



Psychosocial Development: Fathering during Childhood and Adolescence

Corey M. Teague, PhD^{1*}, Jenaia Jones MSW²

¹Department of Psychology, College of Behavioral and Health Sciences, Middle Tennessee State University, United States.

²Department of Social Work, University of Houston, United States.

Article Details

Article Type: Research Article

Received date: 07th February, 2023

Accepted date: 01st March, 2023

Published date: 06th March, 2023

***Corresponding Author:** Corey M. Teague, PhD, Department of Psychology, College of Behavioral and Health Sciences, Middle Tennessee State University, United States.

Citation: Teague, C. M., & Jones, J., (2023). Psychosocial Development: Fathering during Childhood and Adolescence. *J Ment Health Soc Behav* 5(1):178. <https://doi.org/10.33790/jmhsb1100178>

Copyright: ©2023, This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the [Creative Commons Attribution License 4.0](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited.

Abstract

Findings in this study are based on participant indication of father figure type during childhood and adolescence and the effects of father figure type on psychosocial development. Specifically, the five (5) different father figure types investigated were: (1) positive biological father figure, (2) negative biological father figure, (3) positive non-biological father figure, (4) a combination of a positive non-biological father figure and negative biological father figure, and (5) no father figure. This study was guided by Erik Erikson's Theory of Psychosocial Development, which explains the importance of mastering different tasks and developing different virtues during specific stages of human development. Specifically, two research questions were investigated: (1) Which psychosocial strengths or weaknesses best predict no father figure during childhood and adolescence? In addition, (2) what is the difference in the psychosocial development of individuals based on father figure type during childhood and adolescence as it relates to research question one? There were 188 adult participants who were administered a pre-questionnaire in order to gather information on father figure type experienced during childhood and adolescence. The participants then were administered the Measures of Psychosocial Development (MPD). Lastly the participants were administered a post-questionnaire pertaining to father figure type (different from the pre-questionnaire) in order to validate the father figure type that was indicated in the prequestionnaire. The results of this study found that the best psychosocial development predictors of no father figure during childhood and adolescence were significant deficits in the psychosocial virtues of hope/faith and willpower and significant deficits in the psychosocial tasks of trust and autonomy. The results of this study also found that participants who indicated that they had a positive biological father during childhood and adolescence scored higher than any other father figure type on the psychosocial virtues of hope/faith and willpower and psychosocial tasks of trust and autonomy. These findings suggest that efforts to make sure children and adolescents have a father figure will be essentially beneficial to children and adolescents as adults. These findings also suggest that situations that deprive children and adolescents of having a father figure can contribute to negative outcomes for these children and adolescents as adults.

Father Involvement

Fatherhood research has been conducted for decades. There have been studies that investigated a father's influence on children's

development to studies that investigated changing policies regarding separated fathers [1, 2, 3]. These types of studies have been on going and have created a school of fatherhood research that has shown to be reliable. This research reliability is specifically related to fatherhood type and its causal power in relation to various variables such as emotional and behavioral problems, physical development, incarceration, drug abuse, high school dropout rate, and social economic status, to name a few [4-7]. Father positive involvement in a child's life promotes executive functioning development in the child which would seem to have a positive effect on these variables. Garcia et al. [8] and Cabrera et al. [9] both found that father involvement is positively associated with a child's cognitive and language development. Furthermore, adverse childhood experiences have been shown to interfere with the development of executive functioning in children. According to Ray, Choi, and Jackson [10] father involvement decreases adverse childhood experiences. Findings such as these continues to support the school of father involvement research that already exist and points research in a direction to continue to look at other meaningful variables in the lives of children, adolescents and adults.

Many children in the United States and around the world are being raised by single mothers due to out of wedlock births, increases in divorce, parental alienation (i.e. physical and emotional distance caused by mother), and/or father abandonment. In many divorce cases, the mother is the parent who receives full custody of the children, leaving the child with decreased opportunities to interact with the father. However, in many states in the United States, this trend has shifted over the past decade. Courts more and more are equally dividing the child custody between the mother and father allowing the child to get equal time with both parents. Shared custody has shown to be related to improved psychological, physical, social, cognitive and educational outcomes [11]. However, this arrangement may interfere with conscientiousness (i.e. being organized, orderly and planful) in adolescents [12]. Nevertheless, research continues to support a positive relationship between father involvement and childhood, adolescent and adult positive outcomes. Moreover, the quality of the involvement plays a major role in these positive outcomes. Nielsen [13] reported that the quality of the father-child relationship is a greater predictor of positive outcomes unless the negative outcomes are extreme. Studying and promoting father-child relationships in our society continues to prove to be beneficial for

the well-being of individuals, families, groups, organizations and civilization as a whole.

Psychosocial Development

In this study we wanted to investigate the relationship between the quality of father involvement (i.e. father figure type) and psychosocial development. Psychosocial development refers to the development of the personality and the acquisition of social attitudes and skills, from infancy through maturity. The Theory Psychosocial of Development is a theory that explains human personality development as an individual passes through eight stages that cover the life span. This theory was introduced to the science of psychology by ego psychologist Erik Erikson. Ego psychology includes interpersonal reality, affect regulation and social role models in the development of central functions [14]. Erikson's Theory of Psychosocial Development explains how an individual's behavior and mental processes are influenced by social interactions at different stages of life. Erikson also made a huge contribution to understanding of human functioning and dysfunction by developing this theory of human development that extended beyond childhood, through adulthood, and to old age [15]. Therefore, these social interactions explained in the Theory of Psychosocial Development are understood to be able to leave the individual with a different psychological scar or psychological virtue in each stage of psychosocial development. Erikson theorized that the ego itself is shaped and transformed, not only by biological and psychological forces but also by social forces [15]. Erik Erikson once stated that "personality in principle develops according to steps predetermined in the growing person's readiness to be driven toward, to be aware of, and to interact with, a widened social radius". Therefore, this theory posits that an individual's interpersonal realities, cognitive adaptation and emotional regulation are the catalyst toward psychological deficits and psychological strengths (i.e. Virtues).

Psychosocial Stages of Development

Erikson's Theory of Psychosocial Development explains how individuals pass through distinct stages from birth to later life in which there are psychological "tasks" and "crisis" to be solved and a psychological virtue to be gained or not gained in each stage. Erikson identified eight (8) consecutive stages in his theory. The stages, outcomes, and virtues that are about to be discussed here are also characterized in Figure 1. The first stage of Erikson's Theory of Psychosocial Development is called "Trust versus Mistrust". This stage takes place during the first year to first year and a half of life. As the newborn starts to experience his or her environment they will learn that they can trust or not trust that their needs will be met. The infant's trust or mistrust is a mental representation and emotional association of the environment, which includes the people in their lives. If the infant successfully passes through this stage of life, he or she will develop the virtue of hope and faith in the environment and future events, which they will carry into the remainder of his or her life. If the infant does not successfully pass through this stage he or she will develop sensory distortion (maladaptive emotional associations), withdrawal, suspicions, and/or fear of future events.

The second stage is called "Autonomy versus Shame and Doubt". This stage takes place approximately between one (1) to three (3) years of age. As the toddler starts continues to experience his or her environment he or she will develop self-efficacy or self-doubt. This developed self-belief originates from the toddler's opportunities and experiences of doing things on their own that they have learned. The child benefits from being able to experience giving effort, going through a process and having success after that effortful experience. The toddler will then learn what he or she can control and then develop a sense of free will that is corresponded with a developed sense of regret for inappropriate use of self-control [16]. The toddler's self-efficacy or self-doubt is a mental representation and emotional

association of themselves in the environment. Self-conscious emotions are milestones that show that the child is becoming aware of having an actual self that is observable by the self [17]. If the toddler successfully passes through this stage of life, he or she will develop the virtue of willpower which gives them a sense of self-control, adequacy and determination. If the infant does not successfully pass through this stage he or she will exhibit impulsivity, compulsion, feelings of shame and self-doubt.

The third stage is called "Initiative versus Guilt". This stage takes place approximately between three (3) to six (6) years of age. The Theory of Psychosocial Development explains that in this third stage the child starts to test the limits of known actions by initiating new actions. If the child is successful with opportunities to be a self-starter he or she will develop the virtues of purpose and courage. Schacter et al. [16] states that the child learns to initiate, to explore, to imagine and to feel remorse for actions. If the child is not allowed or does not feel safe to test his or her limits, he or she will become inhibited and have to deal with feelings of guilt and inadequacy when he or she desires to be assertive.

The fourth stage is called "Industry versus Inferiority". This stage takes place approximately between five (5) to twelve (12) years of age. During this stage children wake up to the reality of a broader life and that they need to work for what they want to accomplish by learning to do well or correctly in comparison to a standard or to others [16, 17]. They no longer just have to just win the affection of their family of origin but they have to now win the affection of peers and other adults that are not members of the family of origin, which is a more difficult task. The sense of inferiority is essential as it produces a passion in the child to improve as an individual [17]. As children start to broaden their social interactions by way of cognitive development, preschool and school attendance, they will experience their ability to "fit in" or they will be experience being a "misfit". There are many personal characteristics that determine the child's outcomes in this stage (e.g. hygiene, prosocial behavior, effort, following rules/norms, reinforcements from home life etc.). If the child has positive learning experiences in this area they will develop a sense of industry. That is, the child will develop a sense competence and the virtue of purpose. If the child has negative learning experiences in this stage they will develop a sense of inferiority at understanding their life and relationships. This negative outcome leaves the child with a painful sense that they do not measure up.

The fifth stage is called "Identity versus Role Confusion". This stage takes place approximately between twelve (12) to eighteen (18) years of age. In this stage the adolescent goes through the experience of being oneself and sharing oneself. They start to see themselves as individually distinctive yet integrated. During this stage the adolescent through observation and experience will either determine who they are or they will be confused about who they are. According to Erikson, the adolescent will develop an identity or they will experience role confusion. A successful development of identity leads to the development of the virtue fidelity. That is, the adolescent learns and is intrinsically motivated to be loyal to his or her identity. According to Schacter et al. [16], the adolescent develops a sense of self in relation to others and their own internal thoughts and desires. If the adolescent does not learn and establish this intrinsic motivation they will be confused, self-rejecting or conforming to someone else's ideas about them and their relationships.

The sixth stage is called "Intimacy versus Isolation". This stage takes place approximately between eighteen (18) to forty (40) years of age. Now the individual is in the early to middle adulthood stage of life. This is a time when the adult will learn to share his or her previously developed trust/faith, willpower, purpose, competence and loyalty to self with another adult. They learn to seek companionship, love and commitment. Romantic relationships develop and/or fall apart. In

the face of these different romantic outcomes the person learns to give and receive love and make long-term commitments in loving relationships [16]. The sense of virtue that emerges within this positive resolution is love. If this positive resolution is not achieved the person learns to isolate with the inability to form affectionate relationships.

The seventh stage is called “Generativity versus Stagnation”. This stage takes place approximately between forty (40) to sixty-five (65) years of age. Generativity is a person’s establishment, guidance, and enrichment of the living generations and the world he or she inherits that is expressed in family, work and community [18]. These expressions are typically directed towards the next generation. These middle-aged persons strive to become productive doing meaningful work, being cooperative in the community and raising

a functional family. Successful resolution in this stage helps the person to develop the virtue of care. If a person is not successful in this strivings or they shun away from them they will experience stagnation and/or inactivity outside of self-centered interests.

The eighth stage is called “Integrity versus Despair”. This stage takes place approximately at sixty-five (65+) years and onward. Older individuals during this stage take a close look at the life behind them and the life they have in the present time. They develop a sense of meaningful acceptance of life as it was lived by them or they develop a sense of regret in relation to the things not accomplished [16]. Successful resolution in this stage helps the person to develop the virtue of wisdom. If a person is not successful with resolution in this stage they will experience dissatisfaction with life and despair.

Erickson’s Psychosocial Stages of Development					
Stages	Approx. Age	Psychosocial Crisis	Favorable Outcomes	Unfavorable Outcomes	Basic Virtue
1	Birth - 1 Yr.	Trust Vs. Mistrust	*Learn to trust that others will care for their basic needs. *Faith in the environment and future events.	*Learn to mistrust that others will care for their basic needs. *Suspicion and fear of future events.	Hope/Faith
2	1 – 3 Years	Autonomy Vs. Doubt	*Learn to be self-sufficient in many activities. *Learn a sense of self-control and adequacy.	*Learn to doubt their own abilities. *Develop feelings of shame and self-doubt	Willpower
3	3 – 5 Years	Initiative Vs. Guilt	*Learn to be a self-starter, to initiate one’s own activities. *Take on many adult like activities.	*Learn to feel a sense of guilt and inadequacy to be on one’s own. *Feelings of guilt connected to overstepping limits set by parents.	Purpose
4	5 – 12 Years	Industry Vs. Inferiority	*Learn how things work, to understand and organize. *Learn to be competent and productive.	*Learn a sense of inferiority at understanding and organizing. *Feelings of not doing anything well.	Competence
5	12 – 18 Years	Identity Vs. Role Confusion	*Figure out “Who I am” and future roles. *Seeing self as a unique, integrated person.	*Confused about “Who I am” and future roles. *Confusion about what one really is.	Fidelity
6	18 – 40 Years	Intimacy Vs. Isolation	*Learn to seek companionship and love. *Ability to make commitments to others.	*Isolate from companionship and love. *Inability to make commitments and form affectionate relationships	Love
7	40 – 65 Years	Generativity Vs. Stagnation	*Ability to be productive, performing meaningful work and raising a family. *Concern for family and society in general.	*Concern only for self, one’s own well-being and prosperity. *Becomes stagnant and inactive in connection with family or societal wellbeing	Care
8	65 Years +	Integrity Vs. Despair	*Seeing life as a meaningful whole. *Develops a sense of integrity and fulfillment and willingness to face death	*Dissatisfaction with life. *Despairing at goals never reached and questions never answered. *Despair over prospect of death.	Wisdom

Source: Berger, K.S. (1988) The developing person through the lifespan, New York, Worth Publishers, <https://www.simplypsychology.org/Erik-Erikson.html> and <https://pmhealthnp.com/eriksons-stages/>

Figure. 1

Participants

The participants in this study were undergraduate students at Middle Tennessee State University enrolled in various General Psychology courses. This study had a total of 188 participants (N=188). There were 66 male participants and 122 female participants. The participants' ages ranged from 18 to 27. There were fifty-six (56) 18 year olds, sixty (60) 19 year olds, twenty seven (27) 20 year olds, twenty two (22) 21 year olds, nine (9) 22 year olds, seven (7) 23 year olds, four (4) 24 year olds, two (2) 25 year olds, and one (1) 27 year old participants. The inclusion criterion for the participants was the participants' indication that they were not adopted as a child or adolescent on the pre-screen and post screen questionnaires given to the participants.

Method

The groups in this study were differentiated by the participants' father figure type experienced during their childhood and adolescence. There were no experimental groups as all participants completed the same questionnaires and measure. All participants participated in a prescreening that was administered by the Department of Psychology at Middle Tennessee University. In the prescreening the participants indicated the type of father figure they had during childhood and adolescence as well as many other questions related to other personal characteristics, experiences, and beliefs. However, the only responses that were related to the purpose of this study were the responses

related to the type of father figure experienced during childhood and adolescence. As illustrated in Table 2, the questions that indicated the type of father figure experienced during childhood and adolescence were the following: (1) Were you adopted as a child or adolescent?, (2) Did you have a positive male father figure in your life during your childhood and adolescence?, (3) Did you have a positive relationship with your biological father during your childhood and adolescence?, and (4) Was your biological father a part of your life during your childhood and adolescence? The type of father involvement that participants had during childhood and adolescence determined the group in which the participant's Measures of Psychosocial Development results were placed. As illustrated in Figure 2, the five (5) different father figure types investigated were: (1) positive biological father figure (i.e. answer no to question 1 and answer yes to father figure type questions 2, 3 and 4), (2) negative biological father figure (i.e. answer no to question 1, answer no to father figure type questions 2 and 3, and answer yes to father figure type question 4), (3) positive nonbiological father figure (i.e. answer no to question 1, answer yes to father figure type questions 2 and answer no to father figure type question 3 and 4), (4) a combination of a positive nonbiological father figure and negative biological father figure (i.e. answer no to question 1, answer yes to father figure type questions 2 and 4, and no to father figure type question 3), and (5) no father figure (i.e. answer no to question 1 and answer no to father figure type questions 2, 3 and 4).

Questions Given to Participants to Determine Father Figure Type During Childhood and Adolescence	
Q1. Were you adopted as a child or adolescent?	
Q2. Did you have a positive male father figure in your life during your childhood and adolescence?	
Q3. Did you have a positive relationship with your biological father during your childhood and adolescence?	
Q4. Was your biological father a part of your life during your childhood and adolescence?	
Father Figure Type	Response That Determined Father Figure Type
(1) Positive Biological Father Figure	Q1=No, Q2=Yes, Q3=Yes and Q4=Yes
(2) negative biological father figure	Q1=No, Q2=No, Q3=No and Q4=Yes
(3) positive non-biological father figure	Q1=No, Q2=Yes, Q3=No, and Q4=No
(4) A Combination of a Positive Non-biological Father Figure and Negative Biological Father Figure	Q1=No, Q2=Yes, Q3=No, and Q4=Yes
(5) No Father Figure	Q1=No, Q2=No, Q3=No, and Q4=No

Figure. 2

Participants were contacted via email and invited to participate in this study based on their father figure type responses during the prescreening. The participants were not told that this study was about father figure type experience. They were told that this study was investigating the psychosocial development of college students. Each participant scheduled a time in which they could come in person to complete the Measure of Psychosocial Development. Participants were given an informed consent to sign and date and then given instructions on how to complete Hawley's Measures of Psychosocial Development. Each participant was physically unable to sign the informed consent, not needing a witness for the consent process to sign for them. After completing the Measures of Psychosocial Development, each participant completed another brief questionnaire

that was used to verify father figure type responses made during the prescreening. The participants' information and responses were included in the study once they completed each of these steps.

Instrument

Hawley's Measures of Psychosocial Development has been test for reliability and validity and used in different studies to investigate a number of variables. According to Haight [19], Hawley's Measures of Psychosocial Development provides a statistically solid measurement of Erikson's eight positive and negative scales for assessing psychosocial development and screening for a variety of concerns.

Haight [19] investigated the psychometric properties of the measure and found that ninety-seven percent (97%) of the total items maintained robust item-to-subscale agreement. This was evidenced by total item variance, eigenvalues, scree plots, and the interpretability of the factor solution [19]. Haight [19] goes on to find that each of the eight (8) positive and eight (8) negative scales revealed significant inter-subscale correlation at the 0.01 level (two tailed). Chen [20] study that investigated the Roles of Psychosocial Developmental Crisis and Self-Stigma in Mental Health among College Students with Disabilities said this about Hawley's Measures of Psychosocial Development:

The Measures of Psychosocial Development (MPD) [21], consisting of 112 self-descriptive statements measured using a 5-point response scale (from 'not at all like me' to 'very much like me') and evaluating positive and negative attitudes associated with Erikson's eight stages as positive resolution (PR) and negative resolution (NR) scores. Levels of resolution between conflicting attitudes at each stage are indicated by a resolution (R) score obtained by subtracting an NR from the corresponding PR score. R scores denote the status of conflict resolution for each of the eight stages [21]. The MPD manual reports a test-retest reliability coefficient for the individual scales of approximately .80. Its internal consistency coefficient has ranged from .65 to .84 at every stage [21], and those found among Chinese university students were similarly between .65 and .84 [22]. Studies using the MPD in various cultures have discovered favorable data reliability and validity [22]. Our study is the first to use the MPD to assess psychosocial development among college students with disabilities. This study used the Chinese version of the MPD, and the internal consistency of positive and negative items was generally .95.

What these ongoing findings have revealed about Hawley's Measures of Psychosocial Development makes it a valid instrument to investigate psychosocial development in this study. These findings also increase the confidence of the findings in this study as this study investigated variables directly related to this measure. This instrument's ability to measure positive and negative scores in relation to each stage of psychosocial development makes it an instrument that can help answer the research question of this study.

Results

This study was designed to answer the question: "Which psychosocial strengths and weaknesses best predict father absence during childhood and adolescence?" We did a multinomial logistic regression to answer this question. The multinomial logistic regression allows for more than two (2) levels in the group membership variable. As a result, a reference group was chosen. The reference group that was chosen was group 4 (i.e. no father figure), which was the best fit given the research question. Group membership (i.e., father involvement type) was predicted using the eight (8) psychosocial development scales. The likelihood ratio test (see Table 1) indicated we could significantly predict father involvement using the eight (8) scales.

Model	Model Fitting Criteria	Likelihood Ratio Tests		
	-2 Log Likelihood	ChiSquare	df	Sig.
Intercept Only	601.857	25.524	8	.001
601.857 Final	576.333			

Table 1. Model Fitting Information

In order to simplify the statistical process the stepwise method was used. The stepwise method indicated the most influential scales from resolution in stage 1 (R1) to resolution in stage 8 (R8) in order to predict father absence during childhood and adolescence. The significance tests (see Table 2) indicated that Trust versus Mistrust (R1) and Autonomy versus Shame and Doubt (R2) are the significant scales.

Effect	Model Fitting Criteria	Likelihood Ratio Tests		
	-2 Log Likelihood of Reduced Model	Chi-Square	df	Sig.
Intercept	583.546	7.213	4	.125
R2	587.792	11.460	4	.022
R1	601.175	24.842	4	.000

R1 = Trust versus Mistrust, R2 = Autonomy versus Shame and Doubt.

Table 2 Likelihood Ratio Tests

Since the "no father figure" group was chosen as the reference group, it was used as a reference for all follow up tests. Each significance test (see Table 3) tested the odds of being in one group (e.g., +BiOF) versus being in the no father figure group given a one point increase in R1 or R2. For instance, Table 3 indicates the following: The odds of being in the +BiOF group versus the NFF group are 1.2 times higher for a 1 point increase in R1. The significant test allows for the conclusion that differences in R1 and R2 can predict father absence (NoFF) in childhood and adolescence. The results also found that participants who indicated that they had a positive biological father during childhood and adolescence scored higher than any other father figure type on the psychosocial virtues of hope/faith and willpower and psychosocial tasks of trust and autonomy.

Discussion

This study found that children and adolescents who experience no father figure are more likely to present with a deficit in psychosocial development. The deficits that best predicted no father figure during childhood and adolescence were in the virtues of faith, hope and will power. These findings continue the conversation in regards to the importance of a father figure presence in the lives of children and adolescents, initiates investigative hypothetical critical thinking around the father figure in relation to human life span development variables and supports past and recent research findings in relation to the quality of relationship between father involvement in childhood and adolescence. These conversations, investigative hypotheticals and previous and present supportive findings give scientific research the opportunity to inform agencies that focus on the family and policies that affect the family. They also promote organizational and political co-operation with typical familial and individual outcomes that are related to father involvement.

The lack of hope in the context of psychosocial development is the result of an unhealthy level of mistrust that develops in the earliest stage of child development. This hope deficit indicates an increased probability for intrapersonal and/or interpersonal struggles. Lentz [23] found that the level of hope and resilience in middle and high school students predicted the self-report of mental health symptoms. Also, in a study conducted by Chai et al [24], hope was significantly and negatively correlated with depression. Mental health symptoms, in general, are known to cause distress and/or dysfunction. Depressive symptoms are known to effect the quality of life in an intrinsic and an extrinsic manner. People benefit from being resilient when facing mental health issues and the stressors of life in general. Hope and faith deficits combined with typical daily environments that are sometimes unpredictable, undependable and conceivably unsafe can negatively affect a person's ability to persevere (i.e. to be resilient).

Fathering_Type ^a		B	Std. Error	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)	95% Confidence Interval for Exp(B)	
								Lower Bound	Upper Bound
+BioF	Intercept	-.871	.473	3.396	1	.065			
	R2	-.131	.043	9.395	1	.002	.878	.807	.954
	R1	.198	.048	17.173	1	.000	1.219	1.110	1.338
+NonBioF	Intercept	-.578	.433	1.775	1	.183			
	R2	-.072	.040	3.201	1	.074	.931	.860	1.007
	R1	.128	.043	8.812	1	.003	1.137	1.045	1.238
-BioF	Intercept	-.195	.391	.249	1	.618			
	R2	-.077	.039	3.855	1	.050	.926	.857	1.000
	R1	.100	.041	5.932	1	.015	1.105	1.020	1.198
+NonBioF&-BioF	Intercept	-1.098	.512	4.607	1	.032			
	R2	-.106	.046	5.454	1	.020	.899	.822	.983
	R1	.170	.051	11.218	1	.001	1.185	1.073	1.309

a. The reference category is: NoFF = No Father Figure.
 +BioF = Positive Biological Father Figure, +NonBioF = Positive Non-Biological Father Figure,
 -BioF = Negative Biological Father Figure, +NonBioF&-BioF = Positive Non-Biological Father Figure and Negative Biological Father Figure, R1 = Trust versus Mistrust, R2 = Autonomy versus Shame and Doubt.

Table. 3 Parameter Estimates

Du and King [25] found that university students showed better adjustment the more hope they had in relation to family. Natural hope promotes resilience through a person's expectations of good outcomes [26]. Hope and faith deficits can contribute to a person's lack of self-confidence pertaining to their abilities to influence their environment. According to Brackney and Westman [27], hope deficits are related to the perception that external factors control one's life. Individuals with a high external locus of control tend to have less life achievements compared to individuals with a high internal locus of control. In previous studies by different researchers it was found that children with involved fathers had a more "internal locus of control [28-30]. These children had developed a belief that their actions are responsible for their success, not the actions of something or someone outside of them. Deficits in hope can also interfere with intimate relationships as well as non-intimate relationships. Hope has been found to be significantly and negatively related to frustrated belongingness [31]. That is, individuals with less hope tend to have more challenges with long-term personal connections with others. The outcomes of these negative interferences can lead to frustration, anxiety, suspension, withdrawal, and various insecurities. Why do these results make sense? The wisdom of the timeless proverb, "Hope deferred makes the heart sick but a longing fulfilled is a tree of life" seems to be fitting here.

The lack of willpower or "will" in the context of psychosocial development is the result of an unhealthy increase of shame or doubt in the child during early years of development. It causes the person, as a child and as an adult, to implicitly or explicitly ask the question: "Do I have what it takes?" or "Is it okay to be me?" At its extreme expression these questions can lead to deficits in self-regulation, motivation and even contribute to anxiety and negative self-belief. Compagnoni et al. [32] found that kindergarteners with a greater expression of willpower showed better behavioral self-regulation than children with a lesser expression of willpower and the children with a greater expression of willpower were less inhibited when trying to reach a learning goal. Behavioral inhibition that presents as early as the second year of a child's life has been shown to be

associated with all types of anxiety [33]. Erickson's Theory of Psychosocial development attempts to understand what causes a person to feel inadequate in their ability to endure and handle life challenges and problems (i.e. self-doubt). Self-doubt can cause a person's learning to become overly dependent upon others as well as other outcomes related to anxiety and deficits in willpower. In an earlier review conducted by Chorpita and Barlow [34] it was found that evidence from a variety of sources suggests that early experiences that have diminished or absence of personal control may foster a thinking-style characterized by an increased probability of interpreting subsequent events as out of one's control, which may represent a vulnerability for anxiety. A study conducted by Regnerus [35] of University of Texas found that individuals who were more than likely not to have a father figure were almost 4 times more likely to be currently on public assistance, were barely half as likely to be currently employed full-time, were more than 3 times more likely to be unemployed, were 3 times as likely to have had an affair while married or cohabiting, were more likely to have "attachment" problems related to the ability to depend on others, use marijuana more frequently, smoke more frequently, and have more often pled guilty to a non-minor offense. These are dysfunctional outcomes for anyone to experience. Doubt and the lack of willpower interfere with an individual's ability to withstand the different challenges and embrace the different responsibilities that life presents. This could cause an individual to look to others to withstand their challenges in life and embrace their responsibilities. Individuals with this deficit may not consider life challenges and responsibilities to be experiences that could bring them joy in the end. So when life challenges and responsibilities emerge individuals with a willpower deficit may find themselves with an immature, unhealthy, dysfunctional and/or incomplete response. Conversely, if the individual has been able to experience mindfulness in relation to them, which contributed to the development of a growth mind set in relation to their abilities and intelligence, that individual is more likely to overcome self-doubt and establish and maintain a positive life performance [36-38]. Positive awareness of personal abilities and intellectual capacity seems to mediate the outcomes of self-doubt. Therefore, there still

seems to be hope for individuals who have a deficit in willpower as defined and characterized by the Theory of Psychosocial Development. This mediation seems to foster confidence, certainty, and self-discipline.

This study investigated different variables related to father figure type and the eight stages of the Theory of Psychosocial Development. Therefore, it is appropriate and beneficial to examine the relationship between the different stages of the Theory of Psychosocial Development. These relationships are statistically noted in Figure 3. These relationships can help with predictions about development in one stage based on the outcomes in another stage. This part of the discussion will be highlighting these outcomes in the framework and explanations from the Theory of Psychosocial Development. Haight [19] found that trust is positively related to intimacy and ego integrity, mistrust is negatively related to initiative, generativity is negatively related to mistrust, autonomy is positively related to identity, and autonomy is negatively related to isolation.

The development of the virtue of hope/faith (trust) predicts the development of the virtues of love (intimacy) and wisdom (integrity). Therefore, there seems to be a significant probability of long term effects, to some degree, of an individual completing early stages of life with the healthy development hope/faith. These developments can play a role in the ability to have affectionate adult relationships and decrease the probability of adult isolation from prosocial adult interactions as well as play a role in various variables that lead to satisfaction in life span achievements. Conversely, the increase in the deficit of the virtue of hope/faith (mistrust) seems to predict a decrease in the development in the virtue of purpose (initiative). Purpose is connected to the ability to be a self-starter and initiate personal activities. Investigative hypotheses can be considered in relation to the effects of mistrust, the lack of initiative and isolation

on an individual's satisfaction of their life span achievements.

The development of the virtue of willpower (autonomy) seems to predict the development of the virtue of fidelity (identity), which is the virtue that develops with the successful completion of the Identify versus Role Confusion stage. This means that an individual that has a healthy degree of willpower seems to have a greater probability of developing a sense of loyalty to who they become, which allows them to share an authentic integrated self with others and avoid role confusions, identity foreclosures and false self-presentations. The development of the virtue of willpower also seems to predict that a deficit in the virtue of love will not develop. That is, the individual with willpower will be able to grow into adulthood and have close relationships because they are less likely to isolate. These close relationships can be in the context of work, education, worship, friendship and/or romance. This predicted outcome may also be mediated by positive relationship between willpower and fidelity which precedes the development of the virtue of love.

A proactive approach to health and mental health versus a reactive approach has been discussed by different professionals in our society. There are certain situations in which proactivity is more achievable than others. One of the biggest reasons for this is that we live in a free society and we are free to make choices in many situations even if the choice we are making is not beneficial to our health and mental health. However, society does have avenues to educate communities even though those avenues cannot exhaust ever opportunity and need for education. A consideration of different cultures and value systems that exist also requires audiences be considered in the process of a proactive approach to health and mental health. Nevertheless, gaining a continued understanding of different life experiences such father figure type offers information that can be applied proactively and reactively to improve the lives of many.

Positive and Negative Stages		Correlation Coefficient
Trust	Intimacy	(0.54)
Trust	Ego Integrity	(0.54)
Trust	Mistrust	(-0.30)
Autonomy	Identity	(0.52)
Autonomy	Isolation	(-0.16)
Initiative	Industry	(0.52)
Initiative	Mistrust	(-0.17)
Identity	Ego Integrity	(0.56)
Intimacy	Trust	(0.54)
Generativity	Mistrust	(-0.19)

Figure 3. Notable Correlations in Hawley's Measures of Psychosocial Development (MPD)

Recommendations

The replication of an investigation such as this one is feasible and recommended. Also, this research benefits from ongoing inquiry in order to identify and include variables that might have causal powers in relation to the outcomes of this particular study. First, it is recommended that a replication of this study include a more robust measure of father figure type. This study identified father figure type by having the participants answer yes and no questions in relation to having or not having a positive or negative biological or non-biological father figure type. A more robust measure would be able to measure specific personal characteristics of the father figure and specific experiences with the father figure in order to assess and identify father figure type. This type of measure would also be able to identify specific father figure characteristics and experiences that have more causal power in relation to psychosocial development. Second, it is recommended that a replication of this study include

a robust measure of mother figure type. A robust mother figure type measure would allow for an investigation into possible positive and negative mediators in relation to psychosocial outcomes in children and adolescents. It will also increase the understanding of possible psychosocial outcomes by allowing the researcher to look at mother figure type in isolation and in conjunction with father figure type. Thirdly, it is recommended that a replication of this study include a robust measure that characterizes the presence of any older male sibling. This will call into question any similar effects of having an older male sibling on psychosocial development compared to a positive or negative biological or non-biological father figure. It will also call into question the effects of a minimal consciousness of father figure type, which may be reported as no father figure, on psychosocial development. Ongoing research that investigates relationships between father involvement and childhood and adolescent development could benefit from investigating variables

that have been found to be related to the virtues of Erikson's Theory of Psychosocial Development. It is recommended that studies focus on the relationship between father involvement and variables such as locus of control, self-control, self-concept, self-esteem, resilience/hardiness, and optimism. Ongoing studies that investigate non-traditional families and father figure type is recommended as well. These studies would investigate the relationship between two parent homes of the same-sex and psychosocial development of children and adolescents. Replicated and ongoing studies in the area of father figure involvement add to the school of research that already exist in human development and gender studies and allows for a continued opportunity to be successfully proactive and reactive in the lives of individuals.

Competing Interests: The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

References

1. Payne, D.E., & Mussen, P.H. (1956). Parent-child relations and father identification among adolescent boys. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 52, 358-362.
2. Golinkoff, R.N. & Ames, G. (1979). A comparison of fathers' and mothers' speech with their young children, *Child Development*, 50, 28-32.
3. Cashmore, J., Parkinson, P., & Taylor, A. (2008). Overnight stays and children's relationships with resident and nonresident parents after divorce. *Journal of Family Issues*, 29, 707- 733
4. Brooke-Weiss, B., & Brooke-Weiss, C. (1999). Fathers' involvement in children's lives: How dads impact risk and protective factors for healthy child development. Retrieved from <http://www.fatherlove.com/articles/riskfactors.html>
5. Harper, C., & McLanahan, S. (2004). Father absence and youth incarceration. *Research on Adolescents*, 14(3), Retrieved from <https://ezproxy.mtsu.edu:3443/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com.ezproxy.mtsu.edu/login.aspx?direct=true&db=aph&AN=14078974&site=ehost-live&scope=site>
6. Parke, M. (2003). Are married parents really better for children?. Retrieved from http://in.somnia.us/blog/wp-content/uploads/2008/08/marriage_brief3_annotated.pdf
7. Santos, P.H.S. and Silva, M.A. (2008) Retention of Vitamin C in Drying Processes of Fruits and Vegetables—A Review. *Drying Technology*, 26, 1421-1437. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07373930802458911>
8. Garcia, I.L, Fernald, L.C.H., Aboud, F.E., Otieno, R., Alu, E., & Luoto, J.E. (2022). Father involvement and early child development in a low-resource setting, *Social Science & Medicine*, 302, Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2022.114933>
9. Cabrera, N.J., Shannon, J.D., & Tamis-LeMonda, C. (2007). Fathers' Influence on Their Children's Cognitive and Emotional Development: From Toddlers to Pre-K. *Applied Development Science*, 11, 208–213
10. Ray, J.A, Choi, J., & Jackson, A.P. (2021). Adverse childhood experiences and behavior problems among poor Black children: Nonresident father involvement and single mothers' parenting stress, *Child Abuse & Neglect*, 121, Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chiabu.2021.105264>.
11. Steinbach, A. & Augustijn, L. (2022). Children's Well-Being in Sole and Joint Physical Custody Families. *Journal of Family Psychology*, 36, 301–311.
12. Sodermans, A.K & Matthijs, K. (2014). Joint Physical Custody and Adolescents' Subjective Well-Being: A Personality X Environment Interaction. *Journal of Family Psychology*, 28, 346-356.
13. Nielsen, L. (2017). Re-examining the Research on Parental Conflict, Coparenting, and Custody Arrangement. *Psychology, Public Policy, and Law*, 23, 211-231
14. Eagle, M.N. (2020). Toward an Integrated Psychoanalytic Theory: Foundation in a Revitalized Ego Psychology. *Clinical Social Work Journal*, 48, 257–266.
15. Berzoff, J.,(2022). Intersectionality: Power Differentials, Impasses and Enactments in Clinical Practice and in Supervision. *Psychoanalytic Social Work*. 6(6). <https://doi.org/10.1080/15228878.2022.2073457>
16. Schacter, D.L., Gilbert, D.T., Nock, M.K., & Wegner, D.M., (2021). *Introducing Psychology (5e)*: New York, NY: Houghton-Mifflin.
17. Belsky, J. (2010). *Experiencing the Lifespan*, 2nd ed. Worth Publishers, NY, NY, pp. 127 Berzoff, J. (2022). Inside out and outside in: Psychodynamic clinical theory and psychopathology in contemporary multicultural contexts., 5th ed., Rowman & Littlefield, Lanham, MD, US, 447.
18. Newton, N.J., Stewart, A.J., & Vandewater, E.A. (2019). "Age is opportunity": Women's personality trajectories from mid- to later-life, *Journal of Research in Personality*, 80, 43-54.
19. Haight, M.G. (2006). Psychometric Properties of Hawley's Measures of Psychosocial Development: Retrieved from <http://hdl.handle.net/2346/1060>
20. Chen, C.H. (2021). The roles of psychosocial developmental crisis and self-stigma in mental health among college students with disabilities. *International Journal of Disability, Development and Education*, 68(2), 287-302.
21. Hawley, W.A., (1988). The biology of *Aedes albopictus*. *J Am Mosq Control Assoc Suppl*; 1:1-39.
22. Zhang, Y.-C., C.N. Long, W.B. Rossow, and E.G. Dutton, 2010: Exploiting diurnal variations to evaluate the ISCCP-FD flux calculations and radiative-flux-analysis-processed surface observations from BSRN, ARM and SURFRAD. *J. Geophys. Res.*, 115, D15105, doi:10.1029/2009JD012743.
23. Lentz, A.S. (2021). Evidence for relationships between hope, resilience, and mental health among youth, *Journal of Counseling & Development*, 99, 96-103.
24. Chai, W.Y., Kwok, S.Y.C. L. & Gu, M. (2018). Autonomy-granting parenting and child depression: The moderating roles of hope and life satisfaction. *Journal of Child and Family Studies*, 27(8), 2596-2607.
25. Du, H. & King, R.B. (2013). Placing hope in self and others: Exploring the relationships among self-construals, locus of hope, and adjustment. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 54 (3), Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2012.09.015>
26. Roland, A.M. (2022). Hope as a mechanism of resilience, Dissertation Abstracts International: Section B: *The Sciences and Engineering*, 83, 10-B.
27. Brackney, B.E. & Westman, A.S. (1992). Relationships among hope, psychosocial development, and locus of control. *Psychological Reports*, 70(3, Pt 1), 864-866.
28. Pleck, J. H. (1997). Paternal involvement: Levels, sources, and consequences. In M. E. Lamb (Ed.), *The role of the father in child development* (pp. 66–103)
29. Pruett, K. D. (1993). The Paternal Presence. *Families in Society*, 74(1), 46–50. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1177/104438949307400105>
30. Radin, N. (1994). Primary-caregiving fathers in intact families. In A. E. Gottfried & A. W. Gottfried (Eds.), *Redefining families: Implications for children's development* (pp. 11– 54). Plenum Press. Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4899-0961-9_2

31. Umphrey, L.R., Sherblom, J.C., & Swiatkowski, P. (2021). Relationship of Self-Compassion, Hope, and Emotional Control to Perceived Burdensomeness, Thwarted Belongingness, and Suicidal Ideation; *The Journal of Crisis Intervention and Suicide Prevention*, 42(2), 121-127
32. Compagnoni, M., Sieber, J. & Job, V. (2020). My brain needs a break: Kindergarteners' willpower theories are related to behavioral self-regulation. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 11, Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org.ezproxy.mtsu.edu/10.3389/fpsyg.2020.601724>
33. Paulus, F.W., Backes, A., Sander, C.S., Weber, M. & Gontard, A. (2014). Anxiety disorders and behavioral inhibition in preschool children: A population-based study. *Child Psychiatry and Human Development*, 46(1), 150-157
34. Chorpita, B.F. & Barlow, D.H. (1998). The development of anxiety: The role of control in the early environment. *Psychological Bulletin*, 124(1), 3-21.
35. Regnerus, M. (2012). How different are the adult children of parents who have same-sex relationships? Findings from the New Family Structures Study. *Social Science Research*, 41(4), 752-770.
36. Peer, J.W. & McAuslan, P. (2016). Self-doubt during emerging adulthood: The conditional mediating influence of mindfulness. *Emerging Adulthood*, 4(3). 176-185.
37. Zhao, Q., Wichman, A., & Frishberg, E. (2017). Self-Doubt effects depend on beliefs about ability: Experimental evidence. *The Journal of General Psychology*, 146(3), 299-324.
38. Zhao, Q., Gong, L., & Chen, T. (2021). Impacts of growth mindset and concern with performance on resilience to self-doubt in American and Chinese students. *Social Psychology of Education*, 24, 1585–1606.