

Running head: INTACT VS. NOT INTACT FAMILIES AND CHILD OUTCOMES

Examining the Father-Child Relationship: Intact vs. Not Intact Families and Child

Outcomes of Academic Performance, Conduct, and Self-Esteem

Ashley Recker

Hanover College

Winter 2006

## Abstract

This study will be examining the different levels of father involvement with their children in intact as well as not intact families. Intact families are defined as those in which the biological father and biological mother are either married or living together. Not intact families are those in which the biological father and biological mother are either divorced, separated, or the biological father/other male influence is nonexistent. The study will survey individuals, eighteen years of age and older, by way of a self-report online questionnaire. The questionnaire will be given online to Hanover College students, as well as be made available nationally to the general public. The questionnaire includes basic demographic information, and measures of the father-child relationship. It also includes measures of child outcomes in the areas of academic performance, conduct, and self-esteem. It is hypothesized that individuals of intact families will have more positive outcomes than those of not intact families in regards to academic performance, conduct, and self-esteem. Secondly, it is also hypothesized that individuals, whose levels of the father-child relationship are lower, regardless of whether they come from intact or not intact families, will report more negative outcomes in academic performance, conduct, and self-esteem. The findings of this study will not only help further enhance the knowledge of the father-child relationship, but will also shed some light on what type of influence fathers have on child outcomes in the areas of academic performance, conduct and self-esteem.

### Examining the Father-Child Relationship: Intact vs. Not Intact Families and Child Outcomes of Academic Performance, Conduct, and Self-Esteem

Parents play a very important role in the lives of their children. Not only do they provide guidance and support, but they also greatly influence the outcomes of their children. Parents differ in a number of aspects. In particular, parenting styles play an important role in the development of their children. The four most commonly accepted parenting styles are authoritative, authoritarian, permissive, and uninvolved (Baumrind, 1991). Each of these four styles of parenting describes normal variations in the ways in which parents socialize and control their children. They each differ on levels of parental responsiveness and parental demandingness. Parental responsiveness is often described as how supportive or warm a parent is to their child. On the other hand, parental demandingness refers to how the parent controls the behavior of their child.

Authoritative parents are both responsive and demanding. They tend to be assertive with their children but not restrictive. These parents also use supportive disciplinary methods. For example, instead of using physical disciplinary techniques and yelling alone, they take the time to explain to their children what they did wrong and what the consequences for their actions are. These parents also encourage their children to be socially responsible and cooperative. They tend to be more open with their children and offer explanations for their rules and reasons for discipline. These parents are also more willing to listen to and negotiate with their children. Research shows that authoritative parenting styles help deter behavioral problems such as alcohol abuse (Patock-Peckham & Morgan-Lopez, 2006). Studies have also indicated that adolescents of authoritative parents are more likely to turn to their parents, rather than peers, when making decisions that have moral and informational issues (Bednar & Fisher, 2003).

Children of authoritative parents tend to display high cognitive and social competencies in childhood, as well as high self-esteem, academic achievement and social skills in adolescence (Shaffer, 1999).

Authoritarian parents are highly demanding but lack responsiveness. They are often classified as “disciplinarians”. They are highly oriented around obedience and provide very structured environments. These parents expect their children to accept their rules, discipline, judgment and values without questioning or having to provide an explanation. Empirical studies indicate that like Authoritative parenting styles, Authoritarian parenting also helps deter behavioral problems and drug use (Patock-Peckham & Morgan-Lopez, 2006). However, adolescents of authoritarian parents are more likely to turn to and refer to their peers, rather than parents, when making decisions that have moral and informational issues (Bednar & Fisher, 2003). Studies have also suggested that children of authoritarian parents tend to have average cognitive and social competencies, and average academic performance, average social skills and show greater conforming in adolescence (Shaffer, 1999).

Permissive parents are more responsive than they are demanding. They tend to be very lenient with their child and avoid confrontation. Patock-Peckham and Morgan-Lopez’s 2006 study also found that college students who had permissive parents have higher levels of impulsivity and have an increase in alcohol abuse as well as alcohol related problems. Research in the area has also found that adolescents who have permissive parents often become detached from their parents and become psychologically dependent on their peers, rather than developing a healthy autonomy (Devereux, 1972). They are also more likely to turn to their peers when making moral and informational

decisions (Bednar & Fisher, 2003). Children of permissive parents tend to score low on social and cognitive capacities in childhood. In adolescence they tend to have low academic performance, poor self-control, and greater drug use (Shaffer, 1999).

The fourth style of parenting is one of the least common, yet has the potential to be, in extreme cases, the most detrimental type of parenting. The uninvolved parent has little or no responsiveness, and little or no demandingness. While this type of parenting falls in the normal range of parenting styles, in extreme cases it can lead to rejecting and/or neglectful parents (Baumrind, 1991; Shaffer, 1999).

Responsiveness and demandingness have varying effects on child behavior and development. Parental responsiveness has been shown to be associated with predicting social competence and psychosocial development, while parental demandingness is associated with behavioral control (i.e. deviant behaviors, academic performance etc.), and social competence (Darling, 1999). Studies have shown that warm and responsive parenting styles predict social competence and cooperative behavior, while hostile and neglectful parenting styles are associated with aggression, deviant behaviors, and adjustment problems (Chen, Liu, & Li, 2000).

Parental responsiveness and affect are very important and influential components of relationship building. According to Shaffer (1999), responsiveness is the amount of support and affection a parent displays towards their child. Parents who are responsive tend to smile, praise and warmly encourage their children. This aspect of the parent-child relationship is particularly important for adolescents who are beginning to make the shift from family dependency, to autonomy and peer relationships. A 1999 study conducted by Kim, Hetherington, and Reiss, found that adolescents whose parents are negative, or

weren't very monitoring, tended to associate with deviant peers and show greater levels of externalizing behaviors (e.g., acting out and delinquency).

Because of the link between parent-child relationships and child outcomes, it is important to further investigate the importance and different aspects of these relationships. With today's societal shift from traditional parenting roles, it has become especially important to understand how the parental-child relationships are changing, and how these changes are affecting our children and future generations to come.

Research has shown evidence that divorce rates and single mother families have been on the rise. One study in particular found that since 1960, births to unmarried mothers have increased six times (Howard, Lefever, Borkowski, & Whitman, 2006). Because of these findings, it has become important that we understand the importance and involvement of the father in both Intact (the biological father resides with the biological mother) as well as Not Intact families (the biological father being either never existent in the child's life, divorced from the biological mother, or the biological father does not reside with the biological mother). While many people believe that the importance and levels of father-child contact only pertains to those whose families are not intact, research has shown that even in intact families, the level of father-child engagement decreases with age (Yeung, Sandberg, & Davis-Kean, 2001). Yeung et al.'s 2001 study also found that within intact families, a father's earnings have a negative effect on their level of involvement with their children during the week and on weekends this effect is positive. In light of the ever increasing hours that American citizens are working, as well as the increasing number of mothers who have to work in order to provide economic support, this is an alarming situation.

Mothers and fathers play very different roles in the lives of their children. While mothers usually take on more custodial/routine caregiving roles (i.e. feeding and cleaning the child), fathers tend to engage in more social stimulation and interactive activities, for example, play activities, and helping with homework (Jain, Belsky, & Crnic, 1996; Yeung et al., 2001). It is clear that the father plays a very important role in the lives of their children regardless of marital status. One study demonstrated the important influence of the father when they found that a child's father may act as a buffer against negative influences in a child's life, especially among high-risk homes. Children who lacked father contact and had high-risk mothers displayed more externalizing problems (acting out) than those who had father contact and high-risk mothers. (Howard et al., 2006).

It is also important to realize that the amount of time spent with the child, the quality of the experience, and emotional aspects of the father-child relationship benefit children. Research has shown that father availability and involvement is associated with academic success as well as socio-emotional and cognitive well-being/gains in school-age children (Howard et al., 2006). Another study conducted by Dunn, Cheng, O'Connor, and Bridges (2004), found that a more frequent and regular contact with the father is associated with more intense relationships and fewer adjustment problems in children.

Prior research has indicated father-child relationships have an important influence on child outcomes and well-being. Therefore, the purpose of this study is to determine if there is a difference between the types of father-child relationship in intact versus not intact families, and child outcomes. For the purposes of this study, intact families are defined as those in which the biological father and biological mother are either married or

living together. Not Intact families are those in which the biological father and biological mother are either divorced, separated, or the biological father/other male influence is nonexistent. The father-child relationship is measured by child reported father involvement, autonomy support, and warmth. Finally, child outcomes are measured along dimensions of academic performance, conduct, and self-esteem. It is hypothesized that individuals of intact families will have more positive outcomes than those of not intact families in regards to academic performance, conduct, and self-esteem. Secondly it is hypothesized that individuals, whose father's are less involved, regardless of whether they come from intact or not intact families, will report more negative outcomes in academic performance, conduct, and self-esteem.

## Method

### *Participants*

The participants were 234 male and female individuals ranging in age from 18-58 years of age. The mean age for both intact and not intact groups fell between 18 and 24 years, and both groups were predominately Caucasian (Table 1). Originally there were 273 participants in this study. Nineteen of these participants were deleted because they did not complete vital parts of the survey (i.e. family status questions), six were deleted because they were duplicated data entries, and sixteen were deleted because they were under the age of 18. In the end there were a total of 232 participants. Some of the participants were students completing the survey for extra-credit. However, because the survey was posted online, it was open to the public and participants as well as reasons for participation varied. Of the participants, 62% indicated that they were from intact families, and 38% from not intact families. Of those that were from not intact families,

8% reported that their father was deceased. 2.6% of these individuals also indicated that there was no step-father or significant other male figure present in their lives.

### *Measures*

A 77 item questionnaire was created, posted online, and made readily accessible to Hanover College students as well as individuals across the nation. The 77 item self-reported questionnaire used in this study covers basic demographics regarding gender, ethnicity, age, and the participant's family status. It also measures academic performance with questions regarding education, GPA, academic assistance, and involvement in extra-curricular activities, sports, etc. Questions from the POPS scale for college students (Grolnick, Ryan, & Deci, 1991) were used to measure the participant's relationship with their biological father, stepfather, or significant other male figure. Self-Esteem was measured by the Rosenberg Self-reported Self-Esteem scale (Rosenberg, 1965). And finally, a revised version of the Elliot Self-Reported Delinquency Scale (Elliot & Ageton, 1980) was used to measure conduct (See Appendices D-E).

### *Procedure*

Participants were first asked to sign an online informed consent form (Appendix B). They were then asked to complete a 77 item self-report questionnaire designed by the researcher, which took approximately 15-30 minutes to complete (Appendix A). After completion, the participants were provided a debriefing and given the opportunity to obtain additional information regarding the study (Appendix C).

### *Results*

When completing the section about father-child relationships, 93% of participants from intact families and 85.2% of participants from not intact families, completed the

survey about their Biological father. Only 5.7% of not intact participants had no male figure present in their lives to complete the survey about (Table 1).

In order to analyze family status (intact vs. not intact) and the father-child relationship (including warmth, autonomy support, and involvement), the questions that related to each category in the POPS scale for college students were scored, summed, and averaged. A reliability test was then run on the questions that made up each of the father-child relationship levels. The father autonomy support portion of the POPS scale for college students was reliable at a Cronbach's alpha of 0.783. Likewise, the father warmth and father involvement sections had a Cronbach's alpha of 0.778 and 0.782 respectively. A t-test was then run on father warmth indicating that those of not intact families had a mean score of  $M=4.3$ , while those of intact families reported a mean score of  $M=4.691$ . These means were significant at  $t(230)= 2.72, p=0.007$ . A t-test was also run on father autonomy support. Those of not intact families had a mean score of  $M=4.10$ , while those of intact families reported a mean score of  $M=4.37$ . These means were also significant at  $t(230)= 2.13, p=0.03$ . Like father warmth and autonomy support, father involvement mean scores were 4.30 for not intact families, and  $M=4.6$  for intact families. These mean scores were also significant at  $t(230)= 4.70, p<0.001$ . Because the findings for each of the father-child relationship categories were correlated with high reliability, father autonomy support, father warmth, and father involvement were averaged and summed into one total father-child relationship category. The reliability of this combination had a Cronbach's alpha of 0.919. When the total father-child relationship score was correlated with involvement in extracurricular activity, there was a significant difference at  $r= -0.169$ ,

$p=0.01$ . There was also a significant difference in total father-child relationship scores and self-esteem at  $r= 0.196$ ,  $p=0.003$ .

When comparing family status and child outcomes in the areas of academic performance and self-esteem, it was found that family status had no significant impact on academic performance (GPA, extracurricular activities, number of times held back in school, special assistance/tutoring, and highest level of education completed). Family status also had no significant impact on self-esteem.

In order to compare family status and its effects on specific areas of conduct, the Elliot and Ageton, (1980) Delinquency Scale questions were originally sorted by factor analysis into 7 levels which accounted for 63.9% of variance. After eliminating questions 1, 13, and 14, a 5 factor model that accounted for 54.25% of variance was reached. Each of the 5 factor model levels were composed of questions either relating to assault, robbery, drug use, disorderly conduct, or alcohol use (See Table 2). Consistent with academic performance and self-esteem, there was no significant difference in conduct among those from intact and not intact families.

### Discussion

This study has demonstrated that family status has no significant impact on child outcomes in the areas of academic performance, conduct and self-esteem. However, family status does influence the father-child relationship. Individuals of intact families report higher levels of father warmth, father autonomy support and father involvement. It is these levels of the father-child relationship that do impact child outcomes, regardless of family status. In this study the father-child relationship significantly predicts a child's self-esteem, as well as involvement in extracurricular activity. While these were the only

significant findings, it does not mean that fathers don't have an impact on child outcomes in other areas and in different family situations. It is important to note that although this study does not indicate any significant differences in family status and child outcomes, there are significant differences regarding child outcomes in the father-child relationships that other studies have found to correlate not only with father-child relationships, but family status as well (Howard, & Lefever, et al., 2006; Patock-Peckham & Morgan-Lopez, 2006; Shaffer, 1999). Because of the results in this study, it is possible that today's society is changing in a positive manner, in that fathers are making more of an effort to remain close and involved in their children's lives when the family itself is split. One study suggests that overall contact with nonresidential fathers and their children is actually fairly high and stable over time in today's society (Howard, & Lefever, et al., 2006). If this is the case, it may explain why family status has no impact on child outcomes in this study. However, even if this is so, the father-child relationship was still significantly lower in not intact families than intact families.

Although this study has shown interesting and beneficial findings in regards to the father-child relationship, it does have several important limitations. The first major limitation is how family status (intact vs. not intact) were operationally defined. Because families in today's society have tremendously varying living situations, determining if a family is intact or not, is not as simple as just looking at whether or not the biological father and mother are married or living under the same roof. Some participants in this study indicated that their parents were married yet they were not living together under the same roof, or even that their parents were married and living under the same roof but that their father was deceased. Because of these varying situations a more detailed

demographical questionnaire may be beneficial in understanding exactly what is going on in these families. It is very possible that maybe this was an older individual whose father had just recently passed away. Likewise, the married but not living together family could be due to a heavily traveling father or the parents being in the process of a divorce.

Because of these uncertainties, developing a more detailed questionnaire, and developing categories other than just intact or not intact may be beneficial. Another limitation to this study is that the measures of the father-child relationship were purely subjective. There is no way of knowing exactly how much time the father invested into the child, or just how supportive and warm they were. Because of this it may be helpful to somehow incorporate father ratings of involvement, warmth, and autonomy support into future studies. Another limitation of this study is that it excludes children and those under the age of 18. It is very possible that family status may play a greater role in the younger years when parents are the main support system. In future research of this topic it may be interesting to compare children vs. adults and/or young adults vs. older adults in order to see if there are any differences in the father-child relationship, family status, and child outcomes among these groups.

In conclusion, it is very crucial that we continue to explore the impact of the father-child relationship in regards to family status and child outcomes. Because we are seeing an ever increasing amount of not intact families, it is important to examine the father-child relationship as well as its effects on children. Knowing this will help us to better educate society as well as give fathers an incentive to stay involved as well as provide warmth and support in the lives of their children.

## References

- Anju, J., Belsky, J., & Crnic, K. (1996). Beyond father behaviors: Types of dads. *Journal of Family Psychology, 10*(4), 431-442.
- Baumrind, D. (1991). The influence of parenting style on adolescent competence and substance use. *Journal of Early Adolescence, 11*(1), 56-95.
- Bednar, E., & Fisher, T., (2003). Peer referencing in adolescent decision making as a function of perceived parenting style. *Adolescence, 38*(152), 607-621.
- Chen, X., Liu, M., & Li, D., (2000). Parental warmth, control, and indulgence and their relations to adjustment in Chinese children: A longitudinal study. *Journal of Family Psychology, 14*(3), 401-419
- Darling, N., (1999). Parenting Style and Its Correlates. *Clearinghouse on Elementary and Early Childhood Education*.
- Devereux, E., (1972). Authority and moral development among German and American children: A cross-national pilot experiment. *Journal of Comparative Family Studies, 3*(1), 99-124.
- Dunn, J. Cheng, H., O'Connor, T., & Bridges, L. (2004). Children's perspectives on their relationships with their nonresident fathers: Influences, outcomes and implications. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry, 45*(3), 553-566.
- Elliot, D. & Ageton, S. (1980). Reconciling race and class differences in self-reported and official estimates of delinquency. *American Sociological Review, 45*, 95-110.
- Grolnick, W., Ryan, M., & Deci, E. (1991). Inner resources for school achievement: Motivational mediators of children's perceptions of their parents. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 83*(4), 508-517.

- Howard, K., Lefever, J., Borkowski, J., & Whitman, T. (2006). Father's influence in the lives of children with adolescent mothers. *Journal of Family Psychology, 20*(3), 468-476.
- Jain, A., Belsky, J., & Crnic, K., (1996). Beyond fathering behaviors: Types of dads. *Journal of Family Psychology, 10*(4), 431-442.
- Kim, J., Hetherington, M., & Reiss, D. (1999). Associations among family relationships, antisocial peers, and adolescents' externalizing behaviors: Gender and family type differences. *Child Development, 70*(5), 1209-1230.
- Patock- Peckham, J. & Morgan-Lopez, A. (2006). College drinking behaviors: Mediation links between parenting styles, impulsive control, and alcohol-related outcomes. *Psychology of Addictive Behaviors, 20*(2), 117-125.
- Rosenberg, M. (1965). *Society and the adolescent self-image*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Shaffer, D. (1999). *Developmental Psychology, Childhood and Adolescence* (5<sup>th</sup> ed.). Pacific Grove, CA: Brooks/Cole Publishing Company.
- Yeung, J., Sandberg, J., & Davis-Kean, P. (2001). Children's time with fathers in intact families. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 63*(1), 136-154.



**Who are you completing this section about? (check only one)**

Biological Father        Step Father       Significant Other Male Figure

**1- Not true at all**

**2- A little true**

**3- Somewhat true**

**4- Mostly true**

**5- Always true**

1. My father seems to know how I feel about things.  
 1       2       3       4       5
2. My father tries to tell me how to run my life.  
 1       2       3       4       5
3. My father finds time to talk with me.  
 1       2       3       4       5
4. My father accepts me and likes me as I am.  
 1       2       3       4       5
5. My father, whenever possible, allows me to choose what to do.  
 1       2       3       4       5
6. My father doesn't seem to think of me often.  
 1       2       3       4       5
7. My father clearly conveys his love for me.  
 1       2       3       4       5
8. My father listens to my opinion or perspective when I've got a problem.  
 1       2       3       4       5
9. My father spends a lot of time with me.  
 1       2       3       4       5
10. My father makes me feel very special.  
 1       2       3       4       5
11. My father allows me to decide things for myself.  
 1       2       3       4       5
12. My father often seems too busy to attend to me.  
 1       2       3       4       5
13. My father is often disapproving and unaccepting of me.



5. If YES, how many times? \_\_\_\_\_

6. Do/Did you receive any type of tutoring or special help academically?

YES  NO

7. Please list any sports, clubs, organizations or extra-curricular activities you are involved in. Also, please specify how many years you have been involved in each activity. \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

**Section D**

**Below is a list of statements dealing with your general feelings about yourself.**

**If you strongly agree, check SA.**

**If you agree with the statement, check A.**

**If you disagree, check D.**

**If you strongly disagree, check SD.**

1. I try to get even when I'm angry with someone.

SA  A  D  SD

2. When I am angry with someone, I take it out on whoever is around me.

SA  A  D  SD

3. I try to talk over problems with people without letting them know I'm angry.

SA  A  D  SD

4. On the whole, I am satisfied with myself.

SA  A  D  SD

5. At times, I think I am no good at all.

SA  A  D  SD

6. I feel that I have a number of good qualities.

SA  A  D  SD

7. I am able to do things as well as most other people.

SA  A  D  SD

8. I feel I do not have much to be proud of.

SA  A  D  SD

9. I certainly feel useless at times.  
 SA       A       D       SD
10. I feel that I'm a person of worth, at least on an equal plane with others.  
 SA       A       D       SD
11. I wish I could have more respect for myself.  
 SA       A       D       SD
12. All in all, I am inclined to feel that I am a failure.  
 SA       A       D       SD
13. I take a positive attitude toward myself.  
 SA       A       D       SD

**Section E**

**For the following set of questions, select the appropriate number for each statement. Please keep in mind that all responses are completely anonymous.**

- (0) Never**
- (1) Once a day**
- (2) 2-3 times a day**
- (3) Once a week**
- (4) 2-3 times a week**
- (5) Once a month**

**How many times in the past year have you:**

1. Purposely damaged or destroyed property belonging to your parents or other family members.  
 0       1       2       3       4       5
2. Knowingly bought, sold or held stolen goods (or tried to do any of these things).  
 0       1       2       3       4       5
3. Thrown objects (such as rocks, or bottles) at cars or people.  
 0       1       2       3       4       5
4. Lied about your age to gain entrance or to purchase something.  
 0       1       2       3       4       5
5. Attacked someone with the idea of seriously hurting or killing him/her.  
 0       1       2       3       4       5
6. Had sexual intercourse with a person of the opposite sex other than your wife/husband, or significant other.  
 0       1       2       3       4       5

7. Been involved in gang fights.  
 0       1       2       3       4       5
8. Cheated on school tests.  
 0       1       2       3       4       5
9. Stolen money or other things from your parents or other members of your family.  
 0       1       2       3       4       5
10. Hit (or threatened to hit) one of your parents.  
 0       1       2       3       4       5
11. Hit (or threatened to hit) other students.  
 0       1       2       3       4       5
12. Been loud, rowdy, or unruly in a public place (disorderly conduct).  
 0       1       2       3       4       5
13. Bought or provided liquor for a minor.  
 0       1       2       3       4       5
14. Had (or tried to have) sexual relations with someone against their will.  
 0       1       2       3       4       5
15. Used force (strong-arm methods) to get money or things from other students,  
 0       1       2       3       4       5
16. Used force (strong-arm methods) to get money or things from a teacher or other adult.  
 0       1       2       3       4       5
17. Avoided paying for such things as movies, bus or subway rides, and food.  
 0       1       2       3       4       5
18. Been drunk in a public place.  
 0       1       2       3       4       5
19. Stolen (or tried to steal) something at school.  
 0       1       2       3       4       5
20. Broken into a building or vehicle (or tried to break in) to steal something or just to look around.  
 0       1       2       3       4       5
21. Been suspended from school.  
 0       1       2       3       4       5

**How often in the last year have you used:**

22. Alcoholic beverages (beer, wine and hard liquor).

0       1       2       3       4       5

23. Marijuana—hashish ("grass," "pot," "hash").

0       1       2       3       4       5

24. Hallucinogens ("LSD," "Mescaline," "Peyote," "Acid").

0       1       2       3       4       5

25. Amphetamines ("Uppers," "Speed," "Whites").

0       1       2       3       4       5

26. Barbiturates ("Downers," "Reds").

0       1       2       3       4       5

27. Heroin ("Horse," "Smack").

0       1       2       3       4       5

28. Cocaine ("Coke").

0       1       2       3       4       5

Thank you for participating in this survey!

## Appendix B

**Consent Form**

I agree to participate in a study on father-child relationships. I will be completing a survey that will cover basic demographic information, behavioral practices, and questions regarding my relationship with my father. The survey should take no longer than 30 minutes to complete.

**Voluntary participation & Confidentiality**

I understand that my participation in this study is completely voluntary, and that I may choose not to participate and withdraw my consent to participate at any time without being penalized in any way. I also understand that my responses are confidential and that no information about me will be used in any way that reveals my identity.

**Contact information**

If you have any questions or concerns about this study, or if any problems arise, please contact Ashley Recker. She can be reached by email at [reckera@hanover.edu](mailto:reckera@hanover.edu), or Melinda Leonard at [leonard@hanover.edu](mailto:leonard@hanover.edu).

**Consent**

**I have read this consent form and have been given the opportunity to ask questions.  
I give my consent to participate in this study.**

Participant's signature: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

## Appendix C

## Debriefing Form

Thank you for participating in this study. You have just completed an online survey that is looking at the difference in father-child relationships in both intact families, not intact families, and child outcomes in terms of academic performance, conduct, and self-esteem. If you have any questions or concerns regarding this study, or would like to see the results upon completion please contact either, [reckera@hanover.edu](mailto:reckera@hanover.edu) or [leonard@hanover.edu](mailto:leonard@hanover.edu). Once again thank you for your time, and making this study possible.

Appendix D

**Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale** (Rosenberg, 1965)

The scale is a ten item Likert scale with items answered on a four point scale - from strongly agree to strongly disagree. The original sample for which the scale was developed consisted of 5,024 High School Juniors and Seniors from 10 randomly selected schools in New York State.

Instructions: Below is a list of statements dealing with your general feelings about yourself. If you strongly agree, circle **SA**. If you agree with the statement, circle **A**. If you disagree, circle **D**. If you strongly disagree, circle **SD**.

1. On the whole, I am satisfied with myself.	SA	A	D	SD
2*. At times, I think I am no good at all.	SA	A	D	SD
3. I feel that I have a number of good qualities.	SA	A	D	SD
4. I am able to do things as well as most other people.	SA	A	D	SD
5*. I feel I do not have much to be proud of.	SA	A	D	SD
6*. I certainly feel useless at times.	SA	A	D	SD
7. I feel that I'm a person of worth, at least on an equal plane with others.	SA	A	D	SD
8*. I wish I could have more respect for myself.	SA	A	D	SD
9*. All in all, I am inclined to feel that I am a failure.	SA	A	D	SD
10. I take a positive attitude toward myself.	SA	A	D	SD

**Scoring:**

SA=3, A=2, D=1, SD=0.

\*Items with an asterisk are reverse scored. SA=0, A=1, D=2, SD=3.

Sum the scores for the 10 items.

The higher the score, the higher the self esteem.

The scale may be used without explicit permission. The author's family, however, would like to be kept informed of its use:

The Morris Rosenberg Foundation  
 c/o Department of Sociology  
 University of Maryland  
 2112 Art/Soc Building  
 College Park, MD 20742-1315

Appendix E  
**The College-Student Scale**  
 \*Revised version

Thoughts about My Parents

Please answer the following questions about your father. If you do not have any contact with one of your parents (for example, your father), but there is another adult of the same gender living with your house (for example, a stepfather) then please answer the questions about that other adult.

If you have no contact with one of your parents, and there is not another adult of that same gender with whom you live, then leave the questions about that parent blank.

Please use the following scale:

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
not at all true			somewhat true			very true

**Questions about your father:**

- 22. My father seems to know how I feel about things.
- 23. My father tries to tell me how to run my life.
- 24. My father finds time to talk with me.
- 25. My father accepts me and likes me as I am.
- 26. My father, whenever possible, allows me to choose what to do.
- 27. My father doesn't seem to think of me often.
- 28. My father clearly conveys his love for me.
- 29. My father listens to my opinion or perspective when I've got a problem.
- 30. My father spends a lot of time with me.
- 31. My father makes me feel very special.
- 32. My father allows me to decide things for myself.
- 33. My father often seems too busy to attend to me.

34. My father is often disapproving and unaccepting of me.
35. My father insists upon my doing things his way.
36. My father is not very involved with my concerns.
37. My father is typically happy to see me.
38. My father is usually willing to consider things from my point of view.
39. My father puts time and energy into helping me.
40. My father helps me to choose my own direction.
41. My father seems to be disappointed in me a lot.
42. My father isn't very sensitive to many of my needs.

**Scoring Information.** First, scores on the following items must be reversed: 23, 27, 33, 34, 35, 36, 41, 42. To do that, subtract the response from 8 and use the result as the item score. Then form subscale scores by averaging the scores of the items on that subscale, as shown below.

Father Involvement: 24, 27(R), 30, 33(R), 36(R), 39

Father Autonomy Support: 22, 23(R), 26, 29, 32, 35(R), 38, 40, 42(R)

Father Warmth: 25, 28, 31, 34(R), 37, 41(R)

An (R) after an item number is simply a reminder that that item needs to be reverse scored before being averaged.

For original version: <http://www.psych.rochester.edu/SDT/measures/word/POPSfull.doc>

Table 2.

*5 Factor Analysis of Variance Accounted For*

5 Factors of Conduct	Cumulative %
Robbery	51.46%
Assault	62.74%
Drug Usage	50.09%
Disorderly Conduct	40.19%
Alcohol Use	70.41%

Table 1.

*Demographics*

		Intact	Not Intact
Age:	18-24	68.1%	70.5%
	25-34	24.3%	21.6%
	35-58	07.6%	08.0%
Gender:	Male	31.0%	28.0%
	Female	69.0%	72.0%
Ethnicity:	Caucasian	74.3%	70.5%
	African American	09.0%	10.2%
	Other	15.4%	11.3%