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ABSTRACT

PARENTING PRACTICES IN EMERGING ADULTHOOD:
DEVELOPMENT OF A NEW MEASURE

Melanie McKay

Marriage, Family, and Human Development Program
School of Family Life
Master of Science

Given that more and more young people are living at home well into their twenties, and parents no longer see their children as adults until well into their mid to late twenties (Nelson, Walker, Carroll, Madsen, Barry, & Badger, 2006), parents may continue to “parent” for much longer than we have typically believed. Although parenting may still play an important role, little research has been done examining parenting in emerging adulthood, including its correlates and outcomes. As such, there is a need for a measure of parenting that is appropriate for use in emerging adulthood. The current study attempted to develop a measure that identifies and assesses behaviors that reflect various styles of parenting during emerging adulthood including authoritative, authoritarian, and permissive parenting. Specifically, the purposes of this study were: 1) to examine whether or not authoritative, authoritarian and permissive parenting styles could be identified in parents of emerging adults and 2) to assess the validity and reliability of the parenting measure that emerges from the factor analysis for both parents’ self reports and spouse reports. Based on the factor analyses of items in the parenting scale, it appears that
authoritative, authoritarian, and permissive parenting can be identified as distinct and separate parenting styles in parents of emerging adults. The results of the study further suggest that the parenting measure is a reliable and valid measure for use with parents of emerging adults.
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The changing nature of adulthood in western societies such as the United States may be extending the amount of time parents are engaged in “parenting” activities. For example, the majority of 18-25 year olds (i.e., emerging adults) do not consider themselves adults (e.g., Arnett, 2000). Therefore, many parents may feel they still need to help their children navigate this period of experimentation and exploration while at the same time allowing them the independence they want and need. Walking this fine line during the transition to adulthood may be a challenging yet important part of parenting. Indeed, as with all preceding periods of the lifespan, parents may play important roles on the types of outcomes young people experience during this period of their lives.

One feature of today’s society that may highlight the fact that parents are still involved in the lives of their emerging-adult children is the number of children who return home to live with their parents. Recent research shows that nearly half of emerging adults return home to live with parents - oftentimes due to financial need or unemployment (Goldscheider & Goldscheider, 1999). Schnaiberg and Goldenberg (1989) called this “the returning young adult syndrome.” The parent-child relationship is greatly impacted in both positive and negative aspects as the emerging adult returns home, especially depending on the length of the stay. Clemens and Axelson (1985) discovered that the longer an emerging adult resides with parents, the more intense the conflict becomes. Emerging adults’ dependency, unemployment (Aquilino & Supple, 1991) and neglect in fulfilling adult responsibilities of financial independence and employment (Schnaiberg & Goldenberg, 1989) were related to an increase in parent-child conflict and tension in the home.
Furthermore, researchers have found the parent-dyad stronger when the emerging adult lives apart from the parental home. Dubas and Petersen (1996) found that emerging adults who lived at least an hour away from their parents had a closer relationship with them. Similarly, emerging adults enrolled in college were found to have greater relations with their parents, less conflict, and fewer concerns over control. As emerging adults strive to gain more autonomy by fulfilling adult roles (Aquilino, 1996; Schnaiberg & Goldenberg, 1989), the parent-child dyad enters a new stage of commonality where different styles of interaction and mutuality may emerge as a result (Aquilino, 1997).

Resident status is not the only aspect of the parent-child relationship that appears to influence the transition to adulthood. Emotional connectedness with parents is another important mediator for a smooth transition to adulthood. Silverberg and Gondoli (1996) discussed the importance of retaining an emotional connection with parents during adolescence in the midst of striving for autonomy and self-reliance. This may be even more necessary as an adolescent makes the transition into emerging adulthood and then into adulthood. Issues of autonomy and control also appear to be important factors in the parent-child relationship during emerging adulthood (e.g., Fingerman, 2000; Aquilino, 1997).

Given that issues of autonomy, connectedness, and control appear to be major themes of the parent-child relationship during emerging adulthood, and more and more young people are living at home where parents may feel a need to continue to “parent” them, it would be important to examine how these dimensions (i.e., control, autonomy, etc.) are incorporated in the parenting styles of parents of emerging adults. Baumrind (1967; 1971) outlined three typologies of parenting styles known as authoritative, authoritarian, and permissive parenting. Authoritative parenting offers a balance between high nurturance and high control, allowing the child room to
exercise autonomy. Authoritarian parenting restricts autonomy through high coercive control and low nurturance and support. Permissive parenting is high in nurturance and support while being low in control, allowing an excess of autonomy without engendering responsibility. While these different approaches to parenting have been identified and measured in childhood (Baumrind, 1993, Baumrind, 1991, Baumrind, 1978, Black & Baumrind, 1967, Isley, O’Neil, & Parke, 1996, Hart, Nelson, Robinson, Olsen, & McNeily-Choque, 1998; Hart, Newell, & Olsen, 2003, Nix, Pinder Hughes, Dodge, Bates, Pettit, McFadyen, & Steven, 1999) and adolescence (Dornbusch, Ritter, Leiderman, Roberts, and Fraleigh, 1987, Baumrind, 1991; Avenevoli Sessa, & Steinberg, 1999, Avenevoli et al., 1999, Fischer & Crawford, 1992, Darling & Steinburg, 1993), much less work has been done examining parenting styles in emerging adulthood. The work that has been done in emerging adulthood has examined earlier parenting (i.e. during childhood and/or adolescence) and the subsequent outcomes in the years of emerging adulthood. Little, if any, research has examined current parenting styles used with emerging adults. As such, there is no existing measure that has been designed and validated specifically to examine parenting styles in emerging adulthood. Therefore, the purpose of this study was to examine whether or not authoritative, authoritarian and permissive parenting styles could be identified in parents of emerging adults, and to assess the validity and reliability of the parenting measure that emerges from the factor analysis for both parents’ self reports and spouse reports.
Chapter II

Review of the Literature

For most young people in contemporary Western societies, the years from the late teens through the twenties are a time of significant change and importance (Arnett, 2000; Teachman, Polonko, & Leigh, 1987). Scholars have referred to this period with such terms as “arrested adulthood” (Côté, 2000), “youth” (Keniston, 1971), and “emerging adulthood” (Arnett, 2000). These emerging adults (as they hereafter will be called) engage in heightened identity exploration and greater experimentation in the areas of love, work, and worldviews (Arnett, 2000; Barnett, Gareis, James, & Steele, 2003; Cohen, Kasen, Chen, Hartmark, & Gordon, 2003) as they move towards adulthood.

Given that many 18-25 year old young people do not consider themselves adults (e.g., Arnett, 1997; Nelson & Barry, 2005), and many in fact are living with their parents during this time (Goldscheider & Goldscheider, 1999), parents may feel a greater sense of responsibility to continue to “parent” their children. Although parenting may still play an important role, little research has been done examining parenting in emerging adulthood, including its correlates and outcomes. One possible reason for the paucity of work in this area may be due to the lack of a valid and reliable measure of parenting. Such a measure of parenting is necessary because parenting may look quite different in emerging adulthood. Given the developmental tasks of the time period (e.g., becoming an independent adult), parenting may look quite different during this time period. The parenting behaviors that have been used to identify authoritative, authoritarian, and permissive parenting in childhood and even adolescence may not adequately capture the same styles in emerging adulthood. As such, there is a need to develop a parenting measure specifically for emerging adulthood. Therefore, the purpose of this study was to develop a
reliable measure of parenting styles (e.g., authoritative, authoritarian, permissive) in emerging adulthood. In the literature review that follows, I will (a) introduce various styles of parenting that have been examined in the research literature and briefly examine the child correlates and outcomes associated with each parenting style across various stages of development, (b) review the limited extant research regarding parenting in emerging adulthood, and (c) outline the development of the new measure.

*Parenting Styles*

Parenting styles have been described as the collection of parents’ behaviors which create an atmosphere of parent-child interactions across situations (Mize & Pettit, 1997). Based on the work of Baumrind (e.g., 1967; 1978; 1995) and those who have extended her work (e.g., Maccoby & Martin, 1983; Roberts, 1986), several broad typologies of parenting styles (i.e., authoritative, authoritarian and permissive) have been identified. These styles tend to differ along the dimensions of warmth and control. Warmth refers to the degree in which parents display involvement, responsiveness, and support (Hart, Newell & Olsen, 2003). Warm, supportive parenting involves behaviors that are physically and emotionally affectionate, approving, loving and caring (Openshaw, Thomas & Rollins, 1984). Control includes the demands or expectations parents place upon or hold for their children and the degree of monitoring present in parenting. Taken together, the styles of authoritative, authoritarian, and permissive parenting differ in several important features including (a) support shown to a child aimed at forming an emotional connection with the child, (b) behavioral control of the child aimed at promoting mature behavior, and (c) autonomy granting aimed at fostering self-reliance (see Hart, Newell, & Olsen, 2003, for a review).
**Authoritative Parenting.** Authoritative parents tend to display both high control and high responsiveness and warmth to their children. Expectations are clear, rules are firm and rational, and discipline is administered in a consistent manner. Baumrind (1978) explains that authoritative parents openly discuss any problems or actions that may arise in relation to the child and exhibit firm control when necessary. Authoritative parents aim to teach rules of conduct, outline boundaries, foster responsibility through teaching correct principles, and employ consequences for problematic behavior but employ more positive reinforcement (e.g., compliments) than harsh punishment (e.g., spanking). This parenting style offers a balance between high nurturance and high control, in addition to clear communication about expectations for the child (Baumrind & Black, 1967). Authoritative parents do not reward dependency (Baumrind & Black, 1967), but instead set a standard of responsibility and self-control. In sum, authoritative parents set reasonable demands on and have high expectations for their children while being warm and responsive.

**Authoritarian Parenting.** Authoritarian parents combine high control with lower levels of warmth. This parenting style allows for strong parental command over their child, leaving minimal input of the child in decisions or rationales (Baumrind, 1991). Further, in this form of one-way communication, the child is not permitted to express views or opinions (Baumrind, 1977). Measures of coercive and punitive control, such as physical or emotional punishment, are often used by authoritarian parents as a means of disciplining the child. Authoritarian parents are “obedience and status-oriented, and expect their orders to be obeyed without explanation” (Baumrind, 1991, p. 62). The authoritarian parent is demanding and unresponsive to the emotional needs of the child, as well as being controlling, and detached (Black & Baumrind,
1967). In addition to high control and demand, authoritarian parents show little warmth, involvement, support, or emotional commitment to their child (Black & Baumrind, 1967).

Permissive Parenting. Permissive parents exhibit high levels of warmth and low levels of control. Because warmth is displayed through overindulgence, permissive parents tend to be non-demanding and avoidant of controlling behavior or outlining boundaries in the children’s environment (Baumrind & Black, 1967). Little is required of children, especially in areas of maturity and responsibility (Baumrind, 1991). The overall idea of permissive parenting is to allow the child extensive autonomy, corroborated by high parental support, in the hopes of engendering close relationships with their children (Peterson & Hann, 1999). Their discipline, if any, is inconsistent and confusing (Baumrind & Black, 1967) and these parents often surrender to the demands of their child. Bad behavior of the child is seldom acknowledged or corrected by parents and rules are either not enforced or are not clearly communicated. According to Baumrind (1968) children of permissive parents are often left to regulate their own activities, behavior, and emotions at a young age.

Parenting Styles and Outcomes in Childhood and Adolescence

An extensive literature on parenting styles provides evidence that the three models of parental control are linked to a variety of outcomes during childhood and adolescence. For example, the quality of the parent-child relationship during early childhood affects children’s social relationships and behavioral adjustment during middle childhood and adolescence (Scaramella & Leve, 2004). Many studies have shown a link between the parent-child interaction and emotional and behavioral adjustment in early childhood, middle childhood, and adolescence (Scaramella & Leve, 2004).
Authoritative Parenting. Children reared by authoritative parents tend to fare better than children raised by parents who employ permissive or authoritarian parenting styles in most aspects of development (Baumrind, 1991). Beginning in early-childhood, this style of parenting has been shown to produce higher levels of social competence (Baumrind, 1978), a greater ability to regulate emotions, high social skills (Isley, O’Neil, & Parke, 1996), and self-regulation (Black & Baumrind, 1967). During the years of middle-childhood, Baumrind (1993) found that children reared by authoritative parents excelled in areas of independence, creativity, persistence, social skills, academic competence, leadership skills, social perspective-taking, and self-control. Adolescents of authoritative parents have higher self-esteem, are socially confident and competent (Baumrind, 1978), are self-reliant, have greater respect for their parents (Baumrind, 1991), display increased academic performance (Dornbusch, Ritter, Leiderman, Roberts, and Fraleigh, 1987), possess higher levels of self-esteem, engage in fewer acts of deviant behavior and more prosocial behavior (Baumrind, 1991; Avenevoli Sessa, & Steinberg, 1999), and exhibit lower levels of stress and fewer incidences of substance abuse (Avenevoli et al., 1999).

Authoritarian Parenting. Authoritarian parenting, in contrast, is associated with a myriad of negative outcomes throughout development (Peterson & Hann, 1999; Stafford & Bayer, 1993). Preschool-age children exposed to authoritarian parenting have been found to be unhappy, dissatisfied, apprehensive, fearful, socially inhibited, aggressive, and experience difficulty in regulating emotions (Baumrind, 1967; Baumrind & Black, 1967; Hart, Nelson, Robinson, Olsen, & McNeily-Choque, 1998; Hart, Newell, & Olsen, 2003; Nix, Pinderhughes, Dodge, Bates, Pettit, McFadyen, & Steven, 1999). Over the following years of development, both cognitive and social skills continue to fall behind (Baumrind, 1977) and codependence on adult authority figures increases (Fischer & Crawford, 1992). During adolescence, low self-
esteem, low sociability, moodiness, obedience, and apprehensiveness were reported in adolescents of authoritarian parents (Darling & Steinburg, 1993). Studies have suggested a positive correlation between authoritarian parenting and adolescent delinquency (Fergusson, Horwood, & Lynsky, 1994; Huesmann, Eron, Lefkowitz & Walder, 1984) and a negative association to adolescent stress, self-esteem, and substance abuse (Avenevoli, Sessa, & Steinburg, 1999).

Given the central role that control plays in authoritarian parenting, the construct of psychological control deserves particular attention, especially given that physical punishment may be less of an option with emerging-adult children. Psychological control refers to parental interference that controls or manipulates the psychological well-being of the child (Barber, 1996; 2002). Withdrawing love when a child displeases a parent, inflicting guilt or shame as a form of punishment, and using manipulation to gain power in a situation are forms of psychological control over a child (Barber, 1996). Psychological control not only restricts and manipulates young children’s thoughts and actions, but research confirms that psychological control is also linked to problems throughout childhood and adolescence including internalizing problems in children such as shyness, anxiety, and loneliness (Gresham & Elliott, 1990), dependency (Baumrind, 1978), low self-esteem (Hart, Olsen, Robinson, & Mandleco, 1997), withdrawal (Baumrind, 1967; Baumrind & Black, 1967), and depression (Allen, Hauser, Eickholt, Bell & O’Conner, 1994; Barber, Olsen, & Shagle, 1994).

Another form of control is known as behavioral control (e.g., monitoring). Barber (1996) explains that behavioral control can be perceived positively depending on the degree used, whereas psychological control refers to psychological manipulation and is always perceived negatively. Specifically, behavioral control is part of a continuum where permissive parents
have little behavioral control and authoritarian parents exercise extreme levels of control. Authoritative parents tend to have an appropriate balance of control over their children and do so through the use of less coercive and physical means (e.g., spanking). While it has been argued that psychological control is less about controlling behavior and more about manipulating the parent-child relationship and therefore a unique dimension of parenting (Barber, 1996), it too falls on the excessive end of the control continuum. However, it seems important to examine whether psychological control is part of the broader authoritarian construct in emerging adulthood or a unique approach to parenting. Because parents may have less control over an emerging adult’s behavior, it is expected that authoritarian parents will turn to more psychologically controlling techniques and, therefore, will load with “traditional” items making up the construct of authoritarian parenting in emerging adulthood.

**Permissive Parenting.** Permissive parents have little control and few expectations for their children. As a result, preschool children of permissive parents tend to experience difficulty regulating emotions, have low self-control, and be very immature (Baumrind, 1967). Permissive parenting has been linked to bossy, dependant, impulsive behavior in children, with low levels of self-control and achievement; these children do not learn persistence, emotional control, or limitations (Baumrind, 1967). While positive outcomes of permissive parenting may include close parent-child relationships, greater self-esteem, and more autonomy (Herz & Gullone, 1999), this parenting style often fosters more serious problems in adolescence such as drug use and deviant behavior (Baumrind, 1991; Maccoby & Martin, 1983), school misconduct (McCord, 1988), and lower academic achievement (Dornbusch, Ritter, Leiderman, Roberts & Fraleigh, 1987). Further, adolescents of permissive parents tend to lack verbal and behavioral control, be
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more aggressive, and have difficulty following school rules (Dornbusch, Ritter, Leidermarn, Roberts, & Fraleigh, 1987; Lamborn, Mounts, & Steinberg, 1991).

Formative Parenting and Outcomes in Emerging Adulthood

The effects of positive or negative parenting may continue to accrue as the child develops. Indeed, researchers have examined the effects of parenting in childhood on later development. For example, emerging adults reared by authoritative parents scored higher in areas of competence and resilience than did emerging adults from authoritarian or permissive parenting styles (Masten, Burt, Roisman, Obradovic, Long, & Tellegen, 2004). A longitudinal study conducted by Aquilino and Supple (2001) found that the parent-child relationship in adolescence influences the degree of well-being (i.e. life satisfaction, personal efficacy, and self-esteem) experienced in emerging adulthood. Additional studies suggest emerging adults’ self-esteem and self-actualization is positively correlated to authoritative parenting originating in childhood and adolescence (Buri, Louiselle, Misukanis, & Mueller, 1988; Dominguez & Carton, 1997).

In addition to longitudinal studies that examine parenting in adolescents and subsequent development in emerging adulthood, several researchers have conducted retrospective studies in which emerging adults were asked to reflect on how they were parented in adolescence (or parents were asked to reflect on how they parented their adolescent, Aquilino, 1997). For example, Buri (1987), in a study of 81 college-aged students, found that parental acceptance, approval, and support were positively related to self-esteem. Authoritative parenting style has also been associated with the development of autonomy in emerging adults (Dominguez & Carton, 1997). In a study of college students, Gonzalez, Greenwood, and WenHsu (2001) reported that children of authoritarian parents feel pressure to prove their ability, whereas, those
of authoritative parents had greater interest in learning new skills and improving their competence. In another study, authoritarian parenting was found to be negatively related to self-esteem, while authoritative parenting was positively related to self-esteem (Buri, Louiselle, Misukanis, & Mueller, 1988). Permissiveness, however, was not significantly related to self-esteem in emerging adults.

While informative, many of these studies examined only limited aspects of parenting such as parental nurturance (e.g., Buri, 1987), self-actualization (Dominguez & Carton, 1997), or restrictive supervision (e.g., Aquilino, 1997). Few, if any, researchers have examined several broader approaches to parenting (i.e., authoritarian, authoritative, and permissive styles) in emerging adulthood. Furthermore, there are several limitations to both longitudinal and retrospective studies that examine parenting in emerging adulthood. Given the developmental tasks of the time period (e.g., becoming an independent adult), parenting may look quite different during this time period. For example, parents who offered support, fair consequences, and warmth during childhood and adolescence (authoritative parenting) may continue to engender autonomy during emerging adulthood by encouraging the emerging adult to explore matters of love, work, and worldviews. Permissive parents may also try to facilitate autonomy but, like in previous development periods, do so without being involved in their children’s decision making in any way (i.e., expectations, inductive reasoning, etc.). Conversely, parents who used means of coercion or physical punishment to control a child during childhood and adolescence (authoritarian parenting) may use psychological control such as love withdrawal or guilt induction (Barber, 2001) during emerging adulthood. Given the developmental shift of emerging adulthood, a new measure is needed to address concurrent parenting practices.
Taken together, there is rising evidence that parenting styles are linked to outcomes in emerging adulthood. However, most, if not all, of the extant research has examined earlier parenting and the subsequent outcomes in the years of emerging adulthood. Little, if any, research has examined concurrent parenting styles used with emerging adults or the subsequent outcomes associated with each parenting style. Given that more and more young people are living at home well into their twenties, and parents no longer see their children as adults until well into their mid to late twenties (Nelson, Walker, Carroll, Madsen, Barry, & Badger, 2006), parents may continue to “parent.” It would, therefore, be important to assess whether the same parenting constructs employed during childhood and adolescence can be identified, and what the correlates of those approaches to parenting are in emerging adulthood. However, in order to do this, a reliable measure of parenting in emerging adulthood is needed.

Need for a Measure of Parenting in Emerging Adulthood

As noted, there is a need for a measure of parenting that is appropriate for use in emerging adulthood. Aquilino (1997) looks at parent-child relations during the child’s transition to adulthood using longitudinal data from the National Survey of Families and Households (Sweet, Bumpass, & Call, 1988) (Time 1 data collection in 1987-1988, Time 2 in 1992-1993). Although parents reported extensively on their parenting, the study did not identify authoritative, authoritarian, or permissive typologies and how they influenced their young-adult children. Taken together, the studies that have looked at parenting and emerging adults have several significant limitations. First, the majority of them have used retrospective reports in which parents or children were asked to reflect back on the parenting that occurred when the child was an adolescent. There is a need to examine concurrent parenting rather than retrospective approaches. Second, some of the measurement tools used in these studies were developed for
use in childhood and adolescence (Dominguez and Carton, 1997; Gonzalez, Greenwood, & WenHsu, 2001) and do not fully capture the nuances of parenting emerging adults. Finally, little if any work has been done using both parental self reports and spouse reports in addressing parenting during the years of emerging adulthood.

As noted previously, parenting styles tend to differ along the dimensions of (a) support shown to a child aimed at forming an emotional connection with the child, (b) behavioral control of the child aimed at promoting mature behavior, and (c) autonomy granting aimed at fostering self-reliance (see Hart, Newell, & Olsen, 2003 for a review). All of these dimensions are also important in emerging adulthood (Arnett, 2000; Arnett, 2001) but may be displayed differently than in previous developmental stages. Thus, it seems important to capture each of these dimensions in a developmental appropriate way in a measure of parenting.

In other words, while parents may display warmth, support, and control differently with children in emerging adulthood than with younger children, it would be expected that parents still vary in the extent to which they incorporate these dimensions in their relationships with their emerging-adult children. For example, where an authoritarian parent may have used spanking as a means of control during childhood, he or she may now withhold financial help to control his or her child during emerging adulthood. Furthermore, a controlling parent who offers to pay for their emerging adult’s college education may do so under the condition that the child will study the major of the parent’s choice. Similarly, love withdrawal (Barber, 2001) may still be used as a form of psychological control once the emerging adult has left home. For example, authoritarian parents may now exhibit psychological control by not returning phone calls or by making statements such as “after all I did for you, that is how you repay me.” The current study attempted to develop a measure that identifies and assesses behaviors that reflect various styles
of parenting during emerging adulthood including authoritative, authoritarian, and permissive parenting. Specifically, the first purpose of this study was to examine whether authoritative, authoritarian, and permissive parenting styles could be identified in parents of emerging adults. The second purpose of this study was to assess the validity and reliability of the parenting measure that emerges from the factor analysis for both parents’ self reports and spouse reports.
Chapter III

Method

Participants

Participants for this study were drawn from an ongoing study of emerging adults and their parents entitled "Project READY" (Researching Emerging Adults’ Developmental Years). This project is an ongoing, collaborative, multi-site study that is being conducted by a consortium of developmental and family scholars.

The sample used in the current study consisted of 844 parents of emerging adults (463 mothers, 381 fathers) who were recruited through their emerging adult child from six college sites (a small, private liberal arts college and a medium-sized, religious university on the East coast; two large, Midwestern public universities; a large, religious university in the West; and a large, public university on the West coast). The mean age of the sample was 49.1 years (SD = 4.5) for mothers and 51.1 years (SD = 5.3) for fathers. The participants were predominantly European American.

Procedure

Participants completed the Project READY questionnaire via the Internet (see http://www.projectready.net). The use of an online data collection protocol facilitated unified data collection across multiple university sites and allowed for the survey to be administered to parents who were living in various locations throughout the country. Participants were recruited through faculty’s announcement of the study in undergraduate and graduate courses. Professors at the various universities were provided with a handout to give to their students that had a brief explanation of the study and directions for accessing the online survey. Interested students then accessed the study website with a location-specific recruitment code. Informed consent was
obtained online, and only after consent was given could the participants begin the questionnaires. Each participant was asked to complete a survey battery of 448 items. Sections of the survey addressed topic areas such as background information, family-of-origin experiences, self-perceptions, personality traits, values, risk behaviors, dating behaviors, prosocial behaviors, and religiosity. The survey also assessed attitudes and behaviors pertaining to couple formation such as cohabitation, sexuality, and premarital myths. Most participants were offered course credit or extra credit for their own and their parents’ participation. In some cases, participants were offered small monetary compensation (i.e., $10-20 gift certificates) for their participation.

After participants completed the personal information, they had the option to send an invitation to their parents to participate in the study via email. The email invitation included an assigned password and a link to the parents’ version of the questionnaire. The parents were directed to click on the link and enter the password. Once the password was entered, an Informed Consent Form appeared and parents then followed the same protocol as the children. If parents did not have e-mail addresses, mailing addresses were obtained and questionnaires were mailed to them with self-addressed, pre-paid envelops for them to mail back completed surveys. Parents completed a shorter battery of 280 items similar to the ones their children completed, asking them to respond from a parental point of view. Sections of the parent survey addressed additional topic areas such as parenting styles, parental monitoring, quality of relationships, and child temperament.

*Parenting Styles.* Parents completed a battery of assessments that asked them to respond from a parental point of view. The questionnaire (see Appendix 1 for questionnaire) contained approximately 266 items. Sections of our parent questionnaire addressed: (a) demographics (e.g., age, gender, marital status), (b) criteria for adulthood (e.g., “How important is each of the
following in determining whether or not your child has reached adulthood”), (c) achieved criteria for adulthood (e.g., “Indicate the extent to which your child has achieved each of the following”), (d) criteria for marriage readiness (e.g., “How important is each of the following in determining whether or not your child is ready to get married”), (e) attitudes toward romantic relationships and marriage (e.g., “Living together before marriage will improve a couple’s chances of remaining happily married”), (f) financial support (e.g., “To what extent do you currently provide financial support for your child in the following areas?”), (g) parental monitoring (e.g., “For each statement, please indicate which best describes how much you know about your son/daughter”), (h) relationship satisfaction (e.g., “Please indicate to what extent you agree with the following statements about your current marriage/relationship”), (i) relationship qualities for social network members (e.g., “How much free time do you spend with [romantic partner, child]?”), and (j) parenting styles (e.g., “[My partner kicks] [I kick] our child out of the house as a way of disciplining our child”).

Of particular interest for this study was the questionnaire designed to assess parenting styles. The items for the questionnaire were adapted from a parenting measure developed by Robinson et al (1995). Their 62-item questionnaire included questions from Block’s report (1965) and new items constructed by Robinson and colleagues. It was given to 1251 parents with young children assessing Baumrind’s authoritative, authoritarian, and permissive parenting styles. Items were measured with a 5-point scale anchored by never (1) and always (5). Authors of the present study modified many of the questions to be more developmentally appropriate. For example, the authoritative item “I tells child our expectations regarding behavior before the child engages in an activity” was changed to [My partner explains] [I explain] the reasons for our desires for our child (e.g., work, school, marriage). Similarly, authoritarian parenting
assessments of physical punishments such as “Spanks child when child misbehaves” were replaced by items like “[My partner grabs] [I grab] our child when [my partner doesn’t] [I don’t] like what he/she does” or with items indicative of psychological control ([My partner doesn’t] [I don’t] talk to our child when our child’s actions don’t please [my partner] [me]. The final adaptation of the measure that was used in the present study contained 41 items designed to assess various styles of parenting including authoritative [My partner explains/I explain the reasons for our desires for our child (e.g., work, school, marriage)], authoritarian, (My partner explodes/I explode in anger towards our child), and permissive (My partner gives/I give into our child when the child causes a commotion about something) parenting. Participating parents answered questions based on their own parenting as well as their perception of their spouse’s parenting. See Table 1 for a complete list of items.

For the purpose of assessing discriminant validity, items from RELATE (The Relationship Evaluation Questionnaire) were used to address the level of positive family experience. The questionnaire was designed with the perspective that relational aspects of family life, such as the parents’ relationships with children, create a family tone that can be mapped on a continuum from safe/predictable/rewarding to unsafe/chaotic/punishing. This family tone or environment is then believed to influence an individual’s beliefs and behaviors in adult relationships. Participants were asked to evaluate the overall atmosphere in their family while growing up by using the 4-item “family process” scale (e.g., “From what I experienced in my family, I think family relationships are safe, secure, rewarding, worth being in, and a source of comfort”, “We had a loving atmosphere in our family”), and the 4-item “family impact” scale (e.g. “There are matters from my family experience that I am still having trouble dealing with or coming to terms with”, “There are matters from my family experience that negatively
affect my ability to form close relationships”). Both scales contained items with response
categories that ranged from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (5). Busby, Holman, and
Taniguchi (2001) found corresponding alphas between .82 and .85 for family tone and between
.75 and .79 for family impact.
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Results

Parent Measure

Using spousal reports from 785 parents (427 mothers, 385 fathers), a principal components factor analysis with varimax rotation of the factors was performed to assess whether authoritative, authoritarian, and permissive parenting styles would emerge as separate factors. The analysis yielded three factors, authoritative, authoritarian, and permissive styles. These three factors accounted for 51.5% of the variation in scores. Specifically, the authoritative factor accounted for 26.1% of the variation (eigenvalue = 8.63), the authoritarian factor accounted for 18.9% of the variation (eigenvalue = 6.22), and the permissive factor accounted for 6.5% of the variation (eigenvalue = 2.15).

Next, a principal components factor analysis with varimax rotation of the factors was again used to assess if authoritative, authoritarian, and permissive parenting styles could be identified when parents reported on their own parenting. The analysis yielded three factors that accounted for 43.7% of the variation in scores. Specifically, the authoritative factor accounted for 22.1% of the variation (eigenvalue = 7.30), the authoritative factor accounted for 15.5% of the variation (eigenvalue = 5.12), and the permissive factor accounted for 6.1% of the variation (eigenvalue = 2.02).

A factor loading of .50 was used as the criteria for determining substantial cross-loadings (Applebaum & McCall, 1983). No items loaded below .50. However, one item on the self report cross-loaded (“I change the subject if I don’t like what our child has to say”) and eight items did not load on any of the factors. Therefore these nine items were dropped from further analysis. Thus, the final version on the parent instrument – for both self report and spousal
report - consisted of 15 authoritative items, 13 authoritarian items, and 4 permissive items. Factor loadings for self report and spouse report items for the resulting three scales were moderate to high, ranging from .51 to .84 and .50 to .74, respectively (See Table 2 for item descriptions and factor loadings). Computation of Cronbach’s alpha showed all three scales to be adequately reliable. Specifically, Cronbach’s alpha for authoritative, authoritarian, and permissive constructs, respectively, were .90, .87, .55 for self reports (mothers and fathers combined), .88, .86, .58 for mother’s self-reports, and .90, .87, .52 for father’s self-reports. Cronbach’s alpha for spousal reports for authoritative, authoritarian, and permissive parenting, respectively, computed at .94, .89, .64 for spouse reports (mothers and fathers combined) 94, .88, .62 for fathers reporting on mothers and .93, .89, .65 for mothers reporting on fathers. In support of the first hypothesis, these results demonstrate that parents clearly delineated between the three subtypes of parenting styles.

*Item Means and Standard Deviations*

As shown in Table 3, the means range from 3.61 (fathers’ parenting as rated by spouse) to 4.08 (mothers’ self report) for authoritative parenting, 1.83 (fathers’ parenting as rated by spouse) to 1.98 (fathers’ self report and mothers’ parenting as rated by spouse) for authoritarian parenting and 2.06 (fathers’ parenting as rated by spouse) to 2.20 (mothers’ parenting as rated by spouse) for permissive parenting. Standard deviations suggest that there is more variability on parents’ spouse reports than parents’ self reports.

*Inter-correlations*

Correlational analyses were conducted to examine the extent to which the three factors were related. Four analyses were conducted including for fathers’ self-reports, mothers’ self-reports, mothers’ ratings of the fathers, and fathers’ ratings of mothers (see Table 4). For
fathers’ self reports, the authoritative factor was negatively correlated with the authoritarian factor ($r = -0.11, p < .05$) and the authoritarian factor was positively correlated with the permissive factor ($r = 0.36, p < .01$). No association was found between the authoritative and permissive factors. For mothers’ self reports, the authoritarian factor was negatively related to the authoritative factor ($r = -0.21, p < .01$) and positively associated with the permissive factor ($r = 0.26, p < .01$). No association was found between the authoritative and permissive factors. For mothers’ ratings of the fathers, the authoritarian factor was positively related to the permissive factor ($r = 0.18, p < .01$). No other correlations were significant. Finally, for the fathers’ ratings of mothers, the permissive factor was positively associated with both the authoritative factor ($r = 0.14, p < .01$) and the authoritarian factor ($r = 0.38, p < .01$). Though some aspects of parenting appear to be correlated, the modesty of these relationships suggest that both self report and spouse report of parenting styles are tapping individual aspects of parental behavior.

*Discriminant Validity*

As one test of validity, we predicted that parents who practice authoritative parenting would have kids who rated their parents high in aspects of positive parenting. Specifically, we would expect children of authoritative parents to feel a greater sense of comfort, confidence and security in family relationships. Two domains regarding family relations were examined including Family Processes (“From what I experienced in my family, I think family relationships are safe, secure, rewarding, worth being in, and a source of comfort”), and Family Impact (“There are matters from my family experience that I am still having trouble dealing with or coming to terms with.”). Correlational analyses were used to assess the association between authoritative, authoritarian, and permissive parenting, respectively, and both family processes and family impact. For mothers’ self reports, authoritative parenting was positively associated with family
processes ($r = .18, p < .01$). Based on husbands’ ratings of their wife, authoritative parenting was negatively related to family impact ($r = -.22, < .01$). For fathers’ self reports, authoritative parenting was positively associated with family processes ($r = .11, p < .01$). Based on wives’ ratings of their husband, authoritative parenting was positively associated to family processes ($r = .21, p < .01$) and negatively associated with family impact ($r = -.14, p < .01$). For fathers’ self report, authoritarian parenting was positively related to family impact ($r = .12, p < .01$).
Chapter V

Discussion

The purpose of this study was: (1) to examine whether or not authoritative, authoritarian and permissive parenting styles could be identified in parents of emerging adults, and (2) to assess the validity and reliability of the parenting measure that emerges from the factor analysis for both parents’ self reports and spouse reports.

Based on the factor analyses of items in the parenting scale, it appears that authoritative, authoritarian, and permissive parenting can be identified as distinct and separate parenting styles in parents of emerging adults, thereby supporting the first purpose of the study. Such parenting styles have been documented in the existing literature as influential to children’s development in early, middle, and later childhood (Baumrind, 1967; Baumrind, 1993; Dornbusch, et al, 1987; Maccoby & Martin, 1983; Steinberg, et al, 1992; Steinberg, et al, 1991; Darling & Steinberg, 1993; Fischer & Crawford, 1992; Gresham & Elliott, 1990). However, few studies have examined if these different domains of parenting are evident in parents of emerging adults. Consequently, we know little about how these parenting styles relate to and influence children who are bridging the gap from adolescence to adulthood. Therefore, by illustrating that dimensions of authoritative, authoritarian, and permissive parenting can be identified in emerging adulthood, the current study provides the foundation for future studies to explore how these different parenting strategies are related concurrently and predictively to the development of young people in emerging adulthood.

The results of the study suggest that it is a reliable and valid measure. First, factor analyses produced three separate and distinct factors. As shown in Table 2, loadings were found to be strong for items in each extracted parenting factor. These high to moderate loadings
indicate that the variables they construct hang-together well suggesting that the theoretical constructs of parenting are statistically valid. Second, though some aspects of parenting appear to be correlated, the modesty of these relationships suggest that both self report and spouse report of parenting styles are tapping individual aspects of parental behavior. Surprisingly, the authoritarian and permissive factors were slightly correlated for both spouse report and self report of parental behavior. It could be that authoritarian parenting style may not be an effective strategy for dealing with child behavior. Therefore, perhaps parents who employ authoritarian behaviors eventually give in when these behaviors do not produce the desired outcomes, resulting in the parent yielding to the demands of the child. Another possibility is that authoritarian parents feel that once a child turns 18, the child is “on his/her own.” Thus, they may react when confrontational situations arise but leave the child to “grow up” on one’s own. This duality of coercive and hands-off parent-child interactions could explain the relationship between authoritarian and permissive parenting styles. Another possibility is that both authoritarian and permissive parenting might share similar elements during emerging adulthood such as parent-centeredness or emotional distancing. It may be that both constructs are tapping into these aspects of parenting. Regardless of the reason, the fact that the constructs are only modestly correlated at best, suggests they are unique constructs.

Next, cronbach’s alphas are strong with the exception of the permissive factor. These reliability estimates evoke confidence in the reliability of the authoritative and authoritarian factors for mothers and fathers as well as self-reports and spousal ratings. However, they do give reason for concern in regard to the permissive factor. This could be because only four items loaded on the permissive variable. Additional studies may want to include more items which tap dimensions of permissive parenting in order to increase the validity of this construct. It may also
reflect the fact that parents of emerging adults who are permissive are simply not doing a lot of parenting at all. They may believe that their role as parents cease once a child has reached the age of 18. To help us better understand whether or not parents even see permissiveness to be an approach to parenting any longer once a child reaches the age of 18, future work should examine the beliefs underlying these styles.

Finally, validity was assessed by examining associations between parenting dimensions and emerging-adult’s reports of family experience. It was expected that parenting would be related to a child’s perception of his or her family experience. While modest in magnitude, the results suggest this is indeed the case. Specifically, subscales of family processes and family impact were found to correlate with authoritative, authoritarian, and permissive parenting. In particular, mothers and fathers self-reports of authoritative parenting were indicative of emerging adults’ report of family processes. Additionally, results indicated a trend approaching significance for the relationship between fathers’ self-report of authoritative parenting and emerging adults’ perception of family influence. Therefore, we see that self-reports do hold discriminant validity in terms of family outcomes. However, there are two limitations that should be acknowledged. First, the emerging adults’ reports of family experiences are retrospective (i.e., referring to experiences in their family while growing up), and second, the relationships in general focused on family rather than specifically with parents. However, the emerging adults’ reports of family experience were included since family relations are oftentimes viewed through the lens of the parent-child relationship.

Taken together, these findings provide evidence that this instrument provides a reliable and valid measure of a parents’ approach to parenting. Furthermore, it suggests that this holds true for both self and spousal ratings. Interestingly though, self-reports and spouse-reports of
parenting dimensions were correlated with different aspects of emerging adults’ family experience. As spousal reports of maternal authoritative parenting increased, the emerging adult’s perception of the negative impact of family experience decreased. Perhaps the father holds a unique perspective of the mother’s parenting behaviors which allow his responses to tap a dimension of maternal behavior that positively impacts the child. It seems possible that fathers are more likely than mothers to report positive parenting strategies in their spouses than mothers are to reports such positive perceptions of themselves. This may suggest that mothers are more critical of their parenting and subsequent outcomes.

Mothers’ self report of authoritative parenting is not significantly related to the child’s perception of the lasting impact of negative family experiences. It may be that the mother’s perception of self is uniquely important in providing a healthy environment for the child, which positively affects his/her perception of the familial atmosphere. However, the spousal report of authoritative parenting has a significant negative relation to the child’s perception of the lasting impact of negative family experiences. This may mean that the spouse report for mothers is more telling of the child’s perception of family impact than mothers’ self report.

Spousal reports were found to be more telling of family impact in the child’s experience. Specifically, the long-term influence of family relations appeared to be better assessed with spousal reports. These reports may also be more objective, especially mothers’ reporting on fathers’ behavior as seen with authoritative parenting. Given that fathers are more difficult to recruit for participation in research, spousal reports may be more useful. Limitations to spousal reports include the possibility that parents who are no longer living in the same household (e.g., divorce) are not aware of specific parenting behaviors any more. In these cases, self reports may be a better option.
Indeed, self reports may be more indicative of the child’s experience of the family environment (i.e. safe and secure family relationships, loving atmosphere, happy childhood, etc.). As such, self reports would be of greater benefit for studies seeking to capture feelings within the home environment. Self reports may also be more accurate depending on the strength of the relationship one parent may have with their emerging adult. Although Yang et al (2004) found more meaningful linkages between parent-child behavior (i.e. fathers’ psychological control and daughters’ aggression) using spouse reports, self reports were useful in comparing mothers’ and fathers’ perceptions of their own parenting. However, Chamberlain and Peterson (1995) found self-reports to be the least acceptable form of assessment compared to the preferred method of naturalistic observation. Further limitations to self reports may include less objectivity from parents or the presence of social desirability. Taken together, there are strengths and limitations to both spouse reports and self reports and, therefore, researchers will have to make decisions on which to use based on the goals of their study. Fortunately, results of this study provide a valid and reliable measure for both self and spouse report.

Indeed, these finding provide persuasive evidence for the usefulness of this parenting measure in the further study of emerging adulthood. Specifically, it is clear that the influence of parenting in emerging adulthood needs further examination given the continued role parents play in “parenting” their emerging adult. In the future, there may be utility for researchers to explore these parenting practices from the child’s point of view. It would also be important to examine how control, autonomy, and connectedness are incorporated in the parent-child relationship during emerging adulthood. In addition, identifying the link between parenting styles and important milestones in EA (identity development, formation of functional relationships, and participation in risk factors) would also elucidate the impact of the parent-child relationship
during this time period. Therefore, this measure provides an important tool for future work examining the parent-child relationship during this important period of development.

This study is not without limitations. First, this included only those young people attending college. Future work needs to include participants who are not attending school. Second, this study also lacked socioeconomic and ethnic diversity. Future studies may want to assess the validity of the scales using a more diverse sample.

Despite these limitations, this study does provide one of the first attempts to develop a measure for parenting during emerging adulthood. Indeed, the results suggest that the scale is valid and reliable and therefore makes a significant contribution to our understanding of parenting during emerging adulthood.
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Table 1

Parenting Practices Questionnaire

**Authoritative Parenting**

1. [My partner is] [I am] responsive to our child’s feelings and needs.
2. [My partner takes] [I take] our child’s desires into account before asking the child to do something.
3. [My partner explains] [I explain] to our child how we feel about the child’s good and bad choices and actions.
4. [My partner encourages] [I encourage] our child to talk about his/her troubles.
5. [My partner encourages] [I encourage] our child to freely express himself/herself even when disagreeing with parents.
6. [My partner emphasizes] [I emphasize] the reasons for expectations.
7. [My partner gives] [I give] comfort and understanding when our child is upset.
8. [My partner compliments] [I compliment] our child.
9. [My partner shows] [I show] respect for our child’s opinions by encouraging our child to express them.
10. [My partner treats] [I treat] our child like an adult.
11. [My partner explains] [I explain] the reasons for our desires for our child (e.g., work, school, marriage).
12. [My partner allows] [I allow] our child to do what he/she thinks is best.

**Authoritarian Parenting**

4. When our child asks why he/she has to conform, [my partner states] [I state]: because I said so, or I am your parent and I want you to.
10. [My partner punishes] [I punish] by taking privileges (e.g., use of car, rent) away from our child.
13. [My partner yells or shouts] [I yell or shout] when [partner disapproves] [I disapprove] of our child’s actions or choices.
16. [My partner explodes] [I explode] in anger towards our child.
18. [My partner grabs] [I grab] our child when [my partner doesn’t] [I don’t] like what he/she does.
22. [My partner scolds and criticizes] [I scold and criticize] to make our child improve.
25. [My partner uses] [I use] threats as punishment with little or no justification.
27. [My partner punishes] [I punish] by withholding some form of financial support.
29. [My partner scolds and criticizes] [I scold and criticize] when our child’s behavior doesn’t meet our expectations.
32. [My partner always tries] [I always try] to change how our child feels or thinks about
things.
34. [My partner feels] [I feel] a need to remind our child of past choices so he/she doesn’t make mistakes again.
36. [My partner reminds] [I remind] our child that [my partner is] [I am] still his/her parent.
37. [My partner reminds] [I remind] our child of all [my partner has] [I have] done for him/her.

Permissive Parenting

8. [My partner finds] [I find] it difficult to discipline our child.
15. [My partner gives] [I give] into our child when the child causes a commotion about something.
23. [My partner spoils] [I spoil] our child.
41. [My partner ignores] [I ignore] our child’s bad choices.
Table 2

Factor Loadings

**Authoritative Parenting**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Load</th>
<th>Factor 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.79</td>
<td>[My partner is] [I am] responsive to our child’s feelings and needs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.67</td>
<td>[My partner takes] [I take] our child’s desires into account before asking the child to do something.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.75</td>
<td>[My partner explains] [I explain] to our child how we feel about the child’s good and bad choices and actions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.80</td>
<td>[My partner encourages] [I encourage] our child to talk about his/her troubles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.68</td>
<td>[My partner encourages] [I encourage] our child to freely express himself/herself even when disagreeing with parents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.75</td>
<td>[My partner emphasizes] [I emphasize] the reasons for expectations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.82</td>
<td>[My partner gives] [I give] comfort and understanding when our child is upset.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.81</td>
<td>[My partner compliments] [I compliment] our child.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.71</td>
<td>[My partner takes] [I take] into account our child’s preferences in making plans for the family.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.84</td>
<td>[My partner shows] [I show] respect for our child’s opinions by encouraging our child to express them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.68</td>
<td>[My partner treats] [I treat] our child like an adult.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.78</td>
<td>[My partner gives] [I give] our child reasons for the expectations we have for him/her.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.68</td>
<td>[My partner has] [I have] warm and intimate times together with our child.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.75</td>
<td>[My partner explains] [I explain] the reasons for our desires for our child (e.g., work, school, marriage).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.51</td>
<td>[My partner allows] [I allow] our child to do what he/she thinks is best.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Authoritarian Parenting**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Load</th>
<th>Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.65</td>
<td>When our child asks why he/she has to conform, [my partner states] [I state]: because I said so, or I am your parent and I want you to.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.61</td>
<td>[My partner punishes] [I punish] by taking privileges (e.g., use of car, rent) away from our child.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.66</td>
<td>[My partner yells or shouts] [I yell or shout] when [partner disapproves] [I disapprove] of our child’s actions or choices.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.71</td>
<td>[My partner explodes] [I explode] in anger towards our child.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.58</td>
<td>[My partner grabs] [I grab] our child when [my partner doesn’t] [I don’t] like what he/she does.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.72</td>
<td>[My partner scolds and criticizes] [I scold and criticize] to make our child improve.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.63</td>
<td>[My partner uses] [I use] threats as punishment with little or no justification.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.61</td>
<td>[My partner punishes] [I punish] by withholding some form of financial support.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.69</td>
<td>[My partner scolds and criticizes] [I scold and criticize] when our child’s behavior doesn’t meet our expectations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
[My partner always tries] [I always try] to change how our child feels or thinks about things.

[My partner feels] [I feel] a need to remind our child of past choices so he/she doesn’t make mistakes again.

[My partner reminds] [I remind] our child that [my partner is] [I am] still his/her parent.

[My partner reminds] [I remind] our child of all [my partner has] [I have] done for him/her.

Permissive Parenting

Load Factor

[My partner finds] [I find] it difficult to discipline our child.

[My partner gives] [I give] into our child when the child causes a commotion about something.

[My partner spoils] [I spoil] our child.

[My partner ignores] [I ignore] our child’s bad choices.
Table 3

Means and Standard Deviations of Parenting Styles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Dev.</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mother Self-Report</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authoritative</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authoritarian</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permissive</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Father Self-Report</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authoritative</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authoritarian</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permissive</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mother (as reported by spouse)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authoritative</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authoritarian</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permissive</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Father (as rated by spouse)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authoritative</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authoritarian</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permissive</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4

Correlation of Parenting Factors

Father Self Report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Father Authoritative</th>
<th>Father Authoritarian</th>
<th>Father Permissive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Father Authoritative</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-.11*</td>
<td>-.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father Authoritarian</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.36**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father Permissive</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**p<.01

Mother Self Report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mother Authoritative</th>
<th>Mother Authoritarian</th>
<th>Mother Permissive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mother Authoritative</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-.21**</td>
<td>-.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother Authoritarian</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.26**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother Permissive</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**p<.01

Father (as rated by mothers)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Father Authoritative</th>
<th>Father Authoritarian</th>
<th>Father Permissive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Father Authoritative</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father Authoritarian</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.18**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father Permissive</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**p<.01

Mother (as rated by fathers)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mother Authoritative</th>
<th>Mother Authoritarian</th>
<th>Mother Permissive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mother Authoritative</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.14**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother Authoritarian</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.37**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother Permissive</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**p<.01
Table 5

Correlation of Family Background

Mother Self Report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Family Processes</th>
<th>Family Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mother Authoritative</td>
<td>.18**</td>
<td>-.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother Authoritarian</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.10†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother Permissive</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**p<.01
†p>.06

Mother (as rated by spouse)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Family Processes</th>
<th>Family Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mother Authoritative</td>
<td>.11†</td>
<td>-.22**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother Authoritarian</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother Permissive</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**p<.01
†p>.06

Father Self Report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Family Processes</th>
<th>Family Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Father Authoritative</td>
<td>.11*</td>
<td>-.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father Authoritarian</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.12*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father Permissive</td>
<td>.10†</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<.05
†p>.06

Father (as rated by spouse)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Family Processes</th>
<th>Family Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Father Authoritative</td>
<td>.21**</td>
<td>-.14**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father Authoritarian</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father Permissive</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**p<.01