THE UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA

GRADUATE COLLEGE

THE INFLUENCE OF FATHER-DAUGHTER RELATIONSHIP QUALITY ON CURRENT ROMANTIC RELATIONSHIP QUALITY IN WOMEN

A DISSERTATION

SUBMITTED TO THE GRADUATE FACULTY

in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the

Degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

By

RUBY CASIANO
Norman, OK
2010

THE INFLUENCE OF FATHER-DAUGHTER RELATIONSHIP QUALITY ON CURRENT ROMANTIC RELATIONSHIP QUALITY IN WOMEN

A DISSERTATION APPROVED FOR THE
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL PSYCHOLOGY

BY

_____
Dr. Melissa Frey, Chair

_____
Dr. Jody Newman

_____
Dr. Denise Beesley

_____
Dr. Laura Mayeux

_____
Dr. Kathleen Rager

Acknowledgements

As I come to an important milestone of a wonderful, challenging, and painful journey of personal and professional development, I have so much for which to be thankful. I started my Ph.D. program with many different expectations of who I was and who I would become. Along that path, I have found my life enriched and changed by many wonderful and important people. To my cohort – the five individuals with whom I began this challenge – thank you for being part of my life. While we may not still be the same group of people we were in our first year and our relationships have become less defined by the shared struggles of graduate school and more by where we find ourselves individually in life, you are all very important to me. Karen, Seleena, Star, Jack, and Andrea, thank you. The five of you have given me a wealth of memories to take with me.

My friends, the people that kept me appropriately distracted and from becoming overwhelmed by the graduate school experience, thank you. Amy, the nights of dinner and Project Runway or Top Chef helped kept me sane. You were a great mentor to me throughout the program. I'll miss our late night discussion/venting sessions. Thank you.

To my committee, you have watched me grow, stumble, dream, and discover over the last five years, and have offered guidance, encouragement, reality checks, and, above all, kindness. For that, I am eternally grateful. While the make-up of my committee has changed, everyone who has been involved in my time in the program has influenced who I am today. Thank you.

To Dr. Lisa Frey, you have been a compass for me throughout my journey toward my Ph.D. You have given me opportunities to challenge, educate, trust, and celebrate myself, and, for what I want to do in the future, your impact on my professional life will be invaluable. You allowed me to be myself, while at the same time continue to question my assumptions about myself, my therapeutic work, and my identity as a psychologist. I am grateful for your willingness to give of yourself, your time, and your knowledge to help me develop into the psychologist I am becoming. This day, with your guidance and support, has brought me closer to that goal.

To my parents, Anita and Rudy Casiano, this study is in many ways a tribute to your love for me and how that love and support has helped me accomplish all that I have. Mom, your courage and steadiness has taught me to never shy away from a challenge and I drew upon that more times than I can count throughout my education. Dad, your refusal to ever allow me to ever doubt my abilities and your willingness to always allow me to speak my heart and mind has given me the wherewithal to complete the most challenging goal I have set for myself to date. Because you are my parents I stand here today and say, "I have accomplished this." I can never express how thankful I am that I am your daughter.

And most importantly, to my husband, Dan – the person who stood by my side throughout this process and sacrificed the most for my dream – I love you and can never express how much you have enriched my life. You stood by me when I was at my worst and celebrated with me when I was at my best. I can never repay what you have given me with your support, love, understanding, and patience. Without you, this day

would have been lacking and it is because of you that I have a full life. I look forward to reaping the rewards of our work together. Ich liebe dich.

Table of Contents

Acknowledgments iv
List of Tables ix
Abstract x

Chapter Page

I. INTRODUCTION

Overview 1
Statement of the Problem 3

II. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Women's Identity Development 5
Relational theory and identity development 5
Relational images as influences on identity development and adult relationships 8
Measurement of Masculinity and Femininity 11
Influence of Father-Daughter Relationship on Relational Development 14
Gender Self-Confidence, the Father-Daughter Relationship, and Mutuality 20

III. METHODS

Participants 22
Instruments 23
Demographic questionnaire 23
Father-Daughter Relationship Inventory 23
Hoffman Gender Scale 25
Mutual Psychological Development Questionnaire 26
Procedure 27
Research Questions 28
Data Analysis 28

IV. RESULTS

Preliminary Analysis 30
Hierarchical Multiple Regression Model: Mutuality, Gender Self-Acceptance, and Father-Daughter Relationship 31

V. DISCUSSION

Limitations and Future Research 37

Appendix A: IRB Approval Letter 50
Appendix B: Instruments 54
Demographic Questionnaire 54
Father-Daughter Relationship Inventory 56
Hoffman Gender Scale (Form A) (Revised) 58
Mutual Psychological Development Questionnaire: Form A (Partner) 59
Appendix C: Prospectus 61

List of Tables

Table 1: *Reliability, Means, and Standard Deviations Table for Predictor and Criterion Variables*..... 40

Table 2: *Intercorrelations of Predictor and Criterion Variables*..... 41

Table 3: *Summary of Final Step of Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis for Variables Predicting Current Romantic Relationship Quality (MPDQ)* 42

Abstract

This study examined the influence of father-daughter relationship quality on mutuality within women's adult, heterosexual, romantic relationships. Four hundred and nine adult women took part in the study. Participants completed a demographic questionnaire, the Mutual Psychological Development Questionnaire, the Hoffman Gender Scale, and the Father-Daughter Relationship Inventory. A hierarchical regression analysis was conducted with three steps. The regression analysis revealed that the full model predicted significant variance in mutuality scores. More specifically, participant age, emotional responsiveness and communication within the father-daughter relationship, gender self-acceptance, and gender self-definition were found to be significant predictors of mutuality scores in the final step of the model.

Chapter One

Introduction

Overview

The father-daughter relationship is one that has experienced increased research interest in the last 30 years. The majority of this research has dealt with the developmental function of the father within the family structure (Ellis, McFadyen-Ketchum, Dodge, Pettit, & Bates, 1999; Forsman, 1989; Hardesty, Wenk, & Morgan, 1995; Harris & Morgan, 1991; Lamb & Lewis, 2004; Richards, Gitelson, Petersen, & Hutig, 1991). The specific structure of the father-daughter relationship and its influence on the daughter's adult life has been relatively ignored in the literature, however. In addition, the research that does exist for the father-daughter relationship has primarily been done on Caucasian, middle class, college undergraduate females (Way & Gillman, 2000). In response to the gap in research concerning the father's impact on a woman's adult development, this study investigates a community sample of women by examining the influence of how their relationship with their fathers influenced their adult intimate relationships.

Relational Cultural Theory offers a foundation for the premise of this study with its perception of women's development of self. Surrey (1991) proposes women's development and experience of self is primarily cultivated within relationships. Surrey's idea of "self-in-relation" (p. 51) echoes Jordan's (1991) assertion that women develop their self-image directly through the act of being in relationships with others. The quality of the relationship appears to shape a woman's development of self (Jordan, 2001).

> Women's sense of self becomes very much organized around being able to make and then maintain affiliations and relationships. Eventually, for many women the threat of disruption of connections is perceived not as just a loss of a relationship but as something closer to a total loss of self. (Miller, 1976, p. 83)

Relationships within an individual's life, specifically in women's lives, contribute to the development of the "felt sense of self" (Jordan, 1997, p. 15). The current study's focus is congruent with the assumptions of Relational Cultural Theory, reasoning that early, important relationships in a woman's life inform her relational patterns in her future relationships. The synthesis of the self via relational experience and intimate connection with others supports the argument that one's important primary relationships affect more than one's internal world, but one's relational world as well. Thus, it is expected that relationships with important people create templates in which future relationships are navigated. Based on these assumptions, the father-daughter relationship was expected to be instrumental in informing women of what to expect in future male-female relationships.

When exploring women's development, gender identity formation cannot be overlooked. The formation of not only the manner in which a woman navigates society's gender expectations, but also how these expectations are internalized and solidified are key to painting a full picture of how a woman develops over her lifetime. Gender identity formation has been the focus of a vast amount of research. The development of an individual's gender identity has moved from being viewed as a single unipolar concept, to a bipolar conceptualization with separate masculine and

feminine continuums (Bem, 1974; Spence, 1993), and more recently to a multifaceted structure that is formed from the interaction of internal and external influences (Hoffman, Borders & Hattie, 2000).

This study uses Hoffman, Borders, and Hattie's (2000) reconceptualization of gender identity, and more specifically gender self confidence (i.e., an individual's comfort with her gender identity), to examine how a woman's perception of the importance of her self-defined feminine identity contributes to the quality of her adult romantic relationships with men. Hoffman (2006b) introduces gender self-confidence as an alternative to using the traditional gender schema theory (Bem, 1974; Spence, 1993) that has dominated the research on defining gender. Traditional gender schema theory focuses on determining how closely an individual fits society's positive and negative gender stereotypes. In contrast, Hoffman et al. (2000) emphasize the instrumental role the concept of gender self-confidence has in the formation of an individual's gender identity and, in turn, gender self-concept. Thus, it offers an important pathway to tap individual perceptions of gender. By targeting a more in depth and individualized exploration of women's gender internalization, the effect of gender self-confidence in the prediction of adult romantic relationship quality was studied.

Statement of the Problem

The father-daughter relationship, while extremely important in the family dynamic (Miriam, 1982; Morgan, 1998; Morgan, Wilcoxon, & Satcher, 2003), remains shrouded in mystery. By continuing a line of research exploring this relationship, we may better understand the psychological needs of daughters and what benefits may arise from strengthening the father-daughter relationship in therapy. In this study, the focus

of interest is the influence that women's perceptions of the quality of their relationship with their fathers have on adult romantic relationship quality. Therefore, the goal of this study is to explore the influence the father-daughter relationship has on women's romantic relationships beyond what is explained by gender self confidence.

Chapter Two

Review of the Literature

Women's Identity Development

Relational theory and identity development. Women's development has historically been viewed as secondary to male developmental models, and more importantly women have often been viewed as defective versions of men when their development has been scrutinized (Gilligan, 2004; Jordan, 1992; Miller, 1976; Miller & Stiver, 1993). Traditional views of women's development adhere to the universally accepted idea that individuation and self-sufficiency are primary pathways of developing into adulthood. Jean Baker Miller countered this view in 1976 with her publication of *Toward a New Psychology of Women*. In her ground-breaking perspective on women's development, Miller called for a movement away from traditional views of women's growth based on male development and dominant societal perceptions of femininity. Miller asserted that "a more accurate understanding of women's psychology as it arises out of women's life experience rather than as it has been perceived by those who do not have that experience" (p. 48) must play a primary role in order to truly explore women's psychological development. Because there continues to be increased interest in directly investigating women's growth in a more authentic manner, Miller's perceptions continue to reverberate throughout the current literature.

With her call for a new perspective on women's development, Miller (1976) identified relationships as the major conduit of change in the development of the self. According to her theory of women's development, Miller identified relational

experience, the process of being in and remaining in relationship with others, as the dominant influence on the development of the self. The centrality of the relationship in the formation of the self offered by Miller is a reversal of established notions of individual development. Erikson (1968), while recognizing an individual's social stressors as contributory to psychological growth, largely described development as an internal struggle against external forces. Erikson stated it was not until early adulthood, in the Intimacy vs. Isolation stage, that an individual's important relationships begin to be influential and critical. By focusing on the role an individual's early relationships play in the formation of one's identity, Miller (1976) demanded the relational, once sequestered to the female sphere, be viewed not as external to the individual, but as a powerful mirror from which the identity is understood.

By acknowledging the relational process involved in identity formation as a major influence in an individual's development, the number and type of early, important relationships that come to bear on an individual's development create a vast and beautiful web of possibility. Miller's (1976) assertion of the development of self via relationships with others opens up an individual's development to include not only internal forces and external forces, but also the process between the two. Relationships, specifically important primary relationships, have impacts on the individual's view of the world, herself, and her role in relation to others, allowing the individual to be more than an isolated being merely bumping into others – she becomes a connected being able to internalize the reflection of herself through her relationships with others. In the time since Miller's request for a new psychological perspective on women's development, "a relational model of women's psychology has grown out of the

contributions of Miller, Gilligan, and others" (Miller & Stiver, 1993, p. 425) and impacted the way professionals view the relationship. Miller labeled this paradigm Relational Theory, which now is referred to as Relational Cultural Theory (RCT). . This theory continued to evolve out of the discussions of four women - Jean Baker Miller, Irene Stiver, Judith Jordan and Janet Surrey. In 1978, Jean Baker Miller formed this group and today they are the founding members of The Stone Center of Wellesley College, the birthplace of RCT. Today, RCT, which encompasses not only women's development but also human development (Jordan, 2008), has a growing body of literature and research that cements it as an innovative and vigorous theory (Jordan, 2008).

The RCT model that has emerged acknowledges the power that relationships have as the building material of women's development and thus demands an appreciation of what once was seen as a deficiency in women. The traditional view of an individual's struggle toward separation and away from dependence as a sign of healthy development has begun to be questioned. RCT focuses on the impossibility of growth in isolation and the reality that isolative relational behavior leads to psychological pain and maladjustment (Frey, Tobin, & Beesley, 2004; Frey, Beesley, & Miller, 2006). The notion of mutually empathic and impactful relationships as the gold standard of healthy maturity forces a reevaluation of what constitutes healthy development for both men and women. Miller and Stiver (1993) state, "The goal of psychological development is the increasing ability to participate in mutually empathic and mutually empowering relationships rather than increasing separation from others" (p. 426). This goal has become a major cornerstone in the relational model of

development and has been echoed by the majority of the model's major contributors (e.g., Jordan, 1991; Jordan, 1992; Jordan, 1997; Jordan, 2001; Gilligan, 2004; Miller, 1976; Miller & Stiver, 1993; Miller, 2002; Surrey, 1991).

Relational images as influences on identity development and adult relationships. Internalizing repeated experiences, damaging or growth fostering, results in the internalization of the meaning of relationships and what an individual's role is within interpersonal relationships. Miller (2002) defined such *relational images* as "the inner constructions we each create out of our experience in relationships" (p. 1). She further explained that these relational images are formed early and they are malleable, changing in response to the experiences encountered throughout life. They serve as models from which individuals predict what will occur in specific situations. They predict what will happen as well as influence the meaning taken from relational interactions.

Within the relational model, the *relational paradox* is the crux to understanding the damage repetitive, destructive relationships can have on an individual's life. Walker (2004) defined the relational paradox as involving "strategies of disconnection" (p. 13) that are defensive movements away from relationships. The key to this paradox is that these tactics "often retain an appearance of connection while lacking its substance" (p.13). The paradox exists because individuals caught in this relational dance simultaneously yearn for and dread connection. Their defensive position in relationships is learned behavior resulting from repeated and unresolved disconnections in primary, important past relationships (Walker, 2004).

The concept of relational images takes a step closer to explaining repetitive relational behavior that is destructive and perpetuates a dysfunctional relationship by illustrating how early, influential relationships create patterns by which people navigate future relationships. By recognizing that relational images include not only an individual's representation of what to expect from others, but also determine how one perceives oneself in relation to others, RCT offers a powerful explanation of how relationships shape an individual. The combination of both internal and external components reflects how the relational images that are constructed in an individual's primary relationships become powerful forces in an individual's life.

Much of the research and deliberation in relational models has focused on women's relationships with their mothers (Chodorow, 1978; Chodorow, 2004; Stiver, 1991). Stiver (1991) stated,

> One of the most common observations in the process of psychotherapy is that while men may express the wish to be like their fathers, women more often express the wish to be the opposite of their mothers. Paradoxically, it is also evident that strong bonds are often established between mothers and daughters, bonds which continue throughout life. I believe these observations can be examined more fruitfully by exploring the specific features in women's progression from more limited to more complex interrelationships in the family. (p. 109)

Chodorow (2004) went beyond the commonly accepted role the mother has with the pre-social child by asserting mothers play a global role in the gender construction of their daughters. While the mother-daughter relationship literature sheds light on a

frequently misunderstood family dynamic, the primary focus on this relationship appears very much a reaction to the psychoanalytic concepts of the Oedipal Complex and Penis Envy (Benjamin, 1991; Chodorow, 2005). The established perception of the father as the facilitator of separation and individuation within the family dynamic as well as the possessor of power has been challenged within feminist critique. Specifically, feminist psychoanalytic and relational schools of thought have focused primarily on the powerful role of the mother as a challenge to this patriarchal and oppressive conceptualization, perhaps to the detriment of research into the father-daughter dyad (Benjamin, 1991; Chodorow, 2004; Kieffer, 2004). Thus, the role a woman's relationship with her mother has on her relational behaviors has been well established (Chodorow, 2004; Gilligan and Rogers, 1993; Jordan, 1993; Surrey, 1993). However, it is apparent that there is a gap in the literature regarding the role of the father in relational development.

Miller (2002) contended that relational images are aspects of normal development and that the manner in which the relational images are fashioned dictates their effect on relational behavior. She indicated that when relational images are relatively elastic, individuals have the capacity to modify them with new relational experiences. However, if relational images become rigid as a result of being constructed from extremely negative and hurtful relational experiences, they will be much more resistant to change (Miller, 2002). Following Miller's logic, the relational image that is created by an individual's repeated relational experience creates a template by which future relationships will be navigated. The power that relational images based in past experience have on current and future connection offers the possibility of an

influential relationship between women's relationships with their fathers and the quality of their romantic relationships with heterosexual partners.

Measurement of Masculinity and Femininity

The constructs of femininity and masculinity have preoccupied many scholars in the field of psychology. Currently there is a reexamination of how to thoroughly define and measure these constructs. Initially femininity and masculinity were defined as opposite poles of a single construct. Constantinople's (1973) writing on how accurately one can attempt to measure femininity and masculinity reflected the debate at the time. She explained the increasing push to view gender as a more multifaceted concept of human behavior as opposed to the traditional one-dimensional concept that had been accepted as fact up until the 1970s. She stated:

> The most generalized definitions of the terms as they are used by those developing tests of M-F [masculinity-femininity] would seem to be that they are relatively enduring traits which are more or less rooted in anatomy, physiology, and early experiences, and which generally serve to distinguish males from females in appearance, attitudes, and behavior. (Constantinople, 1973, p. 390)

In Hoffman's (2001) analysis of gender measurement in the years following 1975, she observed that "…the majority of masculinity and femininity measures define these terms only stereotypically thereby negating or disallowing personal interpretations of what it means to be male or female" (p. 472). Hoffman identified Constantinople (1973) as one of the first major researchers to question the assumptions made when attempting to measure gender. The assumptions Constantinople identified as flawed

included gender differences being defined by sex differences in survey questions, gender being represented as a one-dimensional construct ranging from extreme masculine to extreme feminine identification, and gender identity being represented in a single score (Constantinople, 1973; Hoffman, 2001). Hoffman described Constantinople as ahead of her time in her willingness to voice reservations regarding the direction the study of gender was taking at the time. Hoffman went further in her critique of gender analysis to state that "there should be allowances made for personal interpretations of what it means to be female or male, and not assume that the so-called stereotypical or traditional woman and man provide templates for everyone's concept of femininity and masculinity" (p.475).

In her development of the Hoffman Gender Scale (HGS), Hoffman outlined a novel way of measuring and perceiving gender. She introduced gender self-concept as a global construct that incorporated gender identity. She defined gender self-concept as:

> …one's perception of self as a man or a woman. It is broader than gender identity in that one perceives oneself as male or female whether or not one has a secure sense or conviction of one's maleness or femaleness. Gender self-concept reflects that which is personally relevant to the individual about being male or female. One's gender self-concept may or may not include a strong gender identity. In turn, one's gender identity may or may not include much gender self-confidence. (Hoffman, Borders, & Hattie, 2000, p.482)

With this departure from traditional gender definitions, Hoffman offered a new manner in which to examine gender.

Hoffman et al. (2000) expanded on their theory of gender self-concept by dividing it into two aspects. They theorized that one's gender self-concept is comprised of gender self-confidence and gender identity. Gender self-confidence was defined as "the intensity of one's belief that she/he meets her/his personal standards for femininity/masculinity" (Hoffman, 2001, p. 481). Gender identity was defined as the "individual's awareness of the satisfaction with being a male or female (Pleck, 1984, p.220)" (as cited in Hoffman, 2001, p. 481). This multi-layered description of gender reflected the multifaceted nature of the movement away from solely socially constructed ideas of gender. Hoffman et al. (2001) found a workable balance between the socially manufactured elements of gender in society and the subjective experience of internalizing those messages.

In their factor analysis of the HGS (Hoffman, et al., 2000), additional factors were revealed. While the overall score of the HGS was found to be a measure of gender self-confidence, two components were found: *gender self-definition* and *gender self-acceptance* (Hoffman et al., 2000; Hoffman, 2006a). Hoffman (2006a) defined gender self-definition as "how strong[ly] a component of one's identity one considers one's self-defined femininity or masculinity to be" (p. 360). For example, individuals with firm gender self-definitions place a large value on their maleness or femaleness and use it as a focal point of their identity. Gender self-acceptance "refers to how comfortable an individual is as a member of his or her gender" (Hoffman, 2006a, p. 360). This

aspect of gender self-confidence reflects how well individuals feel they fit into society's expectations of what a woman or man should be.

The HGS focuses on the most important aspect of gender self-concept, the meaning of gender to the individual (Hoffman, 2006a). Hoffman contends that to thoroughly look at gender self-concept, one must not only look at the gender identity that an individual develops, but the confidence the individual has with the internalized gender and the interaction with the expectations of society (Hoffman et al., 2000). The combination of internal and external factors involved in gender self-confidence reflects the genuine navigation that must be done to be gendered. In Hoffman's definition of gender self-confidence, gender self-acceptance and gender self-definition intersect to describe the internal and external factors that contribute to one's confidence in one's gender identity. Gender self-acceptance addresses external influences: how one's internal gender concept fits with an individual's perception of what or how a gendered person should be. Gender self-definition offers the internal: an idiosyncratic development of a gendered identity (Hoffman et al., 2000).

Influence of Father-Daughter Relationship on Relational Development

Much of the literature on the father-daughter dyad originated from developmental research examining the role of the father in the development of children from birth to adolescence. Much of the early research studied the father's role in the family via reports from the mother (Phares, 1992). Harris and Morgan (1991) and Lamb and Lewis (2004) explored in behavioral terms what fathering looked like from the mother's perspective. Harris and Morgan found evidence supporting the idea that fathers interacted more with their sons; however, if a daughter was in a sibling group

that included brothers, she was likely to indirectly benefit from more interaction. Harris and Morgan asserted, "We believe that the presence of sons draws the father into more active parenting, and this greater involvement benefits daughters, who in turn receive more (but unequal) attention from their father" (p. 540). These studies focused on the father's behavior toward children during childhood. The perspective of analysis of the father-child relationship was that of the observer; however, the perspective of the father or child was not taken into account.

Feminist literature offered much of the dialogue serving as the catalyst that moved research on fatherhood into the area of the father-daughter and father-son dyads. Dalton (1986) and Phares (1992) cited mother-blaming as the reason for the lack of research on the father's influence on the development of children, specifically daughters. Dalton (1986) asserted feminist research must reconsider the father-daughter relationship in two ways: (a) "shift to the father some of the mother-blaming that permeates psychoanalytic theory" (p. 207), and (b) reconceptulize roles within family life typically ascribed to men, as well as the messages of these roles that affect the daughter's self-concept. In her retrospective exploration of "the emotionally absent father" (p. 210), Dalton presented three case studies of women she worked with in her practice. Dalton stated in her analysis that the father imparts to his daughter what being female means through example, by how he treats her and the women around her.

Phares (1992) attributed the literature's tendency to mother-blame as "a sexist bias toward studying mothers' contributions to child and adolescent maladjustment and at the same time ignoring similar contributions by the father" (p. 656). She addressed the lack of research on the effect the father's interaction had on children and

adolescents. She explored four methodological factors that contributed to this lack of attention in the research literature: biases in participant recruitment (i.e. recruitment of female family members only), not controlling for rates of parental psychopathology, research based on sexist theories, and assumptions based on outdated norms. These four factors outline possible reasons mothers have been the focus of blame in regard to child development, particularly relational development, in past research.

While the father has been absent from blame, he has also been absent from being part of the developmental picture of children, particularly daughters. Feminist critiques of the literature (e.g., Chodorow, 2004; Dalton, 1986; Gilligan & Rogers, 1993; Miller, 1976; Morgan, 1998; Phares, 1992) exposed some concerning trends in the perpetuation of the traditional distant, uninvolved role of the father. Both Dalton and Phares alluded to the notion that this portrayal of the father's influence in the family structure is unrealistic.

In reviews of research and case studies, Johnson (1982) and Sharpe (1994) stated that the father plays more than a peripheral role in his daughter's psychosocial development. Johnson (1982) explained the existing body of research of the late 1960s and 1970s focused on the father's role in the daughter's formation of her femininity. Although Johnson's somewhat dated definitions of femininity reflect the time in which she was writing the concept of the father's role as a masculine influence in the development of a woman's sense of femininity is an interesting one. Specifically, the realm of femininity has always been the mother's domain; the mother has been seen as the figure from which a girl's femininity was formed (Johnson, 1982). Introducing the possibility that the father plays a role in his daughter's development of her sense of

herself as a woman was counterintuitive. The father as an influence on femininity implied that the development of a woman's femininity had two pathways, one from interaction with the feminine (i.e., the mother-daughter relationship), and one from interaction with the masculine (i.e., the father-daughter relationship) (Johnson, 1982).

In her book, *Fathers and Daughters*, Sharpe (2004) acknowledged the "otherness" (i.e., the masculine influence of the father; p. 2) of the father-daughter relationship in comparison to the mother-daughter relationship. She cited this otherness as "one of the several factors which further complicate the father-daughter relationship" (p. 2). With her father, a woman experiences learning about herself from one who is not like herself for the first time; she sees herself through the relation to the other, in a relationship with a man. She concluded that the available research supported the assertion that the father-daughter relationship has "significant and far-reaching effects" (p. 3). Sharpe asserted that, in the adult life of the daughter, the father can create a template that the daughter may be drawn to or repelled from in her adult romantic relationships. This template that affects the daughter in the future reiterates the assumptions of RCT (i.e., the concept of relational images) and further solidifies the goals of this study.

Lamb and Lewis (2004) stated, "Men's interactions with their children need to be understood within a network of family relationships" (p. 272). They further theorized that accord within the marital relationship was a key predictor of father-child relationships. While they agreed with much of the research indicating that fathers interact more with their sons, they added that some literature suggested this tendency disappears beyond infancy. In their literature review, Lamb and Lewis found research

that indicated fathers had a tendency to distance themselves from both their sons and daughters after the first 30 months. They cited evidence in the developmental literature suggesting that fathers are more traditional in their play with their children, tending to encourage gendered play and to be more goal oriented and physical in their play (Lamb & Lewis, 2004). These finding are further supported in Bergman's (1995) analysis of men's development through a relational lens (Bergman, 1995). That is, as children move into adolescence, differences surface in sons' and daughters' views of the father but not the mother. Lamb and Lewis theorized that this differentiation might be due to the adolescents' highly gendered perspective of their parents.

Hardesty et al. (1995) challenged the assumption that the quantity of a father's participation is instrumental to the father's influence on a child's development. They suggested a greater focus on the effects of the presence of a father and the nature of his interaction as opposed to the extent of involvement. In their study of the father's involvement with his children and his influence on the development of gender expectations, they found effects were greater for sons. However, they also found that a continuous relationship with the father beyond childhood and into adolescence was more significant than the quantity of a father's involvement.

Richards et al. (1991) found that cross-sex parent characteristics influenced the self-esteem of the child. As was expected, a girl's level of self-esteem seemed to be significantly enhanced by positive interactions with her father. They were surprised to find, however, that there was a weak relationship between mothering and a girl's ego development. This finding fits with earlier research on a father's role in a child's self-esteem acquisition. For instance, Forsman (1989) found not only a strong relationship

between paternal regard and a daughter's self-esteem, but also ambivalence in women in their perspective of their mothers. He interpreted this finding as suggesting there may be a developmental aspect to a woman's perceptions of her parents. Because the population studied was an undergraduate population, Forsman offered the possibility that this perception may change as a woman ages.

Ellis et al. (1999) explored the evolutionary model and its ability to explain the father's role in his daughter's sexual maturation:

> Girls whose early family experiences are characterized by discordant male-female relationships and relatively low paternal investment perceive that male parental investment is not crucial to reproduction; these girls are hypothesized to develop in a manner that accelerates onset of sexual activity and reproduction, reduces reticence in forming sexual relationships, and orients the individual toward relatively unstable pair-bonds. (p. 388)

In their study of 173 girls, they found that the quality of the father's contribution to the family correlated with a girl's onset of puberty (i.e., increased contribution correlated with the later onset of puberty). Specifically, the quality of the father's investment was the most important family ingredient relevant to the timing of a girl's entrance into puberty.

In literature exploring the role of the family in girls suffering from eating disorders, the role of the father in the family constellation has been well documented (Botta & Dumlao, 2002; Jones, Leung, & Harris, 2006). Along with the previously described studies, this research offers powerful support for the impact that the father has

on the daughter's gender identity and the importance of paternal involvement. The research of the father's influence on the development of disordered eating, although focused on the pathology of the daughter's illness, offered support for the idea that fathers influence their daughters beyond childhood development. Morgan (1998) argued that this exploration should be expanded beyond a focus on disordered eating to a focus on how the father-daughter relationship influences a woman's overall psychological and relational well-being, as will be explored in this study.

Scheffler and Naus (1999) found evidence that a father's affirmation predicted a woman's comfort or discomfort with her sexual experiences. While they expected to find similar support for the relationship between fatherly affirmation and self-esteem and fear of intimacy, these relationships were only partially supported; they found fatherly affirmation to predict self-esteem, but not fear of intimacy. Scheffler and Naus (1999) suggested their findings supported the continued focus on this important familial relationship and indicated a need for new instruments to directly investigate the influences of the father on the development of the daughter. In particular, Scheffler and Naus noted their study did not include a relationship quality measure and centered on a daughter's perceptions of her parent's relationship. Morgan (1998, 2003) emphasized the need for instruments measuring the daughter's perception of relational quality.

Gender Self-Confidence, the Father-Daughter Relationship, and Mutuality

These two elements, the father-daughter relationship and gender self-confidence, offer glimpses into some important relational aspects of women's lives. Alone, they influence the quality of life and individual well-being. Taken together and explored concurrently, a more intricate and meaningful picture can be taken of how the father-

daughter relationship impacts a woman's relationships with herself and heterosexual romantic partners. Examining not only external relationships but also a woman's gender self-confidence in the face of societal expectations will allow for a richer picture of the impact of the father-daughter relationship on women's adult romantic relationships.

This research aims to not only add to the scarce literature concerning fathers and daughters but also add to the research on Relational Cultural Theory. Exploring the influence of the father-daughter relationship and its influence on a woman's adult romantic relationships will help clarify the concept of relational images and the power they have in individual's lives.

The current study examines the father-daughter relationship by exploring its influence on the quality of women's adult heterosexual romantic relationships. It was expected that there would be a predictive relationship between the quality of the father-daughter relationship and current relationship quality, beyond the effects of gender self confidence.

Chapter Three

Methods

Participants

This study obtained a community sample to allow for a representative group across the domains of age, race/ethnicity, and education level. Women who have been in a romantic, heterosexual relationship were recruited to participate in the online study. The participants were solicited via email solicitations sent directly from the researcher or indirectly from other participants. Participants were also solicited from online social networking sites and online message boards.

Initially, 409 women took the online survey and the mean age of participants was 35.52 years (*SD* = 10.47). The sample was made up of largely Caucasian participants (83.9%; *n* = 343), followed by participants who identified themselves as biracial/multiracial (4.6%; *n* = 19). The remaining sample identified their racial identity as follows: African American (3.2%; *n* = 13), Hispanic or Latina (3.2%; *n* = 13), Native American/American Indian (2.2%; *n* = 9), Asian American (1.7%; *n* = 7), 1.2% (; *n* = 5) endorsed "other." All participants self-identified their racial/ethnic group.

Educationally speaking, the participants appeared well educated. The majority had completed at least a master's degree (35.2%; *n* = 144), followed by a bachelor's degree (33.3%; *n* = 136). Approximately eighteen percent (*n* = 75) of participants had completed some college, and 1. 7% (*n* = 7) of the sample included individuals who had a high school degree or less. A small percentage of the sample was made up of participants who held doctoral or professional degrees (11.5%; *n* = 47). All participants indicated their level of education.

The socio-economic breakdown of the sample revealed that the majority of the study's participants made less than $25,000 (23.6%; *n* = 95). The next most frequently endorsed levels were $25,000 to $35,000 and over $85,000 (16.9%; *n* = 68, and 15.4%; *n* = 62, respectively). The remaining sample included 14.1% (*n* = 57) making $36,000 to $45,000, 9.7% (*n* = 39) making $46,000 to $55,000, 8.9% (*n* = 36) making $56,000 to $65,000, 7.4% (*n* = 30) making $66,000 to $75, 000, and 4% (*n* = 16) making between $76,000 and $85,000 per year. Approximately, 1.5% (*n* = 6) of participants did not indicate their yearly income.

Instruments

Four instruments were administered in this study (Appendix B). Participants completed a demographic questionnaire for the purposes of this study. The instruments administered included the Psychological Developmental Questionnaire (MPDQ; Genero, Miller, & Surrey, 1992), the Hoffman Gender Scale (HGS; Hoffman et al., 2000), and the Father-Daughter Relationship Inventory (FDRI; Morgan, Wilcoxon, & Satcher, 2003).

Demographic Questionnaire. The demographic information sheet consisted of 15 questions concerning the participants' background, including questions inquiring about a participant's racial/ethnic background, sexual orientation, etc.

The Father – Daughter Relationship Inventory (FDRI). The Father-Daughter Relationship Inventory (FDRI; Morgan, Wilcoxon, & Satcher, 2003) is a 17 item self-report scale used to measure perceived relationship quality of the father-daughter relationship. Each item is measured on a four-point Likert-type scale (1 = Almost Always False to 4 = Almost Always True). Factor analysis of the FDRI has

demonstrated a 3-factor structure: Emotional Responsiveness and Communication (ERC; 10 items, score range = 10 – 40), which measures the quality of the emotional involvement and communication within the father-daughter relationship; Validation and Competence (VC; 4 items, score range = 4 – 16), which measures a daughters perception of her feelings of validation and competence within her relationship with her father; and Intimacy and Conventionality (IC; 3 items, score range = 3 – 12), which measures a daughter perception of her sexuality as a daughter and intimacy within the father-daughter relationship (Morgan, Wilcoxon, & Satcher, 2003). Examples of questions from each subscale are as follows:

ERC: "My father provided emotional support for me."

"My father worked hard at understanding my feelings."

VC: "My father believed I was a capable and competent person."

"My father respected women who exercised independent judgment."

IC: "My father had very traditional attitudes about appropriate behavior for men and women." (Reversed scored)

"I understood my father's expectation about my sexual behavior."

According to Morgan et al. (2003) this instrument is a first step in developing a measure that can tap the complex and indistinct quality of the father-daughter relationship. The authors' preliminary validation of the FDRI suggested that it is a valid measure of the current constructs thought to be most influential in women's development. For the purposes of this study, the subscale scores were used to fully explore different facets of the father-daughter relationship quality in relation to the criterion.

The current study found similar reliability statistics for the overall scale and subscales as Morgan et al. (2003) found in their validation study. For the overall scale, the Cronbach's alpha was .93. At the subscale level, ERC had a Cronbach's alpha of .94, VC an alpha of .79, and IC an alpha of .10. In view of the small number of items comprising the IC subscale, interitem correlations were also examined in order to assess reliability, but were found to be unacceptably low. Due to the very low reliability score of the IC subscale, it was not used in this study. This study utilized the instrument's remaining subscales, (a) Emotional Responsiveness and Communication and (b) Validation and Competence, in the regression model.

Hoffman Gender Scale (HGS: Form A). The Hoffman Gender Scale (HGS) (Hoffman et al., 2000) measures gender self-confidence. The HGS has two versions, one for women and one for men; this study used the version for women. The women's form consists of 14 Likert-type items that range from 1 (strongly disagree) to 6 (strongly agree). To score the instrument, the total scores were calculated for the two instrument subscales, Gender Self-Definition (HGS-SD; 7 items) and Gender Self Acceptance (HGS-SA; 7 items). The total scores of each subscale range from 7 to 84, with higher scores suggesting higher levels of the particular construct. Scores on Gender Self-Definition reveal how solidly a woman's self-defined femininity (femaleness) defines her overall identity (Hoffman et al., 2000). Gender Self-Acceptance measures how comfortable a woman is with her internalized, idiosyncratic idea of femaleness. Sample HGS items include, "My perception of myself is positively associated with my biological sex" (HGS-SD) and "My sense of myself as a female is

positive" (HGS-SA). For the purposes of this study, both subscale scores were utilized, thus measuring each individual's gender self-definition and self-acceptance.

Hoffman et al. (2000) reported a Cronbach's alpha of .94 for the HGS total score in a sample of 273 undergraduate women. In their use of the scale, Dillon, Worthington, Soth-McNett, and Schwartz (2008) obtained Cronbach's alphas of .83 for women on the Gender Self-Definition subscale and .86 for women on the Gender Self-Acceptance subscale. The current study revealed Cronbach's alphas of .91 for the overall scale and .90 and .91 for Gender Self-Definition and Gender Self-Acceptance, respectively.

The Mutual Psychological Developmental Questionnaire (MPDQ: Form A). Genero, Miller, Surrey, and Baldwin (1992) developed the MPDQ, a 27-item self-report scale that measures relational quality, including perceived mutuality in intimate relationships, by exploring an individual's rating of both their own relational actions and the perceived actions of their partner in the relationship. The instrument has been described as a distinctive measure because it is based on a psychological model of mutual connection with others and captures the complex make-up of relationships (Genero et al., 1992). This questionnaire contains both a friend and romantic partner version. The romantic partner version, form A, was used in this study.

The first half of the MPDQ contains 11 items tapping the perceptions of participants' own behavior in the relationship, each item beginning with the stem, "When we talk about things that matter to my spouse/partner, I am likely to…." Item responses are then used to explore different relationship qualities, such as, "…try to understand" and "…have difficulty listening" (reverse score item). In the second half of the instrument, participants are asked to rate their spouse/partner on 11 items based on

their perception of their spouse/partner's presence within the relationship. The item stem is, "When we talk about things that matter to me, my spouse/partner is likely to…." Examples of the response items include "…pick up on my feelings" and "…respect my point of view." For the current study, items were rated on a 6-point Likert-type scale from "1= Never" to "6 = All the time" (range = 22-132), with scores obtained by summing all items endorsed. Higher scores indicate greater levels of perceived relational quality and mutuality in one's romantic relationship.

Genero et al. (1992) found Cronbach's alphas ranging from .86 to .93 in their MPDQ validation study that included a sample of men and women aged 18 to 58. This study found the MPDQ to have a Cronbach's alpha of .92.

Procedure

Prospective participants received either a recruitment email or a post on a social networking site in which they were informed of the purpose and nature of the study and the identity of the author. They were provided a link that led directly to an online survey. The research center at the university ran and monitored the online survey. The survey data was housed on their server and was deleted at the conclusion of the study. Once participants arrived at the online survey, they were presented with an informed consent document, approved by the IRB-NC, which again informed them of the purpose and nature of the study and informed them of the voluntary nature of their participation. They were able to end participation at any time during the survey process. After the consent document, participants were presented with the instruments. First, the demographic questionnaire was presented, followed by the Mutual Psychological Development Questionnaire (MPDQ), the Hoffman Gender Scale (HGS), and finally

the Father-Daughter Relationship Inventory (FDRI). Upon completion of the survey, participants were thanked for their participation and informed how to contact the researcher if they had any questions regarding their participation. Of note is that the survey software used to post the survey packet online did not allow for the counterbalancing of instruments, therefore instrument order was carefully considered in order to limit possible order effects.

Research Questions

This study investigated the following research questions: (a) Do gender self-definition and gender self-acceptance (i.e., HGS-SD, HGS-SA) and the perceived quality of a woman's relationship with her father (i.e., FDRI-ERC, FDRI-VC) influence a woman's perceived relationship quality in adult heterosexual romantic relationships (i.e., MPDQ scores)? and (b) Is there an influence of the father-daughter relationship quality (i.e., FDRI-ERC, FDRI-VC) on current romantic heterosexual relationships beyond what is accounted for by the gender self-confidence subscales (i.e., HGS-SD, HGS-SA)?

Data Analysis

Hoyt, Imel, and Chan (2008) outlined the controversies associated with the use of multiple regression models and concluded there is a need to "expect effect sizes [to] be relatively small and will be detected reliably only with relatively large samples" (p. 332). Hoyt et al. (2008) proposed that a minimum of 150 to 200 participants are necessary to reliably expose significant effects in psychological research. The sample size for the regression analyses more than met this goal, suggesting there was adequate power to detect effects.

A hierarchical regression model was used to examine the relationship of predictor variables to the criterion variable, MPDQ scores. The model included eight predictor variables: age, education level, and years with partner were entered simultaneously in the first step; the HGS subscales (SD and SA) were entered in the second step; and the two subscales of the FDRI (ERC and VC) were entered as a block in the final step. Age, education level, and years together with partner were entered first to partial out their effects before accounting for the variance explained by the predictor variables of interest. Next, the HGS subscales, gender self-definition and gender self-acceptance, were entered to study the contribution of the components of gender self-confidence to current romantic relationship quality. Finally, the two subscales of the FDRI (ERC and VC) were entered at the last step to account for any variance explained by these variables beyond the effects explained by the previously entered variables.

Chapter Four

Results

Preliminary Analysis

Various preliminary analyses were conducted on the data. Of the initial 409 participants, 55 were excluded from the multiple regression analysis due to missing data. The preliminary examination of the data confirmed that all assumptions of the analyses were met except. For all predictor variables within the regression model, multivariate normality was revealed to be upheld based on the p-p plot and scatterplot of the model's standardized residual values. The p-p plot revealed the model's standardized residual values to be linear as expected and the scatterplot revealed a rectangular scatter of residual values.

The means and standard deviations of all variables included in the overall model are given in Table 1. Initial exploration of the data indicated that certain of the demographic variables correlated significantly with the criterion variable, MPDQ scores (see Table 2). Demographic variables that showed significant correlation with MPDQ scores included age of participant, education level of participant, and the number of years participants were in relationship with their partners. Age of participant showed a significant but small correlation with MPDQ (r = -.16, $p < .01$), with a trend toward older participants showing decreased levels of mutuality in their adult romantic relationships. Education level showed a small, significant correlation with MPDQ scores (r = .19, $p < .01$), indicating that the higher a participant's level of education, the higher was the relationship mutuality. The final demographic variable that showed a small, significant correlation with MPDQ scores was the number of years participants

were in relationship with their partners (r = -.14, p < .01). This trend suggests a tendency for relationships that have lasted longer to show decreased levels of mutuality. Based on the correlations, these three variables were entered into the first step of the hierarchical regression analysis to control for their influence on the criterion variable.

The correlations among the instruments that were administered indicated that higher levels of the criterion variable, romantic relationship mutuality (i.e., MPDQ scores), were associated with higher levels of gender self-acceptance (i.e., HGS-SA), as well as higher levels of emotional responsiveness and communication (i.e., FDRI-ERC), and validation and competence (i.e., FDRI-VC) in the father daughter relationship. Although the predictor variables were significantly correlated with each other, the intercorrelations were small to moderate. It was determined that the intercorrelations between the predictors were not unusually high, and thus multicollinearity did not present an obstacle to model interpretation.

Hierarchical Multiple Regression Model: Mutuality, Gender Self-Acceptance, and Father-Daughter Relationship

As illustrated in Table 3, the variance in the criterion variable explained by the full model was .19 ($F(7, 350) = 11.75$, $p < .01$), which is considered a medium effect size (Cohen, 1988). In the first step of the model, age, education level, and time together in a romantic relationship accounted for significant variance, $R^2 = .06$, $p < .01$. Gender self-definition and gender self-acceptance were entered simultaneously in the second step and accounted for significant variance, $\Delta R^2 = .07$, $\Delta F(2, 352) = 13.90$, $p < .01$. In the final step, emotional responsiveness and communication and validation and competence accounted for significant variance, $\Delta R^2 = .06$, $\Delta F(2, 350) = 12.66$, $p < .01$.

To get a better account of how individual predictors affected MPDQ scores, the final step was examined. The final step of the model showed that education level, gender self-definition, gender self-acceptance, and emotional responsiveness and communication were significant predictors of romantic relationship mutuality. The Beta weights provide an indication of the relative importance of the individual predictors, with FDRI-ERC (β = .26, p < .01), HGS-SA (β = .24, p < .01), and Education (β = .18, p < .01) showing the greatest individual contributions to the model. HGS-SD (β = -.11, p < .05) was the weakest predictor, although significant.

Chapter Five

Discussion

The study explored how women's father-daughter relationship quality affects women's adult, heterosexual romantic relationship mutuality while controlling for the effects of gender self-confidence and significant demographic variables. As made evident by a thorough review of the literature, no study to date has explored these variables in relation to one another. The sample used in the current study was comprised of women of various ages and was collected from an online community. Overall, the results of the current study support all research questions posed.

The current study first explored whether gender self-confidence and the perceived quality of a woman's relationship with her father significantly influence a woman's perceived relationship mutuality in her current adult, heterosexual romantic relationships. The results of the hierarchical regression analysis indicated that both gender self-confidence and the father-daughter relationship significantly impact the perceived relationship quality of current romantic relationship, with the significance attributable to gender self-definition, gender self-acceptance, and the emotional responsiveness and communication in the father-daughter relationship. The model showed that the more positive a woman's perception of her father's emotional responsiveness and communication within their relationship, the more likely it was that she perceived her current romantic relationship mutuality to be high. The results also revealed that gender self-acceptance had a significant, positive relationship with woman's current romantic relationship quality. These findings reemphasized the views found in Morgan (1998) and Morgan et al. (2003), that the quality of the father-daughter

relationship impacts the life of a woman beyond the childhood and adolescent developmental years. The results specifically support the view that early interpersonal relationships, including those with fathers, function as the conduit by which women, and more specifically girls, develop an identity of self, emotional bonding and attachment (Morgan, 1998). This study's substantiation of the importance of the father-daughter relationship in women's heterosexual, romantic, relational development further solidifies Morgan et al.'s (2003) conclusion that the father-daughter relationship impacts a woman's relational development in ways that are just beginning to be investigated.

The second hypothesis, which predicted the influence of the father-daughter relationship on current romantic relationship quality beyond that accounted for by gender self-confidence, was partially supported. Emotional responsiveness and communication within the father-daughter relationship was found to have a significant positive relationship with current romantic relationship quality and, more to the point, emotional responsiveness and communication quality was a significant positive influence when the impact of gender self-acceptance and gender self-definition were controlled for. This suggests that the impact of the father-daughter relationship has more bearing on the development of women than previously emphasized in the literature. Morgan (1998) found support in the literature that the father's impact on his daughter was primarily tied to her psychosexual development. The results of this study, while supporting the overall importance of the impact of the father-daughter relationship, more specifically suggests that the emotional receptiveness and openness of a father in relation to his daughter are influential in a woman's development. While still in accordance with Morgan's original premise, these findings open a new avenue

related to how the father is important in a daughter's life. Emotional impact has previously been examined in the literature as a mother's contribution (Lamb & Lewis, 2004); the current study's results suggest that this may be too narrow of a view.

These results offer a new perspective on some common questions surrounding the father-daughter relationship and women's development in general. For example, Wallerstein, Lewis and Blakeslee (2000) conducted a 25 year study in which they followed the lives of 131 children of divorce. In their analysis of not only what was discussed by these children, but also in the researchers' examination of the childrens' lives, there was revealed a resiliency, specifically with girls. A small but unique group of girls within the study's sample grew up to have stable, positive marriages in spite of experiencing the disintegration of their parent's marriage. Through interviews with this subset of girls, Wallerstein et al. discovered that girls who had positive relationships with their fathers, even from afar, were able to engage in adult heterosexual relationships that fulfilled their emotional needs. In other words, the daughter's relationship with her father seemed to shape how she viewed herself and what she expected in her adult relationships with men. The importance of the father-daughter relationship to women's development indicated by the results of the current study offer more insight into Wallerstein et al.'s findings. The positive emotional responsiveness and communication quality within the father-daughter relationship may have offered a resilience factor that compensated for a family situation that could have negatively impacted future romantic relationships.

The lack of significant variance attributable to the construct of validation and competence within the father-daughter relationship further supports this assessment.

Though the daughter might feel validated and competent within her relationship with her father, this does not appear to be the salient factor contributing to mutuality in adult relationships. Instead, the significance of the relational element of the father-daughter relationship, emotional responsiveness and communication, emerges to help form relational images of bidirectional mutuality that impacts adult life.

The inverse relationship gender self-definition had with women's adult romantic relationship mutuality was an unexpected finding. As discussed previously, Hoffman et al. (2000) defined gender self-definition as the degree to which gender, the internalized meaning of femaleness, defines a woman's identity. For example, a woman with a low gender self-definition score would not view her gender identity as central to her overall identity, while a woman with a high score would. The study's findings suggest that as a woman's gender self-definition increases, her adult romantic relationship mutuality scores decrease. What makes this relationship more interesting is that as participants' gender self-acceptance (i.e., comfort with their internalized gender identity) increased, the quality of romantic relationships increased. While it was expected that a woman's gender self-definition and self-acceptance would have a significant impact on romantic mutuality, it was not expected that the more defined a woman is by her internalization of femaleness, the less mutuality she would experience in her romantic relationship. However, it does follow that adult relational mutuality does not depend on how bound one is to one's self-definition of femaleness, or even to having a clearly self-defined sense of femaleness, but rather to one's self-acceptance and comfort regarding however they enact their femininity. Hoffman's (2006a) conceptualization of gender self-confidence, constructed by the interaction between gender self-definition and gender

self-acceptance, specifically allow for these formative constructs to develop independently of one another. For example, Hoffman states that one can have a strong gender self-definition, but a low sense of gender self-acceptance and vice versa. The dynamic nature of Hoffman's theory allow for a more idiosyncratic view of gender self-confidence and, as a result, gender identity formation.

Of the demographic data examined in the analysis, age had a significant influence on mutuality scores. As the age of participants increased, mutuality appeared to decrease. This was an unexpected result. As the trend was considered, it became apparent that as women age, their lives and relationships become more complex. It is possible that the instrument used to measure romantic relationships is not able to take a woman's changing life into account. For example, what is considered mutuality in a romantic relationship at the age of 20 may appear very different at 50. It may also be feasible that mutuality decreases over the lifespan of some romantic relationships. Perhaps other aspects of the relationship, such as security, family, and personal growth, become more important as markers of relational quality as one ages.

Limitations and Future Research

The current study has some limitations. First, the sample used in this study, while representative across various age levels, was primarily Caucasian (83.7%) and therefore not generalizable to non-Caucasian populations. An aspiration of this study was to obtain a more racially and ethnically diverse sample, but the community sample available, although perhaps representative of the geographical area, did not reflect this. Future studies in this area may find it valuable to solicit a sample that is more diverse in

order to explore possible between-group differences in regards to racial and ethnic identity.

Also, the data for this study was collected exclusively through self-report instruments. For example, father-daughter relationship quality was only explored from the adult daughter's perspective. While this fit for the current study's purpose, it may not be a full picture of the relationship. Future studies might more thoroughly explore the father-daughter relationship by including father-daughter dyads in order to give a more contextualized and richer picture of the development of the relationship and the impact on both fathers and daughters.

The correlational nature of this study also was a limitation. Because correlational analysis does not allow for causal relationships to be drawn, the results of the current study can only suggest a possible influence. However, the father-daughter relationship reported on precedes the development of adult relationships, suggesting some confidence in suggesting that the father-daughter relationship is predictive.

As suggested in the literature, this study reinforced the importance of the impact that the father-daughter relationship has on the development of women. Future areas of research that are suggested by the findings of this study include exploring the significance of the father-daughter relationship in the therapeutic treatment of women dealing with relational issues. Morgan (1998) cited the possible power this primary relationship has in the development of many psychological issues woman present with in therapy. Due to the relative neglect of this primary relationship in woman's lives, research on the effects of therapeutic use of the father-daughter relationship would move the field in a new direction.

Another area of research highlighted by the findings of the current study arises from the unexpected contribution gender self-definition offered in the final model. The significant negative relationship gender self-definition had with relationship mutuality scores suggests that the less gender-bound a woman is, the more mutuality she finds in her romantic heterosexual relationships. This finding would benefit from future research and offer possible insight to couple's counseling as well as individual therapy with women.

This study is the first step in examining the impact of the father-daughter relationship on women's development beyond childhood and will hopefully generate more scholarship. It is anticipated that the results of this research will add to the growing body of knowledge in regard to women's relational development.

Table 1

Reliability, Means, and Standard Deviations Table for Predictor and Criterion Variables

Variable	α	*M*	*SD*	*N*
1.Age	-	35.52	10.47	391
2.Education	-	4.41	1.06	404
3.Time Together	-	9.55	10.88	377
4.HGS SD	.90	27.29	7.51	392
5.HGS SA	.91	35.90	5.31	390
6.FDRI ERC	.94	25.12	8.09	382
7.FDRI VC	.79	13.34	2.59	391
8.MPDQ	.92	99.52	12.99	376

Note. Education = highest level of achieved education. Time Together = Length of adult romantic relationship. HGS SD = Hoffman Gender Scale – subscale Gender Self-Definition; higher scores indicate gender self-definition to be a stronger component of one's identity. HGS SA = Hoffman Gender Scale – subscale Gender Self-Acceptance; high scores indicate high degrees of comfort with one's defined gender. FDRI ERC = Father-daughter Relationship Inventory – subscale Emotional Responsiveness and Communication; high scores indicate higher levels of construct in father-daughter relationship. FDRI VC = Father-daughter Relationship Inventory – subscale Validation and Competence; high scores reflect higher levels of construct within Father-daughter relationship. FDRI IC = Father-daughter Relationship Inventory – Intimacy and Conventionality; high scores reflect higher levels of construct within Father-daughter relationship. MPDQ = Mutual Psychological Development Questionnaire; higher scores indicate higher degree of mutuality within romantic relationships.

Table 2

Intercorrelations of Predictor and Criterion Variables

Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1.Age	---	.02	.79**	.04	.01	-.09	-.15**	-.16**
2.Education		---	-.06	-.06	-.02	.06	.26**	.19**
3.Time Together			---	.04	-.01	.01	-.14**	-.14**
4.HGS SD				---	.45**	.05	-.06	-.00
5.HGS SA					---	.18**	.10	.23**
6.FDRI ERC						---	.64**	.31**
7.FDRI VC							---	.25**
8.MPDQ								---

Note. Education = highest level of achieved education. Time Together = Length of adult romantic relationship. HGS SD = Hoffman Gender Scale – subscale Gender Self-Definition; higher scores indicate gender self-definition to be a stronger component of one's identity. HGS SA = Hoffman Gender Scale – subscale Gender Self-Acceptance; high scores indicate high degrees of comfort with one's defined gender. FDRI ERC = Father-daughter Relationship Inventory – subscale Emotional Responsiveness and Communication; high scores indicate higher levels of construct in Father-daughter relationship. FDRI VC = Father-daughter Relationship Inventory – subscale Validation and Competence; high scores reflect higher levels of construct within Father-daughter relationship. FDRI IC = Father-daughter Relationship Inventory – Intimacy and Conventionality; high scores reflect higher levels of construct within Father-daughter relationship. MPDQ = Mutual Psychological Development Questionnaire; higher scores indicate higher degree of mutuality within romantic relationships.
*$p < .05$. **$p < .01$.

Table 3

Summary of Final Step of Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis for Variables Predicting Current Romantic Relationship Quality (MPDQ)

Variable	Step	B	SE B	ß	R^2	ΔR^2	*F* Change	*df*
Age	1	-.15	.08	-.12	.06**	.06**	7.96**	(3, 354)
Education	1	2.15	.62	.18**				
Time Together	1	-.04	.08	-.03				
HGS SD	2	-.19	.09	-.11*	.13**	.07**	13.90**	(2, 352)
HGS SA	2	.59	.13	.24**				
FDRI ERC	3	.41	.10	.26**	.19**	.06**	12.66**	(2, 350)
FDRI VC	3	-.06	.33	-.01				

Note. Education = highest level of achieved education. Time Together = Length of adult romantic relationship. HGS SD = Hoffman Gender Scale – subscale Gender Self-Definition; higher scores indicate gender self-definition to be a stronger component of one's identity. HGS SA = Hoffman Gender Scale – subscale Gender Self-Acceptance; high scores indicate high degrees of comfort with one's defined gender. FDRI ERC = Father-daughter Relationship Inventory – subscale Emotional Responsiveness and Communication; high scores indicate higher levels of construct in Father-daughter relationship. FDRI VC = Father-daughter Relationship Inventory – subscale Validation and Competence; high scores reflect higher levels of construct within Father-daughter relationship. FDRI IC = Father-daughter Relationship Inventory – Intimacy and Conventionality; high scores reflect higher levels of construct within Father-daughter relationship.

*$p < .05$. **$p < .01$.

References

Bem, S. (1974). The measurement of psychological androgyny. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 42*(2), 155-162.

Benjamin, J. (1991). Father and daughter: Identification with difference – a contribution to gender heterodoxy. *Psychoanalytic Dialogues, 1*(3), 277-299.

Botta, R. A., & Dumlao, R. (2000). How do conflict and communication patterns Between fathers and daughters contribute to or offset eating disorders? *Health Communication, 14*, 199-219.

Chodorow, N. J. (1978). *The Reproduction of Mothering*. Berkley: University of California Press.

Chodorow, N. J. (2004). Psychoanalysis and women a personal thirty-five-year retrospect. *The Annual of Psychoanalysis, 32*, 101-129.

Chodorow, N. J. (2005). Gender on the modern-postmodern and classical-relational divide: Untangling history and epistemology. *Journal of the American Psychoanalytic Association, 53*(4), 1097-1118.

Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences* (2nd ed.). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Constantinople, A. (1973). Masculinity-femininity: An exception to a famous dictum? *Psychological Bulletin, 80*(5), 389-407.

Dalton, R. (1986). The psychology of fathers and daughters: A feminist approach and methodology. *Women & Therapy, 5*(2), 207-218.

Dillon, F.R., Worthington, R.L., Soth-McNett, A.M., & Schwartz, S.J. (2008). Gender

and sexual identity-based predictors of lesbian, gay, and bisexual affirmative counseling self-efficacy. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice, 39*(3), 353-360.

Ellis, B. J., McFadyen-Ketchum, S., Dodge, K. A., Pettit, G. S., & Bates, J. E. (1999). Quality of early family relationships and individual differences in the timing of pubertal maturation in girls: A longitudinal test of an evolutionary model. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 77*(2), 387-401.

Erikson, E. (1968). *Identity: Youth and Crisis*, Oxford: Norton & Co.

Forsman, L. (1989). Parent-child gender interaction in the relation between retrospective self-reports on parental love and current self-esteem. *Scandinavian Journal of Psychology, 30*, 275-283.

Frey, L. L., Beesley, D., & Miller, M. R. (2006). Relational health, attachment, and psychological distress in college women and men. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 30*(3), 303-311.

Frey, L. L., Tobin, J., & Beesley, D. (2004). Relational predictors of psychological distress in women and men presenting for university counseling center services. *Journal of College Counseling, 7*(2), 129-139.

Gilligan, C. (2004). Recovering Psyche: Reflections on Life-History and History. *The Annual of Psychoanalysis, (32),* 131-147.

Gilligan, C., & Rogers, A. (1993). Reframing daughtering and mothering: A paradigm shift in psychology. *Daughtering and mothering: Female subjectivity reanalyzed* (pp. 125-134). Florence, KY US: Taylor & Frances/Routledge.

Genero, N. P., Miller, J. B., Surrey, J., & Baldwin, L. M. (1992). Measuring perceived

mutuality in close relationships: Validation of the mutual psychological development questionnaire. *Journal of Family Psychology*, *6*(1), 36-48.

Hardesty, C., Wenk, D., & Morgan, C. S. (1995). Paternal involvement and the development of gender expectations in sons and daughters. *Youth & Society, 26*(3), 283-297.

Harris, K. M., & Morgan, S. P. (1991). Fathers, sons, and daughters: Differential paternal involvement in parenting. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, *53*(3), 531-544.

Hoffman, R.M. (2001). The measurement of masculinity and femininity: Historical perspective and implications for counseling. *Journal of Counseling & Development*, *79*(Fall 2001), 472-485.

Hoffman, R.M. (2006a). Gender self-definition and gender self-acceptance in women: Intersections with feminist, womanist, and ethic identities. *Journal of Counseling & Development*, *86*(Summer 2006), 358-372.

Hoffman, R.M. (2006b). How is gender self-confidence related to subjective well-being? *Journal of Humanistic Counseling, Education and Development, 45*(Fall 2006), 186-197.

Hoffman, R.M., & Borders, L.D. (2001). Twenty-five years after the bem sex-role inventory: A reassessment ad new issues regarding classification variability. *Measurement and Evaluation in Counseling and Development, 34*(April 2001), 39-55.

Hoffman, R.M., Borders, L.D., & Hattie, J.A. (2000). Reconceptualizing femininity and

masculinity: From gender roles to gender self-confidence. *Journal of Social Behavior and Personality, 15*(4), 475-503.

Hoyt, W.T., Imel, Z.E., & Chan, F. (2008). Multiple regression and correlation techniques: Recent controversies and best practices. *Rehabilitation Psychology, 53*(3), 321-339.

Johnson, M. M. (1982). Fathers and "femininity" in daughters: A review of the research. *Sociology and Social Research, 67*(1), 1-17.

Jones, C. J., Leung, N., & Harris, G. (2006). Father-daughter relationship and eating psychopathology: The mediating role of core beliefs. *British Journal of clinical Psychology, 45*, 319-330.

Jordan, J. V. (1991). Development of women's sense of self. In J. V. Jordon, A.G. Kaplan, J. B. Miller, I. P. Stiver, & J.L. Surrey (Ed.s), *Women's growth in connection: Writings from the Stone Center* (pp.11-26). New York: Gilford.

Jordan, J. V. (1992). The relational self: A new perspective for understanding women's development. *Contemporary Psychotherapy Review, 7*56-71.

Jordan, J. V. (1993). The movement of mutuality and power. *Advanced Development, 5*27-36.

Jordan, J. V. (1997). A relational perspective for understanding women's development. In J. V. Jordan (Ed.), *Women's growth in diversity: More writings from the Stone Center* (pp. 9-24). New York: Guilford.

Jordan, J. V. (2001). A relational-cultural model: Healing through mutual empathy. *Bulletin of the Menninger Clinic, 65*(1), 92-103.

Jordan, J. V. (2008). Recent developments in relational-cultural theory. *Women &*

Therapy, *31*(2), 1-4.

Kieffer, C. (2004). Selfobjects, Oedipal Objects, and Mutual Recognition: A Self-Psychological Reappraisal of the Female 'Oedipal Victor'. *The Annual of Psychoanalysis*, *32*, 69-80.

Lamb, M. E., Lewis, C. (2004). The development and significance of father-child relationships in two-parent families. In Lamb, M.E. (Ed.), *The role of the father in child development, Fourth Edition* (pp. 272-306). Hoboken, New Jersey: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Miller, J. B. (1976). *Toward a New Psychology of Women.* Boston: Beacon Press.

Miller, J. B. (2002). How change happens: controlling images, mutuality, and power. *Work in Progress, No. 96*. Wellesley, MA: Stone Center Working Paper Series.

Miller, J., & Stiver, I. (1993). A relational approach to understanding women's lives and problems. *Psychiatric Annals*, *23*(8), 424-431.

Miriam, J. (1982). Father's and "femininity: in Daughters: A review of the Research. *Sociology and Social Research*, *67*, 1-17.

Morgan, J. V. (1998). Fathers and daughters: Recognizing the significance. *Family Therapy*, 25(2), 73-84.

Morgan, J. V., Wilcoxon, S.A., & Satcher, J.F. (2003). The father-daughter relationship inventory: A validation study. *Family Therapy*, *30*(2), 77-93.

Phares, V. (1992). Where's poppa?: The relative lack of attention to the role of fathers in child and adolescent psychopathology. *American Psychologist*, *47*(5), 656-664.

Richards, M. H., Gitelson, I.B., Petersen, A.C., & Hutig, A.L. (1991). Adolescent

personality in girls and boys: The role of mothers and fathers. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 15*, 65-81.

Scheffler, T. S., & Nause, P. J. (1999). The relationship between fatherly affirmation and a woman's self-esteem, fear of intimacy, comfort with womanhood and comfort with sexuality. *The Canadian Journal of Human Sexuality*, *8*(1), 39-45.

Sharpe, S. (1994). *Fathers and daughters*. London: Routledge.

Spence, J.T. (1993). Gender-related traits and gender ideology: Evidence for a multifactorial theory. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *64*(4), 624-635.

Stiver, I.P. (1991). Beyond the oedipus complex: Mother and daughters. In J. V. Jordon, A.G. Kaplan, J. B. Miller, I. P. Stiver, & J.L. Surrey (Ed.s), *Women's growth in connection: Writings from the Stone Center* (pp.97-121). New York: Gilford.

Surrey, J. L. (1991). The self-in-relation: A theory of women's development. In J. V. Jordon, A.G. Kaplan, J. B. Miller, I. P. Stiver, & J.L. Surrey (Ed.s), *Women's growth in connection: Writings from the Stone Center* (pp.51-66). New York: Gilford.

Walker, M. (2004). How relationships heal. In M. Walker, & W. Rosen (Ed.s), *How Connections Heal: Stories from Relational-Cultural Therapy* (pp. 3-21). New York, NY US: Guilford Press.

Wallerstein, J.D., Lewis, J.M., & Blakeslee, S. (2000). *The unexpected legacy of divorce: A 25 year landmark study*. New York: Hyperion.

Way, N., & Gillman, D. A. (2000). Early adolescent girls' perceptions of their

relationships with their fathers: A qualitative investigation. *Journal of Early Adolescence, 20*(3), 309-331.

Appendix A: IRB Approval Letter

The University of Oklahoma
OFFICE FOR HUMAN RESEARCH PARTICIPANT PROTECTION

IRB Number: 12883
Approval Date: February 25, 2010

March 01, 2010

Ruby Casiano
Educational Psychology
919 W. Eufaula Street
Norman, OK 73069

RE: The Influence of Father-Daughter Relationship Quality on Current Relationship Quality in Women

Dear Ms. Casiano:

On behalf of the Institutional Review Board (IRB), I have reviewed and granted expedited approval of the above-referenced research study. This study meets the criteria for expedited approval category 7. It is my judgment as Chairperson of the IRB that the rights and welfare of individuals who may be asked to participate in this study will be respected; that the proposed research, including the process of obtaining informed consent, will be conducted in a manner consistent with the requirements of 45 CFR 46 as amended; and that the research involves no more than minimal risk to participants.

This letter documents approval to conduct the research as described:

Consent form - Other Dated: February 24, 2010 Information Sheet - Revised
Survey Instrument Dated: February 11, 2010 MPDQ - Form A
Survey Instrument Dated: February 11, 2010 Hoffman Gender Scale - Form A
Survey Instrument Dated: February 11, 2010 Father Daughter Relationship Inventory
Survey Instrument Dated: February 11, 2010 Demographic Questionnaire
Other Dated: February 11, 2010 Introductory letter
Protocol Dated: February 11, 2010
IRB Application Dated: February 11, 2010

As principal investigator of this protocol, it is your responsibility to make sure that this study is conducted as approved. Any modifications to the protocol or consent form, initiated by you or by the sponsor, will require prior approval, which you may request by completing a protocol modification form. All study records, including copies of signed consent forms, must be retained for three (3) years after termination of the study.

The approval granted expires on February 24, 2011. Should you wish to maintain this protocol in an active status beyond that date, you will need to provide the IRB with an IRB Application for Continuing Review (Progress Report) summarizing study results to date. The IRB will request an IRB Application for Continuing Review from you approximately two months before the anniversary date of your current approval.

If you have questions about these procedures, or need any additional assistance from the IRB, please call the IRB office at (405) 325-8110 or send an email to irb@ou.edu.

Cordially,

Donald Baker, Ph.D.
Vice Chair, Institutional Review Board

INFORMATION SHEET FOR CONSENT TO PARTICIPATE IN A RESEARCH STUDY

My name is Ruby Casiano, M.Ed. and I am a doctoral candidate in the Counseling Psychology Program in the Educational Psychology department at the University of the Oklahoma. I am requesting that you volunteer to participate in a research study titled, **The Influence of Father-Daughter Relationship Quality on Current Romantic Relationship Quality in Women**. If you are a woman between the ages of 18 and 64 years old and are currently in or have been in a heterosexual relationship in your adult life, you are eligible to participate in this study. Please read this information sheet and contact me to ask any questions that you may have before agreeing to take part in this study.

Purpose of the Research Study: The purpose of this study is to explore the relationship between father daughter relationship quality and adult romantic relationship quality. The goal of this study is to more fully explore the impact a woman's relationship with her father influences her romantic relationships. Your participation in this study is greatly appreciated.

Procedures: If you agree to be in this study, you will be presented with a survey and asked to rate the degree to which you agree with various statements about your relationship with your father, your current or past relationship with a significant romantic partner and your perception of what it means to be female. Your responses will be anonymous. In other words, your responses will not be linked to your identity.

Risks and Benefits of being in the Study: There are little risks associated with participating in this study. The stress brought about by completing this survey is likely no greater than the stress you encounter in your everyday life. If you find any of these questions stressful or prefer not to respond, you have the option of skipping the item or exiting the survey completely. There will be no penalty for doing so. However, the most knowledge will be gained from your responses when you answer the items completely and truthfully. You will likely not gain any direct benefits from participating in the study.

Compensation: You **will not** be compensated for your time and participation in this study.

Voluntary Nature of the Study: Participation in this study is voluntary. Your decision whether or not to participate will not result in penalty. If you decide to participate, you are free not to answer any question or discontinue participation at any time without penalty.

Length of Participation: The survey is expected to take about 20 minutes to complete.

Confidentiality: This study is anonymous. In published reports, there will be no information included that will make it possible to identify you as a research participant.

Contacts and Questions: In the event of a research-related injury, contact the researchers. Contact Ruby Casiano at solace@ou.edu or 405-323-8678, or her advisor, Melissa Frey, PhD, at melissa.frey-1@ou.edu or (405) 325-2914. If you have any questions, concerns, or complaints about the research or about your rights and wish to talk to someone other than the individuals on the research team, or if you cannot reach the research team, you may contact the University of Oklahoma – Norman Campus Institutional Review Board (OU-NC IRB) at (405) 325-8110 or irb@ou.edu.

You should print out and keep a copy of this information sheet for your records.

"***The OU IRB has approved the content of this message but not the method of distribution. The OU IRB has no authority to approve distribution by mass email.***"

"***The University of Oklahoma is an equal opportunity institution.***"

By clicking "I agree", you are agreeing to participate in this study.

APPROVED
FEB 2 5 2010
OU NC IRB

APPROVAL
FEB 2 4 2011
EXPIRES

Appendix B: Instruments

Demographic Questionnaire

In order to successfully complete this study, I would like to know more about you. The information you provide will not be used to identify you in any way.

1. What is your age? _____

2. What is your highest level of education completed?

_____ Less than High School _____ High School Diploma/GED
_____ Some College _____ 4 year College degree (BA/BS)
_____ Master's Degree _____Doctoral Degree
_____ Professional Degree (MD/JD)

3. What race/ethnicity do you consider yourself?

_____ African American
_____ Hispanic or Latino/Latina
_____ Asian American
_____ Native American or American Indian
_____ Caucasian
_____ Biracial/Multiracial
_____ Other: Please specify _____

4. What is your occupation? _____

5. How do you describe your sexual identity/orientation?

_____ Bisexual
_____ Heterosexual
_____ Lesbian or Gay
_____ Transgendered
_____ Questioning/Unsure

6. What is your yearly income?

_____ Less than $25,000
_____ $25,000 – $35,000
_____ $36,000 – $45,000
_____ $46,000 – $55,000
_____ $56,000 – $65,000
_____ $66,000 – $75,000
_____ $76,000 – $85,000
_____ Over $85,000

7. “Father” is defined, in this study, as the adult male who raised you. With this definition in mind, who do you consider your father?

___Biological Father ___Stepfather ___Grandfather ___Uncle
___Other (please specify)_____

8. What is your religious affiliation?

___Agnostic ___Assembly of God ___Atheist
___Baptist ___Buddhist ___Catholic
___Church of Christ ___Church of Latter Day Saints ___Hindu
___Jewish ___Lutheran ___Methodist
___Muslim ___Pentecostal ___Presbyterian
___Other (please specify) _____

9. What is your relationship status?

____Single
____In committed/exclusive relationship
____Married/Partnered
____Divorced, if so how long ago? _____
____Other, please explain _____

10. What is the highest level of education your mother has completed?

_____ Less than High School _____ High School Diploma/GED
_____ Some College _____ 4 year College degree (BA/BS)
_____ Master’s Degree _____ Doctoral Degree
_____ Professional Degree (MD/JD)

11. What is the highest level of education your father has completed?

_____ Less than High School _____ High School Diploma/GED
_____ Some College _____ 4 year College degree (BA/BS)
_____ Master’s Degree _____Doctoral Degree
_____ Professional Degree (MD/JD)

Father Daughter Relationship Inventory

The purpose of this inventory is to gain information about father-daughter relationships. This is not a test, and there are no right or wrong answers.

Instructions: After reading each item, circle the number that corresponds to your answer. Respond to each statement with one of the numbers noted in the legend. * **Please consider the adult male who raised you**.

Legend

1- Almost Always False
2- Generally False
3- Generally True
4- Almost Always True

1. My father provided emotional support for me.	1	2	3	4
2. My father believed that men are superior to women.	1	2	3	4
3. My father encouraged me to play sports.	1	2	3	4
4. My father was involved in my education about sex.	1	2	3	4
5. I felt abandoned by my father.	1	2	3	4
6. My father wanted me to be just like him.	1	2	3	4
7. My father discussed his work with me.	1	2	3	4
8. My father consistently expressed his approval of me.	1	2	3	4
9. My father was embarrassed around me after I reached adolescence.	1	2	3	4
10. Most of my conversations with my father were about money.	1	2	3	4
11. My father was physically affectionate with me in a nonsexual way.	1	2	3	4
12. My father approved of sexual activity outside of marriage.	1	2	3	4
13. My father did not know how to communicate with me.	1	2	3	4
14. My father had very traditional attitudes about appropriate behavior for men and women.	1	2	3	4
15. My father believed I was a capable and competent person.	1	2	3	4

16.	My father treated women as sexual objects.	1	2	3	4
17.	I talked to my father when I was upset.	1	2	3	4
18.	My father intimidated me.	1	2	3	4
19.	My father supervised my dating relationships.	1	2	3	4
20.	I felt close to my father.	1	2	3	4
21.	I felt ashamed about my body when I was around my father.	1	2	3	4
22.	My father was interested in my academic progress.	1	2	3	4
23.	I was no longer “Daddy’s girl” after I reached adolescence.	1	2	3	4
24.	My father worked hard at understanding my feelings.	1	2	3	4
25.	My mother interpreted my father’s behavior for me.	1	2	3	4
26.	My father had high expectations of me.	1	2	3	4
27.	My father violated me though inappropriate sexual contact.	1	2	3	4
28.	My father respected women who exercised independent judgment.	1	2	3	4
29.	My father’s attention was hard to win.	1	2	3	4
30.	When I stared menstruating, my father and I discussed it.	1	2	3	4
31.	My father was a comfort to me when I was angry or sad.	1	2	3	4
32.	My father was more concerned about my getting married than having a successful career.	1	2	3	4
33.	I understood my father’s expectations about my sexual behavior.	1	2	3	4
34.	My father valued my looks more than my intelligence.	1	2	3	4
35.	I could discuss anything with my father.	1	2	3	4
36.	My father thought I was stupid.	1	2	3	4

Morgan, Wilcoxon, & Satcher, 2003

Hoffman Gender Scale (Form A) (Revised)

What do *you* mean by femininity?

_____

_____

Please indicate your level of agreement with each of the following statements by rating it a "1," "2," "3," "4," "5," or "6" as follows:

1	2	3	4	5	6
Strongly Disagree	**Disagree**	**Somewhat Agree**	**Tend to Agree**	**Agree**	**Strongly Agree**

_____

1. When I am asked to describe myself, being female is one of the first things I think of. ____
2. I am confident in my femininity (femaleness). ____
3. I meet my personal standards for femininity (femaleness). ____
4. My perception of myself is positively associated with my biological sex. ____
5. I am secure in my femininity (femaleness). ____
6. I define myself largely in terms of my femininity (femaleness). ____
7. My identity is strongly tied to my femininity (femaleness). ____
8. I have a high regard for myself as a female. ____
9. Being a female is a critical part of how I view myself. ____
10. I am happy with myself as a female. ____
11. I am very comfortable being a female. ____
12. Femininity (femaleness) is an important aspect of my self-concept. ____
13. My sense of myself as a female is positive. ____
14. Being a female contributes a great deal to my sense of confidence. ____

MPDQ: FORM A (Partner)

We would like you to tell us about your relationship with your current or past spouse or partner. By partner, we mean a person with whom you live(d) or with whom you have or have had a steady relationship.

What is your partner/spouse's sex?(please circle one) Female Male

If married, how many years? _____

What is your spouse's age? _____

If not married, how long have you known your partner?_____

What is your partner's age? _____

Are you currently living with your partner?(please circle one)

Yes No

In this section, we would like to explore certain aspects of your relationship with your spouse or partner. Using the scale below, please tell us your best estimate of how often you and your spouse/partner experience each of the following:

1 = Never 3 = Occasionally 5 = Most of the Time
2 = Rarely 4 = More Often than Not 6 = All the Time

When we talk about things that matter to my spouse/partner, I am likely to…

Be receptive	1	2	3	4	5	6
Get impatient	1	2	3	4	5	6
Try to understand	1	2	3	4	5	6
Get bored	1	2	3	4	5	6
Feel moved	1	2	3	4	5	6
Avoid being honest	1	2	3	4	5	6
Be open-minded	1	2	3	4	5	6
Get discouraged	1	2	3	4	5	6
Get involved	1	2	3	4	5	6
Have difficulty listening	1	2	3	4	5	6
Feel energized by our conversation	1	2	3	4	5	6

1 = Never 3 = Occasionally 5 = Most of the Time
2 = Rarely 4 = More Often than Not 6 = All the Time

When we talk about things that matter to me, my spouse/partner is likely to…

Pick up on my feelings	1	2	3	4	5	6
Feel like we're not getting anywhere	1	2	3	4	5	6
Show an interest	1	2	3	4	5	6
Get frustrated	1	2	3	4	5	6
Share similar experiences	1	2	3	4	5	6
Keep feelings inside	1	2	3	4	5	6
Respect my point of view	1	2	3	4	5	6
Change the subject	1	2	3	4	5	6
See the humor in things	1	2	3	4	5	6
Feel down	1	2	3	4	5	6
Express an opinion clearly	1	2	3	4	5	6

Genero, Miller, & Surrey, 1992

Appendix C: Prospectus

The Influence of Father-Daughter Relationship Quality on Women's Current Romantic Relationship Quality

Dissertation Prospectus

Ruby Casiano, M. Ed.

University of Oklahoma

February 11, 2010

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter Page

I. INTRODUCTION 3

Overview 3
Statement of the Problem 5

II. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE 7

Women's Identity Development 7
Relational Theory and Identity Development 7
Measurement of Masculinity and Femininity 13
The BSRI and the PAQ 14
Hoffman's Model of Gender Self-Concept 15
Influence of Father-Daughter Relationship on Relational Development 18
Impact of the Father-Daughter Relationship in Adult Women's Lives 24

III. METHODS 26

Participants 26
Instruments 26
Procedure 30
Research Questions 31
Data Analysis 31

IV. REFERENCES 32

Appendix A: Demographics 39
Appendix B: The Father – Daughter Relationship Inventory 42
Appendix C: Hoffman Gender Scale (Form A) (Revised 45
Appendix D: Mutual Psychological Development Questionnaire 47

Chapter One

Overview

The father-daughter relationship is one that has experienced increased research interest in the last 30 years. The majority of this research has dealt with the developmental function of the father within the family structure (Ellis, McFadyen-Ketchum, Dodge, Pettit, & Bates, 1999; Forsman, 1989; Hardesty, Wenk, & Morgan, 1995; Harris & Morgan, 1991; Lamb & Lewis, 2004; Richards, Gitelson, Petersen, & Hutig, 1991). The specific structure of the father-daughter relationship and its influence on the daughter's adult life has been relatively ignored in the literature. In addition, the research that does exist for the father-daughter relationship has primarily been done on Caucasian, middle class, college undergraduate females (Way & Gillman, 2000). In response to the gap in research concerning the father's impact on a woman's development, the purpose of this study will be to investigate a community sample of women, examining the influence of how their relationship with their fathers influenced their adult intimate relationships.

Relational Cultural Theory offers a foundation for the premise of this study with its perception of women's development of self. Surrey (1991) proposes women's development and experience of self is primarily cultivated within relationships. Surrey's idea of "self-in-relation" (p. 51) echoes Jordan's (1991) assertion that women develop their self-image directly through the act of being in relationships with others. The quality of the relationship appears to shape a woman's development of self (Jordan, 2001).

Women's sense of self becomes very much organized around being able to make and then maintain affiliations and relationships. Eventually, for many women the threat of disruption of connections is perceived not as just a loss of a relationship but as something closer to a total loss of self. (Miller, 1976, p. 83)

Relationships within an individual's life, specifically in women's lives, contribute to the development of the "felt sense of self" (Jordan, 1997, p. 15). The current study's focus is congruent with the assumptions of Relational Cultural Theory, reasoning that early, important relationships in a woman's life inform her relational patterns in her future relationships. The synthesis of the self via relational experience and intimate connection with others supports the argument that one's important primary relationships affect more than one's internal world, but their relational world as well. Thus, it is expected that relationships with important people create templates in which future relationships are navigated. Based on these assumptions, the father-daughter relationship is expected to be instrumental in informing women of what to expect in future male-female relationships.

When exploring women's development, gender identity formation cannot be overlooked. The formation of not only the manner in which a woman navigates society's gender expectations, but also how these expectations are internalized and rectified are key to painting a full picture of how a woman develops over her life span. Gender identity formation has been the focus of a vast amount of research. The development of an individual's gender identity has seen a movement from being viewed as a single unipolar concept, to a bipolar conceptualization with separate masculine and feminine continuums (Bem, 1974; Spence, 1993), and more recently to a multifaceted

structure that is formed from the interaction of internal and external influences (Hoffman, Borders & Hattie, 2000). This study will use Hoffman, Borders, and Hattie's (2000) reconceptualization of gender identity, and more specifically gender self confidence (i.e., an individual's comfort with her gender identity), to examine how a woman's perception of the importance of her self-defined feminine identity moderates the relationship between the quality of a woman's father-daughter relationship and the quality of her adult romantic relationships with men. Hoffman (2006b) introduces gender self-confidence as an alternative to using the traditional gender schema theory (Bem, 1974; Spence, 1993) that has dominated the research on defining gender. Instruments based on traditional gender schema theory (e.g., Bem Sex Role Inventory [Bem, 1995]; Personal Attribute Questionnaire [Spence, 1993]) focus on determining how closely an individual fits society's positive and negative gender stereotypes. Hoffman, et al. (2000) emphasizes the instrumental role the concept of gender self-confidence has in the formation of an individual's gender identity and in turn gender self-concept. Thus, it offers an important pathway to tap individual perceptions of gender. By targeting a more in depth and individualized exploration of women's gender internalization, the moderating effect gender self-confidence may have on the father-daughter relationship in the prediction of adult romantic relationship quality can be studied.

Statement of the Problem

The father-daughter relationship, while extremely important in the family dynamic (Miriam, 1982; Morgan, 1998; Morgan, Wilcoxon, & Satcher, 2003), appears to remain shrouded in mystery. By continuing a line of research exploring this

relationship, we may better understand the psychological needs of daughters and what benefits may arise from strengthening the father-daughter relationship in therapy. In this study, the focus of interest is the influence that women's perceptions of the quality of their relationship with their fathers have on adult romantic relationship quality. Therefore, the goals of this study are to (a) explore the influence the father-daughter relationship has on women's romantic relationships beyond what is influenced by gender self confidence and (b) examine any interaction effects of gender self-confidence and father-daughter relationship quality on women's romantic relationships.

Chapter Two

Review of the Literature

Women's Identity Development

Relational theory and identity development. Women's development has historically been viewed as secondary to male developmental models, and more importantly women have often been viewed as defective versions of men when their development has been scrutinized (Gilligan, 2004; Jordan, 1992; Miller, 1976; Miller & Stiver, 1993). Traditional views of women's development adhere to the universally accepted idea that individuation and self-sufficiency are primary pathways of developing into adulthood. Jean Baker Miller countered this view in 1976 with her publication of *Toward a New Psychology of Women*. In her ground-breaking perspective on women's development, Miller called for a movement away from traditional views of women's growth based on male development and dominant societal perceptions of femininity. Miller asserted that "a more accurate understanding of women's psychology as it arises out of women's life experience rather than as it has been perceived by those who do not have that experience" (p. 48) must play a primary role in order to truly explore women's psychological development. Because there continues to be increased interest in directly investigating women's growth in a more authentic manner, Miller's perceptions continue to reverberate throughout the current literature.

With her call for a new perspective on women's development, Miller (1976) identified relationships as the major conduit of change in the development of the self. According to her theory of woman's development, Miller identified relational

experience, the process of being in and remaining in relationship with others, as the dominant influence on the development of the self. The centrality of the relationship in the formation of the self offered by Miller is a reversal of established notions of individual development. Erikson (1968), while recognizing an individual's social stressors as contributory to psychological growth, largely described development as an internal struggle against external forces. Erikson stated it was not until early adulthood, in the Intimacy vs. Isolation stage, that an individual's important relationships begin to be viewed as influential and critical. By focusing on the role an individual's early relationships play in the formation of one's identity, Miller (1976) demanded the relational, once sequestered to the female sphere, be viewed not as external to the individual, but as a powerful mirror from which the identity is understood.

By acknowledging the relational process involved in identity formation as a major influence in an individual's development, the number and type of early, important relationships that come to bear on an individual's development create a vast and beautiful web of possibility. Miller's (1976) assertion of the development of self via relationships with others opens up an individual's development to include not only internal forces and external forces, but also the process between the two. The impact relationships, specifically important primary relationships, have on the individual's view of the world, herself, and her role in relation to others allow the individual to be more than an isolated being bumping into others – she becomes a connected being able to internalize the reflection of herself through her relationships with others. In the time since Miller's request for a new psychological perspective on women's development, "a relational model of women's psychology has grown out of the contributions of Miller,

Gilligan, and others" (Miller & Stiver, 1993, p. 425) and impacted the way professionals have viewed the relationship. Miller labeled this paradigm Relational Theory, which now is referred to as Relational Cultural Theory (RCT): RCT encompasses not only women's development but also human development (Jordan, 2008). This theory continued to evolve out of the discussions of four women - Jean Baker Miller, Irene Stiver, Judith Jordan and Janet Surrey. In 1978, Jean Baker Miller formed this group and today they are the founding members of The Stone Center of Wellesley College; the birthplace of RCT. Today, RCT has a growing body of literature and research that is cementing it as an innovative and vigorous theory (Jordan, 2008).

The RCT model that has emerged acknowledges the power that relationships have as the building material of women's development and thus demands an appreciation of what once was seen as a deficiency in women. The traditional view of an individual's struggle toward separation and away from dependence as signs of healthy development has begun to be questioned. RCT focuses on the impossibility of growth in isolation and the reality that isolative relational behavior leads to psychological pain and maladjustment (Frey, Tobin, & Beesley, 2004; Frey, Beesley, & Miller, 2006). The notion of mutually empathic and impactful relationships as the gold standard of healthy maturity forces a reevaluation of what constitutes healthy development for both men and women. Miller and Stiver (1993) state, "The goal of psychological development is the increasing ability to participate in mutually empathic and mutually empowering relationships rather than increasing separation from others" (p. 426). This goal has become a major cornerstone in the relational model of

development and has been echoed by the majority of the model's major contributors (e.g., Jordan, 1991; Jordan, 1992; Jordan, 1997; Jordan, 2001; Gilligan, 2004; Miller, 1976; Miller & Stiver, 1993; Miller, 2002; Surrey, 1991).

In this relational perspective of human development and, more specifically, women's development, one assumption is made – as human beings we strive to be in connection and recognized as being able to affect important others in our lives (Miller, 1976; Miller & Stiver, 1993). Miller and Stiver (1993) explained this idea well when they stressed that "people will go through amazing psychological maneuvers to escape the combination of condemned isolation and powerlessness" (p. 428) within their relationships. Within this model, the fear of being alone, completely isolated from connection with others, is recognized as the ultimate cause of suffering. To counter this fear, individuals will alter their perception of themselves in relationship to fit into the relational environment they find themselves in. By withdrawing the unacceptable pieces of themselves, individuals will adapt to their relational environment with the primary goal of maintaining connection. In an atmosphere of growth inhibiting and demeaning connections, an individual will ultimately distort themselves in order to remain in relation to others. This leads to a self-perpetuating cycle of maladjustment (Walker, 2004).

The power of RCT's conceptualization of the relationship has been studied and measured in recent literature (e.g., Frey, Tobin, & Beesley, 2004; Frey, Beesley, & Miller, 2006; Genero, Miller, Surrey, & Baldwin, 1992; Liang, Tracy, Taylor, Williams, Jordan & Miller, 2002). Liang, et al. (2002) developed the Relational Health Indices as a tool to quantify the influence of relational quality on women's lives. The instrument

operationalized and supported RCT's assertion that growth-fostering relationships are defined by authenticity, engagement and empowerment/zest (Liang, et al., 2002). With the literature reflecting a growing interest and justification in the theorized power of the relationship in women's development, continued research into the different types of relationships that impact development, such as the father-daughter relationship, which will be examined in this study, is the obvious next step.

Relational images as influences on identity development and adult relationships. Internalizing repeated experiences, damaging or growth fostering, results in the internalization of the meaning of relationships and what an individual's role is within interpersonal relationships. Miller (2002) defined such *relational images* as "the inner constructions we each create out of our experience in relationships" (p. 1). She further explained that these relational images are formed early and they are malleable, changing in response to the experiences encountered throughout life. They serve as models from which individuals predict what will occur in specific situations. They predict what will happen as well as influence the meaning taken from relational interactions.

Within the relational model, the *relational paradox* is the crux to understanding the damage repetitive, destructive relationships can have on an individual's life. Walker (2004) defined the relational paradox as involving "strategies of disconnection" (p. 13) that are defensive movements away from relationships. The key to this paradox is that these tactics "often retain an appearance of connection while lacking its substance" (p.13). The paradox exists because individuals caught in this relational dance simultaneously yearn for and dread connection. Their defensive position in

relationships is learned behavior resulting from repeated and unresolved disconnections in primary, important past relationships (Walker, 2004).

While similar in some ways to Object Relations theory, RCT offers a more dynamic and communal interaction in which there is an effect on both the self and the object. RCT allows the role of relationships in the development of the self to encompass the rich and powerful elements that are lost in previous models. For example, while Object Relations theory views relationships as important, the relationship is viewed as an external force that is inflicted on the individual as opposed to an internal aspect of the individual (Cashdan, 1988). The concept of relational images takes a step closer to explaining repetitive relational behavior that occurs, specifically when the behavior is destructive and perpetuates a dysfunctional relationship, by illustrating how early, influential relationships create patterns by which people navigate future relationships. By recognizing that relational images include not only an individual's representation of what to expect from others, but also determines how one perceives oneself in relation to others, RCT offers a powerful explanation of how relationships shape an individual. The combination of both internal and external components reflects how the relational images that are constructed in an individual's primary relationships become powerful forces in an individual's life.

Much of the research and deliberation in relational models have focused on women's relationships with their mothers (Chodorow, 1978; Chodorow, 2004; Stiver, 1991). Stiver (1991) stated,

> One of the most common observations in the process of psychotherapy is that while men may express the wish to be like their fathers, women more often

express the wish to be the opposite of their mothers. Paradoxically, it is also evident that strong bonds are often established between mothers and daughters, bonds which continue throughout life. I believe these observations can be examined more fruitfully by exploring the specific features in women's progression from more limited to more complex interrelationships in the family. (p. 109)

Chodorow (2004) goes beyond the commonly accepted role the mother has with the pre-social child by asserting mothers play a global role in the gender construction of their daughters. While much of this literature sheds light on a misunderstood family dynamic, the primary focus on the mother-child relationship appears very much a reaction to the psychoanalytic concepts of the Oedipal Complex and Penis Envy (Benjamin, 1991; Chodorow, 2005). The classic perception of the father as the harbinger of separation and individuation in the family dynamic as well as the possessor of power created a reaction within research. Specifically, feminist psychoanalytic and relational schools of thought have focused on the powerful role of the mother as a challenge to this patriarchal and oppressive conceptualization, which has contributed to a lack of research into the father daughter dyad (Benjamin, 1991; Chodorow, 2004; Kieffer, 2004). The role a woman's relationship with her mother has on her relational behaviors has been well established (Chodorow, 2004; Gilligan and Rogers, 1993; Jordan, 1993; Surrey, 1993). However, it is apparent in the growing literature in this model that there is a gap regarding the role of the father in relational development.

Miller (2002) contended that relational images are aspects of normal development and that the manner in which the relational images are fashioned dictates

their effect on relational behavior. She indicated that when relational images are relatively elastic, individuals have the capacity to modify them with new relational experiences. However, if relational images are "reinforced very powerfully, and especially with threats of isolation and condemnation, we will build more rigid [Relational Images]" and the images will be much more resistant to change (Miller, 2002, p. 1). Following Miller's logic, the relational image that is created by an individual's repeated relational experience creates a template by which future relationships will be navigated. The power that relational images based in past experience have on current and future connection offers the possibility of an influential relationship between women's relationships with their fathers and the quality of their romantic relationships with heterosexual partners.

Measurement of Masculinity and Femininity

The constructs of femininity and masculinity have preoccupied many scholars in the field of psychology. Currently there is a reexamination of how to thoroughly define and measure these constructs. Initially femininity and masculinity were defined as opposite poles of a single construct. Constantinople's (1973) writing on how accurate one can be in attempting to measure femininity and masculinity reflected the debate at the time. She explained the increasing push to view gender as a more multifaceted concept of human behavior as opposed to the traditional one-dimensional concept that had been accepted as fact up until the 1970's. She stated:

The most generalized definitions of the terms as they are used by those developing tests of M-F [masculinity-femininity] would seem to be that they are relatively enduring traits which are more or less rooted in anatomy, physiology,

and early experiences, and which generally serve to distinguish males from females in appearance, attitudes, and behavior. (Constantinople, 1973, p. 390)

The BSRI and the PAQ. In 1974, Sandra Bem developed and published the Bem Sex-Role Inventory (BSRI) as one of the first instruments to measure the masculinity, femininity, or androgyny of an individual using a more systematic sex-typing approach (Hoffman & Borders, 2001; Spence, 1993). Hoffman and Borders (2001) reflected that Bem "challenged the assumption of bipolarity and theorized that the constructs of masculinity and femininity are conceptually and empirically distinct" (p. 40).

The BSRI consists of two scales, a masculine scale and feminine scale, each of which are distinct conceptually and empirically. Bem (1974) constructed the scales using traditional, socially prescribed personality traits that were considered characteristic of masculinity and femininity. Bem was clear in the prescribed use of the scale, emphasizing the interpretation of an individual's score in terms of the score on both scales in order to allow additional possibilities besides masculine and feminine. Specifically, the scale also allowed for an interpretation of androgynous and undifferentiated behavior, reflecting her desire to move away from a purely two dimensional perspective on gender. In the time since Bem unveiled the BSRI, it has become the most frequently used measure of gender (Hoffman & Borders, 2001; Spence, 1993).

In the construction of the Personal Attributes Questionnaire (PAQ), another widely used measure, Spence (1993) constructed an instrument that measured the gender-related attributes of an individual, although conceded that these characteristics were socially linked to stereotypical gendered ideals (i.e., instrumentality and expressivity). In her

comparison of the PAQ and BSRI, Spence concluded that "the PAQ and to a large extent, the BSRI, are measures of the desirable aspects of instrumentality and expressiveness, in line with their content, but not of broad gender concepts such as Masculinity – Femininity, sex typing, or gender schematization" (p. 624). This conclusion is consistent with examinations of the BSRI (Auster & Ohm, 2000; Hoffman, 2001; Hoffman & Borders, 2001).

Hoffman's model of gender self-concept. In Hoffman's (2001) analysis of gender measurement in the years following 1975, she observed that "…the majority of masculinity and femininity measures define these terms only stereotypically thereby negating or disallowing personal interpretations of what it means to be male or female" (p. 472). Hoffman identified Constantinople (1973) as one of the first major researchers to question the assumptions made when attempting to measure gender. The assumptions Constantinople identified as flawed included gender differences being defined by sex differences in survey questions, gender being represented as a one-dimensional construct ranging from extreme masculine to extreme feminine identification, and gender identity being represented in a single score (Constantinople, 1973; Hoffman, 2001). Hoffman described Constantinople as ahead of her time in her willingness to voice reservations regarding the direction the study of gender was taking at the time. Hoffman went further in her critique of gender analysis to state that "there should be allowances made for personal interpretations of what it means to be female or male, and not assume that the so-called stereotypical or traditional woman and man provide templates for everyone's concept of femininity and masculinity" (p.475).

Hoffman built on the notion of the importance of subjective gender identity in the construction of her theory of gender identity development. She quoted Spence's (1984) conceptualization of gender identity as "a basic phenomenological sense of one's maleness and femaleness that parallels awareness and acceptance of one's biological sex and is established early in life. (p. 91)" (as cited in Hoffman, 2001). This definition laid the foundation for Hoffman's use of an individualized, subjective perspective of gender identity. Understanding the internal experience of an individual's gender development as well as the external manifestations of that gender identity allowed for a more complete and comprehensive understanding of an individual's gendered experience. In her development of the Hoffman Gender Scale (HGS), Hoffman outlined a novel way of measuring and perceiving gender. She introduced gender self-concept as a global construct that incorporated gender identity. She defined gender self-concept as:

> …one's perception of self as a man or a woman. It is broader than gender identity in that one perceives oneself as male or female whether or not one has a secure sense or conviction of one's maleness or femaleness. Gender self-concept reflects that which is personally relevant to the individual about being male or female. One's gender self-concept may or may not include a strong gender identity. In turn, one's gender identity may or may not include much gender self-confidence. (Hoffman, Borders, & Hattie, 2000, p.482)

With this departure from traditional gender definitions, Hoffman offered a new manner in which to examine gender.

Hoffman et al. (2000) expanded on their theory of gender self-concept by dividing it into two aspects. They theorized that one's gender self-concept is comprised of gender self-confidence and gender identity. Gender self-confidence was defined as "the intensity of one's belief that she/he meets her/his personal standards for femininity/masculinity…one aspect of one's gender identity" (Hoffman, 2001, p. 481). Gender identity was defined as the "individual's awareness of the satisfaction with being a male or female (Pleck, 1984, p.220)" (as cited in Hoffman, 2001, p. 481). This multi-layered description of gender reflected the multifaceted nature of the movement away from solely socially constructed ideas of gender. Hoffman et al. (2001) found a workable balance between the socially manufactured elements of gender in society and the subjective experience of internalizing those messages.

In the factor analysis of the HGS (Hoffman, et al., 2000), the scale created to operationalize Hoffman's gender self confidence construct, two factors were revealed. While the overall score of the HGS was found to be a measure of gender self confidence, two components were found: *gender self-definition* and *gender self-acceptance* (Hoffman et al., 2000; Hoffman, 2006a). Hoffman (2006a) defined gender self-definition as "how strong[ly] a component of one's identity one considers one's self-defined femininity or masculinity to be" (p. 360). For example, individuals with firm gender self-definitions place a large value on their maleness or femaleness and use it as a focal point of their identity. Gender self-acceptance "refers to how comfortable an individual is as a member of his or her gender" (Hoffman, 2006a, p. 360). This aspect of gender self-confidence reflects how well individuals feel they fit into society's expectations of what a woman or man should be.

The HGS focuses on the most important aspect of gender self-concept, the meaning of gender to the individual (Hoffman, 2006a). Hoffman contends that to thoroughly look at gender self-concept, one must not only look at the gender identity that an individual develops, but the confidence the individual has with the internalized gender and the interaction with the expectations of society (Hoffman et al., 2000). The combination of internal and external factors involved in gender self-confidence reflects the genuine navigation that must be done to be gendered. In Hoffman's definition of gender self-confidence, gender self-acceptance and gender self-definition intersect to describe the internal and external factors that contribute to one's confidence in one's gender identity. Gender self-acceptance addresses external influences: how one's internal gender concept fits with an individual's perception of what or how a gendered person should be. Gender self-definition offers the internal: an idiosyncratic development of a gendered identity (Hoffman et al., 2000).

Hoffman et al. (2000) summed up the theory by stating, "gender self concept was seen as the broadest construct in the model, followed by gender identity, and then by gender self-confidence. Gender self-confidence in turn encompassed both gender self-definition and gender self-acceptance. Women's identity can thus be conceptualized in terms of these constructs" (p. 360). The HGS offers a unique measure of a component of gender that is most accessible to an individual: how one feels about one's gender, how it is defined, and how it measures up to external messages. The HGS accesses a part of gender development that is influenced by one's relationships. Thus, in this study Hoffman's theory of gender and the HGS are applied to gauge the possible influence a

woman's relationship with her father has on her confidence in her femininity or femaleness.

Influence of Father-Daughter Relationship on Relational Development

Much of the literature on the father-daughter dyad originated from developmental research examining the role of the father in the development of children from birth to adolescence. Much of the early research studied the father's role in the family via reports from the mother (Phares, 1992). Harris and Morgan (1991) and Lamb and Lewis (2004) explored in behavioral terms what fathering looked like from the mother's perspective. Harris and Morgan found evidence supporting the idea that fathers interacted more with their sons; however, if a daughter was in a sibling group that included brothers, she was likely to indirectly benefit from more interaction. Harris and Morgan asserted, "We believe that the presence of sons draws the father into more active parenting, and this greater involvement benefits daughters, who in turn receive more (but unequal) attention from their father" (p. 540). These studies focused on the father's behavior toward children during childhood. The perspective of analysis of the father-child relationship was that of the observer's; however, the perspectives of the father or child were not taken into account.

Feminist literature offered much of the dialogue serving as the catalyst that moved research on fatherhood into the area of the father-daughter and father-son dyads. Dalton (1986) and Phares (1992) cited mother-blaming as the reason for the lack of research on the father's influence on the development of children, specifically daughters. Dalton (1986) asserted feminist research must reconsider the father-daughter relationship in two ways: (a) "shift to the father some of the mother-blaming that

permeates psychoanalytic theory" (p. 207), and (b) "explore roles that have been traditionally held by men" (p. 207), as well as the messages of these roles that affect the daughter's self-concept. In her retrospective exploration of "the emotionally absent father" (p. 210), Dalton presented three case studies of women she worked with in her practice. Dalton stated in her analysis that the father "teaches what it means to be a woman by the way he treats [the daughter], her mother, and other women" (p. 209).

Phares (1992) attributed the literature's tendency to mother-blame as "a sexist bias toward studying mothers' contributions to child and adolescent maladjustment and at the same time ignoring similar contributions by the father" (p. 656). She addressed the lack of research on the effect the father's interaction had on children and adolescents. She explored four methodological factors that contributed to this lack of attention in the research literature: biases in participant recruitment (i.e. recruitment of female family members only), not controlling for rates of parental psychopathology, research based on sexist theories, and assumptions based on outdated norms. These four factors outline possible reasons mothers have been the focus of research on child development, particularly relational development.

While the father has been absent from blame, he has also been absent from being part of the developmental picture of children, particularly daughters. Feminist critiques of the literature (e.g., Chodorow, 2004; Dalton, 1986; Gilligan & Rogers, 1993; Miller, 1976; Morgan, 1998; Phares, 1992) expose some concerning trends in the perpetuation of the traditional, distant, uninvolved role of the father. Both Dalton and Phares alluded to the notion that the picture painted of the father's influence in the family structure is unrealistic.

In reviews of research and case studies, Johnson (1982) and Sharpe (1994) stated that the father plays more than a peripheral role in his daughter's psychosocial development. Johnson (1982) explained the existing body of research of the late 1960's and 1970's focused on the father's role in the daughter's formation of her femininity. Although Johnson's somewhat dated definitions of femininity reflect the time in which she was writing the concept of the father's role as a masculine influence in the development of a woman's sense of femininity is an interesting one. The realm of femininity has always been the mother's domain; the mother has been seen as the figure from which a girl's femininity was formed (Johnson, 1982). Introducing the possibility that the father plays a role in his daughter's development of her sense of herself as a woman was counterintuitive. The father as an influence on femininity implied that the development of a woman's femininity had two pathways, one from interaction with the feminine (i.e., the mother-daughter relationship), and one from interaction with the masculine (i.e., the father-daughter relationship) (Johnson, 1982).

In her book, *Fathers and Daughters*, Sharpe (2004) acknowledged the "otherness" (i.e. the masculine influence of the father; p. 2) of the father-daughter relationship in comparison to the mother-daughter relationship. She cited this otherness as "one of the several factors which further complicate the father-daughter relationship" (p. 2). She concluded the research available supported the assertion that the father-daughter relationship has "significant and far-reaching effects" (p. 3). Sharpe asserted that, in the adult life of the daughter, the father can create a template that the daughter may be drawn to or repelled from in her adult romantic relationships. This template that affects

the daughter in the future reiterates the assumptions of RCT and further solidifies the goals of this study.

Lamb and Lewis (2004) stated, “Men’s interactions with their children need to be understood within a network of family relationships” (p. 272). They further theorized that accord within the marital relationship was a key predictor of father-child relationships. While they agreed with much of the research indicating that fathers interact more with their sons, they added that this tendency disappears beyond infancy. In their literature review, Lamb and Lewis found that fathers had a tendency to distance themselves from both their sons and daughters after the first 30 months. They cited evidence in the developmental literature suggesting that fathers are more traditional in their play with their children, tending to encourage gendered play and to be more goal oriented and physical in their play (Lamb & Lewis, 2004). These finding are further supported in Bergman’s (1995) analysis of men’s development from a relational lens (Bergman, 1995). As children move into adolescence, differences surface in sons' and daughters' views of the father but not the mother. Lamb and Lewis theorized that this differentiation might be due to the adolescents’ highly gendered perspective of their parents.

Hardesty et al. (1995) challenged the assumption that the quantity of a father’s participation is instrumental to the father’s influence on children’s development. They suggested a greater focus on the effects of the presence of a father and the nature of his interaction as opposed to the extent of involvement. In their study of the father’s involvement with his children and his influence on the development of gender expectations, they found effects were greater for sons. However, they also found that a

continuous relationship with the father beyond childhood and into adolescence was more significant than the quantity of a father's involvement.

Richards et al. (1991) found that cross-sex parent characteristics influenced the self-esteem of the child. As was expected, "self-esteem appears to be especially enhanced by the girls' positive experience with their fathers" (p. 77). They were surprised to find, however, that there was a weak relationship between mothering and a girl's ego development. This finding fits with earlier research on a father's role in their children's self-esteem acquisition. For instance, Forsman (1989) found not only a strong relationship between paternal regard and a daughter's self-esteem, but also ambivalence in women in their perspective of their mothers. He interpreted this finding by suggesting there may be a developmental aspect to a woman's perceptions of her parents. Because the population studied was an undergraduate population, Forsman offered the possibility that this perception may change as a woman ages.

Ellis et al. (1999) explored the evolutionary model and its ability to explain the father's role in his daughter's sexual maturation:

> Girls whose early family experiences are characterized by discordant male-female relationships and relatively low paternal investment perceive that male parental investment is not crucial to reproduction; these girls are hypothesized to develop in a manner that accelerates onset of sexual activity and reproduction, reduces reticence in forming sexual relationships, and orients the individual toward relatively unstable pair-bonds. (p. 388)

In their study of 173 girls, they found that the quality of the father's contribution to the family correlated with a girl's onset of puberty (i.e., increased contribution correlated

with the later onset of puberty). Specifically, the quality of the father's investment was the most important family ingredient relevant to the timing of a girl's entrance into puberty.

In literature exploring the role of the family in girls suffering from eating disorders, the role of the father in the family constellation has been well documented (Botta & Dumlao, 2002; Jones et al., 2006). Along with the previously described studies, this research offers powerful support for the impact that the father has on the daughter's sexual identity and perception of the importance of paternal involvement. The research of the father's influence on the development of disordered eating, although focused on the pathology of the daughter's illness, offered support for the idea that fathers influence their daughters beyond childhood development. Morgan (1998) argued that this exploration should be taken beyond a focus on disordered eating to a focus on how the father-daughter relationship influences a woman's overall psychological and relational well-being, as will be explored in this study.

Scheffler and Naus (1999) found evidence that a father's affirmation predicted a woman's comfort or discomfort with her sexual experiences. While they expected to find similar support for the relationship between fatherly affirmation and self-esteem and fear of intimacy, these relationships were only partially supported; they found fatherly affirmation to predict self-esteem, but not fear of intimacy. Scheffler and Naus (1999) suggested their findings supported the continued focus on this important familial relationship and indicated a need for new instruments to directly investigate the influences of the father on the development of the daughter. In particular, Scheffler and Naus noted their study did not include a relationship quality measure and centered on a

daughter's perceptions of her parents relationship. Morgan (1998, 2003) also emphasized the need for instruments measuring the daughter's perception of relational quality.

Impact of the father-daughter relationship in adult women's lives. These two elements, the father-daughter relationship and gender self-confidence, offer glimpses into some important relational aspects of women's lives. Alone, they influence the quality of life and individual well-being. Taken together and explored concurrently, a more intricate and meaningful picture can be taken of how the father-daughter relationship impacts a woman's relationship with herself and male romantic partners. By examining not only external relationships, but also a woman's gender self-confidence in the face of societal expectations will allow for a richer picture of the impact of the father daughter relationship on women's adult romantic relationships. This research aims to not only add to the scarce literature concerning fathers and daughters, but also add to the research on Relational Cultural Theory. Exploring the influence of the father-daughter relationship and its influence on a woman's adult romantic relationships will help clarify the concept of relational images and the power they have in individual's lives.

The current study aims to more deeply examine the father-daughter relationship by exploring its influence on the quality of women's adult romantic relationships with men. It is expected that there will be a predictive relationship between the quality of the father-daughter relationship and current relationship quality, beyond the affects gender self confidence. The moderating effects of gender self-confidence on the father-daughter relationship will also be examined.

Chapter Three

Methods

Participants

Participants will include women between the ages of 18 to 64 in an effort to sample from women across different stages of their adult development. This study will draw upon both a university sample and a snowball sample to allow for a more representative sample across the domains of age, race/ethnicity, and education level. Women from a Midwestern university town who are currently or have been in a romantic, heterosexual relationship will be solicited via email, through word-of-mouth, and through the forwarding of the web-based survey by other participants.

It is anticipated that a sample of at least 150 participants will be needed to obtain an adequate power to offer interpretable results. Hoyt, Imel, and Chan (2008) outline the controversies associated with the use of multiple regression models, specifically hierarchical regression models containing moderation interactions, and conclude there is a need to "expect that moderator effect sizes will be relatively small and will be detected reliably only with relatively large samples" (p. 332). Hoyt et al. (2008) propose that a minimum of 150 to 200 participants are necessary to reliably expose moderator effects in psychological research.

Instruments

Demographic Questionnaire. The demographic information sheet (see attached) consists of questions concerning the participants' background, including questions inquiring about a participant's racial/ethnic background, sexual orientation, etc. It consists of 15 questions.

The Father – Daughter Relationship Inventory (FDRI). The Father-Daughter Relationship Inventory (FDRI; Morgan, Wilcoxon, & Satcher, 2003) is a 36 item self-report scale used to measure perceived relationship quality of the father-daughter relationship. Scores on this instrument range from 36-144, with higher scores indicating healthier father-daughter relationships. Each item is measured on a four-point Likert-type scale (1 = Almost Always False to 4 = Almost Always True). Factor analysis of the FDRI has demonstrated a 3-factor structure: Emotional Responsiveness and Communication (ERC), Validation and Competence (VC), and Intimacy and Conventionality (IC) (Morgan, Wilcoxon, & Satcher, 2003). Examples of questions from each construct are as follows:

ERC: "My father provided emotional support for me."

"My father worked hard at understanding my feelings."

VC: "My father believed I was a capable and competent person."

"My father respected women who exercised independent judgment."

IC: "My father had very traditional attitudes about appropriate behavior for men and women." (Reversed scored)

"I understood my father's expectation about my sexual behavior."

According to Morgan et al. (2003) this instrument "was developed to examine the emergent themes of discrete, descriptive categories of the father – daughter relationship" (p. 89). For the purposes of this study, the total score will be used to indicate overall father-daughter relationship quality.

In their validation study of the FDRI, Morgan, Wilcoxon, and Satcher (2003) reported the instrument's internal consistency was examined using item-total

correlations, which were all significant and ranged from .20 to .63 (p<.05). In their substantiation of the scale, Morgan et al. used a sample of 101 adult women solicited via personal appearances by the primary investigator at planned speaking engagements; thus the sample was a rich and varied sample of women from different professional occupational areas. This study seeks to examine father-daughter relationship quality in women from as wide a population sample as possible. Therefore, as was used in the instrument's validation, a snow-ball sample will be solicited as opposed to an undergraduate sample.

Hoffman Gender Scale (HGS: Form A). The Hoffman Gender Scale (HGS) (Hoffman et al., 2000) measures gender self-confidence. The HGS is comprised of two versions, one for women and one for men. This study will use the version for women. The women's form consists of 14 Likert-type items that range from 1 (strongly disagree) to 6 (strongly agree). To score the instrument, the mean scale scores are calculated for the two instrument subscales, Gender Self-Definition and Gender Self Acceptance. The mean scores of each subscale will range from 1 to 6, with higher scores suggesting higher levels of the particular construct. Scores on Gender Self-Definition reveal how solidly a woman's self-defined femininity (femaleness) reflects her overall identity (Hoffman et al., 2000). Gender Self-Acceptance is defined by how comfortable a woman is with her internalized, idiosyncratic idea of femaleness. Sample HGS items include, "My perception of myself is positively associated with my biological sex" (Gender Self-Definition) and "My sense of myself as a female is positive" (Gender Self-Acceptance). For the purposes of this study, the overall scale score will be utilized, thus measuring the individual's overall gender self-confidence,

defined as a woman's belief that she fits her own concept of femininity or femaleness (Hoffman, et al., (2000). The overall score will be obtained by calculating the mean score of the overall scale. High scores suggest an overall higher level of gender self-confidence.

The HGS has demonstrated sufficient internal consistency. Hoffman et al. (2000) showed a Cronbach's alpha of .94 in a sample of 273 undergraduate women. In their use of the scale, Dillon, Worthington, Soth-McNett, and Schwartz (2008) obtained Cronbach's alphas of .83 for women on the Gender Self-Definition subscale and.86 for women on the Gender Self-Acceptance subscale.

The Mutual Psychological Developmental Questionnaire (MPDQ: Form A).

Genero, Miller, Surrey, and Baldwin (1992) developed the MPDQ, a 27-item self-report scale that measures relational quality, including perceived mutuality in intimate relationships by exploring an individual's rating of both their own relational actions and those of their partner in the relationship. The instrument has been described as a distinctive measure because it is based on a psychological model of mutual connection with others and captures the complex make-up of relationships (Genero et al., 1992). This questionnaire contains both a friend and romantic partner version. The Romantic partner version, form A, will be used in this study.

Using the MPDQ, individuals' romantic relationship quality is measured in two ways. The first half of the instrument contains 11 items tapping the perceptions of participants' own behavior in the relationship, each item beginning with the stem, "When we talk about things that matter to my spouse/partner, I am likely to…" Item responses are then used to explore different relationship qualities, such as, "…try to

understand" and "…have difficulty listening"(reverse score item). In the second half of the instrument, participants are asked to rate their spouse/partner on 11 items based on their perception of their spouse/partner's presence within the relationship. The item stem is, "When we talk about things that matter to me, my spouse/partner is likely to…" Examples of the response items include "…pick up on my feelings" and "…respect my point of view." For the current study, items will be rated on a 6-point Likert-type scale from "1= Never" to "6 = All the time" with a scoring range of 0 to 6, with scores obtained by summing all items endorsed. Higher scores indicate greater levels of perceived relational quality and mutuality in one's romantic relationship.

Genero et al. (1992) found Cronbach's alphas ranging from .86 to .93 in their MPDQ validation study that included a sample of men and women aged 18 to 58. Their findings also exhibited high alpha coefficients for forms A and B, ranging from .89 for a friend to .92 for a spouse or partner (Genero et al., 1992). This demonstrated high internal consistency among instrument items.

Procedure

Prospective participants will receive a recruitment email in which they will be informed of the purpose and nature of the study and the identity of the author. They will also be provided a link which will lead directly to an online survey. The Center for Educational Development and Research (CEDaR), housed in the University of Oklahoma's Jeannine Rainbolt College of Education, will run and monitor the online survey. The survey data will be housed on their server and will be deleted at the end of the study. Once participants arrive at the online survey, they will be presented with an informed consent document which will again inform them of the purpose and nature of

the study and inform them of the voluntary nature of their participation. They will be able to end participation at any time during the survey process.

After the consent document, participants will be presented with the instruments. The first will be a demographic questionnaire, followed by the Mutual Psychological Development Questionnaire (MPDQ: form A), the Hoffman Gender Scale (HGS: form A), and finally the Father-daughter Relationship Inventory (FDRI). Upon completion of the survey, participants will be thanked for their participation and informed how to enter a drawing for a fifty dollar gift certificate to Target. In order to protect participant confidentiality, contact information for the principal investigator will be given at the conclusion of the survey and participants will be informed to email the investigator to enter the raffle.

Research Questions

This study will investigate the following research questions: (a) Do gender self-confidence (i.e., HGS scores) and the perceived quality of a woman's relationship with her father (i.e., FDRI scores) influence a woman's perceived relationship quality in adult heterosexual romantic relationships (i.e., MPDQ scores)? (b) Is there an influence of the father-daughter relationship quality on current romantic heterosexual relationships beyond what is accounted for by gender self-confidence? (c) Is the influence of the father-daughter relationship quality on current romantic heterosexual relationship moderated by gender self-confidence?

Data Analysis

A hierarchical multiple regression (Cohen & Cohen, 1983) will be conducted with MPDQ scores as the criterion variable. The predictors will be: FDRI scores and

HGS scores. HGS will be entered first because, as discussed earlier, the literature suggests it is influenced by a woman's relationship with her father and may impact a woman's perception of her experience in a heterosexual relationship. Next, FDRI will be entered because this study aims to examine its unique contribution beyond the amount of variance explained by HGS. After examining main effects, the interaction effects of FDRI and HGS will be examined.

References

Auster, C.J., & Ohm, S. (2000). Masculinity and femininity in contemporary american society: A reevaluation using the bem sex-role inventory. *Sex Roles, 43*(7-8), 499-528.

Bem, S. (1974). The measurement of psychological androgyny. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 42*(2), 155-162.

Bem, S. (1995). Dismantling gender polarization and compulsory heterosexuality: Should we turn the volume down or up? *Journal of Sex Research, 32*(4), 329-334.

Benjamin, J. (1991). Father and daughter: Identification with difference – a contribution to gender heterodoxy. *Psychoanalytic Dialogues, 1*(3), 277-299.

Benjamin, J. (1995). Sameness and difference: Toward an 'overinclusive' model of gender development. *Psychoanalytic Inquiry*, *15*(1), 125-142.

Botta, R. A., & Dumlao, R. (2000). How do conflict and communication patterns Between fathers and daughters contribute to or offset eating disorders? *Health Communication, 14*, 199-219.

Cashdan, S. (1988). *Object Relations Therapy: Using the Relationship.* NewYork: W. W. Norton & Co.

Chodorow, N. J. (1978). *The Reproduction of Mothering*. Berkley: University of California Press.

Chodorow, N. J. (2004). Psychoanalysis and women a personal thirty-five-year retrospect. *The Annual of Psychoanalysis, 32*, 101-129.

Chodorow, N. J. (2005). Gender on the modern-postmodern and classical-relational

divide: Untangling history and epistemology. *Journal of the American Psychoanalytic Association, 53*(4), 1097-1118.

Cohen, J., & Cohen, P. (1983). *Applied multiple regression/correlation analysis for the behavioral sciences* (2nd ed.). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Constantinople, A. (1973). Masculinity-femininity: An exception to a famous dictum? *Psychological Bulletin, 80*(5), 389-407.

Dalton, R. (1986). The psychology of fathers and daughters: A feminist approach and methodology. *Women & Therapy, 5*(2), 207-218.

Dillon, F.R., Worthington, R.L., Soth-McNett, A.M., & Schwartz, S.J. (2008). Gender and sexual identity-based predictors of lesbian, gay, and bisexual affirmative counseling self-efficacy. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice, 39*(3), 353-360.

Ellis, B. J., McFadyen-Ketchum, S., Dodge, K. A., Pettit, G. S., & Bates, J. E. (1999). Quality of early family relationships and individual differences in the timing of pubertal maturation in girls: A longitudinal test of an evolutionary model. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *77*(2), 387-401.

Erikson, E. (1968). *Identity: Youth and Crisis*, Oxford: Norton & Co.

Forsman, L. (1989). Parent-child gender interaction in the relation between retrospective self-reports on parental love and current self-esteem. *Scandinavian Journal of Psychology*, *30*, 275-283.

Frey, L. L., Beesley, D., & Miller, M. R. (2006). Relational health, attachment, and psychological distress in college women and men. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 30*(3), 303-311.

Frey, L. L., Tobin, J., & Beesley, D. (2004). Relational predictors of psychological distress in women and men presenting for university counseling center services. *Journal of College Counseling, 7*(2), 129-139.

Gilligan, C. (2004). Recovering Psyche: Reflections on Life-History and History. *The Annual of Psychoanalysis, (32),* 131-147.

Gilligan, C., & Rogers, A. (1993). Reframing daughtering and mothering: A paradigm shift in psychology. *Daughtering and mothering: Female subjectivity reanalysed* (pp. 125-134). Florence, KY US: Taylor & Frances/Routledge.

Genero, N. P., Miller, J. B., Surrey, J., & Baldwin, L. M. (1992). Measuring perceived mutuality in close relationships: Validation of the mutual psychological development questionnaire. *Journal of Family Psychology*, *6*(1), 36-48.

Hardesty, C., Wenk, D., & Morgan, C. S. (1995). Paternal involvement and the development of gender expectations in sons and daughters. *Youth & Society, 26*(3), 283-297.

Harris, K. M., & Morgan, S. P. (1991). Fathers, sons, and daughters: Differential paternal involvement in parenting. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, *53*(3), 531-544.

Hoffman, R.M. (2001). The measurement of masculinity and femininity: Historical perspective and implications for counseling. *Journal of Counseling & Development*, *79*(Fall 2001), 472-485.

Hoffman, R.M. (2006a). Gender self-definition and gender self-acceptance in women: Intersections with feminist, womanist, and ethic identities. *Journal of Counseling & Development, 86*(Summer 2006), 358-372.

Hoffman, R.M. (2006b). How is gender self-confidence related to subjective well-being? *Journal of Humanistic Counseling, Education and Development, 45*(Fall 2006), 186-197.

Hoffman, R.M., & Borders, L.D. (2001). Twenty-five years after the bem sex-role inventory: A reassessment ad new issues regarding classification variability. *Measurement and Evaluation in Counseling and Development, 34*(April 2001), 39-55.

Hoffman, R.M., Borders, L.D., & Hattie, J.A. (2000). Reconceptualizing femininity and masculinity: From gender roles to gender self-confidence. *Journal of Social Behavior and Personality, 15*(4), 475-503.

Hoyt, W.T., Imel, Z.E., & Chan, F. (2008). Multiple regression and correlation techniques: Recent controversies and best practices. *Rehabilitation Psychology, 53*(3), 321-339.

Johnson, M. M. (1982). Fathers and "femininity" in daughters: A review of the research. *Sociology and Social Research, 67*(1), 1-17.

Jones, C. J., Leung, N., & Harris, G. (2006). Father-daughter relationship and eating psychopathology: The mediating role of core beliefs. *British Journal of clinical Psychology, 45*, 319-330.

Jordan, J. V. (1991). Development of women's sense of self. In J. V. Jordon, A.G. Kaplan, J. B. Miller, I. P. Stiver, & J.L. Surrey (Ed.s), *Women's growth in connection: Writings from the Stone Center* (pp.11-26). New York: Gilford.

Jordan, J. V. (1992). The relational self: A new perspective for understanding women's development. *Contemporary Psychotherapy Review, 7*56-71.

Jordan, J. V. (1993). The movement of mutuality and power. *Advanced Development, 5*27-36.

Jordan, J. V. (1997). A relational perspective for understanding women's development. In J. V. Jordan (Ed.), *Women's growth in diversity: More writings from the Stone Center* (pp. 9-24). New York: Guilford.

Jordan, J. V. (2001). A relational-cultural model: Healing through mutual empathy. *Bulletin of the Menninger Clinic, 65*(1), 92-103.

Jordan, J. V. (2008). Recent developments in relational-cultural theory. *Women & Therapy, 31*(2), 1-4.

Kieffer, C. (2004). Selfobjects, Oedipal Objects, and Mutual Recognition: A Self-Psychological Reappraisal of the Female 'Oedipal Victor'. *The Annual of Psychoanalysis*, *32*, 69-80.

Liang, B., Tracy, A., Taylor, C., Williams, L., Jordan, J., & Miller, J. (2002). The Relational Health Indices: A study of women's relationships. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, *26*(1), 25-35.

Lamb, M. E., Lewis, C. (2004). The development and significance of father-child relationships in two-parent families. In Lamb, M.E. (Ed.), *The role of the father in child development, Fourth Edition* (pp. 272-306). Hoboken, New Jersey: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Miller, J. B. (1976). *Toward a New Psychology of Women.* Boston: Beacon Press.

Miller, J. B. (2002). How change happens: controlling images, mutuality, and power. *Work in Progress, No. 96*. Wellesley, MA: Stone Center Working Paper Series.

Miller, J., & Stiver, I. (1993). A relational approach to understanding women's lives and

problems. *Psychiatric Annals*, *23*(8), 424-431.

Miriam, J. (1982). Father's and "femininity: in Daughters: A review of the Research. *Sociology and Social Research*, *67*, 1-17.

Morgan, J. V. (1998). Fathers and daughters: Recognizing the significance. *Family Therapy*, 25(2), 73-84.

Morgan, J. V., Wilcoxon, S.A., & Satcher, J.F. (2003). The father-daughter relationship inventory: A validation study. *Family Therapy, 30*(2), 77-93.

Murray, S. L., Holmes, J. G., MacDonald, G., & Ellsworth, P. C. (1998). Through the looking glass darkly? When self-doubts turn into relationship insecurities. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*. *75*, 1459-1480.

Phares, V. (1992). Where's poppa?: The relative lack of attention to the role of fathers in child and adolescent psychopathology. *American Psychologist*, *47*(5), 656-664.

Richards, M. H., Gitelson, I.B., Petersen, A.C., & Hutig, A.L. (1991). Adolescent personality in girls and boys: The role of mothers and fathers. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, *15*, 65-81.

Scheffler, T. S., & Nause, P. J. (1999). The relationship between fatherly affirmation and a woman's self-esteem, fear of intimacy, comfort with womanhood and comfort with sexuality. *The Canadian Journal of Human Sexuality*, *8*(1), 39-45.

Sharpe, S. (1994). *Fathers and daughters*. London: Routledge.

Spence, J.T. (1984). Gender identity and its implications for the concepts of masculinity and femininity. *Nebraska Symposium on Motivation, 32,* 59-95.

Spence, J.T. (1993). Gender-related traits and gender ideology: Evidence for a

multifactorial theory. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *64*(4), 624-635.

Steele, C. M., Spencer, S. J., & Lynch, M. (1993). Self-image resilience and dissonance: The role of affirmational resources. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *64*, 885-896.

Stiver, I.P. (1991). Beyond the oedipus complex: Mother and daughters. In J. V. Jordon, A.G. Kaplan, J. B. Miller, I. P. Stiver, & J.L. Surrey (Ed.s), *Women's growth in connection:Writings from the Stone Center* (pp.97-121). New York: Gilford.

Surrey, J. L. (1991). The self-in-relation: A theory of women's development. In J. V. Jordon, A.G. Kaplan, J. B. Miller, I. P. Stiver, & J.L. Surrey (Ed.s), *Women's growth in connection: Writings from the Stone Center* (pp.51-66). New York: Gilford.

Walker, M. (2004). How relationships heal. In M. Walker, & W. Rosen (Ed.s), *How Connections Heal: Stories from Relational-Cultural Therapy* (pp. 3-21). New York, NY US: Guilford Press.

Way, N., & Gillman, D. A. (2000). Early adolescent girls' perceptions of their relationships with their fathers: A qualitative investigation. *Journal of Early Adolescence*, *20*(3), 309-331.

Appendix A

Demographic Questionnaire

In order to successfully complete this study, I would like to know more about you. The information you provide will not be used to identify you in any way.

12. What is your age? _____

13. What is your highest level of education completed?

_____ Less than High School _____ High School Diploma/GED
_____ Some College _____ 4 year College degree (BA/BS)
_____ Master's Degree _____Doctoral Degree
_____ Professional Degree (MD/JD)

14. What race/ethnicity do you consider yourself?

_____ African American
_____ Hispanic or Latino/Latina
_____ Asian American
_____ Native American or American Indian
_____ Caucasian
_____ Biracial/Multiracial
_____ Other: Please specify _____

15. What is your occupation? _____

16. How do you describe your sexual identity/orientation?

_____ Bisexual
_____ Heterosexual
_____ Lesbian or Gay
_____ Transgendered
_____ Questioning/Unsure

17. What is your yearly income?

_____ Less than $25,000
_____ $25,000 – $35,000
_____ $36,000 – $45,000
_____ $46,000 – $55,000
_____ $56,000 – $65,000
_____ $66,000 – $75,000
_____ $76,000 – $85,000
_____ Over $85,000

18. “Father” is defined, in this study, as the adult male who raised you. With this definition in mind, who do you consider your father?

___Biological Father ___Stepfather ___Grandfather ___Uncle
___Other (please specify)_____

19. What is your religious affiliation?

___Agnostic ___Assembly of God ___Atheist
___Baptist ___Buddhist ___Catholic
___Church of Christ ___Church of Latter Day Saints ___Hindu
___Jewish ___Lutheran ___Methodist
___Muslim ___Pentecostal ___Presbyterian
___Other (please specify) _____

20. What is your relationship status?

____Single
____In committed/exclusive relationship
____Married/Partnered
____Divorced, if so how long ago? _____
____Other, please explain _____

21. What is the highest level of education your mother has completed?

_____ Less than High School _____ High School Diploma/GED
_____ Some College _____ 4 year College degree (BA/BS)
_____ Master’s Degree _____ Doctoral Degree
_____ Professional Degree (MD/JD)

22. What is the highest level of education your father has completed?

_____ Less than High School _____ High School Diploma/GED
_____ Some College _____ 4 year College degree (BA/BS)
_____ Master’s Degree _____Doctoral Degree
_____ Professional Degree (MD/JD)

Appendix B

Father Daughter Relationship Inventory

The purpose of this inventory is to gain information about father-daughter relationships. This is not a test, and there are no right or wrong answers.

Instructions: After reading each item, circle the number that corresponds to your answer. Respond to each statement with one of the numbers noted in the legend. * **Please consider the adult male who raised you**.

Legend

3- Almost Always False	3- Generally True
4- Generally False	4- Almost Always True

1. My father provided emotional support for me.	1	2	3	4
2. My father believed that men are superior to women.	1	2	3	4
3. My father encouraged me to play sports.	1	2	3	4
4. My father was involved in my education about sex.	1	2	3	4
5. I felt abandoned by my father.	1	2	3	4
6. My father wanted me to be just like him.	1	2	3	4
7. My father discussed his work with me.	1	2	3	4
8. My father consistently expressed his approval of me.	1	2	3	4
9. My father was embarrassed around me after I reached adolescence.	1	2	3	4
10. Most of my conversations with my father were about money.	1	2	3	4
11. My father was physically affectionate with me in a nonsexual way.	1	2	3	4
12. My father approved of sexual activity outside of marriage.	1	2	3	4
13. My father did not know how to communicate with me.	1	2	3	4
14. My father had very traditional attitudes about appropriate behavior for men and women.	1	2	3	4
15. My father believed I was a capable and competent person.	1	2	3	4

16.	My father treated women as sexual objects.	1	2	3	4
17.	I talked to my father when I was upset.	1	2	3	4
18.	My father intimidated me.	1	2	3	4
19.	My father supervised my dating relationships.	1	2	3	4
20.	I felt close to my father.	1	2	3	4
21.	I felt ashamed about my body when I was around my father.	1	2	3	4
22.	My father was interested in my academic progress.	1	2	3	4
23.	I was no longer “Daddy’s girl” after I reached adolescence.	1	2	3	4
24.	My father worked hard at understanding my feelings.	1	2	3	4
25.	My mother interpreted my father’s behavior for me.	1	2	3	4
26.	My father had high expectations of me.	1	2	3	4
27.	My father violated me though inappropriate sexual contact.	1	2	3	4
28.	My father respected women who exercised independent judgment.	1	2	3	4
29.	My father’s attention was hard to win.	1	2	3	4
30.	When I stared menstruating, my father and I discussed it.	1	2	3	4
31.	My father was a comfort to me when I was angry or sad.	1	2	3	4
32.	My father was more concerned about my getting married than having a successful career.	1	2	3	4
33.	I understood my father’s expectations about my sexual behavior.	1	2	3	4
34.	My father valued my looks more than my intelligence.	1	2	3	4
35.	I could discuss anything with my father.	1	2	3	4
36.	My father thought I was stupid.	1	2	3	4

Morgan, Wilcoxon, & Satcher, 2003

Appendix C

Hoffman Gender Scale (Form A) (Revised)

What do *you* mean by femininity?

_____

_____

Please indicate your level of agreement with each of the following statements by rating it a "1," "2," "3," "4," "5," or "6" as follows:

1	2	3	4	5	6
Strongly Disagree	**Disagree**	**Somewhat Agree**	**Tend to Agree**	**Agree**	**Strongly Agree**

_____

1. When I am asked to describe myself, being female is one of the first things I think of. ____
2. I am confident in my femininity (femaleness). ____
3. I meet my personal standards for femininity (femaleness). ____
4. My perception of myself is positively associated with my biological sex. ____
5. I am secure in my femininity (femaleness). ____
6. I define myself largely in terms of my femininity (femaleness). ____
7. My identity is strongly tied to my femininity (femaleness). ____
8. I have a high regard for myself as a female. ____
9. Being a female is a critical part of how I view myself. ____
10. I am happy with myself as a female. ____
11. I am very comfortable being a female. ____
12. Femininity (femaleness) is an important aspect of my self-concept. ____
13. My sense of myself as a female is positive. ____
14. Being a female contributes a great deal to my sense of confidence. ____

Appendix D

MPDQ: FORM A (Partner)

We would like you to tell us about your relationship with your current or past spouse or partner. By partner, we mean a person with whom you live(d) or with whom you have or have had a steady relationship.

What is your partner/spouse's sex?(please circle one) Female Male

If married, how many years? _____

What is your spouse's age? _____

If not married, how long have you known your partner?_____

What is your partner's age? _____

Are you currently living with your partner?(please circle one)

Yes No

In this section, we would like to explore certain aspects of your relationship with your spouse or partner. Using the scale below, please tell us your best estimate of how often you and your spouse/partner experience each of the following:

1 = Never 3 = Occasionally 5 = Most of the Time
2 = Rarely 4 = More Often than Not 6 = All the Time

When we talk about things that matter to my spouse/partner, I am likely to…

Be receptive	1	2	3	4	5	6
Get impatient	1	2	3	4	5	6
Try to understand	1	2	3	4	5	6
Get bored	1	2	3	4	5	6
Feel moved	1	2	3	4	5	6
Avoid being honest	1	2	3	4	5	6
Be open-minded	1	2	3	4	5	6
Get discouraged	1	2	3	4	5	6
Get involved	1	2	3	4	5	6
Have difficulty listening	1	2	3	4	5	6
Feel energized by our conversation	1	2	3	4	5	6

1 = Never 3 = Occasionally 5 = Most of the Time
2 = Rarely 4 = More Often than Not 6 = All the Time

When we talk about things that matter to me, my spouse/partner is likely to…

Pick up on my feelings	1	2	3	4	5	6
Feel like we're not getting anywhere	1	2	3	4	5	6
Show an interest	1	2	3	4	5	6
Get frustrated	1	2	3	4	5	6
Share similar experiences	1	2	3	4	5	6
Keep feelings inside	1	2	3	4	5	6
Respect my point of view	1	2	3	4	5	6
Change the subject	1	2	3	4	5	6
See the humor in things	1	2	3	4	5	6
Feel down	1	2	3	4	5	6
Express an opinion clearly	1	2	3	4	5	6

Genero, Miller, & Surrey, 1992