This study examines parental and cultural predictors of the severity of parent-adolescent conflict in Appalachian families. Data used for the study was generated by a survey of adolescents in an Appalachian community. The following variables were examined to determine their relationship to severity of conflict between parents and adolescents: support, monitoring, autonomy granting, punitiveness, legitimate authority and familism. Data were analyzed by separating the population into by gender of both parent and adolescent to allow for the examination of differences between the parent and child dyads. Results reflected a significant relationship between punitiveness and severity of conflict in the four dyads. Results reflected predictive relationships between some of the other variables and conflict within the father-daughter dyad. Findings suggest that within Appalachian families, severity of parent-adolescent conflict between fathers and daughters may be enhanced when parents use punitiveness and minimized when fathers use positive parenting behaviors examined in this study.
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Introduction

Parent-adolescent conflict probably occurs in all cultures, though the precise patterns and consequences of these disruptions may vary across societies and ethnic groups. One such distinctive culture may be prevalent in the mountainous area of Appalachia within United States boundaries, which extends north and south along much of the eastern portion of the United States. Particularly in its rural areas, Appalachia may have provided a geographically isolated context, which may have preserved conservative traditions that influenced family dynamics in profound ways. The unique combination of cultural influences that are displayed in Appalachia has led family scholars to examine how the influence of two worlds, the mainstream U.S. culture, and unique Appalachian life-ways, have influenced Appalachian family patterns, one of which may be severity of parent-adolescent conflict, which is specifically addressed in this study.

A culture characterized by the collectivist values of familism, but also fiercely defending such mainstream American values as independence and self-reliance has elicited considerable commentary for this seemingly contradictory combination of values (Dial, 1994; Jones, 1994; Wilson & Peterson, 2000). Some of the historical scholarship of Appalachia has characterized its occupants as isolated and insular, both in terms of the realities of their geography and in the unique patterning of values that may have arisen from the resulting geographic isolation of past times (Brown & Schwarzwell, 1971; R.A.Y.F.C., 1996). The values characteristic of the region, such as strong familism and collectivism, sometimes have been portrayed as “dysfunctional” and at odds with mainstream, middle-class American patterns (Weller, 1965). These distinctive qualities have led many observers to portray the functioning of “mountaineer families” as being at least quaint curiosities, if not manifestations of serious maladjustments (Weller, 1965; Brown & Schwarzwell, 1971).

The prevalence of such negative or distinctive images would seem to require more careful empirical analyses of the cultural characteristics that have shaped the unique qualities of Appalachian communities and families and greater understanding of these characteristics. This cultural environment also may influence how parent-adolescent conflict is patterned and what it means within this unique cultural context. Of particular interest for this study was to examine how specific patterns of family dynamics may either enhance or diminish the severity of parent-
adolescent conflict within Appalachia. Here the focus will be on the extent to which family relationship qualities (i.e., familism) and aspects of the parent-adolescent relationship (parental support, monitoring, punitiveness, autonomy-granting, and parental legitimate authority) are predictors of the conflict severity that develops between parents and their young within Appalachian families. These relationships will be examined by both gender of parent and gender of adolescent. An effort will be made to identify findings that either correspond with or differ from characteristic patterns and direction of relationships previously found in research on “mainstream” U.S. families outside Appalachia.

During the developmental stage of adolescence, the concept of “storm and stress” has often been portrayed as a normative characteristic of this period (Hall, 1904), with the teen years being defined as an almost inevitable period of adolescent mood fluctuations and frequent conflict with parents (Arnett, 1999). Another scholar, Anna Freud, viewed adolescence as a developmental phase in which disruptive behavior would be common and the experience of “storm and stress” as being virtually inherent (Freud, 1958). Peter Blos also viewed the developmental stage of adolescence and its corresponding “emotional turmoil” as normative and productive for furthering development into adulthood (Blos, 1962). Somewhat in contrast, however, were the views of G. Stanley Hall who agreed that biologically based “storm and stress” were fundamental aspects of adolescence, but also recognized that there will be some cultural influence on the presence of conflict between parents and adolescents (Hall, 1904). For example, “storm and stress” were forces that Hall viewed as being more likely to occur in the tumultuous United States of his day than in “older lands with more conservative traditions” (Arnett, 1999).

**Unique Characteristics of Appalachian Families and Parent-Adolescent Conflict**

A key dimension of Appalachian collectivism, familism, is a central aspect of mountaineer domestic life. The characteristic of strong familism may distinguish Appalachian families from patterns of individualism that dominates much of the family life in mainstream American society. Familism can be defined as “…the importance of one’s family reputation and substantial loyalty to one’s family, coupled with distrust for extra familial (and “outsider”) social institutions, such as the school, governmental authorities and external agencies” (Wilson & Peterson, 2000, p. 84). As a central aspect of collectivism, familism is a way of living that gives
priority to the interests of the family group and to what is held in common by group members.

Appalachian familism is described by Kai Erikson (1976) as, “One’s stature in the community as well as one’s inner sense of well-being that is derived largely from the position one occupies in a family network (and in peer groups) and to step out of that embracing surround would be like separating from one’s own flesh” (Erikson, 1976, p. 86). Further insight into collectivistic familism is provided by the following description: “Family values among Appalachians tend to focus on the overall betterment of the family and family loyalty” (Newsome, Bush, Hennon, Peterson & Wilson, 2008, p. 106).

Collectivism and family loyalty of this kind is often exhibited in unique ways, such as when mountaineer youth choose to move near, if not on the same property, as their parents and other members of their kin network (Rural and Appalachian Youth and Families Consortium, 1996). These familistic characteristics of Appalachian culture can function to foster deep connections among family members that are different than the experiences of adolescents from the American mainstream. Specifically, one possibility is that strong family bonds of this kind may deter a developing adolescent from establishing ties with such extra familial social networks as peers and other adults beyond family boundaries that are a common part of the process of attaining autonomy (Wilson & Peterson, 2000). Consequently, it may be true that parent-adolescent conflict plays a role in the progress of adolescents toward autonomy, which if diminished within Appalachian families, might also imply that patterns of parent-adolescent conflict may be different when compared to families of the American mainstream.

Familism, with the combined qualities of family loyalty, rigid family boundaries, and guarded attitudes toward outsiders, also may hinder any inclinations by family members to report problematic family interactions, such as conflict between parents and adolescents, to external agencies that could provide assistance. Moreover, strong familism may function to diminish severe conflict so that higher levels of group cohesion can be maintained (Arnett, 1999). It has been suggested that Appalachian families adhere to a familial hierarchy and traditional gender roles which could influence interactions between family members in ways that differ from that of the American mainstream (R.A.Y.F.C., 1996; Keefe, 1988). These collectivistic or, more specifically, familistic qualities of Appalachian families suggest that relationship predictors of
parent-adolescent conflict may have different predictors and patterns than those of mainstream families that are shaped more extensively by values consistent with individualism and autonomy.

Despite the uniquely collectivistic manifestations of Appalachian culture exhibited through familism, families from this region also are characterized by seemingly contradictory qualities more consistent with the American mainstream, including individualism, autonomy, independence, and personal assertiveness. The value placed on independence within mountain families is viewed as a historical trait, perhaps born out of challenges faced by the difficult conditions of mountainous terrain, geographic isolation, distance from social support systems as well as desires to live in freedom in a self-determined manner (Jones, 1994). Appalachian independence places value on self-reliance, while accommodating the seemingly contradictory goal of maintaining commitments to family cohesion and larger kin-networks (Jones, 1994). This “Appalachian sense of self-reliance” may differ somewhat from mainstream American definitions, through the value of taking care of oneself and by not becoming a burden for members of their kin network, rather than for general purposes of personal advancement or “getting ahead” (Keefe, 1988).

Interdependence and the priority given to group goals over one’s singular goals tend not to be central goals of the mainstream American ideal, but are a more highly valued aspect of traditional Appalachian life. Possibly originating from the challenges of difficult mountain conditions, entire Appalachian kin networks and communities adhere to this idea. The extent to which mountaineer collectivism is at odds with the expectations of the larger culture of the American mainstream is captured well in the following statement: “Members (of Appalachian communities) do not demonstrate the competition and task orientation expected of the mainstream. General American culture emphasizes self-actualization and a private self, with the result being a focus on personal achievement goals and task orientation. In contrast, Appalachian culture is person oriented rather than task oriented, and a person’s identity is dependent on their community and kinship ties” (Russ, 2010, p. 2).

The disparity between what is valued in mainstream America versus what is valued in Appalachia is apparent. This adherence to collectivistic ideals could change how youth from Appalachia attempt to become autonomous compared to patterns for the larger individualistic society that view the collectivistic values of Appalachia as foreign and having less priority.
It is also important to keep in mind, however, that adolescents from rural Appalachia often have considerable exposure to the mainstream culture through the schools, the media, and extensive connections with urban America. These external connections, in turn, may have modified and are continuing to change some of the unique qualities of Appalachian families and suggests that different origins and patterns of parent-adolescent conflict may be less evident than in the past. Because Appalachian adolescents are on the precipice of adulthood, they may be caught, to some degree, between two worlds and the need to develop leanings toward bicultural identities. A common resolution for members of minority communities in America is to develop bicultural identities so they can function effectively in more than one cultural or ethnic context (Wilson & Peterson, 2000). Specifically, Appalachian youth seem to be faced by the need to interweave the traditions and values of their more collectivistic culture of origin, while acquiring the necessary abilities to be young adults who are able to function in the individualistic world of the larger society. Moreover, such bicultural identities may have important implications for both the relationship predictors and patterns of parent-adolescent conflict.

What is definitely clear, however, is that parent-adolescent family dynamics have been studied only minimally within rural Appalachia and particularly how parents and adolescents navigate conflicts within a less individualistic family system. Research on parent-adolescent relationships within this culture is an important objective, therefore, not only for members of Appalachian communities, but also for Appalachian families and youth whose families have migrated to large communities outside of Appalachia, but still cling tenaciously to aspects of mountaineer life-ways. Consequently, further benefit could be gained from acquiring new insights into parent-adolescent interactions and conflict in families who adhere more extensively to ideals of collectivism and may differ from the American mainstream. One possibility may be that strong familism may inhibit severe conflict that is expressed overtly and function to manage parent-adolescent conflict or keep it within levels that do not result in serious damage to these relationships.
Parent Adolescent Conflict: Theory and Research

An examination of the function of conflict between parents and adolescents in any culture requires a guiding framework such as the family conflict perspective. For example, Georg Simmel (1904), a prominent social theorist, viewed conflict as being capable of producing positive outcomes, with conflict functioning to solidify the unity of the groups involved, both internally and in relationship to one another (Farrington & Chertok, 1993). Another theorist, Jetse Sprey describes conflict within families as “confrontations about rules and status privileges” (Sprey, 1979, p. 143). This statement captures an essential function of conflict between parents and adolescents about rules and status privileges, or that of seeking autonomy and other critical tasks involved in the preparation for adulthood. Basic assumptions of this theory define conflict as an endemic, normal and inevitable occurrence within social groups, such as the family, which serve as mediators between the individual and the larger society (Sprey, 1969). Another key aspect of conflict rooted in conflict theory is how the management of such processes functions to determine whether conflict threatens the quality of relationships, benefits them, or results in something in-between (Sprey, 1969). These and other assumptions of conflict theory can be helpful in providing an analysis of Appalachian family dynamics and kinship structure that may differ from the American mainstream in reference to how conflict emerges and tends to become patterned within parent-adolescent relationships.

Current scholarship on parent-adolescent conflict, conducted mostly within samples from the mainstream culture, has evolved over time from a biologically based “storm and stress” stance to a more inclusive conception involving varied forms of conflict shaped by environmental influences. Recent interpretations view conflict as more subject to social-environmental circumstances and as not inevitably being biologically based and having negative consequences for adolescents and their parents. When managed appropriately, conflict can serve the purpose of assisting adolescents to learn strategies for managing conflicts later in life’s varied interpersonal relationships. Steinberg (1990) asserts, for example, that conflict between parents and adolescents can serve a beneficial function “…because it promotes the development of individuation and autonomy within the context of a warm relationship” (Arnett, 1999, p. 320). The capability of conflict to serve a beneficial function within the parent-adolescent relationship lies in the varied way that conflict is communicated and subsequently managed (Bush &
Peterson, in press). A basic understanding of the differences in perceptions of conflict that exist between parents and adolescents is a critical component of harnessing and utilizing the positive potential it holds when appropriately managed.

Another important idea is that conflicts between parents and adolescents also can be viewed in fundamentally different ways by each party. “Many of the conflicts that parents and teenagers have reflect, not only differences of opinion, but differences in the way that issues are framed and defined. Many of the matters that parents and teenagers argue about are seen by parents as involving codes of right and wrong- either moral codes, or more likely, codes that are based on social conventions. These very same issues, however, are seen by teenagers as matters of personal choice” (Steinberg, 2001, p. 6). Recent scholarship, for example, has determined that sources of these conflicts are associated with “transitions in behavioral autonomy or the transfer of responsibilities from parents to children and the transitions in activities over which parents typically exercise jurisdiction” (Collins, Laursen, Mortensen, Luebker & Fereira, 1997, p. 186). This work reveals that the functional role of conflict is to make adolescents ready to accept more responsibilities of adulthood by diminishing dependencies on parents (Collins & Laursen, 2004; Collins, et al, 1997).

A related issue concerns the manner in which conflict can function as either a positive or negative force within the parent-adolescent relationship. Several relationship factors may contribute to the likelihood of parent-adolescent conflict being either a positive or negative influence, as well as being similar or different from mainstream parent-adolescent patterns. Specifically, such qualities of parent-adolescent conflict often are dependent on other aspects of the family/parent-adolescent relationship, such as the degree of familism, the quality of supportiveness in the relationship, the specific parenting control strategies used, and how specific parental practices and qualities may contribute to or diminish the severity of parent-youth conflict. These dimensions of the parent-adolescent relationship, in turn, help determine the extent to which conflict either is managed and used as a positive force for developmental change or contributes to very severe conflict that becomes a threat to the quality and existence of a relationship (Bush & Peterson, in press).
Research Hypotheses: Parental and Family Predictors of Parent-Adolescent Conflict

The primary predictor variables of parent-adolescent conflict for this study are parental support, monitoring, autonomy granting, punitiveness, legitimate authority, and familism. Each of these predictor variables is hypothesized to either enhance the severity of parent-adolescent conflict or function to manage or inhibit severe conflict. The first subgroup of these predictors, support, monitoring, and autonomy granting, are parenting practices that generally promote positive developmental outcomes in the young. Positive parental practices are expected to be negative predictors of and to decrease parent-adolescent conflict (or manage conflict) and foster positive relationship outcomes between parents and adolescents (Peterson & Hann, 1999; Bush, Peterson & Lash, In press). These parenting behaviors, which are exhibited outwardly through physical affection, the maintenance of parental supervision, and the fostering of adolescent autonomy, often have been found to function to develop healthy self-confidence, social competence, and emotional functioning in adolescents. In contrast, problematic parental behavior, such as punitiveness, is typically expected to be a positive predictor of or enhance severe parent-adolescent conflict (Barber, 1986; Bush & Peterson, in press; Gavazzi, 2011; Peterson & Hann, 1999; Peterson, 2005).

The first of these positive parental practices, parental support, warmth or responsiveness, refers to outward displays of physical and verbal expressions of love and affection that contribute to several positive developmental outcomes of adolescents referred to as social competence (Bush & Peterson, in press; Peterson & Bush, in press). Adolescents who receive sufficient supportiveness from parents are more likely to identify with parents and incorporate their attitudes, values and role expectations but, at the same time, parental support paradoxically encourages the progress of the young toward autonomy (Peterson & Hann, 1999).

Supportiveness by the parent conveys acceptance to the adolescent and often results in the adolescent’s positive connections with family, peers and other authority figures and generally produces long-term positive social outcomes (Peterson & Hann, 1999; Bush & Peterson, in press; Peterson & Bush, in press). Collectivistic cultures that emphasize familism, such as that found in rural Appalachia, may provide an added layer of supportiveness beyond the norms provided by families from the individualistic American mainstream. The uniqueness of Appalachian familism may be characterized by extensive family and kin loyalty that is the source
of supportiveness directed at the young. Scholarship by Bogan and colleagues (1996), for example, indicates that both immediate and extended kin provide extensive support to Appalachian adolescents (R.A.Y.F.C., 1996). Templeton and colleagues (2008) found that the family members were voluntarily involved in the role of providing support to adolescents and that adolescents viewed this supportiveness as a positive aspect of their family lives. Specifically, parental support fosters connectedness and cohesiveness between parent and adolescent, which function to manage conflict by diminishing the likelihood that cycles of conflict will result. Consequently, hypothesis one proposes that parental support is expected to be a negative predictor and inhibit (or manage) the severity of parent-adolescent conflict.

The second positive child-rearing practice, parental monitoring, an aspect of moderate parental control, refers to the degree to which parents set rules and boundaries regarding their adolescent’s whereabouts, activities, and friends. When done effectively, parental monitoring serves to “foster social competence and prevent the drift of youth into problematic peer associations, troubled involvements and deviant behavior” (Peterson & Hann, 1999, p. 335; Peterson, 2005). A key component to the effectiveness of parental monitoring is the extent to which parents communicate their expectations and rules to their adolescents (Peterson & Bush, in press). Parental monitoring particularly involves parents having knowledge of and supervising adolescents’ behavior in accordance with parental rules and expectations (Gavazzi, 2011).

Perhaps as a unique characteristic of collectivistic/familistic cultures, and specifically that of Appalachian families, monitoring and enforcement of rules can extend from the immediate family to the larger kin network. Several observers of Appalachian culture and family life describe the prevalence of expectations to conform to the norms of the kin network and community besides those of the immediate family (R.A.Y.F.C, 1996; Wilson & Peterson, 2000). Other research has revealed that teens are aware of their parent’s expectations regarding monitoring their whereabouts and their peer relationships as well as the need to maintain family boundaries (Templeton, et al., 2008). Templeton and colleagues, in their study using an Appalachian sample, have reported that some monitoring duties with adolescents were shared by members of the kin network and the larger community (2008).

Monitoring is commonly conceptualized, therefore, as a moderate form of parental control that does not elicit substantial resistance from adolescents that can ignite cycles of
parent-adolescent conflict (Peterson, 2005). Consequently, *hypothesis two proposes that effective monitoring will be a negative predictor of, or inhibit (or manage) severe parent-adolescent conflict.* A clear provision of rules and expectations in such a non-arbitrary manner contributes to a family environment for adolescents that is more secure, maintains consistent expectations, and functions to manage or diminish the severity of parent-adolescent conflict (Bush, et. al, in press).

A third positive parental practice, psychological autonomy granting, is characterized as using a style of control that allows adolescents to gradually express their individuality within family relationships and become self-directed beyond family boundaries. The process through which parents grant autonomy is central to the adolescent’s feelings of self-esteem and self worth (Peterson & Bush, 2011). Parental granting of autonomy to adolescents occurs through discipline and control strategies that encourage the young to be more self-directed and not to be in conflict with parents as they strive for greater autonomy (Bush & Peterson, in press). As parents allow more independent decision-making by adolescents, the maintenance of appropriate discipline and a close relationship with the parent are crucial aspects of the development of autonomy (Bush & Peterson, In press). In other words, socially adaptive autonomy by adolescents does not develop in an atmosphere of psychological separation from parents, but is a product of continuing positive connections with parents (Peterson, 2005; Peterson & Bush, in press).

An important thing to consider, however, is that, within Appalachian families, the concept of gaining autonomy during adolescence may be a somewhat different experience than in mainstream American culture. Specifically, a higher value may be placed on connectedness within immediate families and extended kin networks in Appalachian culture than is commonly prevalent in the individualistic context of the mainstream culture. This was noted in Templeton’s (2008) research, which indicated that both parents and members of extended kin networks recognized the need for adolescents to become autonomous, but desired this to occur within the safe boundaries of their local communities. An interesting aspect of this study noted that the adults saw the granting of autonomy as a valuable outcome based on the presumed need of the young to develop greater self-direction so they can assume responsibilities as adult members of immediate families and kin networks (Templeton, et. al, 2008). Thus, adolescent autonomy is valued in Appalachian culture but may be more extensively rooted in continuing expectations for connections with parents and family than is true within the cultural mainstream. This may be a
partial result of pervasive aspects of familism, which encourage the development of pride in
one’s heritage, a sense of having interpersonal roots, and a stable context that provides clear
parameters for identity development (Keefe, 1988). This duality of valuing autonomy within the
context of atypically high expectations for connectedness leads to hypothesis three, which
proposes that autonomy granting is expected to be a negative predictor by inhibiting (or
managing) the severity of parent-adolescent conflict. Parents who grant autonomy to adolescents
may be ameliorating or managing conflict by avoiding situations that elicit cycles of severe
conflict. It seems likely that conflict is avoided because adolescents place great value on
autonomy (Steinberg, 2001) and, when parents foster greater self-reliance, sources of conflict
between parents and youth may become minimized. An important qualification to these ideas,
however, is that this hypothesis is based only on theoretical conceptions and does not have
previous empirical support within Appalachian populations.

A fourth parental practice, punitiveness, contrasts with positive parental practices by
often giving rise to developmentally adverse outcomes for individual adolescents and
problematic relationship patterns between parents and adolescents (Peterson & Hann, 1999).
Parental punitiveness is defined as arbitrary verbal or harsh physical attempts to influence the
behavior and internal qualities of adolescents (Peterson & Bush, in press). These restrictive and
problematic parenting practices produce equally problematic outcomes for adolescents. Adverse
consequences from frequent use of punitiveness by parents include lower self esteem, diminished
academic attainment, more substance use, frequent acting out behavior, noncompliance,
rebellion, greater delinquency, and heightened cycles of conflict between parents and adolescents
(Eckinrode, Laird & Dorris, 1993; Peterson, 2005; Patterson & Capaldi, 1991; Peterson &
Hann.1999).

Another finding, with perhaps special implications for cultures characterized by higher
familism, is that parental punitiveness often fosters a separation process in which the desirable
balance between autonomy and continued connectedness with parents can become endangered
(Peterson & Leigh, 1990). This occurs because harsh punitive behavior often elicits feelings of
hostility by adolescents toward their parents that may diminish parent-youth connections and
create conditions conducive to rising levels of conflict. Instead of managing conflict,
punitiveness may be a parental behavior that ignites greater tendencies for parent-youth
relationship disturbance by fostering adolescent hostility toward parents and eliciting forces to resist in the young (Patterson & Capaldi, 1991; Peterson & Hann, 1999).

An important qualification to keep in mind, however, is that punitiveness in collectivistic/familistic cultures may not have the same meaning and consequences as occur within more individualistic contexts (Peterson & Bush, In press). In cultures that differ from some of the values of the individualistic American mainstream, the effect of punitiveness on parent-adolescent conflict is not simple to predict and currently is plagued by an absence of prior research (Bush, Peterson & Lash, In press). Cultures with traditions of high familism like Appalachia may minimize parent-adolescent conflict for the sake of maintaining relationship cohesion, even when parents use punitiveness to affirm their hierarchical positions of authority (Peterson & Bush, in press). Despite this lack of empirical evidence about the use of punitiveness by Appalachian parents, however, hypothesis four proposes that parental punitiveness will be a positive predictor by fostering or instigating the greater severity of parent adolescent conflict. The primary qualification about this hypothesis is that the strong familistic traditions of Appalachia may alter the meaning of punitiveness in ways not yet understood and may have different implications for parent-adolescent conflict than is true for the American mainstream (Wilson & Peterson, 2000).

Parental legitimate authority is another aspect of the parent-adolescent relationship that conceptualizes the parent’s perceived ability to exercise positive influence over their teens. This aspect of the family relationship focuses less on the direct behavior of the parent in exercising power, and more on the adolescent’s subjective assessment of the parent’s right or recognized legitimacy to exercise influence over them (Peterson & Hann, 1999). Parental legitimate power has been reported in previous research to predict such dimensions of youthful social competence as conformity to parents, identification with parents, and autonomy in reference to parents (Henry, Wilson & Peterson, 1989; Peterson & Bush, in press).

Parental legitimate authority does not refer to parenting behavior but rather the adolescent’s perception of their parent’s credibility or competence and “their ability to exercise influence based on social norms” (Peterson & Hann, 1999, p. 338). Perceptions of parental legitimacy are more likely to be rooted in collectivistic or familistic systems where parental influence is more frequently based in rights associated with hierarchical social positions.
Templeton and colleagues (2008), for example, seem to indirectly refer to the legitimate authority of Appalachian parents during the socialization process by proposing that parenting styles also convey an overall tone or relationship climate between parents and their children. Such findings suggest that a climate of loyalty or disloyalty exists based on the adolescent’s willingness to recognize the parent’s right to influence them and may be an important factor in shaping interpersonal patterns within the parent-adolescent relationship (Templeton et al., 2008). These largely theoretical conceptions suggest hypothesis five, which proposes that adolescents’ perceptions of parents having legitimate authority will be a negative predictor by diminishing the severity of (or managing) parent-adolescent conflict. Consequently, the perception that parents have legitimate authority seems likely to function as a means of moderating parent-adolescent conflict to the extent that adolescents recognize the parents’ right to influence them.

Familism, though not a parenting practice, is a value that shapes the interaction and relationships of individuals within the family as well as their community. As noted by Russ, within the context of a culture that emphasizes the collective “self” over the private “self”, parent-adolescent conflict may be inhibited by familistic values (2010). Her assertion that Appalachian individuals have a tendency toward being more “people oriented” rather than “task oriented” reveals the importance of relationships within a familistic culture (Russ, 2010). This “people orientation” associated with collectivistic cultures provides benefits beyond an obvious wealth of loved ones, friends and family. Noted by Templeton and colleagues, the extended kin network found in Appalachian culture provides an added dimension of support and monitoring for the adolescent (2008). The additional support and interaction provided by the kin network that is unique to familistic cultures was viewed by adolescents to be a positive aspect of their family lives (Templeton, et al, 2008).

The common source of conflict that parents perceive as disputes over moral codes in mainstream America may be less likely to become evident within a culture that adheres to values that place one’s belonging within a kin group as a greater priority over the development of a private self (Steinberg, 2001). Adolescents in familistic cultures have been socialized within kin networks that value the maintenance of group cohesion and harmony as a priority over individualistic desires (Arnett, 1999). This conveyance of values by a larger number of trusted adults reinforces Templeton’s research suggesting that interpersonal patterns between parents
and their children are based on rights associated with hierarchical positions within their families (2008). Appalachian adolescents may view conformity to these rights as evidence of their readiness to become active members of the adult kin network.

The focus on the overall cohesiveness and loyalty to the family requires an individual to shift self-focused goals commonly associated with the developmental stage of adolescence toward goals leading to the emergence of adulthood within the context of strong family bonds (Newsome, et al, 2008). The close proximity of residences that Appalachian families often practice and the greater priority given to family and extended kin goals may also contribute to greater tendencies to manage or minimize conflict that might endanger familistic values (RYSC, 1996). Just as mainstream American families utilize conflict in a fashion that promotes the adolescent’s development of abilities necessary for adulthood, Appalachian parents may manage conflict in a preparatory manner, but with a focus being on preparing young persons for adulthood as an integral member of a collectivistic kin network (Templeton, et al, 2008). Appalachian adolescents may view gaining autonomy (and parents may view the granting of autonomy) less through a process of separation from family ties and more as a way of admitting an individual into the adult circle of the kin-network connections and responsibilities. This differing viewpoint about the end result of gaining autonomy in order to become a valued and trusted adult with family responsibilities suggests that the value of familism may buffer severe parent-adolescent conflict. This assertion suggests that Appalachian youth and their parents may seek to minimize conflict, with the knowledge that adolescents will assume the responsibilities of adulthood in a collectivistic culture. This merging of familistic values held by Appalachian parents with the values of their adolescents who seek autonomy, leads to hypothesis six, which proposes that strong familism may inhibit or be a negative predictor of (or manage) severe parent-adolescent conflict. Thus, familism acts as a mechanism that functions to manage or minimize conflict in the interest of promoting harmony and cohesion within the relationship.

**Methods**

Data were gathered in school classrooms using a self-report questionnaire completed by 705 9th-12th graders. The public schools where the questionnaires were distributed are located in two different states within the Appalachian region considered to be rural. At the time of data collection, the areas in which the schools are located were considered to have rates of poverty
and unemployment higher than the national average. The schools where the data collection took place reported a student-teacher ratio of 19:1 and an attendance rate of 94.3%.

Procedure and Sample Descriptions

**Procedure.** In the presence of teachers, self-report questionnaires were administered to the students during regularly scheduled English courses. The survey, which required 35-45 minutes to complete, was comprised of 181 questions that focused on a diverse group of psychosocial and behavioral issues. Students participated voluntarily and received no compensation for completion of the survey.

School officials granted permission for students to complete the surveys in classroom during instruction time. Parental consent was obtained implicitly by the distribution of letters sent home with students. The letters provided a detailed description of the study, invited participation, explained the consent process and described the manner in which parents could refuse participation in the study. Parents were instructed to notify the school if they wished their child to be excluded from participation in the study. There were no requests from parents for their children to be excluded.

Participating students signed assent forms prior to receiving the questionnaire for completion. No students refused to participate in the completion of the questionnaires. After completion of the questionnaires, assent forms were separated from the questionnaires to ensure the confidentiality of the student participants.

**Sample Description.** The study involved 705 9th to 12th grade students ages 14-19 from a rural Appalachian public high school. At the time of data collection, the median age of the participants was 16 years of age (mean= 16.12), with 50.5% of the students being female and 49.5% being male. The average level of completed formal education was slightly higher for mothers than for fathers of the students that participated in the study. Mothers reported, on average, to have completed high school and some additional training after high school. Fathers reported, on average, to have completed either high school or the General Educational Development exam.
Measures

The questionnaire consisted of items that evaluated the adolescents’ perceptions of aspects of their relationship (i.e., perceived parental behavior and parental qualities) with both their mothers and fathers as well as the extent to which familistic patterns were a part of their everyday experiences. The survey acquired information regarding a variety of family issues pertinent for use in this research, such as: parent-adolescent relationships, psychosocial variables, aspects of family dynamics and socio-demographic information. Of specific interest for this study were parenting behaviors (i.e. support, monitoring, autonomy granting and punitiveness), as well as adolescent’s perceptions of parental legitimate power and the prevalence of familistic values.

**Autonomy from Parents.** The measurement of autonomy was based on a ten item summed scale used to examine the growth of self-direction and self-governance in the young (Douvan & Adelson, 1966; Sessa & Steinberg, 1991). Adolescents responded to the questions using a four-point Likert scale ranging from “Strongly Agree” (4 points) to “Strongly Disagree” (1 point). The items in this scale measure the extent to which parents permit adolescents to engage in autonomous decision making and activities without excessive intrusion regarding the adolescent’s choices pertaining to relationships, career objectives, educational goals and lifestyle preferences. Items included the following questions: “I feel that this parent gives me enough freedom” and “This parent has confidence in my ability to make my own decisions”. Cronbach’s alpha reliability for this scale ranged from .87 for mothers to .86 for fathers.

**Parental qualities.** Parental support, monitoring, legitimate authority and punitiveness, independent variables for this study, were measured using the Parent Behavior Measure (PBM) (Peterson, Bush, & Supple, 1999). This measure is a 34 item self-report instrument used as a measure of adolescents’ perceptions of parent’s supportive and controlling dimensions of behavior directed toward adolescents.

Parental support was measured on the PBM using four items that assess the extent to which parents were seen by adolescents as nurtured by their parents, as well as how feelings of acceptance, and warmth were conveyed. Examples of items included in this measure were “This parent has made me feel that he or she would be there if I needed him or her” and “This parent
tells me how much he or she loves me”. Cronbach’s alpha for this subscale ranged from .87 for mothers to .86 for fathers.

Parental monitoring was measured using a six-item subscale from the PBM items, which assessed the extent to which the adolescent perceived that a parent was aware of or supervised their activities, relationships with friends, and use of money. Examples of these items include: “When I go out, this parent knows where I am”, “This parent knows who my friends are” and “This parent knows how I spend my money”. Cronbach’s alpha reliabilities for this subscale were .87 for both mothers and fathers.

Parental legitimate authority was measured using a six-item subscale from the parental power scale that has been used to measure the perceived “right” of parents to exercise influence based on social norms and or control the circumstances in which their adolescents are involved. Items included in this measure ranged from “This parent has a right to influence my decisions about the friends that I choose” to “This parent has a right to influence me about my education”. Reliabilities for this subscale ranged from .83 for mothers and to .85 for fathers.

Parental punitiveness was measured by a nine-item subscale of the PBM. This subscale of the PBM examined adolescents’ perceptions of parental efforts to exert control over adolescents by the use of verbal (e.g., yelling) or physical (hitting) punishment. Questions ranged from “This parent yells at me a lot without good reason” to “This parent punishes me by hitting me”. The Cronbach’s alphas for this subscale were .87 for mothers and .86 for fathers.

**Parent-Adolescent Conflict**. One item was examined to measure severity (how serious are your arguments) of conflict with parents. The item measured adolescent responses to the question “How serious are your arguments with your parents”. A six-point scale was developed for the adolescents responses that was scored 1-6, “1” representing minor (if any) conflicts to “6” representing serious conflicts.

**Familism**. Familism was measured by a five-item scale based on items from the Bardis Familism scale (1959). This instrument assesses adolescents’ feelings and loyalties, rights and obligations associated with family bonds using items such as “A person should always be completely loyal to his or her family” and “Family ties are more important than friendships outside the family”. The participants responded to the items in terms of a four-point Likert scale
which varies from “Strongly Agree” (4 points) to “Strongly Disagree” (1 point). Each of the items is summed for a total score for familism, with higher scores indicating higher levels of familism. This scale demonstrated a Cronbach’s reliability coefficient of .64 with two items deleted from the scale to increase reliability. The following items were deleted due to their effect on the reliability of the subscale: “Family responsibilities should be more important than my career plans in the future” and “Despite opportunities in other areas of the country, I should try to live near my parents (legal guardians) in the future”.

**Analysis**

The hypothesized relationships between the independent variables and severity of parent-adolescent conflict were examined through hierarchical multiple regression analysis. The independent, or predictor variables of support, monitoring, autonomy granting, punitiveness, parental legitimate authority and familism were examined to determine their relationship, if any, with the severity of conflict between Appalachian parents and adolescents. Gender-of-parent and gender-of-adolescent dyads were examined in separate statistical models (i.e., mother’s parental variables were examined separately for both sons and daughters and father’s parental variables were examined separately for both sons and daughters) to assist in the prevention of multicollinearity. The age of the adolescent respondent as well as the level of father’s education were socio-demographic variables that were used as independent control variables in the multiple regression models.

The multiple regression models consisted of a three-step procedure, of which the first step involved the insertion into the statistical model of the socio-demographic variables consisting of the age of adolescent and father’s education variables. The second step included the insertion of parental behaviors and qualities consisting of support, monitoring, autonomy granting, punitiveness and legitimate authority, followed by the third step in the sequence which involved the insertion of the variable familism. A summary of the multiple regression analyses are presented in Table 1 for mother’s analyses and Table 2 for father’s analyses (Appendix B).
Results

An examination of the bivariate correlations in the tables in Appendix A provides substantial credibility to the data for the present study because all of the Pearson correlations were found to demonstrate significant correlations consistent with the 6 hypotheses. These Pearson correlations were not used as the primary means of testing the hypotheses but only to add credibility to the current data and the logic of the hypotheses explored in this study. The results for these analyses can be found in Tables 1 and 2 (Appendix A).

Specifically, the hypothesized relationships for all of the gender of parent-gender of adolescent dyads demonstrated negative bivariate correlations for support (Mothers/daughters= -.29, Mothers/sons=-.22) (Fathers/daughters= -.28, Fathers/sons=-.24), monitoring (Mothers/daughters= -.16, Mothers/sons=-.16 (Fathers/daughters= -.13, Fathers/sons=-.11), autonomy granting (Mothers/daughters= -.19, Mothers/sons= -.15)(Fathers/daughters= -.27, Fathers/sons= -.16), legitimate authority (Mothers/daughters= -.2, Mothers/sons= -.19)(Fathers/daughters= -.27, Fathers/sons= -.22), and familism (Mothers/daughters= -.16, Mothers/sons= -.18)(Fathers/daughters= -.16, Fathers/sons= -.18) as predictors of the severity of conflict that were strongly significant. Consistent with a sixth hypothesis, parental punitiveness was a predictor for all of the gender of parent-gender of adolescent dyads by demonstrating positive bivariate correlations that were strongly significant (Mothers/daughters= .30, Mothers/sons= .23)(Fathers/daughters= .32, Fathers/sons= .30) (see Appendix A).

Although the bivariate correlations provided preliminary support for the present hypotheses, more definitive tests through multiple regression analysis revealed only limited support for these predictions. An examination of the overall predictive effects of the overall multiple regression statistical models (i.e., the Multiple Rs) revealed that only one of the four gender of parent-gender of adolescent models attained statistical significance at the .05 level of significance. Specifically the overall statistical model for the father-daughter relationship attained significance with a Multiple R of .46 and an R Square of .21 (see Appendix B). The overall statistical models for the father-son, mother-daughter, and mother-son dyads failed to demonstrate Multiple R’s and R Squares that attain statistical significance. This indicated that the overall significance of the variables in 3 of the 4 models were not predicting effectively.
The specific multiple regression findings for Hypothesis 1 indicated that parental support was found to be a significant predictor for only one of the four gender of parent-gender of adolescent dyads. Specifically, the father-daughter dyad revealed that support from fathers was a negative predictor of severe parent-adolescent conflict ($\beta = -.14; p < .05$). Hypothesis 2 revealed a lack of significant supportive relationships in all four dyads for the prediction that a negative relationship would be prevalent between parental monitoring and severity of parent-adolescent conflict. Hypothesis 3 revealed a similar lack of supportive significance within the four dyads for the variable autonomy granting as a negative predictor of the severity of parent-adolescent conflict. In contrast, parental punitiveness, or the parental predictor for Hypothesis 4, was found to demonstrate significant relationships with the severity of conflict between parents and adolescents in all four gender of parent-gender of adolescent dyads. When used by mothers, punitiveness was found to be a strong, significant positive predictor of the severity of conflict between both daughters and sons ($\beta = .26; p < .001$ and $\beta = .19; p < .001$ respectively). Correspondingly, father’s use of punitiveness demonstrated strong significant positive relationships with the severity of conflict between both daughters and sons ($\beta = .28; p < .05$ and $\beta = .25; p < .001$ respectively). Findings for Hypothesis 5, in turn, indicated that some of the relationships involving legitimate authority were supportive of this prediction. Specifically, legitimate authority was not a significant predictor of the severity of parent-adolescent conflict within both the mother-daughter and mother-son dyads. In contrast, father’s legitimate authority in reference to both daughters and sons was shown to be a negative predictor, or to inhibit the severity of parent-adolescent conflict ($\beta = -.14; p < .05$ and $\beta = -.15; p < .01$ respectively). Finally, Hypothesis 6, involving familism, was not a significant predictor that inhibits the severity of parent-adolescent conflict in three of the four dyads. Between fathers and daughters, however, familism was shown to be a negative predictor and inhibit or manage the severity of conflict ($\beta = -.10; p < -.05$) (See Tables 1 and 2, Appendix B).

**Discussion**

The findings revealed in this study lead to some interesting insights into parent-adolescent conflict in Appalachian families. The first hypothesis concerning parental support produced significant findings between fathers and daughters, indicating a negative relationship between father’s provision of support to daughters and severity of conflict between them. For the
three other gender of parent-gender of adolescent dyads, results were nonsignificant for the hypothesized relationships. Little is known about the extent of supportiveness provided by Appalachian parents, other than the role of the extended kin network in providing support for adolescents and that this web of supportive adults is viewed positively by adolescents (R.A.Y.F.C, 1996; Templeton, et. al., 2008). Recent findings about the use of supportiveness on the part of fathers for their daughters indicates the power of the father’s role in his daughter’s autonomy development (Peterson & Hann, 1999). This possibly indicates that the provision of support on the part of fathers assists daughters in their advancement toward autonomy, while maintaining connectedness, similar to what is seen in mainstream American parent-adolescent relationships. This evidence of Appalachian fathers influence on daughters’ autonomy may be paralleled by the current results indicating that support from fathers’ functions as a conflict-management tool between them.

Parental monitoring, Hypothesis 2, was not shown to be significant in its prediction of conflict severity in relationships involving mothers and fathers with daughters or sons. These contrary findings could be due to the fact that several Appalachian family researchers have suggested that expectations exist within these family structures that carry an unspoken requirement for members to adhere to the norms of the kin network (R.A.Y.F.C, 1996; Wilson & Peterson, 2000). It is possible that these expectations are conveyed by different means in Appalachian families than in mainstream American families. For example, within mainstream American families, monitoring of adolescents is provided by parents, whereas within Appalachian families, the kin network may play a much larger role in the monitoring of youth (Templeton et al., 2008). The kin network unique to collectivist cultures, such as Appalachia, may participate in the monitoring of youth to such an extent that youth do not view it as a primary responsibility of his or her parents, but more of a practice shared by the network of concerned adults that are active in their daily lives.

Findings for the third hypothesis, parental punitiveness, revealed the conflict-enhancing nature of this predictor within all four gender of parent-gender of adolescent dyads. The strong positive relationships found for punitive strategies by parents revealed that the use of coercive behavior functions to increase conflict severity between parents and adolescents. Across all four dyads, the positive relationships between punitiveness and severity of conflict was consistent
with previous research for parents and adolescents within the mainstream culture and adds to evidence about the detrimental consequences of punitiveness for the quality of parent-adolescent/child relationships (Bush & Peterson, 2012 in press; Eckinrode, Laird & Dorris, 1993; Peterson, 2005; Patterson & Capaldi, 1991; Peterson & Hann, 1999). Although under some collectivistic circumstances, mild forms of punitiveness have been hypothesized to function in less adverse ways within families that have highly cohesive ideals (Peterson & Bush, in press), these findings indicate that Appalachian family dynamics tend to be consistent with what occurs in mainstream American culture. Specifically, the present findings suggest that parents who use of punitive strategies will enhance conflict with adolescents, possibly because adolescents, who are exposed to such arbitrary treatment, may experience increased feeling of hostility toward the parent and may increase their tendency to counterattack as they develop the ability to do so. These attack-counterattack sequences have been found to escalate in frequency within parent-adolescent relationships and become problematic for the competent development of adolescents (Patterson & Capaldi, 1991; Bush & Peterson, in press; Peterson, 2005; Peterson & Bush, in press). Consequently, an important finding revealed by this study is that, despite the adherence of Appalachian families to familism and collectivism, punitiveness functions to enhance the severity of conflict between parents and adolescents.

Results for hypothesis 4, autonomy granting, produced no significant results within the four dyads. The development of autonomy in Appalachian adolescents has been described as being somewhat hindered by the high cohesiveness of family members characteristic of strong family bonds and desire to live in close proximity to kin members (Wilson & Peterson, 2000). This lack of significant findings for autonomy may reflect that Appalachian attitudes toward strong familism and autonomy are in transition within Appalachian families to an extent that the role of autonomy granting may have contradictory or unclear consequences for parent-adolescent conflict within Appalachian families. Contrary to a collectivistic view of a diminished role for autonomy within Appalachian families, however, Templeton and colleagues note that adolescent autonomy was considered valuable to achieve by adults, both parents and other members of the extended kin network as well as the adolescents themselves (2008). Another possibility may be that the failure of autonomy granting to predict may be a simple reflection of methodological differences in an instrument designed to measure adolescent autonomy based on mainstream
American models, rather than patterns of a somewhat distinctive culture that displays many differences from the mainstream.

Parental legitimate authority, the fifth hypothesis, revealed significant findings for the predicted relationships within both of the father dyads, but revealed no significant findings for either of the mother dyads. For fathers and sons and fathers and daughters, results revealed that, as a father’s legitimate authority was perceived by adolescents to increase, this functioned to minimize the severity of conflict with adolescents and functioned as a resource for conflict management. Parental legitimate authority has not been the focus of previous research within an Appalachian population, but Templeton and colleagues (2008) reference the importance of familial hierarchy within familistic cultures in which parental rights and credibility are associated with their perceived social position. This finding may be reflective of the father’s authoritative position within the familial hierarchy of Appalachian families and may provide them with advantages over mothers in terms of their perception of fathers having higher status than mothers and having more influence in managing conflict. Conflict management capabilities of this kind may be the result of traditional gender role divisions in families that provide fathers with considerable perceived authority (Beaver, 1986).

Findings for Hypothesis 6 involving familism as a predictor, revealed a significant relationship for the father-daughter relationship, or only one of the four gender of parent-gender of adolescent dyads. Specifically, as the familistic beliefs of daughters increase, it appears that this reduces the tendency of daughters to engage in severe conflict with their fathers. This might be explained by the fact that Appalachian families have a traditional view of fathers as males-as-heads-of-households and providers (R.A.Y.F.C, 1996). A strong component of the value system of familism is loyalty to family and the kin network (Wilson & Peterson, 2000). This suggests that the values associated with familism, when held strongly by daughters, may function as a conflict management resource that diminishes conflict with fathers, largely because of their position within the family hierarchy.

Conclusion

A common theme that can be found in research focusing on Appalachian families and particularly on Appalachian parents and adolescents is that a substantial deficit of research exists
on the functioning and social determinants of interaction within these Appalachian families. Researchers are more confident of what they do not know about Appalachian families than what they have documented and understand. Punitiveness, a parental behavior that consistently produces negative results within mainstream American families also was found to predict the severity of parent-adolescent conflict within the Appalachian families examined for this study. These findings indicate that the distinctive qualities of Appalachian families do not appear to alter the extent to which parental punitiveness functions to foster parent-adolescent conflict. Instead, the same conflict inducing qualities seem to operate within Appalachian families as is the case within mainstream American families, and particularly in terms of fostering heightened cycles of severe conflict (Eckinrode et al., 1993; Peterson, 2005; Patterson & Capaldi, 1991; Peterson & Hann.1999).

This study also takes note of the fact that Appalachian fathers appear to play a more complex role for either fostering or managing conflict than is true for the role of mothers. Montemayor (1982) noted, for example, that conflict between mothers and their adolescents was characterized as more frequent than conflict between fathers and adolescents (Montemayor, 1982).

Perhaps the everyday frequency of maternal-adolescent conflict reduces its impact and makes it less memorable? With the focus of this study being solely on the severity of conflict between parents and adolescents, rather than its frequency, it is possible that the lack of findings within the mother-adolescent dyads may be attributed to the fact that mothers experience more frequent, but less severe conflict with their adolescents. Mothers in essence may be more mundane participants in everyday parent-adolescent conflicts than fathers and may lose some of their impact as conflict managers due to their lack of hierarchical position and novelty. In contrast, fathers may function as less frequent participants in conflict, but have more effective “shock effect” because their influence on parent-adolescent conflict is more novel and complex. A useful direction of future research within the Appalachian family might benefit from a more inclusive focus on both the frequency and severity of conflict to examine the power of the presently examined parental variables on the part of Appalachian mothers.

Methodological issues that could have contributed to the absence of significant relationships for this study involve the fact that the measures used for this study were developed
specifically for samples from the mainstream population. None of the current measures were
developed specifically for the distinctive qualities of families and parent-adolescent relationships
from Appalachia. Another important problem was that the single item measure used to
operationalize the severity of conflict variable (the dependent variable) demonstrated limited
variation that may not allow for true relationships to become manifest in the multiple regression
tests for many of the hypotheses examined for this study. Instead, a multiple item scale
measuring conflict severity is needed to force a wider range of variation in the dependent
variable. Other methodological issues include the limitation of a convenience sample and the
possibility that the sample used for this study is not reflective of the larger population. And
finally, these results also are subject to the standard limitations of cross-sectional data in the
sense that it is impossible to determine the direction of effects, which can only be inferred from
theoretical ideas because the data measuring both the independent and dependent variables were
gathered at the same time (Peterson & Hann, 1999).

Overall, therefore, this study sought to gain new insight into an aspect of a somewhat
unique family system that has thrived despite many negative characterizations. The driving force
behind the culture of Appalachia is the family, the foundation on which many Appalachian
individuals derive their strength, security and pride. The findings from this research strongly
suggest that much additional work is needed and yet to be done so we can better understand the
functioning of what is believed to be a unique family system that is more familistic and
collectivistic than families from the American mainstream.
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### Appendix A

**Correlation Tables**

**TABLE 1: Mother's Correlation Matrix**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable Name</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Severity of conflict</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>-0.22**</td>
<td>-0.16**</td>
<td>0.23**</td>
<td>-0.15**</td>
<td>-0.19**</td>
<td>-0.18**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Age of adolescent</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Gender of adolescent</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Father's education</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Support</td>
<td>-0.29**</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.50**</td>
<td>-0.29**</td>
<td>0.53**</td>
<td>0.45**</td>
<td>0.43**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Monitoring</td>
<td>-0.16**</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.50**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>0.31**</td>
<td>0.42**</td>
<td>0.33**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Punitiveness</td>
<td>0.30**</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>-0.48**</td>
<td>-0.23**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-0.31</td>
<td>-0.17**</td>
<td>-0.18**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Autonomy</td>
<td>-0.19**</td>
<td>0.11*</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.57**</td>
<td>0.31**</td>
<td>-0.50**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.45**</td>
<td>0.29**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Legitimate Authority</td>
<td>-0.20**</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.51**</td>
<td>0.40**</td>
<td>-0.23**</td>
<td>0.45**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.39**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Familism</td>
<td>-0.16**</td>
<td>0.11*</td>
<td>0.11*</td>
<td>0.26**</td>
<td>0.25**</td>
<td>-0.12*</td>
<td>0.26**</td>
<td>0.37**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean: 1.77 16.12 1.5 6.63 13.75 19.28 13.26 25.13 3.11 3

Standard Deviation: 1.2 1.23 0.5 1.88 2.8 3.91 5.67 5.83 4.01 1.73

Note: Male scores fall above the diagonal, female scores fall below the diagonal

*p<.05  **p<.01

**TABLE 2: Father's Correlation Matrix**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable Name</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Severity of conflict</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.24**</td>
<td>-0.11*</td>
<td>0.30**</td>
<td>0.16**</td>
<td>0.22**</td>
<td>-0.18**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Age of adolescent</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.11*</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Gender of adolescent</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Father's education</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>-0.14*</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Support</td>
<td>-0.28**</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.20**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.46**</td>
<td>-0.29**</td>
<td>0.47**</td>
<td>0.45**</td>
<td>0.39**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Monitoring</td>
<td>-0.13*</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.46**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.30**</td>
<td>0.38**</td>
<td>0.24**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Punitiveness</td>
<td>0.32**</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>-0.43**</td>
<td>-0.19**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-0.38</td>
<td>-0.21**</td>
<td>-0.15**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Autonomy</td>
<td>-0.27**</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.48**</td>
<td>0.31**</td>
<td>-0.42**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.44**</td>
<td>0.22**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Legitimate Authority</td>
<td>-0.27**</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.20**</td>
<td>0.47**</td>
<td>0.46**</td>
<td>-0.18**</td>
<td>0.43**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.34**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Familism</td>
<td>0.16**</td>
<td>0.11*</td>
<td>0.11*</td>
<td>0.24**</td>
<td>0.24**</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>0.24**</td>
<td>0.35**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean: 1.77 16.12 1.5 6.63 12.94 18.14 28.1 12.92 3.04 3

Standard Deviation: 1.2 1.23 0.5 1.88 3.07 4.3 5.66 6.78 4.45 1.76

Note: Male scores fall above the diagonal, female scores fall below the diagonal

*p<.05  **p<.01
Appendix B
Regression Models

### TABLE 1: Mother's Multiple Regression Models

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Severity of conflict between Mothers and sons (n=317)</th>
<th>Severity of conflict between Mothers and daughters (n=324)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age of adolescent</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>-0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father's education</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>-0.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>-0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>-0.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Punitiveness</td>
<td>0.19***</td>
<td>3.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legitimate authority</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>-1.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Familism</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>-1.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple Correlation R</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple Correlation R Squared</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<.05  
**p<.01  
***p<.001

Note. B= Standardized Beta, t= t value

### TABLE 2: Father's Multiple Regression Models

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Severity of conflict between Fathers and sons (n=506)</th>
<th>Severity of conflict between Fathers and daughters (n=509)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age of adolescent</td>
<td>-0.007</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father's education</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>-0.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>-1.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>-0.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Punitiveness</td>
<td>0.25***</td>
<td>4.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legitimate authority</td>
<td>-0.15*</td>
<td>-2.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Familism</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple Correlation R</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple Correlation R Squared</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<.05  
**p<.01  
***p<.001

Note. B= Standardized Beta, t= t value