

6-16-1987

The Relationship Between Father's Parenting Style, Concept of God, and Spiritual Well-Being in Christian College-Aged Women

Teresa L. Dean

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.georgefox.edu/psyd>

 Part of the [Psychology Commons](#)

~~D
1551633
D2702~~

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN FATHER'S PARENTING STYLE,
CONCEPT OF GOD, AND SPIRITUAL WELL-BEING
IN CHRISTIAN COLLEGE-AGED WOMEN

by

Teresa L. Dean

Presented to the faculty of
Western Conservative Baptist Seminary
in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Psychology
in Clinical Psychology

Portland, Oregon

June 16, 1987

MURDOCK LEARNING RESOURCE CTR
GEORGE FOX COLLEGE
NEWBERG, OREGON 97132

Approval

The Relationship between Father's Parenting Style,
Concept of God, and Spiritual Well-being
in Christian College-Aged Women

by

Teresa L. Dean

Signatures:

Rodger K. Buffe Ph.D.

Committee Chairman

Teresa E. Sweeney

Vice President for
Academic Affairs

Gale H. Reid, Ph.D.

Members

Date: March 30, 1988

H. Crosby Ingilizian

3-28-88

Date: 3-28-88

77. Western Baptist Seminary July 1990



THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN FATHER'S PARENTING STYLE,
CONCEPT OF GOD, AND SPIRITUAL WELL-BEING IN
CHRISTIAN COLLEGE WOMEN

WESTERN CONSERVATIVE BAPTIST SEMINARY

PORTLAND, OREGON

Teresa L. Dean

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study is to examine whether an Authoritative parenting style by a woman's father has an effect on her Concept of God and Spiritual Well-being. The Children's Report of Parent's Behavior Inventory (CRPBI), two Concept of God scales, and the Spiritual Well-being scale were given to a randomly chosen sample of 200 women from Messiah College. A total of 127 women responded to the questionnaire.

It was hypothesized that there would be significant relationships between the three scores derived from the CRPBI (Acceptance vs. Rejection, Psychological Autonomy vs. Psychological Control, and Firm Discipline vs. Lax Discipline) and the number of years father was absent (0 to 16) with Spiritual Well-being, Existential Well-

being, Religious Well-being, and the Concept of God scales (Wrathful, Traditional Christian, Kindness, Omniness, Deisticness, Loving God, and Controlling God).

It was also hypothesized that a weighted linear combination of the three scores from the CRPBI and the number of years father was absent from the home would account for greater variance in Spiritual Well-being and Concept of God than single correlations between the scores.

The data was tested by Multiple Regressions. Father Acceptance was related to Spiritual Well-being, Existential Well-being, Religious Well-being, and God as Kind and Loving. Psychological Control negatively related to Spiritual Well-being, Existential Well-being, Religious Well-being, God as loving, and positively related to viewing God as Wrathful and Controlling. Lax Discipline and Father Absence were not related to any of the Spiritual Well-being or Concept of God variables.

A weighted combination of the three scores on the CRPBI, and father absence did not account for greater variance on Spiritual Well-being and its subscales, or the Concept of God scales.

Many factors enter into the development of a view of

God, a sense of well-being about a relationship with Him, and a sense of satisfaction with life. This research indicates that fathers play a significant role in this development.

Acknowledgements

The prospect of completing a task of this size often appears to be a lonely journey. Yet, in reality this project could not have been completed without the help and support of many people.

First, I would like to thank my dissertation committee for their time and commitment in working with me. To Dr. Rodger Bufford for his willingness to take over as committee chairman and for his willingness to look over rough copies. To Dr. Gale Roid for his willingness to continue on the committee even after leaving Western, for his ability to make clear even the most difficult statistical concepts, and for his enthusiastic support. To Dr. H. Crosby Englizian for his willingness to try something new by being on a psychology dissertation committee.

I would also like to thank Dr. Jake Thiessen for his willingness to allow me to use students from Messiah College, and for distributing the packets. Of course, this project could not have been completed without the

help of the students themselves. Thank you to all who took the time to complete and send back the questionnaires.

This dissertation would have never been completed without the tangible help of my friends, Elizabeth Lawrence and Dawn Kreider, who were willing to give of their time to help score the questionnaires. A big thank you goes especially to Dawn who was always willing to score "just one more" even when I wanted to stop. Her continual concern and support helped me to persevere during even the roughest times. Thank you also to Keith Erikson whose expertise on the computer saved me valuable time on the statistical analysis, and whose enthusiasm made even the statistics fun.

Most of all, thank you to my parents, Doug and Carol Dean, who always believed in me and always supported (emotionally, as well as financially) my dream. You taught me to believe in my abilities, and to believe in God. Your acceptance provided a safe base from which I could explore father-daughter relationships and their impact on Spiritual Well-being. To you this work is dedicated.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Approval Page.....	ii
Abstract.....	iii
Acknowledgements.....	vi
Table of Contents.....	viii
List of Tables.....	xi
Chapter 1: INTRODUCTION.....	1
REVIEW OF LITERATURE.....	3
THEORIES OF FEMININE DEVELOPMENT.....	4
PSYCHOANALYTIC THEORY.....	4
SOCIAL LEARNING THEORY.....	10
PARSONS' THEORY.....	13
SUMMARY.....	16
REVIEW OF RESEARCH FINDINGS.....	17
RESEARCH ON FATHER ABSENCE.....	17
FATHER-ABSENCE & HETEROSEXUAL DEVELOPMENT.....	17
FATHER-ABSENCE & PERSONALITY ADJUSTMENT.....	22
SUMMARY.....	23

RESEARCH ON FATHER PRESENCE & DAUGHTER'S	
ADJUSTMENT.....	24
FATHER ACCEPTANCE & HETEROSEXUAL	
ADJUSTMENT.....	25
FATHER ACCEPTANCE & PERSONALITY	
ADJUSTMENT.....	27
SUMMARY.....	28
DIMENSIONS OF FATHER'S BEHAVIOR &	
ADJUSTMENT.....	29
SUMMARY.....	36
CONCEPT OF GOD.....	37
SUMMARY.....	44
SPIRITUAL WELL-BEING.....	45
SUMMARY.....	48
STATEMENT OF PURPOSE & HYPOTHESES.....	48
Chapter 2: METHOD.....	51
SUBJECTS.....	51
PROCEDURE.....	52
INSTRUMENTS.....	53
DEMOGRAPHIC QUESTIONNAIRE.....	53
CHILDREN'S REPORT OF PARENTAL	
BEHAVIOR INVENTORY.....	54
CONCEPT OF GOD SCALES.....	56

SPIRITUAL WELL-BEING SCALE.....	59
STATISTICAL DESIGN.....	61
SUMMARY.....	65
Chapter 3: RESULTS.....	66
DEMOGRAPHIC DATA.....	66
DESCRIPTIVE DATA.....	69
RESULTS OF HYPOTHESES.....	72
HYPOTHESIS 1.....	72
HYPOTHESIS 2.....	75
SUMMARY.....	88
Chapter 4: DISCUSSION.....	90
DISCUSSION OF HYPOTHESES.....	91
HYPOTHESIS 1.....	91
HYPOTHESIS 2.....	93
SUMMARY.....	95
IMPLICATIONS OF RESULTS.....	96
SUMMARY & CONCLUDING REMARKS.....	99
REFERENCES.....	103
APPENDICES.....	120
APPENDIX A COMPLETE QUESTIONNAIRE PACKET.....	120
APPENDIX B RAW DATA TABLES.....	144
APPENDIX C STATISTICAL CALCULATIONS.....	149
APPENDIX D VITA.....	171

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE 1	PERCENTAGES FOR FREQUENCY OF CHURCH ATTENDANCE.....	67
TABLE 2	MEANS, STANDARD DEVIATIONS, & RANGE FOR THE INDEPENDENT AND DEPENDENT VARIABLES.....	70
TABLE 3	CORRELATIONS BETWEEN SWB SCORES AND CONCEPT OF GOD SCORES WITH SCORES ON CRPBI AND FATHER ABSENCE.....	74
TABLE 4	CORRELATION MATRIX FOR FOUR INDEPENDENT VARIABLES.....	77
TABLE 5	SUMMARY OF STEPWISE REGRESSION FOR THE DEPENDENT VARIABLE LOVING GOD.....	78
TABLE 6	SUMMARY OF STEPWISE REGRESSION FOR THE DEPENDENT VARIABLE CONTROLLING GOD.....	80
TABLE 7	SUMMARY OF STEPWISE REGRESSION FOR THE DEPENDENT VARIABLE WRATHFUL GOD.....	81
TABLE 8	SUMMARY OF STEPWISE REGRESSION FOR THE DEPENDENT VARIABLE KINDNESS.....	83
TABLE 9	SUMMARY OF THE STEPWISE REGRESSION FOR THE DEPENDENT VARIABLE SPIRITUAL WELL-BEING.....	84
TABLE 10	SUMMARY OF THE STEPWISE REGRESSION FOR THE DEPENDENT VARIABLE RELIGIOUS WELL-BEING.....	86

TABLE 11 SUMMARY FOR THE STEPWISE REGRESSION FOR THE
DEPENDENT VARIABLE EXISTENTIAL WELL-BEING.....87

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Someone once said, "Fathers have long been the forgotten parents, daughters the forgotten offspring" (Michael Lamb cited in Fields, 1983, p. 6). This is changing. With the advent of the women's movement increased emphasis has been placed on fathers, on daughters, and on their relationships. In the past decade a number of books have been published chronicling father-daughter relationships, or lack of relationships, and the effect of these relationships on women's lives (Anderson, 1983; Appleton, 1981; Fields, 1983; Hamilton, 1977; Hammer, 1982; Kopp, 1979; Laiken, 1981; Leonard, 1982; Meister, 1981; Rue, & Shanahan, 1978; Wakerman, 1984; Woolfolk, & Cross, 1982).

Research has indicated that the quality of the relationship between the father and child is significantly related to cognitive development, moral development, achievement motivation, and sex-role development (Lynn, 1974). Parents' influence in the home was found to revolve around three orthogonal dimensions, acceptance, firm control, and psychological

autonomy. These dimensions are important in understanding the relationship of parent behavior to the child's personality development (Becker, 1964; Goldin, 1969; Roe & Siegelman, 1963; Schaefer, 1965a & b; Siegelman, 1965). Taken together these three dimensions form a parenting style that can be referred to as authoritative (Baumrind, 1971). Parents who are authoritative (high love and high control) have children with attributes which are commonly associated with high levels of personality adjustment.

Do the dimensions of paternal acceptance and paternal control have any impact on a woman's spiritual development? Do women whose fathers were authoritative have higher levels of spiritual well-being than other women? Do women whose fathers were authoritative have better images of God? Since the days of Freud it has been thought that children's concept of God is based upon a projection of their father. Past research has indicated this may not necessarily be true. This research has focused on comparing adjectives to describe God with adjectives to describe self and parents. Past research has not looked at the relationship between the quality of a woman's relationship with her father and the quality of her relationship with God. This study

attempts to examine the importance of a woman's relationship with her father and discover whether his parenting style affects her view of God and level of spiritual well-being.

The rest of this chapter will review the literature on theories of feminine development, the research on the effects of father absence on heterosexual personality adjustment, dimensions of father's behavior and adjustment, as well as reviewing the literature on Concept of God and Spiritual Well-being. In addition, this chapter will include definitions of the terms used, and set forth the hypotheses of the study.

Review of Literature

The importance of fathers in female development has been a topic of new interest in the popular psychology literature; unfortunately researchers have not followed along as quickly. Although more research has been done on the father's role, most research has emphasized the father-son relationship. A major portion of the research on father-daughter relationships has centered on the father's contribution to feminine identity and

subsequent heterosexual relationships (Acheson, 1977; Fleck, Fuller, Malin, Miller, & Acheson, 1980; Johnson, M. M., 1982; Kristal, 1979; Musser, 1982), and personality adjustment (Fish & Biller, 1973; Fleck, et al., 1980; & Ragland, 1978). Since most of the research has focused on the father's role in feminine development we will begin by looking at the basic theories that explain the impact of the father on feminine development.

Theories of Feminine Development

One of the areas where the father is believed to have the biggest impact on his daughter is in her feminine development. There are three basic theories which have attempted to explain the father's role in his daughter's feminine development. The three theories are psychoanalytic theory, social learning theory, and Parson's social role theory.

Psychoanalytic Theory

The traditional psychoanalytic view of feminine development revolves around successful completion of the oedipal conflict. Freud (1933) stated that both boys and girls pass through the early phases of development

in the same way. He suggested in the phase of pre-oedipal attachment the mother is the central figure and primary love object for all children. During this phase the child's relationship to her mother can be described by what Forrest (1966) calls "primary dependency". The child is characterized by infantile survival needs. The oedipal conflict begins at the end of the attachment phase when the little girl begins to differentiate and become aware of herself as a separate identity. During the oedipal conflict the female switches love-objects from the mother to the father when she discovers she does not have a penis. Freud (1933) theorized that this led to feelings of inferiority, and therefore the girl became angry at her mother and blamed her for her lack of a penis. The young girl then attempts to replace her mother in her father's affections. During this phase it is not uncommon for a little girl to be openly seductive toward her father, and to be open in her contempt for her mother.

The resolution of the oedipal stage arises when the girl begins to realize that she will never replace her mother in her father's life and she begins to fear she will lose her mother's love. This fear of retaliation from the mother in the form of loss of love is the

primary motivation to repress the sexual fantasies involving the father.

Freud did not offer much hope for females in resolving their oedipal conflict. He believed that this fear is not as strong in girls as the fear of castration is for boys, and therefore males develop a stronger identification with their fathers than girls do with their mothers. Internalization of the father's prohibitions and the fear of the father's retaliatory measures directly relates to the formation of the superego or conscience. Freud believed that since the girl's fear is less, and because the identification and internalization is not as complete, the girl has an underdeveloped superego or conscience. Freud theorized that unless the father discouraged the young girl's fantasies she may not develop an adequate superego, resulting in her acting out the oedipal conflict later in life.

Henry Biller (1971) states "the father can foster the establishment of a positive feminine sex-role orientation by treating his daughter as a female and encouraging her to value her femininity" (p. 129). Marjorie Leonard (1966) stresses the importance of the

father's role in successful resolution of the oedipal phase. She states:

Following the oedipal conflict, the girl must establish a desexualized object-relationship to her father, enable her later to accept the feminine role without guilt or anxiety and to give love to a young man in her peer group... Crucial to the girl's development is whether or not her father was available to her as a love-object and whether or not he was capable of offering her affection without being seduced by her fantasies, or seducing her with his counter-oedipal feelings (pp. 332-333).

Lora Tessman (1982) states that the father can foster a positive de-sexualized relationship by his willingness to involve himself in the process. The father can do this by appreciating the daughter's femininity, and by encouraging her autonomy. Tessman states this is done by more than a distant pride. The father needs to treat his daughter as an interesting person in her own right; and he needs to show trust in her developing autonomous capacities during joint endeavors. He also has to exhibit his own capacity for excitement or enthusiasms

about discovery in work or play as he invites his daughter to participate in areas of mastery with him.

The father's role is equally important at the time of puberty. During adolescence oedipal issues resurface. Sexual behavior and attitudes exhibited as the adolescent female begins to interact more frequently with males of her own age are directly related to how the girl and her father experienced the earlier oedipal situation. If the girl has developed transparent, affectionate, de-sexualized interactions with her father she will be free of guilt or anxiety in relationships with males her own age. Colarusso and Nemiroff (1982) note that when the adolescent daughter begins to date, many oedipal feelings are stirred up in the middle-aged father by the introduction of a competitor. The father may feel like a neglected outsider as he observes a sexually charged relationship involving someone he loves. These feelings may be similar to what he experienced as a child. The father may respond by attempting to dominate and control the dating relationship, or he may involve himself in it inappropriately through excessive interest or teasing.

Leonard (1966) and Tessman (1982) both stress the importance of the father's resolution of his own oedipal

conflict. If the father is unable to provide the de-sexualized affection his daughter needs "his counter-oedipal response provokes inappropriate defense measures which will then be reciprocated in his daughter's response" (Leonard, 1966, p. 332).

If for some reason the father is absent or unavailable and the oedipal conflict is not resolved optimally, Leonard (1966) theorizes that one of two results may occur. The daughter may develop an idealized image of her father. This idealization may lead her to continually seek a love object similar to this ideal, but she will never be satisfied with the men she meets. The second result may be that a pre-oedipal narcissistic attitude may persist. The girl becomes unable to give love, but she seeks the narcissistic gratification in being loved. She may use her awareness of being attractive to boys to fulfill her need for adulation, and she may use sexuality as a means to that end. Cameron (1963) refers to this type of woman as being an emotionally immature adult who appears incapable of forming permanent and meaningful love relationships.

If the father is seductive towards his daughter due to his own poorly defended counter-oedipal wishes,

similar results may occur. The girl may have anxiety in her relationship with men due to a fear of her inability to control her sexual impulses, or she may develop conscious or unconscious hostility toward men as a defense against her unconscious oedipal wishes. The girl may seek to replace her father with a love object which satisfies her unconscious oedipal wishes.

To summarize, the psychoanalytic theories emphasize the resolution of the oedipal conflict in the establishment of feminine development. Leonard (1966) and Tessman (1982) both stress the importance for the daughter in experiencing a warm, affectionate, de-sexualized relationship with a father who has encouraged and affirmed the daughter's developing femininity. In order for this to happen the father must be secure enough in his own identity to enable the daughter to become secure in hers. Failure to resolve the oedipal conflict results in disturbance in future heterosexual relationships. Research which seems to substantiate the role of the father in subsequent heterosexual relationships will be addressed in a following section.

Social Learning Theory

The Social Learning theory holds that the daughter uses her parents as role models and is reinforced by

both parents for feminine behavior. Learning theorists such as Mowrer (1950) and Sears (1957) focused upon the importance of parental nurturance in the rewarding of the child's sex-appropriate behaviors. The child becomes strongly dependent on the parents for supplying nurturance, and learns to perform those behaviors which the parents reward. Maccoby and Jacklin (1974) concluded that mothers have the predominant role in the sex typing of the young child because she is available as a model during the child's early years. Lynn (1974) reports that some social learning theorists have made much of the boy's need to shift his identification from his mother to his father in order to establish his masculinity. The boy must look to his peers and other significant adults to help him define the masculine role by selectively reinforcing masculine behavior and punishing feminine behavior. However, social learning theorists do not emphasize the father-daughter relationship (Biller, 1971).

Some social learning theorists have found that a child will model after a person she envies or who possesses more power than she (Bandura & Walters, 1963; Kagan, 1958). Hetherington (1965) found children of both sexes tended to imitate the parent who was

dominant. If the mother was dominant girls tended to be more similar to the mother; if the father was dominant the girls were more similar to the father than were the girls in mother-dominant homes. Therefore, it appears that girls imitate their mothers whether or not she is dominant, but if the father is dominant, then the girls incorporate some of his traits into their personality. Biller (1971) believes that the key lies in the father's reinforcing the non-dominant mother's femininity thereby reinforcing their daughters in becoming like their mothers. He states:

However, in terms of the father's ability to reward particular behaviors it can be argued that he has a significant influence on his daughter's personality development. Paternal reinforcement of the girl's attempts to emulate her mother's behavior, and the father's general approval of the mother's behavior, seems particularly important (p. 130).

The social learning theory has stressed the father's role as a reinforcer and as a role model. By serving in these roles the father contributes to his daughter's feminine development.

Parsons' Theory

Talcott Parsons introduced his sex-role theory in 1955. He viewed the mother as very influential in the child's personality development, but not as significant as the father in the child's sex-role functioning (Biller, 1971). Parsons differentiated between two types of roles, instrumental and expressive. He believed that father plays an "instrumental" role in the family, and mother plays an "expressive" role in the family.

Father is the model of the instrumental role in the family. He is society's representative within the family, and the family's representative within society. He brings into the home the values of society such as socially appropriate behavior, culturally based conceptions of masculinity and femininity, the ability to delay gratification, and the disciplined pursuit of goals. He pries the children loose from mother-dependency so that they can grow up and become responsible adults in society. He supplies authority, discipline, and sound judgment. Furthermore, he has the ability to absorb the hostility generated by fulfilling his role (Lynn, 1974).

The mother, as the representative of the expressive role focuses her attention on the internal relationships of the family. She keeps the family running smoothly by facilitating conflict resolution between siblings, and between father and children.

Parsons' theory holds that both boys and girls are raised principally by the mother and she has an expressive relationship with both of them. However, the father rewards his male and female children differently. He encourages instrumental behavior in his son, and expressive behavior in his daughter.

Research has supported Parsons' theory. Tasch (1952) found that fathers viewed their daughters as more delicate and sensitive than their sons. He also found that fathers used physical punishment more frequently with their sons than with their daughters. They also tended to define household tasks in terms of their sex appropriateness; girls were to wash clothes and babysit their siblings. Lewis and Weintraub (1976) observed that fathers engage in more rough-and-tumble play with boys, and more cuddling and comforting play with girls. Goodenough (1957) observed much encouragement from fathers to their daughters to develop in social interaction. Eisenberg, Henderson, Kuhlmann,

and Hill (1967) found that six and ten year old children perceive their fathers a more instrumentally nurturant and their mothers as more affectionately nurturant.

Parsons believed that the daughter's identification was through the mother. He stated the female is prevented from significant interactions with her father because of the erotic elements in the relationship. Therefore, the mother-daughter bond is stronger and the female identifies primarily with her. The father encourages the young girl to model after her mother.

Johnson (1963) disagreed with Parsons on the source of sex-role identification. She proposed that sex-role orientation of both males and females results from identification with the father. She stated the young girl's sex-role behavior is learned via a reciprocal role that she learns as she interacts with her father. In Johnson's view it is imperative for the father to be expressive as well as instrumental. She proposes that through her interactions with her father the daughter learns expressiveness in a more mature form than the earlier infantile expressiveness that she learned as a result of her relationship with her mother. This theory implies that daughters of fathers who are unavailable or unable to be expressive may miss some critical training

in sex-appropriate behavior. The interactions that daughter has with her father are crucial in order to develop the necessary skills for comfortable interactions with men.

Summary

Psychoanalytic, social learning, and Parsons' theories all emphasize that the father plays an important role in feminine development. The psychoanalysts began by emphasizing the need for an intimate but de-sexualized relationship between the father and daughter to enhance future development. They stated that the critical times in this relationship during the oedipal conflict, and during puberty. The social learning theories emphasized the importance of the father as a model and reinforcer. Parsons emphasized the differences between the roles of parents within the family, and Johnson added to this by emphasizing the importance of the father's ability to be warm and expressive as well as instrumental in his relationship to his daughter. The need for warm, accepting relationships where the daughter's femininity is valued seems to be key in healthy development.

Review of Research Findings

The theories previously reviewed provide a framework for the research done on father-daughter relationships. In this section the research regarding the impact of the father upon his daughter will be summarized, as well as research on father absence. This section will conclude by discussing the two dimensions of father's behavior that have been found to be significant for healthy personality development.

Research on Father Absence

It has been observed that most of the information gathered about the importance of the father has been derived from the extensive research on father absence (Lamb, 1975). Once again, most of this research has been done on the effects of father absence on the lives of their sons. The research on fatherless women is scarce. Yet, as of 1984 there were five and a half million girls in the United States growing up without a father (Wakerman, 1984). This statistic implies that the research on father absence has a practical value in our society.

Father Absence and Heterosexual Development. Most of the research done on father absence and female

development has focused on the relationship between father absence and heterosexual development. A classic study was done by Mavis Hetherington (1972) on the effects of father absence on adolescent females' heterosexual adjustment and personality development. From previous research Hetherington concluded that there was minimal relationship between father absence and the development of daughters during preschool and elementary school years. However, as the girl approached adolescence the effects of her paternal deprivation began to emerge, thus supporting Leonard's theory (1966) regarding the re-emergence of the previous oedipal conflict in adolescence.

Hetherington found that girls whose father's were absent before five experienced the most difficulties in heterosexual interactions. Hetherington also found that there was a difference in the way the girls whose parents were divorced related to men and the way those whose fathers had died related to men. She found the daughters of widows exhibited greater inhibition, rigidity, avoidance, and restraint around males, whereas the daughters of divorcees exhibited greater proximity seeking and attention from males, early heterosexual behavior, and various forms of nonverbal communication

associated with openness and responsiveness.

Hetherington also noted evidence of more negative feelings toward the father in the daughters of divorcees than in the daughter of widows. The daughters of widows described their fathers as warmer and more competent than the daughters of divorced parents.

Elyce Wakerman (1984) states that as long as the daughter can keep her perfect fantasy father she is protected from the imperfection of reality, past or present. She explains the hostility exhibited by the daughters of divorce as a protective shield. Her father stands as a living symbol justifying her distrust. Since her father walked out on her, she seeks male approval with a vengeance hoping to obscure the paternal rejection. Wakerman's survey indicates daughters whose father was deceased described him as more warm and loving, good to mother, special, and tender than women whose father were absent through divorce, or women whose father was present. More women who lost their father through divorce characterized him as indifferent, weak, and irresponsible than either of the other two groups. This lends support to the theory that daughters of widows idealized their fathers and daughters of divorcees felt the most negative toward the male parent.

Research on the heterosexual adjustment of college age females from father absent homes is contradictory. A study by Hainline and Feig (1978) attempted to partially replicate Hetherington's study on college age females. Their results indicate father-absent subjects did not behave significantly different with male interviewers, as they did in Hetherington's study. However, Hainline and Feig did note that attitudinal differences about the acceptability of sexual behaviors did occur. The daughters of widows tended to have stricter views about sexual behavior than other subjects. They noted that differences did not extend to reports of actual sexual activity. Kristal (1979) and Musser (1982) both found that daughters who lost their fathers by divorce tended to be more promiscuous in their heterosexual relationships. Kristal (1979) did not find a significant difference between women whose father was absent due to death or divorce.

Hetherington (1973) concluded "...The effects of father absence on females may find its most important evidence in the lives of mature women" (p. 52). A later study by Hetherington (Hetherington & Parke, 1979) found that daughters of divorcees tended to marry earlier and were more likely to be pregnant at the time of marriage.

A nationwide survey conducted by Elyce Wakerman (1984) on father absent women, where the mean age was 42 years, found that women who did not have father or a step-father reported falling in love later. Women with step-fathers report earlier sexual experience. Wakerman also found fatherless women under the age of 25 "do have a penchant for disappointing romances" (p. 194). Within the fatherless group daughters of divorce had a greater tendency than daughters of widows to pursue destructive relationships. Wakerman also found that one third of the married fatherless women had been married more than once compared to one seventh of women from intact homes. Her survey and interviews appear to confirm Hetherington's study.

These studies on father absence confirm that the father plays an important role in future heterosexual relationships. If the father is absent the female is likely to engage in heterosexual behavior earlier, and to feel more anxiety in the dating situation. There is a tendency for women who lost their father young to overidealize his memory, or become negative towards this parental figure. Either way some generalization occurs

towards all males and effects future heterosexual relationships. As Wakerman wrote:

The girl who lost her father at an early age, owing to death or divorce, was gravely disappointed by the first man she ever loved. As a child, she interpreted his absence as a personal rejection; as a young adult, she is likely to struggle through the rejection through her relationships with men (1984, p. 198).

Father-absence and Personality Adjustment. Father absence has also been found to be related to other aspects of the daughter's life. Lynn and Sawrey (1959) found it may lead to increased dependency on the mother. Without the father the child misses the first opportunity to begin the separation-individuation process. Margaret Mahler characterizes the father as the "knight in shining armor" (Abelin, 1980, p. 152). He rescues the daughter from the dependence she has had on her mother. Abelim (1980) notes that girls have been observed to attach themselves earlier and more intensely to their fathers as compared to boys.

Research indicates personality adjustment is also effected by father absence. Allen Baggett (1967), in a

study of father-present, father-separated by death, and father-separated for other reasons (separation, divorce, desertion) among college age students found women whose fathers had died were less well adjusted than father-present women, and that both groups of father-absent women were less well adjusted at home than father-present women. Redding (1971) found that fewer children in classes for the emotionally disturbed had fathers living at home. Trunnell (1968) studied an outpatient population and found that the longer a child had been raised without a father, and the earlier the loss, the more severe the psychopathology.

Father absent women were also found to have higher levels of delinquency (Freud & Burlingham, 1943; Koller, 1971; Lynn, 1974). Lynn (1974) summarizes that "father absent girls may be more impulsive and may be less able to control their aggression than their father-present counterparts" (p. 264). Lynn also reports father loss has been related to alcoholism and suicide attempts in women.

Summary. The loss of father early in life appears to have profound effects on a woman's development. It effects her view of her self, as women who lose their father early secretly fear that they were responsible

for his departure. The loss of a father effects future heterosexual relationships. Women who lose their father through death tend to idealize his image, and women who lose their father through divorce tend to view their father (and other males) as negative. Both groups of women tend to have unrealistic expectations in their relationships with men. Father absence also appears to result in problems in personality adjustment. Research has not looked extensively at the effects of divorce on women who are able to maintain a warm relationship with their noncustodial father. If the father remains involved in his daughter's life she may feel the acceptance needed to enhance her heterosexual and personality adjustment. Thus far, studies have not explored the relationship between father absence and spiritual development.

Research on Father Presence and Daughter's Adjustment

Father absent studies do not always provide a valid picture of the father's influence on children. Pederson (1976) recommended researchers study daughters of fathers who were present in the home. Recently, more research has been done on the role of father acceptance in sexual and personality development.

Father Acceptance and Heterosexual Adjustment.

Research done on females from father present homes has focused in on the quality of the relationship as it relates to the daughter's heterosexual adjustment. Most of the research emphasized the importance of her father's level of acceptance on his daughter. Ragland (1978) studied the social and sexual self-esteem of women aged 18-22 who remembered their fathers as non-accepting when they were aged 10-14. She found that these women reported themselves as low in sexual and social self-esteem. She also surveyed girls 12-14 and found that those who perceived their fathers as non-accepting also reported low social and sexual self-esteem.

Acheson (1977) found that daughters who described their fathers as accepting engaged in heterosexual behaviors at a later age. This confirms Hetherington's (1972) study on heterosexual behaviors in daughters of divorcees discussed previously. The findings of Fleck, et. al., (1980) also confirm the importance of father acceptance in heterosexual adjustment. They found that college females whose father were psychologically absent engaged in heterosexual behaviors at a younger age.

Kristal (1979) found that women who had close, responsive fathers reported having more casual, friendly relationships with men, but were more discriminating about those men with whom they related sexually. Women who had distant fathers reported having fewer non-sexual relationships with men, as well as having many sexual relationships with men they knew and did not know well. Therefore, it appears that women who did not experience father acceptance engage in heterosexual behavior earlier, more often, and are less discriminating in sexual relationships than women who experienced acceptance.

Research has also been done on the relationship between father's psychological absence and heterosexual behavior. Psychological absence was defined as a lack of perceived father acceptance. They found significant correlations related to earlier age of first involvement in heterosexual behavior (i.e. first kiss; first petting; first intercourse); and in anxiety in heterosexual dating situations (Acheson, 1977). Fleck, et al., (1980) also found significant correlations between father psychological absence and greater extent and frequency of heterosexual behaviors, and greater anxiety in dating situations. Musser (1982) failed to

confirm these earlier findings regarding father psychological absence.

Father Acceptance and Personality Adjustment.

Father acceptance has also been found to be significantly related to the daughter's overall personality adjustment. Girls with low levels of acceptance or without a father were found to have significantly higher levels of overall anxiety (Hetherington, 1972; Fleck, et al., 1980).

Studies on self-esteem indicate that children who have warm and accepting fathers tend to have higher self-esteem, whereas fathers who are rejecting and neglecting seem to foster low self-esteem in their children (Coopersmith, 1967; Lynn, 1974). Rosenberg, (1965) and Marto (1982) found significant correlations between a father's self-esteem and the self-esteem of his daughter.

Fish and Biller (1973) measured college women's perceptions of their relationships with their father and their personality adjustment on the Adjective checklist. They found that women who perceived their fathers as having been very nurturant and positively interested in them scored high on the personal adjustment scale of the Adjective checklist. Women who perceived their fathers

as rejecting had low scores on the personal adjustment measure. Fleck, et al., (1980) report that psychological absence by the father correlates with increased anxiety as a personality trait. Musser (1982) confirmed these findings. He found that as the level of father's acceptance increased, the daughter rated herself as having a higher level of personality adjustment.

Summary. It appears that the father-daughter relationship relates to heterosexual adjustment and behavior, and personality adjustment. Daughters who report warm, nurturant, and accepting relationships with their father appear to engage in heterosexual behavior at later age, yet have more comfortable non-sexual relationships with men than do women who report rejecting relationships with their fathers. Accepting relationships also foster healthy personality development in women.

Although heterosexual and personality adjustment has been related to feeling accepted by fathers, research has not been done on the relationship between father's acceptance and a woman's spiritual adjustment. This study examines this question.

Dimensions of Father's Behavior and Adjustment

As previously established, the dimensions of perceived father acceptance is an important aspect of a female's overall adjustment. Along with the dimension of acceptance, a dimension of firm discipline or control, and a dimension of psychological autonomy have also been found to related to children's adjustment (Schaefer, 1965b). Schaefer (1965a) stated "a child's perception of his parents' behavior may be more related to his adjustment than is the actual behavior of his parents" (p. 413). Symonds (1939) was the first to determine that two major dimensions of parent behavior, acceptance-rejection and dominance-submission, seemed to relate to child's behavior. Schaefer (1959) derived a circumplex ordering the two dimensions for maternal behavior. Becker and Krug (1964) showed that this two-dimensional circumplex ordering could be applied to paternal behavior as it related to both male and female children.

Factor analysis of the inventory developed by Schaefer (1965a) indicated that there were three dimensions rather than two (Schaefer, 1965b). Schaefer identified the dimensions as acceptance verses rejection, psychological autonomy versus psychological

control, and firm control versus lax control.

Acceptance versus rejection distinguishes parents who are perceived as detached and uninvolved from those who are perceived as accepting, affectionate, approving, understanding, sensitive to the child's needs and point of view, use much praise in discipline, and seek out the child and enjoy her company (Schaefer, 1959; Becker, 1964). Psychological autonomy versus psychological control distinguishes parents who are perceived as using covert, psychological methods of controlling the child's activities and behaviors, therefore inhibiting individuation and autonomy. Parents who are perceived as firmly controlling as opposed to lax in control make rules and regulations, set limits on the child's activities, and enforce rules and limits (Schaefer, 1965b).

As previously discussed, perceived father acceptance has been shown to be related to many areas of adjustment for females. The dimension of control has not received as much attention in the research on father-daughter relationships.

Early studies on parent-child relations found parents of delinquents were rejecting and either lax or erratic in their use of discipline (Gleuck & Glueck,

1950). In summarizing research on moral development Lynn (1974) found that a combination of a nonauthoritative, warm and interested father and an authoritative, warm, and involved mother tended to produce inadequate moral development in their daughter. This indicates that a warm, but authoritative father may be needed to enhance moral development in girls.

An interesting study by Fischer (1973) explored the relationship between what he called casual behavior on the part of the father and frequency of orgasm in women. Casual behavior on the part of the father is defined as making few rules and not enforcing them, not thinking about, planning for, or worrying about the child. He found women whose fathers were demanding, set high standards, imposed strict regulations, valued honesty, morality, and the strict adherence to rules, while providing acceptance of the daughter as well as pride tended to be more orgasmic than women of casual fathers.

In his classic study on self-esteem, Coopersmith (1967) concluded that definite limits and a set of rules was an important part of the development of high self-esteem in children. If reasonable limits are placed on the child within a context of a positive relationship

the child will internalize a set of standards and values necessary for a secure identity.

Cruse, Foss, and Colbert (1981) used a modified version of Schaefer's Child's Report of Parental Behavior Inventory (CRPBI) to test children's perception of their parents' behavior and their own self-esteem. They found significant correlations between perceptions of father's behavior and self-concept on the dimensions of Control by Guilt and Inconsistent Discipline. They did not find correlations between lax discipline and self-esteem, a finding which contradicts Coopersmith's conclusions. If they had used the full form of the CRPBI results might have been more consistent with Coopersmith. However, their findings do support the conclusion that control by guilt and hostile control have a negative relationship with self-esteem.

A study by McThomas (1976) also found high levels of father control beneficial to the development of high self-esteem in girls. Becker (1964), however, concluded that restrictive discipline fosters inhibited behavior. He found that warm-restrictive parents tended to have passive, well-socialized children. Baumrind (1968) found warm, controlling parents to have responsible, assertive, self-reliant children. The discrepancy found

in their results of these studies may be due to the differences in the definition of restrictiveness. In Becker's model restrictiveness seems to imply hostility as it enforces rules that restrict, bind, and stifle the child. In Baumrind's model restrictiveness deals with reasonable limit setting while encouraging individuality and autonomy.

Diane Baumrind (1966, 1968, 1971) derived three types of parenting styles that correspond to the dimensions of acceptance and control. She labeled these styles authoritative (high control, high love), authoritarian (high control, low love), and permissive (high love, low control).

The authoritarian parent attempts to shape, control and evaluate the child's behavior and attitudes according to set absolute standards. It is more important to these parents that the child obeys the absolute standards they set. Authoritarian parents may use punitive, forceful means to limit the child's expression of self-will in areas where his or her behavior or beliefs conflict with what is considered proper conduct. The child is expected to accept without question the parents word as right and verbal interchange is not encouraged. These parents would be

high on firm control, but low on psychological autonomy and acceptance.

Baumrind describes the authoritative parent as one who attempts:

to direct the child's activities but in a rational, issue-oriented manner. She encourages verbal give and take, and shares with the child the reasoning behind her policy. She values both expressive and instrumental attributes, both autonomous self-will and disciplined conformity. Therefore she exerts firm control at points of parent-child divergence, but does not hem the child in with restrictions. She recognizes her own special rights as an adult, but also the child's individual interests and special ways. The authoritative parent affirms the child's present qualities, but also sets standards for future conduct. She uses reason as well as power to achieve her objectives. She does not base her decisions on group consensus or the individual child's desires; but also does not regard herself as infallible or divinely inspired (1968, p. 261).

The authoritative parent is high in both control and in acceptance, while allowing the child to gain psychological autonomy.

The permissive parent will tend to be affirming and accepting, while making few demands on the child's behavior. This type of parent rarely exercises control over the child. When necessary this parent will use reason and avoid the use of power in attempting to accomplish parental goals. This type of parent would be high on acceptance, and low on firm control. They may be either high or low on psychological autonomy.

John Musser (1982) was the first to study the relationship of a combination of the dimensions of control and acceptance to personality adjustment and heterosexual behaviors. Musser equated high acceptance and high control to the authoritative parenting style. He did not include the dimension of Psychological Autonomy versus Psychological Control. Although Musser did not find an effect for heterosexual behavior, his study did confirm the importance of the added dimension of control in personality adjustment. He found that the dimension of father control accounted for more variance on the level of the daughter's adjustment than the dimension of father adjustment. Musser stated "it

appears that authoritative fathers (high control, high acceptance), therefore, have daughters who rate themselves as being better adjusted" (p. 68).

Summary. The research indicates that daughters who perceive their fathers as accepting, and yet feel he sets firm, consistent limits have higher self-esteem and personality adjustment. Daughters who are raised in a father absent home may miss both of these dimensions and therefore may have decreased self-esteem and personality adjustment, as well as problems in heterosexual relationships. Some women from broken homes may not experience these symptoms if the father and daughter were able to maintain a warm accepting relationship, as well as the father continuing to be a part of the limit setting and disciplining process. This type of relationship after a divorce seems to be rare. Even in the best of divorces there may be some residual effects resulting in feelings of rejection.

The ideal Father is one who can be characterized as authoritative. He provides needed structure and security in an environment of nurturance and acceptance, thereby allowing his daughter to grow and develop into a self-reliant individual. The authoritative father should also enhance the spiritual aspect of his

daughter's life, thereby enhancing her sense of spiritual well-being

Concept of God

Where does a girl first learn about God? Research on the development of God images has been varied. Most would agree that her first introduction to God comes through her family. Disagreement exists on who or what the God image is based. Some believe that God is nothing more than a projection of our father. Freud (1913) stated:

God is in every case modeled after the father, and that our personal relation to God is dependent upon our relation to our physical father, fluctuating and changing with him, and that God at bottom is nothing but an exalted father (1913, p. 244).

God, in Freudian theory was nothing more than a projected image of our own father. Adlerian theory suggests God concepts may be more consistent with those of the preferred parent than with either mother or father per se (Nelson, 1971). Social learning theory suggests that God-concepts would be more like the same

sex parent (Spilka, Addison, & Rosensohn, 1975). A third hypothesis suggests that a person's concept of God depends upon her experience of herself, as a self-directing person (Spilka, et al., 1975). A more general version of the parental projection hypothesis was set forth by Spiro and D'Andrade (in Beit-Hallahmi & Argyle, 1975). This hypothesis states that in every society there is a connection between early socialization experiences and beliefs regarding supernatural beings.

Researchers have attempted to test the projection hypothesis with conflicting results. Vergote, Tamayo, Pasquali, Bonami, Pattyn, and Custers (1969), investigated the differences between maternal and paternal characteristics of God. Subjects rated each of their parents and God on eighteen maternal and eighteen paternal characteristics. They found that the image of God is more paternal than maternal. Nelson and Jones (1957) originally tested the correlation between concept of God and those for father by using a Q-sort method. They found that for their sample (n=16) the concept of God correlated more highly with mother. Other studies using the Q-sort had mixed results. Strunk (1959) found that both the concepts of father and mother were significantly correlated with the concept of God. Godin

and Hallez (1964) found that in general the correlations of the concept of God appeared stronger and more frequent with the maternal image among men, and the paternal image among women. They also found when there was a marked preference for one parent the God concept correlates highly with the concept of the preferred parent.

Nelson (1971) set out to specifically test the preferred parent hypothesis. He found the God-concept correlated higher with the concept of the preferred parent. When there was no preference between the parents, the God/father and God/mother correlations were equal. Nelson explains this as an indication of a more harmonious family, and that both parents are seen closer to the ideal of perfection, which is God. Nicholson and Edwards (1979) also indicate that there are some small, positive relationships between concepts of God and concepts of most admired or same-sexed parent.

Support was found for the self-theory hypothesis in studies by Spilka, Rosensohn, and Tener (1973) and Benson and Spilka (1973). Benson and Spilka (1973) found that self-esteem related positively to loving God-images and negatively to rejecting impersonal-controlling definitions of God. They found that self-

esteem was positively correlated to loving God and Kindly Father images. Self-esteem was negatively correlated with rejecting God-images, such a Vindictive God, Impersonal Allness, Controlling God, and Stern Father. This suggests that impersonality, rigid control, and vindictiveness may have been to some degree perceived as dimensions or components of nonlove. They state that by the process of elimination it seems appropriate to argue that self-esteem influences God-images. They add that "parents and peers may influence both God-images and self-esteem. For example, rejecting parents might induce low self-esteem, and Ss may define God in terms similar to the way they view their parents (which could include a rejecting image in this case)" (p. 306). As seen earlier, self views are often correlated with views of parents and this in turn may influence concepts of God.

Spilka, Addison, and Rosensohn (1975) attempted to develop a way to test the competing theories by using partial correlation methods. They attempted to remove the effects of self and father to test the mother associations; parental evaluations were removed to test the self-esteem theory; and removing the self and other parent effects for each parent in turn. They gave 198

catholic high school students a 12-item semantic differential to assess parent, self, and God images. This scale dealt with two major dimensions, namely loving and controlling. A number of the Adjective rating of God scales constructed by Gorsuch (1968) were also used in order to gain a more complete perspective on God concepts. They also gave each subject a 23-item version of the Coopersmith Self-esteem Inventory, and the Attitudes toward Parents scale.

Spilka, et al., (1975) found no substantive evidence in favor of the Freudian view. They cautiously suggest that parental preference on the part of females may tie to God percepts. They also found that females who viewed themselves as loving or controlling are positively related to like views of God. Females with high self-esteem had significant correlations with the percepts of a loving God, a traditional Christian God, God of kindness, and a non-deistic image.

In discussing their results Spilka, Addison, and Rosensohn note "there is also more than a passing suggestion, specifically among the females, that the control and love dimensions are not necessarily negatively associated (1975, p. 163). Both controlling mother and father affiliate with the concept of an omni-

God image. They hypothesize that the apparent identification of omniness, control, and love in the female sample may reflect an inference of affectional concern from the presence of parents.

The authors of this study note that it might have been better to have utilized a broader spectrum of trait characteristics for self and parent than they employed. They also note that the loving and control dimensions "did seem a priori to be rather central ones when one conceives of the role stereotypes assigned to both parents and God" (Spilka, et al., 1975, p. 164). It is important to note that they used scales that measured attitudes towards parents, not actual behaviors of parents.

Nicholson and Edwards (1979) gathered samples of 105 and 131 persons ranging from thirteen to seventy-three years and included normal and hospitalized adults, college students and Sunday school attenders. They compared images of God with those of one's mother and father using four methods of statistical procedures which fell into two categories: the correlational approach and the difference approach. They found that the methods were consistent with one another, but still leave room for variation among the findings. They also

found that different results are not only a function of the use of various statistical procedures, but also the nature of the samples studied and the measures used. The authors note the presence of a wide variety of influencing factors such as developmental, personality, and social possibilities along with religious affiliation and background, age of conversion, etc., may also have an influence on concept of God.

A recent survey compared concept of parent's personalities to concepts of the personality of God in 196 adults (Justice & Lambert, 1986). (The results of this survey suggest that there is a correlation between subjects' image of their parents and their image of God. An interesting finding of this survey is that subjects who reported having been "inappropriately sexually handled by their father or mother", and/or they had "felt sexually desired by their father or mother" reported a mean God image from 17 to 42 percentage points below the mean of those persons who had not had comparable experiences with their parents. That is, these individuals who had a less positive view of God than individuals who had not experienced sexual abuse. This may indicate that parents behavior has a strong influence on concept of God.

Studies attempting to test the projection theories are plagued with methodological problems. Most studies use a semantic differential checklist against the same checklist used with parental figures. As Beit-Hallahmi and Argyle mention "...samples in most cases were small and were selected unsystematically" (1975, p. 73). Matching profiles indicate evidence for a projection theory, but as Spilka, Hood, and Gorsuch (1985) note this conclusion fails to consider that any two living objects highly valued will have similar profiles and so will correlate. They add that as of yet there is not an established procedure by which the theory can be tested.

Summary. The research findings indicate that while the projection theory can not be substantially proved, research does seem to indicate that there is a similarity between concepts of God and parental images. Yet, within Christian tradition God is viewed as Father. It is important to remember that God is self naming, and He names Himself Father (Quere, 1985). In experiencing God as a father, women are bound to enter into the relationship with preconceived ideas of what a father is like from their own relationship with their own father. Research suggests that women whose fathers are accepting, offer firm control, and psychological

autonomy have better self-esteem, and overall adjustment than other women. The dimensions of control and love are also present in relationship with God. God is a loving and accepting, yet he also sets limits on and disciplines His children. Does a woman who perceives of her father as offering acceptance and control view these same traits in her concept of God? This study attempts to address this question.

Spiritual Well-being

Spiritual well-being has been broadly defined as "the affirmation of life in a relationship with God, self, community and environment that nurtures and celebrates wholeness" (National Inter-faith Coalition on Aging, 1979, p. 1). This definition includes a religious component and a social-psychological component. According to Moberg (1971) spiritual well-being can be conceptualized as being two-faceted, with both vertical and horizontal components. Ellison (1983) proposes that the vertical dimension refers to our sense of well-being in relation to God. The horizontal dimension refers to a sense of life purpose and life satisfaction, with no reference to anything specifically religious.

Ellison (1982) states that it is the spirit that allows for our seeking for meaning and purpose in life.

He said:

...it is the spirit which synthesizes the total personality...the spiritual dimension does not exist in isolation from our psyche and soma, but provides an integrative force. It is effects and is effected by our physical state, feelings, thoughts and relationships (p.332).

We can not be spiritually healthy and psychologically unhealthy or vice versa.

Ellison views spiritual well-being as a measure of the expression of spiritual health rather than of spiritual health per se. The relationship of spiritual well-being to spiritual health is "much like the color of one's complexion and pulse rate as expressions of good health" (1983, p. 332).

In order test the two facets of spiritual well-being, Ellison and Paloutzian designed a Spiritual Well-being scale (SWB) which measures both Religious Well-being (RWB) and Existential Well-being (EWB). The scale consists of ten items measuring the vertical dimension of one's relationship to God (RWB) and ten items

measuring the horizontal component of one's sense of purpose and satisfaction in life (EWB). Taken together these two scales form the total Spiritual Well-being score.

Spiritual Well-being has been found to correlate positively with several variables. As could be expected there are positive relationships with several religious variables. Ellison and Economos (1981) found Spiritual Well-being to be related to doctrinal beliefs, worship orientation, devotional practices, number of Sunday services attended, and amount of time in devotions. Bufford (1984), too, found positive relationships between frequency of church attendance and frequency and duration of devotions. He also found positive relations between frequency of family devotions, importance of religion, religious knowledge, spiritual maturity, financial condition, and the intrinsic scale on the Religious Orientation Scale.

There appears to be a positive relationship to self-concept (Campise, Ellison, & Kinsman, 1979). There also is indication that spiritual well-being may facilitate interpersonal intimacy (Ellison, 1982). Spiritual well-being correlates negatively with loneliness (Paloutzian & Ellison, 1979a,b,c).

Spiritual well-being has also been found to be positively correlated with perceived quality of parent-child relationships, perceived family togetherness, perceived social competence (Campise, Ellison, Kinsman, 1979). Peer relations as a child were also found to correlate significantly with Spiritual well-being (Ellison and Paloutzian, 1978). Mashburn (1986) found marital satisfaction and spiritual well-being to be positively correlated.

Summary. Preliminary studies on spiritual well-being indicate relationships with many variables. It is of interest that spiritual well-being correlates significantly with perceived quality of parent-child relationships. Campise, et al., (1979) do not report how they measure the quality of the relationship. It would seem that women who perceived their fathers as providing acceptance, firm control, and psychological autonomy would have higher scores on all three scales of the spiritual well-being scale.

Statement of Purpose and Hypotheses

Authoritative fathering styles have been found to be related to higher self-esteem and overall personality

adjustment in their daughters. Spiritual well-being has also been found to be related to self-esteem and satisfaction in life. It seems that a woman's relationship with her father effects her spiritual well-being, as well as how she views God. This present effort attempts to study the relationship between fathers parenting style and view of God and Spiritual Well-being. It also attempts to ascertain whether there is a difference in the spiritual well-being and concept of God between women whose fathers were absent during any portion of time from birth to sixteen years of age and those whose father was in the home for all sixteen years. It is hypothesized that:

1. There will be a relationship between independent variables of the three scores on the Children's Report of Parent Behavior Inventory (CRPBI) (Acceptance vs. Rejection, Psychological Control vs. Psychological Autonomy, and Lax Discipline vs. Firm Discipline), and the number of years father was absent from the home (0-16) with the dependent variables Spiritual Well-being (SWB), Existential Well-being (EWB), Religious Well-being (RWB), and the seven concept of God scales (Wrathfulness, Traditional Christian, Kindness, Omniness,

Deisticness, Loving God, and Controlling God) in the following directions:

- a. SWB and its subscales will positively correlate with the Acceptance score, and negatively correlate with Psychological Control, Lax Discipline, and number of years father was absent from the home.
 - b. Traditional Christian, Kindness, Omniness, Deisticness, and Loving God scores will positively correlate with the Acceptance score; they will negatively correlate with Psychological Control, Lax Discipline, and number of years father was absent from the home.
 - c. Wrathfulness and Controlling God scores will negatively correlate with Acceptance scores, and positively correlate with Psychological Control, Lax Discipline, and number of years father was absent from the home.
2. A weighted linear combination of scores from the CRPBI scales and father absence will account for significantly more variance on Spiritual Well-being and its subscales, and the concept of God scales than any of the variables alone.

CHAPTER 2

METHOD

This chapter examines the selection of subjects, the procedure used to gather data, a description of the instruments, and a description of the statistical design used to analyze the data.

Subjects

The subjects for this study were women who were currently enrolled in undergraduate courses at Messiah College. A total of 200 names were randomly selected from a list of female students using a random numbers table. Of the 200 women who were sent questionnaire packets 127 of them responded. Their ages ranged from 18 to 47, with a mean age of 20.35 (s.d. 3.50).

Messiah College is a four year liberal arts college located in Grantham, Pennsylvania. It is owned and operated by the Brethren in Christ Church, and seeks to help students integrate their Christian faith with learning. There is a total enrollment of 1,846

students; 1,169 of the students are female. Messiah College offers majors in 24 areas of study. Students are required to rank in the top half of their graduating high school class, and receive a composite score of 19 on the ACT, or a combined score of 850 on the SAT. Fifty-four percent of the students in the freshman class are from Pennsylvania, 94% live in college housing, 3% have minority backgrounds, and 1% are foreign students.

Procedure

The test packet was hand delivered to the on-campus mailbox of each woman selected by the random numbers table. Each packet contained a letter explaining the nature of the study and requesting the subject's participation. Each packet also included a questionnaire booklet containing a demographic questionnaire, the Father form of the Children's Report of Parental Behavior Inventory (CRPBI), the Adjective Checklist, and the Adjective Rating of God Scale used to measure concept of God, and the Spiritual Well-being scale. The entire questionnaire may be found in Appendix A. The packet also included a self-addressed stamped envelope to use to return the questionnaire to

the investigator, and a postcard to be sent to the examiner indicating the woman's desire to receive a summary of the study. Each participant who indicated interest received a brief description of the major results a conclusions of the study. A follow-up postcard was sent two weeks later to each woman to remind her to complete the questionnaire and to sent it back quickly. Each participant was assured of anonymity and confidentiality.

Instruments

Demographic Questionnaire

The demographic questionnaire was designed by the author. Data was collected pertaining to age at last birthday, current marital status, educational level, current major, occupation of father or head of household, church attendance, and profession of faith. Questions were also asked pertaining to the constellation of the family of origin, including siblings, father presence or absence, if absent why he was gone (death or divorce), number of years of father absence, and was there a step-father present. A space

was provided for women to write anything they wanted to express about their relationship with their father.

Children's Report of Parental Behavior

The revised 192-item form of the Children's Report of Parental Behavior developed by Schaefer (1965a, b) was used to measure perceptions of the father's behavior. The test consists of six 16-item scales and twelve 8-item scales. Subjects are asked to rate their father's behavior as like, somewhat like, or not like each item. These responses were scored 3, 2, 1, respectively, and summed to yield scores on individual subscales. The eighteen subscales are: acceptance, child-centeredness, possessiveness, rejection, control, enforcement, positive involvement, intrusiveness, control through guilt, hostile control, inconsistent discipline, non-enforcement, acceptance of individuation, lax discipline, instilling persistent anxiety, hostile detachment, withdrawal of relations, and extreme autonomy. Factor analyses of the items has indicated three main dimensions underlying the scales: acceptance vs. rejection; firm control vs. lax control; and psychological autonomy vs. psychological control. Scores on the following scales were used to obtain the score for the acceptance verses rejection dimension:

Acceptance + Acceptance of Individuation + Positive Involvement + Child-centeredness - Hostile Detachment - Rejection. The higher the score the more accepting the father was perceived. The highest score possible was 136. Scores on Psychological Autonomy versus Psychological Control were: Hostile Control + Control through Guilt + Instilling Persistent Anxiety + Possessiveness + Intrusiveness + Withdrawal of Relations. The higher the score the more psychologically controlling the father was perceived. The highest possible score is 168. Firm Discipline vs. Lax Discipline scores are obtained from: Nonenforcement + Lax Discipline + Extreme Autonomy + Inconsistent Discipline - Control - Enforcement. The higher the score the laxer the perceived discipline. The highest score possible on this scale was 80.

The Children's Report of Parent Behavior Inventory was selected for this study since it has produced a well-replicated factor structure (Armentrout & Burger, 1972; Cross, 1969; Renson, Schaefer, & Levy, 1968; Schaefer, 1965b) and it is designed to measure the point of view of the child. This instrument has also been shown as a useful measure for assessing young adults' memories of their parents' behaviors. Researchers have

utilized a college student population and found that factor structure for college females was similar to other populations (Armentrout & Burger, 1972; Cross, 1969).

Concept of God Scales

In order to measure each woman's concept of God two scales were employed. The first was a 12-item semantic differential constructed by Benson and Spilka (1973). This device dealt with two major dimensions which seem central to God images (Spilka, Addison, & Rosensohn, 1975): affection and discipline. Scores on the following six pairs of adjectives were summed to yield a Loving God index: close-distant, rejecting-accepting, loving-hating, damning-saving, unforgiving-forgiving, and approving-disapproving. Each item was scored 0 to 6. The maximum Loving God was 36. Scores on the following six pairs of adjectives were summed to give a Controlling God index: demanding-not demanding, freeing-restricting, strong-weak, controlling-uncontrolling, strict-lenient, and permissive-rigid. The same scoring procedure was used, with 36 representing the maximum Controlling God score. This scale was shown to have adequate internal consistency reliability for research purposes with .72 for the

Loving God scale and .60 for the Controlling God measure (Benson & Spilka, 1973).

The second concept of God scale in this study was the Adjective rating of God scale constructed by Gorsuch (1968). Gorsuch constructed this scale building on prior research.

Gorsuch administered 91 adjectives and eight undescribed random variables to 585 undergraduate psychology students encompassing various religious denominations. Primary, secondary, and tertiary factors were analyzed resulting in the inclusion of 11 factors and 76 adjectives. To be included in the scale each variable loaded not less than .40 on the factor; each variable had its strongest loading on the factor, and each variable had no loading on any other factor within .10 of its major loading.

The version of the scale used for this study included only the five factors used by Spilka, et al., (1975) which had the highest internal consistency reliability using 46 of the adjectives. The factors included in this study are: Traditional Christian, Kindliness, Wrathfulness, Deisticness, and Omniness.

Traditional Christian refers to the concept of "a deity who is a deity and yet is actively concerned for

and involved with mankind (Gorsuch, 1968, p. 60). The reliability of the scale was .94 and included 15 adjectives.

Kindliness refers to a God who is kindly disposed toward mankind. Gorsuch does not include the reliability for this factor. There are twelve items which measure this factor.

Wrathfulness refers to the way in which God stands in judgment over mankind. This factor contains eleven adjectives and had a reliability of .83.

Deisticness refers to the view that God is "out there" or "is so transcendent that he has little if any relationship to the world of human existence" (Gorsuch, 1968, p. 62). Gorsuch states that those who rate high on this scale would not be expected to be deeply involved in most phases of religious activity. The reliability on this scale is .71.

The fifth scale, Omniness, refers to the conceptualization of God in which he is given a human characteristic such as potent, and this is raised to the infinite power. The four adjectives on this scale had a reliability of .89.

The women were given the list of 46 adjectives and were asked to rate whether that word (1) does not

describe God; (2) describes God; or (3) describes God particularly well. Each woman was asked to place 1, 2, or 3 in the appropriate box. The words in each factor were added together to obtain the score for that factor. Scores could range from 15 to 45 on traditional Christian; 12 to 36 on kindness; 11 to 33 on wrathfulness; and 4 to 12 on both deisticness and omniness.

Spiritual Well-being Scale

The Spiritual Well-being Scale developed by Paloutzian and Ellison (1979) is a 20 item likert-type scale. Each item is responded to on a six point scale ranging from strongly agree to strongly disagree. Responses for each of the items are assigned a numerical value of 1-6. Ten of the items are designed to measure Religious Well-being (RWB), and 10 of the items measure Existential Well-being (EWB). A combined score provides an overall Spiritual Well-being (SWB) score. Items pertaining to RWB contain a reference to God, and those pertaining to EWB deal with life direction and life satisfaction.

Paloutzian and Ellison (1979) report test-retest reliability of .93 (SWB), .96 (RWB), and .86 (EWB). Coefficient alpha, reflecting internal consistency were

.89 (SWB), .87 (RWB), .78 (EWB), suggesting that the SWB scale and subscales have high reliability and internal consistency. Face validity is suggested by the item content.

Additional research on the Spiritual Well-being scale has shown it can be used as a measure of an individual's quality of life. Ellison and Economos (1981) found strong positive correlations between spiritual well-being and self-esteem, as well as between spiritual well-being and doctrinal and devotional beliefs and behaviors which emphasize God's acceptance and affirmation of the individual. The Spiritual Well-being scale correlated negatively with the UCLA Loneliness Scale, and positively with the Purpose in Life Test, intrinsic religious orientation, self-esteem, and social skills (Bufford, 1984; Campise, Ellison, & Kinsman, 1979; Ellison, & Economos, 1981; Ellison, & Paloutzian, 1978, 1979; Paloutzian, & Ellison, 1979a,b, 1982). Positive correlations were also found between spiritual well-being and perceived quality of parent-child relationships and family togetherness (Campise, et al., 1979).

This scale is being used for this study because it deals with the relationship to the divine, responses

reflect personal experiences, items refer to satisfaction, positive and negative feelings, purpose and meaning and sense of being valued which are commonly accepted indicators of well-being and intrapersonal health (Ellison, 1982).

Statistical Design

All statistical analysis were computed by the use of the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences PC version (Nie, Hall, Jenkins, Steinbrenner, & Bent, 1984). An IBM XT computer was used to perform all of the computations.

Hypotheses' 1a-c (correlations of CRPBI scores, number of years father was absent with SWB subscales and Concept of God scores) were tested using Pearson Product Moment correlations.

Hypothesis 2 (a weighted linear combination of scores from the CRPBI scales and father absence will account for significantly more variance on Spiritual Well-being and its subscales, and the Concept of God scales than any of the variables alone) was tested by the statistical procedure of Multiple regression. Multiple regressions were computed for each of the

dependent variables (Existential well-being; Religious well-being; Spiritual well-being; Loving God; Controlling God; Wrathfulness; Traditional Christian; Kindness; Deisticness; and Omniness). The independent variables in each of the regression analyses were the three scores on the CRPBI (acceptance vs. rejection; psychological control vs. autonomy; and lax discipline vs. firm discipline) and the number of years the father was absent from the home (0 to 16).

Multiple regression is a statistical technique which may be used whenever a dependent variable is to be studied in relationship to one or more independent variables (Cohen & Cohen, 1975). Cohen and Cohen stated "The greatest virtue of the Multiple Regression/Correlation system is its capacity to mirror, with high fidelity, the complexity of the relationships that characterize the behavioral sciences" (p. 7). Regression can be used to measure the degree of linear relationship between a dependent variable and one or more independent variables. The first step is to determine the slope of the line that best fits the data with the least amount of error. A regression equation is formed, which provides a weight for each of the independent variables (IV). Every observed value of the

IV is multiplied by this weight (called a constant). When the regression equation is applied to the IV values for given data, an estimated value of the dependent variable will be given (Y) which will be as close to the actual scores on the dependent variable as possible (Cohen & Cohen, 1975). In order to test the relationship between the dependent and independent variables, a multiple correlation (R) score is calculated. The proportion of the dependent variable's variance shared with the weighted IVs is expressed in the form of multiple correlation squared (R^2).

Not only does Multiple regression determine the relationship between a dependent variable and two or more independent variables, it can also determine the contribution of each IV to the relationship. When an independent variable is added to the equation and there is a large change in R^2 the added variable provides unique information about the dependent variable that is not available from other IV's in the equation. The signed square root of the increase is called the part correlation coefficient or the squared semipartial correlation coefficient. It is important to note that the square of the part coefficient tells only how much R^2 increases when a variable is added to the regression

equation. It does not indicate what proportion of the unexplained variation this increase constitutes (Cohen & Cohen, 1975; Norusis, 1986). To describe the IV's participation in determining the multiple correlation, a partial correlation coefficient is computed. The squared partial correlation is the correlation between the independent variable and the dependent variable when the linear effects of the other independent variables have been taken into account. It answers the question "How much of the Y variance is estimated by this variable which is not estimated by the other independent variables?"

Multiple regression was used to determine the degree to which each of the dependent variables (Spiritual Well-being and its subscales, and the Concept of God scales) was linearly related to the four independent variables.

The stepwise regression technique was used to determine the contribution of each independent variable to the relationship. In this technique each variable is added to the equation if it meets entry requirements. If all of the variables fail to meet the entry requirement then the procedure terminates with no independent variables in the equation. If the variable

passes the criterion, the second variable is selected based on the highest partial correlation. If it passes entry criteria, it then enters the equation, and so on until all the variables which pass the criterion are entered. The criterion for the SPSS/PC+ program is .05 for probability of F-to-enter, and 3.84 for F-to-enter (Norusis, 1986).

Summary

A random sample of 200 college female students from Messiah College were sent questionnaire packets including: Background information, Child's Report of Parental Behavior Inventory (CRPBI), Adjective Checklist, Adjective Rating of God, and Spiritual Well-being scale. Each booklet returned was hand scored and three scores were obtained from the CRPBI; two scores were obtained from the Adjective Checklist; five scores were obtained from the Adjective rating of God; and three scores from the Spiritual Well-being scale. These scores and the number of years father was absent from the home were computed and analyzed to test the hypotheses of this study.

CHAPTER 3

RESULTS

The purpose of this chapter is to describe the demographic data pertaining to the sampled subjects, and to report the results of the statistical analysis computed to test the hypotheses of this study.

Demographic Data

A total of 127 women responded to the questionnaire. Their ages ranged from 18 to 47, with a mean age of 20.35. The majority of women were White (93.7%); 4 of the women (3.1%) were Black; 3 of the women (2.4%) were Hispanic, and one respondent (.8%) was Asian. Most of the women in the sample were single (95.3%), 5 (3.9%) of the women were married, and 1 (.8%) woman reported being separated.

All of the women considered themselves to be Christian. The majority of them marked that they had received Jesus Christ as their personal Savior and Lord, and they sought to follow the moral and ethical teachings of Christ (90.6%). The number of years that

the women considered themselves as a Christian ranged from 1 to 47 with a mean of 11.57. As shown in Table 1, most of the women attended church at least weekly.

Table 1

Percentages for Frequency of Church Attendance

never	1-2 times per year	3-12 times per year	weekly	more than once per week
0	.8	3.9	79.5	15.7

A number of denominations were represented in the sample. Twenty-two of the women (17.3%) were Baptist, five of the women (3.9%) were Church of the Brethren, eight of the women (6.3%) were Methodist, thirteen of the women (10.2%) were Brethren in Christ, eight of the women (6.3%) were Presbyterian, and 71 (55.9%) of the women considered themselves to be of some other denomination.

Most of the women were raised in homes where both of their parents were Christians (77.2%), 16 of the women were raised in homes where only their mother was a Christian (12.6%); 3 women reported that other close

relatives were Christians even though their parents were not (2.4%); and 9 women reported that they did not have Christian parents or relatives (7.1%).

A major demographic question for this study was the number of years the father was absent from the home. The numbers of years absent ranged from 0 to 10. Only 10 women reported their father being absent for any length of time (7.9%). All of the absence were due to divorce or separation. None of the women sampled lost their father through death. One of the women reported her parents divorced, but she lived with her father. Four of the women whose parents were divorced had step-fathers join the family before they were sixteen years old. All of the women sampled knew their natural father to some extent and had some contact with him while they were growing up. This is an unusually small percentage of women who experienced father absence for a sample of this size.

The demographic data indicates that from the perspective of Christian belief this sample was a fairly homogeneous. All of the women claimed to be Christian, most of the women had some type of Christian influence in their upbringing. The majority of women grew up in

intact homes. All of the women had contact with their natural fathers.

Descriptive Data

Before examining the results of the hypotheses of this study descriptive data for the independent and dependent variables will be reported. The means, standard deviations, minimum and maximum scores, and range for each of the subscales is reported in Table 2. On the CRPBI Acceptance vs. Rejection had a possible high score of 136, a possible low score of -40, and a middle score of 48. The higher the score the more accepting the father was perceived to be. The scores ranged from -25 to 135 with a mean of 83.40. This indicates a wide range of perceptions on fathers acceptance with the mean score being on the accepting end.

Psychological Control vs. Psychological Autonomy had a possible high score of 168, a possible low score of 56 with a middle score of 112. The higher the score the more controlling the father was perceived to be. The scores ranged from 57 to 138 with a mean of 83.38 indicating a full range of responses on this scale.

Table 2

Means, Standard Deviations, & Ranges for the Independent
and Dependent Variables

	Mean	Std. Dev.	Min.	Max.	Range
Acceptance	83.40	37.24	-25	135	160
Psy. Control	83.38	16.69	57	138	81
Lax Disc.	23.35	14.53	-11	57	68
Loving God	32.51	3.48	12	36	24
Cont. God	24.52	3.71	12	32	20
Wrathful	15.33	3.14	10	25	15
Trad. Christ.	38.12	4.44	26	42	16
Kindness	30.21	3.40	18	33	15
Omniness	11.09	1.66	5	12	7
Deisticness	4.53	1.12	4	11	7
RWB	52.83	7.21	16	60	44
EWB	48.83	6.84	26	60	34
SWB	101.66	12.06	52	120	68

N = 127

The mean fell below the middle score indicating the majority of women perceived their fathers as providing more psychological autonomy than control.

Lax Discipline vs. Firm Discipline scale had a possible high score of 80, a possible low score of -16, with a middle score of 32. The higher the score the laxer the discipline was perceived to be. The scores ranged from -11 to 57 with a mean of 23.35. The mean fell towards the firm discipline end.

Overall, this sample can be characterized as perceiving their fathers as accepting, providing psychological autonomy, and setting limits firmly.

The Concept of God scores also evidenced a wide range of views of God for this sample. The Loving God scale had a possible high score of 36. The mean was 32.51, and scores ranged from 12 to 36. The Controlling God scale also had a high score of 36. The mean was 24.52, and a range from 12 to 32. The Wrathful scale had a possible low of 10 and a high of 30 possible. The mean was 15.33 with a range from 10 to 25. The Traditional Christian scale had a possible low of 14 and a high of 42. The mean was 38.12 with a range from 26 to 42. The Kindness scale had a possible low of 11 and a high of 33. The mean was 30.21 with a range from 18 to 33. The Omniness scale had a possible low score of 4 with a high of 12. The mean was 11.09 with a range from 5 to 12. The Deisticness scale had a possible low of 4

with a high of 12. The mean was 4.53 with a range from 4 to 11. On the average these women describe themselves as viewing God as Loving, slightly Controlling, in the Traditional Christian manner, Kind, and Omniscient. They do not view God overall as Wrathful or Deistic.

The mean score on the Spiritual Well-being scale was 101.66, Existential Well-being has a mean of 48.83, and Religious Well-being has a mean of 52.83. This sample has lower average scores than the scores reported by Bufford and Parker (1985) from 90 first year students at an evangelical seminary. Their sample had a mean of 56.19 (s.d. 5.15) on RWB, 53.78 (s.d. 5.31) on EWB, and 109.99 (s.d. 9.44) on SWB.

The rest of this chapter will review the results of statistical analyses as it pertains to the major hypotheses of this study.

Results of Hypotheses

Hypothesis 1

The first hypothesis stated that a) Spiritual Well-being and its subscales and the seven concept of God scales will be correlated with b) the three scores derived from the CRPBI and the number of years father

was absent from the home (see Table 3). In addition, the direction of the relationships was predicted.

Hypothesis 1a predicted that SWB, EWB, and RWB would correlate positively with the Acceptance score on the CRPBI, and negatively with the Psychological Control score, Lax Discipline score, and father absence. Upon examination of the correlation matrix (see Table 3), Spiritual Well-being correlates positively with Acceptance ($\underline{r} = .2970$; $\underline{p} < .01$), as does Existential Well-being ($\underline{r} = .2754$; $\underline{p} < .01$), and Religious Well-being ($\underline{r} = .2626$; $\underline{p} < .01$). Spiritual Well-being correlates negatively with Psychological Control ($\underline{r} = -.2915$; $\underline{p} < .01$). Existential Well-being also correlates negatively with Psychological Control ($\underline{r} = -.2598$; $\underline{p} < .01$), as does Religious Well-being ($\underline{r} = -.2237$; $\underline{p} < .01$). None of the relationships with Lax Discipline and Father Absence were significantly correlated. Therefore, hypothesis 1a is confirmed in the predicted direction only for Spiritual Well-being, Religious Well-being, and Existential Well-being with Acceptance and Psychological Control.

Table 3

Correlations Between SWB Scores and Concept of God
Scores with Scores on CRBPI and Father Absence

	Acceptance	Psychological Control	Lax Discipline	Father Absence
EWB	.2754**	-.2915**	-.0043	.1256
RWB	.2626**	-.2237**	.0640	.0876
SWB	.2970**	-.2598**	.0213	.1158
Trad. Chr.	.0432	.1177	-.0740	-.1059
Kindness	.1770*	-.0851	-.0745	-.1025
Omniness	-.0399	.0832	-.0144	-.0651
Deistic	-.1341	.1117	.1435	.0863
Lov. God	.2714**	-.2465**	-.0249	.0580
Cont. God	-.0245	.2037**	-.1375	.0116
Wrathful	-.0690	.2165**	-.0397	.0517

*p < .05

** p < .01

N=127

Hypothesis 1b stated that Traditional Christian, Kindness, Omniness, Deisticness, and Loving God scores would be positively correlated with the Acceptance score, and that they would be negatively correlated with

Psychological Control, Lax Discipline, and father absence. Kindness was positively correlated with Acceptance ($\underline{r} = .1770$; $\underline{p} < .05$). Loving God was also positively correlated with Acceptance ($\underline{r} = .2714$; $\underline{p} < .01$), and negatively correlated with Psychological Control ($\underline{r} = -.2465$; $\underline{p} < .01$). Therefore, hypothesis 1b is supported only for Kindness and Acceptance, and Loving God with Acceptance and Psychological Control.

Hypothesis 1c stated that Wrathfulness and Controlling God scores would negatively correlated with Acceptance scores, and positively correlated with Psychological Control, Lax Discipline, and father absence. Only Controlling God with Psychological Control was significant in the predicted direction ($\underline{r} = .2037$; $\underline{p} < .01$).

Although several of the single order correlations were significant, the strength of the relationship between the variables were relatively small.

Hypothesis 2

Hypothesis 2 stated that a weighted linear combination of scores on CRPBI (Acceptance, Psychological Control, and Lax Discipline) and father absence would account for significantly more variance on Spiritual Well-being (SWB), Existential Well-being

(EWB), Religious Well-being (RWB), Wrathfulness (WRT), Traditional Christian (TC), Kindness (KND), Omniness (OMNI), Deisticness (DEIS), Loving God (LG), and Controlling God (CG) scores. This hypothesis was tested by computing Stepwise Regressions for each of the Spiritual Well-being and Concept of God scores.

Before reporting the results of the significant multiple regression equations, it is also important to consider the amount of redundancy among the independent variables. A correlation matrix for the dependent variables indicates that there are significant, although small, relationships among the dependent variables (see Table 4). These may influence the amount of the unique contribution attributed to each independent variable when the effects of the other independent variables have been partialled out.

Table 4

Correlation Matrix for Four Independent Variables

	Acceptance	Psy. Control	Lax Disc.	Fat. Abs.
Acceptance		-.527**	.187*	-.035
Psy. Control	-.527**		-.436**	.019
Lax Disc.	.187*	-.436**		.182*
Fat. Abs.	-.035	.019	.182*	

* p < .05

** p < .01

Analysis of the Stepwise Regressions indicate that only one variable was entered into any equation. Three of the dependent variables did not have any of the independent variables meet the criterion level, thus regression equations were not computed for these dependent variables. Therefore, hypothesis 2 is not supported. The weighted linear combination of scores from the CRPBI and father absence do not account for significantly more variance on Spiritual Well-being and its subscales, and the concept of God scales than the strongest of the variables alone. Seven of the equations did have one independent variable entered.

An equation was formed for the dependent variable Loving God with the independent variable of Acceptance. The results of the equation indicate with one independent variable $R = .2714$, $R^2 = .0736$, $p < .01$. Table 5 presents a summary of the results for variables both in and out of the equation. When all of the independent variables are forced into the equation $R = .3425$, $R^2 = .1173$, $p < .01$. The other three independent variables do not add significantly to the equation. However, both Acceptance and Control were significantly correlated with Loving God in single order correlations.

Table 5

Summary of Stepwise Regression for the DependentVariable Loving God

Variables in the Equation			
Variable	Multiple R	R^2	F-Test
Acceptance	.2714	.0736	9.94**

Table 5 continued

Variables not in the Equation		
Variable	Increase in R^2	T-Test
Father Absence	.0701	.783
Control	-.1265	-1.420
Discipline	-.0785	-.895

*p < .05 **p < .01 N = 127

The independent variable of Control was the only variable used to form an equation with the dependent variable Controlling God. The results of the equation indicate with one independent variable are $\underline{R} = .2037$, $\underline{R}^2 = .0415$, $\underline{p} < .05$. Table 6 presents a summary of the results for this equation. When all four of the independent variables are forced into the equation $\underline{R} = .2320$, $\underline{R}^2 = .0538$, $\underline{p} > .05$. When all of the independent variables were forced into the equation the equation was no longer significant. This indicates that the relationships may be spurious or false positive.

Table 6

Summary of the Stepwise Regression for the Dependent Variable Controlling God

Variables in the Equation			
Variable	Multiple R	R^2	F-Test
Control	.2037	.041	5.41*
Variables not in the Equation			
Variable	Increase in R^2	T-Test	
Father Absence	.0079	.09	
Acceptance	.0996	1.11	
Discipline	-.0553	-.62	

*p < .05 **p < .01 N = 127

The third equation involves the dependent variable Wrathful with the independent variable Control. The results of the equation with one independent variable are $\underline{R} = .2165$, $\underline{R}^2 = .0469$, $\underline{p} < .05$. Table 7 presents a

summary of the results for variables both in and out of the equation. When all four of the independent variables are forced into the equation $R = .2348$, $R^2 = .0551$, $p < .05$, indicating that when all of the independent variables are taken together the equation is not significant.

Table 7

Summary of the Stepwise Regression for the Dependent Variable Wrathful God

Variables in the Equation			
Variable	Multiple R	R^2	F-Test
Control	.2165	.0469	6.15*
Variables not in the Equation			
Variable	Increase in R^2	T-Test	
Father Absence	.0488	.544	
Acceptance	.0625	.607	

Table 7 continued

Discipline	.0675	.695
------------	-------	------

*p < .05 **p < .01 N = 127

The dependent variable Kindness formed an equation with the independent variable Acceptance. The results of the equation are $\underline{R} = .1770$, $\underline{R}^2 = .0313$, $\underline{p} < .05$. Table 8 presents a summary of the results for variables both in and out of the equation. When all four of the independent variables are forced into the equation $\underline{R} = .2241$, $\underline{R}^2 = .0502$, $\underline{p} > .05$, indicating that when all of the independent variables are added together the equation is not significant.

Table 8

Summary of the Stepwise Regression for the Dependent
Variable Kindness

Variables in the Equation

Variable	Multiple R	R^2	F-Test
Acceptance	.1770	.0313	4.04*

Variables Not in the Equation

Variable	Increase in R^2	T-Test
Father Absence	-.0980	-1.10
Control	.0097	.11
Discipline	-.1114	-1.25

*p < .05 **p < .01 N = 127

The dependent variable Spiritual Well-being formed an equation with independent variable Acceptance. The results of this equation are $\underline{R} = .2970$, $\underline{R}^2 = .0882$, $\underline{p} < .01$. Table 9 presents a summary of the results for the variables both in and out of the equation. When all four of the independent variables are forced into the equation the results are $\underline{R} = .3655$, $\underline{R}^2 = .1336$, $\underline{p} < .01$, indicating the four independent variables taken together do not account for more significant variance than Acceptance alone.

Table 9

Summary of the Stepwise Regression for the Dependent Variable Spiritual Well-being

Variables in the Equation

Variable	Multiple R	R^2	F-Test
Acceptance	.2970	.0882	12.09**

Table 9 continued

Variables Not in the Equation		
Variable	Increase in R^2	T-Test
Father Absence	.1321	1.48
Control	-.1273	-1.43
Discipline	-.0365	-.41

*p < .05 **p < .01 N = 127

The dependent variable Religious Well-being formed an equation with the independent variable Acceptance. The results of this equation are $R = .2626$, $R^2 = .0690$, $p < .01$. Table 10 presents a summary of the results for the variables both in and out of the equation. When all of the independent variables are forced into the equation the results are $R = .3014$, $R^2 = .0909$, $p < .01$. This indicates that the four independent variables taken together do not account for more variance than Acceptance alone. Religious Well-being is related to both Acceptance and Control when single order correlations are computed.

Table 10

Summary of the Stepwise Regression for the Dependent Variable Religious Well-being

Variables in the Equation			
Variable	Multiple R	R^2	F-Test
Acceptance	.2626	.0690	9.26**
Variables Not in the Equation			
Variable	Increase in R^2	T-Test	
Father Absence	.1003	1.12	
Control	-.1041	-1.16	
Discipline	.0156	.17	

*p < .05 **p < .01 N = 127

The last question involves the dependent variable Existential Well-being with the independent variable Control. The results of the equation are $\underline{R} = .2915$, $\underline{R}^2 = .0849$, $\underline{p} < .01$. Table 11 presents a summary of the

results for variables both in and out of the equation. When all of the independent variables are forced into the equation $\underline{R} = .3910$, $\underline{R}^2 = .1529$, $\underline{p} < .01$. The four independent variables taken together do not account for significantly more variance than Control taken alone. Single order correlations indicate Existential Well-being is related to both Control and Acceptance.

Table 11

Summary of the Stepwise Regression for the Dependent Variable Existential Well-being

Variables in the Equation			
Variable	Multiple R	R^2	F-Test
Control	.2915	.0849	11.60**

Table 11 continued

Variables Not in the Equation

Variable	Increase in R ²	T-Test
Father Absence	.1371	1.54
Acceptance	.1487	1.69
Discipline	.1526	-1.72

*p < .05 **p < .01 N = 127

Summary

Positive correlations were found between Acceptance and the variables Spiritual Well-being, Existential Well-being, Religious Well-being, Kindness, and Loving God. A positive correlation was also found between Psychological Control and Wrathful God, and Psychological Control and Controlling God. Negative correlations were found between Psychological Control and Spiritual Well-being, Existential Well-being, Religious Well-being, and Loving God.

Stepwise multiple regression analysis indicated that a weighted linear combination of the independent

variables did not account for significantly more variance than the strongest single variable. Each of the significant equations only involved one independent variable. Therefore, hypothesis 2 was not supported.

There were significant correlations among the independent variables, and these relationships may have affected the amount of variance that could be accounted for by each independent variable. There appears to be enough multicollinearity to cause some suppression among the variables in the regression equation. Only the independent variables Acceptance and Control were related to any of the dependent variables in the multiple regressions. Discussion regarding the implications of the reported results will take place in the next chapter.

CHAPTER 4

DISCUSSION

This chapter discusses implications of the results of the hypotheses as they pertain to the focus of the study. Limitations and problems of the study will also be discussed, as well as areas for further research.

The purpose of this study was to examine the relationship between father's parenting style with Spiritual Well-being and Concept of God in Christian college women. It was believed that daughters whose fathers were high in acceptance, low in psychological control, and high in discipline, would have greater Spiritual Well-being, and a more positive view of God. In addition to father's parenting style, the amount of time he was absent from the home due to divorce, separation, or death was also believed to relate to Spiritual Well-being and Concept of God. It was believed that absence would adversely affect Spiritual Well-being and Concept of God.

Discussion of Hypotheses

Hypothesis 1a-c

The results of this hypothesis confirms that there is a relationship between a woman's perception of acceptance by her father and her Spiritual Well-being, Existential Well-being, and Religious Well-being, and her view of God as kind and loving. The more a woman perceives that her father controls her psychologically the lower her Spiritual Well-being, Existential Well-being, and Religious Well-being, and her view of God as loving. These women may find it difficult to trust that God is loving when their father was manipulative. The more controlling she perceives her father, the more wrathful and controlling she perceives God. The relationships between the variables were small indicating that although there is a linear relationship, it is not a strong relationship.

These findings confirm the previous findings of Campise, Ellison, and Kinsman (1979) who found Spiritual Well-being to be positively correlated with perceived quality of parent-child relationships. The current study took this concept further by examining specific elements of the perceived parenting style, and not just

the perceived quality. Many of the women in the survey voluntarily reported that they believed the quality of their relationship with their father was good, but they also experienced their father as being psychologically controlling.

Although Schaefer (1965b) identified psychological control vs. psychological autonomy as one of the three dimensions measured by the CRPBI, it has not received much attention in the literature. It appears that psychological control negatively relates to well-being in relation to God, and sense of life purpose and life satisfaction. It also relates to viewing God as wrathful and controlling.

A high level of father acceptance relates positively to sense of life purpose and life satisfaction. It also relates to viewing God as a Loving and Kind figure. Perceived father acceptance has also been found to be related to personality adjustment and self-esteem in other studies (Coopersmith, 1967; Fish & Biller, 1973; Lynn, 1974; Musser, 1982).

Lax discipline versus firm discipline did not significantly relate to any of the Spiritual Well-being or concept of God variables. Previous research indicates that firm discipline is related to self-esteem

(Coopersmith, 1967), and personality adjustment (Musser, 1982). From the current study it appears that firm limit setting and clear expectations does not relate significantly to Spiritual Well-being or concept of God. However, it must be noted that this scale had the smallest range, and least amount of variance of the three scores from CRPBI. Thus lack of support for this hypothesis may be due to attenuated range in this sample.

Father absence also did not relate to Spiritual Well-being or concept of God. This may be because of the low number of subjects who experienced any father loss. Only ten of the 127 women sampled experienced any amount of father absence. All of the women had father present up until they were at least six years of age.

Hypothesis 2

The results of this hypothesis indicated that a weighted combination of Acceptance, Psychological Control, Lax Discipline, and Father Absence did not account for more variance in Spiritual Well-being, Existential Well-being, Religious Well-being, and the Concept of God scales than the strongest of the variables alone. Only one variable was related to any of the dependent variables in the regression equation.

However, single-order correlations were found between dependent variables Spiritual Well-being, Existential Well-being, Religious Well-being, and Loving God with both Acceptance and Control. This indicates that there was some suppression among the independent variables due to the multicollinearity. Therefore, hypothesis 2 was not confirmed.

The independent variable Acceptance was related to the dependent variables Loving God, Kindness, Spiritual Well-being, and Religious Well-being. This indicates that women who perceive their father as accepting view God as loving and kind, and have a sense of well-being in their relationship with God. Women who felt accepted by their fathers also felt good about God.

The independent variable Control was related to the dependent variables Controlling God, and Wrathful God indicating that women who perceived their father as psychologically controlling also viewed God as controlling and as wrathful. A negative relationship was found between Existential Well-being and Control indicating that women whose fathers were controlling had less of a sense of well-being about their life direction. It appears that the variable of Psychological Control has a greater relationship to a

positive sense of life direction and life satisfaction. This leads to the conclusion that fathers who attempt to control their daughters through covert guilt-inducing methods produce daughters who have less sense of life direction, and less satisfaction with their lives.

Summary

From the results of this study it appears that Spiritual Well-being and its subscales, and the concept of God as Loving are especially related to the variables of psychological control and acceptance in women's reports of father behavior. Significant correlations were found among the independent variables, therefore they are not mutually exclusive. A woman may experience her father as accepting, and yet may also experience him as psychologically controlling. These scores may cancel each other out. The CRPBI does not ask outright if the women felt accepted or controlled. Instead, it measures actual memories of father's behavior which express these dimensions towards his daughter.

Unlike previous research which indicated the importance of disciplinary style (Coopersmith, 1967; Lynn, 1974; Musser, 1982) this study did not support the importance of firm consistent discipline. This may be due to the characteristics of the population sampled.

All of the women were attending a denominationally based college, and a large number of women had grown up in a home where either one or both parents were Christians. Discipline may not have been an issue for the women in this sample. It may also be due to attenuated range on this scale. This scale had the smallest range of possible scores.

Implications of Results

There are methodological limitations in this study. One of the problems of the study is the significant correlations among the independent variables. This affects the results of the regression equations. It especially effects the amount of unique variance that can be accounted for by each variable. The multicollinearity is evident in the stepwise regression equations where only one independent variable met the criterion for inclusion into the equation.

The women sampled all attended a denominationally based college. This led to a fairly homogeneous population. All of the women sampled considered themselves to be a Christian, and all of the women

actively attended church on a regular basis. Therefore, this study cannot be generalized to non-christians.

Most of the women had been raised in intact families, therefore, the effects of father absence could not be adequately assessed. Most of the women who did report their parents being separated had some contact with their father, or had another father figure. Most of the women also were raised in a Christian environment; this may account for the low number of divorces.

Since this was a homogeneous sample, gathered from only one college, the results cannot be broadly generalized to other samples. Generalizations should be limited to Christian women with similar backgrounds to the women studied (e. g. from intact Christian homes). Further research may want to broaden the sample to women of varying ages, and include more women from divorced or separated homes.

This study also did not ask if any of the women had been in previous therapy, either individual or family. Therapy may have effected the way in which their father was viewed, or their Spiritual Well-being.

A problem also exists in attempting to measure Concept of God, and in attempting to relate concept of

God to father behavior. The projection theory has been quite controversial. (Previous research has found the God concept to be closer to mother (Nicholson, 1978), closer to the preferred parent (Nelson, 1971), and closer to father (Vergote et al., 1968).) Bernard Spilka, after reviewing the research in this area stated, "Correspondences have been shown between parental, deity, and self images, and questions regarding these parallels and how measurement is effected strongly suggest the likelihood that the entire question is spurious and not capable of being objectively resolved" (1978, p. 99). As Nicholson (1978) points out, "a major problem with the research is that it has used mostly the correlational approach and has ended up dealing only with parallels" (p. 56). The current study did not attempt to compare God concepts with father images, nor did it attempt to compare views between mother and father.

The current study examined the relationships between the father's parenting style, and the woman's current level of Spiritual well-being, and her current view of God. This study found a woman's relationship with her father accounts for 8% of the variance on Spiritual Well-being, 8% of the variance on Existential

Well-being, and 6% of the variance on Religious Well-being. Although these are relatively small percentages they indicate that early relationships with fathers are important to women's future spiritual development. Further studies may want to delete the Concept of God scales, and add scores for mother on the CRPBI in order to determine if there is greater variance on Spiritual Well-being and its subscales with mother included. A child's relationship with her parents teaches her about relationships in general. These earliest relationships influence the way a woman will approach other relationships, including God. Therefore, the quality of the relationship with both parents probably influences Spiritual Well-being. Further research should search for other variables which influence Spiritual Well-being.

Summary and Concluding Remarks

In human development there is seldom one event, or one person that can be labeled as causative for another's perception of the world or self. Thus it is with an individual's relationship with God. One person, or one event alone cannot be considered the cause of the

quality of someone's relationship with God. However, earliest relationships with primary caregivers do influence future ways of relation to the world and others, including God.

In the New Testament God is referered to as our Father (Matthew 6:6; Romans 8:15; Galatians 4:6). Throughout the Scriptures the Fathering characteristics are evident. Robert Frost (1978) states that God portrays a warm and personal picture of fatherhood through six roles related to the father-image. These roles include Creator (Acts 17:28), Protector (Psalm 36:7), Provider (Matthew 6:31-32), Corrector (Proverbs 3:11-12), Redeemer (Psalm 103:8, 12-13), and Comforter (2 Corinthians 1:3-4). The New Testament stresses the believer's adoption into the family of God, and God as father. It is natural that a woman's feelings about God as father would be influenced by her experiences with her earthly father. Frost (1978) states there are three things that lead to a faulty concept of God as father.

1. Certain legalistic extremes in Western theology which presents God primarily as a Father-Redemmer.
2. Faulty earthly father relationships which grossly distort the true image of fatherhood.

3. Personal misfortunes which seem difficult to reconcile with the love of an all-powerful Father-God (pp. 19-20).

This study is concerned with the second reason. It appears that a woman's relationship with God is effected by her relationship with her earthly father since he is her model of what fatherhood is about.

Negative relationships with earthly fathers can lead to a mistrust of God the Father. Women whose relationship with God has been negatively influenced by her relationship with her father need help in discovering the characteristics of God as Father. As Diane Tennis wrote "Fortunately; God is God, apart from our images" (1985, p. 24).] ☆

The focus of this study was on the relationship between the amount women perceived their father accepting them, psychologically controlling them, firmly or laxly disciplining them, and being absent from the home, and their view of God and their Spiritual Well-being. The purpose of this study was not to compare the similarity between view of God and view of father, but to compare the relationship with father to the relationship with God.

The results of this study indicate there is a relationship between father's parenting style and Spiritual Well-being, Existential Well-being, Religious Well-being, and viewing God as loving. From this it can be concluded that fathers are important in their daughters' spiritual development, just as they are important in personality adjustment and heterosexual development. However, it seems likely, in light of the limited amount of the total variance accounted for, that many other factors are also significant.

Many women who consider themselves Christians struggle in their relationship with God. Helping them to identify where their view of God is faulty, including helping them to identify where they have projected their father's style of relating to them onto God, is the first step in helping them to begin to experience God as an accepting father, who sets clear limits, yet allows for free will. God, after all is the ideal father.

REFERENCES

- Abelin, E. L. (1980). Triangulation, The role of the father and the origins of core gender identity during the rapprochement sub-phase. In Ruth F. Lax (Ed.) Rapprochement: The critical sub-phase of separation-individuation. New York: International Press.
- Acheson, K. (1977). The role of father's sex-type and father acceptance to personal and heterosexual adjustment in adolescent girls. (Doctoral dissertation, Rosemead Graduate School of Psychology), Dissertation Abstracts, 38, 1945.
- Anderson, C. P. (1983). Father: The figure and the force. New York: Warner Books.
- Appleton, W. S. (1981). Fathers and daughters. Garden City, New York: Doubleday & Company, Inc.
- Armentrout, J., & Burger, G. (1972). Factor analyses of college students' recall of parental child-rearing behaviors. The Journal of Genetic Psychology, 121, 155-161.

- Baggett, A. (1967). The effect of early loss of father upon the personality of boys and girls in late adolescence (Doctoral dissertation, North Texas State University). Dissertation Abstracts, 28, 356-357.
- Bandura, A., & Walters, R. (1963). Social learning and personality development. New York: Holt, Rinhart, and Winston.
- Baumrind, D. (1966). Effects of authoritative parental control on child behavior. Child Development, 37, 887-907.
- Baumrind, D. (1968). Authoritarian vs. authoritative parental control. Adolescence, 3, 255-272.
- Baumrind, D. (1971). Current patterns of parental authority. Developmental Psychology, 4, 1-103 (Monograph).
- Becker, W. (1964). Consequences of different kinds of parental discipline. Review Child Development Research (Vol 1). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Becker, W., & Krug, R. (1964). A circumplex model for social behavior in children. Child Development, 35, 371-396.

- Beit-Hallahmi, B., & Argyle, M. (1975). God as a Father-Projection: The theory and the evidence. British Journal of Medical Psychology, 48, 71-75.
- Benson, P., & Spilka, B. (1973). God-Image as a function of self-esteem & locus of control. Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, 12, (3), 297-310.
- Biller, H. (1971). Father, child, and sex role. Lexington, Mass.: D. C. Heath & Co.
- Bufford, R. (1984). Empirical Correlates of Spiritual Well-being and Spiritual Maturity Scales. Paper presented at the Christian Association of Psychological Studies annual meeting, Dallas, Texas.
- Bufford, R., & Parker, T. (1985). Religion and Well-Being: Concurrent Validation of the Spiritual Well-being Scale. Paper presented at the American Psychological Association annual meeting, Los Angeles, California.
- Cameron, N. (1963). Personality Development and Psychopathology. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co.

- Campise, R., Ellison, C., & Kinsman (1979). Spiritual Well-being: Some exploratory relationships. In R. F. Paloutzian (Chair), Spiritual well-being, loneliness, and perceived quality of life. Symposium presented at the annual meeting of the American Psychological Association, New York.
- Cohen, J., & Cohen, P. (1975). Applied Multiple Regression/correlation Analysis for the Behavioral Sciences. Hillsdale, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Colarusoo, R., & Nemiroff, R. (1982). The father in midlife: Crisis and the growth of paternal identity. In S. Cath, A. Gurwitt, & J. M. Ross (Eds.), Father and Child: Developmental and clinical perspectives. Boston: Little Brown, & Co.
- Coopersmith, S. (1967). The antecedents of self-esteem. San Francisco: W. H. Freeman.
- Cruse, S. J., Foss, C., & Colbert, K. (1981). Children's self-concept and perception of parent's behavior. Journal of Psychology, 108, (2), 297-303.

- Cross, H. (1969). College students' memories of their parents: A factor analysis of the CRPBI. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 33, 275-278.
- Eisenburg, J., Henderson, R., Kuhlmann, W., & Hill, J. (1967). Six and ten-year olds' attribution of punitiveness and nurturance to parents and other adults. Journal of Genetic Psychology, 111, 233-240.
- Ellison, C. W. (1982). Spiritual Well-Being. Paper presented Duke University Medical Center Conference on Spiritual Disease.
- Ellison, C. W. (1983). Spiritual Well-being: Conceptualization and measurement. Journal of Psychology and Theology, 11, (4), 330-340.
- Ellison, C., & Economos, T. (1981). Religious Orientation and quality of life. Paper presented at the Christian Association of Psychological Studies, San Diego.
- Ellison, C., & Paloutzian, R. F., (1978). Assessing quality of life: Spiritual Well-being. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Psychological Association, Toronto.

- Ellison, C., & Paloutzian R. F. (1979). Religious experience and the quality of life. In R. F. Paloutzian (Chair), Spiritual well-being, loneliness, and perceived quality of life. Symposium presented at the annual meeting of the American Psychological Association, New York.
- Fields, S. (1983). Like father, like daughter. Boston: Little, Brown, & Co.
- Fischer, S. (1973). The female orgasm. New York: Basic Books, 1973.
- Fish, K., & Biller, H. (1973). Perceived childhood paternal relationships and college females personality adjustment. Adolescence, 8, 415-420.
- Fleck, J., Fuller, C., Malin, S., Miller, D., & Acheson, K. (1980). Father psychological absence and heterosexual behavior, personality adjustment, and sex-typing in adolescent girls. Adolescence, 15, 847-860.
- Forrest, T. (1966). Paternal roots of female character development. Contemporary Psychoanalysis, 3, 21-28.
- Freud, A. & Burlingham, D. T. (1943). Infants without families. New York: International Universities Press.

- Freud, S. (1913). Totem and Taboo. In Standard Editions, 13.
- Freud, S. (1933). New Introductory Lectures on Psychoanalysis. New York: Carlton House.
- Frost, R. (1978). Our Heavenly Father. Plainfield, New Jersey: Logos International.
- Gleuck, S., & Glueck, E. (1950). Unraveling juvenile delinquency. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- Godin, A., & Hallez, M. (1964). Parental images and divine paternity. In A. Godin (Ed.), From religious experience to a religious attitude. Brussels, Belgium: Lumen Vitae Press.
- Goldin, P. (1969). A review of children's reports of parents behaviors. Psychological Bulletin, 71, 222-236.
- Goodenough, E. W. (1957). Interest in persons as an aspect of sex difference in the early years. Genetic Psychology Monograph, 55, 287.
- Gorsuch, R. L. (1968). The conceptualization of God in attitude ratings. Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, 7, 56-64.

- Hainline, L. & Feig, E. (1978). The correlates of childhood father absence in college-age women. Child Development, 49, 37-42.
- Hamilton, M. L. (1977). Father's Influence on Children. Chicago: Nelson-Hall, Inc.
- Hammer, S. (1982). Passionate Attachments. New York: Rawson Associates.
- Hetherington, M. (1965). A developmental study of the effects of sex of the dominant parent on sex-role preference identification and imitation in children. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 2, 188-194.
- Hetherington, M. (1972). Effects of father absence on personality development in adolescent females. Developmental Psychology, 7, 313-326.
- Hetherington, M. (1973). Girls without fathers. Psychology Today, 6, 47-52.
- Hetherington, M., & Parke, R. (1979). Child Psychology: A contemporary view. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Justice, W. G., & Lambert, W. (1986). A comparative study of the language people use to describe the personalities of God and their parents. The Journal of Pastoral Care, 40, (2), 166-172.

- Johnson, M. (1963). Sex-role learning in the nuclear family. Child Development, 34, 319-333.
- Johnson, M. M. (1982). Fathers and "femininity" in daughters: A review of the research. Sociology and Social Research, 67, (1), 1-17.
- Kagan, J. (1958). The concept of identification. Psychological Review, 65, 296-305.
- Koller, K. M. (1971). Parental Deprivation, Family Background and female delinquency. British Journal of Psychiatry, 118, 319-327.
- Kopp, C. B. (1979). Becoming Female: Perspectives on development. New York: Plenum Press.
- Kristal, J. (1979). The influence of the early father-daughter relationship on feminine sexual behavior (Doctoral disseration, University of Texas at Austin). Dissertation Abstracts International, 39, 4584-4585.
- Laiken, D. S. (1981). Daughters of Divorce: The effects of Parental divorce on women's lives. New York: William Morrow & Co., Inc.
- Lamb, M. (1975). Fathers: Forgotten contributors to child development. Human Development, 18 245-266.
- Leonard, L. S. (1982). The Wounded Woman. Boulder, Co.: Shambahla Publications, Inc.

Leonard, M. (1966). Fathers and daughters: The significance of 'fathering' in the psychosexual development of the girl. International Journal of Psychoanalysis, 47, 325-333.

Lewis, M., & Weintraub, M (1976). The father's role in the infants social network. In M. E. Lamb (Ed.), The role of the father in child development. New York: Wiley.

✓ Lynn, D. (1974). The father: His role in child development. Monterey, Ca.: Brooks/Cole.

Lynn, D., & Sawrey, W. (1959). The effects of father-absence on Norwegian boys and girls. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 59, 258-262.

· Maccoby, E., & Jacklin, C. (1974). The psychology of sex differences. Stanford, CA: Stanford University.

✓ Marto, R. (1984). A father's locus of control, spiritual well-being, and self-esteem and their relationship to his child's self-esteem in a Catholic parochial high school population. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Western Conservative Baptist Seminary.

- Mashburn, D. (1986). Effect of sex-role combinations in couples on Marital Satisfaction and Spiritual Well-being. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Western Conservative Baptist Seminary.
- McThomas, A. (1976). The relationship of parental acceptance and control to self-esteem as a function of age and sex of child. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Rosemead Graduate School of Psychology.
- Meister, R. (1981). Fathers: Daughters, sons, fathers, reveal their deepest feelings. New York: Ballantine Books.
- Moberg, D. O. (1971). Spiritual Well-being: Background and Issues. Washington, D.C.: White House Conference on Aging.
- Mowrer, O. H. (1950). Identification: A link between learning theory and psychotherapy. In Learning theory and personality dynamics. New York: Ronald Press.
- Musser, J. (1982). The relationship of father parenting style and father absence to feminine heterosexual relationships and personality adjustment. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Rosemead Graduate School of Psychology.

National Interfaith Coalition on Aging (1979).

Spiritual Well-being for quality of life research:
Papers and Problems. Sociological Analysis,
Spring.

Nelson, M. O. (1971). The concept of God and feelings
towards parents. Journal of Individual Psychology,
27, 46-49

Nelson, M. O., & Jones, E. M. (1957). An application of
the Q-technique to the study of religious concepts.
Psychological Reports, 3, 293-297.

Nicholson, H. C. (1978). A comparison of four
statistical methods for assessing similarity of God
concepts to parental images. Unpublished doctoral
dissertation, Rosemead Graduate School of
Psychology.

Nicholson, H. C., & Edwards, K. (1979). A comparison of
four statistical methods for assessing similarity
of God concepts to parental images. Paper
presented at the annual meeting of the Society for
the Scientific Study of Religion, San Antonio, TX.

Nie, H., Hull, C., Jenkins, J., Steinbrenner, K., &
Bent, D. (1984). Statistical package for the
social sciences. New York: McGraw-Hill.

- Norusis, M. J. (1986). SPSS/PC+: SPSS for the IBM PC/XT/AT. Chicago: SPSS, Inc.
- Paloutzian, R. F., & Ellison, C. W. (1979a). Developing a measure of spiritual well-being. In R. F. Paloutzian (Chair), Spiritual Well-being, Loneliness, and perceived quality of life. Symposium presented at the annual meeting of the American Psychological Association, New York.
- Paloutzian, R. F., & Ellison, C. W. (1979b). Loneliness and Spiritual well-being as a function of living environment and professional status in adult women. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Western Psychological Association, San Diego.
- Paloutzian, R. F., & Ellison, C. W. (1979c). Religious committment, loneliness, and quality of life. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Christian Association of Psychological Studies, Minneapolis, Minnesota.
- Paloutzian, R. F., & Ellison, C. W. (1982). Loneliness, spiritual well-being, and quality of life. In L. A. Peplau & D. Perlman (Eds.), Loneliness: A sourcebook of current theory, research and therapy. New York: Wiley Interscience.

- Parsons, T. (1955). Family structure in the socialization of the child. In T. Parsons & R. Bales (Eds.), Family, socialization and interaction process. Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press.
- Pederson, F. (1976). Does research on children in father-absent families yield information on father influence? The Family Coordinator, 25, 4559-463.
- Quere, R. (1985). "Naming" God "Father". Currents in Theology and Mission, 12, 5-14.
- Ragland, E. (1978). Social and sexual self-esteem in women and perceived father-daughter relationships during early adolescence (Doctoral dissertation, University of Oklahoma). Dissertation Abstracts International, 38, 5365.
- Redding, J. (1971). Personality factors and family variables differentiating emotionally disturbed, emotionally handicapped and emotionally adjusted pupils (Doctoral dissertation, St. John's University). Dissertation Abstracts International, 31, 5006.
- Renson, G., Schaefer, E., & Levy, B. (1968). Cross-national validity of a spherical conceptual model of parent behavior. Child Development, 39, 1229-1235.

- ✓ Roe, A. & Siegelman, M. A. (1963). Parent-child relations questionnaire. Child Development, 34, 355-369.
- Rosenberg, M. (1965). Society and the adolescent self-image. Princeton, N. J.: Princeton University Press.
- Rue, J. J., & Shanahan, L. (1978). Daddy's Girl, Mama's Boy. New York: The Bobbs-Merrill Co., Inc.
- Schaefer, E. (1959). A circumplex model for maternal behavior. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 59, 226-235.
- ✓ Schaefer, E. (1965a). Children's reports of parental behavior: An inventory. Child Development, 36, 413-424.
- ✓ Schaefer, E. (1965b). A configurational analysis of children's reports of parent behavior. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 29, 552-557.
- Sears, R. (1957). Identification as a form of behavior development. In D. B. Harns (Ed.), The concept of Development. Minneapolis, Minn.: University of Minnesota Press.
- ✓ Siegelman, J. (1965). College student personality correlates of early parent-child relationship. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 29, 558-564.

- Spilka, B. (1978). "The current state of the psychology of religion." Council of the Study of Religion, 9, 96-99.
- Spilka, B., Addison, J., & Rosensohn, M. (1975). Parents, Self, and God: A test of competing theories of individual-religion relationships. Review of Religious Research, 16, (3), 154-165.
- Spilka, B., Hood, R., & Gorsuch, R. (1985). The Psychology of Religion: An Empirical Approach. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Spilka, B., Rosensohn, M., & Tener, S. (1973). Freud revisited: God and father, or is it mother or me? Paper presented at the 1973 convention of the Rocky Mountain Psychological Association, Las Vegas, Nevada.
- Strunk, O. (1959). Perceived relationships between parental and deity concepts. Psychological Newsletter, 10, 222-226.
- Symond, P. (1939). The psychology of parent-child relationships. New York: Appleton-Century.
- Tasch, R. (1952). The role of the father in the family. Journal of Experimental Education, 20, 319-361.
- Tennis, D. (1985). Is God the Only Reliable Father? Philadelphia: The Westminster Press.

- Tessman, L. H. (1982). A note on the father's contribution to the daughter's ways of loving and working. In A. Cath, J. Gurwitt, & J. M. Ross (Eds.), Father and Child: Development and Clinical Perspectives. Boston: Little, Brown, & Co.
- Trunell, T. (1968). The absent father's children's emotional disturbance. Archives of General Psychiatry, 19, 180-188.
- Vergote, A., Tamayo, A., Pasquali, L., Bonami, M., Pattyn, M., & Custers, A. (1968). Concept of God and parental images. Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, 8, 79-87.
- Wakerman, E. (1984). Father Loss. Garden City, New York: Doubleday & Co., Inc.
- Woolfolk, W., & Corss, D. W. (1982). Daddy's little girl: The unspoken bargain between fathers and their daughters. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

APPENDIX A
COMPLETE QUESTIONNAIRE PACKET

Teresa Dean
350 Vine St. Apt. C
Lebanon, PA 17042

February 16, 1987

Dear Student:

Your name has been chosen to participate in a research project on a Woman's relationship with her father and the effects of this relationship on her spiritual well-being and concept of God. Your name was randomly chosen from a list of the female students at your school. Please take time to complete the enclosed booklet.

Your participation in this study is purely optional, but it is greatly desired. This study is for my doctoral dissertation in psychology. I can't complete the dissertation without your help!

Enclosed you will find a booklet containing a background information questionnaire, the Child's Report of Parental Behavior Inventory, Concept of God scales, and the Spiritual Well-Being Scale. Although the booklet looks rather lengthy, it should take about 23 minutes to complete. Once you have completed the booklet please enclose it in the enclosed self-addressed stamped envelope and place it in a mailbox. All of your answers will be completely confidential. Please do not place your name anywhere on the questionnaire booklet.

There is also a postcard in the packet. If you are interested in receiving a summary of the results of this study, please place your name and address on the postcard and turn it into Dr. Thiessen's office. In about six months you will receive a summary of the results.

As I said, your participation is purely optional. If you feel that you are unable to participate in this study, please return the packet to Dr. Thiessen. It would be extremely helpful if you would take the time to fill out the questionnaire and mail it back to me immediately. Thanks a lot for your time and participation!

Sincerely,

Teresa Dean

ID# _____

Fathers, Daughters, and Concept of God
Questionnaire Booklet

PLEASE READ THE DIRECTIONS AT THE BEGINNING OF EACH
QUESTIONNAIRE CAREFULLY. PLEASE ANSWER EVERY QUESTION
AS HONESTLY AS YOU CAN. THANK YOU FOR YOUR TIME AND
PARTICIPATION!

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

_____ AGE AT LAST BIRTHDAY

CURRENT MARITAL STATUS (Check one):

- | | |
|---------------------|---------------|
| _____ Never married | _____ Married |
| _____ Separated | _____ Widowed |
| _____ Divorced | |

CURRENT YEAR OF COLLEGE ENROLLMENT (Check one):

- | | |
|----------------|-----------------|
| _____ Freshmen | _____ Sophomore |
| _____ Junior | _____ Senior |

_____ Graduate
CURRENT MAJOR (Check one):

- | | |
|------------------------|-----------------------|
| _____ Business | _____ Education |
| _____ Christian Ed. | _____ Home Economics |
| _____ Fine Arts | _____ Literature |
| _____ Natural Sciences | _____ Social Sciences |
| _____ Religion | _____ Other |

If Other please list: _____

ETHNIC BACKGROUND (Check one):

- | | |
|----------------|---------------------------------|
| _____ Asian | _____ Black |
| _____ Hispanic | _____ Native American
Indian |
| _____ White | _____ Other |

Frequency of Church Attendance:

- _____never
- _____less than one time per year
- _____once or twice per year
- _____between three and 12 times per year
- _____weekly
- _____more than once per week

DENOMINATIONAL AFFILIATION OR PREFERENCE (Check one):

- | | |
|-------------------|-------------------------|
| _____Baptist | _____Brethren in Christ |
| _____Episcopalian | _____Methodist |
| _____Mennonite | _____Presbyterian |
| _____Other | |

DO YOU PROFESS TO BE A CHRISTIAN? Mark the response which best describes you:

- _____No
- _____Yes, I respect and attempt to follow the moral and ethical teachings of Christ.
- _____Yes, I have received Jesus Christ as my personal Savior and Lord.
- _____Yes, I have received Jesus Christ as my personal Savior and Lord and I seek to follow the moral and ethical teachings of Christ.

If yes, how many years have you been a Christian? _____

WERE YOU RAISED IN A CHRISTIAN HOME? (Check one):

- _____No
- _____No, but close relatives other than my parents were Christians.
- _____Yes, only my mother was a Christian.
- _____Yes, only my father was a Christian.
- _____Yes, both of my parents were Christians.

FAMILY BACKGROUND

DID YOU HAVE ANY SIBLINGS? (Check one):

- _____No, I was an only child.
- _____Yes, I had older siblings.
- _____Yes, I had younger siblings.
- _____Yes, I had both older and younger siblings.

DURING YOUR CHILDHOOD, BIRTH TO 16 YEARS OF AGE, DID YOU LIVE WITHOUT A FATHER OR STEPFATHER IN YOUR HOME? PLEASE FILL IN THE TOTAL NUMBER OF YEARS YOU LIVED WITHOUT A FATHER OR STEP-FATHER IN YOUR HOME (round to the nearest number of years):

_____number of years (from 0 to 16).

WERE YOUR PARENTS EVER DIVORCED OR SEPARATED (Check one):

- _____No _____Yes

IF YES, WITH WHOM DID YOU LIVE? (Check one):

- _____Mother _____Father
- _____Other, please list with whom:_____

IF YOU LIVED WITH SOMEONE OTHER THAN YOUR FATHER HOW OFTEN DID YOU SEE YOUR FATHER? (check one):

- once a month twice a month
 once a week twice a week
 once a week plus vacations
 vacations only
 did not keep regular contact with father
 other

DID YOUR NATURAL FATHER DIE BEFORE YOU WERE SIXTEEN YEARS OF AGE?

- No Yes

IF YES, DID YOUR MOTHER REMARRY?

- No Yes

PLEASE TURN THE PAGE AND BEGIN THE NEXT QUESTIONNAIRE

PARENT BEHAVIOR INVENTORY

INSTRUCTIONS

Please read each item on the following pages and circle the answer that most closely describes the way you remember your father acted toward you when you were around the age sixteen. If you left home before the age of sixteen, answer the questions as you would have before you left home. If you did not grow up with your natural father, but someone took the place of your father in your life, please describe the man you consider to be more of a father to you.

If you think the item is LIKE your father, circle L.

If you think the item is SOMEWHAT LIKE your father, circle SL.

If you think the item is NOT LIKE your father, circle NL.

- | | | | |
|---|---|----|----|
| 1. Makes me feel better after talking over my worries with him. | L | SL | NL |
| 2. Likes to talk to me and be with me much of the time. | L | SL | NL |
| 3. Isn't very patient with me. | L | SL | NL |
| 4. Sees to it that I know exactly what I may or may not do. | L | SL | NL |
| 5. Says I'm very good natured. | L | SL | NL |
| 6. Wants to know exactly where I am and what I'm doing. | L | SL | NL |
| 7. Decides what friends I can go around with. | L | SL | NL |
| 8. Soon forgets a rule he has made. | L | SL | NL |
| 9. Doesn't mind if I kid him about things. | L | SL | NL |
| 10. Is easy with me. | L | SL | NL |
| 11. Doesn't talk with me very much. | L | SL | NL |
| 12. Will not talk to me when I displease him. | L | SL | NL |
| 13. Seems to see my good points more than my faults. | L | SL | NL |
| 14. Doesn't let me go places because something | | | |

	might happen to me.	L	SL	NL
15.	Thinks my ideas are silly.	L	SL	NL
16.	Is very strict with me.	L	SL	NL
17.	Tell me I'm good looking.	L	SL	NL
18.	Feels hurt when I don't follow advice.	L	SL	NL
19.	Is always telling me how I should behave.	L	SL	NL
20.	Usually doesn't find out about my misbehavior.	L	SL	NL
21.	Enjoys it when I bring friends to my home.	L	SL	NL
22.	Worries about how I will turn out, because he takes anything bad I do seriously.	L	SL	NL
23.	Spends very little time with me.	L	SL	NL
24.	Allows me to go out as often as I please.	L	SL	NL
25.	Almost always speaks to me with a warm and friendly voice.	L	SL	NL
26.	Is always thinking of things that will please me.	L	SL	NL
27.	Says I'm a big problem.	L	SL	NL
28.	Believes in having a lot of rules and sticking to them.	L	SL	NL
29.	Tells me how much he loves me.	L	SL	NL
30.	Is always checking on what I've been doing at school or at play.	L	SL	NL
31.	Keeps reminding me about things I am not allowed to do.	L	SL	NL
32.	Punishes me for doing something one day, but ignores it the next.	L	SL	NL
33.	Allows me to tell him if I think my ideas are better than his.	L	SL	NL
34.	Lets me off easy when I do something wrong.	L	SL	NL
35.	Almost never brings me a surprise or present.	L	SL	NL
36.	Sometimes when he disapproves, doesn't say anything but is cold and distant for a while.	L	SL	NL

37.	Understands my problems and worries.	L	SL	NL
38.	Seems to regret that I am growing up and am spending more time away from home.	L	SL	NL
39.	Forgets to help me when I need it.	L	SL	NL
40.	Sticks to a rule instead of allowing a lot of exceptions.	L	SL	NL
41.	Likes to talk about what he has read with me.	L	SL	NL
42.	Thinks I'm not grateful when I don't obey.	L	SL	NL
43.	Tells me exactly how to do my work.	L	SL	NL
44.	Doesn't pay much attention to my misbehavior.	L	SL	NL
45.	Likes me to choose my own way to do things.	L	SL	NL
46.	If I break a promise, doesn't trust me again for a long time.	L	SL	NL
47.	Doesn't seem to think of me very often.	L	SL	NL
48.	Doesn't tell me what time to be home when I go out.	L	SL	NL
49.	Enjoys talking things over with me.	L	SL	NL
50.	Gives me lots of care and attention.	L	SL	NL
51.	Sometimes wishes he didn't have any children.	L	SL	NL
52.	Believes that all my bad behavior should be punished in some way.	L	SL	NL
53.	Hugs and kisses me often.	L	SL	NL
54.	Asks me to tell everything that happens when I'm away from home.	L	SL	NL
55.	Doesn't forget very quickly the things I do wrong.	L	SL	NL
56.	Sometimes allows me to do things that he says are wrong.	L	SL	NL
57.	Wants me to tell him about it if I don't like the way he treats me.	L	SL	NL
58.	Can't say no to anything I want.	L	SL	NL
59.	Thinks I am just someone to "put up with".	L	SL	NL

60.	Speaks to me in a cold, matter-of-fact voice when I offend him.	L	SL	NL
61.	Enjoys going on drives, trips or visits with me.	L	SL	NL
62.	Worries about me when I'm away.	L	SL	NL
63.	Forgets to get me things I need.	L	SL	NL
64.	Gives hard punishments.	L	SL	NL
65.	Believes in showing his love for me.	L	SL	NL
66.	Feels hurt by the things I do.	L	SL	NL
67.	Tells me how to spend my free time.	L	SL	NL
68.	Doesn't insist that I do my homework.	L	SL	NL
69.	Lets me help to decide how to do things we're working on.	L	SL	NL
70.	Says some day I'll be punished for my bad behavior.	L	SL	NL
71.	Doesn't seem to enjoy doing things with me.	L	SL	NL
72.	Gives me as much freedom as I want.	L	SL	NL
73.	Smiles at me very often.	L	SL	NL
74.	Often gives up something to get something for me.	L	SL	NL
75.	Is always getting after me.	L	SL	NL
76.	Sees to it that I'm on time coming home from school or for meals.	L	SL	NL
77.	Tries to treat me as an equal.	L	SL	NL
78.	Keeps a careful check on me to make sure I have the right kinds of friends.	L	SL	NL
79.	Keeps after me about finishing my work.	L	SL	NL
80.	Depends upon his mood whether a rule is enforced or not.	L	SL	NL
81.	Makes me feel free when I'm with him.	L	SL	NL
82.	Excuses my bad conduct.	L	SL	NL
83.	Doesn't show that he loves me.	L	SL	NL

84.	Is less friendly with me if I don't see things his way.	L	SL	NL
85.	Is able to make me feel better when I'm upset.	L	SL	NL
86.	Becomes very involved in my life.	L	SL	NL
87.	Almost always complains about what I do.	L	SL	NL
88.	Punishes me when I don't obey.	L	SL	NL
89.	Always listens to my ideas and opinions.	L	SL	NL
90.	Tells me how much he has suffered for me.	L	SL	NL
91.	Would like to be able to tell me what to do all the time.	L	SL	NL
92.	Doesn't check up to see whether I have done what he told me.	L	SL	NL
93.	Asks me what I think about how we should do things.	L	SL	NL
94.	Thinks and talks about my misbehavior long after its over.	L	SL	NL
95.	Doesn't share many activities with me.	L	SL	NL
96.	Lets me go any place I please without asking.	L	SL	NL
97.	Enjoys doing things with me.	L	SL	NL
98.	Makes me feel like the most important person in his life.	L	SL	NL
99.	Doesn't try to understand my point of view.	L	SL	NL
100.	Believes in punishing me to correct and improve my manners.	L	SL	NL
101.	Often has long talks with me about the causes and reasons for things.	L	SL	NL
102.	Wants to know with whom I've been when I've been out.	L	SL	NL
103.	Is unhappy that I'm not better in school than I am.	L	SL	NL
104.	Only keeps rules when it suits him.	L	SL	NL
105.	Really wants me to tell him just how I feel about things.	L	SL	NL
106.	Lets me stay up late if I keep asking.	L	SL	NL

107.	Almost never goes on Sunday drives or picnics with me.	L	SL	NL
108.	Will avoid looking at me when I've disappointed him.	L	SL	NL
109.	Enjoys working with me in the house or yard.	L	SL	NL
110.	Usually makes me the center of his attention at home.	L	SL	NL
111.	Often blows his top when I bother him.	L	SL	NL
112.	Almost always punishes me in some way when I am bad.	L	SL	NL
113.	Often praises me.	L	SL	NL
114.	Says if I loved him, I'd do what he wants me to do.	L	SL	NL
115.	Gets cross and nervous when I'm noisy around the house.	L	SL	NL
116.	Seldom insists that I do anything.	L	SL	NL
117.	Tries to understand how I see things.	L	SL	NL
118.	Says that some day I'll be sorry that I wasn't a better as a child.	L	SL	NL
119.	Complains that I get on his nerves.	L	SL	NL
120.	Lets me dress in any way I please.	L	SL	NL
121.	Comforts me when I'm afraid.	L	SL	NL
122.	Enjoys staying at home with me more than going out with friends.	L	SL	NL
123.	Doesn't work with me.	L	SL	NL
124.	Insists that I must do exactly what I'm told.	L	SL	NL
125.	Encourages me to read.	L	SL	NL
126.	Asks other people what I do away from home.	L	SL	NL
127.	Loses his temper with me when I don't help around the house.	L	SL	NL
128.	Frequently changes the rules I am supposed to follow.	L	SL	NL
129.	Allows me to have friends at my home often.	L	SL	NL

130.	Does not insist I obey if I complain or protest.	L	SL	NL
131.	Hardly notices when I am good at home or at school.	L	SL	NL
132.	If I take someone else's side in an argument, is cold and distant to me.	L	SL	NL
133.	Cheers me up when I am sad.	L	SL	NL
134.	Does not approve of my spending a lot of time away from home.	L	SL	NL
135.	Doesn't get me things unless I ask over and over again.	L	SL	NL
136.	Sees to it that I obey when he tells me something.	L	SL	NL
137.	Tells me where to find out more about things I want to know.	L	SL	NL
138.	Tells me of all the things he has done for me.	L	SL	NL
139.	Wants to control whatever I do.	L	SL	NL
140.	Does not bother to enforce rules.	L	SL	NL
141.	Makes me feel at ease when I'm with him.	L	SL	NL
142.	Thinks that any misbehavior is very serious and will have future consequences.	L	SL	NL
143.	Is always finding fault with me.	L	SL	NL
144.	Allows me to spend my money in any way I like.	L	SL	NL
145.	Often speaks of the good things I do.	L	SL	NL
146.	Makes his whole life center about his children.	L	SL	NL
147.	Doesn't seem to know what I need or want.	L	SL	NL
148.	Sees to it that I keep my clothes neat, clean and in order.	L	SL	NL
149.	Is happy to see me when I come from school or play.	L	SL	NL
150.	Questions me in detail about what my friends and I discuss.	L	SL	NL

151.	Doesn't give me any peace until I do what he says.	L	SL	NL
152.	Insists I follow a rule one day and then forgets about it the next.	L	SL	NL
153.	Gives me the choice of what to do whenever possible.	L	SL	NL
154.	I can talk him out of an order, if I complain.	L	SL	NL
155.	Often makes fun of me.	L	SL	NL
156.	If I've hurt his feelings, stops talking to me until I please him again.	L	SL	NL
157.	Has a good time at home with me.	L	SL	NL
158.	Worries that I can't take care of myself unless he is around.	L	SL	NL
159.	Acts as though I'm in the way.	L	SL	NL
160.	If I do the least little thing that I shouldn't he punishes me.	L	SL	NL
161.	Hugged or kissed me goodnight when I was small.	L	SL	NL
162.	Says if I really cared for him, I would not do things that cause him to worry.	L	SL	NL
163.	Is always trying to change me.	L	SL	NL
164.	Lets me get away without doing work I have been given to do.	L	SL	NL
165.	Is easy to talk to.	L	SL	NL
166.	Says that sooner or later we always pay for bad behavior.	L	SL	NL
167.	Wishes I were a different kind of person.	L	SL	NL
168.	Lets me go out any evening I want.	L	SL	NL
169.	Seems proud of the things I do.	L	SL	NL
170.	Spends almost all of his free time with his children.	L	SL	NL
171.	Tells me to quit "hanging around the house" and go somewhere.	L	SL	NL
172.	I have certain jobs to do and am not allowed			

- | | | | | |
|------|--|---|----|----|
| | to do anything else until they are done. | L | SL | NL |
| 173. | Is very interested in what I am learning at school. | L | SL | NL |
| 174. | Almost always wants to know who phoned me or wrote to me and what they said. | L | SL | NL |
| 175. | Doesn't like the way I act at home. | L | SL | NL |
| 176. | Changes his mind to make things easier for himself. | L | SL | NL |
| 177. | Lets me do things that other children my age do. | L | SL | NL |
| 178. | Can be talked into things easily. | L | SL | NL |
| 179. | Often seems glad to get away from me for a while. | L | SL | NL |
| 180. | When I upset him, won't have anything to do with me until I find a way to make up. | L | SL | NL |
| 181. | Isn't interested in changing me, but likes me as I am. | L | SL | NL |
| 182. | Wishes I would stay at home where he could care of me. | L | SL | NL |
| 183. | Makes me feel I'm not loved. | L | SL | NL |
| 184. | Has more rules than I can remember, so is often punishing me. | L | SL | NL |
| 185. | Says I make him happy. | L | SL | NL |
| 186. | When I don't do as he wants, says I'm not grateful for all he has done for me. | L | SL | NL |
| 187. | Doesn't let me decide things for myself. | L | SL | NL |
| 188. | Lets me get away with a lot of things. | L | SL | NL |
| 189. | Tries to be a friend rather than a boss. | L | SL | NL |
| 190. | Will talk to me again and again about anything bad I do. | L | SL | NL |
| 191. | Is never interested in meeting or talking with me friends. | L | SL | NL |
| 192. | Lets me do anything I like to do. | L | SL | NL |

PLEASE TURN THE PAGE AND BEGIN THE NEXT QUESTIONNAIRE.

How Would You Describe God?

For each of the following pair of adjectives check the space which best describes how you feel about God. Mark only one space for each pair of adjectives.

close	-----	distant
rejecting	-----	accepting
personal	-----	impersonal
demanding	-----	not demanding
loving	-----	hating
damning	-----	saving
freeing	-----	restricting
strong	-----	weak
unforgiving	-----	forgiving
controlling	-----	uncontrolling
approving	-----	disapproving
strict	-----	lenient
permissive	-----	rigid

Bernard Spilka. Used by permission.

Below are adjectives that many people use to describe God, they may or may not fit the image of God which you hold. For every one of these words write circle the number which best seems to describe God.

1. The word does not describe "God".
2. The word describes "God".
3. The word describes "God" particularly well.

Avenging	1	2	3	Kind	1	2	3
Blessed	1	2	3	Kingly	1	2	3
Blunt	1	2	3	Loving	1	2	3
Charitable	1	2	3	Majestic	1	2	3
Comforting	1	2	3	Matchless	1	2	3
Considerate	1	2	3	Merciful	1	2	3
Creative	1	2	3	Omnipotent	1	2	3
Critical	1	2	3	Omnipresent	1	2	3
Cruel	1	2	3	Omniscient	1	2	3
Damning	1	2	3	Patient	1	2	3
Distant	1	2	3	Powerful	1	2	3
Fair	1	2	3	Punishing	1	2	3
Firm	1	2	3	Real	1	2	3
Forgiving	1	2	3	Righteous	1	2	3
Gentle	1	2	3	Severe	1	2	3
Hard	1	2	3	Sovereign	1	2	3
Impersonal	1	2	3	Steadfast	1	2	3
Important	1	2	3	Stern	1	2	3

Inaccessible	1	2	3	Strong	1	2	3
Infinite	1	2	3	True	1	2	3
Just	1	2	3	Mythical	1	2	3
Wrathful	1	2	3				

SPIRITUAL WELL-BEING SCALE

For each of the following statements circle the choice that best indicates the extent of your agreement or disagreement as it describes your personal experience:

- SA = Strongly Agree
- MA = Moderately Agree
- A = Agree
- D = Disagree
- MD = Moderately Disagree
- SD = Strongly Disagree

- | | | |
|-----|---|-----------------|
| 1. | I don't find much satisfaction in private prayer with God. | SA MA A D MD SD |
| 2. | I don't know who I am, where I come from, or where I'm going. | SA MA A D MD SD |
| 3. | I believe that God loves me and cares about me. | SA MA A D MD SD |
| 4. | I feel that life is a positive experience. | SA MA A D MD SD |
| 5. | I believe that God is impersonal and not interested in my daily situations. | SA MA A D MD SD |
| 6. | I feel unsettled about my future. | SA MA A D MD SD |
| 7. | I have a personally meaningful relationship with God. | SA MA A D MD SD |
| 8. | I feel very fulfilled and satisfied with life. | SA MA A D MD SD |
| 9. | I don't get much personal strength and support from my God. | SA MA A D MD SD |
| 10. | I feel a sense of well-being about the direction my life is headed in. | SA MA A D MD SD |
| 11. | I believe that God is concerned about my problems. | SA MA A D MD SD |

- | | | |
|-----|---|-----------------|
| 12. | I don't enjoy much about life. | SA MA A D MD SD |
| 13. | I don't have a personally satisfying relationship with God. | SA MA A D MD SD |
| 14. | I feel good about my future. | SA MA A D MD SD |
| 15. | My relationship with God helps me not feel lonely. | SA MA A D MD SD |
| 16. | I feel that life is full of conflicts and unhappiness. | SA MA A D MD SD |
| 17. | I feel most fulfilled when I'm in close communion with God. | SA MA A D MD SD |
| 18. | Life doesn't have much meaning. | SA MA A D MD SD |
| 19. | My relation with God contributed to my sense of well-being. | SA MA A D MD SD |
| 20. | I believe there is some real purpose for my life. | SA MA A D MD SD |

Are there any comments you would like to include about your relationship with your father? If so, please feel free to write in the space below.

PLEASE PUT THE COMPLETED BOOKLET IN THE ENCLOSED ENVELOPE AND PUT IT IN THE MAIL BOX AS SOON AS POSSIBLE.

THANK YOU FOR YOUR PARTICIAPTION IN THIS STUDY!

FOLLOW UP POSTCARD

Last week a booklet seeking your input on father-daughter relationships and concept of God was mailed to you. Your name was drawn in a random sample of females from your college.

If you have already completed and returned it please accept my sincere thanks. If not, please do so today. Because it has been sent to only a small, but representative, sample of women it is extremely important that your input also be included in the study.

If by some chance you did not receive the questionnaire, or it got misplaced, please call me, collect (717-274--3212), and I will get another one in the mail to you today.

Sincerely,

Teresa Dean

Dear Teresa,

I was a participant in your study and I am interested in receiving a summary of the results. I understand that because my responses were confidential you will be unable to send me information regarding my personal relationship with my father and how that effected my relationship with God.

Name:

Address:

*Please note that the information will be sent to you in about 4 months.

APPENDIX B
RAW DATA TABLES

APPENDIX B

RAW DATA

Key_of_Raw_Data_by_Columns

- 1-3 = Identification number
- 4-5 = Age
- 6 = Marital Status
- 7 = Year in College
- 8-9 = Major of study
- 10 = Ethnic Background
- 11 = Frequency of Church Attendance
- 12 = Denomination
- 13 = Christian Belief
- 14-15 = Number of years a Christian
- 16 = Christian Home
- 17 = Sibling Composition
- 18-19 = Number of years Father Absent
- 20 = Parents marital status
- 21 = Person with whom subject lived
- 22 = If parents were divorced how often subject saw father
- 23 = Did father die
- 24 = Did mother remarry
- 25-27 = Acceptance vs. Rejection
- 28-30 = Psychological Control vs. Psychological Autonomy
- 31-33 = Lax Discipline vs. Firm Discipline
- 34-35 = Loving God
- 36-37 = Controlling God
- 38-39 = Wrathful God
- 40-41 = Traditional Christian view of God
- 42-43 = Kindness view of God
- 44-45 = Omniness
- 46-47 = Deisticness
- 48-49 = Religious Well-being
- 50-51 = Existential Well-being
- 52-54 = Spiritual Well-being

12114	935741653	01	1	119	71	-2362214273312	46053113		
22114102574	151	01	1	82	91	7332317423212	46057117		
31912	635141152	01	1	130	86	7362519423312	45857115		
41811	14574	551	01	1	128	66	37363113373312	45748105	
51811103464	953	01	1	87	73	52232316423112	45438	92	
619121034641153	121212	79109				9332213393312	45651107		
71811	13432	753	01	1	102	72	233423133932	6	45052102
81911	13464	152	01	1	123	84	33322513332712	45849107	
92013	93474	954	01	1	75	73	24341613423312	55851109	
103723	534242552	01	1	81	77	23362114393212	45560115		
111912	935741553	01	1	110	80	13352818423312	45353106		
122213	23434	952	01	1	114	95	20342412413212	45647103	
132013	43474	353	421612	-25136		11333122423312	46052112		
141912	934741652	01	1	30	95	29332714383212	55346	99	
151811104574	353	01	1	116	89	12342218413012	46051111		
161914	93474	612	01	1	63105	16362416413312	41656116		
172013	93414	853	01	1	82106	4332711413212	45548103		
181811	33473	654	01	1	123	88	17343016403211	45247	99
191811103474	954	01	1	79	83	283620152822	8	46058118	
2022141034141454	01	1	87	98	28322416423312	45538	93		
212113	934442054	01	1	121	78	19362718423312	46052112		
222013	63474	654	01	1	56	87	38312616423312	45651107	
2320131034141154	01	11	70100	-11342117423312		45152103			
241912	33474	823	421412131	94	33342416423312	45749106			
2518111035241153	01	1	90	96	23020123131	8	44544	89	
261911	634741553	01	1	106	65	20332311373210	45254106		
271911	33474	754	01	1	51	86	20312415413112	45052102	
281912	934741453	01	1	-24109	2282914392612	54245	87		
291811103433	153	01	1	124	83	223116113328	8	44946	95
302012	43474	652	01	1	107	63	323230113629	9	45349102
311811	434731854	01	1	126	61	36362713393012	45652108		
321912	734741553	01	1	109	65	27332514403312	46051111		
331811	334141254	01	1	83	70	29362115423312	45954113		
342013	434441352	01	1	127	79	24332511382812	45456110		
352114	13444	953	01	1	71	97	18322614423212	45456110	
362113103474	554	01	1	102	71	32322618362812	46054114		
371912	834141352	01	1	103	95	523128163525	9	45847105	
382013	135741553	01	1	121	75	27352313413312	45949108		
392013	634141233	621711	70	57	452526112923	8	54039	79	
402112	63474	14	322712	-12	82	-43324192622	8	45153104	
412114	63474	51	01	1	81	87	552826113330	8	45248100
423012	63574	414	01	1	34	83	5362412423312	45852110	
432012	134741332	01	1	107	76	1332914403212	45853111		
4418111034741352	01	1	111	80	43425202922	8	65047	97	
452114	334141354	01	1	13	98	7342712383112	45138	89	
4620131035141554	01	1	93	70	29342619423312	45958117			
471912	634741254	01	1	45	84	29312612382812	44436	80	

481911	43574	452	01	1	94	77	29362612423312	46049109
491811	63464	9221021511135	73				47331913403312	86059119
502415	634242431	021711	92116				19312119403312	84843 91
511912103474	754	01	1	47102			15292419423212	45549104
522012	13474	952	01	1	112	82	41362717402912	45150101
5319111035441052		01	1	78	80		33312411292612	45049 99
542013	63434	532	01	1	67	73	36322116413212	45952111
552114	634721553	01	1	128	71		45272621382610	84150 91
561912	234741052	01	1	65	58		37342216392912	65144 95
572012	63544	852	01	1	94	74	26352212362810	45653109
5820131034131552		01	1	98	70		253423113029 9	45049 99
592013	634341454	01	1	99	68		10362811413212	45652108
601911	634641153	01	1	44	70		50352616403312	65752109
612113	734141453	01	1	132	84		3362714422812	46060120
6219121034141253		01	1	81103			12332213363311	74849 97
6320121035741134		01	1	87	68		47332112413312	46060120
641911	63474	453	01	1	41	79	20282119332712	54445 89
6521141035731454		01	1	87	78		26322723423212	54042 82
661912	63414	632	01	1	16108		32322616423312	46049109
671912	635141353	01	1	117	70		20322415393212	74738 85
682113101474	313	01	1	-17138			16362416423312	65444 98
691911	434741552	01	1	101	66		29352116413212	55842100
702114	93574	532	221211	43104			13342617393012	45447101
712114	434641354	01	1	114	91		-33026184232 9	46052112
722113	53444	422	01	1	88	63	44352111423312	46054114
732214	43474	954	01	1	86	68	242819153128 9	64540 85
742012	134141653	01	1	123	70		31332818412812	45855113
752012103474	754	01	1	72	76		48332418393212	45954113
762114	63474	52	01	1	39	61	45321712343312	64652 98
771811103474	513	01	1	105	75		18352513423312	45854112
782013	334741553	01	1	94	75		4322815363712	44645 91
792012	63474	154	01	1	115	80	27333216353111	65236 88
801912	43474	854	01	1	23101		15342815362812	45950109
811811	834741054	01	1	68	68		52291913382712	74533 78
822114	634742152	01	1	98	70		4352113412812	45556111
831912	13444	753	01	1	111	72	313220113728 9	45354107
842013	634741453	01	1	118	84		8352618423312	44950 99
851811	63474	553	01	1	85	79	43351712393210	45646102
861812	93474	512	01	1	117	63	26312321413112	45750107
871811	135141453	01	1	109	82		30362014423312	45747104
882013	634441552	01	1	97	76		353124173526 9	55547102
8922141034441554		01	1	65	70		253418113729 9	45060110
901811103434	453	01	1	118	70		22363120413312	65253105
912014	134141554	01	1	110	84		8323116392912	45653109
922012	73414	52	01	1	74	71	213028152722 8	44747 94
931811103413	52	01	1	100	95		-13428134233 9	45648104
942124	63444	853	01	1	82	79	123228152930 6	45556111
952123	13574	953	01	1	82	79	123228124030 6	45556111

9619121034721253	01	1	109	80	22282114312411	53438	72
9720131034741053	01	1	17	71	27321212393112	45046	96
9822114 634741054	01	1	113	76	20322622423212	65752	109
9922141024241034	01	1	24	108	13342610422912	45251	103
1002114 93474 733	01	1	79	103	25342620423312	45751	110
1012611 134743065	01	1	-5	123	92230204127121	112626	52
1022013 934741053	01	1	92	92	16263119392812	55049	99
1032013 934441652	01	1	113	71	37362017403212	55850	108
1042012 633641032	72	131	1100	74	57363122423312	46058	118
1052012 434741054	01	1	42	104	-5332614403212	45141	92
1061811103474 952	01	1	104	95	27352514423112	44547	92
1071912 93373 452	01	1	48	69	37313017423212	64654	100
1082012 63474 853	01	1	123	71	28342514383212	46057	117
1092013 143141031	82	131	1109	72	383624142822 8	46058	118
11018111034745533	01	1	113	63	15361911393312	46058	118
1112012103474 651	01	1	98	98	23332415393211	45843	101
1122013 134741253	01	1	127	71	20312815353211	55757	114
11320131034741454	01	1	105	97	14312517372912	44840	88
1142012 634441353	01	1	37	80	21342615413212	45651	107
1152013 13474 913	62	181	171	111	12352316382912	44943	92
1161811 434741253	01	1	118	76	29342312423212	45454	108
1172131 347314511	01	1	82	115	20282620413012	44245	87
11830241034441834	01	1	79	92	482030193122 9	73229	61
1192214 724241034	01	1	42	137	162822192718 8	65147	98
1202012 23414 854	01	1	72	73	29312517383312	45242	94
12147241033744754	01	1	88	83	163219153532 5	46036	96
1221811 434741253	01	1	79	68	443325203124 8	45244	96
1232114 43474 812	01	1	9	94	273521172622 9	65649	105
12418111035141132	01	1	102	67	27332817403212	45254	106
12531121034742654	01	1	-7	124	-7123219422412	43926	65
1261912103333 933	01	1	121	82	38332414332712	44339	82
12721141034641853	01	1	107	67	26322125423312	45842	100

APPENDIX C
STATISTICAL CALCULATIONS

Correlations:	FH	AR	AUT	DIS	LOV	CTL
FH	1.0000	-.0348	.0190	.1821	.0580	.0116
AR	-.0348	1.0000	-.5270**	.1873	.2714*	-.0245
AUT	.0190	-.5270**	1.0000	-.4361**	-.2465*	.2037
DIS	.1821	.1873	-.4361**	1.0000	-.0249	-.1375
LOV	.0580	.2714*	-.2465*	-.0249	1.0000	-.1911
CTL	.0116	-.0245	.2037	-.1375	-.1911	1.0000
WTH	.0517	-.0690	.2185*	-.0397	-.2148*	.3014**
TDR	-.1059	.0432	.1177	-.0740	.1668	.1368
KND	-.1025	.1770	-.0851	-.0745	.4130**	-.0359
UPI	-.0651	-.0399	.0832	-.0144	.1489	.1019
DEI	.0863	-.1341	.1117	.1435	-.3313**	-.0004
REL	.0878	.2626*	-.2237*	.0640	.5241**	-.0915
EXT	.1256	.2754**	-.2515**	-.0043	.5994**	-.0621
SWB	.1158	.2970**	-.2598*	.0213	.6826**	-.1047

N of cases: 127 1-tailed Signif: * - .01 ** - .001

" ." is printed if a coefficient cannot be computed

Correlations:	WTH	TDR	KND	OMI	DEI	REL
FH	.0517	-.1053	-.1025	-.0651	.0863	.0876
AR	-.0690	.0432	.1770	-.0399	-.1341	.2628*
AUT	.2163*	.1177	-.0851	.0832	.1117	-.2237*
DIS	-.0397	-.0740	-.0745	-.0144	.1435	.0640
LOV	-.2148*	.1668	.4130**	.1489	-.3313**	.5241**
CTL	.3014**	.1368	-.0359	.1019	-.0054	-.0915
WTH	1.0000	.1388	-.0691	.1328	.2458*	-.0893
TDR	.1388	1.0000	.7008**	.6222**	-.1005	.1972
KND	-.0691	.7008**	1.0000	.4832**	-.1802	.3157**
OMI	.1328	.6222**	.4832**	1.0000	.0094	.0695
DEI	.2458*	-.1005	-.1802	.0094	1.0000	-.4158**
REL	-.0893	.1972	.3157**	.0695	-.4158**	1.0000
EKT	-.1440	.1358	.2453*	.0391	-.3584**	.5280**
SWB	-.1268	.2148*	.3525**	.0803	-.4648**	.7497**

N of cases: 127 1-tailed Signif: * - .01 ** - .001

" . " is printed if a coefficient cannot be computed

Page 4

SPSS/PC+

Correlations: EXT SWB

	EXT	SWB
FH	.1258	.1158
AR	.2754**	.2970**
AUT	-.2915**	-.2598*
DIS	-.0043	.0213
LOV	.5994**	.6326**
CTL	-.0821	-.1047
WTH	-.1440	-.1268
TDR	.1358	.2148*
KND	.2453*	.3525**
OMI	.0391	.0803
DEI	-.3564**	-.4648**
REL	.5280**	.7497**
EXT	1.0000	.9131**
SWB	.9131**	1.0000

N of cases: 127 1-tailed Signif: * - .01 ** - .001

" ." is printed if a coefficient cannot be computed

***** MULTIPLE REGRESSION *****

Listwise Deletion of Missing Data

Equation Number 1 Dependent Variable.. LOV

Beginning Block Number 1. Method: Stepwise

Page 3 SPSS/PC+

***** MULTIPLE REGRESSION *****

Equation Number 1 Dependent Variable.. LOV

Variable(s) Entered on Step Number

1.. AR

Multiple R .27136
R Square .07364
Adjusted R Square .06622
Standard Error 3.35819

Analysis of Variance

	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square
Regression	1	112.05292	112.05292
Residual	125	1409.67947	11.27744

F = 9.91602 Signif F = .0020

Page 4 SPSS/PC+

***** MULTIPLE REGRESSION *****

Equation Number 1 Dependent Variable.. LOV

----- Variables in the Equation -----

Variable	B	SE B	Beta	T	Sig T
AR	.02532	8.03366E-03	.27136	3.152	.0020
(Constant)	30.39981	.73330		41.455	.0000

----- Variables not in the Equation -----

Variable	Beta In	Partial	Min Toler	T	Sig T
FH	.16757	.07016	.99879	.783	.4350
AUT	-.14325	-.12650	.72228	-1.420	.1581
DIS	-.07850	-.08012	.96492	-.895	.3725

End Block Number 1 FIN = .050 Limits reached.

***** MULTIPLE REGRESSION *****

Listwise Deletion of Missing Data

Equation Number 1 Dependent Variable.. CTL

Beginning Block Number 1. Method: Stepwise

Page 10 SPSS/PC+

***** MULTIPLE REGRESSION *****

Equation Number 1 Dependent Variable.. CTL

Variable(s) Entered on Step Number
1.. AUT

Multiple R .20370
R Square .04149
Adjusted R Square .03383
Standard Error 3.65031

Analysis of Variance

	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square
Regression	1	72.10512	72.10512
Residual	125	1665.59567	13.32477

F = 5.41133 Signif F = .0216

Page 11 SPSS/PC+

***** MULTIPLE REGRESSION *****

Equation Number 1 Dependent Variable.. CTL

----- Variables in the Equation -----

Variable	B	SE B	Beta	T	Sig T
AUT	.04532	.01948	.20370	2.326	.0216
(Constant)	20.74107	1.65633		12.522	.0000

----- Variables not in the Equation -----

Variable	Beta In	Partial	Min Toler	T	Sig T
FH	7.3331E-03	.00785	.99964	.088	.9304
RR	.11474	.09926	.72233	1.115	.2671
DIG	-.06013	-.05527	.80962	-.816	.5383

End Block Number 1 PIN = .050 Limits reached.

***** MULTIPLE REGRESSION *****

Listwise Deletion of Missing Data

Equation Number 1 Dependent Variable.. WTH

Beginning Block Number 1. Method: Stepwise

 Page 17 SPSS/PC+

***** MULTIPLE REGRESSION *****

Equation Number 1 Dependent Variable.. WTH

Variable(s) Entered on Step Number
 1.. AUT

Multiple R .21654
 R Square .04689
 Adjusted R Square .03927
 Standard Error 3.07996

Analysis of Variance

	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square
Regression	1	58.33798	58.33798
Residual	125	1185.77225	9.48618

F = 3.14079 Signif F = .0145

 Page 18 SPSS/PC+

***** MULTIPLE REGRESSION *****

Equation Number 1 Dependent Variable.. WTH

----- Variables in the Equation -----

Variable	B	SE B	Beta	T	Sig T
AUT	.04076	.01644	.21654	2.480	.0145
(Constant)	11.93192	1.39753		8.538	.0000

----- Variables not in the Equation -----

Variable	Beta In	Partial	Min Toler	T	Sig T
FH	.04750	.04875	.99964	.544	.5877
AR	.06251	.05442	.72323	.607	.5450
DIS	.06754	.06226	.80982	.695	.4886

End Block Number 1 PIN = .050 Limits reached.

Page 26

SPSS/PC+

***** MULTIPLE REGRESSION *

Equation Number 2 Dependent Variable.. TDR

Beginning Block Number 1. Method: Enter

Page 27

SPSS/PC+

***** MULTIPLE REGRESSION *

Equation Number 2 Dependent Variable.. TDR

Variable(s) Entered on Step Number

- 1.. DIS
- 2.. FH
- 3.. AR
- 4.. AUT

Multiple R .20032
 R Square .04013
 Adjusted R Square .00866
 Standard Error 4.42191

Analysis of Variance

	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square
Regression	4	99.72600	24.93150
Residual	122	2385.50234	19.55330

F = 1.27505 Signif F = .2835

----- Variables in the Equation -----

Variable	B	SE B	Beta	T	Sig T
DIS	1.321706E-03	.03087	4.3233E-03	.043	.9659
FH	-.29835	.25684	-.10546	-1.162	.2477
AR	.01697	.01247	.14230	1.361	.1760
AUT	.05230	.03048	.19657	1.716	.0887
(Constant)	32.43111	3.51805		9.218	.0000

End Block Number 1 All requested variables entered.

*** MULTIPLE REGRESSION ***

Equation Number 2 Dependent Variable.. KND

Beginning Block Number 1. Method: Enter

Page 34 SPSS/PC+

*** MULTIPLE REGRESSION ***

Equation Number 2 Dependent Variable.. KND

Variable(s) Entered on Step Number

- 1.. DIS
- 2.. FH
- 3.. AR
- 4.. AUT

Multiple R .22408
 R Square .05021
 Adjusted R Square .01907
 Standard Error 3.36360

Analysis of Variance

	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square
Regression	4	72.97330	18.24333
Residual	122	1380.29654	11.31382

F = 1.61243 Signif F = .1754

Page 35 SPSS/PC+

*** MULTIPLE REGRESSION ***

Equation Number 2 Dependent Variable.. KND

----- Variables in the Equation -----

Variable	B	SE B	Beta	T	Sig T
DIS	-.02596	.02348	-.11104	-1.105	.2712
FH	-.16320	.19537	-.07544	-.835	.4052
AR	.01585	9.48424E-03	.17377	1.671	.0973
AUT	-3.25377E-03	.02318	-.04056	-.356	.7224
(Constant)	30.25058	2.67606		11.304	.0000

END OF STEP NUMBER 1

Page 38

SPSS/PC+

***** MULTIPLE REGRESSION *

Equation Number 2 Dependent Variable.. OMI

Beginning Block Number 1. Method: Enter

Page 39

SPSS/PC+

***** MULTIPLE REGRESSION *

Equation Number 2 Dependent Variable.. OMI

Variable(s) Entered on Step Number

- 1.. DIS
- 2.. FH
- 3.. AR
- 4.. AUT

Multiple R .11378
 R Square .01295
 Adjusted R Square -.01942
 Standard Error 1.67807

Analysis of Variance

	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square
Regression	4	4.50572	1.12643 **
Residual	123	343.54152	2.81591

F = .40002 Signif F = .9083

----- Variables in the Equation -----

Variable	B	SE B	Beta	T	Sig T
DIS	5.147080E-03	.01172	.04499	.439	.6612
FH	-.07960	.09747	-.07519	-.817	.4157
AR	2.448235E-04	4.73160E-03	5.4856E-03	.052	.9588
AUT	.01067	.01156	.10714	.922	.3581
(Constant)	10.08854	1.33506		7.557	.0000

End Block Number 1 All requested variables entered.

Page 41

 Page 43 SPSS/PC+
 * * * * MULTIPLE REGRESSION *

Equation Number 2 Dependent Variable.. DEI

Beginning Block Number 1. Method: Enter

 Page 44 SPSS/PC+
 * * * * MULTIPLE REGRESSION *

Equation Number 2 Dependent Variable.. DEI

Variable(s) Entered on Step Number

- 1.. DIS
- 2.. FH
- 3.. AR
- 4.. AUT

Multiple R .25585
 R Square .06546
 Adjusted R Square .03482
 Standard Error 1.09893

Analysis of Variance

	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square
Regression	4	10.31982	2.57995 * *
Residual	112	147.33373	1.20765

F = 2.12534 Signif F = .0803

----- Variables in the Equation -----

Variable	B	SE B	Beta	T	Sig T
DIS	.01720	7.67218E-03	.22333	2.241	.0268
FH	.02811	.06383	.03944	.440	.6605
AR	-3.69475E-03	3.09863E-03	-.08971	-.870	.3862
AUT	.01079	7.57366E-03	.16102	1.425	.1568
(Constant)	3.43989	.87430		3.934	.0001

End Block Number 1 All requested variables entered.

Equation Number 2 Dependent Variable.. REL

Beginning Block Number 1. Method: Enter

Page 51 SPSS/PC+

***** MULTIPLE REGRESSION *****

Equation Number 2 Dependent Variable.. REL

Variable(s) Entered on Step Number

- 1.. DIS
- 2.. FH
- 3.. AR
- 4.. AUT

Multiple R .30143
 R Square .09086
 Adjusted R Square .06105
 Standard Error 6.98441

Analysis of Variance

	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square
Regression	4	594.77972	148.69468
Residual	122	5951.41026	48.78205

F = 3.04814 Signif F = .0196

Page 52 SPSS/PC+

***** MULTIPLE REGRESSION *****

Equation Number 2 Dependent Variable.. REL

----- Variables in the Equation -----

Variable	B	SE B	Beta	T	Sig T
DIS	-.02787	.04876	-.05617	-.572	.5687
FH	.49368	.40568	.10752	1.217	.2260
AR	.03885	.01969	.20074	1.973	.0508
AUT	-.06239	.04814	-.14448	-1.296	.1974
(Constant)	55.24038	5.55676		9.941	.0000

End Block Number 1 All requested variables entered.

Equation Number 3 Dependent Variable.. EXT

Variable(s) Entered on Step Number

- 1.. DIS
- 2.. FH
- 3.. AR
- 4.. AUT

Multiple R .39105
 R Square .15292
 Adjusted R Square .12515
 Standard Error 6.39400

Analysis of Variance

	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square
Regression	4	900.43995	225.10999
Residual	122	4987.74902	40.88319

F = 5.51617 Signif F = .0004

Page 61

SPSS/PC+

***** MULTIPLE REGRESSION *****

Equation Number 3 Dependent Variable.. EXT

----- Variables in the Equation -----

Variable	B	SE B	Beta	T	Sig T
DIS	-.09136	.04464	-.19415	-2.047	.0428
FH	.74993	.37139	.17222	2.019	.0457
AR	.02995	.01803	.16316	1.661	.0992
AUT	-.12017	.04407	-.29343	-2.727	.0073
(Constant)	58.18001	5.08703		11.437	.0000

End Block Number 1 All requested variables entered.

***** MULTIPLE REGRESSION *****

Equation Number 4 Dependent Variable.. SWB

Beginning Block Number 1. Method: Enter

Page 63 SPSS/PC+

***** MULTIPLE REGRESSION *****

Equation Number 4 Dependent Variable.. SWB

Variable(s) Entered on Step Number

- 1.. DIS
- 2.. FH
- 3.. AR
- 4.. AUT

Multiple R .36555
R Square .13363
Adjusted R Square .10522
Standard Error 11.40913

Analysis of Variance

	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square
Regression	4	2449.43912	612.35978
Residual	122	15880.52938	130.16827

F = 4.70437 Signif F = .0015

Page 64 SPSS/PC+

***** MULTIPLE REGRESSION *****

Equation Number 4 Dependent Variable.. SWB

----- Variables in the Equation -----

Variable	B	SE B	Beta	T	Sig T
DIS	-.11452	.07965	-.13793	-1.438	.1531
FH	1.17129	.66268	.15245	1.768	.0796
AR	.07085	.03217	.21876	2.203	.0295
AUT	-.15001	.07863	-.20761	-1.903	.0583
(Constant)	110.81713	9.07704		12.209	.0000

***** MULTIPLE REGRESSION *****

Equation Number 2 Dependent Variable.. LOV

Beginning Block Number 1. Method: Enter

Page 6 SPSS/PC+

***** MULTIPLE REGRESSION *****

Equation Number 2 Dependent Variable.. LOV

Variable(s) Entered on Step Number

- 1.. DIS
- 2.. FH
- 3.. AR
- 4.. AUT

Multiple R .34251
R Square .11731
Adjusted R Square .08837
Standard Error 3.31813

Analysis of Variance

	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square
Regression	4	178.51477	44.62869
Residual	122	1343.21751	11.00998

F = 4.05348 Signif F = .0040

Page 7 SPSS/PC+

***** MULTIPLE REGRESSION *****

Equation Number 2 Dependent Variable.. LOV

----- Variables in the Equation -----

Variable	B	SE B	Beta	T	Sig T
DIS	-.04244	.08317	-.17739	-1.832	.0694
FH	.22408	.19273	.10122	1.163	.2472
AR	.01763	9.35602E-03	.15889	1.884	.0619
AUT	-.04710	.08297	-.22521	-2.059	.0416
(Constant)	35.86917	2.63989		13.587	.0000

End Block Number 1 All requested variables entered.

***** MULTIPLE REGRESSION *****

Equation Number 2 Dependent Variable.. CTL

Beginning Block Number 1. Method: Enter

Page 13 SPSS/PC+

***** MULTIPLE REGRESSION *****

Equation Number 2 Dependent Variable.. CTL

Variable(s) Entered on Step Number

- 1.. DIS
- 2.. FH
- 3.. AR
- 4.. AUT

Multiple R .23202
R Square .05383
Adjusted R Square .02281
Standard Error 3.67106

Analysis of Variance

	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square
Regression	4	93.54857	23.38714
Residual	122	1644.15222	13.47666

F = 1.73538 Signif F = .1465

Page 14 SPSS/PC+

***** MULTIPLE REGRESSION *****

Equation Number 2 Dependent Variable.. CTL

----- Variables in the Equation -----

Variable	B	SE B	Beta	T	Sig T
DIS	-.01518	.02563	-.05937	-.592	.5548
FH	.05154	.21323	.02179	.242	.8094
AR	.01117	.01035	.11199	1.079	.2827
AUT	.05260	.02530	.23642	2.079	.0397
(Constant)	19.53646	2.92067		6.699	.0000

End Block Number 1 All requested variables entered.

Page 15 SPSS/PC+

Equation Number 2 Dependent Variable.. WTH

Beginning Block Number 1. Method: Enter

Page 20 SPSS/PC+

***** MULTIPLE REGRESSION *****

Equation Number 2 Dependent Variable.. WTH

Variable(s) Entered on Step Number

- 1.. DIS
- 2.. FH
- 3.. AR
- 4.. AUT

Multiple R .23479
 R Square .05512
 Adjusted R Square .02415
 Standard Error 3.10411

Analysis of Variance

	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square
Regression	4	68.58140	17.14535
Residual	122	1175.52884	9.63548

F = 1.77940 Signif F = .1373

Page 21 SPSS/PC+

***** MULTIPLE REGRESSION *****

Equation Number 2 Dependent Variable.. WTH

----- Variables in the Equation -----

Variable	B	SE B	Beta	T	Sig T
DIS	.01347	.02167	.06229	.622	.5353
FH	.07489	.18030	.03741	.415	.6786
AR	5.692538E-03	8.75255E-03	.06746	.650	.5167
AUT	.05244	.02139	.27855	2.451	.0157
(Constant)	10.13927	2.46961		4.106	.0001

End Block Number 1 All requested variables entered.

Equation Number 1 Dependent Variable.. TDR

Beginning Block Number 1. Method: Stepwise

End Block Number 1 PIN = .050 Limits reached.
 No variables entered/removed for this block.

Equation Number 1 Dependent Variable.. KND

Beginning Block Number 1. Method: Stepwise

Page 31 SPSS/PC+

*** MULTIPLE REGRESSION ***

Equation Number 1 Dependent Variable.. KND

Variable(s) Entered on Step Number
 1.. AR

Multiple R .17697
 R Square .03132
 Adjusted R Square .02357
 Standard Error 3.35588

Analysis of Variance

	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square
Regression	1	45.51589	45.51589
Residual	125	1407.74395	11.26195

F = 4.4155 Signif F = .0465

Page 32 SPSS/PC+

*** MULTIPLE REGRESSION ***

Equation Number 1 Dependent Variable.. KND

----- Variables in the Equation -----

Variable	B	SE B	Beta	T	Sig T
AR	.01614	8.02814E-03	.17697	2.010	.0465
(Constant)	28.86654	.73279		39.392	.0000

----- Variables not in the Equation -----

Variable	Beta In	Partial	Min Toler	T	Sig T
FH	-.09844	-.09792	.99879	-1.096	.2753
AUT	.01124	.00970	.72223	.108	.9141
DIS	-.11160	-.11138	.96492	-1.248	.2144

End Block Number 1 PIN = .050 Limits reached.

* * * * MULTIPLE REGRESSION *

Listwise Deletion of Missing Data

Equation Number 1 Dependent Variable.. OMI

Beginning Block Number 1. Method: Stepwise

End Block Number 1 PIN = .050 Limits reached.
No variables entered/removed for this block.

* * * * MULTIPLE REGRESSION *

Listwise Deletion of Missing Data

Equation Number 1 Dependent Variable.. DEI

Beginning Block Number 1. Method: Stepwise

End Block Number 1 PIN = .050 Limits reached.
No variables entered/removed for this block.

Equation Number 1 Dependent Variable.. REL

Beginning Block Number 1. Method: Stepwise

Page 48

SPSS/PC+

***** MULTIPLE REGRESSION *****

Equation Number 1 Dependent Variable.. REL

Variable(s) Entered on Step Number

1.. AR

Multiple R .26261
 R Square .06897
 Adjusted R Square .06152
 Standard Error 6.98268

Analysis of Variance

	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square
Regression	1	451.46250	451.46250
Residual	125	6094.72647	48.75781

F = 9.25929 Signif F = .0029

Page 49

SPSS/PC+

***** MULTIPLE REGRESSION *****

Equation Number 1 Dependent Variable.. REL

----- Variables in the Equation -----

Variable	B	SE B	Beta	T	Sig T
AR	.05083	.01670	.26261	3.043	.0029
(Constant)	48.58748	1.52474		31.866	.0000

----- Variables not in the Equation -----

Variable	Beta In	Partial	Min Toler	T	Sig T
FH	.09632	.10028	.99879	1.122	.2639
AUT	-.11814	-.10406	.72229	-1.125	.2462
DIS	.01537	.01565	.96492	.174	.8620

End Block Number 1 PIN = .050 Limits reached.

***** MULTIPLE REGRESSION *****

Listwise Deletion of Missing Data

Equation Number 1 Dependent Variable.. EXT

Beginning Block Number 1. Method: Stepwise

Page 55 SPSS/PC+

***** MULTIPLE REGRESSION *****

Equation Number 1 Dependent Variable.. EXT

Variable(s) Entered on Step Number
1.. AUT

Multiple R .29147
R Square .08495
Adjusted R Square .07763
Standard Error 6.56534

Analysis of Variance

	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square
Regression	1	500.22536	500.22536
Residual	125	5387.96361	43.10371

F = 11.60516 Signif F = .0009

Page 56 SPSS/PC+

***** MULTIPLE REGRESSION *****

Equation Number 1 Dependent Variable.. EXT

----- Variables in the Equation -----

Variable	B	SE B	Beta	T	Sig T
AUT	-.11937	.03504	-.29147	-3.407	.0009
(Constant)	58.77927	2.97902		19.731	.0000

----- Variables not in the Equation -----

Variable	Beta In	Partial	Min Toler	T	Sig T
FH	.13118	.13711	.39954	1.541	.1258
AR	.16318	.14986	.72223	1.688	.0940
DIB	-.15223	-.15262	.80982	-1.720	.0880

End Block Number 1 PIN = .050 Limits reached.

*** MULTIPLE REGRESSION ***

Equation Number 2 Dependent Variable.. SWB

Beginning Block Number 1. Method: Stepwise

Variable(s) Entered on Step Number
1.. AR

Multiple R .29703
R Square .08823
Adjusted R Square .08093
Standard Error 11.56297

Analysis of Variance

	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square
Regression	1	1617.19324	1617.19324
Residual	125	16712.77527	133.70220

F = 12.09549 Signif F = .0007

Page 58 SPSS/PC+

*** MULTIPLE REGRESSION ***

Equation Number 2 Dependent Variable.. SWB

----- Variables in the Equation -----

Variable	B	SE B	Beta	T	Sig T
AR	.09620	.02756	.29703	3.478	.0007
(Constant)	93.99226	2.52490		37.226	.0000

----- Variables not in the Equation -----

Variable	Beta In	Partial	Min Toler	T	Sig T
FH	.12626	.13215	.99879	1.485	.1402
AUT	-.14304	-.12731	.72228	-1.429	.1554
DIS	-.03553	-.03655	.96492	-.407	.6845

End Block Number 1 PIN = .050 Limits reached.

APPENDIX D

VITA

VITA

TERESA L. DEAN

Education

Point Loma College
San Diego, California
Bachelor of Arts, 1982

Western Conservative Baptist Seminary
Portland, Oregon
Master of Arts, 1984

Experience

Portland Adventist Convalescent Center
Portland, Oregon
Geriatric Counselor
September 1983 - December 1983

Raphael House
Portland, Oregon
Counselor & Intake Worker
September 1983 - June 1984

Alder Elementary School
Portland, Oregon
Child Therapist
January 1984 - June 1984

Children's Service Division
Albany, Oregon
Family Therapist & Psychological Assessor
June 1984 - December 1984

Coping Training Project
Portland, Oregon
Research Assistant
September 1984 - October 1985

Western Psychological & Counseling Services Center
Portland, Oregon
Practicum Student
July 1984 - May 1985
Psychology Intern
June 1985 - May 1986

Philhaven Hospital
Mt. Gretna, Pennsylvania
Psychology Intern
September 1986 - Present