

PARENTING STYLES AND SPIRITUAL MATURITY

Kenneth E. Bryant, B.A., M.S.

Dissertation Prepared for the Degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

UNIVERSITY OF NORTH TEXAS

December 2001

APPROVED:

Henry L. Harris, Major Professor

Michael Altekruze, Committee Member and
Chair of the Department of Counseling,
Development, and Higher Education

Dennis Engels, Committee Member

Jan M. Holden, Coordinator of the Counselor
Education Program

M. Jean Keller, Dean of the College of Education

C. Neal Tate, Dean of the Robert B. Toulouse
School of Graduate Studies

Bryant, Kenneth E., Parenting styles and spiritual maturity, Doctor of Philosophy (Counselor Education), December 2001, 115 pp., 6 tables, references, 116 titles.

Relationships between parenting styles practiced in individuals' families of origin and the measurement of individuals' spiritual maturity in adulthood were studied. Relationships between gender and the authoritative (facilitative) parenting style comprised the main focus of the study.

Participants for this study were recruited from a large, non-denominational Christian church located in north Texas. A total of 300 individuals were randomly selected. A total of 160 individuals filled out the demographic sheet, the Parental Authority Questionnaire (PAQ), and the Spiritual Assessment Inventory (SAI). Canonical correlation procedures were performed among the set of SAI scales measuring individuals' spiritual maturity (awareness, instability, grandiosity, realistic acceptance, disappointment, and impression management) and the set of PAQ scales that measure parenting styles (authoritative or facilitative, authoritarian, and permissive) of mothers and fathers.

Conclusions about female and male students raised in homes characterized by fathers and mothers with an authoritative (facilitative) parenting style were varied. Female adults raised in homes characterized by fathers and mothers with an authoritative (facilitative) parenting style were not correlated in a positive manner with spiritual maturity. Male adults raised in homes characterized by fathers with an authoritative

(facilitative) parenting style demonstrated significance at only a large observed p value and therefore, could not be reported. Male students raised in homes characterized by mothers with an authoritative (facilitative) parenting style were correlated significantly with spiritual maturity in one correlation at the .04 level of significance. In another correlation, at the .003 level of significance, male adults raised in homes characterized by mothers with an authoritative (facilitative) parenting style were not correlated. Some cautions were discussed regarding the findings, and directions for future research on parenting styles and spiritual maturity were discussed.

Copyright 2001

by

Kenneth E. Bryant

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This dissertation represents the culmination of my time at the University of North Texas. I am grateful to all my professors at UNT for their assistance over the years. I am especially grateful to my dissertation committee: Dr. Henry L. Harris, Dr. Michael Altekruze, and Dr. Denis Engels. I would also like to thank Dr. Richard Herrington for lending his statistical expertise.

I am very grateful to my wife, Carol Bryant, who has stayed by my side and faithfully loved me through this very long and arduous process. Her support and encouragement were invaluable. I also want to thank our four sons, Scott, Aaron, Mark, and Kevin, for their understanding and support throughout what seemed to be an unending process.

Finally, I would like to thank God, my Heavenly Father. He provided the “song” when it seemed the “music” had stopped. His grace also provided the opportunity and the physical, financial, mental, and spiritual resources to accomplish this doctoral program of study.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | Page |
|---|------|
| LIST OF TABLES | vi |
| Chapter | |
| I. INTRODUCTION AND RELATED LITERATURE | 1 |
| Statement of the Problem | |
| Definition of Terms | |
| Limitations | |
| Purpose of the Study | |
| Research Questions | |
| Research Hypotheses | |
| Review of the Literature | |
| II. PROCEDURES | 24 |
| Participants | |
| Instrumentation | |
| Collection of Data | |
| Research Design | |
| III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION | 31 |
| Analysis of Data | |
| Discussion | |
| Suggestions for Future Research | |
| Conclusions | |
| APPENDIX A: Informed Consent | 53 |
| APPENDIX B: Demographic Sheet | 55 |
| APPENDIX C: Parental Authority Questionnaire | 57 |
| APPENDIX D: Spiritual Assessment | 62 |
| APPENDIX E: Table 1 - Canonical Correlation Output Rating Mother for all Respondents | 66 |

| | |
|---|-----|
| APPENDIX F: Table 2 - Canonical Correlation Output Rating Father for all Respondents | 72 |
| APPENDIX G: Table 3 - Females Rating Mother Canonical Correlation Output | 78 |
| APPENDIX H: Table 4 - Females Rating Father Canonical Correlation Output | 84 |
| APPENDIX I: Table 5 - Males Rating Mother Canonical Correlation Output | 90 |
| APPENDIX J: Table 6 - Males Rating Father Canonical Correlation Output | 96 |
| REFERENCES | 102 |

LIST OF TABLES

| Table | Page |
|---|------|
| 1. Canonical Correlation Output Rating Mother for All Respondents | 67 |
| 2. Canonical Correlation Output Rating Father for All Respondents | 73 |
| 3. Females Rating Mother Canonical Correlation Output | 79 |
| 4. Females Rating Father Canonical Correlation Output | 85 |
| 5. Males Rating Mother Canonical Correlation Output | 91 |
| 6. Males Rating Father Canonical Correlation Output | 97 |

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION AND RELATED LITERATURE

Introduction

Concepts of parenting styles and adult spiritual maturity from a Judeo-Christian perspective make up the integral part of this study. Baumrind's (1971) model of parental authority with its multidimensional character, its typological clarity, and its empirical efficacy was used to investigate relationships between parenting styles in individuals' families of origin and spiritual maturity in individuals' adult years. The concept of spiritual maturity was viewed from an object relations viewpoint.

Home has been emphasized as being the center of spiritual formation (Bushnell, 1967; Coe, 1902, 1916, 1917; Nelson, 1967; Richards, 1970, 1975; Westerhoff and Neville, 1974). Faith has been a vital part of daily living which has been best "transmitted and supported by lifestyle, in that life and behavior afford the child the concrete experiences necessary to frame an understanding of faith" (Dirks, 1989, p. 88). Parents, or the primary caregivers in the home, have usually been responsible for establishing a lifestyle that guides a child's spiritual development (Gangel and Gangel, 1987; Guernsey, 1982; Smalley, 1984; Strauss, 1984). Regardless of this phenomenon, a small amount of research has been designed to measure the effect a parent has on a child's religious development (Meadow and Kahoe, 1984; Spilka, Hood, and Gorsuch, 1985).

Freud (1955, 1961) hypothesized individuals' God concepts are primarily projections of attitudes and feelings towards their own father. Rizzuto (1979) suggested that individuals' concepts of God are largely projections of feelings and attitudes towards either one or both parents. Several studies concerning the kind and loving nature of God have been conducted from a psychoanalytic viewpoint (Spilka et al., 1964; Tamayo and Desjardins, 1976). The results of the studies have apparently supported a strong correlation between individuals' perceptions of the loving and caring nature of God and individuals' perceptions of the loving and caring nature of their parents. Yet, research has resulted in conflicted and mixed findings. Some study results have indicated no relationship between individuals' God concepts and parent concepts (Vergote and Tamayo, 1980). Some studies have seemed to indicate a limited but statistically significant relationship between individuals' God concepts and father concepts (Siegmann, 1961). Other studies have indicated a strong relationship only between individuals' God concepts and mother concepts (Nelson and Jones, 1957). Still, other studies seem to have indicated a strong relationship between the God concepts and both the mother and father concepts (Godin and Hallez, 1965; Nelson, 1971; Strunk, 1959).

Relationships between parents and children are a complex, multi-directional process of interactions (Bell, 1968, 1986). Still, parents usually seem to have the greater power to implement long-term goals and plans for child development (Hoffman, 1975). Eisenberg-Berg and Mussen (1978), Hoffman (1979), Jacob (1975), and Thompson and Hoffman (1980) found parent-child relationships to be a primary determinant in moral development. Hoffman (1963) found parent-child relationships are a primary determinant

in moral behavior transmission. Studies by Coby and Kohlberg (1984), Hoffman (1978, 1981), and Thompson and Hoffman (1980) found parent-child relationships to be vital to the development of empathy in children. Colby and Kohlberg (1984) discovered the development of guilt to be primarily related to parent-child relationships. McCord (1988) found a primary relationship between parents and children in demonstration of aggression and antisocial behavior. Jacob (1975), Main and Goldwyn (1984), McCord (1988), McCranie and Bass (1984), Raskin, Boothe, Natalie, Schulterbrandt, and Odle (1971) found the same primary relationship in the development of depressive symptoms in adult children. Buri, Louiselle, Misukanis, and Mueller (1988) found a primary relationship between parents and children in the development of child and adult self-esteem. Archer (1994), Hagen and Wallenstein (1995), Jagacinski and Nichols (1987), and Pintrich and Garcia (1991) found parent-child relationships to be a primary factor in the development of goal orientation and achievement behaviors. Clifford (2000) found the development of mutuality, warmth, and physical intimacy in the spousal relationship to be primarily related to the parent-child relationship. Finally, Wheeler (1989) discovered the parent-child relationship to be a primary determinant in the development of religiosity and spiritual well-being.

In view of the above research, it is evident parent-child relationships have impacted a variety of areas of children's lives throughout the life span. Parent-child interactions seem to have formed a vital crucible of unparalleled influence. Therefore, the impact of parental authority, or parenting styles, on adult spiritual maturity was examined in this study.

Statement of the Problem

Numerous studies have been examined in order to determine the impact of the parenting relationship (Alwin, 1986; Dornbusch, Ritter, Leiderman, Roberts, and Fraleigh, 1987; Ford, Massey, and Hyde, 1986; Lewis, 1981; Portes, Dunham, and Williams, 1986). Studies by Dudley (1978) and Erickson (1962), reanalyzed by Greeley and Geckel (1971), Hoge and Petrillo (1978a, 1978b), and Hoge and Keeter (1976), have examined the relationship between perceived parenting styles in the family of origin to the religious commitment of children. Nonetheless, an electronic search of the databases of ERIC, PsycLIT, and PSYCINFO found no studies that have examined what effect different parenting styles have had on the spiritual maturity in either children or adults. This study was undertaken to investigate parenting styles in individuals' families of origin and their relationship to individuals' current level of spiritual maturity.

Definition of Terms

Spiritual Maturity – Spiritual maturity was defined from a relational perspective (Hall and Edwards, 1995). Spiritual maturity includes the incorporation of two distinct, but related, dimensions of individuals' self-God relationship including awareness of God in daily life and quality of one's relationship with God. For the purposes of this study, spiritual maturity was operationally defined by the 5 factor scale scores on the Hall and Edwards (1996b) Spiritual Assessment Inventory. The scale included scores for awareness and realistic acceptance which are considered positive aspects of one's relationship to God and represent spiritual maturity. The scale also included scores for disappointment with God, grandiosity, and instability which have been considered

negative aspects of one's relationship with God. These scores represented lesser levels of spiritual maturity.

Authoritative (Facilitative) Parenting Style – The parenting styles were limited to the three styles identified by Baumrind and Black (1967): authoritative (referred to as facilitative in this study), authoritarian, and permissive. Authoritative, or facilitative, parents were noted to provide clear and firm direction for their children. They encouraged autonomy, verbal give-and-take, personal growth, responsible maturity, and appropriate involvement of their children in the family decision-making process coupled with ultimate parental authority. Authoritative (facilitative) parents were also characterized by warmth, reason, and flexibility (Buri, 1991).

Authoritarian Parenting Style – The authoritarian parent placed great emphasis on obedience and punitive measures of discipline management. Unquestioning respect for authority, along with absolute conformity to parental demands, were highly valued. Authoritarian parents, with their detached and more emotionally distant interactions with their children, did not encourage verbal give-and-take (Buri, 1991).

Permissive Parenting Style – The permissive parent was tolerant and accepting toward the child's impulses and used as little punishment as possible. The permissive parent did not assume responsibility for shaping a child's behavior, but preferred instead to allow considerable self-regulation by the child (Buri, 1991).

God – A Judeo-Christian interpretation of God was used in this study.

Canonical Correlation – Also called a characteristic root, is a form of correlation relating two sets of variables. As with factor analysis, there may be more than one

significant dimension (more than one canonical correlation), each representing an orthogonally separate pattern of relationships between the two latent variables. The maximum number of canonical correlations between two sets of variables is the number of variables in the smaller set.

The first canonical correlation is always the one that explains most of the relationship. The canonical correlations are interpreted the same as Pearson's r . Their square is the percent of variance in one set of variables explained by the other set along the dimension represented by the given canonical correlation (usually the first). Another way to put it is to say that R^2 is the percent of shared variance along this dimension.

Canonical Variable or Variate – A canonical variable, also called a variate, is a linear combination of a set of original variables in which the within-set correlation has been controlled (that is, the variance of each variable accounted for by other variables in the set has been removed). It is a form of latent variable. There are two canonical variables per canonical correlation (function). One is the dependent canonical variable, while the one for the independents may be called the covariate canonical variable.

Canonical Coefficient – Also called the canonical function coefficient or the canonical weight, the canonical coefficients are the weights in the linear equation of variables which creates the canonical variables. As such, they are analogous to beta weights in regression analysis. There will be one canonical coefficient for each original variable in each of the two sets of variables for each canonical correlation. Thus, for the

dependent set, if there are five variables and there are three canonical correlations (functions), there will be 15 canonical coefficients in three sets of five coefficients.

Canonical Scores – They are the values on a canonical variable for a given case based on the canonical coefficients for that variable. Canonical coefficients are multiplied by the standardized scores of the cases and summed to yield the canonical scores for each case in the analysis.

Structure correlation coefficients – They are also called canonical factor loadings. A structure correlation is the correlation of a canonical variable with an original variable. That is, it is the correlation of canonical variable scores for a given canonical variable with the standardized scores of an original input variable. The table of structure correlations is sometimes called the factor structure. The squared structure correlation indicates the contribution made by a given variable to the explanatory power of the canonical variate based on the set of variables to which it belongs. Structure correlations are used for two purposes.

Index Coefficients – They represent the correlation between scores on one original unweighted variable from the first set and the weighted and aggregated original variables of the other variable set (also called a canonical score).

Canonical variate adequacy coefficient – They identify the average of all the squared structure coefficients for one set of variables (the dependent or the independent set) with respect to a given canonical variable. This coefficient is a measure of how well a given canonical variable represents the original variance in that set of original variables.

Calculating Variance Explained in the Original Variables – The square of the structure correlation is the percent of the variance in a given original variable accounted for by a given canonical variable on a given (usually the first) canonical correlation. Another way of putting it is that the structure correlation squared is the percent of variance linearly shared by an original variable with one of the canonical variates.

Interpreting the Canonical Variables – The magnitudes of the structure correlations help in interpreting the meaning of the canonical variables with which they are associated, much like how factor loadings help interpret the meaning of factors extracted in factor analysis. A rule of thumb is for variables with correlations of 0.3 or above to be interpreted as being part of the canonical variable, and those below not to be considered part of the canonical variable.

Limitations of the Design

Limitations with regard to the specific population utilized in the study may reduce the extent to which results can be generalized.

1. The sample in the present study was a sample of convenience and was not a random sample of all Christian adults and therefore, may not be representative of all Christian adults.

2. The relative homogenous nature of the sample did not reflect the greater variance in the population with regard to demographic variables such as ethnicity, age-range, socio-economic status, or marital status and, therefore, may reduce the extent to which results can be generalized.

3. All the data were collected using paper and pencil self-report instruments.

This method of data collection may be subject to the influence of social desirability and fake-good response sets. Thus, the generalizeability of the results may be limited.

4. The lack of clarity and consistency offered in various studies to define dimensions of spiritual maturity may present a concern over the measurement of variables of spiritual maturity, thus affecting the extent to which results can be generalized.

Purpose of the Study

Several areas have been researched regarding the determining impact of the parenting relationship (Alwin, 1986; Dornbusch et al., 1987; Ford et al., 1986; Lewis, 1981; Portes et al., 1986). Studies by Dudley (1978) and Erickson (1962), which were reanalyzed by Greeley and Gockel (1971), Hoge and Petrillo (1978a, 1978b), and Hoge and Keeter (1976), have examined the relationship between perceived parenting styles in the family of origin and a variety of relevant topics. The research has even included perceived parenting styles in the family of origin and their relationship with the religious commitment of children. Yet, after a recent literature review using the databases of ERIC, PsycLIT, and PSYCINFO there were no studies found which examined what effect different parenting styles have on the spiritual maturity in either children or adults.

The purpose of this study was to determine whether the parenting styles practiced in individuals' families of origin are related to their measurement of spiritual maturity in adulthood. The Parental Authority Questionnaire (PAQ) and the Spiritual Assessment Inventory (SAI) were used to assess the nature of the relationship.

Research Questions

The central impact of the home on spiritual formation in the lives of children, and ultimately adults, has been established by a variety of researchers (Bushnell, 1967; Coe, 1902, 1916, 1917; Nelson, 1967; Richards, 1970, 1975; Westerhoff and Neville, 1974). Negotiating the balance between autonomy and relationship or independence and dependence is a vital part of the parenting role. Kegan (1982) viewed the negotiating of this balance as an ongoing process that is developing and changing throughout the life cycle. Guisinger and Blatt (1994) stated that interpersonal relatedness and self-definition are vitally related. “An increasingly mature sense of self is contingent on interpersonal relationships; the continued development of increasingly mature interpersonal relationships is contingent on mature self-definition” (p. 104).

Object relations theorists conceptualize humans as relation-seeking (Bowlby, 1969; Fairbairn, 1954; Guntrip, 1961; Sullivan, 1953). People, especially children, need people. The search for and maintenance of relationships with others has always been a primary goal and need of everyone. A person cannot be a person without appropriate and meaningful contact with other people (Clifford, 2000).

According to Hall (1996), it is theoretically possible to predict that the quality of individuals’ relationships with God will be similar to the quality of their relationship with others. Data gathered by researchers (Baumrind, 1971; Baumrind and Black, 1967; Ginsburg and Bronstein, 1993; MacCoby and Martin, 1983) validate the belief that particular environments do a better job of supporting and facilitating relationships than others. Therefore, it is the opinion of this researcher that environments that tend to

facilitate the development of quality relationships between people also facilitate the development of quality, mature relationships with God. This researcher looked at how adult individuals' spiritual maturity is related to the parental environment which existed in their family of origin. The study addressed four research questions.

Question I

Do female adults raised in homes characterized by fathers with an authoritative (facilitative) parenting style demonstrate a high level of spiritual maturity as measured by the Spiritual Assessment Inventory (SAI) and Parental Authority Questionnaire (PAQ)?

Question II

Do male adults raised in homes characterized by fathers with an authoritative (facilitative) parenting style demonstrate a high level of spiritual maturity as measured by the Spiritual Assessment Inventory (SAI) and the Parental Authority Questionnaire (PAQ)?

Question III

Do female adults raised in homes characterized by mothers with an authoritative (facilitative) parenting style demonstrate a high level of spiritual maturity as measured by the Spiritual Assessment Inventory (SAI) and the Parental Authority Questionnaire (PAQ)?

Question IV

Do male adults raised in homes characterized by mothers with an authoritative (facilitative) parenting style demonstrate a high level of spiritual maturity as measured by

the Spiritual Assessment Inventory (SAI) and the Parental Authority Questionnaire (PAQ)?

Research Hypotheses

In an effort to answer the above research questions, the researcher formulated four hypotheses.

Hypothesis I

Female adults raised in homes characterized by fathers with an authoritative (facilitative) parenting style will demonstrate a high level of spiritual maturity as measured by the Spiritual Assessment Inventory (SAI) and the Parental Authority Questionnaire (PAQ).

Hypothesis II

Male adults raised in homes characterized by fathers with an authoritative (facilitative) parenting style will demonstrate a high level of spiritual maturity as measured by the Spiritual Assessment Inventory (SAI) and the Parental Authority Questionnaire (PAQ).

Hypothesis III

Female adults raised in homes characterized by mothers with an authoritative (facilitative) parenting style will demonstrate a high level of spiritual as measured by the Spiritual Assessment Questionnaire (SAI) and the Parental Authority Questionnaire (PAQ).

Hypothesis IV

Male adults raised in homes characterized by mothers with an authoritative (facilitative) parenting style will demonstrate a high level of spiritual maturity as measured by the Spiritual Assessment Questionnaire (SAI) and the Parental Authority Questionnaire (PAQ).

Review of the Literature

This section presents a review of literature related to object relations theory and spiritual maturity, and parenting styles and spiritual maturity. Literature related to the use of the Parental Authority Questionnaire (PAQ) and the Spiritual Assessment Inventory (SAI) are presented in Chapter 2 of this study.

Object Relations Theory and Spiritual Maturity

Jones (1991) and Richards and Bergin (1997) believe the epistemological changes in the philosophy of science produced an increased openness in the field of psychology toward spirituality. Theoretical and empirical investigations of the relationship between spiritual maturity and psychological maturity have been ongoing for many years beginning with the arguments of Freud (1955, 1959, 1961, 1964), who believed religion was inherently pathological. Over the years, many empirical investigations of the relationship between religion and mental health have resulted in a variety of findings (Bergin, 1983; Gartner, Larson, and Allen, 1991; Levin and Vanderpool, 1987; Sauna, 1969).

Religion, from a Freudian perspective, is viewed as a defense mechanism that is rooted in a transference process in which God is seen as an exalted father (Hall, 1996).

Post-Freudian thought, with its emphasis on relational theories, views religion as a relationship with God that is founded on individuals' deep structure of internalized relationships instead of as a universal obsession neurosis (Jones, 1991). The health of individuals' relationships with God parallel individuals' object relations maturity. Therefore, the primary area of investigations in the study of religious experience from an object relations' perspective are individuals' relationships with God (Hall, 1996).

Miller (1991) in an attempt to integrate spiritual and psychological maturity from a relational perspective, described spiritual maturity as a meaning-making process which includes autonomy and relationship, and fosters the development of interdependency, intimacy, and the ability to self-give in love. According to Hall (1996), the contemporary psychoanalytic perspective on religion—individuals' relationships with God that both reflect and change their internal object-relational constellation—correspond well to Miller's description of spiritual maturity. Rizzuto (1979) also proposed individuals' private representations of God are a combination of their primary objects that are continually transformed and reshaped as new experiences are internalized in their representational matrices. The positive relationship between God image and level of object relations development has been corroborated by a variety of empirical studies (Birky and Ball, 1988; Brokaw and Edwards, 1994; Spear, 1994).

Another major internal shift in psychoanalytic theory developed from the work of several theorists, in particular the work of Kohut (1984). He theorized that what is internalized is a relationship rather than a static object. The focus shifted from internalized introjects to internal and external relationships (Jones, 1991). Therefore, a

more consistent study of spiritual maturity, in light of this contemporary, psychoanalytic perspective, is one that emphasizes peoples' relationships with God rather than strictly an internal representation of object relations development and God image in a positive manner. It is also possible to theoretically predict that relationships of individuals with God will be similar to the quality of their relationships with others (Hall, 1996).

Rizzuto (1979) collected extensive data on 20 people in a systematic study of the relationship between their psychological development and their formation of God images. As a result, she concluded that the foundation for God images of individuals is established in the earliest years of life, within the context of the mother-child relationship. She also theorized that individuals' concepts of God are dynamic processes which are impacted by many significant others through each consecutive psychological stage. Her discussions of Winnicott's (1971) concept of transitional objects emphasized that the God image is a personalized, representational, transitional object that is increasingly cathected throughout development. Her focus was on the internalized God-object rather than on a relationship with the God.

Theory and research in the area of God image and object relations has also been extended through the work of McDargh (1983, 1986). In an effort to explore the relationship between psychological and religious development from an object relations viewpoint, he conducted an in-depth study of 12 individuals. He theorized that children's images of God originate in their relationship with the parent of the opposite gender. He also suggested that children's God image is a result of the influence of their unique inner representational world. He stated:

Whether a given individual relates to a particular object representation of God with conscious belief, or unbelief, whether that representation is repressed, rejected, embraced, or celebrated has everything to do with the dynamic origins of that representation, its subsequent life history, and hence, if and how it may be available to help the person sustain some sense of being a self-in-representation.” (p. 256)

The various aspects of the relationship between object relations to God images have been researched by a variety of people. Fay (1983) investigated the difference between the conscious symbolic level of parent images and the memory content level of parent images in terms of their interaction with God images. Corzo (1981) investigated the impact of both depression and Christian faith on God images from an object relations viewpoint. Birky and Ball (1988) explored the influence of parent images on God images from an object relations perspective. They tentatively found support for their hypothesis that idealized parent figures are very important in influencing the development of God images. In fact, composite parent scores matched God image scores better than scores for mother and father investigated separately. Brokaw (1991) substantiated the level of object relations development is positively related with God’s love and benevolence, and negatively related with images of God as wrathful, controlling, and irrelevant. Wootton (1991) found significant correlations between God representation and two dependent variables of quality of object-relatedness and defensive functioning. Knapp (1993) discovered significant correlations between scores on the object relations and God image measures while working with recent and long-term sober alcoholics. Finally, Spear

(1994) contributed to object relations literature by discovering notable support for the existence of a pre-conscious God image and its relationship to individuals' matrices of internalized objects.

The previously mentioned research, according to Hall (1996), suggests that individuals' internal object world consists in part of a God image that is positively related to their level of object relations development. As a result, the contemporary psychoanalytic perspective that suggests individuals' religious experience is related to their representation of God that is formed and transformed as an internalized object is strengthened.

Still, contemporary psychoanalytic thought regarding internalized introjects has continued to go through a metamorphosis led by researchers like Klein, Sullivan, Fairbairn, Guntrip, Winnicott and numerous others (Greenberg and Mitchell, 1983). According to Hall (1996), numerous theorists have contributed to the relational/structure model for personality, but none as clearly as Kohut.

Kohut (1984) theorized "a self can never exist outside a matrix of self-objects" (p. 61). He declared that relationships, which people always find themselves in, are what provide the structure of the self. Special importance is given to what he called self-object relationships. A self-object is another person who is experienced as an extension of oneself and who meets an individual's need for transcendence, acceptance, and belonging (Summers, 1994). Kohut, along with others, further suggested that individuals do not internalize static objects. Instead, individuals internalize relationships themselves or patterns of relatedness. This implies that since relationships are internalized rather than

introjects, it is internal relationships that are re-enacted and re-experienced in one's external relationships. Internal relationships are composed of a deep structure and are changed through a logical process of interacting with external relationships. Therefore, the focus becomes the interaction of internal and external relationships with significant others instead of the mere interaction of internal introjects of significant others (Hall, 1996).

Kohut's (1984) theory is a very important change in the psychoanalytic study of religion. He posited a model that views what an individual internalizes is not simply unchanging parental likeness. As noted above, individuals internalize a relationship or pattern of relatedness. This approach changes the focus in the psychoanalytic study of religion from the study of God image to the study of individuals' actual relationships with God. This approach also demonstrates the matrix of internalized relationships (Jones, 1991). The significance of this type of focus is that God representations of individuals are not solely intrapsychic, but they are also interpersonal in nature. Therefore, the focus of contemporary psychoanalytic theory is relationship with God and the constellation of internalized relationships (Hall, 1996).

The concept of spiritual maturity is a subject that is congruent with the contemporary focus on individuals' interpersonal relationships with God. Spiritual maturity has been defined in a variety of ways by various researchers (Hall, 1996). Butman (1990) stated that spiritual maturity must be an observable measurement of an "individual's spiritual fruit" in order to be cogent to clinicians and researchers. Ellison (1983) emphasized individuals' satisfaction with God and life in his theory of spiritual

well-being. Bassett, Sadler, Kobischen, Skiff, Merrill, Atwater and Livermore (1981) explored spiritual maturity in terms of belief and behavior components. Malony (1985) also defined spiritual maturity in terms of belief and behavior. However, Hall and Edwards (1995) defined spiritual maturity from a relational perspective. Their model of spiritual maturity provided a unique perspective that correlated well with a contemporary, psychoanalytic perspective and with the purposes of the present paper.

Spiritual maturity from a relational perspective is an initial step, theoretically and empirically, to surmount the barriers between contemporary psychoanalytic theory and spirituality. There have been only a miniscule number of empirical studies conducted from this specific theoretical perspective. Still, several theoretical articles have investigated the relationship between spiritual and psychological maturity. Some of these articles have used an object relations framework (Hall, 1996).

Carter (1974) theorized that both psychological and spiritual maturity involve parallel processes of actualization and congruence, although their contents are different. Shackelford (1978) conducted a theoretical study of dependence from an object-relations perspective and concluded there are three stages of dependence: infantile, transitional, and mature. Shackelford, from an object-relations perspective, described mature dependence by three characteristics: (a) a differentiation between self and others, (b) an attitude of giving in addition to the capacity to receive, and (c) the mechanism of identification rather than incorporation. Mature dependence is the result of a psychological process that internalizes early experiences of these characteristics as demonstrated by parents and significant others (Hall, 1996). Pingleton (1984) conducted

a similar theoretical study of relational maturity from an object-relations perspective. His results were essentially the same as Shackelford's. Similarly, Carter and Barnhurst (1986), along with Benner (1988) and Jones (1991), have proposed that maturity in relationship to God and others is a dynamic relationship and psychological and spiritual functioning are inseparably related.

Parenting Styles and Spiritual Maturity

Research in the area of parenting styles has increased (Alwin, 1986; Baumrind, 1971; Buri, 1991; Dornbusch et al., 1987; Ford et. al., 1986; Lewis, 1981; Portes et al., 1986; Rollins and Thomas, 1979). Baumrind (1967, 1971, 1980, 1983) provided vast research and discussion on the ways parenting style impacts child development. For the present study, Baumrind's (1971) categories for parenting styles were used: authoritative (facilitative), authoritarian, and permissive. These categories were the result of her study of 32 three- and four-year-olds in which the children were evaluated as follows: (a) those identified as self-reliant, self-controlled, explorative, and content; (b) those identified as discontent, withdrawn, and distrustful; and (c) those who had little self-control or self-reliance and tended to retreat from novel experiences. The parents of the children were evaluated according to the following criteria: (a) parental control, (b) parental maturity demands, (c) parent-child communication, and (d) parental nurturance.

Parental control was characterized by several criteria including consistency of reinforcing parental directives, resistance of acquiescing to a child's demands, and ability to exert influence over the child. Parental control was used to refer to "those parental acts that are intended to shape the child's goal-oriented activity, modify his expression of

dependent, aggressive, and playful behavior, and promote internalization of parental standards” (Baumrind, 1967, p.54). Parental maturity demands “referred to both the pressures put upon the child to perform at least up to ability in intellectual, social, and emotional spheres (independence-training)” (p. 55). Parent-child communication measured the “extent to which the parent used reason to obtain compliance, solicited the child’s opinions and feelings, and used open rather than manipulative techniques of control” (p. 56). Parental nurturance referred to the “caretaking functions of the parent . . . [which included] those parental acts and attitudes that expressed love and were directed at guaranteeing the child’s physical and emotional well-being” (p. 57). Parental nurturance was conveyed by emotional warmth and personal involvement. Warmth was demonstrated by the parent’s love and compassion through sensory stimulation, verbal affirmations, and tenderness. Involvement was conveyed by pride and pleasure in the child’s accomplishments expressed by praise, interest, and protection of the child’s welfare (Freudenberger, 1993).

Baumrind (1971) noted that permissive parents tended to make fewer demands on their children, preferring to allow their children to regulate their own activities as much as possible. Permissive parents did not see themselves as responsible for shaping the behavior of their children. Although they tended to react in an accepting and affirmative manner to their children’s wishes, clear rules were not set and punishment was minimal. Authoritarian parents, on the other hand, tended to place great emphasis on obedience and punitive measures of discipline management. Unquestioning respect for authority, along with absolute conformity to parental demands, tended to be highly valued.

Authoritarian parents, with their detached and more emotionally distant interactions with their children, did not encourage verbal give-and-take. Authoritative (facilitative) parents, however, tended to provide clear and firm direction for their children. They were more likely to encourage autonomy, verbal give-and-take, and appropriate involvement of their children in the family decision-making process coupled with ultimate parental authority. Authoritative parents were also characterized by warmth, reason, and flexibility (Buri, 1991).

Research conducted by Baumrind (1967, 1970, 1971, 1980), Baumrind and Black (1967), and MacCoby and Martin (1983) indicated there are many differences among the children raised in homes characterized by the various parenting styles. Children from authoritative (facilitative) homes were more self-controlled, explorative, self-reliant, self-assertive, realistic, competent, content, and academically motivated. In fact, Ginsburg and Bronstein (1993) suggested an overall intrinsic motivation toward learning. Children from authoritarian homes, when compared to those of authoritative (facilitative) homes, tended to be less content, more insecure and apprehensive, less affiliating toward peers, and more likely to become hostile or regressive under stress” (Baumrind, 1967, p. 81). They were less likely to engage in exploratory and challenge-seeking behavior, lacked initiative, were unhappy, and had low self-esteem (Gonzalez, 1998). Additionally, Ginsburg and Bronstein found a relationship between the authoritarian style and a need for extrinsic motivation in children. Finally, children from permissive homes usually lacked self-control and self-reliance. They tended to be more impulsive, intolerant of frustration, disobedient, and low in perseverance. Ginsburg and Bronstein found children

raised in permissive homes had lower academic performance and a higher need for extrinsic motivation.

CHAPTER II

PROCEDURES

The researcher attempted to determine if there was a relationship between the current level of adult spiritual maturity and the parenting style of the family of origin. This study utilized the Parental Authority Questionnaire (PAQ) and the Spiritual Assessment Inventory (SAI) for data collection.

Participants

Participants were recruited from a large, non-denominational church located in northern Texas. A total of 300 individuals were randomly selected for this study. A total of 160 individuals filled out the demographic sheet, the Parental Authority Questionnaire (PAQ), and the Spiritual Assessment Inventory (SAI). The group included 68 males (42.5%) and 92 females (57.5%). No one was excluded on the basis of race, religion, or ethnicity.

Additional demographic information was collected for the entire group. The participants ranged in age from 18 to 74 years of age and included 138 (86.3%) married, 11 (6.9%) single, 9 (5.6%) divorced, and 2 (1.3%) widowed individuals. Almost 72% (115) of the participants grew up in a Christian home, and 83.1% (133) of them currently attend church at least once a week or more. In terms of ethnicity, 150 (93.8%) were Caucasian, 6 (3.8%) Native American, 2 (1.3%) Hispanic, 1 (.6%) African-American,

and 1 (.6%) international. Over half (56.3%) of the individuals reported an annual income over \$75,000.

Instrumentation

Two self-report instruments were used in the study—The Parental Authority Questionnaire (Baumrind, 1971) and The Spiritual Assessment Inventory (Hall and Edwards, 1996a). In addition to the two self-report instruments, an informed consent and demographic sheet were also distributed to participants. These forms can be found in appendices A and B, respectively.

The Parental Authority Questionnaire (PAQ)

The Parental Authority Questionnaire (PAQ) is based on Baumrind's (1971) parental authority prototypes—authoritative (facilitative), authoritarian, and permissive. The PAQ was developed by Buri (1991) as a substitute for Baumrind's interview and observation methods and contains thirty 5-point Likert items. Ten items measure parental permissiveness, 10 items measure parental authoritarianism, and 10 items measure parental authoritativeness (facilitative). The questionnaire is used to evaluate each parent and produces 6 scores for each subject: mother's permissiveness, mother's authoritarianism, mother's authoritativeness (facilitative), father's permissiveness, father's authoritarianism, and father's authoritativeness (facilitative) (Freudenberger, 1993).

Test-retest results of the PAQ, using a sample population of 61 college students over a two-week interval, produced reliability results of .81 for mother's permissiveness, .86 for mother's authoritarianism, .78 for mother's authoritativeness (facilitative), .77 for

father's permissiveness, .85 for father's authoritarianism, and .92 for father's authoritativeness (facilitative). Responses of 185 college students to the PAQ yielded the following Cronbach coefficient alpha values for each of the six PAQ scales: .75 for mother's permissiveness, .85 for mother's authoritarianism, .82 for mother's authoritativeness (facilitative), .74 for father's permissiveness, .87 for father's authoritarianism, and .85 for father's authoritativeness (facilitative). Considering the fact that the individual scales have only 10 items, the test-retest reliabilities and Cronbach alpha coefficients were highly respectable. A sample of 127 college students was used to determine the discriminant-related validity on the PAQ. Mother's authoritarianism was inversely related to mother's permissiveness ($r = -.38, p < .0005$), and to mother's authoritativeness (facilitative) ($r = -.48, p < .0005$). Father's authoritarianism was inversely related to father's permissiveness ($r = -.50, p < .0005$), and to father's authoritativeness (facilitative) ($r = -.52, p < .0005$). Mother's permissiveness was also found significantly related to mother's authoritativeness (facilitative) ($r = .07, p > .10$), and father's permissiveness was not significantly related with father's authoritativeness (facilitative) ($r = .12, p > .10$) (Freudenberger, 1993).

The correlation between parental warmth and parental nurturance for each parenting style was examined by criterion-related validity. The authoritative parenting style was highest in parental nurturance for mothers ($r = .56, p < .0005$) and fathers ($r = .68, p < .0005$); authoritarian style was inversely related to nurturance for mothers ($r = -.36, p < .0005$) and for fathers ($r = -.53, p < .10$); and permissive style was unrelated to nurturance for mothers ($r = .04, p < .10$) and fathers ($r = .13, p < .10$). Therefore, parental

warmth was confirmed to be a function of parental authority in the PAQ measurement (Freudenberger, 1993). Also, the Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale produced no statistically significant values indicating the PAQ could not be discredited by response biases. Finally, the PAQ was normed on a high school population of 108 upper-class students, and a college population of 171 students (Freudenberger, 1993).

The ability of PAQ to accurately measure Baumrind's (1967) parenting style prototypes was further validated by Buri, et al. (1988). They discovered a strong, positive relationship between parental authoritativeness (facilitative) and adolescent self-esteem, an inverse relationship between parental authoritarianism and adolescent self-esteem, and no relationship between parental permissiveness and adolescent self-esteem. According to Buri (1991), this declared the PAQ to be a valid measure of Baumrind's parenting style prototypes (Freudenberger, 1993).

The Spiritual Assessment Inventory (SAI)

The most recent form of the Spiritual Assessment Inventory is a 47-item self-report inventory (7 of the items have two parts) designed to assess spiritual maturity from a framework that integrates object relations theory and a theology of communication with God. The SAI was founded on the belief that human beings are fundamentally relational. Spiritual development from this viewpoint is seen in a relational context. The perspective of relationship quality incorporated in the SAI has been directly derived from object relations theory where relationships are viewed as centrally vital to healthy development.

The SAI consists of two subscales, the Quality of Relationship with God subscale and the Awareness of God subscale. The subscales are used to identify six factors: (a)

Awareness—measures individuals’ increasing awareness of how God is involved in every aspect of their lives; (b) Instability—measures individuals’ inability to integrate good and bad self- and other-images due to excessive splitting and projection; (c) Grandiosity—measures individuals’ tendencies to be preoccupied with grandiose fantasies and their tendency to present themselves as better than others; (d) Realistic Acceptance—measures individuals’ abilities to integrate both disappointments and positive experiences with God and others; (e) Disappointment—measures individuals’ unrealistic demands on God which cause a great deal of disappointment and frustration with God; and (f) Impression Management—measures test-taking attitudes as they relate to some exaggerated, virtuous, and common spiritual behavior or attitude. The scale addresses characteristics of a frequency and intensity that most religious people would not experience. Profiles, which indicate a strong endorsement of the items associated with the Impression Management scale, represent a test-taking approach that needs to be taken into account when interpreting a scale profile. Four levels of the Quality of the Relationship with God are obtained through the Instability, Grandiosity, Disappointment, and Realistic Acceptance subscales. The awareness of God dimension of the SAI is comprised of the Awareness subscale (Horton, 1998).

Scores are derived by the use of a five-point Likert scale ranging from 1—not at all true of me to 5—very true of me. Hall and Edwards (1996a), using the Bell Object Relations Inventory, reported factor analyses and correlations that are supportive of the underlying theoretical base of the SAI, making the instrument a useful research and clinical tool. The SAI also included an experimental 5-item lie scale which is designed to

measure an honest response set. Factor analyses conducted by Hall and Edwards (1996b) have consistently validated the above mentioned factors. The internal consistency ranges from .46 to .88. Cronbach's coefficient alphas estimated the reliability of the factor scales as follows: Awareness, .95; Disappointment, .90; Realistic Acceptance, .83; Grandiosity, .73; and Instability, .84. No alpha coefficient is presented for the other scales (Horton, 1998).

Collection of Data

Approval was obtained from the University of North Texas Committee for the Protection of Human Subjects. The researcher randomly distributed 300 packets of material to those in attendance at a regular Sunday morning worship service. Each person was given a packet containing an Informed Consent Form (see Appendix A), a Demographic Form (see Appendix B), a copy of the Parental Authority Questionnaire (Buri, 1991) (see Appendix C), and the Spiritual Assessment Inventory (Hall and Edwards, 1996a) (see Appendix D). Participants were allowed to take the materials home and return them within a two-week period of time. Participants did not identify themselves on the informed consent or questionnaires. This procedure was followed in order to assure participants' responses were anonymous and their confidentiality protected.

Research Design

The design of the study was correlational. Canonical correlational procedures were performed between a set of scales that measure spiritual maturity (Set 1–SAI) and a set of scales which measure Parenting Style for mother and father (Set 2–PAQ). Six sets

of canonical correlations were performed between SAI and PAQ. The alpha criterion ranged from .05 to .10 and the variate cutoff correlation is .30. This was done to increase the power of the study due to the small sample (Thompson, 1984).

CHAPTER III

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Analysis of Data

Canonical correlational procedures were performed among a set of scales that measure spiritual maturity (Set 1-SAI) and a set of scales which measure parenting style for mother and father (Set 2-PAQ). Set 1, SAI items included: awareness, disappointment, realistic acceptance, grandiosity, instability, and impression management. Set 2, PAQ items included: permissive, authoritarian, and authoritative (facilitative). The PAQ items were rated for both mother and father. The variables for the SAI scales were labeled respectively: Awareness - SAI_AWA; Disappointment - SAI_DIS; Realistic Acceptance - SAI_REAL; Grandiosity - SAI_GRAN; Instability - SAI_INST; Impression Management -SAI_IMPR. The variables for the PAQ scales were labeled respectively, for rating mother: Permissive - PAQPER_M, Authoritarian - PAQATR_M, and Authoritative (Facilitative) PAQATV_M; for rating father: Permissive - PAQPER_F, Authoritarian - PAQATR_F, and Authoritative (Facilitative) - PAQATV_F.

Six sets of canonical correlations were performed between SAI and PAQ. The alpha criterion ranged from .05 to .10 and the variate cutoff correlation was .30. This was done to increase the power of the study due to the small sample (Thompson, 1984). The canonical correlations were recorded in six tables: Table 1 (Appendix E, p. 62) - All

respondents' (male and female) SAI scores with rating mother on PAQ (Permissive - PAQPER_M, Authoritarian - PAQATR_M, and Authoritative [Facilitative] - PAQATV_M); Table 2 - All respondents' SAI scores with rating father on PAQ (Permissive – PAQPER_F, Authoritarian – PAQATR_F, and Authoritative [Facilitative] – PAQATV_F); Table 3 – Females' SAI scores with rating mother on PAQ; Table 4 – Females' SAI scores with rating father on PAQ; Table 5 – Males' SAI scores with rating mother on PAQ; and Table 6 – Males' SAI scores with rating father on PAQ.

Table 1 (Appendix E, p. 62) does not address any of the hypotheses of this study. Table 1 was included for comparative study. Table 1 presents a canonical correlation between all respondents' (male and female) SAI scores and PAQ scores rated for mother. The first canonical correlation was .425 (18% overlapping variance). The remaining two canonical correlations were effectively zero. With all three canonical correlations included, Wilk's lambda was .76, chi-square was 34, and the observed probability was $p = .013$ with $df = 18$. The first pair of canonical variates for set 1 and set 2 variables accounted for the significant relationships between the two sets of variables.

Data on the first pair of canonical variates appear in Table 1 (F-Q). Shown in the table are correlations between the variables and the canonical variates: Table 1 J, L (structure coefficients); raw and standardized canonical function coefficients: Table 1 F, G, H, I (canonical function weights); within-set-variance accounted for by the canonical variates: Table 1 N, P (adequacy coefficients); index coefficients: Table 1 K, M; and redundancies: Table 1 O, Q.

Structure Coefficients

In Table 1 J, L (structure coefficients), with a cutoff correlation of .3 (rounding to nearest tenth), the variables in the SAI set that were correlated with the set 1 canonical variate (weighted SAI) were: awareness (.46), disappointment (-.28), grandiosity (.73), and impression management (.73). The variables in the PAQ set that were correlated with the set 2 canonical variate (weighted PAQ) were: authoritarian (.30) and authoritative (.66).

Index Coefficients

In Table 1 K, M (index coefficients), with a cutoff correlation of .3 (rounding to nearest tenth), the variables in the SAI set that were correlated with the set 2 canonical variate (weighted PAQ) were: grandiosity (.31), and impression management (.31). The variables in the PAQ set that were correlated with the set 1 canonical variate (weighted SAI) were: authoritative (.28).

Adequacy Coefficients

In Table 1 N, O (adequacy coefficients), the proportion of variance of the set 1 variables (SAI), accounted for by its own canonical variate (weighted SAI) was 24% variance. The proportion of variance in the set 2 variables (PAQ), accounted for by its own canonical variate (weighted PAQ) was 18% variance.

Interpretation of the First Canonical Variate

The structure coefficients for SAI items and the SAI canonical variate indicated that the relationship between the SAI canonical variate (weighted SAI) and the individual ratings for the SAI items were composed of positive associations between the awareness,

grandiosity, and impression management items along with the SAI canonical variates. On the other hand, the structure coefficients indicated a negative association between disappointment and the SAI canonical variate. Taken together these items suggested that the canonical SAI (weighted SAI) represented a spirituality level comprised of a high awareness of God accompanied by realistic demands of God resulting in low levels of disappointment and frustration with God in daily life. There was also a tendency to be preoccupied with grandiose fantasies of God. The high impression management value noted the presence of an attitude among participants that possibly led to exaggerated scores. The index coefficients indicated that this weighted SAI score had a large positive association with an authoritative parenting style, as rated for mothers by all respondents.

Table 2 (Appendix F, p. 68) does not address any of the hypotheses of this study. Table 2 was included for comparative study. Table 2 presents a canonical correlation between all respondents' (male and female) SAI scores and PAQ scores rated for father. The first canonical correlation was .379 (14% overlapping variance). The remaining two canonical correlations were effectively zero. With all three canonical correlations included, Wilk's lambda was .79, chi-square was 28, and the observed probability was $p = .06$ with $df = 18$.

The first pair of canonical variates for set 1 and set 2 variables accounted for the significant relationships between the two sets of variables. The observed probability for the first canonical correlation was close to the alpha criterion of .05. The present sample size was just under the suggested guideline of 20 cases per variable. In the present study, 180 cases would be needed to meet this criterion, whereas only 160 cases were utilized.

With larger sample sizes (e.g. 20 more cases), a medium effect size of .379 would have resulted in a statistically significant result. Therefore, for the purposes of the present study, the .379 canonical correlation was deemed an interesting result that deserved attention, despite the low power to reject the null hypothesis at an alpha of .05 (Thompson, 1984).

Data on the first pair of canonical variates appear in Table 2 (F-Q). Shown in the table are correlations between the variables and the canonical variates: Table 2 J, L (structure coefficients); raw and standardized canonical function coefficients: Table 2 F, G, H, I (canonical function weights); within-set-variance accounted for by the canonical variates: Table 2 N, P (adequacy coefficients); index coefficients: Table 2 K, M; and redundancies: Table 2 O, Q.

Structure Coefficients

In Table 2 J, L (structure coefficients), with a cutoff correlation of .3 (rounding to nearest tenth), the variables in the SAI set that were correlated with the set 1 canonical variate (weighted SAI) were: awareness (.69), disappointment (-.49), grandiosity (.49), and impression management (.77). The variables in the PAQ set that were correlated with the set 2 canonical variate (weighted PAQ) were authoritative (.89).

Index Coefficients

In Table 2 K, M (index coefficients), with a cutoff correlation of .3 (rounding to nearest tenth), the variables in the SAI set that were correlated with the set 2 canonical variate (weighted PAQ) were: impression management (.29). The variables in the PAQ

set that were correlated with the set 1 canonical variate (weighted SAI) were: authoritative (.34).

Adequacy Coefficients

In Table 2 N, 0 (adequacy coefficients), the proportion of variance of the set 1 variables (SAI), accounted for by its own canonical variate (weighted SAI) was 27% variance. The proportion of variance in the set 2 variables (PAQ), accounted for by its own canonical variate (weighted PAQ) was 27% variance.

Interpretation of the First Canonical Variate

The structure coefficients for SAI items and the SAI canonical variate indicated that the relationship between the SAI canonical variate (weighted SAI) and the individual ratings for the SAI items were composed of positive associations between awareness, grandiosity, and impression management items, and the SAI canonical variates. There was a negative association between disappointment and the SAI canonical variate. Taken together these items suggested that the canonical SAI (weighted SAI) represented a spirituality level comprised of a high awareness of God in daily life, a low level of frustration with God, and a tendency to be preoccupied with grandiose fantasies of God. The high impression management score indicated the possible presence of an exaggerated attitude among the participants that could have incorrectly impacted the test scores. The index coefficients indicated that the weighted SAI score had a large positive association with an authoritative parenting style, as rated for fathers by all respondents.

Table 3 (Appendix G, p. 74) documents the rejection of Hypothesis III of this study. Table 3 presents a canonical correlation between female respondents, SAI scores

and PAQ scores rated for mother. The first canonical correlation was .46 (21% overlapping variance). The remaining two canonical correlations were effectively zero. With all three canonical correlations included, Wilk's lambda was .686, chi-square was 26, and the observed probability was $p = .09$ with $df = 18$. The first pair of canonical variates for set 1 and set 2 variables accounted for the significant relationships between the two sets of variables. This canonical correlation was near significance, and represented a medium to large effect size. This was considered a result worthy of attention.

Data on the first pair of canonical variates appear in Table 3(F-Q). Shown in the table are correlations between the variables and the canonical variates: Table 3 J, L (structure coefficients); raw and standardized canonical function coefficients: Table 3 F, G, H, I (canonical function weights); within-set-variance accounted for by the canonical variates: Table 3 N, P (adequacy coefficients); index coefficients: Table 3 K, M; and redundancies: Table 3 O, Q.

Structure Coefficients

In Table 3 J, L (structure coefficients), with a cutoff correlation of .3 (rounding to nearest tenth), the variables in the SAI set that were correlated with the set 1 canonical variate (weighted SAI) were: awareness (.32), grandiosity (.64), instability (.41), and impression management (.58). The variables in the PAQ set that were correlated with the set 2 canonical variate (weighted PAQ) were: permissive (-.31), authoritarian (.46) and authoritative (.56).

Index Coefficients

In Table 3 K, M (index coefficients), with a cutoff correlation of .3 (rounding to nearest tenth), the variables in the SAI set that were associated with the set 2 canonical variate (weighted PAQ) were grandiosity (.29) and impression management (.27). The variables in the PAQ set that were correlated with the set 1 canonical variate (weighted SAI) were authoritative (.26).

Adequacy coefficients

In Table 3 N, 0 (adequacy coefficients), the proportion of variance of the set 1 variables (SAI), accounted for by its own canonical variate (weighted SAI) was 18% variance. The proportion of variance in the set 2 variables (PAQ), accounted for by its own canonical variate (weighted PAQ) was 21% variance.

Interpretation of First Canonical Variate

The structure coefficients for SAI items and the SAI canonical variate indicated that the relationship between the SAI canonical variate (weighted SAI) and the individual ratings for the SAI items were composed of medium positive associations between the awareness, grandiosity, instability, impression management items, and the SAI canonical variates. Taken together these items suggested that the canonical SAI (weighted SAI) represented a spirituality level comprised of a high awareness of God in daily life, a tendency to be unable to integrate good and bad self- and other-images, and a tendency to be preoccupied with grandiose fantasies of God. The high impression management score indicated the possible presence of an exaggerated attitude among the participants that can incorrectly impact the test scores. The index coefficients indicated that this weighted SAI

score was positively associated with an authoritative parenting style, as rated for mothers by women.

Table 4 (Appendix H, p. 80) documents the rejection of Hypothesis I of this study. Table 4 presents a canonical correlation between female respondents SAI scores and PAQ scores rated for father. The first canonical correlation was .48 (23% overlapping variance). The remaining two canonical correlations were effectively zero. With all three canonical correlations included, Wilk's lambda was .681, chi-square was 27, and the observed probability was $p = .08$ with $df = 18$. The first pair of canonical variates for set 1 and set 2 variables accounted for the significant relationships between the two sets of variables. This canonical correlation was near significance, and represented a medium to large effect size that was considered a result worthy of attention.

Data on the first pair of canonical variates appear in Table 4 (F-Q). Shown in the table are correlations between the variables and the canonical variates: Table 4 J, L (structure coefficients); raw and standardized canonical function coefficients: Table 4 F, G, H, I (canonical function weights); within-set-variance accounted for by the canonical variates: Table 4 N, P (adequacy coefficients); index coefficients: Table 4 K, M; and redundancies: Table 4 O, Q.

Structure Coefficients

In Table 4 J, L (structure coefficients), with a cutoff correlation of .3 (rounding to nearest tenth), the variables in the SAI set that were correlated with the set 1 canonical variate (weighted SAI) were: awareness (.53), grandiosity (.43), instability (.32), and impression management (.58). The variables in the PAQ set that were correlated with the

set 2 canonical variate (weighted PAQ) were: permissive (-.43), authoritarian (.42), and authoritative (.60).

Index Coefficients

In Table 4 K, M (index coefficients), with a cutoff correlation of .3 (rounding to nearest tenth), the variables in the SAI set that were associated with the set 2 canonical variate (weighted PAQ) were: impression management (.28) and awareness (.25). The variables in the PAQ set that were correlated with the set 1 canonical variate (weighted SAI) were: authoritative (.29).

Adequacy Coefficients

In Table 4 N, O (adequacy coefficients), the proportion of variance of the set 1 variables (SAI), accounted for by its own canonical variate (weighted SAI) was 16% variance. The proportion of variance in the set 2 variables (PAQ), accounted for by its own canonical variate (weighted PAQ) was 24% variance.

Interpretation of First Canonical Variate

The structure coefficients for SAI items and the SAI canonical variate indicated that the relationship between the SAI canonical variate (weighted SAI) and the individual ratings for the SAI items are composed of medium positive associations between the awareness, grandiosity, instability, impression management items, and the SAI canonical variates. Taken together, these items suggested that the canonical SAI (weighted SAI) represented a spirituality level comprised of a high awareness of God in one's daily life, a tendency to be unable to integrate good and bad self- and other-images, and a tendency to be preoccupied with grandiose fantasies of God. The high impression management score

indicated the possible presence of an exaggerated attitude among the participants that incorrectly impacted the test scores. The index coefficients indicated that this weighted SAI score was positively associated with an authoritative parenting style, as rated for fathers by women.

Table 5 (Appendix I, p. 86) demonstrates the acceptance of Hypothesis IV at the .04 level of acceptance and the rejection of Hypothesis IV at the .003 level of significance. Table 5 presents the canonical correlation between male respondents' SAI scores and PAQ scores rated for mother. The first canonical correlation was .60 (36% overlapping variance). The second canonical correlation was .50 (25% overlapping variance). With all three canonical correlations included, Wilk's lambda was .686, chi-square was 39, and the observed probability was $p = .003$ with $df = 18$. With the first and second canonical correlation included, Wilk's lambda was .657, chi-square was 19, and the observed probability was $p = .042$ with $df = 10$. The first pair of canonical variates for set 1 and set 2 variables accounted for a significant relationship between the two sets of variables. Additionally, the second pair of canonical variates for set 1 and set 2 variables accounted for significant relationships between the two sets of variables. The last canonical correlation was not statistically significant.

Data on the first and second pair of canonical variates appear in Table 5 (F-Q). Shown in the table are correlations between the variables and the canonical variates: Table 5 J, L (structure coefficients); raw and standardized canonical function coefficients: Table 5 F, G, H, I (canonical function weights); within-set-variance

accounted for by the canonical variates: Table 5 N, P (adequacy coefficients); index coefficients: Table 5 K, M; and redundancies: Table 5 O, Q.

Structure Coefficients for First Canonical Variate

In Table 5 J, L (structure coefficients), with a cutoff correlation of .3 (rounding to nearest tenth), the variables in the SAI set that were correlated with the set 1 canonical variate (weighted SAI) were: awareness (-.35), grandiosity (-.88), and impression management (-.40). The variables in the PAQ set that were correlated with the set 2 canonical variate (weighted PAQ) were: permissive (-.76), authoritarian (.41) and authoritative (-.54).

Index Coefficients for First Canonical Variate

In Table 5 K, M (index coefficients), with a cutoff correlation of .3 (rounding to nearest tenth), the variables in the SAI set that were associated with the set 2 canonical variate (weighted PAQ) were grandiosity (-.53). The variables in the PAQ set that were correlated with the set 1 canonical variate (weighted SAI) were permissive (-.45) and authoritative (-.32).

Adequacy Coefficients for First Canonical Variate

In Table 5 N, O (adequacy coefficients), the proportion of variance of the set 1 variables (SAI), accounted for by its own canonical variate (weighted SAI) was 19% variance. The proportion of variance in the set 2 variables (PAQ), accounted for by its own canonical variate (weighted PAQ) was 35% variance.

Interpretation of First Canonical Variate

The structure coefficients for SAI items and the SAI canonical variate indicate that relationships among the SAI canonical variate (weighted SAI) and the individual ratings for the SAI items were composed of negative associations between awareness, grandiosity, impression management items, and the SAI canonical variates.

Taken together these items suggest that the canonical SAI (weighted SAI) represented a spirituality level comprised of a low awareness of God in one's daily life, and a tendency not to be preoccupied with grandiose fantasies of God. The index coefficients indicated that this weighted SAI score was negatively associated with a permissive parenting style as rated for mothers, by men. The index coefficients also indicated that the weighted SAI score was negatively associated with an authoritative (facilitative) parenting style (implying an authoritarian parenting style). Essentially, men rating mothers as non-permissive and authoritarian were also less aware of God, and had a lack of grandiose fantasies of God. The negatively related impression management score added to the credibility of the inventory results.

Structure Coefficients for Second Canonical Variate

In Table 5 J, L (structure coefficients), with a cutoff correlation of .3 (rounding to nearest tenth), the variables in the SAI set that were correlated with the set 1 canonical variate (weighted SAI) were: awareness (.40), disappointment (-.67), realistic acceptance (.55), and impression management (.83). The variables in the PAQ set that were correlated with the set 2 canonical variate (weighted PAQ) were: permissive (-.63), authoritarian (.50) and authoritative (.74).

Index Coefficients for Second Canonical Variate

In Table 5 K, M (index coefficients), with a cutoff correlation of .3 (rounding to nearest tenth), the variables in the SAI set that were associated with the set 2 canonical variate (weighted PAQ) were disappointment (-.34), realistic acceptance (.27), and impression management (.42). The variables in the PAQ set that were correlated with the set 1 canonical variate (weighted SAI) were permissive (-.32), and authoritative (.37).

Adequacy coefficients for Second Canonical Variate

In Table 5 N, 0 (adequacy coefficients), the proportion of variance of the set 1 variables (SAI), accounted for by its own canonical variate (weighted SAI), was 27% variance. The proportion of variance in the set 2 variables (PAQ), accounted for by its own canonical variate (weighted PAQ), was 40% variance.

Interpretation of Second Canonical Variate

The structure coefficients for the SAI items and the SAI canonical variate indicated the relationship between the SAI canonical variate (weighted SAI) and the individual ratings for the SAI items were composed of several positive associations. These included awareness, realistic acceptance, impression management items, and the SAI canonical variates. A negative association was demonstrated between disappointment and the SAI canonical variate. Taken together these items suggested that the canonical SAI (weighted SAI) represented a spirituality level comprised of a high awareness of God in one's daily life, accompanied by a realistic ability to integrate both disappointments and positive experiences with God and others. The positive, high impression management score possibly indicated an exaggerated test-taking attitude that could possibly misrepresent the results. The index coefficients indicated that this

weighted SAI score was positively associated with a non-permissive parenting style and an authoritative parenting style as rated for mothers by men.

Table 6 (Appendix J, p. 92) demonstrates the rejection of Hypothesis II. Table 6 presents a canonical correlation between male respondents' SAI scores and PAQ scores rated for father. The first canonical correlation was .47 (22% overlapping variance). However, the three canonical correlations were insignificant. With all three canonical correlations included, Wilk's lambda was .62, chi-square was 21, and the observed probability was $p = .283$ with $df = 18$. The observed patterns followed the general relationship for the rating of PAQ for mothers. However, this relationship viewed fathers as permissive whereas mothers were viewed as non-permissive. The resulting statistics were not reported given the large observed p value.

Discussion

The primary purpose of this study was to examine possible relationships between the level of spiritual maturity of adult females and males raised in homes characterized by an authoritative parenting style. The results of this study did not support a positive relationship between an authoritative parenting style and spiritual maturity. Several factors, noted in the text that follows, were noted that may have weakened the power of the study.

As noted earlier in this paper, spiritual maturity includes the incorporation of two distinct but related dimensions of one's self-God relationship including awareness of God in daily life and quality of one's relationship with God. For the purpose of this study, spiritual maturity was operationally defined by the six factor scale scores on the Hall and

Edwards (1996b) Spiritual Assessment Inventory (SAI). The SAI consists of two subscales, the Quality of Relationship with God subscale and the Awareness of God subscale. The subscales are used to identify six factors: (a) Awareness—measures individuals' increasing awareness of how God is involved in every aspect of their lives; (b) Instability—measures individuals' inabilities to integrate good and bad self- and other-images due to excessive splitting and projection; (c) Grandiosity—measures individuals' tendencies to be preoccupied with grandiose fantasies and their tendency to present themselves as better than others; (d) Realistic Acceptance—measures individuals' abilities to integrate both disappointments and positive experiences with God and others; (e) Disappointment—measures individuals' unrealistic demands on God which cause a great deal of disappointment and frustration with God; and (f) Impression Management—measures test-taking attitudes as they relate to some exaggerated, virtuous and common spiritual behavior or attitude. The scale addresses characteristics of a frequency and intensity that most religious people would not experience. Profiles, which indicate a strong endorsement of the items associated with the Impression Management scale, represent a test-taking approach that needs to be taken into account when interpreting a scale profile. Four levels of the Quality of the Relationship with God are obtained through the Instability, Grandiosity, Disappointment, and Realistic Acceptance subscales. The awareness of God dimension of the SAI is comprised of the Awareness subscale (Horton, 1998).

As noted earlier in this paper, an electronic search of the databases of ERIC, PsycLIT, and PSYCINFO found no studies that examined effects of different parenting

styles on the spiritual maturity in either children or adults. Reference was also made to the conflicted and mixed findings of other studies looking at relationships between individuals' God concept and parent relationship (Godin and Hallez, 1965; Nelson, 1971; Nelson and Jones, 1957; Siegmann, 1961; Strunk, 1959; Vergote and Tamayo, 1980).

Participants in this study reportedly grew up in families characterized by parents who mostly demonstrated an authoritative (facilitative) parenting style combined with elements of an authoritarian parenting style. There were no permissive parenting styles reported by the participants. In each case, females rating mothers, females rating fathers, and males rating mothers (second canonical variate), the authoritative (facilitative) parenting style seemingly led to participants' increased awareness of how God is involved in every aspect of their lives. In the case of males rating mothers (second canonical variate), the authoritative (facilitative) parenting style seemingly also resulted in an ability to integrate both disappointments and positive experiences with God and others. In this same case, individuals tended to have more realistic demands of God resulting in less disappointment and frustration with God.

The study of males rating mothers was the only example where the authoritative (facilitative) parenting style was reported to be insignificant in the presence of a strong authoritarian parenting style. In that case, participants demonstrated a low awareness of God in their daily lives. At the same time, when they were aware of God, they tended to be preoccupied with grandiose fantasies of God and presented themselves as better than others.

Although the collected data did not confirm the hypotheses of this study, the data possibly confirmed a positive relationship between the authoritative (facilitative) parenting style and the awareness factor of the SAI Awareness of God subscale. At the same time, the collected data on females rating mothers and fathers indicated a strong relationship between the authoritative (facilitative) parenting style and adult females' inability to integrate good and bad self- and other-images due to excessive splitting and projection. The same data demonstrated a relationship between the authoritative (facilitative) parenting style and adult females' tendency to be preoccupied with grandiose fantasies and oftentimes present themselves as better than others.

Some cautions must be presented in relation to this study. The Impression Management scores were high on each of the cases reported with the exception of males reporting on mothers. The Impression Management Scale measures test-taking attitudes as they relate to some exaggerated, virtuous, and common spiritual behavior or attitude. The scale addresses characteristics of a frequency and intensity that most religious people would not experience. Profiles, which indicated a strong endorsement of the items associated with the Impression Management scale, represent a test-taking approach that needs to be taken into account when interpreting a scale profile. The consistently high impression management scores might possibly be indicative of a sample population more concerned about "looking good" on the profiles, rather than being honest. Also, the consistently high impression management scores accompanied by generally high scores on the grandiosity, instability, and disappointment scales, and the frequently low awareness scale scores, possibly indicate a largely spiritually immature survey

population. This observation is somewhat problematic as 72% of the participants reportedly grew up in Christian homes. Whereas this study was based on participants who were reportedly highly religious, the results cannot be generalized to a non-religious sample. Also, the participants were primarily Caucasian (94%) and married (86.3%) people. Therefore, results cannot be generalized reliably to the more diverse, general population. Results of the study also possibly indicate a tendency among religious adults to be unwilling to judge their parents honestly. This might be related to an embedded belief system that has been established by their religious teachings or childhood experiences. Both areas are possible topics for further study.

Suggestions for Future Research

Based on the conclusions and implications of this study, it is recommended future research be conducted to further examine the complex relationships that exist among the dimensions of spiritual maturity and parenting styles in the family of origin. It may be beneficial to conduct a similar study with a more generalizeable, random sample of both the religious and the general population. More subject diversity would be expected that would produce a broader-based and more representative study of the impact of parenting styles on spiritual maturity. The present study utilized a sample of convenience and was conducted utilizing mostly Caucasian participants from a high social-economic class who were attending one non-denominational, Christian church in north Texas on one particular Sunday. Therefore, the ability to make any broad generalizations is severely limited. It is recommended that sampling of both the religious and general populations

include multiple sampling times in multiple settings, utilizing a variety of denominational churches, and religious as well as general audiences.

Other areas of influence need to be considered when investigating spiritual maturity in addition to parenting styles. Some areas of influence might possibly include life experiences, frequency of church attendance, quantity and quality of religious studies, quantity and quality of a personal prayer life, social and economic status, small group participation, denominational involvement, and participation in a mentoring relationship.

The data in this study were derived exclusively through the use of self report measures. It is usually difficult to know the extent reports match object reality, and this is particularly true when the reports are retrospective and focus on a distant time, as is the case here with the reports about parents during childhood. Also, it is not known to what extent the children's temperament influenced the parenting style of the parent or the children's perceptions of their parents' parenting style. Interpretation of interpersonal relationships may be susceptible to projection, misunderstanding, or distortion as a consequence of their significance and emotionally charged nature. Research provides good reason to believe parents have influence on their children, yet, it is appropriate to question what extent later life experiences influence the past, whether past experiences influenced the present, or if the relationships found in this research are due to some other factors. Future research might consider the use of personal interviews and other life assessment tools in order to investigate other influencing factors on spiritual maturity than parenting styles.

Finally, it is recommended that more studies be conducted regarding the validity of the SAI. The SAI is a fairly new research tool with supportive, yet somewhat limited validity and reliability studies.

Conclusion

The purpose of this study was to examine possible relationships between parenting styles and adult spiritual maturity. Based on this study, conclusions about female and male adults raised in homes characterized by fathers and mothers with an authoritative (facilitative) parenting style are varied. Female adults raised in homes characterized by fathers and mothers with an authoritative (facilitative) parenting style were not correlated in a positive manner with spiritual maturity. Male adults raised in homes characterized by fathers with an authoritative (facilitative) parenting style were only significant at a large observed p value and therefore could not be reported. Finally, male adults raised in homes characterized by mothers with an authoritative (facilitative) parenting style were correlated significantly with spiritual maturity in one correlation at the .04 level of significance. In another correlation at the .003 level of significance, male adults raised in homes characterized by mothers with an authoritative (facilitative) parenting style were not correlated.

APPENDIX

APPENDIX A
INFORMED CONSENT

Consent Form

Participant's name: _____

I authorize Kenneth E. Bryant of the Counseling, Development and Higher Education Department of the University of North Texas to gather information from me on the topic of parenting styles and spiritual maturity. I understand that my participation is voluntary, and I may withdraw at any time without penalty, prejudice, or loss of benefits after notifying the researcher.

I understand I will be asked to complete a packet of assessment instruments, including a brief demographic sheet, the Spiritual Assessment Inventory, and the Parental Authority Questionnaire. I understand the projected time for completion of this packet of material is approximately 45 minutes.

I understand that in an effort to gain open and honest responses from me, my confidentiality will be maintained. A request for my name will not be made on any of the self-report measures. This informed consent will be the only time identification will be requested, and these forms will later be withdrawn from the packets and filed under separate cover. The research material will only be available to the principle investigators.

I understand the completion of the self-report scales, mentioned above, will require a certain level of introspection. Self-examination may lead to temporary change in mood/affect that may be either positive or negative. I understand that if, after my participation, I experience undue anxiety or stress that may have been provoked by the experience, Kenneth E. Bryant will be available for consultation.

I may contact Kenneth E. Bryant at (817) 285-9038 should I wish further information about the research. I may also contact Dr. Michael Altekruze at the University of North Texas at (940) 565-2910.

I have read and fully understand the consent form. I sign it freely and voluntarily. A copy has been given to me.

Signature _____ Date _____

I certify that I have personally explained all elements of this form to the subject before requesting the subject to sign it.

Signature _____ Date _____

This project has been reviewed and approved by the University of North Texas

Committee for the Protection of Human Subjects, (940) 565-3940, from 7/3/01 to 7/2/02.

APPENDIX B
DEMOGRAPHIC SHEET

Demographic Data Sheet

1. Age: _____
2. Sex: Male _____ Female _____
3. Marital Status: Single _____ Married _____
 Divorced _____ Widowed _____
4. How old were you when you became a Christian? _____
5. Did you grow up in a Christian home? _____
6. How often do you attend church?
 Once a week or more _____ 2-3 times per month _____
 Once a month _____ Less than once a month _____
7. How often do you have personal devotions (Bible study and prayer)?
 Every day _____ 4-5 times per week _____
 2-3 times per week _____ Once a week _____
 Occasionally _____ Rarely _____
8. What level of education did your parents complete?
 High School _____ Bachelor's Degree _____
 Master's Degree _____ Doctorate Degree _____
9. Are your parents married? _____ divorced? _____
 separated _____ widowed? _____ both deceased _____
10. Are your parents Christians? Father _____ Mother _____
11. How would you rate your overall relationship with your mother when you were growing up? Very close _____ Close _____ Somewhat distant _____ Distant _____
12. How would you rate your overall relationship with your father when you were growing up? Very close _____ Close _____ Somewhat distant _____ Distant _____
13. What is your ethnicity? (please check all that apply)
 African-American _____ Asian-American _____ Caucasian _____
 Hispanic _____ Native American _____ International _____
 Other (please specify) _____
14. What is your estimated annual income?
 \$0 – \$15,000 _____ \$15,001 - \$30,000 _____ \$30,001 - \$45,000 _____
 \$45,001 - \$60,000 _____ \$60,001 - \$75,000 _____ \$75,001+ _____

APPENDIX C
PARENTAL AUTHORITY QUESTIONNAIRE

PARENTAL AUTHORITY QUESTIONNAIRE

For each of the following statements, circle the number on the 5-point scale that best indicates how that statement applies to you and your **FATHER**. Try to read and think about each statement as it applies to you and your **FATHER** during your years growing up at home. There are no right or wrong answers, so don't spend a lot of time on any one item. We are looking for your overall impression regarding each statement. Be sure not to omit any items.

1 = strongly disagree 2 = disagree 3 = undecided 4 = agree 5 = strongly agree

- 1. While I was growing up, my **father** felt that in a well-run home the children should have their way in the family as often as the parents do. 1 2 3 4 5
- 2. Even if his children didn't agree with him, my **father** felt that it was for our own good if we were forced to conform to what he thought was right. 1
2
3
4
5
- 3. Whenever my **father** told me to do something as I was growing up, he expected me to do it immediately without asking any questions. 1 2 3 4 5
- 4. As I was growing up, once family policy had been established, my **father** discussed the reasoning behind the policy with the children in the family. 1 2 3 4 5
- 5. My **father** has always encouraged verbal give-and-take whenever I have felt that family rules and restrictions were unreasonable. 1 2 3 4 5
- 6. My **father** has always felt that what children need is to be free to make up their own minds, and to do what they want to do, even if this does not agree with what their parents might want. 1 2 3 4 5
- 7. As I was growing up, my **father** did not allow me to question any decision that he had made. 1 2 3 4 5
- 8. As I was growing up, my **father** directed the activities and decisions of the children in the family through reasoning and discipline. 1 2 3 4 5
- 9. My **father** has always felt that more force should be used by parents in order to get their children to behave the way they are supposed to. 1 2 3 4 5
- 10. As I was growing up, my **father** did not feel that I needed to obey rules and regulations of behavior simply because someone in authority had established them. 1 2 3 4 5
- 11. As I was growing up, I knew what **father** expected of me in my family, but I also felt free to discuss those expectations with my **father** when I felt that they were unreasonable. 1 2 3 4 5
- 12. My **father** felt that wise parents should teach their children early just who is boss in the family. 1 2 3 4 5

13. As I was growing up, my **father** seldom gave me expectations and guidelines for my behavior. 1 2 3 4 5

14. Most of the time as I was growing up my **father** did what the children in the family wanted when making family decisions. 1 2 3 4 5

15. As the children in my family were growing up, my **father** consistently gave us direction and guidance in rational and objective ways. 1 2 3 4 5
16. As I was growing up, my **father** would get very upset if I tried to disagree with him. 1 2 3 4 5
17. My **father** feels that most problems in society would be solved if parents would not restrict their children's activities, decisions, and desires as they are growing up. 1 2 3 4 5
18. As I was growing up, my **father** let me know what behavior he expected of me, and if I didn't meet those expectations, he punished me. 1 2 3 4 5
19. As I was growing up, my **father** allowed me to decide most things for myself without a lot of direction from him. 1 2 3 4 5
20. As I was growing, up my **father** took the children's opinions into consideration when making family decisions, but he would not decide for something simply because the children wanted it. 1 2 3 4 5
21. My **father** did not view himself as responsible for directing and guiding my behavior as I was growing up. 1 2 3 4 5
22. My **father** had clear standards of behavior for the children in our home as I was growing up, but he was willing to adjust those standards to the needs of each of the individual children in the family. 1 2 3 4 5
23. My **father** gave me direction for my behavior and activities as I was growing up and he expected me to follow his direction, but he was always willing to listen to my concerns and to discuss that direction with me. 1 2 3 4 5
24. As I was growing up my **father** allowed me to form my own point of view on family matters and he generally allowed me to decide for myself what I was going to do. 1 2 3 4 5
25. My **father** has always felt that most problems in society would be solved if we could get parents to strictly and forcibly deal with their children when they don't do what they are supposed to as they are growing up. 1 2 3 4 5
26. As I was growing up, my **father** often told me exactly what he wanted me to do and how he expected me to do it. 1 2 3 4 5
27. As I was growing up, my **father** gave me clear direction for my behaviors and activities, but he was also understanding when I disagreed with him. 1 2 3 4 5
28. As I was growing up, my **father** did not direct the behaviors, activities, desires of the children in the family. 1 2 3 4 5
29. As I was growing up, I knew what my **father** expected of me in the

family and he insisted that I conform to those expectations simply out of respect for his authority. 1 2 3 4 5

30. As I was growing up, if my **father** made a decision in the family that hurt me, he was willing to discuss that decision with me and to admit it if he had made a mistake. 1 2 3 4 5

PARENTAL AUTHORITY QUESTIONNAIRE

For each of the following statements, circle the number on the 5-point scale that best indicates how that statement applies to you and your **MOTHER**. Try to read and think about each statement as it applies to you and your **MOTHER** during your years growing up at home. There are no right or wrong answers, so don't spend a lot of time on any one item. We are looking for your overall impression regarding each statement. Be sure not to omit any items.

1 = strongly disagree 2 = disagree 3 = undecided 4 = agree 5 = strongly agree

1. While I was growing up, my **mother** felt that in a well-run home the children should have their way in the family as often as the parents do. 1 2 3 4 5
2. Even if her children didn't agree with her, my **mother** felt that it was for our own good if we were forced to conform to what she thought was right. 1 2 3 4 5
3. Whenever my **mother** told me to do something as I was growing up, she expected me to do it immediately without asking any questions. 1 2 3 4 5
4. As I was growing up, once family policy had been established, my **mother** discussed the reasoning behind the policy with the children in the family. 1 2 3 4 5
5. My **mother** has always encouraged verbal give-and-take whenever I have felt that family rules and restrictions were unreasonable. 1 2 3 4 5
6. My **mother** has always felt that what children need is to be free to make up their own minds, and to do what they want to do, even if this does not agree with what their parents might want. 1 2 3 4 5
7. As I was growing up, my **mother** did not allow me to question any decision that she had made. 1 2 3 4 5
8. As I was growing up, my **mother** directed the activities and decisions of the children in the family through reasoning and discipline. 1 2 3 4 5
9. My **mother** has always felt that more force should be used by parents in order to get their children to behave the way they are supposed to. 1 2 3 4 5
10. As I was growing up, my **mother** did not feel that I needed to obey rules and regulations of behavior simply because someone in authority had established them. 1 2 3 4 5
11. As I was growing up, I knew what **mother** expected of me in my family, but I also felt free to discuss those expectations with my **mother** when I felt that they were unreasonable. 1 2 3 4 5
12. My **mother** felt that wise parents should teach their children early just who is boss in the family. 1 2 3 4 5

13. As I was growing up, my **mother** seldom gave me expectations and guidelines for my behavior. 1 2 3 4 5

14. Most of the time as I was growing up my **mother** did what the children in the family wanted when making family decisions. 1 2 3 4 5

15. As the children in my family were growing up, my **mother** consistently gave us direction and guidance in rational and objective ways. 1 2 3 4 5
16. As I was growing up, my **mother** would get very upset if I tried to disagree with her. 1 2 3 4 5
17. My **mother** feels that most problems in society would be solved if parents would not restrict their children's activities, decisions, and desires as they are growing up. 1 2 3 4 5
18. As I was growing up, my **mother** let me know what behavior she expected of me, and if I didn't meet those expectations, she punished me. 1 2 3 4 5
19. As I was growing up, my **mother** allowed me to decide most things for myself without a lot of direction from her. 1 2 3 4 5
20. As I was growing up, my **mother** took the children's opinions into consideration when making family decisions, but she would not decide for something simply because the children wanted it. 1 2 3 4 5
21. My **mother** did not view herself as responsible for directing and guiding my behavior as I was growing up. 1 2 3 4 5
22. My **mother** had clear standards of behavior for the children in our home as I was growing up, but she was willing to adjust those standards to the needs of each of the individual children in the family. 1 2 3 4 5
23. My **mother** gave me direction for my behavior and activities as I was growing up and she expected me to follow her direction, but she was always willing to listen to my concerns and to discuss that direction with me. 1 2 3 4 5
24. As I was growing up my **mother** allowed me to form my own point of view on family matters and she generally allowed me to decide for myself what I was going to do. 1 2 3 4 5
25. My **mother** has always felt that most problems in society would be solved if we could get parents to strictly and forcibly deal with their children when they don't do what they are supposed to as they are growing up. 1 2 3 4 5
26. As I was growing up, my **mother** often told me exactly what she wanted me to do and how she expected me to do it. 1 2 3 4 5
27. As I was growing up, my **mother** gave me clear direction for my behaviors and activities, but she was also understanding when I disagreed with her. 1 2 3 4 5
28. As I was growing up, my **mother** did not direct the behaviors, activities, desires of the children in the family. 1 2 3 4 5

29. As I was growing up, I knew what my **mother** expected of me in the family and she insisted that I conform to those expectations simply out of respect for her authority. 1 2 3 4 5

30. As I was growing up, if my **mother** made a decision in the family that hurt me, she was willing to discuss that decision with me and to admit it if she had made a mistake. 1 2 3 4 5

APPENDIX D
SPIRITUAL ASSESSMENT INVENTORY

SPIRITUAL ASSESSMENT INVENTORY

Instructions: Please respond to each statement below by writing the number that best represents your experience in the space to the right of the statement.

It is best to answer according to what really reflects your experience rather than what you think your experience should be.

Give the answer that comes to mind first. Don't spend too much time thinking about an item.

Give the best possible response to each statement even if it does not provide all the information you would like.

Try your best to respond to all statements. Your answers will be completely confidential.

Some of the statements consist of two parts shown here:

- 2.1 There are times when I feel disappointed with God.
- 2.2 When this happens, I still want our relationship to continue.

Your response to 2.2 tells how true statement 2.2 is for you when you have the experience of feeling disappointed with God described in statement 2.1.

| | 1 Not At All True | 2 Slightly True | 3 Moderately True | 4 Substantially True | 5 Very True |
|-----|---|------------------------------|--------------------------------|-----------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 1. | I have a sense of how God is working in my life. | | | | _____ |
| 2.1 | There are times when I feel disappointed with God. | | | | _____ |
| 2.2 | When this happens, I still want our relationship to continue. | | | | _____ |
| 3. | God's presence feels very real to me. | | | | _____ |
| 4. | I am afraid that God will give up on me. | | | | _____ |
| 5. | I seem to have a unique ability to influence God through my prayers. | | | | _____ |
| 6. | Listening to God is an essential part of my life. | | | | _____ |
| 7. | I am always in a worshipful mood when I go to church. | | | | _____ |
| 8.1 | There are times when I feel frustrated with God. | | | | _____ |
| 8.2 | When I feel this way, I still desire to put effort into our relationship. | | | | _____ |
| 9. | I am aware of God prompting me to do things. | | | | _____ |

10. My emotional connection with God is unstable. _____
11. My experiences of God's responses to me impact me greatly. _____
- 12.1 There are times when I feel irritated at God. _____
- 12.2 When I feel this way, I am able to come to some sense of resolution in our relationship. _____
13. God recognizes that I am more spiritual than most people. _____
14. I always seek God's guidance for every decision I make. _____
15. I am aware of God's presence in my interactions with other people. _____
16. There are times when I feel that God is punishing me. _____
17. I am aware of God responding to me in a variety of ways. _____
- 18.1 There are times when I feel angry at God. _____
- 18.2 When this happens, I still have the sense that God will always be with me. _____
19. I am aware of God attending to me in times of need. _____
20. God understands that my needs are more important than most people's. _____
21. I am aware of God telling me to do something. _____
22. I worry that I will be left out of God's plans. _____
23. My experiences of God's presence impact me greatly. _____
24. I am always as kind at home as I am at church. _____
25. I have a sense of the direction in which God is guiding me. _____
26. My relationship with God is an extraordinary one that most people would not understand. _____
- 27.1 There are times when I feel betrayed by God. _____
- 27.2 When I feel this way, I put effort into restoring our relationship. _____
28. I am aware of God communicating to me in a variety of ways. _____
29. Manipulating God seems to be the best way to get what I want. _____
30. I am aware of God's presence in times of need. _____

- 31. From day to day, I sense God being with me. _____
- 32. I pray for all my friends and relatives every day. _____
- 33.1 There are times when I feel frustrated by God for not responding to my prayers. _____
- 33.2 When I feel this way, I am able to talk it through with God. _____
- 34. I have a sense of God communicating guidance to me. _____
- 35. When I sin, I tend to withdraw from God. _____
- 36. I experience an awareness of God speaking to me personally. _____
- 37. I find my prayers to God are more effective than other people's. _____
- 38. I am always in the mood to pray. _____
- 39. I feel I have to please God or He might reject me. _____
- 40. I have a strong impression of God's presence. _____
- 41. There are times when I feel that God is angry at me. _____
- 42. I am aware of God being very near to me. _____
- 43. When I sin, I am afraid of what God will do to me. _____
- 44. When I consult God about decisions in my life, I am aware of His direction and help. _____
- 45. I seem to be more gifted than most people in discerning God's will. _____
- 46. When I feel God is not protecting me, I tend to feel worthless. _____
- 47.1 There are times when I feel like God has let me down. _____
- 47.2 When this happens, my trust in God is not completely broken. _____

APPENDIX E

TABLE 1 – CANONICAL CORRELATION OUTPUT
RATING MOTHER FOR ALL RESPONDENTS

Table 1

Canonical Correlation Output Rating Mother for All Respondents

A. Correlations for Set-1

| SAI_AWA | SAI_DIS | SAI_REAL | SAI_GRAN | SAI_INST | SAI_IMPR | |
|----------|---------|----------|----------|----------|----------|--------|
| SAI_AWA | .0000 | -.2033 | .5117 | .4302 | -.2654 | .4459 |
| SAI_DIS | -.2033 | 1.0000 | -.2819 | -.2013 | .4075 | -.3455 |
| SAI_REAL | .5117 | -.2819 | 1.0000 | .1351 | -.3086 | .4594 |
| SAI_GRAN | .4302 | -.2013 | .1351 | 1.0000 | .0249 | .2791 |
| SAI_INST | -.2654 | .4075 | -.3086 | .0249 | 1.0000 | -.1740 |
| SAI_IMPR | .4459 | -.3455 | .4594 | .2791 | -.1740 | 1.0000 |

B. Correlations for Set-2

| PAQPER_M | PAQATR_M | PAQATV_M | |
|----------|----------|----------|--------|
| PAQPER_M | 1.0000 | -.5209 | -.1085 |
| PAQATR_M | -.5209 | 1.0000 | -.3488 |
| PAQATV_M | -.1085 | -.3488 | 1.0000 |

C. Correlations Between Set-1 and Set-2

| PAQPER_M | PAQATR_M | PAQATV_M | |
|----------|----------|----------|--------|
| SAI_AWA | -.0313 | -.0091 | .2070 |
| SAI_DIS | -.0177 | -.0256 | -.0764 |
| SAI_REAL | -.0673 | -.0466 | .1374 |
| SAI_GRAN | .0931 | .0833 | .1565 |
| SAI_INST | -.0537 | .1671 | -.0233 |
| SAI_IMPR | -.0663 | .0142 | .3140 |

D. Canonical Correlations

| | |
|---|------|
| 1 | .425 |
| 2 | .244 |
| 3 | .143 |

E. Test that remaining correlations are zero:

| | Wilk's | Chi-SQ | DF | Sig. |
|---|--------|--------|--------|------|
| 1 | .755 | 33.997 | 18.000 | .013 |
| 2 | .921 | 9.938 | 10.000 | .446 |
| 3 | .980 | 2.497 | 4.000 | .645 |

F. Standardized Canonical Coefficients for Set-1

| | 1 | 2 | 3 |
|----------|-------|-------|--------|
| SAI_AWA | .151 | .300 | -.214 |
| SAI_DIS | -.149 | .356 | .354 |
| SAI_REAL | -.221 | .244 | -.203 |
| SAI_GRAN | .471 | -.646 | .618 |
| SAI_INST | .389 | -.240 | -1.050 |
| SAI_IMPR | .653 | .625 | .059 |

G. Raw Canonical Coefficients for Set-1

| | 1 | 2 | 3 |
|----------|-------|--------|--------|
| SAI_AWA | .209 | .415 | -.297 |
| SAI_DIS | -.181 | .431 | .429 |
| SAI_REAL | -.335 | .370 | -.308 |
| SAI_GRAN | .947 | -1.299 | 1.244 |
| SAI_INST | .613 | -.379 | -1.656 |
| SAI_IMPR | .948 | .908 | .086 |

H. Standardized Canonical Coefficients for Set-2

| | 1 | 2 | 3 |
|----------|-------|-------|-------|
| PAQPER_M | .617 | -.866 | .671 |
| PAQATR_M | .995 | -.780 | -.424 |
| PAQATV_M | 1.078 | .326 | .208 |

I. Raw Canonical Coefficients for Set-2

| | 1 | 2 | 3 |
|----------|-------|--------|-------|
| PAQPER_M | .923 | -1.294 | 1.003 |
| PAQATR_M | 1.418 | -1.112 | -.604 |
| PAQATV_M | 1.256 | .380 | .242 |

J. Canonical Loadings for Set-1

| | 1 | 2 | 3 |
|----------|-------|-------|-------|
| SAI_AWA | .458 | .417 | .181 |
| SAI_DIS | -.280 | .042 | -.118 |
| SAI_REAL | .142 | .571 | .022 |
| SAI_GRAN | .728 | -.387 | .418 |
| SAI_INST | .254 | -.375 | -.781 |
| SAI_IMPR | .734 | .609 | .103 |

K. Cross Loadings for Set-1

| | 1 | 2 | 3 |
|----------|-------|-------|-------|
| SAI_AWA | .195 | .102 | .026 |
| SAI_DIS | -.119 | .010 | -.017 |
| SAI_REAL | .060 | .139 | .003 |
| SAI_GRAN | .309 | -.095 | .060 |
| SAI_INST | .108 | -.092 | -.112 |
| SAI_IMPR | .312 | .149 | .015 |

L. Canonical Loadings for Set-2

| | 1 | 2 | 3 |
|----------|-------|-------|-------|
| PAQPER_M | -.018 | -.494 | .869 |
| PAQATR_M | .297 | -.443 | -.846 |
| PAQATV_M | .664 | .692 | .283 |

M. Cross Loadings for Set-2

| | 1 | 2 | 3 |
|----------|-------|-------|-------|
| PAQPER_M | -.008 | -.121 | .124 |
| PAQATR_M | .126 | -.108 | -.121 |
| PAQATV_M | .282 | .169 | .040 |

N. Proportion of Variance of Set-1 Explained by Its Own Can. Var.

Prop Var

| | |
|-------|------|
| CV1-1 | .240 |
| CV1-2 | .194 |
| CV1-3 | .140 |

O. Proportion of Variance of Set-1 Explained by Opposite Can.Var.

Prop Var

| | |
|-------|------|
| CV2-1 | .043 |
| CV2-2 | .012 |
| CV2-3 | .003 |

P. Proportion of Variance of Set-2 Explained by Its Own Can. Var.

Prop Var

| | |
|-------|------|
| CV2-1 | .176 |
| CV2-2 | .307 |
| CV2-3 | .517 |

Q. Proportion of Variance of Set-2 Explained by Opposite Can. Var.

Prop Var

CV1-1 .032

CV1-2 .018

CV1-3 .011

APPENDIX F

TABLE 2 – CANONICAL CORRELATION OUTPUT

RATING FATHER FOR ALL RESPONDENTS

Table 2

Canonical Correlation Output Rating Father for All Respondents

A. Correlations for Set-1

| SAI_AWA | SAI_DIS | SAI_REAL | SAI_GRAN | SAI_INST | SAI_IMPR | |
|----------|---------|----------|----------|----------|----------|--------|
| SAI_AWA | 1.0000 | -.2118 | .5139 | .4356 | -.2552 | .4540 |
| SAI_DIS | -.2118 | 1.0000 | -.2770 | -.1953 | .4190 | -.3365 |
| SAI_REAL | .5139 | -.2770 | 1.0000 | .1235 | -.3117 | .4514 |
| SAI_GRAN | .4356 | -.1953 | .1235 | 1.0000 | .0355 | .2709 |
| SAI_INST | -.2552 | .4190 | -.3117 | .0355 | 1.0000 | -.1747 |
| SAI_IMPR | .4540 | -.3365 | .4514 | .2709 | -.1747 | 1.0000 |

B. Correlations for Set-2

| PAQPER_F | PAQATR_F | PAQATV_F | |
|----------|----------|----------|--------|
| PAQPER_F | 1.0000 | -.6543 | .1669 |
| PAQATR_F | -.6543 | 1.0000 | -.4736 |
| PAQATV_F | .1669 | -.4736 | 1.0000 |

C. Correlations Between Set-1 and Set-2

| PAQPER_F | PAQATR_F | PAQATV_F | |
|----------|----------|----------|--------|
| SAI_AWA | -.0871 | -.0083 | .2372 |
| SAI_DIS | -.0715 | .1141 | -.2129 |
| SAI_REAL | -.0032 | -.1073 | .1138 |
| SAI_GRAN | .0989 | -.0068 | .1626 |
| SAI_INST | .0110 | .0721 | -.0405 |
| SAI_IMPR | -.0439 | -.0453 | .2795 |

D. Canonical Correlations

| | |
|---|------|
| 1 | .379 |
| 2 | .237 |
| 3 | .153 |

E. Test that remaining correlations are zero:

| | Wilk's | Chi-SQ | DF | Sig. |
|---|--------|--------|--------|------|
| 1 | .789 | 28.153 | 18.000 | .060 |
| 2 | .922 | 9.689 | 10.000 | .468 |
| 3 | .977 | 2.812 | 4.000 | .590 |

F. Standardized Canonical Coefficients for Set-1

| | 1 | 2 | 3 |
|----------|-------|-------|-------|
| SAI_AWA | .612 | .605 | -.576 |
| SAI_DIS | -.381 | .212 | -.575 |
| SAI_REAL | -.418 | .110 | .808 |
| SAI_GRAN | .033 | -.956 | .112 |
| SAI_INST | .270 | -.171 | -.136 |
| SAI_IMPR | .593 | .171 | -.119 |

G. Raw Canonical Coefficients for Set-1

| | 1 | 2 | 3 |
|----------|-------|--------|-------|
| SAI_AWA | .848 | .838 | -.799 |
| SAI_DIS | -.461 | .257 | -.696 |
| SAI_REAL | -.633 | .167 | 1.221 |
| SAI_GRAN | .066 | -1.917 | .224 |
| SAI_INST | .423 | -.267 | -.213 |
| SAI_IMPR | .863 | .248 | -.173 |

H. Standardized Canonical Coefficients for Set-2

| | 1 | 2 | 3 |
|----------|-------|--------|-------|
| PAQPER_F | .046 | -1.353 | .034 |
| PAQATR_F | .542 | -1.011 | -.991 |
| PAQATV_F | 1.143 | -.212 | -.029 |

I. Raw Canonical Coefficients for Set-2

| | 1 | 2 | 3 |
|----------|-------|--------|--------|
| PAQPER_F | .068 | -1.997 | .050 |
| PAQATR_F | .655 | -1.223 | -1.198 |
| PAQATV_F | 1.217 | -.225 | -.030 |

J. Canonical Loadings for Set-1

| | 1 | 2 | 3 |
|----------|-------|-------|-------|
| SAI_AWA | .693 | .321 | -.010 |
| SAI_DIS | -.488 | .111 | -.716 |
| SAI_REAL | .189 | .374 | .674 |
| SAI_GRAN | .492 | -.681 | .036 |
| SAI_INST | -.018 | -.334 | -.457 |
| SAI_IMPR | .772 | .194 | .232 |

K. Cross Loadings for Set-1

| | 1 | 2 | 3 |
|----------|-------|-------|-------|
| SAI_AWA | .263 | .076 | -.002 |
| SAI_DIS | -.185 | .026 | -.109 |
| SAI_REAL | .072 | .089 | .103 |
| SAI_GRAN | .187 | -.161 | .005 |
| SAI_INST | -.007 | -.079 | -.070 |
| SAI_IMPR | .293 | .046 | .035 |

L. Canonical Loadings for Set-2

| | 1 | 2 | 3 |
|----------|-------|-------|-------|
| PAQPER_F | -.118 | -.726 | .677 |
| PAQATR_F | -.030 | -.026 | -.999 |
| PAQATV_F | .894 | .042 | .446 |

M. Cross Loadings for Set-2

| | 1 | 2 | 3 |
|----------|-------|-------|-------|
| PAQPER_F | -.045 | -.172 | .104 |
| PAQATR_F | -.011 | -.006 | -.153 |
| PAQATV_F | .339 | .010 | .068 |

N. Proportion of Variance of Set-1 Explained by Its Own Can. Var.

| Prop Var | |
|----------|------|
| CV1-1 | .265 |
| CV1-2 | .145 |
| CV1-3 | .205 |

O. Proportion of Variance of Set-1 Explained by Opposite Can.Var.

| Prop Var | |
|----------|------|
| CV2-1 | .038 |
| CV2-2 | .008 |
| CV2-3 | .005 |

P. Proportion of Variance of Set-2 Explained by Its Own Can. Var.

| Prop Var | |
|----------|------|
| CV2-1 | .271 |
| CV2-2 | .177 |
| CV2-3 | .552 |

Q. Proportion of Variance of Set-2 Explained by Opposite Can. Var.

Prop Var

CV1-1 .039

CV1-2 .010

CV1-3 .013

APPENDIX G

TABLE 3 – FEMALES RATING MOTHER CANONICAL
CORRELATION OUTPUT

Table 3

Females Rating Mother Canonical Correlation Output

A. Correlations for Set-1

| SAI_AWA | SAI_DIS | SAI_REAL | SAI_GRAN | SAI_INST | SAI_IMPR | |
|----------|---------|----------|----------|----------|----------|--------|
| SAI_AWA | 1.0000 | -.2036 | .4902 | .3439 | -.3654 | .4307 |
| SAI_DIS | -.2036 | 1.0000 | -.2796 | -.1754 | .3991 | -.3492 |
| SAI_REAL | .4902 | -.2796 | 1.0000 | .0513 | -.4725 | .3963 |
| SAI_GRAN | .3439 | -.1754 | .0513 | 1.0000 | .0519 | .2773 |
| SAI_INST | -.3654 | .3991 | -.4725 | .0519 | 1.0000 | -.2685 |
| SAI_IMPR | .4307 | -.3492 | .3963 | .2773 | -.2685 | 1.0000 |

B. Correlations for Set-2

| PAQPER_M | PAQATR_M | PAQATV_M | |
|----------|----------|----------|--------|
| PAQPER_M | 1.0000 | -.5346 | -.1171 |
| PAQATR_M | -.5346 | 1.0000 | -.4189 |
| PAQATV_M | -.1171 | -.4189 | 1.0000 |

C. Correlations Between Set-1 and Set-2

| PAQPER_M | PAQATR_M | PAQATV_M | |
|----------|----------|----------|--------|
| SAI_AWA | -.0792 | -.1129 | .2844 |
| SAI_DIS | -.1219 | .0704 | .0383 |
| SAI_REAL | -.0524 | -.1702 | .1292 |
| SAI_GRAN | -.1265 | .1893 | .1203 |
| SAI_INST | -.0697 | .2337 | -.0428 |
| SAI_IMPR | -.0403 | -.0109 | .2729 |

D. Canonical Correlations

| | |
|---|------|
| 1 | .460 |
| 2 | .325 |
| 3 | .167 |

E. Test that remaining correlations are zero:

| | Wilk's | Chi-SQ | DF | Sig. |
|---|--------|--------|--------|------|
| 1 | .686 | 26.406 | 18.000 | .091 |
| 2 | .870 | 9.779 | 10.000 | .460 |
| 3 | .972 | 1.985 | 4.000 | .738 |

F. Standardized Canonical Coefficients for Set-1

| | 1 | 2 | 3 |
|----------|-------|-------|-------|
| SAI_AWA | .240 | .636 | .277 |
| SAI_DIS | .261 | .414 | -.626 |
| SAI_REAL | -.308 | .333 | -.742 |
| SAI_GRAN | .403 | -.325 | -.594 |
| SAI_INST | .417 | -.248 | -.122 |
| SAI_IMPR | .692 | .170 | .538 |

G. Raw Canonical Coefficients for Set-1

| | 1 | 2 | 3 |
|----------|-------|-------|--------|
| SAI_AWA | .337 | .894 | .390 |
| SAI_DIS | .323 | .513 | -.775 |
| SAI_REAL | -.483 | .522 | -1.163 |
| SAI_GRAN | .859 | -.693 | -1.266 |
| SAI_INST | .748 | -.445 | -.219 |
| SAI_IMPR | 1.035 | .254 | .805 |

H. Standardized Canonical Coefficients for Set-2

| | 1 | 2 | 3 |
|----------|-------|-------|-------|
| PAQPER_M | .428 | -.625 | 1.082 |
| PAQATR_M | 1.142 | -.864 | .190 |
| PAQATV_M | 1.089 | .358 | .443 |

I. Raw Canonical Coefficients for Set-2

| | 1 | 2 | 3 |
|----------|-------|--------|-------|
| PAQPER_M | .618 | -.903 | 1.562 |
| PAQATR_M | 1.544 | -1.168 | .257 |
| PAQATV_M | 1.176 | .386 | .478 |

J. Canonical Loadings for Set-1

| | 1 | 2 | 3 |
|----------|-------|-------|-------|
| SAI_AWA | .320 | .767 | .113 |
| SAI_DIS | .152 | .090 | -.607 |
| SAI_REAL | -.165 | .697 | -.190 |
| SAI_GRAN | .638 | -.128 | -.284 |
| SAI_INST | .414 | -.535 | -.298 |
| SAI_IMPR | .582 | .407 | .450 |

K. Cross Loadings for Set-1

| | 1 | 2 | 3 |
|----------|-------|-------|-------|
| SAI_AWA | .147 | .249 | .019 |
| SAI_DIS | .070 | .029 | -.102 |
| SAI_REAL | -.076 | .226 | -.032 |
| SAI_GRAN | .293 | -.041 | -.048 |
| SAI_INST | .190 | -.174 | -.050 |
| SAI_IMPR | .268 | .132 | .075 |

L. Canonical Loadings for Set-2

| | 1 | 2 | 3 |
|----------|-------|-------|-------|
| PAQPER_M | -.310 | -.205 | .928 |
| PAQATR_M | .457 | -.680 | -.574 |
| PAQATV_M | .561 | .793 | .237 |

M. Cross Loadings for Set-2

| | 1 | 2 | 3 |
|----------|-------|-------|-------|
| PAQPER_M | -.143 | -.067 | .155 |
| PAQATR_M | .210 | -.221 | -.096 |
| PAQATV_M | .258 | .258 | .040 |

N. Proportion of Variance of Set-1 Explained by Its Own Can. Var.

| Prop Var | |
|----------|------|
| CV1-1 | .178 |
| CV1-2 | .258 |
| CV1-3 | .132 |

O. Proportion of Variance of Set-1 Explained by Opposite Can.Var.

| Prop Var | |
|----------|------|
| CV2-1 | .038 |
| CV2-2 | .027 |
| CV2-3 | .004 |

P. Proportion of Variance of Set-2 Explained by Its Own Can. Var.

| Prop Var | |
|----------|------|
| CV2-1 | .206 |
| CV2-2 | .378 |
| CV2-3 | .416 |

Q. Proportion of Variance of Set-2 Explained by Opposite Can. Var.

Prop Var

CV1-1 .044

CV1-2 .040

CV1-3 .012

APPENDIX H

TABLE 4 – FEMALES RATING FATHER CANONICAL
CORRELATION OUTPUT

Table 4

Females Rating Father Canonical Correlation Output

A. Correlations for Set-1

| SAI_AWA | SAI_DIS | SAI_REAL | SAI_GRAN | SAI_INST | SAI_IMPR | |
|----------|---------|----------|----------|----------|----------|--------|
| SAI_AWA | 1.0000 | -.2124 | .4890 | .3526 | -.3510 | .4392 |
| SAI_DIS | -.2124 | 1.0000 | -.2877 | -.1671 | .4137 | -.3504 |
| SAI_REAL | .4890 | -.2877 | 1.0000 | .0444 | -.4798 | .3987 |
| SAI_GRAN | .3526 | -.1671 | .0444 | 1.0000 | .0576 | .2732 |
| SAI_INST | -.3510 | .4137 | -.4798 | .0576 | 1.0000 | -.2754 |
| SAI_IMPR | .4392 | -.3504 | .3987 | .2732 | -.2754 | 1.0000 |

B. Correlations for Set-2

| PAQPER_F | PAQATR_F | PAQATV_F | |
|----------|----------|----------|--------|
| PAQPER_F | 1.0000 | -.6580 | .1579 |
| PAQATR_F | -.6580 | 1.0000 | -.4706 |
| PAQATV_F | .1579 | -.4706 | 1.0000 |

C. Correlations Between Set-1 and Set-2

| PAQPER_F | PAQATR_F | PAQATV_F | |
|----------|----------|----------|--------|
| SAI_AWA | -.1164 | .0281 | .2201 |
| SAI_DIS | -.1674 | .2195 | -.1403 |
| SAI_REAL | .0477 | -.2133 | .1020 |
| SAI_GRAN | -.0289 | .0817 | .1278 |
| SAI_INST | -.0211 | .1103 | .0524 |
| SAI_IMPR | -.0959 | -.0252 | .2911 |

D. Canonical Correlations

| | |
|---|------|
| 1 | .477 |
| 2 | .293 |
| 3 | .188 |

E. Test that remaining correlations are zero:

| | Wilk's | Chi-SQ | DF | Sig. |
|---|--------|--------|--------|------|
| 1 | .681 | 26.842 | 18.000 | .082 |
| 2 | .882 | 8.792 | 10.000 | .552 |
| 3 | .965 | 2.505 | 4.000 | .644 |

F. Standardized Canonical Coefficients for Set-1

| | 1 | 2 | 3 |
|----------|-------|-------|-------|
| SAI_AWA | .659 | .009 | -.162 |
| SAI_DIS | .171 | -.633 | -.812 |
| SAI_REAL | -.529 | .658 | -.243 |
| SAI_GRAN | .048 | -.276 | .405 |
| SAI_INST | .409 | .443 | .494 |
| SAI_IMPR | .659 | .289 | -.351 |

G. Raw Canonical Coefficients for Set-1

| | 1 | 2 | 3 |
|----------|-------|-------|--------|
| SAI_AWA | .938 | .012 | -.231 |
| SAI_DIS | .212 | -.783 | -1.004 |
| SAI_REAL | -.825 | 1.026 | -.379 |
| SAI_GRAN | .103 | -.587 | .862 |
| SAI_INST | .732 | .792 | .883 |
| SAI_IMPR | .985 | .431 | -.525 |

H. Standardized Canonical Coefficients for Set-2

| | 1 | 2 | 3 |
|----------|-------|-------|-------|
| PAQPER_F | .012 | -.272 | 1.337 |
| PAQATR_F | .915 | -.869 | .859 |
| PAQATV_F | 1.029 | .418 | .347 |

I. Raw Canonical Coefficients for Set-2

| | 1 | 2 | 3 |
|----------|-------|-------|-------|
| PAQPER_F | .017 | -.381 | 1.873 |
| PAQATR_F | 1.018 | -.967 | .955 |
| PAQATV_F | 1.070 | .434 | .361 |

J. Canonical Loadings for Set-1

| | 1 | 2 | 3 |
|----------|-------|-------|-------|
| SAI_AWA | .526 | .339 | -.294 |
| SAI_DIS | .114 | -.696 | -.448 |
| SAI_REAL | -.188 | .734 | -.448 |
| SAI_GRAN | .432 | -.033 | .405 |
| SAI_INST | .324 | -.233 | .452 |
| SAI_IMPR | .578 | .579 | -.261 |

K. Cross Loadings for Set-1

| | 1 | 2 | 3 |
|----------|-------|-------|-------|
| SAI_AWA | .251 | .099 | -.055 |
| SAI_DIS | .054 | -.204 | -.084 |
| SAI_REAL | -.090 | .215 | -.084 |
| SAI_GRAN | .206 | -.010 | .076 |
| SAI_INST | .155 | -.068 | .085 |
| SAI_IMPR | .275 | .170 | -.049 |

L. Canonical Loadings for Set-2

| | 1 | 2 | 3 |
|----------|-------|-------|-------|
| PAQPER_F | -.428 | .366 | .826 |
| PAQATR_F | .423 | -.887 | -.184 |
| PAQATV_F | .601 | .784 | .154 |

M. Cross Loadings for Set-2

| | 1 | 2 | 3 |
|----------|-------|-------|-------|
| PAQPER_F | -.204 | .107 | .155 |
| PAQATR_F | .201 | -.260 | -.035 |
| PAQATV_F | .286 | .230 | .029 |

N. Proportion of Variance of Set-1 Explained by Its Own Can. Var.

| Prop Var | |
|----------|------|
| CV1-1 | .158 |
| CV1-2 | .255 |
| CV1-3 | .154 |

O. Proportion of Variance of Set-1 Explained by Opposite Can. Var.

| Prop Var | |
|----------|------|
| CV2-1 | .036 |
| CV2-2 | .022 |
| CV2-3 | .005 |

P. Proportion of Variance of Set-2 Explained by Its Own Can. Var.

| Prop Var | |
|----------|------|
| CV2-1 | .241 |
| CV2-2 | .512 |
| CV2-3 | .247 |

Q. Proportion of Variance of Set-2 Explained by Opposite Can. Var.

Prop Var

CV1-1 .055

CV1-2 .044

CV1-3 .009

APPENDIX I

TABLE 5 – MALES RATING MOTHER CANONICAL
CORRELATION OUTPUT

Table 5

Males Rating Mother Canonical Correlation Output

A. Correlations for Set-1

| SAI_AWA | SAI_DIS | SAI_REAL | SAI_GRAN | SAI_INST | SAI_IMPR | |
|----------|---------|----------|----------|----------|----------|--------|
| SAI_AWA | 1.0000 | -.2392 | .5219 | .5560 | -.0853 | .4583 |
| SAI_DIS | -.2392 | 1.0000 | -.3080 | -.2353 | .4814 | -.3546 |
| SAI_REAL | .5219 | -.3080 | 1.0000 | .2373 | -.0951 | .5330 |
| SAI_GRAN | .5560 | -.2353 | .2373 | 1.0000 | .0008 | .2823 |
| SAI_INST | -.0853 | .4814 | -.0951 | .0008 | 1.0000 | -.0479 |
| SAI_IMPR | .4583 | -.3546 | .5330 | .2823 | -.0479 | 1.0000 |

B. Correlations for Set-2

| PAQPER_M | PAQATR_M | PAQATV_M | |
|----------|----------|----------|--------|
| PAQPER_M | 1.0000 | -.4934 | -.1260 |
| PAQATR_M | -.4934 | 1.0000 | -.1550 |
| PAQATV_M | -.1260 | -.1550 | 1.0000 |

C. Correlations Between Set-1 and Set-2

| PAQPER_M | PAQATR_M | PAQATV_M | |
|----------|----------|----------|--------|
| SAI_AWA | .0603 | .1260 | .2018 |
| SAI_DIS | .1483 | -.1995 | -.2584 |
| SAI_REAL | -.0814 | .1243 | .2441 |
| SAI_GRAN | .4053 | -.0745 | .2431 |
| SAI_INST | -.0580 | .1475 | -.1426 |
| SAI_IMPR | -.1007 | .0393 | .4729 |

D. Canonical Correlations

| | |
|---|------|
| 1 | .596 |
| 2 | .501 |
| 3 | .350 |

E. Test that remaining correlations are zero:

| | Wilk's | Chi-SQ | DF | Sig. |
|---|--------|--------|--------|------|
| 1 | .424 | 38.649 | 18.000 | .003 |
| 2 | .657 | 18.886 | 10.000 | .042 |
| 3 | .877 | 5.889 | 4.000 | .208 |

F. Standardized Canonical Coefficients for Set-1

| | 1 | 2 | 3 |
|----------|--------|-------|-------|
| SAI_AWA | .347 | .159 | .530 |
| SAI_DIS | -.378 | -.636 | -.651 |
| SAI_REAL | .008 | .048 | .103 |
| SAI_GRAN | -1.060 | -.360 | .228 |
| SAI_INST | .411 | .306 | .728 |
| SAI_IMPR | -.371 | .624 | -.826 |

G. Raw Canonical Coefficients for Set-1

| | 1 | 2 | 3 |
|----------|--------|-------|--------|
| SAI_AWA | .483 | .222 | .737 |
| SAI_DIS | -.442 | -.743 | -.761 |
| SAI_REAL | .011 | .070 | .151 |
| SAI_GRAN | -1.961 | -.667 | .421 |
| SAI_INST | .586 | .437 | 1.039 |
| SAI_IMPR | -.516 | .867 | -1.148 |

H. Standardized Canonical Coefficients for Set-2

| | 1 | 2 | 3 |
|----------|-------|-------|-------|
| PAQPER_M | -.915 | -.299 | .688 |
| PAQATR_M | -.146 | .471 | 1.081 |
| PAQATV_M | -.678 | .778 | -.142 |

I. Raw Canonical Coefficients for Set-2

| | 1 | 2 | 3 |
|----------|--------|-------|-------|
| PAQPER_M | -1.434 | -.469 | 1.078 |
| PAQATR_M | -.228 | .736 | 1.689 |
| PAQATV_M | -.981 | 1.125 | -.205 |

J. Canonical Loadings for Set-1

| | 1 | 2 | 3 |
|----------|-------|-------|-------|
| SAI_AWA | -.353 | .396 | .425 |
| SAI_DIS | .115 | -.677 | -.220 |
| SAI_REAL | -.183 | .545 | .125 |
| SAI_GRAN | -.880 | .066 | .467 |
| SAI_INST | .215 | -.048 | .399 |
| SAI_IMPR | -.393 | .831 | -.268 |

K. Cross Loadings for Set-1

| | 1 | 2 | 3 |
|----------|-------|-------|-------|
| SAI_AWA | -.210 | .198 | .149 |
| SAI_DIS | .069 | -.339 | -.077 |
| SAI_REAL | -.109 | .273 | .044 |
| SAI_GRAN | -.525 | .033 | .164 |
| SAI_INST | .128 | -.024 | .140 |
| SAI_IMPR | -.234 | .416 | -.094 |

L. Canonical Loadings for Set-2

| | 1 | 2 | 3 |
|----------|-------|-------|-------|
| PAQPER_M | -.758 | -.629 | .172 |
| PAQATR_M | .411 | .498 | .764 |
| PAQATV_M | -.540 | .742 | -.396 |

M. Cross Loadings for Set-2

| | 1 | 2 | 3 |
|----------|-------|-------|-------|
| PAQPER_M | -.452 | -.315 | .060 |
| PAQATR_M | .245 | .249 | .267 |
| PAQATV_M | -.322 | .372 | -.139 |

N. Proportion of Variance of Set-1 Explained by Its Own Can. Var.

Prop Var

| | |
|-------|------|
| CV1-1 | .191 |
| CV1-2 | .268 |
| CV1-3 | .116 |

O. Proportion of Variance of Set-1 Explained by Opposite Can. Var.

Prop Var

| | |
|-------|------|
| CV2-1 | .068 |
| CV2-2 | .067 |
| CV2-3 | .014 |

P. Proportion of Variance of Set-2 Explained by Its Own Can. Var.

Prop Var

| | |
|-------|------|
| CV2-1 | .345 |
| CV2-2 | .398 |
| CV2-3 | .257 |

Q. Proportion of Variance of Set-2 Explained by Opposite Can. Var.

Prop Var

CV1-1 .123

CV1-2 .100

CV1-3 .031

APPENDIX J

TABLE 6 – MALES RATING FATHER CANONICAL
CORRELATION OUTPUT

Table 6

Males Rating Father Canonical Correlation Output

A. Correlations for Set-1

| SAI_AWA | SAI_DIS | SAI_REAL | SAI_GRAN | SAI_INST | SAI_IMPR | |
|----------|---------|----------|----------|----------|----------|--------|
| SAI_AWA | 1.0000 | -.2367 | .5224 | .5532 | -.0762 | .4574 |
| SAI_DIS | -.2367 | 1.0000 | -.2834 | -.2334 | .4821 | -.3313 |
| SAI_REAL | .5224 | -.2834 | 1.0000 | .2218 | -.0721 | .5081 |
| SAI_GRAN | .5532 | -.2334 | .2218 | 1.0000 | .0217 | .2682 |
| SAI_INST | -.0762 | .4821 | -.0721 | .0217 | 1.0000 | -.0226 |
| SAI_IMPR | .4574 | -.3313 | .5081 | .2682 | -.0226 | 1.0000 |

B. Correlations for Set-2

| PAQPER_F | PAQATR_F | PAQATV_F | |
|----------|----------|----------|--------|
| PAQPER_F | 1.0000 | -.6564 | .1847 |
| PAQATR_F | -.6564 | 1.0000 | -.4799 |
| PAQATV_F | .1847 | -.4799 | 1.0000 |

C. Correlations Between Set-1 and Set-2

| PAQPER_F | PAQATR_F | PAQATV_F | |
|----------|----------|----------|--------|
| SAI_AWA | -.0413 | -.0365 | .2528 |
| SAI_DIS | .0889 | -.0690 | -.3340 |
| SAI_REAL | -.0887 | .1183 | .1183 |
| SAI_GRAN | .2978 | -.1567 | .2131 |
| SAI_INST | .0579 | -.0333 | -.1371 |
| SAI_IMPR | .0419 | -.0626 | .2551 |

D. Canonical Correlations

| | |
|---|------|
| 1 | .468 |
| 2 | .422 |
| 3 | .204 |

E. Test that remaining correlations are zero:

| | Wilk's | Chi-SQ | DF | Sig. |
|---|--------|--------|--------|------|
| 1 | .615 | 20.920 | 18.000 | .283 |
| 2 | .787 | 10.272 | 10.000 | .417 |
| 3 | .958 | 1.827 | 4.000 | .768 |

F. Standardized Canonical Coefficients for Set-1

| | 1 | 2 | 3 |
|----------|-------|-------|--------|
| SAI_AWA | -.647 | -.527 | .808 |
| SAI_DIS | .860 | -.125 | .272 |
| SAI_REAL | .024 | -.035 | -1.105 |
| SAI_GRAN | .558 | 1.053 | -.197 |
| SAI_INST | -.110 | -.116 | -.078 |
| SAI_IMPR | -.006 | .349 | .583 |

G. Raw Canonical Coefficients for Set-1

| | 1 | 2 | 3 |
|----------|-------|-------|--------|
| SAI_AWA | -.884 | -.721 | 1.104 |
| SAI_DIS | 1.002 | -.145 | .316 |
| SAI_REAL | .035 | -.052 | -1.616 |
| SAI_GRAN | 1.023 | 1.930 | -.361 |
| SAI_INST | -.155 | -.164 | -.110 |
| SAI_IMPR | -.008 | .487 | .815 |

H. Standardized Canonical Coefficients for Set-2

| | 1 | 2 | 3 |
|----------|-------|-------|--------|
| PAQPER_F | .474 | 1.113 | -.602 |
| PAQATR_F | -.392 | .676 | -1.297 |
| PAQATV_F | -.949 | .671 | -.020 |

I. Raw Canonical Coefficients for Set-2

| | 1 | 2 | 3 |
|----------|--------|-------|--------|
| PAQPER_F | .759 | 1.783 | -.965 |
| PAQATR_F | -.560 | .964 | -1.849 |
| PAQATV_F | -1.045 | .739 | -.022 |

J. Canonical Loadings for Set-1

| | 1 | 2 | 3 |
|----------|-------|-------|-------|
| SAI_AWA | -.523 | .234 | .330 |
| SAI_DIS | .824 | -.407 | .209 |
| SAI_REAL | -.429 | .144 | -.501 |
| SAI_GRAN | .001 | .873 | .097 |
| SAI_INST | .364 | -.118 | .053 |
| SAI_IMPR | -.422 | .416 | .250 |

K. Cross Loadings for Set-1

| | 1 | 2 | 3 |
|----------|-------|-------|-------|
| SAI_AWA | -.245 | .099 | .067 |
| SAI_DIS | .386 | -.172 | .043 |
| SAI_REAL | -.201 | .061 | -.102 |
| SAI_GRAN | .000 | .369 | .020 |
| SAI_INST | .171 | -.050 | .011 |
| SAI_IMPR | -.198 | .176 | .051 |

L. Canonical Loadings for Set-2

| | 1 | 2 | 3 |
|----------|-------|-------|-------|
| PAQPER_F | .557 | .794 | .245 |
| PAQATR_F | -.248 | -.377 | -.892 |
| PAQATV_F | -.673 | .553 | .492 |

M. Cross Loadings for Set-2

| | 1 | 2 | 3 |
|----------|-------|-------|-------|
| PAQPER_F | .261 | .335 | .050 |
| PAQATR_F | -.116 | -.159 | -.182 |
| PAQATV_F | -.315 | .233 | .100 |

N. Proportion of Variance of Set-1 Explained by Its Own Can. Var.

| Prop Var | |
|----------|------|
| CV1-1 | .241 |
| CV1-2 | .198 |
| CV1-3 | .080 |

O. Proportion of Variance of Set-1 Explained by Opposite Can. Var.

| Prop Var | |
|----------|------|
| CV2-1 | .053 |
| CV2-2 | .035 |
| CV2-3 | .003 |

P. Proportion of Variance of Set-2 Explained by Its Own Can. Var

| Prop Var | |
|----------|------|
| CV2-1 | .275 |
| CV2-2 | .359 |
| CV2-3 | .366 |

Q. Proportion of Variance of Set-2 Explained by Opposite Can. Var.

Prop Var

CV1-1 .060

CV1-2 .064

CV1-3 .015

REFERENCES

Alwin, D. F. (1986). Religion and parental child-rearing orientations: Evidence of a Catholic-Protestant convergence. *American Journal of Sociology*, *92*(2), 412-440.

Archer, J. (1994). Achievement goals as a measure of motivation in university students. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, *19*, 430-446.

Bassett, R. L., Sadler, R. D., Kobischen, E. E., Skiff, D. M., Merrill, I. J., Atwater, B. J., & Livermore, P. W. (1981). *Journal of Psychology and Theology*, *9*(4), 335-351.

Baumrind, D. (1967). Child care practices anteceding three patterns of preschool behavior. *Genetic Psychology Monographs*, *75*, 43-88.

Baumrind, D. (1970). Socialization and instrumental competence in young children. *Young Children*, *26*(2), 104-119.

Baumrind, D. (1971). Current patterns of parental authority. *Developmental Psychology Monograph*, *4* (1 part 2).

Baumrind, D. (1980). New directions in socialization research. *American Psychologist*, *35*, 639-652.

Baumrind, D. (1983). Rejoinder to Lewis' reinterpretation of parental firm control effects: Are authoritative families really harmonious? *Psychological Bulletin*, *94*(1), 132-142.

Baumrind, D., & Black, A. E. (1967). Socialization practices associated with dimensions of competence in preschool boys and girls. *Child Development*, *38*, 291-327.

Bell, R. (1968). A reinterpretation of the direction of effects in studies of socialization. *Psychology Review*, 75, 81-95.

Bell, R. (1986). Stimulus control of parent or caretaker by behavior of offspring. *Developmental Psychology*, 57, 511-512.

Benner, D. G. (1988). *Psychotherapy and the spiritual quest*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House.

Bergin, A. E. (1983). Religiosity and mental health: A critical reevaluation and meta-analysis. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice*, 14, 170-184.

Birky, I. T., & Ball, S. (1988). Parental trait influence on God as an object representation. *Journal of Psychology*, 122, 133-137.

Bowlby, J. (1969). *Attachment and loss* (Vol. 1). New York: Basic Books.

Brokaw, B. F. (1991). The relationship of God image to level of object relations development (Doctoral dissertation, Biola University, 1991). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 52(11), 6077B.

Brokaw, B. F., & Edwards, K. J. (1994). The relationship of God image to level of object relations development. *Journal of Psychology and Theology*, 22(4), 352-371.

Buri, J. R. (1991). Parental authority questionnaire. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 57(1), 110-119.

Buri, J. R., Louiselle, P. A., Misukanis, T. M., & Mueller, R. A. (1988). Effects of parental authoritarianism and authoritativeness on self-esteem. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 14(2), 271-282.

Bushnell, H. (1967). *Christian nurture*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Butman, R. E. (1990). The assessment of religious development: Some possible options. *Journal of Psychology and Christianity*, 9(2), 14-26.

Carter, J. D. (1974). Personality and Christian maturity: A process congruity model. *Journal of Psychology and Theology*, 2(3), 190-201.

Carter, J. D., & Barnhurst, L. F. (1986, August). *Maturity, intimacy and spirituality*. Paper presented at the Midwest CAPS Convention, Missoula, MT.

Clifford, S. (2000). Early developmental influences on the capacity for mutuality in marital relationships (Doctoral dissertation, Wright Institute Graduate School of Psychology, 2000). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 61(4), 2240B.

Coe, G. A. (1902). *The religion of a mature mind*. Chicago: Fleming H. Revell Company.

Coe, G. A. (1916). *The psychology of religion*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Coe, G. A. (1917). *A social theory of religious education*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.

Colby, A. & Kohlberg, L. (1984). Invariant sequence and internal consistency in moral judgment stages. In W. M. Kurtines & J. L. Gewirtz (Eds.), *Morality, Moral Behavior, and Moral Development*. New York: John Wiley.

Corzo, D. M. (1981). Perceptions of God, parents, and self as a function of depression and Christian faith (Doctoral dissertation, Biola University, 1981). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 42, 1164-1165B.

Dirks, D. H. (1989). Moral maturity and Christian parenting. *Christian Education Journal*, 9(2), 83-93.

Dornbusch, S. M., Ritter, P. L., Leiderman, P. H., Roberts, D. F., & Fraleigh, M. J. (1987). The relation of parenting style to adolescent school performance. *Child Development*, 58, 1244-1257.

Dudley, R. L. (1978). Alienation from religion in adolescents from fundamentalist religious homes. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 17, 389-399.

Eisenberg-Berg, N., & Mussen, P. (1978). Empathy and moral development in adolescence. *Developmental Psychology*, 14, 185-186.

Ellison, C. W. (1983). Spiritual well-being: Conceptualization and measurement. *Journal of Psychology and Theology*, 11(4), 330-340.

Erickson, D. (1962). *Differential effects of public and sectarian schooling on the religiousness of the child*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Chicago.

Fairbairn, W. R. D. (1954). *An object relations theory of the personality*. New York: Basic Books.

Fay, M. A. (1983). An object relations analysis at the conscious symbolic and memory content levels of the maternal and paternal components of the representation of God in five Christian women (Doctoral dissertation, Boston University, 1983). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 43, 4125-4126B.

Ford, D. S., Massey, K. K., & Hyde, D. (1986). Factors related to authoritarian versus nonauthoritarian attitudes toward parenting among college students. *Health Education*, 16(6), 26-28.

Freud, S. (1955). Totem and taboo. In J. Strachey (Ed. and Trans.), *The standard edition of the complete psychological works of Sigmund Freud* (Vol. 13, pp. 1-162).

London: Hogarth Press.

Freud, S. (1959). Obsessive actions and religious practices. In J. Strachey (Ed. and Trans.), *The standard edition of the complete psychological works of Sigmund Freud* (Vol. 9, pp. 115-127). London: Hogarth Press.

Freud, S. (1961). The future of an illusion. In J. Strachey (Ed. and Trans.), *The standard edition of the complete psychological works of Sigmund Freud* (Vol. 21, pp. 3-56). London: Hogarth Press.

Freud, S. (1964). Moses and monotheism. In J. Strachey (Ed. and Trans.), *The standard edition of the complete psychological works of Sigmund Freud* (Vol. 23, pp. 1-137). London: Hogarth Press.

Freudenberger, C. L. (1993). The predictive influence of parenting styles and parental moral behaviors on the development of late adolescent moral behaviors (Doctoral dissertation, Biola University, 1993). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 55(3), 1200B.

Gangel, K., & Gangel, E. (1987). *Building a Christian family*. Chicago: Moody Press.

Gartner, J., Larson, D. B., & Allen, G. D. (1991). Religious commitment and mental health: A review of the empirical literature. *Journal of Psychology and Theology*, 19(1), 6-25.

Ginsburg, G. S., & Bronstein, P. (1993). Family factors related to children's intrinsic/extrinsic motivational orientation and academic performance. *Child Development, 64*, 1461-1474.

Godin, A., & Hallez, M. (1965). Parental images and divine paternity. In A. Godin (Ed.), *From religious experience to a religious attitude* (pp. 65-96). Chicago: Loyola University Press.

Gonzalez, A. R. (1998). Undergraduate students' goal orientations and their relationship to parenting styles (Doctoral dissertation, University of Florida, 1998). *Dissertation Abstracts International, 59*(9), 3347A.

Greely, A. M., & Geckel, G. L. (1971). The religious effects of parochial education. In M. P. Strommen (Ed.), *Research on religious development* (pp. 264-301). New York: Hawthorn.

Greenberg, J. R. & Mitchell, S. A. (1983). *Object relations in psychoanalytic theory*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Guernsey, D. B. (1982). *A new design for family ministry*. Elgin, IL: David C. Cook.

Guisinger, S., & Blatt, S. (1994). Individuality and relatedness: Evolution of a fundamental dialectic. *American Psychologist, 49*, 104-111.

Guntrip, H. (1961). *Personality structure and human interaction*. New York: International Universities Press.

Hagen, A. S. & Wallenstein, C. E. (1995). Achievement goals, self-regulated learning, and the role of classroom context. In P. R. Pintrich (Ed.), *New directions for teaching and learning* (pp. 43-55). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Hall, T. W. (1996). The relationship of spiritual maturity to level of object relations development and God image and the impact of spiritual direction on these variables (Doctoral dissertation, Biola University, 1996). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 57(8), 5360B.

Hall, T. W., & Edwards, K. J. (1995, August). *Development and psychometric analysis of the Spiritual Assessment Inventory*. Paper presented at the 103rd annual convention of the American Psychological Association, New York, NY.

Hall, T. W., & Edwards, K. J. (1996a). The initial development and factor analysis of the Spiritual Assessment Inventory. *Journal of Psychology and Theology*, 24, 233-246.

Hall, T. W., & Edwards, K. J. (1996b). *A factor analytic revision of the Spiritual Assessment Inventory and further evidence of its construct validity*. Paper presented at the 104th annual convention of the American Psychological Association, Toronto, Ontario.

Hoffman, M. L. (1963). Childrearing practices and moral development: Generalizations from empirical research. *Child Development*, 34, 295-318.

Hoffman, M. L. (1975). Moral internalization, parental power, and the nature of parent-child interaction. *Developmental Psychology*, 11, 228-239.

Hoffman, M. L. (1978). Psychological and biological perspectives on altruism. *International Journal of Behavioral Development*, 1, 323-339.

Hoffman, M. L. (1979). Development of moral thought, feeling, and behavior. *American Psychologist, 34*, 958-966.

Hoffman, M. L. (1981). Is altruism part of human nature? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 40*, 121-137.

Hoge, D. R., & Keeter, L. (1976). Determinants of college teachers' religious beliefs and participation. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, 15*, 221-235.

Hoge, D. R., & Petrillo, G. H. (1978a). Determinants of church participation and attitudes among high school youth. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, 17*, 359-379.

Hoge, D. R., & Petrillo, G. H. (1978b). Development of religious thinking in adolescence: A test of Goldman's thinking. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, 17*, 139-154.

Horton, T. G. (1998). The relationship between extrinsic religiosity, intrinsic religiosity, and spiritual maturity to life satisfaction and coping resources (Doctoral dissertation, Southern Nazarene University, 1998). *Dissertation Abstracts International, 60*(2), 855B.

Jacob, T. (1975). Family interaction in disturbed and normal families: A methodological and substantive review. *Psychological Bulletin, 82*, 33-65.

Jagacinski, C. M., & Nichols, J. G. (1987). Competence and affect in task involvement and ego involvement: The impact of social comparison information. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 79*(2), 107-114.

- Jones, J. W. (1991). *Contemporary psychoanalysis and religion*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Kegan, R. (1982). *The evolving self: Problems and process in human development*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Knapp, C. (1993). *Personality transformation and belief in God: An object relations understanding of the spiritual awakening program of Alcoholics Anonymous*. Unpublished master's thesis, Andover Newton Theological School, Newton Centre, MA.
- Kohut, H. (1984). *How does analysis cure?* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Levin, J., & Vanderpool, H. (1987). Is frequent religious attendance really conducive to better health? Toward an epidemiology of religion. *Social Science Medicine*, 24, 589-600.
- Lewis, C. C. (1981). The effects of parental firm control: A reinterpretation of findings. *Psychological Bulletin*, 90(3), 547-563.
- MacCoby, E. E., & Martin, A. M. (1983). Socialization in the context of the family: Parent-child interaction. In P. H. Mussen (Ed.), *Handbook of child psychology* (4th ed). New York: John Wiley.
- Main, M., & Goldwyn, R. (1984). Predicting rejection of her infant from mother's representation of her own experience: Implications for the abused-abusing intergenerational cycle. *Child Abuse and Neglect*, 8, 203-217.

Malony, H. N. (1985). Assessing religious maturity. In E. M. Stern (Ed.), *Psychotherapy and the religiously committed patient* (pp. 25-33). New York: Hayworth Press.

McCord, J. (1988). Parental behavior in the cycle of aggression. *Psychiatry*, *51*, 14-23.

McCranie, E., & Bass, J. (1984). Childhood family antecedents of dependency and self-criticism: Implications for depression. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, *93*, 3-8.

McDargh, J. (1983). *Psychoanalytic object relations theory and the study of religion*. New York: University Press of America.

McDargh, J. (1986). God, mother and me: An object relational perspective on religious material. *Pastoral Psychology*, *34*, 251-263.

Meadow, J. J., & Kahoe, R. D. (1984). *Psychology of religion: Religion in individual lives*. New York: Harper and Row.

Miller, S. G. (1991). Reciprocal maturities: Spirit and psyche in pastoral counseling and spiritual direction. *Pastoral Psychology*, *40*(2), 93-103.

Nelson, C. E. (1967). *Where faith begins*. Richmond: John Knox Press.

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

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

Pingleton, J. P. (1984). *An integrative analysis of psychological and Christian concepts of relational maturity*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Biola University, La Mirada, CA.

Pintrich, P. R., & Garcia, T. (1991). Student goal orientation and self-regulation in the college classroom. In *Advances in Motivation and Achievement* (Vol. 7). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press Inc.

Portes, P. R., Dunham, R. M., & Williams, S. (1986). Assessing child-rearing style in ecological settings: Its relation to culture, social class, early age intervention and scholastic achievement. *Adolescence*, 21(83), 723-735.

Raskin, A., Boothe, H., Natalie, R., Schulerbrandt, J., & Odle, D. (1971). Factor analyses of normal and depressed patients' memories of parental behavior. *Psychological Reports*, 29, 871-879.

Richards, L. O. (1970). *A new face for the church*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan.

Richards, L. O. (1975). *A theology of Christian education*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan.

Richards, P. S., & Bergin, A. E. (1997). *A spiritual strategy for counseling and psychotherapy*. American Psychological Press: Washington, DC.

Rizzuto, A. M. (1979). *The birth of the living God*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Robins, L. N. (1974). *Deviant children grown up: A sociological and psychiatric study of sociopathic personality*. New York: Robert E. Kreiger.

Rollins, B. C., & Thomas, D. L. (1979). Parental support, power, control, and control techniques in the socialization of children. In W. R. Burr, R. Hill, F. I. Nye, & I. L. Reiss (Eds.), *Contemporary theories about the family: Research-based theories* (Vol. 1, pp. 317-364). New York: Free Press.

Sauna, V. D. (1969). Religion, mental health, and personality: A review of empirical studies. *American Journal of Psychiatry*, *125*, 1203-1213.

Shackelford, J. F. (1978). *A comparison of psychological and theological concepts of dependency*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Biola College, La Mirada, CA.

Siegmann, A. W. (1961). An empirical investigation of the psychoanalytic theory of religious behavior. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, *1*, 74-78.

Smalley, G. (1984). *The key to your child's heart*. Waco, TX: Word Books.

Spear, K. (1994). *Conscious and pre-conscious God representations: An object relations perspective*. Paper presented at the 1994 Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association, Los Angeles, CA.

Spilka, B., Armatas, P., & Nussbaum, J. (1964). The concept of God: A factor analytic approach. *Review of Religious Research*, *6*, 28-36.

Spilka, B., Hood, R. W., & Gorsuch, R. L. (1985). *The psychology of religion: An empirical approach*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Strauss, R. L. (1984). *How to raise confident children*. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House.

- Strunk, O. (1959). Perceived relationships between parental and deity concepts. *Psychological Newsletter, 10*, 222-226.
- Sullivan, H. S. (1953). *The interpersonal theory of psychiatry*. New York: Norton.
- Summers, F. (1994). *Object relations theories and psychopathology*. Hillsdale: The Analytic Press.
- Tamayo, A., & Desjardins, L. (1976). Belief systems and conceptual images of God. *Journal of Psychology, 92*, 131-140.
- Thompson, B. (1984). *Canonical correlation analysis*. London: Sage Publications.
- Thompson, R. A., & Hoffman, M. L. (1980). Empathy and the development of guilt in children. *Developmental Psychology, 16*, 155-156.
- Vergote, A., & Tamayo, A. (1980). *The parental figures and the representations of God*. The Hague: Mouton.
- Westerhoff, J. H., & Neville, G. K. (1974). *Generation to generation*. Philadelphia: United Church Press.
- Wheeler, M. S. (1989). The nature of the relationship between the style of parenting and the religiosity and spiritual well-being of college students (Doctoral dissertation, Biola University, 1989). *Dissertation Abstracts International, 50*(8), 2528A.
- Winnicott, D. W. (1971). *Playing and reality*. London: Tavistock Publications.

Wootton, R. J. (1991). God-representation and its relation to object relations and defensive functioning (Doctoral dissertation, Boston University, 1991). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 51, 5600B.