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The father-daughter relationship is significant and consequential. Communication research focused on this relationship is in its infancy, and as such, there is much about the effects of communication patterns in the father-daughter relationship that remain unknown. This dissertation examines the antecedent and consequential correlates of convergence communication in the father-daughter relationship. Convergence communication is the central construct in the Necessary Convergence Communication theory, which is a theoretical framework designed to describe and explain how engaging in a specific, submissive interaction routine (i.e., convergence communication) can increase an individual’s risk for experiencing suboptimal psychosocial development and functioning. In this dissertation, the antecedent correlates are hypothesized to be financial strain, authoritarian parenting, psychological control, and differentiation. The main psychosocial consequential correlate of interest is the self-concept, operationalized as global self-worth, job competence, social acceptance, romantic relationships, and satisfaction with appearance.

Three hundred and eighteen emergent adult females participated in this dissertation study by completing an online survey that contained measures of all the constructs listed above. Structural equation modeling was employed to analyze the data via a two-step procedure in which a measurement model is first constructed and evaluated before moving on to the structural model. The results of this analysis revealed the following: a) the factor structure of convergence communication did not hold, suggesting that the manner in which it is measured needs to be refined; b) psychological control, differentiation, and two aspects of convergence communication (motivation to converge and disequilibrium) were highly correlated indicating they lacked discriminant validity and needed to be combined into a single latent variable (labeled
controlling parenting strategies); c) global self-worth, job competence, and social acceptance were highly correlated indicating they lacked discriminant validity and needed to be combined into a single latent variable (labeled general self-worth); d) financial strain and authoritarian parenting were both positively related to controlling parenting strategies, which was positively related to interpersonal deference; e) convergence communication (operationalized as interpersonal deference) was not related to perceptions of general self-worth, competence in romantic relationships, or satisfaction with appearance; e) controlling parenting strategies was negatively related to general self-worth, competence in romantic relationships, and satisfaction with appearance. These results are discussed with respect to their implications for Necessary Convergence Communication theory, the father-daughter relationship, general aspects of measurement, and the field of family communication. In addition, limitations within this dissertation are discussed and possible directions for future research are emphasized.
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CHAPTER 1: LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction

The father-daughter relationship is assumed to be the least examined and the least understood of the four major parent-child dyadic configurations (i.e., mother-daughter, father-son, mother-son, father-daughter; Fink, Buerkel-Rothfuss, & Buerkel, 1993; Secunda, 1992; Sharpe, 1994; Spillars, John, & Katz, 1992; Van Wormer, 2007). Though this assumption has not been empirically verified, it is certainly true that the father-daughter relationship has not been systematically examined to the same degree as the mother-daughter relationship (Nielsen, 2012). Simply performing a rudimentary search of the PsycINFO database provides evidence of this imbalance. Searching the database using the subject terms “mother-daughter” and “father-daughter,” and limiting the search to peer-reviewed works only, revealed 1,336 scholarly works concerning the mother-daughter relationship published between 1932 and 2013, and 478 concerning the father-daughter relationship published between 1962 and 2013 (a ratio of almost 3 to 1).

This lack of attention to the father-daughter relationship compared to the mother-daughter relationship is particularly noticeable within the field of communication (Punyanunt-Carter, 2006). A search of the discipline’s largest database, Communication & Mass Media Complete, using the same procedure as outlined above produced 51 scholarly works concerning the mother-daughter relationship published between 1980 and 2013. It produced 19 scholarly works concerning the father-daughter relationship published between 1992 and 2013. Broadening the search by using Boolean logic with the following subject terms “mother,” “father,” and “daughter” produced an additional 14 results for mothers and daughters, while producing only an additional 7 results for fathers and daughters. All 26 of the works relating to
fathers and their daughters were published between 1992 and 2013, which appears to indicate that, on average, roughly one scholarly work concerning the father-daughter relationship gets published within the discipline of communication a year.

Though the paucity of research on the father-daughter relationship compared to the mother-daughter relationship, especially within the discipline of communication, is troubling, it is not justification enough for investing the resources necessary to properly examine this relationship. There are likely numerous phenomena and relationships that receive little to no attention from researchers because they have no “real-world” merit. The father-daughter relationship, however, does not fit within this category. In fact, there are both theoretical and empirical reasons to believe that studying the father-daughter relationship has a great deal of “real-world” merit.

From a theoretical standpoint, Amato (1998), following the work of Coleman (1988, 1990), described how the notion of capital, which is divided into three distinct types, helps to illuminate how fathers influence their children. First, fathers can provide human capital, which consists of all the skills, knowledge, and characteristics that are deemed appropriate for success in a given culture. These can include such things as verbal and mathematical abilities, professional skill sets, correct knowledge of social norms concerning personal conduct, and a strong work ethic. According to Amato (1998), fathers who possess these qualities should provide their children with more stimulating home environments, higher academic and occupational aspirations, and greater opportunities to observe proper functioning in social and work settings.

Second, fathers can provide financial capital. Financial capital refers not only to income but also to the resources and experiences that are provided by that income. These would include
such things as proper housing, nutritious foods, and products that help to increase success at
school (e.g., private instructions, personal electronic devices, etc.).

Finally, fathers can provide social capital, which refers to relations in the family and the
community that benefit children. Amato specifically highlighted the co-parental relationship and
the parent-child relationship with respect to social capital (though other relationships can
certainly exist that benefit the child, e.g., father-teacher). The co-parental relationship provides
children with the opportunity to see pro-social dyadic skills played out, and through this
observation, children are likely to model these behaviors. There is also the benefit of being able
to provide children with a singular and unified structure of authority. With respect to the parent-
child relationship, Amato highlighted the importance of parental behaviors that help build a
sense of trust and efficacy in children, which helps to reinforce and develop their sense of self
worth and competence. He also emphasized the importance of parental behaviors designed to
teach a child how to act and interact appropriately and productively within a society constrained
by particular rules and regulations. In sum, fathers are important because they can provide their
children with the types of capital that are important to their development.

From an empirical standpoint, the research on father-child relationships that has been
conducted over the past four decades indicates that fathers influence their children across a wide
range of domains including academic achievement, socio-economic status, cognitive
development, social development/personal relationships, physical health, and psychological
adjustment (for reviews, see Flouri, 2005; Lamb, 2010; Rosenberg & Wilcox, 2006; Tamis-
LeMonda & Cabrera, 2002). Of particular importance in the literature on father-child relations is
the accumulating evidence demonstrating that fathers play just as important a role in their
daughter’s development as mothers, and in some cases, they play a more important role
(Brotherson & White, 2006; Botta & Dumlao, 2002; Boyd, Ashcraft, & Belgrave, 2006; Flouri, 2005; Hutchinson & Cederbaum, 2010; Kosterman, Haggety, Spoth, & Redmond, 2004; Lamb 2010; Perkins, 2001; Secunda, 1992; Stolz, Barber, & Olsen, 2005; Tarnis & Cabrera, 2011). For instance, Flouri (2005) found that father involvement was related to daughters’ psychological distress in a negative fashion similar to mother involvement. Moreover, Lam, McHale, and Crouter (2012) found that for both adolescent girls and boys, time spent with fathers, but not mothers, was positively associated with self-worth and social competence.

Though the empirical research does not provide unequivocal support for the notion that fathers influence child outcomes (see Flouri, 2005, for a discussion), the general pattern emerging from research suggests they do. This coupled with the fact that the majority of children in the U.S. under the age of 18 live with some type of father-figure (Hofferth, Stueve, Pleck, Bianci, & Sayer, 2002) makes studying the father-child relationship, and the father-daughter relationship in particular, a meaningful endeavor.

Moreover, studying the father-daughter relationship through a communicative lens is a vital task for relationship scholars to undertake. Communication is at the foundation of personal relationships (Duck, 1994), especially parent-child relationships (Socha & Stamp, 1995). It is seen as a facilitative force behind the development or decline of family cohesion and adaptability (Barnes & Olsen, 1985; Olson, Sprengle, & Russell, 1979). Indeed, research consistently demonstrates that family systems characterized by positive communication function more optimally than those with poor communication (Olsen, 2000). Moreover, communication patterns and behaviors influence children’s psychosocial outcomes (Ellis, 2002; Floyd & Mormon, 2003; Koerner & Fitzpatrick, 2002b; Jackson, Bijstra, Oostra, & Bosma, 1998). For example, Schrodt, Ledbetter, and Ohrt (2007) demonstrated that supportive communication
patterns and behaviors were positively associated with young adults’ self-esteem and negatively associated with their perceptions of stress and mental health symptoms. Conversely, controlling communication patterns were negatively associated with self-esteem and positively associated with stress and mental health symptoms.

Clearly, communication is a powerful mechanism influencing individuals’ personal and relational functioning for better or for worse. In this dissertation, the communicative phenomenon of interest is convergence communication (Miller-Day, 2004, 2005). Convergence communication is an unhealthy communication pattern defined by a strong power imbalance in which the less powerful partner engages in a meaning-making process dominated by the more powerful partner in order to maintain the relationship. In this way, the less powerful partner does not think and act for him/herself; rather, he/she thinks and acts exactly how the dominant partner desires. Specifically, the purpose of this dissertation is to examine the paternal antecedents of convergence communication in the father-daughter relationship. In addition, this dissertation will examine the effects that engaging in convergence communication with a father can have on an emergent adult daughter’s sense of self-worth and evaluations of competency in domains relevant to her stage in the lifespan.

**Conceptual Overview of Parenting and Its Influence on Child Development**

Within the literature on parent-child interactions and socialization, two broad dimensions of parenting, support and control, have been identified as being important to child development and functioning (Baumrind, 1968; Cummings, Davies, & Campbell, 2000; Crockett & Hayes, 2011; Rollins & Thomas, 1979; Steinmetz, 1979). Support is conceptualized as the parents’ acceptance of and positive feelings for their child (Crockett & Hayes, 2011). Specific parenting behaviors that display support include such things as encouragement, praise, verbal and physical
affection, and responsiveness. Research examining the relationship between parental support and child functioning has consistently found that it positively predicts healthy functioning (Barber, Stolz, Olson, Collins, & Burchinal, 2005; Crockett & Hayes, 2011; Forehand & Nousiainen, 1993).

The dimension of control, which is central to this dissertation, consists of two types: behavioral and psychological (Barber, 1996; Schaefer, 1965; Steinberg, 1990). Each type of control is associated with different parental behaviors, socialization goals, and child outcomes (Crockett & Hayes, 2011). Behavioral control encompasses those parenting practices that are targeted at regulating children’s behavior (Barber, 1996). Thus, specific parental behaviors might include setting firm limits and expectations, monitoring children’s compliance with family rules and expectations, and consistently enforcing appropriate consequences for when violations occur. The goal of behavioral control is to teach children what is and what is not considered acceptable and responsible behavior, which is important considering that children do not always know what is best for them. Research examining the effects of behavioral control on child functioning has consistently revealed that it is linked to positive outcomes (Barber, 1992, 1996; Barber & Harmon, 2002; Barber, Olsen, & Shagle, 1994; Barber et al., 2005; Flechther, Steinberg, & Sellers, 1999; Rubin & Burgess, 2002; Steinberg, 1990).

Psychological control, on the other hand, refers to parenting practices that are designed to regulate children’s internal states, such as emotions, thoughts, and values (Barber, 1996). Barber and Harmon (2002) considered psychological control to be an intrusion into and manipulation of a child’s mental world whereby the child is hindered from differentiating (i.e., separating) from his or her parents. Parents may employ a variety of techniques in the service of enacting psychological control, such as love withdrawal, guilt induction, shaming, constraining the child’s
verbal interactions, and invalidating the child’s feelings. The goal of psychological control is two-fold. First, it teaches children that what they think and feel is inferior to what their parents’ think and feel, and second, it teaches children that they should place more importance on their parents’ thoughts and feelings than their own. In this way, psychological control confines the child to the psychological world of the parent (Barber & Harmon, 2002), and this confinement impedes children’s ability to individuate from their parents (Anderson & Sabatelli, 1992; Barber & Buehler, 1996; Bowen, 1978). It should come as no surprise that research into the effects of psychological control on child functioning has repeatedly found that it is associated with negative outcomes (Barber, 1996; Barber & Harmon, 2002; Barber et al., 2005; Conger, Conger, & Scaramella, 1997; Plunkett, Henry, Robinson, Behnke, & Falcon, 2007; Rogers, Buchanan, & Winchell, 2003; Rubin & Burgess, 2002).

Within both types of control, it can clearly be seen that the strategies employed by parents to achieve their desired ends are communicative in nature. It can also be seen that each type of control highlights different characteristics of communication. With respect to psychological control, dominance is a key parental communicative characteristic; that is, parents use psychologically controlling strategies as a way to assert and maintain their status of authority with respect to their children (Barber & Harmon, 2002). Dominance, along with related constructs such as power, social influence, and coercion, has been the focus of a great deal of social science research, and this is particularly true for communication research (Berger, 1994; Burgoon & Dillman, 1995; Burgoon & Dunbar, 2000). In fact, Berger (1994) stated that “dimensions related to power and dominance are crucial to our understanding of the dynamics of social relationships and the communication that both takes place within them and acts to define them” (p. 451).
Just as important, however, is the concept of submission. Power is a relational characteristic rather than an individual characteristic (Blau, 1964; Dunbar, 2004; Thibaut & Kelley, 1959; Winter, 1973). Dominance cannot exist in a relationship without submission (Leary, 1957). Just as dominance has personal and interpersonal consequences, so too does submission (Miller-Day, 2004, 2005; Powers, Battle, Dorta, & Welsh, 2010). Submission, however, has garnered much less research attention, especially from a communication standpoint (Miller-Day & Walker, 2012). Recent work by Miller-Day and her colleagues (Miller-Day, 2004, 2005; Pettigrew, Miller-Day, & Chesnut, 2012; Miller-Day & Walker-Jackson, 2012) has sought to expand our theoretical and practical knowledge of submission in interpersonal relationships by focusing on the communicative behaviors of submissive partners and how these behaviors relate back to cognitions and psychosocial health factors.

Though this work is insightful, it is still in its infancy. As such, there is still much we do not know about the communicative nature of submission, its antecedent conditions, and its consequences for personal and interpersonal functioning. For example, Miller-Day (2004, 2005) proposed that the relational ecology that cultivates submissive communication is characterized by high levels of psychological control and low levels of individuation among members. However, there is no account of the factors that may contribute to the high levels of psychological control and the low levels of individuation among relational partners. Furthermore, Miller-Day (2004, 2005) proposed that engaging in submissive communication can have deleterious effects on psychosocial functioning, but work to date has focused primarily on depression, eating disorders, and suicidality. Thus, we know little about how engaging in submissive communication affects an individual’s overall evaluations of self-worth and competence, which are likely linked to depression, eating disorders, and suicidality (Harter,
One interpersonal context that would certainly benefit from further investigation of the communicative nature of submission is the father-daughter relationship. The father-daughter relationship is a consequential one for both fathers and daughters (Nielsen, 2012), but, as mentioned previously, this particular dyad has received considerably less attention from researchers, educators, and health professionals than the mother-daughter dyad (Nielsen, 2012). This is unfortunate especially with respect to the issue of interpersonal dominance and submission because empirical evidence suggests that fathers are more likely than mothers to engage in authoritarian parenting (i.e., high control coupled with low warmth; Conrade & Ho, 2001; McKinney & Renk, 2008; Russell, Aloa, Feder, Glover, Miller, & Palmer, 1998). Additionally, some researchers also report fathers engaging in higher levels of psychological control than mothers (Nelson & Coyne, 2009; Nelson & Crick, 2002). Taken together, fathers often are seen as the more domineering force in the family system, and Sharpe’s (1994) insightful qualitative investigation into the relational world of fathers and daughters helps to demonstrate just how domineering fathers are perceived to be by their daughters and how impactful this dominance, and its subsequent submission on the part of daughters, can be to the daughters’ development across the lifespan.

Unfortunately, Sharpe’s (1994) work is the exception rather than the rule, and her work focused much more on the issue of dominance than it did on submission. This lack of emphasis on the process of submission in the father-daughter relational context inhibits the development of a truly detailed understanding of this relationship type and the effects that interpersonal submission can have on its members. Therefore, a primary purpose of this dissertation is to fill this gap in the literature by examining the father-daughter relationship through the lens of Miller-
Day’s (2004, 2005) necessary convergence communication (NCC) theory. NCC theory was developed to elucidate the interactive process of interpersonal submission in close relationships and its relation to psychosocial aspects of human development and functioning.

**Necessary Convergence Communication Theory**

The negotiation of meaning within an interpersonal context is an inherent aspect of human interaction. In a country such as the United States, in which autonomy and independence tend to be highly valued, this process involves at least two autonomous thinkers who bring their own experiences and competencies to bear on the encoding and decoding of messages and related experiences. That is, in fact, the model of communication presented in communication textbooks and taught in introductory undergraduate communication courses (DeVito, 2008; Johnstone, McCullough, & Haman, 2011; McCornack, 2008).

Although this may be the normative approach to the negotiation of meaning and the creation of a shared understanding between two interactants, it certainly is not the only one. In an extensive ethnographic field study of 18 mostly middle-class, grandmother-mother-daughter triads living in a small U.S. town, Miller-Day (2004) noted a communicative process of negotiation and shared understanding characterized by strong power dynamics in which some of the daughters were highly submissive to their mothers. These women were so enmeshed in their relationships with their mothers, and their mothers were so psychologically controlling, that they privileged their mothers’ perspective on issues at the expense of their own. That is, they unquestioningly accepted their mothers’ interpretation of an event as their own. Utilizing grounded theory principles (Glaser & Strauss, 1967), Miller-Day (2004) created NCC theory to explain what she observed in her study.

At its core, NCC theory is concerned with the meaning making process of submissive
relational partners and the effects this process has on their psychosocial development and functioning. The theory rests on five key assumptions (Miller-Day, 2005). First, communication is viewed as an emergent and innovative activity in which interpretative schemata are employed to coordinate meanings. That is, as human beings, we are in a constant state of interpreting our social world and deciphering its various meanings. This process is an interdependent one because meanings are not inherent in objects and symbols; rather, they are derived from people’s interactions (Berlo, 1960). Moreover, this process is governed by communicators’ interpretative schemata, which Miller-Day (2005) defined as “mental structures consisting of organized knowledge about relationships” (p. 4). These interpretive schemata help people make sense of their interactions, and they guide their behavior in their interactions with others (Burleson, Metts, & Kirch, 2000; Collins, Guichard, Ford, & Fenney, 2004; Koerner & Fitzpatrick, 2002a).

This cognitive property of relationships has long been a bedrock of social scientific theorizing about intimate relationships (Baldwin, 1992; Bowlby, 1969). Many terms have been used to refer to these schemata (e.g., working models, interpretive schemata, etc.); however, Planalp (1987) argued that the term “relational schemata” should be employed in abstract discussions because of all the terms contained in the literature, it is the most general. Flecther (1993) proposed people’s relational schemata are hierarchically organized with relationship-specific schemata (e.g., father-daughter) being subsumed under relationship-type schemata (e.g., family) which are subsumed under a general social schemata. Koerner and Fitzpatrick (2002a) adopted this hierarchical conceptualization of relational schemata into their theory of family communication, and they proposed that when individuals need to create or decipher meanings in their family relationships, they will start with their relationship-specific schemata and move to more abstract mental structures of relational knowledge only if the information contained in their
relationship-specific schemata proves to be inadequate for the meaning making process. Ultimately when engaged in the meaning making process, relational partners filter each other’s messages through their respective relational schemata and attempt to (co)create a shared understanding of events (Miller-Day, 2004). As pointed out by Miller-Day (2005), coordination and negotiation, terms that convey the notion of collaboration and egalitarianism, are implicit components of this assumption.

Second, communication is seen as enacting relationships. Duck and Pond (1989) contend that communication is the relationship. That is, it is through communication that relationships are formed, defined, and redefined (see also Duck, 1995). As was pointed out quite some time ago by Watzlawick, Beavin, and Jackson (1967), all verbal and nonverbal messages have both a content level and a relationship level. The content level refers to what was said while the relationship level refers to how it was said and consequently, how the message should be interpreted. For example, if a teenager comes home after curfew and her parents agitatedly greet her at the door with the statement “You’re late,” the content level of the message simply involves time whereas the relationship level of the message is more complex. The teenager may interpret this message as an indictment of her parents’ disappointment in her, as a harsh critique of her ability to make responsible choices, as a parental move to assert or reassert their authority over her, or as a mixture of all three. At any rate, the relationship level of a message is an ever present feature of all messages, and it contains pertinent information about how relational partners view and understand their relationship with each other.

Third, communicative transactions that occur in close relationships are seen as being consequential for both personal and relational identities. In other words, communication impacts people’s definitions of themselves, their relationships, and who they are in their relationships
Within this assumption, the development of a personal identity is seen as occurring within a relational context rather than developing outside of relationships (Adams & Marshall, 1996; Cooley, 1902; Mead, 1934).

Fourth, relational culture is assumed to shape relational schemata. Wood (2000) noted that relational cultures are comprised of systems of shared meanings, habituated interaction patterns, and norms that serve to regulate group members’ roles and behaviors. Just as individuals are socialized into the larger national culture that they are born into, they are also socialized into relational cultures. Inevitably, this socialization process will influence their relational schemata, and Miller-Day (2005) maintained that this socialization process will result in members of the same relational culture possessing similar relational schemata, which should be manifested in their communicative behaviors.

Finally, interpersonal scripts are believed to emerge from relational schemata. Interpersonal scripts are the typical patterns of interaction that occur between relational partners (Baldwin, 1992). They are a type of communicative practice grounded in relational schemata (Koerner & Fitzpatrick, 2002a). These scripts are so ingrained in the relationships of the interactants that they are enacted without any conscious thought or critical reflection much like an actor who has memorized his lines so well that he doesn’t have to think; he just does. People rely upon these scripts to help them enact behaviors that fit within the parameters of their relationship-specific schemata (Miller-Day, 2005).

Based upon these assumptions, Miller-Day (2004) theorized that the phenomenon she observed of unquestioned deference by some of the daughters in her study to their mothers’ interpretative frames was a scripted pattern of interaction that emerged from the daughters’ relational schemas concerning maternal relationships. Specifically, Miller-Day (2004) theorized
that these daughters’ schemas concerning their relationships with their mothers were founded upon “conditional regard” (p. 204). In other words, these women possessed a mental model of their relationship with their mothers which led them to believe that in order for them to be accepted in the relationship, they had to defer to their mothers. These relational schemas, rooted in conditional regard, were believed to be heavily influenced by the culture of the maternal relationships, which she observed as being transmitted across generations. That is, regardless of their spot in the life course, each member of the maternal triad seemed to have the same understanding of maternal relationships and how they were to be enacted, and the adult mothers deferred to their daughters’ grandmothers just as the younger daughters deferred to their mothers (and grandmothers).

Miller-Day (2004) termed the interpersonal script she observed in these maternal relationships convergence communication. Further, she delineated three aspects of this type of communication: a) disequilibrium; b) interpersonal deference; and c) motivation to converge.

**Disequilibrium.** This dimension of convergence communication refers to the unequal balance of participation in and contribution to both social interaction and meaning construction. Miller-Day (2004) observed that some of the daughters in her study initiated fewer interactions than their mothers, and in their interactions, the daughters did not participate or contribute as much as the mothers did. Thus, the dominant or higher-status member (e.g., the mother) had more control over the communicative interactions of the dyad than the submissive or lower-status member (e.g., the daughter). Of far more consequence, however, was the observation that these daughters’ afforded more importance to their mothers’ interpretive schemata than their own. In this way, these daughters gave their mothers the power to determine social meanings. Thus, the mothers not only said more than their daughters during communicative exchanges,
they also had more *say* than their daughters in the interaction. This is an important distinction to make, as simply not participating as much in a social interaction as another does not necessarily imply that a person is being subservient. When, however, a lack of participation is coupled with a lack of contribution to the creation of meaning during an interaction, submission is at work in the relationship via a disequilibrium.

**Interpersonal deference.** This characteristic of convergence communication refers to the submissive partner’s uncritical adoption of the dominant partner’s beliefs, interpretations, and meanings. In this way, the submissive partner does not truly think for him/herself; rather, he/she takes the meanings and interpretations of the dominant member and makes them his/her own. Miller-Day and Walker-Jackson (2012) referred to the classic literary work of *The Fountainhead* (Rand, 1943) to help illuminate this concept. In the book, Rand (1943) describes a group of people known as second-handers. These people prefer not to think for themselves. Instead, they prefer to take what others tell them and make it their own. In effect, their understanding of reality is willingly subjugated to others’ interpretations. This is the dynamic that occurs within the dimension of interpersonal deference.

Conceptually, this dimension of convergence communication is similar to the conformity orientation of the family communication patterns framework (Koerner & Fitzpatrick, 2002b, 2006; Ritchie & Fitzpatrick, 1990). Conformity orientation is defined as, “the degree to which family communication stresses a climate of homogeneity of attitudes, values, and beliefs” (Koerner & Fitzpatrick, 2002b, p. 39). Within families characterized by this orientation, there is a strong belief in family hierarchy (Koerner & Fitzpatrick, 2002b), and parents utilize their power and authority to impose conformity (Ritchie, 1988, 1991). Thus, one would expect interpersonal deference to occur in families operating under a conformity orientation. However,
this may not be the case, as the stressing of conformity by parents does not necessarily ensure that conformity will be achieved. In fact, nowhere in the operationalization of the conformity orientation are individuals asked if they actually think, feel, or behave in a manner that converges with how their parents want them to think, feel, or behave. Rather, individuals are asked to provide their perceptions of how much their parents stressed conformity through different communicative behaviors. This seems to reflect Koerner & Fitzpatrick’s (2002b) assumption that parents have more influence on the climate of family communication than children. Interpersonal deference, on the other hand, does take into account the child’s convergence to parental ways of thinking, feeling, or behaving. Therefore, conformity orientation can be construed as a characteristic of parental dominant communication and interpersonal deference as a characteristic of children’s submissive communication.

**Motivation to converge.** This final dimension of convergence communication refers to the underlining reason behind the submissive partner’s continual self-imposed subjugation. As noted previously, Miller-Day (2004) theorized that the motivation behind incorporating the dominant member’s meanings at the expense of the submissive member’s meanings is fear of suffering relational consequences for not doing so. In this way, the theory embodies the perspective that individuals behave in ways that minimize pain and maximize pleasure (Miller & Dollard, 1941). Not deferring to the dominant partner would risk losing valuable interpersonal resources (i.e., it would constitute pain) while deferring would maintain those resources (i.e., it would constitute pleasure). In this way, Miller-Day (2004) theorized that convergence communication is relationally adaptive.

**Convergence communication and psychosocial functioning.** Miller-Day (2004) was careful to note that disequilibrium, interpersonal deference, and motivation are not necessarily
heinous components of communicative interaction in and of themselves. In fact, there are certain social settings in which these elements might very well be considered appropriate (e.g., education, health care, etc.). According to NCC theory, however, these elements become problematic to people’s psychosocial functioning when they exist to a high degree and consistently occur across time and contexts in a particular relationship.

**Degree.** Degree refers to the relative amount of convergence that occurs within a particular relationship. Miller-Day (2005) outlined four basic levels of convergence communication, and for illustrative purposes, these will be applied to a hypothetical scenario involving a parent-child disagreement over an outfit. Under conditions of high convergence, the child (i.e., the lower-status partner) unquestioningly adopts the parent’s (i.e., the higher-status partner’s) interpretation of the disagreement. That is, the child not only changes the outfit to something that the parent likes but also changes his/her interpretation of the outfit to match the parent’s. Under conditions of moderately high convergence, the child changes the outfit to something that the parent likes, but the child does not alter his/her personal interpretation of the outfit to align with the parent’s. Rather, the change is simply done to appease the parent. Under conditions of moderately low convergence, the child makes minor changes in the outfit to incorporate both interpretations of what is an appropriate outfit to wear. Lastly, under conditions of low convergence, the child listens to the parent’s views on the outfit but changes nothing because he/she likes the outfit (i.e., the child privileges his/her own interpretative frame over the parent’s). NCC theory postulates that the higher the degree of convergence, the more impaired an individual’s psychosocial functioning becomes.

**Chronicity.** Chronicity refers to the length and pervasiveness of convergence within a particular relationship across both time and context. Miller-Day (2004) observed that the women
in her qualitative study who had engaged in convergence communication with their mothers for an extended period of time had an undefined sense of self and lower self-esteem relative to the women who did not have a history of converging with their mothers’ interpretations. Miller-Day (2004, 2005) speculated that pervasive convergence within a relationship would encourage a sense of learned helplessness and depression in the lower-status partner. Miller-Day and Walker-Jackson’s (2012) research utilizing an emerging adult sample of college students demonstrated that, in fact, convergence communication is positively associated with both learned helplessness and depression, especially in females.

Other research focusing on convergence communication has found that, in line with the suppositions of NCC theory, it is related to negative health outcomes such as eating disorders (Miller-Day & Fisher, 2008), and suicidality (Miller-Day, 2010) in emerging adult male and female college students. In a study on parental uses of control and its effect on emerging adult children, the disequilibrium component of convergence communication was found to be inversely related to perceptions of independence (Smith, 2008). That is, individuals who participated less in conversational interactions and the creation of meaning (i.e., more disequilibrium) also perceived themselves to be less independent of their parents. This finding along with Pettigrew and colleagues’ (2012) finding that convergence communication is associated with impeded differentiation in an emerging adult sample of college students lend support to Miller-Day’s (2004) hypothesis that enmeshed relationships are an antecedent condition of convergence communication (although the effects could operate in the opposite direction). Pettigrew and colleagues (2012) also found that psychological control positively predicted convergence communication in their emerging adult sample, as was hypothesized by Miller-Day (2004). The findings of Pettigrew and associates (2012) held for both mothers and
fathers, and both male and female participants indicated they engage in convergence communication more with their fathers than mothers. This last finding is particularly relevant for this dissertation, as it indicates that convergence communication is relevant to the father-child relationship during emerging adulthood.

As mentioned previously, the purpose of this dissertation is to advance our understanding of the father-daughter relationship by situating it within the theoretical framework of NCC theory (Miller-Day, 2004, 2005). To that end, the conceptual model presented in Figure 1 will be examined. The next two sections of this dissertation provide a rationale for the hypothesized model.
Figure 1: Conceptual Model
Antecedent Correlates of Convergence Communication

As has already been noted, Miller-Day (2004, 2005) hypothesized that both psychological control and differentiation are important antecedent conditions to the development of convergence communication, and there is some initial evidence to support this claim in emerging adult samples of college students (Pettigrew et al., 2012; Smith, 2008). Additionally, Pettigrew and his colleagues (2012) found that psychological control and differentiation were inversely associated, which coincides with prior conceptualizations of psychological control as impeding differentiation (Anderson & Sabatelli, 1992; Barber & Buehler, 1996; Barber & Harmon, 2002; Bowen, 1978). Based on this theoretical and empirical evidence, the following hypotheses are proposed:

H1: Perceptions of psychological control will be positively associated with perceptions of convergence communication.

H2: Perceptions of psychological control will be negatively related to perceptions of differentiation.

H3: Perceptions of differentiation will be negatively associated with perceptions of convergence communication.

However, given the dynamics of family life, it seems unlikely that these are the only antecedent conditions of convergence communication. They may be the most proximal with respect to convergence communication, but they are likely influenced by other parental (and in this case paternal) characteristics. In fact, there is good reason to believe that a father’s use of psychologically controlling strategies is influenced by the parenting style that he endorses. Scholars investigating father-child relationships, in general, and father-daughter relationships, in particular, have long recognized that different types of fathers exist (Endres, 1997; Fields, 1983;
Fishel, 1985; Goulter & Minninger, 1993; Jain, Belsky, Crnic, 1996; Marone, 1988; Perkins, 2001; Secunda, 1992). Overall, each of these typologies of fathers includes some type of reference to a dominating, demanding, or authoritarian father. This category of fathers is described as being overly concerned with obedience and conformity. Ultimately, this father seeks to control his children and maintain his privileged position of power within their relationship thereby impeding his children’s ability to develop a healthy degree of differentiation from him.

This type of father is conceptually quite similar to what Baumrind (1968, 1971, 1973) termed the authoritarian parent. In her well-established typology of parenting styles, the authoritarian parent is considered to be low in warmth but high in control. As Baumrind (1968) described, this type of parent seeks to “shape, control, and evaluate the behavior and attitudes of the child in accordance with a set standard of conduct, usually an absolute standard…” (p. 261). This type of parent does not value or encourage verbal give-and-take in the relationship. In fact, Issacs and Koerner (2008) found that this type of parenting style was associated with a conformity orientation to communication within the family. Therefore, the authoritarian parent values obedience and will enact necessary measures to alter his children’s thinking or behavior when he perceives it to be out of line. Since the authoritarian style of parenting privileges conformity and obedience through the exercise of strict control, it is likely that this type of parenting will be related to increased levels of psychological control and decreased levels of differentiation. Thus, the following hypothesis is advanced:

H4: Perceptions of authoritarian parenting will be negatively related to perceptions of differentiation and positively related to perceptions of psychological control.

In addition to the influence of authoritarian parenting, the effect of the father’s socio-economic status (SES) on his parenting practices needs to be considered. Research examining the
role of parental behaviors in the socialization of children has long emphasized the need to consider SES (Gecas, 1979). Results from quantitative studies investigating this issue, though not unequivocal (Meteyer & Perry-Jenkins, 2009), generally find that lower socio-economic conditions measured in terms of education (Davis-Kean, 2005; Dornbusch, Ritter, Leiderman, Roberts, & Fraleigh, 1987; Shumow & Lomax, 2002; Simons, Beaman, Conger, & Chao, 1993), income (Conger, Conger, Elder, Lorenz, Simons, & Whitbeck, 1992; Meteyer & Perry-Jenkins, 2009; Shumow & Lomax, 2002), financial stress (Conger et al., 1992; Gutman & Eccles, 1999; Gutman, McLoyd, & Tokoyawa, 2005; Shumow & Lomax, 2002), quality of work environment (Greenberger, O’Neil, & Nagel, 1994), and/or work conditions (Conger et al., 1992) are associated with decreases in positive parenting behaviors and increases in harsh parenting practices.

More specifically, researchers from a variety of social scientific disciplines have found an association between low parental SES and the adoption of authoritarian beliefs and practices (Bluestone & Tamis-LeMonda, 1999; Dornbusch et al., 1987; Fox & Timmerman, 2002; Furstenberg, Cook, Eccles, Elder, and Sameroff, 1999; Jordan, 1970; Laureau, 2003; McLoyd, 1990; Rosier & Corsaro, 1993; Shumow, Vandell, & Posner, 1998; Thompson, Hollis, & Richards, 2003), as well as the use of psychologically controlling strategies (Barber, 1996; Crockenberg & Litman, 1990; Mason, Couce, Gonzalez, & Hiraga, 1996). Work within the field of communication has revealed a similar pattern (McLeod & Chaffee, 1972; Ritchie, 1997). For example, Ritchie (1997) found that families with lower SES were more likely to utilize a conformity-oriented communication pattern, which endorses more authoritarian beliefs than does a conversation-oriented pattern (Issacs & Koerner, 2008), at home while parents whose jobs favored openness, autonomy, and flexibility were more likely to use a conversation-oriented
communication pattern, which endorses more authoritative beliefs than does a conformity-oriented pattern (Issacs & Koerner, 2008). Thus, it would seem that paternal SES is an important factor to consider in the antecedent milieu of convergence communication, as it is likely to influence key paternal characteristics (i.e., psychological control and authoritarian parenting) that are thought to be responsible for influencing the development of such a communication pattern.

From an empirical standpoint, the issue becomes which measure(s) of SES to include in an analysis. As Short (2005) noted in her review and analysis of different measures of economic well-being, no one particular measure captures the entire variability that is contained within the latent concept. However, when focusing specifically on parenting behaviors, financial strain may be the most informative measure of SES for several reasons.

First, financial strain can cut across different levels of education and income (Short, 2005). That is, income and education (two very popular measures of SES) are usually highly correlated (Shumow & Lomax, 2002; Smetana & Daddis, 2002), so individuals with higher levels of education, by and large, also have higher earnings. Financial strain, however, is a measure of the perceived extent to which families lack goods, services, or the means to engage in extra familial activities (Whelan, 1993). Thus, this measure is more sensitive to family circumstances, which may very well be independent of education level, than income. Second, due to the potential for multicollinearity issues with measures of education and income, less than desirable data analytic procedures often have to be employed (e.g., combining items or running separate analyses; Aytac, Araujo, Johannes, Kleinman, & McKinlay, 2000). A measure of financial stress does not present this dilemma. Finally and perhaps most importantly, is the empirical evidence that suggests fathering behaviors are greatly influenced by economic hardship and strain, with these behaviors becoming more negative as hardship and strain increase.
(Elder, 1974; Elder, Van Nguyen, & Caspi, 1985; Gonzales et al., 2011; Harris & Marmer, 1996; Lempers & Clark-Lempers, 1990; Mayhew & Lempers, 1998; Robertson, Elder, Skinner, & Conger, 1991; Simons, Whitbeck, Melby, & Wu, 1994). This may be especially true for the behaviors they enact with their daughters (Elder et al., 1985; Lempers & Clark-Lempers, 1990; Mayhew & Lempers, 1998). For example, Elder et al. (1985), using data collected from individuals who lived through the Great Depression, provided evidence that economic hardship increased fathers’ rejecting behaviors toward their daughters. Based on the accumulated evidence, the following hypothesis is put forth:

\[ H5: \text{Perceptions of financial stress will be positively related to perceptions of authoritarian parenting and psychological control.} \]

**Convergence Communication and the Self-Evaluative Process in Emerging Adult Females**

Developmental theorists have almost exclusively concluded that issues of identity development and consolidation occur in adolescence (Adelson, 1964; Erikson, 1963; Marcia, 1967). Perhaps the most famous of these theorists is Erikson (1963) who proffered a lifespan theory of psychosocial development that entails eight different stages. Each stage is conceptualized as consisting of a crisis, and the successful resolution of that crisis lays the groundwork for successfully navigating the next stage. In this model, the crisis of adolescence is identity formation versus identity foreclosure. During this transitory period, adolescents are exposed to a milieu of changes in physicality, mental maturity, and social roles and expectations. Through these developmental changes, adolescents make important discoveries about who they are and what they are capable of doing. By the time they reach the end of adolescence, they will have either successfully or unsuccessfully consolidated all they have learned about themselves into a coherent identity.
Recently, however, Arnett (2000, 2004) has argued that this process of identity formation does not end at 18, or in Eriksonian terms, this crisis is not fully resolved by the end of adolescence. He argues for a new period in the life course, termed emerging adulthood (approximately ages 18-25, with the upper bound being flexible; Arnett, 2007), that is concerned with solidifying one’s identity, especially in the realms of love, work, and values. His rationale for the need for this new developmental life stage is rooted in the principle changes that have occurred in the American landscape over the last sixty plus years.

In the 1950s, by the time individuals had reached their late teens and early twenties, they had essentially assumed what the larger society considered to be the primary responsibilities of adulthood: obtaining a full-time job, getting married, and starting a family. In fact, only a small proportion of the populace went on to obtain post-secondary education (Arnett & Taber, 1994). The majority simply transitioned into full-time work. Furthermore, the median age of marriage for women in 1960 was approximately 20, and the median age for men was approximately 22 (Arnett & Taber, 1994). The transition to parenthood usually occurred about one year after marriage (Arnett & Taber, 1994).

Sixty plus years later, however, the timing of these events has changed substantially. The percentage of individuals who have gone on to obtain post-secondary education has increased dramatically (Arnett & Taber, 1994). Just within the 10 year period from 2000 to 2010, college enrollment increased by 34% for students under the age of 25, and the National Center for Education Statistics projects an 11% increase in enrollment for this same demographic from 2010 to 2020 (U.S. Department of Education, 2012). This increase in the number of individuals pursuing higher education means full-time, stable employment is obtained in the middle to late twenties, rather than the early twenties. Additionally, the median age of marriage for women and
men is now 26 and 28, respectively (U.S. Bureau of the Census, 2010). The transition to parenthood still occurs about one year after marriage, but this now occurs toward the end of the third decade of life instead of the beginning.

Furthermore, full-time employment, marriage, and parenthood are no longer considered to be the leading markers of adult maturity. Rather, accepting personal responsibility, making independent decisions, and obtaining financial independence from parents are seen as the top indicators of adulthood status (Arnett, 1998, 2004). In today’s society, individuals do not normally achieve these goals until at least their mid-twenties. For example, financial independence from parents is achieved at later ages than ever before, as is evidenced by the growing trend for emerging adults to receive continued financial support from their parents well into their mid-twenties (Wightman, Patrick, Schoeni, & Schulenberg, 2013), as well as the growing trend for them stay in or return to their parents’ home (Fry, 2013).

These changes in the U.S. landscape (and the landscape of other developed nations; Arnett, 2011) have created an extended period of time between adolescence and young adulthood devoted to continued and intensified identity explorations (Arnett, 2004). In particular, these identity explorations focus on the areas of work, love, and values. As individuals traverse this period of the life course, they engage in a process of self-discovery in these areas that lays the foundation upon which the rest of their adult lives will be built (Arnett, 2004). In fact, research demonstrates that adults often perceive the events that occur during this time period as having more significance in their lives than events that occur at other life stages (Martin & Smyer, 1990). The successful transition from emerging adulthood to young adulthood in the U.S., then, is seen as occurring not only through simply obtaining the cultural markers of adult status, but also through the successful formulation of a coherent, normatively appropriate identity in each
one of these areas (Arnett, 2004).

As with the period of adolescence that precedes it, consolidating one’s identity in emerging adulthood entails asking and answering the question, “Who am I?” (Erikson, 1964). The answer to this question is commonly referred to as one’s self-concept. However, as Harter (1983, 1999, 2012) noted in her conceptualization of the self, the answer to this question cannot be clearly captured by general role descriptions (e.g., “I am a daughter”) or preferences (e.g., “I am a Dallas Cowboys fan”). Rather, to truly grasp the answer to this question, an individual’s overall assessment of self-worth and his/her competence in specific, age-relevant, content areas must be simultaneously considered. That is, the process of asking and answering the question of “who am I?” contains an evaluative component that exists on a continuum from positive to negative appraisals. According to Harter (1983, 1999, 2012), it is the evaluative component of the self that matters for an individual’s well-being, as self-evaluations are often more predictive of individuals’ outcomes than are more objective measures.

Harter (1983, 1999, 2012) has also observed that the self becomes increasingly differentiated with age. Thus, the number of salient domains on which one can evaluate him/herself increases across the lifespan. At the same time, salient domains from earlier points in the lifespan may not carry forward. For example, scholastic competence is a salient domain only during those periods of the lifespan in which an individual is typically enrolled in school. For individuals who are in the life stage of emerging adulthood, Neemann and Harter (1986) postulated that 13 salient domains exist: creativity, intellectual ability, scholastic competence, job competence, athletic competence, satisfaction with appearance, romantic relationships, social acceptance, close friendships, parent relationships, humor, morality, and global self-worth.

Examining the effect of convergence communication on all 13 domains is beyond the
scope of any one research project. Thus, in this dissertation, only those aspects of the self that are most highly relevant to NCC theory, identity explorations in emerging adulthood, and the father-daughter relationship will be examined. These aspects of self include: global self-worth, job competence, social acceptance, romantic relationships, and satisfaction with appearance (see Figure 1).

**Global self-worth.** Global self-worth is conceptualized as people’s overall evaluation of how they feel about themselves (Neemann & Harter, 1986). Though issues of self-worth (also referred to as self-esteem) are relevant for both men and women, there is evidence suggesting females struggle more with maintaining high self-esteem during adolescence and emerging adulthood. For example, a meta-analysis conducted by Kling, Hyde, Showers, & Buswell (1999) showed that women’s self-esteem scores were lower than men’s scores with the greatest difference being during the middle adolescent years. Similarly, a growth-curve analysis that modeled self-esteem over a seven year period and controlled for family cohesion and stressful life events revealed a marked drop in girls’ self-esteem from 12 to 17 whereas boys’ self-esteem was much more stable with only a temporary decline between the ages of 14 and 16 (Baldwin & Hoffman, 2002). Work by Robins, Trzesniewski, Tracy, Gosling, and Potter (2002) using cross-sectional data gathered on over 300,000 participants aged 9 to 90, showed that starting in early adolescence, women had considerably lower self-esteem scores than men. Interestingly, female self-esteem scores were higher in the 13-17 year old group (adolescence) than the 18-22 year old group (emerging adulthood). A longitudinal study by Galambos, Barker, and Krahn (2006) showed that self-esteem increased from 18 to 25 years of age for both men and women, but the levels of women’s self-esteem were consistently lower than the level of men’s self-esteem.

It has been theorized that women struggle more with possessing positive self-images than
do men because they are consistently exposed to unrealistic ideals of beauty via the various forms of mass media that abound in Western civilizations (Becker, Burwell, Herzog, Hamburg, & Gilman, 2002; Richins, 1991; Silverstein, Perdue, Peterson, & Kelly, 1986). Clay, Vignoles, & Dittmar (2005) found support for this in an adolescent sample. They exposed 136 U.K. girls to one of three experimental conditions: control, exposure to an average-sized model, and exposure to an ultra-thin model. The results of their analyses showed that girls who were exposed to the model conditions (regardless of size) reported significantly lower self-esteem scores than did the control group. Work by Rodgers, Chabrol, and Paxton (2011) demonstrated the effects of media influence on the internalization of media ideals, body dissatisfaction, and self-esteem among college aged women. Though they did not specifically assess the relationship between media influence and self-esteem, their model revealed that exposure to media content containing high amounts of messages about physical appearance was positively associated with higher levels of internalizing those messages about appearance. This was, in turn, related to greater body dissatisfaction, which was related to decreased self-esteem.

While it is undoubtedly true that sociocultural factors such as media exposure influence female self-esteem, it seems just as plausible that their self-esteem is influenced by familial factors such as the relationship they have with their fathers. In fact, several studies have examined the influence fathers have on their daughters’ self-esteem with the general finding being that fathers do influence their daughters’ self-esteem (Allgood, Beckert, & Peterson, 2012; Barber & Thomas, 1986; Bulanda & Majumdar, 2009; Cheng & Furnham, 2004; Cooper, 2009; Forsman, 1989; Kinney, 1989; Lam, McHale, & Crouter, 2012; Mori, 1999; Openshaw, Thomas, & Rollins, 1984; Plunkett et al., 2007; Resendez, 2000; Scheffler & Naus, 1999). Of particular relevance to the current investigation is Cheng and Furnham’s (2004) finding that fathers’
discouragement of behavioral autonomy was negatively related to their emerging adult daughters’ self-esteem. This finding highlights the negative effect that paternal control can have on a daughter’s self-worth. However, what this study, and the other listed studies, does not account for is the role that a daughter’s behavior, especially her communicative behavior, may play in effecting her self-esteem.

According to NCC theory (Miller-Day, 2004, 2005), the utilization of a submissive communicative orientation by less powerful dyad members (i.e., daughters) is directly related to their psychosocial functioning. Miller-Day & Walker-Jackson (2012) have provided initial support for this claim by finding that convergence communication was positively associated with learned helplessness and depression, especially in emerging adult females. Interestingly, no empirical study that I am aware of has examined the relationship between convergence communication and self-worth, even though Miller-Day (2004) noted that the women in her ethnographic study who belonged to families characterized by convergence communication appeared to have lower levels of self-worth than those who did not belong to such families. However, research using the family communication patterns perspective has shown that there is a negative correlation between conformity orientation and self-esteem (Farahati, 2011; Hamon & Schrodt, 2012; Huang, 1999; Noller, 1995; Schrodt et al., 2007). Synthesizing all of this evidence, the following hypothesis is advanced:

H6: Perceptions of convergence communication will be negatively associated with perceptions of global self-worth.

**Job competence.** Job competence is defined as people’s general impression of their satisfaction with and confidence in their ability to execute the demands of a job (Neemann & Harter, 1986). Little is known about how fathers influence their daughter’s perceptions of job
competence. In the few studies that have examined job competence in the context of the father-daughter relationship (Hopkins & Klein, 1993; Klein, O’Bryant, & Hopkins, 1996), the findings are mixed. Hopkins and Klein (1993) found that paternal nurturance and daughters’ perceptions of job competence were positively correlated, but this correlation was not statistically significant. This suggests that the quality of care a daughter receives from her father has no impact on her perceptions of job competence. Klein et al. (1996) found that daughters’ perceptions of job competence was positively and significantly related to their father’s authoritative parenting, suggesting paternal care does influence daughters’ perceptions of job competence. Though not specifically assessing job competence, Li and Kerpelman (2007) found that fathers do have an influence on their daughters’ career aspirations. In particular, they found that the closer a daughter was to her father and the less able she was to separate her feelings from her father’s feelings, the more likely she was to align her career aspirations with her father’s aspirations for her if there was a disagreement. This suggests the quality of the father-daughter relationship as well as the daughter’s own behavior is consequential for shaping her view on the appropriateness of a particular career choice. This latter point is especially important to this dissertation, as it demonstrates that the behavior of the daughter (i.e., separating feelings from father’s feelings) is consequential to her outcome (i.e., willingness to change career aspirations).

Within the framework of NCC theory, Li and Kerpelman’s (2007) study provides some support for the claim that enmeshed relationships (i.e., high connectedness coupled with low ability to differentiate thoughts and feelings) are predictive of convergence, as well as the claim that the behavior(s) of the submissive partner are consequential for her own outcomes. Furthermore, their findings demonstrate that the domain of work is one in which the opinions of the father can carry considerable weight with the daughter. Since convergence communication is
positively associated with learned helplessness (Miller-Day & Walker-Jackson, 2012), it stands to reason daughters who engage in convergence communication patterns with their fathers are likely to believe that they are incapable of doing things for themselves, which in the domain of work, would mean they are incapable of choosing the right career path for themselves or, more broadly, are incapable of performing their job well. In this way, convergence communication should lead to general perceptions of incompetence in this domain, and thus, the following hypothesis is posed:

H7: Perceptions of convergence communication will be negatively associated with perceptions of job competence.

**Romantic relationships.** Competence in romantic relationships refers to people’s overall evaluations of their ability to develop romantic relationships, as well as their general desirability to others (Neeman & Harter, 1986). Only a few empirical investigations on the effects of fathering on emerging adult daughters’ self-perceptions of romantic relationships using Harter’s (1983, 1999, 2012) conceptualization of the self have been performed, and as with job competence, they have found mixed results. Hopkins and Klein (1993) found that nurturant fathering was unrelated to daughters’ perceptions of competence in this domain while Klein et al. (1996) found that fathers’ authoritarian parenting was negatively related to daughters’ evaluations of their competence in romantic relationships.

Outside the context of Harter’s (1983, 1999, 2012) conceptualization of the self, the influence of fathers on their daughters’ romantic relationships has received considerable theoretical and research attention. From a psychoanalytic perspective, fathers are believed to exert a great deal of influence over the type and quality of their daughters’ romantic relationships (Biller & Weiss, 1970; Secunda, 1992; Sharpe, 1994). In line with this tradition, fathers are seen
as the first male love in a daughter’s life, and thus, the quality of this relationship affects the quality of all her future relationships with men. Though this perspective is insightful, it does not naturally lend itself to empirical investigation, which makes it difficult to substantiate its claims.

Theory and research from the attachment tradition, however, does offer insight into the effect of fathers on their daughters’ romantic relationships that is supported by empirical investigations. According to this theoretical perspective, children develop internal working models of themselves and relationships through their interactions with their caregivers (Bowlby, 1969; Ainsworth, 1978). Bowlby (1973, 1980) suggested that caregiver communication is important to the attachment process because it can influence how a child’s internal working model develops. According to him, open and honest communication from the parent to the child is conducive for fostering secure internal working models. Conversely, insecure working models may be fostered by communication that forces the child to accept as reality whatever relational model the parent desires even if this model contradicts the child’s own experience.

Cassidy (2001) echoed these sentiments in claiming that secure attachment patterns are represented by honest communication in which the caregiver acknowledges the child’s interpretations of events. In doing this, the caregiver validates the child’s experience, and the child is able to develop a single, coherent internal working model of self and others. Insecure attachments, on the other hand, are the product of parental attempts to have the child embrace a false reality; that is, a reality that does not coincide with what the child is really thinking or feeling. An example that Cassidy (2001) provides of this process of distortion is parents telling their children something does not hurt when, in fact, it does hurt to the child. This contradiction in what the child is experiencing is bound to leave him or her confused. Though this is a relatively simple example, it powerfully illustrates that there are situations in the parent-child
relationship in which the parent and the child differ in their understanding, and how the parent responds to the difference in opinion could have an important impact on the child.

This notion of the validation or distortion of a child’s experience through communicative processes is directly in line with the theoretical underpinnings of NCC theory (Miller-Day, 2004, 2005). Relationships characterized by high levels of convergence communication are described as relationships in which the submissive partner possesses a distorted view of reality simply because he or she is constantly privileging the dominant partner’s meanings and interpretations over his or her own. Miller-Day (2004) provided an example of this phenomenon by recounting a situation in which an adult daughter, who had previously stated how much she liked having her hair up in a clip, took her hair out of the clip after her mother made a negative comment about the hair style. When asked why she changed her hair style, she replied, “Oh, it makes her [my mother] happy and I didn’t like it that way anyway” (p. 206). Thus, the sort of communicative exchanges Miller-Day (2004) witnessed in families characterized by convergence communication seem to reflect Cassidy’s (2001) notion of reality distortion that characterizes insecure parent-child attachment relationships.

Since attachment theory posits that the internal working models developed in youth become more generalized models of relationships in adulthood, the patterns of interaction that typify the parent-child relationship should have some effect on adult children’s working models of romantic relationships. Empirical work tends to support this notion (Dinero, Conger, Shaver, Widaman, Larsen-Rife, 2008; Nosko, Tieu, Lawford, & Pratt, 2011; Jones, Forehand, & Beach, 2000; Seiffge-Krenke, Overbeek, & Vermulst, 2010; Steinberg, Davila, & Fincham, 2006). Moreover, in a recent study by Chesnut (2012), it was found that convergence communication with parents was positively associated with the anxiety dimension of adult romantic attachment
in a sample of emerging adults. Thus, there is some evidence to suggest that a person’s engagement in convergence communication with his/her parents is systematically related to his/her perceptions of how he/she relates to romantic partners. Based on this accumulated evidence, the following hypothesis is posed:

H8: Perceptions of convergence communication will be negatively related to perceptions of competence in romantic relationships.

**Social acceptance.** Social acceptance entails people’s general evaluations of their satisfaction with their social skills and their confidence in their ability to develop friendships (Neeman & Harter, 1986). Similar to competence in romantic relationships, parents are thought to be consequential to their children’s competence in developing social skills and friendships (Bowlby, 1988; Laursen & DeLay, 2011). From an attachment perspective, the internal working models children develop about themselves and others via their early interactions with their caregivers provides the basis for their interactions with peers. Thus, children who have secure attachments with their caregivers also have positive models of self and others, and these positive models promote social competence (Bowlby, 1988). Conversely, children who have insecure attachments have negative models of self and others, and these negative models will interfere with social competence (Bowlby, 1988). Both cross-sectional (Creasey, Kershaw, & Boston, 1999; Forehand & Nousiainen, 1993; Lieberman, Doyle, & Markiewicz, 1999) and longitudinal research (Sroufe, 2005a; Sroufe, Egeland, Carlson, & Collins, 2005; Steele & Steele, 2005) has found support for these claims.

When the focus is narrowed specifically to the father-daughter relationship in emerging adulthood, the amount of research declines and the general trend outlined above becomes less clear. Nielsen (2012) asserts that the quality of the father-daughter bond in this developmental
phase of the daughter’s life is consequential for her social functioning, but Hopkins and Klein (1993) found that paternal nurturance was unrelated to daughters’ perceptions of social acceptance. Klein et al. (1996), however, found that daughters’ perceptions of social acceptance were positively related to their perceptions of their fathers’ use of authoritative parenting. Though the effects of fathering and the father-daughter bond on social competence in emerging adulthood are mixed, it is generally well accepted that being able to connect with peers is critical for the maintenance and bolstering of one’s self-esteem when adjusting to college life (Harter, 1990, 2006). Furthermore, competently developing peer relations provides the emerging adult with a network of support for navigating identity explorations (Harter, 2012), and it sets the tone for one’s success in developing friendships later in life (Roisman, Masten, Coatsworth, & Tellegen, 2004). Therefore, gaining a better understanding of the factors that contribute to social competence in emerging adulthood is an important goal to achieve.

One way of accomplishing this goal is by placing the emphasis on the daughters’ characteristics, rather than the fathers’ characteristics. Considering the connection between convergence communication and the anxiety dimension of attachment (Chesnut, 2012), as well as the connection between convergence communication and learned helplessness (Miller-Day & Walker-Jackson, 2012), it seems reasonable to conclude that a daughter’s engagement in convergence communication with her father will be associated with decreased perceptions of her social competence. Daughters who engage in convergence communication with their fathers are likely to view themselves as generally incompetent and to possess negative working models of self. As they continually submit to their fathers’ interpretation of reality, they begin to see themselves as incapable of independent thought and action, and they begin to view themselves as unworthy and unacceptable. This is bound to erode their confidence in their social competence.
Though not directly assessing the effect of a daughter’s submission to her father, a study by Mori (1999) revealed that daughters with overprotective (i.e., controlling and domineering) fathers were less self-confident with their peers than were daughters whose fathers promoted their independence. According to NCC theory (Miller-Day, 2004, 2005), controlling and domineering parenting begets convergence communication; thus, it is possible the results from Mori’s (1999) study had just as much to do with the daughters’ submission as it did the fathers’ dominance.

Therefore, the following hypothesis is proposed:

H9: Perceptions of convergence communication will be negatively related to perceptions of social acceptance.

**Satisfaction with appearance.** Satisfaction with appearance is conceptualized as people’s overall evaluation of how they feel about their physical appearance (Neeman & Harter, 1986). The manner in which females and males experience this aspect of the self is quite different. Research demonstrates that after about third grade, females’ satisfaction with their appearance declines whereas males’ satisfaction with appearance remains fairly stable (Harter, 2012). Thus, by the time females have entered into emerging adulthood, they have much more negative perceptions of their physical appearance than do males (Harter, 2012; Lowery et al., 2005). As previously stated, one suspected reason for this gender difference is the influence of the media’s unrealistic depiction of female beauty (Becker et al., 2002; Levine & Harrison, 2004; Richins, 1991; Silverstein et al., 1986). As women are bombarded with the media’s image of female attractiveness and beauty, they begin to internalize the standards they are presented with, and this can produce feelings of shame toward and dissatisfaction with one’s body (Smolak & Murnen, 2004; Tiggemann & Lynch, 2001).

The media, however, is not the only force that can influence females’ satisfaction with
their body image. Fathers have also been found to play a significant role in this domain in both childhood and adolescence (Agras, Bryson, Hammer, & Kraemer, 2007; Sarigiani, 1987), as well as emerging adulthood and beyond (Hopkins & Klein, 1993; Jones, Harris, & Leung, 2005; Jones, Leung, & Harris, 2006; Klein et al., 1996; Meyer & Gillings, 2004; Sira & Ballard, 2009; Wonderlich, Ukestad, & Perzacki, 1994). In general, this body of work demonstrates that controlling and rejecting parenting by fathers is related to decreases in females’ body satisfaction via either direct or indirect paths. For example, Klein et al. (1996) found that fathers’ use of authoritarian parenting was negatively related to daughters’ perceptions of their physical appearance. Jones and colleagues (2005, 2006) found evidence that the effect of paternal rejection on daughters’ body satisfaction is fully mediated by the daughters’ belief that they are unlovable and that close relationships will not last.

Nielsen (2012) suggests that father-daughter communication is one of the primary ways through which daughters internalize what they believe to be their fathers’ standards on ideal body weight and beauty. That is, as fathers either directly (e.g., “You seem to be putting on some weight”) or indirectly (e.g., “Wow, she’s cute) talk about body image issues, their daughters interpret their fathers’ meanings and respond accordingly. Thus, a daughter whose father criticizes her weight will likely experience a decrease in her satisfaction with her physical appearance, and she may begin to take steps to correct whatever deficiencies she believes she has.

Research by Gross and Nelson (2000) provides some support for Nielsen’s (2012) claim. Their study found no support for a direct effect between paternal messages about weight and daughters’ preoccupation with their weight, but they did find support for an indirect relationship. Namely, negative messages made by fathers to mothers about the mothers’ weight were found to
be positively associated with daughters’ preoccupation with their weight. Thus, the specific messages that fathers convey to their daughters about their physical appearance may be much less consequential to their body satisfaction than the messages they convey to their daughters about the physical appearance of other women, especially women to which the daughter is emotionally close.

The theoretical underpinnings of NCC theory are congruent with the work of Nielsen (2012) and Gross and Nelson (2000). Specifically, NCC theory posits that individuals who engage in convergence communication adopt the viewpoints of others as their own; thus, the process by which daughters’ internalize their fathers’ ideals, especially maladaptive ideals, of beauty and weight as their own is an act of submission. Considering that perturbations in female body satisfaction are more prevalent in homes characterized by high levels of control and low levels of individuation (Wonderlich et al., 1994) and that convergence communication is especially likely to occur in these same home environments (Miller-Day, 2004, 2005), it stands to reason that daughters who engage in convergence communication with their fathers are also going to have diminished satisfaction with their physical appearance.

Though no research as of yet has tested this assumption, work by Miller-Day and Fisher (2008) provides some evidence for its tenability. Specifically, these researchers found that convergence communication in the father-daughter dyad was positively associated with daughters’ disordered eating behaviors. They suggested that an attempt to regain control of one’s life was the underlying mechanism accounting for this relationship. That is, continued submission makes a person feel powerless, and engaging in disordered eating may provide a person with some sense of control over her own fate (Fairburn & Harrison, 2003).

Just as plausible, though, is the idea that daughters subjugating their own viewpoint on
ideal body weight and appearance for their fathers’ viewpoint leads to increases in body dissatisfaction because they feel their current state does not align with the standards they have internalized from their fathers. This increase in body dissatisfaction, in turn, leads to increases in disordered eating behaviors. Research indicates that body dissatisfaction is a significant predictor of disordered eating behaviors in Western cultures (Noll & Fredrickson, 1998; Rodgers et al., 2011; Tiggemann, 2003). Thus, the relationship between convergence communication in the father-daughter relationship and disordered eating may simply be a byproduct of the direct relationship between convergence communication and body dissatisfaction. Therefore, the following hypothesis is advanced:

H10: Perceptions of convergence communication will be negatively associated with satisfaction with appearance.
CHAPTER 2: METHOD

Participants

The participants for this dissertation study were 318 college-aged women from a large, public, Eastern university. They were given course credit for their participation. On average, the participants were 19 years old ($SD = 1.22$, Range $= 18-26$; 7 participants did not provide their age). The vast majority of the participants identified themselves as Caucasian (82%) with the rest identifying themselves as Asian (10%), Hispanic (2%), African-American (1%), Pacific Islander (1%), or multiracial (4%). Close to 93% of the participants stated that their biological/adoptive parents were still currently married. Close to 97% of the participants indicated they lived with both of their biological/adoptive parents before coming to college with approximately 2% saying they lived with just their biological/adoptive father and about 1% saying they lived with their biological/adoptive father and step-mother. Fifty-six percent were in-coming freshman, and the remaining participants were sophomores (20%), juniors (18%), and seniors (6%). Approximately 83% of the participants indicated their family’s yearly income was at least $50,000 with close to 11% indicating it was less than this (6% did not answer this question). Of those who indicated their family’s yearly income was at least $50,000, over half (53%) indicated it was in excess of $100,000.

Procedure

Participants for this dissertation study were recruited over two semesters through a research participant pool at a large, Eastern, public university. This university’s introductory public speaking class has a research participant component built into it, and in order to receive the 2% of their grade that is designated for this purpose, they must participant in a study or complete an alternative assignment. In order to be eligible for the study, participants needed to
meet the following criteria: a) they had to be female; b) they had to be at least 18 years of age; c) they had to have primarily resided with their biological/adoptive father prior to coming to college or leaving the home for the first time (a minimum of at least two years residing with their biological/adoptive father prior to this transition was set as the standard); and d) their biological/adoptive father still had to be living.

Participants whose responses to the participant pool registration’s pre-screen survey matched these a priori criteria were assigned to the study. Prior to starting data collection, IRB approval was obtained. Once the participants’ names and emails were obtained from the participant pool administrator, they were contacted via email about participating in the study. The email informed them that the principal investigator was a researcher at the university gathering data for a dissertation project. They were informed that the dissertation was primarily focused on college students' self-evaluations and family life with an emphasis on father-child relationships. They were also given specific instructions on how to access the online survey, which was housed on the university’s Qualtrics survey website.

Once the participants successfully accessed the survey, they were presented with an informed consent screen that thoroughly explained the purpose and procedures of the study, its benefits and risks, and their rights as participants in a research study. Those who provided consent were sent to the first page of the questionnaire, while those who did not provide consent were sent to the end of the questionnaire and told to contact the researcher for an alternative assignment. Those who reached the first page of the questionnaire were instructed to respond to all items with their biological/adoptive father in mind. Upon completion of the questionnaire, the participants were thanked for their involvement in the study, and they received their course credit. The participants filled out a variety of self-report measures designed to assess the
variables of interest in this dissertation, and they also answered a series of questions pertaining to
demographic information (see Appendix A). The next section of this dissertation outlines the
specific self-report measures the participants completed.

Measures

**Modified Block Child Rearing Practices Report (MBCRPR).** The MBCRPR (Rickel & Biasatti, 1982) is a 40-item, self-report measure designed to assess two broad aspects of parenting: restrictiveness and nurturance. The original Block Child Rearing Practices Report (Block, 1965) contains 91 items that form between 28 and 33 subscales (depending on the purposes of the researcher). It has been argued that this original measure is too cumbersome and contains too many subscales with low reliabilities (Dekovic, Janssens, & Gerris, 1991). Thus, the modified version is considered a significant improvement over the original. Eighteen items comprise the restrictiveness scale, but following the advice of Dekovic et al. (1991), only those items that assess the use of physical punishment, verbal reprimands, and prohibitions along with items that assess the discouragement of children’s emotional expression, an emphasis on fear of external consequences for misbehavior, and strict parental supervision were included, as these items are representative of authoritarian parenting (see Appendix B). This reduced the number of items to 13. Responses were recorded on a six-point, Likert-type scale ranging from “not at all like him” to “just like him.” Results from the work of Rickel and Biasatti, (1982) and Dekovic et al. (1991) demonstrate that the restrictiveness subcale has good reliability via self-reports (alphas ranging from .82 to .85). In the current study, the reliability coefficient was .88.

**Psychological Control Scale—Youth Self-Report (PCS-YSR).** The PCS-YSR (Barber, 1996) is an 8-item, self-report measure of perceived psychological control (see Appendix C). The PCS-YSR assesses invalidation of feelings, constraint of verbal expressions, personal
attacks, and love withdrawal, which are four dimensions of psychological control (Barber, 1996). Responses were recorded on a six-point, Likert-type scale ranging from “not at all like him” to “just like him.” Higher scores reflect greater psychological control. Barber (1996) demonstrated that the scale possessed good reliability ($\alpha = .83$) and good construct validity. For the present study, the measure had a reliability estimate of .89.

**The Differentiation in the Family System Scale (DIFS).** The DIFS (Anderson & Sabatelli, 1992) is an 11-item self-report instrument designed to assess the tolerance for intimacy and individuality that exists within various family dyads (see Appendix D). Responses were measured on a 5-point, Likert-type scale anchored at “never” and “always.” Anderson and Sabatelli (1992) reported internal reliability coefficients ranging from .84 to .94. Evidence for the construct validity of the DIFS has been found in two studies, and evidence for its discriminate validity has been shown in one study. Bartle and Sabatelli (1989) and Sabatelli and Anderson (1991) demonstrated that the DIFS was associated with family conflict, identity status, negative consequences from using alcohol, levels of family support, depression, and anxiety in theoretically expected ways. Bower (1990) found that the DIFS was able to discriminate between bulimic women in a treatment group and non-bulimic women in a control group. In the present study, the measure was found to have a good reliability estimate ($\alpha = .89$).

**Financial strain.** Financial strain was assessed by the participants’ responses to a series of 13 questions designed to assess their perceptions of their family’s financial stress. These items were taken from the 1998-99 Household Expenditure Survey conducted by the Australian Bureau of Statistics (see Appendix E; Bray, 2001). Bray (2001) demonstrated that these 13 questions consolidated into the following three factors: missing out on activities (6 items), cash flow problems (3 items), and hardship (4 items). All items loaded on their respective factor at .45
or higher. The scales were found to have good reliability in the present study (missing out on activities, $\alpha = .84$; cash problems, $\alpha = .83$; and hardship, $\alpha = .77$, when one item was dropped).

**Convergence Communication Scale (CCS).** The CCS (Miller-Day & Walker-Jackson, 2012) is a 32-item self-report measure that is designed to assess perceptions of convergent communicative interactions between relational partners (see Appendix F). All items were measured on a 5-point, Likert-type scale ranging from “strongly disagree” to “strongly agree.” The overall measure consists of three subscales (i.e., disequilibrium, interpersonal deference, and motivation to converge), which have been validated using exploratory and confirmatory factor analytic techniques on two separate emerging adult samples of college students (Miller-Day & Walker-Jackson, 2012). The disequilibrium subscale consists of seven items which measure perceptions of equality in the relationship. The interpersonal deference subscale consists of 10 items designed to assess respondents’ perceptions of their submission to their relational partner. The motivation to converge subscale consists of 15 items which tap into respondents’ perceptions concerning the pressure they feel to converge with their relational partner’s views. All items are scored so that higher values indicate greater convergence communication. Miller-Day and Walker-Jackson (2012) found the overall scale to be highly reliable with a Cronbach’s alpha of .92, and Pettigrew and associates found good reliability coefficients for both mothers and fathers on the motivation to converge ($\alpha = .88$, $\alpha = .88$) and disequilibrium subscales ($\alpha = .86$, $\alpha = .86$). The deference subscale was found to have lower reliability coefficients ($\alpha = .68$, $\alpha = .73$). Miller-Day and Walker-Jackson (2012) also demonstrated that the CCS has good construct validity. In the present investigation, all three subscales were found to have high reliability estimates (motivation to converge, $\alpha = .94$; disequilibrium, $\alpha = .85$; interpersonal deference, $\alpha = .91$).
The Self-Perception Profile for College Students (SPPCS). The SPPCS (Neeman & Harter, 1986) is a 54-item measure that assesses perceived competence in 12 domains, as well as global self-worth (see Appendix G). These domains were specified a priori, but were validated via exploratory factor analysis. Neeman and Harter (1986) demonstrated that each of the 13 subscales possessed adequate reliability (estimates range from $\alpha = .76$ to $\alpha = .92$). In the current study, only the following subscales were used: global self-worth, job competence, social acceptance, romantic relationships, and satisfaction with appearance. Responses were measured on a 5-point, Likert-type scale anchored at “strongly disagree” and “strongly agree.” In the present study, all subscales had adequate reliability estimates (global self-worth, $\alpha = .89$; job competence, $\alpha = .73$, after dropping one item; social acceptance, $\alpha = .85$; romantic relationships, $\alpha = .78$; and satisfaction with appearance, $\alpha = .87$).

Relationship satisfaction. Relationship satisfaction was assessed in order to control for its effect on convergence communication when examining the effect of psychological control and differentiation on convergence communication. Prior work has demonstrated that perceptions of relationship satisfaction are negatively related to convergence communication (Miller-Day, 2004; Miller-Day & Walker-Jackson, 2012) and psychological control (Urry, Nelson, & Padilla-Walker, 2011), and positively related to differentiation (Kim, Prouty, Smith, Ko, Wetchler, & Oh, 2013; Olson, 2011). Since the goal of this dissertation is to examine the unique effect each of these variables has on convergence communication, the effect of relationship satisfaction needed to be partialed out.

Relationship satisfaction was measured with five items from the Relationship Assessment Scale (RAS; Hendrick, 1988). This scale was originally developed for romantic relationships, so two items were deemed inappropriate for the current investigation, and the remaining five items
were slightly modified in order to fit the father-daughter relationship (see Appendix H). All items were measured on a 5-point, Likert-type scale anchored at “strongly disagree” and “strongly agree.” Factor analysis revealed that all seven items load onto a single factor, and the measure has been found to be reliable with a Cronbach’s alpha of .86 (Hendrick, 1988). This measure had a good reliability estimate in the current study (α = .85).

**Analytic strategy**

Prior to engaging in statistical analyses, the data were examined to ensure that it complied with the basic assumptions of the inferential statistical tests that were employed (e.g., normality, linearity, etc.). The guidelines provided by Kline (2011) were used to determine whether there were any issues with the kurtosis or skewness of the data (i.e., kurtosis greater than |10| and skewness greater than |3|). The data were also examined for univariate and multivariate outliers (Tabachnick & Fidell, 1996), and Mahalanobis d² values were examined to determine if multivariate outliers existed. Scatterplots were also created to examine the linearity of the data. Once this examination was complete and necessary alterations made, statistical analyses began.

**Data analysis.** For the current investigation, structural equation modeling (SEM) was employed to test each hypothesis. SEM is a powerful analytic approach that essentially combines Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) with path analysis (Hox & Bechger, 1998). This approach accounts for measurement error, which allows the relationships among latent variables to be examined more accurately (Holbert & Stephenson, 2002). SEM also allows for the simultaneous testing of hypotheses. Prior to examining the structural model presented in Figure 1, a measurement model was constructed that allowed all of the latent variables to freely covary. The fit of this model was assessed with the following fit indices: the model chi-square (χ²), the relative chi-square value (χ²/df); the standardized root mean squared residual (SRMR); and the
root mean squared error of approximation (RMSEA). The comparative fit index (CFI) was not used in the present dissertation study due primarily to its tendency to penalize larger models (Kenny, 2013). That is, in correctly specified models (e.g., models built with simulated data), the CFI tends to decrease as the number of variables in the model increases (Kenny & McCoach, 2003). This decrease will be even more marked when a model is estimated with real data (Chau & Hocevar, 1995). Moreover, Kenny (2013) noted that when the RMSEA of the null model is less than .158, the CFI should not be used because it will be artificially too low.

The model chi-square is the oldest of the fit statistics used to assess model fit, and it is often referred to as a badness of fit statistic (Kline, 2011). That is, the model chi-square “assesses the magnitude of discrepancy between the sample and fitted covariance matrices” (Hu & Bentler, 1999, p. 2). Thus, the smaller the chi-square value (and consequently, the larger the p-value), the better the model fits the data. Though it is recommended to report this statistic (Hooper, Coughlan, & Mullen, 2008; Kline, 2011), it suffers from two important limitations. Firstly, this statistic is sensitive to sample size, which means it has a biased tendency to reject models when sample sizes are large (Joreskog & Sorbom, 1993). Additionally, when sample sizes are small, this statistic lacks power and may not adequately distinguish between good-fitting and poor-fitting models (Kenny & McCoach, 2003). Secondly, the expected value of the model chi-square is the model’s degrees of freedom (Kenny & McCoach, 2003); however, the model chi-square, on average, tends to exceed the degrees of freedom, especially with small sample sizes (Kenny & McCoach, 2003). Moreover, this bias is dependent on the degrees of freedom such that the bias is intensified in models with large degrees of freedom (Curran, Bollen, Paxton, & Kirby, 2002). Due to this dissertation study’s sample size and model complexity, it was expected that the chi-square statistic would be biased, and as a consequence, additional fit indices were employed to
help evaluate model fit.

The relative chi-square (i.e., $\chi^2/df$; Wheaton, Muthen, Alwin, & Summers, 1977) was created to help alleviate the biases inherent in the chi-square value. Given that the chi-square value should approximate the degrees of freedom, the $\chi^2/df$ ratio should be approximately one in good fitting models (Kenny & McCoach, 2003). The question then becomes how large does this ratio have to be to indicate a poor fitting model. Wheaton et al. (1977) and Schumaker and Lomax (2004) suggest ratios less than 5 indicate an acceptable fit with Byrne (1998) and Tabachnick and Fidell (2007) suggesting the ratio should be less than 2. Kline (2011) stated the lack of consensus on the value of this ratio is its principle weakness. In the present dissertation project, values less than 5 but greater than 2 were considered to reflect acceptable fit, values less than 2 but greater than 1 were considered to reflect good fit, and values approaching 1 were considered to reflect excellent fit.

The standardized root mean square residual (i.e., SRMR) is the standardized value of the root mean square residual (i.e., RMR). The RMR is “the square root of the difference between the residuals of the sample covariance matrix and the hypothesized covariance model” (Hooper et al., 2008, p.54). This value is dependent upon the scales of the variables in the model, so it is difficult to interpret (Kline, 2011); however, the SRMR resolves this problem. The SRMR can range in value from 0 to 1 with smaller values indicating better fit. According to Hu and Bentler (1999), values close to or less than .08 indicate good fit. This value tends to be lower in models with a large number of observed variables, as well as models with a large sample size (Hooper et al., 2008). In AMOS, this value can only be computed with complete data.

The root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA; Steiger, 1990) assesses the degree to which the hypothesized model fits the population covariance matrix reasonably well
The RMSEA is considered to be an extremely informative fit index (Diamantopoulos & Siguaw, 2000), and it is currently the most popular of the various fit indices (Kenny, 2013). Its popularity and usefulness is likely attributable to the fact that it has a known distribution, so a confidence interval can be calculated around the point estimate (Steiger, 2000). This confidence interval provides insight into the precision (i.e., level of uncertainty) of the point estimate (Kenny, 2013; Kenny, Kaniskan, & McCoach, 2013). The wider the confidence interval, the more sampling error present in the point estimate. Moreover, the lower bound of the confidence interval provides information about the close-fit of the model, and the upper bound provides information about the poor-fit of the model (Kline, 2011). Using the guidelines provided by Browne and Cudeck (1993), a value of .05 is set for the lower bound, and a value of .10 is set for the upper bound. Thus, if the lower bound of the confidence interval is equal to or less than .05, then there is statistical evidence that the model is a close-fit. Similarly, if the upper bound is equal to or greater than .10, there is statistical evidence the model is a poor-fit. According to Kline (2011), “the test of the poor-fit hypothesis can serve as a kind of reality check against the test of the close-fit hypothesis” (p. 206).

The RMSEA’s tendency to select parsimonious models has also been touted as a significant strength of this statistic (Deemer, 2008; Hooper et al., 2008); however, this could be a potential limitation given that the value of RMSEA will decrease as the degrees of freedom in a model increases, holding all else constant (Kline, 2011). That is, having more latent variables and/or manifest variables in the model may decrease the value of the RMSEA independently of the misspecification present in the model. Simulation studies (Breivik & Olsson, 2001; Kenny & McCoach, 2003) have shown that this statement is generally true. Thus, RMSEA may favor larger models regardless of whether or not they are correctly specified (Kline, 2011).
Regardless of this apparent limitation, the RMSEA is still a highly useful fit index, and the current consensus on its cut-off value for good-fitting models is close to or less than .06 (Hu & Bentler, 1999) or .07 (Steiger, 2007). With respect to the confidence interval, the lower bound is ideally close to zero, though a more realistic restriction might be .05, with the upper bound not exceeding .08 (Hooper et al., 2008; Kenny, 2013).

Based upon the guidelines referenced above, refinements were made to the measurement model to achieve a good fit. Once a satisfactory measurement model was obtained, the structural model presented in Figure 1 was tested. Since the structural model was nested in the measurement model, a chi-square difference test was conducted to determine if the structural model fit the data significantly worse than the measurement model (Mueller & Hancock, 2007). As necessary, the structural model was revised in order to achieve a nonsignificant chi-square difference test.
CHAPTER 3: RESULTS

Data Screening

The maximum likelihood (ML) estimation method used in this study to test the proposed measurement and structural models is founded upon the assumption of multivariate normality (Holbert & Stephenson, 2002); thus, before hypothesis testing was performed, the data were screened for issues with skewness, kurtosis, and univariate and multivariate outliers. The guidelines presented by Kline (2011) were used to evaluate skewness and kurtosis. Namely, an item with a skewness score greater than |3| and/or a kurtosis score greater than |10| was considered problematic. Nine items on the financial strain measure (three measuring the notion of missing out on activities, three assessing the notion of cash problems, and three measuring the notion of hardship) were found to be problematic (skew range = 3.41-7.09, kurtosis range = 9.20-48.64), as well as one item on the relationship satisfaction scale (skew = -3.17, kurtosis = 10.41). Since the other four items on the relationship satisfaction scale did not exhibit issues with skewness and kurtosis, the problematic item was dropped from further analysis, as opposed to being transformed.

The financial strain items were measured with a dichotomy, so transformations were considered inappropriate, as they would still result in a dichotomy (Allison, 2002). Composites of each type of financial strain were created by summing participants’ responses to the corresponding items. The composite of missing out on activities was within the tolerable range of skewness (2.53) and kurtosis (5.80); however, cash problems (skew = 3.77, kurtosis = 13.85) and hardship (skew = 6.02, kurtosis = 39.02) were not. Transformations, as recommended by Fink (2009), were employed; however, the value of skew and kurtosis remained outside the range of |3| and |10|, respectively. For this reason, all nine of the problematic financial strain
items were dropped from further analysis; leaving three financial strain items that all assessed missing out on activities.

Univariate outliers for dichotomous variables were detected using the guideline provided by Rummel (1970) that any dichotomous variable with a split greater than 90-10 be considered an outlier. The three remaining financial strain items approached this cut-off value, but none exceeded it. Univariate outliers for interval-like data were detected by examining the z-score of every remaining item. Z-scores in excess of 3.29 were considered potential outliers (Tabachnick & Fidell, 1996). Using this guideline, 62 potential outliers were identified (range = 3.31 - 3.93). Histograms were employed to visually inspect the distribution of the items with the identified outliers. As suggested by Tabachnick & Fidell (1996), cases that appeared to be unattached to the rest of the distribution were considered to be outliers. No such cases were found, and it was concluded that the 62 potential outliers were, in fact, not outliers. Given the size of the sample, it is not surprising that z-scores in excess of 3.29 were found, as the extremeness of a z-score is influenced by sample size (Tabachnick & Fidell, 1996), and when sample size is in excess of 100, it has been suggested that the z-score cut-off value be set at 4.00 (Mertler & Vannatta, 2005; Stevens, 1992), which none of the z-scores exceeded.

Multivariate outliers were detected via Mahalanobis $d^2$ values. Conventionally, cases with a Mahalanobis $d^2$ value that is statistically significant at the .001 level are interpreted as potential outliers (Mertler & VAnnatta, 2005; Tabachnick & Fidell, 1996). However, this process can be overly sensitive; thus, Byrne (2001) suggests examining the Mahalanobis $d^2$ values to see if any “large” breaks exist in the data. Though this approach is arguably more subjective than evaluating the $p$-value associated with a particular Mahalanobis $d^2$ value, it does eliminate the potential for deleting or transforming an unnecessary number of cases. With respect to the
current data, the largest break in Mahalanobis $d^2$ values was 16.39 units from 176.54 to 160.15. Given that the data appeared to be otherwise normal, this break in the Mahalanobis $d^2$ values was not considered large enough to constitute a multivariate outlier. Thus, no multivariate outliers were detected in the sample. Table 1 contains descriptive statistics for all of the variables of interest in this dissertation.

**Table 1**

**Descriptive Statistics**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>% No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authoritarian Parenting</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological Control</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Differentiation</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation to Converge</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>2.01</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disequilibrium</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal Deferece</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-worth</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Competence</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Acceptance</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romantic Relationships</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with Appearance</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship Satisfaction</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Strain</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. % No reflects the percentage of participants who said no to all three financial strain items.

**Measurement Model**

After determining there were no issues with multivariate normality, the measurement model (see Figure 2) was constructed based upon the hypothesized conceptual model presented in Figure 1. Initially, only participants who had complete data on all the variables of interest ($N=251$) were included. This was done in order to produce standardized residuals and
modification indices; both of which allow for the examination of localized areas of strain in the measurement model that are otherwise masked by fit indices (Brown, 2006). Model fit based upon participants with complete data was deemed acceptable ($\chi^2 = 7605.42$, $df = 4107$, $p = .000$; $\chi^2/df = 1.85$; RMSEA = .058 [.056-.060]; SRMR = .072).

However, two issues were apparent in this model. First, the subscales of convergence communication did not relate to each other in such a way as to suggest that they were part of a higher order factor structure. In fact, the motivation to converge subscale and the disequilibrium subscale were very highly correlated ($r = .86$), the motivation to converge subscale and the interpersonal deference subscale did not have a statistically significant relationship, and the disequilibrium subscale and the interpersonal deference subscale did not have a statistically significant relationship (see Table 2). Second, multiple variables had extremely high inter-correlations (i.e., close to or greater than |.85|) suggesting multicollinearity and lack of discriminate validity (Brown, 2006). These variables included psychological control, differentiation, the motivation to converge subscale of convergence communication, the disequilibrium subscale of convergence communication, and the global self-worth, job competence, and social competence subscales of the SPPCS.
Figure 2

Measurement Model
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. FS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. AP</td>
<td>.02(.07)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. PC</td>
<td>.04***(.23)</td>
<td>.44***(.71)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. DI</td>
<td>-.03**(-.19)</td>
<td>-.39***(-.68)</td>
<td>-.36***(-.86)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. MC</td>
<td>.03*(.16)</td>
<td>.35***(.66)</td>
<td>.29***(.75)</td>
<td>-.30***(-.82)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. DE</td>
<td>.04*(.18)</td>
<td>.41***(.62)</td>
<td>.39***(.78)</td>
<td>-.42***(-.92)</td>
<td>.36***(.86)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. ID</td>
<td>.01(.04)</td>
<td>.03(.06)</td>
<td>-.03(-.09)</td>
<td>.04(.12)</td>
<td>.05(.14)</td>
<td>-.05(-.12)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. RS</td>
<td>-.02(-.09)</td>
<td>-.32***(-.43)</td>
<td>-.35***(-.63)</td>
<td>.37***(.73)</td>
<td>-.27***(-.58)</td>
<td>-.43***(-.72)</td>
<td>.15***(.32)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. SW</td>
<td>-.03(-.18)</td>
<td>-.14***(-.26)</td>
<td>-.19***(-.47)</td>
<td>.20***(.55)</td>
<td>-.13***(-.38)</td>
<td>-.21***(-.48)</td>
<td>.003(.01)</td>
<td>.18***(.36)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. JC</td>
<td>-.01(-.08)</td>
<td>-.06(-.13)</td>
<td>-.10**(-.29)</td>
<td>.15***(.46)</td>
<td>-.10**(-.31)</td>
<td>-.17***(-.44)</td>
<td>.01(.04)</td>
<td>.13***(.29)</td>
<td>.28***(.89)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. RR</td>
<td>-.02(-.12)</td>
<td>-.10(-.19)</td>
<td>-.12***(-.31)</td>
<td>.12***(.35)</td>
<td>-.08**(-.24)</td>
<td>-.11**(-.26)</td>
<td>.02(.05)</td>
<td>.07(.15)</td>
<td>.22***(.65)</td>
<td>.15***(.50)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. SA</td>
<td>-.02(-.10)</td>
<td>-.18**(-.25)</td>
<td>-.22***(-.39)</td>
<td>.25***(.50)</td>
<td>-.17***(-.36)</td>
<td>-.29***(-.48)</td>
<td>.04(.08)</td>
<td>.25***(.38)</td>
<td>.42***(.86)</td>
<td>.31***(.72)</td>
<td>.26***(.57)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. SWA</td>
<td>-.03(-.11)</td>
<td>-.15(-.19)</td>
<td>-.18***(-.31)</td>
<td>.18***(.33)</td>
<td>-.09(-.19)</td>
<td>-.16***(-.25)</td>
<td>.07(.13)</td>
<td>.20***(.28)</td>
<td>.40***(.76)</td>
<td>.25***(.55)</td>
<td>.27***(.54)</td>
<td>.39***(.55)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Correlations in parentheses. FS = Financial Strain; AP = Authoritarian Parenting; PC = Psychological Control; DI = Differentiation; MC = Motivation to Converge; DE = Disequilibrium; ID = Interpersonal Deference; RS = Relationship Satisfaction; SW = Self-worth; JC = Job Competence; RR = Romantic Relationships; SA = Social Acceptance; SWA = Satisfaction with Appearance

*p < .05; **p < .01; ***p < .001
Following the advice of Brown (2006), latent composites were created by condensing psychological control, differentiation, motivation, and disequilibrium into one latent construct (labeled paternal controlling strategies), and by condensing global self-worth, job competence, and social competence into one latent construct (labeled general self-worth). Not only did creating these two latent constructs make sense from a data-analytic standpoint, but it also made theoretical sense, which is an important consideration when modifying a model (McDonald & Ho, 2002; Mueller & Hancock, 2007). Figure 3 presents this revised measurement model.

Theoretically, psychological control, differentiation, motivation, and disequilibrium are similar to each other in that they all represent controlling parenting strategies and behaviors. Similarly, though an individual’s perceptions of self are expected to become highly differentiated as he/she ages (Harter, 1999, 2012), it stands to reason that some domains of self are going to be barely indistinguishable from each other at different points in the life span. Arnett (2004) suggests that emerging adulthood is a time in the life course characterized by explorations in love and work, so it is not surprising that job competence and social acceptance (which can be seen as a necessary precursor to success in love; Connolly, Furman, & Konarski, 2000; Roisman et al., 2004) are highly intertwined with these emerging adults’ global evaluations of their self-worth.

The modified model fit the data less well than the original model ($\chi^2 = 8376.46, df = 4157, p = .000; \chi^2/df = 2.02; \text{RMSEA} = .064 [.062-.066]; \text{SRMR} = .077$), but this is expected when one creates latent composites (Brown, 2006). The modified model’s fit was still found to be acceptable based upon the established guidelines for evaluating fit indices, and it provided greater parsimony than did the original model. Table 3 contains the covariances and correlations for the revised measurement model.
Figure 3

Revised Measurement Model
Table 3

Revised Measurement Model Covariances and Correlations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. FS</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. AP</td>
<td>.02(.07)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. PCS</td>
<td>.04** (.19)</td>
<td>.47*** (.72)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. ID</td>
<td>.01(.04)</td>
<td>.04(.06)</td>
<td>.001(.001)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. RS</td>
<td>-.02(-.09)</td>
<td>-.31*** (.43)</td>
<td>-.40*** (.69)</td>
<td>.19*** (.32)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. GSW</td>
<td>-.03(-.15)</td>
<td>-.14*** (.25)</td>
<td>-.21*** (.49)</td>
<td>.02(.04)</td>
<td>.19*** (.38)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. RR</td>
<td>-.02(-.12)</td>
<td>-.10 (.19)</td>
<td>-.13*** (.31)</td>
<td>.02(.05)</td>
<td>.07 (.15)</td>
<td>.22*** (.63)</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. SWA</td>
<td>-.03(-.11)</td>
<td>-.15** (.19)</td>
<td>-.17*** (.27)</td>
<td>.09(.13)</td>
<td>.20*** (.28)</td>
<td>.37*** (.70)</td>
<td>.27*** (.54)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Correlations in parentheses. FS = Financial Strain; AP = Authoritarian Parenting; PCS = Paternal Controlling Strategies; ID = Interpersonal Deference; RS = Relationship Satisfaction; GSW = General Self-worth; RR = Romantic Relationships; SWA = Satisfaction with Appearance

*p < .05; **p < .01; ***p < .001
Based upon both theoretical and data-analytic rationale, the modified model was selected over the original model for further analysis. Once the overall structure of the measurement model was solidified, localized areas of strain in the model were investigated by examining standardized residuals, modification indices (MI), and estimated parameter change (EPC) values. Respecifying a model based upon these metrics is essentially exploratory in nature (Harrington, 2009; Mueller & Hancock, 2007), so caution must be taken in order to not capitalize on chance (MacCallum, 2003). In the present investigation, items were considered candidates for revision if they had large standardized residuals (> |2.58|; Byrne, 1998), and they had a combination of MI and EPC values that suggested substantial model improvement if respecification was undertaken (Brown, 2006). Neither condition alone was considered sufficient for respecification.

An examination of standardized residuals, MI, and EPC values revealed that correlating the error terms of two items from the disequilibrium construct (i.e., “We both offer opinions in conversations,” and “We both contribute equally to conversations”) would significantly improve the model. These items are highly similar in nature, and a significant degree of item content overlap can warrant the use of correlated error terms (Byrne, 2001). Therefore, these error terms were correlated, and the measurement model was once again estimated. Model fit did improve ($\chi^2 = 8284.21$, $df = 4156$, $p = .000$; $\chi^2/df = 1.99$; RMSEA = .063 [.061-.065]; SRMR = .077).

The standardized residuals, MI, and EPC values of this newly respecified model were examined to see if any further modifications were necessary. One item from the interpersonal deference construct (i.e., “I tend to embrace my father’s point of view as my own”) was readily identified as a candidate for respecification. The MI and EPC values for this item indicated that it cross loaded with several other latent constructs in the model, and it had multiple standardized residuals that exceeded the |2.58| threshold. Considering the combination of the values for the
standardized residuals, MI, and EPC values, the best course of action for revision was dropping this item, as the evidence suggested the item was nonspecific and dropping it would eliminate multiple strains in the model (Brown, 2006). Model fit without this item was as follows: \( \chi^2 = 8093.64, df = 4065, p = .000; \frac{\chi^2}{df} = 1.99; \text{RMSEA} = .063 [ .061 - .065 ]; \text{SRMR} = .073. \)

After removing this item, the measurement model was estimated again, and further items were investigated for their candidacy for revision. Standardized residuals, MI, and EPC values suggested that two items from the psychological control construct (“My father will avoid looking at me when I have disappointed him” and “My father stops talking to me, if I have hurt his feelings, until I do something to please him again”) needed to have correlated error terms. As with the two items from the disequilibrium construct, the content of these items was highly similar; thus, the error terms were allowed to correlate to help account for the item overlap (Byrne, 2001). Model fit after this modification was as follows: \( \chi^2 = 8030.58, df = 4064, p = .000; \frac{\chi^2}{df} = 1.98; \text{RMSEA} = .062 [ .060 - .064 ]; \text{SRMR} = .073. \)

Once again, the measurement model was estimated, and the standardized residuals, MI, and EPC values were examined for further evidence of model respecification. No such evidence was found. Table 4 contains the covariances and correlations for this final measurement model.

This final measurement model was estimated once again with missing data included. Sixty-eight participants had missing data in their responses, which equates to approximately 21% of the total sample (\( N = 318 \)). Of the 93 indicator items represented in the final measurement model, all but two contained missing values. The percent missing on an item-by-item basis ranged from less than one percent to approximately 2.8%. Overall, the total percent of missing values in the dataset (calculated as the total number of missing data points divided by the total number of possible data points) was roughly 1.1.
Table 4

Final Measurement Model Covariances and Correlations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. FS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. AP</td>
<td>.02(.07)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. PCS</td>
<td>.04** (.19)</td>
<td>.46*** (.71)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. ID</td>
<td>.01(.06)</td>
<td>.06(.08)</td>
<td>.02(.03)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. RS</td>
<td>-.02(-.09)</td>
<td>-.31*** (-.43)</td>
<td>-.40*** (-.69)</td>
<td>.18*** (.29)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. GSW</td>
<td>-.03(-.15)</td>
<td>-.14*** (-.25)</td>
<td>-.21*** (-.49)</td>
<td>01(.02)</td>
<td>.19*** (.38)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. RR</td>
<td>-.02(-.12)</td>
<td>-.10 (-.19)</td>
<td>-.12*** (-.30)</td>
<td>.01(.03)</td>
<td>.07 (.15)</td>
<td>.22*** (.63)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. SWA</td>
<td>-.03(-.11)</td>
<td>-.15*** (-.19)</td>
<td>-.16*** (-.27)</td>
<td>.08(.12)</td>
<td>.20*** (.28)</td>
<td>.37*** (.70)</td>
<td>.27*** (.54)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Correlations in parentheses. FS = Financial Strain; AP = Authoritarian Parenting; PCS = Paternal Controlling Strategies; ID = Interpersonal Deference; RS = Relationship Satisfaction; GSW = General Self-worth; RR = Romantic Relationships; SWA = Satisfaction with Appearance

*p < .05; **p < .01; ***p < .001
The pattern of missingness, however, is often more informative than the percent of missingness (Hair, Black, Babin, & Anderson, 2010). Three general patterns of missingness have been identified in the literature (Graham, 2012): missing completely at random (MCAR), missing at random (MAR), and missing not at random (MNAR). MCAR occurs when “cases with data for a variable, and cases with missing data for a variable, are each random samples of the total” (Graham, 2012, p. 13). MAR occurs when missingness depends on data that is observed but not on data that is missing. Finally, MNAR occurs when missing data on a particular variable is caused by that variable, some variation of that variable, or another related variable that has not been measured. MCAR and MAR are often referred to as ignorable because the mechanism behind the missingness does not have to be taken into account when estimating the missing values (Graham, 2012). MNAR, on the other hand, is often referred to as nonignorable because the missing data mechanism has to be modeled in order to alleviate bias in the parameter estimates (Graham, 2012).

AMOS (version 22.0.0) uses full information maximum likelihood (FIML) to handle missing data, and this approach is a sophisticated and robust method for dealing with missing data (Arbuckle, 1996; Enders & Bandalos, 2001; Yung & Zhang, 2011). FIML uses all available data in the model to contribute to parameter estimation. It does not technically impute missing values, but the process it uses is conceptually quite similar to imputation (Enders & Bandalos, 2001). Additionally, it assumes that the missing values are at least MAR (Enders & Bandalos, 2001). Little’s (1988) test for MCAR was employed, and the results suggested that the missingness was MCAR ($\chi^2 = 3160.68$, $df = 4482$, $p = 1.00$). This test is not infallible, so there is no definitive guarantee that the missingness is MCAR. It could be MAR or MNAR, and unfortunately, there is no way to test for this. However, recent work by Graham (2012) suggests
that MAR is a highly plausible assumption, especially when working with nonclinical samples. Thus, there is sufficient evidence to conclude that using FIML to handle the missing data is appropriate.

The chi-square and relative chi-square of the model worsened with the addition of the cases with missing data ($\chi^2 = 8634.83, df = 4064, p = .000; \chi^2/df = 2.13$) while the RMSEA improved (.060 [.058-.061]). The worsening of the chi-square statistic is not surprising because the formula that AMOS uses to calculate this value gains additional terms when means and intercepts are explicitly estimated in model (which has to be done when estimating a model with missing data). As a consequence of these additional terms, the value of chi-square increases. Furthermore, since the chi-square value increased and the degrees of freedom remained the same, it is also not surprising that the relative chi-square value increased. This value, however, is within its acceptable bounds (i.e., < 5; Wheaton et al., 1977; Schumaker and Lomax, 2004).

Additionally, parameter estimates and standard errors between the measurement model with and without missing data were fairly stable. The only discernable difference between the measurement model with and without missing data was the addition of several more statistically significant covariances (see Table 5). In particular, the following covariances were found to have become statistically significant in the model with missing data: financial strain and romantic competence ($p = .02$), financial strain and relationship satisfaction ($p = .04$), authoritarianism and interpersonal deference ($p = .03$), paternal controlling strategies and interpersonal deference ($p = .02$) and romantic competence and relationship satisfaction ($p = .02$). Overall then, the results suggested that incorporating missing data into the model by way of FIML did not result in a drastically different interpretation of the model; thus, the measurement model was considered to be in adequate condition to proceed to the structural model.
Table 5

Final Measurement Model with Missing Data Covariances and Correlations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. FS</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. AP</td>
<td>.01 (.05)</td>
<td>.01 (.05)</td>
<td>.01 (.05)</td>
<td>.01 (.05)</td>
<td>.01 (.05)</td>
<td>.01 (.05)</td>
<td>.01 (.05)</td>
<td>.01 (.05)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. PCS</td>
<td>.04** (.21)</td>
<td>.04** (.21)</td>
<td>.04** (.21)</td>
<td>.04** (.21)</td>
<td>.04** (.21)</td>
<td>.04** (.21)</td>
<td>.04** (.21)</td>
<td>.04** (.21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. ID</td>
<td>.01 (.04)</td>
<td>.08 (.14)</td>
<td>.08 (.14)</td>
<td>.08 (.14)</td>
<td>.08 (.14)</td>
<td>.08 (.14)</td>
<td>.08 (.14)</td>
<td>.08 (.14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. RS</td>
<td>-.03 (-.13)</td>
<td>-.33*** (-.47)</td>
<td>-.33*** (-.47)</td>
<td>-.33*** (-.47)</td>
<td>-.33*** (-.47)</td>
<td>-.33*** (-.47)</td>
<td>-.33*** (-.47)</td>
<td>-.33*** (-.47)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. GSW</td>
<td>-.03 (-.18)</td>
<td>-.13*** (-.26)</td>
<td>-.13*** (-.26)</td>
<td>-.13*** (-.26)</td>
<td>-.13*** (-.26)</td>
<td>-.13*** (-.26)</td>
<td>-.13*** (-.26)</td>
<td>-.13*** (-.26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. RR</td>
<td>-.03 (-.16)</td>
<td>-.08 (-.17)</td>
<td>-.08 (-.17)</td>
<td>-.08 (-.17)</td>
<td>-.08 (-.17)</td>
<td>-.08 (-.17)</td>
<td>-.08 (-.17)</td>
<td>-.08 (-.17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. SWA</td>
<td>-.02 (-.10)</td>
<td>-.14** (-.21)</td>
<td>-.14** (-.21)</td>
<td>-.14** (-.21)</td>
<td>-.14** (-.21)</td>
<td>-.14** (-.21)</td>
<td>-.14** (-.21)</td>
<td>-.14** (-.21)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Correlations in parentheses. FS = Financial Strain; AP = Authoritarian Parenting; PCS = Paternal Controlling Strategies; ID = Interpersonal Deference; RS = Relationship Satisfaction; GSW = General Self-worth; RR = Romantic Relationships; SWA = Satisfaction with Appearance

*p < .05; **p < .01; ***p < .001
**Structural Model**

Based upon the revisions to the measurement model, a structural model was created that reflected, as closely as possible, the originally hypothesized conceptual model in Figure 1 (see Figure 4). Model fit was as follows: $\chi^2 = 9023.73$, $df = 4082$, $p = .000$; $\chi^2/df = 2.21$; RMSEA = .062 (.060-.064). This structural model is nested within the measurement model, so a chi-square difference test needs to be conducted to determine if the structural model is a significantly worse fit than the measurement model (Mueller & Hancock, 2007). The result of this test should be non-significant. If it is significant, then model revision is warranted. The results of this test are as follows: $\Delta \chi^2 = 388.90$, $\Delta df = 18$, $p < .001$. Thus, the structural model was a significantly worse fit to the data than the measurement model, which indicated the need for model modification.

The first modification involved drawing paths from the paternal controlling strategies construct to the general self-worth, romantic competence, and satisfaction with appearance constructs, as there is ample evidence to suggest that these types of parenting behaviors adversely affect child outcomes (see Cox, Whang, & Gustafsson, 2011 and Laursen & DeLay, 2011, for review). They were originally omitted because NCC theory asserts that convergence communication should be a powerful driving force behind diminished self-perceptions (Miller-Day, 2004, 2005), and the overarching purpose of this dissertation was to examine the antecedent and consequential correlates of convergence communication. This new model (see Figure 5) was re-estimated and displayed the following fit: $\chi^2 = 8894.54$, $df = 4079$, $p = .000$; $\chi^2/df = 2.18$; RMSEA = .061 (.059-.063). The chi-square difference test for nested models revealed, once again, that this structural model also fit the data significantly worse than the measurement model ($\Delta \chi^2 = 259.71$, $\Delta df = 15$, $p < .001$).
Figure 4
Initial Structural Model

Note. Standardized estimates shown. Significant paths marked by *.
The next modification involved allowing the error terms of the three dependent variables to correlate. Harter (1999, 2012; Neemann and Harter, 1986) theorized that these would be separate but interrelated aspects of the self, and empirical investigations have found moderate to high correlations between these constructs (Cosden & McNamara, 1997; Neemann & Harter, 1986). As can be seen from the measurement model, these aspects of self are strongly correlated with each other in this sample. Therefore, these error terms were allowed to covary, and the model was re-estimated. The fit of this newly revised model (see Figure 5) was as follows: \( \chi^2 = 8655.28, df = 4076, p = .000; \chi^2/df = 2.12; \) RMSEA = .060 (.058-.061). The chi-square difference test for nested models was not significant (\( \Delta \chi^2 = 20.45, \Delta df = 12, p > .05 \)), which suggested this model fit the data just as well as the measurement model. As such, the path coefficients for this model were used to evaluate the hypotheses listed in the literature review (see Figure 6).

Due to revisions in the model designed to alleviate issues with multicollinearity and discriminant validity, hypotheses one through three could not be evaluated as originally intended. These hypotheses concerned the relationships between psychological control, differentiation, and convergence communication. Psychological control and differentiation were combined (along with the motivation to converge and disequilibrium constructs from convergence communication) into the paternal controlling strategies latent composite construct. Only interpersonal deference from convergence communication was left as a distinct construct; thus, the relationship between paternal controlling strategies and interpersonal deference was evaluated.
Figure 5

Revised Structural Model

Note. Standardized estimates shown. Significant paths marked by *.
Figure 6

Final Structural Model

Note. Standardized estimates shown. Significant paths marked by *. 
Controlling for relationship satisfaction, the path from paternal controlling strategies to interpersonal deference was found to be significant and positive. That is, daughters who rated their fathers as high in the use of controlling strategies also rated themselves highly with respect to deferring to their fathers’ point of view. This finding provides support for NCC theory by showing that controlling parenting strategies are related to the meaning making process that emergent adult females employ in such a way that greater perceptions of controlling parenting strategies predicts greater deference among daughters to their fathers’ point of view when the effect of relationship satisfaction is controlled. This latter point is important, as the path from relationship satisfaction to interpersonal deference was also found to be significant and positive, indicating that daughters who were satisfied with their relationship with their fathers also relied on their fathers’ point of view in meaning creation. This finding suggests that the use of interpersonal deference by daughters with respect to their fathers can arise from something positive in their relationship, as opposed to arising simply through maladaptive means.

Hypothesis four, which concerned the relationships between authoritarian parenting, daughters’ differentiation, and paternal psychological control, could also not be examined as originally intended. Instead, the relationship between authoritarian parenting and paternal controlling strategies was evaluated. As Figure 5 shows, the path from authoritarian parenting to paternal controlling strategies is significant, positive, and strong in magnitude.

Hypothesis five concerned the relationship between financial stress, authoritarian parenting, and psychological control. Again, the relationship between financial stress and psychological control could not be directly estimated; however, as Figure 5 shows, the path from financial strain to paternal controlling strategies was significant and positive, thereby providing evidence that increased financial strain can adversely affect the parenting strategies fathers
employ with their daughters (or at least it can adversely affect daughters’ perceptions of their fathers’ parenting behaviors). Contrary to expectations, the path from financial stress to authoritarian parenting was not significant. This suggests that while financial strain can adversely influence parenting strategies, it does not seem to influence global attitudes of and orientations toward parenting.

Hypotheses six through ten concerned the relationships between convergence communication, global self-worth, job competence, social competence, romantic competence, and appearance. These hypotheses could not be examined as originally intended due not only to the reconfiguration of convergence communication, but also due to the creation of the general self-worth latent composite consisting of global self-worth, job competence, and social competence. Thus, the relationships between interpersonal deference, general self-worth, romantic competence, and satisfaction with appearance were evaluated. As Figure 6 reveals, the paths from interpersonal deference to general self-worth, romantic competence, and satisfaction with appearance were all non-significant. These findings were contrary to expectations since NCC theory suggests that engaging in convergence communication, and specifically interpersonal deference, should have deleterious effects on an individual’s self-evaluations (Miller-Day, 2004, 2005).

Finally, the added paths from paternal controlling strategies to general self-worth, romantic competence, and satisfaction with appearance were all significant and negative, indicating that controlling parenting practices exercised by fathers have a diminishing effect on daughters’ self-perceptions. Additionally, the added correlations between the error terms of the three dependent variables were all significant and positive, suggesting that general self-worth, romantic competence, and satisfaction with appearance are distinct but related aspects of the self.
The purpose of this dissertation was to systematically examine the antecedent and consequential correlates of convergence communication in the father-daughter relationship using Miller-Day’s (2004, 2005) NCC theory as a guiding framework. The central construct of NCC theory is convergence communication, which is defined as a scripted interaction routine in which a less powerful dyad member (e.g., a daughter) privileges the worldview and opinions of the more powerful dyad member (e.g., a father) over her own. Miller-Day (2004, 2005) proposed that this type of interaction routine would be most likely to exist in relationships characterized by high levels of psychological control and low levels of differentiation. Preliminary work by Pettigrew et al. (2012) provided support for this hypothesis in an emerging adult sample. However, as previously noted, family life is complex, so it is unlikely that psychological control and differentiation are the only predictors of convergence communication. These two variables are likely to be the most proximal and direct predictors of convergence communication, but they are also likely to be influenced by other (perhaps more distal) aspects of the parenting context.

One goal of this dissertation study was to expand NCC theory by examining broader aspects of the parenting context that may contribute to the proximal predictors of psychological control and differentiation. Specifically, authoritarian parenting was hypothesized to be an important contributor to increased paternal psychological control and decreased differentiation (Baumrind 1968, 1971, 1973; Issacs & Koerner, 2008), and financial strain was hypothesized to be a significant contributor to both increased paternal psychological control and authoritarian parenting (Elder, 1974; Elder et al., 1985; Harris & Marmer, 1996; Lempers & Clark-Lempers, 1990; Mayhew & Lempers, 1998; Robertson et al., 1991; Simons et al., 1994). In addition, relationship satisfaction was treated as a control variable when assessing the effects of
psychological control and differentiation on convergence communication due to prior work demonstrating that relationship satisfaction is significantly related to convergence communication (Miller-Day & Walker-Jackson, 2012), psychological control (Urry et al., 2011), and differentiation (Kim et al., 2013; Olson, 2011). Thus, it was partialed out in order to examine the unique predictive power of psychological control and differentiation on convergence communication.

Additionally, this dissertation project was interested in examining the effects that engaging in convergence communication with their fathers has on daughters’ self-concepts during emerging adulthood. Emerging adulthood (Arnett, 2000, 2004) is the stage in between adolescence and young adulthood that many individuals in industrialized countries experience (roughly ages 18-25). According to Arnett (2000, 2004) this is a time characterized by identity explorations mainly in the domains of love, work, and values. That is, this is the period in the life course when individuals are really beginning to solidify who are they by figuring out who they want to be with, what they want to do professionally, and what beliefs they want to adhere to or ignore. Thus, this period of the life course has the potential to greatly influence individuals’ future adult trajectories (Arnett, 2000, 2004).

In addition to Arnett’s (2000, 2004) insightful work on this stage of the lifespan, Harter (1983, 1999, 2012) has suggested that individuals’ self-concepts become increasingly differentiated across the lifespan, as they develop new cognitive abilities and enter into new social structures. Furthermore, Harter (1983, 1999, 2012) has contended that people’s evaluative perceptions (e.g., good/bad) of their competence in the various domains of their self-concepts along with their overall feelings of self-worth should be of primary focus among researchers and practitioners, as these perceptions are often more predictive of behavior than are more objective
indicators. For individuals in the period of emerging adulthood, Harter and her colleagues (2012; Neemann & Harter, 1986) have identified 13 salient domains of the self-concept. In the present dissertation investigation, only the following five were examined due to their theoretical connections to NCC theory, identity explorations in emerging adulthood, and father-daughter relationships: job competence, romantic relationships, social acceptance, satisfaction with appearance, and global self-worth.

Convergence communication was hypothesized to be a negative predictor of all five self-perceptions. NCC theory asserts that engaging in convergence communication can have deleterious effects on individuals’ psychosocial functioning (Miller-Day, 2004, 2005). Prior work has found support for this claim across a range of mental and physical health outcomes (Miller-Day, 2010; Miller-Day & Fisher, 2008; Miller-Day & Walker-Jackson, 2012). Of particular interest to the present investigation is Miller-Day and Walker-Jackson’s (2012) finding that convergence communication is significantly and positively related to learned helplessness. Thus, daughters who engage in convergence communication with their fathers are likely to view themselves as generally incompetent and incapable of meeting the standards set for them by their fathers (and other authority figures). Furthermore, recent work by Chesnut (2012) revealed that convergence communication is significantly and positively related to the anxiety dimension of adult attachment. As such, daughters who engage in convergence communication with their fathers are likely to possess negative working models of self, which insinuates they will view themselves as generally unworthy and unacceptable. Therefore, convergence communication was expected to be a negative predictor of all five self-perceptions.

Based upon the rationale presented above, the conceptual model presented in Figure 1 was advanced and tested on data gathered from 318 emergent adult daughters using SEM.
During the analysis process, several revisions were made to the originally hypothesized model. The final measurement and structural models are presented in Figures 3 and 6, respectively. This section of the dissertation elaborates on the results described in the previous section, and is organized as follows: a) summary of the measurement and structural models; b) implications for NCC theory and the measurement of convergence communication; c) implications for fathering and the measurement of controlling parenting strategies; d) implications for the father-daughter relationship and the measurement of self-perceptions; e) implications for the field of family communication; f) limitations; and g) future directions.

**Summary of the Measurement and Structural Models**

A two-stage approach to SEM analysis was employed in the current dissertation as recommended by Mueller and Hancock (2007). This approach divides the analysis into a measurement model and a structural model. The major benefit of this approach is that it allows a researcher to discover and correct sources of misspecification and strain in measurement prior to examining parameter estimates in the structural model. If the measurement model does not fit the data well, then a researcher cannot have much confidence in the parameter estimates of the structural model. Additionally, since the structural model is nested within the measurement model, a two-stage approach allows a researcher to see if the structural model fits the data significantly worse than the measurement model via a chi-square difference test for nested models (Mueller & Hancock, 2007). If a significant chi-square is achieved, then the researcher knows that there is misspecification in the structural model that needs revision before interpreting the parameter estimates. Ultimately, this is a more sophisticated approach to SEM analysis than an all-in-one process.

Initially, the measurement model was estimated for those participants with complete data.
(N = 251) by allowing all of the latent variables displayed in Figure 1 to freely covary. Using, at first, only those participants with complete data was done in order to help with the assessment of model misspecification, as standardized residuals and modifications indices are not given in AMOS when there is missing data. An examination of the correlations between these latent variables indicated there were some issues with multicollinearity and discriminant validity (i.e., correlations close to or exceeding |.85|; Brown, 2006). The latent variables affected were psychological control, differentiation, motivation to converge, and disequilibrium, as well as global self-worth, job competence, and social competence. Following Brown’s (2006) advice, these measures were combined into two separate latent composites labeled paternal controlling strategies and general self-worth, respectively. Once these latent composites were created, no further issues with multicollinearity and discriminant validity were detected.

The overall fit of this respecified model was found to be acceptable based upon the values for the relative chi-square, the RMSEA, and the SRMR. Measures of global fit, however, do not reveal sources of localized model strain (Brown, 2006), so standardized residuals, MI, and EPC estimates were examined. Items with large standardized residuals (> |2.58|) and large MI and EPC values were considered candidates for revision or deletion. Based upon these metrics, the following changes were made to the measurement model, one at a time: the error terms between two items of the disequilibrium scale were allowed to covary; one item from the interpersonal deference scale was deleted; and two items from the psychological control scale were allowed to covary. Once these respecifications were made, the measurement model was deemed acceptable. Missing data was then incorporated into the model via FIML, and the results remained fairly stable. The structural model was then estimated.

The results of the initial structural model revealed that financial strain and authoritarian
parenting were significant positive predictors of controlling parenting strategies, which in turn, was a significant positive predictor of interpersonal deference, along with relationship satisfaction. However, interpersonal deference was not found to be a significant predictor of general self-worth, romantic competence, or satisfaction with appearance. The structural model, however, was not a good fit to the data, as indicated by a significant chi-square difference test. Thus, some type of respecification was needed. The most logical respecification was to draw paths from paternal controlling strategies to the three dependent variables due to prior work revealing a significant effect of parenting strategies on the self-perceptions of their emerging adult children (Cheng & Furnham, 2004; Cox et al., 2011; Furnham & Cheng, 2000; Hopkins & Klein, 1993; Klein et al., 1996; Laursen & DeLay, 2011).

Adding these paths did help to increase the fit of the structural model, and the paths were found to be significant and negative. A chi-square difference test for nested models, however, revealed that it still fit the data significantly worse than the measurement model. The next most logical respecification was to allow the dependent variables to correlate. According to Harter and her colleagues (Harter, 1999, 2012; Neemann & Harter, 1986), these various self-perceptions should be distinct but related aspects of the self. Indeed, prior research has shown that they evidence strong correlations with each other (Cosden & McNamara, 1997; Neemann & Harter, 1986). Thus, they are related to each other, and treating them as if they are uncorrelated is likely contributing to the significantly worse fit between the structural model and the measurement model (where they are allowed to freely covary). Once this respecification was made, the result of the chi-square difference test for nested models was nonsignificant, indicating no further revisions were needed. The results of this final structural model did not substantively change compared to the structural models that proceeded it.
Clearly, this final model is substantially different from the conceptual model presented in Figure 1. The conceptual model in Figure 1 was based upon several assumptions that were not borne out in this dissertation study. Convergence communication did not fit a higher-order factor structure, and in fact, two aspects of convergence communication were statistically indistinct from psychological control and differentiation. This issue required the creation of a latent composite variable. Additionally, three subscales of the SPPCS were found to be statistically indistinct requiring the creation of another latent composite variable. Furthermore, the claim that convergence communication, which was operationalized as interpersonal deference due to the creation of the paternal controlling strategies composite variable, negatively impacted self-perceptions was not supported by the data. Rather, paternal controlling strategies (comprised of psychological control, differentiation, motivation to converge, and disequilibrium) was found to be a significant, negative predictor of daughters’ self-perceptions. Moreover, the self-perceptions examined in this dissertation study were so strongly correlated with each other, that a good model fit could not be achieved without allowing them to covary. These differences between the hypothesized conceptual model and the final structural model have important implications, and the following sections detail these implications.

**Implications for NCC Theory and the Measurement of Convergence Communication**

NCC theory postulates that one partner’s consistent engagement in submissive interactions (i.e., convergence communication) in a relationship will adversely affect a variety of outcomes related to his/her psychosocial functioning (Miller-Day, 2004, 2005). Indeed, the general trend in studies that have investigated this central tenet of the theory is that convergence communication is negatively related to psychosocial functioning (Miller-Day, 2010; Miller-Day & Fisher, 2008; Miller-Day & Walker-Jackson, 2012). Furthermore, Miller-Day (2004, 2005)
hypothesized that convergence communication consisted of three separate, but related, dimensions: disequilibrium (in interactions and meaning construction), interpersonal deference, and motivation to converge. Recent work by Miller-Day and Walker-Jackson (2012) presented evidence that these three dimensions of convergence communication were strongly correlated, and that they could be adequately fit to a higher-order factor.

The results of this dissertation, however, do not corroborate this past research. The three dimensions of convergence communication did not fit a single, higher-order factor structure. This was largely attributable to the nonsignificant correlations between motivation to converge and interpersonal deference, as well as disequilibrium and interpersonal deference. Another compounding factor was the extremely high correlation between motivation to converge and disequilibrium, which suggested a lack of discriminant validity between these two constructs (Brown, 2006). In other words, though they were hypothesized to be separate aspects of convergence communication, the participants’ responses strongly suggested that they were actually tapping the same phenomenon. Furthermore, these two constructs were also highly correlated with psychological control and differentiation; both of which were hypothesized to be predictors of convergence communication. Again, the strength of the correlations suggested that these constructs lacked discriminant validity, and as such, were all essentially representing the same phenomenon. This point will be discussed at greater length in the next section of the dissertation.

These findings concerning the measurement of convergence communication were unexpected but highly informative. They suggest that the content of the measures used to assess motivation to comply and disequilibrium are highly similar while the content of the measure used to assess interpersonal deference is virtually unrelated to the content of the other two
measures. An examination of the items from the motivation to comply and disequilibrium measures reveals how the original intent to have the items represent distinct, but related, concepts may have gone awry. Items on the motivation to comply measure concern the critical nature of the father (e.g., “My father is critical of me”), the coerciveness of the father when the child does not defer (e.g., “My father ignores me if I don’t defer to him”), and the demandingness of the father for the child’s deference (e.g., “My father tends to demand that I agree with him”). Items on the disequilibrium scale focus on how the father responds to the child’s opinions (e.g., “I do not think my father takes my opinions seriously”) and how conversations are enacted (e.g., “Only my father initiates conversations”).

Clearly, it can be seen that these are intended to be separate constructs; however, it can also be seen how people could respond to them in a manner that suggests they are not truly distinct. For example, the criticalness of the father is likely related to perceptions of how the father reacts to his child’s opinions, and in fact, the two items cited above that relate to this have a significant correlation of .46. Additionally, the demandingness of the father for the child’s deference is likely related to who initiates and controls conversations. An examination of the correlation between the two items cited above that reflects this issue reveals it is significant with a magnitude of .42.

This issue with discriminant validity has implications for NCC theory and the measurement of convergence communication. Convergence communication is defined as a submissive communication pattern characterized by one partner uncritically adopting the interpretations or worldview of another (Miller-Day, 2004, 2005; Miller-Day & Walker-Jackson, 2012). Thus, it is a communicative characteristic of submissive relational partners. In the context of father-daughter relationships (and parent-child relationships more generally), this
communication pattern would be enacted by the daughter, not the father, through interpersonal deference. However, the aspects of motivation to comply and disequilibrium tap characteristics of the father, not the daughter. This is evidenced by examining the content of the respective scales, as well as by their extremely high correlations with psychological control and differentiation, both of which assess how the father treats or reacts to his daughter. Therefore, motivation to comply and disequilibrium are not aspects of convergence communication, as it is currently defined; rather, they are aspects of parenting that potentially encourage a child’s use of convergence communication. These aspects are highly similar to each other, as well as psychological control and differentiation, both of which NCC theory postulates are predictive of convergence communication (Miller-Day, 2004, 2005). The significant and positive path from paternal controlling strategies to interpersonal deference provides support for those postulates.

In addition to the issues with discriminant validity, the findings of the hypotheses concerning the antecedent and consequential correlates of convergence communication illuminate interesting implications for NCC theory. As expected, daughters’ greater perceptions of paternal controlling strategies predicted higher levels of their deference to their fathers’ point of view. This provides strong support for NCC theory’s contention that convergence communication is encouraged by controlling parenting practices. This effect, however, is controlling for daughters’ perceptions of relationship satisfaction. It is important to control for relationship satisfaction because prior work has found that it is negatively associated with convergence communication (Miller-Day, 2004; Walker-Jackson & Miller-Day, 2012) and controlling parenting strategies (e.g., Urry et al., 2011); however, no prior work has examined the simultaneous effect of relationship satisfaction and controlling parenting strategies on convergence communication. Thus, it has not been possible to examine if they are both
independently related to convergence communication, or if one no longer makes a significant
contribution to convergence communication after the effect of the other has been accounted for.

The current results indicate both are significant predictors of convergence
communication; however, the path from relationship satisfaction to interpersonal deference was
positive, which was unexpected. This indicates that, holding the effect of paternal controlling
strategies constant, the greater a daughter’s relationship satisfaction with her father, the more
likely she is to adopt his point of view as her own. This suggests that convergence
communication may emerge in the father-daughter relationship through positive as well as
negative means. Considering that convergence communication is purported to be a maladaptive
communication process that diminishes the psychosocial functioning of the one engaging in it,
this result is surprising and difficult to interpret. However, an examination of the manner in
which interpersonal deference is operationalized sheds some light on this finding. Example items
from this scale include: “My father has a lot of influence over the way I think,” “I often end up
seeing things from my father’s point of view,” “Even if we disagree at first, I often see things my
father’s way,” and “My father can easily change my mind.”

Based simply on the content of the items, there is nothing that indicates agreeing with
these statements represents an engagement in a submissive and maladaptive process of
interpreting one’s social world. On the contrary, any one of those items could be construed as a
natural by-product of a satisfying and close relationship, especially during emerging adulthood
when children are still trying to figure out themselves and their future (Arnett, 2004). For
example, if a daughter is considering whether or not she should pursue a particular major in
college, she may seek out her father for help in making that decision because her prior
experiences suggest he will be able to give her good advice. Under this circumstance, the father
may have a great deal of influence over the way his daughter thinks, but this may not necessarily be maladaptive.

Arguably, this is developmentally based. That is, what is healthy and adaptive in emerging adulthood may not be so at earlier or later periods in the life span. Thus, a father having a great deal of influence over the way his 40-year old, married daughter with two children thinks may indeed be maladaptive (especially if his influence is at odds with the other members in her immediate family system) whereas this same influence over the way his single, 20-year old daughter thinks is not. This may even be less problematic at earlier life stages (i.e., childhood and adolescence) where influence over thinking may be necessary in order to aid in proper socialization. This suggests two types of refinement are needed in the items of the interpersonal deference scale. First, items should be refined so that they more clearly capture the theoretical nature of interpersonal deference. This includes making sure the items capture the notions of degree and chronicity, as NCC theory asserts these concepts are crucial to increasing one’s risk for experiencing negative psychosocial outcomes (Miller-Day, 2004, 2005). As the measure currently stands, neither the amount nor the pervasiveness of convergence are clearly captured. Second, the items should be sensitive to the participants’ stage in the life span. That is to say, different measures should be constructed for different life stages.

These issues in operationalizing interpersonal deference may also account for the nonsignificant paths from interpersonal deference to general self-worth, romantic competence, and satisfaction with appearance. However, if interpersonal deference was operationalized in a manner that may be assessing a benign communication pattern in emerging adulthood, then one would expect significant positive paths, not nonsignificant paths. As it stands, the findings suggest that the influence a daughter allows her father to have over her interpretation of her
social world has no effect on her sense of general self-worth, romantic competence, or satisfaction with appearance. This is indeed puzzling as NCC theory suggests that such subjugation to the father’s interpretive frame should adversely affect self-perceptions (Miller-Day, 2004, 2005), and the competing notion that interpersonal deference, as it was operationalized in this dissertation, may arise through positive means suggests it could positively influence self-perceptions.

In attempting to account for these nonsignificant relationships, at least three possibilities exist. First, perceptions of general self-worth, romantic competence, and satisfaction with appearance are influenced by factors other than the degree of influence a daughter allows her father to have over her interpretations of her social world. Though it stands to reason that there would be a systematic relationship between a daughter deferring to her father’s interpretive frame and her self-perceptions, it could be that these three self-perceptions are simply driven by other factors at this stage in the life course. These daughters are at a stage in their lives where the influence of peers and romantic partners on these outcomes may be more consequential than the influence of parents (Dinero et al., 2009; Rodgers, et al.; Surjadi, Lorenz, Wickrama, & Conger, 2011).

Second, the lack of significant negative relationships is potentially the result of the interpersonal deference measure’s insensitivity to the concepts of degree and chronicity. Though NCC theory postulates that convergence communication is an unhealthy communication pattern, it frames that postulate in the context of degree and chronicity (Miller-Day, 2004, 2005). That is, convergence communication is assumed to be most deleterious to psychosocial functioning when it occurs to a high degree and consistently across time and context. If the interpersonal deference measure more clearly captured the degree and chronicity of convergence communication,
perhaps the hypothesized relations would have been found.

Finally, it is possible no statistically significant linear relationship was found because the relationship is non-linear. NCC theory (Miller-Day, 2004, 2005) argues that high degrees of deference that occur across time and context are deleterious for psychosocial functioning. This type of deference is most likely to occur in highly enmeshed relationships, but high levels of disengagement in relationships has also been linked to negative psychosocial functioning (Olson, 2000; Olson & Gorall, 2003). Therefore, it is possible that a curvilinear relationship exists between interpersonal deference and self-perceptions. That is, individuals who are on the low or the high end of the scale experience diminished self-perceptions compared to those who are not on either extreme of the scale. This was examined in SPSS (version 22.0.0) with the curve estimation procedure. The results indicated there was no statistically significant curvilinear relationship between interpersonal deference and any of the self-perceptions examined in this dissertation. An examination of the scatterplots supplied by this estimation procedure revealed no discernable pattern between interpersonal deference and self-perceptions providing further evidence for the conclusion that no relationship exists between these variables with this sample.

**Implications for Fathering and the measurement of Controlling Parenting Strategies**

One goal of this dissertation was to expand Miller-Day’s (2004, 2005) antecedent correlates of convergence communication by examining the financial stress of the family and the authoritarian parenting nature of the father in addition to psychological control and differentiation. This goal could not be fully realized because of the model respecifications, but the results of the final structural model do provide some interesting insights into the nature of fathering and how it relates to daughters’ convergence communication. These results also provide some important insights into the measurement of parenting constructs. This latter point
will be addressed first, as it will make the interpretation of the former point easier.

In the present investigation, the concepts of psychological control and differentiation were theorized to be related but distinct. Prior work has demonstrated that increased levels of psychological control are associated with decreased levels of differentiation (e.g., Pettigrew et al., 2012). However, the results of this dissertation revealed that psychological control and differentiation, based upon the operationalization of the scales employed, lacked discriminant validity. Thus, they were not truly distinct concepts. This was further complicated by both measures’ lack of discriminant validity with two components of the convergence communication scale: motivation to converge and disequilibrium.

The current results suggest that these four concepts are so similar that people do not make distinctions between them when responding to the items designed to measure each. In closely examining the items from each measure, it can be seen that the manner in which all four concepts have been operationalized is quite similar. For example, psychological control (“My father is always trying to change how I feel or think about things”), differentiation (“My father tells me what I should be thinking”), and motivation to comply (“My father tells me what to believe”) all have at least one item that deals with the father controlling the thoughts and beliefs of his daughter. Similarly, psychological control (“My father stops talking to me, if I have hurt his feelings, until I do something to please him again”) and motivation to comply (“My father ignores me if I don’t defer to him”) both contain items that assess to what degree the father engages in coercive tactics to induce the daughter to conform to his standards. Disequilibrium (“I do not think my father takes my opinions seriously”) and differentiation (“My father discounts my thoughts and opinions”) both contain items that assess how the father responds to the thoughts, opinions, and feelings of his daughter. In essence, all four measures assess the degree
to which a father engages in controlling parenting strategies with his daughter.

These results further demonstrate the significant overlap that exists in the way different theoretical constructs of parenting are operationalized (Crockett & Hayes, 2011). Certainly, NCC theory draws distinctions between the concepts of motivation to comply and disequilibrium and the concepts of psychological control and differentiation; however, the results of this study strongly suggest that they have not been made operationally distinct. This is an issue that needs further attention. Without operationally distinct measures of parenting, it can be difficult, if not impossible, to adequately assess how different aspects of parenting influence each other and various child outcomes. When examining the validity of a particular scale that assesses some aspect or aspects of parenting, more effort should be made to see if it is truly distinct from existing measures (see Padilla-Walker & Nelson, 2012, for an example of this). Additionally, in constructing scales, careful attention must be given to the primary location of the construct. For example, differentiation could be said to be a characteristic of an individual (Bowen, 1978), but it is certainly influenced by that person’s family environment (Anderson & Sabatelli, 1992). Thus, when measuring the concept, should the items assess an individual’s perceptions of him/herself, his/her parent, the general climate of their relationship, or some combination of those perceptions? Developing a scale that clearly answers these questions could help mitigate item overlap, or at the very least, it could help an applied researcher better understand exactly how the scale is measuring the theoretical construct.

Despite these issues with the discriminant validity of some of the parenting measures used in this dissertation, the results of the final structural model were informative. As expected, the paths from financial strain and authoritarian parenting to paternal controlling strategies were both significant and positive, indicating higher levels of both are associated with higher levels of
The effect of authoritarian parenting on paternal controlling strategies ($\beta = .70$) appears to be much stronger than the effect of financial strain ($\beta = .14$), suggesting that possessing an authoritarian orientation toward parenting is more consequential for the use of paternal controlling strategies than is financial strain. However, when the effect of authoritarian parenting is partialed out, financial strain is still explaining unique variance in paternal controlling strategies, which suggests this variable is helpful in understanding what accounts for fathers’ use of controlling parenting strategies.

Contrary to expectations, though, financial strain had no significant impact on authoritarian parenting. Thus, increased perceptions of financial strain do not appear to influence perceptions of authoritarian parenting. This finding suggests that authoritarian parenting is independent of financial strain. This could be the case because authoritarian parenting is a general orientation towards parenting (Cox et al., 2011), and thus, is influenced more by the psychological characteristics or beliefs of the father than by contextual factors.

**Implications for the Father-Daughter Relationship and the Measurement of Self-Perceptions**

The results of this dissertation also have important implications for the father-daughter relationship and the measurement of self-perceptions. As can be seen in the final path model, perceptions of fathers’ use of controlling parenting strategies is negatively related to the three major self-perceptions examined (i.e., general self-worth, romantic competence, and satisfaction with appearance). This evidence strongly suggests that how a daughter perceives her father’s parenting influences how she sees herself. This finding is consistent with prior theory and research on the development of the self (Cooley, 1902; Cheng & Furnham, 2004; Furnham & Cheng, 2000; Harter, 1999, 2012; Hopkins & Klein, 1993; Klein et al., 1996). Daughters’ who
perceived their fathers as being high in the use of controlling parenting strategies were more likely to report lower levels of general self-worth, romantic competence, and satisfaction with appearance. Parenting strategies that are seen as overly controlling invalidate a child’s sense of worth, diminish their self-perceptions, and intensify engagement in self-criticism, especially in the context of the father-daughter relationship (Cheng & Furnham, 2004). Considering that emerging adulthood is a time for solidifying one’s identity (Arnett, 2004), daughters who have controlling fathers may find it especially hard to accomplish this developmental task.

In addition to the findings relating to the father-daughter relationship, the findings relating to the measurement of self-perceptions are also of significance. Neemann and Harter (1986) developed the SPPCS based upon the theoretical assumption that the self becomes increasingly differentiated across the lifespan; thus, how one measures self-perceptions in childhood is not appropriate for how one measures self-perceptions in adulthood. Their original work with this measure validated the factorial structure of the SPPCS using exploratory factor analytic techniques, and demonstrated that each subscale had adequate reliability. In the current dissertation, only five of the 13 subscales were used. To the best of my knowledge, this is the only investigation that has examined any of the factors of the SPPCS in a confirmatory framework.

The results from the initial measurement model strongly indicated that the following three subscales lacked discriminant validity: global self-worth, job competence, and social acceptance. This finding suggested that the participants did not adequately differentiate between these constructs. The lack of differentiation between global self-worth and job competence is not entirely surprising considering Arnett’s (2004) description of emerging adulthood as a time of identity explorations in work. That is, work is a salient aspect of one’s self in this period of the
lifespan, as it is seen as an essential part of becoming a full-fledged adult. The current finding suggests that perceptions of job competence are such a salient part of this period in the life cycle that they are virtually indistinguishable from overall perceptions of worth.

The finding concerning the overlap between social acceptance and global self-worth was a bit more surprising. Arnett (2004) describes emerging adulthood as being principally focused on explorations in love, and so, it would seem to make more sense that perceived competence in romantic relationships be more highly correlated with global self-worth than perceived competence in social acceptance. However, the majority of the participants were at the beginning of this life stage ($M = 19$ years), which is likely more similar to end of adolescence in many ways than it is to the middle or end of emerging adulthood. In adolescence, acceptance and support by the peer group is seen as particularly important to the development of self (Harter, 1999; Sentse, Lindenberg, Omvlee, Ormel, & Veenstra, 2010). Furthermore, competence in the social domain of life is a precursor to success in romantic relationships (Connolly et al., 2000; Roisman et al., 2004); however, the transition to committed relationships may not occur until the end of emerging adulthood and the beginning of young adulthood (Shulman & Connolly, 2013). Thus, at the beginning of emerging adulthood, social acceptance may be more salient because individuals have not yet transitioned from the peer network to committed partnerships. Given this rationale, it does make sense that one’s perception of social acceptance would be highly intertwined with her overall sense of self-worth. Ultimately, this finding suggests that while partialing emergent adults’ self-perceptions into a variety of different categories may be theoretically interesting, it does not seem to capture reality very well.

**Implications for the Field of Family Communication**

The results of the current dissertation study also have implications for the field of family
communication. Most notably, the results suggest that fathers play an important role in their daughters’ lives, especially with respect to their self-evaluations. This finding is in line with a significant body of work that reveals the importance of fathers in their children’s lives (Flouri, 2005; Lamb, 2010; Rosenberg & Wilcox, 2006; Shulman & Seiffge-Krenke, 1997; Tamis-LeMonda & Cabrera, 2002), as well as a small but growing body of work that demonstrates the significance of fathers in their daughters’ lives (Nielsen, 2012; Punyanunt-Carter, 2006; Sharpe, 1994). Thus, the results suggest the father-daughter relationship warrants more empirical study from family communication scholars. As was revealed in the introductory pages of this dissertation, the father-daughter relationship is not currently a major emphasis within the field of family communication.

The father-daughter relationship, however, is beginning to gain traction in disciplines such as psychology and human development and family studies. In fact, the vast majority of the sources presented within this dissertation come from these two disciplines. While the insights these disciplines bring to the father-daughter relationship are useful, they can only provide limited detail about the influence and role of communication because communication is not a major emphasis in these studies. This presents the field of family communication with a unique opportunity to research how general orientations toward communication (e.g., conversation or conformity orientation) and specific communication behaviors (e.g., affectionate communication, confirming communication) shape the father-daughter relationship, as well as influence the individual outcomes of fathers and daughters.

The results of this dissertation also highlight the significant role that dominance and control play in negatively shaping child outcomes. The results of the path analysis revealed that paternal controlling strategies was negatively related to all of the daughters’ self-perceptions.
Dominance and control have long occupied a central place in communication research (Berger, 1994; Burgoon & Dillman, 1995; Burgoon & Dunbar, 2000), and the current results suggest that they should continue to occupy a central role in family communication research on parent-child relationships. However, this does not mean the role of submission should be overlooked. Even though the current results do not provide evidence that submissive communication influences self-evaluations, the potential for this to occur is a reality (e.g., Miller-Day, 2004; Powers et al., 2010). As has already been noted, the operationalization of interpersonal deference may account for the nonsignificant relationships in the path model between it and the self-perception outcomes. Furthermore, convergence communication is only one type of submissive communication. Considering the complex nature of dominance and submission, it is doubtful that there is only one type of submissive communication that can be enacted in parent-child relationships. Thus, the field of family communication should endeavor to study submissive communication from multiple theoretical and methodological perspectives in order to elucidate its variability, as well as its causes and consequences in family life and functioning.

This dissertation’s results also have methodological implications for the field of family communication. Perhaps the most obvious implication is that family communication scholars need to exercise great caution when operationalizing their variables of interest. Several of the variables included in this dissertation study lacked discriminant validity, suggesting they were essentially measuring the same concept. This occurred despite the theoretical distinctions that have been made between the concepts. This underscores Crockett and Hayes’ (2011) observation that there is significant overlap in the way in which different theoretical constructs of parenting are operationalized. Family communication scholars need to make sure that when studying parent-child relationships, they are employing quality measures that are distinct enough to
possess discriminant validity. This could mean that family communication scholars will have to engage in more pilot studies before conducting formal studies.

In addition to taking great caution in operationalizing study variables, the findings of this dissertation also suggest that family communication scholars need to employ CFAs on published scales. This implication is directly in line with the advice of Levine, Hullett, Turner, and Lapinski (2006). Miller-Day and Walker-Jackson (2012) demonstrated that convergence communication consisted of three related but distinct factors that fit a higher-order factor structure. Neeman and Harter (1986) demonstrated that self-evaluations during emerging adulthood could be adequately differentiated into 13 distinct but related domains. In the current investigation, however, neither convergence communication nor the various subscales of the SPPCS retained their pre-specified factor structure. If a CFA had not been employed in the current investigation, these issues would not have been identified, and the conclusions drawn from the results would likely have been erroneous. Thus, family communication scholars cannot simply take for granted that a particular scale will retain its hypothesized structure in their study. As Levine et al. (2006) noted, “one simply cannot make a ‘published = good’ presumption” (p. 310). Measurement invariance is certainly probable, but it is not a guarantee; therefore, family communication scholars need to make sure that they are conducting CFAs on the measurement scales they employ, even if they are not performing an SEM analysis.

Limitations

The current dissertation has several limitations. First, the data were gathered from a single respondent via self-report measures. As such, the results of this dissertation study are subject to all of the biases that come with self-report measures collected from a single respondent. Specifically, the results are subject to perceptual biases and common method
variance biases. The emergent adult daughters in this dissertation study were asked to provide their perceptions of themselves and their fathers on a number of different constructs, and these perceptions may very well be skewed. For example, there is some evidence to suggest that depressed individuals perceive their parents’ behaviors more negatively than objective raters do (Roisman, Padron, Sroufe, Egeland, 2002). There is also evidence that suggests individuals with insecure attachments possess idealized perceptions of their parents (Crowell & Treboux, 1995). Thus, both cognitive and affective states can exert a powerful influence over how a person thinks about herself and her father.

In addition to perceptual biases, having a single respondent fill out self-report measures could produce artificially inflated parameter estimates by way of common method bias (Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Lee, & Podsakoff, 2003). That is, some of the variance accounted for in this dissertation study may simply be an artifact of the measurement method used, rather than the actual constructs employed. All of the constructs in this dissertation study were assessed using Likert-type scales with fairly similar response formats, and this could have easily influenced how the participants responded to the items (Fiske, 1982). In fact, this might potentially account for the high correlations between some of the latent constructs measured in this dissertation study.

Additionally, as Bagozzi and Yi (1991) noted, a variety of response biases could have been present such as social desirability or yea- and nay-saying. With respect to social desirability, several of the measures employed contained items that could easily be evaluated as “good/bad” or “right/wrong.” In an effort to not appear “bad” or “wrong,” it is possible that the participants provided inaccurate information about themselves and/or their fathers. The fact that the means for the model variables are all generally indicative of positive individual and relational functioning combined with their relatively restricted variance (see Table 1) could be interpreted
as evidence of social desirability. It could also be indicative of the propensity for college students to be generally well-adjusted individuals (Arnett, 2004; Eklund, Dowdy, Jones, & Furlong, 2011; Nelson & Padilla-Walker, 2013). With respect to yea- and nay-saying, it is possible that the participants simply responded in a favorable or unfavorable manner to the items regardless of their content. In either event, systematic bias would have been introduced, and the results must be interpreted in light of this possibility.

One way to alleviate some of the bias associated with common method variance is to collect data from multiple respondents (Podsakoff et al., 2003). This was attempted in the current dissertation study. At the end of the survey, the participants were asked to provide the contact information of their fathers. They were informed that this was entirely voluntary and would not have any influence on them receiving their designated course credit. Unfortunately, of the 318 participants, only 12 provided the contact information of their fathers, and of these 12 fathers, only three completed the father version of the online survey. Thus, an examination of the study’s variables from the fathers’ perspective could not be adequately performed.

It is interesting that so few daughters volunteered their fathers’ contact information. There is a long-standing assumption in the social scientific disciplines that fathers are less interested in participating in research than mothers (Phares, 1992). It is possible that daughters hold this same assumption about their fathers. It is also possible that some characteristic(s) of the fathers, daughters, or their relationship accounts for why some did, but most did not, provide their fathers’ contact information. The means of all of the continuous model variables were computed and visually inspected for differences between the two groups (see Appendix I). No inferential tests were conducted due to the severely unequal sample sizes, which impair statistical power. According to G*Power (Faul, Erdfelder, Lang, & Buchner, 2007), in order to detect a
moderate effect size (Cohen’s $d = .5$), a sample size of at least 105 is needed in each group. Several of the mean differences were in the expected direction, but overall, these differences were not very large in magnitude. For example, daughters who provided their fathers’ contact information had a higher average relationship satisfaction score than those who did not provide this information, but the difference between the two average scores was approximately .30.

Of course, it is also entirely possible that some unmeasured variable is the best predictor of who does and who does not provide their fathers’ contact information. For example, daughters’ beliefs about how private or public their fathers’ contact information is could very well influence their willingness to provide this information. Regardless of the reason why a minority did and a majority did not provide their fathers’ contact information, it should be noted that some scholars (e.g., Allgood et al., 2012; Carlson, 2006; Finley & Schwartz, 2004; Rohner, 2004) have argued that when studying the effects of parenting on child outcomes, the only perceptions that matter are the child’s. Thus, while gathering the fathers’ perceptions may be informative, their perceptions of their own attitudes and behaviors may very well be less consequential than their daughters’ perceptions of these attitudes and behaviors.

A second limitation of this dissertation study is that the data were collected through a cross-sectional design, so causality cannot be assessed. This is especially important to note, as the graphical representation of the structural model suggests causality can be clearly inferred. Though clear rationales were provided for why the conceptual model in Figure 1 was constructed as it was, the data are limited in their ability to fully support that causal chain. For example, it is just as plausible that paternal controlling strategies causes authoritarian parenting as it is that authoritarian parenting causes paternal controlling strategies. Furthermore, it is just as plausible that there is some sort of reciprocal relationship that exists between these constructs. At most, it
can only be concluded that the constructs presented in Figure 6 that are connected through statistically significant paths share variance with each other.

A third limitation of this dissertation study is the lack of discriminant validity found among several of the latent constructs. When performing an SEM analysis, the researcher wants the latent constructs to share variance but not to an extreme degree. As Brown (2006) noted, correlations between model variables close to or in excess of 0.85 are considered extreme for applied researchers. A principle concern for a researcher when correlations are this high is multicollinearity, which can have adverse effects on parameter estimation (Hair et al., 2010). For this reason, it is suggested that constructs either be combined or dropped from data analysis. Neither one of these methods is preferable, as they both obstruct the original purpose of the research.

In the current dissertation study, psychological control, differentiation, motivation to converge, and disequilibrium all had to be combined to form a single latent composite. Additionally, global self-worth, job competence, and social acceptance all had to be combined into a single latent composite. Though this alleviated the present issues with discriminant validity and multicollinearity, it also made it impossible to assess direct relationships among these variables, as well as direct relationships between these variables and other model variables. For example, there was no way to assess the unique relationship between psychological control and interpersonal deference, or the unique relationship between differentiation and social acceptance. This limits the specific claims that can be made from this data.

A fourth limitation of this dissertation study was that only one period in the lifespan, emerging adulthood, was assessed. This makes it impossible to understand how individual and relational development influences the observed relationships between model constructs. The
lifespan perspective asserts that individuals and their environments are engaged in a transactional process of mutual influence that is situated within a particular sociocultural-historical context (Williams & Nussbaum, 2001). Thus, change is the rule rather than the exception. What this means for the current dissertation study is that the results cannot be generalized beyond emerging adulthood. As was previously noted, a daughter deferring to her father’s opinions in emerging adulthood may not be consequential for her self-concept, but deferring to her father’s opinions when she is in middle adulthood may have severe repercussions for her self-concept. Additionally, the relationship between interpersonal deference and self-concept may be more consequential at earlier points in the lifespan when a person is just starting to develop and consolidate a sense of self.

Furthermore, as people move across the lifespan, they experience a myriad of changes that could influence how the variables in the current dissertation study relate to each other. The manner in which daughters understand themselves and their fathers is bound to be influenced by their other family relationships, their friendships, their romantic relationships, their educational experiences, their spiritual experiences, and their own parenting experiences, to name just a few. These relationships and experiences change across the lifespan in both salience and intensity, and as a consequence, exert an effect on the developing person and her understanding of her social world. Given the design of the current dissertation study, this effect could not be analyzed.

A fifth limitation of this dissertation study was the reliance on a convenience sample of emerging adults. All of the participants in the current dissertation study were college students enrolled in an introductory communication class at a large, Eastern university. Thus, their experience of the father-daughter relationship is certainly not a representative one. This lack of representation limits the generalizability of the findings. Several scholars have noted that the
experiences of emerging adults are influenced by such factors as whether or not they attend college (Arnett, 2000; Fivush & Buckner, 2003; Nelson & Barry, 2005; Shulman et al., 2005). It is not hard to imagine that the life of a 20-year old college female is different from the life of a 20-year old female who entered the labor force right after high school. These different trajectories in emerging adulthood, however, likely have their roots in the climate of the family at earlier developmental periods. That is, it could very well be that there are systematic differences in the family relationships of those who go to college and those who do not (see Laureau, 2003 for a detailed discussion of this point). In turn, these systematic differences may result in the emergence of different relationships among and between the variables analyzed in this dissertation study.

A final limitation of this dissertation study is that the daughters’ perceptions of their mothers on the parenting concepts were not obtained, so the unique effect of fathers could not be examined. There is research to suggest that mothers and fathers have different effects on child outcomes (Flouri, 2005; Steele & Steele, 2005), and there is research demonstrating that paternal effects are no longer statistically significant after controlling for maternal effects (Sira & White, 2010). The current results are not able to contribute to this theoretical discussion.

**Future Directions**

Moving forward, there are several avenues that need to be pursued. First, the self-report measure of convergence communication needs to be refined. The results of this dissertation study revealed that convergence communication did not retain its hypothesized factor structure. The motivation to converge and disequilibrium subscales were highly correlated while these same subscales were nonsignificantly correlated with the interpersonal deference subscale. Furthermore, the motivation to converge and disequilibrium subscales were highly correlated.
with psychological control and differentiation suggesting that they are assessing aspects of the father and not the daughter.

It would appear, then, that only the interpersonal deference scale assesses Miller-Day’s (2004, 2005) concept of convergence communication. However, results revealed that it did not relate to daughters’ self-perceptions as hypothesized, and that it was positively associated with relationship satisfaction. This latter finding suggests that interpersonal deference may emerge in the father-daughter relationship through optimal mechanisms in addition to suboptimal mechanisms. Miller-Day (2004) noted that this was possible by suggesting that there is nothing inherently maladaptive about interpersonal deference; however, in order for the tenets of the theory to be borne out, there must be a way to distinguish between adaptive and maladaptive deference.

One way this could be achieved is by having a measure that clearly captures the notion of degree and chronicity. Miller-Day (2004, 2005) stated that convergence communication is especially deleterious when it occurs to a high degree and consistently across time and context. Thus, a self-report measure of convergence communication will need to capture both of these elements. Since convergence communication is principally concerned with the process of replacing one’s own opinions with another’s opinions, the scale items could focus on the outcomes of decisions. These items would need to be open-ended in nature, so that the participants could state what their parents’ opinion was, what their opinion was, and what the final decision was. These responses could then be coded for the degree of deference. Also, by providing the participants with a variety of decisions that are germane to their stage in the lifespan, the chronicity of deference could also be assessed.

Another avenue for future research is to perform observational research on convergence
communication either in the lab or in the home setting. As was stated in the limitations section, convergence communication may be a phenomenon that is difficult to accurately assess via self-report measures. Individuals may not feel comfortable indicating the true extent of their submission to their father because doing so might make them lose face. It is also possible that someone might overemphasize their submission to their father, or they might overemphasize the demandingness and controllingness of their father. Observational research overcomes these limitations by relying on the ratings of trained, third-party coders.

Another advantage of observational research is that it would allow for a more nuanced understanding of the communicative behaviors that signal submission. Miller-Day’s (2004, 2005) work on NCC theory did not specifically outline what types of verbal and nonverbal behavior constitute convergence communication. It would seem obvious that such behaviors as acquiescence and silence would constitute submissive forms of communication, but do they actually represent convergence with another’s point of view? Lab- or home-based observations would help in answering this question.

Observational work would also open the door to dyadic data analysis, which is an important avenue for future research to pursue. Outside of Miller-Day’s (2004) ethnographic work on NCC theory, no dyadic data analysis has been utilized with this theory. This means, of course, that no quantitative dyadic data analysis has ever been utilized with this theory. This is quite unfortunate since NCC theory clearly rests upon the assumption that convergence communication arises out of interactions. In the parent-child relationship, the dominance of the parent begets the submissiveness of the child. In turn, the submissiveness of the child begets the dominance of the parent. This iterative cycle is dyadic in nature, and in order to truly understand the development of convergence communication and its subsequent effects, a dyadic approach
will need to be used.

Within the context of the father-daughter relationship, this might be especially challenging. An attempt was made to collect dyadic data for this dissertation project, but overall, the participants were unwilling to provide their fathers’ contact information. Furthermore, the fathers that were contacted were generally unwilling to participate. Thus, great care and careful planning will need to be used to gather enough dyadic data to perform meaningful analyses.

Future research also should utilize longitudinal designs. As previously mentioned in the limitations section, longitudinal designs allow for causality to be explored, and they provide a rich description of how human development unfolds. A longitudinal study that followed fathers and daughters across the entirety of the lifespan would provide researchers with a wealth of knowledge about how communicative behaviors, experiences, and perceptions influence psychosocial functioning. This type of study would also allow for an examination of how daughters influence their fathers’ development, and it would provide insight into how individual and relational development influences the quality of father-daughter communication.

Though this kind of longitudinal work would be insightful, it would also be costly. However, even a smaller scale longitudinal study could provide important insights. For example, a sample of fathers and daughters could be recruited during the daughters’ senior year of high school (i.e., late adolescence) and followed over the course of emerging adulthood. This would equate to roughly 8 years of data collection, as opposed to 40+ years, and it would certainly provide great insight into how characteristics of the father, daughter, and their relationship influence daughters’ psychosocial adjustment in emerging adulthood. Specifically, this study could provide insight into how convergence communication at age 18 relates to romantic relationship quality or job success at age 25 or 26. It could also provide evidence for the stability
or discontinuity of convergence communication in the father-daughter relationship.

Additionally, it would be beneficial for future research to study convergence communication at other periods of the lifespan. Most of the work to date utilizing NCC theory has been conducted with emerging adult samples of college students. Though this is an important group to study, they should not be the sole focus of the research attention. As stated previously, the effect of convergence communication may very well be developmentally based, and in order to fully understand its impact on individual and relational functioning, it must be studied from a developmental perspective. Furthermore, since the theory asserts that high degrees of convergence communication that occur across time and context are especially debilitating to psychosocial development, it would be useful to examine convergence communication in samples that are not generally well-adjusted (e.g., clinical samples). It is possible that some of the null findings reported in this dissertation would be statistically significant if a clinical sample had been used.

A final direction that future research could take is to move beyond perceptual outcomes to more tangible outcomes. That is, instead of investigating how convergence communication relates to daughters’ perceptions of their job competence, romantic relationships, or satisfaction with appearance, researchers can investigate how convergence communication relates to actual job performance, number of romantic relationships, or BMI. Utilizing a more tangible outcome measure accomplishes at least two goals. First, it moves a researcher beyond pure reliance on participants’ perceptions, which may or may not be an accurate reflection of reality. Second, it helps to alleviate the issue of inflated parameter estimates due to common method bias (Podsakoff et al., 2003). Thus, the use of more tangible outcomes may help to capture a more realistic understanding of the relationship between convergence communication and the outcome.
measures incorporated in this dissertation study. To date, research using NCC theory as its guiding framework has predominately relied upon perceptions of psychosocial functioning. It is certainly time to start conducting research that moves beyond people’s perceptions.
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Appendix A

Demographic Questions

1. In what year were you born? _______________

2. What is your ethnicity?
   1 ( ) African-American
   2 ( ) White
   3 ( ) Hispanic
   4 ( ) Asian
   5 ( ) Pacific Islander
   6 ( ) Native American
   7 ( ) Other Please specify: _______________

3. What is your biological sex?
   1 ( ) Male
   2 ( ) Female

4. Are your biological/adoptive parents currently:
   1 ( ) Married
   2 ( ) Cohabiting
   3 ( ) Divorced-Both Single
   4 ( ) Divorced-Both Remarried
   5 ( ) Divorced-Only Mother Remarried
   6 ( ) Divorced-Only Father Remarried
   7 ( ) Divorced-Both Cohabiting
   8 ( ) Divorced-Only Mother Cohabiting
   9 ( ) Divorced-Only Father Cohabiting
  10 ( ) Other Please specify: _____________________________________________________

5. Before coming to college, who did you live with?
   1 ( ) Both biological/adoptive parents
   2 ( ) Biological/adoptive mother-No father
   3 ( ) Biological/adoptive father-No mother
   4 ( ) Biological/adoptive mother-Stepfather
   5 ( ) Biological/adoptive father-Stepmother
   6 ( ) Biological/adoptive mother-Mothers’ boyfriend
   7 ( ) Biological/adoptive father-Fathers’ girlfriend
   8 ( ) Other Please specify: _____________________________________________________
6. Have you resided with these individuals for at least the last two consecutive years?

1 ( ) Yes
2 ( ) No

7. What is your current class standing in college?

1 ( ) Freshman
2 ( ) Sophomore
3 ( ) Junior
4 ( ) Senior

8. What is the current income level of the family you reside with?

1 ( ) less than $10,000
2 ( ) $10,000-$20,000
3 ( ) $20,001-$30,000
4 ( ) $30,001-$40,000
5 ( ) $40,001-$50,000
6 ( ) $50,001-$60,000
7 ( ) $60,001-$70,000
8 ( ) $70,001-$80,000
9 ( ) $80,001-$90,000
10 ( ) $90,001-$100,000
11 ( ) $100,000 +

9. What is your current religious affiliation?

1 ( ) No religion
2 ( ) Roman Catholic
3 ( ) Orthodox Catholic
4 ( ) Jewish
5 ( ) Baptist
6 ( ) Episcopalian
7 ( ) Lutheran
8 ( ) Methodist
9 ( ) Mormon
10 ( ) Presbyterian
11 ( ) Muslim
12 ( ) Pentecostal
13 ( ) Buddhist
14 ( ) Hindu
15 ( ) Other    Please specify: __________________________________________________________
10. Is your religious affiliation the same as those with whom you resided before coming to college?

1 ( ) Yes
2 ( ) No
If no, please explain: _____________________________________________________
Appendix B

Authoritarian Items from the Restrictiveness Subscale of the MBCRPR (Rickel & Biasatti, 1982)

Scale: 1(“not at all like him”)/2(“not like him”)/3(“not much like him”)/4(“somewhat like him”)/5(“like him”)/6(“just like him”)

1) My father let me know how much he sacrificed for me.
2) My father expected me to be grateful and appreciate all the advantages I had.
3) My father taught me that in one way or another, punishment would find me when I was bad.
4) My father encouraged me to keep control of my feelings at all times.
5) My father did not believe that I should have secrets from him.
6) My father used to control me by warning me of all the bad things that could happen to me.
7) My father did not allow me to say bad things about my teachers.
8) My father thought that scolding and criticism would make me improve.
9) My father used to tell me how ashamed and disappointed he felt when I misbehaved.
10) My father did not allow me to question his decisions.
11) My father thought I should be seen and not heard.
12) My father did not allow me to get angry with him.
13) My father believed physical punishment was the best method of discipline.
Appendix C

Psychological Control – Youth Self-Report Scale (Barber, 1996)

Scale: 1(“not at all like him”)/2(“not like him”)/3(“not much like him”)/4(“somewhat like him”)/5(“like him”)/6(“just like him”)

My father is a person who…

1. Is always trying to change how I feel or think about things.

2. Changes the subject, whenever I have something to say.

3. Often interrupts me.

4. Blames me for other family members’ problems.

5. Brings up past mistakes when he criticizes me.

6. Is less friendly with me if I do not see things his way.

7. Will avoid looking at me when I have disappointed him.

8. Stops talking to me, if I have hurt his feelings, until I do something to please him again.
Appendix D

Differentiation in the Family System Scale (Anderson & Sabatelli, 1992)

Scale: 1(“Never”)/2(“Almost Never”)/3(“Sometimes”)/4(“Almost Always”)/5(“Always”)

My father:

1. Shows respect for my viewpoints even when they differ from his own.
2. Responds to my feelings as if they have no value. (R)
3. Demonstrates respect for my privacy.
4. Tells me what I should be thinking. (R)
5. Responds to my feelings in an understanding way.
6. Tells me that I don’t mean what I am saying. (R)
7. Shows a lack of concern for my feelings. (R)
8. Encourages me to express my feelings, good or bad.
9. Discounts my thoughts and opinions. (R)
10. Shows understanding when I don’t wish to share my feelings.
11. Allows me to speak for myself.
Appendix E

Financial Stress (Bray, 2001)

Scale: 1(“No”)/2(“Yes”)

Over the past year, has your family experienced any of the following:

1. Couldn’t afford a night out at least once every two weeks.
2. Couldn’t afford a special meal at least once a week.
3. Couldn’t afford leisure/hobby activities.
4. Couldn’t afford to buy new clothes (had to purchase 2\textsuperscript{nd} hand).
5. Couldn’t afford a week’s vacation away from home.
6. Couldn’t afford to have friends or family over for a meal at least once a month.
7. Couldn’t pay gas/electricity/phone on time.
8. Couldn’t pay registration/insurance on time.
9. Sought financial help from family/friends.
10. Went without meals.
11. Unable to heat your home.
12. Sought assistance from a welfare/community organization.
13. Pawned or sold something.

Items 1-6 assess factor 1: missing out on activities; items 7-9 assess factor 2: cash flow problems; items 10-13 assess factor 3: hardship.
Appendix F

Convergence Communication Scale (Miller-Day & Walker Jackson, 2012)

Scale: 1(“strongly disagree”)/2(“disagree”)/3(“neutral”)/4(“agree”)/5(“strongly agree”)

1. My father is critical of me.
2. I try to accommodate my father’s point of view just to avoid disagreement.
3. My father tells me what to believe.
4. My father’s dominance requires my submission.
5. If we disagree, I’m not sure my father still respects me.
6. I do not think my father takes my opinions seriously.
7. My father asks for my opinion on things. (R)
8. I can count on my father to support my ideas. (R)
9. I tend to embrace my father’s point of view as my own.
10. My father tends to demand that I agree with him.
11. I believe there will be a cost if I do not comply with what my father wants.
12. I run the risk of losing my father’s affection if I do not defer to him.
13. My father ignores me if I don’t defer to him.
14. I fear consequences if I do not defer to my father.
15. I feel there is a risk in challenging my father.
16. My father imposes his will on me.
17. I defer to my father too much.
18. When my father and I disagree, he tends to be coercive.
19. Only my father initiates conversations.
20. We both offer opinions in conversations. (R)
21. We both contribute equally to conversations. (R)

22. My father states things in an unyielding way.

23. My father “steamrolls” over me with his beliefs, actions, arguments.

24. My father can easily change my mind.

25. I eventually begin to see things in the same way as my father.

26. My father is pretty good at getting me to see things the same way he does.

27. Even if we disagree at first, I often see things my father’s way.

28. I often end up seeing things from my father’s point of view.

29. I often agree with my father even when I am unsure of what I think.

30. My father’s certainty makes me question my own ideas.

31. My father has a lot of influence over the way I think.

32. I typically believe what my father tells me to believe.

Items 1-4, 10-18, and 22-23 assess motivation to converge; Items 5-8 and 19-21 assess disequilibrium; Items 9 and 24-32 assess
Appendix G

The Self-Perception Profile for College Students (Neemann & Harter, 1986)

Scale: 1(“strongly disagree”)/2(“disagree”)/3(“neutral”)/4(“agree”)/5(“strongly agree”)

1) I like the kind of person I am.
2) I am not very proud of the work I do at my job. (R)
3) I feel confident that I am mastering my coursework.
4) I am not satisfied with my social skills. (R)
5) I am not happy with the way I look. (R)
6) I like the way I act when I am around my parents.
7) I get kind of lonely because I don’t really have a close friend to share things with. (R)
8) I feel like I am just as smart or smarter than other students.
9) I often question the morality of my behavior. (R)
10) I feel that people I like romantically will be attracted to me.
11) When I do something sort of stupid that later appears funny, I find it hard to laugh at myself. (R)
12) I feel that I am just as creative or even more so than other students.
13) I feel I could do well at just about any new athletic activity I haven’t tried before.
14) I am often disappointed with myself. (R)
15) I feel I am very good at my job.
16) I do very well at my studies.
17) I find it hard to make new friends. (R)
18) I am happy with my height and weight.
19) I find it hard to act naturally when I am around my parents. (R)
20) I am able to make close friends that I can really trust.
21) I do not feel that I am very mentally able. (R)
22) I usually do what is morally right.

23) I find it hard to establish romantic relationships. (R)

24) I don’t mind being kidded by my friends.

25) I worry that I am not as creative or inventive as other people. (R)

26) I don’t feel that I am very athletic. (R)

27) I usually like myself as a person.

28) I feel confident about my ability to do a new job.

29) I have trouble figuring out homework assignments. (R)

30) I like the way I interact with other people.

31) I wish my body was different. (R)

32) I feel comfortable being myself around my parents.

33) I don’t have a close friend I can share my personal thoughts and feelings with. (R)

34) I feel that I am just as bright or brighter than most people.

35) I would like to be a better person morally. (R)

36) I have the ability to develop romantic relationships.

37) I have a hard time laughing at the ridiculous or silly things that I do. (R)

38) I do not feel that I am very inventive. (R)

39) I feel that I am better than others at sports.

40) I really like the way that I am leading my life.

41) I am not satisfied with the way I do my job. (R)

42) I sometimes do not feel intellectually competent at my studies. (R)

43) I feel that I am socially accepted by many people.

44) I like my physical appearance the way it is.

45) I find that I am unable to get along with my parents. (R)
46) I am able to make really close friends.
47) I would really rather be different than I am. (R)
48) I question whether I am very intelligent. (R)
49) I live up to my own moral standards.
50) I worry that, when I like someone romantically, that person won’t like me back. (R)
51) I can really laugh at certain things I do.
52) I feel like I have a lot of original ideas.
53) I don’t do well at activities requiring physical skill. (R)
54) I am often dissatisfied with myself. (R)

Self-worth – items 1, 14, 27, 40, 47, 54
Job competence – items 2, 15, 28, 41
Social acceptance – items 4, 17, 30, 43
Romantic relationships – items 10, 23, 36, 50
Satisfaction with appearance – items 5, 18, 31, 44
Scholastic competence – items 3, 16, 29, 42
Parent relationships – items 6, 19, 32, 45
Close friendships – items 7, 20, 33, 46
Intellectual ability – items 8, 21, 34, 48
Morality – items 9, 22, 35, 49
Humor – items 11, 24, 37, 51
Creativity – items 12, 25, 38, 52
Athletic ability – items 13, 26, 39, 53
Appendix H

Relationship Assessment Scale (Hendrick, 1988)
Scale: 1(“strongly disagree”)/2(“disagree”)/3(“neutral”)/4(“agree”)/5(“strongly agree”)

1. In general, I am satisfied with my relationship with my father.
2. My relationship with my father is good compared to most.
3. Sometimes, I wish I weren’t related to my father. (R)
4. I love my father.
5. There are few problems in my relationship with my father.
Appendix I

Mean Comparisons on Continuous Study Variables for Those Who Did and Those Who Did Not Provide Their Fathers’ Contact Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Provided Contact Information</th>
<th>Did Not Provide Contact Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relationship Satisfaction</td>
<td>4.54 (.59)</td>
<td>4.24 (.79)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authoritarianism</td>
<td>3.05 (.79)</td>
<td>3.05 (.93)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological Control</td>
<td>1.95 (.78)</td>
<td>2.09 (1.03)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Differentiation</td>
<td>4.48 (.38)</td>
<td>4.11 (.68)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation to Converge</td>
<td>1.84 (.78)</td>
<td>2.02 (.76)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disequilibrium</td>
<td>1.85 (.42)</td>
<td>2.00 (.68)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal Deference</td>
<td>2.84 (.77)</td>
<td>2.82 (.76)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Competence</td>
<td>3.65 (.43)</td>
<td>3.68 (.69)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Acceptance</td>
<td>3.46 (.96)</td>
<td>3.67 (.84)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with Appearance</td>
<td>2.81 (1.31)</td>
<td>3.17 (.92)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romantic Relationships</td>
<td>2.96 (1.02)</td>
<td>3.22 (.82)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-worth</td>
<td>3.59 (1.03)</td>
<td>3.75 (.77)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Standard deviations in parentheses.
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