

Parenting Goals of Mothers and Fathers of Toddlers and Preschoolers and Mothers
and Fathers of Adolescents

Catherine Horvath

Thesis submitted to the Faculty of Graduate and Post-Doctoral Studies in partial
fulfillment of the requirements for the PhD degree in Clinical Psychology

School of Psychology

Faculty of Social Sciences

University of Ottawa

© Catherine Horvath, Ottawa, Canada, 2014

Abstract

Parenting is one of the most influential as well as modifiable factors influencing healthy child development (Grusec, 2011; Sanders, 2012). This dissertation includes two studies that were designed to broaden our understanding of parenting in developmental periods widely recognized to present parenting challenges: Study 1 focused on the toddler and preschool years (Crnic & Low, 2002; Kwon, Han, Jeon, & Bingham, 2013) and Study 2 focused on adolescence (Eisenberg et al., 2008; Laursen & Collins, 2009). Both studies involve analysis of data on self-reported parenting responses and parenting goals, as well as parent-rated child adjustment from community samples of mothers and fathers. In the first study parenting similarity in the parenting responses and parenting goals of mothers and fathers of toddlers and preschoolers were examined. As well, I examined whether these were linked to parents' ratings of their children's adjustment on the Child Behavior Checklist Preschool form (Achenbach & Rescorla, 2000). In addition, I examined whether there were differences between parenting situations involving child misbehaviour and child withdrawn behaviour. Participants were 148 families of children aged between 18 months and 60 months. Parenting similarity was found both for parenting responses and for parenting goals. However, neither similarity in parenting responses or parenting goals differed for situations involving child misbehaviour versus child withdrawn behaviour. Furthermore, parenting similarity in parenting responses and parenting goals were not found to be related to each other or to child adjustment. The second study was conducted with mothers and fathers of adolescents and was designed to extend on the work of Hastings and Grusec (1998). In this study I also examined parenting similarity in parenting responses and parenting goals. Participants were 285 parents of adolescents aged 14 to 17 years old (mothers $n = 213$, fathers $n = 68$, dyads $n = 43$). Parenting goals were influenced by characteristics of the situation, but not by parent or

adolescent gender. Parenting goals were not related to parents' ratings of their adolescent children's adjustment on the Child Behavior Checklist School Age form (Achenbach & Rescorla, 2001). As in the first study, I found parenting similarity for parenting responses and parenting similarity for parenting goals, but the two types of similarity were not related to each other. The findings with respect to parenting goals indicate that there is insufficient evidence to justify future parenting goals studies given the limitations of the extant methodology for measuring them. Future parenting similarity studies that use statistical analyses, such as cluster analyses, that allow for the examination of the links between specific parenting similarity (e.g., having two parents that are authoritative vs. two that are authoritarian) and child adjustment hold promise for informing clinical practice with families.

Acknowledgements

Over the years it has taken me to complete this project many people have supported me and I am grateful to them all. My thesis supervisor, Dr. Catherine Lee, has been a guide and companion on this journey. I am thankful for her calm, sage, advice and support at every turn, for pushing me when I needed it, for assisting me to keep perspective and reminding me what the important things are in life when I felt lost, and for her infectious passion for applied clinical research.

A thank you is owed to the members of my committee, Drs. Elisa Romano, Marie-France Lafontaine, and Maria Rogers for supporting me to realize this project by providing incisive feedback that encouraged me to hold my work to the highest academic and professional standards. I would also like to extend a note of thanks to Dr. Dwayne Schindler for the many hours he spent answering my countless questions and helping me ensure I was making the best statistical choices. I am grateful to the families who participated in the studies that comprise this dissertation, for without their generous participation I would not have been able to realize my objectives.

To all my friends and family who were there over the years to support me and help me maintain some semblance of balance in my life and for not giving up on me in this last year as I have been largely invisible in most of your lives: thank you, I hope to repay the kindness someday.

To my husband, thank you for always supporting me and never questioning my choice to go back to school and all the changes it brought to our lives. Thank you for being a wonderfully calm, creative, and nurturing father to our children. I could not imagine a better partner in life. To my children, thank you a thousand times over for all you have given me, you inspire me to be the best person I can be in hopes that I will inspire you to do the same.

Statement of Co-Authorship

This thesis contains two manuscripts, one that has been revised and resubmitted for review at *Journal of Child and Family Studies* and one that is in press at *Marriage & Family Review*. Both manuscripts were prepared in collaboration with my thesis supervisor, Dr. Catherine M. Lee; the first manuscript was also prepared in consultation with Dr. Karen Bax. For both manuscripts, I am the first author and Dr. Lee is the second author. The first manuscript was based on data collected as part of a study funded by the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council, for which Dr. Lee was the principal investigator; Dr. Bax collected data on parenting responses and parenting goals for that study for her doctoral dissertation. I was responsible for developing the hypotheses and research questions with respect to parenting responses and parenting goals. I developed a manual for the coding of parent responses, coded data, trained coders to reliably code parenting responses, planned and conducted statistical analyses, prepared the manuscript, and corresponded with journal editors. Dr. Bax provided feedback on a draft of the manuscript. For the second manuscript, I was responsible for the conceptualization of the study, selection of the measures, development of a coding manual, data coding, training of coders, data collection, planning and conducting statistical analyses, preparing the manuscript, and corresponding with journal editors. Dr. Lee provided advice, support, and guidance with regards to all of these activities.

Table of Contents

Abstract ii

Acknowledgements iv

Statement of Co-Authorship v

Table of Contents vi

General Introduction 1

 The Study of Parenting 1

 Parenting and Child Adjustment 2

 Parenting Behaviour 2

 Parental Affect 4

 Parental Cognitions 4

 Operationalizing Parenting 5

 Parenting Goals 7

 Parenting and Contextual Factors 10

 Parent Gender 11

 Child Gender 14

 Developmental Status of Child 15

 Parenting Similarity 17

 The Current Studies 21

 Hypotheses and Research Questions 22

 Study 1 22

 Study 2 23

Manuscript One 26

 Abstract 27

Does Parenting Similarity Matter? A Study of Parenting Similarity In A Community Sample of Mothers and Fathers of Toddlers and Preschoolers	28
Method	34
Results	38
Discussion	43
References	49
Table 1	57
Table 2	58
Table 3	59
Table 4	60
Table 5	61
Manuscript Two	62
Abstract	63
Parenting responses and parenting goals of mothers and fathers of adolescents	64
Method	70
Results	75
Discussion	80
References	85
Table 1	93
General Discussion	94
Parenting Goals	94
Parenting Similarity	98
Conclusion	102
References	105

Table 1	127
Table 2	128
Table 3	130
Table 4	134
Appendix A Child Behaviour Vignettes – Toddler and Preschool Version	135
Appendix B Study 1 Parent Behaviour Responses Coding Manual.....	138
Appendix C Adolescent Behaviour Vignettes – Pilot Version.....	142
Appendix D Pilot Questionnaire for Adolescent Behaviour Vignettes	149
Appendix E Adolescent Behaviour Vignettes – Final Version	151
Appendix F Study 2 Parent Behaviour Responses Coding Manual.....	155
Appendix G Study 2 University of Ottawa Ethics Approval Notice.....	161
Appendix H Study 2 Recruitment Flyer	162
Appendix I Study 2 Recruitment Email	163
Appendix J Study 2 Recruitment Phone Script	165
Appendix K Study 2 Demographic Questionnaire	168
Appendix L Study 2 Consent Forms	171
Appendix M Table M1	175
Appendix N Table N1	176
Appendix O Table O1	177

Parenting Goals of Mothers and Fathers of Toddlers and Preschoolers and Mothers and Fathers of Adolescents

In this dissertation I describe two studies designed to examine parenting goals, parenting responses, and parenting similarity and their potential links with child adjustment in mothers and fathers of: a) toddlers and preschoolers, and b) adolescents. The first study involved new behavioural coding and analyses of an existing data set (C. M. Lee, Beauregard, & Bax, 2005); the second study involved data collection, coding and analyses on a new sample. In order to lay the groundwork for these studies, background literature is presented. The highest quality literature available for each given subject is presented; that is, meta-analyses and systematic reviews first, followed by longitudinal studies, and finally if no other literature could be found well-designed cross-sectional studies with adequate sample sizes. First, the importance of studying parenting is introduced. This is followed by an overview of the literature examining the links between parenting behaviour, affect, and cognitions and child adjustment. The literature on parenting goals, a type of parenting cognition that may be connected to situational variation in parenting, is presented next. The theoretical basis for the examination of contextual factors that may influence parenting is discussed. This is followed by presentation of the relevant empirical literature on several contextual factors that bear further examination in relation to parenting goals (parent gender, child gender, and developmental period). Finally, a rationale for studying dyadic parenting similarity and a review of the parenting similarity literature is presented.

The Study of Parenting

Parenting is everything that parents do, feel, and think in their roles as parents (Bornstein, 2002). It includes parenting behaviour, affect, and cognitions. Parenting behaviours encompass how parents conduct themselves in their interactions with their

children, including what they say, their body language, and how they discipline their children (Klahr & Burt, 2014). Parent affect refers to affectivity/affective tone (positive vs. negative), affective quality, expression of affect, reactivity, self-regulation, and specific mood states related to the parent role (Rueger, Katz, Risser, & Lovejoy, 2011). Parenting cognitions includes parenting attributions, beliefs, expectations, attitudes, self-efficacy, and goals (Bugental & Johnston, 2000; Hawk & Holden, 2006; Jones & Prinz, 2005; Seng & Prinz, 2008). Since the inception of modern psychology (e.g., Bowlby, 1951; Freud, 2001) the importance of parenting has been of central importance in theories of development and psychopathology. It has been a major focus of research for over fifty years in a range of areas including socialization, child development, developmental psychopathology, education, and public health. This body of research has yielded clear evidence that parenting is one of the more influential, as well as modifiable, factors affecting healthy child development (Grusec, 2011; Sanders, 2012).

Parenting and Child Adjustment

Parenting Behaviour

Parenting research began with a focus on parenting behaviour (e.g., Bandura, 1977; Baumrind, 1966) and this aspect of parenting has received the greatest research attention (Klahr & Burt, 2014). Research has established that positive parenting is associated with better child outcomes in many areas, including children's: brain development (Belsky & de Haan, 2011), social-emotional functioning (Kawabata, Alink, Tseng, van Ijzendoorn, & Crick, 2011; Kuppens, Laurent, Heyvaert, & Onghena, 2013; Lereya, Samara, & Wolke, 2013; Stack, Serbin, Enns, Ruttle, & Barrieau, 2010), academic achievement (Brennan et al., 2013; McWayne, Downer, Campos, & Harris, 2013), and physical and mental health (Besnard, Verlaan, Capuano, Poulin, & Vitaro, 2011; Gerards, Sleddens, Dagnelie, de Vries,

& Kremers, 2011; Gutman & Feinstein, 2010; Schuppert, Albers, Minderaa, Emmelkamp, & Nauta, 2012).

In their review of the literature examining the links between parenting and children's brain functioning and development Belsky and de Haan (2011) concluded that although more research is needed on parenting in the normal range, there is clear evidence that children's brain development is negatively affected by exposure to poor parenting in the form of maltreatment. Many studies have examined links between parenting and various aspects of children's social-emotional functioning, including: relational aggression, emotional competence, and peer relations. Two recent meta-analyses found a positive link between parents' use of psychologically controlling parenting and children's relational aggression (Kawabata et al., 2011; Kuppens et al., 2013). Stack et al.'s (2010) review of longitudinal and intergenerational studies highlighted the substantial body of research linking parenting to children's emotional development over the lifespan and through generations. In a systematic review of the literature on the links between parenting and peer victimization Lereya et al. (2013) found that exposure to negative parenting was higher for children who were victims of peer victimization or both bullies and victims, whereas the experience of positive parenting was a protective factor.

The parenting of both mothers and fathers has been linked to children's academic achievement. In a longitudinal intervention study of the Family Check-Up program Brennan et al. (2013) found that increasing parents' use of positive behaviour support with their children at age 2 years was linked to better academic achievement at ages 5 and 7.5 years than children of control families. In their meta-analysis, McWayne et al. (2013) found small to moderate positive associations between father involvement and early learning.

Connections have also been found between parenting and children's physical and mental health. In their systematic review Gerards et al. (Gerards et al., 2011) found that interventions aimed at improving general parenting yielded small to moderate effects in decreasing childhood obesity. In a longitudinal examination of links between parenting behaviour and child development, Gutman and Feinstein (2010) found that the more mothers interacted with their infants the better the children's fine and gross motor development 12 months later. In terms of child mental health, Besnard et al. (2011) found links between the use of negative parenting by mothers and fathers and children's disruptive behaviour. Similarly, Schuppert et al. (2012) found that exposure to less maternal warmth and more overprotection was associated with the presence of features of Borderline Personality Disorder in adolescents.

Parental Affect

Research on the links between parental affect and child adjustment has found links between parental affect and parenting behaviour (Rueger et al., 2011), as well as parental affective tone and children's physiological stress reactions (Dougherty, Klein, Rose, & Laptook, 2011). In their meta-analysis of the links between parental affect and parenting behaviour, Rueger et al. (2011) found that positive parental affect was associated with supportive parenting and negative parental affect with hostile parenting. Dougherty et al. (2011) found links between parental affective tone and children's cortisol reactivity to psychosocial stressors (i.e., how stressed they became when exposed to a stressor); hostile parenting was associated with higher and increasing cortisol levels.

Parental Cognitions

Examination of the links between parental cognitions and child adjustment has found links between parental attributions, expectations, self-efficacy, schemas and parental affect

and behaviour, as well as child adjustment (Bugental & Johnston, 2000; Creswell, O'Connor, & Brewin, 2006; Jefferis & Oliver, 2006; Seng & Prinz, 2008; Walling, Mills, & Freeman, 2007). In their review of the literature Seng and Prinz (2008) noted links between abusive parenting behaviour and negative parental attributions, unrealistic expectations for child behaviour, poor self-efficacy, decreased feelings of control, and inflexible, overly rigid parenting schemas. In a systematic review, Jones and Prinz (2005) also found evidence of links between both parental and child behaviour and parental self-efficacy. Finally, in their seminal review of the literature on parenting cognitions Bugental and Johnston (2000) also highlighted evidence linking parenting cognitions to parental affect and behaviour and child behaviour. Additionally, Bugental and Johnston (2000) proposed that parenting cognitions such as parenting goals may act as contextually based predictors and/or moderators of parenting behaviours.

In conclusion, there is clear evidence that parenting behaviour, affect and cognitions are linked to child adjustment. This body of research indicates that positive, constructive parenting, which includes multiple aspects of parenting such as age-appropriate discipline, warmth, involvement, and effective monitoring is related to positive child outcomes.

Operationalizing Parenting

When examining the parenting literature one is struck by the considerable variety of terms used to describe and classify parenting (e.g., sensitive, supportive, responsive, positive, directive, dominant, power assertive, negative). However, despite this variability the majority of terms used map on to Baumrind's typology which integrates aspects of parenting behaviour, affect, and cognition to classify parenting on the two dimensions of responsiveness and demandingness into four categories: authoritarian (low responsiveness, high demandingness), authoritative (high responsiveness, high demandingness), permissive

(high responsiveness, low demandingness), and neglectful (low responsiveness, low demandingness) (Baumrind, 1971). The authoritative category, which encompasses the various aspects of positive parenting discussed above, has consistently been found to be the most common parenting style in studies of middleclass, White, North American parents (Baumrind, 1991; Smetana, 1995) and linked to positive child outcomes (Grusec, 2011; Sanders, 2012; Takeuchi & Takeuchi, 2008). However, there is considerable situational variation in parenting (Grusec, 2011) and parenting styles characterize the average of a parent's parenting (Darling & Steinberg, 1993). That is, a parent who is on the whole authoritative in his or her parenting style nonetheless demonstrates permissive or authoritarian parenting behaviours in some situations. For instance, parents may vary their parenting depending on if their child's misbehaviour occurs in a public or private setting or if the nature of their child's behaviour is internalizing or externalizing (Hastings & Coplan, 1999; Hastings & Grusec, 1998). Numerous theories of the determinants of parenting behaviour have postulated that parenting goals play a role in influencing parenting behaviour in specific parenting situations (Chapman, 1981; Darling & Steinberg, 1993; Dix, 1992; Emmerich, 1969; Goodnow & Collins, 1990; Hoffman, 1975; Rubin, Mills, & Rose-Krasnor, 1989). Darling and Steinberg (1993) asserted that it is necessary to study parents' socialization goals and associated behaviours. In concluding their review, Darling and Steinberg (1993) proposed a model in which parents' socialization goals for their children were envisioned as influencing both their parenting style and parenting behaviour. They posited that parents' socialization goals have a direct influence on parents' choice of parenting behaviours which in turn have a direct influence on their child's behaviour. However, parents' socialization goals were viewed as also having an indirect influence on

parenting behaviours via their direct influence on parenting style. Thus, another aspect of parenting that may influence situational variation in parents' parenting is parenting goals.

Parenting Goals

Kuczynski (1984) defined parenting goals as being what a parent wants to accomplish in a specific parent-child interaction and posited that they could explain the lack of consistency across situations and the choice of different types of parenting behaviour in different situations. Kuczynski (1984) proposed that these parenting goals could be categorized according to their immediacy of concern. This conceptualization yielded two categories of parenting goals: short- and long-term compliance goals. To test these ideas Kuczynski (1984) conducted the first empirical study of parenting goals with mothers and their four-year-old children. He found that mothers in a condition designed to elicit long-term parenting goals displayed significantly more reasoning and nurturant behaviour than did the mothers in the short-term parenting goal condition. Kuczynski interpreted his findings as evidence of a link between maternal socialization goals and maternal behaviour and as supporting the utility of categorizing goals in terms of immediacy of concern.

Informed by Kuczynski's (1984) study and previously hypothesized models of parenting that included a goal-regulation component (Emmerich, 1969; Maccoby & Martin, 1983), Dix (1992) proposed a four step goal-regulation model of parenting in which parenting goals play a central role in determining parent behaviour. He distinguished goals by the centre of concern (parent vs. child-oriented) and posited that the type of goal exerts significant influence on parenting behaviour and emotion and resulting child outcomes. Dix (1992) asserted that parents, implicitly or explicitly, hold certain goals they want to accomplish in an interaction with their child which drive their choice of behaviour. Parents constantly monitor whether their choice of behaviour is having the desired result (i.e.,

meeting their goal) and consequently experience either positive or negative emotions; negative emotions when their goal is not being met and positive when it is. Depending on whether the emotions are positive or negative parents then either maintain (positive emotions) or alter (negative emotions) their goals and related behaviour. As well, Dix hypothesized that the steps of his model reciprocally interacted and influenced each other continually.

Hastings and Grusec (1998) adapted Dix's (1992) model, adding relationship-centred goals to Dix's parent and child categories, and combined this with Kuczynski's (1984) emphasis on the immediacy of the concern (short- vs. long-term), thus yielding six types of parenting goals that are presented in Table 1. This current conceptualization of parenting goals goes beyond the notion that parents' sole goal in socializing their children is the internalization of values and autonomy to propose that there are other parenting goals that are contextually influenced (Bugental & Johnston, 2000).

Studies of parenting goals. Table 2 summarizes the seven empirical studies of parenting goals (Chen & Johnston, 2012; Coplan, Hastings, Lagacé-Séguin, & Moulton, 2002; Dix, Gershoff, Meunier, & Miller, 2004; Hastings & Coplan, 1999; Hastings & Grusec, 1998; Hastings & Rubin, 1999; Kuczynski, 1984). As can be seen, the majority of these studies collected data from community samples of mothers (Coplan et al., 2002; Dix et al., 2004; Hastings & Coplan, 1999; Hastings & Grusec, 1998; Hastings & Rubin, 1999; Kuczynski, 1984) of pre-school- (Chen & Johnston, 2012; Coplan et al., 2002; Hastings & Coplan, 1999; Hastings & Rubin, 1999; Kuczynski, 1984) or school- (Hastings & Grusec, 1998) aged children. Data on parenting goals were gathered via: 1) parent responses to open-ended questions (e.g., *What were your goals in this situation?*) and subsequently coded into parenting goal categories (Dix et al., 2004; Hastings & Grusec, 1998; Hastings & Rubin,

1999; Kuczynski, 1984); or 2) parent importance ratings of pre-generated goals (Chen & Johnston, 2012; Coplan et al., 2002; Hastings & Coplan, 1999; Hastings & Grusec, 1998). Finally, data on parenting behaviour were obtained by: 1) direct observation during a laboratory visit (Dix et al., 2004; Kuczynski, 1984); 2) parental self-report in response to vignettes (Chen & Johnston, 2012; Hastings & Grusec, 1998; Hastings & Rubin, 1999); or 3) parental self-report of recalled behaviour from a recent difficult parent-child interaction (Hastings & Grusec, 1998).

Hastings and Grusec (1998) found evidence that the characteristics of a situation may influence parenting goal importance. Specifically, parent-centred goals were rated as most important in responses to a hypothetical public act of misbehaviour (a tantrum in a grocery store); child-centred short-term and relationship-centred long-term goals were rated as most important in response to a hypothetical sibling rivalry situation; child-centred long-term goals were rated as most important in response to a hypothetical situation in which the child used derogatory language. This body of research has also yielded initial evidence of links between parenting goals and parenting behaviour (Dix et al., 2004; Hastings & Grusec, 1998; Hastings & Rubin, 1999) and parenting goals and child adjustment (Hastings & Coplan, 1999).

The series of studies reported in Hastings and Grusec (1998) and the study by Chen and Johnston (2012) are the only parenting goal studies to have included both mothers and fathers. Chen and Johnston's (2012) study was designed to examine mother-father dyads within families and did not make group level comparisons between mothers and fathers. In Hastings and Grusec's (1998) study that included parents and nonparents a small effect of respondent gender was found. Mothers and female nonparents endorsed child-centred short-term and relationship-centred long-term goals as more important than did fathers and male

nonparents. In another study, fathers endorsed child-centred long-term goals as more important than did mothers when asked to recall a recent parent-child conflict (Hastings & Grusec, 1998).

Evidence with respect to child gender is mixed. Two studies found evidence suggestive of a link between child gender and maternal parenting goals (Dix et al., 2004; Hastings & Coplan, 1999), whereas five studies found no evidence of child gender effects (Chen & Johnston, 2012; Coplan et al., 2002; Hastings & Grusec, 1998; Hastings & Rubin, 1999; Kuczynski, 1984). As the majority of these studies did not include fathers it is unknown whether there is an interaction between parent and child gender such as has been found in other studies of parenting.

In summary, investigations of parenting goals conducted to date, using both direct observation of parenting behaviour and self-report in response to vignettes, provide preliminary evidence of a link between parenting goals, and parenting behavioural intentions, recalled behaviours, and observed behaviours. Parent-centred goals tend to be associated with the use of more dominant parenting behaviour and child- and relationship-centred with more reasoning and responsive parenting behaviour. There is also some indication of a link between parenting goals and child adjustment. However, there has been limited examination in investigations of parenting goals of the contextual factors that have been found to influence other aspects of parenting, namely parent gender, child gender, and child's developmental status.

Parenting and Contextual Factors

Many models of child development hold as a central tenet that families are dynamic interactional systems and are only one of the multiple contexts within which parenting and children's development occurs (Bronfenbrenner & Ceci, 1994; Elder, 1998; Minuchin, 1985;

Sameroff, 2009). However, early parenting research was primarily focused on unidirectional effects between maternal parenting and child adjustment. This was gradually superseded by an increasing focus on bidirectional effects, acknowledging that parents and children influence each other (Kuczynski, 2003). More recently, as parenting and child development research has included both fathers and mothers research designs have progressed to include examination of family processes (Kuczynski & Parkin, 2007, 2009; Sameroff, 2009). This has been aided by advances in available statistical techniques, such as multilevel modeling, to examine such complex interactional processes (Jenkins et al., 2009). In the following sections, research on some of the contextual factors that have been found to influence some aspects of parenting, parent gender, child gender, and child's developmental stage, is presented.

Parent Gender

Mothers. At the beginning of the twentieth century, the division of family responsibilities was highly gendered, with men assuming primary responsibility for providing income and women assuming primary responsibility for household and child-care responsibilities (Burgess, 2008; Ravanera, 2008; Yeung, Sandberg, Davis-Kean, & Hofferth, 2001). Therefore, it is natural that studies of the parent-child relationship were initially focused on mothers and their children. The result is a large body of literature on maternal parenting and child adjustment that provides unequivocal evidence of a link between the parenting of mothers and their children's adjustment (e.g., Bayer, Hastings, Sanson, Ukoumunne, & Rubin, 2010; Gutman & Feinstein, 2010; Hofer et al., 2013; Lanza, Huang, Murphy, & Hser, 2013; Schuppert et al., 2012). For instance, in their longitudinal examination of the links between maternal parenting and child adjustment Bayer et al. (2010) found that exposure to less warm-engaged and overinvolved maternal parenting predicted

child internalizing problems. Hofer et al. (2013) found that higher maternal anger and positive conflict reactions predicted fewer adolescent internalizing problems two years later. As well, increased involvement in sexual risk-taking by adolescents has been found to be predicted by low maternal responsiveness and high autonomy granting (Lanza et al., 2013).

Fathers. There has been a dramatic increase in father involvement in the last half century in westernized countries (Lamb, 2010). Nearly half (49%) of Canadian men between the ages of 15-64 are fathers, with 95% of fathers aged 15-64 living in two-parent homes (Ravanera, 2008). Canadian fathers are increasingly involved in childcare with a considerable increase in the proportion who report engaging in child care from 38% in 1986 to 52% in 2005 (Ravanera, 2008). As fathers are assuming more active parenting roles it is even more important for research to examine both mothers and fathers in their roles as parents. It is essential that we do not assume findings from research conducted with mothers will necessarily hold true for fathers; consequently, studies of parenting must include fathers as participants.

Until recently the majority of studies on parenting were conducted using data collected solely from mothers and thus we know less about paternal parenting (Cassano, Adrian, Veits, & Zeman, 2006; Cowan & Cowan, 2002; Phares, Fields, Kamboukos, & Lopez, 2005). However, the growing body of research on paternal parenting has demonstrated a link between fathers' parenting and child adjustment (e.g., Adamsons & Johnson, 2013; Kerr, Capaldi, Pears, & Owen, 2009; McEwen & Flouri, 2009; Pougnet, Serbin, Stack, & Schwartzman, 2011; Schacht, Cummings, & Davies, 2009). In their intergenerational examination of fathers' parenting Kerr et al. (2009) found that fathers who reported having experienced constructive parenting as children were more likely to be well adjusted as adolescents and to engage in constructive parenting as fathers. Relatedly, Schacht

et al. (2009) found decreased positive paternal parenting predicted children's externalizing behaviour problems one year later. Pougnet et al. (2011) found that fathers' use of positive parental control predicted higher performance IQ and lower internalizing problems in their children six years later. Finally, in a meta-analysis of studies looking at the links between nonresident father involvement and child adjustment Adams and Johnson (2013) found that nonresident father involvement was associated with children's social and emotional well-being, academic achievement, and behavioural adjustment.

Mothers and fathers. Research that has included both mothers and fathers has found that they are equally as likely to engage in parenting associated with positive child outcomes (Lamb, 2012; Palkovitz, 2013; Parke, 2013). However, mothers and fathers consistently differ in perceptions of their children and their behaviour (Duhig, Renk, Epstein, & Phares, 2000), the nature of interactions with their children (Lamb, 2010; Parke, 2002), their childrearing attitudes (Beitel & Parke, 1998), and relationships with their adolescent children (Day & Padilla-Walker, 2009; Smetana, Campione-Barr, & Metzger, 2006; Videon, 2005). There is also evidence that mothers and fathers differ in their influence on their children's adjustment (Baker, Fenning, & Crnic, 2011; Cabrera, Shannon, & Tamis-LeMonda, 2007; Day & Padilla-Walker, 2009; Kawabata et al., 2011; Videon, 2005). It has been found that generally children benefit from exposure to these parenting differences (Lamb, 2010; Palkovitz, 2013), pointing to the importance of including both mothers and fathers in studies of parenting to deepen our understanding of the similarities and differences in maternal and paternal parenting, as well as how these may influence child adjustment within individual families.

Child Gender

Just as parent gender may influence parenting so may child gender, and parent and child gender may also interact to influence parenting (i.e., mothers and fathers may parent sons and daughters differently). Parenting research that has examined child gender effects and included both mothers and fathers has found evidence of an interaction between parent and child gender on some aspects of parenting such as: emotional availability, type of play, attachment security, level of conflict in relationship, and parenting style (Bolkan, Sano, De Costa, Acock, & Day, 2010; Diener, Isabella, Behunin, & Wong, 2008; Hagan & Kuebli, 2007; Lindsey & Mize, 2001a; Lovas, 2005; O'Connor, Dunn, Jenkins, & Rasbash, 2006; Schoppe-Sullivan et al., 2006).

In an observational study of mother-toddler and father-toddler interactions Lovas (2005) found an interaction between parent and child gender such that mothers were coded as being the most emotionally available overall, but more so if observed interacting with a daughter than a son. Fathers were coded as being overall less emotionally available than mothers, but as relatively more emotionally available with a daughter than a son. In another observational study, Lindsey and Mize (2001a) also found an interaction between parent and child gender, this time in terms of parent-child play behaviour. Both mothers and fathers engaged in more pretend play when interacting with a daughter than with a son, and this was especially the case for mothers. Fathers used more physical play when interacting with sons than with daughters. Relatedly, Hagan and Kuebli (2007) found that mothers of sons and mothers of daughters monitored their children similarly when children were engaged in a physical risk-taking task, however fathers of daughters monitored their children more than did fathers of sons. In their observational study of mothers and fathers of infants, Schoppe-Sullivan et al. (2006) found that mothers and fathers of sons were equally sensitive to their

children, but mothers of daughters were more sensitive than were either fathers of daughters or mothers of sons. Additionally, fathers of sons who were insecurely attached to their mother were more sensitive with their sons than were fathers whose sons were securely attached to their mothers. In a study of school-aged children, Diener et al. (2008) found that daughters reported greater attachment security to mothers than to fathers, whereas sons reported the inverse, greater attachment security to their fathers than to their mothers. In their study of families from a large community sample, O'Connor et al. found that the level of conflict in father-stepchild relationships differed by child gender; specifically, they found a high degree of conflict in father-stepson than father-stepdaughter relationships (O'Connor et al., 2006). Finally, in a study of early adolescents' perceptions of their mothers' and fathers' parenting Bolkan et al. (2010) found that although adolescents' perceptions of both mothers' and fathers' parenting styles were equally linked to the adolescent adjustment of daughters and sons, perceiving their mother as authoritarian was associated with greater adverse effects for sons than for daughters. Thus, although mothers and fathers are largely similar in their parenting of their sons and daughters there are some gender differences, with mothers generally displaying more sensitive parenting, particularly to daughters, and both mothers and fathers generally demonstrating more sensitive parenting to daughters than to sons. The findings of these studies underline the importance of conducting parenting research informed by developmental theories that emphasize the interdependent nature of parent and child factors.

Developmental Status of Child

Families are changing systems in which parents alter how they parent as their children develop (Carrasco, Rodríguez, del Barrio, & Holgado, 2011). Child developmental status plays a key role in the relation between parenting and child outcomes (Grusec, 2011).

Furthermore, in their longitudinal examination of the stability of parenting in both mothers and fathers Carrasco et al. (2011) found that parent and child gender also influenced parents' child rearing practices across time. As well, research has shown that parent and child gender similarities and differences change as families progress through the stages of development (Talmi, 2013). Thus, it is important to examine parenting at different stages of development.

Toddlerhood and adolescence are both key developmental periods during which the parent-child relationship faces many challenges due to the rapid social, cognitive, and emotional changes of the young person (Campbell, 2002; Crnic & Low, 2002; Edwards & Liu, 2002; Smetana et al., 2006). They are both periods in which children are becoming more autonomous and thus require a renegotiation of parenting roles (Edwards & Liu, 2002; Steinberg & Silk, 2002). Thus, it is important to examine parenting in both of these developmental periods given the challenges of both.

Toddler and preschool period. The toddler and preschool period is the period between infancy and childhood and occurs in the second to fourth years of life (Campbell, 2002; Edwards & Liu, 2002). During this period, as their motor and cognitive abilities develop rapidly, children begin pushing for more autonomy, desiring to exert more control over themselves and their environments, including their parents. However, at the same time that young children are seeking more autonomy they continue to require significant physical assistance with tasks of daily living. The tension created by these competing needs fuels frequent parent-child conflicts (Crnic & Low, 2002; Kwon et al., 2013) with early estimates in the range of 3 to 15 conflicts an hour in nonclinical families (Dunn & Munn, 1985; C. L. Lee & Bates, 1985). Additionally, during this period fathers are often becoming more involved in childcare as mothers discontinue breastfeeding, requiring a renegotiation of parenting roles as parents learn how to coordinate their parenting in this developmental phase

with its new challenges (Edwards & Liu, 2002; McHale, Kuersten-Hogan, Lauretti, & Rasmussen, 2000). Furthermore, facing the challenges of this developmental period has been found to strain the marital relationship, with declines in marital quality during the transition to parenthood well documented (Mitnick, Heyman, & Smith Slep, 2009). Thus, it is important to study the parenting of both mothers and fathers during this developmental period with its unique tasks and stressors.

Adolescence. Adolescents are defined as being in the transitional period between childhood and adulthood, having undergone puberty but not yet having reached adulthood (Steinberg, 2013). Adolescence is marked by an increased orientation away from parents and towards peers, imperfect decision making and accompanying increased risk-taking (Albert & Steinberg, 2011). There is also an increased emergence of internalizing mental health problems in adolescence (Costello, Copeland, & Angold, 2011). Unsurprisingly, parents find parenting their children through adolescence to be the most challenging of the developmental periods (Eisenberg et al., 2008; Laursen & Collins, 2009). During adolescence family relationships go through substantial transformations as parents and their adolescent children renegotiate their roles. There is also evidence of gender intensification during this period (Galambos, Berenbaum, & McHale, 2009; Shanahan, McHale, Crouter, & Osgood, 2007), thus given the findings of the presence of interactions between parent and child gender it seems especially important to conduct studies of parenting during this period that include both mothers and fathers.

Parenting Similarity

As previously mentioned, prominent theories such as ecological systems theory (Bronfenbrenner & Ceci, 1994), life course theory (Elder, 1998), transactional theory (Sameroff, 2009), and family systems theory (Minuchin, 1985) postulate that maternal and

paternal parenting are interdependent processes within family systems. With the recent examination of both mothers and fathers in studies of parenting it has become possible to examine empirically questions that include consideration of the multiple transactional systems and processes that may influence child development. Research into how two parents coordinate their parenting has established that high levels of childrearing disagreement is linked to poorer child adjustment (Teubert & Pinquart, 2010), and that children do best in homes where there is a consistent socialization environment (i.e., parents are predictable and reliable in their affect, behaviour, and structure; McHale & Irace, 2011). One variable that has been hypothesized to play a role is parenting similarity between mothers and fathers of the same family; it has been suggested that parenting dissimilarity could exacerbate or contribute to childrearing disagreements.

Table 3 provides an overview of selected studies that have examined similarity between mothers and fathers. As can be seen these studies have collected data from samples across childhood, from infancy to adolescence. The majority have been cross-sectional examinations of community samples with only a minority examining parenting similarity using longitudinal designs (Lindsey & Caldera, 2005; Martin, Ryan, & Brooks-Gunn, 2007; Putnick et al., 2010; Simons & Conger, 2007). Sample sizes range from small to large, with the largest samples examining adolescent reports of parenting. Data on parenting similarity have been gathered via: direct observation of parenting (Barnett, Deng, Mills-Koonce, Willoughby, & Cox, 2008; Gamble, Ramakumar, & Diaz, 2007; Lindsey & Mize, 2001b; Martin et al., 2007; Russell & Russell, 1994; Ryan, Martin, & Brooks-Gunn, 2006; Simons & Conger, 2007), parent report (Chen & Johnston, 2012; Gamble et al., 2007; Harvey, 2000; Lanz, Scabini, Vermulst, & Gerris, 2001; Lindsey & Caldera, 2005; Lindsey & Mize, 2001b; Meteyer & Perry-Jenkins, 2009; Putnick et al., 2010; Roskam & Meunier, 2009; Russell &

Russell, 1994; Winsler, Madigan, & Aquilino, 2005), adolescent report (Berkien, Louwerse, Verhulst, & van der Ende, 2012; Lanz et al., 2001; McKinney & Renk, 2008; Milevsky, Schlechter, Klem, & Kehl, 2008; Simons & Conger, 2007), and in one case spouse report (Winsler et al., 2005). Direct observation was used predominantly in studies of parents of toddlers and preschoolers, whereas adolescent report was the primary methodology in studies of parents of adolescents.

The majority of studies found evidence for moderate parenting similarity on various aspects of parenting, including goals, beliefs, stress, values for standards of behaviour and gender appropriate behaviour, and parenting style and behaviour. The majority of parenting dyads tended to be similar in parenting style such that supportive parents were coupled with supportive parents and unsupportive parents were coupled with unsupportive parents, but there was an important minority of dyads, representing roughly one-third of parents studied, that were made up of one supportive and one unsupportive parent (Barnett et al., 2008; Berkien et al., 2012; Gamble et al., 2007; Martin et al., 2007; McKinney & Renk, 2008; Milevsky et al., 2008; Roskam & Meunier, 2009; Ryan et al., 2006; Simons & Conger, 2007).

This body of research also yielded evidence of links between parenting similarity and child adjustment. Specifically, there were links when the type of parenting was accounted for. That is, better child outcomes were associated with having two supportive parents, compared to having only one supportive parent, or to having no supportive parents in studies of at-risk families with toddlers and preschoolers (Martin et al., 2007; Ryan et al., 2006) and low income families of school-aged children (Meteyer & Perry-Jenkins, 2009). Studies that collected data via adolescent report found a similar pattern (Berkien et al., 2012; McKinney & Renk, 2008; Milevsky et al., 2008; Simons & Conger, 2007). Furthermore, in a clinical

sample of mothers and fathers of children diagnosed with ADHD, Harvey (2000) found that similarity in child rearing and similarity in discipline were significantly related to fewer child externalizing behaviour problems, even when controlling for parenting effectiveness.

However, several studies suggest that in community samples these results may be due to effective parenting rather than due to similarity and thus should be interpreted cautiously. For instance, Lindsey and colleagues found in community samples that toddler and preschool children that were better liked by peers, rated as more socially competent by teachers, and more compliant at four-month follow-up had parents with a greater degree of parenting similarity in beliefs about use of control and actual use of control; however these associations were reduced when the effect of parenting effectiveness (measured by parent-child responsiveness) on child adjustment was taken into consideration (Lindsey & Caldera, 2005; Lindsey & Mize, 2001b). Likewise, Chen and Johnston (2012) found that the relationships between dissimilarity in parenting behaviours and child adjustment and dissimilarity in parenting goals and child adjustment were mediated by parenting effectiveness in a community sample of families of preschoolers.

The studies of parenting similarity that examined child gender found little evidence it plays a significant role with approximately two-thirds of the studies presented in Table 3 having found no evidence of child gender effects (Chen & Johnston, 2012; Lanz et al., 2001; Lindsey & Mize, 2001b; Martin et al., 2007; McKinney & Renk, 2008; Milevsky et al., 2008; Putnick et al., 2010; Roskam & Meunier, 2009; Simons & Conger, 2007). However, it is noteworthy that the studies that did find evidence suggestive of a link all demonstrated the same pattern, namely that parents were more likely to engage in more controlling or negative parenting with boys than girls (Barnett et al., 2008; Berkien et al., 2012; Lindsey & Caldera, 2005; Meteyer & Perry-Jenkins, 2009; Russell & Russell, 1994) and one study found that

having two unsupportive parents was linked to higher externalizing problems for boys more than for girls (Meteyer & Perry-Jenkins, 2009). Thus, underlining the importance of continuing to include child gender as a variable in studies of parenting.

In conclusion, the findings of parenting similarity studies conducted to date, using direct observation and self- and adolescent-report of parenting behaviour, suggest the possibility of a link between parenting similarity and child adjustment, specifically, supportive parenting. That is, having two parents who are both high in supportive parenting has been associated with better child outcomes. Notably, several studies suggest that in community samples of families with nondisordered children parenting effectiveness and child-rearing disagreements, not dissimilarity, may more likely account for child adjustment. However, the generalizability of these findings is likely limited because few of these studies have examined the links between parenting similarity and child adjustment in clinical samples of families. The only parenting similarity study to examine families with a child experiencing psychopathology found that parenting similarity was linked to child adjustment even when parenting effectiveness was controlled for. It is also worth noting that the majority of the studies that examined parenting similarity in families of adolescents collected data via adolescent report. However, in their study of family parenting styles that collected both adolescent reports and observer ratings of parent behaviour Simons and Conger (2007) found significant discrepancies in parenting style between adolescent and observer ratings thus studies of parents of adolescents are needed that expand on this by using direct observation and parent-report.

The Current Studies

The current studies were designed to broaden our understanding of parenting by extending on previous parenting goals studies by collecting data from mothers and fathers

with children in different developmental periods: young children in the period of toddlerhood and preschoolers and older children in adolescence. By including both mothers and fathers I extended the examination of parenting goals and child adjustment to the area of parenting similarity to further broaden our understanding of parenting within individual families. The collection of data from both members of parenting dyads (i.e., mothers and fathers) permitted the examination of the extent to which parents respond similarly to parenting situations and hold similar goals; as well as, whether similarity between parents is related to child adjustment in two developmental periods. In preparing manuscripts for submission to scholarly journals, the focus of each manuscript reflected the focus of the journal. The first study, revised and resubmitted to *Journal of Child and Family Studies*, conducted with parents of toddlers and preschoolers was presented as an exploration of the importance of parenting similarity and its possible links to child adjustment. The second study, which is in press at *Marriage and Family Review*, was presented as an examination of parenting goals in mothers and fathers of adolescents, a previously unexamined developmental period in parenting goal studies, with the addition of some exploratory questions about parenting similarity. Thus each study makes a unique contribution to the parenting literature. As a result, the hypotheses related to parenting goals presented below were examined in the second study; the exploratory parenting similarity questions were examined in both studies. Table 4 summarizes the hypotheses and research questions examined in each study.

Hypotheses and Research Questions

Study 1

Parenting Similarity Research Questions. Three exploratory parenting similarity questions were examined. 1) Are mothers and fathers in parenting dyads more similar in their parenting responses and parenting goals to each other than they are to other parents? 2) To

what extent is similarity in parenting responses linked to similarity in parenting goals. 3) To what extent is similarity in parenting responses and/or parenting goals linked to child and adolescent adjustment. Informed by developmental theories that stress the importance of keeping in mind the interdependent nature of parent and child factors, I examined these exploratory parenting similarity questions separately in regards to type of child behaviour (child misbehaviour vs. child withdrawn behaviour) and child gender. As far as I know this is the first parenting similarity study to take into account type of child behaviour therefore no specific predictions were made. In relation to child gender, it was predicted that the same patterns found in previous parenting similarity studies would be found. Specifically, it was predicted that parents of boys would report using more controlling parenting than would parents of girls and that boys' adjustment would be more negatively impacted by lower parenting similarity than would girls' adjustment.

Study 2

Parenting goals in mothers and fathers.

Child gender. As the literature on this topic is contradictory, I examined whether there was an interaction between parent and child gender. Specifically, I examined whether the empathic relationship-centred and child-centred short-term goals would be rated as most important by mothers of daughters followed by fathers of daughters, mothers of sons, and finally fathers of sons.

Parent gender. In light of the significant body of parenting research that indicates that, on the whole, community samples of middle class mothers and fathers of nondisordered children are similar in many aspects of parenting it was expected that on average mothers and fathers would report similar parenting goal importance ratings.

Characteristics of the situation. Previous parenting goal investigations have found that parents are more concerned with immediate compliance, discipline, and socialization when dealing with child misbehaviour and aggression and with providing immediate comfort and reassurance that the parent and child can figure out a solution together when responding to child withdrawn behaviour (Coplan et al., 2002; Hastings & Coplan, 1999; Hastings & Grusec, 1998). Thus, I predicted that parents would endorse parent-centred and child-centred long-term goals as most important when responding to child mild to moderate misbehaviour and child-centred short-term and relationship-centred goals when responding to child withdrawn behaviour.

Parenting goals and parenting responses. It was predicted that parent-centred goals would be positively associated with self-reported authoritarian parenting practices but negatively associated with authoritative and permissive parenting practices, whereas child- and relationship-centred goals would be negatively associated with authoritarian parenting practices but positively associated with authoritative and permissive parenting practices. It was predicted that these patterns would be observed in the sample of parents of adolescents.

Parenting goals and adjustment. It was hypothesized that parent-centred goals would be negatively associated with adolescent adjustment whereas child- and relationship-centered goals would be positively associated with better adjustment.

Parenting similarity research questions. The same three exploratory parenting similarity questions examined in Study 1 with parents of toddlers and preschoolers were examined in Study 2 in families with adolescents. 1) Are mothers and fathers in parenting dyads more similar in their parenting responses and parenting goals to each other than they are to other parents? 2) To what extent is similarity in parenting responses linked to

similarity in parenting goals. 3) To what extent is similarity in parenting responses and/or parenting goals linked to adolescent adjustment.

Manuscript One

Does parenting similarity matter? A study of parenting similarity in parents of toddlers and preschoolers*

Catherine Horvath and Catherine M. Lee

University of Ottawa

Karen Bax

The Centre for Children and Families in the Justice System of the London Family Court
Clinic, London, Ontario, Canada

* A revised version of this manuscript is under review in *Journal of Child and Family Studies*.

Abstract

The toddler and preschool years present numerous parenting challenges. This study was designed to explore the extent to which mothers and fathers in dual-income families with toddler or preschool age children are similar in their parenting. Participants were 148 primarily professional, White (84.6%), dual-income couples (mothers $M_{age} = 33.1$ years; fathers $M_{age} = 35.5$ years) with a first child between the ages of 18 to 60 months. Parents completed the Child Behavior Vignettes – Toddler Version which yielded a measure of parenting responses and parenting goals. Parents also completed the Child Behavior Checklist (CBCL: Achenbach & Rescorla, 2000). We calculated parenting similarity using Finn's r and examined responses to parenting situations involving child misbehavior and child withdrawn behavior. We found that parents in two income families were similar in their parenting responses and parenting goals. However the degree of similarity in parenting responses was not related to similarity in goals; furthermore, the degree of similarity was not linked to child adjustment. We offer possible interpretations for these findings and future research directions.

Keywords: parenting similarity; parenting goals; mothers; fathers; within family comparisons

Does parenting similarity matter? A study of parenting similarity in a community sample of mothers and fathers of toddlers and preschoolers

Among the many determinants of children's adjustment, the quality of parenting is one that can most easily be modified (Sanders, 2012). Therefore, prevention programs and interventions for the treatment of child disruptive behavior, parenting education programs, and public health initiatives targeting healthy child development frequently include the promotion of positive parenting (Sanders, 2012). Parenting is especially challenging during the toddler and preschool years as children begin to seek more autonomy, fuelling frequent parent-child conflicts (Crnic & Low, 2002; Kwon et al., 2013). During this demanding developmental phase parents in two income families are often renegotiating their roles and learning how to coordinate their parenting as mothers phase out breastfeeding and fathers become more involved in childcare (Edwards & Liu, 2002). Therefore parenting programs are designed to promote positive parenting and to reduce the development of coercive cycles of parent-child interaction becoming established (Eyberg & Bussing, 2010).

Relatively little is known about how parents coordinate their parenting within individual families during this challenging developmental period. For instance, we do not know the extent to which mothers and fathers within a family respond similarly to child misbehavior and whether this differs according to the type of child misbehavior. Nor do we know how parental similarity is linked to child adjustment. This study was designed to further our understanding of the parenting of mothers and fathers within individual dual income families during the toddler and preschool years by examining dyadic parenting similarity in parenting responses and parenting goals and possible links with parent-rated child adjustment. We expanded on previous parenting similarity studies by looking

separately at parenting situations involving child misbehavior and child withdrawn behavior, as well as comparing parenting similarity on two different parenting constructs.

Parenting includes everything mothers and fathers think, feel, and do in their role as parents. Parenting research began with a focus on parenting behavior (e.g., Bandura, 1977; Baumrind, 1966). Research in this area has produced strong evidence of a link between parenting behavior and child adjustment (Grusec, 2011). In addition, links have been found between parents' thoughts about parenting (parenting cognitions) and parenting behavior and child adjustment (e.g., Bugental & Johnston, 2000; Jones & Prinz, 2005). Parenting cognitions include the attributions parents make for their child's behavior, their feelings of self-efficacy in dealing with child behavior, and their parenting goals. Parenting goals are a type of parenting cognition that refers to parents' desired outcomes in given interactions with their children. Parenting goals are categorized by their center of concern (parent, child, or relationship) and by their immediacy (short-term vs. long-term; Hastings & Grusec, 1998). There is preliminary evidence that parenting goals are associated with parenting behavior (Dix et al., 2004; Hastings & Grusec, 1998; Hastings & Rubin, 1999), as well as with child adjustment (Hastings & Coplan, 1999).

Child adjustment is linked to the parenting of both mothers (Bayer et al., 2010; Gutman & Feinstein, 2010) and fathers (e.g., Pougnet et al., 2011; Schacht et al., 2009). Mothers and fathers tend to play differently with their children, with mothers being more soothing and containing and fathers being more physically active and playful (Lamb & Lewis, 2011). In addition, mothers and fathers perceive their children's behavior differently, with mothers reporting higher levels of behavior problems than do fathers (Duhig et al., 2000). It is not surprising therefore, that mothers' and fathers' parenting have differential links with child adjustment (Baker et al., 2011; Cabrera et al., 2007; Kawabata et al., 2011).

Meta-analytic findings indicate children's relational aggression is positively associated with paternal psychologically controlling parenting but not with maternal psychologically controlling parenting (Kawabata et al., 2011).

Theoretical models emphasize the multiple contexts within which parenting and children's development occurs (Bronfenbrenner & Ceci, 1994; Elder, 1998; Minuchin, 1985; Sameroff, 2009). Although early research examined unidirectional effects between the mother and child, in recent decades research has expanded to include consideration of multiple transactional systems and processes (Kuczynski & Parkin, 2009; Sameroff, 2009). Within parenting research a strong body of evidence links both marital conflict (Cummings & Davies, 2010) and childrearing disagreement (Teubert & Piquart, 2010) to poorer child outcomes. Other research in this area has found that provision of a consistent socialization environment in which parents are predictable and reliable in affect, behavior, and limit setting is linked to better child outcomes (McHale & Irace, 2011). Some have interpreted these research findings as indicating that children with mothers and fathers who are congruent, or similar, in their parenting are more likely to be better adjusted than children whose parents are dissimilar equating parenting similarity with a predictable home environment (e.g., Panetta, Somers, Ceresnie, Hillman, & Partridge, 2014). This has led some researchers to investigate parenting similarity, the degree to which two parents within a family are the same on a given parenting construct, and its possible links to child adjustment (e.g., Lindsey & Caldera, 2005; Lindsey & Mize, 2001b; Martin et al., 2007; Ryan et al., 2006).

Studies of the links between parenting similarity and child adjustment in parents of toddlers and preschoolers have had mixed results. Studies of at-risk or clinical samples have found links, whereas studies of community samples have not found links. In a sample of

parents of at-risk toddlers and preschoolers, Martin and colleagues (Martin et al., 2007; Ryan et al., 2006) found an association between parenting similarity in supportiveness and child adjustment. That is, child cognitive outcomes were better for children with two supportive parents, than for children with only one supportive parent, or no supportive parent. Meteyer and Perry-Jenkins (2009) found similar findings in a study of low-income, employed parents of school-aged children. Additionally, in the only parenting similarity study to our knowledge to use a clinical sample, comprised of mothers and fathers of children diagnosed with ADHD, Harvey (2000) found that parents who were similar in child rearing and similar in discipline had children with fewer externalizing behavior problems, even when controlling for parenting effectiveness (defined as frequent use of good discipline practices and high in warmth).

Overall, the results of these studies suggest that parenting similarity is linked to better child adjustment in at-risk samples. However, in community samples, these links may be partially accounted for by parenting effectiveness. In a middle-class community sample, toddler and preschool children with parents with a greater degree of parenting similarity in beliefs about use of control were better liked by peers, rated by teachers as more socially competent, and more compliant at four-month follow-up than were children with parents with a lesser degree of similarity (Lindsey & Caldera, 2005; Lindsey & Mize, 2001b). A similar pattern was found for degree of parenting similarity in actual use of control. However, the strength of the associations between similarity in beliefs about and actual use of control and better child adjustment was reduced when parenting effectiveness (measured as parent-child responsiveness) was taken into consideration. Similarly, in a community sample of mothers and fathers of preschoolers Chen and Johnston (2012) found that the relationships between dissimilarity in parenting behaviors and child adjustment and

dissimilarity in parenting goals and child adjustment were mediated by parenting effectiveness.

Thus, on the one hand there is some indication that having two supportive parents improves child outcomes for at-risk and clinical samples of children (Harvey, 2000; Martin et al., 2007; Meteyer & Perry-Jenkins, 2009). On the other hand this can be explained by parenting effectiveness (Chen & Johnston, 2012; Lindsey & Caldera, 2005; Lindsey & Mize, 2001b).

Little is known about parenting similarity in response to different types of child misbehavior. Chen and Johnston (2012) examined responses to hypothetical vignettes depicting child externalizing behavior. In observational studies the nature of child behavior to which parents are responding is not reported (e.g., Barnett et al., 2008; Lindsey & Caldera, 2005; Lindsey & Mize, 2001b; Martin et al., 2007; Ryan et al., 2006). Thus, we do not know whether the patterns that have been found in response to child disruptive behavior also apply in response to child withdrawn behavior. It is possible that children may feel more vulnerable when engaged in withdrawn behavior and may be more sensitive to the presence or absence of parenting similarity in response to their behavior.

Previous parenting similarity studies have examined the extent to which parenting dyads are similar on a single parenting construct. It is unknown whether parents who are similar on one parenting construct are also similar on another.

Current Study

The current study was designed to explore parenting similarity in self-reported parenting responses and in parenting goals in response to both child misbehavior and child withdrawn behavior and parent-rated child adjustment in mother-father dyads in dual income families of toddlers and preschoolers. Measuring parenting is methodologically challenging.

Behavioral observation is generally considered the gold standard, especially naturalistic observations; however, it is costly and labor intensive and subject to observer effects (Bakeman & Quera, 2012). Many researchers use self-report questionnaires because they reduce the burden on researchers and participants and are useful for obtaining large samples, however they are prone to social desirability effects (Goodwin, 2010). An intermediary option, that is often employed, is the use of hypothetical vignettes. Using vignettes also allows for: the collection of a larger amount of data from a larger sample than would be possible with observational methods, and the researcher to hold the variability of situations examined constant across parents permitting greater comparability of data. Reports of parents' behavioral responses to hypothetical vignettes have been found to be correlated with observed parenting behavior (Grusec & Walters, 1994; Sigel, McGillicuddy-DeLisi, & Goodnow, 1992). As well, there is evidence supporting the use of hypothetical vignettes to study parents' behavioral responses and cognitions (Dix, Ruble, & Zambarano, 1989; Grusec & Kuczynski, 1980; Rubin & Mills, 1992). Therefore, we used hypothetical vignette methodology in the current study to collect data about mothers and fathers parenting responses and parenting goals.

The current study addressed three parenting similarity questions separately in regards to child misbehavior and to child withdrawn behavior: 1) whether mothers and fathers in parenting dyads were more similar in their parenting responses and parenting goals to each other than they were to other parents; 2) the extent to which similarity in parenting responses was linked to similarity in parenting goals; and 3) the extent to which similarity in parenting responses and/or parenting goals was linked to child adjustment.

Method

Participants

Data reported in this manuscript were collected from a community sample of dual-income parents (C. M. Lee et al., 2005). The sample included parents of boys (49%) and girls (51%). Mean ages were 33.1 years ($SD = 4.3$) for mothers and 35.5 years ($SD = 5.8$) for fathers. The couples had been married or cohabiting for an average of 8.4 years ($SD = 3.5$). Mothers reported that they spent an average of 36.4 hours a week ($SD = 7.3$) in the paid labor force, and fathers 41.8 hours a week ($SD = 7.6$). The median family income was in the \$80,000 to \$99,999 (Cdn) range. Although this is above the Canadian median income for dual-income families (\$73,420), it is comparable to the median income for dual-income families from the region in which the majority of participants resided (\$96,950; Statistics Canada, 2010a). The most common occupational category identified by mothers (43.3%) and fathers (31.8%) was professional. For the participants for whom ethnicity data were available 84.6% reported being White and 15.4% belonging to an ethnic minority group; this is only slightly below the 16% found in the geographic region from which participants came (Statistics Canada, 2010b).

Measures

Parenting responses. To assess parenting responses the **Child Behavior Vignettes – Toddler Version (CBV-T)**¹ was administered. The CBV-T presents parents with four vignettes adapted by Bax (2006) from the vignettes reported by Hastings and Grusec (1998) to depict mild, commonly occurring child misbehavior representative of toddler and pre-school aged behavior. Parents were instructed to imagine themselves and their child as the actors in two situations depicting mild child externalizing behavior (a child yelling that the

¹ See Appendix A.

parent is mean for not giving him/her ice cream; a child refusing to wear a raincoat when it is raining) and two situations depicting mild child withdrawn behavior (a child crying and refusing to go in the water at a swimming lesson; a child refusing to leave the parent's lap to play with other children). To assess parenting responses, parents were asked, "*Describe what you would do: I would . . .*"

To summarize parents' self-reported parenting responses we developed a coding scheme based on Baumrind's (1971) typology and classified parental responses as being: a) authoritative, b) authoritarian, or c) permissive. This was chosen because, despite the variety of terms used to describe parenting, the majority align with Baumrind's widely recognized and used typology. The coding manual was developed by the first author and then used by the first and second author to code a subset of the data until a good level of inter-rater agreement was reached ($K = .84$). Next, two undergraduate psychology students were trained until a good level of inter-rater reliability was obtained, after which they coded the data independently. To prevent coder drift, the first author also independently coded 10% of the data and discussed ratings in weekly meetings with the undergraduate raters. Both undergraduate coders coded twenty percent of the data; inter-rater agreement for the sample as a whole was good ($K = .77$). Our original coding scheme included Baumrind's uninvolved category, however a very low frequency of responses received this code and thus it was not included in analyses.

A single code was assigned per vignette, so the CBV-T yielded four behavior codes for each participant. A copy of the CBV-T and parenting response coding manual is available upon request from the first author².

² See Appendix B.

Parenting goals. Following the procedure used by Hastings and Grusec (1998), after reporting on their parenting behavior in response to the hypothetical situations, parents were asked to rate the importance of the six parenting goals in each hypothetical situation. Hastings and Grusec reasoned that eliciting the behavioral responses first would enhance parents' immersion in the hypothetical situations and thus reduce the likelihood of parents giving socially desirable responses. Thus, after completing the behavior responses to the CBV-T, parents were presented with the vignettes a second time, followed by descriptions of the six parenting goals: parent-centered short-term (*get my child to behave properly*), parent-centered long-term (*reduce my own discomfort*), child-centered short-term (*make my child happier*), child-centered long-term (*help my child get along better in life*), relationship-centered short-term (*teach my child that it is possible for the two of us to work together on a problem*), and relationship-centered long-term (*maintain a trusting relationship with my child*). Parents were asked to rate the importance of each goal in each hypothetical situation on a Likert scale of 1 to 5 with a higher score indicating a higher importance rating.

In this sample, the parent goal ratings on the CBV-T had good internal consistency (mothers $\alpha = 0.86$; fathers $\alpha = 0.88$).

Child Adjustment. Child adjustment was measured by parents' responses to the 99-item Child Behavior Checklist Preschool form (CBCL; (Achenbach & Rescorla, 2000) yielding four scores of child adjustment: a) maternal rating of internalizing behavior problems; b) maternal rating of externalizing behavior problems; c) paternal rating of internalizing behavior problems; and d) paternal rating of externalizing behavior problems. The CBCL is a widely used measure with norms based on a large representative normative sample that yields *T* scores for internalizing and externalizing problems. There is significant

evidence of its internal consistency, test-retest reliability, content and construct validity (Achenbach & Rescorla, 2000).

Procedure

With the approval of our university's Research Ethics Board participants were recruited in multiple ways including: advertisements posted in the community (e.g., daycare centers, community centers, advertisements in parenting magazines) and via a booth at a community parenting event. As described by Lee et al. (2005), parents were eligible to be included in the study if they met the following criteria: a) were the biological or adoptive parents (i.e., not a step-parent family) of children aged 18 to 60 months old who resided with them; b) both parents were either employed for pay 25 or more hours per week, or were full-time students; c) both parents agreed to participate in the study; and d) neither the parents nor the child had any significant physical or cognitive disability requiring exceptional care.

The researchers were contacted by 258 families for information about the study; of these 148 met eligibility criteria. Of these 148 families, 148 provided complete parenting response data, 143 provided complete parenting goals data, and 121 complete child adjustment data. Therefore, analyses involving questions about parenting responses and parenting goals had $n = 143$ and analyses pertaining to the links with child adjustment had $n = 121$.

Parents were interviewed independently of the child's other parent to complete the Child Behavior Vignettes-Toddler and Preschool Version (CBV-T). Interviews were conducted over the phone or in person at the researchers' laboratory or a place of the participant's choice. For the interview portion parents were instructed to imagine that it was their child depicted in the vignettes and each vignette was read aloud to parents using their child's name. Participants were then given a package of questionnaires including the Child

Behavior Checklist (CBCL) to complete at home. On average participants returned questionnaires by mail within 2 weeks for local participants and within an average of 3 weeks for out of province participants. Upon return of the completed questionnaires by both parents families received an honorarium of \$30.00 Cdn.

Dyadic similarity indices (Finn's r) were calculated for each parenting dyad using individual parent responses to the CBV-T (Kenny, Kashy, & Cook, 2006). Finn's r is similar to the intraclass correlation coefficient (ICC) in that it yields a single similarity index from multiple data points for a construct; unlike the ICC Finn's r is not dependent on the distribution of the dyad's responses when responses are given on a Likert-scale (Finn, 1970). Finn's r yields one score per dyad that can be used in subsequent analyses as either an independent or dependent variable (Kenny et al., 2006; Maguire, 1999). A value of 0 indicates that the members of the dyad are as similar to each other as they are to the others in the sample; whereas, a score of 1 indicates perfect similarity and a score of -1 indicates perfect dissimilarity.

For each dyad there were four similarity scores (similarity of parenting responses to child misbehavior, similarity of parenting responses to child withdrawn behavior, similarity of parenting goals in relation to child misbehavior, similarity of parenting goals in response to child withdrawn behavior).

Results

Data Screening

Data were screened for accuracy of data entry, missing values, and violation of assumptions of multivariate analysis. Due to a clerical error, 22% of the data for ethnicity were missing. For other variables there were not more than 5% missing on any given variable and Little's MCAR test was nonsignificant for the continuous variables ($X^2(445) = 429.30, p = .70$)

indicating data that were missing were missing completely at random. Three categorical variables had missing values that were replaced with the modal value for that variable. All analyses were conducted both with and without the missing values replaced; as the results did not change, results are reported with missing data replaced. None of the variables violated the assumptions of multivariate analysis. An examination of the correlation matrix of continuous demographic variables and independent variables revealed that no demographic variable was correlated with more independent variables than would be expected by chance, thus indicating that no demographic variables needed to be controlled for. All analyses were initially performed separately by child gender however because no evidence was found for child gender differences results are reported for the full sample.

Descriptive Data

Means and standard deviations for parenting responses, parenting goals, and CBCL internalizing and externalizing T values are presented in Tables 1, 2, and 3 respectively, for the sample as a whole, as well as separately for mothers and fathers. When presented with vignettes depicting child misbehavior the most commonly reported parenting responses fell into the authoritative category followed by authoritarian and permissive; this pattern was found for both mothers and fathers. When presented with vignettes depicting child withdrawn behavior the most commonly reported parenting responses were in the permissive category followed by authoritative and authoritarian. In terms of parenting goal importance, mothers and fathers gave the highest importance ratings to relationship-centered goals and child-centered long-term goals both for vignettes depicting child misbehavior and withdrawn behavior. Parents gave the lowest goal importance ratings to parent-centered goals and child-centered short-term when presented with vignettes depicting child misbehavior and child

withdrawn behavior. As would be expected in a community-based sample, parents' responses to the CBCL indicated that they perceived their children as exhibiting few behavioral problems.

Similarity in Parenting Responses and Parenting Goals

To determine whether mothers and fathers in parenting dyads were more similar in their parenting responses and parenting goals to each other than they were to other parents, single-sample *t*-tests were run, comparing the sample mean to the population mean. For this analysis the population mean was set to a value of 0 because this indicates no more similarity or dissimilarity within a given parenting dyad than between members of the sample as a whole. That is, if the mean derived from each dyad's similarity index score is positive in value and the *t*-test result is significant it indicates that the members of a parenting dyad are more similar to each other than they are to other participants in the sample. On the other hand if the mean value is negative and the *t*-test is significant it indicates that the members of a parenting dyad are more dissimilar from each other than they are from other participants in the sample.

T-tests were significant both for parenting responses for child misbehavior, $t = 18.91$, $p < .001$, $d = 3.12$, and parenting responses to child withdrawn behavior, $t = 20.56$, $p < .001$, $d = 3.39$. Similarly, *t*-tests were significant for parenting ratings of goal importance for child misbehavior, $t = 26.54$, $p < .001$, $d = 4.45$, and parenting ratings of goal importance for child withdrawn behavior, $t = 22.14$, $p < .001$, $d = 3.72$.

Mean similarity values were positive for parenting responses to child misbehavior, $M = .61$, $SD = .40$, and child withdrawn behavior, $M = .63$, $SD = .37$. This indicated that in this sample, although members of parenting dyads did not provide identical responses, their responses were significantly more similar to each other than they were to the rest of the

sample. Mean similarity values for parenting goal importance were also positive for child misbehavior, $M = .59$, $SD = .27$ and for child withdrawn behavior, $M = .58$, $SD = .31$.

Echoing the findings for parental responses, members of parenting dyads were not identical but were significantly more similar to each other in their ratings of parenting goal importance ratings, for both child misbehavior and child withdrawn behavior, than they were to the other participants in the sample.

To examine whether similarity differed between child misbehavior and child withdrawn behavior paired samples t -tests were conducted. These tests indicated that there were no differences in parent responses similarity ratings between responses to child misbehavior and child withdrawn behavior $t = -0.43$, $p = .67$, $d = -0.05$. Similarly, there were no differences in parenting goals similarity ratings between child misbehavior and child withdrawn behavior $t = 0.49$, $p = .63$, $d = 0.04$.

Post hoc examination of parenting similarity in parenting responses. The use of Finn's r , a global similarity index, provided information about the degree of similarity between parenting dyads but not about the nature of the similarity. That is, two parenting dyads with the same Finn's r value indicating moderate similarity in parenting responses are not necessarily similar. For instance, one dyad's similarity may lie in both parents being high in authoritarianism whereas the other may consist of two parents who are high in permissiveness. Therefore, following the procedure used by Simons and Conger (2007) in their study of parenting similarity, a post hoc examination of parenting dyads' parenting responses was conducted to obtain a clearer picture of the specific combinations of parenting styles, or family parenting styles, that were present in our sample. This was done only for parenting responses and not for parenting goals because with six different parenting goals the resulting large number of combinations rendered meaningful interpretation difficult.

On the basis of the average of the behavior codes assigned for parenting responses to each vignette on the CBV-T parents were classified into one of the three parenting categories, authoritarian, authoritative, or permissive. Parent dyads were then assigned one of nine possible family parenting response classifications. This was done separately for parenting responses to the two vignettes depicting child misbehavior and the two vignettes depicting child withdrawn behavior. As can be seen in Table 4, over 50% of the sample were families in which both parents provided the same response to child behavior; the most common family parenting response classification, in response to both child misbehavior and child withdrawn behavior, was mother authoritative/father authoritative. However, this was closely followed by mother authoritarian/father authoritarian and mother authoritative/father authoritarian combinations when parents were responding to child misbehavior, but by mother permissive/father authoritative and mother permissive/father permissive combinations when parents were responding to child withdrawn behavior.

Association Between Similarity in Parenting Responses and Similarity in Parenting Goals

Two Pearson's bivariate correlations were computed to examine the extent to which similarity in parenting responses was linked to similarity in parenting goals for child misbehavior and child withdrawn behavior. Neither correlation was significant (misbehavior $r = -.03, p = .74$, withdrawn behavior $r = .11, p = .19$), indicating that in this sample the degree to which parenting dyads were similar in their reported parenting responses was not related to the degree to which they were similar in their reported parenting goal importance.

Association Between Parenting Similarity In Parenting Responses and Parenting Goals and Child Adjustment

To examine the extent to which similarity in parenting responses and/or parenting goals was linked to child adjustment a series of four multiple regressions was run with child adjustment as the dependent variable (DV) and parenting similarity as the independent variable (IV). To reduce the numbers of analyses conducted mothers' and fathers' CBCL ratings were combined to create two DVs (CBCL Internalizing T , CBCL Externalizing T); this combined score was considered suitable given the high correlation between their scores (Internalizing T : $r = .499, p < .001$; Externalizing T : $r = .559, p < .001$). To correct for multiple comparisons the Bonferroni correction was applied, resulting in p being set at .01. As can be seen in Table 5, none of the regressions were significant indicating that neither parenting similarity in parenting responses nor parenting goal importance significantly predicted parent-rated child adjustment when controlling for total family income.

Discussion

This study was designed to contribute to our understanding of parenting within individual families during a developmental period when there are numerous parenting challenges, by adding to the literature on parenting similarity and the extent to which this may be linked to child adjustment. We examined self-reported parenting responses and parenting goals and parent-rated child adjustment in a community sample of primarily professional, dual-income mother-father dyads of toddlers and preschoolers. Next we examined the extent to which parents are similar in their parenting responses and their parenting goals. We expanded on previous parenting similarity studies by looking separately at parenting situations involving child misbehavior and child withdrawn behavior. We also

examined whether parenting similarity in one construct, parenting responses, was related to parenting similarity in another construct, parenting goals.

Overall, when presented with vignettes depicting child misbehavior the parents in our sample reported authoritative parenting responses most commonly; when responding to vignettes depicting child withdrawn behavior permissive parenting was the most common response. Post hoc analyses of family parenting response classifications by type of child behavior revealed that in our sample the most common family parenting across both types of child behavior was for both parents to respond in an authoritative manner. This is consistent with the characteristics of our sample and the fact that authoritative parenting has been found to be the most common parenting style in White, middle class, North American samples (Baumrind, 1991). However, it is interesting to note that the next most common family parenting styles in response to child misbehavior were authoritarian responses by both parents, followed by authoritarian responses from one parent and authoritative from the other parent. In contrast, in response to child withdrawn behavior after two authoritative parents the next most common family parenting styles were a permissive mother with an authoritative father and two permissive parents. These findings point to the importance of research designs informed by ecological and transactional theories of development that emphasize the multidirectional nature of the processes at play within families. In terms of parenting goal importance, parents reported that relationship-centered and child-centered long-term goals were the most important to them both in situations of child misbehavior and child withdrawn behavior.

Although members of parenting dyads were not identical in either their behavioral responses, or their parenting goals, our results are consistent with those of Chen and Johnston (2012) and provide preliminary evidence, in a community sample, of moderate

dyadic parenting similarity in self-reported parenting responses and parenting goals for both child misbehavior and child withdrawn behavior.

Previous studies of parenting similarity have examined parenting similarity on various parenting constructs, but have not directly compared parenting similarity on more than one parenting construct. We found that, although the overall similarity levels were comparable for parenting responses and parenting goals and indicative of moderate similarity, they were not linked to each other. This suggests that, in this sample, a couple that is similar on one parenting construct is not necessarily similar on another raising some interesting questions that warrant examination in future studies. For instance, it would be interesting to explore the utility of a global parenting similarity measure that could represent the degree to which a mother and father are similar on a range of parenting constructs.

In examining similarity on a range of parenting constructs, it would be possible to consider whether they are additive, so that the more parenting constructs on which parents are similar the better the adjustment of their child. Alternatively, parenting similarity may be more important on some aspects of parenting than on others. It is also possible that the link between parenting similarity and child adjustment may be moderated by a number of variables, such as child psychopathology or parental psychopathology. It is of course, likely that complete parenting similarity may not be related to better child adjustment because complete similarity would reduce children's experience in responding to different people or to differences in opinion, and the handling of such differences.

Finally, our results were consistent with previous parenting similarity studies conducted with community samples of parents of toddlers and preschoolers finding no evidence of a link between dyadic parenting similarity and child adjustment even when looked at separately by type of child behavior (Chen & Johnston, 2012; Lindsey & Caldera,

2005; Lindsey & Mize, 2001b). However, our results should not be interpreted as meaning that parenting similarity does not matter. Our sample, similar to other parenting similarity investigations relying on community samples (Chen & Johnston, 2012; Lindsey & Caldera, 2005; Lindsey & Mize, 2001b), was made up of North American, predominantly White, dual income households, in which parents most commonly exhibited an authoritative parenting style and had a moderate level of dyadic similarity on all constructs and rated their children as exhibiting few behavioral problems. The cross-sectional nature of our study design also limits the conclusion that can be drawn about the nature of the links between parenting similarity and child adjustment. Therefore our findings may not generalize to all family contexts. The results of Harvey's (2000) study of families of children with ADHD, as well as Martin and colleagues' studies (Martin et al., 2007; Ryan et al., 2006) of at-risk families, indicate that parenting similarity may matter when family systems are stressed.

Consequently, there is a need for future studies that examine the role of parenting similarity and possible links to child adjustment in families where there are additional parenting challenges and stressors such as parent or child psychopathology, parental separation and divorce, and financial and neighborhood stressors. Another possibility that warrants examination in future studies is that parenting similarity may matter to the extent to which it fuels childrearing disagreements and possibly marital conflict. Davies and colleagues have distinguished between constructive and destructive marital conflict; conflict in and of itself is not harmful to children, but rather it is the nature of the conflict and how and whether it is resolved that is related to children's adjustment (Davies, Martin, & Cicchetti, 2012). A lack of similarity in how the members of a couple think about parenting their children, their goals when interacting with their children, and their parenting behavior could be a point of

contention, but may not be problematic in parents who are able to resolve conflicts and keep them from becoming destructive and harmful to children.

It is important to note that, it is possible that one of the reasons we did not find a direct relationship between dyadic parenting similarity and child adjustment was because of the limitation of using a global index of similarity like Finn's r , which indicates only similarity or dissimilarity without giving any information about where the similarity occurs. That is, one parenting dyad with a Finn's r indicating high similarity could consist of two parents who are both high in authoritativeness whereas another parenting dyad with the same Finn's r value may consist of two parents who are both high in authoritarianism. For instance, some studies that collected parenting data via direct observations and had larger sample sizes allowing for the examination of parenting similarity by specific parenting style have found that children with two authoritative parents demonstrate good adjustment and children with two authoritarian parents poor adjustment (Martin et al., 2007; Ryan et al., 2006). However, these studies were comprised of at-risk samples. Additionally, it is recommended that future parenting similarity studies include the examination of similarity in specific parenting goals, as it seems highly likely that children in a family consisting of two parents who are similar in holding parent-centered goals as highly important may differ in their adjustment from children in a family made up of two parents similar in holding relationship-centered goals as highly important.

The results of our study suggest that it may not be necessary for parents to be the same in all aspects of their parenting. Nonetheless, it may be helpful to expectant first time parents to begin to have conversations about parenting their children to discover where their similarities and differences lie, rather than waiting until they are in the midst of parenting

their children as they quickly grow into toddlers and preschoolers with all the challenges this brings (Pruett & Pruett, 2009).

References

- Achenbach, T. M., & Rescorla, L. A. (2000). *Manual for ASEBA preschool forms & profiles*. Burlington, VT: University of Vermont, Research Center for Children, Youth, & Families.
- Bakeman, R., & Quera, V. (2012). Behavioral observation. In H. Cooper, P. M. Camic, D. L. Long, A. T. Panter, D. Rindskopf & K. J. Sher (Eds.), *APA handbook of research methods in psychology, Vol 1: Foundations, planning, measures, and psychometrics* (pp. 207-225). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association; US.
- Baker, J. K., Fenning, R. M., & Crnic, K. (2011). Emotion socialization by mothers and fathers: Coherence among behaviors and associations with parent attitudes and children's social competence. *Social Development, 20*, 412-430. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-9507.2010.00585.x
- Bandura, A. (1977). *Social learning theory*. Oxford: Prentice-Hall.
- Barnett, M. A., Deng, M., Mills-Koonce, W., Willoughby, M., & Cox, M. (2008). Interdependence of parenting of mothers and fathers of infants. *Journal of Family Psychology, 22*, 561-573. doi: 10.1037/0893-3200.22.3.561
- Baumrind, D. (1966). Effects of Authoritative Control on Child Behavior. *Child Development, 37*, 887-907. doi: 10.2307/1126611
- Baumrind, D. (1971). Current patterns of parental authority. *Developmental Psychology, 4*, 1-103. doi: 10.1037/h0030372
- Baumrind, D. (1991). Effective parenting during the early adolescent transition. In P. A. Cowan & E. M. Hetherington (Eds.), *Family transitions* (pp. 111-163). Hillsdale, NJ, England: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

- Bax, K. A. (2006). Between parent similarities in child-rearing goals: Relations to parental, marital and individual adult well-being (Doctoral dissertation, University of Ottawa, 2006). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 66, 6913B.
- Bayer, J. K., Hastings, P. D., Sanson, A. V., Ukoumunne, O. C., & Rubin, K. H. (2010). Predicting mid-childhood internalising symptoms: A longitudinal community study. *The International Journal of Mental Health Promotion*, 12, 5-17. doi: 10.1080/14623730.2010.9721802
- Bronfenbrenner, U., & Ceci, S. J. (1994). Nature-nuture reconceptualized in developmental perspective: A bioecological model. *Psychological Review*, 101, 568-586. doi: 10.1037/0033-295X.101.4.568
- Bugental, D. B., & Johnston, C. (2000). Parental and child cognitions in the context of the family. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 51, 315-344. doi: 10.1146/annurev.psych.51.1.315
- Cabrera, N. J., Shannon, J. D., & Tamis-LeMonda, C. (2007). Fathers' influence on their children's cognitive and emotional development: From toddlers to pre-K. *Applied Developmental Science*, 11, 208-213. doi: 10.1080/10888690701762100
- Chen, M., & Johnston, C. (2012). Interparent childrearing disagreement, but not dissimilarity, predicts child problems after controlling for parenting effectiveness. *Journal of Clinical Child and Adolescent Psychology*, 41, 189-201. doi: 10.1080/15374416.2012.651997
- Crnic, K., & Low, C. (2002). Everyday stresses and parenting. In M. H. Bornstein (Ed.), *Handbook of parenting: Practical issues in parenting* (2nd ed., Vol. 5, pp. 243-267). Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

- Cummings, M. E., & Davies, P. T. (2010). *Marital conflict and children: An emotional security perspective*. New York, NY: Guilford Press.
- Davies, P. T., Martin, M. J., & Cicchetti, D. (2012). Delineating the sequelae of destructive and constructive interparental conflict for children within an evolutionary framework. *Developmental Psychology, 48*, 939-955. doi: 10.1037/a0025899
- Dix, T., Gershoff, E. T., Meunier, L. N., & Miller, P. C. (2004). The affective structure of supportive parenting: Depressive symptoms, immediate emotions, and child-oriented motivation. *Developmental Psychology, 40*, 1212-1227. doi: 10.1037/0012-1649.40.6.1212
- Dix, T., Ruble, D. N., & Zambarano, R. J. (1989). Mothers' implicit theories of discipline: Child effects, parent effects, and the attribution process. *Child Development, 60*, 1373-1391.
- Duhig, A. M., Renk, K., Epstein, M. K., & Phares, V. (2000). Interparental agreement on internalizing, externalizing, and total behavior problems: A meta-analysis. *Clinical Psychology: Science and Practice, 7*, 435-453. doi: 10.1093/clipsy/7.4.435
- Edwards, C. P., & Liu, W.-L. (2002). Parenting Toddlers. In M. H. Bornstein (Ed.), *Handbook of parenting: Children and parenting* (2nd ed., Vol. 1, pp. 45-71). Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Elder, G. H., Jr. (1998). The life course as developmental theory. *Child Development, 69*, 1-12. doi: 10.2307/1132065
- Eyberg, S. M., & Bussing, R. (2010). Parent-child interaction therapy for preschool children with conduct problems. In R. C. Murrihy, A. D. Kidman & T. H. Ollendick (Eds.), *Clinical Handbook of assessing and treating conduct problems in youth* (pp. 139-162). New York: Springer Science.

- Finn, R. H. (1970). A note on estimating reliability of categorical data. *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 30*, 71 - 76. doi: 10.1177/001316447003000106
- Goodwin, C. J. (2010). Observational and survey research methods *Research in Psychology: Methods and design* (pp. 451 - 490). Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Grusec, J. E. (2011). Socialization Processes in the Family: Social and Emotional Development. *Annual Review of Psychology, 62*, 243-269. doi: 10.1146/annurev.psych.121208.131650
- Grusec, J. E., & Kuczynski, L. (1980). Direction of effect in socialization: A comparison of the parent vs. the child's behavior as determinants of disciplinary techniques. *Developmental Psychology, 16*, 1-9.
- Grusec, J. E., & Walters, G. C. (1994). *Can parents' responses to hypothetical childrearing problems predict their behavior?* Paper presented at the Eighth Biennial University of Waterloo Conference on Child Development, Waterloo, Ontario, Canada.
- Gutman, L. M., & Feinstein, L. (2010). Parenting behaviors and children's development from infancy to early childhood: Changes, continuities and contributions. *Early Child Development and Care, 180*, 535-556. doi: 10.1080/03004430802113042
- Harvey, E. A. (2000). Parenting similarity and children with attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder. *Child & Family Behavior Therapy, 22*, 39-54. doi: 10.1300/J019v22n03_02
- Hastings, P. D., & Coplan, R. J. (1999). Conceptual and empirical links between children's social spheres: Relating maternal beliefs and preschoolers' behaviors with peers. *New Directions for Child and Adolescent Development, 86*, 43-59. doi: 10.1002/cd.23219998605

- Hastings, P. D., & Grusec, J. E. (1998). Parenting goals as organizers of responses to parent-child disagreement. *Developmental Psychology, 34*, 465-479. doi: 10.1037/0012-1649.34.3.465
- Hastings, P. D., & Rubin, K. H. (1999). Predicting mothers' beliefs about preschool-aged children's social behavior: Evidence for maternal attitudes moderating child effects. *Child Development, 70*, 722-741. doi: 10.1111/1467-8624.00052
- Jones, T. L., & Prinz, R. J. (2005). Potential roles of parental self-efficacy in parent and child adjustment: A review. *Clinical Psychology Review, 25*, 341-363. doi: 10.1016/j.cpr.2004.12.004
- Kawabata, Y., Alink, L. R., Tseng, W.-L., van Ijzendoorn, M. H., & Crick, N. R. (2011). Maternal and paternal parenting styles associated with relational aggression in children and adolescents: A conceptual analysis and meta-analytic review. *Developmental Review, 31*, 240-278. doi: 10.1016/j.dr.2011.08.001
- Kenny, D. A., Kashy, D. A., & Cook, W. L. (2006). *Dyadic data analysis*. New York: Guilford Press.
- Kuczynski, L., & Parkin, C. M. (2009). Pursuing a dialectical perspective on transaction: A social relational theory of micro family processes *The transactional model of development: How children and contexts shape each other* (pp. 247-268). Washington, DC, US: American Psychological Association.
- Kwon, K.-A., Han, S., Jeon, H.-J., & Bingham, G. E. (2013). Mothers' and fathers' parenting challenges, strategies, and resources in toddlerhood. *Early Child Development and Care, 183*, 415-429. doi: 10.1080/03004430.2012.711591

- Lamb, M. E., & Lewis, C. (2011). The role of parent-child relationships in child development. In M. H. Bornstein & M. E. Lamb (Eds.), *Developmental science: An advanced textbook* (6th ed., pp. 469-517). New York: Taylor and Francis.
- Lee, C. M., Beauregard, C., & Bax, K. A. (2005). Child-related disagreements, verbal aggression, and children's internalizing and externalizing behavior problems. *Journal of Family Psychology, 19*, 237-245. doi: 10.1037/0893-3200.19.2.237
- Lindsey, E. W., & Caldera, Y. M. (2005). Interparental agreement on the use of control in childrearing and infants' compliance to mother's control strategies. *Infant Behavior and Development, 28*, 165-178. doi: 10.1016/j.infbeh.2005.02.004
- Lindsey, E. W., & Mize, J. (2001). Interparental agreement, parent-child responsiveness, and children's peer competence. *Family Relations, 50*, 348-354. doi: 10.1111/j.1741-3729.2001.00348.x
- Maguire, M. C. (1999). Treating the dyad as the unit of analysis: A primer on three analytic approaches. *Journal of Marriage & the Family, 61*, 213-223. doi: 10.2307/353895
- Martin, A., Ryan, R. M., & Brooks-Gunn, J. (2007). The joint influence of mother and father parenting on child cognitive outcomes at age 5. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly, 22*, 423-439. doi: 10.1016/j.ecresq.2007.07.001
- McHale, J. P., & Irace, K. (2011). Coparenting in diverse family systems *Coparenting: A conceptual and clinical examination of family systems* (pp. 15-37). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association; US.
- Meteyer, K. B., & Perry-Jenkins, M. (2009). Dyadic parenting and children's externalizing symptoms. *Family Relations, 58*, 289-302. doi: 10.1111/j.1741-3729.2009.00553.x
- Minuchin, P. (1985). Families and individual development: Provocations from the field of family therapy. *Child Development, 56*, 289-302. doi: 10.2307/1129720

- Panetta, S. M., Somers, C. L., Ceresnie, A. R., Hillman, S. B., & Partridge, R. T. (2014). Maternal and paternal parenting style patterns and adolescent emotional and behavioral outcomes. *Marriage & Family Review, 50*, 342-359. doi: 10.1080/01494929.2013.879557
- Pouget, E., Serbin, L. A., Stack, D. M., & Schwartzman, A. E. (2011). Fathers' influence on children's cognitive and behavioral functioning: A longitudinal study of Canadian families. *Canadian Journal of Behavioral Science, 43*, 173-182. doi: 10.1037/a0023948
- Pruett, K., & Pruett, M. K. (2009). *Partnership parenting: How men and women parent differently-Why it helps your kids and can strengthen your marriage*. Cambridge, MA: Da Capo Press; US.
- Rubin, K. H., & Mills, R. S. L. (1992). Parents' thoughts about children's socially adaptive and maladaptive behaviors: Stability, change, and individual differences. In I. E. Sigel, A. V. McGillicuddy-DeLisi & J. J. Goodnow (Eds.), *Parental belief systems: The psychological consequences for children* (2nd ed., pp. 41-69). Hillsdale: New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.
- Ryan, R. M., Martin, A., & Brooks-Gunn, J. (2006). Is one good parent good enough? Patterns of mother and father parenting and child cognitive outcomes at 24 and 36 months. *Parenting: Science and Practice, 6*, 211-228. doi: 10.1207/s15327922par0602&3_5
- Sameroff, A. (2009). The transactional model *The transactional model of development: How children and contexts shape each other* (pp. 3-21). Washington, DC, US: American Psychological Association.

- Sanders, M. R. (2012). Development, evaluation, and multinational dissemination of the Triple P-Positive Parenting Program. *Annual Review of Clinical Psychology, 8*, 345-379. doi: 10.1146/annurev-clinpsy-032511-143104
- Schacht, P. M., Cummings, E., & Davies, P. T. (2009). Fathering in family context and child adjustment: A longitudinal analysis. *Journal of Family Psychology, 23*, 790-797. doi: 10.1037/a0016741
- Sigel, I. E., McGillicuddy-DeLisi, A. V., & Goodnow, J. J. (1992). *Parental belief systems: The psychological consequences for children (2nd ed.)*. Hillsdale, NJ, England: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
- Simons, L. G., & Conger, R. D. (2007). Linking Mother-Father Differences in Parenting to a Typology of Family Parenting Styles and Adolescent Outcomes. *Journal of Family Issues, 28*, 212-241. doi: 10.1177/0192513X06294593
- Statistics Canada. (2010a). Median total income, by family type, by census metropolitan area. Ottawa, ON: Statistics Canada.
- Statistics Canada. (2010b). Visible minority population, by census metropolitan areas (2006 Census). Ottawa, ON: Statistics Canada,.
- Teubert, D., & Pinqart, M. (2010). The association between coparenting and child adjustment: A meta-analysis. *Parenting: Science and Practice, 10*, 286-307. doi: 10.1080/15295192.2010.492040

Table 1

Means and Standard Deviations for Parenting Responses for Total Sample, and Mothers and Fathers

	Total Sample (<i>N</i> = 298)	Mothers (<i>n</i> = 150)	Fathers (<i>n</i> = 148)
Parenting Response	<i>M</i> (<i>SD</i>)	<i>M</i> (<i>SD</i>)	<i>M</i> (<i>SD</i>)
Child Misbehavior			
Authoritative	1.78 (.88)	1.86 (.89)	1.70 (.86)
Authoritarian	0.78 (.79)	0.73 (.80)	0.84 (.78)
Permissive	0.38 (.55)	0.35 (.53)	0.41 (.57)
Child Withdrawn Behavior			
Authoritative	0.70 (.73)	0.67 (.72)	0.73 (.73)
Authoritarian	0.02 (.15)	0.01 (.08)	0.04 (.20)
Permissive	1.26 (.73)	1.29 (.72)	1.22 (.73)

Table 2

Means and Standard Deviations for Parenting Goals for Total Sample, and Mothers and Fathers

	Total Sample (<i>N</i> = 298)	Mothers (<i>n</i> = 150)	Fathers (<i>n</i> = 148)
Parenting Goal	<i>M</i> (<i>SD</i>)	<i>M</i> (<i>SD</i>)	<i>M</i> (<i>SD</i>)
Child Misbehavior			
PC-ST	3.55 (0.87)	3.50 (0.90)	3.59 (0.84)
PC-LT	2.11 (0.94)	2.15 (0.92)	2.06 (0.95)
CC-ST	2.87 (1.00)	2.87 (0.98)	2.86 (1.00)
CC-LT	4.15 (0.87)	4.17 (0.87)	4.12 (0.86)
RC-ST	4.38 (0.80)	4.45 (0.79)	4.31 (0.81)
RC-LT	4.55 (0.76)	4.58 (0.81)	4.53 (0.71)
Child Withdrawn Behavior			
PC-ST	2.42 (1.02)	2.26 (0.94)	2.57 (1.08)
PC-LT	1.94 (0.92)	1.89 (0.90)	1.98 (0.94)
CC-ST	3.99 (0.77)	4.13 (0.78)	3.84 (0.74)
CC-LT	4.10 (0.89)	4.15 (0.87)	4.06 (0.90)
RC-ST	4.33 (0.77)	4.36 (0.80)	4.29 (0.73)
RC-LT	4.72 (0.51)	4.78 (0.47)	4.67 (0.54)

Note. PC-ST = parent-centered short-term, PC-LT = parent-centered long-term, CC-ST = child-centered short-term, CC-LT = child-centered long-term, RC-ST = relationship-centered short-term, RC-LT = relationship-centered long-term.

Table 3

Means and Standard Deviations for CBCL Scores for Total Sample, and Mothers and Fathers

	Total Sample (<i>N</i> = 247)	Mothers (<i>n</i> = 124)	Fathers (<i>n</i> = 123)
CBCL	<i>M</i> (<i>SD</i>)	<i>M</i> (<i>SD</i>)	<i>M</i> (<i>SD</i>)
Internalizing T	49.60 (8.78)	49.27 (9.17)	49.93 (8.39)
Externalizing T	49.50 (8.15)	50.19 (8.00)	48.80 (8.30)

Table 4

Distribution of Mother-Father Parenting Response Classifications by Child Behavior

	<i>N</i>	<i>%</i>
Child Misbehavior		
Mother authoritarian/Father authoritarian	35	23.6
Mother authoritarian/Father authoritative	28	18.9
Mother authoritarian/Father permissive	1	0.7
Mother authoritative/Father authoritarian	32	21.6
Mother authoritative/Father authoritative	41	27.7
Mother authoritative/Father permissive	1	0.7
Mother permissive/Father authoritarian	7	4.7
Mother permissive/Father authoritative	3	2.0
Mother permissive/Father permissive	-	-
Child Withdrawn Behavior		
Mother authoritarian/Father authoritarian	-	-
Mother authoritarian/Father authoritative	-	-
Mother authoritarian/Father permissive	-	-
Mother authoritative/Father authoritarian	-	-
Mother authoritative/Father authoritative	49	33.1
Mother authoritative/Father permissive	29	19.6
Mother permissive/Father authoritarian	2	1.4
Mother permissive/Father authoritative	36	24.3
Mother permissive/Father permissive	32	21.6

Manuscript Two

Parenting responses and parenting goals of mothers and fathers of adolescents*

Catherine Horvath and Catherine M. Lee

University of Ottawa

* This manuscript is in press at *Marriage and Family Review*.

Abstract

We extended on the work of Hastings and Grusec (1998) by examining the contextual nature of parenting goals in mothers and fathers of adolescents. We also examined dyadic parenting similarity in parenting responses and parenting goals. Participants were 285 primarily professional (48.6%), White (82.7%) parents of adolescents aged 14 to 17 years old (mothers $n = 213$, fathers $n = 68$, dyads $n = 43$). Results of a $2 \times 2 \times 6$ MANCOVA indicated that parenting goals were influenced by characteristics of the situation, but not by parent or adolescent gender. There was dyadic parenting similarity for parenting responses and dyadic similarity for parenting goals. The implications of these findings for parenting interventions and future parenting research using within family comparisons are discussed.

Keywords: parenting goals, mothers, fathers, adolescents, parenting similarity

Parenting Responses and Parenting Goals of Mothers and Fathers of Adolescents

The evidence linking parenting to adolescent outcomes such as social-emotional functioning, academic achievement, and physical and mental health, is unequivocal (Grusec, 2011; Kawabata et al., 2011; Stack et al., 2010). Among the many risk factors for adolescent problems, parenting is one of the most modifiable (Barrett & Turner, 2004). Parenting has been examined in terms of parental affect, behavior, and cognition (e.g., Baumrind, 1971; Kawabata et al., 2011; Locke & Prinz, 2002). Adolescence is a challenging time during which family relationships undergo significant transformations (Smetana et al., 2006), so it is important to examine the links between parenting and adolescent adjustment. The current study was designed to extend on previous investigations of parenting (e.g., Hastings & Grusec, 1998), by examining parenting goals of mothers as well as fathers in a previously unexamined developmental period, adolescence. We also examined dyadic parenting similarity in parenting responses and parenting goals.

Many terms are used in studies of parenting adolescents (e.g., sensitive, supportive, responsive, positive, directive, dominant, power assertive, negative). Nevertheless, most constructs map on to Baumrind's two-dimensional typology that categorizes parenting along the dimensions of responsiveness and demandingness yielding four categories: authoritative, authoritarian, permissive, and neglectful (Baumrind, 1971). Studies conducted with middleclass, White, North American samples have shown that the most common parenting style is authoritative parenting, which is firm, consistent, and responsive (Baumrind, 1991; Smetana, 1995) and in turn is associated with positive adolescent outcomes (Grusec, 2011; Sanders, 2012). However, it is important to remember that parenting styles represent the average of a parent's parenting and that there is considerable situational variation (Grusec,

2011). Nevertheless, as adolescents do best when parents use authoritative parenting across a variety of situations, many parenting interventions are designed to promote greater use of authoritative parenting (Sanders, 2012). We turn now to contextual factors such as parent gender and adolescent gender that might affect parenting.

Parent Gender

Numerous studies have established the influence of maternal parenting on adolescent adjustment (e.g., Hofer et al., 2013; Lanza et al., 2013; Schuppert et al., 2012). A smaller body of work has demonstrated a link between fathers' parenting and adolescent adjustment (e.g., Demidenko, Manion, & Lee, in press; Kerr et al., 2009; McEwen & Flouri, 2009). Studies that examined both mothers' and fathers' parenting, have found considerable overlap, but also some differences. For instance, in a study of parents of early adolescents Bolkan and colleagues (Bolkan et al., 2010) found only 29.6% rated both their parents as authoritative. Other studies have found that according to both parental self-report and adolescent ratings, mothers of adolescents are more likely to use authoritative parenting than are fathers (Milevsky et al., 2008; Smetana, 1995). Consequently, adolescents with a mother who uses authoritative parenting may live in a context in which the father uses a different parenting style. It is therefore, important to examine both mothers and fathers to deepen our understanding of family systems (Smetana et al., 2006).

Adolescent Gender

A number of studies have found evidence of an interaction between parent and adolescent gender effects (Bolkan et al., 2010; Day & Padilla-Walker, 2009; Hoeve, Dubas, Gerris, van der Laan, & Smeenk, 2011; Shanahan et al., 2007). For example, Bolkan et al. (2010) found worse behavioral outcomes for sons who perceived their mothers as authoritarian than for daughters. In another study, Shanahan et al. (2007) found that

daughters rated their mothers as being warmer towards them during middle adolescence than they had been in early adolescence, but sons rated their mothers as being less warm in middle adolescence. These findings highlight the importance of examining adolescent gender effects to expand our understanding of the complex interactions at play within family systems.

Gender effects may be especially salient during adolescence when there is increasing gender differentiation.

Parenting Goals

Bugental and Johnston (2000) proposed that parenting goals may be a mechanism through which global parenting styles are translated and organized into parenting behavior in specific parenting situations. Numerous theories of the determinants of parenting behavior have ascribed a central role to parenting goals as possible predictors of parenting behavior (e.g., Darling & Steinberg, 1993; Dix, 1992; Rubin et al., 1989). Parenting goals refer to the outcomes parents strive for in their interactions with their children and are categorized based on their immediacy (short-term vs. long-term) and their center of concern (parent, child, or relationship) (Hastings & Grusec, 1998). Parent-centered short-term goals are those focused on meeting a parent's immediate need for the child to behave properly; parent-centered long-term goals focus on a parent's long-term needs of having a compliant child that knows proper behavior is expected. Child-centered short-term goals are the goals that meet the immediate needs and/or desires of the child; child-centered long-term goals reflect seeking to teach the child values and societal rules for standards for behavior. Finally, relationship-centered short-term goals are those focused on compromise and preservation of the parent-child relationship in the immediate situation; and relationship-centered long-term goals are focused on promoting family bonds and building loving long-term relationships (Hastings & Grusec, 1998).

Although the construct of parenting goals has an intuitively appealing application to parenting adolescents, to date all studies have focused on parenting of younger children and no studies have examined parenting goals in families with adolescents. In samples of families with preschool and school age children there has been limited examination of whether parenting goals are influenced by parent gender. The series of studies reported in Hastings and Grusec (1998) are the only parenting goal studies to have examined parent gender effects. A small effect was found in one study that included parents and nonparents. It is important therefore to examine possible parent gender effects.

Findings pertaining to child gender in parenting goal studies have been mixed with two studies finding evidence suggesting child gender may influence maternal parenting goals (Hastings & Coplan, 1999; Hastings & Rubin, 1999) and two studies finding no evidence for child gender effects (Coplan et al., 2002; Hastings & Grusec, 1998). It is therefore important to examine possible gender effects. Hastings and Grusec (1998) also reported evidence that parenting goals are affected by characteristics of the situation with parent-centered goals rated as most important when responding to a hypothetical public act of misbehavior (a tantrum in a grocery store), child-centered short-term and relationship-centered long-term goals rated as most important when responding to a hypothetical sibling rivalry situation, and child-centered long-term rated as most important in a situation where the hypothetical 6 year old used derogatory language. There is initial evidence of links between parenting goals and parenting behavior (Dix et al., 2004; Hastings & Grusec, 1998; Hastings & Rubin, 1999) and parenting goals and child adjustment (Hastings & Coplan, 1999). However, with the exception of one study that included fathers (Hastings & Grusec, 1998), studies have collected data only from mothers of young children (toddler, pre-school, and school-aged)

(Coplan et al., 2002; Dix et al., 2004; Hastings & Coplan, 1999; Hastings & Grusec, 1998; Hastings & Rubin, 1999; Kuczynski, 1984).

In this study we collected data from mothers and fathers of adolescents. Our sample also included a subset of mother-father dyads (i.e., parents of the same adolescent) allowing us to explore the possible links between dyadic parenting similarity in parenting responses and dyadic similarity in parenting goals.

Parenting Similarity

The interdependence of maternal and paternal parenting is highlighted in several theoretical frameworks (e.g., ecological systems theory; Bronfenbrenner & Ceci, 1994; life systems theory; Elder, 1998; family systems theory; Minuchin, 1985; transactional model; Sameroff, 2009). Although a significant minority of adolescents live in single parent families, the majority of North American adolescents live in two-parent families (Lofquist, Lugaila, O'Connell, & Feliz, 2012; Statistics Canada, 2012). Because research has shown that adolescents benefit from a consistent socialization environment in which each parent is predictable and reliable in affect, behavior, and limit setting (McHale & Irace, 2011) parents have been encouraged to provide a united front in their interactions with their adolescent children (e.g., Gordon, 2000). Relatively little research has examined inter-parental similarity and whether it promotes better child or adolescent adjustment. There is preliminary evidence that compared to having two unsupportive parents or one supportive and one unsupportive parent having two supportive parents is associated with better adjustment in at-risk children (Martin et al., 2007; Meteyer & Perry-Jenkins, 2009; Ryan et al., 2006) and adolescents according to adolescent self-reports (Berkien et al., 2012; McKinney & Renk, 2008; Milevsky et al., 2008; Simons & Conger, 2007). However, in a community sample of parents of toddlers and preschoolers, Chen and Johnston (2012) found that parenting

effectiveness mediated the links between child adjustment and both dissimilarity in parenting practices and dissimilarity in parenting goals. That is, there was no longer a significant relationship between dissimilarity in either parenting practices or parenting goals and child adjustment once the relation between parenting effectiveness and child adjustment was accounted for.

Current Study

The current study was designed to examine self-reported parenting responses, parenting goals, and parent-rated adolescent adjustment in mothers and fathers of adolescents, including a sub-sample of parents who were in dyads. The first set of hypotheses examined whether patterns found in previous parenting goal studies conducted with mothers of preschool and school-aged children would be found with parents of adolescents, including fathers. We evaluated goal importance ratings and assessed whether parenting goals were influenced by parent gender, child gender and characteristics of the situation. We examined whether parenting goals were linked to parenting responses and to parent ratings of adolescent adjustment. Finally, in a subset of mother-father dyads we planned to examine links between dyadic parenting similarity in parenting responses, parenting goals, and parent ratings of adolescent adjustment. We planned to address three exploratory questions: 1) are mothers and fathers in parenting dyads more similar to each other in their parenting responses and parenting goals than they are to other parents? 2) to what extent is dyadic similarity in parenting responses associated with dyadic similarity in parenting goals? 3) to what extent is dyadic parenting similarity in parenting responses and/or parenting goals related to adolescent adjustment?

Method

Participants

A community sample of parents with adolescents aged 14 to 17 years old participated. We collected complete parenting responses and parenting goal importance data from 285 parents, (mothers $n = 213$ and fathers $n = 68$); four parents did not report their gender. Of these 285 parents, a subsample of 166 parents (mothers $n = 120$; fathers $n = 45$) also provided complete adolescent adjustment data. The sample contained a subsample of 43 dyads (mother and father of the same adolescent).

The sample consisted primarily of married (77.1%), biological parents (91.7%), of 2.6 children on average ($SD = 1.26$). The sample included parents of boys (48.5%) and girls (51.5%). Mean ages were 45.5 years ($SD = 5.58$) for mothers and 47.6 years ($SD = 6.02$) for fathers, with the average age of the target adolescent being 15.5 years ($SD = 1.13$). The median family income was in the greater than \$100 000 range. The most common occupational category identified by mothers and fathers was professional (48.6%). Approximately 82.7% of participants reported being White and 17.3% reported belonging to an ethnic minority group.

Measures

Parenting responses. To assess parenting responses the **Adolescent Behavior Vignettes (ABV)** was administered. The ABV presents parents with vignettes depicting adolescent mild to moderate misbehavior and asks them to describe how they would respond and to rate the importance of each parenting goal. We adapted the Child Behavior Vignettes (CBV) used by Hastings (Coplan et al., 2002; Hastings & Coplan, 1999; Hastings & Grusec, 1998; Hastings & Rubin, 1999). We wrote ten vignettes on topics that have been found to be the most common focus of parent-adolescent conflict: household responsibilities, school

responsibilities, physical appearance, morality/honesty, time use and politeness (Adams & Laursen, 2001; Bibby, 2001; Riesch et al., 2000; Smetana & Gaines, 1999). The ten vignettes were then piloted³ with four mothers and two fathers of adolescents aged 14 to 17 years old to determine that the situations depicted commonly occurring interactions between adolescents and their parents, that no commonly occurring interactions had been overlooked; and that the instructions and vignettes were easy to understand. The edited ABV was subsequently reviewed by three developmental researchers with expertise in the area of parenting goals. The version based on parent and expert feedback was administered to a sample of mothers ($n = 23$) and fathers ($n = 13$) of adolescents to ensure: parent responses to the set of vignettes yielded sufficient response variability in parenting practices and goals; the vignettes depicted commonly occurring parent-adolescent conflict situations; and there were no problems related to online administration of the measure.

The final version of the ABV⁴ consisted of five vignettes depicting common parent-adolescent conflictual interactions. The ABV instructs parents to imagine themselves and their adolescent child as the actors in situations depicting: a) an adolescent who has not done his or her weekly chores, b) an adolescent wearing and refusing to change an inappropriate outfit, c) an adolescent spending all day on the computer, d) an adolescent swearing at a parent in response to a question about homework being completed, and e) an adolescent not keeping their room clean. To assess parenting responses, parents were asked *Describe what you would do first: I would . . .* and *Describe what you would do next: I would . . .* The ABV therefore yields two responses for each vignette.

³ See Appendices C and D.

⁴ See Appendix E.

Coding of parents' self-report parenting responses. To summarize parents' self-reported responses we developed a coding scheme based on Baumrind's (1971) typology to code parental responses as being: a) authoritative, b) authoritarian, or c) permissive. In the original coding scheme we included Baumrind's uninvolved category, as well as a disorganized code to represent parent responses that were a combination of authoritarian and permissive. However, these categories yielded very low frequencies and were not included in analyses.

The resulting two behavior codes for each vignette were combined into a single code per vignette using pre-established decision rules. However, the two vignettes that depicted situations involving two issues were assigned four behavior codes, two for each issue. For example in the vignette, "Your daughter/son is about to leave the house when you notice s/he is wearing an outfit you feel is inappropriate. When you comment, s/he replies, 'Everyone wears stuff like this' and walks out the door slamming it," both the issues of physical appearance and politeness are presented. Therefore, the ABV yielded seven behavior codes for each participant.

The coding manual⁵ was developed by the first author then used by the first and second author to code a subset of the data. Areas of disagreement were resolved by discussion. The manual was edited and refined in an iterative process. We also consulted two developmental psychology researchers and revised the manual based on their feedback. The first author subsequently trained two undergraduate psychology students to code the behavioral intentions for the entire data set. Training continued until a good level of inter-rater reliability was obtained ($K = .75 - .84$), after which the data were coded independently. To prevent coder drift, the first author coded every 10th questionnaire. Both undergraduate

⁵ See Appendix F.

coders coded 20% of the same data in order to establish inter-rater agreement for the sample as a whole; it was found to be adequate ($K = .67$).

Parenting goals. After reporting on their parenting behavior in responding to each hypothetical vignette, parents were then presented with descriptions of the six parenting goals (e.g., parent-centered short-term: *to get my teen to behave properly*) and asked to rate the importance of the goal in each hypothetical situation on a Likert scale of 1 to 5 with a higher score indicating a higher importance rating.

The ABV had excellent internal consistency in this sample (mothers $\alpha = 0.94$; fathers $\alpha = 0.95$). A copy of the ABV is available upon request from the first author.

Child Behavior Checklist (CBCL). Adolescent adjustment was measured by administration of the CBCL School Age for ages 6-18 years to both mothers and fathers (Achenbach & Rescorla, 2001) yielding two scores of adolescent adjustment: a) maternal rating of total behavior problems; and b) paternal rating of total behavior problems. The CBCL is a widely used measure with norms based on large representative sample that yields *T* scores for total problems. There is significant evidence of its internal consistency, test-retest reliability, content and construct validity (Achenbach & Rescorla, 2001).

Procedure

With the approval of our university's Research Ethics Board⁶ participants were recruited via multiple formats in order to obtain as diverse a sample as possible. The majority of participants reported hearing about the study from recruitment emails (58.3%) or another person (24.6%), with some participants reporting being recruited via Internet advertisements (7.6%), in-person recruitment efforts (7.2%), or paper flyer postings (2.2%)⁷.

⁶ See Appendix G.

⁷ See Appendices H, I, and J.

Parents were included in the study if they were: 1) the parent of an adolescent aged 14 to 17 years old; 2) able to read, and write English fluently; and 3) involved in the adolescent's life, for at least two years, in the form of at least weekly contact with the adolescent. We used a psychological definition of a parent, by requiring that the two participating parental figures had been involved in the adolescent's life, for at least two years, in the form of at least weekly contact with the adolescent. The age range of 14 to 17 years old is the period defined as middle adolescence and was chosen to ensure that parents' adolescent children had reached puberty, but not yet left the family home.

All measures were completed online. The ABV and demographic questions⁸ were presented using the online survey tool SurveyMonkey after completion of which participants were redirected to the ASEBA iForms website to complete the CBCL. Upon opening the study homepage participants were first presented with a consent form⁹ and were required to consent to participate in the study before being presented the study measures. Participants were asked to complete the measures independently from the other parent of their adolescent child. Upon completion of the questionnaires participants were offered a five-dollar e-certificate.

Consistent with the procedure used by Hastings and Grusec (1998), parents' self-reported parenting goal importance data were averaged across vignettes creating six scores for parenting goals (parent-centered short-term, parent-centered long-term, child-centered short-term, child-centered long-term, relationship-centered short-term, relationship-centered long-term). Similarly, scores were created for the three self-reported parent responses,

⁸ See Appendix K.

⁹ See Appendix L.

authoritarian, authoritative, permissive, across the five vignettes with a higher score indicating higher frequency of parenting style ranging from 0 to 7.

To examine the hypotheses pertaining to dyadic parenting similarity the individual parent responses to the ABV were used to create a dyadic similarity index for each parenting dyad; larger positive values indicated greater similarity between the two parents in the dyad (Kenny et al., 2006). Finn's r was used for this as, similar to the intraclass correlation coefficient (ICC), it allows for the creation of a single similarity index from multiple data points for a construct, but unlike the ICC it is not dependent on the distribution of the dyad's responses and is recommended when the distribution may not be normal such as when responses are given on a Likert-scale. The similarity index yields one score per dyad without the loss of information that can occur with other data reduction methods such as averaging across responses. A further advantage of using Finn's r is that the resulting values can be used in subsequent analyses as either an independent or dependent variable (Kenny et al., 2006; Maguire, 1999). A value of 0 indicates that the members of the dyad are as similar to each other as they are to the others in the sample; whereas, a score of 1 indicates perfect similarity and a score of -1 indicates perfect dissimilarity.

Results

Data Screening

Data were screened for accuracy of data entry, missing values, and violation of assumptions of multivariate analysis. There was a large amount of missing data, 41.4%, for the adolescent adjustment measure, most likely a result of participants failing to go to the second webpage on completion of the first set of survey questions. Separate variance t -tests showed no systematic relationship between missingness on CBCL data and any of the other variables. That is, participants who completed the CBCL were not significantly different on

any of the independent or dependent variables from those who did not complete it, therefore analyses examining questions regarding links to adolescent adjustment were conducted on the subsample of participants that completed the CBCL ($n = 166$; mothers $n = 120$; fathers $n = 45$). As there were only 28 dyads with data on adolescent adjustment, the sample size was inadequate to conduct dyadic analyses with respect to adolescent adjustment. Also, 11.2% of data reporting family income were missing. Examination of separate variance t -tests indicated that missingness on the family income variable was systematically related to participant ethnicity (participants missing family income data were more likely to belong to an ethnic minority) and participants' authoritarian parenting score (lower in authoritarian parenting responses). Furthermore, an examination of the correlation matrix of continuous demographic variables and independent variables revealed significantly more correlations than would be expected by chance for family income¹⁰. Therefore, all analyses were run controlling for family income. No other demographic variables were identified as needing to be controlled for in analyses.

Primary analyses

Multivariate analyses of covariance (MANCOVAs) were conducted to examine whether patterns found among parents of pre-school age children in previous parenting goals studies would also be found among parents of adolescents. To correct for unequal cell sizes between fathers and mothers we used SSTYPE(2) instead of the default SSTYPE(3) as recommended by Tabachnick and Fidell (2007). Gender effects were assessed in a three-way (2 parent gender x 2 adolescent gender x 6 goal ratings) MANCOVA controlling for family income. Overall means and standard deviations for parenting goals, as well as for each vignette, are presented in Table 1.

¹⁰ See Appendix M for correlation matrix.

There was a significant main effect for parenting goal importance, $F(3.74, 867) = 221.49, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .49, 95\% \text{ CI} [.44 \text{ to } .53]$, indicating that participants differed significantly on their importance ratings for each parenting goal. However, there were no parent or adolescent gender effects in self-reported parenting goal importance and no interactions between parent gender and goals or between child gender and goals, and no interaction between parent gender, child gender, and goals. To determine whether these null findings were attributable to sample size, power analyses were conducted using G*Power 3 software. Power analyses show that the sample size was sufficient to detect medium and large effects of child gender and that the sample size for fathers ($n = 60$) was sufficient to detect large size effects (Faul, Erdfelder, Lang, & Buchner, 2007).

Table 1 presents mean parent goal ratings by vignette. To follow-up on the main effect for parenting goal importance pairwise comparisons among the six types of goals were conducted. Given the large number of comparisons, a Bonferroni correction was applied to control for Type I error setting p at .003. Of the 15 pairwise comparisons, 12 were significant at $p < .001$; the only nonsignificant comparisons were parent-centered short-term versus relationship-centered short-term, $p = 1.0$, parent-centered long-term versus child-centered short-term, $p = 0.66$, and child-centered long-term versus relationship-centered long-term, $p = 1.0$. The results of this analysis indicate that in response to hypothetical vignettes depicting mild to moderate adolescent misbehavior parents: gave the highest importance ratings to child-centered and relationship-centered long-term goals and rated them as significantly more important than they did all other goals.

To examine whether parenting goal importance was influenced by the characteristics of the situation a two way (6 goal ratings x 5 vignettes) MANCOVA was conducted

controlling for family income, with parenting goal importance and vignette as within subject factors. There was a significant main effect for both goal, $F(5, 223) = 128.76, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .74$, 95% CI [.68 to .78], and vignette, $F(4, 224) = 20.28, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .27$, 95% CI [.16 to .35], and a significant interaction between goal and vignette, $F(20, 208) = 6.80, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .40$, 95% CI [.24 to .43].

Pairwise comparisons were conducted to follow-up on the main effect for vignette and the interaction between goal and vignette using the Bonferroni correction. The results of pairwise comparisons for the main effect for goal are not reported here because they appear in the above section. Pairwise comparisons indicated that across the parenting goals, parenting goal importance ratings were not significantly different for the vignettes related to chores, time on the computer, or appropriateness of clothing and rudeness. However, parenting goal importance ratings in response to the vignettes that described an adolescent having an untidy room and responding angrily to inquiries about homework were significantly different from the parenting goal importance ratings for all the other vignettes. An examination of the pairwise comparisons between all the six goals by vignette revealed that the vignette that depicted the most passive misbehavior, being on the computer all day, elicited significantly lower importance ratings for parent-centered long-term goals than did any of the other vignettes. Participants gave significantly higher importance ratings for four of the six goals (parent-centered short- and long-term, child-centered long-term, and relationship-centered short-term) in response to the vignette that contained the strongest act of misbehavior, swearing at a parent query about homework being completed, compared to any of the other vignettes.

To examine the extent to which parenting goals were linked to parenting responses, a correlation matrix was created between the three parenting response count scores (authoritative, authoritarian, and permissive) and the six parenting goal importance scores (parent-centered short-term, parent-centered long-term, child-centered short-term, child-centered long-term, relationship-centered short-term, and relationship-centered long-term). These analyses were run controlling for family income. The partial correlation matrix revealed no significant correlations at $p < .05$.¹¹

To investigate the extent to which self-reported parenting goal importance was associated with parent-rated adolescent adjustment, bivariate correlations between the six parenting goal importance scores and maternal and paternal ratings of total behavior problems on the CBCL were examined. These analyses were run controlling for family income. The partial correlations matrix showed no significant correlations at $p < .05$.¹²

Exploratory analyses - dyadic parenting similarity

All analyses were initially performed separately by child gender however because no evidence was found of child gender effects results are reported for the full sample. To determine whether dyadic parenting similarity was present for parenting response scores and parenting goal importance (i.e., if mothers and fathers in parenting dyads were more similar to each other than they were to other parents) two single-samples t -tests were run, comparing the sample mean to the population mean. For this analysis the population mean was set to a value of 0 indicating no more similarity or dissimilarity within a given parenting dyad than between members of the sample as a whole. If the mean derived from each dyad's Finn's r is positive in value and the t -test result is significant it indicates that the members of a

¹¹ See Appendix N for correlation matrix.

¹² See Appendix O for correlation matrix.

parenting dyad are more similar to each other than they are to other participants in the sample. On the other hand, a negative mean value and significant t -test indicates that the members of a parenting dyad are more dissimilar from each other than they are from other participants in the sample.

T -tests were significant both for parenting responses, $t = 19.15, p < .001, d = 2.92$, and parenting goals, $t = 12.32, p < .001, d = 2.02$. Mean similarity values were positive for parenting responses, $M = .79, SD = .27$, and for parenting goals, $M = .48, SD = .25$, indicating members of parenting dyads were significantly more similar to each other in both their self-reported parenting responses and parenting goals importance ratings than they were to the other participants in the sample. A paired samples t -test between the two similarity indices was significant, $t = 5.76, p < .001, d = 1.34$, indicating that parenting dyads were significantly more similar in reported parenting responses than they were parenting goal importance ratings.

To examine the extent to which dyadic parenting similarity in parenting responses was associated with dyadic parenting similarity in parenting goals a Pearson's bivariate correlation was computed between the two similarity indices. This correlation was not significant ($r = -.08, p = .64$), suggesting that the degree to which parenting dyads are similar in their reported parenting responses is not related to the degree to which they are similar in their reported parenting goal importance. Unfortunately, the sample size was inadequate ($n = 28$) to conduct analyses with respect to dyadic parenting similarity and child adjustment.

Discussion

In this study we examined parenting goals in parents of adolescents. Results partially replicated the pattern of parenting goal importance found in previous parenting goal studies

conducted with parents, primarily mothers of preschool and school-aged children (Coplan et al., 2002; Hastings & Rubin, 1999).

In this sample, the highest importance ratings were assigned to relationship-centered and child-centered long-term goals, which is somewhat different from previous parenting goal studies in which parents rated child-centered long-term and parent-centered goals as most important in situations involving mild to moderate child misbehavior (Coplan et al., 2002; Hastings & Coplan, 1999; Hastings & Grusec, 1998). The difference between our findings and those of studies with parents of younger children indicates important developmental shifts in parenting as children age towards increased discussion, negotiation, and collaborative relationships.

In this sample of parents of adolescents, we did not find support for the hypothesis that either parent or adolescent gender influence parenting goals. There was partial support for the hypothesis that parenting goal importance is affected by characteristics of the situation. Congruent with the findings of Hastings and Grusec (1998), there was a significant goal by vignette interaction, indicating that goals were significantly different across vignettes. Specifically, parents gave significantly lower importance ratings for the parent-centered long-term and short-term goals to the two vignettes depicting the most passive misbehaviors. In contrast, parents gave the highest importance ratings for four of the six goals in response to the vignette that consisted of the most aggressive adolescent misbehavior. We did not replicate the findings of studies that have found evidence of a link between parenting behavior and parenting goal importance ratings, (Dix et al., 2004; Hastings & Grusec, 1998; Hastings & Rubin, 1999); nor did we find evidence of a link between parenting goal importance ratings and adolescent adjustment (Hastings & Coplan, 1999).

The secondary goal was to examine three exploratory questions pertaining to dyadic parenting similarity and parenting responses, parenting goals, and adolescent adjustment. We found preliminary evidence of moderately high dyadic parenting similarity in self-reported parenting responses. This is consistent with findings from studies that collected parenting similarity data via adolescent report of parenting styles from community samples (Berkien et al., 2012; Lanz et al., 2001); the level of dyadic parenting similarity in parenting behavior is slightly higher than was found in studies of families with younger children (Chen & Johnston, 2012; Lindsey & Mize, 2001b). Although we cannot make causal inferences from cross-sectional data, one possible interpretation is that parents may become more similar in their parenting as they parent together over time. We also found preliminary evidence of a moderate degree of dyadic parenting similarity in self-reported parenting goal importance which is consistent with the results from Chen and Johnston's (2012) study with parents of toddlers and preschoolers. In our sample, parenting dyads were significantly more similar in their self-reported parenting responses than they were in parenting goal importance; similarity in parenting responses was not found to be linked to similarity in parenting goals.

Limitations

We were only partially successful in recruiting both mothers and fathers, and those in parenting dyads. A main limitation is the uneven sample sizes for mothers and fathers and the small size of the dyadic sample. Although research on fathers has been steadily increasing researchers continue to find it harder to recruit fathers to participate in parenting research using recruitment methods that have been successful with mothers (Phares et al., 2005). This in turn makes it difficult to recruit parenting dyads as well. Secondly, given the relatively high socioeconomic status of the majority of our participants and the high percentage of two-parent households, our findings may not generalize to all adolescent

family contexts. Another possible limitation was that we collected data regarding parenting responses using parental self-report rather than observation which is considered the gold standard, but in practice is resource intensive and often not done (Bakeman & Quera, 2012). A final limitation was that we examined a limited number of contextual factors and if parenting goals are contextually based then there are likely many parental, child, and relationship factors that could influence them that bear consideration for inclusion in future studies, such as parental fatigue, stress, and mood, child temperament, and quality of parent-child relationship.

Implications and Future Directions

Our study has added to the small body of evidence that indicates parenting goals are contextually based. First, we replicated the findings of Hastings and Grusec (1998) that parents rate different goals as important in different hypothetical parenting situations with parents of adolescents. Second, we found that parents of adolescents rate relationship-centered goals as most important when faced with adolescent mild to moderate misbehavior. These preliminary findings require replication with larger samples of fathers and mothers, parents of children in other developmental periods, as well as extension to the examination of additional contextual factors. Another area of research that has the potential to make an important contribution to our understanding of parenting within families is that of dyadic parenting similarity. In the relatively small dyadic sample we found evidence of dyadic parenting similarity in both parenting responses and parenting goals. Unfortunately, we were not able to examine the exploratory question pertaining to the extent to which dyadic parenting similarity in parenting responses and parenting goals may be linked to adolescent adjustment due to a small sample size. However, studies that have examined the links between parenting similarity and child and adolescent adjustment have found intriguing

evidence that having two supportive parents is linked to better adjustment. Future research that includes data from parenting dyads will expand our understanding of parenting within the context of family systems. This research has the potential to inform the development of parenting interventions that address obstacles to the use of authoritative parenting in a given situation and teach parents skills for identifying and managing these obstacles.

References

- Achenbach, T. M., & Rescorla, L. A. (2001). *Manual for the ASEBA School-Age forms & profiles*. Burlington, VT: University of Vermont, Research Center for Children, Youth, & Families.
- Adams, R., & Laursen, B. (2001). The organization and dynamics of adolescent conflict with parents and friends. *Journal of Marriage & the Family*, *63*, 97-110. doi: 10.1111/j.1741-3737.2001.00097.x
- Bakeman, R., & Quera, V. (2012). Behavioral observation. In H. Cooper, P. M. Camic, D. L. Long, A. T. Panter, D. Rindskopf & K. J. Sher (Eds.), *APA handbook of research methods in psychology, Vol 1: Foundations, planning, measures, and psychometrics* (pp. 207-225). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association; US.
- Barrett, P., & Turner, C. (2004). Prevention of childhood anxiety and depression. In P. M. Barrett & T. H. Ollendick (Eds.), *Interventions that work with children and adolescents: Prevention and treatment* (pp. 429-474). Chichester, UK: John Wiley & Sons.
- Baumrind, D. (1971). Current patterns of parental authority. *Developmental Psychology*, *4*, 1-103. doi: 10.1037/h0030372
- Baumrind, D. (1991). Effective parenting during the early adolescent transition. In P. A. Cowan & E. M. Hetherington (Eds.), *Family transitions* (pp. 111-163). Hillsdale, NJ, England: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
- Berkien, M., Louwse, A., Verhulst, F., & van der Ende, J. (2012). Children's perceptions of dissimilarity in parenting styles are associated with internalizing and externalizing behavior. *European Child & Adolescent Psychiatry*, *21*, 79-85. doi: 10.1007/s00787-011-0234-9

- Bibby, R. W. (2001). *Canada's teens: Today, yesterday, and tomorrow*. Toronto, Ontario: Stoddart Publishing Company Limited.
- Bolkan, C., Sano, Y., De Costa, J., Acock, A. C., & Day, R. D. (2010). Early adolescents' perceptions of mothers' and fathers' parenting styles and problem behavior. *Marriage & Family Review, 46*, 563-579. doi: 10.1080/01494929.2010.543040
- Bronfenbrenner, U., & Ceci, S. J. (1994). Nature-nuture reconceptualized in developmental perspective: A bioecological model. *Psychological Review, 101*, 568-586. doi: 10.1037/0033-295X.101.4.568
- Bugental, D. B., & Johnston, C. (2000). Parental and child cognitions in the context of the family. *Annual Review of Psychology, 51*, 315-344. doi: 10.1146/annurev.psych.51.1.315
- Chen, M., & Johnston, C. (2012). Interparent childrearing disagreement, but not dissimilarity, predicts child problems after controlling for parenting effectiveness. *Journal of Clinical Child and Adolescent Psychology, 41*, 189-201. doi: 10.1080/15374416.2012.651997
- Coplan, R. J., Hastings, P. D., Lagacé-Séguin, D. G., & Moulton, C. E. (2002). Authoritative and authoritarian mothers' parenting goals, attributions, and emotions across different childrearing contexts. *Parenting: Science and Practice, 2*, 1-26. doi: 10.1207/S15327922PAR0201_1
- Darling, N., & Steinberg, L. (1993). Parenting style as context: An integrative model. *Psychological Bulletin, 113*, 487-496. doi: 10.1037/0033-2909.113.3.487
- Day, R. D., & Padilla-Walker, L. M. (2009). Mother and father connectedness and involvement during early adolescence. *Journal of Family Psychology, 23*, 900-904. doi: 10.1037/a0016438

- Demidenko, N., Manion, I., & Lee, C. M. (in press). Father-daughter attachment and communication in depressed and nondepressed adolescent girls. *Journal of Child and Family Studies*.
- Dix, T. (1992). Parenting on behalf of the child: Empathic goals in the regulation of responsive parenting. In I. E. Sigel, A. V. McGillicuddy-DeLisi & J. J. Goodnow (Eds.), *Parental belief systems: The psychological consequences for children* (Second ed., pp. 319-346). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Dix, T., Gershoff, E. T., Meunier, L. N., & Miller, P. C. (2004). The affective structure of supportive parenting: Depressive symptoms, immediate emotions, and child-oriented motivation. *Developmental Psychology, 40*, 1212-1227. doi: 10.1037/0012-1649.40.6.1212
- Elder, G. H., Jr. (1998). The life course as developmental theory. *Child Development, 69*, 1-12. doi: 10.2307/1132065
- Faul, F., Erdfelder, E., Lang, A.-G., & Buchner, A. (2007). G*Power 3: A flexible statistical power analysis program for the social, behavioral, and biomedical sciences. *Behavior Research Methods, 39*, 175 - 191. doi: 10.3758/BF03193146
- Gordon, T. (2000). Parents are persons, not gods *Parent effectiveness training: The proven program for raising responsible children* (pp. 13-35). New York: Random House, Inc.
- Grusec, J. E. (2011). Socialization Processes in the Family: Social and Emotional Development. *Annual Review of Psychology, 62*, 243-269. doi: 10.1146/annurev.psych.121208.131650
- Hastings, P. D., & Coplan, R. J. (1999). Conceptual and empirical links between children's social spheres: Relating maternal beliefs and preschoolers' behaviors with peers. *New*

Directions for Child and Adolescent Development, 86, 43-59. doi:

10.1002/cd.23219998605

Hastings, P. D., & Grusec, J. E. (1998). Parenting goals as organizers of responses to parent-child disagreement. *Developmental Psychology*, 34, 465-479. doi: 10.1037/0012-1649.34.3.465

Hastings, P. D., & Rubin, K. H. (1999). Predicting mothers' beliefs about preschool-aged children's social behavior: Evidence for maternal attitudes moderating child effects. *Child Development*, 70, 722-741. doi: 10.1111/1467-8624.00052

Hoeve, M., Dubas, J. S., Gerris, J. R., van der Laan, P. H., & Smeenk, W. (2011). Maternal and paternal parenting styles: Unique and combined links to adolescent and early adult delinquency. *Journal of Adolescence*, 34, 813-827. doi:

10.1016/j.adolescence.2011.02.004

Hofer, C., Eisenberg, N., Spinrad, T. L., Morris, A. S., Gershoff, E., Valiente, C., . . . Eggum, N. D. (2013). Mother-Adolescent conflict: Stability, change, and relations with externalizing and internalizing behavior problems. *Social Development*, 22, 259-279. doi: 10.1111/sode.12012

Kawabata, Y., Alink, L. R., Tseng, W.-L., van Ijzendoorn, M. H., & Crick, N. R. (2011). Maternal and paternal parenting styles associated with relational aggression in children and adolescents: A conceptual analysis and meta-analytic review.

Developmental Review, 31, 240-278. doi: 10.1016/j.dr.2011.08.001

Kenny, D. A., Kashy, D. A., & Cook, W. L. (2006). *Dyadic data analysis*. New York: Guilford Press.

Kerr, D. C., Capaldi, D. M., Pears, K. C., & Owen, L. D. (2009). A prospective three generational study of fathers' constructive parenting: Influences from family of

- origin, adolescent adjustment, and offspring temperament. *Developmental Psychology*, *45*, 1257-1275. doi: 10.1037/a0015863
- Kuczynski, L. (1984). Socialization goals and mother-child interaction: Strategies for long-term and short-term compliance. *Developmental Psychology*, *20*, 1061-1073. doi: 10.1037/0012-1649.20.6.1061
- Lanz, M., Scabini, E., Vermulst, A. A., & Gerris, J. R. M. (2001). Congruence on child rearing in families with early adolescent and middle adolescent children. *International Journal of Behavioral Development*, *25*, 133-139. doi: 10.1080/01650250042000104
- Lanza, H., Huang, D. Y., Murphy, D. A., & Hser, Y.-I. (2013). A latent class analysis of maternal responsiveness and autonomy-granting in early adolescence: Prediction to later adolescent sexual risk-taking. *The Journal of Early Adolescence*, *33*, 404-428. doi: 10.1177/0272431612445794
- Lindsey, E. W., & Mize, J. (2001). Interparental agreement, parent-child responsiveness, and children's peer competence. *Family Relations*, *50*, 348-354. doi: 10.1111/j.1741-3729.2001.00348.x
- Locke, L. M., & Prinz, R. J. (2002). Measurement of parental discipline and nurturance. *Clinical Psychology Review*, *22*, 895-929. doi: 10.1016/S0272-7358(02)900133-2
- Lofquist, D., Lugaila, T., O'Connell, M., & Feliz, S. (2012). Households and Families: 2010 *2010 Census Briefs* (pp. 1-21).
- Maguire, M. C. (1999). Treating the dyad as the unit of analysis: A primer on three analytic approaches. *Journal of Marriage & the Family*, *61*, 213-223. doi: 10.2307/353895

- Martin, A., Ryan, R. M., & Brooks-Gunn, J. (2007). The joint influence of mother and father parenting on child cognitive outcomes at age 5. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly*, 22, 423-439. doi: 10.1016/j.ecresq.2007.07.001
- McEwen, C., & Flouri, E. (2009). Fathers' parenting, adverse life events, and adolescents' emotional and eating disorder symptoms: The role of emotion regulation. *European Child & Adolescent Psychiatry*, 18, 206-216. doi: 10.1007/s00787-008-0719-3
- McHale, J. P., & Irace, K. (2011). Coparenting in diverse family systems *Coparenting: A conceptual and clinical examination of family systems* (pp. 15-37). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association; US.
- McKinney, C., & Renk, K. (2008). Differential parenting between mothers and fathers: Implications for late adolescents. *Journal of Family Issues*, 29, 806-827. doi: 10.1177/0192513X07311222
- Meteyer, K. B., & Perry-Jenkins, M. (2009). Dyadic parenting and children's externalizing symptoms. *Family Relations*, 58, 289-302. doi: 10.1111/j.1741-3729.2009.00553.x
- Milevsky, A., Schlechter, M., Klem, L., & Kehl, R. (2008). Constellations of maternal and paternal parenting styles in adolescence: Congruity and well-being. *Marriage & Family Review*, 44, 81-98. doi: 10.1080/01494920802185447
- Minuchin, P. (1985). Families and individual development: Provocations from the field of family therapy. *Child Development*, 56, 289-302. doi: 10.2307/1129720
- Phares, V., Fields, S., Kamboukos, D., & Lopez, E. (2005). Still looking for Poppa. *American Psychologist*, 60, 735-736. doi: 10.1037/0003-066X.60.7.735
- Riesch, S. K., Bush, L., Nelson, C. J., Ohm, B. J., Portz, P. A., Abell, B., . . . Jenkins, P. (2000). Topics of conflict between parents and young adolescents. *Journal for Specialists in Pediatric Nursing*, 5, 27- 40.

- Rubin, K. H., Mills, R. S., & Rose-Krasnor, L. (1989). Maternal beliefs and children's competence *Social competence in developmental perspective* (pp. 313-331). New York, NY: Kluwer Academic/Plenum Publishers.
- Ryan, R. M., Martin, A., & Brooks-Gunn, J. (2006). Is one good parent good enough? Patterns of mother and father parenting and child cognitive outcomes at 24 and 36 months. *Parenting: Science and Practice, 6*, 211-228. doi: 10.1207/s15327922par0602&3_5
- Sameroff, A. (2009). The transactional model *The transactional model of development: How children and contexts shape each other* (pp. 3-21). Washington, DC, US: American Psychological Association.
- Sanders, M. R. (2012). Development, evaluation, and multinational dissemination of the Triple P-Positive Parenting Program. *Annual Review of Clinical Psychology, 8*, 345-379. doi: 10.1146/annurev-clinpsy-032511-143104
- Schuppert, H., Albers, C. J., Minderaa, R. B., Emmelkamp, P. M., & Nauta, M. H. (2012). Parental rearing and psychopathology in mothers of adolescents with and without borderline personality symptoms. *Child and Adolescent Psychiatry and Mental Health, 6*, 29. doi: 10.1186/1753-2000-6-29
- Shanahan, L., McHale, S. M., Crouter, A. C., & Osgood, D. (2007). Warmth with mothers and fathers from middle childhood to late adolescence: Within- and between-families comparisons. *Developmental Psychology, 43*, 551-563. doi: 10.1037/0012-1649.43.3.551
- Simons, L. G., & Conger, R. D. (2007). Linking Mother-Father Differences in Parenting to a Typology of Family Parenting Styles and Adolescent Outcomes. *Journal of Family Issues, 28*, 212-241. doi: 10.1177/0192513X06294593

- Smetana, J. G. (1995). Parenting styles and conceptions of parental authority during adolescence. *Child Development, 66*, 299-316. doi: 10.2307/1131579
- Smetana, J. G., Campione-Barr, N., & Metzger, A. (2006). Adolescent development in interpersonal and societal contexts. *Annual Review of Psychology, 57*, 255-284. doi: 10.1146/annurev.psych.57.102904.190124
- Smetana, J. G., & Gaines, C. (1999). Adolescent-parent conflict in middle-class African American families. *Child Development, 70*, 1447-1463. doi: 10.1111/1467-8624.00105
- Stack, D. M., Serbin, L. A., Enns, L. N., Ruttle, P. L., & Barrieau, L. (2010). Parental effects on children's emotional development over time and across generations. *Infants & Young Children, 23*, 52-69. doi: 10.1097/IYC.0b013e3181c97606
- Statistics Canada. (2012, December 24). Children and Youth Retrieved March 25, 2013, 2013, from <http://www.statcan.gc.ca/pub/11-402-x/2012000/chap/c-e/tbl/tbl13-eng.htm>
- Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (2007). *Using Multivariate Statistics* (5th ed.). Boston, MA: Pearson Education Inc.

Table 1

Overall Mean Ratings of the Importance of the Six Parenting Goals and for each Vignette

Parenting Goal	Overall	Vignette				
		Chores	Outfit	Computer	Homework	Room
PC-ST						
<i>M</i>	3.72	3.79	3.82	3.59	4.17	3.42
<i>SD</i>	0.98	1.09	1.17	1.21	1.05	1.25
PC-LT						
<i>M</i>	2.51	2.47	2.58	2.28	2.73	2.54
<i>SD</i>	1.04	1.16	1.22	1.22	1.38	1.24
CC-ST						
<i>M</i>	2.53	2.47	2.45	2.72	2.61	2.52
<i>SD</i>	1.10	1.28	1.24	1.24	1.34	1.27
CC-LT						
<i>M</i>	4.08	4.18	4.00	4.14	4.30	3.89
<i>SD</i>	0.82	0.98	1.08	0.96	0.92	1.08
RC-ST						
<i>M</i>	3.63	3.72	3.70	3.76	3.90	3.57
<i>SD</i>	1.03	1.12	1.16	1.19	1.09	1.24
RC-LT						
<i>M</i>	4.11	4.29	4.19	4.11	4.25	4.02
<i>SD</i>	0.95	0.95	1.00	1.09	0.99	1.12

Note. PC-ST = parent-centered short-term; PC-LT = parent-centered long-term; CC-ST =

child-centered short-term; CC-LT = child-centered long-term; RC-ST = relationship-centered

short-term; RC-LT = relationship-centered long-term.

General Discussion

This dissertation consisted of two studies that were designed to broaden our understanding of parenting within individual families in two developmental periods that are widely recognized to present parenting challenges: the toddler and preschool years and adolescence. Both studies consisted of community samples of mothers and fathers who completed measures of self-reported parenting responses and parenting goals, as well as rating their child's adjustment. The findings from both studies, their implications for future research and practice, and limitations will be reviewed. Following the hypotheses presented in Table 4, results from both studies with respect to parenting goals are presented first, followed by results from both studies with respect to parenting similarity.

Parenting Goals

Parent Gender. Consistent with findings of many other parenting studies that suggest that in general nondisordered community samples of mothers and fathers are similar in how they parent (Lamb, 2012; Palkovitz, 2013; Parke, 2013), mothers and fathers reported similar parenting goal ratings; this was found both in the sample of parents of toddlers and preschool-age children and also in the sample of parents of adolescents. Across both parent genders, descriptive data for mothers and fathers of toddlers and preschoolers show that child-centred long-term and relationship-centred goals were given the highest mean ratings in response to vignettes depicting child misbehaviour as well as to vignettes depicting child withdrawn behaviour. Similarly, mothers and fathers of adolescents rated child-centred and relationship-centred long-term goals as significantly more important than they did all other parenting goals in response to vignettes depicting mild to moderate adolescent misbehaviour. These findings differ from those of other investigations of parenting goals in which participants, primarily mothers, rated child-centered long-term and parent-centered goals as

most important in situations involving mild to moderate child misbehaviour (Coplan et al., 2002; Hastings & Coplan, 1999; Hastings & Grusec, 1998; Hastings & Rubin, 1999). The parenting goal importance ratings for parents of toddlers and preschoolers are descriptive and did not involve a statistical comparison, so we cannot conclude that these parents rated child-centred long-term and relationship-centred goals as significantly higher than they did other goals. In the sample of parents of adolescents, parents appear to focus more on the child and the relationship than they do on their own goals. This may be seen as lending support to the notion that as children develop so do parents, adapting their parenting to support their children in meeting the key developmental tasks of the developmental period they are navigating and to be appropriate to the child's level of social and cognitive development.

Child Gender. Consistent with other studies of parenting goals, there was no evidence of child gender effects. Furthermore, there was no evidence of an interaction between parent and child gender. This may be because our sample (primarily middle class, university educated, White, North American parents) consisted of parents who hold less gender stereotyped views and accordingly, are relatively unaffected by gender stereotypes in parenting their sons and daughters. It remains important to include child gender in examinations of parenting given that it has been found to interact with parenting gender to influence parenting in other studies (Bolkan et al., 2010; Diener et al., 2008; Hagan & Kuebli, 2007; Lindsey & Mize, 2001a; Lovas, 2005; Schoppe-Sullivan et al., 2006).

Characteristics of the situation. An examination of the descriptive data for Study 1 reveals that similar patterns of parenting goal importance ratings were reported by parents of toddlers and preschoolers both in response to vignettes depicting child misbehaviour and in response to vignettes depicting child withdrawn behaviour. Parents differed, however, in their parenting responses. Parents reported higher rates of authoritative parenting responses

when presented with vignettes depicting children engaged in misbehaviour, but higher rates of permissive parenting responses when responding to vignettes describing child withdrawn behaviour. This suggests that parents may have been taking into consideration the nature of their child's behaviour and the situation and modifying their parenting responses accordingly. It is interesting to note that parents reported varying their parenting responses, but not their ratings of goal importance. This may indicate that what is important to parents in the face of undesirable child behaviour may be somewhat constant, but that parents vary how they try to accomplish these goals depending on the context. Interestingly, the vignette depicting the most aggressive act of adolescent misbehaviour yielded high ratings for four of the six parenting goals: parent-centred goals, child-centred long-term, and relationship-centred short-term. Taken together, the findings of both studies suggest that the more extreme the misbehaviour, the more strongly parents react, and the more activated they are overall in their goals.

Parenting goals and parenting responses. Although some researchers have reported associations between parenting goals and parenting behaviour (Dix et al., 2004; Hastings & Grusec, 1998; Hastings & Rubin, 1999; Kuczynski, 1984) no significant links were found between the parenting goal importance ratings and parenting responses of mothers and fathers of adolescents in the second study reported here. Given that study 2 had the largest sample size of any parenting goal study conducted to date ($N = 285$), and included both mothers and fathers, it seems unlikely that this nonsignificant finding was due to a lack of power. Similarly, it does not seem likely the inclusion of fathers in study 2 was the reason, because when analyses were conducted separately for mothers and fathers results remained nonsignificant. However, the lack of a significant finding may be related to the methodological features of the study. The two parenting goal studies (Hastings & Grusec,

1998; Kuczynski, 1984) that found the clearest links between parenting goals and parenting responses used experimental manipulation of parenting goals. The results of the current studies suggest that researchers planning parenting goal investigations in the future should consider the use of experimental manipulation or other methodologies to ascertain more clearly the presence and/or nature of any associations between parenting goals and parenting behaviour.

Parenting goals and adjustment. In terms of associations between parenting goals and adolescent adjustment, no significant links were found with the sample of parents of adolescents. Given that parenting goals were not found to be linked to parenting responses in this sample this is perhaps not a surprising finding. This may in part be due to having had a nondisordered community sample. Previous investigations of parenting goals with community samples also have not produced evidence of consistent patterns of links to parenting behaviour and to child adjustment, with only one study yielding evidence of a clear link between maternal parenting goal importance and preschool teacher ratings of social competence six months later (Hastings & Coplan, 1999).

Implications for future research. As a whole, parenting goal studies have provided some preliminary evidence that parenting goals may, as theorized, act as determinants of parenting behaviour. However, despite the intuitive appeal of models of parenting that have proposed that parenting goals play an important role in explaining situational variation in parenting behaviours (e.g., Darling & Steinberg, 1993; Dix, 1992), empirical investigations to date have not yielded conclusive evidence that supports this. It seems that several factors have hampered this area of research. The primary reason seems to be that extant methodology does not provide a sufficiently reliable, valid, and sensitive measure of parenting goals. The study of cognitions relies on self-report and is thus limited by the

accuracy of, and participants' capacity for, self-reflection and willingness to honestly report their thoughts. Furthermore, in the case of cognitions that are automatic and not in participants' conscious awareness, as may be the case for parenting goals, the reliance on participant accurate self-report seems even more problematic. These limitations in the methodology currently available to capture parents' parenting goals make it difficult to measure parenting goals with the precision needed to draw clear conclusions from this research. If better methodology were developed in the future allowing for more accurate collection of parenting goal data, thus possibly warranting further study of parenting goals, secondary issues that would need to be addressed would include the limited generalizability of findings of previous studies due to a reliance on community samples of mothers of young children. As well, it has been difficult to isolate and conclusively identify potential links between parenting goals and parenting behaviour given the myriad contextual factors that may also play a role in this relationship.

Implications for Practice. The implications for practice that can be drawn from this body of research in general and my two studies in particular, are restricted by the limitations discussed above. In the absence of clear evidence for the influence of parenting goals on parenting behaviour and/or child adjustment the relevance to clinicians remains largely theoretical. It is possible that not all parents are aware of their goals, so it could be helpful for clinicians to assist parents to bring their parenting goals into conscious awareness and reflect on the congruence between their goals and parenting behaviour.

Parenting Similarity

The three exploratory questions pertaining to parenting similarity in parenting goals and parenting responses were examined in both studies and yielded a consistent pattern of results for the samples from both developmental periods. The possibility of child gender

effects on parenting similarity were also examined in both studies, but no evidence of child gender effects were found.

Presence of parenting similarity. Moderate levels of parenting similarity were found in mother-father dyads for self-reported parenting goals and in parenting responses for parents of adolescents, and parents of toddlers and preschoolers. This is consistent with findings from other parenting similarity studies, the majority of which found evidence for moderate similarity between mother-father dyads on the parenting constructs under examination. It could be argued that these findings are an artifact of having White, middle-class, community samples of parents who are likely fairly homogenous in terms of parenting. Interestingly, in examining this question Lanz et al. (2001), using parent and adolescent reports of childrearing practices, found that members of a family were more congruent (i.e., similar) than were randomly generated unrelated parent dyads in the sample. Thus, in a sample that was relatively homogenous, mother-father dyads were still found to be more similar to each other than they were to the sample as a whole. Additionally, the Finn's r statistic calculated for each parenting dyad as an index of similarity gives a measurement in terms of whether a given dyad is more similar to each other than to the other participants in the sample, which is indicated by a value of 0. The mean Finn's r values for parenting goals and parenting responses in both studies were all greater than 0.50, indicating that the mothers and fathers in my studies were more similar to the other parent of their child than they were to parents in general.

No significant differences were found between the degree of similarity in parenting responses and the degree of similarity in parenting goals among parents of toddlers and preschoolers. On the other hand, parents of adolescents were significantly more similar in parenting responses than they were in parenting goals. This may indicate that parent

responses are more consistent in response to adolescent behaviour than they are in response to toddler and preschool behaviour. Future studies that directly compare parenting similarity in different developmental periods as well as those that follow parents longitudinally would improve our understanding of how parenting similarity may change with child developmental status and over time.

Parenting goal and parenting response similarity. Interestingly, despite the presence of parenting similarity for both parenting constructs, in both samples, the two were not found to be related. That is, a mother and father who were highly similar in parenting goals were not necessarily more likely to be highly similar in parenting responses and vice versa. To my knowledge, previous parenting similarity studies have not directly compared similarity on different parenting constructs thus it is not possible to view these results in the context of previous findings. This finding is puzzling and generates some intriguing questions about the nature of within family similarities and differences that merit further investigation in future research. For instance, to what extent, and on which parenting constructs, is within family parenting similarity important? And to what extent do these parenting similarities interact to influence parenting and child adjustment?

Parenting similarity and adjustment. In the sample of mothers and fathers of toddlers and preschoolers there was no evidence of a link between parenting similarity and child adjustment for either parenting goals or parenting responses. Unfortunately, it was not possible to examine possible links between similarity and adolescent adjustment due to low completion rate of the adolescent adjustment measure by participants. This may in part be due to having collected data from a community sample which was largely comprised of families with nondisordered children, with a restricted range of scores on the child adjustment measure, thus making it harder to detect small to moderate size effects. However,

other studies of parenting similarity conducted with community samples also did not find evidence of links with child adjustment (Chen & Johnston, 2012; Lindsey & Caldera, 2005; Lindsey & Mize, 2001b). Overall, this suggests parenting similarity does not contribute to better child adjustment. It could be that parenting similarity is only important for the contribution it may make to childrearing disagreements. As well, it could be that parenting similarity, or dissimilarity, may be a more important contributor to childrearing disagreements in more distressed family systems.

Interpretation of the results of my studies is limited because the similarity index used only gave an indication of degree of similarity but not the direction of the similarity. For example, it was not possible to know whether parents in a parenting dyad with a high parenting goal similarity index score were highly similar in valuing parent-centred goals as highly important or highly unimportant. It is possible that this could have contributed to the null finding with respect to a link between parenting similarity and child adjustment. The studies of parenting similarity that found the strongest evidence for links between similarity and child adjustment in community samples were those that used cluster analysis to classify mother-father dyads into supportive-supportive, unsupportive-unsupportive, and unsupportive-supportive clusters (Martin et al., 2007; McKinney & Renk, 2008; Meteyer & Perry-Jenkins, 2009; Ryan et al., 2006). In my studies I developed a behaviour coding system that classified parents into authoritarian, authoritative, or permissive for each vignette in order to allow for the examination of situational variation in parenting. This rich system resulted in multiple behaviour codes for each parent rather than one overall behaviour code per parent and thus it was not feasible to apply cluster analysis with my data sets. In future research it would be useful to consider research designs that permit the use of cluster analysis or similar analytic approaches such as multilevel modeling. These approaches have the

potential to further our understanding of the complexities of parenting within individual families and how this is associated with child adjustment by yielding more information on family level processes (Jenkins et al., 2009). Furthermore, the only study of parenting similarity that reported evidence of a link between parenting similarity and child adjustment, even when controlling for parenting effectiveness, collected data from a clinical sample (Harvey, 2000). Thus, investigations of parenting similarity have the potential to make important contributions to clinical practice with families by deepening our understanding of the complex interactions that occur between family members within individual families. It would be helpful to extend the examination of parenting similarity to clinical samples to broaden our understanding of the links between parenting and child adjustment within individual families.

Conclusion

The study of parenting and parent-child relationships has become a well-established discipline with over fifty years of research on the topic. Much knowledge has been gained from this research and we are now at a point where we can say with confidence that the parenting of both mothers and fathers is linked to child adjustment across developmental periods. We have learned a great deal about many facets of parenting and their associations with child adjustment, including parental affect, cognitions, and behaviour in both community and clinical samples of parents and children. This knowledge has been used to inform the development of public health programs, prevention programs, and clinical interventions with parents and children to improve child and family outcomes. Moving forward, research that examines a broader spectrum of parent, child, and family characteristics that may influence the relationship between parenting and child adjustment

will enable the tailoring of interventions to individual client characteristics, improving treatment outcomes.

The findings of the current studies provide limited support for the presence of links between parenting goals and parenting behaviour or child adjustment. Parenting research was born out of the theories of child development, socialization, and developmental psychopathology that emphasized that relationships and interactions between family members are transactional, co-constructed, and occur within multiple contexts (Bronfenbrenner & Ceci, 1994; Elder, 1998; Minuchin, 1985; Sameroff, 2009). However, we know relatively little about these processes in individual families, such as how two parents within an individual family coordinate their parenting and how this may be related to the adjustment of their children. Thus, parenting research is needed that collects dyadic data allowing for the examination of parenting in the context of the family unit. Parenting research, such as investigations of parenting similarity, that have collected data on mother-father dyads have found results with direct clinical relevance. Namely, that the best outcomes are found for children with two supportive parents, one supportive – one unsupportive, and two unsupportive respectively indicating that it is not sufficient for two parents to be similar in parenting but that it is only helpful to children if their parents are similar in being highly supportive. The results of the current studies indicate that in fairly homogeneous samples of middle class, White, North American families although moderate parenting similarity may be present on various parenting variables, similarity on one parenting construct is not necessarily related to similarity on another construct. Thus, an avenue for future investigation would be to compare parenting similarity on different parenting constructs to understand if perhaps similarity on certain constructs is more important in terms of child adjustment or if perhaps there is a minimally sufficient similarity threshold, where children

do better when their parents are similar on a sufficient number of supportive parenting constructs.

References

- Achenbach, T. M., & Rescorla, L. A. (2000). *Manual for ASEBA preschool forms & profiles*. Burlington, VT: University of Vermont, Research Center for Children, Youth, & Families.
- Achenbach, T. M., & Rescorla, L. A. (2001). *Manual for the ASEBA School-Age forms & profiles*. Burlington, VT: University of Vermont, Research Center for Children, Youth, & Families.
- Adams, R., & Laursen, B. (2001). The organization and dynamics of adolescent conflict with parents and friends. *Journal of Marriage & the Family*, *63*, 97-110. doi: 10.1111/j.1741-3737.2001.00097.x
- Adamsons, K., & Johnson, S. K. (2013). An updated and expanded meta-analysis of nonresident fathering and child well-being. *Journal of Family Psychology*, *27*, 589-599. doi: 10.1037/a0033786
- Albert, D., & Steinberg, L. (2011). Judgment and decision making in adolescence. *Journal of Research on Adolescence*, *21*, 211-224. doi: 10.1111/j.1532-7795.2010.00724.x
- Bakeman, R., & Quera, V. (2012). Behavioral observation. In H. Cooper, P. M. Camic, D. L. Long, A. T. Panter, D. Rindskopf & K. J. Sher (Eds.), *APA handbook of research methods in psychology, Vol 1: Foundations, planning, measures, and psychometrics* (pp. 207-225). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association; US.
- Baker, J. K., Fenning, R. M., & Crnic, K. (2011). Emotion socialization by mothers and fathers: Coherence among behaviors and associations with parent attitudes and children's social competence. *Social Development*, *20*, 412-430. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-9507.2010.00585.x
- Bandura, A. (1977). *Social learning theory*. Oxford: Prentice-Hall.

- Barnett, M. A., Deng, M., Mills-Koonce, W., Willoughby, M., & Cox, M. (2008). Interdependence of parenting of mothers and fathers of infants. *Journal of Family Psychology, 22*, 561-573. doi: 10.1037/0893-3200.22.3.561
- Barrett, P., & Turner, C. (2004). Prevention of childhood anxiety and depression. In P. M. Barrett & T. H. Ollendick (Eds.), *Interventions that work with children and adolescents: Prevention and treatment* (pp. 429-474). Chichester, UK: John Wiley & Sons.
- Baumrind, D. (1966). Effects of Authoritative Control on Child Behavior. *Child Development, 37*, 887-907. doi: 10.2307/1126611
- Baumrind, D. (1971). Current patterns of parental authority. *Developmental Psychology, 4*, 1-103. doi: 10.1037/h0030372
- Baumrind, D. (1991). Effective parenting during the early adolescent transition. In P. A. Cowan & E. M. Hetherington (Eds.), *Family transitions* (pp. 111-163). Hillsdale, NJ, England: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
- Bax, K. A. (2006). Between parent similarities in child-rearing goals: Relations to parental, marital and individual adult well-being (Doctoral dissertation, University of Ottawa, 2006). *Dissertation Abstracts International, 66*, 6913B.
- Bayer, J. K., Hastings, P. D., Sanson, A. V., Ukoumunne, O. C., & Rubin, K. H. (2010). Predicting mid-childhood internalising symptoms: A longitudinal community study. *The International Journal of Mental Health Promotion, 12*, 5-17. doi: 10.1080/14623730.2010.9721802
- Beitel, A. H., & Parke, R. D. (1998). Paternal involvement in infancy: The role of maternal and paternal attitudes. *Journal of Family Psychology, 12*, 268-288. doi: 10.1037/0893-3200.12.2.268

- Belsky, J., & de Haan, M. (2011). Parenting and children's brain development: the end of the beginning. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, *52*, 409-428. doi: 10.1111/j.1469-7610.2010.02281
- Berkien, M., Louwse, A., Verhulst, F., & van der Ende, J. (2012). Children's perceptions of dissimilarity in parenting styles are associated with internalizing and externalizing behavior. *European Child & Adolescent Psychiatry*, *21*, 79-85. doi: 10.1007/s00787-011-0234-9
- Besnard, T., Verlaan, P., Capuano, F., Poulin, F., & Vitaro, F. (2011). Parental practices of parents of children with behavior problems: Effects of the parent-infant dyad. *Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science/Revue canadienne des sciences du comportement*, *43*, 254-266.
- Bibby, R. W. (2001). *Canada's teens: Today, yesterday, and tomorrow*. Toronto, Ontario: Stoddart Publishing Company Limited.
- Bolkan, C., Sano, Y., De Costa, J., Acock, A. C., & Day, R. D. (2010). Early adolescents' perceptions of mothers' and fathers' parenting styles and problem behavior. *Marriage & Family Review*, *46*, 563-579. doi: 10.1080/01494929.2010.543040
- Bornstein, M. H. (2002). Preface. In M. H. Bornstein (Ed.), *Handbook of Parenting: Vol. 1: Children and Parenting* (2nd ed., Vol. 1, pp. ix - xii). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.
- Bowlby, J. (1951). Maternal care and mental health. *Bulletin of the World Health Organization*, *3*, 355-533.
- Brennan, L. M., Shelleby, E. C., Shaw, D. S., Gardner, F., Dishion, T. J., & Wilson, M. (2013). Indirect effects of the family check-up on school-age academic achievement through

- improvements in parenting in early childhood. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, *105*, 762-773. doi: 10.1037/a0032096
- Bronfenbrenner, U., & Ceci, S. J. (1994). Nature-nuture reconceptualized in developmental perspective: A bioecological model. *Psychological Review*, *101*, 568-586. doi: 10.1037/0033-295X.101.4.568
- Bugental, D. B., & Johnston, C. (2000). Parental and child cognitions in the context of the family. *Annual Review of Psychology*, *51*, 315-344. doi: 10.1146/annurev.psych.51.1.315
- Burgess, A. (2008). The Costs and Benefits of Active Fatherhood. Retrieved from Fathers Direct website: <http://www.fatherhoodinstitute.org/uploads/publications/247.pdf>
- Cabrera, N. J., Shannon, J. D., & Tamis-LeMonda, C. (2007). Fathers' influence on their children's cognitive and emotional development: From toddlers to pre-K. *Applied Developmental Science*, *11*, 208-213. doi: 10.1080/10888690701762100
- Campbell, S. B. (2002). *Behavior problems in preschool children: Clinical and developmental issues (2nd ed.)*. New York, NY: Guilford Press.
- Carrasco, M., Rodríguez, M., del Barrio, M., & Holgado, F. (2011). Relative and absolute stability in perceived parenting behaviour: A longitudinal study with children and adolescents. *Psychological Reports*, *108*, 149-166. doi: 10.2466/02.09.10.21.PR0.108.1.149-166
- Cassano, M., Adrian, M., Veits, G., & Zeman, J. (2006). The Inclusion of Fathers in the Empirical Investigation of Child Psychopathology: An Update. *Journal of Clinical Child and Adolescent Psychology*, *35*, 583-589. doi: 10.1207/s15374424jccp3504_10

- Chapman, M. (1981). Isolating causal effects through experimental changes in parent-child interaction. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology*, *9*, 321-327. doi: 10.1007/BF00916836
- Chen, M., & Johnston, C. (2012). Interparent childrearing disagreement, but not dissimilarity, predicts child problems after controlling for parenting effectiveness. *Journal of Clinical Child and Adolescent Psychology*, *41*, 189-201. doi: 10.1080/15374416.2012.651997
- Coplan, R. J., Hastings, P. D., Lagacé-Séguin, D. G., & Moulton, C. E. (2002). Authoritative and authoritarian mothers' parenting goals, attributions, and emotions across different childrearing contexts. *Parenting: Science and Practice*, *2*, 1-26. doi: 10.1207/S15327922PAR0201_1
- Costello, E., Copeland, W., & Angold, A. (2011). Trends in psychopathology across the adolescent years: What changes when children become adolescents, and when adolescents become adults? *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, *52*, 1015-1025. doi: 10.1111/j.1469-7610.2011.02446.x
- Cowan, P. A., & Cowan, C. P. (2002). Interventions as tests of family systems theories: Marital and family relationships in children's development and psychopathology. *Development and Psychopathology*, *14*, 731-759. doi: 10.1017/S0954579402004054
- Creswell, C., O'Connor, T. G., & Brewin, C. R. (2006). A longitudinal investigation of maternal and child 'anxious cognitions'. *Cognitive Therapy and Research*, *30*, 135-147. doi: 10.1007/s10608-006-9021-1
- Crnic, K., & Low, C. (2002). Everyday stresses and parenting. In M. H. Bornstein (Ed.), *Handbook of parenting: Practical issues in parenting* (2nd ed., Vol. 5, pp. 243-267). Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

- Cummings, M. E., & Davies, P. T. (2010). *Marital conflict and children: An emotional security perspective*. New York, NY: Guilford Press.
- Darling, N., & Steinberg, L. (1993). Parenting style as context: An integrative model. *Psychological Bulletin, 113*, 487-496. doi: 10.1037/0033-2909.113.3.487
- Davies, P. T., Martin, M. J., & Cicchetti, D. (2012). Delineating the sequelae of destructive and constructive interparental conflict for children within an evolutionary framework. *Developmental Psychology, 48*, 939-955. doi: 10.1037/a0025899
- Day, R. D., & Padilla-Walker, L. M. (2009). Mother and father connectedness and involvement during early adolescence. *Journal of Family Psychology, 23*, 900-904. doi: 10.1037/a0016438
- Demidenko, N., Manion, I., & Lee, C. M. (in press). Father-daughter attachment and communication in depressed and nondepressed adolescent girls. *Journal of Child and Family Studies*.
- Diener, M. L., Isabella, R. A., Behunin, M. G., & Wong, M. S. (2008). Attachment to mothers and fathers during middle childhood: Associations with child gender, grade, and competence. *Social Development, 17*, 84-101.
- Dix, T. (1992). Parenting on behalf of the child: Empathic goals in the regulation of responsive parenting. In I. E. Sigel, A. V. McGillicuddy-DeLisi & J. J. Goodnow (Eds.), *Parental belief systems: The psychological consequences for children* (Second ed., pp. 319-346). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Dix, T., Gershoff, E. T., Meunier, L. N., & Miller, P. C. (2004). The affective structure of supportive parenting: Depressive symptoms, immediate emotions, and child-oriented

- motivation. *Developmental Psychology*, *40*, 1212-1227. doi: 10.1037/0012-1649.40.6.1212
- Dix, T., Ruble, D. N., & Zambarano, R. J. (1989). Mothers' implicit theories of discipline: Child effects, parent effects, and the attribution process. *Child Development*, *60*, 1373-1391.
- Dougherty, L. R., Klein, D. N., Rose, S., & Lupton, R. S. (2011). Hypothalamic-pituitary-adrenal axis reactivity in the preschool-age offspring of depressed parents: Moderation by early parenting. *Psychological Science*, *22*, 650-658. doi: 10.1177/0956797611404084
- Duhig, A. M., Renk, K., Epstein, M. K., & Phares, V. (2000). Interparental agreement on internalizing, externalizing, and total behavior problems: A meta-analysis. *Clinical Psychology: Science and Practice*, *7*, 435-453. doi: 10.1093/clipsy/7.4.435
- Dunn, J. F., & Munn, P. (1985). Becoming a family member: Family conflict and the development of social understanding in the second year. *Child Development*, *56*, 480-492. doi: 10.2307/1129735
- Edwards, C. P., & Liu, W.-L. (2002). Parenting Toddlers. In M. H. Bornstein (Ed.), *Handbook of parenting: Children and parenting* (2nd ed., Vol. 1, pp. 45-71). Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Eisenberg, N., Hofer, C., Spinrad, T. L., Gershoff, E. T., Valiente, C., Losoya, S. H., . . . Darling, N. (2008). Understanding mother-adolescent conflict discussions: Concurrent and across-time prediction from youths' dispositions and parenting: I. Introduction and conceptual framework. *Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development*, *73*, 1-30. doi: 10.1111/j.1540-5834.2008.00471.x
- Elder, G. H., Jr. (1998). The life course as developmental theory. *Child Development*, *69*, 1-12. doi: 10.2307/1132065

- Emmerich, W. (1969). The parental role a functional-cognitive approach. *Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development, 34*, iii-71.
- Eyberg, S. M., & Bussing, R. (2010). Parent-child interaction therapy for preschool children with conduct problems. In R. C. Murrihy, A. D. Kidman & T. H. Ollendick (Eds.), *Clinical Handbook of assessing and treating conduct problems in youth* (pp. 139-162). New York: Springer Science.
- Faul, F., Erdfelder, E., Lang, A.-G., & Buchner, A. (2007). G*Power 3: A flexible statistical power analysis program for the social, behavioral, and biomedical sciences. *Behavior Research Methods, 39*, 175 - 191. doi: 10.3758/BF03193146
- Finn, R. H. (1970). A note on estimating reliability of categorical data. *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 30*, 71 - 76. doi: 10.1177/001316447003000106
- Freud, S. (2001). *Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud* (Vol. 19): Vintage Classics.
- Galambos, N. L., Berenbaum, S. A., & McHale, S. M. (2009). Gender development in adolescence. In R. M. Lerner & L. Steinberg (Eds.), *Handbook of Adolescent Psychology, Vol 1: Individual bases of adolescent development* (3rd ed., Vol. 1, pp. 305 - 357). Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons Inc; US.
- Gamble, W. C., Ramakumar, S., & Diaz, A. (2007). Maternal and paternal similarities and differences in parenting: An examination of Mexican-American parents of young children. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly, 22*, 72-88. doi: 10.1016/j.ecresq.2006.11.004
- Gerards, S. M., Sleddens, E. F., Dagnelie, P. C., de Vries, N. K., & Kremers, S. P. (2011). Interventions addressing general parenting to prevent or treat childhood obesity.

International Journal of Pediatric Obesity, 6, e28-e45. doi:

10.3109/17477166.2011.575147

Goodnow, J. J., & Collins, W. A. (1990). *Development according to parents: The nature, sources, and consequences of parents' ideas*. Hillsdale, NJ, England: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

Goodwin, C. J. (2010). Observational and survey research methods *Research in Psychology: Methods and design* (pp. 451 - 490). Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Gordon, T. (2000). Parents are persons, not gods *Parent effectiveness training: The proven program for raising responsible children* (pp. 13-35). New York: Random House, Inc.

Grusec, J. E. (2011). Socialization Processes in the Family: Social and Emotional Development. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 62, 243-269. doi: 10.1146/annurev.psych.121208.131650

Grusec, J. E., & Kuczynski, L. (1980). Direction of effect in socialization: A comparison of the parent vs. the child's behavior as determinants of disciplinary techniques. *Developmental Psychology*, 16, 1-9.

Grusec, J. E., & Walters, G. C. (1994). *Can parents' responses to hypothetical childrearing problems predict their behaviour?* Paper presented at the Eighth Biennial University of Waterloo Conference on Child Development, Waterloo, Ontario, Canada.

Gutman, L. M., & Feinstein, L. (2010). Parenting behaviours and children's development from infancy to early childhood: Changes, continuities and contributions. *Early Child Development and Care*, 180, 535-556. doi: 10.1080/03004430802113042

Hagan, L. K., & Kuebli, J. (2007). Mothers' and fathers' socialization of preschoolers' physical risk taking. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology*, 28, 2-14.

- Harvey, E. A. (2000). Parenting similarity and children with attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder. *Child & Family Behavior Therapy, 22*, 39-54. doi: 10.1300/J019v22n03_02
- Hastings, P. D., & Coplan, R. J. (1999). Conceptual and empirical links between children's social spheres: Relating maternal beliefs and preschoolers' behaviors with peers. *New Directions for Child and Adolescent Development, 86*, 43-59. doi: 10.1002/cd.23219998605
- Hastings, P. D., & Grusec, J. E. (1998). Parenting goals as organizers of responses to parent-child disagreement. *Developmental Psychology, 34*, 465-479. doi: 10.1037/0012-1649.34.3.465
- Hastings, P. D., & Rubin, K. H. (1999). Predicting mothers' beliefs about preschool-aged children's social behavior: Evidence for maternal attitudes moderating child effects. *Child Development, 70*, 722-741. doi: 10.1111/1467-8624.00052
- Hawk, C. K., & Holden, G. W. (2006). Meta-Parenting: An Initial Investigation into a New Parental Social Cognition Construct. *Parenting, 6*, 321 - 342.
- Hoeve, M., Dubas, J. S., Gerris, J. R., van der Laan, P. H., & Smeenk, W. (2011). Maternal and paternal parenting styles: Unique and combined links to adolescent and early adult delinquency. *Journal of Adolescence, 34*, 813-827. doi: 10.1016/j.adolescence.2011.02.004
- Hofer, C., Eisenberg, N., Spinrad, T. L., Morris, A. S., Gershoff, E., Valiente, C., . . . Eggum, N. D. (2013). Mother-Adolescent conflict: Stability, change, and relations with externalizing and internalizing behavior problems. *Social Development, 22*, 259-279. doi: 10.1111/sode.12012
- Hoffman, M. L. (1975). Moral internalization, parental power, and the nature of parent-child interaction. *Developmental Psychology, 11*, 228-239. doi: 10.1037/h0076463

- Jefferis, P. G., & Oliver, C. (2006). Associations Between Maternal Childrearing Cognitions and Conduct Problems in Young Children. *Clinical Child Psychology and Psychiatry, 11*, 83-102. doi: 10.1177/1359104506059125
- Jenkins, J. M., Cheung, C., Frampton, K., Rasbash, J., Boyle, M. H., & Georgiades, K. (2009). The use of multilevel modeling for the investigation of family process. *European Journal of Developmental Science, 3*, 131-149.
- Jones, T. L., & Prinz, R. J. (2005). Potential roles of parental self-efficacy in parent and child adjustment: A review. *Clinical Psychology Review, 25*, 341-363. doi: 10.1016/j.cpr.2004.12.004
- Kawabata, Y., Alink, L. R., Tseng, W.-L., van Ijzendoorn, M. H., & Crick, N. R. (2011). Maternal and paternal parenting styles associated with relational aggression in children and adolescents: A conceptual analysis and meta-analytic review. *Developmental Review, 31*, 240-278. doi: 10.1016/j.dr.2011.08.001
- Kenny, D. A., Kashy, D. A., & Cook, W. L. (2006). *Dyadic data analysis*. New York: Guilford Press.
- Kerr, D. C., Capaldi, D. M., Pears, K. C., & Owen, L. D. (2009). A prospective three generational study of fathers' constructive parenting: Influences from family of origin, adolescent adjustment, and offspring temperament. *Developmental Psychology, 45*, 1257-1275. doi: 10.1037/a0015863
- Klahr, A. M., & Burt, S. (2014). Elucidating the etiology of individual differences in parenting: A meta-analysis of behavioral genetic research. *Psychological Bulletin, 140*, 544-586. doi: 10.1037/a0034205

Kuczynski, L. (1984). Socialization goals and mother-child interaction: Strategies for long-term and short-term compliance. *Developmental Psychology, 20*, 1061-1073. doi:

10.1037/0012-1649.20.6.1061

Kuczynski, L. (2003). Beyond bidirectionality: Bilateral conceptual frameworks for understanding dynamics in parent-child relations. In L. Kuczynski (Ed.), *Handbook of dynamics in parent-child relations* (pp. 1-24). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Kuczynski, L., & Parkin, C. M. (2007). Agency and bidirectionality in socialization: Interactions, transactions, and relational dialectics. In J. E. Grusec & P. D. Hastings (Eds.), *Handbook of socialization: Theory and research* (pp. 259-283). New York, NY: Guilford Press; US.

Kuczynski, L., & Parkin, C. M. (2009). Pursuing a dialectical perspective on transaction: A social relational theory of micro family processes *The transactional model of development: How children and contexts shape each other* (pp. 247-268). Washington, DC, US: American Psychological Association.

Kuppens, S., Laurent, L., Heyvaert, M., & Onghena, P. (2013). Associations between parental psychological control and relational aggression in children and adolescents: A multilevel and sequential meta-analysis. *Developmental Psychology, 49*, 1697-1712. doi:

10.1037/a0030740

Kwon, K.-A., Han, S., Jeon, H.-J., & Bingham, G. E. (2013). Mothers' and fathers' parenting challenges, strategies, and resources in toddlerhood. *Early Child Development and Care, 183*, 415-429. doi: 10.1080/03004430.2012.711591

Lamb, M. E. (2010). *The role of the father in child development (5th ed.)*. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons Inc.

- Lamb, M. E. (2012). Mothers, fathers, families, and circumstances: Factors affecting children's adjustment. *Applied Developmental Science, 16*, 98-111. doi: 10.1080/10888691.2012.667344
- Lamb, M. E., & Lewis, C. (2011). The role of parent-child relationships in child development. In M. H. Bornstein & M. E. Lamb (Eds.), *Developmental science: An advanced textbook* (6th ed., pp. 469-517). New York: Taylor and Francis.
- Lanz, M., Scabini, E., Vermulst, A. A., & Gerris, J. R. M. (2001). Congruence on child rearing in families with early adolescent and middle adolescent children. *International Journal of Behavioral Development, 25*, 133-139. doi: 10.1080/01650250042000104
- Lanza, H., Huang, D. Y., Murphy, D. A., & Hser, Y.-I. (2013). A latent class analysis of maternal responsiveness and autonomy-granting in early adolescence: Prediction to later adolescent sexual risk-taking. *The Journal of Early Adolescence, 33*, 404-428. doi: 10.1177/0272431612445794
- Laursen, B., & Collins, A. W. (2009). Parent-child relationships during adolescence. In R. M. Lerner & L. Steinberg (Eds.), *Handbook of adolescent psychology, Vol 2: Contextual influences on adolescent development* (3rd ed., pp. 3 - 42). Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons Inc; US.
- Lee, C. L., & Bates, J. E. (1985). Mother-child interaction at age two years and perceived difficult temperament. *Child Development, 56*, 1314-1325. doi: 10.2307/1130246
- Lee, C. M., Beauregard, C., & Bax, K. A. (2005). Child-related disagreements, verbal aggression, and children's internalizing and externalizing behavior problems. *Journal of Family Psychology, 19*, 237-245. doi: 10.1037/0893-3200.19.2.237

- Lereya, S. T., Samara, M., & Wolke, D. (2013). Parenting behavior and the risk of becoming a victim and a bully/victim: A meta-analysis study. *Child Abuse & Neglect, 37*, 1091-1108. doi: 10.1016/j.chiabu.2013.03.001
- Lindsey, E. W., & Caldera, Y. M. (2005). Interparental agreement on the use of control in childrearing and infants' compliance to mother's control strategies. *Infant Behavior and Development, 28*, 165-178. doi: 10.1016/j.infbeh.2005.02.004
- Lindsey, E. W., & Mize, J. (2001a). Contextual differences in parent-child play: Implications for children's gender role development. *Sex Roles, 44*, 155-176. doi: 10.1023/A:1010950919451
- Lindsey, E. W., & Mize, J. (2001b). Interparental agreement, parent-child responsiveness, and children's peer competence. *Family Relations, 50*, 348-354. doi: 10.1111/j.1741-3729.2001.00348.x
- Locke, L. M., & Prinz, R. J. (2002). Measurement of parental discipline and nurturance. *Clinical Psychology Review, 22*, 895-929. doi: 10.1016/S0272-7358%2802%2900133-2
- Lofquist, D., Lugaila, T., O'Connell, M., & Feliz, S. (2012). Households and Families: 2010 *2010 Census Briefs* (pp. 1-21).
- Lovas, G. S. (2005). Gender and Patterns of Emotional Availability in Mother-Toddler and Father-Toddler Dyads. *Infant Mental Health Journal, 26*, 327-353. doi: 10.1002/imhj.20056
- Maccoby, E. E., & Martin, J. A. (1983). Socialization in the context of the family: Parent-child interaction. In P. H. Mussen & E. M. Hetherington (Eds.), *Handbook of child psychology: Vol. 4. Socialization, personality, and social development* (4th ed., Vol. 4, pp. 1-101). New York: Wiley.

- Maguire, M. C. (1999). Treating the dyad as the unit of analysis: A primer on three analytic approaches. *Journal of Marriage & the Family*, *61*, 213-223. doi: 10.2307/353895
- Martin, A., Ryan, R. M., & Brooks-Gunn, J. (2007). The joint influence of mother and father parenting on child cognitive outcomes at age 5. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly*, *22*, 423-439. doi: 10.1016/j.ecresq.2007.07.001
- McEwen, C., & Flouri, E. (2009). Fathers' parenting, adverse life events, and adolescents' emotional and eating disorder symptoms: The role of emotion regulation. *European Child & Adolescent Psychiatry*, *18*, 206-216. doi: 10.1007/s00787-008-0719-3
- McHale, J. P., & Irace, K. (2011). Coparenting in diverse family systems *Coparenting: A conceptual and clinical examination of family systems* (pp. 15-37). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association; US.
- McHale, J. P., Kuersten-Hogan, R., Lauretti, A., & Rasmussen, J. L. (2000). Parental reports of coparenting and observed coparenting behavior during the toddler period. *Journal of Family Psychology*, *14*, 220-236. doi: 10.1037/0893-3200.14.2.220
- McKinney, C., & Renk, K. (2008). Differential parenting between mothers and fathers: Implications for late adolescents. *Journal of Family Issues*, *29*, 806-827. doi: 10.1177/0192513X07311222
- McWayne, C., Downer, J. T., Campos, R., & Harris, R. D. (2013). Father involvement during early childhood and its association with children's early learning: A meta-analysis. *Early Education and Development*, *24*, 898-922. doi: 10.1080/10409289.2013.746932
- Meteyer, K. B., & Perry-Jenkins, M. (2009). Dyadic parenting and children's externalizing symptoms. *Family Relations*, *58*, 289-302. doi: 10.1111/j.1741-3729.2009.00553.x

- Milevsky, A., Schlechter, M., Klem, L., & Kehl, R. (2008). Constellations of maternal and paternal parenting styles in adolescence: Congruity and well-being. *Marriage & Family Review, 44*, 81-98. doi: 10.1080/01494920802185447
- Minuchin, P. (1985). Families and individual development: Provocations from the field of family therapy. *Child Development, 56*, 289-302. doi: 10.2307/1129720
- Mitnick, D. M., Heyman, R. E., & Smith Slep, A. M. (2009). Changes in relationship satisfaction across the transition to parenthood: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Family Psychology, 23*, 848-852. doi: 10.1037/a0017004
- O'Connor, T. G., Dunn, J., Jenkins, J. M., & Rasbash, J. (2006). Predictors of between-family and within-family variation in parent-child relationships. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry, 47*, 498-510. doi: 10.1111/j.1469-7610.2005.01527.x
- Palkovitz, R. (2013). Gendered parenting's implications for children's well-being: Theory and research in applied perspective. In W. B. Wilcox & K. Kovner Kline (Eds.), *Gender and Parenthood: Biological and social scientific perspectives* (pp. 215 - 248). New York, NY: Columbia University Press.
- Panetta, S. M., Somers, C. L., Ceresnie, A. R., Hillman, S. B., & Partridge, R. T. (2014). Maternal and paternal parenting style patterns and adolescent emotional and behavioral outcomes. *Marriage & Family Review, 50*, 342-359. doi: 10.1080/01494929.2013.879557
- Parke, R. D. (2002). Fathers and families. In M. H. Bornstein (Ed.), *Handbook of parenting: Being and becoming a parent* (2nd ed., Vol. 3, pp. 27-73). Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Inc.

- Parke, R. D. (2013). Gender differences and similarities in parental behavior. In W. B. Wilcox & K. Kovner Kline (Eds.), *Gender and parenthood: Biological and social scientific perspectives* (pp. 120-163). New York, NY: Columbia University Press.
- Phares, V., Fields, S., Kamboukos, D., & Lopez, E. (2005). Still looking for Poppa. *American Psychologist, 60*, 735-736. doi: 10.1037/0003-066X.60.7.735
- Pouget, E., Serbin, L. A., Stack, D. M., & Schwartzman, A. E. (2011). Fathers' influence on children's cognitive and behavioural functioning: A longitudinal study of Canadian families. *Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science, 43*, 173-182. doi: 10.1037/a0023948
- Pruett, K., & Pruett, M. K. (2009). *Partnership parenting: How men and women parent differently-Why it helps your kids and can strengthen your marriage*. Cambridge, MA: Da Capo Press; US.
- Putnick, D. L., Bornstein, M. H., Hendricks, C., Painter, K. M., Suwalsky, J. T., & Collins, W. (2010). Stability, continuity, and similarity of parenting stress in European American mothers and fathers across their child's transition to adolescence. *Parenting: Science and Practice, 10*, 60-77. doi: 10.1080/15295190903014638
- Ravanera, Z. R. (2008). Profiles of Fathers in Canada. 1-34. Retrieved from Father Involvement Research Alliance website:
http://fira.ca/cms/documents/204/Profiles_of_Fathers_in_Canada.pdf
- Riesch, S. K., Bush, L., Nelson, C. J., Ohm, B. J., Portz, P. A., Abell, B., . . . Jenkins, P. (2000). Topics of conflict between parents and young adolescents. *Journal for Specialists in Pediatric Nursing, 5*, 27- 40.

- Roskam, I., & Meunier, J. C. (2009). How do parenting concepts vary within and between the families? *European Journal of Psychology of Education, 25*, 33-47. doi: 10.1007/BF03173473
- Rubin, K. H., Mills, R. S., & Rose-Krasnor, L. (1989). Maternal beliefs and children's competence *Social competence in developmental perspective* (pp. 313-331). New York, NY: Kluwer Academic/Plenum Publishers.
- Rubin, K. H., & Mills, R. S. L. (1992). Parents' thoughts about children's socially adaptive and maladaptive behaviors: Stability, change, and individual differences. In I. E. Sigel, A. V. McGillicuddy-DeLisi & J. J. Goodnow (Eds.), *Parental belief systems: The psychological consequences for children* (2nd ed., pp. 41-69). Hillsdale, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.
- Rueger, S. Y., Katz, R. L., Risser, H. J., & Lovejoy, M. (2011). Relations between parental affect and parenting behaviors: A meta-analytic review. *Parenting: Science and Practice, 11*, 1-33. doi: 10.1080/15295192.2011.539503
- Russell, A., & Russell, G. (1994). Coparenting early school-age children: An examination of mother-father interdependence within families. *Developmental Psychology, 30*, 757-770. doi: 10.1037/0012-1649.30.5.757
- Ryan, R. M., Martin, A., & Brooks-Gunn, J. (2006). Is one good parent good enough? Patterns of mother and father parenting and child cognitive outcomes at 24 and 36 months. *Parenting: Science and Practice, 6*, 211-228. doi: 10.1207/s15327922par0602&3_5
- Sameroff, A. (2009). The transactional model *The transactional model of development: How children and contexts shape each other* (pp. 3-21). Washington, DC, US: American Psychological Association.

- Sanders, M. R. (2012). Development, evaluation, and multinational dissemination of the Triple P-Positive Parenting Program. *Annual Review of Clinical Psychology, 8*, 345-379. doi: 10.1146/annurev-clinpsy-032511-143104
- Schacht, P. M., Cummings, E., & Davies, P. T. (2009). Fathering in family context and child adjustment: A longitudinal analysis. *Journal of Family Psychology, 23*, 790-797. doi: 10.1037/a0016741
- Schoppe-Sullivan, S. J., Diener, M. L., Mangelsdorf, S. C., Brown, G. L., McHale, J. L., & Frosch, C. A. (2006). Attachment and Sensitivity in Family Context: The Roles of Parent and Infant Gender. *Infant and Child Development, 15*, 367-385. doi: 10.1002/icd.449
- Schuppert, H., Albers, C. J., Minderaa, R. B., Emmelkamp, P. M., & Nauta, M. H. (2012). Parental rearing and psychopathology in mothers of adolescents with and without borderline personality symptoms. *Child and Adolescent Psychiatry and Mental Health, 6*, 29. doi: 10.1186/1753-2000-6-29
- Seng, A., & Prinz, R. J. (2008). Parents who abuse: What are they thinking? *Clinical Child and Family Psychology Review, 11*, 163-175.
- Shanahan, L., McHale, S. M., Crouter, A. C., & Osgood, D. (2007). Warmth with mothers and fathers from middle childhood to late adolescence: Within- and between-families comparisons. *Developmental Psychology, 43*, 551-563. doi: 10.1037/0012-1649.43.3.551
- Sigel, I. E., McGillicuddy-DeLisi, A. V., & Goodnow, J. J. (1992). *Parental belief systems: The psychological consequences for children (2nd ed.)*. Hillsdale, NJ, England: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

- Simons, L. G., & Conger, R. D. (2007). Linking Mother-Father Differences in Parenting to a Typology of Family Parenting Styles and Adolescent Outcomes. *Journal of Family Issues, 28*, 212-241. doi: 10.1177/0192513X06294593
- Smetana, J. G. (1995). Parenting styles and conceptions of parental authority during adolescence. *Child Development, 66*, 299-316. doi: 10.2307/1131579
- Smetana, J. G., Campione-Barr, N., & Metzger, A. (2006). Adolescent development in interpersonal and societal contexts. *Annual Review of Psychology, 57*, 255-284. doi: 10.1146/annurev.psych.57.102904.190124
- Smetana, J. G., & Gaines, C. (1999). Adolescent-parent conflict in middle-class African American families. *Child Development, 70*, 1447-1463. doi: 10.1111/1467-8624.00105
- Stack, D. M., Serbin, L. A., Enns, L. N., Ruttle, P. L., & Barrieau, L. (2010). Parental effects on children's emotional development over time and across generations. *Infants & Young Children, 23*, 52-69. doi: 10.1097/IYC.0b013e3181c97606
- Statistics Canada. (2010a). Median total income, by family type, by census metropolitan area. Ottawa, ON: Statistics Canada.
- Statistics Canada. (2010b). Visible minority population, by census metropolitan areas (2006 Census). Ottawa, ON: Statistics Canada,.
- Statistics Canada. (2012, December 24). Children and Youth Retrieved March 25, 2013, 2013, from <http://www.statcan.gc.ca/pub/11-402-x/2012000/chap/c-e/tbl/tbl13-eng.htm>
- Steinberg, L. (2013). *Adolescence* (10th ed.). New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

- Steinberg, L., & Silk, J. S. (2002). Parenting adolescents. In M. H. Bornstein (Ed.), *Handbook of parenting: Children and parenting* (2nd ed., Vol. 1, pp. 103-133). Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (2007). *Using Multivariate Statistics* (5th ed.). Boston, MA: Pearson Education Inc.
- Takeuchi, M., & Takeuchi, S. (2008). Authoritarian versus authoritative parenting styles: Application of the cost equalization principle. *Marriage & Family Review, 44*, 489-510. doi: 10.1080/01494920802454090
- Talmi, A. (2013). Gender and parenting across the family life cycle. In W. B. Wilcox & K. Kovner Kline (Eds.), *Gender and parenthood: Biological and social scientific perspectives* (pp. 164 - 190). New York, NY: Columbia University Press.
- Teubert, D., & Pinquart, M. (2010). The association between coparenting and child adjustment: A meta-analysis. *Parenting: Science and Practice, 10*, 286-307. doi: 10.1080/15295192.2010.492040
- Videon, T. M. (2005). Parent-Child Relations and Children's Psychological Well-Being: Do Dads Matter? *Journal of Family Issues, 26*, 55-78. doi: 10.1177/0192513X04270262
- Walling, B. R., Mills, R. S., & Freeman, W. S. (2007). Parenting cognitions associated with the use of psychological control. *Journal of Child and Family Studies, 16*, 642-659. doi: 10.1007/s10826-006-9113-2
- Winsler, A., Madigan, A. L., & Aquilino, S. A. (2005). Correspondence between maternal and paternal parenting styles in early childhood. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly, 20*, 1-12. doi: 10.1016/j.ecresq.2005.01.007

Yeung, W., Sandberg, J. F., Davis-Kean, P. E., & Hofferth, S. L. (2001). Children's time with fathers in intact families. *Journal of Marriage & the Family*, 63, 136-154. doi: 10.1111/j.1741-3737.2001.00136.

Table 1. A two-dimensional structure for categorizing parenting goals.

Immediacy of concern		
Centre of concern	Short-term	Long-term
Parent	Parent-centred short-term	Parent-centred long-term
Child	Child-centred short-term	Child-centred long-term
Relationship	Relationship-centred short-term	Relationship-centred long-term

Note. Adapted from Hastings and Grusec (1998)

Table 2. Summary of studies of parenting goals.

Study	Sample	Parenting goals	Behavioural measure	Findings
Chen & Johnston (2012)	160 mother-father dyads Child $M_{age} = 44.5$ months	Parent (P)-, child (C)- & relationship (R)- centred, short (ST) & long (LT) term goals	Parent responses to vignettes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Parenting effectiveness controlled: dissimilarity in parenting goals or responses \neq child adjustment <i>Parent gender effects</i>: not examined <i>Child gender effects</i>: none
Coplan, et al., (2002)	76 mothers (41 of boys, 35 of girls) Child $M_{age} = 47.8$ months	Parent-centred (PC) Empathic/relationship centred (E/R) goals	Not measured	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Child aggression/misbehaviour \rightarrow PC Child withdrawn behaviour \rightarrow E/R <i>Child gender effects</i>: none
Dix, et al., (2004)	128 mothers (61 of boys, 57 of girls) Child $M_{age} = 20$ months	Parent (POC)- & child-oriented (COC) concerns	Observed behaviour	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> \downarrow asynchronous & restrictive maternal behaviour explained by COC. <i>Child gender effects</i>: controlling for child gender \rightarrow asynchronous maternal behaviour – COC link no longer significant.
Hastings & Coplan (1999)	75 mothers (40 of boys, 35 of girls) Child $M_{age} = 47.8$ months	Parent (PC)- & relationship (RC)- centred goals	Not measured	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Child aggressive behaviour \rightarrow PC Maternal PC + RC linked with higher teacher-rated child social competence. <i>Child gender effects</i>: PC: mothers of daughters > mothers of sons
Hastings & Grusec (1998)	Study 1 28 mothers, 20 fathers, 27 female nonparents, 28 male nonparents Child age not reported	Parent (P)-, child (C)- & relationship (R)- centred, short (ST) & long (LT) term goals	Parent responses to vignettes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Dominant assertive behaviour \rightarrow PST & PLT Reasoning behaviour \rightarrow CLT and RLT <i>Parent gender effects</i>: CST: women > men; RLT: women > men

	<p>Study 2 65 mothers (33 of boys, 32 of girls) 31 fathers (14 of boys, 17 of girls) Child M_{age}= 6 years</p>	<p>Parent (P)-, child (C)- & relationship (R)- centred, short (ST) & long (LT) term goals</p>	<p>Recalled from recent difficult interaction</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Child gender effects</i>: none • PC goals → dominant, power assertive behaviour. • RC goals → responsive behaviour. • <i>Parent gender effects</i>: CLT: fathers > mothers. • <i>Child gender effects</i>: none
	<p>Study 3 17 mothers; 27 fathers; 21 female nonparents; 32 male nonparents Child age not reported</p>	<p>Parent (P)-, child (C)- & relationship (R)- centred, short (ST) & long (LT) term goals</p>	<p>Parent responses to vignettes with goal manipulation</p>	<p>Manipulation of goals had significant effect on parent responses:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PC → dominant & directive behaviour. • CC → directing & reasoning behaviour. • RC → responsive & reasoning behaviour. • <i>Parent gender effects</i>: none • <i>Child gender effects</i>: none
Hastings & Rubin (1999)	<p>65 mothers (28 of girls, 37 of boys) Child M_{age}= 49.77 months</p>	<p>Parent-centred (PC), socialization (CC); social interactional (CC); & empathic/relational (RC) goals</p>	<p>Parent responses to vignettes</p>	<p>Child aggression:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PC → ↓ structuring behaviour. • CC → ↑ structuring behaviour. • RC → ↑ supportive behaviour. • <i>Child gender effects</i>: none <p>Child withdrawn behaviour:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CC goals → ↑ structuring behaviour. • RC → ↓ structuring behaviour. • <i>Child gender effects</i>: none
Kuczynski (1984)	<p>64 mothers (32 of boys, 32 of girls) Child age = 4 years old</p>	<p>Short (ST) vs. long (LT) term compliance goals</p>	<p>Observed behaviour in response to goal manipulation</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reasoning & nurturant behaviour: LT > ST • <i>Child gender effects</i>: none

Table 3. Findings of selected studies on parenting similarity

Study	Sample	Parenting construct <i>Similarity term(s)</i>	Findings
Toddler & Pre-school			
Barnett, et al., (2008)	97 families Child $M_{age} = 7$ months	Observed parenting behaviour <i>Interdependence of parenting</i>	<i>Similarity</i> : present for sensitive parenting, when high perceived marital quality present <i>Child adjustment</i> : not examined <i>Child gender effects</i> : negative intrusiveness: fathers of boys > fathers of girls
Chen & Johnston (2012)	160 families Child $M_{age} = 44.5$ months	Self-reported parenting goals, responses, & child-rearing disagreement. <i>Interparent child rearing differences (disagreement vs. dissimilarity)</i>	<i>Similarity</i> : present for parenting goals & responses <i>Child adjustment</i> : when parenting effectiveness controlled for: child-rearing disagreement → child adjustment; but dissimilarity in parenting goals or responses ≠ child adjustment <i>Child gender effects</i> : none
Gamble, et al., (2007)	57 families (Mexican-American) Child $M_{age} = 57.47$ months	Self-reported parenting styles, meta-emotion beliefs, & behavioural strategies; observed behaviour <i>Parenting agreement-disagreement & interparental similarity</i>	<i>Similarity</i> : present for authoritative parenting style, observed supportive/coaching & responsive behaviour, but not permissive or authoritarian style <i>Child adjustment</i> : not examined <i>Child gender effects</i> : not examined
Lindsey & Caldera (2005)	55 families Child $M_{age} = 14$ months (T1); 18 months (T2)	Self-reported child-rearing attitudes <i>Interparental agreement</i>	<i>Similarity</i> : present for beliefs about use of control <i>Child adjustment</i> : agreement on beliefs about use of control (T1) → higher levels of child compliance (T2) (even when controlling for child temperament) <i>Child gender effects</i> : use of directives: mothers of boys > mothers of girls
Lindsey &	33 families	Observed parenting behaviour;	<i>Similarity</i> : moderately present across variables

Mize (2001)	Child age 3-5 years	self-reported beliefs about control <i>Interparental agreement/similarity</i>	<i>Child adjustment:</i> Similarity in beliefs about use of control & in rates of initiation → children more socially competent (mediated by parent-child responsiveness) <i>Child gender effects:</i> none
Martin, et al., (2007)	200 families Child M _{age} = 25 months (T1); 62 months (T2)	Observed parenting behaviour (supportiveness) <i>Parenting homogamy</i>	<i>Similarity:</i> present for supportive parents & unsupportive-negative parents; but, somewhat supportive parents likely coupled with unsupportive-detached parents. <i>Child adjustment:</i> 2 supportive parents (T1) → child with best outcomes (T2), 2 unsupportive → child with worst outcomes (T2) <i>Child gender effects:</i> none
Ryan, et al., (2006)	237 families Child M _{age} = 2 years	Observed parental behaviour Child cognitive outcomes <i>Parenting homogamy</i>	<i>Similarity:</i> supportive-supportive coupling (62%) > supportive-unsupportive (30%) > unsupportive-unsupportive (8%) <i>Child adjustment:</i> 2 supportive parents > 2 unsupportive <i>Child gender effects:</i> controlled for child gender
Winsler, et al., (2005)	28 families Child M _{age} = 48 months	Self- and spousal-reported parenting style and parenting behaviour <i>Inter-parental agreement</i>	<i>Similarity:</i> in permissive parenting style; but not for other parenting styles <i>Child adjustment:</i> not examined <i>Child gender effects:</i> not examined
School-aged			
Harvey (2000)	70 families of children with ADHD Child M _{age} = 9.32 years	Self-reported child-rearing practices & discipline <i>Parenting similarity</i>	<i>Similarity:</i> present for general child-rearing practices & discipline <i>Child adjustment:</i> similarity in practices & discipline → ↓ child externalizing behaviour problems (even when controlling for parenting

			effectiveness) <i>Child gender effects</i> : not examined
Meteyer & Perry-Jenkins, (2009)	85 families Child M _{age} = 7 years	Self-reported parenting behaviour <i>Parental similarity/dyadic parenting & parental agreement</i>	<i>Similarity</i> : present in parenting style: supportive-supportive coupling (34%) > supportive-unsupportive (33%) > unsupportive-unsupportive (33%) <i>Child adjustment</i> : 2 supportive parents > supportive-unsupportive > 2 unsupportive parents. <i>Child gender effects</i> : 2 unsupportive parents → ↑ aggression & hyperactivity for boys, not girls
Putnick, et al., (2010)	111 families Child M _{age} = 10 (T1); 13.5 years (T2)	Self-reported parenting stress <i>Mother-father agreement</i>	<i>Similarity</i> : in parenting stress (moderate) <i>Child adjustment</i> : not examined <i>Child gender effects</i> : none
Roskam & Meunier (2009)	101 families Child 1 M _{age} = 10.45 years Child 2 M _{age} =8.13 years	Self-reported parenting style and parenting behaviour <i>None</i>	<i>Similarity</i> : low to moderate present for components of parenting style <i>Child adjustment</i> : not examined <i>Child gender effects</i> : none
Russell & Russell (1994)	57 families Eldest child M _{age} = 6.8 years	Self-reported parental involvement, child-rearing values; observed parenting behaviour <i>Mother-father interdependence</i>	<i>Similarity</i> : present for values for standards of behaviour & gender appropriate behaviour; no similarity in values for independence, problem-solving characteristics, or social-emotional qualities. <i>Child adjustment</i> : not examined <i>Child gender effects</i> : values for standards of behaviour & gender appropriate behaviour: parents of boys > parents of girls
Adolescents			
Berkien, et al.,	658 adolescents	Adolescent reported parenting	<i>Similarity</i> : present for emotional warmth, rejection,

(2012)	Child M _{age} = 13 years	styles <i>Parental dissimilarity</i>	& overprotection <i>Child adjustment:</i> dissimilarity in parental emotional warmth → ↑ internalizing problems; dissimilarity in parental overprotection → ↑ internalizing & externalizing problems. <i>Child gender effects:</i> maternal rejection: girls < boys
Lanz, et al., (2001)	788 families Child M _{age} = 12.8 years	Self- & adolescent-reported child-rearing behaviours <i>Parenting congruence</i>	<i>Similarity:</i> familial congruence > common cultural congruence for mother-father & parent-adolescent dyads <i>Child adjustment:</i> not examined <i>Child gender effects:</i> none
McKinney & Renk (2008)	475 adolescents Child M _{age} = 19 years	Adolescent-reported parenting styles <i>Interparental agreement/congruent parenting</i>	<i>Similarity:</i> present for parenting style (~50% of sample) <i>Child adjustment:</i> 2 authoritative parents > authoritarian father-authoritative mother > 2 authoritarian parents or permissive father-authoritarian mother. <i>Child gender effects:</i> none
Milevsky, et al., (2008)	272 adolescents Child age = 14-16 years	Adolescent-reported parenting style <i>Congruity</i>	<i>Similarity:</i> present for parenting style (55% of sample) <i>Child adjustment:</i> 2 authoritative parents → ↑ adolescent well-being 2 neglectful parents → ↓ adolescent well-being <i>Child gender effects:</i> none
Simons & Conger (2007)	451 families Child M _{age} = 13.5 years (T1); Child M _{age} = 14.5 years (T2)	Adolescent-reported & observed parenting style <i>Family parenting style</i>	<i>Similarity:</i> present for parenting style <i>Child adjustment:</i> 2 authoritative parents > authoritative – permissive > neglectful mother-neglectful or permissive father > 2 neglectful parents. <i>Child gender effects:</i> none

Table 4. Hypotheses and research questions examined in each study

Hypotheses	Study 1	Study 2
	Parenting Goals	
Parent gender effects		✓
Child gender effects		✓
Characteristics of situation		✓
Parenting goals - parenting responses		✓
Parenting goals → child adjustment		✓
	Parenting Similarity	
Child gender effects	✓	✓
Characteristics of situation	✓	
Present	✓	✓
Parenting goals - parenting response	✓	✓
Similarity → child adjustment	✓	✓ ¹³

¹³ This analysis was planned when the study was designed, but due to a small *n* of fathers who completed the child adjustment measure, it was not possible to statistically test this research question.

Appendix A

Child Behaviour Vignettes – Toddler and Preschool Version

Participant Code _____

Date _____

INTERVIEW: PARENTAL GOALS

I. Below are a number of situations that occur with toddler and preschool children. Imagine that the situations involve you and your child. I will read each situation and then, in only one or two sentences, described what you would do or say to handle the situation. I will be taping your responses.

1. *You are preparing supper. (Child's name) comes into the kitchen and demands an ice cream cone because she/he is hungry. When you offer her/him some crackers and carrot sticks instead and remind her/him that the meal will soon be ready, she/he yells that you are mean.*

Describe what you would do:

I would . . . _____

2. *It is raining heavily. You have set out (child's name)'s rain clothes. She/he screams that she/he does not need a coat.*

Describe what you would do:

I would . . . _____

3. *(Child's name) and his/her friend are playing in the family room while you clean up the kitchen. You hear screams and run to discover the children pulling a favourite toy – (Child's name) grabs the toy and hits his/her friend with it.*

Describe what you would do:

I would . . . _____

4. *At the beginning of her/his swimming lesson (child's name) begins to cry and refuses to go in the water.*

Describe what you would do:

I would . . . _____

5. *You are visiting family friends whom your child knows well. (Child's name) refuses to leave your lap and will not play with the other children.*

Describe what you would do:

I would . . . _____

Part B Instructions: In responding to children, parents have different goals. Based on your answers in A, please listen to the following goals and rate the extent to which each of the goals listed would be important for you in each parenting situation.

1
2
3
4
5

Not at all important
Important
Very Important

1. In the situation where your child demanded ice cream before supper and yelled that you are mean, how important is it to you:
 - a) _____ to get my child to behave properly
 - b) _____ to reduce my own discomfort
 - c) _____ to make my child happier
 - d) _____ to help my child get along better in life
 - e) _____ to teach my child that it is possible for the two of us to work together on a problem
 - f) _____ to maintain a trusting relationship with my child

2. In the situation where your child refused to wear her/his rainwear, how important is it to you:
 - a) _____ to get my child to behave properly
 - b) _____ to reduce my own discomfort
 - c) _____ to make my child happier
 - d) _____ to help my child get along better in life
 - e) _____ to teach my child that it is possible for the two of us to work together on a problem
 - f) _____ to maintain a trusting relationship with my child

3. In the situation where your child grabbed the toy from her/his friend and hit her/his friend with it, how important is it to you:
 - a) _____ to get my child to behave properly
 - b) _____ to reduce my own discomfort
 - c) _____ to make my child happier
 - d) _____ to help my child get along better in life
 - e) _____ to teach my child that it is possible for the two of us to work together on a problem
 - f) _____ to maintain a trusting relationship with my child

4. In the situation where your child refused to go into the water at swim lessons, how important is it to you:
 - a) _____ to get my child to behave properly
 - b) _____ to reduce my own discomfort
 - c) _____ to make my child happier
 - d) _____ to help my child get along better in life
 - e) _____ to teach my child that it is possible for the two of us to work together on a

- problem
- f) _____ to maintain a trusting relationship with my child
5. In the situation where your child refused to leave your lap while visiting family friends, how important is it to you:
- a) _____ to get my child to behave properly
- b) _____ to reduce my own discomfort
- c) _____ to make my child happier
- d) _____ to help my child get along better in life
- e) _____ to teach my child that it is possible for the two of us to work together on a problem
- f) _____ to maintain a trusting relationship with my child

Appendix B

Study 1 Parent Behaviour Responses Coding Manual

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS:

When coding the responses it is important to remember and take into account that they are in regards to toddler-aged children (i.e. 15-60 months). For example, use of distraction is appropriate with this age group where it may not be with an older one.

It is also important to keep in mind that these codes represent 4 different parenting styles that all parents exhibit in some situations and there is not a “best” one.

DECISION RULES FOR MULTIPLE CODES:

When coding the responses to each vignette it may occur that you feel the parents’ responses demonstrate a range of codes, the decision rules to be used in these situations are detailed in the table below:

1 st Response	Last Response	Code
Authoritative	Permissive	Permissive
Permissive	Authoritative	Authoritative
Authoritarian	Authoritative	Authoritarian
Authoritative	Authoritarian	Authoritative
Authoritarian	Permissive	Uncodable
Permissive	Authoritarian	Uncodable
3 styles, or you feel it is unclear		Uncodable

CODE DESCRIPTIONS:

a) AUTHORITARIAN (A1)

Low in warmth and supportiveness and high in behavioural control and demandingness and psychological control (control attempts that intrude into the psychological and emotional development of the child)

General idea: stand ground, get child to comply with no acknowledgement/empathy for what child is feeling; also may take child’s behaviour personally (focus is on parent’s experience not child’s)

Descriptors: make sure they know who’s in charge, punishment, rigid, obedience, harsh rules, I’m the boss, because I said so, forceful, may involve use of physical punishment or other physical action, whatever it takes, restriction/deprivation (taking away of things of privileges), verbal threats, inflexible, strict; withdrawal of love; shaming

Behavioural intentions: control, force, punish, impose, insist

Keywords: force, insist, make him or her, must, never

Examples:

I would insist she wear it and wouldn’t go out until she did (insisting).

I would make him put it on (forcing).
I would not let him go outside (controlling).
I would yell/scream that “hurting is not allowed.”
Tell her that she’s right I am mean (taking behaviour personally).
Too bad, wear your raincoat or stay inside.
I would put her in instant time out (punishment).

b) AUTHORITATIVE (A2)

High in warmth and supportiveness as well as behavioural control and demandingness, however low in psychological control

General idea: stand ground while being responsive and supportive (warm)

Descriptors: awareness of balance between young person’s needs and the need to give structure; firm but fair; give and take; reasonable, structure, standards, guidelines, directive, assertive, democratic, flexible, supportive, modeling; supportive discipline, social responsibility is important; explain; sets appropriate limits; gives responsibility; restatement of rule; natural consequences (allowing child to do undesired behaviour and experience the naturally occurring unpleasant consequence; e.g. running down the stairs and tripping and hurting self)

Behavioural intentions: loving discipline (i.e. holding ground but still being supportive); logical consequences (consequence that is reasonable and appropriate to misbehaviour)

Keywords: say, tell, offer, suggest, explain

Examples:

I would let him go out in the rain to learn that he will get wet (natural consequences).
I would explain to him that it is important for him to wear a coat so that he does not get sick (explaining).
I would let him choose between his coat and an umbrella (giving a choice).
I would offer to help him put his coat on (holding ground but still being supportive).
I would say you can have carrots and crackers or wait until dinner (giving a choice, holding ground).
I would tell him that his behaviour is not acceptable (social responsibility).
I would tell him that I can see how excited he is to get outside and start playing but that it is still important to take the time to dress properly to be warm.
(empathic/supportive response, restatement of rule).

c) PERMISSIVE (P)

High in warmth and supportiveness and low in behavioural control and demandingness

General idea: keep child happy, lack of consequences

Descriptors: appeasement, no guidelines, you’re the boss, lenient, over-involved, indulgent, blurred rules, non-directive, unwilling to make unpopular demands or decisions, concerned with young person’s happiness, material rewards, give in/up, back off

Behavioural intentions: give in, bribe, do it for them

Keywords: not force

Examples:

- I would promise to buy him a treat if he puts his coat on (bribing).
- I would not force him (give in).
- If he wanted to I would let him (give in).
- He doesn't have to do it (give in).
- I would just do it myself because I don't want to see him/her get upset.

d) UNINVOLVED/NEGLECTFUL (N)

Low in warmth and supportiveness as well as behavioural control and demandingness

General idea: not interested in engaging with child

Descriptors: distant, uninterested, passive, absent, neglectful, doesn't worry about young person, not concerned with welfare of young person, dismissive, inattentive

Behavioural intentions: ignore, not pay attention to

Keywords: walk away, leave, turn away

Examples:

- I would ignore him and go ahead without him.
- I would stop talking to him.
- I would not do anything, he can figure it out on his own.
- I would let them sort it out on their own.

e) UNCODABLE (U)

- a. If there are too many codes or contradictory responses
- b. If it is taking you longer than 5 minutes to make a decision and you find yourself guessing at the meaning of words.

KEY QUESTIONS

Ask yourself the following questions:

- i. What is the parent's intention? Is it to stand their ground and get the child to engage in the desired behaviour?

Vignette	Desired behaviour
1	No ice cream until after dinner.
2	To get the child to go out and wear a raincoat.
3	There is a negative consequence for child's behaviour; e.g. toy is taken away; friend is sent home; time out.
4	To get the child in the water.
5	To get the child to play with the other children; e.g. move my chair closer to the other children; play with the other children myself; play with the other children with

	my child.
--	-----------

- ii. If no then the response is Permissive or Uninvolved.
- iii. If yes, then the response is Authoritarian or Authoritative.
- iv. To tell the difference between Authoritarian and Authoritative ask yourself if there is an indication of any warmth and supportiveness (Authoritative) or is the response harsh and/or cold in tone, may use strong words such as “must” or “never” (Authoritarian)?

Appendix C

Adolescent Behaviour Vignettes - Pilot Version

Part A Instructions: Below are a number of situations that can occur between adolescents and their parents. It is possible that not all the situations will have occurred in your family. Whether or not you have experienced these situations imagine that the situations involve you and your adolescent son or daughter. Read each situation and then write one or two sentences describing what you would say or do to handle the situation.

1. Your son/daughter is responsible for some tasks around the house each week; s/he has not done them this week. When you raise the subject with your son/daughter s/he says, "Yah, I know. Sorry, I'll do them tomorrow."

Describe what you would do first: I would . . .

Describe what you would do next: I would . . .

Please indicate whether a situation like this happened in your home. . .

frequently (daily) often (weekly) occasionally (monthly) rarely (few times a year) never

2. Your son/daughter is about to leave the house when you notice s/he is wearing an outfit you feel is inappropriate. When you comment, s/he replies, "Everyone wears stuff like this" and walks out the door slamming it.

Describe what you would do first: I would . . .

Describe what you would do next: I would . . .

Please indicate whether a situation like this happened in your home. . .

frequently (daily) often (weekly) occasionally (monthly) rarely (few times a year) never

3. Your son/daughter is on the computer when you are on your way out of the house on a Saturday morning. When you return in the afternoon he/she is also on the computer looking as though he/she has not moved all day.

Describe what you would do first: I would . . .

Describe what you would do next: I would . . .

Please indicate whether a situation like this happened in your home. . .

frequently (daily) often (weekly) occasionally (monthly) rarely (few times a year) never

4. You are informed that your daughter/son had a problem at school today. You go to your daughter/son's room to discuss this with her/him. Your daughter/son responds by saying that nothing happened and turning her/his back towards you.

Describe what you would do first: I would . . .

Describe what you would do next: I would . . .

Please indicate whether a situation like this happened in your home. . .

frequently (daily) often (weekly) occasionally (monthly) rarely (few times a year) never

5. You and your spouse provide your daughter/son with a cell phone; when you get the monthly bill there is a significant amount in extra charges.

Describe what you would do first: I would . . .

Describe what you would do next: I would . . .

Please indicate whether a situation like this happened in your home. . .

frequently (daily) often (weekly) occasionally (monthly) rarely (few times a year) never

6. Your daughter/son is expected to do homework every day. You ask her/him if she/he has done her/his homework today, she/he responds, "Why are you always on my *#@ing case?"

Describe what you would do first: I would . . .

Describe what you would do next: I would . . .

Please indicate whether a situation like this happened in your home. . .

frequently (daily) often (weekly) occasionally (monthly) rarely (few times a year) never

7. Your daughter/son is responsible for keeping her/his room in a reasonable condition; you have noticed that it has gotten quite out of hand lately.

Describe what you would do first: I would . . .

Describe what you would do next: I would . . .

Please indicate whether a situation like this happened in your home. . .

frequently (daily) often (weekly) occasionally (monthly) rarely (few times a year) never

8. You receive notice from your son/daughter's school that your son/daughter has not attended some of his/her classes.

Describe what you would do first: I would . . .

Describe what you would do next: I would . . .

Please indicate whether a situation like this happened in your home. . .

frequently (daily) often (weekly) occasionally (monthly) rarely (few times a year) never

9. Your daughter/son phones you very late from a friend's house for a ride, you are unable to come and get him/her; he/she responds, "Fine, I'll walk."

Describe what you would do first: I would . . .

Describe what you would do next: I would . . .

Please indicate whether a situation like this happened in your home. . .

frequently (daily) often (weekly) occasionally (monthly) rarely (few times a year) never

10. It is a Friday night, your son/daughter is getting ready to go out the door; you ask him/her where he/she is going, with whom, and when he/she will be home. He/she rolls his/her eyes, sighs, and responds, "What's with the privacy invasion? I'm just going to hang out."

Describe what you would do first: I would . . .

Describe what you would do next: I would . . .

Please indicate whether a situation like this happened in your home. . .

frequently (daily) often (weekly) occasionally (monthly) rarely (few times a year) never

Part B Instructions: In responding to their adolescent children, parents have different goals. Based on your answers in A, read the following goals and rate the extent to which each of the goals listed would be important for you in each parenting situation on a scale of 1 (not at all important) to 5 (very important).

1	2	3	4	5
Not at all important		Important		Very Important

1. Your son/daughter is responsible for some tasks around the house each week; s/he has not done them this week. When you raise the subject with your son/daughter s/he says, "Yah, I know. Sorry, I'll do them tomorrow."

In this situation, how important is it to you to:

- a) _____ to get my teen to behave properly
- b) _____ to reduce my own discomfort
- c) _____ to make my teen happier
- d) _____ to help my teen get along better in life
- e) _____ for my teen and I to work together on this
- f) _____ to maintain a trusting relationship with my teen

2. Your son/daughter is about to leave the house when you notice s/he is wearing an outfit you feel is inappropriate. When you comment, s/he replies, "Everyone wears stuff like this" and walks out the door slamming it.

In this situation, how important is it to you to:

- a) _____ to get my teen to behave properly
- b) _____ to reduce my own discomfort
- c) _____ to make my teen happier
- d) _____ to help my teen get along better in life
- e) _____ for my teen and I to work together on this
- f) _____ to maintain a trusting relationship with my teen

3. Your son/daughter is on the computer when you are on your way out of the house on a Saturday morning. When you return in the afternoon he/she is also on the computer looking as though he/she has not moved all day.

In this situation, how important is it to you to:

- a) _____ to get my teen to behave properly
- b) _____ to reduce my own discomfort
- c) _____ to make my teen happier
- d) _____ to help my teen get along better in life
- e) _____ for my teen and I to work together on this
- f) _____ to maintain a trusting relationship with my teen

4. You are informed that your daughter/son had a problem at school today. You go to your daughter/son's room to discuss this with her/him. Your daughter/son responds by saying that nothing happened and turning her/his back towards you.

In this situation, how important is it to you to:

- a) _____ to get my teen to behave properly
- b) _____ to reduce my own discomfort
- c) _____ to make my teen happier
- d) _____ to help my teen get along better in life
- e) _____ for my teen and I to work together on this
- f) _____ to maintain a trusting relationship with my teen

5. You and your spouse provide your daughter/son with a cell phone; when you get the monthly bill there is a significant amount in extra charges.

In this situation, how important is it to you to:

- a) _____ to get my teen to behave properly
- b) _____ to reduce my own discomfort
- c) _____ to make my teen happier
- d) _____ to help my teen get along better in life
- e) _____ for my teen and I to work together on this
- f) _____ to maintain a trusting relationship with my teen

6. Your daughter/son is expected to do homework every day. You ask her/him if she/he has done her/his homework today, she/he responds, "Why are you always on my *#@ing case?"

In this situation, how important is it to you to:

- a) _____ to get my teen to behave properly
- b) _____ to reduce my own discomfort
- c) _____ to make my teen happier
- d) _____ to help my teen get along better in life
- e) _____ for my teen and I to work together on this
- f) _____ to maintain a trusting relationship with my teen

7. Your daughter/son is responsible for keeping her/his room in a reasonable condition; you have noticed that it has gotten quite out of hand lately.

In this situation, how important is it to you to:

- a) _____ to get my teen to behave properly
- b) _____ to reduce my own discomfort
- c) _____ to make my teen happier
- d) _____ to help my teen get along better in life
- e) _____ for my teen and I to work together on this
- f) _____ to maintain a trusting relationship with my teen

8. You receive notice from your son/daughter's school that your son/daughter has not attended some of his/her classes.

In this situation, how important is it to you to:

- a) _____ to get my teen to behave properly
- b) _____ to reduce my own discomfort
- c) _____ to make my teen happier
- d) _____ to help my teen get along better in life
- e) _____ for my teen and I to work together on this
- f) _____ to maintain a trusting relationship with my teen

9. Your daughter/son phones you very late from a friend's house for a ride, you are unable to come and get him/her; he/she responds, "Fine, I'll walk."

In this situation, how important is it to you to:

- a) _____ to get my teen to behave properly
- b) _____ to reduce my own discomfort
- c) _____ to make my teen happier
- d) _____ to help my teen get along better in life
- e) _____ for my teen and I to work together on this
- f) _____ to maintain a trusting relationship with my teen

10. It is a Friday night, your son/daughter is getting ready to go out the door; you ask him/her where he/she is going, with whom, and when he/she will be home. He/she rolls his/her eyes, sighs, and responds, "What's with the privacy invasion? I'm just going to hang out."

In this situation, how important is it to you to:

- a) _____ to get my teen to behave properly
- b) _____ to reduce my own discomfort
- c) _____ to make my teen happier
- d) _____ to help my teen get along better in life
- e) _____ for my teen and I to work together on this
- f) _____ to maintain a trusting relationship with my teen

Appendix D

Pilot Questionnaire for Adolescent Behaviour Vignettes

I am currently working on my PhD thesis in Clinical Psychology at the University of Ottawa. My thesis will be exploring the goals of parents of adolescents, aged 14 to 17 years old, in everyday interactions with their adolescent children.

To do this I am developing my own questionnaire which is made up of vignettes that are supposed to capture a range of typical adolescent-parent interactions. The first step in developing this measure is for me to get feedback from parents of adolescents and adolescents themselves about whether the vignettes that I have written present examples of typical adolescent-parent interactions; I am looking for fathers, mothers, and adolescent between 14 and 17 years old to share their opinions. This does not involve participating in the study; the information you choose to share will be seen only by myself and will only be used as feedback for adjusting the questionnaire.

If you are willing to help me out with this step all that I need you to do is read the questionnaire below with the vignettes (pages 2-7) and answer the 7 questions on your opinion about what you have read; this should take about 20 minutes.

If you have any questions, or would like more information about the project please do not hesitate to contact me by email, or phone, .

Thank you in advance for your time, this is of great help to me,

Catherine Horvath

1. Were the instructions to Part A easy to understand? If not, please explain why not:

2. In your opinion, were there any vignettes that seemed difficult to understand? If so, which one(s) and why:

3. In your opinion, are the situations described in the vignettes typical parent-adolescent interactions? If no, please indicate which one(s) and why:

4. In your opinion, are there key parent-adolescent interactions that are typical (i.e. occur on a regular basis) that were not represented in these vignettes? If so, please describe:

5. Were the instructions to Part B easy to understand? If not please explain why not:

6. Were the parenting goals described in Part B easy to understand? If not please explain why not:

7. Please list any words used in this questionnaire that you found unclear:

Appendix E

Adolescent Behaviour Vignettes - Final Version

Part A Instructions: Below are a number of situations that can occur between adolescents and their parents. It is possible that not all the situations will have occurred in your family. Whether or not you have experienced these situations imagine that the situations involve you and your adolescent son or daughter. Read each situation and then write one or two sentences describing what you would say or do to handle the situation.

1. Your son/daughter is responsible for some tasks around the house each week; s/he has not done them this week. When you raise the subject with your son/daughter s/he says, "Yah, I know. Sorry, I'll do them tomorrow."

Describe what you would do first: I would . . .

Describe what you would do next: I would . . .

Please indicate whether a situation like this happened in your home. . .

frequently (daily) often (weekly) occasionally (monthly) rarely (few times a year) never

2. Your son/daughter is about to leave the house when you notice s/he is wearing an outfit you feel is inappropriate. When you comment, s/he replies, "Everyone wears stuff like this" and walks out the door slamming it.

Describe what you would do first: I would . . .

Describe what you would do next: I would . . .

Please indicate whether a situation like this happened in your home. . .

frequently (daily) often (weekly) occasionally (monthly) rarely (few times a year) never

3. Your son/daughter is on the computer when you are on your way out of the house on a Saturday morning. When you return in the afternoon he/she is also on the computer looking as though he/she has not moved all day.

Describe what you would do first: I would . . .

Describe what you would do next: I would . . .

Please indicate whether a situation like this happened in your home. . .

frequently (daily) often (weekly) occasionally (monthly) rarely (few times a year) never

4. Your daughter/son is expected to do homework every day. You ask her/him if she/he has done her/his homework today, she/he responds, "Why are you always on my *#@ing case?"

Describe what you would do first: I would . . .

Describe what you would do next: I would . . .

Please indicate whether a situation like this happened in your home. . .

frequently (daily) often (weekly) occasionally (monthly) rarely (few times a year) never

5. Your daughter/son is responsible for keeping her/his room in a reasonable condition; you have noticed that it has gotten quite out of hand lately.

Describe what you would do first: I would . . .

Describe what you would do next: I would . . .

Please indicate whether a situation like this happened in your home. . .

frequently (daily) often (weekly) occasionally (monthly) rarely (few times a year) never

Part B Instructions: In responding to their adolescent children, parents have different goals. Based on your answers in A, read the following goals and rate the extent to which each of the goals listed would be important for you in each parenting situation on a scale of 1 (not at all important) to 5 (very important).

1	2	3	4	5
Not at all important		Important		Very Important

1. Your son/daughter is responsible for some tasks around the house each week; s/he has not done them this week. When you raise the subject with your son/daughter s/he says, "Yah, I know. Sorry, I'll do them tomorrow."

In this situation, how important is it to you to:

- g) _____ to get my teen to behave properly
- h) _____ to reduce my own discomfort
- i) _____ to make my teen happier
- j) _____ to help my teen get along better in life
- k) _____ for my teen and I to work together on this
- l) _____ to maintain a trusting relationship with my teen

2. Your son/daughter is about to leave the house when you notice s/he is wearing an outfit you feel is inappropriate. When you comment, s/he replies, "Everyone wears stuff like this" and walks out the door slamming it.

In this situation, how important is it to you to:

- g) _____ to get my teen to behave properly
- h) _____ to reduce my own discomfort
- i) _____ to make my teen happier
- j) _____ to help my teen get along better in life
- k) _____ for my teen and I to work together on this
- l) _____ to maintain a trusting relationship with my teen

3. Your son/daughter is on the computer when you are on your way out of the house on a Saturday morning. When you return in the afternoon he/she is also on the computer looking as though he/she has not moved all day.

In this situation, how important is it to you to:

- g) _____ to get my teen to behave properly
- h) _____ to reduce my own discomfort
- i) _____ to make my teen happier
- j) _____ to help my teen get along better in life
- k) _____ for my teen and I to work together on this
- l) _____ to maintain a trusting relationship with my teen

4. Your daughter/son is expected to do homework every day. You ask her/him if she/he has done her/his homework today, she/he responds, "Why are you always on my *#@ing case?"

In this situation, how important is it to you to:

- g) _____ to get my teen to behave properly
- h) _____ to reduce my own discomfort
- i) _____ to make my teen happier
- j) _____ to help my teen get along better in life
- k) _____ for my teen and I to work together on this
- l) _____ to maintain a trusting relationship with my teen

5. Your daughter/son is responsible for keeping her/his room in a reasonable condition; you have noticed that it has gotten quite out of hand lately.

In this situation, how important is it to you to:

- g) _____ to get my teen to behave properly
- h) _____ to reduce my own discomfort
- i) _____ to make my teen happier
- j) _____ to help my teen get along better in life
- k) _____ for my teen and I to work together on this
- l) _____ to maintain a trusting relationship with my teen

Appendix F

Study 2 Parent Behaviour Responses Coding Manual

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS:

When coding responses remember that they are in regards to adolescents (i.e. 14-17 years old).

It is important to keep in mind that these codes represent 4 different parenting styles that all parents may exhibit; there is not always a “best” one. Although most parenting experts promote ‘authoritative parenting;’ in some contexts an authoritarian response may be necessary, or in others, it may be reasonable to be permissive.

For each vignette response (there are 2 per vignette) assign one of the following codes. You will then assign an overall code for each vignette (see Decision Rules Table on p.3 for assistance).

It is essential that you not be swayed by a parent’s responses to previous vignettes, that is, code responses to each vignette independently of responses to other vignettes.

Only code behaviour. If a parent describes feelings or thoughts, but does not say what s/he would DO (e.g., “I would feel frustrated,” “I would consider”), the response is Uncodable.

When a parent’s response consists of two or more distinct behaviours/actions (e.g., “I would say I did not appreciate the behaviour, then I would give a consequence”) code each behavioural component separately and then use the Decision Rules Table to give the response an overall code.

For vignette 2 & 4 you will need to assign two sets of codes because there are two adolescent behaviours that need to be addressed. For vignette 2 you will give one code to the parent’s response to the door slamming and a second code to the parent’s response to the inappropriate outfit. For vignette 4 you will give one code to the parent’s response to the swearing and a second code to the parent’s response about the homework. For vignette 2 if the parent does not address the door slamming and walking out, and for vignette 4 if the parent does not address the swearing the code is Permissive)

The following codes are based on Baumrind’s typology which categorizes parenting behaviour on to dimensions, control and warmth/supportiveness:

		CONTROL	
		High	Low
WARMTH/ SUPPORTIVENESS	High	Authoritative	Permissive
	Low	Authoritarian	Neglectful

CODE DESCRIPTIONS:

f) AUTHORITARIAN (A1)

Low in warmth and supportiveness and high in behavioural control and demandingness and psychological control

General idea: get teenager to comply with the parent’s demands; there is no acknowledgement/empathy for what teenager is feeling and no interest in the young person’s point of view; may take teenager’s behaviour personally (focus is on parent’s experience not teenager’s)

Descriptors: need to make sure young person knows who’s in charge; punishment; rigid; values obedience; harsh rules; I’m the boss attitude; because I said so attitude; take young person’s behaviour personally (how could you do this to me?); forceful; may involve use of physical punishment or other physical action; whatever it takes approach; restriction/deprivation (excessive taking away of things or privileges); verbal threats; inflexible; strict; withdrawal of love; shaming

Behavioural intentions: control, force, punish, impose, insist

Keywords: force, insist, make him or her, must, never, threaten, withhold, tell to, confront

Examples:

Insist s/he cleans it (insisting).

Insist/demand she/he changes immediately.

Make her do the task right away (forcing).

Withhold a favour she wants from me until it is done (this is different from imposing a consequence as the parent is taking it personally).

No tv. no computer, no friends until its cleaned up (i.e., a series of negative consequences that seems out of proportion to the transgression).

I’d yell at her/him to get back here and change (imposing).

I’d complain that it’s simple chores and I’m tired of repeating myself (taking behaviour personally).

Get angry (taking behaviour personally).

Confront her/him immediately (controlling and forcing).

g) AUTHORITATIVE (A2)

High in warmth and supportiveness as well as behavioural control and demandingness, however low in psychological control

General idea: stand ground while being responsive and supportive (warm); awareness that the young person has rights and opinions; openness to negotiation

Descriptors: awareness of balance between young person's needs and the need to give structure; firm but fair; give and take; reasonable; standards; guidelines; directive; assertive; democratic; flexible; supportive; modeling; supportive discipline; social responsibility is important; explain; sets appropriate limits; gives responsibility; restatement of rule; clear expectations; logical consequences

Behavioural intentions: loving discipline (i.e. holding ground but still being supportive); logical consequences (consequence that is reasonable and appropriate to misbehaviour); natural consequences

Keywords: say, ask, offer, suggest, explain, clarify, tell that

Examples:

Clarify that I will not be spoken to in that manner (firm but reasonable – supportive discipline).

Clarify that this is an expectation.

Please don't speak to me like that (social teaching).

Negotiate a time to do it (giving a choice, firm but reasonable).

Withhold allowance if she does not follow through (reasonable consequence).

Give them a time frame of when it needs to be completed or a privilege will be taken away (clear statement of expectation and potential negative consequence).

Explain why her/his outfit is inappropriate (explaining, social teaching).

Discuss with her/him managing time better (firm but reasonable).

h) PERMISSIVE (P)

High in warmth and supportiveness and low in behavioural control and demandingness

General idea: keep teenager happy, lack of consequences

Descriptors: appeasement, no guidelines, you're the boss, lenient, indulgent, blurred rules, non-directive, unwilling to make unpopular demands or decisions, concerned with young person's happiness, material rewards, give in/up, back off; may mention a rule but not provide follow through

Behavioural intentions: give in, bribe, do it for them

Keywords: not force, mention, allow

Examples:

I would offer to buy him new clothes if he changed (bribing).

- I would not force him (give in).
- Let her be (give in).
- Let her go (give in).
- I would just do it myself to avoid a fight.

i) UNINVOLVED/NEGLECTFUL (N)

Low in warmth and supportiveness as well as behavioural control and demandingness

General idea: not interested in engaging with teenager

Descriptors: distant, uninterested, passive, absent, neglectful, doesn't worry about young person, not concerned with welfare of young person, dismissive, inattentive

Behavioural intentions: ignore, not pay attention to

Keywords: walk away, leave, turn away

Examples:

- Ignore it.
- I would just leave it.
- I would not do anything.

j) UNCODABLE (U)

- a. If it is taking you longer than 10 minutes to make a decision and you find yourself guessing at the meaning and/or tone of words.
- b. If the response does not represent a behaviour (e.g., "I would feel frustrated," "I would get angry," "I would consider/think").

k) NO RESPONSE (NR)

- a. If the response is blank
- b. If the parent responds, "that has never happened," "she would never do that."

l) TO BE DISCUSSED (TBD)

- a. If you feel the final code for a parent's set of responses to a vignette as determined using the Decision Rules does not correctly represent the parent's style/quality of the interaction.

DECISION RULES FOR MULTIPLE CODES:

When coding the responses to each vignette the parents' responses may demonstrate a range of codes, the decision rules to be used in these situations are detailed in the table below.

	1st Response	Last Response	Code
1	Authoritative	Permissive	Permissive
2	Permissive	Authoritative	Authoritative
3	Authoritarian	Authoritative	Authoritarian
4	Authoritative	Authoritarian	Authoritative

5	Authoritarian	Neglectful	Authoritarian
6	Neglectful	Authoritarian	Authoritarian
7	Authoritarian	Permissive	Disorganized
8	Permissive	Authoritarian	Disorganized
9	Neglectful	Permissive	Disorganized
10	Permissive	Neglectful	Disorganized
11	Authoritative	Neglectful	Uncodable
12	Neglectful	Authoritative	Uncodable
13	3 styles, or you feel it is unclear		Uncodable
14	Final code does not represent parent's style		TBD
15	No response or Uncodable	Any code	Any code
16	Any code	No response or Uncodable	Any code

RATIONALE:

- 1) If the last response of the parent is permissive then the parent is not holding firm & the adolescent has learned that he or she will get what he or she wants by persisting.
- 2) If the last & final response of the parent is authoritative then the parent is holding firm & the adolescent learns that s/he cannot get what s/he wants just by persisting.
- 3) The adolescent's first experience is of a harsh authoritarian response, this sets a negative tone for the interaction, even if the second response is authoritative.
- 4) The second response is a follow-through of non-compliance to an authoritative request. In this case, the overall vignette is coded as being reasonable but setting firm limits, i.e. Authoritative.
- 5 & 6) The adolescent's experience is of a harsh authoritarian response combined with a cold, neglectful disengagement creating an overall experience of being controlled and lacking in warmth.
- 7,8, 9, & 10) Some parents have a Disorganized style which is characterized by alternating between laxness, harsh controlling behaviour, and cold withdrawn behaviour; it can also have a passive-aggressive feel to it. This is often captured by parents who report both an Authoritarian and Permissive response.
- 13) Sometimes it is not possible to arrive at a code because the response may touch on too many different parenting styles or be too unclear. If you are spending more than 10 minutes trying to decide, and still cannot arrive at a code after consultation then it is Uncodable.
- 14) In the event that you feel the final code for a parent's set of responses to a vignette as determined using the above Decision Rules does not correctly represent the parent's style code it TBD and the study authors who will decide on a final code via consensus.

KEY QUESTIONS

Ask yourself the following questions to assist with coding.

As the teenager would you experience this behaviour as:

- a) High or low in control?
 - a. High: response is Authoritarian or Authoritative
 - b. Low: response is Permissive or Neglectful

- b) High or low in warmth/supportiveness? (i.e., is there an indication of any warmth and supportiveness or is there a harshness, coldness and lack of interest in the teenager? NOTE: in the absence of any evidence of harshness/coldness assume presence of warmth)
 - a. High: response is Authoritative or Permissive
 - b. Low: response is Authoritarian or Neglectful

Vignette Specific Notes

Vignette 2

Additional keywords:

Authoritarian = call him/her back; go after him/her

Authoritative = follow out

Vignette 4

The following types of responses are considered a response to the homework and are coded as **Authoritative**:

It's my job as a parent.

It's my duty to check.

I would tell him we want him to be successful at school.

Other Helpful Notes & Special Situations

1. The keywords listed under each Code Description are to be used as initial indicators of the tone of the response and used as final indicators of a given code when responses are terse and information is sparse.
 - a. Example, "ask him to do chores." This parent is holding firm, and the only indicator to differentiate between Authoritative or Authoritarian in this case is the keyword "ask" which points to an Authoritative response.
2. A parent response that just repeats the same thing for both responses to a vignette is coded as Permissive.
 - a. Example: Response 1: "Remind him not to speak that way." Response 2: "Remind them again not to speak that way."

Appendix G

Study 2 University of Ottawa Ethics Approval Notice

File Number: 06-10-03

Date (mm/dd/yyyy): 07/13/2010



Université d'Ottawa **University of Ottawa**
Service de subventions de recherche et déontologie Research Grants and Ethics Services

Ethics Approval Notice

Social Science and Humanities REB

Principal Investigator / Supervisor / Co-investigator(s) / Student(s)

<u>First Name</u>	<u>Last Name</u>	<u>Affiliation</u>	<u>Role</u>
Catherine	Lee	Social Sciences / Psychology	Supervisor
Catherine	Horvath	Social Sciences / Psychology	Student Researcher

File Number: 06-10-03

Type of Project: PhD Thesis

Title: Parenting goals of Mothers and Fathers of Adolescents

Approval Date (mm/dd/yyyy)	Expiry Date (mm/dd/yyyy)	Approval Type
07/13/2010	07/12/2011	Ia

(Ia: Approval, Ib: Approval for initial stage only)

Special Conditions / Comments:

N/A

Appendix H

Study 2 Recruitment Flyer



PARENTS AND TEENAGERS DAILY HASSLES

Are you the parent of a teen aged 14 – 17?

Are you and your child's other parent willing to participate in a research study?

If you answered "yes" to both of these questions, then the researchers in the Family Psychology Lab of the University of Ottawa need your help.

Purpose:

- The purpose of the study is to better understand parent and teen relationships, their daily interactions, and the role these play in teenager's adjustment.

For this study:

- Parents will be asked to independently complete an on-line questionnaire about the daily hassles they encounter with their teenage child
- Each parent will be offered a \$5 electronic gift certificate

To participate:

- At your convenience go to the following website to complete the on-line questionnaire: www.socialsciences.uottawa.ca/fampsy
- For more information, leave a message for **Catherine Horvath** at the Family Psychology Lab: or send an email to:

Appendix I

Study 2 Recruitment Email

Person's name,

I am a doctoral student in the Clinical Psychology program at the University of Ottawa, Canada. My research is about parenting teenagers. I would be grateful if you would consider completing my survey and/or forwarding the study information below on to anyone else you think might be interested.

Thank you very much,

Catherine

Catherine Horvath, MA
Doctoral Candidate, Clinical Psychology



Are you the parent of a teen aged 14 – 17?

Are you and your child's other parent willing to participate in a research study?

If you answered "yes" to both of these questions, then the researchers in the Family Psychology Lab of the University of Ottawa need your help.

You are invited to participate in a **Doctoral thesis** research study conducted by graduate student Catherine Horvath, under the supervision of Dr. Catherine M. Lee of the University of Ottawa. The objective of the research study is to better understand parent and teen relationships, their daily interactions, and the role these play in teenagers' adjustment.

It will take you approximately 30 minutes to complete.

If you wish to participate, please visit (and click PARTICIPATE NOW):

<http://www.socialsciences.uottawa.ca/fampsy/eng/projects.asp>

Your choice to participate is completely voluntary and anonymous.

At the end of the survey you will be given the option to provide an email address to receive

an electronic **\$5 giftcard***. Confidentiality will be maintained and your email address will not be sold or used for any other purpose than the transmission of the giftcard. Thank you for considering participation in this study.

Sincerely,

Catherine Horvath, MA
Doctoral Student, Clinical Psychology
Family Psychology Lab
University of Ottawa

Catherine M. Lee, PhD.
Professor
School of Psychology
University of Ottawa

* *Please note participants are eligible for compensation on only one entry.

Appendix J

Study 2 Recruitment Phone Script

If a child answers phone – alternating between asking for mother or father:

“Hello, may I speak with your mother/father ?”

“Hi, my name is _____. I am phoning you about a study we’re doing at the University of Ottawa, would it be okay if I asked you a few questions to see if you are eligible to take part? It will take no longer than 3 minutes.”

If yes: go to *Eligibility Questions* on page 2.

If no: **“Is there a time that would be better for me to phone back?”**

If yes: write down the date, time, name and telephone number: **“Thank you, I’ll phone you back at that time.”**

If no: **“Thank you for your time, I’m sorry for disturbing you.”**

If person asks for more information about the study at any point during phone call:

“This study looks at how mothers and fathers think about parenting, how they act as parents, and how their teenage children act. Participation in this study consists of taking 20-30 minutes to complete an online questionnaire.”

Eligibility Questions

“Great! This study is about parents of teenagers, so the first question is:

1) “Are you the parent of a teenager aged 14-17 years old?”

If no: **“I’m sorry, but we are looking for parents who have children in this age group. Thank you for your interest in the study”.**

If yes:

2) “Does your teenager live with you?”

If yes: **“How long have you lived together?”**

If over 2 years: go to Question 3

If less than 2 years: **“I’m sorry, but we are looking for parents who have been living with their teenage child for 2 years or more. Thank you for your interest in the study.”**

If no: **“How often do you have contact with him/her?”**

If less than once a week **“I’m sorry, but we are looking for parents who have at least weekly contact with a teenage child. Thank you for your interest in the study.”**

If yes: Question 3

3) “Can you read and write English without difficulty?”

If yes: go to *Procedure for Participants Meeting Eligibility Criteria* on page 3.

If no: **“I’m sorry, but to be able to take part in the study, you need to be able to read and write English without difficulty. Thank you for your interest in the study.”**

Procedure for Participants Meeting Eligibility Criteria

“Thank you, you are eligible to participate in our study. If you choose to participate, you will be asked to complete an online questionnaire concerning: 1) your behaviours and goals as a parent, 2) some basic demographic information; and 3) your teenager’s behaviours. This should take you between 20 and 30 minutes. Your responses will be anonymous and confidential, you will not be asked for any identifying information when completing the questionnaire, unless you wish to receive a \$5 e-certificate for your participation in which case you will only be asked to supply an email address.

Are you interested in participating in this study?”

If yes: “Great! You will need to go to a website to participate, would you prefer I tell you the web address now and you can write it down? Or if you are comfortable you could give me your email address and I will email you the direct link.”

Web address (if they prefer to write it down):
www.surveymonkey.com/s/parenting_goals

In this study we are interested in learning about the perspectives of both mothers and fathers. Do you think the other parent of your teen would also be interested in participating? We would really appreciate it if you would pass on the study information to her/him as well.”

“We would also greatly appreciate it if you would consider passing on information about this study to other parents of teenagers you may know. Would you be willing to do this?”

If yes: “Thank you, if you would like to give me your email address I can send you an email you could then forward on to others you think would be interested.”

Write down email address.

If no: “Thank you for your time, I am sorry for disturbing you.”

Appendix K

Study 2 Demographic Questionnaire

1. Please indicate your gender: Male Female
2. What is your age? _____years
3. How many children do you have living at home? _____ Not living at home? _____
4. Please describe your child/children:

	Age	Child's Gender		Living with you?		Answered Questionnaire About?
Child #1	Male	Female	Yes	No		
Child #2	Male	Female	Yes	No		
Child #3	Male	Female	Yes	No		
Child #4	Male	Female	Yes	No		
Child #5	Male	Female	Yes	No		

5. Does the teenage child you answered this questionnaire about have an intellectual or physical disability that severely affects his or her daily functioning?

6. If yes, please name: _____

7. Describe your relationship with your teen:

- Biological parent
- Step-parent
- Adoptive parent
- Other (please describe)

8. Describe your relationship with your teen's other parent:

- Married
- Common-law
- Separated
- Divorced

9. How many years have you and your partner been together?

Living together – not married	_____ Years	_____ Not applicable
Married	_____ Years	_____ Not applicable
Overall	_____ Years	_____ Not applicable

10. Approximately how many hours per week do you currently work outside the home (for pay) or go to school? _____ hours/week

11. Which of the following best describes your financial situation:

	Me	My partner	Total Family Income
Less than \$10 000	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
\$10 000 to \$19 999	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
\$20 000 to \$29 999	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
\$30 000 to \$39 999	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
\$40 000 to \$49 999	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
\$50 000 to \$59 999	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
\$60 000 to \$69 999	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
\$70 000 to \$79 999	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
\$80 000 to \$89 999	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
\$90 000 to \$99 999	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
\$100 000 or more	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

12. Which of the following categories best fits the work you do:

- Managerial
- Professional
- Technical
- Administrative
- Clerical
- Retail
- Other _____

13. What is your ethnicity? _____

14. How did you hear about the study?

- Email
- Paper Flyer
- Newspaper ad
- Internet Ad
- In-person recruitment
- Another person
- Telephone call
- Other _____

Appendix L

Study 2 Consent Forms

Title of the study: Parenting Goals of Mothers and Fathers of Adolescents

Researcher: Catherine Horvath, Doctoral Student, School of Psychology, Faculty of Social Sciences, Family Psychology Lab, University of Ottawa

Supervisor: Dr. Catherine Lee, PhD, Family Psychology Lab, University of Ottawa

Invitation to Participate: I am invited to participate in the above mentioned research study conducted by Catherine Horvath and her supervisor Dr. Catherine Lee.

Purpose of the Study: The purpose of the study is to examine if there are links between the ways parents think about parenting, how they act as parents, and how their adolescent children act. In particular, in this study the researchers are interested in looking at both mothers and fathers to better understand the differences and similarities in how they parent.

Participation: My participation will consist of filling out two questionnaires online on the following topics: 1) my behaviours and goals as a parent, as well as some basic demographic information; and 2) my adolescent's behaviours. This will take approximately 30-40 minutes to complete.

Risks: My participation in this study will entail that I volunteer my personal time to answer questions about different parenting situations and this may cause me to reflect on my relationship with my children, which may cause me to feel some stress or anxiety related to this. I have received assurance from the researcher that every effort will be made to minimize these risks; that I will be provided with a list of local services for parents and families as well as some informative websites should I wish to further explore my relationship with my children.

Benefits: My participation in this study will not be of direct benefit to myself however it will contribute to our understanding of the links between mothers and fathers' parenting behaviour, their thoughts about parenting, and their children's adjustment. Additionally, it will add to our currently limited knowledge about fathers' parenting as well as the differences and similarities between mothers and fathers and how this may be linked to child adjustment.

Confidentiality and anonymity: I have received assurance from the researcher that the information I will share will remain strictly confidential. I understand that the contents will be used only for the purposes of this study and that my confidentiality will be protected; only the principal investigators Catherine Horvath and her supervisor Dr. Catherine Lee will have access to the data. My responses to the online survey will be directly uploaded into a database. This database will be kept on a secure computer in Dr. Lee's lab and therefore no one other than the researchers will have access to the individual participants' responses. My anonymity will be protected in the following manner: I will not be required to provide my

name or other identifying information when completing the survey unless I wish to receive compensation in which case I will only be asked to supply an email address. Moreover, statistical analyses will not examine the data from individual participants.

Conservation of data: The data collected through the questionnaires will be kept in a secure manner; the electronic data will be stored on a the computer in the principal investigator's laboratory. This computer requires a secure password to logon. Electronic data will be conserved for a period of at least 5 years after the date of publication. After which time the electronic files on the main computer and any backed up electronic files will be deleted.

Compensation: Upon agreement to participate I will be given the option to provide an email address in order to receive an electronic gift card for the value of \$5 which can be redeemed at my choice of: 1) Chapters Indigo; or 2) iTunes in compensation for my participation in this study. My email address will not be retained with the study data and will be used only for the purposes of sending me the compensation.

Voluntary Participation: I am under no obligation to participate and if I choose to participate, I can withdraw from the study at any time and/or refuse to answer any questions, without suffering any negative consequences. If I choose to withdraw, all data gathered about me until the time of my withdrawal will be discarded and not used.

Acceptance: I agree to participate in the above research study conducted by Catherine Horvath of the Department of Psychology, Faculty of Social Sciences, University of Ottawa which research is under the supervision of Dr. Catherine Lee, PhD.

If I have any questions about the study, I may contact the researcher or her supervisor.

If I have any questions regarding the ethical conduct of this study, I may contact the Protocol Officer for Ethics in Research, University of Ottawa, Tabaret Hall, 550 Cumberland Street, Room 159, Ottawa, ON K1N 6N5
Tel.: (613) 562-5841
Email: ethics@uottawa.ca

Please print a copy of this Consent Form for you to keep in your personal files.



Titre du projet: Le
uOttawa

Université d'Ottawa | University of Ottawa

École de psychologie | School of Psychology

Nom de la chercheuse: Catherine Horvath, Étudiante au doctorat, École de psychologie, Faculté des sciences sociales, Laboratoire de recherche sur la famille, Université d'Ottawa

Nom de la superviseuse: Catherine M. Lee, PhD, Laboratoire de recherche sur la famille, Université d'Ottawa

Invitation à participer: Je suis invité(e) à participer à l'étude nommée ci haut qui est menée par Catherine Horvath et sa superviseuse, Dr. Catherine Lee.

But de l'étude: Le but de cette étude est d'examiner si des liens existent entre les pensées parentales, les comportements parentaux, et les comportements de leurs adolescents. Dans cette étude, les chercheuses sont intéressées à inclure à la fois les mères et les pères afin d'examiner les différences et les similarités qui existent entre eux.

Participation: Si j'accepte de participer à cette étude, je compléterai deux questionnaires en ligne sur les sujets suivants : 1) mes comportements et mes objectifs parentaux ainsi que certains renseignements démographiques de base et 2) les comportements de mon adolescent. Ceci me prendra de 30-40 minutes à compléter.

Risques: Je comprends que puisque ma participation dans cette étude inclura des questions sur mes situations parentales, il est possible que celle-ci suscite chez moi une réflexion sur ma relation avec mon adolescent. et que je ressente de l'anxiété ou du stress relié à ceci. Je recevrai une liste de services locaux pour les parents et les familles ainsi que des liens pour des sites internet informatifs dans le cas où j'aimerais examiner ma relation avec mon adolescent en plus de profondeur.

Bienfaits: Ma participation dans cette étude aura pour effet de contribuer à la compréhension des liens entre les comportements parentaux des mères et des pères, leurs pensées parentales, et les comportements de leurs adolescents. De plus, ma participation contribuera aux connaissances limitées sur les comportements parentaux des pères ainsi que sur les différences et similarités entre les mères et les pères et comment ceci est lié aux comportements des adolescents.

Confidentialité et anonymat: J'ai l'assurance des chercheuses que l'information que je partagerai restera strictement confidentielle. Le contenu sera utilisé que pour les objectifs de cette recherche et respectera la confidentialité des participants; seulement les deux chercheuses, Catherine Horvath et Dr. Catherine Lee, ainsi que leur assistant de recherche auront accès aux données. Mes réponses au questionnaire électronique seront téléchargées directement dans une base de données. Cette base de données sera gardée sur un ordinateur sécurisé dans le laboratoire de Dr. Lee. L'anonymat est garanti de la façon suivante : je ne serai pas obligé de fournir mon nom ou toute autre information pouvant m'identifier sauf dans le cas que j'aimerais recevoir une compensation. Dans ce cas là, je serai demandé de

fournir une adresse courriel. De plus, les analyses statistiques n'examineront pas les données des participants individuels.

Conservation des données: Mes réponses seront conservées de façon sécuritaire; les données électroniques seront garder sur un ordinateur dans le laboratoire de la chercheure principale. Cet ordinateur exige un mot de passe pour y avoir accès. Les données seront conservées pour un période de 5 ans après la date de la publication de la recherche; après cette période, les données électroniques seront supprimées.

Compensation: Après avoir décidé de participer, je serai offert l'option de fournir un adresse courriel pour recevoir un carte cadeau électronique dans le montant de 5\$ pour : 1) Chapters Indigo; ou 2) iTunes. Mon adresse courriel ne sera pas garder par la rechercher et sera utiliser seulement pour m'envoyer la compensation.

Participation volontaire: Ma participation dans cette étude est volontaire et je suis libre de me retirer en tout temps, et/ou de refuser de répondre à certaines questions, sans subir de conséquences négatives. Si je choisi de me retirer de l'étude, mes données recueillies jusqu'à ce point seront supprimés.

Acceptation: J'accepte de participer dans cette étude menée par Catherine Horvath à l'École de psychologie, Faculté des sciences sociales, Laboratoire de recherche sur la famille, Université d'Ottawa, qui est supervisée par Dr. Catherine Lee.

Pour tout renseignement additionnel concernant cette étude, je peux communiquer avec la chercheure ou sa superviseure.

Pour tout renseignement sur les aspects éthiques de cette recherche, je peux m'adresser au Responsable de l'éthique en recherche, Université d'Ottawa, Pavillon Tabaret, 550, rue Cumberland, salle 159, Ottawa, ON K1N 6N5
Tél.: (613) 562-5841
Courriel : ethics@uottawa.ca

Veillez s'il-vous-plait imprimer un copie de ce formulaire de consentement pour vos dossiers.

Appendix M

Table M1

Covariate Screening Correlation Matrix for Study 2

Independent Variables	Continuous Demographic Variables		
	Parent Age	Child Age	Total Family Income
Authoritarian Count	-.21**	-.08	-.19**
Authoritative Count	.07	-.07	.24**
Permissive Count	.05	.14*	-.05
PC-ST	-.17**	-.04	-.23**
PC-LT	-.19**	-.13*	-.28**
CC-ST	-.08	-.05	-.13*
CC-LT	-.08	.02	-.10
RC-ST	-.04	-.02	-.08
RC-LT	-.01	-.02	-.12

Note. PC-ST = parent-centred short-term, PC-LT = parent-centred long-term, CC-ST = child-centred short-term, CC-LT = child-centred long-term, RC-ST = relationship-centred short-term, RC-LT = relationship-centred long-term.

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$

Appendix N

Table N1

Partial Correlations Between Parenting Behaviour Responses and Parenting Goal Importance Ratings Controlling for Total Family Income.

	Authoritarian Count	Authoritative Count	Permissive Count
PC-ST	.30	-.05	-.23
PC-LT	.13	-.03	-.12
CC-ST	-.07	.01	.12
CC-LT	.14	-.06	-.09
RC-ST	.13	-.06	-.10
RC-LT	.09	-.06	-.04

Note. PC-ST = parent-centred short-term, PC-LT = parent-centred long-term, CC-ST = child-centred short-term, CC-LT = child-centred long-term, RC-ST = relationship-centred short-term, RC-LT = relationship-centred long-term.

Appendix O

Table O1

Partial Correlations Between Parenting Goals Importance Ratings and Maternal and Paternal Ratings of Child Adjustment Controlling for Family Income.

	Maternal CBCL Total Problems	Paternal CBCL Total Problems
PC-ST	-.23	.12
PC-LT	-.18	-.02
CC-ST	-.08	.19
CC-LT	-.08	.50
RC-ST	-.13	.14
RC-LT	-.15	.24

Note. PC-ST = parent-centred short-term, PC-LT = parent-centred long-term, CC-ST = child-centred short-term, CC-LT = child-centred long-term, RC-ST = relationship-centred short-term, RC-LT = relationship-centred long-term.