

Construction and Validation of PS-FFQ (Parenting Style Four Factor Questionnaire)

Shyny T. Y
Ph.D (Psychology)
Bharathiar University – Coimbatore

Abstract - Parents are the main influence on a child's life. They not only nurture the child physically but their styles of nurturance contribute to the development of the child's psyche of particular interest is the influence of parenting styles on children's academic achievement and various psycho social aspects of development. The crescendo of this nurturance is probably in adolescence when children are preparing for, or even on, the threshold of adulthood. Indian culture traditionally sets great importance on respect due to age. This means that parents put great emphasis on acquiescence and obedience from their children. Modern society sometimes decries the erosion of these values. Yet social transformation in the present time may imply that parenting styles in India are also changing. For instance, expected compliance is often replaced with appeals to the child's reasoning and judgment. The investigator has constructed a scale to measure the style of parenting on adolescents, in particular, three age groups adolescents. By administering it educators may obtain an idea about the parenting styles of parents on their adolescents . . In this study parenting styles are classified in to four categories like Authoritarian or Power asserting disciplinarians , Authoritative or Warm giving protectors , Permissive or Lenient freedom givers, Uninvolved or Selfish autonomy givers. Parenting Style four factor questionnaire (PSFFQ) is mainly constructed as a tool for measuring parenting Styles of adolescent's parents.

Key words - Authoritarian, Power asserting, disciplinarians , Authoritative, Warm giving, protectors , Permissive, Lenient, freedom givers, Uninvolved, Selfish, autonomy givers.

I. INTRODUCTION

This paper describes the development and standardization of a measure of parenting style. Parents have huge impact on a person's life. Number of studies in the area of parenting matches its importance on the developing person. Parenting process combines all the activities of the parents that intended to support their children's wellbeing. One of the most studied approaches to understanding parental influences on human development is concept of parenting style (Baumrind, 1967). Baumrind proposed parenting styles as correlates to socialization of the children. Then many researches recognized the importance of researching role of parenting style in child development (Kordi, 2010; Schaffer, Clark & Jeglic, 2009; Kaufmann, et al, 2000; Lim & Lim, 2003). Many of the studies followed three parenting styles originally proposed by Baumrind namely authoritative parenting, authoritarian parenting and permissive parenting, though in 1971, Baumrind added negligent parenting. Baumrind grouped parents to three (or four) parenting styles according to their child rearing patterns, on the basis of her interviews with parents and children. For grouping parents to different styles, Maccoby and Martin suggested a conceptual structure in 1983; they viewed parenting style as combinations of differing levels of parental demandingness and warmth. The styles are thus determined by measuring parental warmth and demandingness. There is a growing interest in the role of parenting in a person's affective and social characteristics. The attention of educational researchers on the parenting styles and their effects on school relevant developmental outcomes are also on the rise. Several studies found that parenting style or parental behaviour has statistically significant relation with developmental outcomes like performance, achievement strategies, self-regulated learning, achievement goals, self-efficacy and wellbeing of students. Though these studies demonstrated the significance of researching the effect of parenting style in the development of a person, numbers of published instruments for measuring parenting styles are very few, and most of the available instruments are based on tripartite classification of these styles initially proposed Baumrind (Baumrind, 1967). Parenting behaviour is deeply influenced by culture. The culture decides the limits of behaviour that to be controlled and praised. Extant conceptualization of the parental behaviour largely bases on studies conducted with majority White, middle class families' values, cultural norms, and parental expectancies. Hence this study purpose to develop and validate an instrument to identify parenting styles of on their adolescent students in Kerala. Construct of parenting style Parenting can be defined as activities of parents with an aim of helping their child to bring forth. There are two main dimensions underlying parental behaviour (Maccoby & Martin, 1983); they are parental responsiveness and parental demandingness. Parental responsiveness (also referred to as parental warmth or supportiveness or acceptance) refers to "the extends to which parents intentionally foster individuality, self-regulation and self-assertion by being attuned, supportive and acquiescent to children special needs and demands"(Baumrind, 1971). Parental demandingness (also referred to as behavioral control) refers to "the claims parents make on children to become integrated to the family whole, by their maturity demands, supervision, disciplinary efforts and willingness to confront the child who disobeys" (Baumrind, 1971). Categorizing parents according to whether they are high or low on parental demandingness and responsiveness creates a quadrant of parenting styles: indulgent, authoritarian, authoritative and uninvolved (Maccoby & Martin, 1983). Each of these parenting styles

different in naturally occurring patterns of parental values, practices and behaviours (Baumrind, 1971) and a distinct balance of responsiveness and demandingness. Parents need to educate themselves for their children to become good citizens in the future. So, parents required help to develop their parenting skills. Here is the importance of measuring parenting styles by the parents themselves. Then only the teachers, counsellors or psychologist can find out the root cause of adolescent problems. These findings help them to give proper guidance and interventions for both parents as well as adolescents wherever necessary. Now a days parents are too busy and so adolescents are more likely to face problems like parental separation, divorce, conflict etc. Which are thrown away from parental monitoring and supervision. PSFFQ is specially constructed to measure adolescent's parents parenting styles. This questionnaire helps teachers, counsellors and psychologists to find out real causes behind the adolescent behavioural problems, poor academic achievements etc.

II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE

As pointed earlier, the number of published instruments to measure parenting style is very few and most of them identify three styles instead of the four proposed by Baumrind. In 1991, Buri developed parental authority questionnaire (PAQ) to assess Baumrind's (1966) permissive, authoritarian, and authoritative parenting styles consisting of 30 Likert type items. The test provides thirty items for each parent, and the children need to respond on a five point scale. In the same year, Steinberg et al., developed authoritative parenting scale to measure the degree of authoritativeness of the parents (Steinberg, Mounts, Lamborn, & Dornbusch, 1991) on three major components or dimensions: acceptance/involvement, firm control, and psychological autonomy granting. The scale had 36 items measuring parenting style as perceived by child on the 3 dimensions. Alpha coefficient of the dimensions ranged between 0.72 and 0.76. Parenting Style Inventory (PSI-I), by Nancy Darling and Laurence Steinberg (Darling & Steinberg, 1993) was a shorter one, having three subscales- demandingness, emotional responsiveness, and psychological autonomy-granting - with five items each in maternal parenting style. However the below desired reliability coefficient of this instrument among seventh graders has reportedly invited a revision by Nancy Darling and Teru Toyokawa. In the revised numbers of items were increased and a neutral response was added to the original four response format. Beyers and Goossens, in 1999 developed another instrument based on work by Steinberg and colleagues, which has shown good external validity, internal consistency, and test-retest reliability (Lamborn, Mounts, Steinberg, & Dornbusch, 1991). This five point Likert type instrument assesses two dimensions of parenting styles, namely support (alpha coefficient 0.77) and strict control (alpha coefficient 0.74). It is collecting data from parents. Based on median splits, parents were classified as authoritative, authoritarian, indulgent, or uninvolved. Lefebvre (2004) developed "Parental style inventory II (PSI II)" for parents to identify their parenting style. This five point Likert type scale has three dimensions, autonomy granting, demandingness and responsiveness; twelve items in each dimension. The tool has adequate internal consistency, variability and predictive validity. Also the author claims that this instrument is assessing parenting style independent of parenting practices. Gracia, Garcia and Lila, in 2008, developed a parenting style index to assign the parents to four categories based on their parenting style, namely, authoritative, authoritarian, neglectful and indulgent (Gracia, Garcia & Lila, 2008). This measures parental warmth and control, as perceived by the adolescents, with alpha coefficients 0.9 and 0.81 respectively. The tool is developed for Spanish speaking people. Parenting style instruments until this time were developed in other cultures; some consider only three parenting style and some are meant for parents, than children. So, the authors sense the need for a scale of parenting scale in the eastern parenting practices and cultural context. Scale of Parenting Style This scale is used for measuring perceived parenting styles of higher secondary school students. The draft scale has been developed on the basis of theories of Baumrind (1971), and dimensions of parenting style proposed by Maccoby and Martin (1983). Method Participants Data from 832 higher secondary school students from Kerala state were collected and used to develop and standardize the scale of parenting style instrument. The participants are coming under adolescent group. Among the subjects 467 were girls and 365 were boys. The items in the scale were prepared on the basis of description given by Baumrind, Maccoby and Martin for parental responsiveness and parental control. Items measure the responsiveness and control of parents as perceived by their adolescent wards. All the items were prepared as matching for the involvement of both parents. When writing items, consideration is given to all areas, where the parents interacting with their children, like social, educational and personal. For each responsiveness item parallel control item were prepared.

Parents have huge impact on a person's life. Number of studies in the area of parenting matches its importance on the developing person. Parenting process combines all the activities of the parents that intended to support their children's wellbeing. One of the most studied approaches to understanding parental influences on human development is concept of parenting style (Baumrind, 1967). Baumrind proposed parenting styles as correlates to socialization of the children. Then many researchers recognized the importance of researching role of parenting style in child development (Kordi, 2010; Schaffer, Clark & Jeglic, 2009; Kaufmann, et al, 2000; Lim & Lim, 2003). Many of the studies followed three parenting styles originally proposed by Baumrind namely authoritative parenting, authoritarian parenting and permissive parenting, though in 1971, Baumrind added negligent parenting. Baumrind grouped parents to three (or four) parenting styles according to their child rearing patterns, on the basis of her interviews with parents and children. For grouping parents to different styles, Maccoby and Martin suggested a conceptual structure in 1983; they viewed parenting style as combinations of differing levels of parental demandingness and warmth. The styles are thus determined by measuring parental warmth and demandingness. There is a growing interest in the role of parenting in a person's affective and social characteristics. The attention of educational researchers on the parenting styles and their effects on school relevant developmental outcomes are also on the rise. Several studies found that parenting style or parental behavior has statistically significant relation with developmental outcomes like performance, achievement strategies, self-regulated learning, achievement goals, self-efficacy and wellbeing of students (Aunola, Stattin & Nurmi, 2000, Huang & Prochner, 2004, Chan & Chan, 2005, Turner, Chandler & Heffer, 2009, Besharat, Azizi & Poursarifi, 2011, Revers, Mullis, Fortner & Mullis, 2012). Though these studies demonstrated the significance of researching the effect of parenting style in the development of a person, numbers of published

instruments for measuring parenting styles are very few, and most of the available instruments are based on tripartite classification of these styles initially proposed by Baumrind (Baumrind, 1967). Parenting behavior is deeply influenced by culture. The culture decides the limits of behavior that to be controlled and praised. Extant conceptualization of the parental behavior largely based on studies conducted with majority White, middle class families' values, cultural norms, and parental expectancies (Rodriguez, Donovanick & Crowley, 2009). Contextual validity is highly relevant for constructs like parenting styles as the instruments incorporate statements which reflect cultural preference of the respondents. Hence validity of measures of parenting styles solely applying instruments developed in alien cultures is on the least questionable. Hence this study purpose to develop and validate an instrument to identify perceived parenting styles of adolescent students in Kerala. Parenting can be defined as activities of parents with an aim of helping their child to bring forth. There are two main dimensions underlying parental behavior (Maccoby & Martin, 1983); they are parental responsiveness and parental demandingness. Parental responsiveness (also referred to as parental warmth or supportiveness or acceptance) refers to "the extends to which parents intentionally foster individuality, self-regulation and self-assertion by being attuned, supportive and acquiescent to children special needs and demands" (Baumrind, 1971). Parental demandingness (also referred to as behavioral control) refers to "the claims parents make on children to become integrated to the family whole, by their maturity demands, supervision, disciplinary efforts and willingness to confront the child who disobeys" (Baumrind, 1971). Categorizing parents according to whether they are high or low on parental demandingness and responsiveness creates a quadrant of parenting styles: indulgent, authoritarian, authoritative and uninvolved (Maccoby & Martin, 1983). Each of these parenting styles different in naturally occurring patterns of parental values, practices and behaviors (Baumrind, 1971) and a distinct balance of responsiveness and demandingness.

The number of published instruments to measure parenting style is very few and most of them identify three styles instead of the four proposed by Baumrind. In 1991, Buri developed parental authority questionnaire (PAQ) to assess Baumrind's (1966) permissive, authoritarian, and authoritative parenting styles consisting of 30 Likert type items. The test provides thirty items for each parent, and the children need to respond on a five point scale. In the same year, Steinberg et al., developed authoritative parenting scale to measure the degree of authoritativeness of the parents (Steinberg, Mounts, Lamborn, & Dornbusch, 1991) on three major components or dimensions: acceptance/involvement, firm control, and psychological autonomy granting. The scale had 36 items measuring parenting style as perceived by child on the 3 dimensions. Alpha coefficient of the dimensions ranged between 0.72 and 0.76. Parenting Style Inventory (PSI-I), by Nancy Darling and Laurence Steinberg (Darling & Steinberg, 1993) was a shorter one, having three subscales- demandingness, emotional responsiveness, and psychological autonomy-granting - with five items each in maternal parenting style. However the below desired reliability coefficient of this instrument among seventh graders has reportedly invited a revision by Nancy Darling and Teru Toyokawa. In the revised numbers of items were increased and a neutral response was added to the original four response format. Beyers and Goossens, in 1999 developed another instrument based on work by Steinberg and colleagues, which has shown good external validity, internal consistency, and test-retest reliability (Lamborn, Mounts, Steinberg, & Dornbusch, 1991). This five point Likert type instrument assesses two dimensions of parenting styles, namely support (alpha coefficient 0.77) and strict control (alpha coefficient 0.74). It is collecting data from parents. Based on median splits, parents were classified as authoritative, authoritarian, indulgent, or uninvolved. Lefebvre (2004) developed "Parental style inventory II (PSI II)" for parents to identify their parenting style. This five point Likert type scale has three dimensions, autonomy granting, demandingness and responsiveness; twelve items in each dimensions. The tool has adequate internal consistency, variability and predictive validity. Also the author claims that this instrument is assessing parenting style independent of parenting practices. Gracia, Garcia and Lila, in 2008, developed a parenting style index to assign the parents to four categories based on their parenting style, namely, authoritative, authoritarian, neglectful and indulgent (Gracia, Garcia & Lila, 2008). This measures parental warmth and control, as perceived by the adolescents, with alpha coefficients 0.9 and 0.81 respectively. The tool is developed for Spanish speaking people. Parenting style instruments until this time were developed in other cultures; some consider only three parenting style and some are meant for parents, than children. So, the authors sense the need for a scale of parenting scale in the eastern parenting practices and cultural context. Scale of Parenting Style This scale is used for measuring perceived parenting styles of higher secondary school students. The draft scale has been developed on the basis of theories of Baumrind (1971), and dimensions of parenting style proposed by Maccoby and Martin (1983).

Parenting styles have been widely studied in recent research and have been related to many parent characteristics and child outcomes. The Parenting Styles and Dimensions Questionnaire (PSDQ; Robinson, Mandlco, Olsen, & Hart, 2001) is one measure that is widely utilized in current research to examine parenting styles. Although the PSDQ is comprised of authoritative, authoritarian, and permissive subscales, it does not measure the uninvolved parenting style. Additionally, this measure provides continuous variable-centered scores rather than categorizing parenting style typologies. A reconceptualization of the PSDQ may allow researchers to improve and expand on the measurement of parenting styles and identify new ways in which parenting styles relate to parents and families. The aim of the current study is to construct a new measure for identifying adolescent's parents four parenting styles like Authoritarian or Power asserting disciplinarians, Authoritative or Warm giving protectors, Permissive or Lenient freedom givers, Uninvolved or Selfish autonomy givers. Parenting Style four factor questionnaire (PSFFQ) is mainly constructed as a tool for measuring parenting Styles of adolescent's parents.

RESEARCH HYPOTHESIS

1. There will be consistent parenting styles across ages as reported by parent subjects of adolescents with age group twelve, fifteen & eighteen.

2. There will be relatively high positive correlation between authoritarian, authoritative and permissive parenting styles of PS-FFQ and PSDQ
3. The Item analysis of Reliability Coefficient will be greater than .70 for the PS-FFQ

Scoring

The pupil required to respond on the five point scale as all of the time, most of the time, some time, rarely and never. The score was five to one. There are no negative items. Scores for each parent were taken separately and sum of scores of each parents were taken for overall score of an item. Thus the instrument yields four separate scores for each participant, namely Authoritarian or Power asserting disciplinarians, Authoritative or Warm giving protectors, Permissive or Lenient freedom givers, Uninvolved or Selfish autonomy givers.

Item analysis

Item analysis was done using the method suggested by Edwards (1969). 64 answer sheets were selected randomly and they were arranged in the descending order of scores so as to select the top and bottom subjects (27 percent of sample). Item analysis was done by finding out the 't' value of each item. On the basis of these scores, found out parenting style of each parent. Those items having t value exceeding 2.58 were selected for the final scale. The final scale consists of 32 items.

III. RESULTS

Those items having t value exceeding 2.58 were selected for the final scale. The 't' value of each item are given in the table. All items have high validity. So we can include all items of the questionnaire. The reliability also is found as very high. All three variables of PSFFQ except uninvolved one shows high correlation with PSDQ.

IV. CONCLUSION

The present research was conducted to develop and validate an instrument to measure parenting style of adolescent's parents. The result of item analysis, validity and reliability indicates that the present instrument is capable to measure parenting style of adolescent's parents. With the help of this instrument, found that authoritarian parents are more power asserting disciplinarians, authoritative parents are more warm giving protectors, permissive parents are more lenient freedom givers and uninvolved parents are more selfish autonomy givers. These findings are consistent with the construct of three parenting style proposed by Robinson et al. In PSDQ. But here in this tool there is one more parenting style - uninvolved or selfish autonomy givers. So the findings furnished above are providing further evidences for the validity of this scale. This tool PSFFQ is specially constructed to measure adolescent's parents parenting styles and is proved as a good tool for this purpose with high reliability and validity. PSFFQ shows high correlation with PSDQ sub types.

V. RESULTS

TABLE-1 Reliability of PSFFQ AND PSDQ

Reliability-	Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
PS FFQ	0.919	32
PSDQ	0.920	32

Internal consistency is estimated by using Cronbach's alpha. An alpha value of 0.70 or above is considered to be criterion for demonstrating strong internal consistency, alpha value of 0.60 or above is considered to be significant. Here reliability is .92 for the PSFFQ as well as PSDQ. So we can say this newly constructed PSFFQ has very strong internal consistency.

TABLE 2 Means, Standard Deviation, F value and P value of different age groups

PSDQ	Age	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	F	p value
AUTHORITARIAN	12 years	22	27.95	19.37	0.408	0.667
	15 years	22	23.68	20.54		
	18 years	20	22.85	19.63		
AUTHORITATIVE	12 years	22	14.86	8.35	0.115	0.891
	15 years	22	13.82	8.57		
	18 years	20	14.85	7.69		

PERMISSIVE	12 years	22	15.36	12.82	0.423	0.657
	15 years	22	12.09	12.54		
	18 years	20	12.60	12.59		

Table-3

<i>PSFFQ</i>	<i>Age</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>Standard Deviation</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>P value</i>
AUTHORIARIAN	12 years	22	6.41	5.17	0.085	0.918
	15 years	22	6.18	4.86		
	18 years	20	6.80	4.58		
AUTHORITATIVE	12 years	22	8.18	6.96	0.034	0.967
	15 years	22	8.00	7.24		
	18 years	20	8.55	6.64		
PERMISSIVE	12 years	22	15.36	12.82	0.423	0.657
	15 years	22	12.09	12.54		
	18 years	20	12.60	12.59		
UNINVOLVED	12 years	22	27.95	19.37	0.408	0.667
	15 years	22	23.68	20.54		
	18 years	20	22.85	19.63		

A
one
sample

analysis of variance is used to test hypotheses about means when there are three or more groups of one independent variable . In this case, age group was considered to be the independent variable, which included three age groups as (a) 12 years; (b) 15 years; and (c) 18 year. So ANOVA was used to compare the mean intention scores of different age groups . The results of the ANOVA test depicted in Table 2 and table 3 reveals that statistical value is greater than 0.05 for all the variables. So we conclude that the mean score of different variables does not differs with age.

Table-4

CORRELATION TOTAL BETWEEN TWO RATING SCALES AS TOTAL, AGE AND SUBTYPE

Correlation Total	Correlation	Lower bound	Upper bound	Z	p
PSDQ-PSFFQ	0.916	0.909	0.923	25.659	<0.001
Age- 12	Correlation	Lower bound	Upper bound	Z	p
PSDQ-PSFFQ	0.920	0.909	0.931	15.333	<0.001
Age- 15	Correlation	Lower bound	Upper bound	Z	p
PSDQ-PSFFQ	0.892	0.873	0.911	11.499	<0.001
AGE-18	Correlation	Lower bound	Upper bound	Z	p
PSDQ-PSFFQ	0.913	0.918	0.918	22.715	<0.001
total data	Correlation coefficient	Lower bound	Upper bound	Z	p
Authoritarian PSDQ and PSFFQ	0.817*	0.795	0.839	13.095	<0.001
Authoritative PSDQ and PSFFQ	0.818*	0.796	0.840	13.153	<0.001
permissive PSDQ and PSFFQ	0.817*	0.795	0.839	13.095	<0.001

Correlation was seen as appropriate to analyze the relationship between the two variables which were interval-scaled and ratio-scaled. Furthermore, correlation coefficients reveal magnitude and direction of relationships which are suitable for hypothesis testing. Pearson Correlation is used to identify the relationship between old and new questionnaires and the result is exhibited in. A positive correlation exist for the variables for new and old scales as in these case the correlation coefficient has value greater than 0.5 and p value less than 0.05. So we can conclude that correlation is significant.

TABLE-5 MEAN VALUE , STANDARD DEVIATION AND P VALUE OF EACH PSFFQ ITEMS

<i>Variables</i>	<i>Group</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>Std. Deviation</i>	<i>z</i>	<i>p value</i>
PS1	Low	16	1.00	0.00	-13.175	<0.001
	High	16	4.38	1.02		
PS2	Low	16	1.00	0.00	-13.000	<0.001
	High	16	4.25	1.00		
PS3	Low	16	1.00	0.00		
	High	16	5.00	0.00		
PS4	Low	16	1.00	0.00	-9.638	<0.001
	High	16	3.81	1.17		
PS5	Low	16	1.00	0.00	-13.760	<0.001
	High	16	3.94	0.85		
PS6	Low	16	1.00	0.00	-7.720	<0.001
	High	16	3.63	1.36		
PS7	Low	16	1.00	0.00	-26.837	<0.001
	High	16	4.44	0.51		
PS8	Low	16	1.00	0.00	-8.485	<0.001
	High	16	4.00	1.41		
PS9	Low	16	1.00	0.00	-30.812	<0.001
	High	16	4.69	0.48		
PS10	Low	16	1.00	0.00	-8.062	<0.001
	High	16	3.44	1.21		
PS11	Low	16	1.00	0.00		
	High	16	5.00	0.00		
PS12	Low	16	1.00	0.00	-7.674	<0.001
	High	16	3.69	1.40		
PS13	Low	16	1.00	0.00	-30.812	<0.001
	High	16	4.69	0.48		
PS14	Low	16	1.00	0.00	-7.674	<0.001
	High	16	3.69	1.40		
PS15	Low	16	1.00	0.00	-37.831	<0.001
	High	16	4.81	0.40		
PS16	Low	16	1.00	0.00	-9.502	<0.001
	High	16	3.94	1.24		
PS17	Low	16	1.00	0.00	-63.000	<0.001
	High	16	4.94	0.25		
PS18	Low	16	1.00	0.00	-7.720	<0.001
	High	16	3.63	1.36		
PS19	Low	16	1.00	0.00	-33.541	<0.001
	High	16	4.75	0.45		
PS20	Low	16	1.00	0.00	-8.474	<0.001
	High	16	3.81	1.33		
PS21	Low	16	1.00	0.00	-27.111	<0.001
	High	16	4.50	0.52		
PS22	Low	16	1.00	0.00	-10.902	<0.001
	High	16	4.06	1.12		
PS23	Low	16	1.00	0.00	-30.812	<0.001
	High	16	4.69	0.48		
PS24	Low	16	1.00	0.00	-9.501	<0.001
	High	16	4.06	1.29		
PS25	Low	16	1.00	0.00	-33.541	<0.001
	High	16	4.75	0.45		
PS26	Low	16	1.00	0.00	-11.223	<0.001
	High	16	3.88	1.02		
PS27	Low	16	1.00	0.00	-27.813	<0.001

	High	16	4.56	0.51		
PS28	Low	16	1.00	0.00	-6.468	<0.001
	High	16	3.69	1.66		
PS29	Low	16	1.00	0.00	-33.541	<0.001
	High	16	4.75	0.45		
PS30	Low	16	1.00	0.00	-10.987	<0.001
	High	16	4.25	1.18		
PS31	Low	16	1.00	0.00	-30.812	<0.001
	High	16	4.69	0.48		
PS32	Low	16	1.00	0.00	-9.690	<0.001
	High	16	4.25	1.34		

Here the p value less than 0.05. So we can conclude that correlation is significant.

References

- Allen, J.P., Hauser, S.T., Bell, K.L., & O'Connor, T.G. (1994). Longitudinal assessment of autonomy and relatedness in adolescent-family interactions as predictors of adolescent ego development and self-esteem. *Child Development*, 65, 179-194
- Allen, J.P., Hauser, S.T., Eickholt, C., Bell, K.L., & O'Connor, T.G. (1994). Autonomy and relatedness in family interactions as predictors of expressions of negative adolescent affect. *Journal of Research on Adolescence*, 4, 535-552.
- Barber, B.K. (1994). Cultural, family, and personal contexts of parent-adolescent conflict. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 56, 375-386
- Barber, B.K. (1996). Parental psychological control: Revisiting a neglected construct. *Child Development*, 67, 3296-3319.
- Barber, B.K., Olsen, J.A., & Shagle, S.C. (1994). Associations between parental psychological and behavioral control and youth internalized and externalized behaviors. *Child Development*, 65, 1120-1136
- Barber, B.K., Stolz, H.E., & Olsen, J.A. (2005). Parental support, psychological control, and behavioral control: Assessing relevance across time, culture, and method. *Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development*, 70, 1-137
- Baumrind, D. (1966). Effects of authoritative parental control on child behavior. *Child Development*, 37, 887-907.
- Baumrind, D. (1971). Current patterns of parental authority. *Developmental Psychology Monographs*, 4 (Part 2), 1-103.
- Baumrind, D. (1980). New directions in socialization research. *American Psychologist*, 7, 639-652.
- Baumrind, D. (1989). Rearing competent children. In W. Damon (Ed.), *Child development today and tomorrow* (pp. 349-378). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass
- Baumrind, D. (1991a). The influence of parenting style on adolescent competence and substance use. *Journal of Early Adolescence*, 11, 56-95. r
- Baumrind, D. (1991b). Effective parenting during the early adolescent transition. In P. A. Cowan & M. Hetherington (Eds.), *Family Transitions* (pp. 111-159). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum. r
- Baumrind, D. (1996). The discipline controversy revisited. *Family Relations*, 45, 405-414.
- Bean, R.A., Barber, B.K., & Crane, D.R. (2006). Parental support, behavioral control, and psychological control among African American youth: The relationships to academic grades, delinquency, and depression. *Journal of Family Issues*, 27, 1335-1355.
- Bean, R.A., Bush, K.R., McKenry, P.C., & Wilson, S.M. (2003). The impact of parental support, behavioral control, and psychological control on the academic achievement and self-esteem of African American and European American adolescents. *Journal of Adolescent Research*, 18, 523-541.
- Brown, B.B., Mounts, N., Lamborn, S.D., & Steinberg, L. (1993). Parenting practices and peer group affiliation in adolescence. *Child Development*, 64, 467-482.
- Buri, J.R. (1991). Parental authority questionnaire. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 57, 110-119.

- Cooper, C.R., Grotevant, H.D., & Condon, S.M. (1983). Individuality and connectedness in the family as a context for adolescent identity formation and role-taking skill. *New Directions for Child Development*, 22, 43-59.
- Csikszentmihalyi, M., Rathunde, K., & Whalen, S. (1993). *Talented teenagers: The roots of success and failure*. New York: Cambridge University Press. r
- Csikszentmihalyi, M., & Schmidt, J. (1998). Stress and resilience in adolescence: An evolutionary perspective. In K. Borman & B. Scheider (Eds.), *The adolescent years: Social influences and educational challenges* (pp. 1-17). Chicago : University of Chicago Press.
- Csikszentmihalyi, M., & Schneider, B. (2000). *Becoming adult: How teenagers prepare for the world of work*. New York: Basic Books .
- Deci, E.L. (1975). *Intrinsic motivation*. New York : Plenum Press.
- Dunn, J. (1997). Lessons from the study of bidirectional effects . *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 14, 565-573.
- Eccles, J.S., Midgley, C., Wigfield, A., Buchanan, C.M., Reuman, D., Flanagan, C., & Mac Iver, D. (1993). Development during adolescence: The impact of stage-environment fit on young adolescents' experiences in schools and in families. *American Psychologist*, 48, 90-101.
- Gottman, J.M., Katz, L.F., & Hooven, C. (1997). *Meta-emotion: How families communicate emotionally* . Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Gray, M.R., & Steinberg, L. (1999). Unpacking authoritative parenting: Reassessing a multidimensional construct. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 61, 574-587.
- Grolnick, W.S. (2003). *The psychology of parental control: How well-meant parenting backfires*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Grotevant, H.D., & Cooper, C.R. (1985). Patterns of interaction in family relationships and the development of identity exploration in adolescence. *Child Development*, 56, 415-428.
- Grotevant, H.D., & Cooper, C.R. (1986). Individuation in family relationships: A perspective on individual differences in the development of identity and role-taking skill in adolescence. *Human Development*, 29, 82-100.
- Hart, C.H., Newell, L.D., & Olsen, S.F. (2003). Parenting skills and social-communicative competence in childhood. In J. O. Greene & B. R. Burleson (Eds.), *Handbook of communication and social interaction skills* (pp. 753-797). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Hauser, S.T., Houlihan, J., Powers, S.I., Jacobson, A.M., Noam, G.G., Weiss-Perry, B., Follansbee, D., & Book, B.K. (1991). Adolescent ego development within the family: Family styles and family sequences. *International Journal of Behavioral Development*, 14, 165-193
- Hauser, S.T., Powers, S.I., & Noam, G.G. (1991). *Adolescents and their families: Paths of ego development* . New York: Free Press.
- Hektner, J., & Asakawa, K. (2000). Learning to like challenges. In M. Csikszentmihalyi & B. Schneider (Eds.), *Becoming adults: How teenagers prepare for the world at work* (pp. 95-112). New York: Basic Books
- John, O.P., & Benet-Martinez, V. (2000). Measurement: Reliability, construct validation, and scale construction. In H. T. Reis & C. M. Judd (Eds.), *Handbook of research methods in social and personality psychology* (pp. 339-369). Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press .
- Kerr, K.A., & Stattin, H. (2000). What parents know, how they know it, and several forms of adolescent adjustment: Further support for a reinterpretation of monitoring. *Developmental Psychology*, 36, 366-380.
- Kurdek, L.A., & Fine, M.A. (1994). Family acceptance and family control as predictors of adjustment in young adolescents: Linear, curvilinear, or interactive effects? *Child Development*, 65, 1137-1146.
- Lamborn, S.D., Mounts, N.S., Steinberg, L., & Dornbush, S.M. (1991). Patterns of competence and adjustment among adolescents from authoritative, authoritarian, indulgent, and neglectful families. *Child Development*, 62, 1049-1065.
- Leeper, C., Anderson, K.J., & Sanders, P. (1998). Moderators of gender effects on parents' talk to their children: A meta-analysis. *Developmental Psychology* , 34, 3-27.

- Leaper, C., Hauser, S.T., Kremen, A., Powers, S.I., Jacobson, A.M., Noam, G.G., Weiss-Perry, B., & Follansbee, D. (1989). Adolescent-parent interactions in relation to adolescents' gender and ego development pathway: A longitudinal study. *Journal of Early Adolescence*, 9, 335-361. r
- Lerner, R.M., & Lerner, J.V. (1987). Children in their contexts: A goodness-of-fit model. In J. B. Lancaster, J. Altmann, A. S. Rossi, & L. R. Sherrod (Eds.), *Parenting across the lifespan: Biosocial dimensions* (pp. 377-404). New York: Aldine de Gruyter
- Maccoby, E.E., & Martin, J.A. (1983). Socialization in the context of the family: Parent-child interaction. In E. M. Hetherington (Ed.), *Socialization, personality, and social development. Handbook of child psychology: Vol. 4* (pp. 1-101). New York: Wiley.
- Moneta, G.B., & Csikszentmihalyi, M. (1996). The effect of perceived challenges and skills on the quality of subjective experience. *Journal of Personality*, 64, 275-310.
- Morton, T.L., & Mann, B.J. (1998). The relationship between parental controlling behavior and perceptions of control of preadolescent children and adolescents. *Journal of Genetic Psychology*, 159, 477-491.
- O'Connor, T.G., Hetherington, E.M., & Clingempeel, W.G. (1997). Systems and bidirectional influences in families. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 14, 491-504
- Rathunde, K. (1996). Family context and talented adolescents' optimal experience in school-related activities. *Journal of Research on Adolescence*, 6, 605-628.
- Rathunde, K. (2001). Family context and the development of undivided interest: A longitudinal study of family support and challenge and adolescents' quality of experience. *Applied Developmental Science*, 5, 158-171.
- Rathunde, K., & Csikszentmihalyi, M. (1991). Adolescent happiness and family interaction. In K. Pillermer & K. McCarthy (Eds.), *Parent-child relations throughout life* (pp. 143-162). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Robinson, C.L., Mandlco, B., Olsen, S.F., & Hart, C.H. (1995). Authoritative, authoritarian, and permissive parenting practices: Development of a new measure. *Psychological Reports*, 77, 819-830.
- Rosenberg, M. (1965). *Society and the adolescent self-image*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University.
- Rosenthal, D.A., Gurney, R.M., & Moore, S.M. (1981). From trust to intimacy: A new inventory for examining Erikson's stages of psychosocial development. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 10, 525-537.
- Ryan, R.M., & Lynch, J.H. (1989). Emotional autonomy versus detachment: Revisiting the vicissitudes of adolescence and young adulthood. *Child Development*, 60, 340-356.
- Schaefer, E.S. (1965a). A configuration analysis of children's reports of parent behavior. *Journal of Consulting Psychology*, 29, 552-557.
- Schaefer, E.S. (1965b). Children's reports of parent behaviors: An inventory. *Child Development*, 36, 413-424. \
- Schludermann, E., & Schludermann, S. (1970). Replicability of factors in children's report of parent behavior (CRPBI). *Journal of Psychology*, 76, 239-249. \
- Schmidt, J.A., & Padilla, B. (2003). Self-esteem and family challenge: An investigation of their effects on achievement. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 32, 37-46.
- Schwartz, J.C., Barton-Henry, M.L., & Pruzinsky, T. (1985). Assessing child rearing behaviors: A comparison of ratings made by mother, father, child, and sibling on the CRPBI. *Child Development*, 56, 462-479.
- Silk, J.S., Morris, A.S., Kanaya, T., & Steinberg, L. (2003). Psychological control and autonomy granting: Opposite ends of a continuum or distinct constructs? *Journal of Research on Adolescence*, 13, 113-128.
- Steinberg, L. (1990). Interdependency in the family: Autonomy, conflict, and harmony. In S. Feldman & G. Elliot (Eds.), *At the threshold: The developing adolescent* (pp. 255-276). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Steinberg, L. (2001). We know some things: Parent-adolescent relationships in retrospect and prospect. *Journal of Research on Adolescence*, 11, 1-19.

Steinberg, L., Elmen, J.D., & Mounts, N.S. (1989). Authoritative parenting, psychosocial maturity, and academic success among adolescents. *Child Development*, 60, 1424-1436.

Steinberg, L., Lamborn, S.D., Dornbusch, S.M., & Darling, N. (1992). Impact of parenting practices on adolescent achievement: Authoritative parenting, school involvement, and encouragement to succeed. *Child Development*, 63, 1266-1281.

Steinberg, L., & Silk, J.S. (2002). Parenting adolescents. In M.H. Bornstein (Ed.), *Handbook of parenting*, Vol. 1 (2nd ed., pp. 103-133). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Stolz, H.E., Barber, B.K., & Olsen, J.A. (2005). Toward disentangling fathering and mothering: An assessment of relative importance. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 67, 1076-1092.

Strage, A. (1998). Family context variables and the development of self-regulation in college students. *Adolescence*, 33, 17-31.

Vazsonyi, A.T., Hibbert, J.R., & Snider, J.B. (2003). Exotic enterprise no more? Adolescent reports of family and parenting processes from youth in four countries. *Journal of Research on Adolescence*, 13, 129-160.

Walker, L.J., & Taylor, J.H. (1991). Family interactions and the development of moral reasoning. *Child Development*, 62, 264-283.

PS-FFQ
(Parenting Style Four Factor Questionnaire)
By
SHYNY T. Y
Ph.D (Psychology)
Bharathiar University - Coimbatore

Name of Parent:	Age:	Sex: M/F.....
Name of Child:	Age:	Sex: M/F

Instructions: Read the following statements carefully and indicate your single response by putting a “tick” mark in the appropriate box.

SI No	Statements	All of the time	Most of the time	Some time	Rarely	Never
1	I want my child to follow my instructions because I am the authority to decide what to do or what not to do.					
2	I would like to be a friend, Philosopher and guide to my child.					
3	I am very soft with my child so that I cannot correct him/her at proper time by punishment.					
4	I do not have any demand or control on my child and I give total freedom.					
5	I have little patience to tolerate any misbehaviour of my child or to listen to the excuses in any kind of mistakes.					
6	I used to understand the feelings of my child in any situation and always try to get the opinion of my child whenever I buy something for him/her.					
7	Whenever the child comes with low marks, I will not give any punishments rather I feel he/she will become better next time.					
8	As I am very sad and depressed I cannot show much care and deep emotional tie up with my child.					

9	I strongly believe that my child's future is in my hand and so there is a strict time table for my child to follow.				
10	Important decisions of the family are done together and I give full freedom to my child to share everything with me.				
11	I give valuable reward to my child for obeying me or behaving well.				
12	As I am very busy with my household and office duties, I get less time to involve my child's studies or to listen his/her needs and wishes.				
13	I have clear expectations regarding my child's behaviour and I am not much bothered about the likings of my child regarding his/her future.				
14	As I understand the strength and weakness of my child, I set some appropriate rules for him/her and give friendly corrections whenever necessary.				
15	Though I have definite goal and planning about my child's future I cannot follow it strictly because of my leniency.				
16	I have enough stress and strain myself and hence I cannot take care of my child's welfare.				
17	I usually like to give physical punishment than giving advices to my child because I am sure he/she will not listen to it.				
18	I will not force my child in any of his/her future career and I also help him/her to set a realistic goal.				
19	As I was brought up by strictly disciplined parents, I am very liberal with my child.				
20	I usually give more important to my own likes and wishes but not bother much about needs or misbehaviours of my child.				
21	I believe that only through punishment a child can be corrected and I also do not like to give any financial freedom to my child.				
22	Whenever my child fail to follow the time table given to him/her, I remind the consequences with a touch of love and affection.				
23	I like to be a very affectionate parent towards my child and also I take the responsibility of my faulty parenting on my child.				
24	As I am busy and get little time to care my child, he/she is quite free to move own way to take decisions.				
25	The punishment I give to my child depends upon my mood.				
26	My child talks with me out of being punished after he/she has done something wrong.				
27	I always threaten my child with punishment but do not actually doing it because of my leniency.				
28	As I am bounded with severe life problems, I ignore my child's misbehaviour and I have no idea about his/her life outside the home.				
29	Whenever my child shows disobedience, I scold and criticise him/her with bursting anger.				
30	Even though I am busy I have enough time to visit my child's school & to meet teachers to know his/her progress.				
31	Because of excessive love and sympathy I have showing towards my child, he/she has no self discipline.				
32	I never like to tell my child where I am going or why I am late.				

PS-FFQ (Parenting Style Four Factor Questionnaire)

Answer Sheet

Score	5	4	3	2	1	Score	5	4	3	2	1	Score	5	4	3	2	1	Score	5	4	3	2	1
Q	All of the time	Most of the time	Sometimes	Rarely	Never	Q	All of the time	Most of the time	Sometimes	Rarely	Never	Q	All of the time	Most of the time	Sometimes	Rarely	Never	Q	All of the time	Most of the time	Sometimes	Rarely	Never
1						2						3						4					
5						6						7						8					
9						10						11						12					
13						14						15						16					
17						18						19						20					
21						22						23						24					
25						26						27						28					
29						30						31						32					

A₁=.....;

A₂=.....;

P=.....;

U=.....

(A₁=Authoritarian, A₂=Authoritative, P=Permissive, U=Uninvolved)

Have you responded to all of the statements
 Have you entered your responses in the correct boxes
 Have you responded accurately and honestly

Yes/No
 Yes/No
 Yes/No

Name of Parent: Age: Sex: M/F.....
 Name of Child: Age: Sex: M/F.....