

## A COMPONENTS ANALYSIS OF ONE'S IMAGE OF GOD

*Ralph L. Piedmont**Joseph W. Ciarrochi**Joseph E. G. Williams*

## ABSTRACT

Research on Image of God (IOG) has shown it to be related to a wide array of outcomes, including images of parents, rearing environment, and religious affiliation. The purpose of this study was to determine the overall and unique contributions of a variety of psychosocial domains to the prediction of one's IOG. A sample of 138 women and 68 men, both graduate and undergraduate volunteers, completed measures of self personality, spirituality, religious behavior, and family environment, and provided ratings of both parents. Canonical correlation analyses showed all these variables to have significant contributions to IOG, although the unique contribution of these variables (their degree of relatedness when the effects of the other classes of predictors were partialled out) varied as a function of gender. It was concluded that IOG represents an important psycho-theological construct and future research needs to examine how it may causally impact other psychologically salient outcomes.

The question, "Who is God?" is perhaps at the core of many theological, spiritual, and personal endeavors. From a psychological perspective, interest has been directed toward describing the Image of God that people carry and determining their psychosocial importance. The empirical study of Image of God (IOG) goes back over 50 years. Harms (1944) studied IOG in children and noted that these images developed over childhood. Harms concluded that children seemed receptive to a God experience from an early age.

What role does IOG play in an individual's mental life? From where does IOG develop? These are important questions that still are in need of answers. Some believe that IOG enjoys a key role in peoples' general religious outlook and their views of themselves (e.g., Daly, 1973; Stucky-Abbott, 1995). Johnson (1996, p. 36) noted that the symbol of God "... is the focal point of the whole religious system, an entire world order and world view are wrapped up with its character." We believe that IOG represents a cumulative record of an individual's interactions with an experiential God. It is a

reflection of how that "god" was encountered and the emotional reactions that resulted. IOG provides insights into how a person organizes his/her world as well as a reflection of the emotional texture of that inner space. For many, one's IOG is a lens through which many aspects of one's inner world become focused and expressed.

Given this very central role that IOG plays in the psychosocial equilibrium of the person, the natural question that emerges is, "what factors play a role in the formation of one's IOG?" Numerous studies have pursued a variety of approaches to answering this question. Research found that IOG is a father projection (Beit-Hallahmi & Argyle, 1975; Hertel & Donahue, 1995; Justice & Lambert, 1986; Vergote et al., 1969), a mother projection (Nelson & Jones, 1957), and a reflection of the preferred parent (Nelson, 1971). Other data indicated that IOG was very much related to one's own self image (Buri & Mueller, 1993; Francis & Astley, 1997; Piedmont, Williams, & Ciarrocchi, 1997; Schoenfeld, 1987), and one's family environment (Campbell, et al., 1997). Finally, one's religious affiliation has also been shown to play a role in structuring how one perceives God (Barrett & VanOrman, 1996; Broughton, 1975; Foster & Keating, 1992; Roof & Roof, 1984). The fact that IOG connects with so many different aspects of functioning underscores its potential importance in showing how people construct meaning in their lives. These findings represent a mixed blessing for the psychology of religion. On the one hand, the repeated demonstration of the significance of IOG using a wide range of research instruments, methods, age groups, and religious denominations speaks to the robustness of IOG as a meaningful psychological variable. However, the rather broad array of constructs linked to IOG in these studies makes it difficult to draw broad conclusions about the theoretical value of IOG within the self-system.

Recently, a series of studies has attempted to remedy some of the methodological issues in IOG research by using the five-factor model (FFM) of personality (Digman, 1990; McCrae & John, 1992). This model, based on consensus personality research regarding fundamental aspects of human dispositions, appears to have wide potential for studying religious constructs. It provides a tool for integrating religious variables with mainstream psychosocial concepts (see Piedmont, 1999b). As a result, the IOG studies using the FFM have confirmed some earlier work that used different methods and discovered new relationships hitherto unexplored in IOG research (e.g., gender differ-

ences; Ciarrocchi, Piedmont, & Williams, 1998; Piedmont, Williams, & Ciarrocchi, 1997).

Building on the standardization potential of the FFM, we undertook a systematic comparison of the relative contributions of different classes of variables to IOG. Specifically, the purpose of this study was to determine the overall and unique contribution of a variety of psychosocial domains to the prediction of one's IOG. Given the above research, six domains were identified: self-personality, the personality images of mother, the personality images of father, aspects of spirituality, religious behavior, and qualities of one's family environment. This study sought to accomplish three things. First, to determine the general contribution of each class of variables to IOG. It was hypothesized that in the overall sample, each class of variables would be significantly related to IOG. Second, controlling for the presence of all the other predictors, the unique contribution of each class of variables in predicting IOG will be determined. This last set of analyses is important because it explicitly evaluated and controlled for redundancy among these various predictors. In this manner, it was possible to discriminate between truly robust predictors of IOG and variables that carried no intrinsic relatedness. Given the exploratory nature of this question, no specific hypotheses were made concerning the relative strength of correlation of each domain of predictors to IOG. Third, this study repeated the above analyses within gender to determine if the factors contributing to IOG were different in men and women. It was hypothesized that IOG would be related to spirituality and family environment for men, while for women IOG would be related to self-personality, and the rated personalities of mother and father.

## METHOD

### *Subjects*

Participants consisted of 138 women and 68 men (ages 17 to 61,  $M = 24.5$ ,  $SD = 10.9$ ) who were either undergraduate students at a Midwestern University or graduate students in Pastoral Counseling at an Eastern institution. The sample was mostly Roman Catholic (57%), with Orthodox (9%), Lutheran (7%), and Episcopalian (5%) being the next most frequent faiths. All subjects volunteered for this study and some may have received course credit for their participation.

### Measures

#### *Bipolar Adjective Rating Scale (BARS)*

This 80 item scale is designed to capture the five major dimensions of personality: Neuroticism, Extraversion, Openness, Agreeableness, and Conscientiousness. Research has shown this scale to capture stable, trait dimensions of personality that exhibit cross-instrument, cross-observer validity. Responses are measured on a 1 to 7 point Likert scale and scores for each dimension are found by simply summing responses for each domain. Half of the items are negatively reflected to reduce acquiescence effects. Although initially developed and validated for adults (McCrae & Costa, 1985, 1987), this scale has been shown to be reliable and structurally valid with college students (Piedmont, 1995).

#### *Adjective Check List (ACL)*

Developed by Gough and Heilbrun (1983), this measure consists of 300 adjectives from which individuals select those which are viewed as most self-descriptive. The ACL provides information on 33 scales from diverse theoretical orientations, including Murray's (1938) needs, Berne's (1961) Transactional Analysis, Welsh's (1975) Intellectence and Originence scales, and several scales developed by Gough and Heilbrun (1983) to measure salient interpersonal qualities.

Using a panel of experts familiar with the five-factor model (FFM) of personality, John (1990) created adjective marker scales for each dimension of the FFM by having these experts identify Adjective Check List items representative of each domain. These rational judgments were supported by empirical analyses that demonstrated both the convergence of these markers both with other measures of the FFM (McCrae, 1990) and with relevant scales from the ACL (Piedmont, McCrae & Costa, 1991). These FFM marker scales were used in this study to capture images of God, Mother, and Father. Normative values for these scales were obtained from Piedmont (1989). Previous research has shown that ratings of religious figures on the ACL were related to a number of relevant psychosocial criteria (e.g., Ciarrochi, Piedmont, & Williams, 1998; Piedmont, 1999b).

#### *Spiritual Transcendence Scale (STS)*

Developed by Piedmont (1999a), this 24 item scale captures the degree to which an individual can stand outside of his/her own

immediate needs and perspectives and view life from a larger, more unitive perspective. Three subscales are captured: Universality, a belief in the unity and purpose of life; Prayer Fulfillment, an experienced feeling of joy and contentment that results from prayer and/or meditation; and, Connectedness, a sense of personal responsibility to other that cuts across generations and social strata. Items are responded to on a 1 "Strongly Agree" to 5 "Strongly Disagree" scale. Piedmont (1999a; 2001) has shown that these dimensions are independent of the personality domains of the FFM and are able to predict a wide array of relevant life outcomes.

#### *Family Environment Scale (FES)*

Developed by Moos and Moos (1994), this scale contains 90 statements about various aspects of one's family environment that are responded to on a True-False scale. The instrument has ten scales which assess three different domains of family life: *Quality of the Relationship* which is measured by the Cohesion, Expressiveness, and Conflict scales; *Personal Growth*, which is measured by the Independence, Achievement Orientation, Intellectual-Cultural, Active-Recreational Orientation, and Moral-Religious Emphasis scales; and, the *System Maintenance Dimension*, captured by the Organization and Control scales. These scales show adequate internal consistency and temporal stability. Research has shown that these dimensions are useful for understanding the contribution of family dynamics to the experience of both physical and psychological problems.

#### *Demographic Questionnaire*

This multi-item form queried for basic demographic information about each subject. There were also four questions concerning the frequency of various religious behaviors: the amount of time one spends reading the Bible, amount of time reading other religious literature, the amount of time one spends in prayer, and the frequency with which one attends religious services. Each item was responded to on a 7 point Likert scale, from *Never* (1) to *Several Times a Week* (7). Scores from these four ratings were summed to create the Religiosity Index.

### Procedure

Subjects completed the materials in their own homes. Subjects were instructed to complete the forms in the order they were presented. Forms were counterbalanced to control for any order effects. It took subjects approximately one hour to complete these materials.

### RESULTS

Figure 1 presents the ACL profile of all participants' view of God. Scores falling outside of the T-score range of 46 to 54 are considered defining. The low score on Communality indicates a perception of God as one who does not conform to conventional expectations. This profile includes a perception of God as being arrogant, intolerant, and contentious. Interestingly, God is not defined in overly positive or in non-negative terms, suggesting that social desirability is not contaminating these self-reported images. God scores very high on the Nurturance and Nurturing Parent scales, indicating perceptions of God as someone interested in providing material and emotional benefits to others, as being concerned with tradition and with the building of sustained relationships between people of all different socio-demographic strata. Durable, interpersonal relationships which are fulfilling and sustaining are central perceived characteristics. The low Change score indicates a commitment to stability and continuity in these relationships. The high scores on Personal Adjustment and Ideal Self indicate an image of God as being joyful, sociable, and capable. God is seen as a person with a sense of self and presence who is able to constructively engage others in relationships. The low rated score on Adapted Child (which is a measure of psychological maladjustment) reinforces this interpretation and adds that this perceived emotionally effective individual may not always fully consider the personal feelings of others in his strivings for realizing the Divine Plan. On the FFM markers, God was rated high on Agreeableness and low on Neuroticism, indicating a perception of a very stable and caring orientation towards others. Individuals with this type of profile are usually seen as being tolerant, non-critical, unpretentious, optimistic, peaceful, and relaxed.

Tests for gender differences resulted in several significant effects. Women provided higher ratings of God on the Heterosexuality, Self-Confidence, Personal Adjustment, Femininity, and Nurturing Parent

scales. These ratings stressed God's more interpersonal aspects regarding His capacity to initiate and maintain deep, emotionally satisfying relationships with others. Men, on the other hand, rated God higher on the Counseling Readiness scale, indicating a perception of God as having more problems with interpersonal behavior brought on by shyness and detachment. Women's ratings appear to emphasize a more emotionally dynamic Being with a strong capacity to reach out and touch others in an intimate, caring manner. Men see God as being more detached, skeptical of the motives of others, and rejecting.

Table 1 outlines the six classes of variables used to predict IOG. A total of 32 variables will be used in the analyses. Two series of canonical correlation analyses were performed. In the first series of analyses, each domain of variables was entered into a canonical correlation analysis. The amount of variance these variables explained in IOG was determined (redundancy analysis). These findings outline the overall predictiveness of each domain for IOG. The second series of canonical analyses employed residualized variables. Each of the 32 predictors was residualized on the other 31 variables. Each IOG rating was also residualized on both the remaining 4 IOG ratings and all the predictors, save the self-ratings employed in the analysis. In this manner, the unique predictiveness of each set of variables was determined. To the extent that there was redundancy among the predictors, the strength of association between a particular class of predictors and IOG was attenuated relative to its initial analysis.

Table 2 presents the results of these canonical correlation analyses. In looking at the overall sample, it is clear that each class of predictors has a direct, significant relationship with IOG. This finding supports previous research that has documented the singular relatedness of each of these classes of variables. Family environment evidenced the strongest overlap with IOG, explaining 38% of the variance. Self-personality and Image of Father (IOF) were the next largest. In examining the partial relationships (i.e., the association between what is unique in the predictor, controlling for all other predictors, with what is unique in IOG, after controlling for its association with the other predictors), all but Religious Behaviors continued to maintain a significant overlap. Within gender, there appears to be a different pattern of relatedness. IOG for men seems to be a function of mostly self-personality, Images of Father, and Family Environment. Women,

Figure 1. Overall Image of God on the Adjective Check list. Overall  $N = 207$ ; Females = 139; Males = 68. <sup>f</sup>Females rate significantly higher; <sup>m</sup>Males rate significantly higher. T-scores outside of the normative range (e.g., 46 to 54) are given in bold.

ACL SCALE	MEAN SCORE	T-SCORE					
		40	45	50	55	60	65
<b>MODUS OPERENDI SCALES</b>							
Communality <sup>f</sup>	<b>39</b>						
Favorable Adjectives	54						
Unfavorable Adjectives	46						
<b>NEEDS SCALES</b>							
Achievement	52						
Dominance	53						
Endurance	53						
Aggression	46						
Heterosexuality <sup>f</sup>	53						
Affiliation	53						
Order	51						
Intracception <sup>f</sup>	54						
Nurturance <sup>f</sup>	<b>58</b>						
Exhibition	51						
Autonomy	48						
Change <sup>f</sup>	<b>45</b>						
Succorance	46						
Abasement	46						
Deference	52						
<b>TOPICAL SCALES</b>							
Self Confidence <sup>f</sup>	53						
Self Control	52						
Personal Adjustment <sup>f</sup>	<b>55</b>						
Ideal Self	<b>60</b>						
Masculinity	49						
Femininity <sup>f</sup>	<b>45</b>						
Military Leadership	49						
Counseling Readiness <sup>m</sup>	<b>45</b>						
Creative Personality	52						
<b>TRANSACTIONAL ANALYSIS</b>							
Critical Parent	<b>44</b>						
Nurturing Parent <sup>f</sup>	55						
Adult	52						
Free Child	52						
Adapted Child	<b>40</b>						
<b>WELSH SCALES</b>							
Welsh 1	52						
Welsh 2	47						
Welsh 3	53						
Welsh 4	50						
<b>FIVE FACTOR MARKERS</b>							
Neuroticism	42						
Extraversion	50						
Openness	52						
Agreeableness <sup>f</sup>	<b>57</b>						
Conscientiousness	53						

Table 1. Variables Comprising the Six Content Domains

Content Domain	Elements
Self-rated personality	The Big Five domains of Neuroticism, Extraversion, Openness, Agreeableness, and Conscientiousness
Ratings of Mother	The Big Five domains: N, E, O, A, C
Ratings of Father	The Big Five domains: N, E, O, A, C
Transcendence	Universality, Connectedness, and Prayer Fulfillment
Religious Behaviors	Frequency ratings of Reading the Bible, Reading Religious Literature, Praying, and Attending Religious Services
Family Environment	Achievement, Morality, Independence, Cohesion, Intellectual, Activity, Expressiveness, Conflict, Organization, and Control

Table 2. Overall and Unique Contributions of Six Classes of Variables in Predicting Image of God

	Initial		Unique	
	R <sup>2</sup> <sub>M</sub> <sup>a</sup>	R <sub>M</sub>	R <sup>2</sup> <sub>M</sub>	R <sub>M</sub>
<b>Overall Sample (N = 207)</b>				
Self-Personality	.26***	.51	.16*	.40
Family Environment	.38***	.62	.34**	.58
Transcendence	.12**	.35	.15**	.39
Religious Behaviors	.14*	.37	.07	.26
Image of Mother	.18**	.42	.23***	.48
Image of Father	.25***	.50	.24***	.49
<b>Males (N = 68)</b>				
Self-Personality	.57***	.75	.58***	.76
Family Environment	.61*	.78	.67*	.82
Transcendence	.20	.45	.37	.61
Religious Behaviors	.21	.46	.29	.54
Image of Mother	.34	.58	.45	.67
Image of Father	.50**	.71	.41	.64
<b>Females (N = 138)</b>				
Self-Personality	.26*	.51	.20	.45
Family Environment	.46***	.68	.47**	.69
Transcendence	.17*	.41	.23**	.48
Religious Behaviors	.18*	.42	.15	.39
Image of Mother	.23*	.48	.30**	.55
Image of Father	.28**	.53	.28*	.53

\*  $p < .05$ ; \*\*  $p < .01$ ; \*\*\*  $p < .001$ ; <sup>a</sup>  $p < .10$ .

<sup>a</sup> multivariate R squared, based on Cohen and Cohen (1983), calculated as:  $(1 - Wilks\ Lambda)$ .

on the other hand, involve all six domains. Clearly, IOG has a different etiology for men and women.

Of more interest are the unique contributions. As noted above, these analyses include residualized variables and therefore control for the presence of the non-included variables. As a result, the use of residuals allows for an evaluation of the incremental validity of each domain of variables: Do they provide any *unique* explanatory power? In looking at the overall sample, all but one class of variables (Religious Behaviors) continued to be significantly associated with IOG. Religious behaviors do not continue to be significant once the other variables are partialled out. Family Environment, Images of Mother, and Father appear to explain the most variance in IOG. Transcendence had a more modest relatedness. Overall, these variables are explaining the lion's share of variance in IOG.

However, gender differences are more clearly noted here. For men, when controlling for the various predictors, Image of Father is no longer significant, although Self-personality and Family Environment emerged as the major predictors. All five of the personality domains were related to IOG. Family environment was only marginally predictive. The type of family environment that was related to IOG was a relationship oriented family that expressed anger and conflict directly among members and which also emphasized religious and moral values over competitive and achievement values.

For women a different set of predictors emerges. Self personality played less of a unique role. Spiritual Transcendence emerged as a significant predictor of IOG, with only the Universality and Connectedness facets being relevant. Concerning images of mother, ratings of her extraversion and (low) conscientiousness were most predictive. Thus the principled, formal, conservative, and cautious aspects of mother were most correlated to women's IOG. However, for father, rated levels of (higher) neuroticism and (lower) agreeableness were most related to IOG. Thus, father's level of emotional bluster and interpersonal chauvinism were important contributors in how women imaged God. Finally, concerning family environment, growth-oriented aspects of the family that encouraged self-sufficiency and assertiveness were most predictive of IOG. These results further underscore the hypothesis that IOG develops out of very different processes for men and women. For women, IOG does not reflect much of their own self-images, rather God embodies special qualities of their caregivers and family environment. Those aspects of self that are salient

are more focused on spiritual connectedness and union than on more self-oriented needs and motivations.

#### DISCUSSION

Several points of interest emerge from these data. First, the overall canonical correlation analyses support previous research which has identified a wide array of variables predictive of one's IOG. Certainly all six domains identified here are, on their face, significantly related to IOG. These six domains of variables appeared to capture the majority of the variance in IOG. Each of these domains, with the exception of Religious Behaviors, has something to contribute to one's IOG, and these relations hold even when controlling for other potential predictors. It is interesting to note that most of these different variables are relationship oriented: how one perceives and relates to parents, siblings, and God. To some extent, our IOG is a reflection of our ability to initiate and maintain emotionally meaningful relationships with others. It would be interesting to identify other potential predictors, although these data suggest that much of one's IOG is represented in these six classes of constructs.

Second, the methodology used here has important implications for future IOG research. Clearly, there is a sizable amount of redundancy among the predictor sets. Controlling for this redundancy results in very different patterns of findings. For example, for men Image of Father has no unique predictiveness, perhaps because it shares much in common with the self-ratings of personality. However, effect for Family Environment becomes slightly strong once other factors are controlled. Its effect may get washed out in the presence of so many other collinear variables. With women, the role of self-personality in predicting IOG was lost once its overlap with other variables was controlled. The same applies for the Religious Behaviors set. Future research needs to take not just a multidimensional approach to understanding IOG, but it must appreciate the fundamental overlap among these various predictors.

Third, how IOG is formed seems to be quite different for men and women. Different factors appear to play significant roles in its development. For men, they appear to take a more "agentic" approach, relying on self-images to generate their orientation towards God. Women, in contrast, appear to rely on a more "communal" process,

including images obtained not only from self, but also from significant others to whom they have a relationship. These etiological differences are well worth study in their own right. Such a research program may have much to say on how men and women approach God and the needs they seek to have satisfied (e.g. Ciarrocchi et al., 1998).

Fourth, on a more speculative note, the causal relationship between these two sets of variables needs to be examined in more detail. For the purposes of this report the position was taken that IOG emerged from these various sets of predictors. In other words, how one sees God was seen as a product of one's own personality and family of origin. However, the opposite perspective is also equally tenable: One's perceptions of self and family dynamics may emerge from one's relationship to God. How these two sets of variables relate to one another causally needs further study. Is there a simple cause and effect relationship? Are they mutually influencing one another? Or, are both these variables caused by some other latent dimension, like culture? The application of structural equation modeling seems a likely next step for research in this area.

Finally, it also needs to be determined what impact IOG has on the direction and quality of people's lives. How does IOG function to give depth, support, and encouragement to one's life? Given a certain IOG, what kinds of events can be predicted for a person later in life? These are important questions that address spiritual as well as psychological issues. From the latter perspective, the psychotherapeutic value of IOG needs to be articulated as well as methods for including this resource in the therapeutic process. It is hoped that the current study has provided a framework for researchers to use in approaching these questions and an analytic strategy to employ in uncovering empirical answers.

There are three important limitations to the current study. First, the 2:1 ratio of women to men is very skewed, but does reflect the current high percentages of women who are majoring in the social sciences. However, the reader needs to be cautious in examining the obtained gender differences; replication is certainly in order here. The lack of findings for men in some places may be a consequence of the lower power inherent to those analyses. Perhaps more comparable results would have been found if the ratio of men and women were equal. Second, the sample is mostly Roman Catholic, and this compromises the generalizability of these findings. Perhaps other faiths may evidence different patterns of relationships among these

variables. Finally, the sample is mostly comprised of undergraduate students, another factor which may both restrict the generalizability of these findings and be another explanation for the null findings obtained. Without knowing how spirituality and religious behaviors may or may not change over the adult life span, it is possible that a different pattern of findings would have emerged if older participants were included.

Nonetheless, these findings do hold promise for future IOG research, showing that a number of psychosocial variables were related to one's view of God. These effects were maintained even after controlling for the presence of other potential predictors. IOG represents an important psychological construct because of its relatedness to so many aspects of one's life, such as self-esteem, loneliness, depressive symptomatology, and childhood traumatization (Benson & Spilka, 1973; Carroll, 1992; Doehring, 1993; Kane, Cheston, & Greer, 1993; Schwab & Petersen, 1990). The domains of variables included in this study captured the majority of variance in IOG and thus provide a framework for understanding previous research in this area. The many variables found linked to IOG can now be sorted into conceptual categories relating to our own self-perceptions, our relationships with significant others, rearing experiences/environment, and our own spiritual motivations. Information from each of these domains can be expected to provide insights independent of the others. The domains identified in this report provide a foundation for the development of broad conceptual models for image of God that specify its origins, developmental sequence, psychological significance, and potential clinical utility.

#### REFERENCES

- Barrett, J. L., & VanOrman, B. (1996). The effects of image-use in worship on god concepts. *Journal of Psychology and Christianity, 15*, 38-45.
- Beit-Hallahmi, B., & Argyle, M. (1975). God as a father projection: The theory and the evidence. *British Journal of Medical Psychology, 48*, 71-75.
- Benson, P., & Spilka, B. (1973). God image as a function of self-esteem and locus of control. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, 12*, 297-310.
- Berne, S. L. (1961). *Transactional analysis in psychotherapy*. New York: Grove Press.
- Broughton, W. (1975). Theistic conceptions in American protestantism. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, 14*, 331-344.
- Buri, J. R., & Mueller, R. A. (1993). Psychoanalytic theory and loving god concepts: Parent referencing versus self-referencing. *The Journal of Psychology, 127*, 17-27.

- Campbell, C. D., Nordlund, M., Olson, R., Nordlund, C., Crawford, D., & Bufford, R. K. (1997). *The relationship between family health and concept of god*. Poster presented at the Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association, Chicago, IL.
- Carroll, W. C. (1992). *Depressed mood in religiously committed persons: A cross-sectional study*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Loyola College in Maryland.
- Ciarrocchi, J. W., Piedmont, R. L., & Williams, J. E. G. (1998). "Who do you say I am?" Personality and gender dimensions in the images of Jesus, Mary, and Joseph. *Review for the Social Scientific Study of Religion*, 9, 127-145.
- Cohen, J., & Cohen, P. (1983). *Applied multiple regression/correlation analysis for the behavioral sciences (2nd ed.)*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum Associates.
- Daly, M. (1973). *Beyond God the Father: Toward a philosophy of women's liberation*. Boston, MA: Beacon Press.
- Digman, J. M. (1990). Personality structure: Emergence of the five-factor model. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 41, 417-440.
- Doehring, C. (1993). *Internal desecration: Traumatization and representations of God*. NY: University Press of America.
- Foster, R. A., & Keating, J. P. (1992). Measuring androcentrism in the western god-concept. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 31, 366-375.
- Francis, L. J., & Astley, J. (1997). The quest for the psychological Jesus: Influences of personality on images of Jesus. *Journal of Psychology and Christianity*, 16, 247-259.
- Gough, H. G., & Heilbrun, A. B. (1983). *The adjective check list manual*. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.
- Harms, E. (1944). The development of religious experience in children. *American Journal of Sociology*, 50, 112-122.
- Hertel, B. R., & Donahue, M. J. (1995). Parental influences on god images among children: Testing Durkheim's metaphoric parallelism. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 34, 186-199.
- John, O. P. (1990). The "Big Five" factor taxonomy: Dimensions of personality in the natural language and in questionnaires. In L. Pervin (Ed.), *Handbook of personality theory and research* (pp. 66-100). New York: Guilford Press.
- Johnson, E. A. (1996). *She who is: The mystery of God in feminist theological discourse*. NY: Crossroad.
- Justice, W. G., & Lambert, W. (1986). A comparative study of the language people use to describe the personalities of God and their earthly parents. *The Journal of Pastoral Care*, 40, 166-172.
- Kane, D., Cheston, S., & Greer, J. (1993). Perceptions of God by survivors of childhood sexual abuse: An exploratory study in an under-researched area. *Journal of Psychology and Theology*, 21, 228-237.
- McCrae, R. R. (1990). Traits and trait names: How well is openness represented in the natural languages? *European Journal of Personality*, 4, 119-129.
- McCrae, R. R., & Costa, P. T., Jr. (1985). Updating Norman's "Adequate Taxonomy": Intelligence and personality dimensions in natural language and in questionnaires. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 49, 710-721.
- (1987). Validation of the five-factor model of personality across instruments and observers. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 52, 81-90.
- McCrae, R. R., & John, O. P. (1992). An introduction to the five-factor model and its applications. *Journal of Personality*, 60, 175-215.
- Moos, R. H., & Moos, B. S. (1994). *Family environment scale, manual (3rd ed.)*. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychological Press.
- Murray, H. A. (1938). *Explorations in personality*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Nelson, M. O. (1971). The concept of god and feelings toward parents. *Journal of Individual Psychology*, 27, 46-49.
- Nelson, M. O., & Jones, E. M. (1957). An application of the Q-technique to the study of religious concepts. *Psychological Reports*, 3, 293-297.
- Piedmont, R. L. (1989). Achievement motivation and fear of success in males and females. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 49(11), 5054-B (University Microfilms No. DA8827940).
- (1995). Big five adjective marker scales for use with college students. *Psychological Reports*, 77, 160-162.
- (1999a). Does spirituality represent the sixth factor of personality? Spiritual Transcendence and the five-factor model. *Journal of Personality*.
- (1999b). Strategies for using the five-factor model of personality in religious research. *Journal of Psychology and Theology*, 27, 338-350.
- (2001). Spiritual Transcendence and the scientific study of spirituality. *Journal of Rehabilitation*, 67, 4-14.
- Piedmont, R. L., McCrae, R. R., & Costa, P. T., Jr. (1991). Adjective check list scales and the five-factor model of personality. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 60, 630-637.
- Piedmont, R. L., Williams, J. E. G., & Ciarrocchi, J. W. (1997). Personality correlates of one's image of Jesus: Historiographic analysis using the five-factor model of personality. *Journal of Psychology and Theology*, 25, 364-373.
- Roof, W. C., & Roof, J. L. (1984). Review of the polls: Images of god among americans. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 23, 201-205.
- Schoenfeld, E. (1987). Images of god and man: An exploratory study. *Review of Religious Research*, 28, 224-235.
- Schwab, R., & Petersen, K. U. (1990). Religiousness: Its relation to loneliness, neuroticism and subjective well-being. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 29, 335-345.
- Stucky-Abbott, L. (1995). The impact of male God imagery on female identity meaning. *Journal of Pastoral Care*, 47, 240-251.
- Vergote, A., Tamayo, A., Pasquali, L., Bonami, N., Pattyn, M-R, & Custers, A. (1969). Concept of god and parental images. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 8, 79-87.
- Welsh, G. S. (1975). *Creativity and intelligence: A personality approach*. Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina, Institute for Research in Social Science.