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ABSTRACT

This study was designed to examine relationships between giftedness and perceived paternal child-rearing along two dimensions: nurturance-rejection and restrictiveness-permissiveness. Giftedness was defined as having five component parts: IQ, academic achievement, creativity, leadership ability, and participation in visual/performing arts. Unlike many other studies involving giftedness, this research investigates behavior using an ecological framework. It was expected that this perspective in combination with the identification of different components of giftedness might explain conflicting findings in past research that indicated correlations for giftedness with both parental nurturance and parental rejection.

Forty-two male and forty-three female college psychology students participated in this study. Each subject completed the following questionnaires: the Modified Child-rearing Practices Report to measure perceived parenting attitudes; the Paternal Involvement in Child Care Index to measure paternal involvement; the Culture Fair Intelligence Test for IQ scores; and the Cree Questionnaire as an index of creativity. A Biographical Data form requested information about academic achievement, leadership ability, and arts participation, as well as family and background variables.

The results indicated that: 1) Giftedness was positively related to perceived paternal nurturance, but there were no significant relationships between giftedness and restrictiveness. 2) The only components of giftedness which correlated with perceived paternal nurturance were time spent in leadership positions and creativity. 3) Finally, non-traditional fathers were perceived as more nurturant than traditional fathers. These results are discussed in terms of their implications for the design of future research on giftedness and parental attitudes, and problems and issues in intervention with and identification of the gifted.
GIFTEDNESS AND PERCEIVED PATERNAL CHILD-REARING PRACTICES:

NURTURE AND RESTRICTIVENESS
INTRODUCTION

Past research in the areas of giftedness and parenting have produced conflicting results, indicating correlations for giftedness with both parental nurturance (Arasteh, 1968; Cornell, 1983) and parental rejection (Berger, 1980a; Cornell, 1983; Friedman, 1972; Nesbit & Karagianis, 1982). One reason for this conflict may lie in differing conceptual and operational definitions of giftedness. Some studies define "giftedness" in terms of academic achievement (Cornell, 1983), whereas others use IQ scores, or creativity measures (Siegelman, 1973). Based on a literature review, Fox (1982) defined five areas that contribute to giftedness: IQ, academic achievement, creativity, leadership ability, and participation in visual and performing arts.

Another reason for the conflict in giftedness literature can be found in the researchers' approaches to the problem. Each study views behavior from a single dimension, and two such studies do not necessarily use the same dimension of behavior. Some examine only specific characteristics of the individual (Arasteh, 1968); others look at giftedness and parenting in terms of family systems (Siegelman, 1973); and others investigate cultural
effects on giftedness and parenting (Friedman, 1972). Belsky (1980) noted a similar problem in research on child abuse. He outlined an ecological model that would enable researchers to systematically organize a large body of data, and would serve as a guide for future inquiry. This model is, in fact, applicable to many areas of research in that it provides a way to view a relationship from multiple levels of behavior.

**Ontogenic development**

The first level examines individual characteristics that contribute to the behavior under study. For example, a parent uses child-rearing techniques that he or she has learned from his or her own parents. The gender of the child may affect parental attitudes toward the child, just as the gender of the parent may affect parental attitudes. Ontogenic variables considered in this study were the subject's gender, college standing, and age. In addition, the components of giftedness all describe characteristics of the subject, which defines them as ontogenic, also.

**The microsystem**

This level examines the family setting in which a behavior occurs. Parent-child interactions, or even child-child and spousal interactions are categorized here. Using this level of Belsky's model (1980), a child can be seen as a causative agent in the parenting process.

"Children influence their parents' behavior while
simultaneously being influenced by it" (Belsky, 1980, p. 645). The following microsystemic variables were considered in this study: perceived paternal nurturance, perceived paternal restrictiveness, quality of parental marriage, father's age, mother's age, number of sisters, and number of brothers.

The exosystem

The third level investigates behavior in terms of formal and informal social structures. It describes how friends, neighbors, and economic states affect interactions within the family. Giftedness and parenting may both be affected by socioeconomic status. Positive correlations between giftedness and paternal nurturance were found in middle class children, but not in lower class children (Biller, 1982). Exosystemic variables used in this study were mother's and father's education, mother's and father's occupation, and family's socioeconomic status (SES).

The macrosystem

The macrosystem describes the influence of cultural values and belief systems. Values, attitudes, and societal tolerances affect what are considered to be appropriate familial policies. In America, for example, fathers participate less in childcare than do fathers in other cultures, such as Japan (Parke, 1976). Currently, American attitudes towards child-rearing are changing;
fathers show an increasing involvement in childcare (Feldman, Nash, & Aschenbrenner, 1983). Paternal involvement in childcare was the macrosystemic variable included in this study.

In the following pages I will describe past research in the areas of giftedness, parenting attitudes, paternal effects on childcare, and relationships between giftedness and parenting. Results from these areas will be integrated in the ecological framework devised by Belsky (1980). This will be followed by a brief description of my hypotheses.
CHAPTER I

LITERATURE REVIEW

Giftedness and parenting practices

There are almost as many definitions of "gifted" children as there are experiments that study giftedness. Until 1971, few states had any legal definitions of giftedness, and those which did varied considerably (Fox, 1981). In 1971, however, Congress legislated a definition of gifted and talented children as those who "are capable of high performance" (Fox, 1981).

Children capable of high performance include those in any of the following areas, singly or in combination: 1) general intellectual ability, 2) specific academic aptitude, 3) creative or productive thinking, 4) leadership ability, 5) visual and performing arts (p. 1104).

Within eight years, 42 states had some definition for giftedness patterned after the federal version (Fox, 1981). Many states subsequently developed school programs specially designed for gifted students.

The relationship between giftedness and parenting practices is unclear. Past research indicates a relationship for giftedness with both a nurturance-rejection continuum and a restrictiveness-permissiveness continuum. Characteristics that distinguish a child from
others or cause a child to stand out have been found to elicit abuse, or at least parental rejection (Nesbit & Karagianis, 1982). Giftedness is such a characteristic, as are excessive crying, prematurity, physical handicaps, and intelligence level. Each can contribute to making a child "different" or "special" (Berger, 1980a).

Generally, research with "special" children has been limited to the developmentally disabled or retarded. Friedman (1972), however, suggested that precocious children, as well as retarded or handicapped children, were likely to be abused because they were different. Children with high IQ scores (one measure of giftedness) represent one extreme of intelligence, and thus diverge from the norm. A gifted child in a family where other members are not gifted will stand out from those family members. A gifted child from a family of gifted people might not appear extraordinary among his/her family, yet still be conspicuous among peers or neighbors. Siegelman (1973) found that creative students (one aspect of giftedness) described their parents as more rejecting than loving, although it is not clear if a causal relationship exists here.

In a study on labeling effects, Cornell (1983) suggests a relationship between restrictive parenting attitudes and giftedness, defined by academic achievement. He examined giftedness from a family systems framework, in
which the gifted child is idealized, and plays the role of a theoretical counterpart to the scapegoating of an emotionally disturbed child. Cornell suggested that idealization could be detrimental to a gifted child due to excessive pressure and/or unrealistic expectations by the parents, qualities that are demonstrated by restrictive parents.

A relationship may also exist between restrictive attitudes and giftedness defined by IQ scores (Cornell, 1983). Although IQ was not fully examined because scores were not available in the control group, Cornell was able to acquire IQ scores for the gifted children. The mean IQ for the children with high academic achievement was 135. Therefore, if a relationship exists between restrictiveness and academic achievement, and a relationship exists between academic achievement and IQ, it is likely that a relationship may also exist between restrictiveness and IQ.

On the other hand, Arasteh (1968) implied that parental nurturance was related to giftedness, defined by visual/performing arts and leadership ability. Cornell studied giftedness from a societal perspective, seeing the effects of the exosystem upon both the microsystem and the individual. Arasteh viewed giftedness solely from the position of ontogenic development. Cornell included the effects of two systems that Arasteh chose not to examine.
Naturally their conclusions would differ.

Thus, the controversy surrounding the giftedness literature probably results from different approaches to the problem. Some researchers pursue it from a purely ontogenic perspective, others from a microsystemic view, and others from a combination of both. But, all of these approaches may be valid and not mutually exclusive.

Paternal effects on child development

Recently, research on parenting has shifted focus from maternal contributions toward child care to paternal contributions. Most theories have assumed the importance of maternal factors in child development because the mother spends more time with the infant/child than the father (Ainsworth, 1962; Bowlby, 1969). This assumption has two major problems: 1) the importance of the interaction between a mother and child is exaggerated by ignoring the effects of the father, and 2) the amount of time spent together is a poor predictor of the quality of a relationship (Lamb, 1976c). Lamb asserts that how the time is spent with the child is more important than how much time is spent.

Many researchers hoped to resolve the issue of parental importance by looking at infant attachment. But, the results of attachment studies are contradictory. In some studies, infants showed no parental preference in stress-free situations, but the same infants preferred
their mothers when stressed (Lamb, 1976d). Some studies indicate that both parents are equal attachment figures, but children tend to affiliate more with their fathers (Lamb, 1976c), and some show that fathers interact less with children than mothers (Keller, Montgomery, Moss, Sharp, and Wheeler, 1975). Other studies showed that infants older than nine months indicated no preference for either parent (Cohen & Campos, 1974; Kotelchuck, Zelazo, Kagan, & Spelke, 1975; Lamb, 1976b; Ross, Kagan, Zelazo, & Kotelchuck, 1975; Schaffer & Emerson, 1964; Spelke, Zelazo, Kagan, & Kotelchuck, 1973). These contradictory conclusions indicate that the issue of parental importance is far from clear.

Paternal effects on intellectual functioning have been another area of controversy. As mentioned in the last section, questions arise as to whether giftedness in children is related to parental nurturance, or parental rejection. Radin (1976) noted several studies in which a relationship existed between intelligence and paternal nurturance. Lamb (1976c) suggests that fathers facilitate cognitive development from infancy. Underachievers had poor relationships with their fathers, whom they perceived as rejecting or hostile (Grunebaum, Hurwitz, Prentice, & Sperry, 1962; Hurley, 1967). Ainsworth (1962), too, stated that this relationship stems from infancy. Securely attached infants were more likely to explore the
environment and trust the caregiver (Ainsworth, Blehar, Waters, & Wall, 1978; Lamb, 1976c; Lamb, 1982; Main & Weston, 1982). Father absence has been hypothesized to produce deterioration of school performance in boys (Bronfenbrenner, 1967) as well as diminished intellectual capacity (Blanchard & Biller, 1971; Santrock, 1972), and lower analytic cognitive style (Carlsmith, 1973; Lessing, Zagorin, & Nelson, 1970). And Carlsmith (1973) states that fathers affect cognitive styles; boys whose fathers are absent are more likely to display a pattern of test scores that corresponds to females. This not only indicates an effect on cognition due to fathers, but also shows an effect of the child's gender on father-child interactions.

Additionally, Biller (1982) described studies in which boys who were underachievers in school had inadequate relationships with their fathers. Radin (1972) concluded that paternal nurturance was positively correlated with intelligence, whereas paternal restrictiveness was negatively correlated with intelligence. In short, past research indicates a definite effect on giftedness related to fathers, although it again is not clear whether that relationship is with paternal nurturance or paternal restrictiveness.

Belsky (1984) identified SES as an important factor in support systems and in environmental stressors that
influence parental functioning. Radin (1976) identified the father's SES as an important predictor of the child's cognitive abilities. This correlation remained fairly constant across studies, although the reason for the relationship is obscure.

I recently conducted a study with college students on child-rearing attitudes and giftedness (Monson, 1984). Giftedness was operationally defined by participation in a gifted program for three or more years prior to college; this information was obtained from mass-testing questionnaires. Fifteen gifted women, nine gifted men, fifteen non-gifted women, and eleven non-gifted men completed the three parts of the Modified Child-rearing Practices Report (Rickel & Biasatti, 1982), which measured parenting attitudes; a questionnaire asking for biographical data; and a questionnaire evaluating discipline techniques. It was expected that subjects would mimic their perceptions of their parents' attitudes, and that gifted subjects would be more likely to perceive parents as restrictive and rejecting than would non-gifted subjects.

Most of the variables that correlated with subjects' attitudes and perceptions of parental attitudes were actions, characteristics, or concerns of the father. It appeared that students perceived their fathers to have more influence on their perceptions of parenting than
their mothers. Although these findings were inconsistent with the majority of literature on parenting, they were consistent with more recent studies (Biller, 1982; Blanchard & Biller, 1971; Carlson, 1984; Feldman et al., 1983; Jordan, Radin, Epstein, 1975; Nash, 1976; Radin, 1972, 1973, 1976; Santrock, 1972; Siegelman, 1973).

Additional results indicated a relationship between parenting and marriage quality. The quality of the marital relationship was found by Feldman et al. (1983) to be the single most powerful predictor of paternal involvement and satisfaction. This has been confirmed by Belsky (1981), Entwistle and Doering (1981), and Grossman, Eichler, and Winickoff (1980).

In spite of correlations for giftedness with both parental rejection and parental nurturance, the controversy about how gifted children perceive their parents can be resolved by examining surrounding factors such as the gender of the subjects studied (Jordan, Radin, & Epstein, 1975), paternal restrictiveness, and differences in the socioeconomic status of the subjects (Lamb, 1976c). Positive correlations between giftedness and paternal nurturance were found to be higher in boys than in girls (Jordan et al., 1975). Lamb (1976c) stressed the importance of paternal nurturance as well as restrictiveness suggesting that both are important factors. But Johnson (1963) identified the crucial
variable as being the warmth and quality of the relationship. And correlations between giftedness and paternal nurturance were found in middle class children, but not in lower class children (Lamb, 1976c; Radin, 1972). It can be seen that paternal nurturance is related to the giftedness of the child, the gender of the child, and the status of the family. By viewing these results from each level of Belsky's model (ontogenic development, the microsystem, the exosystem, and the macrosystem), one can more easily see the pattern of interactions.

**Traditional parenting attitudes**

With the coming of industrialization, the pattern of the absent working father began (Nash, 1976). Caretaking responsibilities fell almost entirely to the mother. Societal attitudes traditionally dictated that a father's responsibilities included playing with the children and administering a large proportion of discipline, but no participation in childcare (Feldman, Nash, & Aschenbrenner, 1983; Lamb, 1976c). In fact, Feldman et al. found no correlation between playfulness and caretaking in fathers (1983).

Recently, however, societal attitudes are changing; more mothers are working, and in many cases, fathers are sharing childcare activities (Feldman et al., 1983). These changes in the macrosystem (i.e., increased participation of fathers in caretaking) should establish a
greater child-father attachment (Feldman et al., 1983; Lamb, 1976c; Nash, 1965), an effect upon the microsystem. Fathers who shared caregiving tasks have been considered non-traditional (Lamb, Frodi, Hwang, & Frodi, 1983), and were found to be more nurturant than fathers who did not participate in childcare (Carlson, 1984). Therefore, it seems likely that traditional fathers (those who do not participate in caregiving tasks) may be perceived by their children as less nurturant than non-traditional fathers.

**Hypotheses**

In viewing giftedness and parenting attitudes from multiple behavior systems, it is possible to understand both of these areas better (Henggeler, Brunk, & Haefele, 1982). When the effects of parenting on child and adult development are better understood, it may be possible to devise better methods of intervention in cases of pathology. For example, child abuse and neglect, conduct disorders in children, and confused generational roles may be better treated with interventions that analyze behavior from multiple levels.

Paternal involvement may relate to giftedness in college students. Giftedness correlates with students' perceptions of parental child-rearing attitudes. It is likely that these attitudes are continued from generation to generation. If a negative pattern results (such as child abuse), it may be possible to alter the pattern and
produce a more positive result, provided enough is known about the phenomenon.

In short, Belsky's ecological model of behavior provides a framework for integrating divergent perspectives. It provides a way to systematically define the conditions for the parenting process (Belsky, 1980). In light of past research and this ecological model, my hypotheses in the present research were as follows.

1. Giftedness and perceived paternal parenting will be correlated with each other. The research clearly shows a relationship between these two factors. Controversy occurs only when discussing the dimension of parenting that relates to giftedness; do gifted students perceive their fathers as more nurturant or more restrictive than non-gifted students? In viewing this from an ecological perspective, I expect to resolve some of this controversy by explaining results in terms of multiple levels of analysis.

2. When giftedness is broken down into its components, each component will correlate with different aspects of perceived paternal attitudes. Specifically, students with high IQ scores, high academic achievement (Cornell, 1983), or high arts participation (Arasteh, 1968) will perceive their fathers as more restrictive than those with lower scores. Nurturant attitudes will correlate with creativity (Siegleman, 1973), leadership
ability, and arts participation (Arasteh, 1968) in the same manner. Although IQ, academic achievement, creativity, leadership ability, and arts participation all contribute to giftedness, they clearly measure different things (Fox, 1981). Viewing giftedness in light of its components may also help to untangle some of the confusion about how giftedness and parenting relate.

3. Traditional fathers (those who do not participate in childcare) should be perceived as less nurturant than non-traditional fathers (those who do participate in childcare). In traditional families, fathers participate in disciplinary tasks, and mothers participate in childcare tasks. As a result, fathers are likely to appear more restrictive than nurturant, and mothers may appear more nurturant than restrictive. In non-traditional families, fathers and mothers are likely to participate more equally in childcare and in discipline tasks. Consequently, perceived paternal nurturance and perceived maternal restrictiveness are likely to increase. One of the questions Carlson (1984) investigated was whether or not fathers who are highly involved in childcare are more nurturant than less-involved fathers. The results of her study suggested that fathers who are more nurturant are more likely to become involved in childcare tasks.
CHAPTER II

METHOD

Subjects

Forty-five male and fifty-one female students from Introductory Psychology classes at The College of William and Mary participated in this study. Only subjects with both parents living and married to each other were accepted. Consequently, three male and eight female subjects were disqualified on the basis of the parents' status as divorced for more than one calendar year, leaving a balance of 42 male and 43 female subjects. This sample size met the criteria Friedman (1982) suggests is adequate for this type of design. Each student received 1 1/2 hours of research credit (as a course requirement) for participation in this study. Sign-up lists were posted on a bulletin board that was designated for this purpose.

Subjects in this study had a mean age of 18.9 and were a little more than halfway through the freshman year in college. Average mother's age was 46 and father's average age was 48. The mean IQ score was 123; the mean GPA was 3.67; and the mean combined (verbal and quantitative) SAT score was 1207.
Measures

Attitudes. Parenting practices were measured using the modified Child-rearing Practices Report developed by Rickel and Biasatti (1982), who found it to be a more manageable version of Block's Report (Rickel and Biasatti, 1982). The Child-rearing Practices Report (CRPR) consists of 91 socialization-relevant items presented to the parent in a Q-sort forced-choice format with a seven-step distribution. In the first-person form, it can be used with mothers and fathers. In the third person form, the CRPR can be used with people of all ages to evaluate the attitudes of their parents.

The Rickel-Biasatti version of the CRPR consists of 40 items rated on a six-point Likert scale. It isolates two major factors: nurturance-rejection, and permissiveness-restrictiveness. The validity and reliability for these two factors were not affected by the condensation of the test, nor were they affected by the rating change (Rickel & Biasatti, 1982). In the present study, subjects were asked for their perceptions of the father's attitudes when the subject was 3 through 12 years old. The CRPR was shown to be consistent over time in a study of parents' reports of their children ages 3 through 12 (Roberts et al., 1984). According to these authors, inconsistencies occurred only in the emphasis on achievement and independence (which increased), and the
expression of physical affection (which decreased).

Earlier experience with the Child-rearing Practices Report demonstrated the congruence of the parent self-report measure with observational data on parents. The long-term reliability of the Child-rearing Practices Report as a measure of parent attitudes and values now receives further support, as shown by the large number of highly significant positive correlations manifested over a 9-year time span (p. 595).

These ages correspond to a time when a child learns to understand others' perspectives, and to master "a complex set of mental operations that lay the foundation for much of the thinking he or she will do as an adult" (Kastenbaum, 1979, p. 353). Therefore, information about children's perspectives during this age bracket may be useful in understanding how these subjects could interact as parents themselves.

**Paternal involvement.** The Paternal Involvement in Child Care Index developed by Carlson (1984) was used to measure the degree of paternal involvement. It included questions concerning: a) the extent of the father's involvement with the student, b) participation in child care tasks, c) involvement in socialization tasks, d) influence in family decision-making, and e) availability to the child (Carlson, 1984).

**Giftedness.** In my previous study (Monson, 1984) problems in the operational definition of giftedness may have been responsible for the lack of correlation between gifted subjects and their perceptions of parents as
nurturant and restrictive. Giftedness in this study was consequently measured by testing each of the five categories defined by Congress: intellectual ability, creativity, academic aptitude, leadership ability, and visual/performing arts (Fox, 1981).

The Culture Fair Intelligence Test served as a measure of intelligence. Adcock and Webberly (1971) described it as a well-known intelligence test with a broad range of difficulty, which should be suitable for IQ's ranging from average to above average. This test correlates well with both the Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale and the Otis Quick Test (Cowden, Peterson, & Pacht, 1971), and has been used successfully in research (Thomas & Holcomb, 1981).

Creativity was measured with the Cree Questionnaire. Munger (1965) has presented evidence demonstrating the validity and reliability of this scale. The Cree Questionnaire can be used as a research device for rough screening of creativity (Nauman, 1965).

A biographical data questionnaire requested information about Grade Point Average and Scholastic Achievement Test scores (to determine academic aptitude); type of positions held in fraternities or sororities, clubs, sports, or class functions, and time spent in these positions (to determine leadership ability); and type and quantity of participation in art, music, and/or drama (to
determine proficiency in visual/performing arts).

Subjects' background. It was noted (Monson, 1984) that students whose parents were not married saw themselves as less restrictive than did those whose parents were married. This shows a relationship between parenting and marriage quality. In the present study, this variable was controlled by using only students whose parents are living and married to each other. Quality of the relationship was determined by the following statements in the biographical data questionnaire. 1) My parents are willing to communicate with each other. 2) My parents respect each other. 3) My parents are considerate of each other. 4) My parents get along with each other. 5) My parents are satisfied with their marriage. The subjects were asked to rate these statements on a six-point Likert scale. Future research may need to further examine how the marital relationship affects perceptions of parenting attitudes in children.

Belsky (1984) identified SES as an important factor in support systems and in stress factors that influence parental functioning. Mueller & Parcel (1981) found that many research studies abuse the use of SES. Some studies generalize, describing their populations as from a middle-class public school, or a basically homogeneous group, without measuring SES at all. Those that do use an SES measure tend to use Hollingshead's Two-Factor Index of
Social Position, or the Edward's scale used in the U.S. Census. These scales, however, are thought to be outdated and ineffective (Mueller & Parcel, 1981). The Edward's scale was last updated in 1938. In addition to assuming that education will be reflected in occupation, Edward's scale is known to be very heterogeneous within categories. It includes in the professional category lawyers with an income of $18,700 and radio operators with an income of $7,300. The Hollingshead Index also has not been updated to match the current labor market. And because it was developed on a sample from a single New England community, its reliability is questionable.

A scale developed by Nock & Rossi (1978, 1979) is suggested as an alternative. This scale considers levels of occupation and education for both marital partners. Thus, a doctor whose wife works at home, a doctor whose wife is a doctor, and a doctor who is a bachelor would not all have the same SES level, even if their income and education were equal. As SES needs to be more precisely measured, Nock & Rossi's system was used in the present study.

The biographical data questionnaire was also used to obtain information on age, gender, college standing, plans for marriage and children, number and ages of siblings, parents' occupation (including years spent in that occupation and number of hours of work per week), and
education.

Procedure

This study was conducted in ten sessions, with five make-up sessions. Prior to beginning, the subjects were told that they would be participating in thesis research comparing different attitudes toward parenting (further details can be found in Appendix I). Each subject was given a consent form, the biographical data questionnaire, the Rickel-Biasatti Modified CRPR, the Paternal Involvement in Child Care Index, the Cree Questionnaire, and Cattell's Culture Fair Intelligence Test. Test order was randomized across test sessions. Each questionnaire was completed and returned before starting the next one. The median time to complete a set of questionnaires was 67 minutes. All answers were anonymous; each set of questionnaires was numbered, and each subject was given a designated number. These numbers were used to keep the sets of questionnaires together, not to identify the subjects. No list was kept of subjects' numbers. After completing the study, subjects were informed that, more specifically, this study was examining the relationship between giftedness in young adults and their perceptions of their fathers' child-rearing attitudes (see Appendix IV). Those subjects who were interested in the results of the study were instructed to write their addresses on the consent forms. After the study and its analyses and
conclusions were completed, a summary of the results was compiled and mailed to interested subjects.
CHAPTER III

RESULTS

The data gathered from this study were analyzed separately for each hypothesis in the following ways.

Hypothesis one: Giftedness and Perceived Paternal Parenting

Each component of giftedness (IQ, creativity, GPA & SAT, leadership ability, and arts participation) was standardized using $Z$ -scores. The $Z$ -scores were then summed to yield an overall giftedness score for each subject. The relationship between giftedness and perceived paternal parenting was measured using Pearson correlations. One correlation compared giftedness and perceived nurturance; the second correlation compared giftedness and perceived restrictiveness.

A significant correlation was obtained for giftedness and perceived nurturance with $r (81) = .197, p < .05$. The correlation between giftedness and perceived restrictiveness was not significant. It appears that as giftedness increases, perceptions of paternal nurturance also increase.
Hypothesis two: Giftedness components and perceived paternal parenting

Each aspect of giftedness may have a different relationship to paternal attitudes. A stepwise multiple regression analysis was conducted to identify those variables of giftedness which account for the largest amount of unique variability in subject's perceptions of paternal attitudes. Leadership ability and arts participation were subdivided into: number of years in leadership positions, and types of positions; number of years of arts participation, and number of performances. These combined with IQ, SAT and GRE scores, and creativity for a total of eight factors of giftedness used in the prediction of restrictive and nurturant attitudes.

The major predictor variable for nurturance was the number of years in leadership positions, accounting for 4.9% of the variance. Creativity was the next best predictor, accounting for an additional 2% of the variance in perceived paternal nurturance. Table 1 presents the zero-order correlations, usefulness index, and tests of significance for these predictors.
Table 1

Multiple Regression Analysis Predicting Perceived Paternal Nurturance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor variable</th>
<th>Correlation with criterion index</th>
<th>Usefulness</th>
<th>Unstandardized b error of b</th>
<th>Standard t for β = 0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Years in leadership positions</td>
<td>.221</td>
<td>.049</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creativity</td>
<td>.182</td>
<td>.020</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

R² = .069, F(2, 78) = 2.90, p = .06
p < .10
Hypothesis 3: Traditionality and Perceived Paternal Parenting

Parenting scores for traditional fathers were compared to those of non-traditional fathers using t-tests. Membership in traditional and non-traditional groups was determined by a tertiary split; the scores were divided into thirds. Those in the top third were "non-traditional," and those in the bottom third were "traditional." A significant effect was obtained for the effect of traditional attitudes on nurturance, \( t (58) = -5.68, p < .0001 \), but not for the effect of traditional attitudes on restrictiveness, \( t (58) = 0.72, p < .10 \).

Table 2 presents the means, standard deviations, and sample sizes of each group. It can be seen that non-traditional fathers are perceived as more nurturant than traditional fathers.

Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent variables</th>
<th>Traditional</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Non-traditional</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>n</td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>n</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nurturance*</td>
<td>33.16</td>
<td>9.31</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>43.97</td>
<td>4.91</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restrictiveness</td>
<td>32.84</td>
<td>7.97</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>31.38</td>
<td>7.86</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*\( p < .0001 \)
Additional Analyses

Because the subject was randomly sampled, I examined potential confounding variables statistically. Stepwise multiple regression analyses were employed to determine predictor variables of perceived paternal practices. The following variables were monitored through the biographical data questionnaire: gender, age, college standing, adoptions, plans for marriage and/or children, SES using both parents, parental ages, quality of parents' marriage, and the number of siblings.

Perceived nurturance can be predicted by the apparent quality of the parents' marriage (accounting for 32.1% of the variance), which has a positive correlation, and the number of sisters of the subject (predicting an additional 6.8%), which has a negative correlation with perceived paternal nurturance (PPN). IQ is also negatively correlated, adding 4.1% variance, for a total of 33%. Table 3 shows the statistics for these variables. For perceived paternal restrictiveness (PPR), total SES was found to account for 8.1% of the variance with a negative correlation. In addition, marriage quality is negatively correlated, predicting 5.8%; gender is also negatively correlated, and it predicts 3.2%; father's age correlates negatively with restrictiveness and accounts for 4.4% variance; number of sisters is positively correlated, accounting for 6.3%; and GPA predicts 1.8% variance in a
negative correlation. These account for a total of 29.6% of the variance in restrictiveness. Table 4 shows these statistics.
Table 3

**Multiple Regression Analysis with Total Variable Pool Predicting Nurturance**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor variable</th>
<th>Correlation with criterion</th>
<th>Usefulness index</th>
<th>Unstandardized b</th>
<th>Standard t for error of b</th>
<th>( \bar{\alpha} = 0 )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Marriage quality</td>
<td>.566</td>
<td>.321</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>5.29*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of sisters</td>
<td>-.293</td>
<td>.068</td>
<td>-2.75</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>-2.66**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IQ</td>
<td>-.127</td>
<td>.041</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-1.91#</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( R^2 = .431, F(3,50) = 12.62, p < .0001 \)
\( *p < .0001 \quad **p = .01 \quad #p < .10 \)

---

Table 4

**Multiple Regression Analysis with Total Variable Pool Predicting Restrictiveness**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor variable</th>
<th>Correlation with criterion</th>
<th>Usefulness index</th>
<th>Unstandardized b</th>
<th>Standard t for error of b</th>
<th>( \bar{\alpha} = 0 )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total socioeconomic status</td>
<td>-.284</td>
<td>.081</td>
<td>-.34</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>-3.12*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marriage quality</td>
<td>-.258</td>
<td>.058</td>
<td>-.28</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>-2.34**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject's gender</td>
<td>-.139</td>
<td>.032</td>
<td>-3.37</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>-1.87#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father's age</td>
<td>-.049</td>
<td>.044</td>
<td>-.47</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>-2.43**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of sisters</td>
<td>.174</td>
<td>.063</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>2.14**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPA</td>
<td>-.023</td>
<td>.018</td>
<td>-3.22</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>-1.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( R^2 = .297, F(6,47) = 3.31, p < .01 \)
\( *p < .05 \quad **p < .01 \quad #p < .10 \)
CHAPTER IV
DISCUSSION

The results of this study are summarized as follows.

1) Giftedness was positively related to perceived paternal nurturance. There were no significant relationships between restrictiveness and giftedness. 2) The only important components of giftedness in perceived paternal nurturance were time spent in leadership positions and creativity. 3) Finally, non-traditional fathers were perceived as more nurturant than traditional fathers.

Marriage quality, number of sisters, and IQ also affected the subject's perceptions of father's nurturance. Socioeconomic status predicted restrictiveness, as did marriage quality, subject's gender, father's age, and number of sisters. Each of these will be discussed in detail.

Hypothesis one: Giftedness and perceived paternal parenting

As giftedness increases, perceived paternal nurturance also increases. This tells merely that a relationship exists between giftedness and perceived parenting attitudes. It also indicates that this relationship occurs with nurturance and not with
restrictiveness. But, in order to discover more about this relationship, the component parts of giftedness must be examined.

**Hypothesis two: Giftedness components and perceived paternal parenting**

Breaking giftedness into its components yields a relationship between leadership ability and perceived paternal nurturance. In other words, as the time spent in leadership positions increases, perceived paternal nurturance (PPN) also increases. Creativity also increases with PPN.

These results support the conclusion that different components of giftedness measure different qualities. If all components measured the same thing, one might expect them each to account for variance in PPN. Yet, only creativity and leadership ability have a significant relationship with PPN, and even these are distinct from each other. The giftedness components represent characteristics of the individual that are related to a variable in the environment, the father's perceived nurturance. Consequently, much of the controversy among studies of giftedness and parenting may lie in the type of giftedness variable used, and the framework in which it is analyzed.
Hypothesis three: Traditionality and perceived paternal parenting

Non-traditional fathers (fathers who participate in childcare activities) are perceived as more nurturant than traditional fathers. Restrictiveness in this study was not significantly related to traditional approaches in fathers. These results confirm the conclusions drawn by Carlson (1984). It may be that nurturance is a function of participation in childcare. Thus, fathers usually participate less in childcare than do mothers, and fathers are usually seen as less nurturant than mothers. But when fathers do participate in childcare, they are perceived as more nurturant than fathers who do not participate in childcare.

Additional analyses

Perceived paternal nurturance. Parental marriage quality, number of sisters of the subject, and IQ also predict PPN. Marriage quality in particular seems to be important in the perceptions of nurturance of the father. Higher qualities of marriage occur with higher nurturance scores. It is possible that subjects who perceive their parents' marriage as good, attribute that to nurturant qualities in the parents. Because fathers are not traditionally nurturant, a good marriage may be indicative of unusual nurturant attitudes in a father. Feldman et al. (1983) suggested that in a good marriage, fathers are
more willing to invest in the parental relationship.

Increases in the number of sisters predict decreases in PPN. Thus, the more sisters a subject has, the less nurturant the father appears. It is true that fathers often are seen to be more acceptant of dependent behavior in girls (Snow, Jacklin, and Maccoby, 1983). Father-daughter interaction generally consists of more holding and close-proximity activities than does father-son interaction. Yet, close-proximity activities involve one-on-one interaction, and are difficult to expand to include three or more people. In families with many daughters, the father may spend less time with each than in families with few daughters. This conclusion indicates the need to observe other family (microsystemic) variables when conducting research on parental attitudes.

Finally, it can be seen that as IQ increases, PPN decreases. More gifted students here perceive their fathers as more rejecting. This further supports the fact that different factors of giftedness reflect different aspects of parenting.

All of these findings can be presented from the perspective of Belsky's model (1980). PPN occurs in a family setting in which the parental marriage quality is good and the number of sisters is small. Higher PPN is also observed for individuals with lower IQ scores. In short, PPN is reflected in two microsystemic variables and
one ontogenic variable.

**Perceived paternal restrictiveness.** Socioeconomic status (SES) appears to be the most important predictor of perceived paternal restrictiveness (PPR). As SES increases, PPR decreases. In this situation, the exosystem may produce an effect on the microsystem. It seems that, with SES accounted for, PPR and giftedness have no significant relationship. Studies that produced a relationship between giftedness and PPR may not have adequately measured SES. As Nock and Rossi (1978) noted, most researchers in psychology assume that because the subject pool is in a college that serves mostly middle-class families, they can safely treat all subjects as if they are middle-class. The present study, however, was conducted at a college with mostly middle to upper-middle class students. Yet, 16% of the subjects were not from middle or upper-middle class families. A noticeable portion of the subject pool was not homogeneous. Furthermore, SES turned out to be a significant predictor of PPR. These two points taken together indicate that SES needs to be measured more accurately than in previous research.

Additional predictor variables for PPR include marriage quality, subject's gender, and father's age, which were all negatively correlated with PPR. The number of sisters was positively correlated, and the GPA was
negatively correlated with PPR. Higher marriage quality predicts lower restrictiveness scores. This result compliments the prediction that can be made from marriage quality with regard to nurturance. Increases in marriage quality predict increases in PPN and decreases in PPR. When the marriage quality is poor, each parent may redirect conflict to interactions with the child (Belsky, 1981). In other words, in a family with poor marital relations, the parents may not actively fight with each other, but may instead channel their disagreements through the child by the use of more restrictive parenting. It may be that a poor marriage is the result of conflict between dyads in the family. The greater the perceived conflict between the father and mother, the more restrictive the father appears.

Subject's gender has a negative correlation with PPR. Female subjects see their fathers as less restrictive than do male subjects. This result agrees with the finding that fathers often treat their sons more harshly than their daughters (Lamb, 1976c). Therefore, gender is another important ontogenic variable.

Father's age also predicts PPR. Older fathers seem less restrictive than younger fathers. This finding seems contrary to what might be expected, because younger fathers are assumed to be perceived as closer to the subject, and therefore less restrictive. One possible
explanation for this result lies in the change of values as adulthood progresses. Older parents tend to be less concerned with personal satisfaction, and more willing to consider the needs of the child (Kuhlen, 1968). Or, older parents may find it easier to accept parental roles (Bell, 1967), and therefore will be more willing to overcome traditional patterns (Nydegger, 1973). Another possible explanation may lie in the area of cohort effects. Currently, there appears to be less emphasis on permissiveness than there was 20 years ago (Kastenbaum, 1979). Older fathers would have been more exposed to permissive child-rearing attitudes than would younger fathers. Consequently, the older fathers would be more likely to use permissive techniques than the younger fathers.

The number of sisters also affects the perceived attitudes of fathers. The greater the number of sisters, the more restrictive the father appears. This result agrees with its compliment; as the number of sisters increases, the perceived paternal nurturance decreases, and the perceived paternal restrictiveness increases. Again, this may be attributable to the fact that fathers are seen to be more acceptant of dependent behavior in girls (Snow, Jacklin, and Maccoby, 1983). Also, although fathers tend to use less physical punishment with girls, they tend to be more rigid in their sex-role
stereotypes, and less accepting of deviance from these stereotypes. Therefore, students with many sisters may see their fathers as less tolerant with girls, and perceive their fathers as more restrictive.

Finally, GPA is negatively correlated with PPR. Higher GPA scores occur with lower restrictiveness scores. This finding agrees with Cornell's study (1983). Based on his study, I expected to find that IQ and academic achievement would predict restrictiveness, but not nurturance. Thus, the subjects who do well in school see their fathers as less restrictive than do those who do less well in school. Or, gifted students view their fathers as more permissive than less gifted students.

These findings can also be presented from the perspective of Belsky's model (1980). PPR occurs in a social structure of lower SES. It occurs within a family setting in which the parental marriage quality is poor, the father is young, and there are many sisters. PPR also occurs in relation to individual characteristics of gender and GPA. Fathers are more likely to be seen as restrictive by sons with lower GPA's than by daughters, or by offspring with higher GPA's. In short, PPR is reflected in an exosystemic variable, three microsystemic variables, and two ontogenic variables.
Limitations of this study

Certain aspects of the design in this study may make generalization difficult. I have used self-report measures to acquire data, and these materials measure perceived paternal practices, whereas most of the literature studies parenting by experimenter-rated or parental-report measures. In a review, however, Biller (1982) noted studies by Katz and by Solomon that reported results similar to each other, although Katz used a self-report measure completed by boys, and Solomon used experimenter ratings. Although these studies indicate a similarity between self-report measures and experimenter ratings, the measures in this study are also retrospective. In reflecting upon events six or more years ago, the subjects may have distorted memories of what transpired.

In some cases, especially with the giftedness variables, the measures are somewhat vague. Leadership ability, arts participation, and marriage quality were devised for this study. Future research should use objective measures that have been previously validated.

Many other explanations for the conflicting results in the literature and in this study are possible. It is possible that a relationship between giftedness and parenting breaks down with extreme child-rearing attitudes, or that extremes of giftedness can break down
this relationship. In addition, this study assumed that each of the measures for giftedness was distinct; it is equally likely that they overlap. Perhaps a part of IQ scores and a part of leadership ability measure the same quality. Yet they might each measure a part of other qualities as well.

Some major concerns with generalizing my results rest with the data analysis and the subject sample. The variance in perceived parenting accounted for in this study is quite small, although significant. With perceived paternal restrictiveness, for example, six variables were required to account for almost 30% of the total variance. Most of these data analyses are correlational. Therefore, few causal relationships can be established in this study.

The population of the subject pool was highly restricted; it consisted primarily of college freshman and sophomores with an average background of upper-middle-class families. Although these characteristics have been accounted for statistically, there probably was not sufficient variation among subjects in most of the variables to make comparisons to other populations, such as abused or neglected children, families in lower SES brackets, or much older or younger people.

Furthermore, this sample did not represent a wide range of giftedness; most of the scores were high average
and above. Using a college subject pool also restricts
the sample to academically successful gifted students.
Many gifted students quit school before going to college
(Fox, 1981). Because paternal attitudes are tied to need
achievement (Lamb, 1976c), it may be that gifted subjects
who perceive their fathers as restrictive, quit school
eyearly. Clearly, this is not a definitive study. Yet it
sets up criteria for future research along guidelines that
take into account multiple levels of the stimulus
environment. This study utilizes a technique for
integrating divergent results into a coherent whole.

Conclusion

In light of the restricted sample of giftedness in
this study, future research may need to investigate
giftedness and perceived parenting attitudes in younger
subjects. A similar study conducted in a junior high
school, or the first two years of high school may resolve
some issues concerning PPR and giftedness. If it is true
that subjects who see their fathers as restrictive quit
school early, it may be possible to place these subjects
in a highly nurturant program, or a non-restrictive
program to facilitate the development of their potential.

Although Congress defined five categories of
giftedness and declared high performance in any of them to
be indicative of giftedness, these categories clearly do
not represent the same qualities. This conclusion could
have a significant impact not only on future research in
giftedness, but also on the applications of past research
in schools. Gifted and talented programs in schools tend
to look primarily at IQ, academic achievement or aptitude,
and occasionally at creativity. This may not only leave
out a substantial number of gifted people, but it may also
lump together people who probably have very different
assets and needs. In short, it may only be a little
better than leaving these students in the general school
population. Ideally, schools should deal with gifted
students according to his or her abilities.
Thank you for coming. My name is Christine Monson, and I am doing research for my thesis. In this study I am comparing different attitudes toward parenting. I would like you to complete 4 indices/questionnaires and a biographical data form, which will require (at most) 1 1/2 hours. The questionnaires are arranged in sets, and each set has an identifying number. The first page in the set is a consent form. [pass out consent forms] Please read it carefully. If you have any questions, feel free to ask me. If you are willing to participate further in this study, sign and date the bottom of the consent form. If you would like the results of the study sent to you, put your campus address below your signature.

When you are finished, remove the piece of paper at the top with a number written on it, and pass the consent form forward. Your signature on the consent form allows me to keep track of who participates in this study, insuring that you get your lab credit.

The number you now have tells you which set of questionnaires to complete. Your answers on these questionnaires will be anonymous. Now that the consent forms are removed from the sets of questionnaires, your names can no longer be connected with the answers. All that is left is a number I will use to identify only the
group to which you belong.

As you fill out each questionnaire, return it to me and wait until everyone is finished. Then I will start you on the next questionnaire. You may bring me any questions you have at any point in the session. At the end I will explain this study a little further.
APPENDIX II

College of William and Mary

Psychology Department Consent Form

The general nature of this experiment on paternal child-rearing attitudes and subject giftedness conducted by Christine Monson has been explained to me. I understand that I will be asked to complete four questionnaires/indices. I further understand that my responses will be confidential and that my name will not be associated with any results of this study. I know that I may refuse to answer any question asked and that I may discontinue participation at any time. I also understand that any grade, payment, or credit for participation will not be affected by my responses or by my exercising any of my rights. I am aware that I may report dissatisfactions with any aspect of this experiment to the Psychology Department's Research Ethics Committee. My signature below signifies my voluntary participation in this experiment.

_________________________  _______________________
Date                          Signature
APPENDIX III
Questionnaires

Biographical Data

Subject
Number: ___
Gender: ___ GPA (high school): ___
Age: ___ SAT scores (total): ___
Class (Fr, So, Jr, Sr, Oth): ___
Were you adopted? ___ yes At what age? ___
___ no

Do you plan for eventual marriage?
___ yes in (circle one): 0-5 years 5-10 years 10 or more years
___ no

Do you plan to have children?
___ yes in (circle one): 0-5 years 5-10 years 10 or more years
___ no

Father
Presently living: ___ yes
___ no How old were you when he died? ___
Age: ___
Education (years completed): ___
Occupation: ____________________________
   if military, please include branch of service and rank.
   number of years spent in this occupation: ___
   number of hours per week spent in this occupation: ___

Mother
Presently living: ___ yes
___ no How old were you when she died? ___
Age: ___
Education (years completed): ___
Occupation: ____________________________
   if military, please include branch of service and rank.
   number of years spent in this occupation: ___
   number of hours per week spent in this occupation: ___

Marital Status
Are your parents married to each other? ___ yes
___ no
not-at-all descriptive | highly descriptive
1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6

Use this scale to answer the following questions.

___ 1. My parents are willing to communicate with each other.
___ 2. My parents respect each other.
___ 3. My parents are considerate of each other.
___ 4. My parents get along with each other.
___ 5. My parents are satisfied with their marriage.

Siblings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of brothers</th>
<th>Ages</th>
<th>Number of sisters</th>
<th>Ages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

List any positions you have held in fraternities/sororities, clubs, sports, or class offices and the time spent in each, prior to entering college.
(ex., secretary in SAI - 1 year)

List any participation in music, art, and/or drama. Give the time spent in each activity and any shows, performances, or presentations in which you took part, prior to entering college.
(ex., play piano - 15 years - junior recital: May, 1980)
Directions for Cree questionnaire

Do not make any marks on the booklet. It is reusable. On the separate answer sheet fill in the information called for.

This booklet contains a list of questions about likes and dislikes, preferences and habits in everyday life. There are no right or wrong answers to these questions because one answer is not necessarily better than some other answer.

For each question, circle the answer that fits you best. Three possible answers have been placed beside each statement as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>yes</th>
<th>undecided</th>
<th>no</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Do you often hum or sing? Y ? N

If your answer is "no," circle the letter "N."
If your answer is "yes," circle the letter "Y." If you cannot decide whether to answer a question "yes" or "no," circle the question mark.

There is no time limit. However, it is best to record your first, immediate reaction to each question. Do not omit any questions.

As soon as you are sure you understand the instructions, turn to page 5 of the booklet and start marking your answers to the questions.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QUESTIONS</th>
<th>ANSWERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Do you think thorough study of the literature in a field is essential to the generation of new ideas?</td>
<td>Y ? N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Do you enjoy being the host at a party?</td>
<td>Y ? N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Do you like to introduce the speaker at a meeting?</td>
<td>Y ? N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Do you find it difficult to speak before an audience?</td>
<td>Y ? N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Do you have confidence in yourself?</td>
<td>Y ? N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Do you often tell stories to entertain others?</td>
<td>Y ? N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Would you enjoy being the toastmaster at a banquet?</td>
<td>Y ? N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Do you enjoy presenting a new project before a group?</td>
<td>Y ? N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. In doing work planned by others do you often think of ways in which the work layout could be improved?</td>
<td>Y ? N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Do you avoid public speaking?</td>
<td>Y ? N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Do you like work that requires much talking?</td>
<td>Y ? N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Do you like to be the chairman of a meeting?</td>
<td>Y ? N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Do you often try to persuade others to your point of view?</td>
<td>Y ? N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Do you enjoy introducing people?</td>
<td>Y ? N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Do you often participate in physical sports?</td>
<td>Y ? N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Do you remember people's birthdays and anniversaries?</td>
<td>Y ? N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Do you feel different from most groups in which you find yourself?</td>
<td>Y ? N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Do you feel sentimental about anniversaries and birthdays?</td>
<td>Y ? N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Do you remember the names of people you meet?</td>
<td>Y ? N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Do you spend much of your leisure time out-of-doors?</td>
<td>Y ? N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Do you spend many evenings with friends?</td>
<td>Y ? N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Do you like work involving competition?</td>
<td>Y ? N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. At a lecture, do you occasionally have so many ideas of your own that you have trouble listening to the lecturer?</td>
<td>Y ? N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Are you quick at spotting the flaws in people's ideas?</td>
<td>Y ? N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Are you considered unconventional?</td>
<td>Y ? N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

GO ON TO NEXT PAGE
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QUESTIONS</th>
<th>ANSWERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do you have a vivid imagination?</td>
<td>Y ? N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are you usually cool and composed in a dangerous situation?</td>
<td>Y ? N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If you have a hobby, do you enjoy ignoring instructions and striking off on your own?</td>
<td>Y ? N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are you sometimes considered to be cold and unsympathetic?</td>
<td>Y ? N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In general, have you been deeply interested in those problems to which you have found an answer?</td>
<td>Y ? N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As a child, were you inclined to take life seriously?</td>
<td>Y ? N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are you often bored with people?</td>
<td>Y ? N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you stick to pet schemes and ideas even though other people think you're wrong?</td>
<td>Y ? N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you sometimes get new ideas about work if you are in a different place for a time?</td>
<td>Y ? N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In solving problems, do you think it is important to control the direction of thought?</td>
<td>Y ? N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you gather a great deal of information on a problem before you make a guess about its solution?</td>
<td>Y ? N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you prefer specific instructions to those which leave many details optional?</td>
<td>Y ? N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you get acquainted with your neighbors?</td>
<td>Y ? N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Should one compromise one's own views in order to insure group harmony?</td>
<td>Y ? N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you like work that must be very systematic and orderly?</td>
<td>Y ? N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you often feel anxious about the success of your efforts?</td>
<td>Y ? N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When attacking a problem do you form a working hypothesis early in the process?</td>
<td>Y ? N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can you stay with your work long hours without feeling tired?</td>
<td>Y ? N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you frequently daydream?</td>
<td>Y ? N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you sometimes have vivid images or dreams which become the basis of a new idea?</td>
<td>Y ? N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the morning do you usually bound out of bed energetically?</td>
<td>Y ? N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you get many creative ideas when you are happy?</td>
<td>Y ? N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you often work slowly and leisurely?</td>
<td>Y ? N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are you likely to give up a plan if others disagree with it?</td>
<td>Y ? N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As a student did you let some courses slide and thereby gain time to work on more interesting courses?</td>
<td>Y ? N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

GO ON TO NEXT PAGE
QUESTIONS

51. Do you like work in which you must influence others? ................................. Y ? N
52. Do you often fret about the daily chores? ....................................................... Y ? N
53. Do you usually keep your thoughts to yourself? .............................................. Y? N
54. Do you ordinarily work quickly and energetically? ........................................ Y? N
55. When you have a hunch, do you have a good idea of what suggested it? ......... Y ? N
56. Do you often get behind in your work? ........................................................... Y ? N
57. When working with theoretical ideas do you think of concrete examples? ......... Y ? N
58. Are you usually ready to stop work at mealtime? .......................................... Y ? N
59. In doing routine chores, do you often find yourself thinking about unsolved problems? ................................................................. Y ? N
60. When you go home do you leave your work behind? ...................................... Y ? N
61. Does it take a long time in the morning before you are fully awake? ............. Y ? N
62. Are you fundamentally a contented person? ................................................. Y ? N
63. Is it easy to leave your work at bedtime? ....................................................... Y ? N
64. Do you often see many ways to tackle a problem? ........................................ Y ? N
65. Do your best hunches come during intensive work? ...................................... Y ? N
66. Do people often discuss new problems with you? ......................................... Y ? N
67. Are you likely to find the answer to a problem when your back is to the wall? . Y ? N
68. Were you in the top fourth of your college class? ......................................... Y ? N
69. Is your handwriting rather fast? ................................................................. Y ? N
70. Do you use any deliberate means to create favorable conditions for getting new ideas? ................................................................. Y ? N
71. Do you generally walk faster than most people? .......................................... Y ? N
72. Do you like work in which you must change often from one task to another? . Y ? N
73. Do you often feel impatient? ................................................................. Y ? N
74. Do you write down a new idea for fear you may forget it? ......................... Y ? N
75. Are you more restless and fidgety than most people? ................................... Y ? N

GO ON TO NEXT PAGE
QUESTIONS

76. Are your hunches often right? .......................................................... Y ? N
77. Do you swear often? .......................................................... Y ? N
78. Do you assume responsibilities without much hesitation? .......................................................... Y ? N
79. Are you often in a hurry? .......................................................... Y ? N
80. When you have an important problem, do you prefer to think it through alone? .......................................................... Y ? N
81. Would you like to drive a car rather fast if there were no speed limit? .......................................................... Y ? N
82. Do you have a large and sprawling handwriting? .......................................................... Y ? N
83. Can you keep several assistants busy? .......................................................... Y ? N
84. Are you trying to become a person who knows a lot about a lot of things? .......................................................... Y ? N
85. Do you enjoy promoting a new project? .......................................................... Y ? N
86. Do you usually have a "ready answer?" .......................................................... Y ? N
87. Do you like to work late at night? .......................................................... Y ? N
88. Do you like to sleep over an unsolved problem? .......................................................... Y ? N
89. Do you like to explain things to other people? .......................................................... Y ? N
90. Are you frequently considered to be happy-go-lucky? .......................................................... Y ? N
91. Do you get many new ideas while teaching? .......................................................... Y ? N
92. Do you believe in a life hereafter? .......................................................... Y ? N
93. Are you pretty good at thinking of alibis on the spur of the moment? .......................................................... Y ? N
94. Do you talk more slowly than most people? .......................................................... Y ? N
95. Do you sometimes get new ideas about work while on a vacation? .......................................................... Y ? N
96. Do you like work that puts you in contact with a lot of people? .......................................................... Y ? N
97. Do you get new ideas when you are confined to bed by illness? .......................................................... Y ? N
98. Are you considered to be absent-minded? .......................................................... Y ? N
100. Can you think of more problems than you would ever have time to work out? .......................................................... Y ? N

GO ON TO NEXT PAGE
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QUESTION</th>
<th>ANSWER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>101. Does working under pressure bother you?</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102. Do good ideas seem to come to you unexpectedly?</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103. Are you likely to take charge in case of an accident?</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104. Do hunches sometimes come to you just before going to sleep?</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105. Does the solution to a problem often seem to come suddenly?</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106. Do you have a strong motivation to be outstandingly successful?</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107. Do you enjoy formulating new problems?</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108. Would you be interested in administering a large scientific laboratory?</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109. Is it easy for you to express yourself in conversation?</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110. Would you be willing to sacrifice a great deal for scientific achievement?</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111. Are the arts more important to you than the sciences?</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112. Do you like work that requires much reading?</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113. Do you have a wide range of interests?</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114. Do you like work that requires scientific precision?</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115. Do you like to work with theoretical ideas?</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116. Do you like work that has a lot of excitement?</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117. Do you try to keep abreast of a wide range of professional literature?</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118. As an adolescent were you interested in philosophical problems?</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119. Have some of your relatives been highly gifted?</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120. Do you easily win the friendship of strangers?</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121. Are you creative in more than one field?</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122. Are you interested in some form of art?</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123. Do you like work in which there are many problems to be solved?</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124. Are you moderately skilled in any of the arts?</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125. Have you ever thought you might compose music?</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QUESTIONS</td>
<td>ANSWERS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126. Have you had the opportunity to work or study with teachers who were creative?</td>
<td>Y ? N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127. Do you enjoy working with tools?</td>
<td>Y ? N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128. Are you resourceful in fixing mechanical things about the house?</td>
<td>Y ? N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>129. Do people think you are too interested in your work?</td>
<td>Y ? N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130. Are you handy with tools?</td>
<td>Y ? N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131. As a child were you greatly interested in mechanical things?</td>
<td>Y ? N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132. Do you have an easygoing attitude toward life?</td>
<td>Y ? N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>133. Do you usually work fast?</td>
<td>Y ? N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>134. Is a certain amount of leisure necessary for you to do your best thinking?</td>
<td>Y ? N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135. Do you usually make up your mind quickly?</td>
<td>Y ? N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136. Do you get your best ideas while working under pressure?</td>
<td>Y ? N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137. Do you have systematic work habits?</td>
<td>Y ? N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138. Does vigorous exercise often help you get new hunches in solving problems?</td>
<td>Y ? N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139. Do you have more self-confidence than most people?</td>
<td>Y ? N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140. Do you like work that has regular hours?</td>
<td>Y ? N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>141. Do you make up your mind easily?</td>
<td>Y ? N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142. Are your ideas similar to those of most of your acquaintances?</td>
<td>Y ? N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>143. Do you usually agree with the group about how things should be done?</td>
<td>Y ? N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>144. Do you get your best ideas when you are relaxed?</td>
<td>Y ? N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>145. Do you enjoy spending leisure time on physical work?</td>
<td>Y ? N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Directions for Culture Fair Test

Preliminary instructions:
In these booklets there are four tests which are like four different games or puzzles. There are no words in them — only drawings. Each of the tests has some examples for you to practice on so that you can see how to do it. First, we'll look at the examples together and then you'll be asked to go ahead on your own. Some of the questions at the end of each test may be quite hard to do, but try as many as you can. Even when you're not sure, mark the answer you think might be right, rather than none. It's perfectly all right to guess if you don't know the answer. You don't lose points for wrong guesses, and you might guess right.

Please don't turn any page until I tell you. You are to mark all your answers on the answer sheet you've been given and not in the test booklet. If you have any questions, raise your hand.

[These instructions are for booklet Form A. The instructions for Form B change only in the examples used and the order given.]

Test 1

Open the booklet to the first page, Test 1. Look at the first example. At the left, there are four boxes. The last one is empty. Continuing along that row, you see six more boxes, marked a, b, c, d, e, and f. Of those six boxes, one will fit correctly in the empty box.

Here the little tree is bending over more and more in the first three pictures. Choose the correct box from over here on the right to go in the empty box. (Point and pause.) The right answer has been given to you in this first example. It's the tree in the third box, because that's the one that has tilted over more than the last one in the boxes on the left. Notice on your answer sheet under 'Test 1' that this answer, c, has been marked for you in this first example.

Look at the second example. The black part comes down lower and lower each time. (Point.) So at the next step it would come more than half way down. Choose the answer you think is right and fill in the box for the correct answer on your answer sheet. (Pause.) Answer E is correct.

Now look at the third example. See, it's as if something is growing, step by step. In the third box there are three, beginning from the top, so four will go in the empty box. Choose the square on the right that has four in the right position and on your answer sheet mark the right answer. Answer E is correct.

When I tell you to start, go on and do the rest
yourself. Begin with the first row just below the examples and work through this page and the next. In each row, choose just one of the boxes on the right which would correctly go in the empty box and mark it as your answer on your answer sheet, as you did in the examples. You may not have time to finish them all, but work as quickly and carefully as you can. In all the tests you'll be taking, you may change your answer if you change your mind, but not after I say, 'Stop.' Start.

Stop after 3 minutes.

Test 2

Turn the page to Test 2. Look at the examples at the top of the page. Three of the boxes in each example have shapes that are alike in some way, but the other two are different from these three. In each row, you are to find the two boxes that are different from the others. When you have found them, fill in, on your answer sheet, the two boxes that have the same letters under them as the answers you have chosen. In the first example, three figures have three sides and the two different figures are four-sided. They are answers b and d. They are marked for you as the correct answers, because they are different from the other figures in that row. Look at the second example. Find the two that are different. Mark them on your answer sheet. The correct answers are c and e.

You have the idea. Now, when I say to start, choose two figures in each row that are different from the others. Then quickly mark the two boxes that have the same letters as the ones you choose. Work carefully and quickly and finish as many as you can on these two pages. Start.

Stop after 4 minutes.

Test 3

Turn the page to Test 3. Look at the examples. In the large square there are four little boxes. Three of the boxes have drawings in them, but the drawing for the other square is missing. One of the boxes in the row at the right fits correctly in the empty box. You're to choose the right one and mark the answer on your answer sheet.

In the first example, the second answer, b, has been chosen because it fits best in the empty box. It has been marked for you.

Now look at the second row. C is the right answer because it fits the empty box best.

In the third example, we should look for one circle and it should be white, not dotted. So f is the correct answer.
When I tell you to start, begin with the first row, just below the last example and find the drawing that would look right in the empty box. Then, on your answer sheet, fill in the little box under the letter that is the same as your answer. Do both pages. Start.

Stop after 3 minutes.

Test 4

Turn the page to Test 4. In the separate box of the first example, there is a dot which is in both the circle and the square. Now look at the row of the five possible answers and see if you can find a drawing where you could put in one dot that will be inside both the circle and the square. Answer c is correct.

Look at the second example. In the separate box, the dot is inside the three-sided figure but outside the four-sided figure. In the row of boxes there is just one figure where you could put a dot in the three-sided figure and not get it in the four sided figure, too. Look carefully and you will see that the correct answer is d.

In the third example, you notice that the dot is in the three-sided figure and above the curved line. Answer b is correct.

When I tell you to start, begin with the first row under the heavy line. Look carefully where the dot is. Then find a drawing where you could do just the same, and mark the little box on your answer sheet that has the same letter as the answer you chose. Please do not make any marks on the booklet. Is that clear? Start.

Stop after 2 1/2 minutes.

Turn your booklet over.
Test of “g”: Culture Fair
SCALE 3, FORM A

Prepared by R. B. Cattell and A. K. S. Cattell

Name_______________________
First______________________ Last_____________________
Sex ________________________ (Write M or F)

Name of School (or Address)________________________________________

Today’s Date_________________________________ Grade (or Class)________

Date of Birth____________ Age______________
Month Day Year Age Years Months

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Score

M._______
Q_______

1963 Edition


Cat. No. AJ241
### TEST 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Examples</th>
<th>a</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>c</th>
<th>d</th>
<th>e</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>Answers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="image1" alt="Example 1" /></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><img src="image2" alt="Answer C" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image3" alt="Example 2" /></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image4" alt="Example 3" /></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image5" alt="Example 4" /></td>
<td>a</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>f</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image6" alt="Example 5" /></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. ![Diagram 1](image7)                       |   |   |   |   |   |   |         |
2. ![Diagram 2](image8)                       |   |   |   |   |   |   |         |
3. ![Diagram 3](image9)                       |   |   |   |   |   |   |         |
4. ![Diagram 4](image10)                      |   |   |   |   |   |   |         |
5. ![Diagram 5](image11)                      |   |   |   |   |   |   |         |

Go on to the next page.
### TEST 2

#### Examples

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>a</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>c</th>
<th>d</th>
<th>e</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td><img src="example1a.png" alt="Example 1a" /></td>
<td><img src="example1b.png" alt="Example 1b" /></td>
<td><img src="example1c.png" alt="Example 1c" /></td>
<td><img src="example1d.png" alt="Example 1d" /></td>
<td><img src="example1e.png" alt="Example 1e" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td><img src="example2a.png" alt="Example 2a" /></td>
<td><img src="example2b.png" alt="Example 2b" /></td>
<td><img src="example2c.png" alt="Example 2c" /></td>
<td><img src="example2d.png" alt="Example 2d" /></td>
<td><img src="example2e.png" alt="Example 2e" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td><img src="example3a.png" alt="Example 3a" /></td>
<td><img src="example3b.png" alt="Example 3b" /></td>
<td><img src="example3c.png" alt="Example 3c" /></td>
<td><img src="example3d.png" alt="Example 3d" /></td>
<td><img src="example3e.png" alt="Example 3e" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td><img src="example4a.png" alt="Example 4a" /></td>
<td><img src="example4b.png" alt="Example 4b" /></td>
<td><img src="example4c.png" alt="Example 4c" /></td>
<td><img src="example4d.png" alt="Example 4d" /></td>
<td><img src="example4e.png" alt="Example 4e" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td><img src="example5a.png" alt="Example 5a" /></td>
<td><img src="example5b.png" alt="Example 5b" /></td>
<td><img src="example5c.png" alt="Example 5c" /></td>
<td><img src="example5d.png" alt="Example 5d" /></td>
<td><img src="example5e.png" alt="Example 5e" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td><img src="example6a.png" alt="Example 6a" /></td>
<td><img src="example6b.png" alt="Example 6b" /></td>
<td><img src="example6c.png" alt="Example 6c" /></td>
<td><img src="example6d.png" alt="Example 6d" /></td>
<td><img src="example6e.png" alt="Example 6e" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Answers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>b</th>
<th>d</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td><img src="answer1.png" alt="Answer 1" /></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td><img src="answer2.png" alt="Answer 2" /></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td><img src="answer3.png" alt="Answer 3" /></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td><img src="answer4.png" alt="Answer 4" /></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Go on to the next page.*
### TEST 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Example</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="image1.png" alt="Examples" /></td>
<td>a</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>f</td>
<td></td>
<td>b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image2.png" alt="Examples" /></td>
<td>a</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>f</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image3.png" alt="Examples" /></td>
<td>a</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>f</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image4.png" alt="Examples" /></td>
<td>a</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>f</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image5.png" alt="Examples" /></td>
<td>a</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>f</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Go on to the next page.
End of Test 3

STOP! Do not turn the page until told to do so.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Examples</th>
<th>Answers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="example1.png" alt="Example" /></td>
<td><img src="answer1.png" alt="Answer" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="example2.png" alt="Example" /></td>
<td><img src="answer2.png" alt="Answer" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="example3.png" alt="Example" /></td>
<td><img src="answer3.png" alt="Answer" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="example4.png" alt="Example" /></td>
<td><img src="answer4.png" alt="Answer" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="example5.png" alt="Example" /></td>
<td><img src="answer5.png" alt="Answer" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="example6.png" alt="Example" /></td>
<td><img src="answer6.png" alt="Answer" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="example7.png" alt="Example" /></td>
<td><img src="answer7.png" alt="Answer" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="example8.png" alt="Example" /></td>
<td><img src="answer8.png" alt="Answer" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="example9.png" alt="Example" /></td>
<td><img src="answer9.png" alt="Answer" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="example10.png" alt="Example" /></td>
<td><img src="answer10.png" alt="Answer" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*End of Test 4*
Modified Child-rearing Practices Report
(questions with (*) load onto the nurturance factor)

Please rate the following questions about your father's child-rearing methods using the scale below.
Base your answers on your father's attitudes during the time when you were between 3 and 12 years of age.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>not-at-all descriptive</th>
<th>highly descriptive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2 3 4 5 6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

_1.*My father respected my opinions and encouraged me to express them._
_2. My father did not believe young children of different sexes should be allowed to see each other naked._
_3.*My father gave me comfort and understanding when I was scared or upset._
_4. My father tried to keep me away from children of families who had different ideas or values from his._
_5. My father thought a child should be seen and not heard._
_6.*My father expressed affection physically by hugging, kissing, and holding me._
_7.*Some of my father's greatest satisfactions were gotten from his children._
_8. My father did not want me to try things if he thought I might fail._
_9.*My father encouraged me to wonder and think about life._
_10.*My preferences were usually taken into account in making plans for the family._
_11.*My father felt I should have time to think, to daydream, and to loaf sometimes._
_12. My father did not allow me to say bad things about my teachers._
_13. My father taught me that in one way or another, punishment would find me when I was bad._
_14. My father did not allow me to get angry with him._
_15.*My father was easy-going and relaxed with me._
_16.*My father talked it over and reasoned with me when I misbehaved._
_17.*My father trusted me to behave as I should, even when he was not around._
_18.*My father joked and played with me._
_19.*My father and I shared many warm, intimate times together._
_20.*My father encouraged me to be curious, to explore, and to question things._
_21. My father expected me to be grateful and appreciate all the advantages I had._
_22. My father believed in starting toilet training as early as possible._
_23.*My father emphasized praising me when I was good more than punishing me when I was bad._
24. *My father let me know he appreciated what I tried or accomplished.

25. *My father encouraged me to talk about my troubles.

26. My father did not believe children should have secrets from their parents.

27. My father encouraged me to keep control of my feelings at all times.

28. My father dreaded answering my questions about sex.

29. *My father let me know when he was angry.

30. My father encouraged me to do things better than others.

31. My father thought scolding and criticism would make me improve.

32. My father let me know how much he sacrificed for me.

33. My father did not allow me to question his decisions.

34. My father used to tell me how ashamed and disappointed he felt when I misbehaved.

35. My father wanted me to make a good impression on others.

36. *My father found being with his children interesting and educational, even for long periods of time.

37. My father expected me not to get dirty while I was playing.

38. My father used to control what I did by warning me of all the bad things that could happen to me.

39. My father did not want me looked upon as different from others.

40. My father did not believe I should be given sexual information until I could understand everything.


Paternal Involvement in Child-care Index

1. How involved was your father in caring for you and any of your siblings?

very involved involved neutral uninvolved very uninvolved

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. How frequently are the following parenting tasks done in your family? What percentage of these tasks are done by:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TASKS</th>
<th>Freq.</th>
<th>Some</th>
<th>Infreq.</th>
<th>Father</th>
<th>Mother</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Feeding the children</td>
<td>b.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Having sole responsi-</td>
<td>d.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bility for the children</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Punishing the children</td>
<td>f.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Setting limits for the children's behavior</td>
<td>h.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Helping children with personal problems</td>
<td>j.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k. Bathing and dressing the children</td>
<td>l.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. Putting the children to bed</td>
<td>n.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o. Helping children to learn</td>
<td>p.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Not counting the hours you spent in a school or center, with a sitter, or asleep for the night, what percentage of the remaining time was your father your prime caregiver? ________% 

4.(12). Who in your family generally makes decisions about the following and how frequently?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Father</th>
<th>Father more</th>
<th>Father and</th>
<th>Mother more</th>
<th>Mother always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>than Mother</td>
<td>Mother equally</td>
<td>than Father</td>
<td>always</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Concerning childrearing:
   1. when children should be disciplined ____
   2. when children are old enough to try new things ____
5. (14). Who did you generally go to when: Father Mother Other
   a. you hurt yourself (i.e., fell down)
   b. you needed help
   c. you wanted to play
APPENDIX IV
Debriefing

Please do not discuss this study before February 15. My results depend upon your cooperation.

In this study I am examining the relationship between giftedness in young adults and their perceptions of their fathers' child-rearing attitudes. In the study you have just completed, paternal attitudes are being measured by statements on the child-rearing scales. I can use this information to look at child-rearing on two dimensions: nurturance-rejection, and restrictiveness-permissiveness. For example, the statement "My father did not allow me to question his decisions," is a rejecting statement. To this I added a measure of paternal involvement in child-care, and several measures of giftedness (such as IQ, creativity, etc.). I can also look at giftedness from five dimensions: intellectual ability, academic achievement, creativity, leadership ability, and visual/performing arts. I plan to compare your scores on the giftedness tests with your perceptions of your fathers' views and your awareness of his involvement in child-care.

DO YOU HAVE ANY QUESTIONS?

Please remember that there are other sessions after this, and the validity of the data I collect depends upon your cooperation. Please do not discuss this with anyone involved in this study before February 15. I would really appreciate it. Thank you.
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