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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

“The way we communicate with others and with ourselves ultimately determines the quality of our lives.” – Anthony Robbins, author and life coach

The idea that people’s lives are directly and indirectly shaped through their interactions with others is not a novel one. Nevertheless, the significant connection between the quality of one’s interpersonal relationships and one’s overall quality of life remains important. Ryff and Singer (2007) assert that actively maintaining positive and satisfying interpersonal connections is as significant for an individual’s overall health as eating well and exercising regularly.

In particular, an individual’s level of relationship satisfaction with certain influential interpersonal partners has been shown to affect his or her level of psychological well-being (Barnett, Kibria, Baruch, & Pleck, 1991; Black & Pedro-Carroll, 1993; Bogard, 2005; Videon, 2005). For example, children’s level of relationship satisfaction with their parent(s) can influence children’s psychological well-being (Barnett et al., 1991; Black & Pedro-Carroll, 1993; Bogard, 2005; Videon, 2005). The type of relationship children have with their fathers, especially, can affect children’s cognitive, social, emotional, and physical health (Lamb, 1986, 1997; Lamb & Lewis, 2005; Schwebel, & Brezausek, 2007). For instance, Shek (2002) found that the quality of a father’s parenting is strongly connected to adolescent well-being. Specifically, researchers have revealed that a daughter’s relational satisfaction with her father can
exhibit a significant influence over her psychological well-being (Barnett et al., 1991; Black & Pedro-Carroll, 1993; Bogard, 2005; Videon, 2005).

Psychological well-being is unique and valuable concept that can be used to gauge a person’s perceived emotional and mental outlook on life (Ryff, 1995; Ryff & Singer, 2007; Seifert, 2005); it is concerned with how people react to the usual stresses that accompany their daily living (Bradburn, 1969; Ryff; 1995; Ryff & Singer, 2007). The structure of psychological well-being relied upon in the current investigation is based on six theoretically-derived dimensions, which include autonomy, environmental mastery, potential growth, positive relations with others, purpose in life, and self-acceptance (Ryff, 1989b, 1995; Seifert, 2005). Continued study of psychological well-being is important, and the established connection between relationship satisfaction and psychological well-being is a potentially rich area for additional empirical scrutiny. It is asserted in the current investigation that exploring this association within the context of father-young adult daughter relationships, specifically, is essential to reveal how and/or why exactly a daughter’s perceived satisfaction of her relationship with her father may come to influence her psychological well-being.

Some researchers have suggested that communication exchanges with certain interpersonal partners may perhaps play a specific role in explaining the connection between relationship satisfaction and psychological wellness (Miller-Day, 2004, 2005, 2006; Vazsonyi et al., 2003). For instance, the concept of communication satisfaction has been linked with relational satisfaction (Beatty & Dobos, 1992; Dainton, Stafford, & Canary, 1994; Hecht, 1978a, 1978b; Punyanunt-Carter, 2005, 2007b). The daily
conversations individuals have with certain interpersonal partners can influence their level of relational satisfaction, which can subsequently spread to how they view other areas of their lives. In this sense, people’s interpersonal communication exchanges may exert a significant impact on their emotional and mental outlook concerning themselves, others, and life in general. However, little empirical information, beyond vague descriptions (i.e., poor communication, etc.), has been offered to reveal whether—and if so, how and/or why precisely—the interpersonal conversations people have on a regular basis (with certain influential interpersonal partners) could perhaps shape their psychological health and well-being (Miller-Day, 2004, 2005, 2006; Vazsonyi et al., 2003). So, currently, there is a lack of theoretically-based, empirical findings to explain the probable connection between one’s interpersonal communication patterns (e.g., communication satisfaction), one’s relational satisfaction, and one’s psychological well-being.

Nevertheless, communication scholars have found that a person’s perceived degree of relational satisfaction (i.e., one’s attitude toward the partner and the relationship) with a dyadic partner is tied inextricably to his or her perceived degree of communication satisfaction (i.e., whether one’s expectations are met regarding a particular communication exchange and/or a series of exchanges) with that particular partner (Beatty & Dobos, 1992; Dainton et al., 1994; Hecht, 1978a, 1978b; Punyanunt-Carter, 2005, 2007b). Relationships are developed and maintained primarily through communication exchanges, so it makes sense that people’s interpersonal interactions with particular influential partners can affect their perception of how satisfied they are with the
relationship itself. For example, if a daughter views positively the general pattern of interpersonal communication she shares with her father, then she would likely report a high level of both communication and relational satisfaction regarding her father. In this case, the daughter’s perception of how satisfied she is with her communication interactions with her father is influencing directly her perception of how satisfied she is with her relationship with her father overall.

Moreover, researchers have found that individuals’ communication and relational satisfaction is often determined by whether their interpersonal motives for communicating with a particular interpersonal partner are fulfilled (Beatty & Dobos, 1992; Dainton et al., 1994; Martin & Anderson, 1995; Punyanunt-Carter, 2005, 2007b; Rubin, Perse, & Barbato, 1988). Stated another way, interpersonal communication motives have been shown to drive communication and relational satisfaction (Beatty & Dobos, 1992; Dainton et al., 1994; Martin & Anderson, 1995; Punyanunt-Carter, 2005, 2007b; Rubin et al., 1988).

Interpersonal communication motives are “relatively stable personal characteristics that explain how one communicates in relationships” (Martin & Anderson, 1995, p. 120; see also Rubin et al., 1988). Six interpersonal communication motives have been identified to account for some of the most common reasons people opt to engage in communication, which are pleasure, affection, inclusion, escape, relaxation, and control (Rubin et al., 1988; R. Rubin & Rubin, 1992). In short, the theory of interpersonal communication motives offers an ideal framework for learning about why and how people talk to each other as well as some of the outcomes associated with their exchanges.
Accordingly, it is hypothesized in the current investigation that a daughter’s interpersonal communication motives for communicating with her father will drive her communication satisfaction and relational satisfaction in regard to her father, which will in turn influence her level of psychological well-being. In other words, it is posited that a daughter’s perceived level of communication and relational satisfaction with her father will mediate a connection between her interpersonal communication motives and her psychological well-being. Baron and Kenny (1986) explained, “…mediators speak to how or why [certain] effects occur” (p. 1176). In this conceptual model (see Figure 1), interpersonal communication motives are cast as the independent variable, communication satisfaction and relational satisfaction are viewed as mediating variables, and psychological well-being is viewed as a dependent variable. Specifically, the model predicts that within father-daughter relationships: (1) a daughter’s interpersonal communication motives will influence her perceived communication and/or relational satisfaction (Path a); (2) a daughter’s perceived communication and/or relational satisfaction will impact her level of psychological well-being (Path b); and (3) a daughter’s perceived communication and/or relational satisfaction with her father will mediate a relationship between her interpersonal communication motives and her level of psychological well-being (Path c).
The objectives of this investigation are both theoretical and practical. The immediate goal is to couple the interpersonal communication motives model with the concept of satisfaction to determine whether there is a significant connection between one’s interpersonal communication motives and satisfaction (communication and/or relational) and one’s psychological well-being. This empirical scrutiny may have theoretical value in that the results of the study could help to extend the interpersonal communication motives model. Additionally, investigation may yield results that are of practical value for field-based professionals who work to help individuals’ improve their psychological well-being. For example, the current study could help to explain how
specific interpersonal communication processes are related to a person’s emotional and mental well-being.

To articulate fully the need for further study on interpersonal communication motives, communication and relational satisfaction, and psychological well-being among father-young adult daughter dyads, definitions of the variables of interest are provided along with a critical review of pertinent related findings. Conceptualizing the variables of interest and reviewing the literature will provide a framework for the proposed study and further clarify the research problem of interest.

CHAPTER II
REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The review of literature is organized topically and begins with an exploration of the interpersonal communication motives model, which is the primary theoretical framework for the current study. Next the concepts of communication and relational satisfaction are defined. Communication and relational satisfaction are considered to be complementary frameworks (to the interpersonal communication motives model) within this investigation, so relevant findings related to interpersonal communication motives and communication and relational satisfaction research are highlighted. Then psychological well-being is conceptualized, as it is a key outcome variable in the current examination. Empirical connections between relational satisfaction and psychological well-being are also outlined (particularly in female college students). Finally, findings are highlighted intermittently throughout the literature review to validate the need for an investigation of interpersonal communication motives, communication and relational
satisfaction, and psychological well-being in the context of father-young adult daughter relationships.

Interpersonal Communication Motives

The theory of interpersonal communication motives offers an appropriate framework for learning about why and how people talk to each other as well as some of the outcomes associated with their exchanges. To recognize fully the significance and necessity of scrutinizing interpersonal communication motives in combination with communication and relational satisfaction and psychological well-being, and in the context of father-young adult daughter relationships, it is important to understand the assumptions that comprise the theoretical framework. Accordingly, an overview and brief history of the theory of interpersonal communication motives is provided in the next section. Subsequent support for the interpersonal communication motives model is also presented. Then, weaknesses in the existing literature on motives are highlighted.

Motives—Overview and Brief History

Rubin et al. (1988) created the interpersonal communication motives model (ICMM) to identify the reasons people consciously choose to talk to others. Motives are defined as, “relatively stable personal characteristics that explain how one communicates in relationships” (Martin & Anderson, 1995, p. 120). A key aspect of the interpersonal communication motives model is that people are aware of their motives (Rubin et al., 1988; R. Rubin & Rubin, 1992). Rubin et al. (1988) identified six motives to account for some of the most common reasons people opt to engage in communication. The six motives are pleasure, affection, inclusion, escape, relaxation, and control (Rubin et al.,
Pleasure motives indicate that communication is undertaken because it is fun, exciting, stimulating, entertaining, etc. Affection motives for a communication interaction point to one’s need or desire to offer help, to let others know one cares, to thank others, and to show encouragement and concern. Inclusion motives represent the need to be with others, talk to others, diminish loneliness, gain reassurance, etc. Escape motives express a need to procrastinate, fend off boredom, etc. Relaxation motives generally emerge from the need or desire to unwind, feel more settled, and reduce tension and stress. Control motives indicate that communication is spurred by a need to tell someone something, to get someone’s help, to gain something important, and so on (Rubin et al., 1988; R. Rubin & Rubin, 1992).

The interpersonal communication motives model (ICMM) is an extension of the mass media uses and gratifications theory (Blumler & Katz, 1974; Katz, 1959; Katz, Blumler, & Gurevitch, 1974; A. Rubin & Rubin, 1985; McQuail, 1994). The uses and gratifications perspective is concerned mainly with the motives people have for choosing to use particular forms of media to meet their particular need(s) (Katz et al., 1974; A. Rubin & Rubin, 1985). The major motives for seeking mediated interaction(s) outlined in the uses and gratifications theory include to pass time, to learn about specific content, and to gain companionship, excitement, escape, enjoyment, social interaction, relaxation, and/or information (A. Rubin & Rubin, 1985). The idea that people’s motives are apparent to them and that people are active rather than passive users of media are critical parts of the theory of uses and gratifications and are reflected in the interpersonal communication motives framework (Katz et al., 1974; A. Rubin & Rubin, 1985).
The central claim of the uses and gratifications perspective is that oftentimes peoples’ motives are fulfilled through their conscious choice to engage in mediated interactions (e.g., watching television, reading a newspaper, etc.) (A. Rubin & Rubin, 1985). However in the theory of interpersonal communication motives, Rubin et al. (1988) recognized that oftentimes people’s choices to initiate interpersonal exchanges are spurred by different motives than those that are associated with their decision to initiate mediated interactions. Rubin et al. (1988) also recognized that, in many instances, people rely on interpersonal (rather than mediated) interactions to fulfill their motives (e.g., affection). So in the theory of interpersonal communication motives, Rubin et al. (1988; R. Rubin & Rubin, 1992) extended the uses and gratifications framework to the context of interpersonal relationships and identified the six interpersonal communication motives of pleasure, affection, inclusion, escape, relaxation, and control.

The framework of interpersonal communication motives is also rooted in the theory of interpersonal needs (Schultz, 1966). In interpersonal needs theory, Schultz (1966) asserted that people make decisions about whether to begin, maintain, and/or end an interpersonal relationship based upon the degree to which their primary interpersonal needs are met. Schultz (1966) identified three primary interpersonal needs, which were affection, inclusion, and control. In the theory of interpersonal communication motives, Rubin et al. (1988) extended Schultz’s (1966) theory to include research on other relationship issues in addition to the relationship issues associated with deciding whether to develop, maintain, and/or dissolve a particular interpersonal connection, which were originally the focus of Schultz’s (1966) interpersonal needs theory. Furthermore, in the
ICMM. Rubin et al. (1988) identified and offered the additional concepts of *pleasure*, *relaxation*, and *escape*.

Rubin et al. (1988) also articulated an important distinction between needs and motives in the interpersonal communication motives model. Although there is an important relationship, or interdependence, between motives and needs, the two terms should not be used interchangeably. Rather, needs represent conditions or situations in which something that is necessary is lacking (see Maslow, 1943; 1970), whereas motives spur an individual to act in an attempt to satisfy his or her need(s). In other words, needs are manifested, or made apparent, in motives. Thus, according to interpersonal communication motives model (ICMM), motives are the reasons people choose to initiate interpersonal communication with others and motives are the result of their particular needs (Rubin et al., 1988; R. Rubin & Rubin, 1992). In sum, the interpersonal communication motives model helps to explain how and why people choose to talk with interpersonally close others.

*Motives—Subsequent Studies*

Subsequent research on interpersonal communication motives has lent additional support for the model. Researchers have used the framework to examine motives throughout the lifespan (Barbato & Perse, 1992; 1999; Barbato, Perse, & Graham, 1997; Downs & Javidi, 1990). Additionally, motives have been studied in a variety of relational contexts, like between parents and children (Barbato & Perse, 1999; Martin & Anderson, 1995; Punyaunut-Carter, 2005, 2007a) and among other types of interpersonal partners (i.e., friends, romantic partners, co-workers, etc.) (Barbato & Perse, 1992; Step &
Motives have also been looked at in combination with a range of variables, such as personality traits (e.g. extroversion) (Paulsel & Mottet, 2004), nonverbal immediacy behaviors (Myers & Ferry, 2001), communication apprehension (Kondo, 1994), conversational sensitivity (Hosman, 1991), need for privacy (Hosman, 1991), loneliness (Downs & Javidi, 1990; Hosman, 1991) and self-disclosure (Martin & Anderson, 1995). Furthermore, motives have been used to examine the conversational climate, value, and quality of everyday conversations (Step & Finucane, 2002). Finally, motives have also been used to investigate relational and communication satisfaction (Martin & Anderson, 1995; Punyanunt-Carter, 2005; Rubin et al., 1988).

In sum, the framework of interpersonal communication motives has been shown to be a heuristic theory, as it has generated a great deal of research. The interpersonal communication motives model is also a useful theory as it has been linked with a number of important variables. In spite of the strengths of the framework, there are weaknesses that merit further study. Continued empirical exploration using the interpersonal communication motives model is necessary. Research in this vein has the potential to yield information that could lend additional support for the interpersonal communication motives model and also extend the theoretical model. With these goals in mind, some of the weaknesses related to the research on the interpersonal communication motives model are outlined in the following section.

Motives—Weaknesses

The two gaps in the literature surrounding interpersonal communication motives highlighted in this section deal with research that has been done on interpersonal
communication motives among parents and children specifically. It is argued that there is a need for further research on parent-child motives, because researchers know little about (1) how the sex composition of the parent-child dyad (i.e., mother-daughter, father-daughter, etc.) influences interpersonal communication motives and (2) how the age of a child (i.e., young child offspring, adolescent, young adult, etc.) impacts interpersonal communication motives.

**Same-Sex versus Cross-Sex Parent-Child Interpersonal Communication Motives**

Researchers have demonstrated that people’s interpersonal communication motives differ depending on the type of relationship (i.e., parent-child relationships, friendships, romantic relationships, professional relationships, etc.) (Graham, Barbato, & Perse, 1993; Fitzpatrick & Badzinski, 1984; Fitzpatrick & Caughlin, 2002). At times, motives are also influenced by the sex composition of the dyad (i.e., male-female, male-male, female-female) (Barbato, Graham, & Perse, 2003). For example in parent-child dyads, parents have reported sex-based distinctions in their reasons for talking to their children; both mothers and fathers stated that they have different motives for communicating with their sons as compared to their daughters (Barbato et al., 2003). Parents were more likely to talk with their same-sex child for the motive of escape (Barbato et al., 2003). Mothers reported that they talk to their daughters and fathers indicated that they talk to their sons when they are motivated by a need to escape or get away from the stress, worries, responsibilities etc. of daily living (Barbato et al., 2003). It has also been suggested that sons and daughters typically have different reasons for
communicating with their mothers compared to their fathers (Martin & Anderson, 1995; Punyanunt-Carter, 2005).

Another disparity concerning the study of interpersonal communication motives is the difference in the number of studies conducted on same-sex (mother-daughter, father-son) parent-child relationships as compared to cross-sex (mother-son, father-daughter) parent-child relationships (Beatty & Dobos, 1992; Fitzpatrick & Caughlin, 2002; Martin & Anderson, 1995; Punyanunt-Carter, 2005, 2006, 2007a, 2007b). Mother-daughter exchanges and motives have been studied more frequently than father-daughter interactions and motives (Beatty & Dobos, 1992; Fitzpatrick & Caughlin, 2002; Martin & Anderson, 1995; Punyanunt-Carter, 2005, 2006, 2007a, 2007b). Researchers have looked at why mothers and daughters and fathers and sons talk with one another, but much less attention has been given to the reasons fathers and daughters communicate (Beatty & Dobos, 1992; Martin & Anderson, 1995; Punyanunt-Carter; 2005, 2007a).

Prior research on interpersonal communication motives among parents and children have focused more on mother-child interactions, because traditionally, mothers have been identified as the most instrumental figure in child rearing (Bowlby, 1973, Freud, 1949, Nielsen, 2001; 2007; Winnicott, 1964, Yingling, 1995). Only recently have researchers begun to recognize the magnitude of the influence fathers have on their children’s developmental processes. Increasingly, fathers are being recognized as equally important figures for their children as mothers, as research shows that fathers are taking a more active and equal role in their children’s upbringing (Nielsen, 2001, 2007). As such,
it is appropriate and vital to investigate interpersonal communication motives among father-daughter dyads.

Furthermore, studies that have investigated motives among fathers and daughters have produced mixed results (Martin & Anderson, 1995; Punyanunt-Carter, 2005, 2007a). Martin and Anderson (1995) surveyed young adult sons and daughters and found that they communicate more frequently with their fathers for four of the six interpersonal communication motives: inclusion, escape, control, and relaxation. Punyanunt-Carter (2005), however, investigated young adult daughters and reported that they communicate more frequently with their fathers for the interpersonal communication motives of affection, relaxation, pleasure, and inclusion. So, young adults in Punyanunt-Carter’s (2005) study indicated affection as their top motive, while young adults in Martin and Anderson’s (1995) investigation did not even cite affection among their top four motives. This disparity among the findings could be due, at least in part, to the fact that Martin and Anderson (1995) surveyed both young adult sons’ and daughters’ interpersonal communication motives in regard to their fathers, whereas Punyanunt-Carter (2005) surveyed solely young adult daughters’ interpersonal communication motives for talking with their fathers.

Additionally, within these two studies, fathers’ and daughters’ motives were scrutinized in terms of the overlap between fathers’ and daughters’ motives and impacts that could be associated with the similarity or dissimilarity between fathers’ and daughters’ motives (e.g., satisfaction) (Martin & Anderson, 1995; Punyanunt-Carter, 2005). This specific focus offered a limited view of interpersonal communication motives
in father-daughter relationships. Thus, it remains important to conduct additional research to look at interpersonal communication motives more carefully in father-daughter relationships.

Taken collectively, the above findings make it apparent that interpersonal communication motives differ depending upon the type of relationship and the sex of the interpersonal partners. The above findings also point to a fruitful area for future study and lend support for the current investigation. Canary and Hause (1993) highlighted a need for the extension of communication-based theories to explicate how sex and communication are related. The authors explained, “there are sex differences in communication, but they are eluding us” (Canary & Hause, 1993, p. 141). The research area of father-daughter communication is no exception, as there is a considerable gap in the existing knowledge regarding father-daughter relationships and interpersonal communication motives (Canary & Hause, 1993; Punyanunt-Carter, 2005). Researchers need to conduct further studies on parent-child interpersonal communication motives. It is especially important to look at children’s motives and how their motives differ depending upon the sex of the child and the sex of the parent. Accordingly, the current investigation examined the reasons why daughters communicate with their fathers by using the theoretical framework of the interpersonal communication motives model (Rubin et al., 1988) in an attempt to help to close these gaps in the existing literature.
Children’s and/or Adolescents’ versus Young Adults’ Interpersonal Communication Motives

Aside from the innovative work of Martin and Anderson (1995) and Punyanunt-Carter (2005), most of the empirical investigations involving parent-child communication motives have been conducted among young children and/or adolescents as opposed to young adult children (Fitzpatrick & Caughlin, 2002). Researchers have indicated that parents’ interpersonal motives for communicating with their children change depending on the age of the child (Barbato et al., 2003). Barbato et al. (2003) studied interpersonal communication motives among parent-child dyads and found that parents’ interpersonal communication motives regarding their children change over time as children move from childhood to adolescence to young adulthood and beyond. Consider the following assertion from Barbato et al. (2003), “…when parents communicate with their children to alleviate loneliness and share their feelings, they do so with their older children” (p. 137). If parents’ motives are altered or impacted as a result of their children’s age, then it is likely that the reverse is true as well. It is likely that children’s motives for talking to their parents would also change or be influenced by the child’s age. However, the likely change in children’s interpersonal motives for communicating with their parents as they move from childhood to adolescence to young adulthood has not been examined as extensively. So, the present investigation offers important information about interpersonal communication motives in young adult daughters in attempt to fill this gap in the existing literature.
Motives—Summary

To review, the construct of interpersonal communication motives as outlined by Rubin et al. (1988) offered an enhanced understanding of motives in interpersonal exchanges, and ensuing studies have shown the versatility and utility of the theory. Interpersonal communication motives have been studied among a diversity of relational partners (i.e., marital partners, friends, etc.) (Barbato & Perse, 1992; 1999; Martin & Anderson, 1995; Punyaunut-Carter, 2005, 2007a; Step & Finucane, 2002). Interpersonal communication motives have also been examined in relation to a variety of variables (e.g., satisfaction) (Martin & Anderson, 1995; Punyanunt-Carter, 2005, 2007b). In spite of the strengths of the framework, continued empirical exploration using the interpersonal communication motives model is necessary.

Specifically, it has been argued that there is a need for further research on parent-child motives, because the influence of the sex composition of the parent-child dyad (i.e., mother-daughter, father-daughter, etc.) on interpersonal communication motives has not been articulated fully in the empirical literature. Also, the age of a child (i.e., young child, adolescent, young adult, etc.) affects parent-child interpersonal communication, but this influence has yet to be understood entirely. It has been asserted that, in particular, there are gaps in the existing literature on interpersonal communication motives among fathers and young adult daughters. These weaknesses are addressed by the current investigation. The relationship between young adult daughters and their fathers offers a rich context for examining the relationships between interpersonal communication motives, satisfaction, and psychological well-being. Accordingly, an empirical study of father-daughter
interpersonal communication motives was conducted, specifically an investigation of interpersonal communication motives among fathers and their young adult daughters. The following research question was put forth for empirical examination:

RQ1: What interpersonal communication motives occur most frequently for young adult daughters when choosing to communicate with their fathers?

Interpersonal Communication Motives and Satisfaction

The interpersonal communication motives model (ICMM) has been used to examine communication and relational satisfaction. Researchers have found a link between the communication motives people have for talking with their interpersonal partners and their view of how satisfied they are—in general—with their conversations with one another (i.e., communication satisfaction) and with their interpersonal relationship (i.e., relational satisfaction) (Martin & Anderson, 1995, Punyanunt-Carter, 2005; Rubin et al., 1988). For example, Rubin et al. (1988) found that individuals’ interpersonal communication motives of pleasure, affection, and relaxation are related positively to their global, or overall, communication satisfaction. Martin and Anderson (1995) reported that young adults’ motives of control and pleasure significantly predicted their communication satisfaction with their fathers. Punyanunt-Carter (2005) revealed young adult daughters who communicated with their fathers for relaxation, pleasure, and/or affection also reported a higher degree of communication satisfaction with their fathers, while the motives of relaxation, pleasure, and inclusion predicted young adult daughters’ relational satisfaction with their fathers.
In spite of these contributions, this line of research merits further attention. There is a need to understand better how father-daughter interpersonal communication motives impact daughters’ perceived communication and relational satisfaction in regard to their connections with their fathers. However, it is crucial to explain the concepts of communication and relational satisfaction before the different aspects of the research problem regarding interpersonal communication motives and communication and relational satisfaction can be addressed. As a result, communication and relational satisfaction are conceptualized in the next section.

Communication and Relational Satisfaction

To understand the importance of studying communication and relational satisfaction further, and before the weaknesses related to interpersonal communication motives and satisfaction research can be outlined entirely, it is important to provide a working definition of the concepts as they relate to this study. As such, an overview of communication and relational satisfaction and a review of relevant findings associated with the concepts is provided in the ensuing section. The review of pertinent findings on communication and relational satisfaction is centered on the research that has examined communication and relational satisfaction in conjunction with interpersonal communication motives and in the context of father-daughter relationships—particularly father-young adult daughter dyads.

Satisfaction—on a broad level—can be defined as the feelings of happiness, pleasure, and/or contentment that go along with the fulfillment or gratification of some need or desire (American Heritage Dictionary, 2005; Microsoft Network (MSN))
Encarta® World English Dictionary, North American Edition, 2007). Needs and desires can range from simple types (e.g., food, water, etc.) to complex types (e.g., relationship satisfaction, job satisfaction, overall life satisfaction, etc.). So in the current report, overall satisfaction is defined as the feelings of contentment that result from the fulfillment of some need.

Within the current report, communication and relational satisfaction are viewed as complementary frameworks for the interpersonal communication motives theory. The concepts of communication and relational satisfaction have been important outcome variables for communication researchers who have studied effects related to interpersonal communication motives (Beatty & Dobos, 1992; Dainton et al., 1994; Punyanunt-Carter, 2007b). Previous researchers who have focused on the connection between communication and relational satisfaction and interpersonal communication motives have explained that the concepts are two distinct, yet interdependent, dimensions of satisfaction and both dimensions are often associated with interpersonal communication motives (Beatty & Dobos, 1992; Dainton et al., 1994; Punyanunt-Carter, 2007b).

*Communication* satisfaction depends on whether partners feel as though their expectations are met through their conversational exchanges with each other (Beatty & Dobos, 1992; Dainton et al., 1994). Generally speaking, communication satisfaction is high when expectations are met. Expectations typically involve the fulfillment of some type of internal reward (i.e., reinforce positive ideas, avoid negative feelings, uphold ideal self-image, etc.) (Beatty & Dobos, 1992; Dainton et al., 1994; Punyanunt-Carter, 2007b). *Relational* satisfaction includes partners’ views of the relationship itself (e.g., the
quality of the relationship). Relational satisfaction also includes partners’ perceptions of one another (Beatty & Dobos, 1992; Dainton et al., 1994; Punyanunt-Carter, 2007b).

To summarize, satisfaction is a multidimensional concept characterized by communication and relational levels of satisfaction (Beatty & Dobos, 1992; Dainton et al., 1994; Punyanunt-Carter, 2005; 2007b). Communication satisfaction is based on the fulfillment of individual, positive expectations and it normally offers internal rewards (Hecht, 1978a; 1978b; Punyanunt-Carter, 2005; 2007b). Relational communication is defined as “…an individual’s attitude toward the partner and the relationship, typically in terms of the perceived quality of the relationship” (Dainton et al., 1994, p. 90). And finally, communication satisfaction is linked with relational satisfaction (Punyanunt-Carter, 2005). As such, both communication and relational satisfaction were analyzed in the present study, and it was proposed that both communication and relational satisfaction are associated with interpersonal communication motives.

To understand better the necessity of scrutinizing interpersonal communication motives and communication and relational satisfaction in the context of father-young adult daughter relationships, important findings related to research on interpersonal communication motives and communication and relational satisfaction are reviewed in the next section. Then, relevant limitations in the interpersonal communication motives and satisfaction literature are addressed.

**Interpersonal Communication Motives and Satisfaction — Important Findings**

Interpersonal communication motives and communication and relational satisfaction have been studied in conjunction with one another. People’s interpersonal
communication motives can often help to explain and predict their perceived communication and/or relational satisfaction with their interpersonal partners (Martin & Anderson, 1995; Punyanunt-Carter, 2005; Rubin et al., 1988). The interpersonal communication motives model (ICMM) can be used to explain and predict individuals’ perceived relational and communication satisfaction with regard to their relationships and communicative exchanges with interpersonally close others (Martin & Anderson, 1995; Punyanunt-Carter, 2005; Rubin et al., 1988). For example, Rubin et al. (1988) surveyed 504 participants (44.8% male and 55.2% female) who ranged in age from 12 to 91 years ($M = 40.25$) and found that people who communicated with others primarily for pleasure, inclusion, affection, and relaxation also reported higher levels of overall communication satisfaction.

Martin and Anderson (1995) studied interpersonal communication motives and satisfaction among fathers and young adult children. Young adults’ with the motives of control and pleasure reported a high degree of communication satisfaction with their fathers. In addition, fathers and young adults who reported similar motives for communicating with each other also reported higher levels of perceived communication satisfaction (Martin & Anderson, 1995). Particularly, fathers and young adults shared the interpersonal motives of affection and pleasure, and these two overlapping motives were related significantly to fathers and young adults’ levels of communication satisfaction with one another (Martin & Anderson, 1995).

Punyanunt-Carter (2005) argued that communication researchers have yet to scrutinize thoroughly the significant relationship between interpersonal communication
motives and satisfaction among fathers and daughters. For instance, Punyanunt-Carter (2005) pointed out that communication research has failed to offer strategies for how fathers and daughters can increase their satisfaction with one another or how fathers and daughters might improve their relationships. Subsequently, Punyanunt-Carter (2005) extended the work of Martin and Anderson (1995) and found a significant link between interpersonal communication motives and satisfaction in father-young adult dyads. Punyanunt-Carter (2005) looked at father-young adult daughter pairs, in particular, with regard to their interpersonal motives and satisfaction with each other. Punyanunt-Carter (2005) found that, “…fathers and daughters felt the most satisfied when they are communicating with each other for pleasure” (Punyanunt-Carter, 2005, p. 299). In the study, fathers and daughters shared three primary motives for communicating with each other, which were affection, pleasure, and relaxation (Punyanunt-Carter, 2005). Daughters also reported that they communicate with their fathers for the purpose of inclusion (Punyanunt-Carter, 2005). Neither fathers nor daughters reported communicating with each other for the motive of escape or control (Punyanunt-Carter, 2005). As a result of the findings related to her study, Punyanunt-Carter (2005) offered that communication and relational satisfaction among fathers and daughters could be increased by promoting more affectionate, pleasurable, relaxing, and inclusive communication among the pair.

Similarly, Martin and Anderson (1995) and Punyanunt-Carter (2005) chose to focus on the relationship between fathers’ and young adult children’s motives for communicating with one another and how that relationship impacted their satisfaction
with each other. Punyanunt-Carter (2005), however, decided to concentrate on fathers and their young adult daughters specifically, whereas Martin and Anderson (1995) looked at both young adult sons’ and daughters’ relationships with their fathers. From these two studies outlined directly above, researchers know more about the important connection between interpersonal communication motives and communication and relational satisfaction in father-young adult child dyads. For instance, when fathers’ and young adult children’s interpersonal motives overlap, their communication and relational satisfaction increases (Martin & Anderson, 1995; Punyanunt-Carter, 2005). Also, certain interpersonal communication motives are stronger predictors than others in terms of communication and relational satisfaction.

Interpersonal Communication Motives and Satisfaction—Weaknesses

The research question of interest in the current study is not whether young adult daughters are satisfied with their fathers—although daughters’ communication and relational satisfaction are important and key variables in the proposed study. Instead, the question of interest to the current investigation was concerned with the outcomes that may be associated with daughters’ communication and relational satisfaction with their fathers. Specifically, this study investigated whether young adult daughters who are satisfied (communicatively and relationally) with their fathers have higher levels of psychological well-being. There is a need for such research for a two primary reasons, which are outlined in greater detail in the ensuing section of this report.

In spite of the strengths of the results produced by the innovative research of Martin and Anderson (1995) and Punyanunt-Carter (2005), there are two major problems
regarding the connection between father-young adult daughter communication motives and communication and relational satisfaction. First, there is a need to study further how father-daughter interpersonal communication motives impact daughters’ perceptions of communication and relational satisfaction in regard to their relationships with their fathers. Second, little information has been revealed to suggest possible outcomes that may be associated with young adult daughters’ interpersonal communication motives with their fathers. In particular, there is a need to assess how the relationship between interpersonal communication motives and communication and relational satisfaction may influence daughters’ psychological well-being.

*Daughters’ View*

Studies have shown that young adult daughters have specific reasons (or motives) for communicating with their fathers and that—even more importantly—young adult daughters’ motives are related to their communication and relational satisfaction with their fathers (Martin & Anderson, 1995; Punyanunt-Carter, 2005). Although researchers have revealed important information through studies focused on father-young adult daughter communication motives and communication and relational satisfaction, these investigations were analyzed mainly in terms of the interdependence between fathers’ and daughters’ interpersonal communication motives and communication and relational satisfaction as opposed to being focused specifically on young adult daughters’ point of view alone (Martin & Anderson, 1995; Punyanunt-Carter, 2005). In other words, young adult daughters’ interpersonal motives for communicating with their fathers and their communication and relational satisfaction with their fathers have yet to be examined.
apart from their fathers’ viewpoints. Research of this type is necessary and appropriate to identify possible outcomes for daughters (e.g., psychological well-being, depression) that could be related to their interpersonal motives for talking with their fathers. Psychological well-being is an important and fitting outcome variable to scrutinize within the context of the current study, because of the significant empirical connection that has been established between psychological well-being and satisfaction (Barnett et al., 1991; Black & Pedro-Carroll, 1993; Bogard, 2005; Videon, 2005). As a result, the present study was focused on solely young adult daughters’ perceptions of interpersonal communication motives and young adult daughters’ perceived communication and relational satisfaction with their fathers, rather than the interdependence between fathers’ and daughters’ interpersonal communication motives and perceived satisfaction. Young adult daughters’ degree of psychological well-being was also examined.

_Satisfaction and Other Outcomes_

Another reason it is necessary to research young adult daughters’ interpersonal communication motives and communication and relational satisfaction with regard to their fathers is because previous studies have revealed little about how young adult daughters’ communication and/or relational satisfaction with their fathers may be related to other important outcome variables for daughters, such as daughters’ level of psychological well-being. For instance, Punyanunt-Carter (2005) offered that satisfaction among fathers and young adult daughters can be increased by promoting more affectionate and pleasurable communication. Yet there is a gap in the literature as to the potential benefits associated with increasing communication and/or relational satisfaction.
in father-young adult daughter relationships. For example, it could be possible that young adult daughters’ communication and/or relational satisfaction with their fathers is related to young adult daughters’ psychological well-being; however, empirical investigation is necessary to scrutinize such claims.

Beatty and Dobos (1992) investigated communication and relational satisfaction between fathers and their adult sons and offered implications for future cross-sex parent-child research. The authors called for further exploration into how young adult children’s perceived satisfaction can affect subsequent outcomes for young adult children (Beatty & Dobos, 1992). For example, perceived relational and communication satisfaction among parent-child dyads has been associated with the developmental processes surrounding certain personal characteristics for children (i.e., self-esteem and self-identity, academic achievement, creativity, etc.) (Endres, 1997; Perkins, 2001; Wynns & Rosenfeld, 2003; Fitzpatrick & Caughlin, 2002). Satisfaction in parent-child relationships has also been shown to influence children’s behavior and satisfaction regarding their future relationships (Beatty & Dobos, 1992; Endres, 1997; Perkins, 2001). Beatty and Dobos’ (1992) research on interpersonal motives and communication and relational satisfaction in father-son relationships was an important contribution, because the authors explicitly drew a link between satisfaction and potential outcomes. For instance, the researchers explained that communication motives and communication and relational satisfaction experienced within the father-adult son duo can serve as predictors of motivation and satisfaction in other close relationships (Beatty & Dobos, 1992). Based on these findings, it is logical to assume that interpersonal motives and satisfaction in father-daughter bonds
would serve to forecast important outcome variables for daughters too. Nonetheless, logical intuition alone does not suffice and Beatty and Dobos (1992) were not specifically addressing the outcome variable of interest to this investigation, which is psychological well-being. More empirical research needs to be conducted to analyze the possible mediating effects of communication and/or relational satisfaction between young adult daughters’ motives for communicating with their fathers and other important outcome variables for young adult daughters like psychological well-being.

Endres (1997), too, called for a better understanding of outcomes for daughters related to their view of their bond with their fathers. Endres’ (1997) findings are revealing particularly when compared and contrasted to the results of Martin and Anderson’s (1995) and Punyanunt-Carter’s (2005) studies on father-young adult child communication. Endres (1997) conducted an extensive investigation of father-daughter relationships, particularly the processes and effects of father-daughter communication. Endres (1997) reported that there are four types of fathers, which include the *knight in shining armor, the buddy, the authoritarian, and the shadow*. The *knight in shining armor* (KISA) father-figure talks a great deal with his daughter (Endres, 1997). Endres (1997) explained the KISA father, “…may be a storyteller, and he knows all the answers. His language may be flirtatious or romantic, accentuating the male-female roles” (p. 323). The *buddy* father is typically seen as more of a peer or a friend rather than as a hero or an authority figure (Endres, 1997). Endres (1997) conceptualized the *buddy* father’s communication with his daughter as follows, “The *buddy* father talks to his daughter often and about many things, though the topics are frequently sports or politics” (p. 324).
Furthermore, “The buddy father teaches his daughter a number of skills, often traditionally male skills, and assures her she can pursue whatever interests her” (Endres, 1997, p. 324). The majority of daughters who participated in Endres (1997) study on father-daughter communication reported having a buddy image of their fathers. Endres (1997) described the authoritarian father as one who “…has little time to talk to his daughter…” (p. 324). When the authoritarian father communicates with his daughter, “…it is usually to lay down the law or to express his approval or disapproval of something…he expects to be listened to, although he doesn’t always listen in return (Endres, 1997, p.324). “There is silence between the shadow father and his daughter. He ignores the conversation or only half-listens. He is personified as having difficulty expressing feelings; it is easier for him to look away” (Endres, 1997, p. 325).

Endres’ (1997) explanation of three themes (out of the four themes that emerged from the study) mirrors Rubin et al.’s (1988) conceptualization of interpersonal communication motives, which was applied and supported in Punyanunt-Carter’s (2005) and Martin and Anderson’s (1995) studies. Endres’ (1997) knight in shining armor theme can be compared to the interpersonal motives of pleasure, affection, and escape; the buddy theme is similar to the interpersonal motives of pleasure, affection, inclusion and relaxation; and the authoritarian theme resembles the interpersonal motive of control. However, where Martin and Anderson (1995) and Punyanunt-Carter (2005) failed to articulate outcome likelihoods beyond the concept of relationship and communication satisfaction, Endres (1997) was able to point to some possible effects related to why, how, and what fathers and daughters talk about, as well as some outcome areas of interest for
future researchers. For example, Endres (1997) reported that the father-daughter bond can influence daughters’ self-identify and self-esteem and daughters’ overall life satisfaction.

Although Endres (1997) provided relevant insight into the father-daughter bond, some of his results also suggested a need for further study. Endres (1997) reported uncertain results related to the outcomes of father-daughter relationships in regard to daughters’ transition to young adulthood, and asserted that research efforts can benefit greatly by scrutinizing this outcome area more closely. In other words, although communication and relationship satisfaction are important, another step is necessary where outcomes are concerned. Particularly, there remains a vital need for studies that explore the outcomes associated with satisfaction and/or a lack of satisfaction in father-young adult daughter relationships and exactly how satisfaction translates to young adult daughters’ daily interactions and living.

To summarize, although researchers have demonstrated that satisfaction is a key variable to examine with regard to interpersonal communication motives (Martin & Anderson, 1995; Punyanunt-Carter, 2005; Rubin et al., 1988), there is a need for further study on satisfaction. As such, the following hypotheses were forward for empirical examination:

\( H_{1a} \): There will be a positive relationship between young-adult daughters’ interpersonal communication motive(s) of relaxation, inclusion, affection and/or pleasure (in regard to their fathers) and young adult daughters’ degree of perceived communication satisfaction with their fathers.
H₁b: There will be a positive relationship between young-adult daughters’ interpersonal communication motive(s) of relaxation, inclusion, affection and/or pleasure (in regard to their fathers) and young adult daughters’ degree of perceived relational satisfaction with their fathers.

H₂a: There will be a negative relationship between young-adult daughters’ interpersonal communication motives of escape and control (in regard to their fathers) and young adult daughters’ degree of perceived communication satisfaction with their fathers.

H₂b: There will be a negative relationship between young-adult daughters’ interpersonal communication motives of escape and control (in regard to their fathers) and young adult daughters’ degree of perceived relational satisfaction with their fathers.

Even still, satisfaction was not the final outcome variable of interest in the present study. Rather, satisfaction was important to the current investigation, because it was viewed as a possible mediating between interpersonal communication motives and psychological well-being. So where Martin and Anderson (1995) and Punyanunt-Carter (2005) looked at satisfaction as the final outcome variable in their studies on father-young adult daughter communication motives, this study sought to scrutinize the possible impact of satisfaction on other important outcome variables—specifically psychological well-being. Research of this type may provide important information about the specific role that verbal and nonverbal interactions play in shaping one’s overall emotional and mental disposition, or his or her psychological well-being. As such, the concept of psychological well-being is turned to next.
Psychological Well-Being

Psychological well-being is a distinct and multidimensional concept that can be used to measure an individual’s perceived emotional and mental outlook on life (Ryff, 1995; Seifert, 2005). Psychological well-being is concerned with individuals’ reactions to the typical stresses of daily living (Bradburn, 1969; Ryff, 1995); it includes “…people’s day-to-day feelings and evaluations of their lives” (Lyubomirsky & Dickerhoof, 2006, p. 166).

*Psychological Well-Being—Overview*

For more than thirty years, there were two main conceptions of psychological well-being, or positive functioning (Ryff, 1989a, 1989b, 1995; Ryff & Keyes, 1995). The first view held that psychological well-being could be characterized as the balance between positive and negative affect (Ryff & Keyes, 1995; Bradburn, 1969). The second, and more accepted, perspective on psychological well-being defined the concept in terms of one’s overall, or global, life satisfaction (Ryff & Keyes, 1995; see also Andrews & McKennell, 1980; Andrews & Withey, 1976; Bryant & Veroff, 1982; Campbell, Converse, & Rodgers, 1976).

Arguing a need for a more valid conceptualization and operationalization of psychological well-being, along with a need for a theory-based formulation of the construct, Ryff (1989a, 1989b, 1995) and Ryff and Keyes (1995) presented a third viewpoint on psychological well-being that is now accepted and used widely in the field of psychology and beyond. Their concept of psychological well-being—as conceptualized and operationalized by Ryff (1989a, 1989b, 1995) and Ryff and Keyes
—stems from a social-psychological perspective and is an attempt to study mental health in normative populations (Bradburn, 1969; Lyubomirsky & Dickerhoof, 2006; Ryff, 1995; Ryff et al., 2001; Seifert, 2005).

The conception and measurement of psychological well-being outlined by Ryff (1995) is theoretically driven by empirical findings from the fields of developmental psychology, clinical psychology, and mental health (see Figure 2). Ryff (1995) explained that are three main bodies of literature that drive the current conceptualization of psychological well-being. The first area of study is developmental psychology (particularly life span development) (Ryff, 1995). Developmental psychology presents several conceptions of wellness, which are “…conceived as progressions of continued growth across the life course” (Ryff, 1995, p. 99). Ryff (1995) explained further that developmental psychology influences include, “…Erikson’s model of the stages of psychological development, Buhler’s formulation of basic life tendencies that work toward the fulfillment of life, and Neugarten’s decriptions of personality change in adulthood and old age” (Ryff, 1995, p. 99). The second body of literature providing a foundation for the current structure of psychological well-being is based in the field of clinical psychology (Ryff, 1995). This notion of psychological well-being (like the developmental psychology conception) also depicts multiple formulations of wellness, “…such as Maslow’s conception of self-actualization, Roger’s view of the fully functioning person, Jung’s formulation of individuation, and Allport’s conceptions of maturity” (Ryff, 1995, p. 99). The third area of study that influences how psychological well-being is defined and measured currently is mental health (Ryff, 1995). Ryff (1995)
pointed out that “the literature on mental health, although guided largely by absence-of-illness definitions of well-being, includes significant exceptions, such as Jahoda’s formulation of positive criteria of mental health and Birren’s conception of positive functioning in later life” (p. 99).


Figure 2: Core Dimensions of Well-Being and Their Theoretical Origins (Ryff, 1995, p.100)
The first dimension of psychological well-being is self-acceptance. A high level of self-acceptance includes a positive attitude toward the self, knowledge and acceptance of multiple aspects of self (i.e., one’s good and bad qualities, etc.), and positive feelings toward past living (Ryff & Keyes, 1995). Ryff and Keyes (1995) explain that a low level of self-acceptance consists of feelings of dissatisfaction toward the self, disappointment with what has occurred in the past, anxiety over personal characteristics, and the desire to be someone different other than oneself.

Environmental mastery is the second dimension of psychological well-being. People who exhibit high levels of environmental mastery have a sense of mastery and competence in managing their environment (Ryff & Keyes, 1995). High level scorers of environmental mastery also have the ability to control simultaneously a complex array of external activities and make effective use of available opportunities (Ryff & Keyes, 1995). Ryff and Keyes (1995) explain that these types of people display an ability to choose or create situations that suit their personal needs and ideals. Alternatively, low level scorers of environmental mastery have difficulty managing everyday affairs, feel unable to change or improve their surrounding environment, are unaware of and/or are unwilling to seize existing opportunities, and lack a sense of control over the external world (Ryff & Keyes, 1995).

The third dimension of psychological well-being is called positive relations. A high level of positive relations refers to the existence of warm, satisfying, trusting relationships with others (Ryff & Keyes, 1995). These types of people are concerned with the well-being of others and are capable of strong empathy, affection, and intimacy.
High level scorers of positive relations comprehend the give and take of human relationships (Ryff & Keyes, 1995). A low level of positive relations is characterized by the existence of no, or very few, intimate, trusting relationships with others (Ryff & Keyes, 1995). Low level scorers on the dimension of positive relations find it difficult to be affectionate, open, and concerned about others and are isolated and frustrated when they are in interpersonal relationships (Ryff & Keyes, 1995). Furthermore, these people are not likely to compromise to maintain satisfying relational ties with others (Ryff & Keyes, 1995).

The fourth dimension of psychological well-being is known as purpose in life (or life purpose). Someone who scores high on this dimension has goals and a clear sense of direction about his or her life (Ryff & Keyes, 1995). These individuals feel there is meaning to present, past, and future living and hold beliefs that add purpose to their lives (Ryff & Keyes, 1995). They also exhibit clear aims and objectives for living (Ryff & Keyes, 1995). On the other hand, individuals who scores low on the dimension of purpose in life lack a sense of meaning in life (Ryff & Keyes, 1995). They have few goals or aims and lack a clear sense of direction regarding their lives (Ryff & Keyes, 1995). Low level scorers on purpose of life do not see much meaning in past living and have little or no views or beliefs that give meaning to their present life (Ryff & Keyes, 1995).

Personal growth is the fifth dimension of psychological well-being. People who have high levels of this dimension usually feel as though they are continually developing, and they see themselves as growing and expanding (Ryff & Keyes, 1995). Also, these
types of people are open to new experiences and have a clear sense of their own unique potential (Ryff & Keyes, 1995). They also see improvement in themselves and their actions over time and view themselves as changing in ways that reflect deeper levels of self-awareness and effectiveness (Ryff & Keyes, 1995). A lower level scorer on the personal growth dimension of psychological well-being is likely to have a sense of personal stagnation (Ryff & Keyes, 1995). Over time, these types of individuals do not exhibit a sense of personal improvement or growth (Ryff & Keyes, 1995). They feel bored and uninterested with life and feel unable to develop new outlooks and behaviors (Ryff & Keyes, 1995).

The sixth dimension of psychosocial well-being is autonomy. A high level of autonomy includes an attitude of self-determination and independence, the ability to resist social pressures to think and behave in certain manners, and the ability to regulate thoughts and actions based on internal standards (Ryff & Keyes, 1995). A low level of autonomy is made-up of an overwhelming concern about others’ expectations and evaluations, a reliance on others to make important decisions, and conformity to social pressures to think and act in certain ways (Ryff & Keyes, 1995).

Ryff and Keyes’ (1995) conceptualization of psychological well-being is the definition used in the current study. Their description of psychological well-being offers the most comprehensive and empirically driven conceptualization to date (Ryff & Keyes, 1995). Although other definitions of psychological well-being exist, these conceptualizations do not provide as rich a picture of psychological well-being, nor do they offer the same high degree of internal validity and reliability. Accordingly,
psychological well-being is defined according to Ryff and Keyes’ (1995) six-dimensional conceptualization within this prospectus.

Some researchers choose to use psychological well-being as an independent variable that influences certain dependent, or outcome, variables (Seifert, 2005). Alternatively, other researchers opt to view psychological well-being as a dependent variable that is affected by particular antecedent conditions (Seifert, 2005). In this investigation, psychological well-being is viewed as a dependent variable. Specifically, psychological well-being was predicted to be affected by the unique relationship between interpersonal communication motives and satisfaction. Scrutinizing the multiple facets of psychological well-being as a dependent variable could reveal certain aspects of one’s overall emotional and mental health that are related specifically to one’s interpersonal communication motives and perceived level of satisfaction.

Psychological well-being is a valuable concept because it encompasses multiple aspects of one’s perceived psychological wellness (Ryff, 1995; Seifert, 2005). Psychological well-being has been found to be a valid and reliable indicator of emotional and mental health (Ryff, 1995; Seifert, 2005). Measuring individuals’ psychological well-being can help to uncover the degree to which individuals are “…self-accepting, are pursuing meaningful goals with a sense of purpose in life, have established quality ties with others, are autonomous in thought and action, have the ability to manage complex environments to suit personal needs and values, and continue to grow and develop” (Seifert, 2005, p. 4).
In addition, psychological well-being is an important concept because it offers researchers a clear framework for examining positive, normative mental dispositions (Ryff, 1995; Seifert, 2005). Ryff (1995) articulated the importance of such study, paradoxically, one of the most important reasons to study the positive end of the mental health spectrum is to identify what is missing in people’s lives. That is [the category of] people…who are not troubled by psychological dysfunction, but who, nonetheless, lack many of the positive psychological goods in life. (Ryff, 1995, p. 103)

Researchers who have examined the psychology of human emotions and mental health have focused mostly on negative emotions and poor mental states as opposed to positive affect and normative mental functioning (Bradburn 1969; Davis, 1965; Lyubomirsky & Dickerhoof, 2006; Ryff, 1995; Seligman & Csikszentmihalyi, 2000). This imbalance dates back almost four decades (Bradburn 1969; Davis, 1965; Lyubomirsky & Dickerhoof, 2006; Seligman & Csikszentmihalyi, 2000). In spite of a slight increase in empirical attention to positive emotions and psychological health, “a focus on negative and maladaptive behavior continues to persist” (Lyubomirsky & Dickerhoof, 2006, p. 166). A keyword search conducted on April 16, 2008 via the research database PsycINFO provides an example of this disproportion in the literature on negative versus positive emotional and mental health. A keyword search of the term ‘depression’ yielded close to 80,000 entries, whereas a search using ‘satisfaction’ as the key term revealed just over 30,000 results. And a keyword search of the word ‘happiness’ revealed fewer than 3,000 results. This general imbalance is problematic because the large majority of
individuals report that they experience positive emotions and mental attitudes the majority of the time (Diener & Diener, 1996; Lyubomirsky & Dickerhoof, 2006). Ryff (1995) clarified the problem of placing too much emphasis on negative affect and mental health (e.g., anxiety, stress, depression) in lieu of positive emotions and mental functioning (e.g., well-being, satisfaction, happiness). The author explained that research findings related to psychological well-being are relatively few compared to knowledge about psychological dysfunction (Ryff, 1995). She wrote,

The imbalance is evident in magnitude of research—studies of psychological problems dwarf the literature on positive psychological functioning—and in the meaning of basic terms (e.g., typical usage equates health with the absence of illness). A person is viewed as mentally sound if he or she does not suffer from anxiety, depression, or other forms of psychological symptomatology. This prevailing formulation never gets to the heart of wellness; to do so, we must define mental health as the presence of the positive (Ryff, 1995, p. 99).

So, psychological well-being is one way that researchers have been able to systematically approach the study of normative mental functioning. Psychological well-being offers an empirical snapshot of one’s psychological wellness related to his or her daily living. It offers a more optimistic approach to the study of psychological wellness (Lyubomirsky & Dickerhoof, 2006). Psychological well-being is a concept that turns attention away from dissatisfaction with life and undesirable emotional states (e.g., anxiety, stress, depression) to satisfaction with life and desirable mental states (e.g., joy, excitement) (Lyubomirsky & Dickerhoof, 2006).
Finally, psychological well-being is an important outcome variable to study because several encouraging outcomes have been linked to psychological well-being. For example, people with higher levels of psychological well-being typically display higher levels of self-esteem and emotional intelligence (Smith, Heaven, & Ciarrochi, 2008). People who are psychologically well also report that they are more satisfied, in general, with other areas of their lives (i.e., professional life, personal life, spiritual life, etc.) (Smith et al., 2008). Alternatively, there are negative outcomes that have been associated with psychological well-being. For instance, people who have lower levels of psychological well-being also usually have lower levels of self-esteem and emotional intelligence and indicate less general satisfaction regarding other areas of their lives (Smith et al., 2008). Additionally, individuals with lower levels of psychological well-being have also been shown to be at a higher risk for developing serious emotional and mental disorders like anxiety and depression (Smith et al., 2008). The concept of psychological well-being offers a rich avenue for exploring possible causes and/or effects that may be related to the presence and/or absence of many desirable mental dispositions.

In spite of what is known about psychological well-being, researchers have indicated a need to learn more about the multiple aspects of psychological well-being—especially the communicative aspects (Miller-Day, 2004, 2005, 2006; Vazsonyi et al., 2003). Although it is valuable to investigate negative affect and poor mental health, it is also necessary to study positive emotions and mental functioning (Diener & Diener, 1996; Lyubomirsky & Dickerhoof, 2006). This assertion is true especially when scrutinizing relationships between parents and children. It is important particularly to examine
positive affect and mental health between fathers and daughters because the majority of daughters report positive relationships with their fathers overall; yet, these same daughters still indicate a desire to improve their relationships—especially their communication exchanges—with their fathers (Nielsen, 2001, 2007).

Revealing information about the specific relationships between interpersonal communication motives, satisfaction, and psychological well-being can be beneficial on both a theoretical level and a practical level. Accordingly, this study sought to investigate whether interpersonal communication motives interact with satisfaction to impact young adult females’ psychological well-being. With this objective in mind, the connection between psychological well-being and satisfaction is detailed next.

*Psychological Well-Being and Satisfaction*

Satisfaction is an important variable in terms of the current study, because it has been related to other important variables such as psychological well-being (Bogard, 2005; Videon, 2005). However, the relationship between interpersonal communication motives and satisfaction has never been examined in conjunction with psychological well-being. Yet, this connection is important to study to determine whether—and if so, how—satisfaction acts as a mediating variable between interpersonal communication motives and psychological well-being. So, this study will help to fill this gap in the existing literature by examining the relationships between interpersonal communication motives (independent variable), satisfaction (i.e., communication and relational satisfaction) (mediating variable), and psychological well-being (dependent variable). Consequently, the research findings that support a connection between satisfaction and psychological
well-being and the need for further study on the relationship between these two variables are examined next. The findings and weaknesses highlighted are focused particularly on what researchers have learned about satisfaction and psychological well-being in the context of father-young adult daughter relationships.

**Psychological Well-Being and Satisfaction—Important Findings & Weaknesses**

Researchers have indicated that the quality of parent-child interactions, especially the quality of father-daughter exchanges, influences daughters’ psychological well-being (Black & Pedro-Carroll, 1993; Bogard, 2005; Videon, 2005). Barnett et al. (1991) examined adult daughters’ relationships with their mothers and fathers to determine whether there was a significant connection between daughters’ perceived quality of their parental relationships and daughters’ overall mental health. Barnett et al. (1991) reported, “Having a positive relationship with a parent was associated with daughters’ reports of high well-being and low [psychological] distress” (p. 29). In this study, daughters who reported a positive relationship with their parents also displayed fewer symptoms of anxiety and depression (Barnett et al., 1991). Black and Pedro-Carroll (1993), too, found that young adult daughters who had a positive relationship with their parents, namely their fathers, were also less likely to possess a depressive affect. In addition, Bogard (2005) revealed that paternal relationships are tied directly to their daughters’ psychological well-being and depressive tendencies, which is a finding that was echoed by Videon’s (2005) results. Considering the above findings, it is apparent that fathers are an important influence on their children’s psychological well-being, and especially on their daughters’ psychological well-being. Videon (2005) explained that, generally,
parents influence children’s’ psychological well-being on two points. First, parents influence children’s overall psychological well-being and, second, parents influence children’s psychological well-being over time as the parent-child relationship changes. A critical review by Videon (2005) demonstrated that most empirical investigations of parent-child satisfaction and psychological well-being have been concerned with the former. Videon (2005) highlighted a need to examine the latter and to look at how transformations in the parent-child relationships over time (e.g., a daughter leaving home to attend college) can impact satisfaction and psychological well-being overall.

Also, most research efforts on psychological well-being among fathers and daughters have been centered on young children and adolescents as opposed to young adult daughters. For example, Videon (2005) found that adolescent daughters’ satisfaction with their fathers was connected to adolescent daughters’ psychological well-being. Videon (2005) stated “research indicates that parent-child relations remain important influences on adolescents’ well-being” (p. 56; see also Van Wel, Linssen, & Abma, 2000). However, Videon (2005) was only able to suggest such a link between fathers and young adult daughters. Nevertheless, Videon’s (2005) findings do show the need for further study among young adults. The author explained, “…the influence of parent-child relations in adolescence is not transitory; the affective quality of parent-child relationships in the teenage years has been shown to influence the long-term trajectory of offspring well-being into adulthood” (p. 56) (see also Biller & Kimpton, 1997; Roberts & Bengtson, 1996). In sum, fathers are important to their daughters’ psychological well-being, but little is known about how fathers affect daughters’ psychological well-being
over time or how fathers influence psychological well-being in their young adult daughters specifically (Black & Pedro-Carroll, 1993; Bogard, 2005; Videon, 2005). As such, this investigation helps to address these weaknesses in the existing literature.

A final weakness, in addition to those highlighted above, is that few studies have been conducted on modern-day father-child relationships (Barnett et al., 1991; Bogard, 2005; Endres, 1997; Lamb, 1986; Martin & Anderson, 1995; Neilson, 2001, 2007; Perkins, 2001; Punyanunt-Carter, 2005, 2006, 2007a, 2007b; Videon, 2005). This gap is apparent especially where research on father-daughter bonds is concerned. Videon (2005) pointed out that most of the research on satisfaction and psychological well-being among parents and children was built on an outdated characterization of fatherhood. Videon (2005) asserted,

Most theories of family life were developed when the majority of husbands and wives engaged in a strongly gendered division of labor. However, these explanatory frameworks may no longer be as relevant to contemporary social life. Because of shifting gender roles, this is a unique time to reexamine fathers’ impact on their children’s well being. In response, to the massive changes in gender roles, demographers, economists, and sociologists have paid a great deal of attention to women’s increasing participation in the paid labor force and the impact it has on a gamut of facets of family life (i.e., children’s well-being, marital stability, spouses’ mental health, marital satisfaction, etc.). Although a substantial literature exists on women’s performance of the traditionally male domain of breadwinning, much less attention has focused on
men’s shifting roles into traditionally female domains. Therefore, little is known of fathers’ relations with their children or the impact of father-child relations on children’s well-being. (p. 73)

Modern fathers are more involved with their children and interact with their children in different ways as compared to previous fathers (Lamb, 1986, 1997; Lamb & Lewis, 2005; Videon, 2005). Today’s fathers are described as “…active, nurturant, involved caretakers of their children” (Videon, 2005, p. 58; see also Lamb, 1986, 1997; Lamb & Lewis, 2005). Researchers across disciplines are now beginning to realize the importance and necessity of scrutinizing the father-child (and especially the father-daughter) bond (Barnett et al., 1991; Bogard, 2005; Endres, 1997; Lamb, 1986,1997; Lamb & Lewis, 2005; Martin & Anderson, 1995; Neilson, 2001, 2007; Perkins, 2001; Punyanunt-Carter, 2006; Videon, 2005). Yet, it is clear that further empirical study is needed to learn about father-daughter relationships. Thus, the present investigation adds to the emerging body of literature on father-daughter connections by looking for a connection between interpersonal communication motives, satisfaction and psychological well-being in father-young adult daughter relationships.

In sum, although father-daughter relationships have been shown to be important in terms of satisfaction and psychological well-being, the unique connection between fathers and daughters remains under-studied. Researchers know little about how communication with fathers may impact daughters’ psychological well-being over time or how fathers impact young adult daughters’ psychological well-being. Furthermore, prior research on father-daughter satisfaction and psychological well-being is limited,
because fathers today are different than fathers were 30 or more years ago. Most of the theories and ideas that have guided and provided support for subsequent studies were based on characterizations that are now outdated (Endres, 1997; Lamb, 1986, 1997; Lamb & Lewis, 2005; Neilson, 2001, 2007; Perkins, 2001; Videon, 2005). Further empirical examination of father-daughter relationships is necessary as a result of these gaps.

So, in addition to being understudied in the interpersonal communication motives and satisfaction research, investigations on father-young adult daughter relationships are also lacking where psychological well-being is concerned (Bogard, 2005; Videon, 2005). Moreover, psychological well-being has not been studied in conjunction with interpersonal communication motives and satisfaction. In sum, there remains a critical need for studies that explore the outcomes associated with satisfaction and/or a lack of satisfaction in father-young adult daughter relationships and exactly how satisfaction translates to young adult daughters’ daily interactions and living—specifically how young adult daughters’ satisfaction with their fathers may impact young adult daughters’ psychological well-being. Consequently, this study examined interpersonal communication motives, satisfaction, and psychological well-being among young adult daughters and their fathers. So, the following hypotheses were put forth for empirical testing:

H3a: There will be a positive relationship between young-adult daughters’ perceived degree of communication satisfaction with their fathers and young-adult daughters’ level of psychological well-being.
H₃b: There will be a positive relationship between young-adult daughters’ perceived degree of relational satisfaction with their fathers and young-adult daughters’ level of psychological well-being.

H₄a: The relationship between young-adult daughters’ interpersonal motives for communicating with their fathers and young-adult daughters’ level of psychological well-being will be mediated by young-adult daughters’ perceived degree of communication satisfaction with their fathers.

H₄b: The relationship between young-adult daughters’ interpersonal motives for communicating with their fathers and young-adult daughters’ level of psychological well-being will be mediated by young-adult daughters’ perceived degree of relational satisfaction with their fathers.

Final Summary

The purpose of the above literature review was to reveal what researchers have discovered about interpersonal communication motives, communication and relational satisfaction, and psychological well-being. The review of literature focused specifically on providing a summary of findings related to the variables of interpersonal communication motives, communication and relational satisfaction, and psychological well-being in the context of father-young adult daughter relationships. In addition to presenting an examination of relevant findings, weaknesses in the pertinent literature were also provided to show the gaps that merit further empirical study, specifically that there is a need for further research on interpersonal communication motives,
First, the above literature review addressed the interpersonal communication motives model. This section included an overview and a brief history of the motives model, as well as a review of subsequent studies on interpersonal communication motives. Finally, limitations in the interpersonal communication motives literature were highlighted, and a need for further research was asserted for two main reasons. The first reason for additional research is that researchers know little about how the gender composition of the parent-child dyad (i.e., mother-daughter, father-daughter, etc.) influences motives. Additionally, the age of a child (i.e., young child, adolescent, young adult, etc.) likely impacts parent-child motives, but in ways that are still unclear.

In the next major section of the literature review, an analysis of interpersonal communication motives and communication and relational satisfaction research findings was put forth. Satisfaction was defined in this part of the literature review and an overview of satisfaction was provided. Important findings on interpersonal communication motives and communication and relational satisfaction were also showcased along with gaps in the interpersonal motives and communication and relational satisfaction literature. In particular, it was argued that research is lacking concerning daughters’ communication motives and communication and relational satisfaction regarding their fathers. There is a need to study important outcomes variables—specifically psychological well-being—and how the relationship between
interpersonal communication motives and communication and/or relational satisfaction among father-daughter dyads may affect daughters’ psychological well-being.

Next, psychological well-being was conceptualized and the connection between psychological well-being and satisfaction was articulated. Findings of importance and related weaknesses on psychological well-being and satisfaction research were explored and a need for further research was established. Specifically, it was argued that researchers need to look at father-young adult daughter relationships—and especially over time in the presence of major life changes, like a daughter leaving home to attend college. It was asserted that researchers need to examine this phenomenon due to the importance of, yet lack of research on, fathers’ effect on their daughters’ psychological well-being.

Research Question 1 and Hypotheses

In spite of what is known about the unique connection between interpersonal communication motives and communication and relational satisfaction, researchers need to learn more about whether motives and satisfaction interact to influence other outcome variables, such as psychological well-being. Father-young adult daughter relationships offer an appropriate context for the proposed study. Consequently, the current study will fill the gaps in the existing literature by (1) studying young adult daughters’ interpersonal communication motives for talking with their fathers, (2) studying the relationship between young adult daughters’ motives for communicating with their fathers and daughters’ perceived communication and relational satisfaction with their fathers and (3)
investigating the possible/likely interplay between daughters’ perceived communication and relational satisfaction with their fathers and daughters’ psychological well-being.

Research of this kind has the potential to shed light on the how interpersonal exchanges between fathers and daughters impact daughters’ satisfaction, thus extending the theoretical model of interpersonal communication motives. Research of this type also has the potential to reveal information about how the unique relationship between young adult daughters’ interpersonal communication motives and communication and/or relational satisfaction may influence the important outcome of psychological well-being for young adult daughters. Communication and/or relational satisfaction may be mediate a significant connection between interpersonal motives and psychological well-being. Subsequently, research on father-young adult daughter interpersonal communication motives, communication and relational satisfaction, and psychological well-being may be of value on both a theoretical and on a practical level.

In sum, a need for further study of young adult daughters’ interpersonal communication motives, communication and relational satisfaction, and psychological well being with regard to their fathers has been asserted as the rationale for the current study. Young adult daughters’ interpersonal motives for communicating with their fathers, young adult daughters’ communication and relational satisfaction with their fathers, and young adult daughters’ psychological well-being were examined. This author is confident that research in this direction will provide a crucial and missing explanatory element where outcomes like psychological well-being are concerned. Thus, the following research question and hypotheses were put forth for empirical examination:
RQ1: What interpersonal communication motives occur most frequently for young adult daughters when choosing to communicate with their fathers?

H1a: There will be a positive relationship between young-adult daughters’ interpersonal communication motive(s) of relaxation, inclusion, affection and/or pleasure (in regard to their fathers) and young adult daughters’ degree of perceived communication satisfaction with their fathers.

H1b: There will be a positive relationship between young-adult daughters’ interpersonal communication motive(s) of relaxation, inclusion, affection and/or pleasure (in regard to their fathers) and young adult daughters’ degree of perceived relational satisfaction with their fathers.

H2a: There will be a negative relationship between young-adult daughters’ interpersonal communication motives of escape and control (in regard to their fathers) and young adult daughters’ degree of perceived communication satisfaction with their fathers.

H2b: There will be a negative relationship between young-adult daughters’ interpersonal communication motives of escape and control (in regard to their fathers) and young adult daughters’ degree of perceived relational satisfaction with their fathers.

H3a: There will be a positive relationship between young-adult daughters’ perceived degree of communication satisfaction with their fathers and young-adult daughters’ level of psychological well-being.
H₃b: There will be a positive relationship between young-adult daughters’ perceived degree of relational satisfaction with their fathers and young-adult daughters’ level of psychological well-being.

H₄a: The relationship between young-adult daughters’ interpersonal motives for communicating with their fathers and young-adult daughters’ level of psychological well-being will be mediated by young-adult daughters’ perceived degree of communication satisfaction with their fathers.

H₄b: The relationship between young-adult daughters’ interpersonal motives for communicating with their fathers and young-adult daughters’ level of psychological well-being will be mediated by young-adult daughters’ perceived degree of relational satisfaction with their fathers.

Figure 3: Conceptual Model (Including Research Question 1 & Hypotheses)

Note: Based on the basic causal chain of mediation presented by Baron and Kenny (1986, p. 1176).
CHAPTER III

METHOD

Now that the literature review, research question, and hypotheses have been presented, the methods employed in the study are detailed next. This section includes an explanation of the research design, sample characteristics, data collection procedures, and measurement scales. The design of the study is addressed first.

Research Design

The purpose of the present investigation was to learn more about possible links between young-adult daughters’ interpersonal communication motives for talking with their fathers, young-adult daughters’ communication and relational satisfaction with their fathers, and young-adult daughters’ psychological well-being. Accordingly, young-adult daughters were solicited to participate in the study and to provide information regarding the variables of interest and a number of demographic items. So, the characteristics of the sample of participants and the specific procedures used for data collection are provided below.

Sample Characteristics

Participants were 223 female college students (specifically, young-adult daughters) enrolled in an introductory communication course at a large Midwestern university. Participants ranged in age from 18 to 24. Responses of any participant 25 or older were omitted in the general data cleaning stage of the research process. The inclusion criteria for participants required they be a daughter with a living father or father-figure. The majority of daughters reported on their relationship with their biological father (92%) as
opposed to their step-father (7%). Only one participant responded to items based on her relationship with her father-figure (i.e., her paternal uncle). Most participants reported that they did not live with their fathers (66.4%), whereas the remaining participants did share a residence with their fathers (33.6%). Finally, 66.4% of daughters indicated that their parents were married and 20.9% of daughters in the study reported that their parents were divorced.

Procedures

Participants were recruited from the introductory communication course mentioned above. Students voluntarily participated in this research study or they had the option of completing an alternative assignment. As the course is taught in a hybrid format, orienting students to communication theory, and subsequently the research process, is an appropriate and ethical objective of the course. Students who wanted to participate in the study and who met the inclusion criteria (i.e., female, living father-figure) signed up to take part in the project through a secure online participation system. Subsequently, participants received an e-mail explaining briefly the nature of the study. This correspondence included a link for an online survey. Participants were asked to access the survey via the link. Once participants clicked on the survey link, they were asked to submit their informed consent (after reading the informed consent form at the beginning of the survey). Participants were not able to navigate through the survey without providing their informed consent, so this procedure ensured that all participants were properly informed before engaging in the research project.
After providing informed consent, participants were directed to an electronic questionnaire and asked to respond to each of the items posed. The survey contained four scales and a number of demographic items. At the end of the electronic survey, participants were directed to a different and secure cite, which allowed them to record their participation in the study without linking their name to their individual responses on the survey. Participants’ identities in regard to their individual responses on the survey items remained anonymous. Tracking of participants’ credit for completing the research study was kept separate from the data collected so as to ensure anonymity. This step of the research process yielded 245 completed surveys; however, after general data cleaning procedures were performed, 223 individual sets of responses were analyzed.

Instruments and Measures

*Interpersonal Communication Motives*

Rubin et al. (1988) largely based their assumptions surrounding the development of the Interpersonal Communication Motives (ICM) scale on concepts borrowed from the mass media uses and gratifications perspective, which offered explanations and predictions concerning individuals’ motivation to communicate with others (A. Rubin & Rubin, 1985). Rubin et al. (1988) also credited the interpersonal needs theory (Schultz, 1966) with providing extensive literature based themes and categories regarding why people do the things they do, think the thoughts they think, say the things they say, and so on. In short, the ICM scale (Rubin et al., 1988) measures why people communicate and to a certain extent what they communicate about.
Graham et al. (1993) provided an increased understanding of the construct, measure, and model of interpersonal communication motives. The results from two empirical studies, in which the researchers tested a model of interpersonal communication motives and the construct validity of the Interpersonal Communication Motives (ICM) scale (Rubin et al., 1988), indicated support for both reliability and validity of the ICM (Graham et al., 1993). Graham et al. (1993) stated, “Thus, the ICM can be adapted reliably to specific contexts” (p. 184). Additional support for the instrument has been garnered through various studies in regard to the ICM factor structure (Downs & Javidi, 1990; Hosman, 1991). Furthermore as Graham (1994a, 1994b) and Graham et al. (1993) reported, communication motives have been linked to gender (Barbato & Perse, 1992; Rubin et al., 1988), age (Barbato & Perse, 1992; Downs & Javidi, 1990; Rubin et al., 1988), communication apprehension (Rubin et al., 1988), level of loneliness (Downs & Javidi, 1990; Hosman, 1991), contextual age (Barbato & Perse, 1992; R. Rubin & Rubin, 1992), locus of control (R. Rubin & Rubin, 1992), overall communication satisfaction (Rubin et al., 1988), and “…who people talk to and what they choose to talk about and what they talk about” (Graham et al., 1993, p. 213). Taken collectively, these empirical studies lend considerable support for the viable use and wide application of the interpersonal communication motives construct and model and the ICM scale (Rubin et al., 1988) to examine interpersonal and communicative phenomena. Consequently, the ICM scale was selected for use in the current study.

The 28-item Interpersonal Communication Motives (ICM) scale (Rubin et al., 1988) (Appendix B) was used to measure young-adult daughters’ communication
motives for talking with their fathers. The scale assessed communication motives on six dimensions or sub-scales: pleasure (8 items), affection (5 items), inclusion (4 items), escape (4 items), relaxation (4 items), and control (3 items) by asking participants to report on why they communicate with their fathers. Young adult daughters were instructed to rate each item in terms of how alike it was to their reason for talking to their fathers. Responses were collected via a five-point Likert-type scale, where 5 equaled “exactly like my reasons” and 1 equaled “not at all like my reasons”. Reliability was calculated for each of the six sub-scales. Cronbach’s alpha was high for all six. Specifically, the calculated reliabilities for the current study were pleasure ($\alpha = .97$), affection ($\alpha = .91$), inclusion ($\alpha = .91$), escape ($\alpha = .85$), relaxation ($\alpha = .96$), and control ($\alpha = .81$).

Satisfaction

As previously stated in the above literature review, satisfaction is a multidimensional concept characterized by relational and communicative levels of satisfaction (Beatty & Dobos, 1992; Dainton et al., 1994; Punyanunt-Carter, 2005, 2007b). Relational communication is defined as “…an individual’s attitude toward the partner and the relationship, typically in terms of the perceived quality of the relationship” (Dainton et al., 1994, p. 90). Communication satisfaction is based on the fulfillment of individual, positive expectations and it normally offers internal rewards (Hecht, 1978a, 1978b; Punyanunt-Carter, 2005, 2007b). And finally, relationship satisfaction is linked with communication satisfaction (Punyanunt-Carter, 2005). Both relational and communication satisfaction were analyzed in the current study.
Accordingly, satisfaction was operationalized via two scales, which were the Communication Satisfaction Inventory (Com-Sat) (Hecht, 1978a, 1978b) and the Relational Satisfaction Scale (Norton, 1983).

*Communication Satisfaction*

Hecht (1978a, 1978b) conceptualized communication satisfaction as the fulfillment of individual, positive expectations and explained that satisfaction offers internal rewards. Hecht (1978a, 1978b) created a measurement tool to gauge communication satisfaction. The Com-Sat is considered to be a credible and accurate measure of general communication satisfaction with one’s interpersonal partners, including friends, acquaintances, and strangers (Hecht, 1978a, 1978b; Hecht & Martson, 1978; Graham, 1994b). Graham (1994b) summarized perfectly the essence and significance of the Com-Sat Inventory. “Hecht’s discriminative fulfillment approach says that past experiences, given one’s own behavior, influence expectations of another’s. The fulfillment of these expectations through interaction results in communication satisfaction” (Graham, 1994b, p. 217). In conclusion, the Com-Sat Inventory was selected to measure daughters’ perceived communication satisfaction because both reliability and validity for the scale have been well-established and the concept measured is of particular interest to the current study.

The Communication Satisfaction Inventory (Com-Sat) (Hecht, 1978a, 1978b) (Appendix C) was used to gauge daughters’ communication satisfaction with their fathers. The Interpersonal Communication Satisfaction Inventory (Com-Sat) (Hecht, 1978a, 1978b) used in this study is a 19-item, unidimensional, Likert-type scale that asked
participants to respond to items ranging from strongly agree (7) to strongly disagree (1).
The inventory was slightly modified for use in the present study to gauge communication satisfaction overall, as opposed to communication satisfaction in one particular exchange or interaction. Reliability for the scale was high ($\alpha = .94$).

Relational Satisfaction

The Relational Satisfaction Scale—adapted from the Quality Marriage Index (Norton, 1983) (Appendix D) was used to examine daughters’ perceived relational satisfaction with regard to their fathers. This measure has been shown to be reliable and valid and appropriate for use among parents and children to gauge their levels, or degrees, of relational satisfaction (Norton, 1983). The Relational Satisfaction Scale relied upon in the present study was adapted from the Quality Marriage Index (Norton, 1983) and is a 5-item instrument. Each of the five items required participants to assess the degree to which they agreed or disagreed (Norton, 1983). Answers were collected via a 7-point Likert-type scale where one equaled “strongly agree” and seven equaled “strongly disagree”.

Specifically, young adult daughters were asked to provide a self-report of their relational satisfaction with regard to their fathers. The Relational Satisfaction Scale (Norton, 1983) was used to calculate an overall picture of relational satisfaction between daughters and their fathers. Cronbach’s alpha for the scale indicated a high level of reliability in the current study ($\alpha = .98$).

Psychological Well-Being

The psychological well-being measure has been found to be appropriate for use across diverse demographic groups, including a range of ages (Ryff & Keyes, 1995). The
scale was tested on a nationally representative sample and analyses yielded high internal consistency and test-retest reliability (Ryff & Keyes, 1995). Moreover, researchers have suggested that multi-item measures of psychological well-being are more reliable than single-item measures of psychological well-being (Abu-Rayya, 2006; Ryff, 1989b). Accordingly, the multidimensional Psychological Well-Being Scale developed by Ryff (1989a, 1989b) and Ryff and Keyes (1995) was used to gauge young adult daughters’ psychological well-being in the present investigation.

The Psychological Well-Being Scale (Ryff, 1989a, 1989b; Ryff & Keyes, 1995) (see Appendix E) is a 54-item, self-report instrument used to measure six distinct dimensions of positive functioning. The six dimensions are autonomy, environmental mastery, personal growth, positive relations, purpose in life, and self-acceptance (Ryff, 1989a, 1989b; Ryff & Keyes, 1995). Participants were asked to respond to a 6-point Likert-type scale for each of the 54 items (9 items per sub-scale). The 6-point scale for each question ranged from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (6) (Ryff, 1989a, 1989b; Ryff & Keyes, 1995). In this study, Cronbach’s alpha was calculated for autonomy ($\alpha = .79$), environmental mastery ($\alpha = .81$), personal growth ($\alpha = .82$), positive relations with others ($\alpha = .83$), purpose in life ($\alpha = .82$), and self-acceptance ($\alpha = .85$). Reliability was high for all six sub-scales of the measure. The means, standard deviations, and alphas for all scales and subscales employed in the study can be found in Table 1.
Table 1

Means (M), Standard Deviations (SD), and Cronbach’s Alphas (α) for all Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>α</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interpersonal Communication Motives</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pleasure</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affection</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusion</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Escape</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relaxation</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Communication Satisfaction</strong></td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Relational Satisfaction</strong></td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Psychological Well-Being</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Mastery</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Growth</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Relations with Others</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose in Life</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Acceptance</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER IV
RESULTS

Research Question 1 (RQ₁) asked what interpersonal communication motives occur most frequently for young-adult daughters in terms of when they choose to communicate with their fathers. To answer this question, the items within each of the six sub-scales of the Interpersonal Communication Motives Scale (ICM) (Rubin et al., 1988) were summed and the mean and standard deviation for each subscale was calculated (Table 1). Results revealed that young-adult daughters possessed all six interpersonal communication motives in regard to why they talk with their fathers. The majority of young-adult daughters in the study reported that they communicate primarily with their fathers for pleasure ($M = 3.2$) and affection ($M = 3.2$). Young-adult daughters also indicated that they are motivated moderately by inclusion ($M = 2.9$) and relaxation ($M = 2.8$). And finally, young-adult daughters’ reported that they are somewhat inclined to talk with their fathers due to the interpersonal communication motives of control ($M = 2.5$) and escape ($M = 2.1$). (Sub-scales could vary from one to five).

A series of regression analyses were performed to test the conceptual model and the hypotheses proposed in the current investigation. The model under investigation in the present study is based on Baron and Kenny’s (1986) basic causal chain of reasoning, so their steps to test for mediation were used in this study.

1. The first step to establish mediation was regressing the dependent variable (psychological well-being) on the independent variable (interpersonal communication motives). Each of the six dimensions of psychological well-being
(i.e., autonomy, environmental mastery, personal growth, positive relations with others, purpose in life, and self-acceptance) were regressed on each of the six dimensions of interpersonal communication motives (i.e., pleasure, affection, inclusion, escape, relaxation, and control), as opposed to analyzing the two variables as one-dimensional concepts. This step was used to establish whether any of the six interpersonal communication motives influenced significantly any of the six dimensions of psychological well-being.

2. The second step to establish mediation was regressing the mediator (communication and relational satisfaction) on the independent variable (interpersonal communication motives) to determine whether communication and/or relational satisfaction were effected significantly by any of the six interpersonal communication motives. Communication and relational satisfaction (both unidimensional concepts) were regressed on the multiple dimensions of interpersonal communication motives. This step tested Path a of the conceptual model and hypotheses H1a, H1b, H2a, and H2b.

3. The third step to establish mediation was regressing the mediator (communication and relational satisfaction) on the dependent variable (psychological well-being) and controlling for the independent variable (interpersonal communication motives). The unidimensional concepts of communication and relational satisfaction were regressed on the multiple dimensions of psychological well-being. This step assessed Path b of the conceptual model and hypotheses H3a and
H₃b by testing for a significant relationship between communication and relational satisfaction and any of the six dimensions of psychological-well-being.

4. The fourth step to establish mediation was regressing the dependent variable (psychological well-being) on the independent variable (interpersonal communication motives) and controlling for the mediator (communication and relational satisfaction). It is important to note that, according to Baron and Kenny (1986), only significant relationships found in steps 2 and 3 can be tested in Step 4. As such, only the dimensions that emerged as significant in steps 2 and 3 were tested in Step 4. In particular, this step was used to look for a reduced and non-significant relationship between two specific interpersonal communication motives (i.e., escape and relaxation) and three specific dimensions of psychological well-being (i.e, personal growth, purpose in life, and self-acceptance). As such three separate regressions were conducted for the following three pairs, (1) escape and personal growth, (2) escape and purpose in life, and (3) relaxation and self-acceptance. This step tested Path c of the conceptual model and hypotheses H₄a and H₄b.

Results—Step 1

The results of Step 1 revealed that daughters’ interpersonal communication motive of affection was a significant predictor of five of the six dimensions of psychological well-being, which were environmental mastery ($\beta = .27; p = .01$), personal growth ($\beta = .26; p = .01$), positive relations with others ($\beta = .21; p = .04$), purpose in life ($\beta = .25; p = .02$), and self-acceptance ($\beta = .26; p = .01$) (Table 2). Daughters’
interpersonal communication motive of *escape* was shown to be a significant predictor of psychological well-being on the dimensions of *personal growth* \((\beta = -.18; p = .02)\) and *purpose in life* \((\beta = -.22; p = .01)\) and daughters’ interpersonal communication motive of *relaxation* was a strong predictor of psychological well-being on the dimension of *self-acceptance* \((\beta = .30; p = .02)\). The psychological well-being dimension of *autonomy* was not predicted by any of the six interpersonal communication motives. Further, the interpersonal motives of *pleasure, inclusion, and control* exerted no influence over any of the six dimensions of psychological well-being.

Table 2

*Step 1: Regressing Psychological Well-Being Dimensions on Interpersonal Communication Motives Dimensions*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interpersonal Communication Motives</th>
<th>Pleasure</th>
<th>Affection</th>
<th>Inclusion</th>
<th>Escape</th>
<th>Relaxation</th>
<th>Control</th>
<th>Adjusted (R^2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Psychological Well-Being</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Mastery</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.27**</td>
<td>-.22</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Growth</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.26**</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>-.18*</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Relations</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.21*</td>
<td>-.21</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose in Life</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.25*</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.22**</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Acceptance</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.26**</td>
<td>-.21</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.30*</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* All betas \((\beta)\) are final standardized betas. \(*p \leq .05. \quad **p \leq .01.\)

**Results—Step 2: H\(_{1a}\), H\(_{1b}\), H\(_{2a}\), and H\(_{2b}\)**

Two of the hypotheses addressed by Step 2 (testing Path \(a\)) predicted a relationship between interpersonal communication motives and communication...
satisfaction. In particular, \( H_{1a} \) predicted a positive relationship between daughters’ interpersonal communication motives of relaxation, inclusion, affection, and/or pleasure and daughters’ communication satisfaction with their fathers. And \( H_{2a} \) posited a negative relationship between daughters’ interpersonal communication motives of escape and control and daughters’ communication satisfaction with their fathers.

Findings generated from Step 2 showed that three interpersonal communication motives were significantly related with communication satisfaction (See Table 4). Daughters’ interpersonal communication motives of pleasure (\( \beta = .55; p < .01 \)), and relaxation (\( \beta = .26; p < .01 \)) were both positively related to daughters’ communication satisfaction with their fathers. Daughters’ interpersonal communication motive of escape (\( \beta = -.14; p < .01 \)) was negatively related to daughters’ communication satisfaction with their fathers. These three motives together explained 70 percent of the variance in regard to communication satisfaction (Adj. \( R^2 = .70 \)).

The empirical connections found between pleasure and communication satisfaction and relaxation and communication satisfaction were predicted by \( H_{1a} \); however, because affection and inclusion were also predicted to have a positive relationship with communication satisfaction by \( H_{1a} \), but in fact did not, only partial support for \( H_{1a} \) was found. Partial support was also found for \( H_{2a} \). The negative relationship found between escape and communication satisfaction was anticipated and predicted by \( H_{2a} \), but the lack of results to suggest any significant connection—positive or negative—between control and communication satisfaction was unexpected and
contrary to $H_{2a}$. Consequently, these results generated partial support for both $H_{1a}$ and $H_{2a}$.

The next two hypotheses tested via Step 2 predicted connections between interpersonal communication motives and relational satisfaction. $H_{1b}$ predicted there would be a positive relationship between daughters’ interpersonal communication motives of relaxation, inclusion, affection, and/or pleasure and daughters’ relational satisfaction with their fathers. $H_{2b}$ predicted a negative relationship between the interpersonal communication motives of escape and control and relational satisfaction.

Results revealed that daughters’ interpersonal communication motive of pleasure ($\beta = .55; p < .01$) significantly influenced their degree of relational satisfaction with their fathers. However, this connection was the only significant finding in terms of a link between interpersonal communication motives and relational satisfaction for young adult daughters. As a result, only minor support was declared for $H_{1b}$. On the contrary, absolutely no support was able to be offered for $H_{2b}$, because neither escape nor control was related to relational satisfaction for young-adult daughters in this study. In spite of the limited support for $H_{1b}$ and lack of support for $H_{2b}$, the interpersonal communication motive of pleasure was able to account for 55 percent of the variance in daughters’ relational satisfaction with their fathers ($Adj. R^2 = .55$).

Taken collectively, the results of Step 2 indicate an important connection between interpersonal communication motives and communication satisfaction and between interpersonal communication motives and relational satisfaction (see Table 3). In particular, the findings point to a stronger relationship between interpersonal
communication motives and communication satisfaction as compared to relational satisfaction. Three interpersonal communication motives of pleasure, escape, and relaxation were connected with communication satisfaction, whereas one interpersonal communication motive (i.e., pleasure) was linked with relational satisfaction.

Table 3

Step 2: Regressing Communication Satisfaction and Relational Satisfaction on Interpersonal Communication Motives Dimensions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interpersonal Communication Motives</th>
<th>Pleasure</th>
<th>Affection</th>
<th>Inclusion</th>
<th>Escape</th>
<th>Relaxation</th>
<th>Control</th>
<th>Adjusted $R^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Communication Satisfaction</td>
<td>.55**</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.14*</td>
<td>.26**</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relational Satisfaction</td>
<td>.55**</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. All betas ($\beta$) are final standardized betas. *$p \leq .01$. **$p \leq .001$.

Results—Step 3: $H_{3a}$ and $H_{3b}$

Step 3 allowed for an examination of $H_{3a}$ and $H_{3b}$. $H_{3a}$ predicted a positive relationship between communication satisfaction and psychological well-being. $H_{3b}$ predicted a positive relationship between relational satisfaction and psychological well-being. An analysis of the results from Step 3 yielded support for the viability of Path b of the conceptual model, which corresponded with $H_{3a}$ and $H_{3b}$. Significant support was generated for $H_{3a}$ whereas $H_{3b}$ was slightly supported.
Specifically, controlling for the influence of the interpersonal communication motives, communication satisfaction was shown to have a significant effect on five of the six dimensions of psychological well-being (Table 4). Communication satisfaction was linked with environmental mastery ($\beta = .35; p < .01$), personal growth ($\beta = .39; p < .01$), positive relations with others ($\beta = .44; p < .01$), purpose in life ($\beta = .27; p = .03$), and self-acceptance ($\beta = .38; p < .01$). Communication satisfaction explained 12 percent of the variance in psychological well-being ($Adj. R^2 = .12$). As such, this relationship was deemed significant. So, all but one dimension (autonomy) of young-adult daughters’ psychological well-being was impacted by their communication satisfaction with their fathers, and, thus, H$_{3a}$ was largely supported.

Relational satisfaction, when controlling for interpersonal communication motives, was significantly related with only one dimension of psychological well-being, which was personal growth ($\beta = -.20; p = .05$). Relational satisfaction had no significant connections to any of the other five dimensions of psychological well-being, suggesting a weak link between relational satisfaction and psychological well-being as operationalized in the current study. As such, H$_{3b}$ was only supported to a minor extent.

Similar to the conclusions drawn in Step 2 about interpersonal communication motives and communication satisfaction, the findings from Step 3 showed that communication satisfaction had a stronger connection with psychological well-being than relational satisfaction. Communication satisfaction was related to five of the six dimensions of psychological well-being (i.e., environmental master, personal growth, positive relations with others, purpose in life, and self-acceptance), while relational
satisfaction was connected with one of the six dimensions of psychological well-being (i.e., personal growth). It is clear from this part of the investigation that there is a significant, positive relationship between young-adult daughters’ communication satisfaction with their fathers and young-adult daughters’ psychological well-being. Daughters’ perception of how satisfied they are with their communication exchanges with their fathers has a direct influence over daughters’ psychological well-being.

Table 4

*Step 3: Regressing Communication Satisfaction and Relational Satisfaction on Psychological Well-Being Dimensions Controlling for Interpersonal Communication Motives Dimensions*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Psychological Well-Being</th>
<th>Communication Satisfaction</th>
<th>Relational Satisfaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Mastery</td>
<td>.35**</td>
<td>-.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Growth</td>
<td>.39**</td>
<td>-.20*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Relations with Others</td>
<td>.44**</td>
<td>-.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose in Life</td>
<td>.27*</td>
<td>-.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Acceptance</td>
<td>.38**</td>
<td>-.17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. All betas (β) are final standardized betas. *p ≤ .05. **p ≤ .001.*

Results—Step 4: H₄a and H₄b

Step 4 was used to test the two mediational hypotheses posed in the study. First, H₄a predicted a connection between interpersonal communication motives and psychological well-being would be mediated by communication satisfaction. Second, H₄b predicted that any considerable link between interpersonal communication motives and
psychological well-being would be mediated by relational satisfaction. In Step 4, only the significant relationships that emerged from steps 2 and 3 were tested (see above for explanation). Accordingly, three remaining dimensions of psychological well-being (i.e., personal growth, purpose in life, and self-acceptance) were regressed on two dimensions of interpersonal communication motives (i.e., escape and relaxation), controlling for communication and relational satisfaction (see Table 5).

Table 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interpersonal Communication Motives</th>
<th>Escape</th>
<th>Relaxation</th>
<th>Adjusted R²</th>
<th>Escape</th>
<th>Relaxation</th>
<th>Adjusted R²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>β Step 4</td>
<td>β Step 4</td>
<td>β Step 1</td>
<td>β Step 1</td>
<td>β Step 1</td>
<td>β Step 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological Well-Being</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Growth</td>
<td>-.17**</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.18*</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose in Life</td>
<td>-.21**</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.22**</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Acceptance</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.30*</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. All betas (β) are final standardized betas. *p ≤ .05. **p ≤ .01.*

First, personal growth was regressed on escape, controlling for communication satisfaction (β = -.17; p = .01). This score was compared to the calculation established in Step one regarding personal growth and escape (β = -.18 and p = .02), where communication satisfaction was not controlled for. Next, purpose in life was regressed on escape and communication satisfaction was controlled for (β = -.21 and p = .00). These findings were compared to the findings in Step 1 for purpose in life and escape (β = -.22
and \( p = .01 \), where communication satisfaction was not controlled for. Third, and finally, self-acceptance was regressed on relaxation while controlling for communication satisfaction (\( \beta = .05 \) and \( p = .58 \)). These results were compared to the findings in Step 1 for self-acceptance and relaxation (\( \beta = .30 \) and \( p = .02 \)), where communication satisfaction was not controlled for.

To establish a mediational relationship, the results of these three comparisons had to reveal a reduced or non-significant effect of the independent variable on the dependent variable (Baron & Kenny, 1986). However, this was not the case with the three different comparisons made between Step 1 and Step 4. Therefore, it was concluded that neither communication nor relational satisfaction mediated a connection between young-adult daughters’ interpersonal communication motives for talking with their fathers and young-adult daughters’ psychological well-being. So, the results gathered from Step 4 failed to offer support for either of the mediational hypotheses (i.e., \( H_{4a} \) and \( H_{4b} \)) put forth in the present investigation.

CHAPTER V
DISCUSSION

Research has shown that a daughter’s relational satisfaction with her father can have a significant influence over her psychological well-being (Barnett et al., 1991; Black & Pedro-Carroll, 1993; Bogard, 2005; Videon, 2005). Relational satisfaction is often intertwined with communication satisfaction and communication satisfaction is often driven by interpersonal communication motives (Martin & Anderson, 1995; Punyanunt-Carter, 2005; Rubin et al., 1988). Accordingly, this study investigated the possible
connection between young adult daughters’ interpersonal communication motives for talking with their fathers, young adult daughters’ communication and relational satisfaction with their fathers, and young adult daughters’ psychological well-being. The overarching objective of the present study was to gain a better understanding of how and/or why exactly a young adult daughter’s communication exchanges and her communication and/or relational satisfaction with her father may come to influence her psychological well-being.

A research question and several hypotheses were presented to guide this investigation. The conceptual model that was tested predicted that (1) (Path a) there would be a significant relationship between daughters’ interpersonal communication motives for talking with their fathers and daughters’ relational and communication satisfaction with their fathers, (2) (Path b) there would be a significant relationship between daughters’ relational and communication satisfaction with their fathers and daughters’ psychological well-being, and (3) (Path c) daughters’ relational and/or communication satisfaction with their fathers would mediate a connection between daughters’ interpersonal communication motives for talking with their fathers and daughters’ psychological well-being.

In brief, the overall results of this investigation suggested four main connections, which were (a) a significant connection between certain interpersonal communication motives and certain dimensions of psychological well-being, (b) a significant relationship between certain interpersonal communication motives and communication satisfaction, (c) a significant association between communication satisfaction and psychological well-
being, and (d) a lack of a mediational relationship between communication satisfaction and psychological well-being. These conclusions were reached based on the statistical analyses performed via Steps 1 through 4 (outlined above in the results section of this report). Steps 1 through 4 were followed to test the conceptual model and corresponding hypotheses under examination. The model and hypotheses were based on Baron and Kenny’s (1986) basic causal chain of reasoning.

In the present study, the mediational hypotheses (i.e., H₄a and H₄b) were unsupported, meaning that neither communication nor relational satisfaction mediated the relationship between interpersonal communication motives and psychological well-being. Thus, the conceptual model proposed in the current report was unsubstantiated. Although the overall premise of the model was not confirmed, certain paths within the model were supported. For example, an analysis of Path a (i.e., H₁₅, H₁₆, H₂₅, and H₂₆) revealed a noteworthy link between interpersonal communication motives and communication satisfaction. A significant connection was also found along Path b (i.e., H₃₅ and H₃₆) of the model between communication satisfaction and psychological well-being. And, in the initial analysis (before communication satisfaction was controlled for), interpersonal communication motives were significantly related to psychological well-being. So, all of the pieces, or paths, of the model were shown to be statistically significant to varying degrees. Yet, the overarching prediction of the model—the big picture—was not confirmed statistically.

Although communication satisfaction did not mediate a relationship between interpersonal communication motives and psychological well-being, interpersonal
communication motives and communication satisfaction still emerged as key variables in regard to psychological well-being within the current study. Young adult daughters’ interpersonal communication motives for talking with their fathers and young adult daughters’ perception of how satisfied they are with their communication with their fathers exerted a powerful influence over young adult daughters’ level of psychological well-being. The communication exchanges between a young adult daughter and her father can shape a daughter’s emotional and mental outlook on life. Specifically, a young adult daughter’s interpersonal communication motives for talking with her father and her level of communication satisfaction with her father can impact, her relational satisfaction with other interpersonal partners in her life, her sense of competency in managing her environment, her feelings about her potential as an individual, her outlook on her future, and her self-concept.

So, the current study produced some interesting findings, but, similar to any empirical examination, it is not without its weaknesses. Admittedly, the results of this study did not support or offered marginal support for some of the hypotheses posed. Nevertheless, the findings generated by this study overall provided important and new information about the role of communication in father-young adult daughter relationships. Specifically, this study added to the growing body of literature on father-daughter communication by testing a possible explanation of how and why the communication exchanges young adult daughters have with their fathers can impact young adult daughters’ psychological well-being. The following sections of the discussion provide a fuller analysis of the specific findings of the study. Both strengths and weaknesses of the
current investigation are presented and suggestions for future research are offered. A discussion of Research Question 1 (RQ1) is undertaken first.

Discussion—Research Question 1

The results related to RQ1 produced an important snapshot of young adult daughters’ reasons for talking with their fathers. RQ1 was concerned with the interpersonal communication motives daughters cited most frequently in regard to why they engage in conversations with their fathers. Overall, the results showed that young adult daughters possessed all six interpersonal communication motives of pleasure, affection, inclusion, escape, relaxation, and control. The current investigation revealed further that the top two interpersonal communication motives daughters possessed were pleasure and affection. Young adult daughters also indicated that they are motivated moderately by inclusion and relaxation. And finally, young adult daughters reported that they are somewhat inclined to talk with their fathers due to the interpersonal communication motives of escape and control.

The results of RQ1 are revealing particularly when compared to the results of a previous study on interpersonal communication motives in father-young adult daughter relationships. Punyanunt-Carter (2005) studied interpersonal communication motives among fathers and young-adult daughters and revealed that young-adult daughters communicate with their fathers mainly for the motives of pleasure, affection, inclusion and relaxation. However, young adult daughters in her study did not report communicating with their fathers for the motives of escape or control (Punyanunt-Carter, 2005). So in this previous study, young adult daughters reported having only four of the
six possible interpersonal communication motives (Punyanunt-Carter, 2005). Alternatively, young-adult daughters in the present study reported possessing all six communication motives in regard to why they talk to their fathers. So, this finding suggested young adult daughters choose to communicate with their fathers for a variety of reasons and is an important contribution made by the current study.

Although young adult daughters in the current study reported possessing all six interpersonal communication motives for communicating with their fathers, daughters’ motive of escape was relatively low compared to the other five interpersonal communication motives they reported. Young adult daughters cited the escape motive least frequently in this investigation. This result is in line with findings reported by Barbato et al. (2003). Barbato et al. (2003) found that parents were more likely to talk with their same-sex children (than their opposite-sex children) for the motive of escape. The results of the current investigation suggested that what is true for parents in terms of their interpersonal communication motives in regard to their children may also be true for children’s interpersonal communication motives in regard to their parents. That is, children appear to also be less likely to talk with their opposite-sex parent for the motive of escape and may be more inclined to seek out their same-sex parent to fulfill their need(s) related to the motive of escape. This finding is another important contribution produced by the current study, as it revealed a more lucid vignette of interpersonal communication motives in cross-sex parent-child relationships.

Interestingly, the majority of young adult daughters in the current study reported that their top two interpersonal communication motives for talking with their fathers were
pleasure and affection. Pleasure motives indicate that communication is undertaken because it is fun, stimulating, enjoyable, etc. (Rubin et al., 1988; R. Rubin & Rubin, 1992). Affection motives represent a need to demonstrate concern, encouragement, appreciation, etc. to a relational partner (Rubin et al., 1988; R. Rubin & Rubin, 1992). Young adult daughters in this study reported that they often seek-out their fathers to fulfill these needs. These findings echo Punyanunt-Carter’s (2005) findings, as she also found that young adult daughters often communicate with their fathers based on the motives of pleasure and affection. Consequently, this study provided further understanding and evidence of young adult daughters’ interpersonal communication motives for talking with their fathers.

As a result of the current investigation, specifically RQ1, more is known about father-daughter interpersonal communication motives, particularly young-adult daughters’ motives for choosing to communicate with their fathers. The current investigation revealed that young adult daughters have a range of reasons for talking to their fathers as participants indicated that all six interpersonal communication motives impact why they choose to talk with their fathers. Moreover, young adult daughters indicated that a lot of the time the main reasons they talk to their fathers is to fulfill their interpersonal communication motives of pleasure and affection. These findings related to RQ1 are important because they help to fill the gap in the literature surrounding what interpersonal communication motives look like between opposite-sex parent-child dyads (i.e., mother-son, father-daughter) and how interpersonal communication motives are influenced by the age of the child. Communication researchers have only recently began
to scrutinize the father-young adult daughter relationship. The findings about father-
young adult daughter interpersonal communication motives uncovered in this study add
to the growing body of work on father-daughter communication processes.

**Discussion—Step 1**

Step 1 of the investigation was used to see whether there was a significant
relationship between interpersonal communication motives and psychological well-being. There were no hypotheses associated with this step; rather the purpose of undertaking this step in the analysis was to provide a baseline of the association between interpersonal communication motives and psychological well-being. Specifically, the calculations produced in Step 1 were compared to the calculations that resulted from Step 4 to conclude whether the relationships between interpersonal communication motives and psychological well-being were mediated by communication and/or relational satisfaction. Thus, these results are explained further and provide more meaning within the discussion of Step 4 provided in an ensuing section of this report. Nonetheless, it is important still to highlight the findings generated by Step 1.

The results of Step 1 revealed that daughters’ interpersonal communication motive of affection was a significant predictor of five of the six dimensions of psychological well-being, which were environmental mastery, personal growth, positive relations with others, purpose in life, and self-acceptance. So young adult daughters who were motivated to talk to their fathers to help them, to let them know they care, to thank them, and to show encouragement and concern were also higher in their overall levels of emotional and mental health. This finding suggests that it is important for young adult
daughters’ psychological well-being for fathers and young adult daughters to be able to foster and maintain an interpersonal connection that allows daughters to talk easily with their fathers to fulfill their needs associated with their interpersonal communication motive of affection.

Moreover, the significant relationship between young adult daughters’ interpersonal communication motive of affection and their psychological well-being that was revealed by the current study is similar to results produced by Endres (1997). Endres (1997) conducted an extensive investigation of father-daughter communication processes and effects and categorized fathers into four typologies (i.e., the knight in shining armor, the buddy, the authoritarian, and the shadow). Three of the four father types described by Endres (1997) can be compared to Rubin et al.’s (1988) conceptualization of interpersonal communication motives (see Literature Review section above for a full comparison). Of particular interest, Endres’ (1997) conception of the buddy type of father is similar to the interpersonal communication motive of affection.

According to Endres (1997), buddy fathers typically communicate with their daughters about a variety of topics, to help their daughters learn multiple skills, and to provide assurance to daughters that they can pursue whatever they are interested in. The buddy father is an affectionate father who is often viewed by his daughter as more of a peer or a friend than as a hero (i.e., the knight in shining armor) or an authority figure (i.e., the authoritarian) (Endres, 1997). Importantly, the majority of daughters in Endres’ (1997) study reported having a buddy image of their fathers. Endres (1997) explained that the buddy father was considered to be the ideal type of father within the study, because
daughters’ who viewed themselves as having a buddy father also had higher levels of self-esteem and overall life satisfaction compared to daughters’ who viewed themselves as having one of the other types of fathers. So, Endres’ (1997) results suggested that, in essence, buddy fathers communicate with their daughters in a manner that helps to fulfill daughters’ needs related to daughters’ interpersonal communication motive of affection. The presence of this positive pattern of communication between father and daughter led to increased levels of psychological well-being for daughters (Endres, 1997). Thus, in line with Endres’ (1997) research, it makes sense that daughters in the current study who reported communicating with their fathers for the interpersonal communication motive of affection also displayed higher levels of psychological well-being.

The results of Step 1 revealed further that daughters’ interpersonal communication motive of escape was shown to be a significant predictor of psychological well-being on the dimensions of personal growth and purpose in life. It is interesting that young adult daughters’ scored highest on the dimensions of personal growth and purpose in life when they were motivated to communicate with their fathers based on a desire to procrastinate, to get away from pressures and responsibilities, etc. These daughters’ need to escape their daily lives could signify a young person who is lacking in internal motivation, direction, and purpose. Instead, however, these daughters exhibit a strong sense of continued self-development and growth. They are open to new experiences and have a good grasp on their potential. These daughters also have clear goals and a sense of direction in their lives; they possess a feeling that life is meaningful and has purpose. Consequently, it could be possible that young adult daughters’ who
communicate with their fathers for the motive of escape experience higher levels of personal growth and purpose in life due, in part, to the interactions they share with their fathers—interactions that allow them to take a break from the mundane and stressing aspects of their daily living and return perhaps more refreshed and ready to tackle their various tasks and responsibilities with new vigor.

The results of Step 1 also revealed that daughters’ interpersonal communication motive of relaxation was a strong predictor of psychological well-being on the dimension of self-acceptance. According to the psychological well-being scale (Ryff, 1989b, 1995) employed in the current study, people who score high on self-acceptance have a positive view of themselves and their past experiences and they acknowledge and accept the various parts of who they are as an individual—both positive and negative. Considering this description of the self-acceptance dimension of psychological well-being, it makes sense that young adult daughters have higher levels of self-acceptance when they have a relationship with their fathers that allows them to go to their fathers when they need to unwind and relax. Young adult daughters indicated that they look to their fathers to talk with them and provide a safe place for them to let down their guard and to simply be themselves. This pleasant break, or rest, that daughters aim for through an exchange or series of exchanges with their fathers allows daughters to feel less tense and, ultimately, also leads to greater levels of self-acceptance among young adult daughters. This is an important contribution of the current investigation. It suggested that young adult daughters have certain communicative needs in regard to their fathers that, when fulfilled, can lead to a strong and positive sense of self for young adult daughters.
Taken together, the results of Step 1 revealed that three of the six interpersonal communication motives. Affection, escape, and relaxation were all significantly linked with various dimensions of psychological well-being, with the exception of the psychological well-being dimension of autonomy, which was not predicted by any of the six interpersonal communication motives. Further, the interpersonal motives of pleasure, inclusion, and control exerted no influence over any of the six dimensions of psychological well-being. These findings suggest a notable tie between young-adult daughters’ motives and their psychological well-being. The results of this step will be addressed again in the discussion of Step 4, as the calculations performed in this step (Step 1) were used for comparison purposes within Step 4 to determine whether the relationships between interpersonal communication motives and psychological well-being were mediated by communication and/or relational satisfaction.

Discussion—Step 2: H$_{1a}$, H$_{1b}$, H$_{2a}$, and H$_{2b}$

Step 2 of the analysis produced information about Path $a$ of the conceptual model and allowed for testing of H$_{1a}$, H$_{1b}$, H$_{2a}$, and H$_{2b}$. The first two (of the four) hypotheses addressed by Step 2 posited that young adult daughters’ interpersonal communication motives for choosing to communicate with their fathers would be significantly related to young adult daughters’ perception of their communication satisfaction with their fathers. In particular, H$_{1a}$ predicted a positive relationship between the motives of relaxation, inclusion, affection, and/or pleasure and communication satisfaction and partial support was found for this hypothesis. H$_{2a}$ posited a negative relationship between the motives of
escape and control and communication satisfaction and partial support was generated for this hypothesis as well.

The results from this step provided partial support for H_{1a} and showed that young adult daughters’ three interpersonal communication motives of pleasure, escape, and relaxation were significantly related to their communication satisfaction with their fathers. So, these results suggested that communication satisfaction increases when young adult daughters’ are motivated to talk to their fathers because it is fun (pleasure), to get away from what they are doing (escape), and/or to unwind (relaxation), and so on. Other researchers have revealed similar results. For example, Rubin et al. (1988) found that people who communicated with others for pleasure and relaxation also reported higher levels of overall communication satisfaction. Learning more about connections like this may have practical value. For instance, fostering certain types of communication interactions (such as exchanges motivated by pleasure, escape, and/or relaxation) within a father-daughter relationship could lead to higher levels of communication satisfaction and even possibly an enhancement in relational satisfaction overall.

To review, partial support was found for H_{1a} and H_{2a}. H_{1a} was supported in part due to the empirical connections found between pleasure and communication satisfaction and relaxation and communication satisfaction. Affection and inclusion did not relate significantly with communication satisfaction however. The negative relationship found between escape and communication satisfaction provided partial support for H_{2a} results were found to suggest any significant link—positive or negative—between control and
communication satisfaction. Consequently, both hypotheses tested in this step (i.e., \( H_{1a} \) and \( H_{2a} \)) were partially supported.

The analyses pointed to the important connection between interpersonal communication motives and communication satisfaction in father-young adult daughter dyads. The fact that the interpersonal communication motives of pleasure, escape, and relaxation were related positively to communication satisfaction provided further evidence of the empirical tie between young adult daughters’ interpersonal communication motives for talking with their fathers and young adult daughters’ communication satisfaction with their fathers. These results are an important contribution, as they highlight possible communication patterns among fathers and daughters that could lead to higher levels of communication satisfaction. Further scrutiny of this connection may reveal practical strategies and techniques for improving communication satisfaction in father-daughter relationships.

The next two hypotheses tested via Step 2 predicted a relationship between interpersonal communication motives and relational satisfaction. \( H_{1b} \) predicted there would be a positive relationship between daughters’ interpersonal communication motives of relaxation, inclusion, affection, and/or pleasure and daughters’ relational satisfaction with their fathers. \( H_{2b} \) predicted a negative relationship between the interpersonal communication motives of escape and control and relational satisfaction. Results revealed that daughters’ interpersonal communication motive of pleasure significantly influenced their degree of relational satisfaction with their fathers. This connection was the only significant finding in terms of a link between interpersonal
communication motives and relational satisfaction for young adult daughters. As a result, only minor support was declared for H\textsubscript{1b}. In other words, overall, young adult daughters’ interpersonal communication motives for talking with their fathers did not significantly predict young adult daughters’ relational satisfaction with their fathers. Furthermore, absolutely no support was able to be offered for H\textsubscript{2b}, because neither escape nor control was related to relational satisfaction for young-adult daughters in this study. In spite of minor support for H\textsubscript{1b} and a lack of support for H\textsubscript{2b}, the results yielded here were revealing. Primarily, these findings (compared to the findings surrounding H\textsubscript{1a} and H\textsubscript{1b}) suggested that communication satisfaction is more heavily influenced by interpersonal communication motives than relational satisfaction for young adult daughters regarding their fathers. These results spoke to the importance of interpersonal communication motives in predicting communication satisfaction in father-young adult daughter relationships.

Taken collectively, the results of Step 2 indicate an important connection between interpersonal communication motives and communication satisfaction. In particular, the findings point to a stronger relationship between interpersonal communication motives and communication satisfaction as compared to relational satisfaction. In short, specific interpersonal communication motives (i.e., pleasure, escape, and relaxation) daughters have for talking to their fathers exerted a significant influence over daughters’ perception of how satisfied they are with their communication exchanges with their fathers. These results are noteworthy because they emphasized how communication patterns among fathers and daughters may increase communication satisfaction. Specifically, these
results say that daughters are more satisfied with their communication with their fathers when it is fun, relaxing, and helps them to escape. Future research on interpersonal communication motives and communication satisfaction in the context of father-young adult daughter relationships could produce useful information as to why this connection exists. Also, further examination of this topic may lead to suggestions for increasing communication satisfaction among fathers and young adult daughters.

Discussion—Step 3: H₃a and H₃b

Step 3 allowed for an examination of H₃a and H₃b (i.e., Path b). H₃a predicted a positive relationship between communication satisfaction and psychological well-being and H₃b predicted a positive relationship between relational satisfaction and psychological well-being. An analysis of the results from Step 3 yielded support for the viability of Path b of the conceptual model, which corresponded with H₃a and H₃b. Significant support was generated for H₃a and H₃b was slightly supported.

Specifically, controlling for the influence of the interpersonal communication motives, communication satisfaction was shown to have a significant effect on five of the six dimensions of psychological well-being. Communication satisfaction was linked with environmental mastery, personal growth, positive relations with others, purpose in life, and self-acceptance. So, all but one dimension (autonomy) of young-adult daughters’ psychological well-being was impacted by their communication satisfaction with their fathers, and, thus, H₃a was largely supported.

Relational satisfaction, controlling for interpersonal communication motives, was connected with only one dimension of psychological well-being, which was personal
growth. Relational satisfaction had no significant connections to any of the other five dimensions of psychological well-being, suggesting a weak link between relational satisfaction and psychological well-being as operationalized in the current study. As such, $H_{3b}$ was only supported to a minor extent.

Similar to the conclusions drawn in Step 2 about interpersonal communication motives and communication satisfaction, the findings from Step 3 showed that communication satisfaction had a stronger connection with psychological well-being than relational satisfaction. Although the findings of this study cannot speak necessarily to why relational satisfaction did not link with psychological well-being, what is clear from this part of the investigation that there is a significant, positive relationship between young-adult daughters’ communication satisfaction with their fathers and young-adult daughters’ psychological well-being. Daughters’ perception of how satisfied they are with their communication exchanges with their fathers has a direct influence over daughters’ psychological well-being.

Importantly, these results spoke to the fundamental role that communication satisfaction plays in influencing psychological well-being in father-young adult daughter dyads. Previous research found a connection between perceived communication satisfaction among parent-child dyads and the developmental processes surrounding certain personal characteristics for children (i.e., self-esteem and self-identity, academic achievement, creativity, etc.) (Endres, 1997; Perkins, 2001; Wynns & Rosenfeld, 2003; Fitzpatrick & Caughlin, 2002). Communication satisfaction in parent-child relationships has also been shown to influence children’s behavior and satisfaction regarding their
future relationships (Beatty & Dobos, 1992; Endres, 1997; Perkins, 2001). Although several researchers have asserted a connection between communication satisfaction and possible related outcomes, the current study was the first to examine the likely connection between communication satisfaction and psychological well-being in the context of father-young adult daughter relationships. The results produced by this study highlighted a significant relationship between young adult daughters’ communication satisfaction with their fathers and young adult daughters’ level of psychological well-being. Particularly, it was concluded that the perception young adult daughters have of their communication exchanges with their fathers influences young adult daughters on the psychological well-being dimensions of environmental mastery, personal growth, positive relations with others, purpose in life, and self-acceptance.

Whereas Martin and Anderson (1995) and Punyanunt-Carter (2005) looked at communication satisfaction as the final outcome variable in their studies on father-young adult daughter relationships, this study scrutinized the possible impact of communication satisfaction on another important outcome variable—specifically psychological well-being. Thus, this finding revealed an important picture of the connection between communication interactions and psychological well-being by providing important information about the specific role that verbal and nonverbal interactions play in shaping young adult daughters’ overall emotional and mental disposition, or their psychological well-being.
Discussion—Step 4: H$_{4a}$ and H$_{4b}$

H$_{4a}$ and H$_{4b}$, which corresponded with Path $c$ of the conceptual model, were tested via Step 4. Both H$_{4a}$ and H$_{4b}$ were mediational hypotheses. H$_{4a}$ and H$_{4b}$ predicted that any significant connection between interpersonal communication motives and psychological well-being would be mediated by communication satisfaction and/or relational satisfaction, respectively. Support was not generated for either of the mediational hypotheses (i.e., H$_{4a}$ and H$_{4b}$) put forward. It was concluded that neither communication nor relational satisfaction mediated a connection between young-adult daughters’ interpersonal communication motives for talking with their fathers and young-adult daughters’ psychological well-being.

To review, interpersonal communication motives were related to communication satisfaction and to psychological well-being in the current study. Furthermore, it was revealed that communication satisfaction was linked to psychological well-being. However, communication satisfaction did not mediate the connection between interpersonal communication motives and psychological well-being. In the current study, the reason that motives were connected with communication satisfaction and psychological well-being and the reason that communication satisfaction links up with psychological well-being were not the same—the reasons for each of these occurrences did not overlap.

Although neither communication nor relational satisfaction was concluded to be a mediating variable in the current investigation, both interpersonal communication motives and communication satisfaction were still central in regard to understanding how
young adult daughters’ communication interactions with their fathers can impact young adult daughters’ psychological well-being. In sum, it was apparent from the current investigation that interpersonal motives, communication satisfaction, relational satisfaction, and psychological well-being may not be best studied and understood in conjunction with one another. Nevertheless, it is important to continue to examine the connections established in this study between interpersonal communication motives and psychological well-being and between communication satisfaction and psychological well-being. Further empirical study is needed to learn more about the links between interpersonal communication motives and psychological well-being and between communication satisfaction and psychological well-being in the context of father-young adult daughter relationships.

Research of this type is necessary and important considering the multiple implications surrounding the connections established in this investigation. The fact that (1) young-adult daughters’ interpersonal communication motives of affection, escape, and relaxation were found predict their emotional and mental health on various dimensions of psychological well-being (i.e., environmental mastery, personal growth, positive relations with others, purpose in life, and self-acceptance) and (2) that young adult daughters’ communication satisfaction was significantly connected to five of the six dimensions of psychological well-being, suggested powerful theoretical and practical gains.

Theoretically, this study provided further support for the usefulness of the interpersonal communication motives model (Rubin et al., 1988) and also helped to extend the model into the realm of psychological well-being. The current study also
offered further evidence of the construct validity and reliability of the interpersonal communication motives scale, particularly among father-young adult daughter populations.

Practically, learning more about the links established in this investigation between interpersonal communication motives and psychological well-being and communication satisfaction and psychological well-being can be of field-based value. For example, professionals who work to help individuals increase their levels of psychological health and well-being could apply the information revealed here and/or in future investigations to add a layer of insight and effectiveness to their efforts.

Volumes of research point to a dire need for a better understanding of the factors—especially communicative factors—that may evoke, perpetuate and/or alleviate an unhealthy emotional and mental outlook on life; there is a particular need to address such issues among young adult female populations (National Alliance on Mental Illness [NAMI], 2005; National Institute of Mental Health [NIMH], 2000, 2005; Miller-Day 2005). Adolescents and young adults (~13-24 years) experience more depressive symptoms and a higher suicide risk than any other age group (NAMI, 2005; NIMH, 1997, 2005; Wight et al., 2004), and twice as many females battle depression compared to males (NIMH, 2000, 2005). However, much of the literature on emotional and mental health is focused on adolescents as opposed to young adults (Miller-Day, 2004, 2005, 2006).

Furthermore, relatively little information has been revealed to date about the likely trajectory of a father’s influence on his daughter’s psychological well-being over
time and in the face of important life changes (i.e., a daughter leaving home for the first time to attend college; a daughter’s navigation of her necessary transition from dependent-adolescent to independent-young adult, etc.) (Black et al., 1993; Bogard, 2005, Videon, 2005). Thus, this research project on the emotional and mental outlook of female young adults helps to close these existing gaps in the literature, while pointing to the need for additional scrutiny of interpersonal communication exchanges in regard to psychological well-being and especially in father-young adult daughter relationships. Young adult daughters’ communication satisfaction with their fathers, in particular, emerged as a central predictor of young adult daughters’ psychological well-being and therefore merits further empirical investigation.

Future Research

So in spite of the strengths of this examination, there is ample room for the continued exploration of the research problem of interest. Future studies should consider different frameworks (instead of the interpersonal communication motives model) that could be used to explain the connection between communication satisfaction and psychological well-being. For example, attachment theory may provide some insight into how father-daughter communication exchanges work to influence daughters’ emotional and mental outlook on life. Further, it is possible that the theory of relational maintenance could shed light on the connection between young adult daughters’ communication satisfaction with their fathers and young adult daughters’ level of psychological well-being. Accordingly, attachment theory and the construct of relational maintenance are each reviewed briefly to explain how they could perhaps illuminate the
relationship between communication satisfaction and psychological well-being in father-young adult daughter relationships.

Attachment theory is based on the idea that individuals develop an attachment style in regard to their relationships with their primary caregivers (Ainsworth, Blehar, Waters, & Wall, 1978; Bachman & Bippus, 2005; Bowlby, 1969, 1973, 1975, 1979, 1980, 1988). Individuals’ attachment styles are based on the way they cognitively interpret messages and behaviors. Attachment orientations also involve the way people communicate with and act toward others (Bartholomew, 1990; Farinelli & Mikkelson, 2005). Although the roots of attachment theory are based in infant and primary caregiver relationships, the theory has been extended to account for relational attachments across the life span (Bachman & Bippus, 2005; Bowlby, 1969, 1973, 1975, 1979, 1980, 1988, Farinelli & Mikkelson, 2005; Hazan & Shaver, 1987). George, Kaplan, and Main (1985) also reported that early attachment styles affect adult relationships. Punyanunt-Carter (2007) explained, “…the bonds between infant and caretaker develop into prototypes for other relationships…attachment styles play a vital role from childhood through adulthood” (p. 105).

Attachment theory has been used to highlight and make sense of the important role of communication within relationships (Ainsworth et al., 1978). It has been suggested that attachment orientations are unquestionably linked to communication behaviors and patterns (Guerrero & Burgoon, 1996; Punyanunt-Carter, 2007). Although attachment theory has been applied to the communication exchanges between romantic partners and friends, the theory has not been used nearly as much in family
communication studies. Attachment theorists have not examined attachment theory in family systems beyond the interpersonal tie between mother and child. For instance, few researchers have examined attachment theory in regard to the relationship between father and daughter (Punyanunt-Carter, 2007). It is important for communication researchers to pursue this distinct relationship more vigorously to help shed light on attachment theory and its practical implications in regard to father-daughter relationships.

Even if a mother is present, and in the role of primary caretaker for a child, fathers are still shown to be important attachment figures (Punyanunt-Carter, 2007). The father-daughter relationship should be looked at from the perspective of attachment theory more frequently. Attachment theory offers a valuable theoretical framework for examining several aspects of the father-daughter relationship. For example, attachment theory has been used to study father-daughter communication and communication satisfaction (Punyanunt-Carter, 2007). Punyanunt-Carter (2007) found that daughters who displayed a secure attachment style with their fathers were more satisfied with their communication with their fathers than daughters with avoidant attachment orientations. Krause and Haverkamp (1996) asserted that attachment styles simultaneously effect and illuminate parent-child interactions. These conclusions are noteworthy because they help to support the claim that attachment theory could perhaps be used to explain the empirical relationship between young adult daughters’ communication satisfaction with their fathers and young adult daughters’ psychological well-being.

Dindia (2003) (see also Canary & Stafford, 1994; Dindia & Canary, 1993) defined the construct of relation maintenance as: (1) keeping a relationship in existence
(i.e., continuity); (2) keeping a relationship in a specified state (stability) (e.g., more or less intimate); (3) keeping a relationship in a satisfactory state (i.e., satisfaction, contentment, quality, etc.), and (4) keeping a relationship in repair. Importantly, most of the relational work required to maintain a satisfying bond takes the form of, or is enacted through, verbal and nonverbal communication exchanges. Consequently, the role of communication in relational maintenance is evident in the relational maintenance strategies identified by Canary and Stafford (1994). Relationships are developed, maintained, and even terminated primarily through the exchange of verbal and nonverbal messages. Thus, it could be beneficial to scrutinize young adult daughters’ relational maintenance behaviors in regard to their fathers and in connection with the variables of communication satisfaction and psychological well-being.

Aside from these two suggestions for future research, there are other limitations surrounding the current investigation that should be addressed by additional study. One major limitation of the current investigation was a lack of diversity among participants. The majority of participants in the study were Caucasian. Further, all participants were college students, which suggested a lack of divergence in terms of participants’ socio-economic status. So, the homogeneity of the sample limited the generalizability of the results produced by the study. Thus, future research on father-young adult daughter relationships should aim to target a sample that more closely resembles the diversity of the population being examined. Another potential limitation was the scale used to gauge relational satisfaction. Although the scale relied upon in the current investigation was found to be reliable and was highly correlated with communication satisfaction, young
adult daughters’ relational satisfaction did not significantly influence their psychological well-being as was anticipated. Prior research has suggested a strong connection between relational satisfaction and psychological well-being, but such a relationship was not found in the present study. Considering that there are different ways that the concept of relational satisfaction can be operationalized, studies that employ a different measure (e.g., Vangelisti & Caughlin’s (1997) version of the Marital Opinion Questionnaire (see Huston, McHale, & Crouter, 1986), adapted to examine parent-child relational satisfaction or Hendrick, Dicke, & Hendrick’s (1988) Relationship Assessment Scale) than the one used in this investigation (i.e., Norton’s (1983) Relational Satisfaction Scale) could provide a more revealing and conclusive description of relational satisfaction and psychological well-being in father-young adult daughter relationships.

Conclusion

In conclusion, the current investigation revealed an important link between young adult daughters’ communication satisfaction with their fathers and young adult daughters’ psychological well-being. Although this connection could not be explained fully by the present investigation, the existence of the relationship between communication satisfaction and psychological well-being in the context of father-young adult daughter relationships suggests the connection provides an important area for further study. It is likely that the link between interpersonal communication motives and psychological well-being is somewhat related to the association between communication satisfaction and psychological well-being; however, the framework of interpersonal communication motives did not illuminate how and/or why specifically a young adult daughter’s
communication satisfaction with her father influences her psychological well-being as was hoped. Nevertheless, the results produced by the study did reveal noteworthy information about father-young adult daughter communication in general and pointed to some possible areas for future empirical examination. For instance, future studies should look at the connection between communication satisfaction and psychological well-being using the theory of attachment or the framework of relational maintenance. Also, future investigations could benefit from gathering a more diverse sample of participants and, perhaps, from relying on a different tool to measure relational satisfaction than the instrument used in this study. Future investigations of this type and similar sorts could yield a richer picture of how and/or why exactly communication exchanges between fathers and young adult daughters may come to influence important outcome variables for daughters, such as their psychological well-being.
### Appendix A

Structure of Psychological Well-Being: Definitions of Theory-Guided Dimensions of Psychological Well-Being (Ryff & Keyes, 1995)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Higher scorer:</th>
<th>Lower scorer:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td>is self-determining and independent, able to resist social pressures to think and act in certain ways, regulates behavior from within, evaluates self by personal standards.</td>
<td>is concerned about the expectations and evaluations of others, relies on judgments of others to make important decisions, conforms to social pressures to think and act in certain ways.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Mastery</td>
<td>has a sense of mastery and competence in managing the environment, controls complex array of external activities, makes effective use of surrounding opportunities, able to choose or create contexts suitable to personal needs and values.</td>
<td>has difficulty managing everyday affairs, feels unable to change or improve surrounding context, is unaware of surrounding opportunities, lacks sense of control over external world.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Growth</td>
<td>has a feeling of continued development, sees self as growing and expanding, is open to new experiences, has sense of realizing his or her potential, sees improvement in self and behavior over time, is changing in ways that reflect more self-knowledge and effectiveness.</td>
<td>has a sense of personal stagnation, lacks sense of improvement or expansion over time, feels bored and uninterested with life, feels unable to develop new attitudes or behaviors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Relations</td>
<td>has warm, satisfying, trusting relationships with others; is concerned about the welfare of others; capable of strong empathy, affection, and intimacy; understands give and take of human relationships.</td>
<td>has fewer close, trusting relationships with others; finds it difficult to be warm, open, and concerned about others; is isolated and frustrated in interpersonal relationships; not willing to make compromises to sustain important ties with others.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose in Life</td>
<td>has goals in life and a sense of directedness, feels there is meaning to present and past life, hold beliefs that give life purpose, has aims and objective for living.</td>
<td>lacks a sense of meaning in life; has few goals or aims, lacks sense of direction; does not see purpose in past life; has no outlooks or beliefs that give life meaning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Acceptance</td>
<td>possesses a positive attitude toward the self; acknowledges and accepts multiple aspects of self, including good and bad qualities; feels positive about past life.</td>
<td>feels dissatisfied with self, is disappointed with what has occurred in past life, is troubled about certain personal qualities, wishes to be different than what he or she is.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B

Interpersonal Communication Motives Measure (ICM) (Rubin et al., 1988)

*Instructions:* Indicate the number that best represents the reasons why you talk to your father.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Exactly</th>
<th>A lot</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>Not much</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pleasure</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I talk to my father because it’s fun.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I talk to my father because it’s exciting.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I talk to my father to have a good time.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I talk to my father because it’s thrilling.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I talk to my father because it’s stimulating.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I talk to my father because it’s entertaining.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I talk to my father because I enjoy it.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I talk to my father because it peps me up.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affection</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I talk to my father to help him.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I talk to my father to let him know I care about his feelings.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I talk to my father to thank him.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I talk to my father to show him encouragement.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I talk to my father because I’m concerned about him.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Inclusion</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I talk to my father because I need someone to talk to or to be with.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I talk to my father because I just need to talk about my problems sometimes.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I talk to my father because it makes me feel less lonely.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I talk to my father because it’s reassuring to know he is there.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Escape**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I talk to my father to put off something I should be doing.</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I talk to my father to get away from what I am doing.</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I talk to my father because I have nothing better to do.</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I talk to my father to get away from pressures and responsibility.</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Relaxation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I talk to my father because it relaxes me.</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I talk to my father because it allows me to unwind.</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I talk to my father because it’s a pleasant rest.</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I talk to my father because it makes me feel less tense.</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Control**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I talk to my father because I want him to do something for me.</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I talk to my father to tell him what to do.</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I talk to my father to get something I don’t have.</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix C

Communication Satisfaction Scale (Comm-SAT) (Hecht, 1978a; 1978b)

Instructions: Please indicate the degree to which you agree or disagree that each statement describes your typical conversations with your father.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Moderately disagree</th>
<th>Slightly disagree</th>
<th>Undecided or Neutral</th>
<th>Slightly agree</th>
<th>Moderately agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Typically, my father lets me know that I am communicating effectively. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Typically, nothing is accomplished.* 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Overall, I would like to have more conversations with my father. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Overall, my father genuinely wants to get to know me. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Typically, I am very dissatisfied with our conversations.* 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Typically, I have something else to do besides talk to my father.* 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Typically, I feel that during conversations I am able to present myself as I want my father to view me. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Typically, my father shows me that he understands what I say. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Typically, I am very satisfied with our conversations. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Typically, my father expresses a lot of interest in what I have to say. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Typically, I do NOT enjoy our conversations.* 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Typically, my father does not provide support for what he says.* 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Typically, I feel like I can talk about anything with my father. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Typically, we each get to say what we want. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Overall, I feel that we can laugh easily with each other. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Typically, our conversations flow smoothly. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Typically, my father changes the topic when his feelings are brought into the conversation.* 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Frequently, my father says things which add little to the conversation.* 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Typically, we talk about something I am not interested in.* 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

*Note: Items reverse coded.
Appendix D

Relational Satisfaction Scale (Adapted from Quality Marriage Index) (Norton, 1983)

*Instructions*: Please indicate the degree to which you agree or disagree with the following statements about your relationship with your father.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Moderately disagree</th>
<th>Slightly disagree</th>
<th>Undecided or Neutral</th>
<th>Slightly agree</th>
<th>Moderately agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- My father and I have a good relationship.
- My relationship with my father is very stable.
- My relationship with my father is strong.
- My relationship with my father makes me happy.
- I really feel like part of a team with my father.
Appendix E

Psychological Well-Being Scale (Ryff, 1989b; 1995)

*Instructions:* Please indicate the amount to which you agree or disagree with each of the following statements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Moderately Agree</th>
<th>Slightly Agree</th>
<th>Slightly Disagree</th>
<th>Moderately Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Autonomy*

- I am not afraid to voice my opinions, even when they are in opposition to the opinions of most people. 6 5 4 3 2 1
- My decisions are not usually influenced by what everyone else is doing. 6 5 4 3 2 1
- I tend to worry about what other people think of me.* 6 5 4 3 2 1
- Being happy with myself is more important to me than having others approve of me. 6 5 4 3 2 1
- I tend to be influenced by people with strong opinions.* 6 5 4 3 2 1
- I have confidence in my opinions, even if they are contrary to the general consensus. 6 5 4 3 2 1
- It's difficult for me to voice my own opinions on controversial matters.* 6 5 4 3 2 1
- I often change my mind about decisions if my friends or family disagree.* 6 5 4 3 2 1
- I judge myself by what I think is important, not by the values of what others think is important. 6 5 4 3 2 1

*Environmental Mastery*

- In general, I feel I am in charge of the situation in which I live. 6 5 4 3 2 1
- The demands of everyday life often get me down.* 6 5 4 3 2 1
- I do not fit very well with the people and the community around me.* 6 5 4 3 2 1
- I am quite good at managing the many responsibilities of my daily life. 6 5 4 3 2 1
- I often feel overwhelmed by my responsibilities.* 6 5 4 3 2 1
- I generally do a good job of taking care of my personal finances and affairs. 6 5 4 3 2 1
- I am good at juggling my time so that I can fit everything in that needs to get done. 6 5 4 3 2 1
- I have difficulty arranging my life in a way that is satisfying to me.* 6 5 4 3 2 1
- I have been able to build a home and a lifestyle for myself that is much to my liking. 6 5 4 3 2 1

*Personal Growth*

- I am not interested in activities that will expand my horizons.* 6 5 4 3 2 1
- I don't want to try new ways of doing things--my life is fine the way it is.* 6 5 4 3 2 1
I think it is important to have new experiences that challenge how you think about yourself and the world.

When I think about it, I haven’t really improved much as a person over the years.*

I have the sense that I have developed a lot as a person over time.

I do not enjoy being in new situations that require me to change my old familiar ways of doing things.*

For me, life has been a continuous process of learning, changing, and growth.

There is truth to the saying you can’t teach an old dog new tricks.*

**Positive Relations With Others**

Most people see me as loving and affectionate.

Maintaining close relationships has been difficult and frustrating for me.*

I often feel lonely because I have few close friends with whom to share my concerns.*

I enjoy personal and mutual conversations with family members or friends.

I don’t have many people who want to listen when I need to talk.*

It seems to me that most other people have more friends than I do.*

People would describe me as a giving person, willing to share my time with others.

I have not experienced many warm and trusting relationships with others.*

I know that I can trust my friends, and they know they can trust me.

**Purpose In Life**

I live life one day at a time and don’t really think about the future.*

I tend to focus on the present, because the future nearly always brings me problems.*

My daily activities often seem trivial and unimportant to me.*

I don’t have a good sense of what it is I’m trying to accomplish in life.*

I used to set goals for myself, but that now seems like a waste of time.*

I enjoy making plans for the future and working to make them a reality.

I am an active person in carrying out the plans I set for myself.

Some people wander aimlessly through life, but I am not one of them.

I sometimes feel as if I’ve done all there is to do in life.*

**Self-Acceptance**

When I look at the story of my life, I am pleased with how things have turned out.

In general, I feel confident and positive about myself.

I feel like many of the people I know have gotten more out of life than I have.*

I like most aspects of my personality.
I made some mistakes in the past, but I feel that all in all everything has worked out for the best. 6 5 4 3 2 1
In many ways, I feel disappointed about my achievements in life.* 6 5 4 3 2 1
My attitude about myself is probably not as positive as most people feel about themselves.* 6 5 4 3 2 1
The past had its ups and downs, but in general, I wouldn't want to change it. 6 5 4 3 2 1
When I compare myself to friends and acquaintances, it makes me feel good about who I am. 6 5 4 3 2 1

*Note: Items reverse coded.
Appendix F

Consent and Demographic Items

1. I agree to take part in this research project.
   a. Yes
   b. No

2. I know what I have to do and that I can stop at any time, without penalty.
   a. Yes
   b. No

3. I am at least 18 years old.
   a. Yes
   b. No

4. Please indicate your consent or lack of consent by selecting the appropriate option below:
   a. Accept
   b. Decline

5. Some of the questions in the following survey will ask you to provide information about your communication and your relationship with your father. Please indicate specifically who you will focus your responses to these items on:
   a. Your biological father
   b. Your step-father
   c. Other (please specify): ____________________________
(Please be sure to keep the person you identified [i.e., your biological father, your step-father, etc.] in mind the whole time you are responding to items that ask about your father.)

6. What is your age? _______

7. What is your father’s age? _______

8. Which of the following choices best represents your ethnicity?
   a. African American
   b. Asian American
   c. Caucasian
   d. Hispanic American
   e. Native American
   f. Other (please specify):
      ______________________________________

9. How many siblings do you have? _______

10. How many brothers do you have? _______

11. How many sisters do you have? _______

12. What is your birth order among your siblings?
    ______________________________________

   (For example, if you have 4 siblings, and you are the second oldest child in your family, then your birth order would be 2 out of 4)

13. In the last month, how many times did you talk with your father? (approximately)
    _____
14. On average, in any given month, how many times do you talk with your father?
   (approximately) ______

15. In the last month, how many minutes did you talk with your father?
   (approximately) _____

16. On average, in any given month, how many minutes do you talk to your father?
   (approximately) ______

17. How many years of your life, if any, have you lived with your father?
   (approximately) __

18. Do you currently live with your father?
   a. Yes
   b. No

19. What is the relational status between your mother and father? Please select ONE of the following choices to describe your parents’ relationship:
   a. My mother and father are married.
   b. My mother and father are divorced.
   c. My mother and father are married, but they are legally separated.
   d. My mother and father are life partners, but they have never been married.
   e. My mother and father were life partners, who are now separated, but they have never been married.
   f. Other:

   ______________________________________________________________
<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>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Pleasure</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>
<td></td>
<td>1.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Affection</td>
<td>.72**</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>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Inclusion</td>
<td>.73**</td>
<td>.72**</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>4. Escape</td>
<td>.37**</td>
<td>.31**</td>
<td>.42**</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>5. Relaxation</td>
<td>.82**</td>
<td>.66**</td>
<td>.78**</td>
<td>.46**</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Control</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.17*</td>
<td>.33**</td>
<td>.14*</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Communication Satisfaction</td>
<td>.82**</td>
<td>.67**</td>
<td>.67**</td>
<td>.22**</td>
<td>.75**</td>
<td>- .04</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Relational Satisfaction</td>
<td>.74**</td>
<td>.59**</td>
<td>.62**</td>
<td>.34**</td>
<td>.65**</td>
<td>- .04</td>
<td>.78**</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Autonomy</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.15*</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Environmental Mastery</td>
<td>.21**</td>
<td>.24**</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.19**</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.35**</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>.43**</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Personal Growth</td>
<td>.14**</td>
<td>.19**</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.39**</td>
<td>-.20**</td>
<td>.30**</td>
<td>.47**</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Positive Relations</td>
<td>.30**</td>
<td>.28**</td>
<td>.16*</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.25**</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.44**</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.28**</td>
<td>.59**</td>
<td>.57**</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Purpose in Life</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.16*</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.16*</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.27**</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.27**</td>
<td>.57**</td>
<td>.59**</td>
<td>.50**</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Self-Acceptance</td>
<td>.20**</td>
<td>.24**</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.21**</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.38**</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>.45**</td>
<td>.63**</td>
<td>.61**</td>
<td>.62**</td>
<td>.55**</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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