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The present study was conducted to investigate the relationship between father involvement, nurturant fathering, and the psychological well-being among young adult women. A total of 99 young adult, female, university students completed retrospective measures of nurturant fathering, father involvement, and measures of current psychological well-being (measured in terms of self-esteem, life satisfaction, and psychological distress). Results indicated that retrospective perceptions of both father involvement and nurturant fathering were positively correlated with daughters' current levels of self-esteem and life satisfaction. Perceptions of expressive involvement, and nurturant fathering were found to have the strongest relationship with self-esteem and life satisfaction. Results, however, did not indicate any significant correlations between fathering measures and daughters' current psychological distress. Together, the results of
the present study provide several important implications for future father-daughter research and the field of marriage and family therapy.
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to thank Dr. Scot Allgood for his expertise and guidance from beginning to end. I would also like to thank my committee members, Dr. Troy Beckert and Jana Darrington, for their support and assistance throughout the entire process.

I give special thanks to both of my parents, especially my father, Dr. Richard Connelly, for his endless support and amazing abilities as an educator, a mentor, and most importantly a father. He truly inspired this project. Last, but not least, I want to thank my husband for his patience, love, support, and never-ending inspiration. I could not have done it without all of you.

Cami C. Petersen
CONTENTS

ABSTRACT ........................................................................................................................................ iii

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS ....................................................................................................................... v

LIST OF TABLES ................................................................................................................................. ix

CHAPTER

I. INTRODUCTION .............................................................................................................................. 1

Fathers and the Psychological Well-Being of Daughters ................................................................. 2
Systems Theory and the Father-Daughter Relationship ................................................................. 4
Purpose of Study ................................................................................................................................ 5

II. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE ..................................................................................................... 6

History of Father Involvement Research ...................................................................................... 6

Defining Father Involvement ........................................................................................................... 6
Engagement ......................................................................................................................................... 8
Accessibility ....................................................................................................................................... 10
Responsibility ..................................................................................................................................... 12
Evolution of the Involvement Construct ......................................................................................... 13
Measuring Father Involvement .......................................................................................................... 16
Fathers and the Psychological Well-Being of Children ................................................................ 20
Fathers and Daughters ....................................................................................................................... 23

Self-Esteem ........................................................................................................................................ 25
Life Satisfaction ................................................................................................................................. 28
Psychological Distress ....................................................................................................................... 30

Summary and Research Questions ................................................................................................... 32

III. METHODS ...................................................................................................................................... 34

Design ................................................................................................................................................ 34
Sample ............................................................................................................................................... 35
Measures ........................................................................................................................................... 37
IV. RESULTS .............................................................................................................. 46

Data Analysis ........................................................................................................... 46
Correlations Among the Nurturant Fathering Scale and the Father Involvement Scale Measures ................................................................. 47
Relationship Between Father Involvement, Nurturant Fathering, and Daughters' Self-Esteem .............................................................. 48
Relationship Between Father Involvement, Nurturant Fathering, and Daughters' Life Satisfaction ......................................................... 51
Relationship Between Father Involvement, Nurturant Fathering, and Daughters' Psychological Distress .................................................. 53

V. DISCUSSION ........................................................................................................ 56

Strengths of Study ................................................................................................... 56
Father Involvement, Nurturant Fathering, and the Self-Esteem of Young Adult Daughters ................................................................. 58
Father Involvement, Nurturant Fathering, and the Life Satisfaction of Young Adult Daughters ................................................................. 61
Father Involvement, Nurturant Fathering, and the Psychological Distress of Young Adult Daughters ......................................................... 63
Findings in Relation to Lamb’s Model of Father Involvement ......................................... 65
Limitations and Suggestions for Future Research .................................................... 66
Implications for the Field of Marriage and Family Therapy ...................................... 68

REFERENCES ........................................................................................................ 75

APPENDICES ......................................................................................................... 88
Appendix A. Letter of Information.........................................................89
Appendix B. Measures........................................................................91
# LIST OF TABLES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Ethnicity and Religion of Daughters and Fathers</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Correlations Among the Nurturant Fathering Scale and Father Involvement Scale Measures</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Correlations Among Fathering Scales and Psychological Well-Being Variables</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

Over the last thirty years, fathering research has undergone substantial advances both theoretically and empirically. Prior to the mid 1980s, father involvement was conceptualized and operationalized as a temporal and readily observable phenomenon (Lamb, 1997a; Lamb, Pleck, Charnov, & Levine, 1985; Palkovitz, 1997; Pleck, 1997). That is, father involvement was portrayed almost solely as the amount of time fathers spend with children or specific events tallied, usually in direct interaction with children. In an effort to expand the conceptual understanding of father involvement and further refine the quantitative measurements of father involvement, Lamb et al. (1985) proposed a three-part typology of father involvement that allowed researchers to examine involvement in a more comprehensive fashion with the assistance of more clear and consistent definitions. Lamb’s model considered three dimensions of involvement including engagement, which includes a father’s direct interaction with their child; accessibility, which refers to a father’s physical or psychological availability to his child; and responsibility for the care of the child, as distinct from the performance of care.

As fathering research has progressed, it has become apparent that the associations with desirable child outcomes found in most research is actually with positive forms paternal involvement, not simply involvement per se (Cabrera, Tamis-LeMonda, Bradley, Hofferth, & Lamb, 2000; Parke, 2000; Pleck, 1997). Based on this finding, Pleck asserted that good child outcomes should best be predicted by the combination of high quantitative involvement and quality than by either dimension alone. In response to this assertion, the content and quality of involvement have gradually become incorporated
into the ways that father involvement is conceptualized and measured (Dollahite, Hawkins, & Brotherson, 1997; Hawkins & Palkovitz, 1999; Palkovitz, 1997). In addition, while most fathering research has historically been taken from the perspective of fathers and mothers, researchers have now begun to recognize the potential importance of examining father involvement from the perspective of children themselves (Finley & Schwartz, 2004; Hawkins & Palkovitz). The work of Finley and Schwartz, in particular, exemplifies the evolutionary process that has taken place in father involvement research. These authors created two father involvement measures designed to assess children’s retrospective reports of involvement, tapping both quality, defined as “nurturant fathering,” and quantity of involvement, in a variety of domains.

Fathers and the Psychological Well-being of Daughters

While substantial advances have been made in fathering research, research examining father-daughter relationships is still relatively scant, in fact, as Secunda (1992) observed, of all the family ties, the father-daughter relationship is the least understood and the least studied. Yet, there is substantial evidence suggesting that the father-daughter relationship is a relationship worthy of scientific research (Baruch & Barnett, 1975; Nielsen, 2001; Secunda). Within the last decade and a half, a small, but strong, body of literature has consistently highlighted several positive implications of father involvement on the developmental outcomes of daughters.

Three major areas, among others, in which fathers have been shown to positively influence daughters’ development, are directly related to elements of psychological well-being: self-esteem, life satisfaction, and psychological distress (Amato, 1994; Baruch &
Barnett, 1975; Van Wel, Linssen, & Abma, 2000; Wenk, Hardesty, Morgan, & Blair, 1994). Most commonly reported is the positive influence a father can have on the self-esteem of his daughter. According to Wexler (1996) the father-daughter relationship is pivotal in the formation of girls' self-esteem. Several studies provide support for this finding (Baruch & Barnett; Gecas & Schwalbe, 1986; Richards, Gitelson, Petersen, & Hurtig, 1991; Wenk et al.).

Current research examining the life satisfaction of off-spring shows parent-child interactions to be the strongest predictor of life satisfaction in adolescent off-spring (Huebner, 1991; Leung & Leung, 1992; Young, Miller, Norton, & Hill, 1995). This research provides evidence that fathers, as well as mothers, have the potential to strongly influence the life satisfaction of their daughters. Additional research has provided evidence for the veracity of these findings (Amato, 1994; Young et al.).

Research concerning father involvement and the psychological distress of daughters is quite intriguing. The work of Van Wel et al. (2000) provides evidence that the father-child relationship may have stronger implications for the psychological distress of daughters than for sons. Their findings also suggest that fluctuations in the father-child bond have more repercussions for the emotional stability of girls than for boys.

Empirical evidence clearly suggests that fathers do have a powerful potential to positively influence the psychological well-being of their daughters. However, it remains unclear how daughters' retrospective perceptions of their fathers' qualitative (or "nurturant") and quantitative fathering behaviors affects this process for young adult daughters who are transitioning from adolescence to adulthood.
While father involvement, nurturant fathering, and the psychological well-being of young adult daughters has received some attention (Schwartz & Finley, 2006), it has not been examined in the unique framework of systems theory.

According to systems theory, "the essential properties of an organism, or living system, are properties of the whole, which none of the parts have. They arise from the interactions and relationships among the parts" (Nichols & Schwartz, 2004, p. 95). Thus, from a systems perspective, it would make little sense to try to understand the behavior, or the development, of a young woman separate from her most immediate context, her family.

To begin the shift from looking at the individual, to considering the family as a system, means shifting focus from individuals to the patterns of their relationship. From a system perspective, a family is more than a collection of individuals; it is a network of relationships, one of which is the father-daughter relationship. In systemic terms, the system that is created between a father and his daughter, as a product of their patterned interaction with one another, can be referred to as a "subsystem." And it is the unique characteristics of the father-daughter subsystem that is of primary interest to the present study. More specifically, it is proposed, that the results of the present study, when considered in light of systems theory, may have several important implications for marriage and family therapist who are working with fathers and daughters in a clinical setting.
Purpose of Study

A young woman’s level of psychological well-being may have significant implications on her ability to successfully engage in the family life cycle tasks of early young adulthood, such as: attaining an education, learning to work, preparing for a career, differentiating from their family of origin, and developing intimate peer relationships (Carter & McGoldrick, 1980; Fulmer, 2005). Therefore, the process of how young women attain high levels of psychological well-being is of particular interest to this study. According to systems theory, a well-functioning family provides a context in which each member masters appropriate developmental tasks, and is thus prepared to interface successfully with other systems (Becvar & Becvar, 1999). Working from this perspective, this project focuses on the role that fathers play in the development of their daughters’ psychological well-being. More specifically, the purpose of the present study was to examine how young adult daughters’ retrospective perceptions of quality (or “nurturant fathering”) and quantity of father involvement, during adolescence, is related to their current levels of psychological well-being (i.e., self-esteem, life satisfaction, and psychological distress).
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Over the last three decades, fatherhood has increasingly become an area of considerable interest in the social science and mental health disciplines. This insurgent interest in fatherhood has resulted in an expanding body of research and theory that explore several aspects of the fathering experience. As a result, substantial advances have been made in efforts to understand father-child relationships, paternal influences on child development, and the particular impact of father involvement on children, families, and fathers themselves (see Lamb, 1997b, for a detailed review). This literature review will focus on 1) a brief history of father involvement research, 2) the conceptual and empirical evolution of the involvement construct, and 3) the associations between father involvement and the psychological well-being of children, particularly daughters. Research questions and hypotheses for the present study will also be presented.

History of Father Involvement Research

Defining Father Involvement

The concept of father involvement has had an important place in the scholarship of family studies and human development (Biller, 1993; Blankenhorn, 1995; Lamb, 1997a; Parke, 1996; Pleck, 1997). In fact, the term father involvement may be as common to scholars as such terms as martial quality and attachment (Hawkins & Palkovitz, 1999). According to Hawkins and Palkovitz however, while martial quality and attachment have a considerable history with important debates about what the concepts mean and how
they should or should not be measured, father involvement is still undergoing the maturation process in terms of conceptualization and measurement.

Because father involvement is a "multidimensional, continually evolving concept, both at the level of scholarship and at the level of cultural awareness," investigators of father involvement have struggled over the years with definitions of what it means to be an "involved father" (Cabrera, Tamis-LeMonda, Lamb, & Boller, 1999, p. 4). The term, father involvement, as it has been used over the past three decades, is conceptualized and operationalized primarily as a temporal and readily observable phenomenon (Lamb, 1997a; Lamb et al., 1985; Palkovitz, 1997; Pleck, 1997). That is, father involvement has been portrayed almost solely as the amount of time fathers spend with children or specific events tallied, usually in direct interaction with children. This portrayal is a result of the pioneering work of developmental psychologists, many of whom emphasize methodologies that lend themselves to quantifiable time and observable interaction (Lamb, 1999a).

This emphasis on temporal involvement also fits with a broader social agenda: the need for fathers to assume a greater load of direct caregiving because of mothers' greater involvement in paid labor (Bradford, Hawkins, Palkovitz, Christiansen, & Day, 2002; Cabrera et al., 2000; Pleck, 1997). Time, or the lack of it, may be a crucial way that parents think about their involvement with their children (Palkovitz, 1997). Although time in direct interaction is an important dimension of father involvement, it has been argued that this single-minded focus on unitary dimensions of father involvement does not account for the broad range of activities and various pathways by which fathers can
influence their children (Hawkins & Palkovitz, 1999; Marsiglio, Amato, Day, & Lamb, 2000; Pleck, 1997).

As early as 1985, researchers began to look for ways in which they could capture a more complete and in-depth understanding of father involvement. In an effort to expand the conceptualization and further refine the quantitative measurements of father involvement, Lamb and his colleagues (1985), proposed a three-part typology of father involvement that a number of scholars have endorsed and continued to use (e.g., Cabrera et al., 2000; McBride, 1990; Pleck, 1997). In fact, even recently, the model developed by Lamb and his colleagues has been described as the most influential scheme offered to identify and distinguish between the different components that father involvement in child rearing might entail (Parke, 2000). Lamb and colleagues’ model considers three dimensions of father involvement including: (1) engagement, or a father’s direct interaction with the child, in the form of caretaking, play, or leisure, (2) accessibility, which is a father’s presence or availability to the child, and (3) responsibility for the care of the child, as distinct from the performance of care.

Engagement

Sometimes referred to as interaction, engagement was originally defined by Lamb et al. (1985) as “a father’s direct contact with his child, through caretaking and shared activities” (p. 884). Since Lamb and colleagues’ formulation and definition of engagement, several scholars and researchers have used the concept of engagement in a variety of ways to conceptualize and measure the amount of time that fathers spend
interacting one-on-one with their children. Although the ways that engagement has been measured over the years has varied, the basic conceptual understanding of engagement has remained fairly consistent (see Bradford et al., 2002; Cabrera et al., 2000; McBride, 1990; Parke, 2000; Pleck, 1997).

In 1987, Levant, Slattery, and Loiselle conducted a study which examined patterns and correlates of fathers' involvement in household chores and child care. In assessing levels of engagement, these authors measured direct interaction by time spent in specific activities in the following four areas: discipline, recreation, caretaking, and communication-nurturance.

McBride (1990) used Lamb and colleagues' (1985) tripartite model to investigate the effects of a parent education/play program on the types of involvement fathers have with their children and on their perceived sense of competence in parenting skills. Engagement was measured by total amount of time spent interacting with children throughout the day including everything from personal hygiene (shower, shave, etc.), to work activities, to relaxation type activities (watching TV, going for a walk, etc.).

In an effort to measure the amount of time that heterosexual fathers, living in a two-parent household, spend engaging with their minor children, Marsiglio (1991) chose to measure engagement by the amount of time fathers spent in specific activities with their children. For preschoolers, activities included father-child outings away from home (e.g., parks, museums, zoos), playing together at home, and reading to the child. For school-aged children, activities included father-child contact in leisure activities, working on projects or playing at home, private talks, and helping with reading or homework assignments.
In 1994, Masako Ishii-Kuntz conducted face-to-face interviews with father-child pairs in order to measure the amount of reported time that fathers and children spend engaging with one another. In this study, engagement was measured by time spent in the following activities: eating breakfast (or dinner) together, talking to each other, helping the child with his/her homework, and having time together for sports, taking walks, and other recreational activities.

Researchers have varied in the ways they have operationalized the engagement construct, however, the conceptual understanding of engagement, provided by Lamb and colleagues' (1985) model, has remained consistent, and as demonstrated above, has been shown to be useful in the empirical study of the father involvement construct. Overall, positive paternal engagement, regardless of the ways in which it has been measured, has been found to be significantly related to a cluster of child outcomes including self-control, self-esteem, life skills, and social competence in both elementary-age children and adolescents (Amato, 1987). Although Lamb's concept of engagement has been the most widely and frequently used concept of his three-part model, accessibility and responsibility have also been shown, throughout the years, to be useful in expanding the ways in which researchers define and explore the various pathways by which fathers influence the lives of their children.

**Accessibility**

Accessibility, a concept related to engagement, refers to a father's potential availability for interaction, by virtue of being [physically or psychologically] present or accessible to the child whether or not direct interaction is occurring (Cabrera et al., 2000;
Lamb et al., 1985; McBride, 1990; Pleck, 1997). Examples of accessibility may include such things as cooking in the kitchen while the child is plays nearby, being physically absent but easily accessible by phone, and watching television together, but not directly interacting (Lamb, 2000). As with engagement, accessibility has been used in father involvement research to assess one of the many ways in which fathers are involved in the lives of their children. Averaging across several studies, Pleck found that fathers’ proportional accessibility is about two-thirds of mothers’. According to Pleck this figure is about 50% higher than the corresponding averages in the 1970s and 1980s studies. This suggests that father involvement is increasing to some extent, at least in terms of increased accessibility.

On average, research that has used the accessibility construct to measure involvement has found that fathers spend more time being accessible to their children than they do engaging or being responsible (McBride & Mills, 1993; Nock & Kingston, 1988; Pleck, 1997). This is a positive finding especially when considering the consequences of father accessibility on child-outcomes. For example, for early childhood outcomes, preschool children of substantially engaged (i.e., performing 40% or more of the within-family child care) and accessible fathers show more cognitive competence, more internal locus of control, more empathy, and less gender-role stereotyping (Lamb, 1987; Radin, 1994). In addition, paternal accessibility has been shown to influence the quality of the father-child relationship. In a short-term longitudinal study focusing on the father-adolescent relationship, fathers who were more accessible were found to be more accepting of the adolescents, and involvement predicted increasing acceptance over time as reported by both the father and the adolescent (Almeida & Galambos, 1991).
Responsibility

Responsibility is the hardest type of involvement to define, but has been said to be perhaps the most important type of involvement because it reflects the extent to which a father takes ultimate responsibility for the care and welfare of his child (Cabrera et al., 2000; Lamb, 2000). Responsibility includes awareness of the child’s social, emotional, cognitive, and physical needs. It also involves implementing strategies to meet these needs such as, selecting a pediatrician and making appointments, selecting child care-settings or arranging for babysitters, and making arrangements for care and nurturance for a child when they are sick (Cabrera et al., 2000; Lamb, 2000; Lamb et al., 1985; McBride, 1990; Palkovitz, 1997).

On average, fathers’ share of responsibility is substantially lower than mothers’ and lower than mothers’ share of engagement or accessibility (Pleck & Masciadrelli, 2004). In addition, research has yet to identify any child-care task for which fathers have primary responsibility (Pleck & Masciadrelli). While these studies demonstrate that fathers are less responsible for the care of their children than are mothers, other studies have provided some evidence that when fathers have a higher sense of competence in parenting they participate more in being responsible for their children (Baruch & Barnett, 1986; McBride & Mills, 1993). This finding may be of particular interest to educators and clinicians in helping fathers become more involved through increasing their skills and confidence as a parent. In addition, according to Pleck’s (1997) review of the literature, a father’s level of responsibility may be more likely to influence children indirectly via the potential benefits that responsibility offers mothers, primarily employed mothers.
Evolution of the Involvement Construct

Lamb and colleagues' (1985, 1987) tripartite model allows researchers to examine father involvement in a more comprehensive fashion with the assistance of more clear and consistent definitions (Pleck, 1997). While Lamb et al.'s (1985, 1987) typology affords advantages over less differentiated models of father involvement and has made considerable contributions to time-based measurements of father involvement, the model remains primarily quantitative in nature, considering only the amount of time spent engaging in interaction, being accessible, and carrying out responsibilities.

Considering this content-free conceptualization of involvement, Pleck (1997) has argued that the critical question concerning father involvement is: "How good is the evidence that father's amount of involvement, without taking into account its content and quality, is consequential for children?" (p. 68). According to Cabrera et al. (1999), Cabrera et al. (2000), and Parke (2000), there is no evidence linking involvement per se (i.e. amount) with desirable child outcomes. In fact, according to Parke (1996) and Palkovitz (1997) if the quality of involvement is inferior or harmful (e.g., in case of an abusive father) more father involvement can be linked to poorer developmental outcomes for the child. The associations with desirable child outcomes found in most research are actually with positive forms of paternal involvement, not simply amount of involvement (Cabrera et al., 1999; Parke, 2000; Pleck). Therefore it may be the quality of the father-child involvement that is more clearly linked to children's developmental outcomes than quantity alone.
As fathering research has evolved, the content and quality of involvement have gradually become incorporated in father involvement measures (see Pleck, 1997 for a comprehensive summary). In 1997, Joseph H. Pleck proposed that involvement needs to be combined with qualitative dimensions of paternal behavior through the concept of “positive paternal involvement.” According to Pleck, positive paternal involvement means “high engagement, high accessibility, and high responsibility with positive engagement behaviors and stylistic characteristics” (p. 102). Positive paternal involvement, which is measured by assessing both quantitative and qualitative aspects of involvement, is thus distinct from paternal involvement per se and a large set of studies has provided empirical support for the hypothesis that positive paternal involvement benefits children (see Amato & Rivera, 1999).

Based on the hypothesis that good child outcomes are a function of positive paternal involvement, rather than quantitative amounts of involvement, Pleck (1997) purports that good child outcomes should best be predicted by the combination of high quantitative involvement and high quality than by either dimension alone. He suggests that measures of father involvement will be improved by identifying how specific paternal actions (such as soothing children, reading to them, or helping them solve a personal problem) are thought to enhance children’s particular developmental outcomes.

As research has evolved, content and quality of involvement have gradually become incorporated in father involvement theories and measures. Two developments in particular, are especially noteworthy for their attempts to refine and expand conceptualizations of father involvement to capture the range of activities and pathways by which fathers can influence their children’s lives.
First, Palkovitz (1997) developed a multidimensional and multifaceted framework that conceptualizes the ways parents can be positively involved in their children's lives in three domains of functioning: cognitive, affective, and behavioral. Later, Hawkins and Palkovitz (1999) built on this framework by outlining specific ways to improve conceptualization and measurement. They identified several domains of fathering that are conceptually related to various developmental trajectories of children, adolescents, and young adults. Researchers such as Finley and Schwartz (2004) have found the work of Hawkins and Palkovitz to be helpful in deviating from the more time-based measures in two ways. First, it encourages the specification of the many different domains of children's lives in which fathers may or may not be engaging their children or attempting to promote some aspect of development when they interact with their children. Second, it allows for the quantification of the perceived level of father involvement (i.e., the degree to which fathers were perceived as being involved in each domain of their children's development) (Finley & Schwartz).

The second noteworthy development in the evolution of fathering research is provided by Dollahite et al. (1997). Based on the work of Erik Erikson (1982), these authors approach fathering from an ethical perspective, based on the assumption that men have the desire, ability, and ethical responsibility to care for the next generation. Dollahite and his colleagues created their framework, coined generative fathering, or simply fatherwork, in an effort to provide both conceptual clarity and practical utility. Their goal was to provide a set of ideas and ideals that could suggest to scholars and practitioners important areas to attend to in trying to understand and encourage good fathering.
As conceptualizations of father involvement have matured, the need for improved measures of the father involvement construct has become apparent. The theory behind father involvement has moved faster than the ability to measure the new constructs (Hawkins & Palkovitz, 1999; Lamb, 1999a; Marsiglio et al., 2000).

Measuring Father Involvement

The empirical work of Bradford et al. (2002) follows the earlier conceptual work of Hawkins and Palkovitz (1999) and Palkovitz (1997). Their goal was to develop a “reliable and valid self-report instrument for fathers that captured the breadth and richness of father involvement, but was short enough for inclusion in large-scale surveys of broader family issues” (Bradford et al., p. 185).

To generate potential items for a self-report measure, they used the information provided by Palkovitz (1997), and consulted a handful of recent scholarly works (e.g., Doherty, Kouneski, & Erickson, 1998; Dollahite & Hawkins, 1998; Snarey, 1993). They generated a list of more than 100 potential items, which were reduced to 43 items termed “Inventory of Father Involvement” (IFI). The final items tapped the behavioral, cognitive, and affective domains originally identified by Palkovitz, and the moral/ethic dimensions from the generative fathering framework (Hawkins & Dollahite, 1997; Dollahite & Hawkins), as well as items assessing direct and indirect involvement. In addition, they attempted to word items in ways that would be applicable to fathers in diverse household structures (e.g., married, unmarried, and divorced).

After conducting both exploratory and confirmatory analyses of the IFI structure, nine distinct dimensions of father involvement were identified. These included (a)
providing, (b) support of the mother, (c) disciplining and teaching responsibility, (d) encouraging success in school, (e) giving praise and affection, (f) spending time together and talking, (g) being attentive to their children’s daily lives, (g) reading to their children, and (h) encouraging children to develop their talents. All of which were refined using 26 items (Bradford et al., 2002). According to Bradford et al. the multidimensional operationalization of father involvement, provided by the IFI, should allow researchers to explore more subtle, theoretical linkages between aspects of father involvement and children’s development and well-being. While Bradford and colleagues’ believe that the IFI offers a richer and more refined measure of father involvement, they also make clear the continuity between their measure and the three-fold conceptualization of father involvement suggested by Lamb et al. (1985, 1987).

Although Bradford et al. (2002) reported being encouraged by their initial effort with the IFI, they readily admitted that much remains to be done. To gain a more complete understanding of father involvement, future studies need to include children’s reports. Gaining the perspective of the child, they say, is likely to yield important and somewhat different information that more fully captures the concept of father involvement.

In 2004, Finley and Schwartz created two measures of fathering that employ a child-centered approach emphasizing children’s phenomenological retrospective perceptions of father involvement. According to Finley and Schwartz, the essence of their approach is that what is important to the children in the long run and what most heavily affects children’s current and future behavior is the long term parent ‘residue’ within the children that is encapsulated within the children’s retrospective perceptions of their parents (p. 145).
Thus, according to these authors, if a young adult daughter perceived that her father was highly involved in her life, then that father’s impact on his daughter is a consequence of her perception of high involvement— independent of the accuracy of that perception (Finley & Schwartz).

Building on the father involvement literature, the core conceptualizations underlying the phenomenological approach used by Finley and Schwartz (2004) are: (a) there are many different domains of a child’s life in which a father may or may not be involved; (b) what is most important is the child’s perception of the father’s level of involvement; (c) the long-term impact that the father has on his child is a function of the child’s perception; and (d) one way to measure this long-term impact is to ask adolescent or adult children to retrospectively report on their perceptions of their fathers’ involvement and nurturance.

Based on this phenomenological perspective, Finley and Schwartz (2004) developed two instruments. The first instrument, the Nurturant Fathering Scale (Finley, 1998; Williams & Finley, 1997) was designed to measure the affective quality of fathering. Their conception of nurturant fathering, which represents the extent to which young adult children perceive their fathers as having been emotionally available, loving, and caring, is related to Rohner’s theory of paternal acceptance-rejection (see Rohner & Britner, 2002; Rohner & Veneziano, 2001, for reviews). Rohner (1998), who supports the notion that positive child outcomes are a product of both the quantity and quality of father involvement, conceptualized quality in terms of father love. According to parental acceptance-rejection theory, paternal acceptance, also termed father love, includes such
feelings and behaviors (or children’s perceptions of such feelings and behaviors) as paternal nurturance, warmth affection, support, comfort, and concern (Rohner).

The second instrument, the Father Involvement Scale (Finley & Schwartz, 2004, 2005a, 2005b; Schwartz & Finley, 2006), was developed to assess adolescent and adult children’s retrospective perceptions of their fathers’ involvement in 20 different domains of their lives. According to Finley and Schwartz (2004, 2005b) the involvement scale was developed in two steps. First, the domains included in the measure were derived from the work of Hawkins and Palkovitz (1999), which calls for the study of father involvement to move beyond time-based measures and attend to multiple domains of fathering. Accordingly, their measure of father involvement surveys instrumental and expressive domains of fathering, both of which have been found to mediate the effects of proxy measures (e.g., time spent with the child) on adolescent psychosocial functioning (Salem, Zimmerman, & Notaro, 1998). Second, as recommended by Hawkins and Palkovitz (1999), for each domain, items were constructed to assess reported and desired levels of father involvement (one item for reported involvement and one item for desired involvement).

Together, the Father Involvement Scale and the Nurturant Fathering Scale, provide a measure of the perceived quality of father-child relationships as well as the extent to which children feel that their fathers are involved in various contexts of their lives. These measures are an attempt to empirically test the latest iterations of father involvement theory.
Based on family systems theory, Jacobvitz and Bush (1996) support the idea that individual development is a product of the relationships within the family system. Working from this perspective, the following section focuses on the role that father involvement plays in the development of children’s psychological well-being, specifically older adolescents and young adult children. In addition, this section will also focus on the importance of children’s perceptions of fathering behaviors, as they relate to various aspects of psychological development, both immediate, and across time.

Although there has been some variation in the precise ways that psychological well-being has been defined, the literature shows general consistency in defining and measuring psychological well-being in terms of self-esteem, life satisfaction, and psychological distress (Amato, 1994; Morgan, Wilcoxon, & Satcher, 2003; Roberts & Bengtson, 1993; Schwartz & Finley, 2006; Van Wel et al., 2000).

While the vast majority of the psychological literature focuses on parent-child relationships early in children’s development (Bowlby, 1985; Chodorow, 1978; Freud, 1938), relatively little theoretical and empirical work has focused on the nature, activities, and impact of parent-child relationships in adolescence and early adulthood (Videon, 2005). One possible reason for this neglect may be due to the fact that adolescence is typically thought of as a time when children distance themselves from their parents, and peers take on increasing importance (Videon). As a result, most of the literature examining adolescent development typically gives larger emphasis to the influence of peers (Harris, 1998).
Although peers and dating relationships become increasingly influential throughout the teenage years, research indicates that parent-child relations remain important influences on adolescents’ well-being (Van Wel et al., 2000). In fact, the influence of parents on adolescent’s psychological well-being is sometimes found to bear more weight than that of peers (Field, Lang, Yando, & Bendell, 1995; Greenberg, Siegal, & Leitch, 1983; Rosenberg, 1979). In addition, the influence of parent-child relationships in adolescence is not transitory; the affective quality of parent-child relationships in the teenage years has been shown to influence the long-term trajectory of off-spring well-being into adulthood (Roberts & Bengston, 1993; Van Wel et al., 2000).

While some social scientists have emphasized fathers’ unique mental and behavioral qualities that contribute to children’s well-being (Milkie, Simon, & Powell, 1997), others have asserted that fathers and mothers alike influence children by virtue of nurturant caretaking (Lamb, 1986; Rohner, 1998). According to Rohner and Veneziano (2001), one dramatically important component of the concept of “quality of relationship” has to do with warmth, supportiveness, comforting, caring, nurturance, affection, or simply love. In their review of the fathering literature, these authors found that father love, by itself is implicated in a wide variety of developmental outcomes including children’s and adult’s psychological health and sense of well-being. As demonstrated by the following section, this appears to be a consistent finding throughout the literature concerning the influence of fathers of the psychological well-being of their children.

Father involvement combined with nurturance have been found to be positively associated with children’s social competence, internal locus of control, and the ability to empathize (Lamb, 1987; Radin & Russell, 1983; Snarey, 1993). Studies of adults yield
supporting evidence. In a longitudinal analysis, Block (1971) showed that well-adjusted men and women generally grew up in families in which fathers were warm and involved. Additionally, designing his study around the central hypothesis that closeness to fathers, independent of closeness to mothers, is associated positively with adult children’s psychological well-being, Amato (1994) gathered data from adult children regarding their closeness to and contact with parents. In addition, he asked questions assessing children’s psychological well-being (defined as, global happiness, satisfaction with life, psychiatric symptoms, and self-esteem). His findings provided evidence that regardless of the quality of the mother-child relationship, the closer children were to their fathers, the happier, more satisfied, and less distressed they report being.

In 1998, Veneziano and Rohner found that for European American children (ages 8-18), father involvement, defined as accessibility, responsibility, decision making about children’s care and well-being, and percentage of total time spent caring for the child, by itself was significantly related to psychological adjustment. Paternal involvement was also related significantly to children’s perceptions of paternal acceptance-rejection. According to these authors, these correlations suggest that the more involved that fathers were in the lives of their children, the more youths’ tended to experience their fathers as accepting. In addition, as fathers became increasingly involved, youths’ psychological adjustment tended to be better. Thus, according to these authors, perceived paternal acceptance appears to be the “generative mechanism by which paternal involvement is able to influence youths’ psychological functioning” (p. 341).

Amato and Gilbreth’s (1999) meta-analysis of 63 studies supports the finding that paternal encouragement, support, and closeness are more predictive of youths’ social,
emotional, and psychological well-being than the frequency of contact between children and their nonresident fathers. Continuing this line of research, findings by Van Wel et al., (2000) provide additional support that the closeness or bond that fathers have with their children is positively related to the psychological well-being of children, both immediate and across time. Their results showed that a change in the father-child bond does correspond to a parallel change in the psychological well-being of the young people studied. Further, their results showed that this connection does not become weaker as the adolescents/young adults grow older. This demonstrates that fathers continue to be significant for the psychological functioning of their growing children, a finding which is also apparent in other studies (Paterson, Field, & Pryor, 1994).

Fathers and Daughters

The literature just reviewed demonstrates that fathers can play a significant role in the developmental outcomes of children, specifically in the area of psychological well-being. While the amount and quality of father involvement has been shown to have implications for both sons and daughters, much of the literature specific to father-child relationships downplays the importance of this relationship on daughter development, especially when compared to the mother-daughter relationship (Nielsen, 2001). The assumption that mothers have a greater influence on the development of their daughters appears to have cultural as well as empirical support, and is evident not only in the content of father-daughter literature, but is highlighted by the lack of exposure that the father-daughter relationship has received in both popular literature and that which is empirically based (Nielsen).
As Secunda (1992) observed, fathers do have a profound impact on daughters
development, yet, of all the family ties, the father-daughter relationship is the least
understood and least studied. The observation noted by Secunda has also been noted by
several others (Abramovitch, 1997; Daniels, 1998; Lamb, 1999a; Phares, 1999). Nielsen
(2001) also called attention to the lack of exposure that father-daughter relationships
receive. She believes that America, for the most part
tends to idealize, honor, and make more positive assumptions about mothers than
fathers – not only in terms of how much more nurturing, unselfish, self sacrificing
and sensitive mothers supposedly are, but also in terms of how loyal, honest, and
trustworthy each parent supposedly is as a spouse. This, in turn can make it
difficult for fathers to become as close as most mothers are to their children,
especially their daughters (p. 284).

In her research, Nielsen (2001) highlights society’s neglect of father-daughter
relationships on several levels including entertainment, literature, research, and therapy.
Because research is slowly, but surely, providing strong evidence that fathers do in fact
make significant contributions to several important aspects of female development,
Nielsen strongly believes that America’s current perspective and neglect of the father-
daughter relationship may be detrimental to fundamental aspects of healthy female
development. In addition, she believes that this neglect may also have a negative impact
on paternal development, which Nielsen claims is an instinctual desire that most, if not
all, men have and are often denied.

Perhaps another contributing factor to the neglect of the father-daughter
relationship is the long-standing notion that fathers play a more important role in the
development of sons than daughters (Morgan et al., 2003). Although developmental
research has shown that fathers are typically less involved with their daughters than with
their sons, the quality of parenting that children of both genders receive from their fathers can have long term psychological implications (Amato, 1994; Biller, 1993; Van Wel et al., 2000; Wenk et al., 1994).

Within the last decade and a half, a small but strong body of literature has consistently highlighted several positive implications of father-daughter interactions on female developmental outcomes, deeming this relationship as significant and potentially powerful. Interestingly, three major areas in which fathers have been shown to positively influence daughters’ development are directly related to elements of psychological well-being: self-esteem, life satisfaction, and psychological distress (Amato, 1994; Richards et al., 1991; Van Wel et al., 2000; Wenk et al., 1994).

Self-Esteem

Commonly reported within father-daughter research is the positive influence a father can have on the self-esteem of his daughter (Baruch & Barnett, 1975; Forsman, 1989; Gecas & Schwalbe, 1986; Richards et al., 1991). In an effort to define self-esteem, Coopersmith (1967) provided the following description:

By self-esteem we refer to the evaluation which the individual makes and customarily maintains with regard to himself; it expresses an attitude of approval or disapproval, and indicates the extent to which the individual believes himself to be capable, successful, significant, and worthy. (p. 4)

Similarly, Rosenberg (1965) stated, “When we speak of high self-esteem...we shall simply mean that the individual respects himself, considers himself worthy...Low self-esteem, on the other hand, implies self-rejection, self-dissatisfaction, self-contempt” (p. 31).
Baruch and Barnett (1975) found that females who are able to identify with their fathers had higher measures of self-esteem, independence, and success, and that greater father participation in child-rearing was associated with less stereotypical views of gender roles. This is especially significant in that Lamb (1981) stated that negative, and overly rigid, views of femininity (e.g., dependent, primary caregiver) hamper a daughter’s positive notions of femininity (e.g., warmth, expressiveness, and empathy) which greatly facilitates the development of her self-concept.

In their review of the literature, Gecas and Schwalbe (1986) established consistent findings supporting the idea that parental behavior that indicates a positive evaluation of sons and daughters, such as support, participation, and interest in the child, are positively related to the child’s self-esteem. They suggest that the main effect of this type of parental behavior seems to be that it conveys to the child information about his or her inherent worth.

In their own research, Gecas and Schwalbe (1986) gathered data from 128 intact families. They paid particular attention to parental control/autonomy (degree to which parents attempt to limit child’s autonomy), support (helping, affection, expressions of approval), and participation behaviors (spending time and sharing activities), as reported by mothers and fathers, children’s perceptions of parental behavior, and the effects of these on various aspects of children’s self-evaluations (self-worth, self-efficacy, and general self-esteem). Using Pearson’s product-moment correlations, their results showed that adolescent self-esteem was more strongly related to adolescent’s perceptions of parental behaviors than to parental reports of their own behavior. In fact, parents’ reports of their own behavior had very little effect on their children’s self-esteem. Interestingly,
correlations were somewhat stronger for fathers’ behaviors than for mothers. Additionally, while girl’s self-esteem was consistently unaffected by parental control/autonomy, results showed that girls were more strongly affected by parental support and participation behaviors.

Continuing this line of research, Richards et al. (1991) gathered data from 139 high school seniors in an effort to examine the role that mothers and fathers play in the personality development of their adolescents, with self-esteem as a variable of major interest. The 72 girls and 67 boys who were included in the study ranged in age from 17-18 years. Using semi-structured interviewing, students were asked questions about their relationship with their mothers and fathers, their perception of parenting behaviors, with subsequent measures of self-esteem (i.e., Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale; see Rosenberg, 1965) assessed. Results showed that while mother and father behaviors were associated with daughter self-esteem, a more powerful relationship between fathers and daughters’ self-esteem was found. Thus, self-esteem appears to be especially enhanced by girls’ positive experiences with their fathers where the support of fathers is demonstrated through showing affection, helping, and expressing approval. The findings of Forsman (1989) also provide support for the unique and weighted contribution that fathers lend to the self-esteem of their daughters.

This is further supported by Wenk et al. (1994) who, using longitudinal data of 367 adolescent males and 395 adolescent females, examined adolescents perceptions of their father’s and mother’s behavioral and emotional involvement and their current psychological well-being (operationalized as self-esteem, life satisfaction, and mental health). Results showed that feeling close to father had a significant positive effect on
both the self-esteem and life satisfaction of daughters. In addition, receiving enough love from father showed positive effects on the mental health of daughters. Interestingly, there was not a significant association found between daughters’ psychological well-being and fathers’ behavioral involvement.

Research done by Roberts and Bengtson (1993) demonstrated that self-esteem might be a mechanism for the long-term psychological effects of father-daughter affection. Subsequently, they found that baseline self-esteem in young adulthood appeared to predict later satisfaction and distress for adult women. This suggests that greater father-daughter affection early in a daughter’s adult life may contribute to later well-being by bolstering her self-esteem. In summary, these results suggest that emotional or affective involvement of fathers, compared to behavioral involvement, may have a much stronger influence on the self-esteem of adolescent females. In addition, this effect appears to have both immediate and long-term consequences for daughters.

Life Satisfaction

Ryff (1989), who noted the lack of theoretical grounding in research on psychological well-being, indicated that measures of life satisfaction, as opposed to previous measures of happiness, are most appropriate when examining the construct of psychological well-being. His argument is based on the fact that life satisfaction measures enduring characteristics of psychological well-being rather than short-term well-being.

Life satisfaction is generally described as “a feeling of well-being with one’s self and life circumstances” (Young et al., 1995, p. 813). Life satisfaction has been measured
in terms of satisfaction with life in general, or a combination of satisfaction in key areas such as: neighborhood, job or career, house or apartment, friends, hobbies or leisure activities, marriage, children, and financial situation (Amato, 1994; Freudiger, 1983). In addition, life satisfaction, when measured for children and adolescents has also been defined and measured as satisfaction with school, friends, family, self, and gender (Young et al., 1995).

Current research examining the life satisfaction of offspring shows parent-child interactions to be the strongest predictors of life satisfaction in adolescent offspring (Huebner, 1991; Leung & Leung, 1992; Young et al., 1995). This research has provided strong evidence that fathers, as well as mothers, do have the potential for positively influencing the life satisfaction of their daughters. In his examination of father-child relations and offspring well-being in early adulthood, Amato (1994) found that a daughters closeness to her father yielded significant associations with her life satisfaction. This finding held true even when closeness to mothers was controlled for.

In addition, the work of Young et al. (1995) supports these findings. In an effort to examine the effects of parental supportive behaviors on life satisfaction of adolescent offspring, these authors employed a sample of 640, 12 to 16 year-old children, living in two-parent families. They measured three types of supportive parent behaviors: (1) intrinsic support (i.e., encouragement, appreciation, being pleased with the child, trust, and love), (2) extrinsic support (i.e., hugging and kissing, taking the child to dinner or a movie, and buying the child something special), and (3) perceived closeness to mother and father (i.e., wanting to be like the parent, enjoying doing things with the parent, amount of affection expressed by the parent, and amount of time the parent spent with the
child). Analyses showed adolescents' perceptions of parental support, particularly intrinsic support and closeness, to be positively correlated to the life satisfaction measure. In addition, they found that perceived paternal love and caring was as predictive of sons' and daughters' life satisfaction— including their sense of well-being — as was maternal love and caring.

**Psychological Distress**

Psychological distress is difficult to define because it encompasses such a vast array of symptoms. Perhaps one of the simplest ways to define distress may be any psychological symptom(s) that are consistent with clinically recognized disorders (Lambert et al., 1998). Even without clear, consistent definitions for what constitutes psychological distress, researchers have used a variety of constructs when studying parent-child interactions.

In an examination of adult daughter-parent relationships and their associations with daughters' subjective well-being and psychological distress, Barnett, Kibria, Baruch, and Pleck (1991) defined and measured psychological distress in terms of anxious and depressive symptomatology. Based on their review of past and current literature, these authors hypothesized that daughter-father role quality is inversely related to psychological distress, with high role quality related to low levels of anxiety and depression, and low role quality related to high levels of anxiety and depression. Results of their study confirmed their hypothesis that adult daughters' relationships with their fathers were negatively associated with psychological distress, and positively related to their well-being.
In 2000, Van Wel and colleagues conducted a study to explore the correlation between the parental bond and the well-being of adolescents and young adults. Psychological stress, which was defined as a component of well-being, was measured by using an abbreviated version of the General Health Questionnaire. The scale consisted of 9 statements (e.g., “Did you feel you could no longer cope during the past four weeks?”; “Have you felt tense and nervous over the past 4 weeks?”; “Did you feel unhappy and down during the past 4 weeks?”). Answers could vary from (1) “not at all” to (4) “more than usual.” These authors also used an additional measure to assess for psychological stress with regard to suicidal thoughts. The question was asked: “Have you – over the past 12 months – ever thought of committing suicide?” The answers could vary from (1) “never” to (4) “often.”

Employing a longitudinal design, Van Wel et al. (2000) found that over a period of three years, a change in the father-child and mother-child bond proves to correspond to a parallel change in the psychological well-being (i.e., general well-being, psychological stress, and suicidal thoughts) of the young people studied. While no differences between the sexes occurred with respect to general well-being; for girls, the connection between changes in the parental bond and changes in psychological stress was considerably stronger, with significance for boys found at the .05 level and at the .001 level for girls. In addition, the relationship between the parental bond and suicidal thoughts was statistically significant for females only. These findings suggest that fluctuations in the quality of the mother-daughter and father-daughter bond have more repercussions for the emotional stability of girls than for boys.
As demonstrated by the studies just reviewed, and others not reviewed here (Amato, 1994; Brook, Whiteman, Brook, & Gordon, 2001; Roberts & Bengtson, 1993), psychological distress appears to be most commonly defined and measured in terms of depression, anxiety, and sometimes symptoms of suicide ideation. These studies provide support for the notion that the closeness, bond, or quality of relationship that a daughter experiences with her father is significantly associated with her level of psychological distress and her overall level of psychological well-being. When considering the literature on father involvement and psychological well-being, the work of Finley and Schwartz (2004) stands out. These authors, who conceptualizes the quality of father involvement in terms nurturant fathering, or in other words, fathering that demonstrates paternal nurturance, warmth affection, support, comfort, and concern; may potentially capture the essence of, or path by which fathers are able to positively influence the psychological well-being of their developing daughters.

Summary and Research Questions

The research just reviewed demonstrates the significance of the father-daughter relationship on key aspects of female development, specifically those pertaining to psychological well-being (i.e., self-esteem, life satisfaction, psychological distress). This kind of research provides substantial evidence that father involvement, in combination with quality, or nurturant fathering, has a powerful influence for good on the immediate and long-term outcomes of daughters' psychological well-being. More specifically, the literature reviewed also demonstrates the important impact that children's perceptions of fathering has on various aspects of psychological well-being. While the link between
fathering and child outcomes has been established, the process of how this works for young adult daughters during the transition from adolescence to adulthood, has not been directly studied. In addition, the relationship between young adult daughters retrospective perceptions of fathering behaviors during adolescence, and current levels of psychological well-being, has not yet been examined.

The literature reviewed indicates that the following constructs are related to the well-being of daughters. First, father involvement, which refers to the amount or quantity of time that fathers are involved in various domains of their daughter's lives. Second, nurturant fathering, refers to the affective quality of fathering. And third, psychological well-being, defined in terms of self-esteem, life satisfaction, and psychological distress, refers to the extent to which young adult daughters are psychologically adjusted. By examining these variables, as a means of understanding how fathers influence their daughters' development during the transition from adolescence to adulthood, the following research questions were suggested:

1. Is there a relationship between self-esteem and retrospective perceptions of father involvement and nurturant fathering during adolescence?

2. Is there a relationship between life satisfaction and retrospective perceptions of father involvement and nurturant fathering during adolescence?

3. Is there a relationship between psychological distress and retrospective perceptions of father involvement and nurturant fathering during adolescence?
CHAPTER III

METHODS

This study examined the ways in which retrospective perceptions of father involvement and nurturant fathering are related to the psychological well-being of young adult daughters. In describing the methodology for the proposed study, this chapter is organized as follows. First, the design of the study will be presented. Second, a description of the sample will be given, as well as the population from which it was drawn. Third, a description of the data collection instruments and their psychometric properties will be provided. Fourth, study procedures will be described including recruitment, the obtaining of informed consent, and all data collection procedures.

Design

This study employed a descriptive design with correlational analyses. The purpose of the chosen design and method of analysis was to determine the magnitude and direction of the relationship between the identified variables (Gall, Gall, & Borg, 2003). In this case, the dependent variable was the current psychological well-being of young adult daughters, and the independent variables were the perceived levels of father involvement and nurturant fathering. Given the exploratory nature into the relationship between dependent and independent variables, a descriptive design, with correlational analyses, was most appropriate.

The use of retrospective reports, provided by young adult daughters, to assess perceived levels of father involvement and nurturant fathering, is based on previous
research which has demonstrated that individuals’ perceptions are uniquely associated with the experiences that individual’s report (Harter, Whitesell, & Kowalski, 1992; Kaplan & Boss, 1999; Khaleque & Rohner, 2002; Rohner, 1986; Rohner & Veneziano, 2001). In other words, a father’s impact on his daughter is more likely to be related to the daughter’s perception of his involvement, rather than the nature of his actual involvement (Finley & Schwartz, 2004).

Sample

While father involvement, nurturant fathering, and the psychological (and/or psychosocial) well-being of young adults has been studied (Schwartz & Finley, 2006), reported results have not yet differentiated between findings for daughters and sons. In addition, these variables have not yet been examined in the unique framework of the family life cycle (Carter & McGoldrick, 1980, 2005). The life cycle stage that is of particular importance to the proposed study is that of the “unattached young adult” who is between their family-of-origin and their family of procreation (Carter & McGoldrick, 1980). Fulmer (2005) defined the age range for the early stage of the unattached adult as ages 18 to 21. In Schwartz and Finley’s (2006) sample, the mean age was 21.5, which, according to the family life cycle (Fulmer), characterizes a sample of young adults that is likely to have already achieved the task of early young adulthood. Because the mean age for marriage in the U.S. is 25.1 (Johnson & Dye, 2005), Schwartz and Finley’s (2006) sample may arguably be a representative sample of the unattached young adult phase in the U.S., however, the mean age for marriage in Utah, where the sample was drawn from, is 21.9. Accounting for these factors, the sample for this study included unmarried, young
adult females, between the ages of 18 and 21. According to Kraemer and Thiemann (1987), the minimum sample size required for 90% power at the 5% significance level, using a one-tailed test for a study like this requires a minimum of 32 subjects. For this study, data were gathered from 99 participants.

Because the specific population, as outlined in the family life cycle, has not yet been studied using specific measurements for psychological well-being, this study was exploratory in nature. As suggested by Miller (1986), a nonprobability sample, selected by the use of a convenience sampling technique, was used for this study. Participants were drawn from general education classes at Utah State University (USU). Female students enrolled in general education classes were chosen for three reasons. First, females are of primary interest because as Secunda (1992) observed, of all the family ties, the father-daughter relationship is the least understood and least studied. In addition, Nielsen (2001) strongly believes that America’s current neglect of the father-daughter relationship may be detrimental to fundamental aspects of healthy female development. Second, Arnett (2000) stated that young adulthood might be an appropriate time to gather retrospective reports of parenting because young adults often reflect back and look forward as they prepare to face the challenges of adulthood.

Young women, who are attending college, are likely to be actively preparing to face the challenges of adulthood as they engage in family life cycle tasks such as attaining an education, learning to work, preparing for a career, differentiating from their family of origin, and developing intimate peer relationships (Carter & McGoldrick, 1980; Fulmer, 2005). Third, students who enroll in general education classes tend to be in their first or second year of college and are typically younger than students who are taking
classes for a declared major. With 99 questionnaires administered and 99 returned, the response rate for this study was 100%. All participants were single females between the ages of 18 and 21 years of age, with a mean age of 19.73. All participants were enrolled in general education courses at a local university. The mean years of education completed for participants was 14.15 years. The large majority of participants were Caucasian and reported affiliation with the local dominant religion of Mormonism (see Table 1).

According to the data provided by the young adult daughters in our sample, the mean age for participants’ fathers was 50.9, and the mean years of education completed was 16.4 years. Like daughters, the large majority of fathers were Caucasian and reported by their daughters to be Mormon (see Table 1).

Measures

Father Involvement Scale

The Father Involvement Scale (FIS; Finley & Schwartz, 2004) is a 20-item measure designed to assess adolescent and adult children’s retrospective perceptions of their fathers’ involvement. Each question was asked in two forms, the first focusing on how involved their fathers were, as perceived in retrospect, and the second on how involved the daughters wished their fathers had been. Questions referring to perceived involvement are answered using a 5-point Likert scale with 1 representing never involved and 5 representing always involved. Questions referring to desired levels of involvement are answered using a 5-point Likert scale with 1 representing much less involved and 5 representing much more involved. A sample item from this scale reads, “How involved was your father in your emotional development?” The participants were instructed to
write the reported involvement rating in the blank to the right of the question, and the
desired involvement rating in the blank to left of the question. Total scores for reported
and desired involvement were created by summing the respective domain ratings. Total
possible scores for these range from 20 to 100.

Table 1

*Ethnicity and Religion of Daughters and Fathers*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Daughters (n = 99)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian/White</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic Latino</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mormon</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>92.9</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>92.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Factor analyses of the reported involvement items from the FIS in Finley and
Schwartz’s (2004) sample yielded three components which Finley and Schwartz
categorized as subscales: expressive involvement, instrumental involvement, and
mentoring/advising involvement. Expressive involvement refers to those items that are related to the affective experience between father and child and includes involvement in emotional, social, spiritual, physical, leisure, activities, caregiving, and companionship domains. Instrumental involvement refers to areas in which fathers take responsibility for the caretaking and welfare of their children and includes involvement in ethical, career, responsibility, independence, income, protecting, discipline, and school domains. And mentoring/advising covers activities in which fathers are directly teaching their children, and includes involvement in intellectual, competence, mentoring, and advising domains. According to Finley and Schwartz (2004), effect sizes ranged from .46 to .79 for items loading on expressive involvement, from .50 to .78 for items loading on instrumental involvement, and from .65 to .72 for items loading on both factors, providing evidence for construct validity.

Internal consistency tests for all three subscale scores and total reported FIS score revealed high Cronbach’s alpha coefficients (Expressive Involvement = .93, Instrumental Involvement = .91, Mentoring/Advising = .90, and Total Involvement = .97; Finley & Schwartz, 2004). Analysis for the desired involvement items yielded two subscales: expressive desired involvement and instrumental desired involvement. For desired involvement, scores on all subscales and on the total scale comprising all the items were highly internally consistent as measured by the following Cronbach’s alphas: Expressive Desired Involvement = .93, Instrumental Desired Involvement = .92, and Total Desired Involvement = .96.
Nurturant Fathering Scale

The Nurturant Fathering Scale (Finley, 1998; Williams & Finley, 1997) is a 9-item measure designed to assess the affective quality of fathering. Each question was rated on a 5-point Likert-type scale that participants use to characterize their relationship with their father or father figure. A sample item from this scale reads, “Did you feel that you could confide in (talk about important personal things with) your father?” Possible answers range from 1 (never) to 5 (always). Total scores were created by adding all 9 items, with possible scores ranging from 9 to 45.

Cronbach’s alpha coefficients for scores on the Nurturant Fathering Scale provided by Finley’s (1998) and Williams and Finley’s (1997) research with adolescents and young adults have ranged between .88 and .94. In addition, the sample used by Schwartz and Finley (2005) yielded a Cronbach’s alpha coefficient of .95. An exploratory factor analysis of the Nurturant Fathering Scale items produced a single factor accounting for 60.4% of variability (Finley & Schwartz, 2004). All nine items loaded at .76 or higher, which provides evidence of construct validity.

The work of Finley and Schwartz (2004) provides evidence suggesting that despite high intercorrelations among the NFS and the subscales of the FIS, they cannot be collapsed into a single factor. In an effort to address the issue of high correlation among the NFS and the FIS, Finley and Schwartz estimated a one-factor solution for nurturant fathering and reported involvement. The model containing the nurturant fathering and reported involvement was associated with a high comparative fit index (CFI) value (.99), but the root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA) value, which is used to measure model fit, was extremely high (.30). Because a RMSEA that is close to zero
indicates that a model fits the data (Sprenkle & Piercy, 2005), according to Finley and Schwartz, the elevated RMSEA value provides some evidence for discriminant validity of the NFS, Expressive Involvement, Instrumental Involvement, and Mentoring/Advising Involvement subscales. Although the high intercorrelations clearly demonstrate that the subscales are measuring something in common, according to Finley and Schwartz, the high RMSEA value may be indicative of variance uniquely attributable to each subscale.

Outcome Questionnaire 10.2 (OQ-10.2)

The OQ – 10.2 (Lambert et al., 1998) is a 10-item measure that has a primary function of tracking patient progress during treatment for psychological disorders (Lambert et al.). The OQ –10.2 has two identifiable subscales, which are wellness and distress. Items 1 through 5 belong to the wellness subscale and measure the absence of symptoms as well as the degree to which people are satisfied with their quality of life. Items 6 through 10 belong to the distress subscale and identify symptoms of anxiety, depression, and stress related disorders.

The 10 items that make up the OQ – 10.2 were selected from the 45 items that make up the OQ –45.2. On the basis of a discriminate function analysis applied to these 45 items, the 10 items that best discriminated a random sample of non-patient community members from patients diagnosed with a wide variety of DSM, Axis I disorders, were chosen to be included in the OQ – 10.2 (Lambert et al., 1998). Sample items from the OQ – 10.2 read as follows, “I am satisfied with my life,” “I feel my love relationships are full and complete,” “I feel blue.” Participants were asked to indicate how often they agree with each of the 10 items, with 0 indicating never, and 4 indicating almost always. The
first five items are reversed scored. A total score was obtained by adding all ten items with possible scores ranging from 0 to 40; 0 meaning no distress, and 40 meaning highest possible distress. As provided by Lambert et al. the average score for college students is 9.84. There is no apparent difference in OQ – 10.2 scores of average males and females and data analyzed up to this point does not suggest that scores vary systematically with age (Lambert et al.).

Since the OQ – 10.2 is a short form of the OQ – 45.2, its reliability is compared to the full scale. According to Lambert et al. (1998), the full scale Outcome Questionnaire (45 items) shows internal consistency (Chronbach’s alpha) above .90, and test-retest reliability of .84 over 3 weeks within a college student population. Concerning the validity of the OQ – 10.2, Seelert (1997) found correlations between the Duke Health Profile subscales and the OQ – 10.2 subscales ranging from -.60 to -.77. All correlations were significant at or beyond the .001 level of confidence (Seelert). Further validity data supporting the use of the OQ – 10.2 is provided by concurrent validity data. In comparing the OQ – 10.2 to several measures that are commonly used to screen people for depressive and anxiety-based symptomology, the following correlation coefficients were found: Symptom Check list-90-R (.75), Beck Depression Inventory (.58), Inventory for Interpersonal Problems (.68), and Social Adjustment Scale (.71). According to Lambert et al., these coefficients are all significant at the .01 level of confidence and suggest that there is some degree of overlap between the OQ – 10.2 and these scales.
Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale

The Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale (RSE; Rosenberg, 1965) is designed to provide a unidimensional measure of global self-esteem defined as “a positive or negative orientation toward oneself; an overall evaluation of one’s worth or value” (Department of Sociology: University of Maryland, 2006). Each of the 10 items are answered on a four point Likert scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 4 (strongly agree). Five questions are reverse scored. Sample items from the instrument read as follows, “I feel that I am a person of worth, at least on an equal plane with others,” and “At times I think I am no good at all.” A total score was obtained by adding all ten items and can range from 10 to 40. Although there are no discrete cut-off points to delineate high and low self-esteem, in general, the higher the score, the higher the self-esteem (Department of Sociology: University of Maryland).

The RSE generally has high reliability of scores within college student populations with a test-retest correlation of .85 over a 2 week period (Robinson & Shaver, 1973), and Cronbach’s alpha coefficients for scores of various samples are in the range of .77 to .88 (Department of Sociology: University of Maryland, 2006). Convergent validity for college student populations is reported between $r = .56$ and $r = .83$ (Silber & Tippett, 1965) and discriminant validity at $r = .53$ (Robinson & Shaver). In addition, the RSE correlates .45 and .66 with one-item self-reports of self-esteem and has been used as a brief and reliable measure of self-esteem (Robinson & Shaver).
Procedures

Recruitment procedures for obtaining the sample were as follows. An undergraduate research assistant, from Utah State University (USU), attended a variety of USU's general education courses and made a standardized announcement inviting all unmarried female students between the ages of 18 and 21 who had an identified father figure in their life during their adolescent years, to participate in the study. This announcement also delineated details of participation including the completion of the questionnaire, time estimated to complete the questionnaire, and compensation for participation (i.e. entrance into a drawing for a $50 gift certificate to Hastings).

At this point, the research assistant gave interested students a packet containing the Father Involvement Scale, Nurturant Fathering Scale, OQ 10.2, Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale, and the demographic form, all of which were condensed into one single questionnaire (see Appendix B). The packet also included a card asking for contact information so that participants could be entered into the drawing. Additionally, the packet included a Letter of Information that provided the introduction/purpose of the study, procedures, risks/benefits, emphasis of voluntary participation, and details of confidentiality. It was explicitly stated that by returning the questionnaire, students officially became participants of the study. Students were asked to seal their completed questionnaire in the envelope provided them, and return it to the research assistant separate from the contact information card.

Students completed the questionnaire during class time. Time to complete the entire assessment ranged between 10 and 15 minutes. The research assistant collected
completed questionnaires in class. All identifying information was separated from data so it was impossible to identify specific participants. The Internal Review Board for Human Subjects at Utah State University approved all methods and procedures (see Appendix A).
CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

The relationship between each of the father involvement and nurturant fathering scales and subscales and the current psychological well-being of young adult daughters were assessed and are reported in this chapter. The following section will report all data analytic methods for the present study and the reliability of all measures, discuss the intercorrelations of scales and subscales, and present the results of each research question individually.

Data Analysis

A Cronbach's alpha coefficient was used to measure the reliability of all scales and subscales for respondents' scores. Because this study sought to explore the relationship between father involvement, nurturant fathering, and psychological well-being, analysis employed the use of Pearson's product-moment correlations. Pearson's correlation coefficient ($r$) was most appropriate for this study because it is designed to measure the strength and direction of the relationship between any two continuous variables (Gall et al., 2003).

To answer the first research question, Pearson's $r$ was calculated with the self-esteem scale and the father involvement scale and subscales. Doing this allowed the researchers to determine the strength and direction of the relationship between young adult daughter's level of self-esteem and their perceptions of their father's overall level of involvement as well as involvement in specified domains. To answer the second and third
research questions, the same procedures were carried out, with life satisfaction and psychological distress as the dependent variables.

Using Chronbach’s alpha coefficient, the reliability of all measures was tested for the present sample. The Nurturant Fathering Scale (NFS), showed a Chronbach’s alpha coefficient of .92, and the Father Involvement Scale (FIS) showed a reliability of .94. Each of the FIS subscales also revealed high Chronbach’s alpha coefficients (Expressive Involvement = .89, Instrumental Involvement = .86, and Mentoring/Advising Involvement = .85). Instruments measuring dependent variables (i.e. self-esteem, life-satisfaction, and psychological distress of daughters) also yielded high Chronbach’s alpha coefficients. For the Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale (RSE), a reliability of .87 was found. OQ 10.2 items, which were used to measure life-satisfaction, had a Chronbach’s alpha coefficient of .85, and OQ 10.2 items, which were used to measure psychological distress, a reliability of .79 was found. Overall, all measures showed high reliability, with all but one measure showing a Chronbach’s alpha coefficient of .80 or above.

Correlations Among the Nurturant Fathering Scale and the Father Involvement Scale Measures

Consistent with Finley and Schwartz (2004), correlations among the Nurturant Fathering Scale (NFS) and the Father Involvement Scale (FIS) measures were large (Cohen, Cohen, West, & Aiken, 2003), with correlation coefficients in this study ranging from .68 to .84, with 46 to 71% of the variance shared between scales. These results show that the NFS was closely related to all measures of reported involvement. Also consistent with the findings of Finley and Schwartz, correlations among the FIS subscales
(expressive involvement, instrumental, involvement, and mentoring/advising involvement) were large, with correlation coefficients ranging from .75 to .93, and 56% to 86% of the variance shared between subscales (see Table 2).

Table 2

*Correlations Among the Nurturant Fathering Scale and Father Involvement*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Total Father Involvement</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.93***</td>
<td>.93***</td>
<td>.92***</td>
<td>.82***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Expressive Involvement</td>
<td>.75***</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.80***</td>
<td>.84***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Instrumental Involvement</td>
<td></td>
<td>.83***</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.68***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Mentoring/Advising Involvement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.73***</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Nurturant Fathering Scale</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05. **p < .01. ***p < .001.

Relationship Between Father Involvement, Nurturant Fathering, and Daughters' Self-Esteem

As a means of understanding how young adult daughter's retrospective perceptions of their father's involvement and nurturant behaviors during adolescence is related to current psychological well-being, three research questions were tested. The first research question was as follows: Is there is a relationship between self-esteem and retrospective perceptions of father involvement and nurturant fathering?
Using Pearson’s Correlation Coefficient (r), bivariate correlations were conducted to determine the relationship of reported father involvement and nurturant fathering to the self-esteem of young adult daughters. Correlations were run separately for self-esteem and the following independent variables: total father involvement, expressive involvement, instrumental involvement, mentoring/advising involvement, and nurturant fathering (see Table 3).

For total levels of involvement, a correlation was run with total father involvement scale scores, representing the independent variable, and Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale (RSE) total scale scores, representing the dependent variable. As predicted, a relationship was found between self-esteem and overall perceived levels of father involvement. As predicted the relationship between these two variables was in a positive direction and accounted for 14% of the variance.

For Expressive Involvement, a subscale of the FIS, a correlation was run for subscale items (caregiving, companionship, sharing activities, emotional development, spiritual development, physical development, social development, and leisure), which represent the independent variable, and RSE (self-esteem) total scale scores. As predicted, a positive relationship between perceived levels of expressive involvement and the self-esteem of young adult daughters was found, which accounted for 15% of the variance.

Instrumental Involvement, also a subscale of the FIS, which includes the following items: discipline, providing income, protecting, school or homework, developing responsibility, developing independence, moral development, and career development; was correlated with RSE total scores. Although the association between
self-esteem and instrumental involvement seems to be weaker than its relationship with total involvement and expressive involvement, results suggest there is a relationship between a father’s level of instrumental involvement, as perceived by his daughter, and the self-esteem of that daughter. As hypothesized, this relationship is in a positive direction, and accounted for 9% of the variance.

Table 3

*Correlations Among Fathering Scales and Psychological Well-Being Variables*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Self-Esteem</th>
<th>Life Satisfaction</th>
<th>Psychological Distress</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female Students (n = 99)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Total Father Involvement</td>
<td>.37***</td>
<td>.35***</td>
<td>-0.21*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Expressive Involvement</td>
<td>.39***</td>
<td>.43***</td>
<td>-0.20*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Instrumental Involvement</td>
<td>.30**</td>
<td>.24**</td>
<td>-0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Mentoring/Advising Involvement</td>
<td>.33**</td>
<td>.25*</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Nurturant Fathering Scale</td>
<td>.39***</td>
<td>.55***</td>
<td>-0.18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05. **p < .01. ***p < .001.

Mentoring/Advising Involvement, the last subscale of the FIS, which includes the following items: mentoring, giving advice, intellectual development, and developing competence; was also correlated with self-esteem total scores. Again, as predicted, results showed a positive association between variables and accounted for 11% of the variance.
Lastly, perceived levels of nurturant fathering, measured by the NFS, were correlated with self-esteem total scores. As expected, results suggested that there is a positive relationship between daughters' perceived levels of nurturant fathering and current levels of self-esteem, which accounted for 15% of variance. In conclusion, based on all of the findings pertaining to research questions number one, we reject the null hypothesis.

**Relationship Between Father Involvement, Nurturant Fathering, and Daughters’ Life Satisfaction**

To more fully capture the relationship between perceptions of fathering and daughter well-being, the second research question addressed the following question: Is there is a relationship between life satisfaction and retrospective perceptions of father involvement and nurturant fathering?

A second set of correlation tests was run using life satisfaction as the dependent variable and the same fathering scales and subscales as the previous research question. Similar to the previous set of tests, using Pearson’s correlation coefficient (r), bivariate correlations were conducted to determine the relationship of reported father involvement and nurturant fathering to the life satisfaction of young adult daughters. Overall, results showed that there is a positive relationship between perceived levels of father involvement and nurturant fathering, and the life satisfaction of young adult daughters.

For total levels of involvement, a correlation was run with total Father Involvement scores, representing the independent variable, and items from the OQ 10.2, which were used to measure life satisfaction, as the dependent variable. As predicted,
results showed the existence of a relationship between variables in a positive direction, accounting for 12% of the variance. For Expressive Involvement, a correlation was run for subscale items and the same OQ 10.2 life satisfaction items. Findings for these variables suggested the presence of a positive relationship, which accounted for 18% of the variance. Instrumental Involvement was correlated with life satisfaction items from the OQ 10.2. Although the association between life satisfaction and instrumental involvement seems to be weaker than its’ relationship with total involvement and expressive involvement, results suggest the presence of a positive relationship between perceived levels of instrumental involvement and the life satisfaction of young adult daughters, accounting for 6% of the variance. The last subscale of the FIS, Mentoring/Advising Involvement, was also somewhat correlated with life satisfaction items from the OQ 10.2. As expected, the relationship between these two variables is also in a positive direction, and accounts for 6% of the variance.

Lastly, perceptions of nurturant fathering, measured by the NFS, were also correlated with life satisfaction items from the OQ 10.2. As predicted, findings suggest there is a positive relationship between daughters’ perceived levels of nurturant fathering and current levels of life satisfaction, accounting for 30% of the variance. To conclude this section, based on our findings for research question number two, we reject the null hypothesis.
Relationship Between Father Involvement, Nurturant Fathering, and Daughters' Psychological Distress

The third component of psychological well-being is psychological distress. The last research question tested was as follows: Is there a relationship between psychological distress and retrospective perceptions of father involvement and nurturant fathering? Using psychological distress as the dependent variable, a third set of tests were run. As with the previous sets of tests, the same fathering scales and subscales were used, and using Pearson's correlation coefficient ($r$), bivariate correlations were conducted to determine the relationship of perceptions of father involvement and nurturant fathering to the psychological distress of young adult daughters. Results showed a weak negative relationship between perceptions of father involvement, nurturant fathering, and the psychological distress of young adult daughters, however, contrary to what was expected, these findings were not statistically significant.

For total levels of involvement, a correlation was run with total Father Involvement scale scores, and items from the OQ 10.2, which was used to measure psychological distress. Results showed a slight negative correlation between the variables which accounted for 4% of the variance. Findings for all three of the FIS subscales were similar, but with varying degrees of significance. For Expressive Involvement, a correlation was run for subscale items and OQ 10.2 psychological distress items. The strength of this relationship was slightly stronger for these variables than both of the other FIS subscales, but still only accounted for 4% of the variance.
Instrumental Involvement was also correlated with psychological distress items from the OQ 10.2. The association between psychological distress and instrumental involvement was similar to total involvement and expressive involvement, suggesting a negative relationship between a father’s level of instrumental involvement and the psychological distress of his young adult daughter. This relationship accounted for 3% of the variance. However, because it failed to meet the $p = .05$ level of significance it cannot be considered a significant correlation. The last subscale of the FIS, Mentoring/Advising Involvement, was also found to be somewhat correlated with psychological distress items from the OQ 10.2. Results showed a slightly negative relationship between variables, accounting for 4% of the variance. However, it also did not meet the $p = .05$ level of confidence, and therefore cannot be considered a significant correlation.

Lastly, perceptions of nurturant fathering, measured by the NFS, were also correlated with psychological distress items from the OQ 10.2. Findings did suggest a negative relationship between daughters’ perceived levels of nurturant fathering and current levels of psychological distress, accounting for 3% of the variance. However, this too did not meet the $p = .05$ level of significance, and therefore cannot be considered as a significant correlation. In conclusion, accounting for all results pertaining to our third research question, we fail to reject the null hypothesis.

In summary, results for research questions number one and two provide support for their corresponding hypotheses stated at the end of chapter two. Results for research question number three, however, do not provide support for its corresponding hypothesis. In general, results showed that young adult daughters’ retrospective perceptions of higher levels of father involvement and nurturant fathering were associated with higher levels of
self-esteem and life satisfaction for daughters. However, retrospective perceptions of father involvement and nurturant fathering did not demonstrate any significant correlations with the psychological distress of young adult daughters. While the findings for the first two research questions are generally consistent with and supported by the larger body of fathering literature, the findings of our third research question are inconsistent with previous research. Discussion for the results of all research questions will be provided in the following chapter.
CHAPTER V
DISCUSSION

The present study was conducted to ascertain the relationship between the psychological well-being of young adult daughters and retrospective perceptions of father involvement and nurturant fathering during adolescence. In an effort to discuss the findings of the present study, this chapter will be organized follows: (1) strengths of the present study will be discussed, (2) for each research question, findings, in relation to the null hypothesis and the larger body of fathering literature, will be discussed (3) limitations of the present study and recommendations for future research will be reviewed, and (4) implications for the field of marriage and family therapy will be presented.

Strengths of Study

The greatest strength of this study was that each of the four instruments used to collect data demonstrated high reliability. Chronbach’s alpha coefficients for the total Father Involvement Scale (FIS) and FIS subscales for the present sample are very comparable to those in the samples of Finley and Schwartz (2004) and Schwartz and Finley (2006). In addition, when compared with Chronbach’s alpha coefficients for the Nurturant Fathering Scale (NFS) in other samples (Finley, 1998; Schwartz & Finley, 2006; Williams & Finley, 1997), the reliability for the present sample is very strong.

For the Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale (RSE), Chronbach’s alpha coefficient in the present sample was higher than that which was found within other college student
populations (Robinson & Shaver, 1973). In addition, the reliability coefficient for the RSE in our sample was well within the range of Chronbach’s alpha coefficients found in a variety of samples (Department of Sociology: University of Maryland, 2006). Lastly, reliabilities for OQ 10.2 subscales, used to measure life satisfaction and psychological distress for the present sample, also demonstrated high reliability. Chronbach’s alpha coefficients for both subscales were within a few points of those of other college student populations (Lambert et al., 1998).

Because there is a high degree of similarity between the reliability coefficients for each of measures used in the present study and the reliability coefficients for these same measures, as used in various samples, it can be concluded that our study retains a high level of internal consistency. Subsequently, this conclusion provides a logical justification for the use of these measures in our study, as well as justification for the validity of our research findings.

Other strengths of the present study include the use of reports from the perspective of the child, whereas most studies on parent-child relationships assess relationship variables from the perspective of the parent (Shek, 1993). This study also provides support for the use of retrospective reports of father involvement and nurturant fathering, adding a unique focus of retrospective perceptions during adolescence specifically. Several studies have successfully used this phenomenological approach to study a variety of constructs (Harter et al., 1992; Kaplan & Boss, 1999; Khaleque & Rhoner, 2002; Rohner, 1986, Rohner & Veneziano, 2001); however, very few have used this approach when examining perceptions of father involvement. In fact, to date, other than the work of Finley and Schwartz (2004, 2005a, 2005b; Schwartz & Finley, 2006), no
other research has considered father involvement and nurturant fathering from this approach. In addition, no other research has employed the use of retrospective reports specific to the adolescent years.

Father Involvement, Nurturant Fathering, and the Self-Esteem of Young Adult Daughters

In regards to the first research question, the null hypothesis states that: There is no relationship between self-esteem and retrospective perceptions of father involvement and nurturant fathering. In light of the results in the previous chapter, the null hypothesis was rejected. Based on data analysis, there is a relationship, in a positive direction, between the self-esteem of young adult daughters and retrospective perceptions of fathering involvement and nurturant fathering.

Overall, results showed that retrospective perceptions of father involvement and nurturant fathering have a moderately strong relationship, in a positive direction, with the self-esteem of young adult daughters. Correlation coefficients for expressive involvement and nurturant fathering suggest these two variables have the strongest relationship with daughters' self-esteem. Together, these findings indicate that when young adult daughters' retrospective perceptions of overall father involvement and nurturant fathering during adolescence are higher, the current self-esteem of daughters is also higher. More specifically, these finding suggests that perceptions of nurturant fathering, and expressive types of father involvement, including such things as companionship, father-daughter activities, and emotional involvement may be slightly more important to the self-esteem of young adult daughters than the other aspects of father involvement measured in this
study. These results show general consistency with previously cited literature (Gecas & Schwalbe, 1986; Richards et al., 1991; Roberts & Bengtson, 1993; Shek, 1993; Wenk et al., 1994). A specific review of the similarities and differences will follow.

The findings of Gecas and Schwalbe (1986) provide support for the theoretical grounding of the present study, that what affects the self-esteem of daughters most is her perception of her fathers' behaviors, regardless of his actual behaviors, or his perceptions of his actual behaviors. Additionally, while Gecas and Schwalbe found a significant relationship between the self-esteem of daughters and perceptions of support and participation of fathers, they also found that the self-esteem of girls was consistently unaffected by fathers' control/autonomy. This is consistent with the findings of the present study, which suggest that perceptions of instrumental types of involvement, such as discipline, have the weakest correlations with self-esteem. These findings indicate that daughters' self-esteem may be more a function of reflected appraisals, it being more sensitive to the support-and-nurturance dimension of fathering behavior.

The findings of the present study were also consistent with the research of Richards et al. (1991) in that self-esteem appears to be especially elevated by girls' positive experience with their fathers, where the support of fathers is demonstrated through showing affection, helping, and expressing approval, all of which are aspects of expressive involvement and nurturant fathering.

Comparing the results of the present study with the findings of Wenk et al. (1994), some consistencies and some inconsistencies were found. First, the results of Wenk et al. were consistent with the findings of the present study in that feeling close to father, which is an aspect of nurturant fathering, has a significant positive effect on the
self-esteem of daughters. Second, their results did not show a significant association between daughters’ self-esteem and fathers’ behavioral involvement (defined in terms of spending time together); however, the results of the present study suggest that in addition to perceptions of fathering quality, there is a relationship between perceptions of the quantity of father involvement and the self-esteem of daughters. The present study assessed this relationship as a matter of “level of involvement” rather than in terms of “time spent” in involvement. Therefore, the differences in conceptualization and measurement between these studies may account for the differences in the findings.

The results of the present study actually showed stronger correlations between fathering measures and daughters’ self-esteem than those found by Shek (1993). Both studies used versions of the Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale (RSE) to measure self-esteem, however, Shek used a 15-item instrument designed to measure father treatment styles, while the present study used more comprehensive measures of fathering behaviors. The stronger correlations found in the present study may indicate that the highly specific nature of the fathering measures used in the present study are able to capture a more complete understanding of how perceptions of fathering behaviors, in a wide range of areas, are related to the self-esteem of daughters.

The findings of the present study also provide support for the findings of Roberts and Bengtson (1993). Research done by these authors suggests that greater father-daughter affection early in a daughter’s adult life contributes to later well-being by bolstering her self-esteem. The results of the present study appear to be consistent with these projections by demonstrating that there is a significant relationship between the way that a young adult perceives her father’s nurturant behaviors during adolescence, and her
current levels of self-esteem. This suggests that fathers’ nurturant behaviors, during adolescence, may have a long-term influence on daughter well-being.

To summarize, the results for the first research question show general consistency with the larger body of fathering research that suggests both quantitative (level of father involvement) and qualitative (nurturant fathering) aspects of fathering, as retrospectively perceived by daughters, are significantly related to daughters’ self-esteem. More specifically, findings that perceptions of expressive types of involvement, and nurturant fathering behaviors, tend to have a stronger relationship with the self-esteem of young adult daughters is also supported by the larger body of father-daughter literature.

Father Involvement, Nurturant Fathering, and the Life Satisfaction of Young Adult Daughters

In regards to the second research question, the null hypothesis states that: There is no relationship between life satisfaction and retrospective perceptions of father involvement and nurturant fathering. In light of the results presented in chapter two, the null hypothesis was rejected. Based on data analysis, there is a positive relationship between the self-esteem of young adult daughters and retrospective perceptions of fathering involvement and nurturant fathering.

When life satisfaction measures were correlated with total FIS scores, a moderate positive relationship was found. The interesting aspect of this finding comes however when considering the amount of variation among correlation coefficients for FIS subscales and life satisfaction measures. For the Instrumental and Mentoring/Advising
Involvement, weak, positive relationships were found, however, for the Expressive Involvement, a moderate to strong relationship, in the positive direction was found.

These findings suggest that when considering the life satisfaction of young adult daughters, perceptions of expressive fathering behaviors may be of great importance. Findings of the present study also revealed that perceptions of nurturant fathering are also strongly related to the life satisfaction of young adult daughters. This suggests that the perception of having close, loving, and nurturant relationships with fathers' during adolescence strongly influences the life satisfaction of young adult daughters. Again, these finding are generally consistent with the larger body of fathering literature (Amato, 1994; Shek, 1993; Wenk et al., 1994; Young et al., 1995). As such, a detailed review of similarities will follow.

Results taken from the studies of Young et al. (1995), Wenk et al. (1994), and Shek (1993) appear to support the findings of the present study that, as perceptions of supportive paternal behaviors that are expressive and nurturing in nature increase, so does the life satisfaction of daughters. While Young et al. and Shek demonstrated this immediate relationship between variables; the findings of Wenk et al. and the present study were able to demonstrate that daughters perceptions of supportive or nurturant fathering behaviors during adolescence continue to have a relationship with daughters’ life satisfaction into young adulthood.

In addition, the findings of Wenk et al. (1994) demonstrated that the effect of emotional involvement on the life satisfaction of daughters is stronger than the effect of behavioral involvement. This is not unlike the findings of the present study, which
demonstrated that perceptions of nurturant fathering have the strongest relationships with daughters' life satisfaction.

The results of the second research question provide evidence that retrospective perceptions of father involvement and nurturant fathering during adolescence are significantly, and positively, associated with the current life satisfaction of young adult daughters. More specifically, perceptions of expressive fathering behaviors and nurturant fathering appear to have the strongest relationship with daughters' level of life satisfaction. As demonstrated, these findings are consistent with the larger body of fathering literature.

Father Involvement, Nurturant Fathering, and the Psychological Distress of Young Adult Daughters

In regards to the third research question, the null hypothesis states that: There is no relationship between psychological distress and retrospective perceptions of father involvement and nurturant fathering. In light of the results in the previous chapter, the null hypothesis cannot be rejected. Based on data analysis, there is no significant relationship between the psychological distress of young adult daughters and retrospective perceptions of fathering involvement and nurturant fathering.

When psychological distress measures were correlated with total FIS scores and FIS subscale scores, weak, non-significant, negative relationship were found. The relationship between psychological distress and NFS scores, were also non-significant.

In general, the results for this particular research question did not reflect the overall trend in the larger body of fathering literature. Several articles reviewed for this
study presented findings suggesting that father involvement is significantly, and inversely related to the psychological distress of child, adolescent, young adult, and adult daughters (Amato, 1994; Barnett et al., 1991; Flouri & Buchanan, 2003; Harris, Furstenberg, & Marner, 1998; Shek, 1993; Van Wel et al., 2000; Videon, 2005). Inconsistencies between the present study and prior studies may however be accounted for through the present study’s use of retrospective data. While all the reviewed studies measured current father-daughter relationship variables and current levels of psychological distress, the present study measured retrospective perceptions of fathering variables to current levels of psychological distress. The clear discrepancy in findings, between the present study and past studies, brings into question the viability and validity of assessing current distress by past relationships.

Although is has been shown that there is a relationship between daughters’ levels of psychological distress and perceptions of father involvement (Barnett et al., 1991; Roberts & Bengtson, 1993; Van Wel et al., 2000), it may not be possible, for reasons unapparent, to use retrospective reports of fathering as a correlate for the construct of current psychological distress.

In all cases, the studies reviewed in chapter two included much larger, representative samples than that of the present study (Amato, 1994; Barnett et al., 1991; Brook et al., 2001; Roberts & Bengtson, 1993; Van Wel et al., 2000). The studies cited in chapter two demonstrated stratification among socioeconomic classes and ethnicity. Most studies were either national surveys or school-based studies. However, the sample for the present study consisted of a highly homogeneous population collected through a convenience sampling technique.
Additionally, none of the research reviewed employed the use of the OQ 10.2 as a measure of psychological distress. Although the Chronbach's alpha score for the OQ 10.2 distress subscale demonstrated high reliability for the present sample, the results of the study may bring into question the validity of the subscale as an independent measure of psychological distress. One reason for this may be that according to Lambert et al. (1998), the stated purpose and primary function of the OQ 10.2 is that of a brief screening instrument intended to "track patient progress during administration of psychological and drug treatments for psychological disorders" (p. 1). As a general measure of overall life distress, items may be tied too closely to psychopathology.

In summary, the results for the third research question showed that there are no significant relationships between psychological distress and our fathering scales. These findings are inconsistent with the larger body of fathering literature which demonstrates that quantitative, and especially qualitative, aspects of fathering do have a significant influence on the psychological distress of daughters, both immediate and across time.

Findings in Relation to Lamb's Model of Father Involvement

Research specific to Lamb's (1986) three-part model of father involvement have shown all three aspects of involvement, namely engagement, accessibility, and responsibility to be related to a wide array of positive developmental outcomes in children and adolescents (Almeida & Galambos, 1991; Amato & Rivera, 1999; Brotherson, Yamamoto, & Acock, 2003; Lamb, 1987; Radin, 1994). The measures used in the present study captured several aspects of each of these dimensions of fathering and
were able to demonstrate that indeed the quantity of father involvement, in all of Lamb's fathering dimensions, during adolescence, does have a significant relationship with current levels of functioning in young adult daughters. However, the overall findings of this study provide some evidence that what is most important, in any dimension of involvement, is that it is high in quality and conveys a feeling of support, love, and nurturance to adolescents, specifically daughters.

Limitations and Suggestions for Future Research

The results of the present study should be considered exploratory in light of several substantial limitations. First, the sample used in the present study is a convenience sample and therefore there is a high degree of homogeneity within the sample. This high degree of homogeneity severely limits the generalizability of the research findings. Findings of this study can only extend to White, female college students, between the ages of 18 and 21, attending the local university where this study was conducted. In order to determine if the results of the present study hold true across ethnic and religious affiliations, and can be generalized to a more representative population, future research should include a more ethnically and religiously diverse sample. In addition, the use of a university sample may have screened out a variety of young women, for example, those from lower socioeconomic brackets, and those with social, intellectual, or emotional difficulties. Community-based studies may help to address this limitation.

Second, because reports of father involvement and nurturant fathering were only collected from daughters, the data solely represents correlations between daughters’
perceptions of fathering and psychological well-being. Based on the work of Finley and Schwartz (2004), and Gecas and Schwalbe (1986), the present study was conducted under the assumption that regardless of a father’s actual behavior, it is the perception his daughter has of his behavior that effects her development most. However, because reports of father involvement and nurturant fathering were not gathered from fathers themselves, it cannot be confirmed that this is the case for the women in our study. In order to determine the veracity of the study’s assumptions, it is important for future studies to gather reports from both daughters and fathers.

Third, considering findings from the larger body of fathering literature, it was surprising that the results for the third research question were as weak as they were. Because the correlations between fathering variables and the psychological distress of daughters in the present study were non-significant, there is cause to seriously consider possible limitations of the study that may have accounted for the results of this particular research question. First and foremost, because it is not known which types of distress are stable over time, future studies need to give specific attention to which types of psychological distress can be used as a valid correlate for retrospective measures of father involvement. Second, future studies should also employ the use of other more comprehensive and specific measures of psychological distress designed for non-clinical populations.
Implications for the Field of Marriage and Family Therapy

One of the greatest challenges facing anyone who treats families is finding a way to see past personalities to the patterns of influence that shape family members’ behavior. In the words of Nichols and Schwartz (2004), “experience teaches that what shows up as one person’s behavior may be a product of relationship” (p. 94). This being the case, the field of marriage and family therapy has deeply embedded its roots in the theoretical grounding of family systems theory. Systems theory requires that when working with individual problems, one must consider the context in which these problems developed and/or exist.

From a family systems perspective, the findings of the present study offer several potential implications for marriage and family therapists who are working with adolescent females and their families, as well as those who are working with young adult women. This section will discuss research findings in relation to individual development and the family life cycle, general treatment issues, and specific therapy models that may be used to promote the healthy development of adolescent and young adult daughters.

*Individual Development and the Family Life Cycle*

During each life cycle phase, two separate processes are occurring. First, a person is building a foundation of self knowledge with which to understand herself. At the same time, she is developing a foundation of knowledge about who she is in relation to all other people with whom she interacts (Carter & McGoldrick, 2005). Therefore, it can be
said that individual life stages are contextual, and one major context is that of family
life cycle (Carter & McGoldrick, 1980). As such, family systems theory serves as a
natural therapy position for bringing together developmental and relationship issues
(Armour, 1995).

For females, adolescence and young adulthood represent specific stages of
development, and include a variety of tasks that are essential to healthy development. The
primary task for females between the ages of 13 and 21, according to Erikson’s (1963)
theory of psychosocial development, is to solidify a healthy identity that will successfully
lead them into adulthood. This takes place as adolescent females are able to learn self-
acceptance and achieve interpersonal relationships (Armour, 1995). The results of the
present study suggest that by being more involved in the lives of their adolescent
daughters, fathers may be able to help their daughters establish a healthy sense of self and
a strong identity by helping to increase their self-esteem and life satisfaction.

Family systems theory suggests that a well-functioning family provides a context
in which each member masters appropriate developmental tasks, and is thus prepared to
interface successfully with other systems (Becvar & Becvar, 1999). As adolescents
proceed through the stage of identity development they do so in the context of their
evolving family, which can be described by stages of the family life cycle. The fourth
stage of the family life cycle, defined as "families with adolescents," presents an array of
tasks for adolescents and their parents. As a part of identity development, adolescents
must take appropriate steps toward individuation and differentiation from their family-of-
origin (Nichols, 1996). Corresponding tasks for parents include creating flexible
boundaries to permit the adolescent to move in and out of the family system to allow for
increased independence and autonomy (Becvar & Becvar). Therefore, fathers’ involvement and nurturant behaviors not only have positive implications for the individual development of daughters, but fathers’ ability to manage and adapt involvement appropriate to changing relational needs, has positive implications for daughters’ development through family life cycle.

According to Carter and McGoldrick (1980), the appearance of symptoms in one or more family members, during transitions in individual and family life cycle stages, indicate that the appropriate life cycle tasks are not being mastered. From this perspective, the following section is designed to provide suggestions on how research findings from the present study can be used, in a therapy setting, to help daughters and their families, during the family life cycle stages of adolescence of young adulthood.

General Treatment Issues

The findings of the present study which suggest that perceptions of father involvement, regardless of actual father involvement, influence the psychological well-being of daughters highlight the importance of assessing family relationships from the perspective of each family member. This may be especially poignant if a father believes his actions to be nurturant and expressive in nature, but are not perceived as such by his adolescent daughter. Highlighting these discrepancies, and their consequences, may serve as a point for therapeutic intervention.

In addition, marriage and family therapists, working with young adult women who have self-esteem or general life satisfaction issues, may consider a thorough assessment of the father-daughter relationship during adolescence. Identifying low levels
of involvement or emotional connectivity between young women and their fathers, again, may serve as a point for therapeutic intervention. Attachment problems, due to low levels of involvement or bonding, may need to be addressed.

Lastly, research has provided evidence that when fathers have a higher sense of competence in parenting, they show increased involvement with their children (Baruch & Barnett, 1986; McBride & Mills, 1993). Because the findings of the present study suggest that there is a relationship between father involvement and the self-esteem and life satisfaction of daughters, during therapy, clinicians may focus on parenting skills as a way to increase father involvement and promote healthy father-daughter interaction.

**Structural Family Therapy**

A major premise of structural family therapy is that family systems must be stable enough to ensure continuity, but flexible enough to accommodate to changing circumstances (Minuchin, 1974). During the adolescent stage of the family life cycle, this is especially important. This is a time parents need to be flexible enough to allow their daughters increased autonomy, but structured enough to keep adolescents safe (Carter & McGoldrick, 1980). According to this model of therapy, family dysfunction results from a combination of stress and a family’s failure to realign themselves to cope with it (Colapinto, 1991). Entering a new stage of the family life cycle, like adolescence, can cause stress for all family members, and if inappropriately dealt with, problems can arise (Carter & McGoldrick, 2005). The findings of the present study suggest that during adolescence, the fathers of study participants were able to involve themselves in ways that positively influenced their daughters’ later self-esteem and life satisfaction.
According to the structural model, fathers' ability to do this is likely to be a reflection of adaptive and healthy organization within the family as a whole, characterized by healthy boundaries and a strong ability to accommodate to changing needs within the family (Minuchin, 1974).

Behavioral Therapy

Fathers can help build the positive identity of their daughters through reinforcement. The findings of present study show that actions, such as, engaging in activities, playing and having fun, and talking with daughters, have a positive relationship with the self-esteem and life satisfaction of daughters. These types of fathering behaviors may help to produce a close, emotional bond between fathers and daughters, which may reinforce the self-esteem and life satisfaction of daughters, and essentially the overall identity development of the daughter. In a therapy setting, it would therefore be useful to assess what types of positive behaviors fathers are currently engaging in with their daughters, and the frequency with which these behaviors take place. Based on the findings of the present study, gaining the daughters perceptions of the quality and quantity of her father's behaviors may be important. Intervention may simply include increasing the frequency of positive fathering behaviors as a means of reinforcing positive identity development in daughters.

One important aspect of nurturant fathering is a daughters' perception that she can confide in or talk about personal things with her father. By enhancing communication between fathers and daughters, through behavioral therapy, families can learn to resolve
conflict and problem-solve together. Doing so is likely to increase a daughter’s perception that her father is approachable and safe to talk to, which is an aspect of nurturant fathering.

**Experiential Therapy**

Trends in previous research have found that adolescence is a time when parents typically distance themselves from their children (Almeida & Galambos, 1991). The results of the present study, however, suggest that this may be a mistake. The findings of the present study emphasize the important relationship between perceptions of expressive and nurturant types of fathering and the self-esteem and life satisfaction of daughters during adolescence. Therefore, experiential therapy, which focuses on the emotional experiences within families, may be highly effective in working with fathers and adolescent daughters, regardless of the presenting problem.

Experiential therapy may be useful for clinicians in helping fathers and daughters uncover their honest emotions, and then forge more genuine family ties out of their enhanced authenticity (Nichols & Schwartz, 2004). This process may be facilitated through a variety of experiential techniques that promote communication and interaction between fathers and daughters. First, family sculpting may be used as a means of portraying each person’s perspective of the family and his or her place in it. This may help fathers and daughters more fully understand and appreciate the perspective of the other. Role-playing can be used to increase empathy among family members by means of sharing one’s own perspective or taking the perspective of another family member.
(Nichols & Schwartz). For example, a father might be asked to imagine himself as a girl caught in the same dilemma that his daughter.

Implementing the findings from the present study, through the use of experiential therapy, may help fathers and daughters get beneath the surface of their interactions to explore the deeper feelings that drive them. By talking to fathers and daughters about what they’re feeling, and the roots of such feelings, fathers and daughters can be helped to get past the defensiveness that keeps them apart, and reconnect at a more genuine level (Nichols & Schwartz, 2004). According to the results of the present study, it is this type of emotional connectivity that adolescent daughters, over time, will benefit most from in their relationship with their father.

In conclusion, the findings of the present study provide support for Secunda’s (1992) observation that fathers can have a significant influence on the development of their daughters. Results of the present study suggest that there is a significant positive relationship between retrospective perceptions of both father involvement and nurturant fathering during adolescence, and the self-esteem and life satisfaction young adult daughters. More specifically, the findings of the present study suggest further that retrospective perceptions of nurturant fathering and expressive types of father involvement during adolescence have the strongest relationships with self-esteem and life satisfaction of daughters in their young adult years. As reviewed, these findings provide several implications for marriage and family therapists who are working with fathers and/or daughters in a therapy setting, and can be used to guide both assessment and intervention throughout the therapeutic process.
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APPENDICES
Appendix A. Letter of Information
Letter of Information
Father Involvement and the Psychological Well Being of Daughters

Introduction/Purpose: Professor Scot Allgood and Cami Petersen in the Department of Family, Consumer, and Human Development at Utah State University are conducting a research study on the relationship between young single women and their fathers. There will be approximately 30 females between the ages of 18 - 21 who will take part in this research project.

Procedures: If you agree to participate in this project you will be asked to fill out a questionnaire that may take about 10-15 minutes to complete. Please complete this questionnaire before discussing the answers with anyone. To protect your identity, please do not put your name on the questionnaire. Once you have completed this questionnaire please seal it in the envelope provided. If you are filling out this questionnaire in class, please return your questionnaire to the research assistant. If you are filling out this questionnaire at home, please return it to the research assistant on your next day of class. To thank you for helping in this study all participants' names will be put in a raffle for a fifty-dollar gift certificate to Hastings. In order for you to be eligible for this raffle we will need some identifiable information. A separate postcard is included asking for your name and address; please return this to the research assistant with your questionnaire, but do not seal it in the envelope with your questionnaire to keep your answers anonymous.

Risks/Benefits: There is a potential risk that some of the questions may cause psychological discomfort. If that is true for you please call either Professor Allgood or Cami Peterson at the numbers provided for a referral for psychological services. There may or may not be a direct benefit to you by participating in this study. However, we hope to understand how to facilitate communication about activities that may further strengthen relationships with fathers. We hope that the data collected from this study will help provide information for therapists about education on parenting and to also provide additional information to help distressed adolescents and their parents.

Voluntary Participation: Your participation is completely voluntary. If at any time you feel uncomfortable with material presented you may withdraw at anytime without consequences.

Confidentiality: Please do not put your name or any identifying information on the survey. Completed surveys will be kept in a locked file cabinet in the Family Life Center. By completing the questionnaire you understand this Letter of Information along with the possible risks and benefits of participation, and give consent for your questionnaire to be used in data analysis.

The Institutional Review Board for the protection of human participants involved in research at USU has approved this research study. If you have any questions or concerns about your rights, you may contact them directly at (435) 797-0567.

Scot M. Allgood, Ph.D. / Date
 Principle Investigator
(435) 797-7425

Camille Peterson / Date
 Research Assistant
(435) 797-7425
Appendix B. Measures
Instructions: Please rank each of the following 20 items on a scale between 1 and 5. In the left column, please circle the number representing how involved your father actually was in the specified areas of your life and development during your adolescent years (ages 13 to 18). In the right column, please circle the number that represents how involved you wish your father had been in the specified areas of your life and development during your adolescent years.

During adolescence, how involved was your father in the following aspects of your life and development?

| 1. Never involved | 1. Much less involved |
| 2. Rarely involved | 2. A little less involved |
| 3. Sometimes involved | 3. It was just right |
| 4. Often involved | 4. A little more involved |
| 5. Always involved | 5. Much more involved |

| 1. Intellectual development | 1. Intellectual development |
| 2. Emotional development | 2. Emotional development |
| 4. Ethical/moral development | 4. Ethical/moral development |
| 5. Spiritual development | 5. Spiritual development |
| 1 | 1 |
| 2 | 2 |
| 3 | 3 |
| 4 | 4 |
| 5 | 5 |

During adolescence, what did you want your father’s level of involvement to be compared with what it actually was?
For questions 21-29 please answer each question by circling the response that most closely resembles your thoughts about your relationship with your father during adolescence.

21. How much do you think your father enjoyed being a father?
   - Not at all  A little  Somewhat  Very Much  A great deal

22. When you needed your father's support, was he there for you?
   - Never  Rarely  Sometimes  Often  Always

23. Did your father have enough energy to meet your needs?
   - Never  Rarely  Sometimes  Often  Always

24. Did you feel that you could confide in (talk about important personal things with) your father?
   - Never  Rarely  Sometimes  Often  Always

25. Was your father available to spend time with you in activities?
   - Never  Rarely  Sometimes  Often  Always

26. How emotionally close were you to your father?
   - Not at all  A little  Somewhat  Very  Extremely

27. How well did you get along with your father?
   - Very poorly  Poorly  Ok  Well  Very well

28. Overall, how would you rate your father?
   - Poor  Fair  Good  Very good  Outstanding

29. As you go through your day, how much of a psychological presence does your father have in your daily thoughts and feelings?
   - Never there  Rarely there  Sometimes there  Often there  Always there
Looking back over the last week, including today, help us understand how you have been feeling. For questions 30-39, please read each item carefully and circle the response which best describes your current situation.

1 2 3 4 5
Never Rarely Sometimes Frequently Almost always

30. I am a happy person. 1 2 3 4 5
31. I am satisfied with my life. 1 2 3 4 5
32. I am satisfied with my relationships with others. 1 2 3 4 5
33. I feel loved and wanted. 1 2 3 4 5
34. I feel my love relationships are full and complete. 1 2 3 4 5
35. I feel fearful. 1 2 3 4 5
36. I feel something is wrong with my mind. 1 2 3 4 5
37. I feel blue. 1 2 3 4 5
38. I feel lonely. 1 2 3 4 5
39. I feel stressed at work (work is defined as employment, school, housework, volunteer work, etc.). 1 2 3 4 5

Below is a list of statements dealing with your general feelings about yourself. For questions 40-49, please circle the response that best describes your thoughts.

1 2 3 4
Strongly Disagree Disagree Agree Strongly Agree

40. On the whole, I am satisfied with myself. 1 2 3 4
41. At times, I think I am no good at all. 1 2 3 4
42. I feel that I have a number of good qualities 1 2 3 4
43. I am able to do things as well as most other people 1 2 3 4
44. I feel I do not have much to be proud of 1 2 3 4
45. I certainly feel useless at times. 1 2 3 4
46. I feel that I’m a person of worth, at least on an equal 1 2 3 4
plane with others
47. I wish I could have more respect for myself 1 2 3 4
48. All in all, I am inclined to feel that I am a failure. 1 2 3 4
49. I take a positive attitude toward myself. 1 2 3 4

Instructions: For questions 50-55, please answer first about yourself, and second about your father.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>You</th>
<th>Your Father</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50. Age (in years)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51. Education (years)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(12 = high school)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52. Ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) African American/black</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Asian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Native American/Eskimo/Aluet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) Caucasian/White</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) Other (Please Specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53. Religious affiliation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) Mormon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Protestant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Catholic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) Other (Please Specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54. How often do you attend religious services?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) Never, or almost never</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Occasionally</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) One to three times per month</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) One or more times per week</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) Don’t know</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55. How religious would you say you are?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) Not at all religious</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Slightly religious</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Moderately religious</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Very religious</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>