DOI: 10.14691/CPPJ.20.2.199

# Image of God and the father among adolescent boys

Wioletta Radziwiłłowicz\*

Instytut Psychologii, Uniwersytet Gdański, Gdańsk

#### Michał Tracz

Wyższe Seminarium Duchowne Karmelitów Bosych, Poznań

The aim of the study was to analyze the relations between the image of a father and his parental attitudes and the image of God among adolescent boys. The principal assumptions of object relations theory and attachment theory and analysis was carried out in specific groups of adolescents: A group of boys from the resocialization Salesian Education Centre, and a group of boys studying in Salesian Secondary School (Catholic school). In total, 61 boys aged from 14 to 19 years (M=16.46, SD=1.1) were examined. Methods of the study: The Parent-Child Relations Questionnaire (Roe & Siegelman), God Image Questionnaire (Lawrence), Measurement of Religious Concepts (Gorsuch, 1968), Scale of God Loving and Control (Benson & Spilka). The boys from the Education Centre compared with the boys from the Secondary School perceived their father as less loving and more controlling. Father's dominating parental attitudes were: high attitude of rejecting and low attitude of loving. The image of God in both groups did not differ significantly. He was seen as a loving one and the boys from the Secondary School saw him as more controlling and omnipotent than the boys from the Education Centre. The boys from the Education Centre perceive God as less distant and fearful than their own father, whereas the boys from the Secondary School conversely, as more distant and fearful. Relations that were revealed between the image of a father and the image of God, were connected with father's demanding attitude and perception of God as accepting, present, posing challenges for the boys from the Secondary School. For the boys from the Education Centre, the more rejecting the father was, the more God was seen as less omnipotent. These results partially confirm the compensation model (the boys from the Education Centre) and the correspondence model (the boys from the Secondary School).

Key words: Father's image, God image, adolescence, attachment theory, object relations theory

## INTRODUCTION

Religion can be defined as the experiential encounter of the human being with the Holy and responsive conduct of the human being (Mensching, 1959). It is an attitude towards a definite object (sacrum), the personal God in Christianity. This attitude is in its structure analogous to human relationships and, although it refers to a specific object (Jarosz, 2003; 2006), it can become a subject of research and discussion in psychology.

The most fundamental concept of religion defined in a such way is the idea of God (Tokarski, 2011). According to the paradigm accepted in this paper, this concept is not inborn (nativist theory), but formed gradually in the mind of a child during the process of socialization and modified by the individual's own emotional experience and actions (Król, 2006). The image of God is formed by the individual's cognitive and emotional schemes which shape a certain concept of divinity and determine attitudes and behavior towards it (Kuczkowski, 1998). Lawrence (unpublished doctoral dissertation, 1991, quoting: Hall & Sorenson, 1999a) distinguished between the God concept and God image. God concept refers to an intellectual definition of God and is understood as a real (objective) meaning of the term (denotative meaning). It is accompanied by various connotative meanings colouring them emotionally and it expresses a personal, evaluative relation to this concept (Walesa, 2005). Which means image of God is a set of remembered and interpreted associations and experiences saturated with a certain affective laden. It is worth mentioning that, despite distinction above, these terms are very often used interchangeably in specialist literature (Król, 1982b).

Analyzing the idea of God and other religious concepts, we should be aware that "full semantic structure of a given thing is very complex and multi-layered. It depends on the external features of the thing, on the accompanying external conditions as well as on the internal, subjective characteristics of the assessing person (...). Hence, in a human being, each religious word is surrounded by a specific aura which is oriented and cognitive (...), emotional and motivational (...), decision-making, executive and expressive" (Walesa, 2005, p. 252).

<sup>\*</sup> Korespondencję dotyczącą artykułu można kierować na adres: Wioletta Radziwiłłowicz, Instytut Psychologii, Uniwersytet Gdański. e-mail: psywr@univ.gda.pl

There are certain psychosocial and cultural factors that strongly influence the definite image of God that is formed in an individual person. Among them: the family (relationship with parents), peer milieu, processes of socialization and education (Chlewiński, 1977; Potvin, 1977; Tokarski, 2011). Psychologists generally stress the importance of parent-child relationship and parental images for the formation of God concept. The most fundamental and historically earliest view, confirmed by many studies, is that the image of God is mostly influenced by the father (Potvin, 1977; Justice & Lambert, 1986; Limke & Mayfield, 2011). Researches indicate also that God image depends on the image of mother (Nelson & Jones, 1957, quoting: Król, 1982b, 1989). The largest number of researchers believe that God image is influenced by both parents (Potvin, 1977; Birky & Ball, 1988; Dickie et al., 1997, 2006). This view is confirmed by a Polish research conducted by Kuczkowski (1982) which also shows that God image is influenced by both a mother and a father.

Some authors suggest that the figure of a male parent is more important for females while the figure of a female parent is more important for males (Godin & Hallez, 1964; Deconchy, 1968, both quoting: Potvin, 1977). On the other hand, there are also findings showing a tendency for God image to become similar to samesex parent image what is in accordance with the theory of social learning and the mechanisms of modeling and imitation (Kuczkowski, 1998). Others claim that the crucial factor is not so much parent sex as a stronger bond with a parent (Nelson, 1971; Stewart, 1967, both quoting: Potvin, 1977).

The number of theories and certain inconsistency of results may point to the fact that it is a very complex reality affected by many different factors. However, considering past and current studies it can be concluded that experiences from childhood (and adolescence) have an essential influence on a personal image of God. These experiences have permanent consequences and the later ones can only have a corrective influence.

What are the psychological mechanisms underlying the formation of the image of God? Król (1982b) lists four fundamental ones: Imitation – replicating the behavior of other people; Identification – becoming like another person, one of the parents or a significant figure, whereby a child assimilates attitudes toward religion and God by the model the other provides; Projection – a unconscious mechanism that involves taking one's own qualities or feelings and ascribing them to God; Generalization – a tendency to respond to others, even to God, with feelings experienced in contact with another person.

Contemporary psychology of religion emphasizes not so much the "pure" mechanism of projection of definite father/mother image onto the image of God but rather the effect the emotional attitude to parents has on His image (Król, 2006). Redirection of negative or positive emotions (which appear in contact with parents) to other people, and also to God, takes place in accordance with the process of generalization (irradiation) of feelings. If a child experiences love and learns to respond to feelings of sympathy, treats adults with confidence, they will naturally form a similar relationship with other people and with God. Furthermore, they will expect love and trust that were experienced in their relationship with their parents. The emotional climate of childhood home is crucial not only for the functioning of a person in adulthood but also for the development and forming of God image (Leist, 1982, quoting: Król, 2006).

# GOD IMAGE IN PSYCHOANALYTIC THEORY

Psychoanalysis recognize the early parent-child relationship as a fundamental factor for the development and formation of personality. This applies also to the religious sphere and the process of shaping God image.

According to Freud, the image of God is a projection of feelings and attitudes towards own father. At the age of 3 - 4 years children "deify" their father and tend to ascribe him attributes of absolute: omnipotence and omniscience. But when, at some point of their lives, they discover the limits of that ideal father's image, they experience feelings of deep frustration which can be overcame by projecting these features and the need for security onto God (Bovet, 1951, quoting: Król, 1982b; Rümke, 1952). "Every man creates God in the image and likeness of father and our personal relation to God depends on our relation to our physical father: this relationship changes as their father changes. God is in fact nothing but an exalted father" (Freud, 1998, p. 365). Freud used several terms for the process that transforms the paternal imago into the God image - these are as follows: an exalted father, a transfiguration of father, a likeness of father, a sublimation of father, a surrogate of father, a substitute of father, a copy of father. God really is the father (quoting: Rizzuto, 1979, p. 31).

The above theory is confirmed by a therapeutic practice. Patients who described their parents as strict, violent, aggressive personalities admitted that they were unable to imagine God different from a strict, awesome power (Kuczkowski, 1998). The anger directed toward God is very often a result of unsatisfactory relationship with a father, associated mainly with constant mutual struggle (Rümke, 1952).

# GOD IMAGE IN OBJECT RELATIONS THEORY

The object relations theory assumes that the fundamental need of each person is the need for interpersonal bond (relationship). The personalities of adults and their inner lives are strongly influenced by the relation between an infant and a mother in an early childhood. According to this theory, God image is always rooted in these bonds."The image of God protects a person and expresses the sense of fullness, feeding and wellness experienced at the very beginning by fusion with primary caregiver (usually mother). It protects the child against the effects of the earliest separation and at the same time maintains the lively and hopeful legacy of the primeval fusion experienced in the earliest months of life" (Helfaer, 1972, quoting: Molenda, 2006, p. 247). God can be regarded as an idealized object, represented mentally in a similar way to the idealized mother.

Rizzuto (1979) contributed to deepening the understanding of God image by analyzing it as a transitional object. The term was introduced by Winnicott (1971) and originally referred to items such as: toys, clothes, parents' belongings, etc.) which in moments of fear and threats consolation the child and gave a sense of security. According to the author, God is such transitional object, but unlike the other transitional objects, He doesn't lose importance and significance over the years (*decathexis*). He never disappears and is always potentially available.

A child, according to own needs, creates God image of the available material received from the primary objects and first experiences. The mental process of forming God image does not end, but lasts for the whole life.

### GOD IMAGE IN ATTACHMENT THEORY

Attachment theory assumes the existence of a complex attachment system that has emotional, motivational and behavioral dimensions and is developed in the process of natural selection aiming to maintain proximity between a helpless child and his caregiver, or attachment figure (Kirkpatrick, 1998). Attachment-related behaviors create an emotional bond between a parent and a child. Although they are especially visible during childhood, they are present throughout the whole life.

Kirkpatrick (1998) was the first to assume that attachment theory gives a theoretical framework for understanding many aspects of religion, including the belief in personal God, who can be described as a secure attachment figure. "The idea of God is an idea of an absolutely adequate attachment-figure (...) God is regarded as a protective parent who is reliable and always available to children when they are in need" (Kaufman, 1981, quoting: Kirkpatrick & Shaver, 1990, p. 318). There are two models explaining the formation of God image and the relationship with Him.

The fist one is the correspondence model. Its adherents would suggest that securely attached individuals develop a more positive image of God (more loving, less distant and controlling), an image that is consistent with the internal representation of the attachment figure. In contrast, people with avoidant-insecure attachment style would rather keep away from religion and relationship with God (Kirkpatrick & Shaver, 1990; Brokaw & Edwards, 1994; Hall, Brokaw, Edwards & Pike, 1998; Kirkpatrick, 2005).

The second approach, the compensation model, focuses on the dynamics of the attachment system and hence assumes that God is a substitute attachment figure. Children can create an idealized image of God in order to compensate for a defective bond with parents. Therefore, individuals lacking secure attachment are willing to turn to God, seeking support and safety in Him (Kirkpatrick & Shaver, 1990; Granqvist, 1998; Kirkpatrick, 1998; Granqvist & Hagekull, 2001).

There are also attempts to integrate these models and the confirming data them (Granqvist & Hagekull, 1999; 2001; McDonald, Beck, Allisin & Norsworthy, 2005). It is probable that a person showing an insecure attachment style is strongly motivated to turn to God as a substitute attachment figure (compensation model). On the other hand, individuals showing a secure attachment style easily form a positive relationship with God (correspondence model).

## THE PRESENT STUDY

### RESEARCH PROBLEM

The presence of the father in the process of education is not only important and necessary, but also irreplaceable. It is believed that the father in a family represents a certain social order, rules and values, thus exerts a significant influence on a social and moral development of the child (Meerloo, 1956, quoting: Biller, 1971). The boy's proper identification with his father entails the internalization of values and moral standards, which contribute to the formation of his conscience (Hollmanm, 1971; Biller, 1971). Its absence leads very often to serious conflicts with social norms and to criminal behavior. Many studies indicate that the condition for the boy's proper identification is the experience of positive interaction with his father, further, a strong emotional bond with him, also seeing him as a strong, effective, successful and admired person, which makes the son wants to become like a father (Wolicki, 1983). A father gives his son stimuli and patterns of social and moral development which a mother are not able to offer him (entirely or in such a wide range) (Witczak, 1987; Ogletree, Jones & Coyle, 2002; Parke et al., 2004).

This above refers to the comprehensive development of a young person, so also to the sphere of religion, in which the concept of God takes a central place. Research suggests that family environment plays a fundamental role not only in the later functioning of the child in relation to other people, but also in forming God image (Leist, 1982, quoting: Król, 2006). A child with a certain experience of relationship with their parents, enters the social life and on the basis of that previous experiences moulds attitudes and expectations and also expects similar experiences to parental in contact with other people (including God). When the family environment is full of negative emotions, a child may have a tendency to treat others as a potential threat, react with fear, escape or aggression (Gerstmann, 1976, quoting: Król, 1982b). Child's emotional experiences in contact with a father tend to be generalized and transferred to God image. For example, "if a father is a tyrant, if the child is accustomed to tremble before him in fear, and God is called

the Father, is it possible that none of that tyrant image of earthly father has been transferred to the image of God the Father?" (Haendler 1954, quoting: Król, 1982b).

Many studies support the theory that shaping God's concept is influenced mainly by the emotional experiences derived from the structure of a family environment, among which the influence of a father are decisive (Król, 1989), because, as already has been mentioned, he embodies the "higher order of life, he is the source of higher orders, he is experienced by the child as the smartest, strongest, omniscient. He grows in a remarkable figure, the child's fate and misery depends on him, he knows everything and anything can (...). This image of a father, which has different variations of judgment, is being created in the minds of every child and from the angle of that image he or she sees the world, evaluates things and people, and forms God concept" (Król, 1982b, p. 205). Literature and studies conducted so far indicate the existence of a strong link between the image of one's own father and the image of God (Król, 1982a).

This research is an another attempt to taking up this issue, assuming the object relations theory and attachment theory, in specific groups of adolescents: a group of the boys from Education Centre and a group of the boys attending catholic Secondary School.

#### **RESEARCH QUESTIONS AND HYPOTHESES**

On the basis of the theory and current research we can formulate the following questions:

- Question 1: Are there differences in the image of a father between the boys from Education Centre and the boys from Secondary School?
- Question 2: Are there differences in the perception of God's between the boys from Education Centre and Secondary School?
- Question 3: Are there relationships between fathers' parental attitudes and God image in boys in the both groups studied?

In the context of the above research questions the following hypotheses are set:

- Hypothesis 1: The boys from Education Centre perceive their own fathers and their parental attitudes more negatively than the boys from Secondary School.
- Hypothesis 2: The boys from the Education Centre perceive God more negatively than boys from Secondary School.
- Hypothesis 3a: The positive image of the father and appropriate parental attitudes are associated with a positive image of God.
- Hypothesis 3b: The negative image of the father and inappropriate parental attitudes are associated with the negative image of God.

#### METHOD

#### PARTICIPANTS

In order to verify the hypotheses formulated above the research was conducted among two groups of adolescents: 27 boys from the resocialization Salesian Education Centre (hereinafter: Education Centre) in Rzepczyno nearby Świdwin (Poland) and 34 boys from the Salesian Secondary School (hereinafter: Secondary School) in Rumia (Poland).

In total, 61 boys aged from 14 to 19 years participated in this study. The mean age the boys from Education Centre was 16.67 years (SD=1.27, min.=14, max.=19) and the mean age of the boys from Secondary School was 16.21 years (SD=1.04, min.=15, max.=19). Analysis of Student's *t*-test for independent groups showed that the differences between groups in terms of age were nonsignificant [t(59)=-1.56; n.s.].

All the boys declared their affiliation to the Catholic Church. The level of a religious commitment and a subjective level of faith were examined. The groups did not differ significantly in terms of the level of involvement in religious practices  $[\chi^2(3)=2.83; n.s.]$  nor of the level of faith  $[\chi^2(4)=2.29; n.s]$ . In both groups the respondents declared small/moderate involvement in religious practices and an average (less often quite high) level of faith.

The study groups did not differ in the number of siblings [ $\chi^2(7)=13.38$ ; p<.06; statistical tendency]. The groups differ significantly in terms of education level of father's [ $\chi^2(5)=29.15$ ; p<.001] and mother's [ $\chi^2(4)=$ 18.07; p < .01]. Mothers (61.8%) and the fathers (64.7%) of the boys from Secondary School mostly had higher education, then vocational secondary education (17.6% of mothers and 20.6% of fathers), secondary education (11.8% of mothers and 5.9% of fathers) and not have completed secondary education (8.8% of mothers and 8.8% of fathers). In the group of the boys from Education Centre only 3.7% of mothers and 3.7% of fathers had higher education. Most of the parents (40.7% of mothers and 37% of fathers) had vocational secondary education, followed by secondary education (25.9% of mothers and 29.6% of fathers), primary (11.1% of mothers and 18.5%of fathers) and not have completed secondary education (18.5% of mothers and 7.4% of fathers) education.

Furthermore, the socioeconomic status of the family were examined. The economic status as a very good were declared by 18% of the boys from Secondary School and 11% of the boys from Education Centre; as just good: 67% and 33%, respectively, as a rather good 12% and 19%. The economic status as bad or rather bad declared 3% of the boys from Secondary School and 37% of the boys from Education Centre. Integroup comparison of socioeconomic status revealed significant difference [ $\chi^2(4)=14.10; p<.01$ ].

#### MEASURES

The following measures were used in this study:

- 1. The Parent-Child Relations Questionnaire (A. Roe and M. Siegelman) in an authorized translation by W.S. Kowalski (1983). Structure of the questionnaire is closely associated with authors' typology of parental attitudes which assumes two basic concepts, Warm and Cold. From these derive another, more specific, which describe the five parental attitudes: Love (L), Reject (R), Demand (D), Casual (C) and Attention (A). PCR consists of 50 items. Respondents are taking position by four possible answers: "yes", "probably yes", "probably not" and "no", for which they receive 4, 3, 2, or 1 point, respectively. There are 10 items in each of the five scales (maximum score, providing a high intensity of the attitude, is 40 points). To our study the part of "My father" were used.
- 2. God Image Inventory (GII) by R.T. Lawrence (1991, quoting: Hall & Sorenson, 1999a, pp. 399-406), which explores the image of God understood as an affectively laden experience of God. The original English version of the questionnaire contains 156 items in six main scales measuring different aspects of God image: Presence, Challenge, Acceptance, Benevolence, Influence and Providence. In addition, there are two control scales: Faith and Salience. The instrument is scored on a four-point Likert scale: "strongly agree", "agree", "disagree", "strongly disagree". In this study the Polish experimental version was used: the questionnaire was translated from English and shortened to 112 items (16 items for each of the main scales and 8 items for control scales).

The psychometric values of original English version are satisfying. Reliability coefficients measured by Cronbach's alpha range from .86 (Challenge) to .94 (Presence) for the main scales and the control scales. Interscale correlations ranged from .84 (Presence with Influence) to .44 (Providence with Benevolence). Thus scales demonstrate a stable pattern of intercorrelatios, which indicates good temporal stability.

Convergent and discriminate validity was established by correlated the GII scales with seven other measures (Intrinsic, Extrinsic, Achievement, Self-Esteem, Altruism, Locus of Control and God Control) and turn out to be satisfying. For instance, there were computed correlation coefficients between the subscale of Influence and *Internal Locus* of Control (-.42) and God Control Scale (.50) and also between the subscale of Providence and God Control (.63) (Lawrence, 1991, quoting: Hall & Sorenson, 1999a).

3. *Religious Concept Survey* (RCS) by R.L. Gorsuch (1968) containing 91 adjectives among which, some are closely related to God (omnipotent, holy, eternal, divine, etc.) and others usually describing people and their attitudes (strong, gentle, loving, fast,

etc.). The author describes the methods of testing psychometric properties of the instrument, however, does not provide with the values obtained.

For this study the English version was translated into Polish and also the scale of responses was expanded from three to five possibilities: "definitely yes", "yes", "yes and no", "no", "definitely not". Moreover, based on the factors determined by the author, the following factors were distinguished: Benevolence, Wrathfulness, Absence, Omnipotence, Value, Irrelevancy and Power. The guestionnaire was prepared in two versions. The first examined God image, the second Image of father (RCS-F; "F" as in "father"). Due to the fact that RCS was originally designed to measure God image, in the second version (RCS-F) the following statement was added: "Some adjectives may seem to you as completely non-matching to describe the father - try to take it metaphorically".

4. Loving and Controlling God Scales (LCGS) by P. Benson and B. Spilka (1973, quoting: Hall & Sorenson, 1999b, pp. 406-407). It measures two primary dimensions of God image: a loving and controlling. The scale contains 10 pairs of opposing adjectives. Five pairs of adjectives were used for Loving God: Damning – Saving, Rejecting – Accepting, Loving - Hating, Unforgiving - Forgiving, and Approving - Disapproving. Likewise, five pairs of adjectives were used for the Controlling God index: Demanding - Not Demanding, Freeing - Restricting, Controlling - Uncontrolling, Strict - Lenient and Permissive - Rigid. They are scored on a semantic differential scale from 0 to 6 so the maximum score for both indexes is 30 points. The scale was translated from English. Used to investigate both God image and the image of a father (LCGS-F). Psychometric properties of the scale are as follows. Reliability: scale homogeneity were examined and Cronbach's alpha coefficient was .72 for Loving God scale and .60 for Controlling God scale. Validity was proved by positive correlation between Loving God scale and self-esteem and also negative correlation between Controlling God scale and the level of object relations development as measured by the Ego Function Assessment Questionnaire (EFAQ-R), but there were not provided numerical values

# RESULTS

# IMAGE OF A FATHER

of coefficients.

Statistical analysis of the results of the assessment of fathers' parental attitudes showed that the group of boys from the Education Centre is characterized by low scores (close to very low ones) on the scale of paternal Love, the average on the scale of Demand, the average (close to low

#### Table 1

Average scores of perception of fathers' parental attitudes (PCR) by the boys from both groups

Paternal attitude	Group	М	SD	Percentiles
Love	boys from Secondary School	31,91	5.04	47
	boys from Education Centre	21,54	5.74	7
Demand	boys from Secondary School	24,94	5.83	44
	boys from Education Centre	26,46	5.52	53
Attention	boys from Secondary School	22,53	4.57	50
	boys from Education Centre	19,81	6.43	30
Reject	boys from Secondary School	16,85	5.21	32
	boys from Education Centre	24,62	5.99	90
Casual	boys from Secondary School	23,00	4.08	52
	boys from Education Centre	24,96	6.48	70
Explanation:	Percentiles	Evaluation		
	95 – 100	very hight		
	74 – 94	hight		
	27 – 73	average		
	6 – 26	low		
	0 – 5	very lov		

### Table 2

Differences in perception of fathers between the boys from two groups (LCGS-F)

Father image	Group	М	SD	t	df	р
Accepting – Rejecting	boys from Secondary School	5.21	.84			
	boys from Education Centre	2.69	2.05	6.47	58 58 58 58 58 58 58 58 58 58 58 58 58 5	.001
Saving – Damning	boys from Secondary School	4.71	.87			
	boys from Education Centre	2.58	1.76	5.86	58	.001
Loving – Hating	boys from Secondary School	5.59	.66			
	boys from Education Centre	3.19	2.08	6.33	58	.001
Approving – Disapproving	boys from Secondary School	5.18	.83			
	boys from Education Centre	2.81	1.50	7.79	58	.001
Forgiving – Unforgiving	boys from Secondary School	4.79	1.04			
	boys from Education Centre	2.73	1.91	5.36	58	.001
LOVING	boys from Secondary School	25.47	3.37			
(general score)	boys from Education Centre	14.00	8.40	7.25	58	.001
Controlling – Uncontrolling	boys from Secondary School	2.74	1.62			
	boys from Education Centre	2.92	1.90	41	58	.680
Demanding – Not Demanding	boys from Secondary School	4.82	.90			
	boys from Education Centre	3.19	2.19	3.93	58	.000
Strict – Lenient	boys from Secondary School	2.06	1.59			
	boys from Education Centre	3.50	2.06	-3.05	58	.003
Rigid – Permissive	boys from Secondary School	2.74	1.58			
	boys from Education Centre	3.35	1.79	-1.40	58	.170
Restricting – Freeing	boys from Secondary School	2.00	1.23			
	boys from Education Centre	2.69	2.24	-1.53	58	.130
CONTROLLING	boys from Secondary School	14.35	4.98			
(general score)	boys from Education Centre	15.65	7.02	84	58	.400

ones) on the scale of Attention, high results on the scale of Reject and average (close to high ones) on the scale of Casual (Table 1). The boys from Secondary School received average scores in all the scales (there were close to low ones only on the Reject scale).

The differences between the boys from Education Centre and Secondary School were statistically significant on the scales of paternal Love (t=7.44. p<.001) and Reject (t=-5.36, p<.001). Thus, the boys from Education Centre perceived their fathers as less loving and more rejecting than the boys from Secondary School.

It was also examined whether the boys from both groups differ in terms of the perception of their fathers as Loving and Controlling (LCGS-F). The analysis of Student's t-test for independent groups confirmed the results obtained in the first stage of the analysis (RCS) that the boys from Education Centre evaluate their fathers lowe on the general index of Loving (p<.001), than the boys from Secondary School, which shows itself in the perception of him as less Accepting (p<.001), Saving (p<.001), Loving (p<.001), Approving (p<.001) and Forgiving (p<.001) (Table 2).

However, the differences in the index of Controlling father were non-significant. Statistical significant were only two items – the boys from Education Centre perceived their fathers as less Demanding (p<.0002) and more Strict (p<.003) than the boys from Secondary School.

In conclusion, the results obtained allow to confirm the first hypothesis that the boys from Education Centre have more negative image of their father (and their parental attitudes) compared with the boys from Secondary School.

#### **GOD IMAGE**

Another analysis was to verify the second hypothesis according to which the boys from Education Centre perceive God more negatively than the boys from Secondary School. The analysis of the results obtained in the God Image Inventory (GII) showed no statistically significant differences between the groups. The results obtained do not allow to confirm the second hypothesis.

#### Table 3

Differences in perception of God between the boys from two groups (LCGS)

Father image	Group	М	SD	t	df	р
Accepting – Rejecting	boys from Secondary School	4.44	1.26			
	boys from Education Centre	4.72	1.97	66	57 57 57 57 57 57 57 57 57 57 57 57 57	.510
Saving – Damning	boys from Secondary School	4.74	1.11			
	boys from Education Centre	5.20	1.35	-1.45	57 57 57 57 57 57 57 57 57 57 57 57 57	.150
Loving – Hating	boys from Secondary School	5.53	.86			
	boys from Education Centre	5.00	2.02	1.37	57	.180
Approving – Disapproving	boys from Secondary School	4.85	1.46			
	boys from Education Centre	5.12	1.42	70	57	.490
Forgiving – Unforgiving	boys from Secondary School	5.32	.98			
	boys from Education Centre	5.40	1.12	28	57	.780
LOVING	boys from Secondary School	24.88	4.64			
(general score)	boys from Education Centre	25.44	4.91	44	57	.660
Controlling – Uncontrolling	boys from Secondary School	2.47	1.54			
	boys from Education Centre	1.48	2.14	2.07	57	.040
Demanding – Not Demanding	boys from Secondary School	4.35	1.45			
	boys from Education Centre	4.56	1.78	49	57	.630
Strict – Lenient	boys from Secondary School	1.79	1.41			
	boys from Education Centre	.92	1.26	2.46	57	.020
Rigid – Permissive	boys from Secondary School	2.26	1.42			
	boys from Education Centre	1.48	1.61	1.98	57	.052
Restricting – Freeing	boys from Secondary School	2.12	1.77			
	boys from Education Centre	2.16	2.41	08	57	.940
CONTROLLING	boys from Secondary School	13.00	4.41		57	.055
(general score)	boys from Education Centre	10.60	4.98	1.95		

There were also examined whether there were differences between the groups in perceiving God as Loving and Controlling (Table 3). There were no differences in the perception of God as Loving (p<.66). The analysis revealed a statistical tendency which indicates that the boys from Education Centre perceive God as less Controlling (p<.055). Thus, the boys from Secondary School perceive God as more Controlling (p<.04), Strict (p<.02) and Rigid (p<.052). However, there are not high scores (the value below average).

The analysis of the results obtained in the RCS indicate no significant intergroup differences in the perception of God's Benevolence, Wrathfulness, Absence, Value and Irrelevancy. The only feature differing both groups concerned God's Omnipotence (t=3.48, p<.0009), where the boys from Secondary School received significantly higher scores (M=18.76, SD=1.94) than the boys from Education Centre (M=15.15, SD=.66).

In conclusion, the image of God in the group of the boys from Education Centre and Secondary School did not differ significantly. In both groups God was seen as a Loving. The only significant differences concerned perception of God by the boys from Secondary School as more Controlling and more Omnipotent than by the boys from Education Centre.

### COMPARISON OF THE FATHER'S AND GOD'S CHARACTERISTICS IN THE STUDIED GROUPS

The results of the analysis above (indicating existence of significant intergroup differences in fathers' parental attitudes and also very similar perceiving of God in both groups of the boys) became the reasons to analyze simultaneously similarities and differences in the boys' images of father and God. Therefore, images of God and father within the two groups there were compared in terms of 91 characteristics (RCS's adjectives).

In the group of the boys from Secondary School father's and God's differed significantly in 41 characteristics (Appendix – Table 5). Taking into account intensity of the features and the level of significance of the differences it can be observed that many characteristics (e.g. All-wise, Blessed, Holy, Infinite, Omnipotent, Omnipresent, Powerful, Steadfast) were attributed uniquely to God. Many features were common to a father and God, such as Blunt, Comforting, Considerate, Fair, Helpful, Important, Protective, Righteous, Safe, Warm. At the same time, a father and God were not seen as Avenging, Cruel, Dangerous, False, Feeble, Jealous.

Whereas, in the boys from Education Centre a father and God differed in terms of 70 characteristics (Appendix – Table 6). God, in comparison with a father, was Omnipotent, Omniscient, Powerful, Eternal, Blunt, Charitable, Comforting, Considerate, Creative, Fair, Fatherly, Glorious, Lenient, Patient, Protective, Safe, Helpful, Supporting, etc. While a father was described as Critical, Cruel, Damning, False, Wrathful, etc. The configuration of the results above inspired the author's to prepare the overall table of similarities ("0") and differences ("+"/"-") in the image of God and a father in both groups (Table 4). "0" means that the difference was statistically non-significant (it may indicate the likeness of God and a father in terms of given characteristic). "+" means assessing God higher than a father, while "-" lower, in terms of given characteristic.

Moreover, two characteristics that differ in sign in the two groups (in addition to the features described above) appear to be very interesting. The boys from Education Centre perceive God as less Distant and Fearful than their own father, whereas the boys from Secondary School conversely, as more Distant and Fearful.

# RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE IMAGE OF A FATHER AND GOD IMAGE IN THE STUDIED GROUPS

Last hypothesis assumed that a positive image of a father was associated with a positive image of God, and conversely, the negative image of a father was associated with the negative image of God. The analysis of the results of God Image Inventory (GII) and The Parent-Child Relations Questionnaire (PCR) did not reveal any correlation between parental attitudes and the image of God in the group of the boys from Education Centre.

Also in the group of the boys from Secondary School expected correlation was not observed. The analysis revealed only a moderate positive correlation between the father's Demanding attitude and perception of God as Accepting (r=.348, p<.05), Present (r=.372, p<.05) and Challenging (r=.429, p<.05). This means that the boys whose father was more demanding perceive God as being more accepting, more experience his presence in their lives and they see him as someone who puts out new challenges, constantly calls for development and overcoming difficulties.

The analysis of PCR's and RCS's results showed no correlation between them. In the group of the boys from Secondary School there were no significant correlations, while in the group of the boys from Education Centre there were just one moderate negative correlation between the Rejecting attitude of a father and the perception of God's Omnipotence (r=-.429, p<.05). Thus, the results obtained do not allow to completely confirm third hypothesis.

# DISCUSSION

# HYPOTHESIS 1. THE INTERGROUP DIFFERENCES IN THE IMAGE OF A FATHER

The results obtained confirm the hypothesis that the boys from Education Centre have a more negative image of their father and his parental attitudes compared with the boys from Secondary School. The boys from Education Centre perceive their fathers as less loving and more

### Table 4

Similarities ("0") and differences ("+"/"-") in the image of God and the father in two groups (RCS)

	ltem	Boys from Education Centre	Boys from Secondary School	_
1.	Absolute	+	+	_
2.	Active	+	0	_
3.	All-wise	+	+	_
4.	Avenging	_	0	_
5.	Blessed	+	+	-
6.	Blunt	+	0	_
7.	Charitable	+	0	_
8.	Comforting	+	0	_
9.	Considerate	+	0	_
10.	Controlling	+	0	_
11.	Creative	+	+	
12.	Critical	-	-	_
13.	Cruel	-	0	_
14.	Damning	-	0	_
15.	Dangerous	-	0	
16.	Demanding	0	0	_
17.	Democratic	-	-	_
18.	Distant	-	+	-
19.	Divine	+	+	_
20.	Eternal	+	+	_
21.	Everlasting	+	+	_
22.	Fair	+	0	_
23.	Faithful	+	+	-
24.	False	-	0	_
25.	Fast	0	0	_
26.	Fatherly	+	0	_
27.	Fearful	-	+	_
28.	Feeble	_	0	_
29.	Firm	0	0	-
30.	Forgiving	+	+	_
31.	Formal	+	0	_
32.	Gentle	+	+	_
33.	Glorious	+	+	_
34.	Gracious	+	+	-
35.	Guiding	+	0	-
36.	Hard	0	0	_
37.	Helpful	+	0	-
38.	Holy	+	+	_
39.	Impersonal	0	+	_
40.	Important	+	0	_
41.	Inaccessible	0	+	_
42.	Infinite	+	+	-
43.	Jealous	-	0	
44.	Just	+	0	
45.	Kind	+	0	E C

	- 3		
46.	Kingly	+	+
47.	Lenient	+	+
48.	Loving	+	0
49.	Majestic	+	+
50.	Matchless	0	+
51.	Meaningful	+	0
52.	Meek	+	+
53.	Merciful	+	+
54.	Moving	+	0
55.	Mythical	0	+
56.	Omnipotent	+	+
57.	Omnipresent	+	+
58.	Omniscient	+	+
59.	Patient	+	+
60.	Passive	0	0
61.	Permissive	0	+
62.	Powerful	+	+
63.	Protective	+	0
64.	Punishing	0	0
65.	Real	0	
66.	Redeeming	+	0
67.	Restrictive	0	
68.	Righteous	+	0
69.	Safe	+	0
70.	Severe		0
71.	Sharp	0	0
72.	Slow	0	0
73.	Soft	+	+
74.	Sovereign	+	+
75.	Steadfast	+	+
76.	Stern	т	0
70.	Still	0	+
78.		+	+
70. 79.	Strong	+	
	Supporting		0
80.	Timely	0	
81.	Tough	+	0
82.	True	0	0
83.	Unchanging	+	0
84.	Unyielding	+	0
85.	Valuable	+	0
86.	Vigorous	0	-
87.	Weak	0	0
88.	Warm	+	0
89.	Worthless	0	0
90.	Wrathful	-	0
91.	Yielding	0	_

Explanation: "+" – assessing God higher than the father, "–" assessing God lower than the father, "0" – statistically non-significant

controlling in comparison with the boys from Secondary School. The dominant parental attitudes indicated by the boys from Education Centre were high attitude of rejecting and low (close to very low ones) loving attitude. In addition, consistent with the results above the analysis of the Salesian Education Centre's documentation indicated that most of that boys experienced pathological behavior from their fathers. These were: aggression (N = 9), alcohol abuse (N = 10), mental cruelty to them or mother (N = 11) and physical violence against them or a mother (N = 10). Four fathers got a sentence and four were unemployed for a long time. These traumatic events did not occur in the group of the boys Secondary School. It can be concluded, although the issues above was not the subject of the analysis in the paper, that the father's failure to fulfill parental, socialization and economic roles seems to be an important factors in the mechanism of social maladjustment adolescent boys. That image of a father confirms data on the transmission of psychopathology in the family. Well, father's psychopathological symptoms are strongly associated with child's externalizing disorders while a mother's psychopathological symptoms with child's internalizing disorders (Radziwiłłowicz, 2010). Moreover, a higher degree of negative feelings showed to a son may be associated with lower levels of emotional and social competences such as ineffective and inappropriate action in behavior in social situations, difficulties in interacting with others, less prosocial behaviors as well as greater amount of aggressive and destructive behavior (Foster, Reese-Weber & Kahn, 2007). On the other hand, many features such as self-confidence, assertiveness and general social competences are related to the warm relationship between a father and a son (Hoffman, 1961, quoting: Biller, 1971).

# HYPOTHESIS 2. THE INTERGROUP DIFFERENCES IN GOD IMAGE

The second problem concerned the existence of the differences in God image between the boys from Secondary School and Education Centre. The analysis of the results has not brought the discovery of significant differences. The image of God in the boys in both groups is similar.

There were only few differences between the groups in the perception of God's omnipotence, the boys from Education Centre assessed it significantly lower. In addition, they evinced a greater tendency to perceive God as less controlling (i.e. uncontrolling, lenient and permissive) than the boys from Secondary School. Therefore, from object relations' perspective, it can be assumed that God perceived by the boys from both groups as loving is a good object.

### HYPOTHESES 3A AND 3B. THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN PARENTAL ATTITUDES AND GOD IMAGE

The last question of the study concerned the correlation between parental attitudes of fathers and the sons' God image. The analysis of the results have not led to confirmation the expected correlations.

The only significant positive correlation concerned the father's Demanding attitude and the perception of God as Accepting, Present and Challenging in the boys from Secondary School. The more the father was demanding the more God was seen as accepting, present and putting challenging. However, the analogous correlations did not occur in the group of the boys from Education Centre. In this group a moderate negative correlation between the father's Rejecting attitude and the Omnipotence of God was revealed. The more the father was rejecting the more God was seen as less powerful. These results can be interpreted based on the attachment theory. Children are usually very helpless in impacting the environment which they live in. Such power – in the experience of the boys from Education Centre – might also not have God.

However, intra-group comparison of the characteristics attributed to a father and God showed that in the group of the boys from Secondary School a father and God differed significantly in 41 features, while in the group of the boys from Education Centre in 70 (of 91 features). The boys from Secondary School attributed to God typical characteristics of deity (omniscient, omnipotent, infinite, etc.). Both God and a father were characterized by characteristics closely related to secure attachment and a good object (comforting, important, protective, safe, etc.). However, a father and God were not perceived as bad objects, i.e. cruel, dangerous, avenging, etc. Alike in the group of the boys from Education Centre God had many characteristics of a good object and secure attachment relationship, a father had characteristics of a bad object (cruel, damning, critical) which indicate insecure attachment. The results of the group of the boys from Education Centre could partly confirm compensation model, according to which people who have a deficiency of a secure relationship are willing to turn to God seeking in him support and security. Children can create an idealized image of God in order to compensate for their fathers' deficit (Kirkpatrick & Shaver, 1990; Kirkpatrick, 1998; Dickie et al., 2006). It can be assumed with prudence that the boys from Education Centre idealize God more than the boys in the second group, believing it to be more lenient, permissive and uncontrolling, and less fearful and distant. Whereas, in the group of the boys from Secondary School images of a father and God are more consistent with the correspondence model according to which God image is consistent with the representation of the attachment figure. However, to confirm these assumptions with more confidence, further research should be carried out.

# CONCLUSION

The results only partially confirmed stated hypotheses. The relationships between the images of parents and God image are very complex and difficult to identify in one study. It is advisable to continue to seek a specific

processes and relationships in a diverse contexts which lead to forming a specific God image. And this occur throughout life. During childhood parents play a fundamental role, their attitudes and prevailing in the family the overall emotional climate. Then a school-age child obtains systematic knowledge about God on the lessons of religion and has the ability to participate more actively in the religious life of the community of believers. Finally, during adolescence, a young person begins to make a critical analysis of current knowledge and experience: is wondering, asking, seeking, evaluating and questioning very often. During this time religious involvement (or its lack) becomes a personal choice. It is also the time in which previously formed God image (mostly unconsciously) is likely to be subjected to conscious reflection and possible corrective actions.

#### REFERENCES

- Biller, H.B. (1971). Father, child and sex role. Paternal determinants of personality development. Lexington: Heath Lexington Books.
- Birky, I.T., Ball, S. (1988). Parental trait tnfluence on God as an object representation. *Journal of Psychology: Interdisciplinary and Applied*, 122, 2, 133-137.
- Brokaw, B.F., Edwards, K.J. (1994). The relationship of God image to level of object relations development. *Journal of Psychology and Theology*, 22, 352-371.
- Chlewiński, Z. (1977). Psychologiczne uwarunkowanie idei Boga. W: M. Jaworski, A. Kubiś (red.), *Teologia nauką* o Bogu. IV Kongres Teologów Polskich Kraków-Mogiła 14-16 IX 1976 (s. 135-154). Kraków: Polskie Towarzystwo Teologiczne.
- Dickie, J.R., Eshleman, A.K., Merasco, D.M., Shepard, A., Vander Wilt, M., Johnson, M. (1997). Parent-child relationships and children's images of God. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 36, 1, 25-43.
- Dickie, J.R., Ajega, L.V., Kobylak, J.R., Nixon, K.M. (2006). Mother, father, and self: Sources of young adults' God concepts. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 45, 1, 57-71.
- Foster, P.A., Reese-Weber, M., Kahn, J.H. (2007). Fathers' parenting hassles and coping: Associations with emotional expressiveness and their sons' socioemotional competence. *Infant and Child Development*, 16, 277-293.
- Freud, Z. (1998). Totem i tabu. Kilka zgodności w życiu psychicznym dzikich i neurotyków. W: Z. Freud (red.), *Pisma społeczne* (s. 241-375). Warszawa: Wydawnictwo KR.
- Gorsuch, R.L. (1968). The conceptualization of God as seen in adjective ratings. Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, 7, 56-64.
- Granqvist, P. (1998). Religiousness and perceived childhood attachment: On the question of compensation or correspondence. Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, 37, 2, 350-367.
- Granqvist, P., Hagekull, B. (1999). Religiousness and perceived childhood attachment: Profiling socialized correspondence and emotional compensation. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 38, 254-273.
- Granqvist, P., Hagekull, B. (2001). Seeking security in the new age: On attachment and emotional compensation. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, 40*, 529-547.

- Hall, T.W., Sorenson, R.L. (1999a). God Image Inventory (Lawrence, 1991). W: P.C. Hill, R.W. Hood Jr. (red.), *Measures of religiosity* (s. 399-406). Birmingham: Religious Education Press.
- Hall, T.W., Sorenson, R.L. (1999b). Loving and Controlling God Scales (Benson i Spilka, 1973). W: P.C. Hill, R.W. Hood Jr. (red.), *Measures of religiosity* (s. 406-407). Birmingham: Religious Education Press.
- Hall, T.W., Brokaw, B.F., Edwards, K.J., Pike, P.L. (1998). An empirical exploration of psychoanalysis and religion: Spiritual maturity and object relations development. Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, 37, 2, 303-313.
- Hollman, L.M. (1971). Identification and conscience development. Child Development, 42, 1071-1081.
- Jarosz, M. (2003). Interpersonalne uwarunkowania religijności. Lublin: Towarzystwo Naukowe KUL.
- Jarosz, M. (2006). Relacja do Boga w psychologii religii. W: S. Głaz (red.), Podstawowe zagadnienia psychologii religii. Kraków: Wydawnictwo WAM, 253-270.
- Justice, W.G., Lambert, W. (1986). A comparative study of the language people use to describe the personalities of God and their earthly parents. *Journal of Pastoral Care*, 40, 2, 166-172.
- Kirkpatrick, L.A. (1998). God as a substitute attachment figure: A longitudinal study of adult attachment style and religious change in college students. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 24, 9,* 961-973.
- Kirkpatrick, L.A. (2005). Attachment, evolution and the psychology of religion. New York: Guilford Press.
- Kirkpatrick, L.A., Shaver, P.R. (1990). Attachment theory and religion: Childhood attachments, religious beliefs, and conversion. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Reli*gion, 29, 3, 315-334.
- Kowalski, W.S. (1983). Kwestionariusz stosunków między rodzicami a dziećmi A. Roe i M. Siegelmana. Warszawa: Wydawnictwa Radia i Telewizji.
- Król, J. (1982a). Wpływ posiadanego obrazu ojca na pojęcie Boga u młodzieży. Roczniki Filozoficzne KUL, 30, 4, 73-103.
- Król, J. (1982b). Wpływ posiadanego obrazu ojca na pojęcie Boga u dzieci. W: Z. Chlewiński (red.), *Psychologia religii* (s. 181-223). Lublin: Towarzystwo Naukowe KUL.
- Król, J. (1989). Postawy rodzicielskie, poziom samoakceptacji a pojęcie Boga. Studium psychologiczne. Lublin: Redakcja Wydawnictw KUL.
- Król, J. (2006). Pojęcie Boga u dzieci i młodzieży w świetle dotychczasowych badań. W: S. Głaz (red.), *Podstawowe* zagadnienia psychologii religii (s. 225-243). Kraków: Wydawnictwo WAM.
- Kuczkowski, S. (1982). *Psychologia kształtowania się obrazu Boga*. Kraków: Wydział Filozoficzny Towarzystwa Jezusowego.
- Kuczkowski, S. (1998). *Psychologia religii*. Kraków: Wydawnictwo WAM.
- Limke, A., Mayfield, P.B. (2011). Attachment to God: Differentiating the contributions of fathers and mothers using the experiences in Parental Relationship Scale. *Journal* of Psychology and Theology, 39, 2, 122-129.
- McDonald, A., Beck, R., Allison, S., Norsworthy, L. (2005). Attachment to God and parents: Testing the correspondence vs. compensation hypotheses. *Journal of Psychol*ogy and Christianity, 24, 1, 21-28.
- Mensching, G. (1959). Die Religion. Erscheinungsformen, Strukturtypen und Lebensgesetze. Stuttgart: Curt E. Schwab.

- Ogletree, M.D., Jones, R.M., Coyl, D.D. (2002). Fathers and their adolescent sons: Pubertal development and paternal involvement. *Journal of Adolescent Research*, 17, 418-424.
- Parke, D.R., Dennis, J., Flyr, M.L., Morris, K.L., Killian, C., McDowell, D.J., Wild, M. (2004). Fathering and children's peer relationship. W: M.E. Lamb (red.). *The role* of the father in child development (s. 307-340). Hoboken: John Wiley i Sons.
- Potvin, R.H. (1977). Adolescent God images. Review of Religious Research, 19, 1, 43-53.
- Radziwiłłowicz, W. (2010). Depresja u dzieci i młodzieży. Analiza systemu rodzinnego – ujęcie kliniczne. Kraków: Oficyna Wydawnicza Impuls.
- Rizzuto, A. (1979). The birth of the living God. A psychoanalytic study. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

- Rümke, H.C. (1952). The psychology of unbelief: character and temperament in relation to unbelief. London: Rockliff.
- Tokarski, S. (2011). Obraz Boga a dojrzałość osobowościowa. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Kardynała Stefana Wyszyńskiego.
- Walesa, Cz. (2005). Rozwój religijności człowieka. Tom I: Dziecko. Lublin: Wydawnictwo KUL.
- Winnicott, D.W. (1971). *Playing and reality*. New York: Routledge.
- Witczak, J. (1987). Ojcostwo bez tajemnic. Warszawa: Instytut Wydawniczy Związków Zawodowych.
- Wolicki, M. (1983). Mechanizm modelowania w kontakcie ojca z dzieckiem. *Problemy Rodziny*, 2, 17-21.

#### Appendix

#### Table 5

Assessment of God's and the father's characteristics in a group of boys from Secondary School

No.	Item		М	SD	t	df	р
1.	Absolute	God	2.81	1.13			
		father	1.90	1.26	3.42	32	.002
2.	Active	God	2.75	1.11			
		father	3.06	1.02	-1.37	32	.170
3.	All-wise	God	3.81	.39			
		father	1.54	1.14	10.59	32	.000
4.	Avenging	God	.72	.76			
		father	.84	1.00	62	32	.530
5.	Blessed	God	3.51	.83			
		father	1.30	1.10	8.88	32	.000
6.	Blunt	God	3.51	.61			
		father	3.24	.79	1.60	32	.110
7.	Charitable	God	2.90	1.12			
		father	2.75	.75	.77	32	.440
8.	Comforting	God	3.15	1.00	66		.510
		father	3.27	.76		32	
9.	Considerate	God	3.03	.95			
		father	3.21	.89	79	32	.330
10.	Controlling	God	2.90	.87			
		father	2.75	.90	.81	32	.410
11.	Creative	God	3.48	.75			
		father	2.54	1.27	4.01	32	.000
12.	Critical	God	1.60	1.14			
		father	2.21	1.11	-2.73	32	.010
13.	Cruel	God	.57	.79		0.5	
		father	.54	.86	.16	32	.860
14.	Damning	God	.87	1.13			
		father	.93	1.22	28	32	.770

No.	Item		М	SD	t	df	р	
15.	Dangerous	God	.81	1.04				
		father	.42	.86	1.55	32	.130	
16.	Demanding	God	2.66	1.16			100	
		father	2.81	1.01	70	32	.480	
17.	Democratic	God	1.87	1.29	0.07			
		father	2.69	.98	-3.07	32	.004	
18.	Distant	God	1.87	1.49	0.70	20		
		father	.78	1.11	3.72	32	.000	
19.	Divine	God	3.69	.63	40.05	32	000	
		father	.87	1.11	12.35	32	.000	
20.	Eternal	God	3.75	.56	45.00	32	000	
		father	.63	.99	15.03	32	.000	
21.	Everlasting	God	3.81	.46	46.46	22	000	
		father	.63	1.02	16.16	32	.000	
22.	Fair	God	3.63	.65	.84	32	.040	
		father	3.51	.66	.04	32	.040	
23.	Faithful	God	3.69	.52	2.81	32	.008	
		father	3.12	1.16	2.01	32	.008	
24.	False	God	.30	.52	.82	80	32	.410
		father	.21	.54	.02	52	.410	
25.	Fast	God	2.09	1.34	.50	32	.600	
		father	2.24	1.10	.50	52	.000	
26.	5. Fatherly	God	3.42	1.11	27	32	.780	
	<b>- - - - - - - - - -</b>	father	3.48	.71	.21	02	.700	
27.	Fearful	God	.87	.96	3.20	32	.003	
		father	.38	.60	5.20	52	.000	
28	Feeble	God	.54	.93	.16	32	.870	
		father	.51	.76		02	.010	
29.	Firm	God	2.72	1.20	58	32	.560	
		father	2.84	1.06		02	.000	
30.	Forgiving	God	3.60	.66	2.33	32	.030	
		father	3.24	.79				
31.	Formal	God	2.18	1.29	.10	32	.910	
	• *	father	2.15	1.27				
32.	Gentle	God	3.18	.80	3.41	32	.002	
	<b>a</b> t t	father	2.60	.86				
33.	Glorious	God	3.51	.75	3.06	32	.004	
	•	father	2.87	.92				
34.	Gracious	God	3.45	.90	2.81	32	.008	
0.5	0.11	father	2.78	1.02	-	-		
35.	Guiding	God	3.00	1.00	1.42	32	.160	
		father	2.78	.99		-		
36.	Hard	God	2.15	1.17	-1.12	32	.270	
07		father	2.48	1.06		. –		
37.	Helpful	God	3.30	.84	32	32	.750	
		father	3.36	.69	.52	<u>.</u>	.100	

No.	Item		М	SD	t	df	р				
38.	Holy	God	3.69	.68							
		father	.93	1.24	12.41	32	.000				
39.	Impersonal	God	1.93	1.56							
		father	.27	.62	5.66	32	.000				
40.	Important	God	3.45	.90							
		father	3.39	.78	.32	32	.740				
41.	Inaccessible	God	1.54	1.39	0.55						
		father	.60	.74	3.55	32	.001				
42.	Infinite	God	3.48	.75	42.82	22	000				
		father	.57	.93	13.82	32	.000				
43.	Jealous	God	.90	1.15	50	22	600				
		father	.78	1.05	.52	32	.600				
44.	Just	God	3.33	.98	1.36	32	.180				
		father	3.12	.73	1.30	32	.100				
45.	Kind	God	3.36	.89	1.42	32	.160				
		father	3.15	.71	1.42	32	.100				
46.	Kingly	God	3.27	.91	9.94	32	.000				
		father	.90	1.23	9.94	32	.000				
47.	Lenient	God	3.63	.60	2.08	2.08	2.08	2.08	2.09	32	.040
		father	3.24	.93	2.00	52	.040				
48.	Loving	God	3.69	.63	.23	32	.810				
		father	3.66	.54	.25	52	.010				
49.	Majestic	God	3.21	1.02	6.28	32	.000				
		father	1.57	1.45	0.20	52	.000				
50.	Matchless	God	3.06	1.29	4.48	32	.000				
		father	1.66	1.45	0	52	.000				
51.	Meaningful	God	3.42	.90	0.00	32	1.000				
		father	3.42	.79	0.00	02	1.000				
52.	Meek	God	2.63	1.31	2.12	32	.040				
		father	2.21	1.19	2.1.2	02	10-10				
53.	Merciful	God	3.61	.60	3.33	32	.002				
		father	3.06	.96	0.00	02	.002				
54.	Moving	God	2.54	1.14	.43	32	.660				
		father	2.42	1.11							
55.	Mythical	God	1.84	1.52	3.74	32	.000				
		father	.66	1.05							
56.	Omnipotent	God	3.78	.41	14.38	32	.000				
		father	.69	1.15		-					
57.	Omnipresent	God	3.84	.36	13.61	32	.000				
	<b>•</b> • • • •	father	.72	1.20		-					
58.	Omniscient	God	3.78	.41	13.86	32	.000				
50	Deffect	father	.66	1.19							
59.	Patient	God	3.48	.79	3.21	32	.003				
00	Desclar	father	2.81	1.21	-	-					
60.	Passive	God	1.63	1.51	1.10	32	.270				
		father	1.36	1.14		-	.270				

No.	Item		М	SD	t	df	р	
61.	Permissive	God	2.27	1.16				
		father	1.70	.76	3.38	32	.002	
62.	Powerful	God	3.60	.89				
		father	1.60	1.43	6.77	32	.000	
63.	Protective	God	3.48	.75	22	22	.740	
		father	3.27	.83	.32	32	.740	
64.	Punishing	God	1.87	1.16	-1.02	32	.310	
		father	2.09	1.01	1.02	02	.010	
65.	Real	God	2.69	1.13	-12.64	32	.010	
		father	3.36	.89				
66.	Redeeming	God	3.09	.97	72	72 32	.470	
		father	3.21	.81				
67.	Restrictive	God	1.78	1.05	-2.55	32	.020	
		father	2.33	.88				
68.	Righteous	God	3.21	.89	.57	32	.570	
		father	3.12	.81	-	-		
69.	Safe	God	3.18	.72	96	32	.340	
70	0	father	3.33	.69				
70.	Severe	God	1.51	1.06	88	32	.380	
74	Charp	father	1.69	1.13				
71.	Sharp	God father	2.12 1.84	1.26 1.12	.96	32	.310	
72.	Slow	God	1.04	1.06				
12.	Slow	father	1.15	.90	.00	32	1.000	
73.	Soft	God	2.81	1.04				
/0.	oon	father	2.27	.97	2.94	32	.006	
74.	Sovereign	God	2.78	1.08				
	g.	father	1.81	1.37	3.16	32	.000	
75.	Steadfast	God	3.27	.87				
		father	2.36	1.08	4.62	32	.000	
76.	Stern	God	1.87	1.29				
		father	1.75	1.09	.51	32	.610	
77.	Still	God	1.75	1.52				
		father	1.30	1.05	3.74	32	.000	
78.	Strong	God	3.42	.75				
		father	2.93	.86	2.61	32	.010	
79.	Supporting	God	3.42	.90		0.5		
		father	3.27	.76	.86	32	.390	
80.	Timely	God	2.30	1.44	0.00			
		father	2.96	.88	-2.86	32	.007	
81.	Tough	God	3.27	.91	1 40	20	260	
		father	3.09	.72	1.13	32	.260	
82.	True	God	3.30	1.04	60	20	E 20	
		father	3.42	.70	62	32	.530	
83.	Unchanging	God	3.30	1.01	1 0 1	30	070	
		father	2.90	.76	1.81	32	.070	

No.	Item		М	SD	t	df	р
84.	Unyielding	God	2.93	.76			
		father	2.51	.899	<b>1</b> .81	32	.070
85.	Valuable	God	3.24	1.00			
		father	3.45	.97	91	32	.370
86.	Vigorous	God	2.54	1.17			
		father	3.00	.96	-2.08	32	.040
87.	7. Weak	God	.48	.66			
		father	.57	.66	82	32	.410
88.	Warm	God	3.21	.81			
		father	3.24	.75	18	32	.850
89.	Worthless	God	.51	1.12			
		father	.30	.63	1.02	32	.310
90.	Wrathful	God	1.03	1.04			
		father	1.30	1.15	-1.17	32	.240
91.	Yielding	God	1.00	1.03			
		father	1.42	1.06	-2.07	32	.045

### Table 6

Assessment of God's and the father's characteristics in a group of boys from the Education Centre

No.	Item		М	SD	t	df	р
1.	Absolute	God	2.65	1.26			
		father	1.69	1.40	2.95	25	.007
2.	Active	God	3.08	.89			
		father	1.88	1.39	3.74	25	.000
3.	All-wise	God	2.92	1.46			
		father	1.35	1.29	5.26	25	.000
4.	Avenging	God	.65	1.01			
		father	2.19	1.38	-5.31	25	.000
5.	Blessed	God	3.54	.90			
		father	1.19	1.32	6.24	25	.000
6.	Blunt	God	3.31	1.08			
		father	1.35	1.35	6.87	25	.000
7.	Charitable	God	3.23	.99			
		father	1.50	1.20	5.55	25	.000
8.	Comforting	God	3.35	.89			
		father	1.54	1.24	5.85	25	.000
9.	Considerate	God	3.23	.81			
		father	1.35	1.16	6.38	25	.000
10.	Controlling	God	3.12	1.10			
		father	2.08	1.49	3.50	25	.002
11.	Creative	God	3.46	.70			
		father	1.42	1.13	7.58	25	.000
12.	Critical	God	1.00	1.13			
		father	2.35	1.35	-4.59	25	.000
13.	Cruel	God	.46	.70			
		father	1.81.54	1.54	-5.06	25	.000

No.	Item		М	SD	t	df	р
14.	Damning	God	.38	.69			
		father	2.08	1.52	-5.68	25	.000
15.	Dangerous	God	.62	.89	4.47	05	000
		father	1.85	1.46	-4.17	25	.000
16.	Demanding	God	2.08	1.49	71	25	.480
		father	2.38	1.47	71	23	.400
17.	Democratic	God	.92	1.09	-2.81	25	.009
		father	1.85	1.31	2.01	20	
18.	Distant	God	1.00	1.09	-3.71	25	.001
		father	2.12	1.33			
19.	Divine	God	2.85	1.31	5.63	25	.000
		father	.81	1.09		-	
20.	Eternal	God	3.27	1.18	7.98	25	.000
04	Evente ette e	father	.62	1.09			
21.	Everlasting	God	3.38	1.09	6.73	25	.000
00	<b>F</b> _:-	father	.85	1.34			
22.	Fair	God	3.46	.81 1.38	<b>5</b> .64	25	.000
22	Faithful	father God	1.81 3.19	1.30			
23.	Faithful	father	1.69	1.20	4.11	25	.000
24.	False	God	2.22	1.45			
27.	1 0.50	father	2.00	1.43	-3.94	25	.000
25.	Fast	God	2.09	1.34			
	. 1 doi	father	2.24	1.10	.58	25	.550
26.	. Fatherly	God	3.31	1.12			
	<b>,</b>	father	1.73	1.34	5.45	25	.000
27.	Fearful	God	.81	1.16			
		father	1.69	1.40	-2.89	25	.008
28.	Feeble	God	.46	.70			
		father	1.62	1.44	-4.02	25	.000
29.	Firm	God	2.46	1.47			
		father	2.46	1.17	0	25	1.000
30.	Forgiving	God	3.38	.85			
		father	2.23	1.33	3.69	25	.001
31.	Formal	God	2.62	1.32			
		father	1.54	1.24	3.19	25	.004
32.	Gentle	God	3.15	1.04			
		father	1.69	1.31	4.37	25	.000
33.	Glorious	God	3.42	.80		05	
		father	1.62	1.23	6.79	25	.000
34.	Gracious	God	3.27	1.04	4.94	25	000
		father	1.62	1.26	4.84	25	.000
35.	Guiding	God	2.89	1.21	0.77	25	040
		father	1.85	1.28	2.77	25	.010
36.	Hard	God	2.65	1.29	39	25	.690
		father	2.77	1.10	59	20	.090

No.	Item		М	SD	t	df	р
37.	Helpful	God	3.42	.75			
		father	1.81	1.35	39	25	.690
38.	Holy	God	3.50	.94			
		father	1.00	1.32	8.19	25	.000
39.	Impersonal	God	1.69	1.49			
		father	1.19	1.38	1.27	25	.220
40.	Important	God	3.46	.76	5.40	05	
		father	2.00	1.32	5.46	25	.000
41.	Inaccessible	God	.96	1.11	4.05	05	000
		father	1.65	1.26	1.95	25	.060
42.	Infinite	God	2.88	1.45	5.00	25	000
		father	.96	.99	5.23	25	.000
43.	Jealous	God	.62	.85	-4.59	25	.000
		father	1.96	1.50			
44.	Just	God	3.38	.75	6.13	25	.000
		father	1.69	1.28			
45.	Kind	God	3.08	1.16	3.29	25	.003
		father	1.85	1.28	3.29	25	.003
46.	Kingly	God	3.00	1.23	5.02	25	.000
		father	1.19	1.16	5.02	25	.000
47.	Lenient	God	3.42	1.23	4.91	25	.000
		father	1.81	1.16	4.91	23	.000
48.	Loving	God	3.58	.64	0.70	25	.000
		father	2.35	1.49	3.78		
49.	Majestic	God	2.65	1.46	4.07	25	.000
		father	1.38	1.29	4.07	23	.000
50.	Matchless	God	2.08	1.59	.99	25	.330
		father	1.69	1.28	.99	23	.550
51.	Meaningful	God	3.38	.75	4.13	25	.000
		father	2.12	1.42	4.15	25	.000
52.	Meek	God	3.00	1.09	5.41	25	.000
		father	1.468	1.17			
53.	Merciful	God	3.27	1.11	4.00	25	.000
		father	1.81	1.29			
54.	Moving	God	2.73	1.31	2.89	25	.008
		father	1.54	1.27			
55.	Mythical	God	1.50	1.47	1.95	25	.060
		father	1.00	1.23	1.00		
56.	Omnipotent	God	3.08	1.38	4.75	25	.000
		father	.92	1.35			.000
57.	Omnipresent	God	3.08	1.35	6.34	25	.000
		father	.81	1.26			
58.	Omniscient	God	3.23	1.33	6.14	25	5 .000
		father	.92	1.32	<b></b>		
59.	Patient	God	3.38	.85	5.88	25	.000
		father	1.50	1.33	0.00	20	.000

No.	Item		М	SD	t	df	р
60.	Passive	God	2.38	1.35			
		father	1.65	1.23	1.95	25	.060
61.	Permissive	God	2.07	1.12		0.5	
		father	1.92	1.18	.43	25	.650
62.	Powerful	God	3.19	1.29	5.00	05	000
		father	1.15	1.15	5.39	25	.000
63.	Protective	God	3.50	.90	5.04	25	.000
		father	1.85	1.31	5.04	25	.000
64.	Punishing	God	1.92	1.46	-1.38	25	.180
		father	2.46	1.20	1.00	20	.100
65.	Real	God	2.92	1.23	.90	25	.370
		father	2.65	1.09		20	.010
66.	Redeeming	God	3.12	1.10	3.01	25	.006
		father	2.08	1.32		20	
67.	Restrictive	God	1.85	1.34	-1.00	25	.320
		father	2.23	1.36			
68.	Righteous	God	2.85	1.37	3.43	25	.002
		father	1.77	1.14		-	
69.	Safe	God	3.38	.85	5.01	25	.000
		father	1.96	1.34			
70.	Severe	God	1.62	1.38	-2.21	25	.040
74	01	father	2.23	1.47			
71.	Sharp	God	2.15	1.40	.67	25	.050
72.	Slow	father God	1.88	1.36			
12.	SIOW	father	2.73	1.23	-1.49	25	.150
73.	Soft	God	3.00	1.37			
10.	oon	father	1.65	1.26	4.51	25	.000
74.	Sovereign	God	3.00	1.29			
	oovoroign	father	2.23	1.47	2.79	25	.010
75.	Steadfast	God	2.73	1.38			
		father	1.35	1.19	4.62	25	.000
76.	Stern	God	1.19	1.16			
		father	1.96	1.48	-2.56	25	.020
77.	Still	God	1.35	1.41			
		father	1.77	1.36	-1.04	25	.310
78.	Strong	God	3.35	1.09			
		father	2.81	1.13	2.27	25	.030
79.	Supporting	God	3.35	1.05			
		father	1.73	1.28	6.19	25	.000
80.	Timely	God	2.15	1.43			
		father	2.00	1.32	.38	25	.700
81.	Tough	God	3.54	.64			
		father	2.46	1.42	3.49	25	.002
82.	True	God	2.81	1.26			
		father	2.46	1.33	1.10	25	.280

No.	Item		М	SD	t	df	р
83.	Unchanging	God	3.23	1.03	3.39	25	.002
		father	2.19	1.35			
84.	Unyielding	God	3.27	1.66	3.38	25	.012
		father	2.15	1.28			
85.	Valuable	God	3.27	1.04			
		father	2.12	1.39	3.95	25	.000
86.	Vigorous	God	3.04	1.18			
		father	2.54	1.24	1.44	25	.160
87.	Weak	God	.96	1.07	-1.12 25		.270
		father	1.31	1.12		25	
88.	Warm	God	3.19	1.02	3.68	25	.001
		father	1.92	1.32			
89.	Worthless	God	1.00	1.13			
		father	1.23	1.30	74	25	.460
90.	Wrathful	God	1 <b>.04</b>	1.18	-4.32	25	.000
		father	2.35	1.35			
91.	Yielding	God	1.77	1.50	.380 2		
		father	1.62	1.23		25	.710