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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

Background of the Problem

Current Perspectives on Bidirectional Research

The parent-child relationship initiates a child into the social world and reshapes components of the adult self-concept into identification with parental roles. Much of what occurs between parents and children transform a biological organism into a human being and confronts adults with a new set of experience and responsibilities. Through this fact of the socialization process, parents and children acquire the knowledge, attitudes, skills, values, and expectations that allow them to become increasingly integrated into new social relationships (Peterson & Rollins, 1987, p. 471).

Since the 1940s, periodic changes have occurred in the research approaches and the theoretical frameworks used in the study of parent-child socialization. Despite such changes, these approaches have been subjected to increasing criticism because all approaches assume that parents "socially mold" their offspring (Bell & Harper, 1977; Hartup, 1978; Hill, 1981; Lerner & Spanier, 1978; Maccoby & Martin, 1983; Peterson & Rollins, 1987). This one-way process of parent's characteristics and child's outcome has been perpetuated by both the theoretical frameworks and the results of empirical research. The impact of parental characteristics (socialization) on children used in the
study of parent-child socialization in the 1940s and 1950s has been studied in terms of the personality development of young children. Yet reviews of the parent-child research in this period of time led to the conclusion that little support existed for the psychoanalytic position that maternal styles of caregiving, feeding, weaning and toilet training shaped the young children's personality development (Orlansky, 1949; Sewell, 1952; Zigler & Child, 1973).

Later, in the 1960s, 1970s, and 1980s, however, studies conducted in the parent-child area used approaches drawn from the social learning, observational learning, and social power orientation to examine the influence of parental characteristics on children's social and personality outcomes (Bandura, 1976; Bandura & Walters, 1963; Dager, 1964; Hoffman, 1980; Maccoby & Martin, 1983; McDonald, 1977, 1979, 1980; Rollins & Thomas, 1975, 1979; Smith, 1970; Steinmetz, 1979). Rollins and Thomas (1979) in their review of child socialization literature published between 1960 and 1974, cited five or more empirical studies which correlated parental behaviors or attitudes of support control attempts (rules explanations), or power to each of the following variables: cognitive development, conformity, creativity, locus of control of reinforcement, moral behavior, self-esteem, social disabilities, schizophrenia, achievement, and sex role orientation (cited in Odor, 1986, P. 2). These studies indicated that parental attitudes and behaviors (as
characteristics) do clearly influence the child's development (as outcomes).

Recent research brings an increasing tendency to view parent-child socialization as a mutual or bidirectional process between the participants, rather than as a unilateral process in which children are molded by adults (Cogswell, 1974). Robert Sears (1951) first advocated that investigators begin to address bidirectional models, yet research reflecting this orientation was virtually nonexistent until the late 1960s and the early 1970s.

To date, empirical investigations that deal with newer approaches to the study of parent-child socialization have several deficiencies requiring attention by future investigators (Peterson, & Rollins, 1987). For instance, much of the existing work or research in this bidirectional model has concentrated mainly on infants and young children, whereas the later period of development, particularly adolescence, has been largely neglected (Bell, 1971; Bell & Harper, 1977; Buss, 1981; Newman, & Murray, 1983; Osofsky & O'Connell, 1982; Yarrow, Waxler, & Scott, 1971). Even more serious has been the failure of researchers to develop theoretical concepts that provide insight into the nature, the antecedents, and the consequences of bidirectional interaction (Osofsky & Connors, 1979). As a result, bidirectional research has been preoccupied with a descriptive orientation, various methodological issues, and
the observation of behavior sequences, without sufficient
attention to conceptualizing interaction (Peterson &
Rollins, 1987).

In response to these research deficiencies, research of
adolescents is necessary to complete the whole of informed
study on the entire human development life span. The period
of adolescence is important in the study of parent-child
relationships because of the many changes that take place
during this period. This is the time of transition between
childhood and maturity (Newman & Newman, 1986). Also, this
period in the life span involves dramatic transition in the
physical, social, sexual, and intellectual spheres.
Transition of this order must necessitate adaptation of an
unusually wide-ranging nature (Coleman, 1977). According to
Hall (1904), the capacity for personal and social change
emerges as a result of a number of maturational changes that
occur simultaneously during adolescence. Bandura (1982) has
recently focused his attention on how people translate their
knowledge and skills into action. Applying this idea to
adolescence, it may well be a time in life when the sense of
self-efficacy could be modified by important success or
failure experiences.

Erikson (1956, 1959) views adolescence as a time for
search, experimentation, and introspection during which a
sense of self (identity) is achieved. It is during this
period that the adolescent who has positive attitudes toward
work and confidence in his own skills through the process of examining self will develop a strong achievement orientation. Kohlberg (1958) theorizes that adolescence is vitally important in the emergence of a personal morality. During this life stage a new level of cognitive flexibility is achieved which fosters a more relativistic approach to the formation of moral principles. Adolescents must maintain the role of child and yet simultaneously take on the role of independent, autonomous adult (Gold & Douvan, 1969). This effort to balance connectedness and autonomy contributes to a critical process of individualization from one's parents (Josselson, 1980; Odor, 1986).

If differences in child development owing to different socialization practices of parents are to be found, they are expected to be most visible during adolescence. In addition, to the extent that the parent-child relationship does involve reciprocal interactions, the bidirectional component of parent-child socialization should be readily observable in adolescence.

In adolescence, parent-child relationships are in a state of transition and these interactional relationships occur within the family structure and its surrounding social networks. The concepts from the symbolic interaction framework, a sociological perspective used extensively to interpret family structure and interaction (Burr, Leigh, Day, & Constantine, 1979; Holman & Burr, 1980), provides an
appropriate context for integrating parent-child research in terms of a "family" perspective and its surrounding social networks. In family interaction, complex sets of meanings are learned that allow family members to communicate, share experiences, and involve two or more persons in an especially intense social process (Burr, et al., 1979; Peterson & Rollins, 1987; Turner, 1970). This framework is appropriately applied to adolescence study because adolescents are in the stage of life in which they develop greater ability in dealing with the symbols and values that influence their interaction within social groups.

To sum up, the parent-child relationship, especially in the family, does need to be studied from a perspective where the reciprocal interactions can be evaluated. Also, this relationship needs to be viewed from a symbolic interaction perspective. A symbolic interaction perspective is based on the process and relationships which occur within a family (Burr et al., 1979). Therefore, a symbolic interaction perspective may be useful in understanding the process as well as the quality of parent-adolescent socialization (e.g., parent-adolescent communication). Through this dyad of parent-adolescent communication, it may also be useful in understanding the development of the adolescent's psychosocial well-being.

Along with personality, socialization is a primary concept highlighted by the symbolic interaction perspective
Socialization can be viewed as a lifelong process through which individuals obtain information about specific behavior patterns, such as their role and power in decision making situations, and later internalize those beliefs (Murray, 1984). Adolescents establish their unique psychosocial well-being through this reciprocal socialization. In addition, this reciprocal relationship also effects the parents. Parents can be influenced through the established socialization by changing the quality of the parent-adolescent relationship or adjusting their attitudes towards discipline (e.g., parenting styles). Socialization processes enable parents and adolescents to bring their lines of action into accord with each other and establish a relationship of fundamental mutual regard. Thus, a parent and a child can engage in an interaction, begin to impose meanings on the gesture as well as communication of the other, and develop mutual expectations. As Turner (1962) has mentioned, both participants seem to be engaging in the role-taking process within the most basic of human relationships.

The Current Study

Although parent-adolescent communication and adolescents' well-being have been studied especially as they relate to gender differences between adolescent and parents (Noller & Bagi, 1985), little research has been conducted
concerning adolescents’ psychosocial well-being as it relates to the family setting or socialization process. Little research has been done concerning the bidirectional influences during adolescence. This study will investigate whether there exists a significant relationship across the levels of parenting styles, age, and sex of adolescents in quality of parent-adolescent communication as well as adolescents’ psychosocial well-being. It applies a developmental approach to the study of parenting style, parent-adolescent communication and adolescents’ psychosocial well-being.

The present study will investigate quality of communication as measured by Barnes and Olson (1982) across the parent-adolescent dyads by gender of adolescents and parents, as well as age of adolescents, parenting styles as measured by Elder (1962, 1963) and well-being of adolescents as measured by an index of satisfaction with school, confidence, decision making and feelings of being understood and loved. The relationship of parent behaviors to adolescents’ well-being development and gender differences at different stages of adolescence will be studied. In addition, a longitudinal method will be used to look at the developmental changes between two data sets and a bidirectional analysis will be used to look at the influence of the reciprocal influences of adolescents and parent behaviors. Moreover, a time-lag design will be used
to examine whether or not there is a cohort difference between these two data sets.

This study will take advantage of a multivariate design (cf. a sequence design) to provide a more thorough description of interrelated developmental processes. Average scores of youth at three stages of dyads of parent-adolescent communication will be reported. The relative importance of the same or opposite sex parent in the socialization process will be revealed. Also, the parenting styles in relation to quality of parent-adolescent communication and to adolescents' psychosocial well-being will be indicated. This study, then, should be a valuable contribution to the field of child and family development, especially to the contribution of bidirectional processes in family study during adolescence.

Assumptions

It is assumed that parent-child socialization has bidirectional influences, interacts as a reciprocal relationship between parents and children, and needs to be expanded beyond dyadic phenomenon. Even though several studies (i.e., Bell, 1971; Bell & Harper, 1977; Buss, 1981; Osofsky & O'Connell, 1982; Yarrow, Waxler, & Scott, 1971) have looked at the reciprocal interactions of infants and young children from the bidirectional model, there is a lack of research supporting the reciprocal interaction from the
bidirectional model focusing on adolescents. In this study, the bidirectional influences between parents and adolescents are expected to be significant.

It is also assumed that the parent-adolescent communication is related to parenting styles. Barnes and Olson's (1985) research indicated that balanced families (Circumplex Model) had more positive parent-adolescent communication than extreme families. They also found that families with good parent-adolescent communication perceived themselves in terms of the Circumplex Model as higher on family cohesion, family adaptability, and family satisfaction. In the present study, parenting styles are manipulated as a typology categorized by parental power and induction environments. Thus, applying this assumption to this study, families characterized by a democratic parenting style (medium power) and high induction (frequent) are expected to have more positive parent-adolescent communication in comparison with the other types of parenting styles.

Studies (including Bachman, 1970; Barnes & Olson, 1985; Chartier & Chartier, 1975) have found families with good parent-adolescent communication have higher self-esteem and well-being. Applying these findings to this study, it is assumed that well-being of adolescents is expected to have a significantly positive relationship with positive parent-adolescent communication.
Finally, it is assumed that the mother-adolescent communication relationship appears to be generally higher in quality (and quantity) than the father-adolescent relationship. Balswick and Balkwell (1977) found that females not only disclose more than males, but elicit more disclosure than males (cited in Noller & Bagl, 1985). Moreover, Noller and Bagl (1985) also found that there were clear differences for the females, with more self-disclosure to mothers than fathers in the areas of interest, sex roles, relationships, sexual information and sexual problems.

Research Questions

Cross-sectional Comparisons

1. Is there a significant difference in quality of communication across the parent-adolescent dyads by gender of adolescents and parents as well as age of adolescents?

Hypothesis 1: Level of quality of parent-adolescent communication (as reported by adolescents) will be highest for mother-daughter dyads and lowest for father-son dyads within each of three adolescents’ age groups.

2. Is there a significant difference in quality of communication across the six parental styles measured as power by induction environments in relation to age and gender of adolescents?
Hypothesis 2: The quality of parent-adolescent communication is significantly different across six parenting styles. The pattern of relationship will differ by gender and age groups.

3. Is there a significant positive correlation between quality of communication and the well-being of adolescents?

Hypothesis 3: The types of quality of communication (Open Family Communication and Problems in Family Communication) are positively related to the well-being of adolescents.

4. Is there a significant difference in the well-being of adolescents by gender and age of adolescents?

Hypothesis 4: Level of the well-being of adolescents will be significantly different by gender and age groups.

5. Is there a significant difference in the well-being of adolescents across the six parental styles measured as power by induction environments by age and gender of adolescents?

Hypothesis 5: The well-being of adolescents is significantly related to six different parenting styles. The pattern of relationship will differ by gender and age groups.
Longitudinal Comparisons

6. Is there a significant difference in the well-being of adolescents between Time 1 and Time 2 data?

Hypothesis 6: The well-being decreases with age for those subjects studied at Time 1 and Time 2.

7. Is there a significant difference in the adolescent’s perception of parenting style between Time 1 and Time 2 data?

Hypothesis 7: As time changes and adolescents grow up, the typology of parenting styles (as reported by adolescents) will be significantly different between the two data sets.

8. Is there a significant relationship between the well-being of adolescents at Time 1 and parent-adolescent communication at Time 2?

Hypothesis 8: The well-being of adolescents at Time 1 will be positively related to parent-adolescent communication at Time 2.

9. Is there a significant relationship between the adolescent’s perception of parenting styles at Time 1 and parent-adolescent communication at Time 2?

Hypothesis 9: The typology of parenting styles at Time 1 (as a measure by the parental power and induction and as reported by adolescents) will be a significant predictor of parent-adolescent communication at Time 2.
Bidirectional Research Questions (An Analysis of Adolescents' Influence on Parents and Parents' Influence on Adolescents)

10. Does adolescents' well-being at Time 1 influence the parent's satisfaction with parenting at Time 2?
   Hypothesis 10: Level of adolescents' well-being at Time 1 will be positively related to the parent's satisfaction with parenting at Time 2.

11. Does the parent's satisfaction with parenting at Time 1 influence adolescents' well-being at Time 2?
   Hypothesis 11: Level of the parent's satisfaction with parenting at Time 1 will be positively related to adolescents' well-being at Time 2.

12. Does the parenting style at Time 1 influence the well-being of adolescents at Time 2?
   Hypothesis 12: The parenting style measured at Time 1 will be significantly related to adolescents' well-being at Time 2.

13. Does the well-being of adolescents at Time 1 influence the parenting model at Time 2?
   Hypothesis 13: Level of adolescents' well-being at Time 1 will be significantly related to change in the parenting style at Time 2 (planned to categorize adolescents by parental power (high, medium, and low) and induction (frequent and infrequent) relative to the parenting style at
Cohort Difference Research Questions

14. Is there a significant difference in the well-being of adolescents across the comparisons of the same age groups between Time 1 and Time 2 data?

Hypothesis 14: Level of adolescents' well-being will be the same between the two data sets within each of three age groups.

15. Is there a significant difference in adolescent's perception of parenting styles across the comparisons of the same age groups between Time 1 and Time 2 data?

Hypothesis 15: The categories of the typology of the parenting styles will be the same between the two data sets within each of three age groups.

16. Is there a significant difference in parenting satisfaction across the comparisons of the same age groups between Time 1 and Time 2 data?

Hypothesis 16: Level of the parenting satisfaction (as measured by parents) will be the same between the two data sets within each of three age groups.

Definition of Terms

Adolescent: An individual between the ages of 10 years and 20 years. The present investigation will study males and females in three groups whose average ages are 11, 14, and 17 years.
Communication: An essential ingredient to the establishment of the types of negotiation processes families adopt to meet the developmental changes dictated by the growth of individual members (Barnes & Olson, 1982). The individual's typical frame of reference to interact with the other family members will be investigated to look at the aspects of the content and process of the parent-adolescent interaction. In this study, communication will be measured by the 20-item Parent-Adolescent Communication—a scale developed by Barnes and Olson (1982), as Open Family Communication and Problems in Family Communication. This scale was developed to measure both positive and negative aspects of communication.

Open Family Communication: The summation score of ten items in the Parent-Adolescent Communication measures the more positive aspects of parent-adolescent communication. The foci are on the freedom or free flowing exchange of information, both factual and emotional, as well as the sense of lack of constraint and degree of understanding and satisfaction experienced in their interaction.

Problems in Family Communication: The score of summation of ten items in Parent-Adolescent Communication measures the more negative aspects of parent-adolescent communication. The foci are
on the negative aspects of communication, hesitancy to share, negative styles of interaction, and selectivity and caution in what is shared.

**Induction:** Also called "explanation of rules and restrictions", it is the explanation of reasons for rules and the pointing out of consequences of the child's behavior to others (Saltzstein, 1976). Induction is related to parental support and warmth addressed by Rollins and Thomas (1979). In this study, induction will be measured by an adaptation of Elder's (1962, 1963) questionnaire which asks adolescents that if a parent makes a particular decision or has certain rules to follow, how often will the parent explain the reason. This is a measure of the information flow between parent and child regardless of whether the child requests such an explanation or not. In this study, two parenting styles are represented as high induction (frequent) and low induction (infrequent).

**Power:** Parental power is measured by the adolescent's response to another adaptation of Elder's (1962, 1963) questionnaire, which asks how most decisions are made between the respondent and the parent. In this study, three parenting styles manipulated in the variable of the power control will be identified which are indicated by the amount of power parents demonstrate: autocratic (high power), democratic (medium power), and permissive
Autocratic: The parent has primary power in making decisions regarding the adolescent’s behavior. However, the adolescent may have an opportunity to express his or her opinion when family decisions are being made.

Democratic: The parent encourages the adolescent to participate in discussing issues related to his or her own behavior, yet maintains the right to make or approve the final decision.

Permissive: The parent allows the adolescent to have the majority of power in making decisions about issues regarding him or herself (Elder, 1962).

In this study, when combining power and induction together, we can get a typology of six parenting styles. Those are 1) low power (permissive) and high induction (frequent), 2) medium power (democratic) and high induction (frequent), 3) high power (autocratic) and high induction (frequent), 4) low power (permissive) and low induction (infrequent), 5) medium power (democratic) and low induction (infrequent), and 6) high power (autocratic) and low induction (infrequent).

Well-being of Adolescents: The individual’s psychosocial growth based on certain variables such as: competence, independence, and emotional support. The well-being of
adolescents will be measured as an index of satisfaction with school, decision making ability, confidence, and feelings of being understood and loved. In this study, the well-being of adolescents will be measured by an adaptation of Elder's (1962, 1963) questionnaire explaining the rate of the overall satisfaction with school, daily decisions made in the family, the confidence one has in one's own ideas and decisions, and feelings of being understood and loved by the parents.

Socialization: This is the process by which developing adolescents and parents, through social interaction, acquire the knowledge, attitude, skills, values, and expectations that allow them to become increasingly integrated into their social relationships and that are adaptive to one's culture (Baumrind, 1980; Peterson & Rollins, 1987). In this paper, the parent-child socialization is focused on the reciprocal interaction relationships between the children and parents. Thus, parents can influence children and children can also influence parents (a bidirectional approach).
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

The parent-child socialization process has been viewed as a reciprocal interaction and the family has been viewed as a system or a union to work out the problems existing within families. Within the family, members can establish harmonious relationships by means of communication and support from each other; this has either a direct or an indirect influence on the intraindividual's well-being and growth—either physical, social or psychological. The seriousness of the consequences of the teenagers' development will affect their future growth. Thus, the adolescent's psychosocial growth as a state of well-being could be closely related to effective family functioning and the communication between the adolescents and their parents. It also makes this study important as a social issue worthy of study.

The review of literature focuses on (a) communication, (b) parent behaviors and adolescent outcomes, (c) parenting styles, (d) well-being, and (e) communication and well-being.
Communication

Communication may be viewed as a symbol, transactional process, or, to put it more simply, as the process of creating and sharing meaning (Galvin & Brommel, 1982). It is used as a symbol for the exchange of messages and ideas. The symbol must be understood if the meaning is to be shared by the communicators. That communication is transactional means that when people communicate, they have a mutual impact on one another (Galvin & Brommel, 1982). In short, you do not originate communication, you participate in it (Watzlawick et al., 1967). In so doing, in communicative relationships, all participants are both "affecting or being affected, when one appears to be sending many more messages than the other" (Berger, 1980). The transactional nature of communication reflects the nature of the relationships through the context of the system which one uses to communicate with the other.

Communication is generally accepted as one of the most crucial facets of interpersonal relationships (Barnes & Olson, 1982). The family's communication throughout the adolescent stage represents a crucial factor contributing to the overall family atmosphere (Noller & Bagi, 1985). Although the stage of adolescence can be regarded as a "launching period"—a time when the adolescent strives for increasing independence and, finally, a chance to leave the immediate family system—this stage is also associated
with the adolescent's need for warm and accepting support from the parent (Erikson, 1959). As McGoldrick and Carter (1980) have emphasized, the changes in the family systems should lead to the development of a more age-appropriate relationship between the parents and the adolescent.

Research has shown a relationship between parent-adolescent communication and adolescent self-esteem (Matteson, 1974) as well as adolescent school adjustment (Sporakowski & Eubanks, 1976). Research also has demonstrated the facilitating effects of positive growth-producing communication on self-esteem and well-being (Bachman, 1970; Chartier & Chartier, 1975).

Moving to the more practical level, the significance of effective communication between spouses and within families has been recognized by therapists, researchers and family life educators. Paolino and McCrady (1978) have recommended communication training as an effective intervention for marital maladjustment. There are a great number of people involved in the marriage and family enrichment movement (e.g., Mace, 1977; Sherwood & Scherer, 1975; Van Zoost, 1973) who are incorporating communication skills training into their enrichment programs.

Because of this variety of formulation and the consequent variety of operationalizations of communication, few studies are directly comparable (Barnes & Olson, 1982). Barnes and Olson (1982) stated "Communication has been
studied as a general construct (Navran, 1967); as self-disclosure (Jorgensen & Gaudy, 1980; Levinger & Senn, 1967); as a skill-learning process during therapy (Schreiber, 1966); in terms of different styles or patterns of interaction (Corrales, 1974; Hawkins, et al., 1980; Miller, 1974), or in terms of couple's hesitancy to communicate within the context of a close interpersonal relationship (Powers & Hutchinson, 1979)" (p. 52). The scales of those studies as mentioned above are designed to measure each spouse within the family and by means of self-report.

Barnes and Olson (1982) have designed a measurement focusing on family communication as reported by each of three different members including each spouse and one adolescent within the family. They will each describe the amount of openness, and the extent of problems or barriers to family communication. Indeed, the Parent-Adolescent Communication Scales were used to measure the adolescent's perception of the quality of his or her relationship with mother and father. These scales assess openness of communication, trust and honesty, and the positive or negative emotional tone of interactions between the adolescent's perceptions of interaction with mother and with father. Although theorists have looked at the parent-adolescent relationship in terms of change, weakening, conflict, dissipation and revitalization (Youniss & Smollar, 1985), this relationship has been studied from a unilateral
direction according to internal dynamics, its socializing function, its interpersonal relationships with others and its place in a social-historical evolution. Research has been done in many fields—i.e., behavior change, socialization procedures either in parent-adolescent or peer relations, identity, autonomy, moral development, self-esteem, self-competence and so on from a unilateral direction. The Parent-Adolescent Communication Scales (Barnes & Olson, 1982) are able to help researchers look at the parent-adolescent relationship from a bidirectional dimension.

Parent-adolescent communication seems to be influenced by several factors—individual characteristics, reciprocal relationships with each parent, the family system itself and the cultural milieu. In regard to the parent-child relationships, there has been a movement away from a unidimensional explanation of causality regarding the parent-child relationship (Rollins & Thomas, 1979; Waters & Waters, 1980). Support for this position is most clearly evident in the recent work of Newman and Murray (1983). Moreover, Beiser (1964) and Belsky (1981) asserted that the child's development cannot be adequately understood by a unilateral consideration of parents' influences, but that a consideration of the child's individuality is also required. The research of Thomas et al. (1970) pointed out the influence of the temperament—environment interactional
process in addition to noting the influence of infant temperament on mothers' attitudes and quality of parenting. In addition, Lewis and Rosenblum (1974) have documented the effect of the infant on mother–infant interaction while Buss and Plomin (1975) stressed the importance of compatibility in the temperament of parents and children.

According to Newman and Murray (1983), "To date, research in this bidirectional model has concentrated mainly on infants and young children (Bell, 1971; Bell & Harper, 1977; Buss, 1981; Osofsky & O'Connell, 1982; Yarrow, Warler, & Scott, 1971). There is much less research on parent–adolescent interaction based on this bidirectional model, although there is evidence that the reciprocity continues into the adolescent period" (p. 295).

Moving back to parent–adolescent communication research, there has been no research clearly incorporating a bidirectional model. In fact, there is a notable lack of study concerning the adolescent variable in parent–child communication to view the parent–adolescent relationship in general. A pioneer study of Barnes and Olson (1982) used the parent–adolescent communication scale to take into account the response of multiple family members rather than relying on the perception of a single family member as "representative". This study presented some clear evidence to support this position and demonstrate the value of the family level analysis.
Parent Behaviors and Adolescent Outcomes

The greatest concentration by researchers within the social mold ("parent effects") perspective has been given to the parental characteristics and child-rearing behaviors that influence the social and personality development of children. Much of the research within the social mold perspective has been designed to examine a variety of typologies and dimensions of parental behaviors that predict the personality characteristics of and the social outcomes for children. In a comprehensive literature review of adolescents' autonomous behaviors, Odor (1986) included the following studies as significant research contributions. Baumrind (1971) proposed that the development of autonomy in children is inhibited by overprotective, permissive, and undemanding passively accepting parents. However, autonomy is fostered by those parents who are independent, demanding, and individualistic. Children's behavioral organization is facilitated by clearly labeled acceptable and unacceptable behaviors followed by reasons and verbal discussion.

Parental induction (or love-oriented positive discipline) is an influence attempt by parents that places rational maturity demands on children, offers explanations, and makes children aware that their actions have consequences for others (Hoffman, 1970; Rollins & Thomas, 1979; Steinmetz, 1979). Also, parental induction encourages role taking in children by providing them with information
about the parents' inner experiences, their expectations, and their rationale for their child-rearing actions. It serves as a primary mechanism through which parents communicate, justify, and encourage the internalization of role expectations (Hoffman, 1980). Another parental control attempt, parental coercion (power), is the direct and arbitrary application of force (Hoffman, 1970; Rollins & Thomas, 1979; Steinmetz, 1979). The frequent use of coercion by parents communicates rejection of the child and a low valuation of the child's "self". Children who are exposed to high levels of coercion often develop values and expectations that differ widely from those of their parents.

Elder's (1962) study of sixty ninth- and twelfth-graders revealed that frequent explanations of rules heightened the adolescents' perceptions of reasonable demands. Parental dominance that was excessive was associated with diminished learning of restrictions and obligations. Moderate to low parental power was necessary for effectiveness beyond the family context. According to Elder, practice in decision making and intrinsic direction is essential for both the internal motivation and confidence to govern self (Elder, 1963).

Conger's (1977) study had similar results. Democratic parents encouraged contributions to decision making and responsibility by the adolescent, but autocratic parents did not encourage autonomy. Permissive parents did not
encourage responsibility but enabled autonomy to flourish.

Elder's (1963) large scale study (7400 rural white male and female adolescents in grades 7 through 12) revealed that the most confident and autonomous decision makers had permissive parents who infrequently explained rules. Infrequent rule explanations correlated with less autonomy irrespective of parental power level.

Adolescents were more self confident but were dependent decision makers when their autocratic parents had a high frequency of rule explanation than when their autocratic parents infrequently explained the rules. However, as parental power diminished, frequent explanation of rules facilitated an increase in both self confidence and decision making.

Independent decision makers who lacked confidence were found to have parents who infrequently explained rules and were either autocratic or permissive. These parents were negatively viewed as rejecting and unsympathetic. The children of permissive parents who infrequently explained rules were somewhat more autonomous than the children of autocratic parents.

There was some correlation between frequency of rule explanation in moderate (democratic) to low (permissive) parental power levels and adolescents' confidence and independent decision making. Elder suggests that infrequency of explanation may discourage self confident
decision making and may affect the adolescents' desire for autonomy. Elder's (1963) study was replicated by Enright et al. (1980). The study was based in a large metropolitan area with 168 students in the seventh and eleventh grades. Some sex differences were noted: male autonomy was facilitated by autocratic fathers and mothers but female autonomy was most facilitated by permissive fathers and democratic mothers. Enright et al. attributed this difference between the studies to the operational definitions of autonomy. Elder (1963) assessed autonomy using a one item method. Enright et al. used Kurtines' (1978) more detailed procedure. Social class differences may also have affected the results of these two studies. Differences in parenting behaviors between social classes have been documented by Bronfenbrenner (1958).

Despite the findings of Enright et al. (1980), it is commonly held that high levels of parental power inhibit the development of adolescents' autonomy, especially when used with infrequent explanation. Hoffman's (1960) study revealed that extreme use of power with infrequent explanation was perceived by the child as unreasonable and threatening. Intrinsic controls were not found to be facilitated by this form of parenting.

Rollins and Thomas (1979) also suggest that a high parental power level without explanations inhibits adolescents' responsiveness to the environment and
effectiveness within that environment. This may result in the child's view of self as incapable of impacting on his/her own environment. Rollins and Thomas propose that adolescents' behaviors are positively correlated with the following factors: parental support, power of the same-sexed parent, inductive control attempts, and parent valuing of socially competent behaviors.

Rosen and D'Andrade (1959) found a correlation between poorly adaptive academic orientation and autocratic parents who infrequently used induction. Approximately fifty percent of boys and girls in the seventh through ninth grades (who had parents using these parenting strategies) were ambivalent about completing their high school education.

Scott (1940) also found that poorly adapted children reported their parents to be critical and authoritarian. In Goldin's (1969) literature review, a tendency toward reporting parents as "excessively psychologically controlling" was found in underachievers, withdrawn children, and classroom disrupters. Stierlin (1974) reported clinical findings in disturbed families of a pattern of interference in autonomous behaviors by family members. Impediments to independent perceptions and cognitions are frequently exhibited.
Parenting Styles

Over the past four decades, research in the parent-child relationship has concerned itself, primarily, with two critical parental behaviors—(a) control techniques, and (b) parental support (Rollins & Thomas, 1979). Elder (1962) developed a measure of parent socialization behaviors which has been used extensively as an index of parenting style (e.g., Elder, 1963, 1965, 1971; Enright, Lapsley, Drivas, & Fehr, 1980; Lesser & Kandel, 1969, Murray, 1984; Odor, 1986). This scale has been and continues to provide a prototypic measure of alternative parenting styles and their hypothesized resultant effect on adolescent behavior (Enright, et al., 1980).

Elder (1963) studied the effects of three levels of parental power combined with either high or low frequency of parental explanation of rules (induction) on adolescent behavior and reactions to their parents. The three levels of parental power are autocratic (high power), democratic (medium power), and permissive (low power). These combinations comprised six different parenting styles.
Parental Power

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Autocratic</th>
<th>Democratic</th>
<th>Permissive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n d</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t u</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a c</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l t</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1: PARENTAL POWER BY INDUCTION GRID

Although Elder's measure of structural differences in parent-adolescent socialization practices focus primarily upon what Rollins and Thomas (1979) categorize as "control attempts", Elder (1963) postulates that the use of frequent explanation by parents is an induction substantiated by the finding that measures of support and use of legitimate power or inductive control attempts are moderately correlated (Hoffman, 1980; Thomas, et al., 1974). Thus, although the majority of works in the study of the adolescent's role in family decision making (e.g., Elder, 1962, 1963; Enright, Lapsley, Drivas, & Fehr, 1980; Harris & Howard, 1981) and parental power (e.g., Gecas, 1971; McDonald, 1977) have relied strictly upon the responses of adolescents as an indication of parental behavior, those measures appear to capture the essence of the two parent variables studied in the parent-child socialization literature over the past four decades.
Furthermore, in addition to Elder's work, Baumrind (1971) presents a thorough evaluation, using eight types of parenting styles, authoritarian, authoritative, authoritative nonconforming, nonconforming, nonconforming permissive, permissive, rejecting-neglecting and authoritarian-rejecting-neglecting. From a large number of specific behaviors obtained from the Parent Behavior Rating Scales, a cluster analysis was used to obtain separate summary variable scores for fathers and mothers on each cluster of parental behaviors. Following this, the Circumplex Model of Marital and Family Systems (i.e., Olson, Russell, & Sprenkle, 1979, 1980, 1983) provides a typology for classifying families. Studies of parent-child socialization practices have typically focused on specific child behaviors in terms of cognitive development (e.g., Altman, 1973; Copper, Grotevant, Moore, & Condon, 1982; Grotevant & Cooper, 1983; Heilbrun, Harrell, & Gillard, 1967; Heilbrun, Orr, & Harrell, 1966; Steinberg & Hill, 1978), creativity (e.g., Dreyer & Wells, 1966; Heilburn, 1971), moral behavior (e.g., Hoffman, 1963; Hoffman & Saltzstein, 1967; Murray, 1984), ego development (e.g., Odor, 1986), self-esteem (e.g., Coopersmith, 1967; Gecas, 1969, 1971; Thomas et al., 1974), instrumental competence in children (e.g., Baumrind, 1967; Baumrind & Black, 1967), behavior problems in children (e.g., Apperson, 1961; Weiss, 1965), drug abuse (e.g., Bender, 1974; Hunt, 1972), academic
achievement (e.g., Becker, 1970; Miller, 1967) and parent-adolescent communication (e.g., Barnes & Olson 1985). Yet it has been suggested (Kelman, 1958) that comparable behavior patterns may result from a wide range of seemingly incompatible motivations and influences. For example, adolescent autonomy as measured by Elder (1963) may reflect either anti-social rebellion or the culturally valued and adaptive process of individualization from parents (Josselson, 1980) for older adolescents.

Well-being

Well-being is defined as welfare, health, happiness or prosperity (Hornby, 1982). Well-being in this study is defined as the quality of psychosocial growth. Moreover, well-being in this study is focused on the psychosocial growth through family functions as a system. It can be better explained from the theory employed as the family system. From the family structure perspective, or family system theory, scholars such as Haley (1980), Hoffman (1981), Minuchin, Rosman, & Baker (1978), tend to understand adolescents' behavior by viewing them within the context of family structure, interaction, and relationships. From this perspective, every member within the family structure works out the problems he or she encounters and participates in the family affairs as an active participant to stabilize the whole system and to solve problematic behaviors. In
addition, Farber's (1964) concepts in assessing such a family in terms of "closed" and "opened" systems further provides more information in the triadic interaction between the parents and the child. When a child enters this dyadic relationship between the couple, there is a family system established as a triadic relationship. Closed systems tend to duplicate themselves, and a closed system is maintained by fostering isolation, preseveration, slow turnover, and sentimental factors which include the emotional ties between the parents and children. In contrast to the family viewed as a closed system, the family as a open system has a more permeable boundary between the family and forces outside the family, and is much fluid in operation. Change, reform, and deviance would be more common in open systems (Schvaneveldt & Ihinger, 1979, p. 457). Traditional adolescents' studies have been focused on comparisons between normal families--two intact parents and their children together, and single-parent families or remarried families, in the child's birth order, in family size, or in the types of roles children perform in contrast to siblings. More recently, attention has been focused on the degree of cohesion (emotional compatibility or dissonance) between members of the family in terms of both levels of power as well as the impact coalitions or subgroups have concerning behavior patterns (Leigh & Peterson, 1986).
Cohesion is a concept concerned with levels of emotional attachment between family members. It is also used as a means of identifying various levels of emotional bonding, spacing, or distancing (i.e., Olson, Sprenkle, & Russell, 1979) within the family. It refers directly to the degree of warmth and attachment experienced by family members (Olson, Russell, & Sprenkle, 1983). Disengagement and enmeshment are the terms used to define the extreme levels of a cohesion continuum (Minuchin, 1974). Applying these terms to adolescent studies, Garmezy and Rutter (1983) stated that in disengaged relationships with parents or families, adolescents would feel little of the support and emotional attachment that is still important for them. However, with enmeshed relationships or families there is little space for the emergence of autonomy and individual identity, both of which are significant developments for adolescents (Grotevant, 1983; Leigh & Peterson, 1986; Marcia, 1980; Minuchin, Rosman, & Baker, 1978). Thus, too little or too much cohesion or closeness may cause some problems for adolescents. A balance in the degree of emotional closeness will allow for some support and cohesion while also allowing for individual development within the family system. However, the degree of closeness may even vary during adolescence, beginning closer to the enmeshed area in pre- and early adolescence and ending closer to the disengaged area of the cohesion continuum when adolescents
leave home so that they may develop autonomy or independence (Olson, et al., 1983). In this study well-being is going to be examined from the perspective that emotional bonding or support is a part of adolescent well-being in relation to parent-communication and parenting styles.

The aim of this study is to look at the adolescents' psychosocial well-being as an index of satisfaction with schools, decision making, confidence, and feelings of being understood as well as loved, all of which are crucial to the individual's psychosocial growth. In this study, well-being will be measured as a dependent variable influenced by the family structure, specifically parenting styles, and parent-adolescent communication—focusing on a positive or supportive perspective in contrast to a negative (problem) or defensive perspective. Also, well-being will be analyzed to see developmental changes and gender differences as a pattern of the adolescents' psychosocial growth.

Well-being has been examined from several theoretical perspectives—biological, psychodynamic, social and cognitive. From the biological perspective, the important somatic changes have been examined which occur during the second decade of life and the many classical speculations about concurrent and lasting impacts of parental change (cf. Blos, 1962; A. Freud, 1958; Hall, 1904). Empirical studies concerning the intraindividual's biological change could be very important in increasing our understanding of
early adolescence, especially the adolescents' psychosocial adaptation to biological status and biological changes. In the first early studies—the cross-sectional study (Steinberg & Hill, 1978) and the longitudinal follow-up (Steinberg, 1981) of the earlier cross-sectional study, Steinberg (1981) found that changes in sons' pubertal status was systematically associated with both adolescents and parental behavior in a Structured Family Interaction Task (SFIT). Also, he found there were some differences between fathers and mothers about parental attitudes in facing their sons' puberty change. Mothers seemed to interrupt more at the peak of pubertal change than earlier or later in the pubertal cycle. With increasing maturity, sons interrupted their mothers more, deferred to them less and both sons and mothers explained themselves less. After the pubertal apex, mothers also deferred more to sons. In contrast, with greater maturity, sons interrupted their fathers less and deferred to them more and fathers interrupted their sons more and deferred to them less. Also, fathers provided more explanations as the sons matured to the apex of pubertal growth and then fewer as sons continued mature (a quadratic trend). Moreover, Steinberg (1987) indicated that adolescents, because of puberty and body change, will tend to argue more with parents even in mundane matters—e.g., taking out the garbage, coming home on time, or cleaning up the bedroom.
It seems fairly well accepted that the presence of adolescents is disruptive to families. Noller and Callen (1986) and Steinberg (1987) quote studies which found that at each stage where adolescents were in the family, marital and family satisfaction was lower and family stress was higher than at any other stage. Moreover, physical growth at puberty provides concrete evidence that one phase of life is coming to a close and a new phase is beginning. As Lewin has pointed out, "Changes in the inner-personal region, including body boundaries, physical strength, and sexual impulses, may produce uncertainty and anxiety" (Newman & Newman, 1986).

From the psychodynamic perspective, during early adolescence an individual must confront tumultuous intrapsychic energies and a demanding social world, both of which cause dramatic alterations in the self-concept (Savin-Williams & Demo, 1984). This characterization is the classical portrait subscribed to by many clinicians and parents, buttressed in large part by early theorists of adolescent development (cf. Blos, 1962; Freud, 1948, 1958; Hall, 1904). Self-esteem reaches an all-time low, fluctuating from one moment to another during these stressful years.

The existing literature on adolescence reveals several sources of stress to which adolescents find themselves vulnerable in their ongoing social interactions. The stress
emanating from the family, school, and peer groups are considered to be of particular relevance (Breton, 1972; Elkin & Handel, 1978; Glynn, 1981). In addition, Siddique and D'Arcy (1984) pointed out that, in general, adolescence is indeed a period in the life span which contains certain difficulties and developmental stresses involving major adaptations, but the full-blown storm and stress syndrome appears to be relatively limited. They indicated that the majority of adolescents seem to get along well with adults and can cope effectively with demands of school and peer groups. Adolescents also use their resources to make adjustments to environmental stressors. Nevertheless, a significant minority of adolescents do experience problems, distress and turmoil.

From the social and cognitive perspective, psychosocial theory provides the best explanation of social and cognitive components involving the individual's intimate relationships. The impact of stress factors on the psychosocial development of adolescents has been the catalyst for a long-standing debate. Some studies (e.g., Coleman, 1961; Epperson, 1964; Jahoda & Warren, 1965) present persuasive evidence calling into question the centrality of peer groups in a teenager's life. Other studies (e.g., Elkin & Westley, 1955; Jenck et al., 1972) indicate that the family continues to be the major impact during the adolescent transition. Moreover, Rutter and his
colleagues (1979, 1980) seem to accept that the family influence and schooling both affect the adolescent’s psychosocial growth and health.

In sum, any dissatisfactions with the quality of family life, e.g., communication problems with parents, fear of their disapproval, lack of intimacy and intrafamily conflict, are likely to be viewed with greater alarm and may be expressed in an emotionally charged manner.

Theory on adolescents’ well-being is equally diverse. Four broad perspectives—biological, psychodynamic, socialization and cognitive—have spawned specific theories with a variety of emphases and themes. These concepts have helped me integrate ideas such as whether or not the well-being of adolescents changes from the developmental point of view; whether or not the well-being of adolescents differentiates across the age and gender of adolescents; and whether or not the well-being of adolescents relates to the family system. These family systems include parenting models or parent-adolescent dyads of communication.

From the biological perspective, Steinberg (1987) pointed out that studies of early adolescence—the years from 10 to 13—revealed that puberty plays a central role in triggering parent-adolescent conflict. Specifically, as youngsters develop toward maturity, bickering and squabbling with parents increase. Psychoanalytic conceptualizations in particular have portrayed adolescence as a time of storm and
stress, during which autonomy can be achieved only by breaking away from the parents and severing infantile object ties (Blos, 1979; Coleman, 1977). However, the opposite view, that adolescence is a placid time marked in most families by little parent-adolescent conflict and by strong agreement on basic value, has been taken by some researchers working with a non-clinical population (Offer, 1969; Offer et al., 1981). In addition, from the cognitive and interpersonal perspective, Youniss (1980) derived his perspective from the writing of Piaget (1932) and Sullivan (1953). According to their perspective, children experience life in two general relationships— one with parents, the other with peers and friends. Experience here is psychological; that is, the focus is on the meaning of the interaction. The two patterns were experiences based on greater authority and expertise with parents (unilateral), and negotiation and co-construction with peers (mutual) (Hunter, 1984). The structure called unilateral authority means that parents know how children should act and that they want children to learn a desired behavior. It means that children acknowledge their parents' authority and take a position that is complementary to it (Hinde, 1979).

Dimensions of Well-being

In this study, the well-being of adolescents is defined within a psychosocial perspective based on the following variables: competence, independence, and emotional support.
Competence Competence may be expressed as a feeling of effectiveness and skill in any number of specific areas. It represents a central developmental issue which requires the energy of the person toward the end of childhood and into adolescence (White, 1960). Psychosocial theory suggests that toward the end of middle school age (8-12) a person's fundamental attitude toward work is established. Each new skill the child acquires helps him feel independent and brings new responsibilities which increase his sense of worth. The child evolves an initial assessment of whether or not he will be able to make a contribution to his immediate social community (Erikson, 1959; Newman & Newman, 1976).

The outcome of the crisis of industry versus inferiority will have direct implications for the young person's ability to master the tasks of early adolescence (Newman & Newman, 1978). A child who has a positive attitude toward work and confidence in his own skills will approach the developmental tasks of early adolescence with an achievement orientation.

Independence Psychologists who study adolescence agree that the establishment of a psychological sense of independence is a central issue during this life stage (Newman & Newman, 1978). Gold and Douvan (1969) state that the adolescents must continue to be a son or daughter and meet the obligations the role imposes, while at the same
time abandoning the role of dependent child and gradually assuming the position of independent autonomous adult. This same notion is presented by Blos (1968) as an abandonment of infantile identification (Newman & Newman, 1978). In addition, Douvan and Adelson (1966) postulated that adolescents report overt signs of independence from home: they make decisions about clothes, or dating; they have cars; they stay out late. But they maintain the attachment to their families emotionally and in their value orientation. In sum, adolescents during this life stage desire to make their own decisions concerning anything which makes them feel independent, while they still hold an attachment to their families and regard the parents' value.

Emotional Support. Few of us would disagree with the notion that the family is an important context for individual development. In looking at the family context of early adolescence, there is considerable agreement among scholars that as youngsters proceed through the teenage years, they move toward greater autonomy in their relationships with their parents (Conger & Petersen, 1984; Richardson, 1984). At times, this change in the parent-adolescent relationship may lead to increased conflict (Montemayor, 1982). Yet, in most cases, such family discord probably occurs alongside family harmony. Therefore, in thinking about psychosocial well-being adjustments in adolescence, we need to consider that overall quality of the
Parent-adolescent relationship quality may be determined by two dimensions: support and restrictiveness. Parental support in the form of listening to problems and suggesting solutions has been found to be associated with greater satisfaction with the parent-adolescent relationship as well as greater mental and physical well-being among adolescents (Burke & Weir, 1979). In so doing, adolescents will achieve a positive emotional development—i.e., feelings of being understood and loved by parents. Indeed, several empirical investigations indicate that parental support, encouragement, and affection are positively related to the child's self-esteem (Bachman, 1970; Coopersmith, 1967; Gecas, 1971; Rosenberg, 1965).

Based on the above variables, in this study I intend to create the adolescent's psychosocial well-being index including satisfaction with school, confidence about self, decision making, and feelings of being understood and loved by parents.

**Communication and Well-being**

Communication is a crucial aspect of interpersonal relationships. Two major types of support—emotional and instrumental—can be provided through communication (Cobb, 1976). Walker and Greene (1986) found that communication with parents made significant contributions to the self-
esteem of adolescents. This study implied that the more positive open communication developed by the parent-adolescent dyad, the higher the level adolescents' well-being (self-esteem) may be expected. It seems that the quality of the relationship with one's parents continues to influence self-esteem after the child becomes an adolescent. In addition, the Offer et al. study (1982) illustrated the importance of parent-adolescent congruence for adolescent adjustment. When parents agreed about the items on the questionnaire, the child's vocational and educational goals were higher. There was also a positive relationship between parent-child congruence and the child's self image.

Extending this notion to parent-adolescent communication, it can be inferred that if the parent-adolescent communication is more positively open, the adolescent's sense of well-being will be greater? Willingness to communicate, and to be open and supportive of the other's ideas are critical components in increasing the adolescent's well-being and the quality of adolescent-parent relationship. Also, Bell and Avery (1985) indicated a significant positive relationship between family bonds and the social competence measures, which included social self-esteem, instrumentality, expressiveness, shyness and the degree of satisfaction/ease in same- and opposite-sex peer relationships.
Summary

A review of the literature suggested that adolescence may be a time of increased stress among family members as a result of changes within the adolescent, the parents, and the family system. As the adolescent's age increases, it could be expected that he/she would have an increased sense of independence or autonomy. However, as the adolescent's age increases, it could also be expected that he/she would have decreased the number and magnitude of emotional ties with parents and would have increased the sources of support from outside of the family. In addition, a review of the literature has suggested that the family's quality of communication throughout adolescence represents a crucial factor contributing to the overall family atmosphere.

A review of the literature has also suggested that adolescent development is related to certain socialization behaviors of parents. When parents clearly label specific behaviors as acceptable or unacceptable and exercise moderate to low amounts of power, adolescents are better able to organize and control their behavior independent of their parents. When parents exercise high levels of power, adolescents tend toward developing an external moral orientation based on fear of detection and punishment. However, parental use of induction has been found to be directly related to an increased level of internal moral orientation in the adolescent and its subsequent evidence of
that orientation in patterns of behavior.

The parental parenting styles have been found to be related to greater involvement in the adolescent's academic achievement, his/her self-esteem, and parent-adolescent communication.

Frequent use of induction by parents encouraged a child's confidence and independence in decision-making, but only when used with moderate to low levels of parental power. Since confidence and independence in decision-making are conceptually linked to higher levels of psychosocial well-being in the adolescent, it may be expected that frequent parental induction will also be related to higher levels of adolescents' well-being, especially when accompanied by moderate to low levels of parental power.

Because the parent-child socialization process, especially those of infants and young children, is made evident in a reciprocal level of relationship (through a bidirectional influence), it may be assumed that the socialization process influences, and is influenced by, the level and quality of communication between the parent and the adolescent.
CHAPTER III
METHODOLOGY

The purpose of this study was to explore the relationship between parents and adolescents with special focus on the quality of parent-adolescent communication, parenting styles, and adolescents' psychosocial well-being.

Data for this study are part of a larger project entitled "Changing Characteristics of the Parent-Child Relationship during Adolescence" conducted by Dr. Barbara M. Newman and funded by the Ohio Agricultural Research and Development Center (H-713). This is a longitudinal exploratory study that is examining the dimensions of family power, organization, love, communication, independence, and person-perception in families of adolescents. The author of this dissertation has been a member of the research team since the first data-collection phase of the study was completed. Also, the author of this dissertation has been a member of the research team during the second data-collection phase of the study in order to carry out the longitudinal investigation.
Sample Selection

The research consisted of Time 1 and Time 2 data. Subjects at Time 1 were 110 adolescents and their parents living in Franklin County, Ohio, and subjects in Time 2 were 102 adolescents and their parents also living in Franklin County, Ohio. The second data collection occurred three years later. At Time 1, to be included in this study the oldest child must have been in one of three age groups; 11 years (ranging from 10 years, 10 months to 12 years, 2 months); 14 years (13 years, 10 months to 15 years, 2 months); or 17 years (16 years, 10 months to 18 years, 2 months). For each age group a minimum of 15 families with oldest males and 15 families with oldest females were included. However, at Time 2 data for inclusion in this study, the oldest child must have been in one of three age groups; 11 years (ranging from 10 years, 4 months to 12 years, 11 months); 14 years (13 years, 9 months to 16 years, 7 months); or 17 years (16 years, 10 months to 19 years, 11 months). At Time 1, one hundred and ten families responded (36%) by completing the questionnaires and finishing the interview; at Time 2, forty-three newly selected families with their child aged 11 responded (39%) by completing questionnaires and finishing the interview. For each group a minimum of 10 families with oldest males and 10 families with oldest females were included. This non-random sample was selected from church and school directories, sports team
lists, and suggestion made by graduate students and other participants in the study. The data at Time 1 were collected from August 1, 1982 through April 1, 1984, and the data at Time 2 were collected from December 20, 1986 through July 30, 1987. The children at these two data-collections at the ages of 11, 14, or 17 years were interviewed by a same-sexed member of the research team at home along with their two parents. Adolescents were oldest or only children. Families were predominantly intact, although in some cases, families with step-parents were included if they had been married for at least 5 years.

Subjects

The sample was composed of 43 families with children 11 years old (24 males and 19 females); 36 families with children 14 years old (19 males and 17 females); and 31 families with children 17 years old (16 males and 15 females). Three years later, the sample consisted of 43 families with 11 year old children (22 males and 21 females) who were newly selected as an 11 year old group; 33 families with 14 year old children (21 males and 12 females) who were 11 year old children at Time 1; and 26 families with 17 year old children (16 males and 10 females) who were 14 year old children at Time 1.
Data Collection Procedures

The research proposal was approved by the Human Subjects Review committee of the Ohio State University (Appendix A). The families with 14 and 17 year-olds were contacted through the telephone call from one of two graduate research associates to determine whether or not they were still interested in the follow-up investigation. Because they had moved, were too busy, or were not interested, some families with the 14 or 17 year-olds dropped out from this study. Each newly selected family with the 11 year-olds was mailed a letter of introduction, inviting them to participate in the study (Appendix B). This letter was followed by a telephone call from one of two graduate associates involved in the project to allow them the opportunity to ask further questions, and to set up time for an interview. Interviews were conducted within the families' own homes with all three members present.

The complete interview took an average of two hours to complete. Interviews generally were conducted during a weekday evening or on a weekend. Prior to the interview, consent forms were completed (Appendix C). During the interview, questionnaires were administered to both the adolescent and his/her parents by a graduate associate (Appendix D & E). Sex of adolescent and interviewer were matched to reduced the anxiety level of the adolescent (cf. Olson & Cromwell, 1975). Family members were usually seated
at a table and requested to keep their written answers confidential. Questionnaires were individually collected upon completion. This seating arrangement was also advantageous when tape recording the family moral dilemma discussion following the questionnaire (Appendix F).

**Instrumentation and Measures**

Data were collected from the adolescents and their parents through a paper and pencil questionnaire designed by Dr. Barbara M. Newman. The questionnaire used in this study was composed of standard demographic and family background questions, as well as fixed alternative questions from Elder's (1962, 1963) work on decision making, family authority, and child rearing structure. In Elder's (1962, 1963) inventory, self-confidence, satisfaction with school, decision making ability and feelings of being understood and loved made an index of the well-being of adolescents, which was included as the dependent variable measure. Also, a scale based on the parent-adolescent communication (Barnes & Olson, 1982) was included as the dependent variable measure. Other than these, the unique sex and age group and the different patterns of family organization (i.e., parenting styles) were included as independent variables.

For the independent and dependent variables, the independent variables were sex, which was uniquely manipulated in the sample, age group, which was naturally
manipulated by the birth data, parenting styles, which were measured as six levels—high power (autocratic) and high frequency of induction, medium power (democratic) and high frequency of induction, low power (permissive), and high frequency of induction, high power (autocratic) and low frequency of induction, medium power (democratic), and low frequency of induction, and low power (permissive) and low frequency of induction—with regard to the power used within the families and rules governed within the families. The dependent variables were measured in this study as follows:

**Parent-Adolescent Communication**

The parent-adolescent communication scale (PACS) was designed by Barnes and Olson (1982) to measure the aspects of family communication as experienced by each spouse and one adolescent. The PACS initially consisted of thirty-five items selected for testing in a pilot-study. On the basis of the factor analysis, the PACS was reduced from 35 to 20 items. The PACS consisted of two subscales which each tapped both content and process issues. The first subscale, open Family Communication, measured the more positive aspects of parent-adolescent communication. The focus was on the freedom or free flowing exchange of information, both factual and emotional as well as on the sense of lack of constraint and degree of understanding and satisfaction experienced in their interactions. The second subscale, Problems in Family Communication, focused on the negative
aspects of communication, hesitancy to share, negative styles of interaction, and selectivity and caution in what was shared. An example of the Open Family Communication was "I am very satisfied with now my (mother/father, or adolescent) and I talk together". And an example of Problems in Family Communication was "My (mother/father, child) has a tendency to say things to me which would be better left unsaid". The summation of these two subscales was a total score which indicated the overall parent-adolescent communication.

The PACS has been shown to have high Cronbach's Alpha used to compute the internal consistency reliability of the final factors and scales. The alpha reliability was .87 for Open Family Communication, .78 for Problems in Family Communication and .88 for the Total Scale. The results indicated that the two subscales and the total scale were very reliable. Test-retest reliability was also high for each of three categories: Open Family Communication; .77 for Problem in Family Communication; and .60 for Total Score. Scoring of the PACS of the family was based on items from the two subscales which are intermingled on the questionnaire (see #28 on Appendix D and #26 and #27 on Appendix E). The total score was basically a sum score, but it was necessary to distinguish items from the two subscales. Open Family Communication was a sum score of items 1, 3, 6, 7, 8, 9, 13, 14, 16, 17. The subscale of
Problems in Family Communication needed to be flipped in point value. This could be accomplished in three different ways: by changing every 5 to 1 and 4 to 2 on these 10 items; by subtracting each response value from 6 and using the resulting difference or by adding the point value of all the items on this subscale and subtracting this total from 60. These items were 2, 4, 5, 10, 11, 12, 15, 18, 19, and 20.

In this investigation, the subscale of Problems in Family Communication was used to add all the items on this subscale and to subtract this total from 60. Recall that the scores on the problems scale were reversed such that a high score indicated a lack of communication problems.

Although the scale items were common, the responses varied considerably among family members. In order to reflect these differences, the norms of four different subdivisions need to be included: 1) fathers' reporting an interaction with the adolescent; 2) mothers' reports; 3) adolescents' reports regarding their mothers; and 4) adolescents' reports about interactions with their fathers.

Parenting Styles

Elder's (1962, 1963) testing procedure is a brief fixed alternative inventory developed to measure parental power in child rearing practices and its effect on the adolescent. Responses have typically been collected from adolescents alone, without inclusion of parental reports. Items address such areas as child rearing structure, frequency of parental
explanation for rules, compliance with parental requests, desire to role model the parents, behavioral autonomy, and adolescent self-confidence and self-reliance in decision making.

Enright et al., (1980) state "Reliability estimates of this testing procedure have not generally been calculated because of its nominal structure and small number of items (p. 532)". However, Enright et al., argue that it appears to have considerable face validity. Elder's procedure has been extensively used as an index of parenting styles (Elder, 1962, 1963, 1965, 1971; Enright et al., 1980; Lesser & Kandel, 1969; Murray, 1984) and is frequently cited as the child rearing typologies (Baumrind, 1971; Rollins & Thomas, 1979).

Items from Elder's work were included in this study as measures of level of parental authority or power as decision making as well as parental use of induction as rules governed. These two of Elder's questions were also asked with regard to each parent (See #10 to #13 in Appendix E). These items were also scored by two members of the research team and were used as part of their doctoral dissertations (Murray, 1984; Odor, 1986).

Using only the adolescent's perceptions, measures of the child rearing environment consisted of two five-points items, one assessing the mother's power in child rearing and the other assessing the father's power (Elder, 1962, 1963).
The child rearing environment involving each parent was originally measured by Elder on two items (one in relation to the father and the other in relation to the mother) using a seven-point scale ranging from "autocratic" to "ignoring" (1962) but later (1963) condensed to three points ranging from "autocratic" to "permissive". However, for the purpose of this study an intermediate range for assessing child rearing structure (environment) was used, consisting of a five-point scale ranging from "autocratic" to "permissive". This measure erased the "ignoring" category in which Elder (1962) found very small percentages of parents and which showed no meaningful differences in analyses. The item indicating a democratic pattern was rephrased as "my (mother/ father) makes the decision but not without considering my opinions," which incorporates Elder's two original items for authoritarian and democratic styles and reflects his latter categorization. The equalitarian style was rephrased as "We arrive at decision together." Since reliability estimates of this testing procedure generally have not been calculated, at Time 1 data an internal reliability coefficient using Cronbach's Alpha of .69 was obtained for these two item scales, suggesting that there is some consistency between adolescents' views of their mothers' and fathers' pattern of authority or power in child rearing. However, at Time 2 data, these two items were categorized into three: autocratic (high parental power),
democratic (medium parental power) and permissive (low parental power). The category "autocratic" indicated a pattern rephrased as "my father/mother just tells me what to do" or "my father/mother makes the decision, but not without considering my opinions". The category "democratic" indicated a pattern rephrased as "We arrive at decision together", and the category "permissive" indicated a pattern rephrased as "I can make my own decision but my father/mother would like me to consider his/her opinions" and "I can do what I want regardless of what my father/mother thinks".

For the induction (rules governed), the first model was based upon the adolescent’s perceptions. Frequency of parental explanations was assessed for each parent using a five-point scale, ranging from "never" to "yes, always" (Elder, 1962, 1963). This first model consisted of two items and obtained a Cronbach’s Alpha of .63. In this study, frequency of parental explanation of rules and restrictions (induction) was categorized into two: low frequency of induction and high frequency of induction. Low frequency of induction indicated a pattern answered as "never", "once in a while", and "sometimes". High frequency of induction indicated a pattern answered as "usually" and "always".

Taken together with power and induction, a typology of parenting styles can be established. Six categories can be
obtained: High Parental Power (Autocratic) and High Frequency of Induction, High Parental Power (Autocratic) and Low Frequency of Induction, Medium Parental Power (Democratic) and High Frequency of Induction, Medium Parental Power (Democratic) and Low Frequency of Induction, Low Parental Power (Permissive) and High Frequency of Induction, and Low Parental Power (Permissive) and Low Frequency of Induction.

Well-being

The scale for adolescent's perception of well-being was composed of seven items; a five-point item assessing the degree in which he or she was satisfied with school, a four-point item assessing the number of persons involved in family daily decisions, a four-point item indicating the adolescent's perception of self-confidence, two five-point items representing the degree to which the adolescent feels each parent understands him/her, and two four-point items describing the perceived level of love in the relationship of the adolescent and each parent.

This index referred to the Time 1 data conducted by a part of Murray's doctoral dissertation (1984). In her dissertation, she used two models explaining the autonomy and support. Using the adolescent's perceptions originally consisted of three four-point items which assessed level of behavioral autonomy in decision making (Elder, 1962, 1963). For this model, an internal reliability coefficient of .73
was achieved. The scale for adolescent's perception of family support was composed of nine items: a four-point item assessing the number of persons involved in family daily decision making, two five-point items indicating the adolescent's perception of desirability of each parent as a role model, four five-point items which represented the degree to which the adolescent feels each parent understands him/her and the adolescent's perception of his/her level of understanding the parent, and two four-point items which described the perceived level of love in the relationship of the adolescent and each parent. Using a principle components analysis, these nine items loaded heavily on one factor (see Table 1). For this model of support a Cronbach's Alpha of .73 was obtained. However, for the present model of well-being of adolescents, self-confidence and satisfaction with school were combined with Murray's measures of autonomy and support (including decision making as well as feelings of being understood and loved) to combine an overall measure of adolescents' psychosocial growth—well-being.

**Data Analyses**

To investigate the demographic variables, measures of frequency, means, and analysis of variance techniques (ANOVA) were used. These techniques assessed whether any age level differences (11 years, 14 years, and 17 years)
### Table 1

**Factor Analysis of Adolescents' Perception of Support**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Support Items</th>
<th>Factor I</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participation in Decision Making</td>
<td>0.4728</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desirability of Mother as</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role Model</td>
<td>0.6781</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desirability of Father as</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role Model</td>
<td>0.6943</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adolescent's Level of Understanding on Mother</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother's Level of Understanding of Adolescent</td>
<td>0.7048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adolescent's Level of Understanding of Father</td>
<td>0.4211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father's Level of Understanding of Adolescent</td>
<td>0.4246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feeling of Love with Mother</td>
<td>0.6041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feeling of Love with Father</td>
<td>0.3749</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Variance Explained by Factor I = 2.9361
existed within the five major variables of this study, such as years married at birth of child, age at birth of child on parents, and years of parents on parents. For the typology of parenting styles, parental power and induction were measured by adolescent's responses to two questions originally used by Elder (1962, 1963). The five levels of responses were gathered as a typology of parenting styles which indicated three levels of parenting power (autocratic, democratic, and permissive) and two levels of induction (frequent or infrequent). Appendix G illustrates how responses were divided.

In order to get the bidirectional analysis, multiple family member data is required. Other than this, the data manipulation procedures employed in this study utilized the discrete model using the adolescents' perceptions. Analyses of data in this study are referred to as a sequence design including cross-sectional comparisons, longitudinal comparisons, bidirectional analysis and cohort difference analysis. To answer Research Questions 1-5, measures of analysis of variance techniques (ANOVA) were used to analyze the age-level and gender differences across the parent-adolescent dyads relationships and the multicollinearity between and among the demographic variables, dependent variables, and independent variables. The Research Questions 6-9 were longitudinal analyses. The use of a paired t-test analysis was planned to analyze Research Question 6 in order
to obtain the difference within the time change. A chi-square test was used to answer Research Question 7 in order to obtain the difference of adolescents' perception in the parenting style. A Pearson's product moment correlation coefficient ($r$) analysis was used to answer Research Question 8 in order to see the relationship between these two dependent variables and also a regression model was planned to look at the prediction of the linear trend. The one-way repeated measures ANOVA was utilized to analyze Research Question 9 in order to get the difference between the category of parenting styles at Time 1 and the parent-adolescent communication at Time 2. For Research Questions 10-13 of the bidirectional analyses, a Pearson's product moment correlation coefficient ($r$) was used to analyze Research Question 10-11 in order to test the relationships between the two variables and a regression model was also utilized to predict the linear trend. However, because the parenting style is a category, a use of one-way ANOVA and a use of chi-square were planned to analyze Research Questions 12 and 13 in order to see whether or not the parenting styles at Time 1 influenced well-being of adolescents at Time 2, and whether or not well-being of adolescents at Time 1 influenced the parenting styles at Time 2. For the different cohort data in Research Questions 14 and 16, a two-sample t-test analysis was used to check differences between these two data sets. While in Research Question 15,
a chi-square test was utilized to check differences between
the two data sets.

For all the statistical techniques utilized to analyze
the data in this study, an alpha (level of significance) of
.05 was used. The Statistical Analyses System (SAS, 1982)
was used in each analysis.

Limitations

The sample of this investigation consisted of intact
white, non-rural families having an oldest child at the age
of 11, 14, or 17 years and it was also found that the sample
included mostly middle-class families. Generalizations to
single parent, minority, rural, non-middle-class or
different-culture families should be made with caution. In
addition, this sample was not chosen at random. Because of
this non-random sample selected from limited affiliation,
such as church, school directories, sports team lists or
suggestions made by other participants, many subjects knew
members of at least one other family within the sample.
This may result in a highly homogeneous sample.

Families who participated in the study may also be
different from those who declined to participate. Murray
(1984) and Odor (1986) suggested that families may have
depressed to participate because they were too busy, not
interested, less invested in family roles, protective of
their privacy, or experiencing a significant amount of
parent-adolescent conflict.

Families who participated in this study showed their interests or enthusiasm; however, there may have been a problem with fatigue about the interview scheduled in weekday evenings. This problem was most likely to occur with adolescents or those adults who arrived home from work or school or sport team at a late hour (7 pm - 8:30 pm) just in time to participate in the interview. Also, this interview needed an average of two hours to finish the questionnaire and tape recording, which seemed to have been a burden for their schedule. That could have altered their attitudes from those who scheduled interviews on weekends because they may have had enough time to review the questionnaire and/or did not have the same level of fatigue.

Because of the second data following procedure of Time I data, the loss of families in the age group of 14 and 17 years resulted in the small number of families and limited data analysis, although in the data analysis, the demographic variables showed no differences in these three age groups. With a different number of persons allocated in sex and age-level cells (see Table 2), attention to such issues as the interactive effects of sex and age was inappropriate when using the multivariate approach. Sample size also limited the comparisons of families with employed mothers and with those families in which mothers were full-time homemakers, or the comparison of step-families with
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic Variables</th>
<th>11 Years (n=43)</th>
<th>14 Years (n=36)</th>
<th>17 Years (n=31)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sex of Adolescent</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Years Married at</strong></td>
<td>$\bar{x}$ 4.21</td>
<td>$\bar{x}$ 3.42</td>
<td>$\bar{x}$ 4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birth of Child</td>
<td>S.D. 2.39</td>
<td>S.D. 2.41</td>
<td>S.D. 6.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age at Birth of Child</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father</td>
<td>$\bar{x}$ 28.63</td>
<td>$\bar{x}$ 27.61</td>
<td>$\bar{x}$ 29.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S.D. 4.24</td>
<td>S.D. 4.62</td>
<td>S.D. 5.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>$\bar{x}$ 27.51</td>
<td>$\bar{x}$ 26.28</td>
<td>$\bar{x}$ 26.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S.D. 3.08</td>
<td>S.D. 4.59</td>
<td>S.D. 5.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Years of Education</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Degree</td>
<td>53.49% (n=23)</td>
<td>51.52% (n=17)</td>
<td>46.15% (n=12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Degree</td>
<td>27.90% (n=12)</td>
<td>27.27% (n=9)</td>
<td>34.61% (n=9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-4 Years College</td>
<td>4.65% (n=2)</td>
<td>6.06% (n=2)</td>
<td>3.85% (n=1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2 Years College</td>
<td>9.30% (n=4)</td>
<td>12.12% (n=4)</td>
<td>3.85% (n=1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School Diploma</td>
<td>4.65% (n=2)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7.69% (n=2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 2 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic Variables</th>
<th>11 Years (n=43)</th>
<th>14 Years (n=36)</th>
<th>17 Years (n=31)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Father (continued)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-12th Grade</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Than 8th</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>3.03% (n=1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mother</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Degree</td>
<td>30.23% (n=13)</td>
<td>12.12% (n=4)</td>
<td>42.31% (n=11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Degree</td>
<td>41.86% (n=18)</td>
<td>51.51% (n=17)</td>
<td>34.62% (n=9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-4 Years College</td>
<td>6.98% (n=3)</td>
<td>6.06% (n=2)</td>
<td>3.85% (n=1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2 Years College</td>
<td>6.98% (n=3)</td>
<td>15.15% (n=5)</td>
<td>7.69% (n=2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School Diploma</td>
<td>9.30% (n=4)</td>
<td>12.12% (n=4)</td>
<td>11.54% (n=3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-12th Grade</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Than 8th</td>
<td>4.65% (n=2)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Occupation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Father</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional and Technical</td>
<td>60.46% (n=26)</td>
<td>72.72% (n=24)</td>
<td>69.23% (n=18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers and Administrators</td>
<td>6.97% (n=3)</td>
<td>18.18% (n=6)</td>
<td>23.07% (n=6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales Workers</td>
<td>20.9% (n=9)</td>
<td>6.06% (n=2)</td>
<td>3.84% (n=1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical and Kindred Workers</td>
<td>2.32% (n=1)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic Variables</th>
<th>11 Years (n=43)</th>
<th>14 Years (n=36)</th>
<th>17 Years (n=31)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Father (continued)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craftsmen</td>
<td>2.32% (n=1)</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.84% (n=1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operatives, except</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport Equipment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operatives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labors, except Farm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmers and Managers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm Laborers and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm Foremen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Workers, except Private Household</td>
<td>2.32% (n=1)</td>
<td>3.03% (n=1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Household</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mother</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional and</td>
<td>58.13% (n=11)</td>
<td>57.57% (n=19)</td>
<td>57.69% (n=15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic Variables</th>
<th>11 Years (n=43)</th>
<th>14 Years (n=36)</th>
<th>17 Years (n=31)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother (continued)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrators</td>
<td>9.30% (n=4)</td>
<td>3.03% (n=1)</td>
<td>11.54% (n=3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales Workers</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3.85% (n=1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical and Kindred</td>
<td>4.65% (n=2)</td>
<td>3.03% (n=1)</td>
<td>3.85% (n=1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craftsmen</td>
<td>2.32% (n=1)</td>
<td>3.03% (n=1)</td>
<td>3.85% (n=1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operatives, except</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport Equipment</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operatives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laborers, except Farm</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmers and Managers</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm laborers and</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm Foremen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Workers, except Private Household</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6.06% (n=2)</td>
<td>3.85% (n=1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic Variables</th>
<th>11 Years (n=43)</th>
<th>14 Years (n=36)</th>
<th>17 Years (n=31)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother (continued)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Household</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workers</td>
<td>- -</td>
<td>- -</td>
<td>- -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homemakers (fulltime)</td>
<td>13.95% (n=6)</td>
<td>21.21% (n=7)</td>
<td>11.54% (n=3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students (fulltime)</td>
<td>- -</td>
<td>- -</td>
<td>- -</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Intact families.

In addition, Thomas et al., (1974) found the role of religious preference to be significant in their study of family socialization, parental control, and power and the adolescent. Elder (1962, 1963) also found variables of family size and religious preference to be significant. However, these variables of possible importance were not evaluated at the time. Moreover, the other variable—peer group value—which is possibly important to adolescent development, was not addressed. Later research undertaken by Coleman (1977) addressed many of these same issues; he puts forth the notion that there is no apparent dissonance between peer group values and the values of the family. He also hypothesized that peer group membership does not appear to generate any major conflicts within the family itself. Also, Offer and Offer (1975) stated "peer group values do have an influence on behavior, but most often the influence can be negated by the stronger inculcated parental values". However, the comparisons between the parental values and peer group values might be an important addition for further studies.

Finally, the new data set at Time 2 has a larger range of age in one of three age groups than that at Time 1. When doing the cross-sectional analysis, the generalization of age difference needed to be made with caution. Nonetheless, it can provide information which may be useful
in planning the direction of future research.

**Summary**

Chapter 3 has presented the methods utilized in this study. The methods of sample selection, subjects between the two data sets, data collection procedures, instrumentation, and scoring of measures were explained. The data analyses for each research question were offered. Finally, several limitations concerning the generalization of findings were considered.
CHAPTER IV
RESULTS

In this investigation, the parent-adolescent relationship was examined through the use of a multidimensional analysis of the quality of parent-adolescent communication and adolescents' psychosocial well-being. The analyses of quality of communication and the well-being of adolescents included the following factors: 1) age of the oldest adolescent, 2) sex of the oldest adolescent, and 3) parenting styles (as perceived by the adolescents). The multidimensional analysis was a sequential design which involved cross-sectional, longitudinal, bidirectional, and cohort analyses. For those cross-sectional research questions (1-5) aimed at an understanding of age related differences for each single variable: age, sex of child, parent-child dyad, and parenting styles were considered the independent variables. Those items related to the family childrearing atmosphere or processes (such as the quality of parent-adolescent communication and adolescents' psychosocial well-being) were considered the dependent variables. However, in the longitudinal research questions (6-9) aimed at an
understanding of developmental change for each variable singularly, age was considered the independent variable. Those items related to the family childrearing atmosphere or processes (such as the quality of parent-adolescent communication and adolescents’ psychosocial well-being) were considered dependent variables in the longitudinal study. For those bidirectional research questions (10-13) concerned with the influence model of parent-adolescent socialization (between parents' characteristics and children’s outcome or between children’s characteristics and parents' outcome), adolescents’ psychosocial well-being at Time 1 was used to predict parenting satisfaction at Time 2; and parenting satisfaction at Time 1 was used predict adolescents’ psychosocial well-being at Time 2. For those cohort research questions (14-16) aimed at an understanding of two-cohort differences among three age groups, age and time measurement of interview were considered the independent variables; and those items related to the family childrearing atmosphere or processes (such as adolescents’ psychosocial well-being, parenting style, and parenting satisfaction) were considered the dependent variables.

In this study, there were six types of parenting styles measured as a typology manipulated by parental power (high, medium, and low) and parental induction (frequent and infrequent). The measure of quality of parent-adolescent communication was originally designed by Barnes and Olson
(1982) to assess aspects of family communication experienced by each spouse and one adolescent. Two subscales (i.e., Open Family Communication and Problems in Family Communication) were included in the dyads of family members. Adolescents' psychosocial well-being was created as an index to assess the adolescents' overall psychosocial growth, including competence, independence, and emotional support. In this investigation, adolescents' psychosocial well-being consisted of seven items which assessed the degree of satisfaction they felt with school, their self-confidence, decision making ability, and feelings of being understood and loved. Families were classified into three categories—those with oldest children who were either 11, 14, or 17.

**Description of the Sample**

Before presenting the results of the data analyses, the descriptive statistics for demographic variables collected from the Time 2 data, the differences of 11-year-old groups in demographic variables between the two data sets, and the comparisons in parenting styles and parent-adolescent communication with other normed studies will be presented.

**Descriptive Data of the Sample at Time 2**

Descriptive statistics of the sample at Time 2 are made evident in Table 2. The descriptive characteristics for the demographic variables were similar for each of the three age groups. Analysis of variance techniques indicated
that no significant differences existed among the three age groups as a function of parents' ages at the birth of the child, the parents' level of education, the years of marriage at the time of the child's birth and the family occupational level, as measured by the higher (husband's or wife's) occupational level as defined by the revised Duncan scale (Stevens & Featherman, 1980). Therefore, none of the demographic variables differed significantly by age of the adolescent.

The mean number of years of marriage at the birth of the first child for parents with 11 year-old children was 4.21 years (S.D. = 2.39). For parents with 14 year-old children it was 3.42 years (S.D. = 2.41), and for parents with 17 year-old children it was 4.00 years (S.D. = 6.11). Parents of the 14 year-old adolescents were generally married a shorter time prior to the child's birth than parents of either of the 11 year-old and 17 year-old groups.

When comparing the parents' mean age at the time of the child's birth, fathers of the 11 year-old adolescents and fathers of 17 year-old adolescents were older, but fathers of the 14 year-old adolescents were somewhat younger. A similar pattern was obtained for the mother's mean age at the time of the child's birth.

The educational level of parents was found to reveal that the majority of fathers at Time 2 data had received at least a college degree. In families with older children of
both Time 1 and Time 2, there appeared to be more fathers who had not attended college or completed high school. Among fathers of 11 year-old adolescents, all received at least a high school diploma. About 81% received a college degree or more. Among fathers of 14 year-old adolescents, 78% of them had finished their education with a college or graduate degree. Among fathers of 17 year-old adolescents, 80% of them had received a college or graduate degree.

The mothers at Time 2 seemed to be as well-educated as at Time 1. However, there were fewer women with graduate degrees than men in families with 11 and 14 year-olds. Among mothers of 11 year-old adolescents, 72% of them had achieved at least a college degree or more. Among mothers of 14 year-old adolescents, 63% of them completed their education with a college or graduate degree. Among mothers of 17 year-old adolescents, 77% of them received a college or graduate degree.

The majority of the fathers of the adolescents of each group were classified as professional or technical workers, as defined by the 1970 Census Occupational Code (U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1973). Among fathers of 11 year-old adolescents, about 81% of the fathers could be classified as professional or technical or as sales workers. Among fathers of 14 year-old adolescents, about 90% of the fathers were classified as professional or technical workers or as managers and administrators. Among fathers of 17
year-old adolescents, about 92% of them were also most frequently employed as professionals or technical workers or as managers or administrators.

The mothers of the adolescents of each age group were also most likely to be employed as professional or technical workers. Homemaking was the next most likely employment category for those mothers. Among mothers of 11 year-old adolescents, about 72% of them were employed as professional or technical workers or full-time homemakers. Among mothers of 14 year-old subjects, about 79% of them were employed as professional or technical workers or full-time homemakers. Among mothers of 17 year-old subjects, about 69% of them were employed as professionals and technical workers or full-time homemakers; however, 11% of them were employed as managers and administrators which was the same percentage as for the full-time homemakers.

Cohort comparison

At Time 2, the new 11 year-old group was selected from a new cohort group which was different from the 11 year-old cohort group at Time 1. Hence, comparisons of demographic variables were necessary. When comparing the parents' mean age at the time of the child's birth, mothers of the Time 1 data ($\bar{x} = 25.56 \text{ years, } S.D. = 4.12$) were significantly younger than those of the Time 2 data ($\bar{x} = 27.51, S.D. = 3.08$), $t(43) = 2.61, p < .01$. Yet the age differences of the fathers at both times were not significant. The pattern
indicated mothers of 11 year-olds at Time 2 seemed to wait for a longer time to have the first child than those at Time 1. Moreover, when comparing the mean number of years of marriage at the birth of the first child for parents with 11 year-old children in both times, the parents at Time 2 ($\bar{x} = 4.21$, S.D. = 2.39) were significantly different from those at Time 1 ($\bar{x} = 3.21$, S.D. = 2.05), $t(43) = 2.34$, $p<.02$. Parents of the 11 year-old adolescents at Time 1 were generally married a shorter time prior to their child’s birth than parents of the 11 year-old adolescents at Time 2.

The educational level of the parents of both 11 year-old groups reveal no significant differences in either parent’s educational level. Fathers of both 11 year-old groups had at least high-school diplomas and the majority of them had at least graduated from college. A similar pattern was obtained when looking at the mothers’ educational level. The majority of the mothers had at least graduated with a college degree and some with a high-school diploma. However, the mothers were less likely to have completed a graduate degree than the fathers.

In comparisons of the family occupational levels of both 11 year-old groups, fathers were more likely to be employed as professional or technical workers, they were next most likely to be employed as sales workers. However, mothers were most likely to be employed as professional or technical workers and next most likely to be homemakers. At
both times, among 11 year-old adolescents, the parents were employed in the same occupational level as defined by the revised Duncan scale (Stevens & Featherman, 1980).

**Comparisons with Original Normed Studies**

To examine the relationship of parenting styles and the quality of parent-adolescent communication between the present study and the original normed studies, differences between autocratic, democratic, and permissive parents were examined with variables of age and sex of the adolescent controlled (Table 3 & 4).

Comparing the parenting styles of the present study with the original study (Elder, 1963), a similar pattern seemed to be indicated. However, the present study had a smaller number of subjects than the original study. Because the subjects of the present study were from middle-class white families, the comparisons were made only with the middle class subjects in Elder's study. Elder's study did contain class differences.

Generally, in Elder's (1963) original study, mothers were more likely to explain frequently to younger rather than older adolescents and to girls rather than boys; age and sex differences were inconsistent for fathers. Moreover, within each age and sex group, frequent explanations were least common among autocratic parents and were most common among democratic parents. Autocratic parents were inclined to resist explaining their rules and
## TABLE 3

Frequent Parental Explanations by Autocratic, Democratic, and Permissive Parents

Age and Sex Controlled

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Parental Power</th>
<th>17 Male</th>
<th>17 Female</th>
<th>14 Male</th>
<th>14 Female</th>
<th>11 Male</th>
<th>11 Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Autocratic</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother Democratic</td>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>(10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permissive</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>(7)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autocratic</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father Democratic</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(7)</td>
<td>(7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permissive</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Parental Power</th>
<th>17 Male</th>
<th>17 Female</th>
<th>14 Male</th>
<th>14 Female</th>
<th>11 Male</th>
<th>11 Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Autocratic</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother Democratic</td>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>(10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permissive</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>(7)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autocratic</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father Democratic</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(7)</td>
<td>(7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permissive</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Notes

- **Autocratic**: Strict rules, little flexibility.
- **Democratic**: Balanced rules, open discussions.
- **Permissive**: Few rules, much freedom.
TABLE 4

Frequent Parental Explanations by Autocratic, Democratic, and Permissive Parents

Sex Controlled

Frequent Parental Explanations: Per Cent of Adolescents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Autocratic</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>Permissive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boys</td>
<td>(8)</td>
<td>(9)</td>
<td>(14)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(16)</td>
<td>(6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>47.0</td>
<td>53.0</td>
<td>87.5</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>72.7</td>
<td>27.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girls</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>(15)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(13)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>45.4</td>
<td>54.6</td>
<td>88.2</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>92.8</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boys</td>
<td>(7)</td>
<td>(8)</td>
<td>(15)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>(15)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>46.6</td>
<td>53.4</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>78.9</td>
<td>21.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girls</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>(10)</td>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>(11)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>54.6</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>73.3</td>
<td>26.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean Per Cent Difference between Freq and Infreq. Explanations

<p>| | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mother</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-7.2</td>
<td>75.6</td>
<td>61.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-7.7</td>
<td>38.8</td>
<td>52.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
thereby imposed coercive controls and demands. However, in the present study both democratic and permissive parents were more likely than autocratic parents to explain their rules and policies. Age differences were consistent for both mothers and fathers: they all attempted to explain frequently to younger rather than older adolescents. Conversely, sex differences were evident in the behaviors of the mothers and fathers. Mothers were more likely to explain to girls rather than boys. In contrast, fathers were more likely to explain to boys than to girls.

In order to compare the parent-adolescent communication in the present study with Barnes and Olson's (1985) study, the quality of parent-adolescent communication (reported by adolescents) was examined. Differences between the quality of parent-adolescent communication (Open Family Communication and Problems in Family Communication) were examined with dyads across sex of parents and adolescents (Table 5). In the Barnes and Olson's (1985) study, the adolescents reported more positive interactions with their mothers than with their fathers, indicating a greater degree of openness in the mother-child relationship. The teens reported about equal levels of problems in trying to communicate with each of their parents. In the present study, the adolescents reported about equal levels of openness in trying to communicate with each of their parents. The adolescents, however, reported less problems
TABLE 5

Paired t test Comparing Family Members' Responses on the Parent-Adolescent Communication Scale

In Barnes and Olson's (1985) study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Openness Scale</th>
<th>Problem Scale</th>
<th>Parent-Adolescent Communication</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Respondent</td>
<td>Group Mean</td>
<td>t Value</td>
<td>Group Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adolescents</td>
<td>36.03</td>
<td>5.08</td>
<td>66.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regarding Mothers</td>
<td></td>
<td>**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adolescents</td>
<td>33.35</td>
<td>30.47</td>
<td>63.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regarding Fathers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

At the Present Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Openness Scale</th>
<th>Problem Scale</th>
<th>Parent-Adolescent Communication</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Respondent</td>
<td>Group Mean</td>
<td>t Value</td>
<td>Group Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adolescents</td>
<td>36.44</td>
<td>30.47</td>
<td>66.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regarding Mothers</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adolescents</td>
<td>35.34</td>
<td>31.87</td>
<td>67.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regarding Fathers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p<.05
** p<.01
*** p<.001
in communicating with their fathers than with their mothers, indicating a lower level of problems in the father-child relationship. It may be that in this study fathers as doorkeepers determine the willingness to attend the interview for the representative families in this study; therefore, it may hold true that fathers appear to show less problems in communicating with adolescents than mothers in the problems subscale of communication in comparison with the Barnes and Olson study (1985). From both studies, there appeared to be similar patterns established for mother-adolescent communication. In the present study, higher scores were evident in the problems subscale and the total score for father-adolescent communication. This is an indication that adolescents had less problems in communicating and better quality of communication with fathers.

**Overview of Nature of the Data**

Before presenting the inferential statistical analyses used in this study, an overview of the nature of the data (from the self-report questionnaire on processes involved in adolescents' psychosocial well-being, parent-adolescent communication, and parents' report of parenting satisfaction) will be presented. The means, standard deviation, and range of responses of the variables in the study for each of three age groups are presented in Table 6. In addition, the relationship between study dependent
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variables</th>
<th>11 Years (n=43)</th>
<th>14 Years (n=33)</th>
<th>17 Years (n=36)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>Range</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Mother-Adolescent Communication</td>
<td>36.86</td>
<td>6.44</td>
<td>24 - 50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problems in Mother-Adolescent Communication</td>
<td>31.67</td>
<td>5.04</td>
<td>20 - 46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Father-Adolescent Communication</td>
<td>37.95</td>
<td>7.56</td>
<td>22 - 50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problems in Father-Adolescent</td>
<td>33.51</td>
<td>5.32</td>
<td>23 - 47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother Parenting Satisfaction</td>
<td>4.39</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>2 - 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father Parenting Satisfaction</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>3 - 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
variables and demographic variables (described earlier in Chapter 4) were examined by use of Pearson product moment correlation coefficients (r). Variables were correlated within each age group (Table 7 to 9). In families with 11 year-old adolescents (Table 7), five pairs of variables were found to be significantly correlated. Both parents' educational levels were significantly correlated with the adolescents' psychosocial well-being (p<.05). The higher educational level the parents attained, the higher well-being growth the adolescents had. The problems in mother-adolescent communication (as perceived by the adolescents) was significantly correlated with father's education (p<.03) and family SES (p<.02). Thus, 11 year-olds having more highly educated fathers perceived both mothers and fathers as having less problems in the mother-adolescent communication. Also the mother's parenting satisfaction was highly significantly correlated with father's education (p<.01), indicating the higher education the fathers had, the more parenting satisfaction the mothers had.

In families with 14 year-old adolescents (Table 8), one pair of variables was found to be significantly correlated. There was a positive relationship between open mother-adolescent communication and family SES (p<.03) on the basis of the higher occupational standing of husband or wife.

In families with 17 year-old adolescents (Table 9), four pairs of variables were found to be significantly
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Well-being of Adolescents</th>
<th>Open Mother-Adolescent Communication</th>
<th>Problems in Mother-Adolescent Communication</th>
<th>Open Father-Adolescent Communication</th>
<th>Problems in Father-Adolescent Communication</th>
<th>Mother Parenting Satisfaction</th>
<th>Father Parenting Satisfaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Father's Age at Child's Birth</td>
<td>.042</td>
<td>-.008</td>
<td>.210</td>
<td>-.082</td>
<td>-.119</td>
<td>.079</td>
<td>.147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother's Age at Child's Birth</td>
<td>-.149</td>
<td>.145</td>
<td>.145</td>
<td>-.246</td>
<td>-.309*</td>
<td>-.124</td>
<td>-.065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years Fathers Married at Birth</td>
<td>.165</td>
<td>.242</td>
<td>.090</td>
<td>.151</td>
<td>.079</td>
<td>-.177</td>
<td>.177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years Mothers Married at Birth</td>
<td>.167</td>
<td>.151</td>
<td>.148</td>
<td>.158</td>
<td>.049</td>
<td>-.004</td>
<td>.100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father's Education</td>
<td>.304*</td>
<td>.122</td>
<td>.331*</td>
<td>-.012</td>
<td>.127</td>
<td>.424**</td>
<td>-.074</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother's Education</td>
<td>.322*</td>
<td>.112</td>
<td>.086</td>
<td>.087</td>
<td>.090</td>
<td>.043</td>
<td>-.230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family SES (Occupational)</td>
<td>.289</td>
<td>.134</td>
<td>.344*</td>
<td>.109</td>
<td>.231</td>
<td>.271</td>
<td>.017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* P < .05
** P < .01
TABLE 8
Correlation among Demographic, Independent, and Dependent Variables in Families with 14 Year-Olds Adolescents (n=33)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Well-being of Adolescents</th>
<th>Open Mother-Adolescent Communication</th>
<th>Problems in Father-Adolescent Communication</th>
<th>Open Father-Adolescent Communication</th>
<th>Problems in Father-Adolescent Communication</th>
<th>Mother Parenting Satisfaction</th>
<th>Father Parenting Satisfaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Father's Age at Child's Birth</td>
<td>.235</td>
<td>-.034</td>
<td>-.109</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>.117</td>
<td>.161</td>
<td>.121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother's Age at Child's Birth</td>
<td>.282</td>
<td>.061</td>
<td>-.030</td>
<td>.101</td>
<td>.235</td>
<td>.144</td>
<td>.187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years Fathers Married at Birth</td>
<td>.113</td>
<td>-.157</td>
<td>-.174</td>
<td>-.035</td>
<td>.116</td>
<td>-.084</td>
<td>-.048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years Mothers Married at Birth</td>
<td>.045</td>
<td>-.144</td>
<td>-.138</td>
<td>-.049</td>
<td>.111</td>
<td>-.134</td>
<td>-.057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father's Education</td>
<td>-.118</td>
<td>.065</td>
<td>-.031</td>
<td>-.175</td>
<td>-.029</td>
<td>-.065</td>
<td>.128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother's Education</td>
<td>-.073</td>
<td>.079</td>
<td>-.017</td>
<td>.066</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>.132</td>
<td>-.038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family SES (Occupational)</td>
<td>.317</td>
<td>.368*</td>
<td>-.001</td>
<td>.227</td>
<td>.105</td>
<td>.296</td>
<td>.263</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* P < .05
** P < .01
TABLE 9
Correlation among Demographic, Independent, and Dependent Variables in Families with 17 Year-Olds Adolescents (n=26)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Well-being of Adolescents</th>
<th>Open Mother-Adolescent Communication</th>
<th>Problems in Mother-Adolescent Communication</th>
<th>Open Father-Adolescent Communication</th>
<th>Problems in Father-Adolescent Communication</th>
<th>Mother Parenting Satisfaction</th>
<th>Father Parenting Satisfaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Father's Age at Child's Birth</td>
<td>-.027</td>
<td>.243</td>
<td>.178</td>
<td>-.133</td>
<td>.179</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>-.154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother's Age at Child's Birth</td>
<td>.035</td>
<td>.079</td>
<td>.324</td>
<td>-.230</td>
<td>-.243</td>
<td>-.126</td>
<td>-.118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years Fathers Married at Birth</td>
<td>-.197</td>
<td>-.018</td>
<td>-.125</td>
<td>-.236</td>
<td>-.380*</td>
<td>.143</td>
<td>.027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years Mothers Married at Birth</td>
<td>-.290</td>
<td>-.070</td>
<td>-.101</td>
<td>-.023</td>
<td>.057</td>
<td>-.048</td>
<td>.023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father's Education</td>
<td>.106</td>
<td>-.235</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>-.401*</td>
<td>-.309</td>
<td>-.385*</td>
<td>.113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother's Education</td>
<td>.189</td>
<td>-.154</td>
<td>.060</td>
<td>-.089</td>
<td>-.473**</td>
<td>-.191</td>
<td>.191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family SES (Occupational)</td>
<td>.336</td>
<td>.090</td>
<td>.198</td>
<td>-.216</td>
<td>-.219</td>
<td>-.038</td>
<td>-.029</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* P < .05
** P < .01
correlated. The positive father-adolescent communication (Open Family Communication) was negatively correlated with mother's educational attainment ($p < .04$). The same expected relationship was not found for father's report of educational level. However, the negative father-adolescent communication (Problems in Family Communication) was negatively correlated with father's report of years married at child's birth ($p < .05$) and mother's educational level ($p < .01$). This informed the evidence that the longer the father was married at the child's birth and the higher the mother's educational attainment, the more problems adolescents had in communicating with their fathers.

Mother's parenting satisfaction was negatively correlated with father's report of educational attainment ($p < .05$). This informed the evidence that the higher the father's educational attainment, the lower the mother's satisfaction with her parenting.

To summarize, this study revealed in families of 11 year-olds that adolescent's reports of well-being were significantly related to parents' educational attainment. Open father-adolescent communication was negatively correlated with mother's educational attainment in families of 17 year-olds. Open mother-adolescent communication was significantly related to family SES in families of 14 year-olds. The problems in mother-adolescent communication were significantly related to the father's educational attainment
and family SES in families of 11 year-olds. The problems in father-adolescent communication were negatively related to mother's age at the child's birth in families of 11 year-olds, the number of years father was married at the birth of the target child, and mother's educational attainment in families of 17 year-olds. However, there is a contradictory finding between mother's parenting satisfaction and father's educational attainment in families of 11 and 17 year-olds. The families of the 11 year-olds reported a positive relationship between these two variables, yet the families of the 17 year-olds reported a negative relationship.

Because several of the study and demographic variables were found to be significantly correlated, a relevant concern was that variables be so highly correlated that they measure the same phenomenon, and thus reduce the validity of the statistical analysis. Such a condition is called multicollinearity. In no case did the correlation among dependent variables and demographic variables approach .85 or higher, the level at which concern for multicollinearity becomes a problem (Pedhazur, 1982).

**Analysis of Research Questions**

A multidimensional analysis was used to examine the nature of the relationships between the independent and dependent variables in this study. This multidimensional analysis included cross-sectional, longitudinal,
bidirectional, and cohort comparisons. The cross-sectional analyses (Research Questions 1 to 5) were used to predict the developmental and sex differences in the adolescents' psychosocial well-being and the quality of communication across the parent-adolescent dyads by gender of adolescents and parents and age of adolescents. Also, parenting style as an independent variable was used to determine if differences existed in the types of parenting styles as it related to adolescents' psychosocial well-being and the quality of parent-adolescent communication. Thus, in testing the relationship between or among the quality of parent-adolescent communication and other independent variables (such as sex and age of adolescent, parenting styles, etc.), this methodology was preferable. An additional test was used to determine the relationship between adolescents' psychosocial well-being and the quality of parent-adolescent communication. Longitudinal analyses (Research Questions 6 to 9) were used to predict whether, as time changed, there was a developmental change (from 11 year-olds at Time 1 to 14 year-olds at Time 2 and from 14 year-olds at Time 1 to 17 year-olds at Time 2) in the adolescents' psychosocial well-being as well as in the parenting styles of their parents. Another test was performed to determine if parent-adolescent communication could be predicted from the adolescents' psychosocial well-being and parenting style of the parents at Time 1.
Bidirectional analyses (Research Questions 10 to 13) were used to check whether a reciprocal model existed that explained parent-child socialization (parents' characteristics and children's outcome in contrast to children's characteristics and parents' outcome). It was first determined whether the parents' satisfaction was a predictor of the adolescents' psychosocial well-being and vice versa. Cohort comparisons (Research Questions 14 to 16) were used to check whether differences existed between the two sample groups in both data sets within each of three age groups.

All research questions were tested separately at each of the three adolescent age levels. Parent-adolescent communication questions were tested utilizing both subscales to determine the quality of communication from gender differences in the dyads of communication within each of three adolescent age levels. Rationale for this research design was based on findings that showed that the dependent variables investigated in the study changed according to the age of the adolescents, sex differences, and parenting styles in the dyads of parent-adolescent communication. This present study, using an index of adolescents' well-being, was planned to assess the differences among age, sex and parenting styles.

1. Is there a significant difference in quality of communication across the parent-adolescent dyads by gender
of adolescents and parents as well as age of adolescents?

In this analysis, the quality of parent-adolescent communication used the adolescent's perception. Two three-way (3x2x2) - two between factors (e.g., age and sex) and one within factor (e.g., dyad) -- repeated-measures analyses of variance for each of the communication subscales provided support for a relationship between the age of adolescents and the quality of parent-adolescent communication, \( F(2, 96) = 7.05, p < .001 \) for Open Family Communication and \( F(2, 96) = 3.50, p < .03 \) for Problems in Family Communication. Moreover, this repeated-measures ANOVA provided support for a relationship between two dyads (adolescent-mother and adolescent-father communication), \( F(1, 96) = 3.61, p < .06 \) and among the interactions of dyads, age, and sex of adolescents, \( F(2, 96) = 2.51, p < .08 \) for Problems in Family Communication. A Duncan's Multiple Range Test, conducted as a post hoc analysis, indicated that a significant difference in quality of family communication existed among the three age groups. For Open Family Communication score, 11 year-olds were the most likely to communicate with parents (\( \bar{x} = 38.43 \)); 17 year-olds were the next likely to communicate with parents (\( \bar{x} = 35.15 \)); and 14 year-olds were the least likely to communicate with parents (\( \bar{x} = 33.28 \)). However, for Problems in Family Communication score, 11 year-olds revealed the least problems in communicating with parents (\( \bar{x} = 32.61 \)); 14 year-olds were the next least likely to have
problems in communicating with parents ($\bar{x} = 30.21$); and 17 year-olds were the most likely to have problems in communicating with parents ($\bar{x} = 29.86$). For the dyads on the problems subscale in Family Communication, it appeared that adolescents had less problems in family communication with the father ($\bar{x} = 31.50$) than with the mother ($\bar{x} = 30.28$). Using a Duncan's Multiple Range test conducted as a post hoc analysis, the quality of communication across the parent-adolescent dyads by gender of adolescents and parents and age of the adolescents indicated that a significant difference on the problems subscale in family communication existed among dyads (adolescent-mother and adolescent-father communication), age, and sex of adolescent (see Graph 1). The patterns of mean scores sequence for mother-adolescent and father-adolescent problems in communication by age and sex of adolescent are presented in Graph 1.

These three-way repeated-measures ANOVAs suggested that there are significant differences between the age of adolescents and open parent-adolescent communication. Families with 11 year-old adolescents were the most likely to communicate positively with each other; families with 17 year-old adolescents were the next most likely to communicate positively with each other; and families with 14 year-old adolescents were the least likely to communicate positively with each other. Families with 11 year-old adolescents had the least problems in communicating with
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each other; families with 14 year-old adolescents had fewer problems in communicating with each other than the families with 17 year-old adolescents who had the most problems in communicating with each other. In addition, there are suggested significant differences among two dyads of parent-adolescent communication, age, and sex of adolescent. It seemed that the youngest female group had the least problems in communicating with both parents; the 17-year-old female group had the most problems in communicating with the mother; and the 14-year-old female group had the most problems in communicating with the father.

2. **Is there a significant difference in quality of communication across the six parenting styles measured as power by induction environments in relation to age and gender of adolescents?**

In this analysis, the quality of parent-adolescent communication and parenting styles used the adolescent’s perception. Two four-way (6x3x2x2)—three between factors (e.g., age, sex, and parenting styles) and one within factor (e.g., dyads)—repeated-measures analyses of variance for each of the communication subscales provided support for a relationship between the age of adolescents and the quality of parent-adolescent communication. In these four-way repeated-measures ANOVAs, the relationships between age of child and the quality of communication and between age, sex of child, and the quality of communication were basically
the same as in Research Question 1. In addition, the introduction of parenting styles provided new information about the quality of parent-adolescent communication. These four-way repeated-measures ANOVAs also provided support for a relationship in mother's parenting styles, $F(5,67) = 3.12$, $p < .01$, in dyads (father-adolescent and mother-adolescent communication) and mother's parenting styles, $F(5,67) = 3.30$, $p < .01$, and in age of adolescent, dyads, and mother's parenting styles $F(5,67) = 2.17$, $p < .04$ (see Graph 2). The patterns of mean scores sequence for open mother-adolescent and father-adolescent communication by age of child and mother's parenting are presented in Graph 2.

Post hoc analyses between open mother-adolescent communication and the mother's parenting styles indicated that the mother's parenting with medium power by frequent induction had the greatest open mother-adolescent communication ($\bar{x} = 40.75$); the mother's parenting with low power by frequent induction had the second greatest open mother-adolescent communication ($\bar{x} = 37.93$); the mother's parenting with high power by frequent induction had the third greatest open mother-adolescent communication ($\bar{x} = 37.30$); the mother's parenting with medium power by infrequent induction had the fourth greatest open mother-adolescent communication ($\bar{x} = 36.50$); the mother's parenting with low power by infrequent induction had the second lowest open mother-adolescent communication ($\bar{x} = 32.71$); and the
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mother's parenting with high power and infrequent induction had the least open mother-adolescent communication ($\bar{x} = 27.00$).

Moreover, post hoc analyses between dyads of parent-adolescent communication and the mother's parenting styles indicated that there were significant differences in communication with the father depending on the mother's parenting styles. When adolescents perceived their mother's parenting with high power by infrequent induction, open father-adolescent communication ($\bar{x} = 33.33$) was greater than open mother-adolescent communication ($\bar{x} = 27.00$); when adolescents perceived their mother's parenting with medium power by infrequent induction, open mother-adolescent communication ($\bar{x} = 36.50$) was greater than open father-adolescent communication ($\bar{x} = 33.00$); when adolescents perceived their mother's parenting with low power by infrequent induction, open father-adolescent communication ($\bar{x} = 34.43$) was greater than open mother-adolescent communication ($\bar{x} = 32.71$); when adolescents perceived their mother's parenting with high power by frequent induction, open father-adolescent communication ($\bar{x} = 38.15$) was greater than open mother-adolescent communication ($\bar{x} = 37.30$); when adolescents perceived their mother's parenting with medium power by frequent induction, open mother-adolescent communication ($\bar{x} = 40.76$) was greater than open father-adolescent communication ($\bar{x} = 36.41$); and when adolescents
perceived their mother’s parenting with low power by frequent induction, open mother-adolescent communication \(\bar{x} = 37.93\) was greater than open father-adolescent communication \(\bar{x} = 34.69\).

Concerning mother-adolescent problems in communication, this four-way repeated-measures ANOVA provided support for a relationship between the problems in parent-adolescent communication and the mother’s parenting styles, \(F(5,67) = 2.01, p < .08\), and among the problems in parent-adolescent communication, age, and sex of adolescents, \(F(2,67) = 2.98, p < .05\) (see Graph 3). Although the error term in Graph 3 was different from that in Graph 1, the relationship between age, sex of child, and the quality of communication was basically the same as Graph 1.

Post hoc analyses between the problems in parent-adolescent communication and the mother’s parenting styles indicated that there were significant differences in the problems subscale in parent-adolescent communication depending on the mother’s parenting styles. When adolescents perceived their mother’s parenting with high power by infrequent induction, the problems in father-adolescent communication \(\bar{x} = 33.20\) were less negative than the problems in mother-adolescent communication \(\bar{x} = 30.75\); when adolescents perceived their mother’s parenting with medium power by infrequent induction, the problems in mother-adolescent communication \(\bar{x} = 32.00\) were less
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negative than the problems in father-adolescent communication (\( \bar{x} = 28.50 \)); when adolescents perceived their mother's parenting with low power by infrequent induction, the problems in father-adolescent communication (\( \bar{x} = 32.29 \)) were less negative than the problems in mother-adolescent communication (\( \bar{x} = 29.00 \)); when adolescents perceived their mother's parenting with high power by frequent induction, the problems in father-adolescent communication (\( \bar{x} = 35.23 \)) were less negative than the problems in mother-adolescent communication (\( \bar{x} = 31.31 \)); when adolescents perceived their mother's parenting with medium power by frequent induction, the problems in father-adolescent communication (\( \bar{x} = 33.07 \)) were less negative than the problems in mother-adolescent communication (\( \bar{x} = 32.28 \)); and when adolescents perceived their mother's parenting with low power by frequent induction, the problems in mother-adolescent communication (\( \bar{x} = 31.24 \)) were less negative than the problems in father-adolescent communication (\( \bar{x} = 30.72 \)).

This four-way repeated-measures ANOVA provided support for a relationship between open father-adolescent communication and the father's parenting styles, \( F(5,63) = 2.79, p<.02 \), between the two positive dyads of parent-adolescent communication, \( F(1,63) = 3.98, p<.05 \), and between dyads and the father's parenting styles (perceived by adolescents), \( F(5,63) = 2.79, p<.02 \).
Post hoc analyses between open father-adolescent communication and the father’s parenting styles indicated that the father’s parenting with medium power by frequent induction had the most open father-adolescent communication ($\bar{x} = 39.48$); the father’s parenting with low power by frequent induction had the second most open father-adolescent communication ($\bar{x} = 39.19$); the father’s parenting with high power by frequent induction had the third most open father-adolescent communication ($\bar{x} = 31.75$); the father’s parenting with medium power by infrequent induction had the fourth most open father-adolescent communication ($\bar{x} = 32.09$); the father’s parenting with high power by infrequent induction had the second lowest open communication ($\bar{x} = 29.85$); and the father’s parenting with low power by infrequent induction had the least open father-adolescent communication ($\bar{x} = 28.87$).

Post hoc analyses indicated that mother-adolescent communication ($\bar{x} = 36.16$) was more positive than father-adolescent communication ($\bar{x} = 35.09$). In addition, post hoc analyses indicated that there were significant differences in open communication with the mother depending on the father’s parenting styles. When adolescents perceived their father’s parenting with high power by infrequent induction, open mother-adolescent communication ($\bar{x} = 35.07$) was greater than open father-adolescent communication ($\bar{x} = 29.85$); when adolescents perceived their father’s parenting with medium
power by infrequent induction, open mother-adolescent communication ($\bar{x} = 35.27$) was greater than open father-adolescent communication ($\bar{x} = 32.09$); when adolescents perceived their father's parenting with low power by infrequent induction, open mother-adolescent communication ($\bar{x} = 35.50$) was greater than open father-adolescent communication ($\bar{x} = 28.88$); when adolescents perceived their father's parenting with high power by frequent induction, open mother-adolescent communication ($\bar{x} = 37.25$) was greater than open father-adolescent communication ($\bar{x} = 31.75$); when adolescents perceived their father's parenting with medium power by frequent induction, open father-adolescent communication ($\bar{x} = 39.48$) was greater than open mother-adolescent communication ($\bar{x} = 38.20$); and when adolescents perceived their father's parenting with low power by frequent induction, open father-adolescent communication ($\bar{x} = 39.19$) was greater than open mother-adolescent communication ($\bar{x} = 35.65$).

Also, this four-way repeated-measures ANOVA provided support for a relationship between the problems in father-adolescent communication and the father's parenting styles, $F(5,63) = 3.90, p < .004$, and between the problems in parent-adolescent communication and the father's parenting styles $F(5,63) = 2.72, p < .03$.

Post hoc analyses between the problems in the father-adolescent communication and the father's parenting styles
indicated that there were significant differences for
problems in communication with the father depending on the
father's parenting style. The father's parenting with
medium power by frequent induction had the least problems in
father-adolescent communication ($\bar{x} = 35.40$); the father's
parenting with low power by frequent induction had the
second lowest problems in father-adolescent communication ($\bar{x} = 33.57$); the father's parenting with high power by frequent
induction had the third lowest problems in father-adolescent
communication ($\bar{x} = 31.75$); the father's parenting with high
power by infrequent induction had the fourth lowest problems
in father-adolescent communication ($\bar{x} = 28.57$); the father's
parenting with low power by infrequent induction had the
second most problems in father-adolescent communication ($\bar{x} = 27.62$); and the father's parenting with medium power by
infrequent induction had the most problems in father-
adolescent communication ($\bar{x} = 27.54$).

In addition, post hoc analyses between the problems
in parent-adolescent communication and the father's
parenting styles indicated that there were significant
differences in communication problems with parents depending
upon the father's parenting styles. When adolescents
perceived their father's parenting with high power by
infrequent induction, the problems in mother-adolescent
communication ($\bar{x} = 30.36$) were less negative than the
problems in father-adolescent communication ($\bar{x} = 28.57$);
when adolescents perceived their father's parenting with medium power by infrequent induction, the problems in mother-adolescent communication ($\bar{x} = 30.18$) were less negative than the problems in father-adolescent communication ($\bar{x} = 27.55$); when adolescents perceived their father's parenting with low power by infrequent induction, the problems in father-adolescent communication ($\bar{x} = 31.81$) were less negative than the problems in mother-adolescent communication ($\bar{x} = 29.24$); when adolescents perceived their father's parenting with high power by frequent induction, the problems in mother-adolescent communication ($\bar{x} = 31.25$) were less negative than the problems in father-adolescent communication ($\bar{x} = 28.58$); when adolescents perceived their father's parenting with medium power by frequent induction, the problems in father-adolescent communication ($\bar{x} = 30.80$) were less negative than the problems in mother-adolescent communication ($\bar{x} = 29.73$); and when adolescents perceived their father's parenting with low power by induction, the problems in father-adolescent communication ($\bar{x} = 33.58$) were less negative than the problems in mother-adolescent communication ($\bar{x} = 30.73$).

In summary, these four-way repeated-measures ANOVAs suggested that there are significant differences between age of the adolescent and the quality of parent-adolescent communication and among age, sex of the adolescent, and mother-adolescent and father-adolescent problems in
communication (same results as Research Question 1). It also suggested that there are significant differences between two dyads of parent-adolescent communication and parenting styles, between the quality of parent-adolescent communication and parenting styles, and among age of child, dyads, and mother’s parenting. This indicated that the more the parents utilized induction, the more parent-adolescent communication was shown in both the open and problems subscales. This also indicated that, when parents used medium or low power to control their child, the better the quality of communication that existed between the parents and the adolescent. This pattern was also evident in the interaction among age of child, mother-adolescent communication, and mother’s parenting. When adolescents reported that, when their mother used more induction, three age groups all indicated they had better communication (openness) with their mothers; when their mother used less induction, three age groups all indicated they had worse communication (openness) with their mothers. The 11 year-olds reported that, when perceiving their mother’s parenting as medium power by frequent induction, they had the most open communication with their mother; however, the 17 year-olds reported that, when perceiving their mother’s parenting as high power by infrequent induction, they had the least open communication involvement with their mother.
By contrast, in the interaction among age of child, open father-adolescent communication, and mother’s parenting, the pattern was not so evident as that among age of child, open mother-adolescent communication, and mother’s parenting. Although there was no consistent relationship shown in this interaction, it seemed that, when adolescents reported their mother’s parenting with less induction, they had more open communication involvement with their fathers, especially for 17 year-olds. The 11 year-olds reported that they had the most open communication with their father when they perceived their mother’s parenting as low power by infrequent induction; yet, the 14 year-olds reported that they had least open communication with their father, when they perceived their mother’s parenting as low power by infrequent induction.

3. **Is there a significant positive correlation between the quality of communication and well-being of adolescents?**

In this analysis, the quality of parent-adolescent communication and well-being of adolescents used the adolescent’s perception. Well-being of adolescents was created as an index to measure the adolescents’ psychosocial growth (satisfaction with school, self-confidence, decision making, and feelings of being understood and loved). A Pearson product moment (r) correlation coefficient provided support for a positive relationship between the quality of communication and the well-being of adolescents. There was
a positive relationship between open mother-adolescent communication and the well-being of adolescents ($r = .544, p<.0001$), between the problems in mother-adolescent communication and the well-being of adolescents ($r = .396, p<.0001$), between open father-adolescent communication and the well-being of adolescents ($r = .519, p<.0001$), and between the problems in father-adolescent communication and the well-being of adolescents ($r = .473, p<.0001$).

There was a positively significant relationship between four types of parent-adolescent communication and the well-being of adolescents. The more Open Family Communication with parents resulted in a higher level of well-being in the adolescents; and the more Problems in Family Communication with parents (the less problems communication with parents) also resulted in a higher level of well-being in adolescents.

4. Is there a significant difference in the well-being of adolescents by gender and age of adolescents?

In this analysis, the well-being of adolescents was perceived by adolescents. A two-way (2x3) analysis of variance provided no support for a relationship between age of the adolescent and the well-being of adolescents, $F(2,93) = 1.22, p<.29$, between sex of the adolescent and the well-being of adolescents, $F(1,93) = .00, p>.95$, and between age and sex of the adolescent and the well-being of adolescents, $F(2,93) = 1.59, p<.21$. 
5. Is there a significant difference in the well-being of adolescents across the six parental styles measured as power by induction environments by age and gender of adolescents?

In this analysis, the well-being of adolescents and the parenting styles were perceived by the adolescent. A three-way (6x2x3) analysis of variance provided support for a relationship between the mother’s parenting styles and the well-being of adolescents, $F(5, 91) = 4.35$, $p < .002$, between the father’s parenting styles and the well-being of adolescents, $F(5, 90) = 4.70$, $p < .001$, and between the interaction of sex and age of adolescents and the father’s parenting styles and the well-being of adolescents, $F(7, 90) = 2.34$, $p < .04$ (see Graph 4).

A Duncan’s Multiple Range Test, conducted as a post hoc analysis, indicated that there were significant differences in the well-being of adolescents depending on the mother’s parenting styles. When adolescents perceived their mother’s parenting with medium power by frequent induction, they had the greatest well-being score ($\bar{x} = 25.82$); when adolescents perceived their mother’s parenting with high power by frequent induction, they had the second greatest well-being score ($\bar{x} = 25.46$); when adolescents perceived their mother’s parenting with low power by frequent induction, they had the third greatest well-being score ($\bar{x} = 24.57$); when adolescents perceived their mother’s parenting with low power by infrequent induction, they had the fourth greatest
Well-being of Adolescents in Relation to Father Parenting Styles

Boys

PARENTING STYLE

HPII: High Power Infrequent Induction
MPII: Medium Power Infrequent Induction
LPII: Low Power Infrequent Induction
HPFI: High Power Frequent Induction
MPFI: Medium Power Frequent Induction
LPFI: Low Power Frequent Induction

11-year-old group
14-year-old group
17-year-old group
Graph 4 (cont'd)

Well-being of Adolescents in Relation to Mother Parenting Styles

Girls

Well-being of Adolescents in Relation to Mother Parenting Styles

**PARENTING STYLE**

- **HPII:** High Power Infrequent Induction
- **MPII:** Medium Power Infrequent Induction
- **LPII:** Low Power Infrequent Induction
- **HPFI:** High Power Frequent Induction
- **MPFI:** Medium Power Frequent Induction
- **LPFI:** Low Power Frequent Induction

- **11-year-old group**
- **14-year-old group**
- **17-year-old group**
well-being score ($\bar{x} = 24.00$); when adolescents perceived their mother's parenting with medium power by infrequent induction, they had the second lowest well-being score ($\bar{x} = 22.25$); and when adolescents perceived their mother's parenting with high power by infrequent induction, they had the least well-being score ($\bar{x} = 20.64$).

Moreover, post hoc analyses between the father's parenting and the well-being of adolescents indicated that there were significant differences in the well-being of adolescents depending on the father's parenting styles. When adolescents perceived their father's parenting with medium power by frequent induction, they had the greatest well-being score ($\bar{x} = 25.91$); when adolescents perceived their father's parenting with low power by frequent induction, they had the second greatest well-being score ($\bar{x} = 24.83$); when adolescents perceived their father's parenting with high power by frequent induction, they had the third greatest well-being score ($\bar{x} = 24.25$); when adolescents perceived their father's parenting with medium power by infrequent induction, they had the fourth greatest well-being score ($\bar{x} = 23.72$); when adolescents perceived their father's parenting with low power by infrequent induction, they had the second lowest well-being score ($\bar{x} = 22.57$); and when adolescents perceived their father's parenting with high power by infrequent induction, they had the least well-being score ($\bar{x} = 22.14$).
In summary, these analyses of variance suggested that there were significant differences between parenting styles and the well-being of adolescents. For both mother’s and father’s parenting styles, adolescents who perceived their parents’ parental styles with medium power by frequent induction had higher levels of well-being; and adolescents who perceived their parents’ parental styles with high power by infrequent induction had lower levels of well-being. Also, the interaction among sex, age of adolescent, and the father’s parenting styles suggested that the father’s parenting with frequent induction had higher levels of well-being among the six age-and-sex groups.

6. Is there a significant difference in the well-being of adolescents between Time 1 and Time 2 data?

In this analysis, the well-being of adolescents was perceived by the adolescent. A paired t-test analysis provided support that the well-being of adolescents at Time 1 was significantly greater than that at Time 2. For the group in which the adolescents were 11 years old at Time 1 and 14 years old at Time 2, \( t(33) = 5.16, p < .001 \); and for the group in which the adolescents were 14 years old at Time 1 and 17 years old at Time 2, \( t(21) = 2.26, p < .04 \). The well-being of adolescents at Time 1 was greater than that at Time 2.

7. Is there a significant difference in the adolescent’s perception of parenting style between Time 1 and Time 2?
In this analysis, the parenting styles were reported by the adolescent. A chi-square test analysis indicated that the mother's parenting in the group in which the adolescents were 11 years old at Time 1 and 14 years old at Time 2 was not significantly different, $X^2(20) = 26.56$, $p < .15$; the mother's parenting in the group in which the adolescents were 14 years old at Time 1 and 17 years old at Time 2 was not significantly different, $X^2(20) = 24.36$, $p < .23$; the father's parenting in the group which was 11 years old at Time 1 and 14 years at Time 2 was not significantly different, $X^2(25) = 24.47$, $p < .49$. The father's parenting in the group which was 14 years old at Time 1 and 17 years old at Time 2 was significantly different, $X^2(20) = 30.96$, $p < .06$. However, the number in each cell of parenting style was not sufficient. The parenting styles did not change, except in the group which was 14 years old at Time 1 and 17 years old at Time 2 in which a change in the father's parenting styles was reported.

8. Is there a significant relationship between the well-being of adolescents at Time 1 and parent-adolescent communication at Time 2?

In this analysis, the well-being of adolescents and the quality of parent-adolescent communication were reported by the adolescent. A Pearson product moment ($r$) correlation coefficient provided no support for a relationship between
the following variables: the well-being of adolescents at Time 1 and open mother-adolescent communication at Time 2 in the group which was 11 years old at Time 1 and 14 years old at Time 2 ($r = .22, p < .21$); the well-being of adolescents at Time 1 and open father-adolescent communication at Time 2 in the group which was 11 years old at Time 1 and 14 years old at Time 2 ($r = .17, p < .33$); the well-being of adolescents at Time 1 and open mother-adolescent communication in the group which was 14 years old at Time 1 and 17 years old at Time 2 ($r = .08, p < .70$); the well-being of adolescents at Time 1 and open father-adolescents communication at Time 2 in the group which was 14 years old at Time 1 and 17 years old at Time 2 ($r = .18, p < .37$); the well-being of adolescents at Time 1 and the problems in mother-adolescent communication at Time 2 in the group which was 11 years old at Time 1 and 14 years old at Time 2 ($r = .13, p < .48$); the well-being of adolescents at Time 1 and the problems in father-adolescent communication in the group which was 11 years old at Time 1 and 14 years old at Time 2 ($r = .11, p < .53$); the well-being of adolescents at Time 1 and the problems in mother-adolescent communication in the group which was 14 years at Time 1 and 17 years at Time 2 ($r = .05, p < .80$); and the well-being of adolescents at Time 1 and the problems in father-adolescent communication in the group which was 14 years old at Time 1 and 17 years old at Time 2 ($r = .29, p < .16$). No significant relationship between the well-being
of adolescents at Time 1 and parent-adolescent communication at Time 2 was evident.

9. Is there a significant relationship between the adolescent's perception of parenting styles at Time 1 and parent-adolescent communication at Time 2?

In this analysis, the well-being of adolescents and the quality of parent-adolescent communication were reported by the adolescent. A one-way analysis of variance provided support for a relationship between mother's parenting at Time 1 and problems in parent-adolescent communication at Time 2, $F(5,53) = 2.57, p<.04$, between father's parenting at Time 1 and open parent-adolescent communication at Time 2, $F(5,53) = 3.58, p<.007$, and between father's parenting at Time 1 and the problems in parent-adolescent communication at Time 2, $F(5,53) = 3.09, p<.02$.

A Duncan's Multiple Range Test (conducted as a post hoc analysis) indicated that there were significant differences in communication problems with parents at Time 2 depending on the mother's parenting styles at Time 1. Adolescents who perceived their mother's parenting with low power by frequent induction at Time 1 had the least problems in parent-adolescent communication at Time 2 ($\bar{x} = 31.70$); adolescents who perceived their mother's parenting with medium power by frequent induction at Time 1 had the second lowest problems in parent-adolescent communication at Time 2 ($\bar{x} = 31.56$); adolescents who perceived their mother's
parenting with high power by frequent induction at Time 1 had the third lowest problems in parent-adolescent communication at Time 2 ($\bar{x} = 30.30$); adolescents who perceived their mother's parenting with high power by infrequent induction at Time 1 had the fourth lowest problems in parent-adolescent communication at Time 2 ($\bar{x} = 30.00$); adolescents who perceived their mother's parenting with low power by infrequent induction at Time 1 had the second most problems in parent-adolescent communication at Time 2 ($\bar{x} = 25.42$); and adolescents who perceived their mother's parenting with medium power by infrequent induction at Time 1 had the most problems in parent-adolescent communication at Time 2 ($\bar{x} = 24.00$).

Moreover, post hoc analyses also indicated that there were significant differences in open communication with parents at Time 2 depending on the father's parenting style at Time 1. Adolescents who perceived their father's parenting with medium power by frequent induction at Time 1 had the most open parent-adolescent communication at Time 2 ($\bar{x} = 36.36$); adolescents who perceived their father's parenting with low power by frequent induction at Time 1 had the second most open parent-adolescent communication at Time 2 ($\bar{x} = 35.38$); adolescents who perceived their father's parenting with high power by infrequent induction at Time 1 had the third most open positive parent-adolescent communication at Time 2 ($\bar{x} = 35.50$); adolescents who
perceived their father's parenting with high power by frequent induction at Time 1 had the fourth most open parent-adolescent communication at Time 2 ($\bar{x} = 32.37$); adolescents who perceived their father's parenting with medium power by infrequent induction at Time 1 had the second lowest open parent-adolescent communication at Time 2 ($\bar{x} = 29.50$); and adolescents who perceived their father's parenting with low power by infrequent induction at Time 1 had the least open parent-adolescent communication at Time 2 ($\bar{x} = 25.00$).

In addition, post hoc analyses indicated that there were significant differences in communication problems with parents at Time 2 depending on the father's parenting style at Time 1. Adolescents who perceived their father's parenting with low power by frequent induction at Time 1 had the least problems in parent-adolescent communication at Time 2 ($\bar{x} = 31.19$); adolescents who perceived their father's parenting with high power by infrequent induction at Time 1 had the second lowest problems in parent-adolescent communication at Time 2 ($\bar{x} = 31.05$); adolescents who perceived their father's parenting with medium power by frequent induction at Time 1 had the third lowest problems in parent-adolescent communication at Time 2 ($\bar{x} = 30.94$); adolescents who perceived their father's parenting with high power by frequent induction at Time 1 had the fourth lowest problems in parent-adolescent communication at Time 2 ($\bar{x} =$
adolescents who perceived their father's parenting with medium power by infrequent induction at Time 1 had the second most problems in parent-adolescent communication at Time 2 ($\bar{x} = 28.33$); and adolescents who perceived their father's parenting with low power by infrequent induction at Time 1 had the most problems in parent-adolescent communication at Time 2 ($\bar{x} = 20.67$).

In summary, the analysis of variance clearly suggested there are significant differences between parenting styles at Time 1 and the problems in parent-adolescent communication at Time 2. Likewise, the analysis of variance seemed to suggest that parents with more frequent induction at Time 1 are more likely to communicate with adolescents in both open and problems subscales at Time 2.

10. **Does adolescents' well-being at Time 1 influence the parent's satisfaction with parenting at Time 2?**

In this analysis, the well-being of adolescents was reported by the adolescent; however, the parent's satisfaction was perceived by the parent. A Pearson product moment ($r$) correlation coefficient provided no support for a relationship between the well-being of adolescents at Time 1 and mothers' parenting satisfaction at Time 2 in the group who were 11 years old at Time 1 and was 14 years old at Time 2 ($r = .11, p<.55$) or in the group who were 14 years old at Time 1 and was 17 years old at Time 2 ($r = .16, p<.43$). Also, the Pearson product moment ($r$) correlation provided no
support for a relationship between the well-being of adolescents at Time 1 and fathers' parenting satisfaction at Time 2 in the group who were 11 years old at Time 1 and 14 years at Time 2 ($r = .26, p < .14$) or in the group who were 14 years old at Time 1 and 17 years old at Time 2 ($r = .34, p < .09$). No significant relationship was noted between the well-being of adolescents at Time 1 and parents' satisfaction at Time 2.

11. **Does the parent's satisfaction with parenting at Time 1 influence adolescents' well-being at Time 2?**

   In this analysis, the parents' satisfaction were perceived by the parents; however, the well-being of adolescents was perceived by the adolescent. A Pearson product moment ($r$) correlation coefficient provided no support for a relationship between mothers' parenting satisfaction at Time 1 and the well-being of adolescents at Time 2 in the group who were 11 years old at Time 1 and 14 years old at Time 2 ($r = .17, p < .35$) or in the group who were 14 years old at Time 1 and 17 years old at Time 2 ($r = -.19, p < .39$). Also, it provided no support for a relationship between fathers' parenting satisfaction at Time 1 and the well-being of adolescents at Time 2 in the group who were 11 years old at Time 1 and 14 years old at Time 2 ($r = .31, p < .08$) or in the group who were 14 years old at Time 1 and 17 years old at Time 2 ($r = -.19, p < .41$). There was no significant relationship between the parents'
satisfaction at Time 1 and adolescents' well-being at Time 2.

12. **Does the parenting model at Time 1 influence the well-being of adolescents at Time 2?**

   In this analysis, the parenting model and the well-being of adolescents were reported by the adolescent. A one-way analysis of variance provided no support for a relationship between the mother's parenting styles at Time 1 and the well-being of adolescents at Time 2. $F(5, 53) = 1.15$, $p < .35$, and between the father's parenting styles at Time 1 and the well-being of adolescents at Time 2, $F(5, 53) = 1.01$, $p < .42$. No significant differences were noted between the parenting model at Time 1 and the well-being of adolescents at Time 2.

13. **Does the well-being of adolescents at Time 1 influence the parenting model at Time 2?**

   In this analysis, the parenting model and the well-being of adolescents were reported by the adolescent. A chi-square test analysis indicated that the well-being at Time 1 did not influence the mother's parenting change at Time 2, $\chi^2(1) = 2.14$, $p < .14$. In contrast, the chi-square test analysis indicated that the well-being of adolescents at Time 1 did influence the father's parenting change at Time 2, $\chi^2(1) = 3.38$, $p < .06$. It appeared that the father's parenting changed at Time 2 when the well-being of the adolescents at Time 1 was low (below the median).
14. **Level of adolescents' well-being will be the same between the two data sets within each of three age groups.**

In this analysis, the well-being of adolescents was reported by the adolescent. A two sample t-test analysis provided support for the different levels of adolescents' well-being in the 11-year-old group, \( t(40) = 2.52, p < .01 \) and in the 14-year-old group, \( t(33) = 1.85, p < .06 \). However, it provided no support for the different levels of adolescents' well-being in the 17-year-old group, \( t(21) = .67, p < .51 \). Cohort differences were noted in the well-being of the 11 and 14 year-olds.

15. **Is there a significant difference in adolescents' perception of parenting styles across the comparisons of the same age group between Time 1 and Time 2 data?**

In this analysis, the parenting styles were perceived by the adolescent. A chi-square test analysis provided no support for the change of the mother's parenting style within each of three age groups---\( \chi^2(5) = 9.81, p < .09 \) for the 11-year-old group, \( \chi^2(5) = 5.02, p < .41 \) for the 14-year-old group, and \( \chi^2(5) = 10.14, p < .10 \) for the 17-year-old group. The chi-square test analysis provided no support for the change of the father's parenting in the 14- and 17-year-old group---\( \chi^2(5) = 2.71, p < .74 \) for the 14-year-old group and \( \chi^2(5) = 10.14, p < .07 \) for the 17-year-old group. Support was provided for the change of the father's parenting style in the 11-year-old group, \( \chi^2(5) = 11.28, p < .05 \). However,
sufficient members in each cell of the chi-square test lacked. No cohort differences in the parenting changes within each of three age groups were noted except for the 11-year-old group who perceived their father's parenting style differently between the two data sets.

16. Is there a significant difference in parenting satisfaction across the comparisons of the same age groups between Time 1 and Time 2 data?

In this analysis, the parenting satisfaction was perceived by the parent. A two sample t-test analysis provided no support for the different levels of mother parenting satisfaction within each of three age groups—\( t(43) = 1.06, p<.29 \) for the 11-year-old group, \( t(33) = 1.39, p<.17 \) for the 14-year-old group, and \( t(26) = .21, p<.83 \) for the 17-year-old group. In addition, no support for the different levels of father parenting satisfaction within each of three age groups—\( t(43) = .28, p<.78 \) for the 11-year-old group, \( t(33) = .71, p<.48 \) for the 14-year-old group, and \( t(26) = .96, p<.92 \) for the 17-year-old group was provided. No significant cohort differences in parenting satisfaction within each of three age groups were found.

Summary

Presented in Chapter 4 are the results found in this study. The demographic characteristics of the sample include the comparison between two 11-year-old cohort
groups, and the comparisons in the measures between this study and the original normed studies (i.e., the parenting styles and the parent-adolescent communication).

In this chapter, a multidimensional analysis (including cross-sectional, longitudinal, bidirectional and cohort comparisons) was used to assess the relationships between age and sex of the adolescent and each of the study variables. In cross-sectional comparisons, age and sex differences between members of a family (e.g., the parent-adolescent communication) were examined using repeat-measures analysis of variance procedures (i.e., three-way and four-way ANOVA). Age differences were somewhat significant in the quality of parent-adolescent communication. Younger children appeared to have more communication involvement with parents in each of the two communication subscales. In addition, there were significant differences between the quality of parent-adolescent communication and parenting styles. Parenting style differences were related to in both open (positive) and problems (negative) subscales of communication. Results indicated that the more the parents used induction, the more open and the less problematical parent-adolescent communication proved to be. Although there were no significant age and sex differences found in the well-being of adolescents, there were significant differences in the influences of parenting styles on the well-being of
adolescents. There was an indication that parenting with medium power by frequent induction produced a higher level of well-being in the adolescents. In contrast, parenting with high power by infrequent induction produced a lower level of well-being in the adolescents. In addition, there was a positively significant relationship found between the well-being of adolescents and both communication subscales (open and problems).

Longitudinal comparisons proposed in this study (including the well-being of adolescents, parenting style as perceived by adolescents, the relationship between the well-being of adolescents at Time 1 and parent-adolescent communication at Time 2, and the differences between the adolescent’s perception of parenting styles at Time 1 and parent-adolescent communication at Time 2) were found to be significant only in the development of the adolescent’s well-being. The data indicated that the well-being of adolescents at Time 1 was greater than that found at Time 2. There was a significant change in the parenting styles of families that included those 14 year-old adolescents at Time 1 and those same adolescents who were 17 years old at Time 2. There appeared to be a significant relationship between the parenting styles at Time 1 and parent-adolescent communication at Time 2. This finding was further informed by a closer look at the parenting of both the mother and father. Adolescents with mothers’ using more frequent
induction at Time 1 had more open communication with their mothers at Time 2, and adolescents with fathers' using parenting with more induction at Time 1 had better communication with their fathers at Time 2 (in both open and problems subscales).

Bidirectional comparisons proposed in this study (including whether adolescents' well-being at Time 1 influenced the parent's satisfaction with parenting at Time 2, whether the parent's satisfaction with parenting at Time 1 influenced adolescents' well-being at Time 2, whether the parenting model at Time 1 influenced the well-being of adolescents at Time 2, and whether the well-being of adolescents at Time 1 influenced the parenting model at Time 2) led to the conclusion that the father's parenting change at Time 2 only occurred when the well-being of adolescents at Time 1 was low (below the median).

Cohort comparisons (including the well-being of adolescents, the adolescent's perception of parenting styles, and the parent's satisfaction with parenting) were found to be significantly different only in the well-being of adolescents in families with 11 and 14 year-olds.
Summary of Findings

Adolescence is a complex life process impacting both the adolescent and the family unit of which the adolescent is a member. Such a symbolic interaction perspective is based on the process and relationships which occur within a family (Burr et al., 1979). This perspective makes the assumption that the child's self-esteem (part of well-being) is a function of the parent's reflected appraisal of the child's inherent worth. This reflected appraisal by the parent occurs during the course of parent-child interactions (e.g., Coopersmith, 1967; Gecas et al., 1974). Thus, parent-adolescent communication as symbolic interaction can be expected to affect the adolescent's growth in psychosocial well-being (such as competence, independence, and emotional support). In the family interaction, complex sets of meanings are learned that allow family members to communicate, share experiences, and involve two or more persons in an especially intense social process. Through this process of parent-adolescent reciprocal socialization, each family member's perception of parent-adolescent interaction, and the roles each person plays, are
internalized, and contribute to the development of the social life. Considering the change in areas of physical, social, and psychological development during adolescence, the changes in the family system should lead to the development of a more age-appropriate relationship between the parents and the adolescent.

The adolescent years in the family are likely to be a time of personal change for both young people and their middle-aged parents (Hill, 1980). As the adolescent matures, more abilities in dealing with symbols and values are developed. This greater cognitive and social competence will influence the adolescent's interaction within social groups. Although the adolescent's expanded autonomy and capabilities increase (through participating in the role-taking of others and in the development of autonomy and independence), this maturation may mean the loss of emotional ties (support) or shared beliefs with the parents that still maintain importance for the adolescent. The development of the adolescent would then be logically expected to influence the parent-adolescent relationship (in terms of communication) as well as within the growth of adolescents' own psychosocial well-being.

The theory of "storm and stress" posits that during early adolescence tumultuous intra-psychic energies and a demanding social world are confronted, both of which cause dramatic alterations in self-concept. Self-esteem (as part
of the well-being of adolescents) reaches an all-time low, fluctuating from one moment to another during these stressful years (cf. Blos, 1962; Freud, 1948, 1958; Hall, 1904). More recently, studies indicate that as youngsters move into their adolescent years, they become increasingly adultlike in appearance, engage in more peer-oriented activities, and desire and display greater autonomy and independence (Conger & Peterson, 1984). The early adolescent years, in particular, can be a time of heightened conflict in, and reorganization of, the parent-child relationship (Montemayor, 1983; Steinberg, 1981).

In addition to parent-adolescent conflict, the adolescent's emotional autonomy can be related to aspects of the evolving parent-child relationship that may result in the growth of the adolescents' psychosocial well-being. It could be expected that this growth of the adolescents' well-being (fostered by competence, independence, and emotional support) would decrease as the adolescent matures. Also, parent-adolescent communication could be expected to differ to some extent because of the conflicts between the parents and the adolescent. It has been assumed that a unidimensional model in relation to youngsters and their relationship with their parents has consequences for adolescents' psychosocial well-being. However, given what we know about the reciprocal nature of parent-child relationships, it appears to be likely that bidirectional
influences are at work. Therefore, the adolescents' well-being could be expected to influence parental satisfaction as well as parenting styles.

As the adolescent matures, family environments that offer explanations of rules and regulations and encourage increasing autonomy by the youngster as he or she matures, were expected to foster the well-being of adolescents as well as to generate the more positive aspects of parent-adolescent communication. Family environments that maintain high levels of parental control over adolescents and offer few explanations of family policies were expected to increase more negative aspects of communication between the parents and adolescent, and thus impede the growth of the well-being of adolescents.

Given the above considerations, this study used a multidimensional analysis to explore the relationship between the parents and the adolescent through the quality of communication as it related to the adolescents' psychosocial well-being and to the parenting style. Following one-hundred and ten families (having oldest children aged of 11, 14, or 17 at Time 1) and one-hundred and two families (with oldest adolescents aged 11, 14, or 17 at Time 2) independent questionnaires assessing various aspects of family interactions and behaviors were completed. Information collected from the questionnaires included standard demographic questions, along with questions
regarding parent-child socialization processes involved in parent-adolescent communication and the adolescents' well-being (such as satisfaction with school, self-confidence, decision making, and feelings of being understood and loved). These processes included the quality of parent-adolescent communication, level of support (induction) and control (power), growth of the adolescents' psychosocial well-being and the parental satisfaction with parenting. Adolescents' responses to questions concerning parents' use of power and induction and concerning the quality of communication with parents were analyzed separately for mothers and fathers within each of the three adolescent age groups. The questions concerning the quality of family communication were based on the Parent-Adolescent Communication Scale originally developed by Barnes and Olson (1982). The questions concerning the parenting styles were based on two of the questions originally used in Elder's (1962, 1963) questionnaire on Child-Rearing Relationships as a measurement of parental power and induction in child rearing practices and its effects on the adolescent. Age related differences were significant in the area of parent-adolescent communication, but not in the area of well-being of adolescents. Both communication subscales (open and problems) were significantly higher in families with 11 year-olds than either families with 14 or with 17 year-olds. No sex differences were evident. The interaction of age and
sex was only evident in the problems subscale of parent-adolescent communication. There was some support for the relationship between the parenting styles as the parental power by induction and the quality of parent-adolescent communication and between the parenting styles of parental power by induction and the psychosocial well-being of adolescents. In addition, there was some support for the relationship between the well-being of adolescents and both communication subscales.

Discussion

The present study provides a multidimensional analysis, including cross-sectional, longitudinal, bidirectional, and cohort confirmation of and elaboration on many findings in the studies of adolescent familial relationships as reported in the preceding literature review. Eight of the sixteen hypotheses in this study received at least partial support, and six were confirmed fully. The following discussion addresses these findings.

Cross-sectional Comparisons

Age Difference Age of the adolescent was expected to relate to the study variable. McGoldrick and Carter (1980) have emphasized that the changes in the family system should lead to the development of a more age-appropriate relationship between the parents and the adolescent. Changes in the intergenerational patterns of communication
over the course of male development have been substantiated by Steinberg and Hill (1978) in their cross-sectional study as well as in the extension and replication of the longitudinal data in Steinberg and Hill's (1978) cross-sectional study of adolescent males. As suggested by the findings of these studies, the apex pubertal period may be a time of heightened conflict between the adolescent and his parents as parents react to their son's ascendency with increased control. Thus, it is likely that conflict increases as the adolescent matures and the adolescent familial communication with parents decreases. However, no empirical study provides an explanation of the changes in the intergenerational patterns of communication over the course of female development.

The present study provided a curvilinear relationship for interaction of age and sex in the quality of parent-adolescent communication. In the problems subscale, the youngest female group had the least problems in communicating with both parents; the 17-year-old female group had the most problems in communicating with the mother; and the 14-year-old female group had the most problems in communicating with the father. In addition, age-related differences in the quality of parent-adolescent communication were found. In open family communication, a curvilinear relationship for the age differences was found. The youngest group seemed to communicate the most positively
with parents; the 17-year-old group seemed to communicate the next most positively with parents; and the 14-year-old group seemed to communicate the least positively with parents.

In addition to open family communication, a linear relationship for the age differences in problems in family communication was identified. The 11 year-olds were the least likely to have problems in communicating with parents; the 14 year-olds were the next least likely to have problems in communicating with parents; and the 17 year-olds were the most likely to have problems in communicating with parents. Although the age differences were not absolutely linear or direct, these patterns would lead one to believe that the 11 year-olds were more likely or more willing to communicate with parents than the 14 or 17 year-olds. Unfortunately, the frequency, time spent communicating or topics of the parent-adolescent communication were not available. Otherwise, a better explanation might be provided for the relationship between age and the quality of parent-adolescent communication for the older age groups.

The relationships among parent-child dyads, child’s age, and mother’s parenting style were also significant in this study (p<.04). Among the youngest group, those who perceived their mother’s parenting as medium or low power by frequent induction had the highest level in open parent-adolescent communication for both mother and father. The 17
year-olds who perceived their mother's parenting as high power by infrequent induction had the lowest level in open mother-adolescent communication. The 14 year-olds who perceived their mother's parenting as high power by infrequent induction had the lowest level in open father-adolescent communication. The use of high power and few explanations has the most negative impact on the father-adolescent communication for the 14-year-old group. Perhaps since this is the peak of puberty, the encounters between adolescent and father are conflictual, especially if the mother does not create an open problem-solving context for family communication.

The relationship between the parental strategy of power by induction and age of adolescent was not significant in this study. This relationship and the Time 1 data provide support of Murray's (1984) study, but it is in contrast to Elder's (1963) classic study. The younger adolescents in Elder's study perceived their parents as more powerful or authoritarian in decision making than did the older adolescents. It may be that today (over 25 years after Elder's study) society encourages the development of equalitarian or permissive parent-adolescent interaction at an earlier age. This trend could also reflect a prevailing attitude of equality purported by middle-class families today. This may also support Roberts, Block, and Block's (1984) reports of continuity in child rearing methods across
time. Finally, the differences between the age related findings of Elder in comparison to those in this study may be due to the nature of the data analysis. Elder looked at simple percentages of adolescents in each of his child rearing categories. However, this study assumes the parents' power and induction are ordinal variables as measured by a certain type of parenting style and applies multivariate statistics based on that position.

No relationship was found between age of the adolescent and the parents' use of power and induction. This is in contrast to Steinberg's (1981) study in which parental explanations to boys age 11 to 14 years declined over time. Newman (1983) has suggested that with the advent of formal operations, the adolescent is offered the capability to examine inconsistencies in parental rules or values, and is more likely to press for explanations. If parents do not provide explanations, then the adolescent becomes frustrated. Murray (1984) explained that such studies are composed in large part of well-educated parents, and greater amounts of formal education have been associated with increased parental interpersonal sensitivity (Rainwater, 1960). Therefore, it may be that these parents were aware of the need to maintain high levels of induction throughout the adolescent years.

However, the current study provided support for the relationship between parenting styles and the quality of
parent-adolescent communication. The more the parents used induction, the more positive communication existed between the parents and the adolescent. In addition to frequency of parental explanation, democratically structured relationships (medium parental power) were related to the quality of parent-adolescent communication. This is consistent with Elder's (1963) findings: "It appears that as structural asymmetry increases in parent-child relations toward either autocratic control or permissive obedience to parental rules becomes increasingly contingent on explanatory efforts by parents. In addition to the factor of parental affection and explanations, extreme asymmetry in the structure of the child-rearing relationship may be associated with general communication failures in the transmission of rules and values. Under such conditions parents may simply say little and rigorously control their children or detach themselves completely in child rearing" (p. 60).

No relationship was found between age of the adolescent and the well-being of the adolescent. This is in contrast to the fact that both popular notions and academic thinking consider adolescence as a time of major changes in all areas of functioning. Adolescence is said to involve dramatic transitions in the physical, social, and intellectual spheres, and transitions of this order must be stressful (Health & Welfare Canada, 1983). Since the family, school,
and peer groups form the major socializing influences on adolescents, their expectations or the demands they make on adolescents may at times convert into cross-pressures (Brittain, 1963). Adolescents may perceive those expectations as limiting their behavior or counter to their predispositions and may react with some degree of dissatisfaction and emotional distress (Siddique & D'Arcy, 1984). Also, Hill and Steinberg (1976) have suggested that relationships characterized by the child's emotional dependence on parents are transformed into more autonomous and equitable relations between the parents and the adolescent. Well-being was defined in this study as including three major areas—competence, independence, and emotional supports—and was used to assess the adolescents' psychosocial growth. Therefore, it may be that the adolescents increase autonomous decision making and simultaneously transfer the emotional supports to those that are outside of the family.

**Sex Difference** Sex of the adolescent was not significantly related to any of the study variables. This was not surprising, especially in light of Barnes and Olson's (1985), Grotevant and Cooper's (1983), and Steinberg's (1981) recent emphasis on the communication differences between males and females. The collective results of these studies suggest that these communication differences are not due to the sex of the adolescent. This view is in contrast
to earlier studies (e.g., Jourard, 1971; Jourard & Richman, 1963; Weihe & Scott, 1976; Weihe & Williams, 1972), which have found that females generally disclose more than males in their communication with parents.

Also, traditional sex roles define males as more instrumental and females as more expressive or emotionally open. Yet, the present findings, in part, support the work of others: there were no differences between the family communication level of boys and girls ages 11 through 17 years with respect to sex alone (Barnes & Olson, 1985; Grotevant & Cooper, 1983; Steinberg, 1981). In addition, as in the studies cited above, this study found substantial differences in patterns of parent-adolescent communication between mothers and fathers. This investigation indicated that father-adolescent communication had less problems than mother-adolescent communication in the problems subscale of communication.

No relationship was found between sex differences and the well-being of adolescents, although most studies of adolescents have examined the sex differences in relation to differential structural conditions, arguing that females are placed in a relatively disadvantageous position in contemporary society (D’Arcy & Siddique, 1984; Eichler, 1983; Siddique & D’Arcy, 1984). Existing research findings indicate that female adolescents tend to be highly dependent on their families and, to some extent, on their peers for
emotional support and expression of their personal problems (e.g., Epstein, 1970; Douvan & Adelson, 1966). Female adolescents are also found to be more inclined to conform to adult values than males (Tanner, 1978). Eichler (1983) argues that due to their differential structural positions, adolescent males and females are likely to experience the same families differently. Moreover, in the Siddique and D'Arcy study (1984), there were significant sex differences in the locus of control orientation, with female adolescents showing a greater externality than males which is closely associated with several symptoms of distress. In addition, Thornburg and Shinn (1982) found that 11 to 14-year-old females perceived less power in family decision making than did males. Douvan and Adelson (1966) reported that, despite the emphasis on independence within our society, only 25% of girls aged 17-18 said that independence or autonomy was an important parental expectation. It may be that for the well-being of adolescents, competence, independence, and emotional supports must be included.

This lack of association (for example, females are inclined to have less competence and independence, but more emotional supports from parents) held true based on the adolescent's sex alone. Therefore, when considering the seven items used to assess the adolescents' psychosocial well-being, it may be that the consistent lack of relationship between sex of the adolescent and any of the
study variables reflects the androgynous nature of these middle-class urban families, indicating that all family members hold somewhat similar perceptions of the adolescents' growth in psychosocial well-being regardless of the child's sex.

**The Quality of Parent-Adolescent Communication Most Related to the Well-being of Adolescents** The most consistent and clear relationships were found between the quality of parent-adolescent communication and the adolescents' well-being. Each of four correlational analyses (i.e., between the open father-adolescent communication, between the problems father-adolescent communication, between the open mother-adolescent communication, and between the problems mother-adolescent communication and the adolescents' well-being) reaches very high levels of positive correlation (p<.0001). This view is consistent with earlier research (e.g., Bachman, 1970; Chartier & Chartier, 1975; Matteson, 1974). Matteson (1974) indicated that there is a relationship between parent-adolescent communication and adolescent self-esteem; and additionally, Bachman (1970) and Chartier and Chartier (1975) demonstrated the facilitating effects of positive growth-producing communication on self-esteem and well-being. If families encourage adolescents through communicating with each other, then an increase in adolescents' well-being in the family should be expected.
Parenting Styles Most Related to Adolescents' Well-being

The most consistent and clear relationships between the parenting styles and the adolescents' well-being were also found when analyzing the parental power by induction (Pxi) style. This was supported, especially in light of Elder's (1963) findings on the relationships between autonomous decision making and self-confidence and the parental power by induction. Elder (1963) suggested that adolescents with democratic or permissive parents are much more likely to be confident in their ideas and opinions and to be independent in decision making if their parents explain their rules more often than if the rules are not explained. Infrequent explanations by autocratic parents were related to both low confidence and independence in decision making. The present findings indicated that adolescents who perceived their parents' parenting styles as medium power by induction had a higher level of well-being; and adolescents who perceived their parents' parenting styles as high power by infrequent induction had a lower level of well-being. Thus, the present study highly supported the work of Elder in that the legitimizing of parental dominance has the effect of making this power acceptable, and, in doing so, heightens dependency needs as well as self-confidence.

To summarize, the cross-sectional comparisons concluded that the 11 year-olds had better quality of communication with parents than did the 14 and 17 year-olds. When parents
used medium or low power plus frequent induction, the adolescent had better quality of communication with parents and also developed higher levels of well-being. In addition, there was a positively significant relationship found between the well-being of adolescents and the quality of parent-adolescent communication existed in the parent-adolescent relationship, the more levels of well-being adolescents developed.

**Longitudinal Comparisons**

This study provided the benefits of looking at issues of causality and reciprocity with a research base of adolescent developmental changes which were distributed in two data sets. Observing the adolescent differences and similarities in development within the family across time should provide a significant contribution to the research literature. Also, combining the cross-sectional and longitudinal comparisons make the research worthwhile. The longitudinal comparisons in this current investigation included: the developmental changes in the well-being of adolescents between the two data sets; the developmental changes in parenting styles between the two data sets; the relationship between the well-being of adolescents at Time 1 and parent-adolescent communication at Time 2; and the differences between the adolescent’s perception of parenting styles at Time 1 and parent-adolescent communication at Time 2.
Although there was no difference between age of the adolescent and the well-being of adolescents in the cross-sectional comparisons, significant developmental changes in the well-being of adolescents at both times were found (see Table 10). When the adolescent matures, the psychosocial well-being significantly declines in the families with the adolescent aged 11 and 14. Over the course of the developmental changes, this is consistent with both popular notions and academic thinking which consider adolescence as a time of major changes in all areas of functioning. In addition, when time changes, the psychosocial well-being also significantly declines in the families with the adolescent aged 11 and 14. Such a short period of time (three years) does not result in time factor as the generational effect. It might be that puberty comes earlier in the Time 2 group than in the Time 1 group or that parents, school, or peers form more social influences or demand more (e.g., academic or competent ability) on adolescents in the Time 2 group than in the Time 1 group as time changes. Those social influences cause may produce personal changes in adolescents' psychosocial well-being. This historical decrement in adolescents' well-being needs further clarification.

Brittain (1963) postulated that since the family, school, and peer groups form the major socializing influences on adolescents, their expectations or the demands they make
### TABLE 10
The Developmental and Historical Differences of the Well-being of Adolescents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data</th>
<th>11 Year-Olds</th>
<th>14 Year-Olds</th>
<th>17 Year-Olds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Time 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>(44)</td>
<td>(36)</td>
<td>(31)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>26.41</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>24.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>(40)</td>
<td>(33)</td>
<td>(26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>24.93</td>
<td>23.73</td>
<td>24.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>3.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mean Differences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developmental</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
on adolescents may at times convert into cross-pressures. In addition, Siddique and D'Arcy (1984) state that adolescents may perceive those expectations as limiting their behavior or counter to their predispositions and may react with some degree of dissatisfaction and emotional distress. Thus, it may be that, as adolescents mature, they encounter more emotional distress and lose self-confidence. Also, Murray (1984) found that level of family support was significantly higher for 11 year-olds than for 14 or 17 year-olds. This negative relationship between family emotional support and age substantiates the work of others (e.g., Steinberg, 1981; Thornburg & Shinn, 1982) that have predicted difficulties increasing throughout early adolescence. Therefore, one would expect a large decrease in feelings of support to occur when adolescents matured. For the 17 year-olds parental restrictions on their attempts at increased independence may also be seen as a decrease in support within the family, resulting in a reciprocal decrease in expressions of closeness. Maintaining bonds of affection, while encouraging behavioral autonomy, appears to be a crucial issue in families with early adolescents (Newman, 1983).

The most consistent and clear relationships between parent behavior and the adolescents' assessment of the quality of parent-adolescent communication were assessed using these two different variables across time.
Developmental changes were also found when analyzing parental power by induction (PxI) style. When analyzing parental power and parental induction together as the typology of the parenting styles in this study, results generally support this hypothesis. The current study indicated that adolescents who perceived their parents' parenting styles as medium or low power by induction at Time 1 had a higher level of communication on both subscales of parent-adolescent communication at Time 2 (e.g., openness and problems); and adolescents who perceived their parents' parental styles as high power by infrequent induction at Time 1 had a lower level of communication in both subscales of parent-adolescent communication at Time 2. Yet, in one case, results were not significant or conclusive (e.g., the mother parenting at Time 1 and the open mother-adolescent communication). This view supports both Elder's (1963) early study (which suggested that extreme asymmetry in the structure of the child-rearing relationship may be associated with general communication failures in the transmission of rules and values) and the cross-sectional comparisons in this study (discussed earlier in this chapter). Therefore, it appears that there is a relationship between parenting styles and parent-adolescent communication; and that to most effectively study parenting styles, both parental power and induction must be studied together.
However, in the present study, no developmental changes in parenting styles as perceived by adolescents across time were found. As adolescents mature, their perceptions of the parenting styles were similar across time. This view is consistent with Murray's (1984) finding and the cross-sectional comparisons in this study. Yet, it is in contrast to Elder's (1963) classic study in which he suggested that younger adolescents perceived their parents as more powerful or authoritarian in decision making than did the older adolescents. It may be that today (25 years after Elder's study) society encourages the development interaction at an earlier age.

Also, it may be due to the nature of the data analysis in this study. This study used parental power by induction as a typology of parenting styles. In addition, when assessing six types of parenting styles, the subjects across each type of parenting style in this study may be not enough to result in the differences in the data analysis (e.g., the \( \chi^2 \) statistical test analysis).

Additionally, no relationships (over the course of developmental changes) between the well-being of adolescents at Time 1 and the quality of parent-adolescent communication at Time 2 were found. However, there was a highly positive relationship between the well-being of adolescents and the quality of parent-adolescent communication at the Time 2 cross-sectional comparisons. The differences between the
cross-sectional and longitudinal comparisons in relation to the well-being of adolescents and the quality of parent-adolescent communication may be due to the nature of the data analysis. Longitudinal comparisons in this study used the adolescents' perceptions of the well-being at Time 1 and the quality of parent-adolescent communication at Time 2. Some of the subjects may have dropped out who at Time 1 had different perceptions of well-being from those still included in the second data analysis, and the 11 year-olds who had a higher level of well-being and communication scores shown in the cross-sectional comparisons were not included. This may have resulted in the different findings between those two different comparisons.

To summarize, the longitudinal comparisons indicated that adolescents' well-being declined over time. There was a positively significant relationship between the adolescent's perception of the parents' parenting styles at Time 1 and the quality of parent-adolescent communication at Time 2. When adolescents perceived their parents' parenting styles with more explanations (induction) at ages 11 and 14, they communicated better with parents at ages 14 and 17.

Bidirectional Comparisons

The bidirectional-systemic perspective consists of four hypotheses used to examine the parent-adolescent dyad, all of which try to find cues that parent-adolescent socialization is not just a one-way process from parent to
adolescent, but a two-way process or reciprocal relationship between parent and adolescent. Two of these hypotheses as to the "child effect" on position are a reversal of the traditional social-mold perspective and examine how children influence adults (e.g., Bell & Harper, 1977; Lerner & Spanier, 1978; Maccoby & Martin, 1983; Newman & Murray, 1983). Thus, these bidirectional comparisons of "adolescent effects" examine how the adolescents' perception of well-being influences the behavior and attitudes of the parental parenting; and the bidirectional comparisons of "parent effects" examine how parents behavior or attitudes influence the well-being of adolescents (as the child's outcome). The adolescents' effects were expected to relate to the behavior and attitudes of the parental parenting.

The "parent effects" in the bidirectional comparisons of this study between the parenting model (behavior) at Time 1 and the well-being of adolescents at Time 2 and between the parental parenting satisfaction (attitudes) at Time 1 and the well-being of adolescents at Time 2 were not found. These views were not consistent with Peterson and Rollins' (1987) and Rollins and Thomas' (1979) explanations that parental support can be viewed as a gesture or a significant symbolic interaction communicating that both the child's "self" and the child's actions are valued by the parents.

Parents use supportive behavior as a means of encouraging and assigning significance to specific behaviors.
and internal states of children. Support fosters child behavior that is consistent with parental expectations and that enhances the self-image of children. These views are also not consistent with Peterson and Rollins' (1987) and Rollins and Thomas' (1979) explanations in relation to power control. Peterson and Rollins (1987) suggested that the most common definitions of control refer to actions used by parents while attempting to modify the behavior and the internal state of children. In a review of the parent-child research by Rollins and Thomas (1979) this dimension of the child socializer role was referred to as "parental control attempts". In addition to identifying various subdimensions of parental control or support, investigators (cf. Baumrind, 1967, 1971; Becker, 1964; Thomas et al., 1974) have attempted to resolve inconsistencies in the research by developing models that combine parental styles with certain kinds of parental control attempts and support: a combination of parenting styles are used to perform the child socializer role. These models allow researchers to illustrate how combinations of certain levels of power control and induction "interact" to produce different outcomes in children. That is, high control and high support might produce high compliance; high control and low support might produce noncompliance; low control and low support might produce social withdrawal; and low control and high support might produce independence in children. This
study is composed in large part of that sample. However, since the parenting styles were combinations of parental power and induction (support), collapsing parental styles into six types might be problematic. The distribution of the small sample for each type of parenting style may result in difficulties finding the relationship between parenting styles and well-being of adolescents.

No relationship between the well-being of adolescents at Time 1 and the parents' satisfaction was found in the "child effects", indicating that adolescents psychosocial well-being did not influence the parents' attitudes (satisfaction) toward parenting styles. This finding is not consistent with Peterson and Rollins' (1987) explanations in which they postulated that children who exhibit high levels of socially competent behavior, for example, are probably displaying behavior consistent with parental expectation.

However, another child effect in this study, does in part, support the hypothesis, which indicated the father's parenting changed at Time 2 when the adolescents' well-being at Time 1 was low (below the median). This view supports Peterson and Rollins' (1987) suggestions that agreement between parental expectations and children's role performance, in turn, is likely to elicit favorable responses (such as support and induction) from the parents who are recipients of this influence. By contrast, socially
incompetent role-performance by children (e.g., antisocial aggression) usually differs from parental expectations and is likely to elicit upper-limit controls (e.g., parental coercion). This may also support Bengtson and Troll's (1978) reports that authorities concerned about cross-generational transmission have suggested that youth movements may effect or "resocialize" the attitudes of parents in a variety of areas. The younger generation often identifies an area of life or a "keynote issue" and seeks to challenge the existing attitudes, expectations, and role behaviors of their elders in these areas (Peterson & Rollins, 1987).

To summarize, the "parent effects" of the bidirectional model were not evident in this investigation. However, the "child effects" of the bidirectional model were found in that the father's parenting style at Time 2 changed when their child's well-being at Time 1 was low (below the median). Therefore, although the reciprocity of the parent-adolescent relationship was not made evident, this study at least provided some support of the "child effects" in the bidirectional model.

Cohort Comparisons

The cohort comparisons in the time-lag design cannot give us direct information about age changes or age differences because only one age group is studied. However, it provides information about factors that may
confound the age comparisons in longitudinal and cross-sectional designs. Cohort comparisons across limited time periods combine cross-sectional and longitudinal comparisons. This procedure has been referred to as sequential design and permits the researcher to account for developmental and historical effects (Baltes, 1968; Schaele, 1965).

In this investigation each of three age groups has been examined: level of adolescents' well-being between the two data sets; the perception of adolescents in the parental parenting styles between the two data sets; and the parental parenting satisfaction between the two data sets. Due to the short time period (3 years after the first data collection), the historical effects on each hypothesis would not be expected to significantly relate to the study variables. Miller (1987) has suggested that one does not need to worry about the fact that two groups are born within a short time when comparing historical effects. Although we live in a time of rapid cultural and educational change, samples within the short span of life can usually be assumed to belong to the same generation. These changes may affect at least some between-age comparisons even among child samples.

Changes in the adolescents' perception of the parental parenting styles and in parental satisfaction over the course of historical effects were not found. However, in
the present study, changes in the adolescents' well-being over the course of three and a half years were found in families with the adolescent aged 11 and 14 year old (see Table 10). This view is consistent with the longitudinal comparisons of the well-being of adolescents, which indicated the well-being of adolescents declined as the adolescent grew up. In addition, this finding indicated that as time changed, 11 and 14 year-olds' well-being declined. These two findings have accounted for developmental and historical effects on the well-being of adolescents. A further statistical procedure "Estimation of Confidence Intervals", was used to check the differences between the change scores in both developmental and historical effects. This statistical examination showed that there was no difference between these two change scores, which indicated that both of the two effects influenced the decreased well-being of adolescents. However, the developmental effects had a larger means of differences ($\bar{x} = -2.76$ for the 11-14 year-olds and $\bar{x} = -1.52$ for the 14-17 year-olds) than the historical effects ($\bar{x} = -1.48$ for the two-cohort 11 year-olds and $\bar{x} = -1.27$ for the two-cohort 14 year-olds).

To summarize, the table 10 noted that the cross-sectional comparison at Time 1, the longitudinal comparison, and the cohort comparison on adolescents' psychosocial well-being were significantly different, indicating the well-
being of adolescents declined when adolescents matured or time changed; however, the cross-sectional comparison at Time 2 was not significantly different. It may be that although the adolescents' expanded autonomy and capabilities increase (through participating in the role-taking of others and in the development of autonomy and independence), this maturation may mean the loss of emotional ties (support) or shared beliefs with the parents that still maintain importance for the adolescent. Also, it may be that the natural component of the well-being of adolescents in this study result in the decline because the emotional support takes up four items out of seven items. Thus, when adolescents mature, the intraindividual personal change results in a decline in the well-being of adolescents. In addition, the historical effect of a decline in the well-being of adolescents may be a product of heightened demands from parents, school, or peers. Therefore, conclusions about the declined well-being of adolescents should be made with caution. Both developmental and time factors influenced the decline in the adolescents' psychosocial well-being.

Influences of Demographic Variables

Pearson correlation coefficients (r) were used in this study to check for strong relationships among any of the demographic and study variables (reported in chapter 4). In families of 11 year-olds, as fathers' educational attainment
Increased, the well-being of adolescents increased ($r = .304, p<.05$); the adolescents had less problems in communicating with mothers ($r = .331, p<.03$); and the mother's parenting satisfaction increased ($r = .424, p<.01$). It follows that highly educated fathers may encourage adolescent behavioral autonomy and give them more emotional supports, and these strategies may affect the mother's parenting satisfaction and result in less negative communication with the adolescent. Moreover, as mothers' formal educational attainment increased, the well-being of adolescents also increased ($r = .332, p<.05$). It follows that highly educated mothers may also be able to give adolescents emotional bonds and encourage their behavioral autonomy.

Elder's (1962, 1963) work would suggest that this relationship between years of education and empathic ability exists. Empathic ability may also influence the mothers' awareness of the importance of allowing young adolescents increased behavioral autonomy and of giving adolescents emotional supports. This may increase the mother parenting satisfaction as well as the mother-adolescent communication in the problems subscale.

The family SES (measured by the higher of the parents' occupational status using the revised Duncan scale) had a significant relationship with the problems in mother-adolescent communication ($r = .344, p<.02$), which indicated
families with the higher family SES had less problems in the mother-adolescent communication. It appears that adolescents in the higher SES families had less problems in communicating with their mothers. This view is consistent with the fathers' educational attainment. It may be that higher SES families are impacted by the fathers' higher level of formal education.

In families with 11 year-olds, there appears to be a negative correlation between mothers' age at the target child's birth and the problems in father-adolescent communication. The older the mother was upon having the first child, the more problems adolescents had in communicating with their fathers ($r = -.309, p<.05$). The reasons behind this phenomenon remain unclear and can be investigated by future research.

In families with 14 year-olds, strong correlations existed between the positive mother-adolescent communication and family SES ($r = .368, p<.03$). It appears that adolescents in the higher SES families had more openness in communicating with mothers. Although families with 14 year-olds did not show any relationship between parents' educational attainment and the quality of parent-adolescent communication, this relationship between family SES and the positive mother-adolescent communication was consistent with families with 11 year-olds, who reportedly had less problems in communicating with mothers when they were in the higher
family SES.

In contrast, in families with 17 year-olds, as fathers' formal educational attainment increased, adolescents had less open communication with fathers; and mothers had less parenting satisfaction. Also, as mothers' educational attainment increased, it appeared that adolescents had more problems in communicating with fathers. Although there were no relationships shown between the family SES and the quality of parent-adolescent communication, the belief that fathers of upper social classes are more dominant than fathers from lower social classes (Ericksen, Yancey, & Ericksen, 1979) may be reflected in the negative correlations of parents' education and the adolescents' perception of the quality of parent-adolescent communication in families with 17 year-olds. It may be that parents with 17 year-olds who have higher formal educational attainment encourage their child's behavioral autonomy and emotional independence. Therefore, adolescents may communicate more with people outside the family (e.g., peers, school adults). Additionally, mothers of 17 year-olds appear to have low satisfaction with parenting. There appears to be a negative correlation between the number of years between the fathers' marriage and birth of the first child and the negative father-adolescent communication. The reasons behind this phenomenon remain unclear and can only be illuminated by future research.
Across the three age groups there was a general trend toward a positive relationship of fathers' or mothers' education or family SES and the quality of parent-adolescent communication and the mother parenting satisfaction in families with 11 or 14 year-olds as well as the well-being of adolescents in families with 11 year-olds. Yet, for adolescents aged 17, there was a trend toward a negative relationship between parents' level of education and the quality of parent-adolescent communication and the mother's parenting satisfaction. While parental education may be related to increased awareness, communication, encouragement of behavioral autonomy, or emotional supports, it appears to hold true more consistently in families with 11 or 14 year-olds. It may be that education provides parents' (especially for mothers) increased awareness of the need for adolescent power or equality in general. With the increased behavioral autonomy, well-being, or good quality of communication with mothers, an increase in the mother's parenting satisfaction may result. Nevertheless, this trend of interaction did not hold true for families with 17 year-olds. It may be that conflict with older adolescents is related to the parents' own mid-life transition, a crisis more likely to occur among well-educated adults (Levinson, 1977).
Implication for Practitioners or Family-Life Education

This study noted that parenting styles in the middle-class families had a significant relationship with the quality of parent-adolescent communication as well as adolescents' well-being. When adolescents perceived their parents' parenting style with frequent induction (explanation to the rules), they developed higher levels of well-being and had better quality of communication with parents, especially when the parents used medium or low power to control the adolescent. Thus, as the implication to the practitioners or family-life educators, I suggest that the parents utilize more induction and less power control in their child-rearing practices. Within a structure of low power and high induction adolescents can develop more autonomy, competence, and emotional (interpersonal) involvement with parents during adolescence. Also, adolescents can communicate more positively and less problematically with the parents.

Recommendation for Research

Research-related issues will be presented in two parts. The first part represents those aspects of the current study which could benefit from methodological improvements. The second part represents issues that would be of interest in future research endeavors.
Methodological Improvements

This study has taken advantage of Murray's (1984) first phase of a cross-sectional study, combining the longitudinal comparisons and time-lag (cohort) comparisons as a sequential design, plus the bidirectional comparisons used to look at the influence of the parent-adolescent socialization (e.g., child effects, parent effects, or the reciprocal relationship). In comparison to a standard cross-sectional design, the sequential design has the advantage of at least partially unconfounding age and year of birth (because there are at least two different cohorts for each age tested); it also provides a time-lag comparison through the appearance of the same age group at different times of testing. At the same time, the design avoids some of the problems found with longitudinal designs, such as the effects of repeating testing on the subject's behavior.

Interpretations of the findings from later research encounters with these same families will have the additional benefit of looking at issues of causality and reciprocity by using multiple-perception (cf. Murray, 1984) and multiple-regression techniques.

The multiple-perception model could provide a better understanding of the higher level of agreement between the perceptions or reports of different family members, and this model could also help improve the accuracy of adolescent reports of parenting styles or parent-adolescent
communication.

The multiple-regression techniques could provide a better understanding in each particular explanation of variance and causality in the family study (e.g., the well-being of adolescents or parenting styles in this study). Using this approach, both the actor’s prior behavior and the partner’s prior behavior are entered as predictors of the actor’s current behavior. This procedure would provide estimates of the independent effects of self-behavior, the partner’s behavior, and their interaction in the socialization process.

Another difficulty encountered in this study was the validity of questionnaire reports. Although survey questionnaire are far more efficient than other methods (e.g., observational, experimental, etc.), validity would be improved through the use of path analysis and structural models or by the use of interviews and survey questionnaires in conjunction with observational procedures. This would facilitate an examination of the relationship between a set of variables that are ordered causally according to theory (Asher, 1976; Joreskog & Sorbom, 1979). This approach would allow the attitudes, perceptions, expectations, and behaviors of the respondents to be assessed.

Future researchers can benefit by examining how social development is facilitated or hindered by the interrelationships among such settings as the parent-child
dyad, the parents’ working setting, the school, and the peer group. Another longitudinal study should be concerned with looking at changes in the expectation and performance of parent-child roles over time. Also, the unclear conclusion concerning changes of well-being in adolescents needs to be clarified.

Another difficulty encountered in this study was the generalization of the sample. The sample in this current study is nonrandomized and limited by a certain subculture (i.e., middle-class white) which lacks comparability with other subcultures (e.g., other racial groups, control or experimental families in terms of hospital or treatment status).

In the current study, three levels of parental power were measured by collapsing five levels of responses into three, and two levels of parental induction were measured by collapsing five levels of responses into two (see Appendix G). These three levels of parental power by two levels of parental induction made six types of categories as a typology of the parenting styles. After data had been collected and analyzed, it was found that a very small percentage or none of the families in the sample existed in certain types of parenting style, especially when looking at age differences. As a result, there was difficulty in measuring whether the predicted characteristics of parenting styles changed over time; or whether the predicted
characteristics of parenting styles influenced parent-adolescent communication.

It would have been helpful to have stratified the sample as well as to have a larger sample in order to have guaranteed enough diversity of parenting styles. This may have been accomplished by having located some of the subjects in neighborhoods where less highly educated or SES parents reside. A wide range of parenting styles may have been obtained by not having relied so heavily upon personal recommendations for locating potential subject families. Larger samples in each type of parenting style may have helped the accuracy in the statistical manipulation (e.g., chi-square test analysis). Finally, as Murray (1984) suggested, the use of a much larger and more diverse sample would allow for an analysis of models with a great number of variables and interaction terms, would enhance the understanding and interrelationships, and the statistical manipulation of that data.

Issues for Future Research

This study, although revealing interesting comparative findings on some study variables, leaves several questions unanswered or in need of further clarification:

1. Which model (developmental or historical) can better explain the fact that well-being of adolescents declined as time changed? These are issues that require repeated sequential designs to clarify as well as to check
age differences which were not revealed through the cross-sectional comparisons in this study.

2. How does parents' level of "mid-life crisis" (Levinson, 1977) influence the adolescents' psychosocial well-being and the quality of parent-adolescent communication in general? If both the parents and adolescents are experiencing stress and inner-conflict, the entire family system should potentially be in a state of change as well.

3. As a bidirectional model, what kind of child characteristics influence parent outcome? Does the psychosocial well-being of adolescents influence the psychosocial well-being of parents? If not, which model (child effects, parent effects, or reciprocal relationship) provides the clearest picture of adolescent-parent socialization?

4. How do findings based on the Barnes and Olson's (1982) quality of parent-adolescent communication differ from those based on Noller and Bagi's (1985) parent-adolescent communication on both process and content dimensions in relation to gender differences in family communication? If it is true that the females (daughters and mothers) communicate better with the other generation than males in frequency and self-disclosure, then it may be that a schema of parent-adolescent communication based upon the "female mode of development" would be most useful.
5. What influences do outside family resources (e.g., peers, school, community, etc.) have on the well-being of adolescents? Do these differ by age and sex of the participants?

6. What is the agreement of the perceptions of family members about parent-adolescent communication? Does this differ by age and sex of the family members?

7. What processes are involved in the family members' triadic interactions? What patterns of verbal or nonverbal parent-child relationships are noted? Do these differ by age and sex of the participants?

8. What is the relationship between the quality of parent-adolescent communication and specific demographic variables (e.g., the number of years parents were married at the birth of their first child or the age parents were when their first child was born)? This relationship (especially for the negative father-adolescent communication) appeared in families of both 11 and 17 year-olds, and appears to have currently unknown significance in the parent-child socialization process.

9. Is the way I defined the well-being in this study bounded to the western culture or can it apply to different cultures? Would the pattern about the development in the well-being of the adolescent in the different culture be the same as that in the western culture?
10. Finally, are methods of analyzing whole family or multiple perception data superior to individual measures in explaining the dynamics of a group level measure, such as family communication? If so, which methods are best? If not, which individual or individuals' perceptions provide the clearest picture of group level measures? In other words, what methods account for the greatest amount of variance in a family factor? Is the increased information obtained in multiple perceptions research worth the cost of gathering and analyzing those data?

**Summary of Major Findings**

This investigation has studied the parent-adolescent relationship by using a multidimensional analysis (a sequential design, plus bidirectional comparisons) to assess the quality of parent-adolescent communication, the well-being of adolescents, and parenting styles in families of 11, 14, and 17 year-olds. It has been demonstrated that the quality of parent-adolescent communication and the well-being of adolescents are clearly related to parenting styles (as manipulated by parental power and induction).

A brief summary of the most important findings of this study follows:

1. There were no significant sex differences for the quality of parent-adolescent communication, the well-being of adolescents, and parenting styles.
2. There were no age differences for adolescents' psychosocial well-being at Time 2 in this study; however, there were age differences at Time 1, indicating the well-being of adolescents declined as age increased.

3. Age differences were somewhat significant in the quality of parent-adolescent communication. The 11 year-olds had the most communication involvements with parents in both subscales of the quality of parent-adolescent communication. The interaction of age and sex also demonstrated that 11-year-old females had the most communication involvements with parents in both subscales of the quality of parent-adolescent communication.

4. There were highly significant relationships between the quality of parent-adolescent communication and parenting styles (shown on both cross-sectional and longitudinal comparisons) and between the well-being of adolescents and parenting styles. In general, when parents utilized more induction involvement or were inclined to use medium or low power to control their child, the better quality of communication with parents the adolescent had, and the higher well-being the adolescent had.

5. The quality of parent-adolescent communication was highly correlated with the well-being of adolescents.

6. The mean difference in the developmental change in the well-being of adolescents was higher than that of the historical (cohort) change in the well-being of adolescents,
although both indicated that the well-being of adolescents declined, as time changed.

7. Fathers' parenting styles changed when they perceived their child at a low level of well-being (below the median).

8. Bidirectional influences were not clear in this study except that the adolescents' well-being influenced some fathers to change their parenting styles.

9. Cohort differences were not evident except that the well-being of adolescents declined in families of 11 and 14 year-olds.

10. The most clear relationships existed between parenting styles and the quality of parent-adolescent communication in families with 11 year-olds.

11. Eleven year-old adolescents had higher psychosocial well-being in families when parents were highly educated.

12. When fathers were highly educated, mothers had higher quality in communicating with adolescents and in satisfaction with their parenting in families with 11 year-olds. However, these findings were contradicted in families with 17 year-olds.

13. The quality of mother-adolescent communication was highly correlated with families' SES in families with 11 and 14 year-olds.
APPENDIX A

Human Subjects Approval
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APPENDIX B

Letter of Introduction to Prospective Families
I would like to invite you to participate in a study of changing family relationships during the adolescent years. We are trying to get a better understanding of the way parents and their children relate to one another as the children grow up. I am interested in your ideas, feelings, and reactions to questions about decision making, family responsibilities, and family values. The study will require your participation in a family interview that will take about one hour. Your oldest child must be 11 years old. I will also ask you to fill out a questionnaire that will take about forty minutes. There are no right or wrong answers to any of the questions. I simply want to know your views.

Your answers would be completely confidential. They will be used like an opinion poll to get an idea of how people think about important aspects of family life. I hope you would be willing to talk with me again in about three years so I can learn how your family is changing.

I believe the information that is gathered from this study will be of great value in helping children and parents to understand the quality of family life during the adolescent years. One of the members of our research team will be calling you soon to find out if you might be interested in participating in our research. Please feel free to contact me at 292-5881 if you have further questions about this project.

Sincerely,

Barbara M. Newman
Associate Provost
Academic Affairs and Director of Project

BMH/dlb
APPENDIX C

Consent Form
I consent to serve as a subject in the research investigation entitled: \textbf{CHANGING CHARACTERISTICS OF THE PARENT-CHILD RELATIONSHIP DURING ADOLESCENCE}

The nature and general purpose of the research procedure have been explained to me. This research is to be performed by or under the direction of Dr. Barbara M. Newman, who is authorized to use the services of others in the performance of the research.

I understand that any further inquiries I make concerning this procedure will be answered. I understand my identity will not be revealed in any publication, document, recording, video-tape, photograph, computer data storage, or in any other way which relates to this research. Finally, I understand that I am free to withdraw my consent and discontinue participation at any time following the notification of the Project Director.

Signed \hspace{1cm} (Subject)

Date \hspace{1cm}

Time AM \hspace{1cm} PM

Witness - (Auditor)

Investigator
APPENDIX D

Adolescent Questionnaire
Interviewer's Name:__________________________________________________________________________
Child's Name:______________________________________________________________________________
Date:_______________________________________________________________________________________

BOYS ONLY

1. Did the boy have noticeable facial hair in the following places:
   a. corners above top lip.................................Yes( )  No( )
   b. noticeable moustache...............................Yes( )  No( )
   c. side of face........................................Yes( )  No( )
   d. chin...............................................Yes( )  No( )
   e. other, where______________________________

2. How well developed was the boy's general muscular build? Was he...
   1 ( ) Very athletic-looking
   2 ( ) Somewhat athletic-looking
   3 ( ) Not very athletic-looking
   4 ( ) Not at all athletic-looking

GIRLS ONLY

3. How well-developed was the girl's figure (i.e., bust development)? Was she...
   1 ( ) Very developed
   2 ( ) Somewhat developed
   3 ( ) Development was just noticeable
   4 ( ) Not even noticeable development yet

4. Has the girl menstruated?..............................Yes( )  No( )
PARENT-ADOLESCENT RELATIONSHIPS

Thank you for agreeing to participate in this ongoing study of parent-adolescent relationships. We are interested in your opinions. There are no right or wrong answers to these questions. We just want to know what you think.

If there are any questions you do not wish to answer, please feel free to omit them. Your answers will be completely confidential. They will be used like an opinion poll to get an idea of how people view this important period of family life.

Once again, we sincerely appreciate the time you are giving to this research activity.
FAMILY NAME: ________________________________________________________

GIVEN NAME: ________________________________________________________

DATE: ___________ TIME: ___________

1. Your age _______________________ and birth date ____________________

2. Your sex (circle one) BOY GIRL

2a. Your weight in lbs. _______. Height in feet and inches ________.

3. What grade in school are you in now? ______________________

4. In your religious preference Protestant, Roman Catholic, Jewish or something else? Check one.

   ________ Protestant
   ________ Roman Catholic
   ________ Jewish
   ________ Other
   ________ Please ____________________ (Specify)

5. In general, how religious minded would you say you are—very religious minded, more than average, average, less than average, or not at all religious minded? Check one.

   ________ Very
   ________ More than average
   ________ Average
   ________ Less than average
   ________ Not at all

6. Please rate your overall satisfaction with school. Check one.

   ________ Highly dissatisfied
   ________ Dissatisfied
   ________ Somewhat satisfied
   ________ Satisfied
   ________ Highly satisfied

7. For daily decisions in your family, how would you say those decisions are reached? Check one.

   ________ My mother makes most family decisions.
   ________ My father makes most family decisions.
   ________ My mother and father make most family decisions.
   ________ My mother, father, and the children make most family decisions together.

Can you describe a recent family decision and tell how it was reached?
8. How confident are you that your own ideas and decisions about what you should do and believe are right and best for you? Check one.

________ I am not at all confident.
________ I am a little confident.
________ I am quite confident.
________ I am completely confident.

9. When you have a really important decision to make about yourself and your future, do you make it on your own, or do you like to get help on it? Check one.

________ I'd rather let someone else decide for me.
________ I depend a lot on others and like other people's advice.
________ I get other ideas then make up my own mind.
________ I make up my own mind without any help.

10. When you don't know why your mother makes a particular decision or has certain rules for you to follow, will she explain the reason? Check one.

______ Never
______ Once in a while
________ Sometimes
________ Usually
________ Yes, always

Can you give an example of a rule your mother made that you did not understand or agree with and what happened?

11. When you don't know why your father makes a particular decision or has certain rules for you to follow, will he explain the reason? Check one.

______ Never
______ Once in a while
________ Sometimes
________ Usually
________ Yes, always

Can you give an example of a rule your father made that you did not understand or agree with and what happened?
12. In general, how much are your needs and opinions considered when decisions are made between you and your mother? Check one.

_________ My mother just tells me what to do.
_________ My mother makes the decisions but not without considering my opinions.
_________ We arrive at decisions together.
_________ I can make my decisions, but my mother would like me to consider her opinions.
_________ I can do what I want regardless of what my mother thinks.

13. In general, how much are your needs and opinions considered when decisions are made between you and your father? Check one.

_________ My father just tells me what to do.
_________ My father makes the decisions but not without considering my opinions.
_________ We arrive at decisions together.
_________ I can make my decisions, but my father would like me to consider his opinions.
_________ I can do what I want regardless of what my father thinks.

14. Would you like to be the kind of person your mother is? Check one.

_________ Not at all
_________ In only a few ways
_________ In many ways
_________ In most ways
_________ Yes, completely

15. Would you like to be the kind of person your father is? Check one.

_________ Not at all
_________ In only a few ways
_________ In many ways
_________ In most ways
_________ Yes, completely

16. How would you react if your parents objected to your seeing some of your friends? Check one.

_________ I would feel angry
_________ I would feel guilty
_________ I would feel hurt
_________ I would not care
_________ I would try to understand their concerns
17. If your parents were to object strongly to some of the friends you had, would you: (Check one).

________ Keep going with them openly.
________ See them secretly.
________ See them less.
________ Stop going with them.

18. Which of these answers would your mother expect you to check? Check one.

________ Keep going with them openly.
________ See them secretly.
________ See them less.
________ Stop going with them.

19. Which of these answers would your father expect you to check? Check one.

________ Keep going with them openly.
________ See them secretly.
________ See them less.
________ Stop going with them.

20. How well do you understand your mother? Check one.

________ I never understand her.
________ Usually, I do not understand her.
________ Sometimes I understand her.
________ I usually understand her.
________ I understand her perfectly.

21. How well does your mother understand you? Check one.

________ She never understands me.
________ Usually, she does not understand me.
________ Sometimes she understands me.
________ She usually understands me.
________ She understands me perfectly.

22. If your mother was asked how well she understood you, which of these would your mother check? Check one.

________ I never understand him/her.
________ Usually, I do not understand him/her.
________ Sometimes I understand him/her.
________ I usually understand him/her.
________ I understand him/her perfectly.
23. How well do you understand your father? Check one.

________ I never understand him.
________ Usually, I do not understand him.
________ Sometimes I understand him.
________ I usually understand him.
________ I understand him perfectly.

24. How well does your father understand you? Check one.

________ He never understands me.
________ Usually, he does not understand me.
________ Sometimes I understand him.
________ I usually understand him.
________ I understand him perfectly.

25. If your father was asked how well he understood you, which of these would your father check? Check one.

________ I never understand him/her.
________ Usually, I do not understand him/her.
________ Sometimes I understand him/her.
________ I usually understand him/her.
________ I understand him/her perfectly.

26. Please give a number from 5 to 1 to show how much you agree or disagree with each statement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESPONSE CHOICE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Strongly Disagree Moderately Disagree Neither Agree Moderately Agree Strongly Agree

1. I can discuss my beliefs with my mother without feeling restrained or embarrassed.

2. Sometimes I have trouble believing everything my mother tells me.

3. My mother is always a good listener.

4. I am sometimes afraid to ask my mother for what I want.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESPONSE CHOICES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. My mother has a tendency to say things to me which will be better left unsaid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. My mother can tell how I'm feeling without asking.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I am very satisfied with how my mother and I talk together.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. If I were in trouble, I could tell my mother.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. I openly show affection to my mother.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. When we are having a problem, I often give my mother the silent treatment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. I am careful about what I say to my mother.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. When talking to my mother, I have a tendency to say things that would be better left unsaid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. When I ask questions, I get honest answers from my mother.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. My mother tries to understand my point of view.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. There are topics I avoid discussing with my mother.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. I find it easy to discuss problems with my mother.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. It is very easy for me to express all my true feelings to my mother.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. My mother nags/bothers me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. My mother insults me when she is angry with me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. I don't think I can tell my mother how I really feel about some things.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
27. Please give a number from 5 to 1 to show how much you agree or disagree with each statement.

----------------------------------- RESPONSE CHOICES -----------------------------------
-----------------------------------

      1  2  3  4  5
Strongly Moderately Neither Agree Moderately Strongly
Disagree Disagree Nor Disagree Agree Agree

1. I can discuss my beliefs with my father without feeling restrained or embarrassed.
2. Sometimes I have trouble believing everything my father tells me.
3. My father is always a good listener.
4. I am sometimes afraid to ask my father for what I want.
5. My father has tendency to say things to me which would be better left unsaid.
6. My father can tell how I'm feeling without asking.
7. I am very satisfied with how my father and I talk together.
8. If I were in trouble, I could tell my father.
9. I openly show affection to my father.
10. When we are having a problem, I often give my father the silent treatment.
11. I am careful about what I say to my father.
12. When talking to my father, I have a tendency to say things that would be better left unsaid.
13. When I ask questions, I get honest answers from my father.
14. My father tries to understand my point of view.
15. There are topics I avoid discussing with my father.
16. I find it easy to discuss problems with my father.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESPONSE CHOICES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

17. It is very easy for me to express all my true feelings to my father.

18. My father nags/bothers me.

19. My father insults me when he is angry with me.

20. I don't think I can tell my father how I really feel about some things.

28. Which of the following best describes your relationship with your mother? Check one.

- **I am absolutely confident of my mother's love.**
- **Sometimes I worry that my mother and I are not as close as we might be.**
- **There is a growing sense of distance between me and my mother.**
- **Right now, my mother and I have very few loving moments.**

29. Which of the following best describes your relationship with your father? Check one.

- **I am absolutely confident of my father's love.**
- **Sometimes I worry that my father and I are not as close as we might be.**
- **There is a growing sense of distance between me and my father.**
- **Right now, my father and I have very few loving moments.**
30. Please complete these phrases any way you wish.

1) My mother

2) My father

3) I know my father loves me when he

4) I wonder if my father loves me when he

5) I know my mother loves me when she

6) I wonder if my mother loves me when she

31. What are the qualities your mother has that you admire most?

32. What are the qualities your mother has that you admire least?
33. What are the qualities your father has that you admire most?

34. What are the qualities your father has that you admire least?

35. What qualities of yours does your mother admire most?

36. What qualities of yours does your mother admire least?

37. What qualities of yours does your father admire most?

38. What qualities of yours does your father admire least?
CHILD'S FORM

Draw 2 circles in each box to show your relationship with your mother at each age period.

AGE PERIODS

1-5  6-10  NOW

Relationship with Mother

Draw 2 circles in each box to show your relationship with your father at each age period.

Relationship with Father
CHILD'S FORM

Draw 2 circles in each box to show your relationship with your mother at each age period.

AGE PERIODS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1-5</th>
<th>6-10</th>
<th>11-13</th>
<th>Now</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Relationship with Mother

Draw 2 circles in each box to show your relationship with your father at each age period.

Relationship with Father
CHILD'S FORM

Draw 2 circles in each box to show your relationship with your mother at each age period.

### AGE PERIODS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1-5</th>
<th>6-10</th>
<th>11-13</th>
<th>14-16</th>
<th>Now</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Relationship with Mother**

Draw 2 circles in each box to show your relationship with your father at each age period.

**Relationship with Father**
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APPENDIX E

Parent Questionnaire
PARENT-ADOLESCENT RELATIONSHIPS

Thank you for agreeing to participate in this ongoing study of parent-adolescent relationships. We are interested in your opinions. There are no right or wrong answers to these questions. We just want to know what you think.

If there are any questions you do not wish to answer, please feel free to omit them. Your answers will be completely confidential. They will be used like an opinion poll to get an idea of how people view this important period of family life.

Once again, we sincerely appreciate the time you are giving to this research activity.
FAMILY NAME: ________________________________________________
GIVEN NAME: ________________________________________________
RELATION TO CHILD: __________________________________________

DATE: _______ TIME: _______

1. Child's age________ and birth date_________ boy  girl

2. Your age_________ and birth date__________

3. Your age at child's birth____________________

4. Number of years of marriage at child's birth__________________

5. How many children do you have?______________________________
   Please give the ages of your children.
   Boys___________________________
   Girls__________________________

6. Is your religious preference Protestant, Roman Catholic, Jewish or something else? Check one.
   Protestant
   Roman Catholic
   Jewish
   Other
   Please_________________________ (Specify)

7. In general, how religious minded would you say you are—very religious minded, more than average, average, less than average, or not at all religious minded? Check one.
   Very
   More than average
   Average
   Less than average
   Not at all

8. Number of years of marriage at time of interview_________
9. The average age for the major growth spurt in adolescent is about 13 for boys and 11 for girls. Would you say your child was an early, average, or late maturer?

Early_________Average_________Late___________

9a. What is your child's weight in pounds___________lbs.

Height in feet and inches__________/__________.

10. What is the highest grade in school you have completed? Check one.

_________Less than 8th grade
_________9-12th grade
_________High school diploma
_________1-2 years of college
_________3-4 years of college
_________College degree
_________Graduate degree

11. Please describe your profession and your current job.

Profession
----------

Job
___

12. Please rate your overall satisfaction with your work. Check one.

_______Highly dissatisfied
________Dissatisfied
________Somewhat satisfied
________Satisfied
________Highly satisfied

13. Please rate your overall satisfaction in your marriage. Check one.

_______Highly dissatisfied
________Dissatisfied
________Somewhat satisfied
________Satisfied
________Highly satisfied
14. Please rate your overall satisfaction with the role of parent. Check one.

________ Highly dissatisfied
________ Dissatisfied
________ Somewhat satisfied
________ Satisfied
________ Highly satisfied

15. Please think back to when you were an adolescent. For daily decision when your were growing up, how would you say those decisions were reached? Check one.

________ My mother made most decisions.
________ My father made most decisions.
________ My parents made most decisions together.
________ My parents and children made most decisions together.

16. For daily decisions in your family, how would you say those decisions are reached? Check one.

________ I make most family decisions.
________ My spouse make most family decisions.
________ My spouse and I make most decisions together.
________ My spouse, my children, and I make most decisions together.

Can you describe a recent family decision and tell how it was reached?

17. How confident are you that your child’s ideas and decisions are right and best for him/her? Check one.

________ I am not at all confident.
________ I am a little confident.
________ I am quite confident.
________ I am completely confident.

18. When your child has a really important decision to make about himself/herself and his/her future, do you encourage your child to make the decision on his/her own or do you encourage him/her to get help on it. Check one.

________ I'd rather have someone else decide for him/her.
________ I encourage him/her to depend on other people's advice.
________ I encourage my child to get other ideas and then make up his/her own mind.
________ I encourage my child to make up his/her own mind without any help.
19. When you make a decision or set a rule and your child doesn't understand why you have made that decision or rule, will you explain the reason? Check one.

________ Never
________ Very few times
________ Sometimes
________ Usually
________ Yes, always

Can you give an example of a rule your child did not understand or agree with and what happened?

20. In general, how are most decisions made about what your child wants to do? Check one.

________ I just tell him/her what to do.
________ I make the decisions but not without considering his or her own opinions.
________ We arrive at decisions together.
________ My child can make his/her own decisions, but I would like him/her to consider my opinions.
________ My child can do what he/she wants regardless of what I think.

21. Would you like your child to be the kind of person you are? Check one.

________ Not at all
________ In only a few ways
________ In many ways
________ In most ways
________ Yes, completely

22. Would you like to be the kind of person your son/daughter is? Check one.

________ Not at all
________ In only a few ways
________ In many ways
________ In most ways
________ Yes, completely

23. If you were to object strongly to some friends your son/daughter has, what would you expect would be the most likely way your child would respond? Check one.

________ Keep going with them openly.
________ See them secretly.
________ See them less.
________ Stop going with them.
24. How well do you think you understand your son/daughter? Check one.

________ I never understand him/her.
________ Usually I do not understand.
________ Sometimes I understand.
________ I usually understand.
________ I understand him/her perfectly.

25. If your son or daughter were asked how well you understand them, which of these would your son/daughter check? Check one.

________ I never understand him/her.
________ Usually I do not understand him/her.
________ Sometimes I understand him/her.
________ I usually understand him/her.
________ I understand him/her perfectly.

26. How well does your son/daughter understand you? Check one.

________ He/she never understands me.
________ Usually he/she does not understand.
________ Sometimes he/she understands.
________ He/she usually understands me.
________ He/she understands me perfectly.

27. If your son/daughter were asked how well he/she understood you, which of these would your son/daughter check? Check one.

________ I never understand him/her.
________ Usually I do not understand him/her.
________ Sometimes I understand him/her.
________ I usually understand him/her.
________ I understand him/her perfectly.

28. Please give a number from 5 to 1 to show how much you agree or disagree with each statement.

RESPONSE CHOICES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Moderately Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Agree</th>
<th>Moderately Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. I can discuss my beliefs with my child without feeling restrained or embarrassed.

2. Sometimes I have trouble believing everything my child tells me.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESPONSE CHOICES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. My child is always a good listener.
2. I am sometimes afraid to ask my child for what I want.
3. My child has a tendency to say things to me which would be better left unsaid.
4. My child can tell how I'm feeling without asking.
5. I am very satisfied with how my child and I talk together.
6. If I were in trouble, I could tell my child.
7. I openly show affection to my child.
8. When we are having a problem, I often give my child the silent treatment.
9. I am careful about what I say to my child.
10. When talking with my child, I have a tendency to say things that would be better left unsaid.
11. When I ask questions, I get honest answers from my child.
12. My child tries to understand my point of view.
13. There are topics I avoid discussing with my child.
14. I find it easy for me to express all my true feelings to my child.
15. It is very easy for me to express all my true feelings to my child.
16. My child nags/bothers me.
17. My child insults me when s/he is angry with me.
18. I don't think I can tell my child how I really feel about some things.
29. Which of the following best describes your relationship with your child. Check one.

_______I am absolutely confident of my son's/daughter's love.
_______Sometimes I worry that my son/daughter and I are not as close as we might be.
_______There is a growing sense of distance between me and my child.
_______Right now my son/daughter and I have very few loving moments.

30. Please complete these phrases any way you wish.

1) My son/daughter

2) I know my son/daughter loves me when he/she

3) I wonder if my son/daughter loves me when

31. What are the qualities your son/daughter has that you admire most?

32. What are the qualities your son/daughter has that you admire least?

33. Which of your qualities does your child admire most?

34. Which of your qualities does your child admire least?
PARENT'S FORM

Draw 2 circles in each box to show your relationship with your child at each age period.

AGE PERIODS

If your child is 11:

1-5

6-10

Now

If your child is 14:

1-5

6-10

11-13

Now

If your child is 17 or older:

1-5

6-10

11-13

14-16

Now
APPENDIX F

Family Moral Dilemma Questionnaire
Dilemma Questions

Story I. Joe is a fourteen-year-old boy who wanted to go to camp very much. His father promised him he could go if he saved up the money for it himself. So Joe worked hard at his paper route and saved up the $40 it cost to go to camp and a little more besides. But just before camp was going to start, his father changed his mind. Some of his friends decided to go on a special fishing trip, and Joe's father was short of the money it would cost. So he told Joe to give him the money he had saved from the paper route. Joe didn't want to give up going to camp, so he thought of refusing to give his father the money.

1. Should Joe refuse to give his father the money? Why?

2. Is there any way in which the father has a right to tell his child to give him the money? Why?

3. What is the most important thing a good father should recognize in his relation to his child? Why that?
4. What is the most important thing a good child should recognize in his/her relation to his/her father? Why that?

5. Why should a promise be kept?

6. What makes a person feel bad if a promise is broken?

7. Why is it important to keep a promise to someone you don't know well or are not close to?
Story II:

Two young men, brothers, had gotten into serious trouble. They were secretly leaving town in a hurry and needed money. Karl, the older one, broke into a store and stole $500. Dob, the younger one, went to a retired old man who was known to help people in town. Bob told the man that he was very sick and he needed $500 to pay for the operation. Really he wasn’t sick at all, and he had no intention of paying the man back. Although the man didn’t know Bob very well, he loaned him the money. So Bob and Karl skipped town, each with $500.

1. Which would be worse, stealing like Karl or cheating like Bob? Why?

2. Suppose Bob had gotten the loan from a bank with no intention of paying it back. Is borrowing from the bank or the old man worse? Why?

3. What do you feel is the worst thing about cheating the old man?

4. Why shouldn’t someone steal from a store?
5. What is the value or importance of property rights?

6. What do people mean by conscience? What do you think of as your conscience and what does it do?

7. Is there anything about your sense of conscience which is special or different from that of most people? What?

8. How do people get their consciences? (How did you get or develop a conscience?)
APPENDIX G

Parental Power and Frequency of Induction Questions
PARENTAL POWER AND FREQUENCY OF INDUCTION QUESTIONS

Parental power was measured by the following questions:

"In general, how are most decisions made between you and your father/mother?"

High Parental Power (Autocratic)

1. My father/mother just tells me what to do.
2. My father/mother makes the decisions, but not without considering my opinions.

Medium Parental Power (Democratic)

3. We arrive at decisions together.

Low Parental Power (Permissive)

4. I can make my own decisions, but my father/mother would like me to consider his/her opinions.
5. I can do what I want regardless of what my father/mother thinks.

Frequency of Parental explanation of rules and restrictions (induction) was measured by:

"When you don’t know why your father/mother makes a particular decision or has certain rules for you to follow, will he/she explain the reason?"

Low Frequency of Induction

1. Never.
2. Once in a while.
3. Sometimes.

High Frequency of Induction

4. Usually.
5. Always.
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