

1972

A comparative study of personality traits of fatherless boys with and without a big brother.

Frank J. Seifert
University of Windsor

Follow this and additional works at: <http://scholar.uwindsor.ca/etd>

Recommended Citation

Seifert, Frank J., "A comparative study of personality traits of fatherless boys with and without a big brother." (1972). *Electronic Theses and Dissertations*. Paper 544.

This online database contains the full-text of PhD dissertations and Masters' theses of University of Windsor students from 1954 forward. These documents are made available for personal study and research purposes only, in accordance with the Canadian Copyright Act and the Creative Commons license—CC BY-NC-ND (Attribution, Non-Commercial, No Derivative Works). Under this license, works must always be attributed to the copyright holder (original author), cannot be used for any commercial purposes, and may not be altered. Any other use would require the permission of the copyright holder. Students may inquire about withdrawing their dissertation and/or thesis from this database. For additional inquiries, please contact the repository administrator via email (scholarship@uwindsor.ca) or by telephone at 519-253-3000ext. 3208.

U N I V E R S I T Y O F W I N D S O R
The School of Social Work

A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF PERSONALITY TRAITS OF
FATHERLESS BOYS WITH AND WITHOUT A BIG BROTHER

by

Frank J. Seifert

A Research Project presented to the School of Social Work of
the University of Windsor in partial fulfilment of the
requirements for the degree of Master of Social Work.

June, 1972

Windsor, Ontario, Canada

7

© Frank J. Seifert 1972

409515

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author wishes to express sincere appreciation and sincere thanks to Dr. John Barnes, School of Social Work, University of Windsor, for his guidance and encouragement throughout the course of this research and the writing of this thesis.

Special thanks should be expressed to Dr. W. Y. Wassef, School of Social Work, and Dr. R. Helling, Department of Sociology, University of Windsor for their helpful suggestions.

THESIS COMMITTEE

Committee Chairman	Dr. John Barnes
Member	Dr. W. Y. Wassef
Member	Dr. Rudolph Helling

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ABSTRACT	viii
LIST OF TABLES	viii
CHAPTER	
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Purpose of the Study	
Nature of the Problem	
Reason for the Study	
Methodology	
Organization of the Study	
II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE	6
1. Fatherlessness	6
2. Parental Identification	10
3. Fatherlessness and Big Brothers	15
III. RESEARCH DESIGN	20
1. Purpose and Hypothesis	20
2. Working Definition	21
3. Formal Definition	21
4. Population	22
5. Method of Data Collection	25
6. Validity and Reliability	27
7. Procedure	29
8. Statistics	29
9. Interpretation of Statistical Findings	29
IV. FINDINGS	31
V. DISCUSSION	36
1. Statistically Significant Findings	36
2. Statistically Insignificant Findings	38
3. Social Desirability	41

CHAPTER		Page
VI	SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDED AREAS OF RESEARCH	49
	BIBLIOGRAPHY	55
	VITAE	57

LIST OF TABLES

No.		Page
I	AGE DISTRIBUTION OF THE EXPERIMENTAL AND CONTROL GROUPS	24
II	RELIABILITY COEFFICIENTS	28
III	THE MEAN RAW SCORES	33
IV	SUMMARY TABLE OF F-RATIOS	34
V	THE MEAN SCALE SCORES	35
VI	THE RATINGS OF SOCIAL DESIRABILITY AND UNDESIRABILITY OF INDIVIDUAL FACTORS OF THE JUNIOR PERSONALITY QUIZ ACCORDING TO A SURVEY AMONG 10 MENTAL HEALTH PROFESSIONALS	43
VII	DIFFERENCE BETWEEN EXPERIMENTAL GROUP AND CONTROL GROUP ON THE 12 FACTORS OF THE JUNIOR PERSONALITY QUIZ IN TERMS OF SOCIAL DESIRABILITY OF SCORES WHERE "+" SIGNIFIES SOCIAL DESIRABILITY AND "-" SIGNIFIES SOCIAL UNDESIRABILITY	44

ABSTRACT

The problem under consideration in this study is fatherlessness. The purpose is to compare the personality characteristics of two groups of fatherless boys. One of these groups had received Big Brothers services, the other had not. It is hoped that this comparison may throw some light on the effectiveness of a Big Brother relationship with a fatherless boy, and also indicate the effectiveness of services provided by social agencies such as the Big Brothers Association.

In order to achieve the goal of this study the following procedures were applied. First, two groups of boys between ages 10 and 16 were selected and matched for age. One group consisted of 27 fatherless boys who are involved in the Big Brother program and have been assigned a Big Brother for a period from 9 to 18 months. The second group of boys consisted of 27 fatherless boys from the Windsor community who are not involved in any formal organization which provides services similar to Big Brothers, nor are they known to have any father substitute in their lives. The comparison was made by means of the Junior Personality Quiz (J.P.Q.) which is a structured 144 question survey standardized for 10-16 year old boys. This instrument measures 12 personality dimensions.

It was hypothesized that there would be a difference between the two groups. It was further hypothesized that the difference between the groups would be in a socially desirable direction, by which the effectiveness of a Little Brother-Big Brother relationship could be determined.

Statistical analysis was performed using the computer program Balanova 5. The results indicated that there was statistically significant difference between the two groups on 2 factors of the J. P. Q. With respect to this it was concluded that Little Brothers appear to be more patient, self-controlled, and mature individuals who are able to tolerate differences of opinion with others. On the other hand, the group of fatherless boys without a father surrogate was found to be impatient, quick to anger, slow to calm down with inability to tolerate differences of opinion with others. Little Brothers were also found to be more fond of school, quick to accept cultural standards, attentive and friendly to their associates, while fatherless boys without Big Brothers tend to dislike learning and have surly reaction to authority and their peers.

With respect to other methods of data evaluation, namely a non-statistical inspection of data and their expression in terms of constructed "social desirability" scales, the overall research indicates that the group of Little Brothers meets the social and personality expectations more adequately than the group of boys without a

father substitute. Since this finding was indicative of a stated criterion for determining the effectiveness, it was concluded that the Big Brother-Little Brother relationship has some positive effects on the personal and social development of fatherless boys involved in this study.

CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of the study is to assess the differences in personality traits that might exist between a group of fatherless boys who have been supplied with a substitute father figure by the Big Brothers Association of Windsor (BBA), and a group of fatherless boys who were not provided with a substitute father figure from that organization. It is hoped that this study might shed some light on the effect of the BBA service to those boys who for some reason are left fatherless.

Nature of the Problem

A large number of children in our society grow up without the influence of a male adult in their lives, due to death, divorce, illegitimacy or imprisonment. Many social problems such as alcoholism, homosexuality, delinquency are linked to fatherlessness.¹ On the basis of this correlation between fatherlessness and the above named social problems it is assumed that the absence of a father figure is a factor in the psychological

¹Sula Wolf, Children Under Stress (London: Allen Lane The Penguin Press, 1969), p. 80.

development of such children. It is also assumed that in the North American culture a father figure in a boy's life is needed for the boy's healthy psycho-social development.

Since 1904, attempts have been made to mitigate the effects of fatherlessness by the use of a substitute father figure. The problem under discussion is whether such fatherless children, exposed to substitute father figures, differ from fatherless children not exposed to a substitute father figure on certain personality traits.

The use of a substitute father figure to help fatherless boys is a concept made popular and acceptable by the Big Brothers Association. Big Brothers is one of a few community agencies which provides services to fatherless boys between the age 8 and 16 to help develop in a way of living which is both personally adequate and socially acceptable. In the group under the discussion, as Laura M. Ferrier from the Big Brothers of Toronto states

we do not often find the hardened criminal or the unredeemable deviant from social norms - but no one could deny that it is at this age that many men start on the path to a criminal career - maybe not in the actual commital of an offense against the law, but in the formation of attitudes that will lead to non-acceptance of codes which society deems necessary for its proper functioning.²

²Laura M. Ferrier, "Differential Disposition in Court Cases as Related to Fatherlessness", (Speech Presented to the Canadian Congress of Criminology and Corrections, Ottawa, June 15, 1971), p.1.

Reason for the Study

The reason for the study is to assess whether the use of a substitute father figure is linked with positive differences in personality dimensions of fatherless boys. The answer to such a question will be important in planning preventive social services for children who have no father figure. It will also help to throw light on the effectiveness of the Big Brothers Association which attempts to lessen the psychological damage of fatherlessness by the use of substitute father figures.

It is felt that a study as this in the field of social service is important since there are very few empirical studies relating to the effectiveness of services that are provided by social agencies such as the Big Brothers Association. The results of such studies can be quite valuable in the planning of social service programs and service delivery.

Methodology

To assess the differences in personality traits that might exist between a group of boys with no father figure, the Junior Personality Quiz³ was administered to two groups. The Junior Personality Quiz (J.P.Q.) is a

³Junior Personality Quiz (Champaign, Illinois: Institute for Personality and Ability Testing, 1953).

structured 144 item questionnaire for 10-16 year old boys which has been developed as a tool for measuring 12 dimensions of Personality (see p.25).

The first, experimental group consisted of 27 fatherless boys associated with a father substitute, a Big Brother, referred to as Little Brothers. The second, control, group consisted of 27 fatherless boys not provided with a Big Brother nor involved in any formal organization which provides similar services like the Big Brothers Association. The two groups were compared on the J. P. Q.

At the significant level of 0.05 the statistical analysis of variance was performed using the computer program Balanova 5. The 12 scales of the J. P. Q. were used as a dependent variable. The interpretation of statistical findings was made 1.) in terms of statistically significant differences between the two groups; 2.) in terms of statistically insignificant but noticeable differences between the two groups; and 3.) in terms of social desirability through a non-statistical visual inspection of data. Since social desirability is not considered in the scoring of the Junior Personality Quiz, it was necessary to establish the social desirability of individual factors. For this purpose 10 professionals from the field of mental health in the Windsor community were approached, interviewed and the table of social desirability of individual factors of the J. P. Q. was constructed (see p.43).

Organization of the Study

The nature of the problem, namely with focus on the phenomena of fatherlessness, parental identification, and the aspect of fatherlessness as related to the Big Brothers movement, will be presented in Chapter II. Then the elements of the research design in Chapter III and the discussion of the findings in Chapters IV and V. Finally, the summary of this study with recommendations for further research will be presented in Chapter VI.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

This section is divided into three parts. The first part discusses the phenomenon of fatherlessness and its meaning in terms of social and psychological deprivation. The second part deals with the problem of parental identification as reflected by psychoanalytical theory and related studies. And the third part gives important background information on the Big Brothers movement and the importance of the Little Brother-Big Brother relationship. These areas provide the basic context necessary to understand the present study.

1. Fatherlessness

At every stage of development the child needs the father who is an object of love, security and identification. Bailey⁴ states that "the father in the boy's life is a person who teaches him to become a man". The logical reversal of this general but clear statement could be that a boy who does not have a father or a father surrogate has no one to teach him how to become a man. The loss of either

⁴William Bailey, "The Volunteer Big Brother in the Helping Role", Child Welfare (December, 1967), Vol. XLVI, No.10, p.562.

parent is assumed to have a traumatic effect on the child and it can contribute to difficult personal development, though it is generally understood that the death of a mother leads to greater disruption of the family than the death of a father.⁵

The child, by losing a parent, becomes a "poor child". Having one parent he is different from his two-parent peers. Frequently accompanying economic difficulties may result in the child wearing different and fewer clothes, having different and fewer toys, and having a narrower range of social experience. There is, in the child, a loss of self-esteem, feelings of security and a sense of inferiority to other children.

Thus, certainly, one of the basic needs for the child in the North American culture is for a father.⁶ The ideal aspects of fatherhood noted by English⁷ are:

1. Companion and inspiration for the mother;
2. Awakener of the emotional potentials of his child;
3. Beloved friend and teacher to his child;
4. Ego ideal for masculine love, ethics, and morality;
5. Model for social and vocational behaviour;

⁵Sula Wolf, Children Under Stress, p 80.

⁶S. R. Slavson, Child Psychotherapy (New York: Columbia University Press, 1952), p.76.

⁷Spurgeon O. English, M.D., "The Psychological Role of the Father in the Family", Social Casework, Vol. XXXV, No.8 (October, 1954), p. 323.

6. Stabilizing influence for solution of oedipus complex;
7. Protector, mentor and hero for grade school child;
8. Counselor and friend for his adolescent;

The loss of these aspects in a child's life suggest the nature and extent of deprivation which fatherlessness brings about. The child does not learn about himself and his roles by experiencing his own behaviour but also by experiencing the behaviours of others who serve him both as mirrors and as models for imitation.

In the context of our cultural expectations it is hypothesized that it is usually from the father that the boy-child draws much of his strength and fashions his personality. When the child, for whatever reason, is deprived of the like-sexed parent model, considerable emotional disturbance may occur. Often, a father's abandonment of the family means to the child that his father does not like him. This may be further complicated by an unconscious idea on the part of the child that he is somehow responsible for the resulting loss of a parent.⁸

Fatherlessness does not affect only the child, but it changes a mother as well. By losing a father the child has also lost a part of his mother. For example, Wolf⁹ in

⁸Percival M. Symonds, The Dynamics of Parent-Child Relationship (New York: Columbia University Press, 1949), p.103.

⁹Wolf, Children Under Stress, p.86.

writing of the loss of the father in death states, "That's not only grief that has altered her but her state of widowhood. To make a success of this new role she must mobilize parts of her personality that were previously hidden: masculine attitudes of energy and independence are called for". The widowed mother does not have too much time for the child. She does not have time, energy, and very frequently not enough money to take the child out for amusement, to read him stories, to supervise his homework, or to play games with him.¹⁰ And frequently in this type of situation, nothing is more important for her young son than to have the same bike as his classmates or to have a man who will take him to a ball or hockey game.

The mother changes both on the social and emotional level. Usually she withdraws socially from other people,¹¹ forming an unhealthy symbiotic relationship with her child,¹² with a variety of feelings including inadequacy, shame, guilt, humiliation, failure, or anger.¹³

¹⁰Ibid., p.85.

¹¹Ibid., P.81.

¹²Herbert S. Stream, "Treatment of Mothers and Sons in the Absence of the Father, Social Work, Vol.6, No.3 (July, 1961), p.29.

¹³Joseph E. Steigman, "The Deserted Family", Social Casework (April, 1957), Vol.38, No.4, p.167.

2. Parental Identification.

Parental identification can be defined as "internalization of personality characteristics of one's own parent and unconscious reactions similar to that of parent."¹⁴ Closely related to this concept is that of sex-role identification. Sex-role identification refers to "internalization of the role considered appropriate to a given sex and to the unconscious reactions characteristic of that role".¹⁵ Boys and girls come to learn their sex identities through differential observations and emotional attachments,¹⁶ usually in regard to their parents. Thus in home situations that do not offer adequate role identification and sex-role differentiation, as it is in the case of the father-absent homes, the boy-child can have considerable difficulty in achieving adequate masculine identification.¹⁷

¹⁴David B. Lynn, "Sex Role and Parental Identification" in Readings in the Psychology of Parent-Child Relations, ed. by Gene R. Medinnus (John Wiley & Sons, Inc. 1967) p.273.

¹⁵Ibid.

¹⁶Frederick Elkin, The Child and Society (New York: Random House, Inc., 1969), p.53.

¹⁷Barclay A. and D. R. Cusumano, "Father Absence, Cross-Sex Identity, and Field-Dependent Behaviour in Male Adolescents" in Readings in Adolescent Development and Behaviour, ed. by John P. Hill and Jev Shelton (New Jersey: Prentice Hall, 1971), p.164.

It was the insight of Sigmund Freud¹⁸ that hypothesized that

the early loss of one of the parents, whether by death, or separation, with the result that the remaining parent absorbs the whole of the child's love, determines the sex of the person who later to be chosen as a sexual object and may thus open the way to permanent inversion.

Psychoanalytic theory states that both male and female infants are initially identified with their mother. It is the boy-child, not the girl-child, who has to shift from this initial feminine identification to a masculine identification with the father.¹⁹ In this respect the proper identification is more difficult for a boy-child. This need to learn masculine identification is the reason the father has a very important place in the boy-child's development of masculine role. English²⁰ states that "the solution of oedipus complex for the boys is a gradual 'giving up' of his mother and an acceptance and desire to be like his father". If there is no father, other males, such as teachers, family friends, an uncle, a minister, a Big Brother, or some popular and admired public figure may be chosen as a

¹⁸Sigmund Freud, Three Essays on the Theory of Sexuality (London: Hogarth Press and the Institute of Psychoanalysis, 1953), Vol.7, p.563, cited by Herbert S. Stream in "Treatment of Mothers and Sons in the Absence of the Father", Social Work, Vol.6, No.3 (July, 1961), p.29.

¹⁹Lynn, "Sex Role and Parental Identification", p.275.

²⁰English, "The Psychological Role of the Father", p.326.

model for male identification.²¹ A shortcoming is that such people are never known closely and as intimately as one's own father and in this regard they are less satisfactory.²² A second difficulty is that the model chosen from the external environment may be an undesirable person. In this regard it is assumed that the procedure of selection of a Big Brother by the competent professionals of the agency reduces the possibility of such undesirable models.

Many studies have been carried out in the area of parental and sex identification which, in most cases, indicate the importance of the male-child's need for a strong father-figure or a surrogate in his life. Hopefully, these will serve him as models for healthy identification. The studies done by Rohrer and Edmonson²³ indicate that males raised in a matriarchal setting manifest sex-role conflicts when in competition with other males. Crites²⁴ reports that identification with either parent significantly affects the patterning of the boy's vocational interests

²¹Solomon Diamond, Personality and Development, (New York: Harper and Bros., 1957), p.247.

²²Wolf, Children Under Stress, p.87.

²³J. H. Rohrer and M. S. Edmonson, The Eighth Generation, (New York: Harper and Bros., 1960).

²⁴John O. Crites, "Parental Identification in Relation to Vocational Interest Development" in Readings in Adolescent Development and Behaviour, ed. by John P. Hill and Jev. Shelton, (New Jersey: Prentice Hall, 1971), p.169.

but that the identification with the father is more important. Barclay and Cusumano²⁵ also view the absence of an adequate male model within the family as the crucial factor which forces the boy-child to identify with available male models in the external environment. They note that this might result in identification with the "overt and culturally sanctioned manifestations of masculinity".²⁶

The findings of Payne and Musser²⁷ support the importance of a strong father model for a boy. High-father identification was related strongly to masculinity of attitudes. Boys with high-father identification also were reported to be more friendly and less anxious in school. Stream²⁸ has studied the pathological symbiotic mother-son relationship in absent-father families. He concludes that the mother frequently uses the son unconsciously as a psychological spouse and sees the third person (in this study a male caseworker) as an intruder who wants to disrupt the emotional harmony she has established.

²⁵Barclay and Cusumano, "Father Absence and Field Dependent Behaviour", p.164.

²⁶Ibid., p.167.

²⁷Donald E. Payne and Paul H. Mussen, "Parent-Child Relations and Father Identification Among Adolescent Boys" in Readings in Adolescent Development and Behaviour, ed. by John P. Hill and Jev Shelton, New Jersey: Prentice Hall, 1971), p.157.

²⁸Stream, "Treatment of Mothers and Sons in the Absence of the Father", p.29.

In the North American culture a boy-child is expected to be aggressive, explorative, rough and strong.²⁹ Thus, it can be hypothesized that there is evidence of strong feminine influence in the boy-child's sex-role identification if such expected behaviours are minimal or lacking. A large number of studies of father-absent boys, not necessarily based upon psychoanalytic theory, confirm this hypothesis. Thus, for instance, Burton and Whiting³⁰ considered cultural and environmental influences as primary influences effecting identification. They developed their "status envy" hypothesis which predicts that persons will identify with models who control resources they covet. Thus boys from father-absent homes where the mother is a holder of a "status-envy" tend to identify with the available maternal model and experience considerable cross-sex identity conflict with consequent little or over-aggressive behaviour. However, not all the studies confirm such general and widely accepted assumptions. For instance, McCord and Thurber³¹

²⁹Harold W. Bernard, Adolescent Development, (Scranton: Intext Educational Publishers, 1971), p.82.

³⁰Roger V. Burton and John W. M. Whiting, "The Absent Father and Cross-Sex Identity" in Studies in Adolescence, ed. by Robert E. Grinder (New York: The MacMillan Company, 1963), p.107.

³¹Joan McCord, William McCord and Emily Thurber, "Some Effects of Parental Absence on Male Children" in Studies in Adolescence, ed. by R. E. Grinder (New York: The MacMillan Company, 1963), p.118.

studied the degree of femininity in 205 father-absent homes. Three sets of ratings were used to test feminization of the male-children: homosexual tendencies, dependency, and lack of aggressiveness. McCord and Thurber found that neither homosexuality nor dependency differentiated significantly between the father-absent boys and those whose fathers were present in the home. The aggression scale was significantly related but in the opposite direction than predicted. The boys from the father-absent homes showed more aggressiveness. Also studies done during the Second World War³² and in navy families with the father absent in service³³ report relevant findings.

In spite of the fact that the theoretical core of this study rests upon the basic assumption that a boy-child in the North American culture needs a strong male figure within the family with which he can identify, the argument could be presented that it is not always so. However, this is not the goal of this study. Therefore it can be hypothesized that inadequate identification with adults in the family may cause the child to experience considerable difficulty in future interpersonal relationships. Such inadequate

³²Burton and Whiting, "The Absent Father and Cross-Sex Identity", p.116.

³³Genevieve Gabower, "Behaviour Problems of Children in Navy Officer's Families", Social Casework (April, 1960), Vol.XLI, No.4, p.177-184.

identification may be resolved for the child through healthy relationships with concerned individuals (such as Big Brothers) and groups.³⁴

3. Fatherlessness and Big Brothers.

Some of the important needs of the boy-child, namely his need for a strong male figure in his life have been discussed. In this light can also be seen the importance of the services provided by the Big Brothers Association.

From the historical point of view the original stimulus for establishing Big Brothers came as the intention to help delinquent boys. In December 1904, Mr. Ernest K. Coulter who was the Clerk of the newly established children's court of New York City, gathered 40 men from the Men's Club of the Central Presbyterian Church to undertake a new experiment based on the agreement of these men that each of them would take a personal interest in one boy.³⁵

These men, the original Big Brothers, recognizing that each case of delinquency had its individual problem, agreed to work quietly for at least one year to test the One Man-One Boy formula before making any public announcement. Their tools were warm, human interest and personal friendship. The results were immediately encouraging. Little Brothers responded so well that

³⁴Wolf, Children Under Stress, p.86.

³⁵The Big Brother Interpreter, a periodical letter originated by the Big Brothers Association of Hamilton, Vol.1, No.2.

seldom did any of those initial charges again come into conflict with the law.³⁶

Since 1904 the Big Brothers movement has spread over North America. In 1966 Big Brothers came into existence in Windsor, Ontario, when a group of men headed by Mr. Pierre Phillips decided to do something about the needs of fatherless boys in this area. Since that the agency has developed a caseload of 215 active relationships between a volunteer adult man, a Big Brother, and a fatherless boy between age 8-16, a Little Brother.

The purpose of the Big Brother agency is to provide an adult male friend for a fatherless boy. As Mr. Paul Schiller, the present director of Big Brothers Association of Windsor says, "We don't expect from a Big Brother what we would expect from a psychologist or a social worker. But we do stress that what the Big Brother gives--the offer of friendship--is not to be underestimated. We are convinced it has great therapeutic value."³⁷

Lichtenberg³⁸ states that "the relationship with the Big Brother is a 'substitute' for the relationship that a boy normally has with his father, an older brother, uncle

³⁶Ibid.

³⁷Program and Rationale of Big Brothers of Windsor, UCS Presentation, 1971.

³⁸Ben Lichtenberg, "On the Selection and Preparation of the Big Brother Volunteer", Social Casework (October, 1956), Vol. XXXVII, No.8, p.396.

a grandfather, or even a particularly friendly neighbour. It may enable the boy to form more adequate identifications, to have opportunity to imitate a mature adult, and to develop an association that can broaden his activity horizons." It is the "therapy of friendship" which underlines the whole philosophy of Big Brothers movement. W. C. Menninger³⁹, a noted North American psychiatrist states

..... it is an interpersonal relationship in which there is a great deal of emotion that flows both ways between the therapist, between the Big Brother and the troubled youngster. It's a relationship in which there has to be varying degrees of give and take on both sides, an investment of interest in each other depending so much on mutual interests, and activities and beliefs.

Despite the wide acclaim as to the benefit of the Big Brother-Little Brother relationship, there has been done very little empirical research in this area. Gull and Seifert⁴⁰ did study that intended to evaluate the efficiency of the Big Brother agency in Windsor, Ontario, and to measure the effectiveness of a Big Brother-Little Brother relationship. They compared three groups of boys: 1.) fatherless boys matched with a Big Brother (Little Brothers);

³⁹William C. Menninger, M.D. "The Therapy of Friendship", a paper given at 8th Annual Meeting of Big Brothers of America, Inc. (St. Louis, Missouri, May 17, 1956).

⁴⁰Arlene Gull and Frank Seifert, Review and Appraisal of the Big Brother of Greater Windsor Association, (Windsor, Ont.: Big Brothers Association, 1971).

2.) Control Group of boys with both parents present in the home; 3.) Waiting List Group, fatherless boys who were on the waiting list of the Big Brothers agency and who had not yet been assigned a Big Brother. The third group was included to measure the degree of change that takes place in a boy who enters the Big Brother program. A variety of measures were utilized in the comparison. In general, Gull and Seifert concluded that the Little Brothers did not differ significantly from the Control Group. However, non-statistical inspection of data revealed noticeable differences between the Control and Little Brothers groups and the Waiting List Group. Waiting List boys were seen as "more discouraged with themselves, more overwhelmed with their difficulties, more prone to anxiety and more lacking in self-confidence."⁴¹ Gull and Seifert concluded that the Big Brother-Little Brother relationship had been beneficial to the boys involved in the program and suggested that further stability and validity could be attributed to their study if a group of fatherless boys in no way involved in the Big Brother program could be compared to a group of Little Brothers. The present study is a continuation in the direction of Gull and Seifert's suggestion.

The next chapter will present, in more details, the components of the research design such as the purpose of

⁴¹Ibid., p.74.

the study, hypothesis, working and formal definitions,
description of the population, and general methodology.

CHAPTER III

RESEARCH DESIGN

This chapter will present the elements of the Research Design, namely the purpose of the study, hypothesis, and working definition. It will also present the nature of and criteria for selection of population with method and procedure of data collection.

1. Purpose and Hypothesis

As was noted in the Introduction, the problem under consideration in this study is a comparative one. The purpose of this study is to investigate whether or not there is a difference in personality characteristics between a group of boys with a father substitute and a group of fatherless boys without a father substitute. It is hypothesized that there will be a difference and that this difference will be in a socially desirable direction. For this reason the 12 scales of the Junior Personality Quiz were used as a dependent variable. The problem was approached by comparing a group of Little Brothers with a group of fatherless boys not involved in any formal organization which provides services similar to Big Brothers.

2. Working Definition

Fatherless boy is defined as a boy whose father is absent from the boy's home for reasons such as divorce, separation, imprisonment and death for a period longer than one year. In such case the mother takes the prime responsibility for up bringing the child.

Little Brother is defined as a fatherless boy who has been involved in the Big Brother program for a period of 9 to 18 months. (Nine months was considered to be minimal amount of contact with a Big Brother before any significant changes in Little Brother's behaviour and personality could be observed).

Big Brother is defined as an adult male volunteer of 21-56 years of age supplied to a fatherless boy by the Big Brothers Association who has committed himself to see a boy regularly at least once a week.

Effectiveness can be defined as positive traits in Little Brother's behaviour and personality as reflected in the Junior Personality Quiz factors which may be associated with his relationship with a Big Brother. "Positiveness" of these traits will be determined by constructing a social desirability scale of individual factors of the J. P. Q.

3. Formal Definition.

Since the effectiveness of the Little Brother-Big Brother relationship will be based on positive or negative

nature of personality characteristics and their expression in terms of social desirability, the factorized Junior Personality Quiz was considered to be the appropriate operational instrument. By means of 144 item questionnaire the J. P. Q. offers a practical and objective operation of a child's total personality. It also offers a descriptive interpretation of findings.

4. Population

The population used in this experiment is taken from a population of fatherless boys living in the Windsor area. This population is divided into two groups equal in number, namely 27, and age distribution and matched for age.

Experimental Group (Little Brothers) consists of 27 subjects who were selected in a random manner from total population of 215 Little Brothers according to the files kept by the Big Brothers Association of Windsor. The following criteria for the desired sample were stated:

Firstly, Little Brothers had to be between 10 and 16 years of age since the J. P. Q. is standardized on population of 10-16 years old. This way a small number of Little Brothers not falling into this age range were not considered in the sample.

Secondly, subjects in this group had to be involved in the Big Brother program for a period of 9 to 18 months.

Nine months was decided to be the minimal amount of contact with a Big Brother during which some behaviour or personality changes in Little Brothers could be noticed. Eighteen months was decided to be the upper period limit during which the behaviour or personality changes in Little Brothers could be still associated with the relationship with a Big Brother. It was thought that after this period it would be more difficult to decide whether the changes in Little Brothers' behaviour and personality can be associated with a relationship with a Big Brother or to his natural development and maturation. Also, this way the sample was given more homogeneity.

Only 76 of 215 active Little Brothers corresponded to these criteria. Names and age of 76 Little Brothers were put on separate cards, shuffled, and subjects were selected proportionally to the age distribution of the total population of Little Brothers.

Control Group consists of 27 fatherless boys from the Windsor area who have no father substitute and are not involved in any formal organization which provides services similar to the Big Brothers Association. This sample was selected and tested through cooperation of teachers, clergymen, and school principals in Windsor area. The same criteria were implemented as in the case of an experimental group. Because of the rather limited total population no systematic random procedure was applied. The control group

was matched with the experimental group for age. Table 1 gives the Age Distribution of the Experimental and Control Groups.

TABLE 1
AGE DISTRIBUTION OF THE EXPERIMENTAL
AND CONTROL GROUPS

Age	Number of Subjects	
	EG ^a	CG ^b
10	6	6
11	3	3
12	3	3
13	5	5
14	5	5
15	4	4
16	1	1
TOTAL	27	27

a. Experimental Group

b. Control Group

5. Method of Data Collection

The Junior Personality Quiz is a 144 item questionnaire measuring 12 personality factors of subjects 10-16 years old. It can be administered to individuals or a group. The approximate time of testing is 45 minutes.⁴²

The following is a brief description of the 12 factors of the J. P. Q. indicating the meanings of high and low scores of individual factors according to the manual of the J. P. Q.⁴³ It should be noted that while most factors are bi-pollar, that is, indicating the meaning of both high and low scores, some factors, e.g. Intelligence, are mono-pollar, that is, not contrasted with the low score meaning nor another personality dimension as it is in the case of most factors.

Factor 1. Emotional Sensitivity - vs. - Toughness. The individual high in this tends to be sensitive, imaginative, timid, friendly, soft-hearted, kindly, preferring adventures in imagination to those in fact. The low score associates with toughness, emotional hardness, practicality, independence, and lack of artistic feeling.

Factor 2. Nervous Tension - vs. - Autonomic Relaxation. The individual high in this tends to be overwrought, tense, excited, irritable, anxious, despondent, and easily upset.

⁴²Junior Personality Quiz, p.1.

⁴³Ibid., p.8.

Factor 3. Neurotic, Fearful Emotionality - vs. Stability or Ego Strength. The individual high in this tends to be emotionally unstable and discouraged with himself, overwhelmed by his difficulties, prone to anxieties and lacking in confidence.

Factor 4. Will Control - vs. - Relaxed Casualness. The individual high in this tends to be self-controlled, orderly inhibited, persistent, and punctual.

Factor 5. Impatience Dominance. The individual high in this is impatient, quick to anger and slow to calm down and unable to tolerate differences of opinions with others.

Factor 6. Cyclothymia - vs. Schizothymia. The individual high in this tends to be sociable, easy-going, warm-hearted. The low score in this associates with a dislike to groups, rigidity, sticking to old ways, and preference of serious friends to fun-loving ones.

Factor 7. Adventurous Cyclothymia - vs. Withdrawn Schizothymia. The individual high in this tends to be bold and boisterous. The low score associates with being shy, quiet, polite, aloof, and lacking in confidence.

Factor 8. Socialized Morale - vs. Dislike of Education. The individual high in this tends to be fond of school and all that goes with it, quick to accept cultural standards, and attentive and friendly to his associates. The low score associates with a dislike of learning, feeling one is badly treated, and having a surly reaction to

authority and associates.

Factor 9. Independent Dominance. The individual high in this tends to be dominant, competitive, sticks to his own opinions, feels that he has difficulty in getting across what he wants to say, and does not appreciate obeying rules.

Factor 10. Energetic Conformity - vs. Quiet Eccentricity. The individual high in this tends to be lively, goes along with the group, is a good mixer, has "cheap" interests, and does not think much for himself. The low score associates with a person who tends to be eccentric, likes to think on his own, and has more thoughtful tastes, and reports fatigue and slowness in action.

Factor 11. Surgency - vs. - Desurgency. The individual high in this tends to be talkative and excitable, likes lively parties, prefers occupations like actor and lawyer, and likes constant variety. The low score associates with seriousness, preference of mechanical interests, and a tendency to be quiet and anxious.

Factor 12. Intelligence. This has the usual association of an intelligence test score. The high score associates with higher intelligence.

6. Validity and Reliability

Internal validation of the test refers to a

characteristic of items in a battery of terms "how well each measures a known, definite personality factor."⁴⁴ External or social validity refers to "how well the factors predict performance in an infinite number of specific social (occupational, clinical, educational) performances".⁴⁵

It is thought that the Junior Personality Quiz has high validity since

it takes account of the real structure of personality and aims to get distinct measures for independent dimensions, such as intelligence, ego strength, level of anxiety. In the second, it aims to predict a great range of performances from the same personality test battery, instead of having to contrast an equally great range of ad hoc tests for each distinct clinical, educational, or guidance problem.⁴⁶

Since the test is a structured one, it claims to have a high degree of reliability in relation to a short testing period (45 minutes) with the exception of factors 5, 6, 9, and 10, which have low reliability for a routine use and are intended to be only experimental. Table 2 shows the reliability coefficients of individual factors.

TABLE 2
RELIABILITY COEFFICIENTS⁴⁷

FACTORS											
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
.83	.58	.51	.50	.25	.31	.54	.52	.30	.35	.45	.78

⁴⁴Ibid., p.2.

⁴⁶Ibid.

⁴⁵Ibid.

⁴⁷Ibid., p.3.

7. Procedure

The subjects were seen by the researcher and his assistants (Experimental Group), and by the researcher only (Control Group), at their homes or schools. The Junior Personality Quiz was administered according to test manual instructions to each subject in an individual test setting.

8. Statistics

A 2 x 12 analysis of variance was considered to be the appropriate statistical treatment of the data. Analyses were performed using the computer program Balanova 5. The significancy level was set at .05.

9. Interpretation of Statistical Findings

The statistical findings are divided into three categories:

1. statistically significant findings;
2. statistically insignificant but noticeable findings;
3. expression of statistical findings in terms of "social desirability" through a non-statistical visual inspection of data.

Although the individual factors of the Junior Personality Quiz are expressed in descriptive terms,⁴⁸

⁴⁸Ibid., p.8.

social desirability is not considered in the scoring procedure of the J. P. Q. The social desirability of individual factors was established by means of contacting 10 professionals in the field of mental health in the Windsor community (see p. 42) who were presented the exact original descriptive interpretation of the factors in the copy of the manual of the J. P. Q., and asked to assign a "+" sign (socially desirable) or a "-" sign (socially undesirable) to the high score of each particular factor.

The following chapter will present the results of the statistical analysis.

CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS

This chapter will present the statistical results. For the statistical purpose the following hypotheses were formulated:

Null Hypothesis: H_0 :

There will be no significant difference on the measures of the Junior Personality Quiz between the group of Little Brothers and the group of fatherless boys not involved in any formal organization which provides similar services to Big Brothers.

Alternative Hypothesis: H_1 :

There will be a significant difference on the measures of the Junior Personality Quiz between the experimental group of Little Brothers and the control group of fatherless boys not involved in any formal organization which provides similar services to Big Brothers.

Twelve analyses of variance were performed using the computer program Balanova 5. The mean scores of the experimental group and the mean scores of the control group (Table III) were compared on each of the 12 factors

of the Junior Personality Quiz. The results are summarized in Table IV which shows the obtained values of F-ratios.

It has been found that the values related to the factors 5 and 8 of the Junior Personality Quiz were significant beyond the .05 level of significance. Hence the experimental data related to these two factors do not support the above stated Null Hypothesis. This means that there are significant differences between the two groups of subjects used in this study concerning the investigation of the effectiveness of a relationship between a fatherless boy and a Big Brother. Further elaboration of this phenomenon is given in Chapter V.

The values of F-ratios related to the remaining 10 factors of the Junior Personality Quiz were not found to be statistically significant at the .05 level of significance and thus the above stated Null Hypothesis cannot be rejected. This means that the factors, 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 9, 10, 11, and 12 of the Junior Personality Quiz did not differentiate significantly between the two groups of subjects used. However, non-statistical inspection of findings in Table IV, Summary Table of F-ratios, reveals that there is also a noticeable difference between the two groups of subjects on factors 2, 4, 7, and 9 of the Junior Personality Quiz.

TABLE III
THE MEAN RAW SCORES

Factors Groups	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
CG	5.11	6.78	5.40	6.30	6.19	7.04	5.07	5.59	6.81	6.55	5.78	6.77
EG	5.22	5.85	5.19	6.82	4.85	7.52	5.89	7.11	6.07	6.50	5.91	7.02

TABLE IV
SUMMARY TABLE OF F-RATIOS

Factors of J.P.Q.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
Fabs (1,52)	0.06	1.76	0.23	1.88	7.63*	1.10	2.40	8.26*	1.76	0.01	0.01	0.22

* The critical value of F associated with 1 and 52 degrees of freedom (for numerator and denominator respectively) at the .05 level of significance is 4.04 [$F_{.95}(1,52)=4.04$]⁴⁹

TABLE V
THE MEAN SCALE SCORES

Factors Groups	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
CG	6	8	6	5	7	6	5	6	7	5	7	5
EG	6	7	6	6	6	7	6	7	6	5	6	5

CHAPTER V
DISCUSSION

This chapter will discuss the statistical findings presented in Chapter IV as related to the hypothesis and the purpose of the study. The discussion will be divided into three parts, namely with respect to 1.) statistically significant findings; 2.) statistically insignificant but noticeable difference between the two groups of subjects; and 3.) the tentative non-statistical inspection of findings and its interpretation in terms of social desirability.

1. Statistically Significant Findings

It was hypothesized that there would be a difference in personality characteristics between the group of Little Brothers and the group of fatherless boys not involved in any formal organization which provides similar services to Big Brothers. The statistical findings confirm that at the .05 level of significance there is a statistically significant difference between the two groups on factors 5 and 8 of the Junior Personality Quiz.

On Factor 5, Impatient Dominance⁵⁰, the control group of fatherless boys without Big Brothers scored

⁵⁰Ibid., p.9.

significantly higher (F-ratio=7.63 as compared to a statistically significant critical value of 4.04) than the experimental group of Little Brothers. According to the Junior Personality Manual⁵¹ the high score is associated with the individual who is "impatient, quick to anger, slow to calm down, and unable to tolerate differences of opinion with others".⁵² The logical reverse implication of the high score interpretation is that the low scoring individuals, in this study the experimental group of Little Brothers tend to be more patient, self-controlled, and mature individuals who are able to tolerate differences of opinion with others.

However, the value of this statistically significant finding is considerably decreased by its low reliability (see p.). Factor 5 of the Junior Personality Quiz is considered to be one of four "experimental" factors.⁵³ In fact, with the consistency coefficient of 0.25 this factor has the least reliability of the 12 factors of the Junior Personality Quiz.

Hence the second statistically significant difference between the two groups of subjects on Factor 8 seems to be more important. With the consistency coefficient of 0.52 (see p.), this factor is constructed to measure the dimensions of "Socialized Morale - vs. - Dislike of Education".⁵⁴ The high scoring individuals, in this study

⁵¹Ibid.

⁵²Ibid.

⁵³Ibid., p.3.

⁵⁴Ibid., p.10.

the control group of Little Brothers, "are fond of school and all that goes with it, quick to accept cultural standards, and attentive and friendly to their associates."⁵⁵ The low scoring individuals, in this study the experimental group of fatherless boys without Big Brothers, "dislike learning, feel they are badly treated, and have a surly reaction to authority and to associates."⁵⁶

2. Statistically Insignificant Findings

As mentioned in Chapter IV, the non-statistical inspection of Table IV, The Summary Table of F-Ratios, suggests that also difference between the two groups of subjects on factors 2, 4, 7, and 9 are not to be ignored.

Factor 2, (F-ratio = 1.76 as compared to required statistically significant critical value of $F_{.95} = 4.04$) with reliability coefficient 0.58 is suggested to measure "Nervous Tension - vs. - Autonomic Relaxation".⁵⁷ The high scoring individuals, in this study the control group of fatherless boys not involved in Big Brothers program tend to be "overwrought, tense, excited, irritable, anxious, despondent, and easily upset".⁵⁸ In children, this is diagnostically associated with a certain type of high-strung, overextended child.⁵⁹ As far as it is known the measure of this factor "can change rather markedly over the

⁵⁵Ibid.

⁵⁶Ibid.

⁵⁷Ibid., p.9.

⁵⁸Ibid.

⁵⁹Ibid.

course of time with change of environmental stress, therapy, etc."⁶⁰ It is speculated that also the Big Brother program can have similar impact on a child. The manual of the Junior Personality Quiz does not offer the interpretation of the low score. But it can be reasonably speculated that the low scoring individuals, in this study the group of Little Brothers, are more relaxed, balanced, and self-controlled.

Factor 4, (F-ratio = 1.88 as compared to a required statistically significant critical value of $F_{.95} = 4.04$), with reliability coefficient of .50 (see p.28), stands Will Control against Relaxed Casualness.⁶¹ The high scoring individuals, in this study the group of Little Brothers, tend to be "self-controlled, orderly, inhibited, persistent, and punctual."⁶² The authors of the Junior Personality Quiz manual state that the higher measure of this factor is in children "who make good leaders, and who make good progress in school and elsewhere relative to what might be expected from their intelligence."⁶³ The manual does not offer the interpretation of low score.

Factor 7, (F-ratio = 2.40 as compared to required statistically significant F critical value of 4.04) with consistency coefficient of .54 (see p.28) is constructed to measure "Adventurous Cyclothymia - vs. Withdrawn

⁶⁰Ibid.

⁶¹Ibid.

⁶²Ibid.

⁶³Ibid.

Schizothymia".⁶⁴ The high scoring individuals, in this study the experimental groups of Little Brothers, are "bold and boisterous".⁶⁵ The low scoring individuals, in this study the control group of fatherless boys not involved in Big Brothers program, tend to be "shy, quiet, polite, aloof, and lacking in confidence".⁶⁶ These boys also tend to be rather more frequently in trouble with the law and rules, but also tend to be chosen as leaders.⁶⁷

Factor 9, (F-ratio = 1.76 as compared to required critical value $F_{.95} = 4.04$), with the consistency coefficient of only .30 (see p. 28) is also considered for another of four "experimental" factors of the Junior Personality Quiz. It is constructed to measure "Independent Dominance". The high scorer, in this study the control group of fatherless boys without Big Brothers, indicates a dominant, competitive, and rigid individual who "sticks to his own opinions" but feels that he has difficulty in getting across what he wants to say and does not appreciate obeying rules.⁶⁸

The visual inspection of Table IV, Summary Table of F-ratios, reveals that on six factors of the Junior Personality Quiz, namely on factors 1, 3, 6, 10, 11, and 12 the statistical difference between the two groups of subjects is so minimal that it can be both statistically and

⁶⁴Ibid., p.10.

⁶⁵Ibid.

⁶⁶Ibid.

⁶⁷Ibid.

⁶⁸Ibid.

behaviourally neglected. Of these only Factor 6 with F-ratio = 1.10 as compared to required critical value $F_{.95} = 4.04$ is close to being considered non-statistically significant. However, its low consistency coefficient .31 radically decreases the value of its results. The high scorers, in this study the experimental group of Little Brothers, tend to be sociable, easy-going, and warm-hearted individuals. The low scoring individuals, in this study the control group of fatherless boys without a Big Brother, tend to dislike groups, are rather rigid, has sleep disorders, and prefers serious friends to fun-loving ones.⁶⁹

3. Social Desirability

So far, no effectiveness value was assigned to the obtained data and its presented interpretation. In order to elucidate the effectiveness of the Big Brother relationship with a fatherless boy it seemed best to develop the argument in terms of "social desirability" of the scores earned between the two groups of this study. Since social desirability is not considered in the scoring of the Junior Personality Quiz it was necessary to establish the social desirability of individual factors.

Since the researcher did not want to determine this by himself on the basis of his own personal values, it was

⁶⁹Ibid.

felt that the more objective manner to achieve this could be done through approaching a group of his colleagues. Ten professionals in the field of mental health in Windsor community, namely six social workers (five M.S.W.'s and one B.S.W.) and four clinical psychologists (one Ph.D. and three M.A.'s), all members of the staff of the I.O.D.E. Hospitals, Windsor, Ontario, were approached. They were presented the interpretation of the individual factors in the original copy of the Junior Personality Quiz⁷⁰ manual and asked to assign a "+" sign (socially desirable) or a "-" sign (socially undesirable) to the high score of each particular factor. The essential basic core of the meaning of high and low scores on each factor was the same as given in Chapter III, page 25 of this study. It was further decided that a consensus of at least 80% was needed to establish the social desirability or undesirability of a high score on a particular factor. Table VI presents the ratings of the ten professionals as to the social desirability or undesirability of the 12 factors of the Junior Personality Quiz.

⁷⁰Ibid., p.8.

TABLE VI
 THE RATINGS OF SOCIAL DESIRABILITY AND UNDESIRABILITY OF
 INDIVIDUAL FACTORS OF THE JUNIOR PERSONALITY QUIZ
 ACCORDING TO A SURVEY AMONG 10 MENTAL HEALTH PROFESSIONALS.

Factor	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
High Score	+	-	-	+	-	+	+	+	?	-	+	+
Low Score	-	+	+	-	+	-	-	-	?	+	-	-

Except for factors 1, 4, 8, and 9, all high scores received a 100% endorsement as being either desirable or undesirable. On Factors 1, 4, and 8 of the consensus was 90%, which was above the decision level of 80%. On Factor 9 the consensus was 60%, which was below the decision level of 80%. Thus in terms of our decision rule concerning desirability and undesirability, Factor 9 was considered to be undecided.

The purpose of considering high factor scores in terms of their social desirability will soon be evident. Table VII presents the mean scale scores of the experimental (Little Brothers) and control group (fatherless boys not involved in any program similar to Big Brothers) on the 12 factors of the Junior Personality Quiz. If we now

replace these scores with the signs "+" or "-" for high scores as indicated in Table VI, we get Table VII, which shows a difference between the experimental and control groups on the 12 factors of the Junior Personality Quiz in terms of social desirability.

TABLE VII

DIFFERENCE BETWEEN EXPERIMENTAL GROUP AND CONTROL GROUP ON THE 12 FACTORS OF THE JUNIOR PERSONALITY QUIZ IN TERMS OF SOCIAL DESIRABILITY OF SCORES WHERE "+" SIGNIFIES SOCIAL DESIRABILITY AND "-" SIGNIFIES SOCIAL UNDESIRABILITY.

Factors	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
Control Group	+	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	?	+	+	+
Experimental Group (LB)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	?	+	+	+

As can be seen from Table VII, on 5 factors, namely 1, 3, 10, 11, and 12, the Experimental Group scored comparably to the control group. On factor 9 the direction high or low, of social desirability could not be determined.

On six factors, namely, 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, and 8, the experimental groups of Little Brothers scored higher in the socially desirable direction. Even when the statistical difference between the two groups on factors 1, 3, 10, 11, and 12 is so small that it can be statistically and

behaviourally neglectable, on NO factor did the experimental group of Little Brothers score lower in the socially undesirable direction. However, it should be noted in all fairness that the social desirability suggested in Table VII is "relative" to this study and in the context of the larger population the mean scale scores here given the social undesirability value of "-" may be considered to be within limits of desirability. Nevertheless, our presentation of the scores in terms of social desirability does not lessen the fact that the higher scores are earned by the experimental group, that is, by Little Brothers. Thus it seems that the difference evidenced by these two groups can reasonably be attributed to the prime independent variable of this study, namely the involvement or non-involvement in the Big Brother program.

Hence, with respect to the first and the second part of this chapter, namely the statistically significant difference between the two groups on factors 5 and 8, and non-statistically significant but noticeable difference between the two groups on factors 2, 4, 7, and 9, the following conclusion can be made:

The group of Little Brothers does not display the amount of nervous tension with syndromes of irritability, anxiety, short temper, and tension like the group of fatherless boys without a Big Brother. In this sense, Little Brothers seem to be more relaxed and balanced with

consequent stronger security and confidence in coping with their social and personal conflicts. They tend to be more self-controlled, persistent and punctual than the group of fatherless boys without a Big Brother. Little Brothers also tend to have less difficulties in terms of academic and vocational achievement, tend to be more independent and chosen as leaders. They are more patient in social situations, more tolerable of other people's opinions. They tend to be more sociable, easy-going and warm-hearted individuals who also have less troubles with the law and with obeying general rules and cultural standards. They are not so shy, aloof and insecure as the group of fatherless boys without Big Brothers.

All these phenomena indicate that the relationship of a fatherless boy or a boy who is deprived of a healthy, strong father-figure at home with a father-substitute, a Big Brother, is effective.

In this sense and with respect to Chapter II, Review of Literature, in which the importance of a father-figure for a boy-child in this culture was discussed it can be also concluded that an adult male volunteer, a Big Brother, has a capacity to substitute in an effective way a weak, ineffective or missing father-figure in a boy-child's home. For a fatherless boy he has a capacity to be an awakener of his emotional potentials, his beloved friend and teacher, his ego ideal for masculine love, ethics, and morality, his model

for social and vocational behaviour, stabilizing influence for solution of his oedipus complex, his counsellor and friend.⁷¹ By relieving a Little Brother's mother of her "masculine" functions⁷², a Big Brother can also serve as her companion, inspiration, and support,⁷³ and this way to contribute effectively to a Little Brother's family healthier personal and social development. A Big Brother, as it appears from this study, decreases the Little Brother's chance for breaking the law as well as his identification with an undesirable male model in external environment.⁷⁴

On the whole, with respect to the hypothesis (p.20) which says that there will be a difference between the two groups of subjects, that is, between the experimental group of Little Brothers and the control group of fatherless boys not involved in any formal organization which provides similar services to Big Brothers, it can be concluded that a significant difference between the two groups was found. Since this difference was found to be in a socially desirable direction (see p.41), it can be reasonably concluded that the Big Brother-Little Brother relationship

⁷¹Spurgeon O. English, "The Psychological Role of the Father in the Family", p.323.

⁷²Wolf, Children Under Stress, p.86.

⁷³English, "The Psychological Role of the Father", p.323.

⁷⁴Diamond, Personality and Development, p.247.

may have a positive effect on the personal and social development of fatherless boys involved in the program of the Big Brothers Association of Greater Windsor. Hence the relationship is concluded to be effective.

CHAPTER VI
SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDED
AREAS OF RESEARCH

This chapter will present the summary of the research and will give some suggestion for further research.

The study attempted to measure the effectiveness of the relationship offered to a fatherless boy in Windsor community by the Big Brothers Association. It was felt that a study of this nature was desirable and needed in the field of social services since there are only a few empirically oriented studies which can contribute to the understanding of the effectiveness of the services provided by social agencies such as Big Brothers. In order to achieve the goal of this study, two groups of boys between ages 10 and 16 were selected. One group consisted of 27 fatherless boys who are involved in the Big Brother program and have been assigned a Big Brother for longer than 9 months and not longer than one year and a half. The second group of boys consisted of 27 fatherless boys from the Windsor community who are not involved in any formal organization which provides services similar to those of Big Brothers. The groups were matched in age. The comparison was made by means of the Junior Personality Quiz which is a structured 144 question survey standardized for 10-16 year old boys.

This questionnaire measures 12 personality dimensions.

It was hypothesized that there would be a difference between the two groups of subjects, namely between the experimental group of Little Brothers and the control group of fatherless boys without a father substitute who are not involved in any formal organization which provides similar services to Big Brothers Association. It was further hypothesized that the difference between the groups would be in a socially desirable direction by which the effectiveness of a Little Brother-Big Brother relationship could be determined.

The statistical data obtained and their analysis indicated that there was a statistically significant difference between the two groups on 2 factors of the J. P. Q. With respect to this it was concluded that Little Brothers appear to be more patient, self-controlled, and mature individuals who are able to tolerate differences of opinion with others. On the other hand, the group of fatherless boys not involved in the Big Brothers program was found to be impatient, quick to anger, slow to calm down with inability to tolerate differences of opinions with others. Little Brothers were also found to be more fond of school, quick to accept cultural standards, attentive and friendly to their associates, while fatherless boys without a father substitute tend to dislike learning and have a surly reaction to authority and to their peers.

With respect to other methods of data evaluation, namely a non-statistical inspection of data and their expression in terms of social desirability, the research indicates that the group of Little Brothers meets the social and personality expectations more adequately than the group of boys without a father surrogate. They do not display the amount of nervous tension with syndromes of irritability, anxiety, and short temper as the group of fatherless boys not involved in the Big Brother program. They also seem to be more relaxed and balanced with subsequent stronger security and confidence in coping with their social and personal conflicts. They tend to be more self-controlled, persistent and punctual than the group of fatherless boys without a father substitute. Little Brothers also tend to have less difficulties in terms of academic and vocational achievement, they tend to be more sociable, easy-going and warm-hearted individuals than the boys without Big Brothers. Also, they tend to have less trouble with the law, with obeying general rules and with accepting cultural standards. Since all these phenomena are indicative of a socially desirable direction it was concluded that the Big Brother-Little Brother relationship does have positive effects on fatherless boys involved in this study.

One difficulty in assigning a great deal of importance to the conclusion that the Big Brother-Little Brother relationship is effective in helping fatherless

boys is the fact, that the population might be very possibly biased. Inclusion in the Big Brothers program itself may be hypothesized to be due to certain factors in the child's social life. What are the factors which are linked to inclusion in the program might be one of the questions which remain unanswered. A study could be of value which delved into the various social factors linked to inclusion or non-inclusion of the fatherless boy in the Big Brothers Association. The following are some of the factors which could be of significance in determining whether a boy participated in the Big Brothers Association program or not:

- a. education of mother, intelligence;
- b. income and occupation of mother;
- c. number and sex vs. age constellation of siblings;
- d. mother's attitudes towards accepting help;
- e. mother's attitudes towards child rearing;
- f. availability of other male figures in the extended family;
- g. neighbourhood.

The question posed by these factors indicates that some sections of the population would tend to be more aware of and more willing to use the services of the B. B. A. It could be hypothesized that the positive results obtained in this study indicating significantly more positive social and personality traits in boys involved in the Big Brothers program, could be due to these other factors.

Further validity, to the results obtained in this study could be given by comparing a group of Little Brothers with a matched group of fatherless boys without a father surrogate who are in trouble with the law. Such a study could indicate the effectiveness of the Big Brothers program as contrasted by delinquency and could broaden the implication of Big Brothers services in the Windsor community.

Another approach would be to devise a true control group of boys without the Big Brother relationship. Boys referred to Big Brothers would be assigned randomly either to enter the program or not enter the program for a period of time. Psychological testing of both groups before their random selection and after a period of time should indicate any difference in performance due to inclusion in the program. This is a common means of assessment the probable effectiveness of a service.

The data obtained in this study is too limited to answer all these questions. Since sufficient empirical data is lacking, further research is necessary to determine whether correlation and causal factors have been confused in this study, This can give us more insight into the effectiveness of services provided by social agencies such as the Big Brothers Association and serve as a basis for recommendations in the area of service planning and service delivery to fatherless boys.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

- Anthony, E.J. and Benedek, T. Parenthood, Its Psychology and Psychopathology, Boston: Little Brown and Company, 1970.
- Ball, J. C. Social Deviancy and Adolescent Personality. University of Kentucky Press, 1962.
- Barclay, A. and Cusumano, D.R. "Father Absence, Cross-Sex Identity, and Field-Dependent Behaviour in Male Adolescents." Readings in Adolescent Development and Behaviour. Edited by John P. Hill and Jev Shelton. New Jersey: Prentice Hall, Inc., 1971.
- Bernard, H.W. Adolescent Development. New York, Scranton: Irwin Educational Publishers, 1971.
- Burton, R.V. and Whiting, J. W. M. "The Absent Father and Cross-Sex Identity." Studies in Adolescence. Edited by Robert E. Grinder. New York: The MacMillan Company, 1963.
- Crites, J.O. "Parental Identification in Relation to Vocational Interest Development." Readings in Adolescent Development and Behaviour. Edited by John P. Hill and Jev Shelton. New Jersey: Prentice Hall, Inc., 1971.
- Diamond, S. Personality and Temperament. New York: Harper and Bros., 1957.
- Elkin, F. The Child and Society. New York: Random House, Inc., 1969.
- Lynn, D.B. "Sex-Role and Parental Identification". Edited by Gene R. Medinnus. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1967.
- McCord, J., et. al. "Some Effects of Parental Absence on Male Children." Studies in Adolescence. Edited by Robert E. Grinder. New York: The MacMillan Company, 1963.

- Medinnus, G.R. "Delinquents' Perception of Their Parents".
Readings in the Psychology of Parent-Child Relations.
Edited by Gene R. Medinnus. New York: John Wiley
and Sons, 1967.
- Payne, D.E. and Mussen, P.M. "Parent-Child Relations and
Father Identification Among Adolescent Boys ."
Readings in Adolescent Development and Behaviour.
Edited by John P. Hill and Jev Shelton. New Jersey:
Prentice Hall, Inc., 1971.
- Slavson, S.R. Child Psychotherapy. New York: Columbia
University Press, 1952.
- Symonds, P.M. The Dynamics of Parent-Child Relationship.
New York: Columbia University Press, 1949.
- Winter, B.J. Statistical Principles in Experimental Design.
New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1962.
- Wolf, S. Children Under Stress. London: Allen Lane
The Penguin Press, 1969.

Articles and Periodicals.

- Bailey, William. "The Volunteer Big Brother in the Helping
Role." Child Welfare XLVI (December, 1967),
562-8.
- English, O.S. "The Psychological Role of the Father in the
Family." Social Casework. XXXV (October, 1954),
323-9.
- Gabower, Genevieve. "Behaviour Problems of Children in
Navy Officers' Families". Social Casework XLI
(April, 1960), 177-84.
- Hirsohn, Sid. "The Role of the Male Caseworker with the
Adolescent Boy". Social Casework XXXI (January,
1950), 23-8.
- Lerner, Samuel H. "Effects of Desertion on Family Life."
Social Casework XXXV (January, 1954), 3-8.
- Lichtenberg, Ben. "On the Selection and Preparation of the
Big Brother Volunteer." Social Casework XXXVII
(October, 1956), 396-400.

Royfe, Ephrain H. "The Role of a Social Worker in a Big Brother Agency." Social Casework XLI (March, 1960), 139-44.

Steigman, Joseph E. "The Deserted Family." Social Casework XXXVIII (April, 1957), 167-70.

Strean, Herbert S. "Treatment of Mothers and Sons in the Absence of the Father." Social Casework VI (July, 1961), 29-35.

The Big Brother Association of Hamilton. The Big Brother Interpreter, I. No.2.

Unpublished Materials

Ferrier, Laura M. "Differential Disposition in Court Cases as Related to Fatherlessness." Paper presented to the Canadian Congress of Criminology and Corrections, Ottawa, June 15, 1971.

Menninger, William C. "The Therapy of Friendship." Paper presented at 8th Annual Meeting of Big Brothers of America, St. Louis, Missouri, May 17, 1956.

Gull, Arlene and Seifert, Frank. "Review and Appraisal of the Big Brother of Greater Windsor Association." Study completed in cooperation with The Federal Government's Opportunity for Youth Programme, Windsor, Ontario, September, 1971.

VITAE

Frank Seifert was born April 24, 1944 at Jicin, Bohemia, Czechoslovakia. He attended public and high school in Prague, Czechoslovakia. In 1961 he was admitted to Prague's Charles University. He presented and defended his zoological thesis "Cultivation of Pigeons on Experimental School Farms" on June 17, 1965, and graduated with a University Degree in Natural Science and Physical Education on June 28, 1965.

He was married in Prague in 1966. In October, 1968 he and his wife Eva and their daughter Petra came to Canada. He was admitted to 2-year M.S.W. program at the University of Windsor in September, 1970. He expects to graduate with an M.S.W. degree in October, 1972.