

CONSTRUCTION AND VALIDATION OF A FOUR PARENTING STYLES SCALE

by

Livia Lorena Ribeiro

A Thesis

Presented to

The Faculty of Humboldt State University

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Master of Arts

In Psychology: Counseling

August, 2009

CONSTRUCTION AND VALIDATION OF A FOUR PARENTING STYLES SCALE

by

Livia Lorena Ribeiro

Approved by the Master's Thesis Committee:

Bettye S. Elmore, PhD., Major Professor	Date
-----------------------------------------	------

Lou Ann Wieand, PhD., Committee Member	Date
----------------------------------------	------

Nancy E. Dye, M.P.H., PhD., Committee Member	Date
----------------------------------------------	------

James Dupree, PhD., Graduate Coordinator	Date
------------------------------------------	------

John Lyon, Dean for Research and Graduate Studies	Date
---------------------------------------------------	------

Abstract

Construction and Validation of a Four Parenting Styles Scale

by Livia Ribeiro

Researchers have developed the concept of parenting styles to describe the interaction between parents and their children during the socialization process. Much of the research on parenting style has been based on Baumrind's (1966) three distinct styles; authoritative, authoritarian, and permissive. Several researchers, including Baumrind, have suggested that the permissive style is in fact two distinct types of parenting styles, i.e., permissive-indulgent and permissive-indifferent (sometimes referred to as permissive-rejecting and/or permissive-neglectful and currently uninvolved parents).

The scale most often designed to measure perceived parenting styles is based on three parenting styles, although it has long been accepted that there are indeed four prototypes based on Baumrind's model. Several factors have been identified and promoted as separating or distinguishing the different parenting styles. The major factors tend to be whether or not the parent is high or low in the following behaviors: 1) warmth and nurturing; 2) maturity demands; 3) control of child's behavior; and 4) communication between parent and child (the extent to which the child's opinion is sought and listened). Based on these four behaviors and whether or not a parent was high or low on each, the Parenting Style Scale (PSS) was designed to assess consistency of parenting over

developmental age as well as parenting styles using the notion of four as opposed to three parenting styles.

This study attempted to create and assess a new measure to evaluate the consistency of perceived parenting over time using five ages in development. The measure was also based on four parenting styles, authoritarian, authoritative, permissive-indulgent and permissive-indifferent or neglect, instead of three authoritarian, authoritative and permissive. Two parent-child scenarios were developed for the ages 4, 7, 10, 13 and 16. The new measure was developed using a 5 point Likert and forced choice response format asking the participant to select whether or not their parent responded to a child behavior from All of the Time = 5 to Never = 1. After responding to all of the scenarios for a particular age the respondent was then asked to pick the response which best matched the manner in which they remembered their parent may have responded.

The scenarios were developed from a review of the literature on parent-child interactions in high and low degrees of warmth, nurturing, communication, demand for maturity and control of the child's behavior. In addition, parenting practices around age appropriate socialization issues were the basis of each of the scenarios

In this study the PSS was correlated with two other measures. Five hypotheses regarding consistency over age, validity and reliability were posed. The Parental Authority Questionnaire (Buri, 1991), based on three parenting styles was employed to examine convergent validity, while discriminate validity was obtained through the Beck

Depression Inventory-II (Beck, 1996). Reliability was assessed using item analysis reliability coefficient alpha and split-half analyses.

Results with 62 participants, 39 females and 23 males were employed to analyze consistency, validity and reliability. Descriptive statistics, Pearson correlation and Cronbach's Alphas were employed to analyze the data. These results revealed a strong consistency of reported parenting style across the five ages for these participants. The correlations between all of the ages except four and sixteen were significant and positive. The R^2 values ranged from $R^2 .40$ to $R^2 .03$. The correlation between four and sixteen resulted in the lowest predictability. Good reliability Cronbach's Alpha of (.78) and Guttman split half reliability .85 were found for the new PSS but questionable validity was obtained. It was concluded that further testing is needed.

Acknowledgements

It seems like a life time ago that this project began, and though many challenges have come about for me in the past few years, the vision of completing this project has kept me determined. I feel very fortunate to have had the opportunity to pursue my educational goals, and this thesis project is a reminder of how lucky I have been.

I am extremely grateful to my sons, LJ and Lorenzo for providing me with the motivation to continue forward, even when I felt most unmotivated and hopeless. LJ and Lorenzo, you two continue to show me, everyday, how powerful a mother's love can be. I thank my husband Alexandre for his love and support, who has kept me on task at times when I needed it most.

I am thankful to Dr. Bettye Elmore, whose knowledge has seen me through the completion of this project. I am constantly amazed at Bettye's compassion and love for life and children. This same love for children is what helped me develop this project. Dr. Lou Ann Wieand and Dr. Nancy Dye are very much appreciated for the time invested in this project. I'd also like to thank Cynthia Werner for her time and kindness in putting this thesis together.

Table of Contents

	Page
Abstract.....	iii
Acknowledgements.....	vi
Table of Contents.....	vii
List of Tables	ix
List of Figure.....	ix
Introduction.....	1
Statement of the Problem.....	6
Review of the Literature	6
Baumrind and three parenting styles.....	6
Maccoby and martin parenting styles	10
Developing the Parental Styles Scale (PSS)	11
Research Hypotheses	15
Method	16
Participants.....	16
Measures	16
Procedure	22
Results.....	24
Discussion.....	40
Conclusions.....	47
References.....	48

Appendix A Parental Authority Questionnaire (PAQ)	54
PAQ (mother).....	55
PAQ (father).....	61
Appendix B Parenting Scenario Scale	67
Appendix C BDI (BDI-II).....	78
Appendix D Consent Form Study.....	82

List of Tables

Table	Page
1 Descriptive Statistics for the Age Parental Score for the PSS	26
2 Correlations and Coefficients of Determination R^2 for the Five Age Groups on PSS	28
3 Descriptive Statistics for the PSS Total Items and the Four Parenting Subtypes.....	31
4 Correlations between the Parenting Style Prototypes of the PAQ and PSS.....	34
5 Correlations between the BDI and the Parenting Style Prototypes of the PSS.....	36
6 Reliability for the PSS using Cronbach's Alpha for 40 Items	38

List of Figure

Figure	Page
1. Conceptualization of Four Parenting Styles based on High and Low Parental Behavior for Warmth and Nurturing, Maturity Demands, Control of the Child's Behavior and Communication between the Parent and the Child (Base in part from Baumrind, 1971 and Maccoby and Martin, 1983).....	13

Introduction

Since 1966, researchers have conducted a great deal of research evaluating parent child interactions using the prototype of parental patterns developed by Baumrind (1966 & 1971), i.e., authoritative, authoritarian and permissive. In 1983 Maccoby and Martin modified this prototype by theorizing that there were enough differences in the permissive styles of parenting to warrant two, not one, category, i.e., permissive indulgent and permissive rejecting/neglecting. Most recently researchers have maintained consensus that parenting can be viewed through four prototypes of parenting styles (Baumrind, 1971; Maccoby and Martin, 1983; & Steinberg, Dornbusch, & Brown, 1992). There has been, however, a slight change in identifying the prototypes. A authoritative and authoritarian remain the same while permissive indulgent was separated into two prototypes, permissive indulgent and permissive rejecting/neglecting (Eisenberg & Valiente, 2002; Gershoff, 2002; Thompson, 1998).

Baumrind in 1971 suggested that her three parenting styles, authoritative, authoritarian, and permissive were representative of the styles parents used in the socialization of children based on high and low nurturing, maturity demands, communication and control of the child's behavior. Maccoby and Martin (1983) using the same prototypes defined by Baumrind (1971) suggested that four parenting styles would be more representative of the differences in parenting when the permissive indulgent style was examined in terms the characteristics outlined by Baumrind. Permissive indulgent parents tend to be high warmth, nurturing and communication and low in

maturity demands and control, while Permissive Rejecting/Neglecting parents tend to be low in warmth, nurturing and communication and low in maturity demands and control.

In spite of the revision suggested by Maccoby and Martin (1983) much of the research on parenting styles has continued to employ Baumrind's (1971) conceptualization and Buri's measure based on three parenting styles (1991). Some researchers when addressing parenting or socialization interactions have employed the three prototypes, while some have employed the four; this may occur because presently there are no measures of parenting based on four parenting styles. Steinberg (1990) employed three styles in an article done by Steinberg, Dornbusch, and Brown, (1992) and later in an article by Darling and Steinberg (1993) he employed four styles without any discussion of the differences between the two.

Several reasons may account for not making a distinction between the permissive styles. Darling and Steinberg suggested that whatever the limitations of Baumrind's model it has proven to be "fruitful for research on parenting" (p. 491). These researchers also suggested that the Maccoby and Martin's (1983) transformation is within the same "social learning or ethological perspective, (p. 491)". It is not clear whether these researchers approved the use of three styles or four. The problem is that many researchers support the original conceptualization by Baumrind (1971) and support the revision by Maccoby and Martin (1983) at the same time. Some confusion should come from the differences in the permissive parenting style but there is little discussion of this dilemma. It appears that may rest on the fact that permissiveness may be seen as poor parenting, whether or not it is indulgent or neglectful. A review of over one hundred fifty articles

online advising parents regarding parenting styles, speak of four styles. They praise authoritative parenting and advise parents of the negative consequences of permissive parenting.

The following represents two examples of the type or general tone of information provided online to parents. Researchers in refereed journals tend to avoid this advice giving presentation, although some developmental texts may engage in suggesting which is the preferred without much explanation. Henshaw (2009) in discussing what parenting style is best using three styles states that the “authoritative parenting style is considered to be the healthiest and most balanced approach to parenting ..., while: The permissive parenting style is an anything goes style. ... Children of permissive parenting usually engage in attention seeking behavior, also known as acting out (p.1).” Van Wagner (2009) using four styles based on Baumrind’s initial study and numerous researchers claims the following conclusions can be made:

Authoritarian parenting styles generally lead to children who are obedient and proficient, but they rank lower in happiness, social competence and self-esteem.

Authoritative parenting styles tend to result in children who are happy, capable and successful (Maccoby, 1991).

Permissive parenting often results in children who rank low in happiness and self-regulation. These children are more likely to experience problems with authority and tend to perform poorly in school.

Uninvolved parenting ranks lowest across all life domains. These children tend to lack self-control, have low self esteem and are less competent than their peers (p 1).

This introduces another issue around parenting, which is the notion that there has existed the assumption that permissive parenting is negative, thus whether high or low permissiveness the results in child behavior are similar in being inappropriate. This may or may not be true. As Maccoby (1990) attempted to explain, there is a difference in permissive parenting when it involves indulgence and when it involves uninvolved or neglect. When viewed from the responsive aspect of parenting style, permissive indulgent parents tend to be warm and available, and to provide emotional support for their child. The permissive neglectful parent tends to be cold and emotionally unavailable often “parentalizing” the child through a lack of control and boundaries (Kerig & Wenar, 2006). Furthermore, according to Schumacher, Smith-Slip & Hyman (2001) less is known about the neglectful parent than any other type.

Berger (1999) suggested that the child raised with permissive indulgent parenting may be similar in behavior on some dimensions to children with authoritative parents. The behaviors they may have in common are high self-esteem and social skills while achievement may be somewhat lower for children raised with permissive indulgent parents.

Meyer (2004), in a study on secure attached young adults who reported having experienced authoritative or permissive parenting as a child, found few differences between these two groups. His subjects were similar in overall intimacy, interpersonal and affective intimacy. There were no reported differences in ego identity. In general there were no differences in an overall sense of well being. However, there were some differences in these two groups, in that young adults who reported having an authoritative

parent, reported being significantly more cheerful and less depressed than those reporting a permissive parental style. Young adults with authoritative parents reported they were more energetic and reported having more satisfying and interesting lives than did those participants who reported having experienced a permissive parental style.

On the other hand the young adults with permissive parents reported having less emotional behavior and anxiety than did young adults with authoritative parents. Finally, in social problem solving the groups were equal in reporting the ability to engage in decision making and solution implementation. Young adults who reported having the authoritative parenting style were better in problem definition and formulation, and generating alternatives for problem solving.

Regardless of number of styles, most researchers agree that the interaction between parents and their children is an important aspect of the socialization of children (Baumrind, 1971; Maccoby & Martin, 1998; Gray & Steinberg, 1999). Furthermore, these researchers agree that parental behavior toward children tends to vary along two dimensions. The first dimension, which is parental responsiveness, includes love, warmth, and nurturance. This dimension taps the degree to which parents respond to their children's needs in either a supportive or rejecting manner. The second dimension is termed parental demandingness and control, which includes discipline and punishment. This dimension taps the manner in which parents require maturity and responsible behavior from their children.

Statement of the Problem

A thorough examination of the literature revealed that there were very few measures available to examine four parenting styles. The few measures that existed included only three parenting styles. There appears to be a need for a measure based on four styles of parenting. This study constructed a measure of four parenting styles based on the dimensions outlined by Maccoby and Martin (1983) as a rationale for four parenting styles measure.

Review of the Literature

Baumrind and three parenting styles

Baumrind (1971) grouped parent's behavior according to whether they were high or low on parental demandingness and responsiveness and created a typology of three parenting styles: authoritarian, authoritative, and permissive. Each of these parenting styles reflected different naturally occurring patterns of parental values, practices, and behaviors (Baumrind, 1991) and a distinct balance of responsiveness and demandingness.

Permissive parents were seen as more responsive than they are demanding. According to Baumrind's perspective permissive indulgent parents were "nontraditional and lenient, did not require mature behavior, allowed considerable self-regulation, and avoided confrontation" (Baumrind, 1991, p. 62). Her prototype did not include the affect or feelings toward the child involved in permissive parenting that represents a tendency of the parent to be neglectful and rejecting, i.e., being indifferent allowing extremes of

self-regulation and ignoring the child. Authoritarian parents, on the other hand, were seen as highly demanding and directive, and not responsive.

According to Baumrind, "They are obedience- and status-oriented, and expect their orders to be obeyed without explanation" (p. 62). Authoritarian parents appear to provide well-ordered and structured environments with clearly stated rules. However, authoritative parents were both demanding and responsive. She suggested that, "They monitor and impart clear standards for their children's conduct. They are assertive, but not intrusive and restrictive. Their disciplinary methods are supportive, rather than punitive. According to Baumrind these parents want their children to be assertive as well as socially responsible, and self-regulated as well as cooperative" (Baumrind, p. 62).

There is some evidence that suggested that authoritarian parents attempt to control their children's behavior through the use of guilt induction, withdrawal of love, or shaming (McCord, 1996). One key difference between authoritarian and authoritative parenting is in the dimension of psychological control. Psychological control refers to attempts that intrude into the psychological and emotional development by the parent (Baumrind, 1991; McKay, 2006). Authoritarian and authoritative parents place high demands on their children and expect their children to behave appropriately and obey parental rules. However, authoritarian parents also expect their children to accept their values, reasons and goals without questioning. On the other hand, authoritative parents are open to more give and take with their children; they make greater use of explanations, and listen to their children's opinions. According to Baumrind (1991, authoritative and authoritarian parents are equally high in *behavioral control*; however, authoritative

parents tend to be low in *psychological control*, while authoritarian parents tend to be high.

The findings of studies on consistence of parenting style over time have suggested the following. Several researchers have shown that the different parenting styles may have different consequences for children (Brenner & Fox, 1999). Parenting styles have been employed to predict a child's well being in the areas of self-esteem, social competence, academic performance, psychosocial development, and problem behavior. Research based on parent interviews, child reports, and parent observations has consistently found that children and adolescents whose parents are *authoritative* rate themselves and are rated by objective measures as more socially and instrumentally competent than those whose parents are non-authoritative (Baumrind, 1991). Also, children and adolescents from authoritarian families (high in demandingness, but low in responsiveness) tend to perform moderately well in school and be uninvolved in problem behavior (Weiss & Schwarz, 1996), but they have poorer social skills, lower self-esteem, and higher levels of depression (Miller, Cowan, Cowan, Hetherington, & Clingempeel, 1993).

In reviewing the literature on parenting styles, one is struck by the consistency with which authoritative upbringing is associated with both instrumental and social competence and lower levels of problem behavior in both boys and girls at all developmental stages (Baumrind, 1991; Darling & Steinberg, 1993). The benefits of authoritative parenting and the harmful effects of uninvolved or demanding intrusive parents are evident as early as the preschool years and continue throughout adolescence

and into early adulthood (McKay, 2006; Steinberg, Lamborn, Darling, Mounts & Dornbusch, 1994). Some of the harmful effects are seen in competence confidence, and low self-esteem as well as anxious and/or aggressive behavior. However, the largest differences found between children with parents that are uninvolved and negligent is the fact that they have a tendency to be unengaged socially (Lamborn, Mounts Steinberg & Dornbusch, 1991).

Differences between children from authoritative homes and their peers are equally consistent, but somewhat smaller (Weiss & Schwarz, 1996). Just as authoritative parents appear to be able to balance their conformity demands with their respect for their children's individuality, so children from authoritative homes appear to be able to balance the claims of external conformity and achievement demands with their need for individuation and autonomy.

In conclusion, Baumrind (1991) has suggested that parenting style provides a clear indicator of parenting functioning that predicts a child's well-being across a wide spectrum of environments and across diverse communities of children. Both parental responsiveness and parental demandingness are important components of good parenting. Authoritative parenting, which balances clear, high parental demands with high responsiveness and recognition of child autonomy, is one of the most consistent family predictors of competence from early childhood through adolescence.

However, despite the long tradition of research into parenting style, a number of issues remain outstanding. Foremost among these are issues of definition, developmental change in the manifestation and correlation of parenting styles, and the benefits of

authoritative parenting over the other styles of parenting (Barber, 1996; Baumrind, 1991; Darling & Steinberg, 1993). Furthermore, the distinction permissive parenting suggested by Maccoby and Martin (1983) continues to have an unexplored area of parenting. A measure to assess these four styles may assist researchers in exploring the differences between three and four parenting styles.

Maccoby and Martin parenting styles

Maccoby and Martin (1983) based their research of the four parenting styles on two dimensions: demandingness and responsiveness. They stated that the authoritarian style was high in demandingness but low in responsiveness, and the authoritative style was high in demandingness and responsiveness. However, Maccoby and Martin took the permissive style a step further than Baumrind (1971). They discussed two patterns of parenting within the permissive style, the permissive-indulgent and the permissive-indifferent. The authoritarian type included children raised in families with high levels of demand and control, low levels of warmth and responsiveness these children had low self-esteem and demonstrate low levels of social skill. The authoritative type of parenting was associated with consistently high outcomes, parents were high in both control and warmth, setting limits but responding to individual needs. These children demonstrated high levels of self-esteem, were independent, complied with parents' requests, were self-confident and achievement oriented. They were also less likely to demonstrate depression or delinquency.

The permissive type on the other hand included children raised in families with low levels of demand and control, but high levels of warmth and responsiveness. These children were immature in their behavior with peers, were aggressive and were not likely to be independent or take on responsibility. The neglecting type was associated with the most consistent negative outcomes. These children demonstrated disturbances in relationships with peers and adults. By adolescence they were impulsive, antisocial and demonstrate low levels of achievement.

Maccoby in 1992 was critical of the PAQ because it did not include permission parenting. She based her criticism on the finding that college students report that their parents had been neglectful to them. Much of the research on parenting style employ a definition of permissiveness that can include both indulgence and neglect, i.e., permissive parents are low in demandingness and exercise low levels of control of their children. However, the two styles are quite different in warmth, nurturance and communication. This study attempted to develop a measure on four styles recognizing the differences in permissive parenting.

Developing the Parental Styles Scale (PSS)

The intent of this study was to provide an alternative measure to the Parenting Assessment Questionnaire developed by Buri, 1991 to assess parenting styles. The assumption behind the need for a new measure was based on the fact that much of the research employed used Buri's measure of three types when in fact Maccoby and Martin

(1983) and Baumrind (1991) suggest both behaviorally and theoretically that there exist four prototypes of parenting styles.

The PSS is not only different in the concept of parenting style but also includes a measure of consistency of parenting over developmental ages (Brenner & Fox, 1999). Items for the scale were constructed by the students in the Child Research Group at Humboldt State University and this researcher. The literature pertaining to parenting styles as determined by Baumrind (1966, 1971, 1991) modified by Maccoby and Martin (1983) was reviewed as well as the literature pertaining to the outcomes of discipline on the child. Furthermore the group reviewed articles on the internet regarding attitudes toward parenting styles. Notes were taken by the reviewers and a matrix was developed. (See figure 1 for a conceptualization of four parenting styles based on high and low parental behaviors for warmth and nurturing, maturity demands, control of the child's behavior, and communication between the parent and the child (Baumrind, 1971 and Maccoby and Martin, 1983).

The matrix depicted the major concepts employed, representing the different behaviors performed by the parents in each of the four styles. Furthermore, the developmental literature regarding changes in children's need for autonomy, and less control by the parents was reviewed (Baumrind, 1991; Eisenberg, Spinard, Gabes, Reiser, Cumbuland, Shepard, Valiente, Loseya, Gurthuer & Thompson, 2004; Eisenberg & Valiente, 2002; Gersgiffm 2002; Holden & Miller, 1999; Maccoby, 1984; Parpe & Buvel, 1998). Five ages were looked at; age four representing toddlers, age seven representing the early school age child, age nine representing the late

Parenting Styles

Authoritative

- High Warmth/Nurturing
- High Maturity Demands
- High in Control of Child's Behavior
- High Communication between Parent/Child*

Authoritarian

- Low Warmth/Nurturing
- High Maturity Demands
- High in Control of Child's Behavior
- Low Communication between Parent/Child*

Permissive-Indulgent

- High Warmth/Nurturing
- Low Maturity High Demands
- Low in Control of Child's Behavior
- High Communication between Parent/Child*

Permissive-Rejecting

- Low Warmth/Nurturing
- High Maturity Demands
- Low in Control of Child's Behavior
- Low Communication between Parent/Child*

Figure 1. Conceptualization of Four Parenting Styles based on High and Low Parental Behavior for Warmth and Nurturing, Maturity Demands, Control of the Child's Behavior and Communication between the Parent and the Child (Base in part from Baumrind, 1971 and Maccoby and Martin, 1983)

*The extent to which the child's opinions are sought and listen to school age child, age 13 representing early adolescence, and age 16 representing late adolescence (Cole, Micheal, & Teti, 1994; Kochanska, Murray, & Harlan, 2000).

The content of the items or scenarios focused on atypical negative behavior for the age. The items purpose was to describe a typical parent child scene when discipline needs to be applied. The researcher developed two scenarios for each of the ages employed. No item sampling was completed, that is, no large pool of items were developed, instead examples of misbehavior in children was obtained from several sources in the literature on child misbehavior (Fischel & Liebert, 2000; Gartrell, 2003 & 1995; Greenberg & Doyle, 1991

The format of the measure was to use a five point Likert Scale from one to five with one being always and five representing never. The measure also required the respondent a set of alternative responses. This was not a multiple choice format with correct and incorrect answers but a selection of responses from a set of options all relating a parents behavior.

Developing the test scenarios took an inordinate amount of time. The researchers role-played the scenarios, responded to different sets of responses and discussed the limitations and advantages of each. There was an attempt to find names that are often used for both genders, i.e., Taylor, Terry, and Chris are examples. In addition, the title *parent* was used in order to enable the participant to imagine the parent that was most likely to employ discipline when they were a child. A preliminary paper was presented at the Western Psychological Association meeting in 2002 (Elmore, Weinstein and Ribeiro, 2002) and changes were made to the PSS based on feedback received. However, no pilot study was conducted and in a sense this research represents an attempt to pilot test the PSS. The test tryout for the items or scenarios, the format and the rationale underlying the

measure as well as the validity and reliability of the measure rest with the results found in this study.

Research Hypotheses

1. There will be consistent parenting styles across ages as reported by the subjects.
2. There will be a relatively high positive correlation between the authoritative and authoritarian parenting styles and a high negative correlation between the permissive indulgent and neglecting subscales of the Parenting Styles Scale (PSS) and the authoritative, authoritarian and permissive subscales of the Parental Authority Questionnaire (PAQ).
3. There will be a relatively low negative correlation between the authoritarian, permissive indulgent and neglecting subscales of the Parenting Styles Scale (PSS) and the Beck Depression Inventory II (BDI-II).
4. The item analysis reliability coefficient will be greater than .70 for the PSS.
5. The split half correlation between the two halves of the PSS measure will be greater than .70.

Method

Participants

The 62 participants in this study were students attending a small college in Northern California. All of the participants were over the age of 18, with the ranges in ages occurring from 18 to 30. The mean age of the participants was 21.61 and the modal age was 21. The gender of the participants was unequal; there were 39 females and 22 males. There were 3 freshman, 3 sophomores, 27 juniors and 29 seniors. The Institutional Review Board on February 27, 2009, original #04-17, approval #08-62 approved this study.

Measures

Three measures were employed in this study, the Parental Authority Questionnaire (PAQ) (Buri, 1991), the Parental Scenario Scale (PSS) (Elmore, Weinstein, and Ribeiro, 2002) and Beck Depression Inventory II (BDI-II)(Beck, 1996).

Parental Authority Questionnaire (PAQ). Buri (1991) developed a self report measure asking an adult to respond to how their parents acted toward them, when the adult was a child. In addition, the PAQ was designed as a measure of Baumrind's (1971) three parenting styles based on authority, disciplinary practices of warmth, demands, expectations and control. The measure consists of 30 items, 10 for each of the different styles of parenting in a five point Likert format ranging from strongly agree to disagree. The items are written from the perspective of the child but responded to by adults in a

self-report manner, i.e., what would your mother or father have done when you were a child. There is a separate form for mother and a form for father, but the questions are the same and in the same order.

The three parenting style questions are embedded in the questionnaire in a random order. Authoritative parents are flexible, use reason with their children, are rational, maintain firm and clear boundaries, while being consistent in the expectations of their children's behavior (items 4, 5, 8, 11, 15, 20, 22, 23, 27 and 30.), Authoritarian parents attempt to maintain unquestioning obedience from their children and attempt to control their behavior often through the use of punishment as a form of discipline (items 2, 3, 7, 9, 12, 16, 18, 25, 26, and 29), Permissive parents tend to be relatively warm as well as non-demanding and controlling of the child (items 1, 6, 10, 13, 14, 17, 19, 21, 24, and 28). To score the PAQ the individual items for each parenting subtype are summed. The score on each subscale are from a minimum of 10 to a maximum of 30.

The reliability of the PAQ was found to be .77 to .92 in a test re-test check over a two-week period of time (Buri, 1991). Validity for the PAQ was found to be .74 to .87 for the subscales (Buri,). In order to add the data on reliability and validity for the PAQ, this study completed split-half and item analysis reliability using the participants of this study. Furthermore, validity was examined through a comparison with the Parenting Styles Scale as an integral part of this study (results are outlined in the results section.) (See Appendix A)

Parenting Styles Scale (PSS) (Elmore, Weinstein and Ribeiro, 2002). Baumrind (1971) suggested that there were three prototypes of parenting styles; however, Maccoby

and Martin (1983) added a fourth parenting style. They suggested that the permissive style should be two styles, permissive-indulgent and permissive-neglecting/rejecting. The Parenting Styles Scale (PSS) was developed to test for four parenting styles.

The basic design of the parent-child PSS scenarios are as follows. After reading and discussing parenting children at various ages, two scenarios were developed for each of the following ages: 4, 7, 10, 13, and 16. The Child Research Group was made up of ten hundred undergraduate students and this researcher. We read 100s of articles on parenting, parenting styles and discipline. The five ages were selected as reference points at which parents may use a different style of parenting. Four choices were available, the respondent was asked to answer on a five point Likert Scale from “All of the Time to Never” for all of the scenarios and to pick the one which best represented what their parent would have done in the particular case. The final test consists of 40 responses.

The first twenty of the items contain scenarios for the five ages followed by twenty additional scenarios for the same ages. The participants were asked to read each of the scenarios and answer according to how they felt their parents would have responded to the scenario when the participant was that age. The four choices presented centered around one response similar to how each parent in each of the following parenting styles would have responded to the child; authoritarian, authoritative, permissive and neglecting. For example:

Please read the following scenarios and respond to each statement in the manner in which your parent would have responded when you were a child.

Terry has difficulty dressing for school. As a 4-year old often insists, no one can help. However, delays up to a half hour are expected, with tears and tantrums when procrastination can no longer happen because everyone has to leave the house for work, school etc.

1. The parent asks Terry to please hurry and reminds the child that they have to leave in 5 minutes because they will be late for work and Terry will be late for school. The parent continues to remind the child until they negotiate that Terry will get a reward in the car if the clothes are on in the next minute. The parent helps Terry to put the clothes on. (Permissive)

\ _____ 5 _____ / _____ 4 _____ / _____ 3 _____ / _____ 2 _____ / _____ 1 _____ /
All of the Time Most of the Time Sometime Rarely Never

2. The parent picks the child up the clothes half on, half off, leaves Terry, and the clothing at the preschool. The parent explains to the director that they cannot do anything with the child and leaves without saying goodbye. (Neglect)

\ _____ 5 _____ / _____ 4 _____ / _____ 3 _____ / _____ 2 _____ / _____ 1 _____ /
All of the Time Most of the Time Sometime Rarely Never

3. The parent tells Terry that they have negotiated for the last time. The parent explains that they will both be late for work and school if they do not leave in the next five minutes. The parent explains that they will now have to finish dressing the child if they do not put the clothes on immediately. When the child is dressing, the parent explains that they will help them with learning how to get dressed at another time. (Authoritative)

_____5_____/______4_____/______3_____/______2_____/______1_____/

All of the Time Most of the Time Sometime Rarely Never

4. The parent demands that Terry put the clothes on immediately. When the child is not compliant; the parent follows through with corporal punishment and a warning regarding what will happen if this behavior occurs again. (Authoritarian)

_____5_____/______4_____/______3_____/______2_____/______1_____/

All of the Time Most of the Time Sometime Rarely Never

Circle one of the above four statements which best describe what your parent was most likely to have done: 1 2 3 4

There are some major differences between this scale and the scale by Buri (1991). First, both scales contain a five point Likert response scale. However, the PSS scale in addition contains a forced choice among the four responses for each of the 10 scenarios. For example: Please read the following scenario and respond to the four responses to each. Circle one of the above four statements which best describes what your parent was most likely to have done: 1 2 3 4

This assures that in the set of responses for each scenario, one response will be a clear choice of a specific parenting style. In addition, the PSS is based on four not three parenting styles. (See Appendix B.)

The purpose of this study was to establish the reliability and validity of the PSS, a new test to be employed for research purposes; no reliability or validity data is yet available for this measure. Split-half reliability and item analysis reliability were completed with these participants. In terms of validity, convergent validity was established through an examination of the correlation between the scores on the PAQ and discriminate validity with BDI-II with the PSS. The design of the test is such that the first twenty items can be used as a shortened version of the scale. Item analysis was employed for the entire measure and the two shorter version scales. (See Appendix B)

Beck's Depression Inventory II (Beck, 1996). Beck, Steer, and Brown released the revised publication of the Depression Inventory II in 1996. The Beck Depression Inventory II is the latest version available. This version contains 21 items was used in this study. The Beck Depression Inventory-II (Beck, 1996) measures the level of depression a person is experiencing. The BID-II was selected for validating the PSS using discriminate validity because of the differences in the underlying psychological construct to be tested, i.e., depression and parenting style. Some of the respondents may have been experiencing depression but most psychological constructs measure, to some degree more or less, and aspect of human behavior.

In the early stages of planning for this research a mechanical test for engineers was considered; however, test was rejected because it might have caused some confusion

to the participants. Furthermore, the same problem, as with depression occurs, i.e., the participants may have had varying degrees of a mechanical aptitude. Similar to depression some of the participants may have scored high in ability. The BID-II was final selected because of its clarity, readability and differences from parenting style as well as the fact that it is often used in this type of research (Beck, Brown, & Steer, 1989).

Validation against criteria for BDI-II total scores has been correlated with scores on other psychological tests. The BDI-II is positively related to the Scale for Suicide Ideation ($r = .37$, $n = 158$) as well as the Beck Hopelessness Scale ($r = .68$, $n = 158$). The BDI-II was also positively correlated with the Hamilton Psychiatric Rating Scale for Depression ($r = .71$, $n = 87$) and the Hamilton Rating Scale for Anxiety ($r = .47$, $n = 87$; Beck et al., 1996). A diagnostic effectiveness study using a clinical college sample of 127 students yielded a 93 percent true positive rate and 18 percent false positive rate (Beck et al., 1996). It was expected that the scores on the BDI-II would be negatively correlated with scores on the new PSS measure. (See Appendix C)

Procedure

Participants were selected from the classes offered at Humboldt State University. From these classes, anyone 18 years or older was asked to participate in the study. The participants were asked to fill out a questionnaire. Participants were told they were free to leave at any time during the testing. The questionnaire was administered in class. No remuneration was given the participants for participating in the study. An experimenter remained in the room at all times during the administration of the questionnaires.

The questionnaires were administered in random order for each set handed out, i.e., BDI-II, PSS, and PAQ. Participants returning the packet to the researcher were considered to be implied consent. (See Appendix D) The following were the only instructions given the participants. “We ask that you answer these questions thoughtfully and honestly. Please do not write your name on the questionnaire at any time”.

The questionnaires were kept in a locked file drawer until the data were analyzed and the thesis completed. After that time the raw data and files will be destroyed.

Results

This study involved designing and testing a measure for use in evaluating parenting styles that included age differences in parenting style and the inclusion of four, instead of three, prototypes or subtypes of parenting. Five hypotheses were examined to test the feasibility or developmental constancy, reliability and validity of the new measure, the Parents Styles Scale (PSS). It was expected that the new measure would correlate positively with the Parental Authority Questionnaire (PAQ) the established measure used most often in research is based on three parenting styles. Furthermore, it was expected that the PSS be negatively correlated with the Beck Depression Inventory II (BDI-II). Finally, it was expected that item and split half analysis would be greater than .70.

The PSS was scored in the following manner. The format of the measure asked the participants to respond to four scenarios using a 5 point Likert Scale, from All of the Time = 5 to Never = 1, for five ages 4, 7, 10, 13 and 16. The participants were then asked to respond to each of the scenarios in terms of how their parent would have responded to the behavior depicted in the scenario when they were a child. Next, they were asked to circle one of the four statements which best described what their parent was most likely to have done when they were a child. In this way each participant received two parenting style scores; an age parenting score and a total parenting score. The scenarios occurred for each age group in the order of Permissive, Neglect, Authoritative and Authoritarian.

In scoring the two groups of five age sets using the Likert Scale the age parenting responses were totaled. The permissive scenarios were scored (items 1, 5, 9, 13, 17, 21,

25, 29, 33 and 37) for a permissive score, neglect (2, 6, 10, 14, 18, 22, 26, 30, 34, and 37) for a neglect score, authoritative (3, 7, 11, 15, 19, 23, 27, 31, 35 and 39) for a authoritative score and authoritarian (4, 8, 12, 16, 20, 24, 28, 32, 36 and 40) for a authoritarian score. The first hypothesis dealt with the ability of the PSS to maintain consistency as a parenting scale over developmental time or for different ages.

Table 1 presents the descriptive statistics, including item, mean, standard deviations and variances for the age parental score on the PSS. Results of correlations for the five age groups revealed significant positive correlations for all of the age groups except between four and sixteen which was positive but not significant. In addition all of the remaining age correlations were significant at the .01 level except for the correlation for age groups 7 and 4 which was significant at the .05 level for the remaining age group comparisons.

Next a coefficient of determination, R^2 , which demonstrates the strength of the relationship, was computed by obtaining the square of Pearson's r for all of the correlations. "The coefficient of determination (the square of the correlation coefficient) indicates the proportion of variation in one variable (for example the dependent variable) that is explained by its linear association with the other variable expressed in the right-side of the linear regression equation, (Loether & McTavish, 1988, p. 344). It provides a measure of how well future outcomes are likely to be predicted by the model. The coefficient of determination or R^2 is similar to the statistical Eta squared employed in ANOVAs to test the strength of the relationship found. Table 2 shows the correlations for the five age groups and the coefficient of determination for each correlation.

Table 1

Descriptive Statistics for the Age Parental Score for the PSS

		N	Mean	Std. Deviation
four	1.00	17	9.9412	1.71284
	2.00	1	8.0000	.
	3.00	28	9.5000	1.87577
	4.00	16	9.8125	1.22304
	Total	62	9.6774	1.66718
seven	1.00	17	20.0588	4.29346
	2.00	1	17.0000	.
	3.00	28	19.6429	3.26842
	4.00	16	20.4375	3.36588
	Total	62	19.9194	3.54964
nine	1.00	17	21.2353	4.68414
	2.00	1	16.0000	.
	3.00	28	20.6429	3.39077
	4.00	16	20.2500	4.21900
	Total	62	20.6290	3.96391
thirteen	1.00	17	19.2941	3.54903
	2.00	1	17.0000	.
	3.00	28	20.1071	3.34818
	4.00	16	18.6250	4.97829
	Total	62	19.4516	3.85252
sixteen	1.00	17	19.4706	4.01743
	2.00	1	24.0000	.
	3.00	28	20.9286	4.82991
	4.00	16	20.2500	4.34358
	Total	62	20.4032	4.44810

These results revealed a strong consistency of reported parenting style across all ages for these participants. The highest R^2 values were found for age thirteen and nine .404, .372 for age nine and seven, .367 for nine and sixteen and .321 for sixteen and seven. The lowest R^2 values were for four and all of the ages, sixteen R^2 .031, thirteen R^2 .173, nine R^2 .115 and seven R^2 .104. See Table 2 for the remaining coefficients. The level of predictability revealed by these findings allowed this researcher to have enough confidence in the PSS measure to answer the remaining hypotheses.

Table 2

Correlations and Coefficients of Determination R^2 for the Five Age Groups on PSS

		Four	Seven	Nine	Thirteen	Sixteen
Four	Pearson Correlation	1	.322*	.339**	.416**	.177
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.011	.007	.001	.169
	N	62	62	62	62	62
	Coefficient of Determination R^2		.104	.115	.173	.031
Seven	Pearson Correlation	.322*	1	.620**	.463**	.567**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.011		.000	.000	.000
	N	62	62	62	62	62
	Coefficient of Determination R^2	.104		.372	.214	.321
Nine	Pearson Correlation	.339**	.620**	1	.636**	.606**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.007	.000		.000	.000
	N	62	62	62	62	62
	Coefficient of Determination R^2	.115	.372		.404	.367
Thirteen	Pearson Correlation	.416**	.463**	.636**	1	.545**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.001	.000	.000		.000
Sixteen	Pearson Correlation	.177	.567**	.606**	.545**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.169	.000	.000	.000	
	N	62	62	62	62	62
	Coefficient of Determination R^2	.031	.321	.367	.297	

*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Next the total parenting score was developed. The total parenting score was obtained by totaling the circled scenario which the participant reported as the parenting style that the parent might use most often. Each group of four scenarios was given a 1, for permissive, 2, for neglect, 3 for authoritative and 4 for authoritarian. These ten scores were totaled for a total parenting style score. (See Table 3 for descriptive statistics for the PSS)

The total parenting score was employed to test the remaining four hypotheses regarding construct validity and reliability. Convergent validity was employed by using a parenting measure that should be highly correlated with the PSS, the PAQ and discriminate validity was obtained by using a measure that was not related to the construct of parenting, the BID-II.

The second hypothesis stated there would be a relatively high correlation between the Authoritative and Authoritarian subtypes of parenting subscales of the PSS and the PAQ and a relatively low negative correlation between the PAQ Permissive subtype and the PSS Permissive and Neglect subtypes. Overall this hypothesis was not supported (see Table 4 results of correlations). The correlation between the Authoritative subscale of the PAQ and the Authoritative subscale of the PSS was positively correlated but the correlation was not significant. In addition, the PAQ subscale for Authoritarian parenting and the PSS Authoritarian subscale were not significant but a positive correlation was found. The positive correlations aspects of this hypothesis were not supported although the correlations were in the expected direction. (See Table 4)

The expectation of negative correlations in the second hypothesis was supported in part. The correlation between the Permissive parenting subscale of the PAQ and the PSS was not significant but a negative correlation was found in the expected direction.

Finally, the correlation between the PAQ for permissive parenting style and the PSS Neglect was negatively correlated and significant at the .01 level, $r = -.332$, which supports that portion of the hypothesis. (See Table 4 for correlations between parenting styles prototypes of the PAQ and PSS.)

Table 3.

Descriptive Statistics for the PSS Total Items and the Four Parenting Subtypes

	Mean	Std. Deviation	Variance
PSS 1	2.6129	.92957	.864
PSS 2	1.4677	.88183	.778
PSS 3	3.1290	1.04777	1.098
PSS 4	2.4677	1.26384	1.597
PSS Total 1	1.9355	1.02223	1.045
PSS 5	2.9032	1.03559	1.072
PSS 6	1.9032	.84368	.712
PSS 7	2.8065	1.18514	1.405
PSS 8	2.1452	1.19900	1.438
PSS Total 2	2.2419	1.03521	1.072
PSS 9	1.9032	1.06678	1.138
PSS 10	2.5968	1.16590	1.359
PSS 11	2.8226	1.24827	1.558
PSS 12	3.1935	1.26541	1.601
PSS Total 3	2.1935	1.00554	1.011
PSS 13	2.4032	1.29892	1.687

	Mean	Std. Deviation	Variance
PSS 14	1.7419	1.05482	1.113
PSS 15	3.0161	1.24784	1.557
PSS 16	3.0484	1.22042	1.489
PSS Total 4	1.9032	.88168	.777
PSS 17	2.8387	1.33298	1.777
PSS 18	2.6613	1.49253	2.228
PSS 19	2.0806	1.25839	1.584
PSS 20	3.3548	1.39198	1.938
PSS Total 5	2.5323	.90023	.810
PSS 21	1.8548	.98923	.979
PSS 24	3.5000	1.27716	1.631
PSS Total 6	1.7258	.90842	.825
PSS 25	3.5000	.97089	.943
PSS 26	1.7097	.99815	.996
PSS 27	3.2258	1.07763	1.161
PSS 28	1.7258	1.01091	1.022
PSS Total 7	2.1774	1.00040	1.001
PSS 29	2.1774	1.22172	1.493

	Mean	Std. Deviation	Variance
PSS 30	1.5323	.95330	.909
PSS 31	3.1774	1.26133	1.591
PSS 32	3.2258	1.33575	1.784
PSS Total 8	1.8387	.85303	.728
PSS 33	2.6613	1.12997	1.277
PSS 34	1.3226	.69599	.484
PSS 35	3.0968	1.09709	1.204
PSS 36	2.1613	1.21727	1.482
PSS Total 9	1.9194	.96323	.928
PSS 37	3.1613	1.35735	1.842
PSS 38	1.5484	.91754	.842
PSS 39	2.9516	1.07775	1.162
PSS 40	1.8065	1.31621	1.732
PSS Total 10	2.3065	.93368	.872
Authoritarian	.7258	1.08898	1.186
Authoritative	2.9516	2.33594	5.457
Permissive	3.6452	2.01711	4.069
Neglect	2.7097	2.36357	5.586

Table 4

Correlations between the Parenting Style Prototypes of the PAQ and PSS

		Authoritarian PSS	Authoritative PSS	Permissive PSS	Neglect PSS
Authoritarian PSS	Pearson				
	Correlation	1	-.134	-.120	-.133
	Sig(2- tailed)		.298	.354	.302
	N	62	62	62	62
Authoritative PSS	Pearson				
	Correlation	-.134	1	-.414**	-.001
	Sig(2- tailed)	.298		.576**	.000
	N	62	62	62	62
Permissive PSS	Pearson				
	Correlation	-.120	-.414**	1	-.404**
	Sig(2- tailed)	.354	.001		.001
	N	62	62	62	62
Neglect PSS	Pearson				
	Correlation	-.133	-.576**	-.404**	1
	Sig(2- tailed)	.302	.000	.001	
	N	62	62	62	62
Permissive PAQ	Pearson				
	Correlation	.082	.464**	-.232	-.332**
	Sig(2- tailed)	.525	.111	.070	.008
	N	62	62	62	62

* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed)

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)

In summary, the validity testing using the PAQ did not support the second hypothesis. There was a positive correlation between the authoritative and authoritarian subscales of the two measures, but they were not significant as predicted. There was however a negative correlation between the Permissive subscale of the PAQ and the Permissive and Neglect subscales of the PSS. The PAQ and PSS Permissive and Neglect were significantly negatively correlated, and this last finding supports the hypothesis.

Hypothesis three pertaining to discriminate validity stated that there would be a relatively high negative correlation between the PSS parenting subscales and the Beck Depression Inventory II (BDI-II). Negative correlations were found for the Authoritarian, Permissive and Neglect parenting styles but they were not significant. Furthermore, the correlation between the Authoritative parenting style and the BID-II was positive but not significant. (See Table 5 for correlations between the BDI-II and the parenting subtypes of the PSS.)

Hypotheses four and five tested the reliability of the PSS. Item analysis correlations Alpha and split half statistics were employed. It was predicted that both Cronbach's Alpha and split-half testing would be higher than .70. Results of reliability testing through item analysis revealed a Cronbach's Alpha of .781 for the 40 items. All of the items correlated revealed a Cronbach's Alpha that ranged from .791 to .769 for the

Table 5

Correlations between the BDI and the Parenting Style Prototypes of the PSS

		Authoritarian PSS	Authoritative PSS	Permissive PSS	Neglect PSS	BDI Total
Authoritarian Correlation PSS (tailed)	Pearson	1	-.134	-.120	-.133	-.003
			.298	.354	.302	.981
	Sig. (2- tailed)	62	62	62	62	62
	N					
Authoritative Correlation PSS (tailed)	Pearson	-.134	1	-.414**	-.576**	.130
		.298		.001	.000	.314
	Sig. (2- tailed)	62	62	62	62	62
	N					
Permissive Correlation PSS (tailed)	Pearson	-.120	-.414**	1	-.404**	-.107
		.354	.001		.001	.408
	Sig. (2- tailed)	62	62	62	62	62
	N					
Neglect Correlation PSS (tailed)	Pearson	-.133	-.576	-.404**	1	-.047
		.302	.000	.001		.717
	Sig. (2- tailed)	62	62	62	62	62
	N					
BDI Total Pearson Correlation Sig. (2- tailed)		-.003	.130	-.107	-.047	1
		.981	.314	.408	.717	
		62	62	62	62	62
	N					

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

total measure. The means and standard deviations as well as Cronbach's Alpha for items deleted can be found in Table 6. Cronbach's Alpha for the Authoritative subscale of the PSS was .76, for Authoritarian it was .80, for Permissive it was .79 and for Neglect the Cronbach's Alpha was .73. The Guttman Split-Half evaluation and Spearman-Brown coefficients were both .851 for the forty items.

The reliability Cronbach's Alpha for the items of the PAQ was .51 and the split-half Guttman was .64 and Spearman-Brown coefficient was .65 for these participants. Cronbach's Alpha for Authoritative was .89, .90 for Authoritarian and .76 for Permissive. Finally, the Cronbach's Alpha for 21 items on the BID-II was .898 and the split-half Guttman and Spearman-Brown coefficient was .865. Hypotheses 3 and 4 confirmed both Alpha and the split-half measure were above .70.

Table 6

Reliability for the PSS using Cronbach's Alpha for 40 Items

	Scale Mean if Item Deleted	Scale Variance if Item Deleted	Corrected Item-Total Correlation	Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted
PSS 1	97.8065	217.241	.099	.782
PSS 2	98.9516	213.260	.263	.777
PSS 3	97.2903	215.193	.147	.781
PSS 4	97.9516	218.735	.013	.787
PSS 5	97.5161	208.877	.363	.773
PSS 6	98.5161	213.762	.257	.777
PSS 7	97.6129	211.487	.230	.778
PSS 8	98.2742	212.596	.194	.779
PSS 9	98.5161	205.631	.459	.769
PSS 10	97.8226	223.427	-.114	.791
PSS 11	97.5968	202.212	.480	.767
PSS 12	97.2258	212.538	.181	.780
PSS 13	98.0161	203.295	.427	.769
PSS 14	98.6774	206.550	.433	.770
PSS 15	97.4032	214.605	.127	.782
PSS 16	97.3710	215.778	.099	.783
PSS 17	97.5806	204.280	.387	.771
PSS 18	97.7581	210.383	.189	.781
PSS 19	98.3387	205.113	.391	.771
PSS 20	97.0645	201.963	.427	.769
PSS 21	98.5645	214.020	.201	.779
PSS 22	99.0484	212.539	.295	.776
PSS 23	96.8065	207.798	.352	.773

Scale Mean if Item Deleted		Scale Variance if Item Deleted	Corrected Item Total Correlation	Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted
PSS 24	96.9194	218.928	.007	.787
PSS 25	96.9194	217.321	.089	.782
PSS 26	98.7097	213.488	.217	.778
PSS 27	97.1935	208.913	.334	.774
PSS 28	98.6935	205.593	.489	.769
PSS 29	98.2419	205.596	.391	.771
PSS 30	98.8871	208.430	.417	.772
PSS 31	97.2419	208.842	.285	.776
PSS 32	97.1935	210.487	.220	.778
PSS 33	97.7581	211.301	.250	.777
PSS 34	99.0968	215.105	.255	.778
PSS 35	97.3226	206.025	.431	.770
PSS 36	98.2581	211.309	.226	.778
PSS 37	97.2581	206.326	.324	.774
PSS 38	98.8710	216.114	.143	.780
PSS 39	97.4677	207.532	.390	.772
PSS 40	98.6129	220.602	-.039	.790

Discussion

This study's objective was to design, construct and test the validity and reliability of a new measure of parenting styles. The problem as explored in the Review of the Literature is that recent researchers almost always refer to four parenting styles while the most often used measure employs only three styles.

The item analysis reliability and split half analysis for the PSS, PAQ and the BID-II were found to be adequate with these participants. The reliability Cronbach's Alpha for the PSS was good (.78) and the split-half (.85) was very good. The BID-II, the most often used measure for depression had stronger reliability, (.90), while the PAQ had very good reliability coefficient for authoritarian and authoritative, but the overall coefficient was quite poor(.53). However, a major problem for the PSS measure employed in this study was validity, i.e., does the test measures the construct it set out to measure? The poor validity of the PAQ suggests some differences in how each measure defines the parenting styles. These differences are discussed below.

Some of the insights gained from this analysis relate to the correlations between the parental styles prototype. It is interesting to note that the Authoritative and Authoritarian subscales of the two measures PSS and PAQ were positively correlated, although not significantly. This may imply that the reasoning and defining factors behind these two parenting styles may be clearer than those for permissive and neglecting, as suggested by this researcher and others (Maccoby, 1991). Permissive parenting referred

to as indulgent has shifted in meaning from not being child centered to parenting that is high in nurturing and protection while low in control as well as allowing the child an excess of autonomy; however, with limited responsibility (Baumrind, 1993; Baumrind, 1991; Darling & Sternberg, 1993; Hart, Newell, & Olsen, 2003; Isley, O'Neil, & Parke, 1996). Therefore, the PSS and PAQ employed different definitions of permissive. Future researcher should be aware of this problem and developmental theorist should perhaps reconceptualize the definitions included in the four types of parenting styles to be more dependable (Maccoby, 1991).

The PAQ asks the respondents to answer in general as to how their parents would have parented, while the PSS contained age constraints. The respondents were asked to respond in terms of how their parents would have responded at a particular age, 4, 7, 9, 13, and 16. The major difference in parenting was between ages four and sixteen. The correlation was significant for all of the age comparisons except these two ages. Why this occurred cannot be discovered through this research but several assumptions may be true.

Maccoby (1983) suggests that parents have a tendency to shift the control of the child's behavior from the parent to the child. As the child gets older, more discussion of problem behaviors occurs between the parent and the child (Parpe & Buvel, 1998). This shift is referred to as a shift to co-regulation (Maccoby, 2000) and represents a change in the manner in which parents discipline their children (Eisenberg, 1996). A second rational may be found in emotional self-regulation. According to Eisenberg, et al. (2004), emotional self-regulation involves the self control of one's emotions, attention and behavior. The four year old needs the parent more or less to help in control of his/her

emotions and behaviors. The sixteen year old may need less control from their parent. These participants may be reporting the tendency for their parent and themselves to shift control, from the parent to the child.

Originally Maccoby and Martin (1983) developed the permissive indulgent and permissive rejecting from the Baumrind's permissive. Current researchers employ permissive and uninvolved over rejecting and/or neglecting (Holden & Miller, 1999; Eisenberg & Valiente, 2002; Gershoff, 2002). There appears to be a real need to behaviorally redefine the parenting styles based on new observational and clinical research. Many researchers have begun to employ other methods than the PAQ, observation, clinical interview and typological models (Gray & Sternberg, 1999; Sternberg, et al., 1994).

The four subscales of the PSS were negative correlated which suggest that each is measuring different aspects of parenting styles but it is not clear whether or not they are measuring parenting styles as Baumrind had proposed (1971). The lack of validity for the PSS suggests this may be a strong possibility. Wang & Tamis-LeMonda (2003) found that no single parenting style is universally appropriate. A good question to ask is: Are there universal parenting styles that can be reduced to three or even four prototypes? An additional question to ask is about changes in development.

Another interesting finding in this study was that the PSS was negatively correlated with the BID-II for Authoritarian, Permissive and Neglect parenting styles but not for Authoritative where it was positive. One suggesting for this finding might be that individuals experiencing the parenting style avoid expressing negative feelings because

of denial and other psychological problems (Prevatt, 2003). Prevatt found that family practices were associated with adjustment and resiliency. This does not account for why, however, should that be a positive correlation between Authoritative parenting and depression. None of the research reviewed suggested a relationship between authoritative parenting and depression in fact much of the research suggest only positive outcomes when this type of parenting is employed (Sternberg, et al., 1994). Meyers (2004) found no differences in reported behavior on a number of measures between reported permissive and authoritative parenting. How can this be accurate when much of the research reviewed found a number of social and emotional problems associated with permissive parenting (Baumrind, 1991; Darling & Steinberg, 1993; McKay, 2006; Miller, et al., 1993; Steinberg, et al., 1994; Weiss & Schwarz, 1996). The problem may be found in the use of parenting styles that are over forty years old.

The most important finding in this study may not be related to the major task at hand but insight gained from working with the concept of parenting styles prototypes and attempts to measure these subtypes. It appears that there is a need not only for a new measure but a need for a reconceptualization of the concept of parenting styles in general, especially for the permissive style. Buri's (1991) measure contains ten items for permissive parenting related to indulgent parenting. Of these ten, seven appear to relate to indulgent parenting and three to neglect. Neglect is an aspect of some parenting styles, although some researchers argue it is hard to define

Limitations of the Study

The usual limitation of most beginning research attempted by beginning scholars, also applies to this study. The small sample of 62 makes this a pilot study, not a major study to test the measure. This small sample size affects the ability to generalize these findings, and to adequately make comparisons with a well researched measure like the PAQ. Some of the problems with generalization center on the fact that the participants were all college educated, in fact, the largest number of were seniors 46.8 percent, which is nearly half. Educated participants cannot be ruled out but they do not make a good representative sample of the population experiencing parenting. All levels of education should have been included by having equal or near equal Ns. Another limitation related to college education, is the fact that the participants attending the college were all Euro-American and middle class. A more diverse participant pool in terms of ethnic and cultural identity, as well as classes may have produced different answers from those found in this study. The gender difference was not great but having a larger number of females may have affected the results here, given the small number of participants. In spite of these limitations there is a great deal of value in these results. Generalization possibilities are not the only source of insight gained from research. Replication, comparison and correlations with other measures add to our knowledge regarding parenting style prototypes.

This study had some problems with scoring the PSS. The PAQ asks questions leading directly to being scored as Authoritative, Authoritarian and Permissive responses, while the PSS had face validity in terms of embedding the concepts of warmth, communication, maturity demands and reasoning. Although this may have lead the

participants to answer differently on the two measures in terms of parenting style the information obtained may be of great value.

Furthermore, the PAQ had a mother form and a father form asking the same questions and the PSS had only one form, and referred not to mother or father but to parent. The unequal nature of the three relationships may have affected the results obtained here. Only the mother form was employed for several reasons. First, some of the participants did not have a father. Also, some of the participants were confused because the questions and the order of the questions were the same only the directions changed from mother to father. Many of the participants expressed dissatisfaction with having to respond to the same questions over again. In this study only the responses for mother were employed in attempt to equalize the responses. It was thought that when answering for mother only one parent was involved. Again, making this decision may have affected the responses obtained here.

It is hoped that this research be replicated with the following modifications; a larger and more diverse sample is needed in terms of gender, education, ethnic and cultural backgrounds, a larger sample of participants in general is needed, and finally, the measures need to be modified to have a better fit one way would be to separate permissive. It is important but in research of this nature it may be more important to modify the measures employed for greater comparison.

Finally, some of the insights gained from this research suggest that further researchers should look at the concept of parenting style prototypes in general. It may be that new prototypes especially from a developmental perspective need to be developed in

terms of the definition, measuring and application of parenting style prototypes (Brennner & Fox, 1999).

Conclusions

The major importance of this study may not be in the results found here but in the effort expended in designing a new measure to match the research labors of current researchers. The failure of this study to establish validity does not discredit the notion of a new measure. The fault in this study, in terms of validity may lie outside of the current research practices on parental style prototypes. In fact the fault may be in attempting to replicate research based on notions regarding parenting styles that are forty years old. Parenting and raising children is a dynamic behavior that may change over time and what is needed is not only a new major or modified measure, but new major research on what constitutes parenting style prototypes in this new century. Continued research on the PSS may be the first step in this direction.

References

- Barber, B. K. (1996). Parental psychological control: Revisiting a neglected construct. *Child Development, 67*(6), 3296-3319.
- Baumrind, D. (1966). Effects of authoritative parental control on child behavior. *Child Development, 37*, 887-907.
- Baumrind, D. (1971). Current patterns of parental authority. *Developmental Psychology Monographs, 4*(1, Part 2).
- Baumrind, D. (1991). Parenting styles and adolescent development. In J. Brooks-Gunn, R. Lerner, & A. C. Petersen (Eds.), *The encyclopedia of adolescence* (pp.746-758). New York: Garland.
- Beck, A. T., Brown, G., & Steer, R. A. (1989). Sex differences on the revised Beck Depression Inventory for outpatients with affective disorders. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 53*, 693-702.
- Beck, A. T., Steer, R. A., & Brown, G. K. (1996). *Beck Depression Inventory II Manual*. San Antonio, TX: The Psychological Corporation.
- Berger, K. (2000). *The Developing Person Through the Life Span*. New York: Worth Publishing, Inc.

- Brenner, V. & Fox, F. A. (1999). An empirically derived classification of parenting practices. *Journal of Genetic Psychology*, 160, 343-356.
- Buri, J. (1991). Parental Authority Questionnaire. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 57(1), 110-119.
- Chao, R. K. (2001). Extending research on the consequences of parenting style for Chinese Americans and European Americans. *Child Development*, 72 (6), 1832-1843.
- Cole, P.M., Michel, M.K., & Teti, L. O. (1994). The development of emotion regulation and dysregulation: A clinical perspective. In N.A. Fox (Ed.), *Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development*.
- Darling, N., & Steinberg, L. (1993). Parenting style as context: An integrative model. *Psychological Bulletin*, 13(3), 487-496.
- Eisenberg N., Spinrad, T. L., Fabes, R. A., Reiser, M., Cumberland, A., Shepard, S.A.,
- Valiente, C., Losoya, S. H., Guthrie, I.K., & Thompson, M. (2004). The relations of effortful control and impulsivity to children's resiliency and adjustment. *Child Development*, 75, 25-46.
- Eisenberg N., & Valiente C. (2002). Parenting and children's prosocial and moral development. In M. Bornstein (Ed.), *Handbook of Parenting: Vol. 5: Practical issues in parenting*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

- Elmore, B., Weinstein, J., & Ribeiro, L. (2002). *The Parenting Styles Scale*. Paper Presented at the Western Psychological Association meetings, April 2006.
- Fischel, J. E., & Liebert, R.M. (2000). Disorders of elimination. In A. J. Sameroff, M. Lewis, & S. M. Miller (Eds.), *Handbook of developmental psychopathology* (pp.625-640). New York, Kluwer Academic.
- Gartrell, D.J. (1995). Misbehavior or mistaken behavior? *Young Children*, 50(5), 27-34.
- Gartrell, D. J. (2003). *A guidance approach for the encouraging classroom (3rd ed.)* Clifton Park, NY: Delmar Learning.
- Gershoff, R. T. (2002). Parental corporal punishment and associated child behaviors and experiences: A meta-analytic and theoretical review. *Psychological Bulletin*, 128, 539-579.
- Gray, M. R., Steinberg, L. (1999). Unpacking authoritative parenting: Reassessing a multidimensional construct. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 61, 574-587.
- Henshaw, J. (2009). *What parenting style is best?*
<http://www.familyresource.com/parenting/> parent-education/what-parenting-style-is-best.
- Holden, G. W., & Miller, P. C. (1999). Enduring and different: A meta-analysis of the similarity in parents' child rearing. *Psychological Bulletin*, 125, 223-254.

- Kerig, P., & Wenar, C. (2006). *Developmental Psychopathology: From infancy through adolescence*. New York: McGraw Hill.
- Lamborn, S., Mounts, N., Steinberg, L., & Dornbusch, S.M. (1991). Patterns of competence and adjustment from authoritative, authoritarian, indulgent, and neglectful families. *Child Development*, 62, 1049-1065.
- Loether, H. J., & McTavish D. J. (1988). *Descriptive and Inferential Statistics: An Introduction*. (3rd ed.). Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
- Maccoby, E. E., & Martin, J. A. (1983). Socialization in the context of the family: Parent-child interaction. P. H. Mussen (Ed.) & E. M. Hetherington (Vol. Ed.), *Handbook of child psychology: Vol. 4. Socialization, personality, and social development* (4th ed., pp. 1-101). New York: Wiley.
- Maccoby, E. E. (1991). The role of parents in the socialization of their children: A Historical overview. *Developmental Psychology*, 28, 1006-1017.
- Maccoby, E. E. (2000). Parenting and its effect on children: On reading and misreading behavior. *Genetics Annual Review of Psychology 2000*. Vol. 51, 1-24.
- McCord, J. (1996). Unintended consequences of punishment. *Pediatrics*, 98, 832-834.
- McKay, M. (2006). *Parenting practices in emerging adulthood: Development of a new measure*, (M.A), Brigham Young University.

- Meyer, D. (2004). *Exploring secure attachment and parenting style as they relate to intimacy, well-being, social problem-solving and ego-identity*, (M.A), Humboldt State University.
- Miller, N. B., Cowan, P. A., Cowan, C. P., Hetherington, E. M., & Clingempeel, W. G. (1993). Externalizing in preschoolers and early adolescents: A cross-study replication of a family model. *Developmental Psychology*, 29, 3-18.
- Prevatt, F. F. (2003). The contribution of parenting practices in a risk and resiliency model of children's adjustment.. *British Journal of Developmental Psychology*, 21, 469-480.
- Schumacher, J. A., Smith-Slep, A. M., Heyman, R. E., (2001). *Risk factors for child neglect. Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 6, 231-254.
- Steinberg, L. (1990). *Interdependency in the family: Autonomy, conflict, and harmony. In S. Feldman & G. Elliot (Eds.), At the threshold: The developing adolescent, (pp. 255-276). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.*
- Steinberg, L., Dornbusch, S. M., & Brown, B. (1992). Ethnic differences in adolescent achievement: An ecological perspective. *American Psychologist*, 47, 723-729.

Steinberg, L., Lamborn, S. D., Darling, N., Mounts, N. S., & Dornbusch, S. M. (1994).

Over-time changes in adjustment and competence among adolescents from authoritative, authoritarian, indulgent, and neglectful families. *Child Development*, 65, 754-770.

Thompson, R. A. (1998). Early sociopersonality development. In W. Damon (Series

Ed.) & N. Eisenberg (Vol. Ed.) *Handbook of child psychology Vol. 3, Social, emotional, and personality development* (4th ed., pp.25-104). New York: Wiley.

Wagner, K. V. (2009). Parenting styles: The four styles of parenting.

<http://psychology.about.com/od/developmentalpsychology/a/parenting-style.htm>

Wang, S., & Tamis-LeMonda, C. (2003). Do child-rearing values in Taiwan and the

United States reflect cultural values of collectivism and individualism? *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 34, 629-642.

Weiss, L. H., & Schwarz, J. C. (1996). The relationship between parenting types and

older adolescents' personality, academic achievement, adjustment, and substance use. *Child Development*, 67(5), 2101-2114.

Appendix A

Parental Authority Questionnaire (PAQ)

PAQ (mother)

Instructions. For each of the following statements, circle the number of the 5-point scale (1 = strongly disagree, 5 = strongly agree) that best describes how that statement applies to you and your father. Try to read and think about each statement as it applies to you and your father during your years of growing up at home. There are no right or wrong answers, so don't spend a lot of time on any one item. We are looking for your overall impression regarding each statement. Be sure not to omit any items.

1. While I was growing up my mother felt that in a well-run home the children should have their way in the family as often as the parents do.

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree

2. Even if his children didn't agree with her, my mother felt that it was for our own good if we were forced to conform to what she thought was right.

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree

3. Whenever my mother told me to do something as I was growing up, she expected me to do it immediately without asking any questions.

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree

4. As I was growing up, once family policy had been established, my mother discussed the reasoning behind the policy with the children in the family.

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree

5. My mother has always encouraged verbal give-and-take whenever I have felt that family rules and restrictions were unreasonable.

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly	Disagree	Neither agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
Disagree		nor disagree		

6. My mother has always felt that what children need is to be free to make up their own minds and to do what they want to do, even if this does not agree with what their parents might want.

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly	Disagree	Neither agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
Disagree		nor disagree		

7. As I was growing up my mother did not allow me to question any decision she had made.

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly	Disagree	Neither agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
Disagree		nor disagree		

8. As I was growing up my mother directed the activities and decisions of the children in the family through reasoning and discipline.

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly	Disagree	Neither agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
Disagree		nor disagree		

9. My mother has always felt that more force should be used by parents in order to get their children to behave the way they are supposed to.

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly	Disagree	Neither agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
Disagree		nor disagree		

10. As I was growing up my mother did not feel that I needed to obey rules and regulations of behavior simply because someone in authority had established them.

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly	Disagree	Neither agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
Disagree		nor disagree		

11. As I was growing up I knew what my mother expected of me in my family, but I also felt free to discuss those expectations with my mother when I felt that they were unreasonable.

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree

12. My mother felt that wise parents should teach their children early just who is boss in the family.

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree

13. As I was growing up, my mother seldom gave me expectations and guidelines for my behavior.

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree

14. Most of the time as I was growing up my mother did what the children in the family wanted when making family decisions.

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree

15. As the children in my family were growing up, my mother consistently gave us direction and guidance in rational and objective ways.

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree

16. As I was growing up my mother would get very upset if I tried to disagree with her.

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree

17. My mother feels that most problems in society would be solved if parents would not restrict their children's activities, decisions, and desires as they are growing up.

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree

18. As I was growing up my mother let me know what behavior she expected of me, and if I didn't meet those expectations, she punished me.

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree

19. As I was growing up my mother allowed me to decide most things for myself without a lot of direction from her.

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree

20. As I was growing up my mother took the children's opinions into consideration when making family decisions, but she would not decide for something simply because the children wanted it.

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree

21. My mother did not view herself as responsible for directing and guiding my behavior as I was growing up.

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree

22. My mother had clear standards of behavior for the children in our home as I was growing up, but she was willing to adjust those standards to the needs of each of the individual children in the family.

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree

23. My mother gave me direction for my behavior and activities as I was growing up and she expected me to follow her direction, but she was always willing to listen to my concerns and to discuss that direction with me.

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly	Disagree	Neither agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
Disagree		nor disagree		

24. As I was growing up my mother allowed me to form my own point of view on family matters and she generally allowed me to decide for myself what I was going to do.

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly	Disagree	Neither agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
Disagree		nor disagree		

25. My mother has always felt that most problems in society would be solved if we could get parents to strictly and forcibly deal with their children when they don't do what they are supposed to as they are growing up.

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly	Disagree	Neither agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
Disagree		nor disagree		

26. As I was growing up my mother often told me exactly what she wanted me to do and how she expected me to do it.

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly	Disagree	Neither agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
Disagree		nor disagree		

27. As I was growing up my mother gave me clear direction for my behaviors and activities, but she was also understanding when I disagreed with her.

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly	Disagree	Neither agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
Disagree		nor disagree		

28. As I was growing up my mother did not direct the behaviors, activities, and desires of the children in the family.

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree

29. As I was growing up I knew what my mother expected of me in the family and she insisted that I conform to those expectations simply out of respect for her authority.

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree

30. As I was growing up, if my mother made a decision in the family that hurt me, she was willing to discuss that decision with me and to admit it if she had made a mistake.

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree

PAQ (father)

Instructions. For each of the following statements, circle the number of the 5-point scale (1 = *strongly disagree*, 5 = *strongly agree*) that best describes how that statement applies to you and your father. Try to read and think about each statement as it applies to you and your father during your years of growing up at home. There are no right or wrong answers, so don't spend a lot of time on any one item. We are looking for your overall impression regarding each statement. Be sure not to omit any items.

1. While I was growing up my father felt that in a well-run home the children should have their way in the family as often as the parents do.

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree

2. Even if his children didn't agree with him, my father felt that it was for our own good if we were forced to conform to what he thought was right.

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree

3. Whenever my father told me to do something as I was growing up, he expected me to do it immediately without asking any questions.

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree

4. As I was growing up, once family policy had been established, my father discussed the reasoning behind the policy with the children in the family.

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree

5. My father has always encouraged verbal give-and-take whenever I have felt that family rules and restrictions were unreasonable.

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree

6. My father has always felt that what children need is to be free to make up their own minds and to do what they want to do, even if this does not agree with what their parents might want.

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree

7. As I was growing up my father did not allow me to question any decision he had made.

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree

8. As I was growing up my father directed the activities and decisions of the children in the family through reasoning and discipline.

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree

9. My father has always felt that more force should be used by parents in order to get their children to behave the way they are supposed to.

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree

10. As I was growing up my father did not feel that I needed to obey rules and regulations of behavior simply because someone in authority had established them.

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree

11. As I was growing up I knew what my father expected of me in my family, but I also felt free to discuss those expectations with my father when I felt that they were unreasonable.

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly	Disagree	Neither agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
Disagree		nor disagree		

12. My father felt that wise parents should teach their children early just who is boss in the family.

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly	Disagree	Neither agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
Disagree		nor disagree		

13. As I was growing up, my father seldom gave me expectations and guidelines for my behavior.

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly	Disagree	Neither agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
Disagree		nor disagree		

14. Most of the time as I was growing up my father did what the children in the family wanted when making family decisions.

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly	Disagree	Neither agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
Disagree		nor disagree		

15. As the children in my family were growing up, my father consistently gave us direction and guidance in rational and objective ways.

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly	Disagree	Neither agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
Disagree		nor disagree		

16. As I was growing up my father would get very upset if I tried to disagree with him.

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly	Disagree	Neither agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
Disagree		nor disagree		

17. My father feels that most problems in society would be solved if parents would *not* restrict their children's activities, decisions, and desires as they are growing up.

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly	Disagree	Neither agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
Disagree		nor disagree		

18. As I was growing up my father let me know what behavior he expected of me, and if I didn't meet those expectations, he punished me.

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly	Disagree	Neither agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
Disagree		nor disagree		

19. As I was growing *up my* father allowed me to decide most things for myself without a lot of direction from him.

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly	Disagree	Neither agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
Disagree		nor disagree		

20. As I was growing up my father took the children's opinions into consideration when making family decisions, but he would not decide for something simply because the children wanted it.

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly	Disagree	Neither agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
Disagree		nor disagree		

21. My father did not view himself as responsible for directing and guiding my behavior as I was growing up.

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly	Disagree	Neither agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
Disagree		nor disagree		

22. My father had clear standards of behavior for the children in our home as I was growing up, but he was willing to adjust those standards to the needs of each of the individual children in the family.

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly	Disagree	Neither agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
Disagree		nor disagree		

23. My father gave me direction for my behavior and activities as I was growing up and he expected me to follow his direction, but he was always willing to listen to my concerns and to discuss that direction with me.

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly	Disagree	Neither agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
Disagree		nor disagree		

24. As I was growing up my father allowed me to form my own point of view on family matters and he generally allowed me to decide for myself what I was going to do.

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly	Disagree	Neither agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
Disagree		nor disagree		

25. My father has always felt that most problems in society would be solved if we could get parents to strictly and forcibly deal with their children when they don't do what they are supposed to as they are growing up.

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly	Disagree	Neither agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
Disagree		nor disagree		

26. As I was growing up my father often told me exactly what he wanted me to do and how he expected me to do it.

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly	Disagree	Neither agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
Disagree		nor disagree		

27. As I was growing up my father gave me clear direction for my behaviors and activities, but he was also understanding when I disagreed with him.

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree

28. As I was growing up my father did not direct the behaviors, activities, and desires of the children in the family.

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree

29. As I was growing up I knew what my father expected of me in the family and he insisted that I conform to those expectations simply out of respect for his authority.

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree

30. As I was growing up, if my father made a decision in the family that hurt me, he was willing to discuss that decision with me and to admit it if he had made a mistake.

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree

Appendix B

Parenting Scenario Scale

Parenting Scenario Scale

Elmore, Weinstein, and Ribeiro

Please read the following scenarios and respond to each statement in the manner in which your parent would have responded when you were a child.

I. Terry has difficulty dressing for school. As a 4-year old often insists, no one can help. However, delays up to a half hour are expected, with tears and tantrums when procrastination can no longer happen because everyone has to leave the house for work, school etc.

1. The parent states that Terry will get a reward in the car if the clothes are on in the next minute. The parent helps Terry to put the clothes on.

\ _____ 5 _____ / _____ 4 _____ / _____ 3 _____ / _____ 2 _____ / _____ 1 _____ /

All of the Time Most of the Time Some time Rarely Never

2. The parent picks the child up clothes half on, half off, and leaves Terry and the clothing at the preschool.

\ _____ 5 _____ / _____ 4 _____ / _____ 3 _____ / _____ 2 _____ / _____ 1 _____ /

All of the Time Most of the Time Some time Rarely Never

3. The parent tells Terry that they have negotiated for the last time. The parent explains that they will now have to finish dressing the child.

\ _____ 5 _____ / _____ 4 _____ / _____ 3 _____ / _____ 2 _____ / _____ 1 _____ /

All of the Time Most of the Time Some time Rarely Never

4. The parent demands that Terry put the clothes on immediately. When the child is not compliant; the parent follows through with corporal punishment and a warning regarding what will happen if this behavior occurs again.

\ _____ 5 _____ / _____ 4 _____ / _____ 3 _____ / _____ 2 _____ / _____ 1 _____ /

All of the Time Most of the Time Some time Rarely Never

Circle one of the above four statements which best describe what your parent was most likely to have done:

1, 2, 3, or 4.

II. On Sunday morning Cameron's grandparent comes to visit and Cameron, who is 7 years old, refuses to pick up the books, toys and clothes strewn across the bedroom floor. Cameron continues this obstinate behavior after the grandparent arrives.

5. Cameron's parent negotiates with Cameron regarding the responsibility of picking up the toys. They state that the grandparent traveled a long way for a visit. They tell the child to come to breakfast first, but the child will have to pick up the room later.

\ _____ 5 _____ / _____ 4 _____ / _____ 3 _____ / _____ 2 _____ / _____ 1 _____ /

All of the Time Most of the Time Some time Rarely Never

6. Cameron is ignored while the parent prepares breakfast. The adults have breakfast without Cameron who finally comes in from the bedroom, grabs a roll off the table, and runs back to the bedroom.

\ _____ 5 _____ / _____ 4 _____ / _____ 3 _____ / _____ 2 _____ / _____ 1 _____ /

All of the Time Most of the Time Some time Rarely Never

7. They explain that the rule has been to clean the room on Sunday morning before breakfast. They state that they are concerned over Cameron's unhappiness in the situation, but the room should be picked up before coming out to breakfast.

\ _____ 5 _____ / _____ 4 _____ / _____ 3 _____ / _____ 2 _____ / _____ 1 _____ /

All of the Time Most of the Time Some time Rarely Never

8. Cameron is punished verbally and physically in front of the grandparent because they have "crossed the limits." They state that there will be no further discussion and the room will be picked up before breakfast.

\ _____ 5 _____ / _____ 4 _____ / _____ 3 _____ / _____ 2 _____ / _____ 1 _____ /

All of the Time Most of the Time Some time Rarely Never

Circle one of the above four statements which best describe what your parent was most likely to have done:

5, 6, 7, or 8.

Please read the following scenarios and respond to each statement in the manner in which your parent would have responded when you were a child.

III. It is 8:30 at night on a school night and 10-year old Chris does not want to bath, but wants instead to view a two-hour television presentation of new shows for the next season.

9. They say that it is the child's choice to bath but for health and social reasons, they really should bathe. They offer to remain or leave while Chris makes a choice.

\ _____ 5 _____ / _____ 4 _____ / _____ 3 _____ / _____ 2 _____ / _____ 1 _____ /
All of the Time Most of the Time Some time Rarely Never

10. The parent tells Chris to get into the tub and states that they are going to bed.

\ _____ 5 _____ / _____ 4 _____ / _____ 3 _____ / _____ 2 _____ / _____ 1 _____ /
All of the Time Most of the Time Some time Rarely Never

11. After drawing a bath the parent reminds Chris that they are to take a bath every day. They listen to the concerns over not bathing and they remain in the area until the child has gotten into the tub and taken a bath.

\ _____ 5 _____ / _____ 4 _____ / _____ 3 _____ / _____ 2 _____ / _____ 1 _____ /
All of the Time Most of the Time Some time Rarely Never

12. After drawing a bath the parent tells Chris to get into the tub and that they will not tolerate any further delays or "backtalk." They state that Chris is 10 and should not need any further reminding.

\ _____ 5 _____ / _____ 4 _____ / _____ 3 _____ / _____ 2 _____ / _____ 1 _____ /
All of the Time Most of the Time Some time Rarely Never

Circle one of the above four statements which best describe what your parent was likely to have done:

9, 10, 11, or 12.

IV. On Thursday during lunch at school 13-year old Bobbie was sent to the principal's office for inappropriate behavior in the cafeteria.

13. In the principal's office, the parent asks Bobbie to recount what happened. They let the child know that they think the child has acted irresponsibly. They listen to Bobbie's side of the incident and offer choices in terms of resolving the current situation.

_ 5 _ / _ 4 _ / _ 3 _ / _ 2 _ / _ 1 _ /
All of the Time Most of the Time Some time Rarely Never

14. In the principal's office the parent tells Bobbie that this is the first and only time they will waste their time coming to the school. They promise the principal that they will deal with the matter when they return home because they are too busy to deal with it now.

_ 5 _ / _ 4 _ / _ 3 _ / _ 2 _ / _ 1 _ /
All of the Time Most of the Time Some time Rarely Never

15. In the principal's office, the parent is quick to praise Bobbie's past school behavior and state that they trust Bobbie. They, however, ask the child to discuss the current problem with them in order to help them understand why the incident occurred. They let the child know that they care but that they expect Bobbie to behave at school.

_ 5 _ / _ 4 _ / _ 3 _ / _ 2 _ / _ 1 _ /
All of the Time Most of the Time Some time Rarely Never

16. In the principal's office, the parent states that they will not tolerate this type of behavior. They tell the child that they expect them to behave at school just as they behave at home. They also relate that there will be serious consequences if this type of behavior occurs again.

_ 5 _ / _ 4 _ / _ 3 _ / _ 2 _ / _ 1 _ /
All of the Time Most of the Time Some time Rarely Never

Circle one of the above four statements which best describe what your parent was likely to have done:

13, 14, 15, or 16.

Please read the following scenarios and respond to each statement in the manner in which your parent would have responded when you were a child.

V. Robin is a 16-year old who wants radically to change some aspects of body appearance. According to Robin most 16-year olds have had many things done.

17. The parent discusses the procedure with Robin in an attempt to obtain understanding why the child wants the procedure. The parent also discusses the outcomes that may or may not happen when and if the child chooses to obtain the procedure.

\ _____ 5 _____ / _____ 4 _____ / _____ 3 _____ / _____ 2 _____ / _____ 1 _____ /
All of the Time Most of the Time Some time Rarely Never

18. The parent tells Robin that any type of surgery is not coming out of their pocket; therefore, if they insist they will need to think about how they're going to afford it.

\ _____ 5 _____ / _____ 4 _____ / _____ 3 _____ / _____ 2 _____ / _____ 1 _____ /
All of the Time Most of the Time Some time Rarely Never

19. The parent talks with several experts in the area in question. They discuss the pros and cons of such a radical procedure with Robin but insist that the child not continue attempting to obtain surgery.

\ _____ 5 _____ / _____ 4 _____ / _____ 3 _____ / _____ 2 _____ / _____ 1 _____ /
All of the Time Most of the Time Some time Rarely Never

20. The parent tells Robin that they need to concentrate on school success and developing their mind and not their body. They also state that they will refuse to sign any medical consent forms.

\ _____ 5 _____ / _____ 4 _____ / _____ 3 _____ / _____ 2 _____ / _____ 1 _____ /
All of the Time Most of the Time Some time Rarely Never

Circle one of the above four statements which best describe what your parent was likely to have done:

17, 18, 19, or 20.

I. Four-year old Jesse wants to be allowed to ride bikes in the street like their 10-year old sibling. When the parent says no, Jesse screams and cries out saying “I hate you, it’s not fair!”

21. The parent explains that Jesse is not old enough to ride in the street, but when Jesse screams, the parent allows Jesse to ride with the sibling, while keeping a close eye on the 4-year old.

\ _____ 5 _____ / _____ 4 _____ / _____ 3 _____ / _____ 2 _____ / _____ 1 _____ /
All of the Time Most of the Time Some time Rarely Never

22. The parent tells Jesse to go ride wherever they want because they don’t have time to argue.

\ _____ 5 _____ / _____ 4 _____ / _____ 3 _____ / _____ 2 _____ / _____ 1 _____ /
All of the Time Most of the Time Some time Rarely Never

23. The parent explains to Jesse that the sibling is older, has been riding bikes longer, and knows how to be safe in the street. They explain that if Jesse attempts to ride alone or does not follow the rules, there will be no riding the bike.

\ _____ 5 _____ / _____ 4 _____ / _____ 3 _____ / _____ 2 _____ / _____ 1 _____ /
All of the Time Most of the Time Some time Rarely Never

24. The parent says they have already told Jesse “No” and that screaming and crying will not change the situation. The parent states that Jesse should stay either in the yard or on the sidewalk or they will take the bike away.

\ _____ 5 _____ / _____ 4 _____ / _____ 3 _____ / _____ 2 _____ / _____ 1 _____ /
All of the Time Most of the Time Some time Rarely Never

Circle one of the above four statements which best describe what your parent was likely to have done:

21, 22, 23, or 24.

Please read the following scenarios and respond to each statement in the manner in which your parent would have responded when you were a child.

II. Seven-year old Alex wants to help prepare a fruit salad for dinner. To prepare the salad, Alex will need to use a sharp knife. Alex would like to help with the cutting of the fruit into small pieces by using a sharp knife and placing the fruit in a bowl.

25. The parent considers the request and says that the sharp knife can be dangerous so Alex should use a butter knife, which is less sharp, and can still cut fruit easily.

_ 5 _ / _ 4 _ / _ 3 _ / _ 2 _ / _ 1 _ /

All of the Time

Most of the Time

Some time

Rarely

Never

26. The parent is relieved that someone else wants to make the salad; they leave Alex in charge of making the fruit salad.

_ 5 _ / _ 4 _ / _ 3 _ / _ 2 _ / _ 1 _ /

All of the Time

Most of the Time

Some time

Rarely

Never

27. The parent listens to Alex's side, but for safety reasons directs the child toward another safer task.

_ 5 _ / _ 4 _ / _ 3 _ / _ 2 _ / _ 1 _ /

All of the Time

Most of the Time

Some time

Rarely

Never

28. The parent tells Alex to leave the kitchen, and not to distract them while they are working

_ 5 _ / _ 4 _ / _ 3 _ / _ 2 _ / _ 1 _ /

All of the Time

Most of the Time

Some time

Rarely

Never

Circle one of the above four statements which best describe what your parent was likely to have done:

25, 26, 27, or 28.

III. Pat, a 10-year old wants to attend the midnight movie with their older sibling and a group of the sibling's friends. The movie contains some adult language and inappropriate sexual behavior (mild nudity). Pat loudly gives the mom reasons why seeing the movie is appropriate.

29. The parent tells Pat if they do decide to go to the movie to be aware that it may be inappropriate because of the content and late hour.

\ _____ 5 _____ / _____ 4 _____ / _____ 3 _____ / _____ 2 _____ / _____ 1 _____ /
All of the Time Most of the Time Some time Rarely Never

30. The parent tells Pat that they will be playing cards with their friends on the night of the movie and they have to fend for themselves. They yell to come home directly when the movie has ended.

\ _____ 5 _____ / _____ 4 _____ / _____ 3 _____ / _____ 2 _____ / _____ 1 _____ /
All of the Time Most of the Time Some time Rarely Never

31. The parent listens to Pat's protest and reasons with the child why they should not attend the movie. In the end the decision is not to see the movie. Instead, the parent states that they will make popcorn and watch an appropriate video together.

\ _____ 5 _____ / _____ 4 _____ / _____ 3 _____ / _____ 2 _____ / _____ 1 _____ /
All of the Time Most of the Time Some time Rarely Never

32. The parent tells Pat that under no circumstances will they be allowed to attend the movie with the sibling. In their opinion, the child is too young to see a movie of this type and besides the bedtime rule of nine o'clock cannot be broken for any reason.

\ _____ 5 _____ / _____ 4 _____ / _____ 3 _____ / _____ 2 _____ / _____ 1 _____ /
All of the Time Most of the Time Some time Rarely Never

Circle one of the above four statements which best describe what your parent was likely to have done:

29, 30, 31, or 32.

Please read the following scenarios and respond to each statement in the manner in which your parent would have responded when you were a child.

IV. Kim, a thirteen-year old, wants to go on a first date. They state that all of the other thirteen year old girls and boys have already been dating. Kim was asked by a friend to go out to the mall and see a movie. After being asked out, Kim goes home and explains to the parent that this is an important opportunity.

33. The parent listens intently as Kim explains why dating would be a good idea. The parent wants to know all about the friend and why Kim is interested in dating. The parent trusts Kim to do whatever seems right after their discussion.

\ _____ 5 _____ / _____ 4 _____ / _____ 3 _____ / _____ 2 _____ / _____ 1 _____ /

All of the Time Most of the Time Some time Rarely Never

34. The parent replied, "Sure, whatever!" to Kim's request to go out with a friend without looking up from the television screen.

\ _____ 5 _____ / _____ 4 _____ / _____ 3 _____ / _____ 2 _____ / _____ 1 _____ /

All of the Time Most of the Time Some time Rarely Never

35. The parent listens to Kim's request for permission to go out with a friend. The parent explains that despite what Kim's friends are allowed to do, Kim is too young to go on a date. Instead, Kim's parents offer to allow the friend to come to dinner.

\ _____ 5 _____ / _____ 4 _____ / _____ 3 _____ / _____ 2 _____ / _____ 1 _____ /

All of the Time Most of the Time Some time Rarely Never

36. The parent says that there is no way that Kim would be allowed to go on a date. Kim is too young to date and that's that. The parent refuses to listen to Kim's reasons for being allowed to date. Kim is told to follow the house rules or lose other privileges that are already enjoyed.

\ _____ 5 _____ / _____ 4 _____ / _____ 3 _____ / _____ 2 _____ / _____ 1 _____ /

All of the Time Most of the Time Some time Rarely Never

Circle one of the above four statements which best describe what your parent was likely to have done:

33, 34, 35, or 36.

V. It is three in the morning and Taylor is not home. It is two hours past the curfew when the parents receive a call. Taylor explains that due to drinking, driving home is a problem. The parent agrees to pick up Taylor at a friend's house.

37. The parent states that if Taylor is going to drink, to they should drink responsibly, i.e. secure a designated driver, if none, call the parent. Taylor should be concerned regarding responsibility for the well being of self and others.

\ _____ 5 _____ / _____ 4 _____ / _____ 3 _____ / _____ 2 _____ / _____ 1 _____ /

All of the Time Most of the Time Some time Rarely Never

38. The parent complains over having lost so much sleep the night before because of Taylor's lack of consideration by calling so late. The parent instructs Taylor to call a cab next time or just walk home, "It's only five miles."

\ _____ 5 _____ / _____ 4 _____ / _____ 3 _____ / _____ 2 _____ / _____ 1 _____ /

All of the Time Most of the Time Some time Rarely Never

39. The parent listens to Taylor; however they stated that Taylor would be subject to more parental supervision until there are no more drinking episodes.

\ _____ 5 _____ / _____ 4 _____ / _____ 3 _____ / _____ 2 _____ / _____ 1 _____ /

All of the Time Most of the Time Some time Rarely Never

40. The parent threatens to send Taylor to the juvenile hall. The parents tell Taylor that if this ever happens again the police will be the ones to pick up Taylor.

\ _____ 5 _____ / _____ 4 _____ / _____ 3 _____ / _____ 2 _____ / _____ 1 _____ /

All of the Time Most of the Time Some time Rarely Never

Circle one of the above four statements which best describe what your parent was likely to have done:

37, 38, 39, or 40.

Appendix C

BDI (BDI-II)

1. Sadness
 - 0 I do not feel sad
 - 1 I feel sad much of the time
 - 2 I am sad all the time
 - 3 I am so sad or unhappy that I can't stand it.
2. Pessimism
 - 0 I am not discouraged about my future
 - 1 I feel more discouraged about my future than I used to be
 - 2 I do not expect things to work out for me
 - 3 I feel my future is hopeless and will only get worse
3. Past Failure
 - 0 I do not feel like a failure
 - 1 I have failed more than I should have
 - 2 as I look back, I see a lot of failures
 - 3 I feel I am a total failure as a person
4. Loss of Pleasure
 - 0 I get as much pleasure as I ever did from the things I enjoy
 - 1 I don't enjoy things as much as I used to
 - 2 I get very little pleasure from the things I used to enjoy
 - 3 I can't get any pleasure from the things I used to enjoy
5. Guilty Feelings
 - 1 I don't feel particularly guilty
 - 2 I feel guilty over many things I have done or should have done
 - 3 I feel guilty most of the time
 - 4 I feel guilty all of the time
6. Punishment Feelings
 - 0 I don't feel I am being punished
 - 1 I feel I may be punished
 - 2 I expect to be punished
 - 3 I feel I am being punished
7. Self Dislike
 - 0 I feel the same about myself as ever
 - 1 I have lost confidence in myself
 - 2 I am disappointed in myself
 - 3 I dislike myself
8. Self-Criticalness
 - 0 I don't criticize or blame myself more than usual
 - 1 I am more critical of myself than I used to be
 - 2 I criticize myself for all of my faults
 - 3 I blame myself for everything bad that happens
9. Suicidal Thoughts or Wishes
 - 0 I don't have any thoughts of killing myself
 - 1 I have thoughts of killing myself, but I would not carry them out
 - 2 I would like to kill myself
 - 3 I would kill myself if I had the chance

10. Crying
 - 0 I don't cry anymore than I used to
 - 1 I cry more than I used to
 - 2 I cry over every little thing
 - 3 I feel like crying, but I can't
11. Agitation
 - 0 I am not more restless or wound up than usual
 - 1 I feel more restless or wound up than usual
 - 2 I am so restless or agitated that it's hard to stay still
 - 3 I am so restless or agitated that I have to keep moving or doing something
12. Loss of Interest
 - 0 I have not lost interest in other people or activities
 - 1 I am less interested in other people or things than before
 - 2 I have lost most of my interest in other people or things
 - 3 It's hard to get interested in anything
13. Indecisiveness
 - 0 I make decisions about as well as ever
 - 1 I find it more difficult to make decisions than usual
 - 2 I have much greater difficulty in making decisions than I used to
 - 3 I have trouble making any decisions
14. Worthlessness
 - 0 I do not feel I am worthless
 - 1 I don't consider myself as worthwhile and useful as I used to
 - 2 I feel more worthless as compared to other people
 - 3 I feel utterly worthless
15. Loss of Energy
 - 0 I have as much energy as ever
 - 1 I have less energy than I used to have
 - 2 I don't have enough energy to do very much
 - 3 I feel utterly worthless
16. Changes in Sleeping Patterns
 - 0 I have not experienced any change in my sleeping pattern
 - 1a I sleep somewhat more than usual
 - 1b I sleep somewhat less than usual
 - 2a I sleep a lot more than usual
 - 2b I sleep a lot less than usual
 - 3a I sleep most of the day
 - 3b I wake up 1-2 hours early and can't get back to sleep
17. Irritability
 - 0 I am no more irritable than usual
 - 1 I am more irritable than usual
 - 2 I am much more irritable than usual
 - 3 I am irritable all the time

18. Changes in Appetite
- 0 I have not experience any change in my appetite
 - 1a My appetite is somewhat less than usual
 - 1b My appetite is much less than before
 - 2a My appetite is much greater than usual
 - 3a I have no appetite at all
 - 3b I crave food all the time
19. Concentration Difficulty
- 0 I can concentrate as well as ever
 - 1 I can't concentrate as well as usual
 - 2 It's hard to keep my mind on anything for very long
 - 3 I find I can't concentrate on anything
20. Tiredness or Fatigue
- 0 I am no more tired or fatigues than usual
 - 1 I get more tired or fatigued more easily than usual
 - 2 I am too tired or fatigued to do a lot of the tings I used to do
 - 3 `I am too tired or fatigued to do most of the things I used to do
21. Loss of Interest in Sex
- 0 I have not noticed any recent change in my interest in sex
 - 1 I am less interested in sex than I used to be
 - 2 I am much less interest in sex now
 - 3 I have lost interest in sex completely

Appendix D

Consent Form Study

Thank you for agreeing to participate in this research project on relational aggression. The principal investigator is Livia Ribeiro (llw13@humboldt.edu). She is a graduate student working on her master's thesis. She can be contacted through her thesis chairperson Bettye Elmore (bse1@humboldt.edu), Professor of Psychology at Humboldt State University, at (707) 826-4313.

Your participation in this study is entirely voluntary and you may decline to continue at any time without jeopardy. You will remain anonymous at all times. By completing and returning this questionnaire packet, you are indicating your consent to participate.

Your participation will provide you with experience in the research process and increase our collective knowledge about parental styles. The process should take approximately 15 minutes.

If you feel the need to discuss the questionnaires after completing them, please contact the project supervisor Bettye Elmore, Ph.D., Psychology Department, Humboldt State University, Arcata, California, 95521, USA

Age: _____

Gender: _____

What is your level of education: Please Check one of the following:

Freshman _____

Sophomore _____

Junior _____

Senior _____

Graduate _____