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ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to examine the relationship between parental leadership and behavioural problems in children. A need was felt for this type of study as the literature indicated that parents, and in particular the father was abdicating his leadership position with resulting detrimental effects on the children.

An instrument to measure parental leadership was adapted from the Leadership Behavior Description Questionnaire (L.B.D.Q.) developed by the Ohio State University Leadership Studies. The authors also developed their own subscales and added these to the L.B.D.Q. instrument as a test of validity. A high correlation was found between the two.

The questionnaire was administered to the parents of 38 families in the Windsor area, half of which had children that had been referred to an outside agency for behaviour problems and half of which had children that had not been so referred. The two groups were frequency matched on the variables of age and sex of the identified children and the family's religion and social position. The data did not support the re-
searchers' hypotheses that the level of family leadership and of paternal leadership would be negatively associated with behaviour problems among children. A significant association was found between maternal leadership and behaviour problems in girls. However, the data indicated that there were no other significant relationships between the variables.
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INTRODUCTION

The father's role has suffered tremendous change during the past century due to sociological changes in society and to the development of psychological theories emphasizing the significance of the mother-child relationships, almost to the exclusion of the father. This change, we believe, is having a detrimental effect on the family functioning and on the treatment of children and families. In many North American homes, the father is virtually absent due to his lack of involvement with other family members.

Many fathers are so committed to their occupations and civic responsibilities that they spend evenings doing overtime at the shop or office or attending community meetings. They will give up their weekends for the sake of business conferences and sales promotions, but fail to realize that their sons dream of going fishing with their dad, and their daughters wonder if men can do anything but worry about work. On the other hand, some men are simply apathetic about their role in the family outside of being the breadwinner. They leave the children to their mother, who is supposed to know more about children. Besides, they feel, they work hard all week.
and deserve to be able to sit down and rest with the newspaper or T.V. in front of them without the children bothering them. In fact, that is too often the only time that the father takes time to discipline the children and teach them the values and attitudes which society expects of them. Both the father who is committed to pursuits outside the home and the one who is passive and apathetic about his family role, have abdicated their responsibility.

In a reciprocal relation to the husband-father, the role of the wife-mother has become increasingly dominant. This has been due, in part, to the same sociological developments which contributed to the changing role of the father—industrialization, urbanization, automation, sexual revolution, inflation and shifting ideology. In addition, psychoanalytic theories and childrearing psychology have, in the past century, emphasized almost exclusively the mother-child relationship.

As Bigner stated in his review of the literature on the father's role:

There is a dearth of data available in the literature concerning fathering per se and the isolation of those behavioral variables which make the role take on its significance... in contrast, there is a relative wealth of data concerning the importance of mothering and its implications for subsequent psychosocial functioning in life.

(Bigner, 1970, p. 357)

In light of this decline of the father's involvement in the family and the scarcity of literature on the father's
influence on personality development, we have three main concerns. Firstly, we question the longstanding assumption that the emotional health of a child depends primarily on a close, warm relationship with the mother. It is our contention that the relationship with the father is of at least equal significance in the child's development. Therefore, we believe that the father's involvement is essential for healthy psychosocial functioning and that the present lack of father involvement will have a detrimental effect on children and on society.

A second concern is the lack of consideration given to the father and his role in the treatment of families and children by social work agencies and departments. This is especially true in child-protection and adoption agencies, but is also the case in many other areas of social work. Assessments of families to determine if a child is in need of care, to select foster homes or to screen adoption applications virtually neglect the father and his parenting qualities. The marital relationship may be evaluated but the husband's skills are rarely examined. Martin Wolins stated that:

Homefinding literature has for half a century relegated the father to a secondary position ... the role of the wife-mother is best fulfilled when it is successfully complemented by the role of the husband-father.

(Wolins, 1963, p. 50)

In other areas of social work the father is
similarly not involved in assessment and treatment. This is often due to the inconvenience of scheduling appoint-
ments or to his lack of motivation to involve himself.
Social workers tend to accept these difficulties as insurmountable and consider the father to be of only
dubious significance in the assessment and resolution of dysfunction in children and families. We feel that there is a need for empirical evidence that the father does have a significant effect on the psychosocial functioning of children in order to counteract this trend in social work.

Thirdly, there has been among church circles an increasing volume of literature advocating the father's leadership in the home and the mother's submissiveness to her husband as put forth in Ephesians 5 and 6. Although we are in support of a renewed involvement of the father in the family's leadership, we are concerned that there is little research support for the claim that these biblical principles will lead to healthier family living and healthier child development.

It is our hope, then, that this proposed research will help to fill the gap in theoretical knowledge about the father's role in the psychosocial development of children. This increased knowledge and empirical evidence is required to speak to the need for increased involvement of fathers in families for the sake of their children's
well being; the need for greater attention to the father in social work assessment and treatment; and to the need for the testing of family principles being increasingly taught by Christian literature.
CHAPTER I

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Fathering, A Cultural, Historical and Theoretical Perspective

Cultural and Historical Perspective

The father's role has many similarities across cultures. In most societies, families live with or near the husband's parents. Most trace family descent through the father, rather than the mother.

We know from anthropology that polygamous marriages, having many wives, is permitted in a number of cultures. However, polyandry, having many husbands, is much less common. "In two-thirds of societies, the husband exercises considerable authority over his wife, and in only a few does she have more authority than he" (Stephens as quoted by Lynn, 1974, p. 27). In three-quarters of societies, the wife is required to make a ritualistic sign of deference to her husband (e.g., bowing). The father in most cultures has more ultimate power over his children than the mother. Alexander Mitscherlich, the German psychoanalyst:

Believes the image of the father to be imbedded in the very roots of civilization and that the
loss of this paternal image leaves cultures vulnerable to many ills - alienation, irresponsibility, anxiety, and aggression. In the absence of direct paternal instruction in practical life and the consequent loss of a dependable tradition, people orient themselves by each other, giving the peer group its modern impact, with its concomitant risks of envy, rivalry, and transitory mass movements. (Mitscherlich as quoted by Lynn, 1974, p. 43)

In Sweden, 'advocates of male emancipation' are lobbying for legislation that would give fathers a leave of absence with pay to stay home with newborn children, the right already given to mothers.

The ancient Greek family's basic unit of power was the father's authority. The father was the trustee for the family and the household priest. He had the power of life and death over his children. They remained under his authority until his death or until such time as he decided to exclude them from the family.

The Hebrew fathers had inherent power patterned after Jehovah. Their life and death power over their children continued even after the children married. The Hebrew father's main responsibilities were to teach his children in the way of Jehovah, to teach his son a trade and to teach him the Torah.

The father's power in the Roman society was almost unlimited. After an early education that was usually given by the mother, the son spent the remaining time learning his father's trade. The father's authority in
Roman culture reached over his children, daughters-in-law and grandchildren.

In the early Germanic and Anglo Saxon tribes, the father had less power than the Greek and Roman ones. There were more limits on the father's right to put his children to death or sell them into slavery.

In medieval Europe up to the 15th century, children were sent to live with a male teacher or master in order to obtain training and apprenticeship. The 15th century children were seen as an economic benefit rather than appreciated for their individuality and inherent value. Later in the 15th century, school replaced the master-trainee relationship. The children still boarded out, living at the school, or with relatives. The schoolmaster or the master of the house in the private lodging still provided a male model for the children.

Further change in family patterns took shape in the 18th century which revolutionized the society of that time. Families became more private, children began to be accepted more for their inherent value rather than merely for their economic contribution. In 1789, the French Revolution was largely responsible for the minimizing of the father's authority in the family. The revolutionaries tried to take away the families' authority over child rearing because they saw the family as an institution belonging to the old order of things.
Hence, the divorce laws were eased, and the paternal power to discipline was withdrawn. The results of this revolutionary action had wide ranging implications. Political, religious, and customary controls were lost. Many wives and children were abandoned and a new wave of extreme licence reigned. "Divorce, illegitimacy and juvenile crime became commonplace" (Lynn, 1974, p. 67).

To restore the French society back to order, these laws were later revoked and replaced with more stringent ones.

During this period in Paris, the absence of the father from the family and the loss of his authority were associated with a loss of cohesion, if they did not actually cause it. (Lynn, 1974, p. 67)

During the colonial period, America was dominated by a strong patriarchal system. The early immigrants had the Hebrew concept of the patriarchal family as described in the Bible. "In general, the colonial father was the supreme authority, the wife administered his will, and the children obeyed without question" (Lynn, 1974, p. 68). Combined with this strong patriarchal authority, the father showed his strong love and care for his children by his teachings of the scriptures and by making every attempt to bring them to salvation.

However, the freedom of the frontier bred a strong need for a rugged individualism and personal resourcefulness. Hence, the father's son became his own master much sooner, and the New World father lost
his autocratic power, but won the favour of his children who sought his advice and affection.

Post Civil War developments caused the North American society to take on a new face. The frontier freedom, and the absence of a ruling class created a climate that encouraged families to operate more democratically. Increased industrialization removed the centre of education, work, and recreation away from the home to outside institutions. Child labour laws and compulsory education reduced the father's control over his children and increased his economic responsibility for their care. Large scale immigration brought to a clash Old World and New World values, further reducing the father's authority, control, and reverence. Contemporary society, with its wide ranging media influences, expensive lifestyles, competitive spirit, and strong feminist movements has further minimized the father's influence in the family.

Theoretical Perspective

Freudian Theory

Our research draws from several major theories. We will describe Freudian theory first as many of the other theories are, in part at least, influenced by it.

Freud's description of the Oedipal complex expounded his belief that the male between the ages of three and five
years desires an exclusive relationship with his mother. Freud believed that the young male saw his father as an aggressive competitor for his mother's affection, and that he feared castration at the hands of his father as a result (Biller, 1974). Because of this castration fear, the young male is motivated to identify with his father from whom he develops his masculine characteristics. Bronfenbrenner (1960) pointed out that Freud's later writings alluded to a more affectionate relationship between the boy and the father (Biller, 1974). Birlingham (1973) states that Freud occasionally mentioned the importance of an affectionate father-child relationship in pre-Oedipal or early childhood (Biller, 1974). However, Fenichel (1945) describes Freudian theory as perceiving the father as primitive and threatening during the Oedipal period (Biller, 1974). This fathering behaviour is attributed by Freud as developing strong masculine tendencies in boys.

Girls, according to Freud, tend to turn their affection from their mother to their father when they discover that they do not have a penis as do their brothers and male playmates. They are, therefore, susceptible to their father's flirtation but are not as motivated as are the boys to resolve the conflict because the fear of a loss of the mother's love is weaker than the young male's fear of castration by the father.
Consequently, girls do not resolve the Oedipus complex, but continue to have an imperfectly developed conscience - one still influenced by feelings of affection or hostility.

Learning Theory

Learning theory, as Freudian theory, maintains that the boy's initial identification is with the mother. "As the father becomes more a source of reinforcement, around the age of four, the boy imitates the father and gradually becomes masculine" (Biller, 1974, p. 13).

Mower (1950) "emphasized the importance of developmental identification in the sex role development of both boys and girls" (Biller, 1974).

Developmental identification postulates that the emotional tie between the parents and the children motivates the child to imitate the parents he loves. According to learning theory, this identification develops out of a warm, loving relationship between the child and his parents. The child is dependent on that parental affection and is afraid to lose it. He identifies strongly with his parents by modelling his own behaviour after that of his parents.

Role Theory

Parsons is the main theorist here. He differentiates between the expressive and the instrumental roles that are at work in any system. In the family system, the father performs the instrumental role. He
is the representative of society within the family and the representative of the family within the society. The father is the family executive, supplying "authority, discipline and neutral, objective, sound judgement" (Lynn, 1974, p. 104). He "demonstrates to the family the art of planning, the disciplined pursuit of goals, and the delaying of immediate gratification in favour of ultimately more satisfying distant goals" (Lynn, 1974, p. 104).

The mother performs the expressive functions. She performs the integrative and supportive role. This "involves keeping intact the internal affairs of the family" (Lynn, 1974, p. 104).

Lynn (1974) mentions that of 56 societies studied, there were 48 in which the father played the instrumental role and only eight in which he played the expressive role; there were six societies in which the mother played the instrumental role and 50 in which she played the expressive role.

Parsons sees the father as the primary transmitter of society's principles and values. He "regards the father as the parent who symbolizes the authority of the society for us all" (Lynn, 1974, p. 107).

These theories present many similarities in their view of the father but they do present different emphases. In classical Freudian theory, the father is seen as punitive and threatening. Learning theory presents the
father as warm and affectionate, while role theory stresses the father as "the principal rewarding and punitive agent" (Biller, 1974, p. 14).

According to these theories, it can be seen that the father's influence in the family is very potent. This is why the present researchers believe that the nature of the father's influence needs to be further studied. We ask ourselves, "What would be the consequences, then, if the father's potency, both in the home and as an image of society's authority were dwindled?" (Lynn, 1974, p. 107).

The Theory of Parental Deprivation

From the more comprehensive theories has developed the theory of parental deprivation and its effects on the child's development. Grygier states that "parental deprivation in children ... is recognized as a prime cause of delinquency and other personality disorders" (Grygier, 1969, p. 213). Despite the research and the recognition that this theory has attracted, it has concentrated only on maternal deprivation, almost ignoring the dimensions of paternal and dual parental deprivation. It is in essence, then, a theory of maternal deprivation. John Bowlby was primarily responsible for this emphasis on maternal deprivation. In his study of 44 juvenile thieves, he found a high incidence of maternal separation or deprivation in the family backgrounds of his subjects (Bowlby, 1947). He developed further literature on the
subject and became an authority on the effects of maternal deprivation (Bowlby, 1950, 1951).

The theory of maternal deprivation is based mainly on propositions regarding the incidence of maternal deprivation in the background of delinquent subjects when compared to a control group of non-delinquents (Glueck, 1952; Bowlby, 1950, 1951, 1952).

More recently, there have been efforts to fill the gap in the theory of parental deprivation by increasing attention on paternal deprivations which has led to studies on variations of fathering and their effect.

Variations in Fathering and their Effects on Child Development

In this section we will review the relevant literature which focusses on various father behaviours and their effects on child behaviour. We will review various studies which have looked at the father's role in the development of his child's sexuality, his social adjustment, his cognitive and academic adjustment, his creativity, and his moral development.

The Child's Sexuality

Biller found that "frequent paternal decision-making, competence, nurturance, and limit-setting can enhance the boy's overall masculine development" (Biller, 1974, p. 18). Altucker's (1957) study of adolescent boys with low masculine interest showed that masculine develop-
ment in boys was hampered when the father did not provide a strong masculine role model such as an ability to make decisions. He also found that a parental role reversal had the same effects (Biller, 1974).

The quality of the parental interaction has also been shown to influence the masculine development of boys.

The boy's perception of his father can also be influenced by his mother's behavior. In father-mother interactions some mothers encouraged their husbands to make decisions while others appeared to prevent their husbands from serving as adequate models by constantly competing with them for the decision-making role.

(Biller, 1974, p. 32)

The quality and quantity of the father's involvement in the family has also been shown to have a modelling influence on male children.

The stereotype of the masculine hardworking father whose primary activity at home is lying on the couch watching television, or sleeping, is all too accurate a description of many fathers. If the boy's father is not consistently involved in family functioning, it is much harder for his son to learn to be appropriately assertive, active, independent, and competent.

(Biller, 1974, p. 32)

Mussen discovered that teens who perceived their fathers as loving and warm were better adjusted than teens who perceived their fathers as being less involved in affectionate relationships with them. Distler discovered that university males who ranked themselves as high in masculinity "viewed their fathers as high in nurturance, limit setting, and competence" (Biller, 1974, p. 37).
Green looked at the lack of paternal participation in our fast-moving commuter society. He found that the middle-class uninvolved father "interferes with the boy's masculine development" (Biller, 1974, p. 38). Freedheim found that "authority in making decisions in the home was more closely related to the boy's masculinity than were other aspects of paternal dominance" (As quoted by Lynn, 1974, p. 125).

The degree of paternal nurturance has also been linked to the sex role development of female children. The high nurturant father-daughter relationship is more likely to increase the femininity of daughters (Lynn, 1974).

In summary, research seems to support the combination of high paternal nurturance with high involvement in child care as having the most positive influences on high masculinity in sons and high femininity in daughters (Lynn, 1974; Biller, 1974).

The Child's Social Adjustment

Research supports the notion that the child's social adjustment depends highly on the quality of the father-child relationship. Biller writes that "the father's interest and consistent participation seems to strongly contribute to the development of the child's self-confidence and self-esteem" (Biller, 1974, p. 55). Slater reported that students who scored high on a social
adjustment questionnaire, related that they perceived their fathers as supportive and affectionate (Biller, 1974).

Biller (1971a, 1972a) reported that male children whose fathers were not nurturant but spent much time at home had poor social adjustment. It appeared from the results of this research that the lack of paternal nurturance provided a poor example regardless of the amount of time the father spent in the home. As a result, his male children, according to Biller, adjusted poorly. In view of these results, Biller suggested that the boy with an uninvolved father may be better adjusted if the father is absent from the home. Biller further mentions that the "father-absent boys often have better personality adjustments than boys with passive ineffectual fathers" (Biller, 1974, p. 56). Biller also reported that "boys in father-absent families who have a positive relationship with highly competent mothers seem to be less likely to become delinquent than boys in father-present families who have inadequate fathers" (Biller, 1974, p. 68).

In an intensive study at McGill University by Westley and Epstein, it was discovered that the emotional adjustment of the children as well as the quality of the mother-father relationship "was associated with the father having a higher initial social status than the mother, a balanced relatively sex-typed parental division of labor, and a father-led pattern of authority (father and mother
discussion but with the father making the majority of decisions)" (Biller, 1974, p. 74). Westley and Epstein's research appears to strongly support our hypothesis that families with fathers having higher leadership will have children who have fewer behavioural problems.

In Westley and Epstein's study, some very relevant data was presented which is extremely applicable to our hypothesis. Westley and Epstein described their results in this way.

The father-led families seemed most successful. In such families decisions were arrived at through discussion, but the father more often had the final say, making the decisions between 55 and 65 percent of the time. The children from these families appeared to be good leaders, particularly stable and assertive.

(Biller, 1974, p. 74)

Many of the studies on parental interaction patterns have looked at the paternal role. Biller relates several of these in the following passage.

Some of the most intriguing, as well as methodologically sound studies have provided observations of family functioning in standardized problem solving situations. Mishler and Wexler (1968) and Shuhan (1970) found that high paternal involvement and decision-making are uncommon in families in which there is a severely disturbed son.

(Biller, 1974, p. 82)

Barthoemier proposed that the wife is more nurturant and better socially adjusted if she has a positive relationship with her husband. Many studies have reported on the positive effects of a nurturant mother-daughter interaction pattern (Hetherington, 1965; Hetherington and
Inadequate fathering or mothering is frequently a reflection of difficulties in the husband–wife relationship. Such difficulties may be particularly apparent in the husband’s and wife’s inability to adequately provide one another with affection and sexual gratification. ... Fathers whose children had conduct problems were frequently poor enforcers of discipline, especially of rules established by the mother. ... If the father and mother mutually satisfy and value each other, the child is much better able to learn effective interpersonal skills.

(Biller, 1974, pp. 119, 123)

Lynn (1974) described various characteristics of delinquent boys’ fathers. They offered little direction to their sons, were unprotective, and they did not share in the boys’ plans, activities or interests. They often ridiculed their sons for their mistakes, they were hostile, lacking in affection or sympathy. These fathers were unacceptable models for the boys, were often aggressive, controlling, rigid, prone to alcoholism and they frequently used physical punishment.

It appears, then, from various research studies reported, that the quality combined with quantity of paternal involvement has a strong impact on the social adjustment of children.
The Child's Cognitive and Academic Functioning

In terms of cognitive development, Lynn reported several studies that suggest that "under-achievement in males may be related to a clash between sons and domineering, punitive or overprotective fathers" (Lynn, 1974, p. 181). "Underachievement in females may be related to distant, autocratic and punitive fathers" (Lynn, 1974, p. 181).

Academic achievement of girls was found by Lynn to be associated with the quality of the relationship with their parents, but less with their parents' academic expectations for them. For a boy, academic achievement is less related to how he identifies with the father, but is more associated with the father's expectations for him (Lynn, 1974).

Scholastic aptitude and analytic skills are associated with paternal involvement and affection for sons, but are related to paternal involvement and to restraint in expression of affection for daughters ... low achievement in boys seems more directly related to conflict with father than it is in girls, and his rejection seems to have more devastating consequences for boys.

(Lynn, 1974, pp. 191, 192)

Bowerman and Elder discovered that excellency in academic functioning was associated with fathers who were perceived "as dominant in decision making and democratic in parent child relations" (Biller, 1974, p. 73). Cervantes found that adolescent school dropouts were more likely to
have fathers who had a low influence in the household (Lynn, 1974). Biller reported that "frequent observation of a father who enjoys intellectual activities does much to further a child's cognitive development. However, if the father does not enjoy such activities, the child is less likely to excel in school" (Biller, 1974, p. 132).

The Child's Creativity

There have been very few studies in this area of the child's development. Biller reported that highly creative individuals had fathers with a high educational level combined with positions carrying much status. It was also reported that "fathers of creative children are expressive, non-controlling and well educated" (Lynn, 1974, p. 188). Fathers of creative college women were described as artistic, or intellectual, or gentle, self-controlled, men of integrity (Lynn, 1974).

The Child's Moral Development

Lynn has identified four components of moral development. We have stated them in this way:

1) Ability to make moral judgements;
2) Resistance to temptation;
3) Sense of guilt or remorse after transgression;
4) Confession of misdeeds.

A child's resistance to temptation is reduced in the child whose parents place too much pressure on him to succeed.
This pressure usually takes the form of rejection or physical punishment.

Lynn stated that "too much paternal control may inhibit a son's moral judgement" (Lynn, 1974, p. 197). It has also been found that involving the child in decision-making discussions increases the child's level of moral judgement.

Evidence supports the position that the father's warm approach, allowing the boy to take him as a model, enhances high-level moral development, but that the use of power or the withdrawal of love are either unrelated to the boy's moral development or related only to its more superficial aspects....For his daughters, the father's use of power was negatively related to internalized moral judgement, and his withdrawal of love was positively related to the more superficial response of confession but negatively associated with consideration for others. His reasoning with her by asking her to think of the consequences of her action was positively related to both internalized moral judgement and consideration of others.

(Lynn, 1974, p. 200)

Based on his analysis of the research, Lynn states that:

The evidence leads to the conclusion that the father's influence is prominent in children's moral development, in their tendency to express or inhibit aggression, and in whether or not they become delinquent.

(Lynn, 1974, p. 215)

In terms of the female children's moral development, a greater delinquency rate was found among girls who had lost their mothers than among girls who had lost their fathers.

The delinquency pattern does not appear to be as strong for girls who have inadequate fathers as it is for
boys. However, as mentioned earlier, the father does have a fairly strong influence with his daughters. This influence, however, appears to emphasize affect, rather than power or limit setting. For boys, a combination of their father's affect and strong limit setting appears to have a stronger influence in their moral development.

Theories of Family Power Structure

A third area to be considered for the purpose of our research is that of theories of "family power structure" (Safilios-Rothschild, 1970). These theories are derived, in part, from systems theory and family systems theory. The fairly recent concept of 'system' has attracted theorists who have developed various hypotheses, some of which have been empirically tested. "Systems theory attempts to focus on the functional facts of relationships," thus providing the empirical dimension which is necessary for the development of a theory (Bowen, 1973). In systems theory as it applies to social work, any group of people related in some way is a system. Thus, we could move from the overall culture or society as a system, to a community as a system, and then to a family. Nathan Ackerman, and many others, have applied the systems theory to the family in the recent growth of family systems theory (Ackerman, 1972). As applied to the family:

Systems theory assumes all important people in the family unit play a part in the way family
members function in relation to each other and in the way the system finally erupts... The family is a system in that a change in the functioning of one family member is automatically followed by a compensatory change in another family member.

(Bowen, 1973, p. 20)

It is within the context of the family as a system that Robert Blood developed his "resource theory" of family power structure (Blood and Wolfe, 1960). The resource theory states that a spouse's degree of power or control over decisions depends on the degree to which he/she has access to certain resources such as income, education, job status, social status, etc. As the access to resources for one spouse changes, it will alter not only his/her degree of decision-making power but also that of the spouse. When a woman takes a job outside of the home, her new job status will increase her power and thereby decrease her husband's control over decision-making. This resource theory has stimulated much research since it was first postulated. Among these are studies concerned with the relationship between family power structure and social class; cross-cultural comparisons of family power structure; marital satisfaction and decision-making power; perception of family power held by husbands and wives, adolescents and children; relationship between the family cycle and family power structure; religious perspective and decision-making pattern; and the effects on adolescents' personality of
the family power structure. (See Safilios-Rothschild, 1970, for a decade review of the literature.) Thus, many testable propositions have been added to this body of knowledge.

However, a great deal of confusion still surrounds this theory. For one thing, as Safilios-Rothschild (1969) has pointed out, "most investigations in this area have used interchangeably the terms 'family power' or 'power structure,' and the terms 'decision-making,' 'family authority,' and 'influence.'" Other terms that have been used are 'marital authority pattern,' 'decision-making power' or 'power structure,' 'decision authority' and 'authority.' The definitions of these terms have varied; collection of data has been done in some studies by observation of family or marital interaction, in others by interview questionnaire. Safilios-Rothschild points out that although the concept of family power has not been clearly defined, it can be "measured indirectly through behavioral acts in which the degree of one's power is put to the test" (1969, p. 540).

Therefore, despite the limitation of studies on family power structure, the findings can be helpful in suggesting trends and in the formulation of further propositions. Indeed, the research does indicate a consistent trend. Mother-dominated homes, as opposed to father-dominated homes, have been associated in some studies with less compatibility of college students with both
parents; less satisfaction of wives and husbands with their home life; disruption of boys' masculine identification and decreased femininity of daughters; weaker moral development of both boys and girls; lower verbal achievement of girls; sexual promiscuity of adolescent girls; homosexuality in sons; conduct problems among children; alcoholism in adult offspring; and psychological maladjustment of children (Lynn, 1974; Biller, 1974). The sex role development of boys, for example, is adversely affected by a dominant mother whereas a dominant father encourages healthy masculine development in his son but does not negatively affect his daughter's femininity. In fact, it tends to enhance it. David Lynn also finds that a passive father who is nagged and degraded by a domineering wife can lead to sexual promiscuity in their daughter. Reviewing the clinical observations of Peter Blos and Alfred Friedman, he summarizes their opinions this way:

A yearning for a strong father, combined with anger at the mother for deprecating him can be the precipitating conditions for sexual acting out.

(Lynn, 1974, p. 209)

In his report of a correlational study of six-to-twelve-year old children, Lynn states that:

The fathers of the conduct-problem children tended to withdraw from situations and not to enforce regulations but to leave things to the mother, who was active and tense, free with suggestions, dictatorial and thwarting. The
mother, frustrated by the father, became more shrill; the father, frustrated by the mother, became increasingly withdrawn and lax with the child.

(Lynn, 1974, p. 244)

The findings cited above support the postulation that father-dominant homes are preferable for the healthy rearing of children, but they are not without challenge. Some of these studies are contradicted by the findings of others (Lynn, 1974). These contradictions are due, at least in part, to the inconsistent definition of 'dominance,' 'authority,' and 'power structure' that was mentioned earlier. In fact, the concept of family or conjugal power structure implies by its very terminology, a conflictual relationship between spouses. It is not surprising, then, that studies such as that by Murray Straus (1962) produce data that indicate that the autonomic type of equalitarian spousal relationship provides the most effective socializing environment for children. In our study, we will utilize the concept of leadership and will not presume the existence of a battle for power.

*Leadership Theory*

Because there is an absence of leadership theory which pertains to families, we believe that it is necessary to review the available leadership theory that exists in other sectors of our society such as small groups and management.
As we view the family system as a small group, we believe the existing leadership theory in this area to be applicable to the family. Johnson and Johnson (1975) define leadership as an "influence relationship occurring among mutually dependent group members" (p. 17). This definition would appear to be highly applicable to the contemporary family group.

Four approaches to leadership theory have been stated as "trait, position, style, and distributed functions" (Johnson and Johnson, 1975, p. 20). Similarly, Ross and Hendry (1957), identified three approaches to leadership. These were "leadership as traits within the individual leader, leadership as a function of the group, and leadership as a function of the situation" (p. 17, 22, 26).

Leadership Traits

In feudal times, when leadership positions were often passed down from generation to generation, and aristocratic social systems dominated, leadership was thought to be an innate trait. However, with the coming of democracies, leadership began to be understood more as behaviours that could be learned. For many years, studies in leadership were based on the old concept of leadership as emanating from the individual's personality trait. Great men in government, Kings and Queens, were considered to be ideal leaders. It was thought that you
either 'had it' or 'didn't have it' for leadership. Early studies by Bird (1940) and Stogdill (1948) failed to provide any consistency between various traits that were supposed to characterize leaders (Ross and Hendry, 1957). Johnson and Johnson (1975) concluded the following from the trait studies:

People who are highly motivated to become leaders, who have the energy, drive, self-confidence, and determination to succeed, will become leaders, because they work hard to get leadership positions (p. 20).

This would suggest that individuals are not born leaders, but rather, they can be trained to become effective leaders. It would follow, therefore, if the family can be considered a small group, that the father as well as other family members can learn leadership behaviour.

**Leadership Position**

Another theoretical assumption that has often been made on leadership is that it must automatically carry high authority or status. This theoretical approach is often practiced in our contemporary corporate structures, which are based on a hierarchical bureaucracy. This includes the chain of command system from the president, vice president, middle management down to line staff. In this system, the position supported by organizational rules maintains that subordinates report to superiors. This approach does not take into account the potential leadership influences of the individuals that are not
involved in positions of authority. Secondly, it is not necessarily valid to assume that the behaviour of people in high-authority positions is always effective leadership behaviour. This approach also assumes that the hierarchical or position system is more efficient because it is task oriented. However, without the possibility of input from other leadership behaviour practiced by the employees, morale may drop drastically and in the long run this system may be detrimental to production output.

Brill reported general findings from research on the types of leadership that allow people to function at their best and thus produce the highest output.

1. People work best when stress on status and hierarchy is minimal and when the relationships among workers on all levels are collegial rather than hierarchical. (By definition, 'collegial' is used to mean relationships based on respect for individual integrity, knowledge, and skill and recognition of their value and the value of the persons exercising them. 'Hierarchical' is used in the sense of meaning dictatorial control based on status and position, lacking in recognition of the worth and integrity of the individual, both as a person and as a worker).

2. People work most effectively, creatively, and happily and are able to use their abilities to the greatest extent in those groups where controls are neither autocratic nor laissez-faire but based on sound democratic principles. (These particular findings tend to substantiate the principle that people have both a basic need and a right to be involved in decision-making in matters pertaining to their own welfare).

(1976, p. 88).

Research findings appear to support that the position or
hierarchical theoretical approach to leadership does not provide an optimum environment for meeting basic human needs and production output.

In an effort to find more effective leadership approaches, researchers began to look at various leadership styles.

**Leadership Styles**

Lewin, Lippitt and White (1939) identified three leadership styles: "autocratic, democratic, and laissez-faire" (Johnson and Johnson, 1975, p. 21).

In the autocratic style the leader determines all policy and gives orders to the group members. In the democratic style, the policies are set through group discussions and decision, with the leader encouraging and helping the group to interact. In the laissez-faire style there is very little participation by the leader.

(Johnson and Johnson, 1975, p. 21)

Livingston presented a chart analysing the ranges and effects of leader styles. He outlined three leadership ranges: the high pressure or autocratic, the variable, and the no pressure or democratic (Hoefling, p. 5). The Livingston Study is a good example where the concept of leadership is included in management theory. The managerial grid concept presented by Blake and Mouton (Hoefling, p. 7) offered two definite dimensions of leadership: (1) task accomplishment, and (2) concern for people. In terms of Livingston's chart, the variable leader style would come closest to meeting a balance between task accomplishment and concern for people.
Sterling Livingston's Analysis of
Ranges of Leader Styles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concept</th>
<th>High pressure or Autocratic</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>No pressure or Democratic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authority and control</td>
<td>Will to achieve and planned performance</td>
<td>Self-interest and free will</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominant self-reliant people</td>
<td>Objective-creative people</td>
<td>Tolerant, self-trusting people</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controlling Forcing</td>
<td>Development Helping</td>
<td>Permissive Non-directive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directive Decisions made</td>
<td>Interactive (flexible)</td>
<td>Consultative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct Standards set</td>
<td>Analysis and action</td>
<td>Define objectives</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tight control Reward and punish</td>
<td>Approve plans</td>
<td>Give guidance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Obtain commitment</td>
<td>Self-decision</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Control flexibility Reward and challenge</td>
<td>Loose control</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reward and recognition</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results Short run</td>
<td>Good to excellent Unimpressive</td>
<td>Excellent Excellent Unimpressive Poor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long run</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problems</td>
<td>Overburdened managers Passive subordinates High turnover</td>
<td>Keeping the task challenging Mediocre performance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Hoefling, p. 5)
In applying these various styles to the family system, it would appear that the fathers who came closest to the variable leader style would have the most positive effects on the other family members.

For the purpose of our study, we have defined an effective paternal leader as generally practicing the following components: (1) giving of oneself; (2) open and flexible towards other family members; (3) an initiator; (4) a teacher-disciplinarian; (5) providing a model for other members; (6) respect for the individuality and equality of each family member; (7) ability at decision-making. In terms of Livingston's chart on leader styles, these components of paternal leadership that we wish to include in our study would appear to fit the variable type of leader style. However, this does not mean that various situations would not demand a temporary autocratic or democratic leader style.

A good leader must change his style, depending on the situation at the time and the group he is leading. A good leader, then, should be able to be autocratic if the situation and group dictate that style, and democratic if the situation or group changes. Most of his time will be spent in the middle of the range or in the variable leadership category. The key to good leadership, then, is to be able to vary the style depending on the situation and the group.

(Hoefling, p. 7)

Ross and Hendry (1957), in their discussion of leadership as a function of the group and of the situation, appear to support Hoefling's approach to leadership.
The effective paternal leader should be able, then, to balance the various leadership styles according to the nature and situation of his family. In times of family crisis such as sickness, tragedy, economic threats, the father may have to be dominant, directive and keep tight control of the family. Livingston indicated in his chart that the short run effects of the autocratic leader style are "good to excellent" (Hoefling, p. 6). However, in times when there is no crisis, the autocratic father would not achieve the same results. Livingston reports unimpressive results in the long run for the autocratic style of leadership.

Distributed Functions' Theory of Leadership

The last approach to leadership theory presented by Johnson and Johnson "emphasizes that leadership is a matter of abilities and skills that are learned" (Johnson and Johnson, 1975, p. 22).

Leadership is defined as the performance of acts to help the group reach its goals, maintain itself in good working order, and adapt to changes in the environment, and these acts are group functions. Leadership functions include setting goals, helping the group proceed toward these goals, and providing necessary resources to accomplish the goals. Other functions not directly related to achieving the group's goals, such as improving the group's stability and making sure that individual members are satisfied, are also part of leadership behaviours. (Johnson and Johnson, 1975, p. 22)

Johnson and Johnson (1975) report that "goal objectives and group maintenance are generally considered to
be the two basic objectives of a group" (p. 22). Group objectives is concerned with various group tasks while the maintenance functions are the people-oriented functions.

One of the most crucial maintenance functions in problem-solving groups is that of encouraging members to participate. A person will be committed to implementing a group decision if he has been involved in helping to make it....The basic conclusion from research on this issue is that people will work to make successful what they have helped to create. The more members participate in decision-making discussions, the more they will believe they have influenced the decision, the more they will be committed to it, and the more responsibility they will take for making the decision work....Group cohesion, consequently, will be high, and the group will be seen by its members as a source of social and emotional rewards.

(Johnson and Johnson, 1975, pp. 40, 41)

Blake and Mouton's managerial grid has also shown that the high task and high people-oriented leader is the most effective leader. If these contemporary findings can be related to the family, we can assume that the high task, high people-oriented father will be most effective in the family system. As yet, there has not been a leadership instrument specifically designed to measure leadership in the family. The leadership scales used in our study have been used to measure leadership behaviour in various types of groups ranging from military, industry, and education. The scales originate from the Ohio State University leadership studies. The leadership instrument used in this research is known as the Leadership Behavior Des-
cription Questionnaire (L.B.D.Q.) A detailed description of the instrument is included in Chapter II.

**Biblical Concepts**

**A Review**

Many other forces have influenced the development of the family. We do not have time to discuss all of these. However, Judaeo-Christian concepts and life-style as the basis of most Western cultures have had a profound effect on the evolution of the family. As has been stated:

Christianity has been one of the dominating forces in shaping Western civilization. It has permeated our institutions, given us the moral basis for our laws, formed our ideals, and until recently the church itself controlled our education.

(Bullough, 1973, p. 49)

For this reason, we consider the Biblical concept of the family worthy of examination here.

Traditionally, the church has had a hierarchical view of human relationships.

One which says that the headship of the man is a divine absolute, transcending the relativities of time and place. The primary model of all social relationships is the family, in which the woman as wife is subject to the man as husband even as the children are subject in all things to their parents. This family structure reflects God's "chain of command," which must be recognized and maintained if human society is to survive as fully human.

(Jewett, 1975, p. 51)

This theology was based on St. Paul's teaching in his
letter to the Ephesian church:¹

Be most careful then how you conduct yourselves: like sensible men, not like simpletons... Be subject to one another out of reverence for Christ. Wives be subject to your husbands as to the Lord; for the man is the head of the woman, just as Christ is the head of the church. Christ is indeed, the Saviour of the body; but just as the church is subject to Christ, so must women be to their husbands in everything.

Husbands, love your wives, as Christ also loved the church and gave himself up for it, to consecrate it, cleansing it by water and word, so that he might present the church to himself all glorious, with no stain or wrinkle or anything of the sort, but holy and without blemish. In the same way men also are bound to love their wives, as they love their own bodies. In loving his wife a man loves himself. For no one ever hated his own body; on the contrary, he provides and cares for it; and that is how Christ treats the church, because it is his body, of which we are living parts. Thus it is (in the words of Scripture) 'a man shall leave his father and mother and shall be joined to his wife, and the two shall become one flesh.' It is a great truth that is hidden here. I for my part refer it to Christ and to the church, but it applies also individually: each of you must love his wife as his very self; and the woman must see to it that she pays her husband all respect.

(Ephesians 5:15; 21-33, NEB)

This view of male-female relationships supported societal attitudes toward women in Greek, Roman and Hebrew cultures where a woman was considered to be inferior, regarded as property and as an object of evil (Bullough, 1973). As the church grew in numbers and power, it carried this

¹Other relevant passages that are often referred to include Genesis 1:27-31; Genesis 2:15-25; Genesis 3:4-7; 16-19; I Corinthian 11, 14; I Timothy 2; Colossians 3:18-19; I Peter 3:1.
view of man-woman, husband-wife relationships through the ages and into diverse cultures. The Protestant Reformation began a slow change in this attitude. Luther's doctrine of the universal priesthood of believers brought a greater equality to the sexes, although he allowed for women to take up the office of ministry only in times of necessity (Jewett, 1975). Calvin also brought some improvement to the status of women when he argued that the woman was given to man as a companion to share all of life with him rather than to be merely his bedchamber companion for "the remedy of his concupiscence" (Jewett, 1975). However, the attitude that women are inferior still predominated. According to Calvin, "the woman was created later (than the man) to be 'a kind of appendage'; she was given to the man as 'a lesser help-meet'" (Jewett, 1975, p. 68).

More recently, there have been numerous attempts within the church to re-examine the church's attitude toward women and the meaning of the Biblical teaching on the husband-wife relationship. Some of these attempts have sought to re-establish a literal interpretation of the command to wives that they be submissive and obedient. Bill Gothard's Institute in Basic Youth Conflicts and Larry Christenson (1970) both stress that the wife must be obedient to her husband in all things, except where that would lead her directly into sin. Only then, they argue, will God be able to work in their husbands through
His "chain of command." Christenson's interpretation of scripture does not even allow for social equality of men and women. Referring to Galatians 3:28, which states, "There is no such thing as Jew and Greek, slave and free-
man, male and female; for you are all one person in Christ Jesus." Christenson argues:

Some people have taken this isolated text as a basis for teaching an indiscriminate social 'equality' between men and womdn. But this is far from the Apostles' meaning.

(Christenson, 1970, p. 38)

Marabel Morgan's (1973) advice to Christian women similarly advocates that wives must cater to their husband's needs and whims, and submit to their decisions and requests. In fact, she encourages them to actively excite and fulfill their husbands' sexual drives by greeting them in sexy costumes when they come home from work. Unfortunately, such a view of women reinforces the lingering attitude that women are sexual partners only.

More scholarly attempts to find a Christian pers-
spective on the issue of husband-wife relationship have produced a more balanced interpretation of the scriptural concepts. Carl Barth emphasizes the inter-dependence and also the differentness of male and female. While believing that scripture does not allow the church to avoid the fact that there is to be superordination and subordination in the male-female relationship, he argues that, "in no sense is the meaning (of 'submission') to be conceived in terms
of the relationship of owner and chattel, of superior and subordinate, or even of prince and subject" (Jewett, 1975, p. 79). In maintaining that man and woman are equal though different, Barth focuses on God's order for relationships between the sexes:

The supremacy of man is not a question of value, dignity or honour, but of order. It does not denote a higher humanity of man. Its acknowledgement is no shame to woman. On the contrary, it is an acknowledgement of her glory, which in a particular and decisive respect is greater than that of man....She is his glory of God (I Cor. 11:7)....It is the peculiar glory of her creation, i.e., that she was 'taken out of man,' that she completes the creation of man from man himself and that this is crowned by his own recognition and confession - it is this distinction - insurpassable in its own way, which, not for her humiliation but her exaltation, specifically and inexorably assigns her to this position. Only in this position does she possess her true humanity, but in this position she really does possess it.

The concept of order as a means of understanding the Biblical concept of the marriage relationship is echoed by James Olthius (1975) who refers to the 'offices' or 'position' or 'calling' of 'husband' and 'wife.' Man and woman are called to serve ("be submissive to") one another (Eph. 5:21) through their office of husband and wife, the office determining how they are to relate to one another. Building on the understanding that God's creational intent was that man and woman be companions for one another, as equal partners in fulfilling their charge to "fill the earth and subdue it" (Genesis 1:28),
Olthius (1975) emphasizes that subjection does not mean inferiority or being substandard, but it "has to do with obeying one's calling, being subject to the demands of the office" (p. 143-144). Headship\(^2\) has nothing to do with being boss or lording it over another, rather "headship has to do in the first place with the main direction of the marriage ... what is the meaning of marriage? What are its overriding goals? What vision is going to guide day-to-day activities and decisions?" (Olthius, 1974, p. 27). Following the model of Christ who is the head of the church, man in his position as husband is to serve his wife (and family) by providing leadership in the setting of family goals, the assessment of the family's direction, the setting of expectations, and in calling members to fulfill these. He is to be the initiator in the building of family cohesion, being the first to seek reconciliation and being actively involved with family members. As a wife, the woman is to serve her husband by allowing him to assume leadership of the family and by supporting him in this role.

Barth and Olthius present a contemporary view of women which challenges the church's traditional attitude that women are second-class creatures, somehow unequal to men. However, at least one theologian is not satisfied

\(^2\)The Greek word here holds the meaning of "source" or "origin" of life and energy.
with even this interpretation of the scriptures. Professor Paul Jewett (1975) of the Fuller Theological Seminary criticizes Barth's reasoning that man and woman are different though equal and that because of this differentness the woman is necessarily subordinate in the male-female relationship. Jewett (1975) rejects any concept of a hierarchical relationship between man and woman as he believes that such a view "requires one to argue not only for the priority but also the superiority of the male" (p. 14). He rejects the notion of male superiority basing his rationale, as Olthius does, on the creation idea of male and female as equal partners.

An Evaluation

From the above discussion it can be seen that the Judaeco-Christian concept of man and woman has contributed to the unjust and often cruel treatment of women. However, this strong cultural force has often served a purpose in providing strict roles for societal behaviour. As David Lynn states in reference to a work by C. Kirkpatrick:

Marital deterioration is especially likely to occur in households in which conjugal roles are not rigidly prescribed by society....With marital roles undefined, with women's knowledge of their inferior position made increasingly conscious by the dissemination of the Women's Liberation point of view, with men threatened by women's anger and by changing sex roles, and with both husband and wife adhering to the self-fulfillment ethic, the inevitable conclusion is that unhappy and broken marriages will increase....As a consequence the proportion
of children who suffer the effects of conflict-laden homes and of broken homes will increase. (Lynn, 1974, pp. 136-137)

The present authors believe that this role confusion is not necessary. Like Carl Barth, we believe that there is an order in the marriage relationship which transcends time and cultures, although obedience to this ordinance must be worked out within the meaning of each culture and in the context of each couple's life together. While subscribing to the Judaeo-Christian beliefs and lifestyle, ourselves, we recognize the danger of misguided interpretations of the Biblical principle for the marriage relationship. Therefore, we reject any concept of the marriage relationship that considers one partner to be less than equal to the other. We are in accord with Barth and Olthius who base their understanding of the marriage relationship on the creation idea of equal partnership and companionship, yet who recognize the principle that the partners are called to the particular offices of husband and wife which have different but complementary roles.

These roles call for headship on the part of the husband and submission on the part of the wife. This does not imply superiority and inferiority, or lord and slave. Rather, as Olthius conceptualizes this, headship means that the husband is responsible for leading the family in deciding on its direction, setting its goals and
expectations and calling family members back to these. Note the similarity here with Parson's theory of instrumental and expressive roles that sees the father as the one who is concerned with bringing society's values and expectations into the family and preparing the family members to go into society.

Olthius states further that:

Headship does not mean that the husband leads or decides in every detail. Once a man and woman have decided which vision of life is going to norm their activities in the marriage, they can leave the decisions in day-to-day affairs to the partners with the appropriate talents, temperaments and situations. (Olthius, 1975, pp. 27-28)

As this statement implies, the wife's submission does not require her to cast aside her intellect and deny her opinions. Olthius makes this clear in the following comment:

The husband can only command the wife to live up to what the two of them mutually pledged when they married. Likewise, if the husband neglects his office, the wife ought to call the husband back to their mutual vows (p. 27).

Even Larry Christenson encourages wives not to stifle their personality and individuality:

Submission does not mean that one remains piously silent, 'leaving everything in the husband's hands.' Submission to authority means that you put yourself wholly at the disposal of the person who is set over you. ... If a wife withholds her understanding and feeling on a matter, she is being less than submissive, for she is not putting these things at her husband's disposal. (Christenson, 1970, p. 43)
He states further that:

Submissiveness is not a matter of mere outward form but of inner attitude. A wife can be a person of strong, even outspoken opinions, and still be submissive to her husband's authority, if deep down she respects him and is quite prepared and content for him to make and carry out the final decision (p. 42).

Therefore, submission, as we view it, is not contradictory with the wife's equality with her husband; nor does it deny her individuality and talents and intellect. This paradox also exists in Christ's relationship with the Father. As Reverend John Gunstone (1974) points out, Christ was both submissive to God the Father in His role as the Messiah, and at the same time was His coequal.

Perhaps this can be seen more clearly by looking at the other side of the coin - the husband's leadership. In fact, we feel that the church has over-emphasized the need for women to be submissive and has failed to teach husbands their responsibility to be family leaders. In our review of the literature only one book was found that devoted itself to this concern (Page, 1973). Judaeo-Christian principles of leadership are antithetical to the common concept of leadership. Christ, as the leader of His church, led by serving His disciples. He washed their feet. He exhausted himself in teaching, healing, consoling, and finally in dying for His church. Christ, himself, summed up the principle of leadership in this way:
You know that in the world the recognized rulers lord it over their subjects, and their great men make them feel the weight of authority. That is not the way with you; among you, whoever wants to be great must be your servant, and whoever wants to be first must be the willing slave of all. For even the Son of Man did not come to be served but to serve, to give up his life as a ransom for many.

(Mark 10:42-45)

As Wolfe (1969) expressed it, in the leadership that Christ displayed and taught, "The motivation is love, the method is service, the purpose is redemptive, the result is freedom" (p. 29). His leadership was characterized by humility; giving of himself; loyalty to His followers; initiation of relationships and reconciliation; respect for the uniqueness and worth of each individual; firmness in His teaching and standards of character, balanced by compassion and acceptance; and finally, behaviour that provided a model of His teaching. These traits of leadership bear a resemblance to the principles of effective leadership that the research discussed previously has found.

This concept of leadership emphasizes the husband's responsibility to serve his wife and family, rather than granting him any privileged status or power that his wife might resent. Is there any wife who would not gladly yield submissively to such leadership?

**Summary**

In this chapter we have reviewed literature from
many areas and have discovered a consistent indication of the importance of the father's role in child development. Freud's psychoanalytic theory, Parson's theory of instrumental and expressive roles and learning theory all view the father as the parent who interprets and teaches society's values and appropriate behaviour to children. The father is also seen as the one who is the family's representative in society. Research into the effects of fathering on child development indicates that the father influences the child's sex-role identification, social adjustment, cognitive development, creativity, and moral development. A high degree of paternal involvement, affection, nurturance, decision-making and limit-setting are associated with the positive development of the child in the above-mentioned areas. Theories of family power structure, though limited in their sophistication, also indicate that the father is an important factor in child development. Homes where the father is dominant in decision-making and influence are associated with boys who are more socially adjusted than are boys from mother-dominant homes. However, there is a danger inherent in the family power theories that the variable of marital conflict may prove to override the variable of mother- or father-dominance in importance. Therefore, we have looked at leadership theory, and there we find the importance of people-oriented behaviours as
well as task-oriented functions in leadership. Similar to what has been found in studies on fathering, the most effective leadership is that where the leader's behaviour demonstrates a high degree of involvement, consideration, respect for group members' individuality and where the leader is simultaneously able to set expectations for the group, make needed decisions, and be the group's representative to those outside the group. Although there have been many cultural and historical influences on the role of the father in the family, none is more persuasive and enduring in Western societies as that of Judaeo-Christian concepts of the family and the husband-wife relationship. Although doctrines claiming to have a Biblical basis have been used to support the unjust and sometimes cruel treatment of women, the present authors believe that Biblical concepts are consistent with what research has found to be the most beneficial style of fathering for healthy child development, and with the leadership behaviours that have been identified as being most effective. We believe that these Biblical concepts can be helpful in calling fathers back to their needed role in child development and family leadership.
CHAPTER II

METHODOLOGY

Concepts

This study makes use of the concepts of role, leadership, and family system. Concepts are defined as:

A selection of certain phenomena which are grouped or classified together. Such a selection is neither true nor false; rather, it is judged in terms of its utility for the advancement of scientific knowledge.

(Phillips, 1967, p. 32)

The concept of role applies to the areas of sociology, psychology, anthropology, social work, professional organizations, family system and small groups.

Role is defined as:

The behavior that is expected and also the actual behavior that is acted. Role is a relational concept. It applies to more than one person and implies reciprocal relationships.

(Klein, 1972, p. 96)

For example, in this study, the husband's leadership role may be dependent on the wife's reciprocal role of acceptance of his leadership.

Klein further mentions that "what is acceptable behavior for a role is determined by social norms" (p. 96). The father's role in the family has been drastically
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affected by the changing contemporary social norms. It no longer appears necessary for a father to provide effective leadership in his family. What has become more important is that he provide effective leadership in his profession or in his place of employment. Developing their leadership skills in their own families is not now a priority for most men. We believe that this new social role played by the father, which is largely determined by social norms, is having a detrimental effect on the contemporary family system.

Leadership is another concept relevant to this study. A leader is one who exercises positive influence upon others. In a family system, a strong paternal leader will exercise more positive influence through his actions than any of the other family members. Johnson and Johnson (1975, p. 22) state that a leader is one who exercises most influence in goal-setting and goal achievement in a group.

The most widely accepted approach to leadership today is known as the distributed functions approach (Johnson and Johnson, 1975, p. 22).

The functional approach to leadership is, at this time, the most concrete and direct approach available for improving the leadership skills of an individual and for improving the effectiveness of a working group. (Johnson and Johnson, 1975, p. 23)

The final concept used in this study is that of
family system. This concept includes several other concepts such as "acts, statuses, sentiments, goals, time, rank" (Klein, 1972, p. 131). Family system "cannot be thought of as a theory because it does not explain what happens" (Klein, 1972, p. 131). Family therapy can be considered a theory because it explains what happens between the various family member relationships. The family system as a concept does not do this. It does, however, provide a guideline for the further study of the variables within its boundary.

System analysis is useful because it permits the worker to locate the tensions and ascertain how they operate. Such identification can reveal major points of friction which may make the system nonfunctional or dysfunctional. The assessment of these major incongruents, distortions, misapprehensions, is useful, for example, in family group counseling. (Klein, 1972, p. 131)

In terms of this study, we hypothesize that a lack of father leadership within the family system could render the family system dysfunctional. Perhaps one of the children would take over the leadership that he or she is not prepared for. In the absence of a strong paternal leadership influence, the wife may have to take a stronger leadership role which, according to some researchers, might leave gaps in the family system.

Where there is no father figure, or one who is too weak, too remote or busy, too tyrannical, the dependency on the mother remains too strong and lasting. She may reign, but she will not rule. Later on in life, the individual's
ability to establish mature relations is severely damaged. (Meerlo, 1968, p. 105)

One of the advantages of the family system concept is that it "allows one to select the most feasible point of entry within the system" (Klein, 1972, p. 132). We selected the variable father leadership as the most feasible as the point of entry into the family system. We looked at the father's leadership role and its effects on the children who make up parts of the family system.

**Research Question and Hypotheses**

These concepts of family system, leadership and role enable us now to state our research questions as follows:

Is there any relationship between the variables of paternal leadership, maternal leadership, and behaviour problems among children?

From this question we can specify three hypotheses:

1) The degree of parental leadership provided in the home is negatively related to the existence of behaviour problems among the children.

2) The degree of paternal leadership provided is negatively related to the existence of behaviour problems among the children.

3) Children exhibiting behaviour problems will tend to have fathers who rate lower than their mothers in family leadership while children not displaying behaviour
problems will tend to have fathers who rate higher than their mothers in leadership.

The hypotheses would appear to be of the experimental type. Firstly, we are concerned with the relationship of analytical variables. These variables, in terms of the hypotheses, are the leadership rating of the father, and of the mother and the occurrence of behavioural problems among the children. Secondly, the hypotheses are based on the idea that change in one variable affects a change in the other variables. For example, a change in the father's or mother's leadership would affect the behaviour of the children. More specifically, a weak father leader may be related to an increase in behavioural problems among his children. However, if the leadership of that same father (a change in one variable) were to become stronger, it could effect a change in the other variable. In this case, change in the leadership variable might result in fewer behavioural problems among the children.

Thirdly, the hypotheses attempt to test other potential associations between the variables of leadership of the father and mother and behavioural problems in children. We have assumed from various theories such as psychoanalytical, developmental and family systems theory that the father and mother have an important role to play in relation to the other family members. However, this does not mean that causation can be identified.
In terms of the above criterion for experimental type hypotheses, it would appear that the hypotheses stated in this study lend themselves to feasible research.

**Operational Definitions**

Polansky states that an operational definition "consists of the steps, actions, 'operations' one performs in order to relate the concept to events in the real world" (Polansky, 1975, p. 23). These definitions must attempt to describe how the concepts will be measured and what observable, or measurable phenomena will be used as indicators of the concept. The operational definition must correspond to the conceptual definition. They must be a valid representation of the construct that they are attempting to operationalize.

The definitions which we have operationalized for the purpose of measurement are: children who present behaviour problems; children who do not present behaviour problems; paternal leadership; maternal leadership; and family leadership. Firstly, children who present behaviour problems are defined as those who are referred to the Youth Guidance Project from intact families and the residents of Maryvale School for Girls, who also come from intact families.

Secondly, children who do not present behaviour problems are defined as those in Windsor's two high
schools chosen for the study, who have not been referred to an agency because of behavioural problems, who are similar in sex, religion, socio-economic class and age to the above defined group, and who come from intact families.

Thirdly, leadership must be defined in terms of how it can be empirically measured. For the purpose of this study, leadership is a role which will be measured by means of a questionnaire which will rate the various components of leadership as defined in the L.B.D.Q. instrument which will be discussed more fully in the design.

Paternal and maternal leadership, for the purpose of this study, has been defined according to the leadership function that the father and mother perform in the family based on the subscales of the L.B.D.Q. instrument.

Definition of the Subscales

1) Representation - Father or mother speaks and acts as the representative of the family (5 items).

2) Demand Reconciliation - Father or mother reconciles conflicting demands and reduces disorder to system (5 items).

3) Tolerance of Uncertainty - Father or mother is able to tolerate uncertainty and postponement without anxiety or upset (10 items).

4) Persuasiveness - Father or mother uses persuasion and argument effectively; exhibits strong con-
victens (10 items).

5) Initiation of Structure - Father or mother clearly defines own role, and lets followers know what is expected (10 items).

6) Tolerance of Freedom - Father or mother allows followers scope for initiative, decision, and action (10 items).

7) Role Assumption - Father or mother actively exercises the leadership role rather than surrendering leadership to others (10 items).

8) Consideration - Father or mother regards the comfort, well-being, status, and contributions of family members (10 items).

9) Predictive Accuracy - Father or mother exhibits foresight and ability to predict outcomes accurately (5 items).

10) Integration - Father or mother maintains a closely knit family; resolves inter-member conflicts (5 items).

(Stogdill, 1963, p. 3)

We also added the subscales of limit-setting, decision-making, nurturance, and leadership acceptance to define further the specific leadership function of the mother and father in the families interviewed. These behaviours, as noted in the review of literature, were found to be the most significant parenting behaviours
affecting child development.

Limit-setting is defined as the degree of initiative that the mother or father show in setting reasonable limits or discipline on the behaviour of the children. Decision-making is defined in terms of which partner most often has the last say in important family decisions, based on that partner's willingness to listen to the other members' suggestions in making these family decisions. Nurturance is defined as the quality of time spent by the partner with the children. Finally, leadership acceptance is defined as the degree to which family members are willing to accept the parental leadership.

Assumptions

The researchers make several assumptions in this study. As stated by Tripodi:

Included in the researcher's formulation of the study problem should be a statement of major assumptions in regard to selection of variables, definitions of concepts, and measurement procedures.

(Tripodi, 1970, p. 83)

Tripodi defines assumptions as "propositions which have not been verified, but which are taken as given for the purpose of investigation" (Tripodi, 1970, p. 74).

In the study, we are making several assumptions related to variables. Firstly, variables other than sex, religion, socio-economic class and age are assumed to be insignificant in affecting the outcome of the study.
Secondly, although we recognize that variables other than father's or mother's leadership (e.g., peer relations, relationships with relatives, etc.) are significant in the socializing of children, we assume for the purpose of this study that the father's and mother's leadership is most important.

Assumptions concerning the definitions of our populations are also made for the purpose of the study. We assume that children referred to the Youth Guidance Project are experiencing behaviour problems, while those in the high schools chosen for the study who are not referred for behaviour problems are not experiencing behaviour problems. Furthermore, we assume that leadership does not imply a conflictual relationship or a struggle for power. We also assume that leadership can be measured indirectly by measuring behaviour in relation to other members of the family system. We further assume that the people will answer the questionnaire honestly.

Research Design

According to Tripodi's classification system, the study is a quantitative-descriptive study of the hypothesis-testing sub-type. Like the true experimental studies, it is seeking "a quantitative-description among specified variables" (Tripodi, 1969, p. 23). However, it is unlike the experimental design because there is no manipulation
of the independent variable (behaviour problem). Nor is there any randomization which is essential for true experimental studies. Manipulation of variables has been replaced by the ex post facto method of measuring the leadership variable in a group of families after the occurrence of behaviour problems among children, and comparing it to leadership scores of families where this variable has not occurred. In place of randomization, we have matched the population for age and sex of the identified child and the families' religion and social position.

The study meets the prerequisite of a quantitative-descriptive study as defined by Tripodi (p. 37). Firstly, the study "cannot be classifiable as an experimental study." Secondly, "the study must include variables which are amenable to measurement and, hence, quantitative-description." In the study, the measure of leadership behaviour of mothers and fathers is correlated with the occurrence of behaviour problems in children. This correlation of measurable variables meets the third prerequisite, this being that:

The study must have one of the following purposes pertaining to the seeking of knowledge: the testing of hypotheses or the accurate description of quantitative relations among variables selected for inclusion of the research.

(Tripodi, 1969, p. 39)

Of the two purposes listed above for quantitative-descriptive research, it is the intent of the study
to test hypotheses. Tripodi defines the hypothesis-
testing sub-type as:

Those quantitative-descriptive studies which
contain in their design of research explicit
hypotheses to be tested. The hypotheses are
typically derived from theory, and they may be
either statements of cause-effect relationships
or statements of association between two or
more variables without reference to a causal
relationship.

(Tripodi, 1969, p. 39)

Our hypotheses are statements of association between the
variables of paternal leadership, maternal leadership,
and behaviour problems in children. There is no state-
ment of causation, although causation may be an implication
of the data results.

This design has several limitations to it as there
are several factors threatening the internal and external
validity which cannot be completely controlled for.

Eight extraneous variables which "if not controlled
in the experimental design, might produce effects con-
founded with the effect of the experimental stimulus"
are identified by Campbell and Stanley (1963, p. 5).

Some of these do not concern us because of the nature of
our study so we have chosen to eliminate their discussion
under this design. One of the variables that Campbell
and Stanley list is that of testing: "the effects of
taking a test upon the scores of a subsequent testing."
Although we will not be taking two observations of each
group, we have administered the same questionnaire twice
to each respondent within the same interview. The first was for an evaluation of their own leadership behaviour and the second was to evaluate their spouse's leadership behaviour. The second time the questionnaire was completed, their responses may have been affected by the first because the first test completion has provided a learning experience. They may understand the questions better after answering them once. They may also try to determine the most acceptable response during the initial completion of the test. This process may then have altered their responses on the second testing, even though they were evaluating their spouse instead of themselves. These variables will then threaten to alter the measurement of the dependent variable (leadership) regardless of the presence of the independent variable (behaviour problem). We tried to control this by means of instructions to the respondents directing them to regard the behavioural items in the questionnaire as being neutral. Assurance of their anonymity in the study and that their responses were not to be seen by their spouse hopefully reduced the threat posed by this variable to validity.

Instrumentation or instrument decay is a variable very similar to the previous one, especially since the subjects in the study were also the ones who rated their leadership and that of their spouse. Instrumentation refers to the danger that "changes in the calibration
of a measuring instrument or changes in the observers or scorers used may produce changes in the obtained measurement" (Campbell and Stanley, 1963, p. 5). When the respondents answered the questionnaire the second time, their responses may have been affected by their familiarity with the questions and their weariness at this point in the interview. As little could be done to control for this, it is a limitation of the study.

The greatest threat to our study's validity was the "biases resulting in differential selection of respondents for the comparison groups" (Campbell and Stanley, 1963, p. 5). The study involved a reference group composed of families of children who had been referred for behaviour problems. A matched contrast group was chosen from families of children not referred for behaviour problems. However, the variables involved were too numerous and complex to match the two groups on all of them. Yet, each of these variables, as Campbell and Stanley state, represent a plausible rival hypothesis to the research hypothesis. For example, in our proposed study, the sex of the child could have been a determining variable in the occurrence of behavioural problems. Unless this variable was controlled for and thus its related rival hypothesis proven implausible, the validity of our findings about the relationship between leadership and behaviour problems may have been weakened. An effort
was made to control for these variables. However, only some control could be achieved due to time and resources available to the researchers in the face of innumerable intervening variables. This limitation is the major criticism of Campbell and Stanley of the ex post facto matched group study.

The final threat to internal validity was posed by the process of selection. This was of some concern in the study because we asked for volunteers to participate as respondents. This process of selection may have served to screen out some parents who are passive, unwilling to be involved, or some who feel threatened about their position as father or mother. This may have brought respondents who would score higher in leadership than would the average parent. However, as both the reference group and contrast group consisted of volunteers, this factor of motivation was comparable in each group. The fact that the respondents for the reference group were approached by their social worker to participate may, nevertheless, have caused some parents to volunteer who otherwise would not have. While the relationship between worker and reference group subjects may have had a tendency to obligate the subject to participate, no such obligating relationship existed between the researcher and the families in the contrast population. This may have resulted in a slightly higher degree of self-motivation.
among the contrast group than among the reference group. This problem could have been overcome by using the same recruiting methods for both groups.

**Sampling Procedure**

The first step in the "sampling plan" (Polansky, 1975, p. 94) was to find a suitable population that would contain the variables we wished to study. In terms of our reference group, we wanted to study the relationship between paternal and maternal leadership and the existence of behavioural problems in children. The study population consisted of parents of children from 19 intact families referred for behavioural problems in the Youth Guidance Project and Maryvale, school for girls. We decided on these two agencies because they were prepared to provide intact families with both males and females as the identified behavioural problem. We decided to select both sexes as we were interested in the relationship of the father's and mother's leadership to both sons and daughters. The contrast sample was made up of 19 intact families whose children have not been referred to an outside agency for behavioural problems.

The populations are non-probability samples or samples of convenience because the population was not selected at random giving "equiprobability" (Ferguson, 1971, p. 133) to the wider population. We matched
the reference sample to the contrast sample in terms of the child's age, sex, socio-economic status and religion of the family. The sample is "matched" and dependent on "voluntary participation" (Isaac, 1975, p. 160).

As we have stated previously, the limitation on the matching of the reference and contrast group is the greatest danger to our study's validity. Of the innumerable extraneous variables that might be related to behaviour disturbance among children, we have chosen the above four variables because they appear to us to be the most important and the most commonly used. In particular, sex of the children is important in the theories of maternal and paternal influences on child development. Other variables not controlled for but accounted for were the presence of persons other than immediate family in the home; the child's ordinal position in the family; the number of siblings; and the family's main wage-earner.

We chose a small sample as we anticipated increasing difficulties in locating intact families in the two agencies used if we increased the sample significantly.

Recruitment and location of sample

In view of recruiting the populations, we went through several steps. The Youth Guidance workers provided a list of intact families receiving service from their agency. We followed up with a phone call to each family to explain the study and obtain their cooperation.
The Maryvale agency made their social workers available to approach intact families of girls in their program.

Secondly, we wrote letters (See Appendix I) explaining in a non-threatening way the nature of our study. We distributed these letters to the workers at Maryvale as a guide for them in answering questions as they were presenting the study and seeking the participation of intact families.

Thirdly, we approached a staff member of the Youth Guidance project who works in several high schools in the city. He volunteered to help us locate our contrast population. We designed an information sheet to help him discover age, sex of children and the name and address of potential parent participants. The Youth Guidance worker attempted to find out, during informal talks, if the families of the children surveyed were intact and if any of the children had been referred for behavioural problems. He double-checked the list of names accumulated by giving cards with names of families to the guidance counsellors and asking them to remove the card if they knew of any referral for behaviour problems in particular families.

Once this process was completed, the worker gave us the screened cards and we followed up with a letter (See Appendix III) and a telephone call asking for participation. In the interview, we screened further for behavioural problems by administering the preliminary
information sheet designed for use in the contrast group (See Appendix IV) after their response to the question-
naire. The sheet was designed for quick conversion using the Hollingshead Two-Factor Index of Social Position.

Two Windsor high schools were used in the study. The Youth Guidance worker recruited at the schools by
approaching students in the cafeteria to fill out the brief information sheet. The students were invited to
volunteer to complete the survey sheet if both their natural parents lived at home, and if they and their
siblings had never been involved in serious behaviour problems. This initial screening process, though limited
in its reliability, was successful in having some of the students screen out their families on the basis of these
criterion as revealed by their comments.

The second screening process involved the guidance counsellors' cooperation in removing the cards containing
the names of families they knew had behavioural problems with their children or were not in fact intact. However,
in one of the schools the guidance counsellors chose not to cooperate, so this second screening process was not
implemented in this high school. The principal, however, did cooperate in the study by giving the Youth Guidance
worker the permission to use the first screening process in the cafeteria.
The third screening process was implemented by the researchers in the actual interview by administering the information sheet containing the following question: "Has the behaviour of any of your children presented a problem requiring outside help?" This third and final screening process identified three families who indicated that one or more of their children had been referred for a behavioural problem to an outside agency. In view of these results, it appears that possible behaviour problems in this high school population were sufficiently screened using two out of the three screening measures originally designed by the researchers.

In the other high school population, all three screening measures were used as the guidance counsellors cooperated in the second screening procedure. No behavioural problems were revealed among the population used in the final screening during the actual interviews. The researchers assumed from these results that the screening measures used were effective in minimizing the probability of the existence of behavioural problems among the children in the control group. Representativeness of the sample

"The degree of the sample's representativeness is the key to establishing a legitimate claim that a study's findings are likely to approximate closely what could have been learned had the entire population been studied."
(Polansky, 1975, p. 95). The degree of our sample's representativeness must be questioned for several reasons. We do not have random samples but rather non-probability samples. Hence, we have several limitations in generalizing the findings to the wider population.

Ferguson states that the researcher can treat his population as representative if "the sample shows no bias on a number of known characteristics, that is, it may not differ from a random sample as far as these characteristics are known." In this case, Ferguson continues, the researcher "may be prepared to regard it as representative of the larger group or population and treat it as if it were a random sample" (Ferguson, 1971, p. 135).

We do not regard the sample of families as representative of the larger population since the characteristics of the samples are biased. We would have difficulty with the contrast group in terms of the definition of children not having behavioural problems as those children who have not been referred to a social agency or other outside service. If we had wanted to make this sample more representative we would have had to randomize it and rework the definition to screen more carefully for the existence of child behavioural problems within the particular families under study. The lack of referral to an outside agency does not necessarily mean an absence of behavioural problems.
In terms of the reference group, it is also difficult to discuss the sample as representative of the larger population with behavioural problems existing in their families. A limited type of behavioural problems is found in the Youth Guidance and Maryvale programs. Other types of behavioural problems resulting from low I.Q., organic damage, and retardation may not be directly related to parents' leadership and may not be present in the above programs or referred to any other outside social agency. Also, the types of behavioural problems likely to be encountered in the above programs are acting-out types. There are various other types of behavioural or emotional problems in existence in the general population of families (e.g., withdrawal) which cannot be covered under our criteria for behavioural problem. As a result of this limitation, the study's findings are limited to the relationship between parental leadership and the existence or absence of particular types of acting-out behavioural problems which are normally referred to Youth Guidance and Maryvale. In terms of the narrow definition of behavioural problems (again for convenience) we are not able to generalize beyond the sample to the wider population of families having behavioural problems present with their children.

Data Collection Procedures

The researchers administered to the contrast sample
a preliminary information sheet (See Appendix II). This served a twofold purpose. One, it provided us with the basic "descriptive data" (Polansky, 1975, p. 138) such as sex, age, number of children, religion and socio-economic level, and whether any of the children had been referred for behavioural problems.

The second part of the data collection consisted of a self-administered questionnaire with both the mother and the father evaluating their own leadership.

The third part of the data collection process consisted of the respondents (mothers and fathers) evaluating each other in private using the same questionnaire.

In order to prevent possible contamination, the researchers instructed the respondents to work privately and to sit away from each other. The respondents were not allowed to confer with each other at any time while they had the questionnaire in hand.

The administration of the questionnaire took from 1/2 to 1 hour. During this time, the researchers acted as limited resource persons, acting mainly to give clear, concise directions as to the actual administration of the questionnaire (i.e., instructions, ground rules, distributing and collecting questionnaires). To minimize researcher contamination, the researchers responded to any inquiry in regard to the actual content of the
questionnaire with the standardized response, "Use your own judgement."

We decided on a structured questionnaire for several reasons. One, we had not developed our own questionnaire, but rather we were using a structured leadership questionnaire which had already been developed and administered in numerous social situations with high reliability and validity. In terms of the forms of the data collection, the main limitation of the questionnaire was that it had not been applied to the family group. Hence, there was a possibility that the data collected may not have specifically been relevant to the family. To minimize this limitation we sought permission from the original publishers to drop items which did not relate specifically to the family group. We were also given permission by the publishers to make modifications that would facilitate the application of the instrument to the family. These modifications will be explained in detail later in our discussion of the instrument.

Secondly, in a structured questionnaire, "all respondents have the same possible choices, all questions are worded in exactly the same way, and the questions are presented to the respondent in the same order. Instructions and explanations are fixed, and there is no opportunity for the respondent to seek further clarification" (Polansky, 1975, p. 135). We feel that
the structured questionnaire gave us more consistent responses as well as saved us valuable time.

The use of closed questions possibly increased the validity of our responses. "Dohrenhead found that open questions were less efficient than closed questions, and there was no evidence that they produced ... more validity" (Polansky, 1975, p. 137).

Thirdly, the reliability of the questionnaire used had been improved through "manipulation of order and style" (Polansky, 1975, p. 143) through years of testing and application by numerous researchers in various social studies. The present order and style of the questions has been proven through extensive application to be highly reliable. Since the instrument was being applied to family groups for the first time, the reader will have reason to question its validity.

However, the instrument design has survived statistically rigorous testing and wide research application. In view of the above, we chose to use the L.B.D.Q. instrument because of its known reliability. The validity question will have to remain a limitation until this instrument has undergone more extensive application than we could provide with the limited family samples in this study.

Finally, the researchers added closed, all encompassing questions at the end of the questionnaire to check the consistency of the overall responses to the
questionnaire. These questions were analyzed as part of the total score and analyzed separately. A separate chart was designed showing the results of these summary questions in comparison to the results of the responses to the actual questionnaire. A correlation coefficient was applied to the two sets of questions as a check on validity.

**Instrument**

The L.B.D.Q. (Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire) was developed as an instrument that would measure the leadership of superiors as described by subordinates. "It can be used to describe the behavior of the leader, or leaders, in any type of group or organization, provided the followers have had an opportunity to observe the leader in action as a leader of their group" (L.B.D.Q., Form XII, Manual, p. 1).

The L.B.D.Q. was started by Hempill and further developed by members of the Ohio State Leadership Studies. Shartle was mainly responsible for outlining the theory behind the questionnaire. In 1945, when the Ohio State Leadership Studies group was formed, there was no "satisfactory theory or definition of leadership available" (L.B.D.Q., Form XII, Manual, p. 1).

Through further research, Halpin, Winer, and Fleishman reduced the myriad of dimensions of leader
behaviour to two subscales called **Consideration** and **Initiation of Structure**. These two original subscales of leadership behaviour were included in the present revision of the L.B.D.Q. **Consideration** is defined as the leader's regard for "the comfort, well-being, status, and contribution of followers" (L.B.D.Q., Form XII, Manual, p. 3). **Initiation of Structure** means that the leader "clearly defines his own role, and lets followers know what is expected" (L.B.D.Q., Form XII, Manual, p. 3).

These two original subscales have been used widely in research in the military, industry and education. Halpin (L.B.D.Q., Form XII, Manual, p. 1) mentions that in various studies "the agreement among respondents in describing their respective leaders has been checked by a between-group vs. within-group analysis" (L.B.D.Q., Form XII, Manual, p. 1) using the F ratios. Polansky describes the F ratio as the "distribution of variances among samples" (p. 219). The analysis of variance in these studies found the F ratio to be significant at .01 level. This meant that "followers tend to agree in describing the same leader, and the descriptions of different leaders differ significantly" (L.B.D.Q., Form XII, Manual, p. 1).

These two scales were shown independent and reliable as they met all the criteria for reliability. They were internally consistent, they possessed high
rater agreement, and stability over repeated measurements over time.

The validity of these two subscales was assessed through correlations with independent leadership measures such as objective group indices (absenteeism, turnover, peer ratings).

Since two subscales were not sufficient to measure the varied modes of leader behaviour, various other subscales were developed through time.

A new theory of role differentiation and group achievement by Stogdill, and the survey of a large body of research data that supported that theory, suggested that a number of variables operate in the differentiation of roles in social groups.

(L.B.D.Q., Form XII, Manual, p. 2)

The following subscales developed from this theory are: tolerance of uncertainty, persuasiveness, tolerance of freedom, predictive accuracy, integration of the group, and reconciliation of conflicting demands. Further research resulted in the further development of the following: representation of group interests, role assumption, production emphasis, and orientation toward superiors. A definition of these subscales along with the number of question items in each was presented in the operational definitions.

The present L.B.D.Q. is the fourth revision of the questionnaire and the authors state that further revision or modification is acceptable.
Although the L.B.D.Q. has never been used in a family situation, its validity and reliability has been very high in various other social groups in society. Since we know from role theory and small group theory that the family is a social group, we maintained the position that there was a strong possibility that the L.B.D.Q.'s reliability and validity would be applicable to the family group as well. We must, however, concede that until extensive application of the L.B.D.Q. to families is achieved, we will have no certainty as to its validity and reliability in testing family leadership. Extensive application of the L.B.D.Q. to families was beyond the scope of this study. Further validation of the instrument in future family leadership studies would be useful.

For the purpose of this study, we made some modification of the L.B.D.Q., Form XII. Firstly, we added pronouns of the female gender to the items. We also changed the pronoun "He" to "I" on half the questionnaires, these to be used for self-evaluations. The other half of the copies were altered so that each item would begin "My partner." These were used for the spouses' evaluation of each other. Finally, we changed the word "group" to "family" in the items. For example, item 37 which read in the original, "He treats all group members as his equal" now reads in the modified copy, "I treat all family
members as my equal." The copy for the partner's evaluation of each other read, "My partner treats all family members as his/her equal." These modifications did not affect the meaning of the items and therefore they did not reduce the reliability as established by the original authors.

A second change in the questionnaire was the elimination of two subscales consisting of twenty items. The dimensions "orientation to superiors" and "production emphasis" did not meet the criterion of face validity. Face validity states that "the relevance of the measuring instrument to what one is trying to measure is apparent on the face of it" (Selltiz, 1959, p. 165). It was apparent that the items of these subscales were not valid indicators of family leadership. Therefore, they were dropped from the modified questionnaire. As the reliability of each subscale has been established independent of the others, the elimination of two subscales did not affect the reliability of the others. The face validity of the remaining items was strengthened by the original work put into the selection of these items from an original 1,790 items listed on descriptions of leadership behaviour by the staff of the Ohio State University's Personnel Research Board. Also, from our own knowledge of leadership in small group settings and of family dynamics, it appeared to us that the remaining
items, on the surface, were valid for the family.

Beyond these concerns, however, there are questions about the reliability and validity of the L.B.D.Q., Form XII as a measurement of leadership in the family. Reliability is "the extent to which repetition of the study would result in the same data and conclusions" (Goode and Hatt, 1952, p. 153); while validity is the extent to which the questions "provide the kind of information the researcher wants" (Goode and Hatt, 1952, p. 153). As stated above, we cannot claim that this instrument was a valid measurement of leadership in the family as it had never been applied to the family group.

First of all, however, let us clarify that we were not concerned with pragmatic validity, as the authors of the questionnaire already warn against using it "in selection, assignment, or assessment purposes" (L.B.D.Q., Form XII, Manual, p. 8). Instead, construct validity will be the focus of our concern. This refers to the validity of the measurement as "the basis for inferring the degree to which the individual possesses some characteristic presumed to be reflected in the test performance" (Selltiz, 1959, p. 159).

As it was not feasible for us to administer the questionnaire several times to the same respondents or even to several different groups of respondents, we could not test accurately the reliability of the
instrument. This also limited the demonstration of validity, for as Selltiz stated, "to the extent that a measure is unreliable it lacks validity" (Selltiz, 1959, p. 178). To improve validity, we added more global questions to the L.B.D.Q. which were a more direct measurement of leadership than the questionnaire items. A correlation coefficient provided a measure of the association between the scores on the L.B.D.Q. items and the global questions. A high coefficient strengthened the validity of the questionnaire.

Although the reliability of the L.B.D.Q. has been proven in various settings, we were limited in the extent to which we could establish its reliability, and therefore its validity in the family.

Pattern of Data Collection

The L.B.D.Q. was administered to each spouse individually for a self-evaluation and then individually again for an evaluation of each other. The respondents were seen in their home at which time the researchers introduced the study and questionnaire and then acted as resource persons. Telephone contacts were made to arrange consent and time of visits. The home setting was chosen for all the respondents as opposed to office or other setting for several reasons. We hoped that responses would be more consistent if the respondents
were in a familiar setting. Polansky mentions that "interviews in the respondents' homes may provide more privacy, and thus result in more frankness in answers, than an office setting" (p. 147). It seemed appropriate, then, to the researchers, to make use of the home environment to collect their data as they were studying leadership behaviour within the family environment.

The researchers decided to administer the self-evaluation questionnaire first so as not to bias the respondents. The L.B.D.Q., Form XII, Manual describes the instrument valid for self-evaluations but not for evaluation of another's leadership, unless the number of respondents evaluating the same leader exceeds four but isn't more than seven. We asked the couples to evaluate each other as a check against their self-evaluations. Because the spouse consists of only one perception of the partner's leadership, it did not add validity to the measurement of leadership collected from self-evaluations. However, it did add a basis for interesting comparison and it also provided some measure of perceived parental leadership within the families under study.

Furthermore, the total parental leadership scores could be compared between families having children with behavioural problems and families with an absence of children with behavioural problems.
Summary

In this chapter, we have presented the concepts of role, leadership and family system which are relevant to the study. We have also presented the research question and the three hypotheses for testing. We have stated and operationalized the relevant definitions used. We then presented the logic of the research design. It is classified as a quantitative-descriptive study with the purpose of testing hypotheses about the association of the three variables of maternal and paternal leadership and of behavioural problems in children. For the purpose of this study, we found this type of design to be the most suitable. The meaning of this, in terms of the study, is that the design is not truly experimental and therefore lacks the control over the independent variable and intervening variables. It allow for a more exact study. Consequently, we had to make an effort to control these variables so as to approximate true experimentation and maximize validity. Specific threats to internal validity in the study included: 1) testing; 2) instrumentation; 3) biases resulting in differential selection of respondents for the comparison groups; and 4) the effects of selection. The primary concern was a bias in our selection of respondents. To the extent that these variables could not be controlled, we report them as limitations to the claim that the data is a valid
measure of leadership behaviour and of the incidence of behaviour problems in children. The only factor that jeopardizes the generalizability of the research is the lack of a random and representative selection of respondents for the study. This limits greatly a claim of representativeness. Finally, we presented the instrument with the modifications applied for its use in the study.
CHAPTER III

ANALYSIS OF DATA

The Population

As described previously, a group of families having children with behaviour problems was matched with a group of families with normal children on the variables of age and sex of the identified child, and the families' religion and social position. In addition to these, several other factors were accounted for in order to eliminate further alternate hypotheses for any relationship found between the dependent and independent variables.

Table 1 indicates that an approximate match was achieved on the variable of age. The identified children ranged in age from 11 to 17 years, inclusive. Although a perfect match was not obtained on each of these, the two groups were similar enough to eliminate this factor as an intervening variable.

TABLE 1

FREQUENCY OF FAMILIES BY AGE
OF IDENTIFIED CHILD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GROUP</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>16</th>
<th>17</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contrast</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

85.
Similarly, the composition of the reference group according to the sex of the identified children was matched by the contrast group's distribution of boys and girls. Table 2 shows that in both groups the frequency of boys was greater than that of girls.

**TABLE 2**

**FREQUENCY OF FAMILIES BY SEX OF IDENTIFIED CHILD**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GROUP</th>
<th>MALE</th>
<th>FEMALE</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contrast</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Attempts to match the two groups on the families' religion were less successful than hoped for. As shown in Table 3 below, the reference group was composed of 11 Roman Catholic compared to eight Protestant families, while the contrast group consisted of eight families of each. The remaining three families described their religious affiliation as being other than Roman Catholic or Protestant. Although this difference must be cited as a limitation it is too small to be a major threat to our research.
### TABLE 3
FREQUENCY OF FAMILIES BY RELIGION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GROUP</th>
<th>ROMAN CATHOLIC</th>
<th>PROTESTANT</th>
<th>OTHER</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contrast</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An approximate match between the two groups on the fourth controlled variable, social position, was also achieved as shown in Table 4. Hollingshead's Two-Factor Index was used for this purpose. In general, the families in both groups tended to be in the lower to middle range. Fifteen of the reference families and 14 of the contrast families were in the lower vs. lower middle categories. The contrast group was composed of families having a slightly higher social position in that one family in the contrast group was in the upper middle category without a corresponding family from the reference group in this position. There was also a greater frequency of reference group families in the lower category than there were contrast group families. However, the frequencies of the families in lower and lower middle categories are similar for both groups.
TABLE 4
FREQUENCY OF FAMILIES BY
SOCIAL POSITION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GROUP</th>
<th>I UPPER</th>
<th>II UPPER MIDDLE</th>
<th>III MIDDLE</th>
<th>IV LOWER MIDDLE</th>
<th>V LOWER</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contrast</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although it was not possible to match the groups on more than four variables, accounting for other factors that were felt to be important enabled us to discount them as significant influences on the variables under study. Firstly, it was thought that paternal and maternal leadership or behaviour problems might be influenced by which parent is the main wage-earner. All 38 families studied reported that the fathers were the main wage-earners. Therefore this variable was constant.

The family size and the ordinal position of the identified children was also considered as a possible influence on the variables under study. It can be seen from Table 5 that the contrast group tended to be composed of smaller families than those which comprised the reference group. While only four contrast families had more than four children, nine of the reference group families had between five and nine children. However,
this difference was not great and existed primarily in the range of five to six children.

TABLE 5
FREQUENCY OF CASES BY FAMILY SIZE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NUMBER OF CHILDREN</th>
<th>REFERENCE</th>
<th>CONTRAST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6 records the frequency of families in each group according to the ordinal position of the identified child in relation to his/her siblings. The greatest difference between the two groups in regard to this factor is the fact that in eight reference group families, the identified child was a first-born, while the frequency
in the contrast group was three. On the other hand, in nine contrast families, the second- and third-born child was the identified child while this was the case in none of the reference families.

**TABLE 6**

**FREQUENCY OF FAMILIES BY ORDINAL POSITION OF IDENTIFIED CHILD**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ORDINAL POSITION</th>
<th>FREQUENCY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>REFERENCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>19</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While these factors may not have any bearing on the results of this study, they should be considered as possible influences and therefore as limitations.

One final factor was accounted for. The presence of people in the home other than immediate family members was thought to be a possible intervening variable. This
could be expected to be especially so if a paternal or maternal grandparent was living with the family. However, no reference group families and only one control group family reported the presence of someone other than immediate family in the home. In this instance, it was reported that this person was a relative other than a grandparent or an aunt or uncle.

The Research Question and Hypotheses

The data collected were intended to answer the research question: "Is there any relationship between the variables of paternal leadership, maternal leadership and behaviour problems among children?" It was hypothesized that relationships between these variables would, indeed, be found. In this section we will examine the data to determine if these predictions are true and to discover if there are any unexpected significant associations between the identified variables. For the purpose of our study, the criteria for significance will be $P < 0.05$.

The first hypothesis states that "the degree of parental leadership provided in the home is negatively related to the existence of behaviour problems among the children." To test this hypothesis a family leadership score was calculated for each family by summing the paternal and maternal leadership scores. Table 7 shows
the mean and the standard deviation on family leadership scores for the reference and contrast groups. The lower mean for the reference group suggests that the families in which children have behaviour problems have a lower family leadership score than do families where children do exhibit behaviour problems. The standard deviation also suggests that there is a greater variance of scores from the mean in the reference group than in the contrast group. Table 8 also shows this difference between the two groups and reveals that this variance is toward the lower extreme. However, the significance of the difference between the two groups' scores was tested with the T-test and found not to be significant. Therefore, the first hypothesis is not supported by the data.

TABLE 7
MEAN FAMILY LEADERSHIP SCORES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GROUP</th>
<th>FAMILY LEADERSHIP SCORE</th>
<th>( \bar{X} )</th>
<th>S</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reference</td>
<td></td>
<td>647.552</td>
<td>52.162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contrast</td>
<td></td>
<td>664.684</td>
<td>35.021</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ t = 1.190428; P \text{ ns} \]
TABLE 8
DISTRIBUTION OF FAMILY LEADERSHIP SCORES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GROUP</th>
<th>REFERENCE</th>
<th>CONTRAST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>550-600</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>601-650</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>651-700</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>701-750</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The second hypothesis stated that "the degree of paternal leadership provided is negatively related to the existence of behaviour problems among the children." To test this hypothesis the leadership scores of the fathers in each group were compared. As Table 9 reveals, the mean scores of the fathers in each group were almost identical, suggesting that there was no difference in the level of paternal leadership in the reference and contrast families. The standard deviations indicate a greater variance from the mean in the reference group than in the contrast group, and the distribution in Table 10 shows that the variance is toward the lower ranges. However, the results of the T-test showed that the difference is not significant. Therefore, the second hypothesis is also without support from the data.
TABLE 9
MEAN PATERNAL LEADERSHIP SCORES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GROUP</th>
<th>PATERNAL LEADERSHIP SCORES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\bar{X}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>329.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contrast</td>
<td>329.737</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

t = 0.25296002; $P$ ns

TABLE 10
DISTRIBUTION OF PATERNAL LEADERSHIP SCORE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PATERNAL LEADERSHIP SCORE</th>
<th>GROUP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>CONTRAST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>250-300</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>301-350</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>351-400</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The third hypothesis predicted that the study would show that:

Children exhibiting behaviour problems will tend to have fathers who rate lower than their mothers in family leadership; while children not displaying behaviour problems will tend to have fathers who rate higher than their mothers in leadership.

Table 11 shows the number of families in each study group in which the paternal leadership score was greater than the mother's and those in which the mother's leadership score was greater than the father's. Contrary to the
hypothesis, this data showed that the tendency for the father's leadership score to exceed that of the mother's was greater in the homes of problem children than of normal children. Conversely, more families in the contrast group than the reference group had mothers who scored higher in leadership than did the fathers. The Chi Square ($\chi^2$) was applied to this data and revealed that the association was not significant.

**TABLE 11**

**FREQUENCY OF FAMILIES BY:**

**FAMILY TYPE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GROUP</th>
<th>FATHER STRONGER</th>
<th>MOTHER STRONGER</th>
<th>EQUAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contrast</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$\chi^2 = 1.244; \text{ df.} = 2; P \text{ ns}$

Table 12 shows another way of looking at the same data. The means of leadership scores for mothers and fathers in the reference and contrast groups revealed that, on the average, the fathers in the reference group had higher scores than the mothers in the same group. In the contrast group, on the other hand, the fathers had an average leadership score that was lower than the mean for the mothers. This was in the opposite direction
to what was hypothesized. The T-test, however, showed that neither of these differences in scores were significant. Therefore, the data indicated that there was no significant association between which parent was stronger in leadership and the occurrence of behaviour problems.

TABLE 12
COMPARISON OF MATERNAL AND PATERNAL LEADERSHIP BY GROUP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GROUP</th>
<th>MEAN OF LEADERSHIP SCORES</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MOTHER</td>
<td>FATHER</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>318.079</td>
<td>32.571</td>
<td>329.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contrast</td>
<td>334.921</td>
<td>20.861</td>
<td>329.500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ t = 1.084; \text{P ns} \]
\[ t = 0.728; \text{P ns} \]

We have not found any indication in the data of the relationships that we predicted would be found among paternal leadership, maternal leadership and behaviour problems among children. The question we ask now is, "Why does the data not support the hypotheses and the literature that has been reviewed?" One possible reason for this is the limitations that have been noted in regard to the questionnaire that was used to measure leadership. Was the L.B.D.Q. a valid measurement of leadership in the home? The reader will recall that 11
questions more directly related to the family situation than the L.B.D.Q. items were added to the L.B.D.Q. questionnaire. These provided a method of testing the validity of the L.B.D.Q. items. The results of a Pearson r for correlation revealed that 70% of the variation in the score on the researcher's questions was accounted for by a variation in the score on the L.B.D.Q. items. This means that the two sets of questions measured the same phenomena. Assuming that the researcher's questions were a valid measurement of leadership in the family, we can infer from this finding that the L.B.D.Q., as modified for this study, is an accurate measurement of family leadership. This would suggest, then, that the questionnaire was not the reason for the data's failure to support the hypotheses. The assumption on which this logic is based, however, must leave doubt in one's mind as to whether or not the questionnaire did actually measure what it was intended to. In connection with this, it is highly probable that cultural expectations influenced the fathers to inflate their scores more so than the mothers.

A second possible explanation for the study's unexpected results is that the selection procedure used did not provide two distinctly different groups. In other words, the definition of families with children exhibiting behaviour problems and those with children not
displaying behaviour problems did not discriminate sufficiently between the two desired groups, resulting in two groups that were more similar than intended in regard to the dependent variable. Of the two sources used for the reference group, it would be expected that the Youth Guidance families as opposed to the Maryvale families were especially similar to the contrast families. The fact that Maryvale's program provides for residential treatment indicates that children in this program had acute behaviour problems. The behaviour of boys in the Youth Guidance program, by contrast, cannot be considered to have been as problematic. Therefore, the Youth Guidance boys may not have differed significantly from the boys in the contrast group.

The data seems to support this explanation. Table 13 identifies the mean paternal and maternal leadership scores for the two groups used in the reference population compared to those for the families of boys and girls in the contrast population. It can be seen that the scores for the parents of the Maryvale girls were lower than those of parents in any other group, including the Youth Guidance population. Although the T-test results revealed that the difference in scores between the Maryvale fathers and the Youth Guidance fathers were not significant, the mean score for Maryvale mothers was found to be significantly lower than that of the mothers
of contrast girls, and the mothers of contrast boys (See Table 14). This suggests that the Maryvale population provided a greater difference from the contrast families on the variable of behaviour problem among children than did the Youth Guidance population. Therefore, a sample that was more differentiated from the general population on the dependent variable would perhaps have provided more significant data.

**TABLE 13**

**MEAN MATERNAL AND PATERNAL LEADERSHIP SCORES ACCORDING TO SAMPLE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SAMPLE</th>
<th>MOTHER</th>
<th></th>
<th>FATHER</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\bar{x}$</td>
<td>$s$</td>
<td>$\bar{x}$</td>
<td>$s$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryvale Girls</td>
<td>305.25</td>
<td>27.929</td>
<td>324.0</td>
<td>20.895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Guidance Boys</td>
<td>324.0</td>
<td>33.853</td>
<td>332.038</td>
<td>37.025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contrast Girls</td>
<td>334.0</td>
<td>21.377</td>
<td>334.428</td>
<td>30.232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contrast Boys</td>
<td>335.833</td>
<td>21.400</td>
<td>327.333</td>
<td>22.223</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A final explanation for the lack of support for the hypotheses is simply that there may be no association among the variables. Paternal leadership, maternal leadership and behaviour problems among children may not be significantly related to one another in any way.

Although we have not been able to support the
### Table 14

Degree of Association Between Mean Paternal and Maternal Leadership Scores and Various Sample Populations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Maryvale Girls</th>
<th></th>
<th>Youth Guidance Boys</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>Father</td>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>Father</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryvale Girls' Fathers</td>
<td>2.343 0.025</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Guidance Boys' Mothers Fathers</td>
<td>1.862 ns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contrast Girls' Mothers Fathers</td>
<td>3.563 0.001</td>
<td>1.237 ns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contrast Boys' Mothers Fathers</td>
<td>3.789 0.001</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.288 ns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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study's hypotheses, we have answered, in part, the research question. In the context of this study, we now know that the associations among the identified variables that were defined by the hypotheses do not exist. The question that now begs to be answered is: "Are there any other relationships among these variables?"

One possible relationship that was unexpected has been suggested by some of the data already examined. Tables 11 and 12 indicated that the occurrence of behaviour problems might be associated with fathers who are lower in leadership, than mothers. However, as pointed out, this difference was not significant. Secondly, we might ask if the occurrence of behaviour problems among children is related to the degree to which family leadership is egalitarian. The mean differences between mother and father in each group were calculated. As Table 15 shows, the parents in the reference group had a greater mean difference than those in the contrast group, suggesting that parents in contrast families were more egalitarian in their leadership. However, the difference between these two means was not significant as revealed by the T-test. Therefore, there cannot be said to be an association between these variables.

Thirdly, we were curious to know if there were any associations between the subscales of leadership as defined previously and the occurrence of behaviour problems among
### Table 15

**Mean Differences Between Paternal and Maternal Leadership Scores**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GROUP</th>
<th>MEAN DIFFERENCES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\bar{X}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>29.184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contrast</td>
<td>22.263</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$t = 0.091797919$ P ns

Children. Table 16 shows the mean of subscale scores for the reference and contrast groups for those dimensions where there appeared to be a difference worth noting. These subscales - nurturance, consideration, decision-making and tolerance of freedom - were found in the review of the literature to be paternal behaviours that have a significant effect on child development. However, the T-test revealed that although the contrast fathers rated higher on these dimensions than did the reference fathers, the difference was not significant.

A final association that might be looked for is one between the levels of mother's leadership score and the occurrence of behaviour problems. Table 13 showed that while the mean paternal leadership scores in all the samples were almost identical, the mother's of the girls in the reference group had a mean score that
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBSCALES</th>
<th>REFERENCE FATHER</th>
<th>CONTRAST FATHER</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\bar{X}$</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>$\bar{X}$</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tolerance of Freedom</td>
<td>35.184</td>
<td>5.553</td>
<td>36.842</td>
<td>3.258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consideration</td>
<td>36.079</td>
<td>3.203</td>
<td>37.273</td>
<td>4.175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision-making</td>
<td>14.947</td>
<td>1.632</td>
<td>15.342</td>
<td>1.667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nurturance</td>
<td>11.079</td>
<td>2.077</td>
<td>12.053</td>
<td>1.517</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
was significantly lower than that of the mothers of contrast girls and contrast boys. This might suggest that it is the mother's level of leadership that is related to behaviour problems, for girls at least. Although the mothers of Youth Guidance boys had a mean leadership score lower than that of contrast boys, it was not a significant difference. This would suggest that it might only be daughters who are sensitive to a lower level of maternal leadership in the home. We must remember, however, that the lack of significant difference between the Youth Guidance sample and the contrast group may be due to the limitations of the sampling procedure that was noted previously.

Table 12 also suggests that the mother's leadership may be the independent variable associated with behaviour problems. The mean leadership score of mothers in the reference group was 318.079 compared to 334.921 for the contrast group's mothers. On the surface, this indicated that the occurrence of behaviour problems was dependent on the mother's level of leadership and that there was negative association. However, the T-test revealed that the difference between these two groups was not significant.

In summary, the population used in this study consisted of two groups of 19 families. The groups were similar on several variables but differed on the variable
of "children experiencing behaviour problems." The groups were similar in their composition on the characteristics of the family's religion and social position. The children identified in each group ranged in age from 11 to 17 years with proportions of each age category that were similar in the two groups. In both groups, approximately two-thirds of the children were male and one-third were female. The main wage-earner in all families was the father and in only one family was someone other than immediate family living in the home. The research question was answered only in part by data which indicated that the relationships between the identified variables that were predicted did not exist in the study's population. Nor were other significant associations found between the variables, with the exception that lower maternal leadership seemed to be positively associated with girls who exhibited behaviour problems. The lack of significant findings may be attributed to the instrument's lack of validity as a measure of family leadership; a sampling procedure which did not differentiate sufficiently between the two study groups; or to the absence of any significant relationships between these variables.
CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

This study was undertaken because of the concern of the researchers about the current changes in the father's role in the family and their possible effects on child development. The literature supported the contention that the father's parenting behaviour had an important role in the development of children. The quality of what was found to be the optimum fathering behaviours was similar to the style of leadership that was found in other studies to be most effective in small group systems. On the basis of this knowledge, a quantitative-descriptive study was conducted in which the parents of two groups of families were given a modified version of the Leadership Behavior Description Questionnaire. The two groups were frequency matched on variables of age and sex of identified children, and the religion and social class of the family. They differed in that only one group of families had children who exhibited behaviour problems. The data revealed few significant associations between the variables of maternal leadership, paternal leadership and behaviour problems among children. The significant relationships were:
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Mothers of girls who exhibit behaviour problems are significantly lower in leadership than the mothers of girls or those of boys who do not display behaviour problems.

Girls who exhibit behaviour problems have mothers who are significantly lower in leadership than their fathers.

Although the data did not support the hypotheses, there were slight trends in the direction predicted. These trends were as follows:

- Family leadership was slightly higher in the homes of the 'normal' children than in the reference group families.

- Maternal leadership was slightly higher in the homes of the 'normal' children than those of the children with behaviour problems.

- Although the mean paternal leadership score in each group was equal, the scores of four out of 19 reference group fathers fell in the lowest of three ranges while only one contrast father scored in this range. This indicated a tendency for the fathers of problem behaviour children to score lower in leadership than contrast fathers.

- Fathers of 'normal' children tended to score higher than did fathers of 'problem' children on the subscales of consideration, tolerance of freedom, nurturance and
limit-setting.

The failure of the data to find these trends to be significant may have been due to the limitations of the study's methodology. The first of these limitations was the instrument's questionable validity as a measure of family leadership. Although a high correlation between the L.B.D.Q. scores and those on a set of original items was found, it is expected that neither of these sets of questions was able to overcome the cultural expectation that would influence fathers more so than mothers to inflate their scores. The correlation between the two sections of this study's instrument should encourage further efforts to find a valid and reliable instrument for measuring family leadership. Perhaps the questions must be more indirect in order to obtain honest responses. Another alternative would be to apply the questionnaire to the children in the home.

A second weakness in the methodology was the sampling procedure used to select the population for study. It was found that the Maryvale sample provided a significant difference between the mothers of that group and the mothers of the contrast group. It also provided a significant difference between fathers and mothers within the sample. On the other hand, the difference between the Youth Guidance sample and the contrast group was not significant. As the identified
in the Maryvale sample were all female, one could conclude that the difference in leadership scores is significant only for girls. However, the programs of Maryvale and Youth Guidance differ a great deal suggesting that the severity of the behaviour problem also influenced the study's outcome. If this interpretation is true, it is likely that a similar study, using as a reference group a population of children who exhibit more severe behaviour problems, would show the trends listed above to be significant.

Following on this reasoning, we could speculate that such a study would reveal that families in which children exhibit behaviour problems, compared with families of 'normal' children, provide significantly lower levels of family leadership, maternal leadership and paternal leadership.

The finding that a low maternal leadership score is associated with behaviour problems among children was somewhat puzzling initially. The literature had suggested that the occurrence of behaviour problems would be negatively associated with paternal leadership. However, in view of current social changes that have brought about a decline in the father's involvement in the family, this data could be interpreted as an indication that, unless the mother can compensate for the father's non-involvement, there may be detrimental effects on the children. It may be that these social influences have been so strong that fathers in both the reference and contrast groups have become equally non-involved in their homes. The level of
maternal leadership exceeded that of paternal leadership in the families of normal children. Though this difference was not significant, it may suggest that the mother's ability to compensate for the lower paternal leadership is the significant factor influencing the occurrence of behaviour problems among children. The effects on children of inadequate/over-adequate marital functioning have already been cited by family theorists (Andres, 1973).

Further research into the relationships between maternal and paternal leadership and behaviour problems among children would be worthwhile. In view of the above discussion and the findings of literature, efforts must be made to counteract the trend toward inadequate fathering and over-adequate mothering with its accompanying ill effects on children. Research is a starting point. The L.B.D.Q. would appear to be an instrument worth refining for this purpose. As a result of the high correlation between the added items and those of the L.B.D.Q., the questionnaire's validity has been strengthened. However, further modification of this instrument is needed to overcome the cultural influences that may bias the father's responses. Further study should also concentrate on populations of children with more clearly defined behaviour problems in order to provide a significant difference between reference and contrast samples. We remain convinced that if such a study was undertaken, it would reveal significant association between the variables specified in this research.
APPENDIX I

Letter of Introduction
(Reference Group)
March 13, 1976

Dear Parents:

We are two students studying for our Master's degree in Social Work at the University of Windsor. As a part of our work we are conducting a research study into the role of parents. We feel that the role of parents in the family is very important. However, there is little information on the topic of parenting. By means of our study we hope to provide information on parenting that will help other parents in their families and social workers in their work with families. As young fathers, ourselves, we also hope to learn from this study.

We would appreciate your co-operation in participating in this study with us. This would involve giving some brief information about your family. It would also require 1 1/2 - 2 hours of your time to meet with the researchers at a time convenient for you. During this interview, each parent will be given a questionnaire to be completed individually in the presence of the researcher who will provide any assistance necessary. No names or addresses will be collected with the information. As we will be receiving information from many different families in the Windsor area it will be impossible to identify individual families. If you are interested in being a part of this study would you please complete the preliminary information form attached to help us plan our study, and give it to your worker. Thank you very much.

Sincerely yours,

Jim Green

Hugh Drouin
APPENDIX II

Preliminary Information Sheet
(Reference Group)
Preliminary Information

Hugh Drouin and Jim Green
School of Social Work
University of Windsor
Windsor, Ontario

For the purpose of categorizing our research findings we would appreciate receiving some information about your family. Because of the number of responses we will be receiving from the Windsor area it will not be possible to identify you by means of this information. Please do not put your name or address on this paper. Thank you very much for your assistance.

I) Who is usually the main wage-earner in your family?
   1) Wife   2) Husband

II) What is the usual occupation of your family's main wage-earner?

III) Please describe briefly what this job involves.

IV) Please indicate your family's religion by checking one of the following:

   ___ Roman Catholic    ___ Protestant    ___ Other

V) Education: What was the last grade completed by your family's main wage-earner? (Please check one of the following.)

   1) ___ Graduate Professional Training
   2) ___ University degree completed (under-grad)
   3) ___ Community college completed or partial university
   4) ___ Grade 12-13
   5) ___ Grade 10-11
   6) ___ Grade 7-9
   7) ___ Grade 1-7

VI) Please indicate the ages of your children in the chart below:

   Male
   ____________________________

   Female
   ____________________________

VII) Please circle the age of the child in the program at
VIII) Does anyone other than your immediate family reside in your home?
No ___ Yes ___

If yes, please check one of the following:

___ grandparents on father's side
___ grandparents on mother's side
___ aunt or uncle
___ other relation
___ boarder unrelated to family
APPENDIX III

Preliminary Information Sheet
(Control Group)
Preliminary Information

Hugh Drouin and Jim Green
School of Social Work
University of Windsor
Windsor, Ontario

For the purpose of categorizing our research findings we would appreciate receiving some information about your family. Because of the number of responses we will be receiving from the Windsor area it will not be possible to identify you by means of this information. Please do not put your name or address on this paper. Thank you very much for your assistance.

I) Who is usually the main wage-earner in your family?

1) Wife ______ 2) Husband ______

II) What is the usual occupation of your family's main wage-earner?

_____________________________________________________

III) Please describe briefly what this job involves.

_____________________________________________________

IV) Please indicate your family's religion by checking one of the following:

___ Roman Catholic ___ Protestant ___ Other

V) Education: What was the last grade completed by your family's main wage-earner? (Please check one of the following.)

1) ___ Graduate Professional Training
2) ___ University degree completed (under-grad)
3) ___ Community college completed or partial university
4) ___ Grade 12-13
5) ___ Grade 10-11
6) ___ Grade 7-9
7) ___ Grade 1-7

VI) Please indicate the ages of your children in the chart below:

_____________________________________________________

Male

_____________________________________________________

Female

_____________________________________________________

VII) Has the behaviour of any of your children presented a problem requiring outside help?

No _________ Yes ________
VIII) Does anyone other than your immediate family reside in your home?

No ___ Yes ___

If yes, please check one of the following:

___ grandparents on father's side
___ grandparents on mother's side
___ aunt or uncle
___ other relation
___ boarder unrelated to family
APPENDIX IV

Letter of Introduction
(Control Group)
May 17, 1976

Dear Parents:

We are two students studying for our Master's degree in Social Work at the University of Windsor. As a part of our work we are conducting a research study into the role of parents. We feel that the role of parents in the family is very important. However, there is little information on the topic of parenting. By means of our study we hope to provide information on parenting that will help other parents in their families and social workers in their work with families. As young fathers, ourselves, we also hope to learn from this study.

We would appreciate your co-operation in participating in this study with us. It would involve 45-60 minutes of your time to meet with one of us at a time convenient for you. During this interview, each parent will be given a questionnaire to be completed individually in the presence of one of the students who will provide any assistance necessary. No names or addresses will be collected with this information in order to assure anonymity. As we will be receiving information from many different families in the Windsor area, it will be impossible to identify individual families. Your child has volunteered your name and telephone number with the possibility that you may be interested. In the near future one of the research students will be telephoning you to ask for your co-operation and to arrange an appointment. Regardless of your decision, all records of your name and address will be discarded upon completion of this research project.

Sincerely yours,

Jim Green

Hugh Drouin

Prof. Robert Chandler
APPENDIX V

Leadership Behavior Description Questionnaire
(Modified)
On the following pages are a list of statements. Each statement describes a specific kind of behaviour but does not ask you to judge whether the behaviour is desirable or undesirable. Each statement should be looked at as describing a separate behaviour. This is not a test; there are no "right" or "wrong" answers. Its only purpose is to make it possible for you to describe, as accurately as you can, your behaviour and that of your partner.
DIRECTIONS

a. READ each item carefully.

b. THINK about how frequently you engage in the behavior described by the item.

c. DECIDE whether you (A) always, (B) often, (C) occasionally, (D) seldom or (E) never act as described by the item.

d. DRAW A CIRCLE around one of the five letters (A B C D E) following the item to show the answer you have selected.

A - Always
B - Often
C - Occasionally
D - Seldom
E - Never

e. MARK your answers as shown in the examples below.

Example: I often act as described................. A [3] C D E
Example: I never act as described................. A B C D [3]
Example: I occasionally act as described........ A B [3] C D E

1. I act as the spokesman of the family........ A B C D E
2. I wait patiently for the results of a decision................................. A B C D E
3. I make pep talks to stimulate the family.... A B C D E
4. I let family members know what is expected of them........................ A B C D E
5. I allow the members complete freedom in their work........................ A B C D E
6. I am hesitant about taking initiative in the family......................... A B C D E
7. I am friendly and approachable.............................. A B C D E
8. I make accurate decisions................................. A B C D E
9. I publicize the activities of the family...... A B C D E
10. I become anxious when I cannot find out what is coming next............. A B C D E
11. My arguments are convincing...................... A B C D E
12. I encourage the use of uniform procedure.... A B C D E
<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>I permit the members to use their own judgment in solving problems.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>I fail to take necessary action.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>I do little things to make it pleasant to be a member of the family.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>I keep the family working together as a team.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>I speak as the representative of the family.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>I accept defeat in stride.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>I argue persuasively for my point of view.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>I try out my ideas in the family.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>I encourage initiative in the family members.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>I let other persons take away my leadership in the family.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>I put suggestions made by the family into operation.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>I seem able to predict what is coming next.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>I speak for the family when visitors are present.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>I accept delays without becoming upset.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>I am a very persuasive talker.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>I make my attitudes clear to the family.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>I let the members do their work the way they think best.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>I let some members take advantage of me.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>I treat all family members as my equals.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td>I settle conflicts when they occur in the family.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.</td>
<td>I represent the family at outside meetings.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A - Always
B - Often
C - Occasionally
D - Seldom
E - Never

34. I become anxious when waiting for new developments.......................... A B C D E
35. I am very skillful in an argument................. A B C D E
36. I decide what shall be done and how it shall be done......................... A B C D E
37. I assign a task, then let the members handle it.............................. A B C D E
38. I am the leader of the family in name only........................................ A B C D E
39. I give advance notice of changes................... A B C D E
40. Things usually turn out as I predict........... A B C D E
41. I handle complex problems efficiently........... A B C D E
42. I am able to tolerate postponement and uncertainty.......................... A B C D E
43. I am not a very convincing talker................ A B C D E
44. I assign family members to particular tasks...................................... A B C D E
45. I turn the members loose on a job, and let them go to it.................... A B C D E
46. I back down when I ought to stand firm................. A B C D E
47. I keep to myself................................................................. A B C D E
48. I am accurate in predicting the trend of events.............................. A B C D E
49. I get swamped by details......................................................... A B C D E
50. I can wait just so long, then blow up................. A B C D E
51. I speak from a strong inner conviction................. A B C D E
52. I make sure that my part in the family is understood by the family members........ A B C D E
53. I am reluctant to allow the members any freedom of action.......................... A B C D E
54. I let some members have authority that I should keep...................... A B C D E
55. I look out for the personal welfare of family members.......................... A B C D E
A - Always
B - Often
C - Occasionally
D - Seldom
E - Never

56. I see to it that the work of the family is coordinated......... A B C D E
57. I get things all tangled up......................... A B C D E
58. I remain calm when uncertain about coming events........... A B C D E
59. I am an inspiring talker.......................... A B C D E
60. I schedule the work to be done.................. A B C D E
61. I allow the family a high degree of initiative............... A B C D E
62. I take full charge when emergencies arise...................... A B C D E
63. I am willing to make changes...................... A B C D E
64. I help family members settle their differences.............. A B C D E
65. I can reduce a madhouse to system and order................. A B C D E
66. I am able to delay action until the proper time occurs....... A B C D E
67. I persuade others that my ideas are to their advantage ...... A B C D E
68. I maintain definite standards of performance................. A B C D E
69. I trust the members to exercise good judgment................ A B C D E
70. I overcome attempts made to challenge my leadership......... A B C D E
71. I refuse to explain my actions........................... A B C D E
72. I anticipate problems and plan for them....................... A B C D E
73. I get confused when too many demands are made of me.......... A B C D E
74. I worry about the outcome of any new procedure.............. A B C D E
75. I can inspire enthusiasm for a project....................... A B C D E
76. I ask that family members follow standard rules and regulations........ A B C D E
A - Always
B - Often
C - Occasionally
D - Seldom
E - Never

77. I permit the family to set its own pace...... A B C D E
78. I am easily recognized as the leader of the family............................... A B C D E
79. I act without consulting the family........ A B C D E
80. I maintain a closely knit family........ A B C D E
81. If the children misbehave while my partner and I have company, I am the one who disciplines them............................... A B C D E
82. When there are important decisions to be made in our family, I have the last say...... A B C D E
83. I spend time playing with our children...... A B C D E
84. I set the standards for behavior in our family............................... A B C D E
85. My suggestions are ignored when our family makes decisions............................... A B C D E
86. I engage in conversation with my children.... A B C D E
87. I provide the discipline when children in our home do not obey family rules........ A B C D E
88. When emergencies occur in our family, I am too overwhelmed to make necessary decisions............................... A B C D E
89. I encourage family members to develop their talents............................... A B C D E
90. The leadership that I give is accepted by family members............................... A B C D E
91. The family outings that we have are organized by me............................... A B C D E
DIRECTIONS

a. READ each item carefully.

b. THINK about how frequently your partner engages in the behavior described by the item.

c. DECIDE whether your partner (A) always, (B) often, (C) occasionally, (D) seldom or (E) never acts as described by the item.

d. DRAW A CIRCLE around one of the five letters (A B C D E) following the item to show the answer you have selected.

   A - Always
   B - Often
   C - Occasionally
   D - Seldom
   E - Never

e. MARK your answers as shown in the examples below.

Example: Your partner often acts as described........ A B C D E
Example: Your partner never acts as described........ A B C D E
Example: Your partner occasionally acts as described..................... A B C D E

1. Your partner acts as the spokesman of the family.......................... A B C D E

2. Your partner waits patiently for the results of a decision................. A B C D E

3. Your partner makes pep talks to stimulate the family........................ A B C D E

4. Your partner lets family members know what is expected of them........... A B C D E

5. Your partner allows the members complete freedom in their work........... A B C D E

6. Your partner is hesitant about taking initiative in the family............... A B C D E

7. Your partner is friendly and approachable.................................... A B C D E

8. Your partner makes accurate decisions......................................... A B C D E

9. Your partner publicizes the activities of the family.......................... A B C D E

10. Your partner becomes anxious when he/she cannot find out what is coming next........... A B C D E
11. Your partner's arguments are convincing........ A B C D E

12. Your partner encourages the use of uniform procedures.................. A B C D E

13. Your partner permits the members to use their own judgment in solving problems........ A B C D E

14. Your partner fails to take necessary action.................................. A B C D E

15. Your partner does little things to make it pleasant to be a member of the family........ A B C D E

16. Your partner keeps the family working together as a team................... A B C D E

17. Your partner speaks as the representative of the family..................... A B C D E

18. Your partner accepts defeat in stride................ A B C D E

19. Your partner argues persuasively for his/her point of view................. A B C D E

20. Your partner tries out his/her ideas in the family......................... A B C D E

21. Your partner encourages initiative in the family members.................. A B C D E

22. Your partner lets other persons take away his leadership in the family........ A B C D E

23. Your partner puts suggestions made by the family into operation........... A B C D E

24. Your partner seems able to predict what is coming next..................... A B C D E

25. Your partner speaks for the family when visitors are present............... A B C D E

26. Your partner accepts delays without becoming upset......................... A B C D E

27. Your partner is a very persuasive talker................................ A B C D E

28. Your partner makes his attitudes clear to the family....................... A B C D E

29. Your partner lets the members do their work the way they think best......... A B C D E
A - Always
B - Often
C - Occasionally
D - Seldom
E - Never

30. Your partner lets some members take advantage of him.......................... A B C D E
31. Your partner treats all family members as his/her equals.......................... A B C D E
32. Your partner settles conflicts when they occur in the family.................... A B C D E
33. Your partner represents the family at outside meetings......................... A B C D E
34. Your partner becomes anxious when waiting for new developments............. A B C D E
35. Your partner is very skillful in an argument........................................ A B C D E
36. Your partner decides what shall be done and how it shall be done.............. A B C D E
37. Your partner assigns a task, then lets the members handle it.................. A B C D E
38. Your partner is the leader of the family in name only............................ A B C D E
39. Your partner gives advance notice of changes..................................... A B C D E
40. Things usually turn out as he/she predicts......................................... A B C D E
41. Your partner handles complex problems efficiently.................................. A B C D E
42. Your partner is able to tolerate postponement and uncertainty.................. A B C D E
43. Your partner is not a very convincing talker....................................... A B C D E
44. Your partner assigns family members to particular tasks....................... A B C D E
45. Your partner turns the members loose on a job, and lets them go to it......... A B C D E
46. Your partner backs down when he/she ought to stand firm....................... A B C D E
47. Your partner keeps to himself/herself................................................. A B C D E
48. Your partner is accurate in predicting the trend of events..................... A B C D E
49. Your partner gets swamped by details............................................... A B C D E
50. Your partner can wait just so long, then blows up................................ A B C D E
<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>51.</td>
<td>Your partner speaks from a strong inner conviction.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52.</td>
<td>Your partner makes sure that his part in the family is understood by the family members.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53.</td>
<td>Your partner is reluctant to allow the members any freedom of action.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54.</td>
<td>Your partner lets some members have authority that he/she should keep.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55.</td>
<td>Your partner looks out for the personal welfare of family members.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56.</td>
<td>Your partner sees to it that the work of the family is coordinated.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57.</td>
<td>Your partner gets things all tangled up.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58.</td>
<td>Your partner remains calm when uncertain about coming events.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59.</td>
<td>Your partner is an inspiring talker.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60.</td>
<td>Your partner schedules the work to be done.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61.</td>
<td>Your partner allows the family a high degree of initiative.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62.</td>
<td>Your partner takes full charge when emergencies arise.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63.</td>
<td>Your partner is willing to make changes.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64.</td>
<td>Your partner helps family members settle their differences.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65.</td>
<td>Your partner can reduce a madhouse to system and order.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66.</td>
<td>Your partner is able to delay action until the proper time occurs.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67.</td>
<td>Your partner persuades others that his/her ideas are to their advantage.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68.</td>
<td>Your partner maintains definite standards of performance.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69.</td>
<td>Your partner trusts the members to exercise good judgment.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70.</td>
<td>Your partner overcomes attempts made to challenge his/her leadership.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A - Always  
B - Often  
C - Occasionally  
D - Seldom  
E - Never

71. Your partner refuses to explain his/her actions. ........................................... A B C D E
72. Your partner anticipates problems and plans for them. ................................. A B C D E
73. Your partner gets confused when too many demands are made of him/her. ........ A B C D E
74. Your partner worries about the outcome of any new procedure. ..................... A B C D E
75. Your partner can inspire enthusiasm for a project......................................... A B C D E
76. Your partner asks that family members follow standard rules and regulations. .. A B C D E
77. Your partner permits the family to set its own pace .................................. A B C D E
78. Your partner is easily recognized as the leader of the family. ....................... A B C D E
79. Your partner acts without consulting the family. ....................................... A B C D E
80. Your partner maintains a closely knit family ............................................. A B C D E
81. If the children misbehave while your partner and you have company, your partner is the one who disciplines them ........................................... A B C D E
82. When there are important decisions to be made in your family, your partner has the last say ......................................................... A B C D E
83. Your partner spends time playing with your children .................................... A B C D E
84. Your partner sets the standards for behavior in your family. ....................... A B C D E
85. Your partner's suggestions are ignored when your family makes decisions ....... A B C D E
86. Your partner engages in conversation with your children ............................. A B C D E
87. Your partner provides the discipline when children in your home do not obey family rules ................................. A B C D E
A - Always
B - Often
C - Occasionally
D - Seldom
E - Never

88. When emergencies occur in your family your partner is too overwhelmed to make necessary decisions...................................... A B C D E

89. Your partner encourages family members to develop their talents................................................. A B C D E

90. The leadership that your partner gives is accepted by family members........................................ A B C D E

91. The family outings that you have are organized by your partner.................................................. A B C D E
APPENDIX VI

L.B.D.Q. Record Sheet and Scoring Key
## L.B.D.O. FORM XII - RECORD SHEET

### SECTION I

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Representation</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>17</th>
<th>25</th>
<th>33</th>
<th>41</th>
<th>49*</th>
<th>57*</th>
<th>65</th>
<th>73*</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Reconciliation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10*</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>34*</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>50*</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>74*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Tol. Uncertainty</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>43*</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Persuasion</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Structure</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>53*</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>77</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Tol. Freedom</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14*</td>
<td>22*</td>
<td>30*</td>
<td>38*</td>
<td>46*</td>
<td>54*</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>78</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Role Assumption</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>47*</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>71*</td>
<td>79*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Consideration</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Predictive Acc.</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SECTION II

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Limit-setting</th>
<th>81</th>
<th>84</th>
<th>87</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Decision-making</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>85*</td>
<td>88*</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Nurturance</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>89</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Leadership Acc.</td>
<td>90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTALS**

<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**SCORING KEY**

*Starred items are scored 1 2 3 4 5

All other items are scored 5 4 3 2 1
BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books


Articles and Periodicals


Unpublished material


Hoefling, Col. J. A. "Leadership:...There is no 'right' way."

VITA

James Arthur Green was born in Galt, Ontario on June 3, 1949. He attended Hillside and Little's Corners elementary schools and received his secondary education at Glenview Park S.S. In September, 1969 he entered the Bachelor of Social Work program at the University of Windsor. During his undergraduate studies his work experiences included employment as a group leader and residential counsellor with Windsor Group Therapy Project and field placement with the Children's Aid Society of the County of Essex. In May, 1973 he obtained his Bachelor of Social Work degree and began employment with the Children's Aid Society of Guelph and Wellington County. In July of the following summer he married Dorothy Biebrach. They returned to Windsor in September, 1975 where Mr. Green enrolled in the Master of Social Work program at the University of Windsor. His graduate field placement was with the Social Work Department of the Windsor Separate School Board. He expects to receive his Master's of Social Work degree in October, 1976. Mr. Green has accepted a position with the Youth Guidance Program of Youth For Christ in London, Ontario.
VITA

Hubert Armand Drouin was born in Sturgeon Falls, Ontario on May 1, 1950. He attended l'Ecole Sacre Coeur elementary school and received his secondary education at the Sturgeon Falls Secondary School. In September 1969 he was admitted to the University of Windsor where he enrolled in the Bachelor of Social Work program. During the summer of 1970 he attended intersession and summer school to work toward his Bachelor of Arts degree. His undergraduate work experiences included employment in Adult Education with Frontier College in Northern British Columbia and a social work internship at the Ontario Hospital School, Cedar Springs. In August 1972 he was married to Carol Ann Frankling of Toronto. He obtained his Bachelor of Arts and Bachelor of Social Work degrees in May 1973. Following graduation, he was employed by the Children's Aid Society of the County of Essex and by the Regional Psychiatric Centre in Kingston, Ontario. In September 1975 he enrolled in the Master of Social Work program at the University of Windsor. His graduate field placement was with the Windsor Group Therapy Project. He expects to obtain his Master of Social Work degree in the fall of 1976. Mr. Drouin has accepted a position as Chief Psychiatric Social Worker at the Regional Psychiatric Centre in Kingston, Ontario.