fortunately, the overall sample sizes for the analyses conducted range from 39 to 42, which is not a large difference.

Since the survey was conducted on-line, participants were more likely to feel anonymous and therefore be more honest than they would be while filling it out in a group setting. However, if a participant experienced stress due to technology or computers, this may be a threat to validity. This is why a survey item assessing whether the survey being conducted on-line made the survey easier, the same, or harder to complete was included. Of the 40 participants who answered the question concerning how filling the survey out on-line affected them, 39 answered that it was easier filling it out on-line than on paper and 1 answered that it was the same. None found the survey being conducted on-line to be more difficult or stressful. However, the participants did self-select themselves knowing that the survey would be on-line. Perhaps those prospective participants who experience stress due to technology issues simply did not choose to participate.

*Future Implications*

This study contributes to the growing body of literature on the significance of the father-son relationship and the outcomes with which it may be associated. It may aid in the implementation of a community outreach program that will promote the involvement of fathers in the guidance of a son’s behavior with both spouses and children. It is also hoped that this study may aid therapists in promoting the relational involvement of the father when sons are demonstrating negative or antisocial behaviors.
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APPENDIX A

PARENT-ADOLESCENT RELATIONSHIP QUALITY SCALE

1. How much does your father mean to you?
   1  2  3  4  5
   nothing at all  very much

2. Does your father talk with you about his problems?
   1  2  3  4  5
   never  always

3. How much interest does your father show you?
   1  2  3  4  5
   very little  very much

4. If you need advice on important questions, how often do you turn to your father?
   1  2  3  4  5
   almost never  almost always

5. How warm are your father’s feelings for you today?
   1  2  3  4  5
   no warm feelings at all  very warm feelings

6. How warm are your feelings for your father?
   1  2  3  4  5
   no warm feelings at all  very warm feelings
APPENDIX B

MASCULINE GENDER ROLE STRESS SCALE

1  2  3  4  5
Not at all stressful Extremely stressful

Factor 1: Physical Inadequacy

Feeling that you are not in good physical condition
Not being able to find a sexual partner
Having your lover say that she/he is not satisfied
Being perceived by someone as “gay”
Losing in a sports competition
Being perceived as having feminine traits
Appearing less athletic than a friend
Being compared unfavorably to men
Knowing you cannot hold your liquor as well as others

Factor 2: Emotional Inexpressiveness

Telling your spouse that you love him/her
Telling someone that you feel hurt by what she/he said
Admitting that you are afraid of something
Having your children see you cry
Talking with a woman who is crying
Comforting a male friend who is upset
Having a man put his arm around your shoulder

Factor 3: Subordination to Women

Being outperformed at work by a woman
Having a female boss
Letting a woman take control of the situation
Being married to someone who makes more money than you
Being with a woman who is more successful than you
Being outperformed in a game by a woman
Needing your spouse to work to help support the family
Admitting to your friends that you do housework
Being with a woman who is much taller than you

Factor 4: Intellectual Inferiority

Having to ask for directions when you are lost
Working with people who seem more ambitious than you
Talking with a “feminist”
Having people say that you are indecisive
Having others say that you are too emotional
Working with people who are brighter than you
Staying home during the day with a sick child

Factor 5: Performance Failure

Being unemployed
Not making enough money
Finding you lack the occupational skills to succeed
Being unable to perform sexually
Being too tired for sex when your lover initiates it
Being unable to become sexually aroused when you want
Getting passed over for a promotion

Getting fired from your job
APPENDIX C

COUPLE BEHAVIOR REPORT (CBR)

1. My partner and I help each other feel unique in our relationship (EB)
2. When my partner and I get together after a long day, we say hello to each other (SR)
3. My partner and I talk about the special things we have done in the past (M)
4. My partner and I do things together that are fun (EA)
5. It is hard to know where we stand in our relationship (F**)
6. My partner and I talk only when we want to discuss important matters (ST**)
7. We can correct each other without a lot of hurt feelings (EB)
8. We just don’t seem to remember to say hello to each other (SR**)
9. When my partner and I get together, we enjoy talking about our favorite memories (M)
10. Fun activities are a priority in our relationship (EA)
11. We have a hard time expressing approval or disapproval regarding the other’s behavior (F**)
12. We regularly sit and talk about things we both enjoy (ST)
13. When my partner or I make a mistake, we try to encourage each other in a positive way (EB)
14. We show that we are happy to see each other by the things we say and do (SR)
15. We look at pictures and scrapbooks and remember the “good old days” in our relationship (M)
16. Our relationship is boring (EA**)
17. My partner and I find it hard to know what the other has to say (ST)
18. We each enjoy listening to what the other has to say (ST)
19. My partner and I can tell each other about the things we like in our relationship (EB)
20. When we arrive home, we don’t notice each other or seem to care (SR**)
21. Talking with my partner is like talking about “old times” with a good friend (M)
22. I wish I was part of a relationship where we did more fun things together (EA**)
23. We are both clear about where we stand in our relationship (F)
24. My partner and I aren’t good at showing interest in what the other is saying (ST**)
25. My partner and I praise each other for the things we do well (EB)
26. My partner and I say hello to each other in verbal and nonverbal ways throughout the day (SR)
27. We don’t talk about important memories from our past (M**)
28. Fun activities are not a priority in our relationship (EA**)
29. We set aside time just to talk about “everyday” things (F)
30. My partner and I just don’t seem to have much to say to each other (SR)
31. In our relationship, we tell each other when one of us does something good (EB)
32. We often hug or kiss when we see each other (SR)
33. We’re happy just to sit and reminisce about our life together (M)
34. My partner and I do exciting thing together (EA)
35. We can express our true feelings in our relationship (F)
36. When we talk about things, we each seem to understand what the other is feeling (ST)

Subscale Abbreviations (**reverse coded)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ego-Building Comments (EB)</th>
<th>Exciting Activities (EA)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Salutary Recognition (SR)</td>
<td>Feedback (F)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expanding Memories (M)</td>
<td>Small-Talk (ST)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX D

GHENT PARENTAL BEHAVIOR SCALE SCALE-PARENT VERSION

(TRANSLATED FROM DUTCH)

On the following pages you will find some statements about handling your child. Read each statement carefully. Indicate for each statement how frequently you use this way of handling your child. You can choose from the following answer possibilities:

☐ never ☐ rarely ☐ sometimes ☐ often ☐ always

*Keep in mind that your answer is related to one and the same child.* It is possible that you think about some statements: “I should like to do it differently.” Nevertheless, indicate how you act in reality. There are no good or wrong answers. Please do not skip any items.

**Items (normally presented in a quasi-random order)**

*Positive Parenting*

pos1 I make time to listen to my child when he wants to tell me something.
pos2 When my child seems to have a problem, I discuss with him what is wrong.
pos3 In the evening I talk with my child about the past and the coming day.
pos4 When my child has a problem, we look together at different possible solutions.
pos5 I ask my child about his hobbies and interests.
pos6 I make excursions together with my child
=pos7 I compliment my child when he spontaneously helps me out (for instance with setting* the table)
pos8 When my child and I have a disagreement, we talk it over and we look together for a solution.
pos9 I do activities together with my child, because I know that my child likes it (for instance playing a game*, shopping together)
pos10 I give my child a compliment, hug, or a tap on the shoulder as a reward for good behavior.
pos11 When I see my child after a day of school, I make it possible to spend some time with him.

*Monitoring*

mon1 I keep track of the friends my child is seeing.
mon2 I keep track of the neighborhoods my child visits.
mon3 When my child goes* out somewhere on his own, I inquire if he has actually been there.
mon4 I ask my child how he spends his pocket money

*Rules*

rul1 I teach my child to be polite at school.
rul2 I teach my child to obey rules.
rul3 I teach my child to adapt to the habits of our family.
rul4 I teach my child to adapt to rules at school or at work.
rul5 I teach my child to handle his things with respect.
rul6 I teach my child respect for authority.*
rul7 I teach my child that it is important to behave properly.

**Discipline**
dis1 When my child doesn’t obey a rule (for instance: he comes home late without a valid reason; he has not completed a chore), then I punish him.
dis2 I punish my child when he makes a nuisance of himself (for instance because he nags, contradicts me, lies, argues).
dis3 When my child has done something wrong, I punish him by taking away something nice (for instance the child can’t watch TV, isn’t allowed to go out, has to be home earlier, has to go to bed earlier).
dis4 When my child has been misbehaving, I give him a chore for punishment.
dis5 When my child does something that I don’t want him to do, I punish him

dis6 It happens that I don’t punish my child after he has done something that is not allowed.

**Inconsistent Discipline**
inc1 When my child doesn’t obey a rule, it happens that I threaten with a punishment, but that in the end I don’t carry it out.
inc2 When I have punished my child, it happens that I let my child out of the punishment early.
inc3 Before I eventually give a punishment, I have told my child many times that I would punish his behavior.

**Harsh Punishment**
har1 I slap my child when he has done something wrong.
har2 I spank my child when he is disobedient or naughty.
har3 I shake my child when we have a fight.
har4 I spank my child when he doesn’t obey rules.

**Ignoring**
ign1 When my child does something that is not allowed, I give him an angry look and pretend he is not there.
ign2 When my child does something that is not allowed, I only talk to him again when he behaves better.
ign3 When my child does something that is not allowed, I give him an angry look and I ignore him afterward.
ign4 When my child does something that is not allowed, I don’t talk to him until he says sorry.

**Material Rewarding**
rew1  I give my child money or a small present when he has done something that I am happy about.
rew2  When my child has done his best, I allow something extra (for instance staying up later).
rew3  I let my child buy something when he has done something well.

*Autonomy*
aut1  I teach my child to solve his own problems.
aut2  I teach my child to make* his own decisions.
aut3  I teach my child that he is responsible for his own behavior.

*These items were corrected for better cultural understanding in the United States.*
APPENDIX E

THE MARLOWE-CROWNE SOCIAL DESIRABILITY SCALE (SHORT FORM)

Personal Reaction Inventory
Listed below are a number of statements concerning personal attitudes and traits. Read each item and decide whether the statement is true or false as it pertains to you personally. (Please circle the word)

1. I’m always willing to admit it when I make a mistake. TRUE FALSE
2. I like to gossip at times TRUE FALSE
3. There have been occasions when I took advantage of someone TRUE FALSE
4. I always try to practice what I preach TRUE FALSE
5. I never resent being asked to return a favor TRUE FALSE
6. I have never been irked when people expressed ideas very different from my own TRUE FALSE
7. I sometimes try to get even rather than forgive and forget TRUE FALSE
8. I have never deliberately said something that hurt someone’s feelings TRUE FALSE
9. At times I have really insisted on having things my own way TRUE FALSE
10. There have been occasions when I felt like smashing things TRUE FALSE
APPENDIX F

DEMOGRAPHICS

Age ______

Ethnicity (check all that apply): □ Caucasian □ African-American □ Pacific Islander
□ Asian □ Native American □ Latino/Hispanic

Number of Marriages ______

Length of current relationship (years/months) ________

How would you describe the status of your relationship? (Check one)
□ exclusively dating □ cohabitating □ common law relationship □ engaged □ married

Number of children ______

Number of sons ______

Age of target son (this is the son you will base all your answers on) __________

I am the □ biological, □ step-, □ adopted father of the target son.

If you are the adopted or step-father of your target son, how long have you been in the primary caregiving role? (years/months) ________

How religious are you?

1  2  3  4  5  6  7
Not at all somewhat extremely

Has using a computer made it more difficult or easier to complete this questionnaire?

A  More difficult
B  about the same
C  Easier
Table 1
Correlations Between Father-Son Relationship Quality and Gender Role Stress Subscales
(N = 43)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender Role Stress</th>
<th>Physical Inadequacy</th>
<th>Emotional Inexpressiveness</th>
<th>Subordination to Women</th>
<th>Intellectual Inferiority</th>
<th>Performance Failure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Father-Son</td>
<td>.023</td>
<td>-.047</td>
<td>-.196</td>
<td>-.241</td>
<td>.413*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship Quality</td>
<td>.882</td>
<td>.767</td>
<td>.207</td>
<td>.119</td>
<td>.006</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Correlation is significant at the .01 level
Table 2

Correlations Between Father-Son Relationship Quality and Adult Relationship Satisfaction Subscales (N = 42)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Adult Relationship Satisfaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ego-Building Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father-Son Relationship Quality</td>
<td>0.134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship Quality</td>
<td>0.398</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3

Correlations Between Father-Son Relationship Quality and Positive Parenting Behaviors
Subscales (N = 39)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positive Parenting Behaviors</th>
<th>Positive Monitoring</th>
<th>Rules</th>
<th>Discipline</th>
<th>Rewards</th>
<th>Autonomy Building</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Father-Son</td>
<td>.121</td>
<td>-.041</td>
<td>.113</td>
<td>-.002</td>
<td>.092</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship Quality</td>
<td>.451</td>
<td>.316</td>
<td>.801</td>
<td>.487</td>
<td>.991</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4
Correlations Between Gender Role Stress Subscales and Adult Relationship Satisfaction
Subscales (N = 42)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender Role Stress Subscales</th>
<th>Adult Relationship Satisfaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Physical</td>
<td>Ego-Building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subordination</td>
<td>Salutary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intellectual</td>
<td>Recognition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance</td>
<td>Expanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequity</td>
<td>Memories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inexpressiveness</td>
<td>Exciting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to Women</td>
<td>Activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inferiority</td>
<td>Feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failure</td>
<td>Small-Talk</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Ego-Building | .045 | -.293* | .069 | -.148 | -.080 |
| Comments     | .776 | .059 | .665 | .350 | .616 |
| Salutary     | .000 | -.258 | .079 | -.287* | .114 |
| Recognition  | .998 | .100 | .619 | .065 | .474 |
| Expanding    | -.057 | -.358** | -.123 | -.321** | -.246 |
| Memories     | .718 | .020 | .439 | .038 | .116 |
| Exciting     | -.040 | -.342** | -.087 | -.205 | -.148 |
| Activities   | .803 | .027 | .586 | .194 | .349 |
| Feedback     | .004 | -.363** | -.155 | -.234 | -.281 |
|              | .982 | .018 | .327 | .135 | .072 |
| Small-Talk   | -.009 | -.317** | -.151 | -.368** | -.257 |
|              | .957 | .041 | .338 | .017 | .101 |

* Correlation reaches near significance
** Correlation is significant at the .05 level
Table 5
Correlations Between Gender Role Stress Subscales and Negative Parenting Behaviors
Subscales (N = 42)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender Role Stress</th>
<th>MGRS</th>
<th>Physical Inadequacy</th>
<th>Emotional Inexpressiveness</th>
<th>Subordination to Women</th>
<th>Intellectual Inferiority</th>
<th>Performance Failure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inconsistent</td>
<td>.227</td>
<td>.184</td>
<td>.201</td>
<td>-.016</td>
<td>.160</td>
<td>.298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discipline</td>
<td>.164</td>
<td>.263</td>
<td>.220</td>
<td>.921</td>
<td>.331</td>
<td>.065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harsh</td>
<td>-.346*</td>
<td>-.229</td>
<td>-.212</td>
<td>-.197</td>
<td>-.276</td>
<td>-.359*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Punishment</td>
<td>.031</td>
<td>.160</td>
<td>.195</td>
<td>.230</td>
<td>.089</td>
<td>.025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ignoring</td>
<td>-.072</td>
<td>-.259</td>
<td>.239</td>
<td>-.024</td>
<td>.010</td>
<td>-.179</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Correlation is significant at the .05 level