

2-5-2005

Adolescents and Their Fathers: Do Dads Make a Difference?

Dimitra Kamboukos
University of South Florida

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarcommons.usf.edu/etd>

 Part of the [American Studies Commons](#)

Scholar Commons Citation

Kamboukos, Dimitra, "Adolescents and Their Fathers: Do Dads Make a Difference?" (2005). *Graduate Theses and Dissertations*.
<https://scholarcommons.usf.edu/etd/716>

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate School at Scholar Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Graduate Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Scholar Commons. For more information, please contact scholarcommons@usf.edu.

Adolescents and Their Fathers: Do Dads Make a Difference?

by

Dimitra Kamboukos

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy
Department of Psychology
College of Arts and Sciences
University of South Florida

Major Professor: Vicky Phares, Ph.D.
Ellis Gesten, Ph.D.
Marc Karver, Ph.D.
Kristen Salomon, Ph.D.
Trevor Stokes, Ph.D.

Date of Approval: February 9, 2005

Keywords: perceptions of parents, parenting practices, developmental psychopathology,
gender differences, paternal influences

© Copyright 2005, Dimitra Kamboukos

Dedication

This dissertation is dedicated to my parents, grandparents, sister and uncle who have always provided me with love, support, encouragement and guidance. Thank you for always being there. I would have never been able to complete this quest without you.

Acknowledgments

I would like to thank Dr. Behrokh Ahmadi for her support and encouragement in the early stages of this study. This dissertation would have not been possible without the generosity of the participating schools and teachers who were willing to help me out during a very busy school season. Dr. Kennedy: Thank you for being the first to say “yes” to my project, for generously opening up your school to me, and for all your help. Ms. Robins: I am very grateful for your enthusiasm, assistance and support, and for embracing my project. Ms. Webb and Mr. Cooper: Words cannot describe my gratitude. Thanks for welcoming me into your school - two years in a row! I am very grateful for your hard work, support, assistance, and commitment to this project. I am especially grateful to the adolescents and parents who took the time to complete the surveys. Their willingness to share a bit of their lives will help us better understand parent-adolescent relationships. I would like to acknowledge all my family, friends and colleagues from Tampa to New York to Greece (and other places along the way) who have stood by me and believed in me throughout this long journey. A special acknowledgment goes out to the following individuals who actively assisted with the project: Vani Simmons, Jessica Curley, Idia Binite, Shereece, Fields, Ted Dwyer, Elena Lopez, David Herst, Octavio Salcedo, Kelli-Lee Hartford and Q Abdullatif. A special thanks to Christine Totura and Ray Santa Lucia for their invaluable help, support and friendship. I would like to acknowledge my committee and Chair, Dr. Rick Weinberg, for their guidance and support. Lastly, an enormous thank you goes out to my advisor, mentor and role-model, Dr. Vicky Phares: Thank you for all your hard work, support, encouragement, and faith in me and this project. All this would have not been possible without you.

Table of Contents

List of Tables	iv
Abstract	vi
Introduction	1
Parental Role in Adolescents' Functioning	2
Fathers' Parenting Practices	8
Importance of Adolescents' Gender	12
Adolescents' Perceptions of Parents and Parenting Practices	17
Rationale and Purpose of Study	20
Hypothesis 1	21
Hypothesis 2	22
Hypothesis 3	22
Method	23
Participants	23
Measures	27
Parent Surveys	27
Demographic Information Form	27
Perceptions of Parents - Parent Form	28
Child Behavior Checklist	29
Adolescent Surveys	29
My Mom and Dad	29
Demographic Information Form - Adolescent	29
Perception of Parents (POP)	31
Children's Report of Parental Behavior Inventory- Revised (CRPBI-R)	32
Youth Self-Report	33

Procedure	33
Design and Data Analysis	36
Results	38
Missing Data	38
Descriptive Statistics	40
Control Variables	40
Predictor Variables	42
Outcome Variables	44
Gender Differences in Perceptions of Parents and Parenting Practices	45
Overview	45
Adolescent Gender Differences on the POP	46
Adolescent Gender Differences on the CRPBI-R	47
Correlational Analyses	49
Overview	49
Correlations for Boys and Girls Combined	49
POP and Adolescent Outcomes	49
CRPBI-R and Adolescent Outcomes	53
Adolescent Gender Differences in Correlation Analyses	52
POP and Adolescent Outcomes by Adolescent Gender	53
CRPBI-R and Adolescent Outcomes by Adolescent Gender	54
Summary of Adolescent Gender Differences in Correlations	57
Regression Analyses	57
Overview	57
Diagnostics	59
Regressions for Boys and Girls Combined	60
Predicting Internalizing Problems in Adolescents	60
Predicting Externalizing Problems in Adolescents	66

Summary of Regressions for Boys and Girls Combined	73
Adolescent Gender Differences in Regressions	75
Summary of Adolescent Gender Differences in Regressions	78
Discussion	80
Paternal Involvement	80
Perceptions of Parents	83
Perceptions of Parents and Adolescent Outcomes	86
Parenting Practices and Adolescent Outcomes	89
Adolescent Gender Differences	92
The Unique Role of Fathers	95
Implications	96
Limitations	99
Future Directions	102
References	107
Appendices	138
Appendix A: Family Information Form - Parent	139
Appendix B: Perception of Parents - Parent Version	142
Appendix C: My Mom and Dad	143
Appendix D: Family Information Form - Adolescent	144
Appendix E: Perception of Parents - Adolescent	148
Appendix F: CRPBI-R	149
Appendix G: Letter of Invitation and Consent Form	151
Appendix H: Instructions for Teachers	157
Appendix I: Adolescent Assent	159
About the Author	End Page

List of Tables

Table 1	Participation response rates by school	24
Table 2	Adolescents' reports of parental involvement: Overall and by adolescent gender	40
Table 3	Means and standard deviations for predictor variables (POP, POP-P and CRPBI-R)	43
Table 4	Means and standard deviations for outcome variables (CBCL and YSR)	45
Table 5	Adolescent-reported predictor variables (POP and CRPBI-R) by adolescent gender	48
Table 6	Pearson correlations of perception of parents (POP) and adolescent functioning across three informants: Overall group	51
Table 7	Pearson correlations of parenting practices (CRPBI-R) and adolescent functioning across three informants: Overall group	52
Table 8	Correlations of perceptions of parents (POP) and adolescent functioning across three informants: By adolescent gender	55
Table 9	Correlations of parenting practices (CRPBI-R) and adolescent functioning across three informants: By adolescent gender	56
Table 10	Hierarchical multiple regressions for adolescent-reported factors predicting internalizing problems across three informants: Boys and girls combined	61
Table 11	Hierarchical multiple regressions for adolescent- and parent-reported factors predicting internalizing problems across three informants: Boys and girls combined	63
Table 12	Individual contribution (beta weights) of adolescent-reported predictors to internalizing problems across three informants: Boys and girls combined	64
Table 13	Individual contribution (beta weights) of adolescent- and parent-reported predictors to internalizing problems across three informants: Boys and girls combined	65

Table 14	Hierarchical multiple regressions for adolescent-reported factors predicting externalizing problems across three informants: Boys and girls combined	67
Table 15	Hierarchical multiple regressions for adolescent- and parent-reported factors predicting externalizing problems across three informants: Boys and girls combined	68
Table 16	Individual contribution (beta weights) of adolescent-reported predictors to externalizing problems across three informants: Boys and girls combined	71
Table 17	Individual contribution (beta weights) of adolescent- and parent-reported predictors to externalizing problems across three informants: Boys and girls combined	72
Table 18	Hierarchical regressions predicting to adolescent-reported internalizing and externalizing problems from adolescent-reported predictors: By adolescent gender	76
Table 19	Individual contribution (beta weights) of adolescent-reported predictors to self-reported internalizing and externalizing problems: By adolescent gender	79

Adolescents and Their Fathers: Do Dads Make a Difference?

Dimitra Kamboukos

ABSTRACT

This study explored the role of fathers in adolescents' behavioral and emotional functioning. Results revealed gender differences in adolescent ratings of their parents. Compared to girls, boys endorsed significantly lower negative affect toward mothers and fathers. Girls reported higher levels of maternal versus paternal involvement, monitoring and acceptance, and higher positive and lower negative affect toward mothers than fathers. Few gender differences were found in associations between maternal and paternal variables and adolescent outcomes. Results supported the unique contribution of fathers in explaining adolescent emotional and behavioral functioning. When considering boys and girls separately, fathers added unique variance in explaining self-reported internalizing problems for boys only. Results are discussed within the context of family-based research.

Introduction

The configuration of the American family has changed dramatically over the past thirty-five years. In 1970, about 87% of children under the age of 18 lived with both biological parents, whereas by the year 2000, that number dropped to 66% (U. S. Census Bureau, 2000). Further, single-father households increased over five-fold from 393,000 in 1970 to 2 million in 2000, and single-mother households increased three-fold from 3 million to 10 million in that same time period (Fields & Casper, 2001). Despite these demographic statistics, fathers continue to be involved with their children and a large proportion of children in single-mother households have contact with their fathers on a regular basis (Danziger & Radin, 1990; Seltzer, 1991). Specifically, almost half of all children who live with their single mothers have weekly or monthly contact with their biological father, whereas only 19% of children have no contact with their father at all (Doherty, Kouneski, & Erickson, 1998; Seltzer & Brandreth, 1994).

Changes in the past thirty-five years have also included a higher incidence of never-married parents, increased paternal involvement in childcare, mothers entering the workforce full time, and dependence on other members of the family, such as grandparents, and after-school programs, for childcare (Howard, 1995; Hwang & Lamb, 1997; Smith, 2002; U. S. Census Bureau, 2000). Yet, despite these changes, research on parental effects on child and adolescent development has primarily focused on mothers (Lamb, 1975; Phares, 1992; Phares & Compas, 1992; Silverstein & Phares, 1996; Phares, Fields, Kamboukos, & Lopez, 2005).

Although there has been growing awareness of the importance of fathers in adolescents' development (Cabrera, Tamis-LeMonda, Bradley, Hofferth, & Lamb, 2000; Lamb, 1997; Larson & Richards, 1994; Phares, 1999), there remains a paucity of research on paternal influences. For example, Phares and Compas (1992) found that although 48% of family-based studies focused on mothers, only 1% examined fathers exclusively. Further, about a quarter (26%) of the studies examined fathers and mothers separately, while the remaining 25% examined "parents" without distinguishing between mothers and fathers. An updated review conducted a decade later by Phares and colleagues (2005) revealed that fathers continue to be underrepresented in studies on developmental psychopathology. Pediatric psychology research falls even further behind clinical child psychology in the inclusion of fathers and in the investigation of distinct maternal and paternal effects (Phares, Lopez, Fields, Kamboukos, & Duhig, in press).

In short, additional research is needed to examine the distinctive connections between the father-adolescent relationship and adolescent functioning and to understand the similarities and differences of maternal and paternal influences on children and adolescents (Hosley & Montemayor, 1997; Phares & Compas, 1992; Larson & Richards, 1994). The current study will therefore focus on the unique contributions of fathers in adolescence, by examining the associations among adolescents' perceptions of their mothers and fathers, mothers' and fathers' perceptions of their adolescents, and adolescents' emotional and behavioral functioning.

Paternal Role in Adolescent's Functioning

In the United States, mothers have traditionally provided childcare, nurturance, and comfort to offspring, whereas fathers contribute financial resources and recreational

activities (Fagot & Hagan, 1991; Fish, New, & VanCleave, 1992; Pleck & Masciadrelli, 2004; Simons, Whitbeck, Beaman, & Conger, 1994). Although a large proportion of mothers currently share the workforce with fathers, fathers continue to spend less time with their children compared with mothers and rarely take on the sole responsibility of care taking (Bianchi, 2000; Lamb, 1997; Montemayor & Brownlee, 1987; Parke, 2000; Pleck, 1985, 1997; Pleck & Masciadrelli, 2004; Yeung, Sandberg, Davis-Kean, & Hofferth, 2001). In fact, employed mothers spend twice as much time in childcare and housekeeping roles than fathers (Pleck, 1985; 1997). Mothers hold primary responsibilities in addressing their infants' and young children's daily needs and medical care, despite evidence that fathers are equally capable of carrying out these duties (Parke, 2000). Instead, fathers' interactions with children are primarily as a playmate rather than a caretaker (Pleck & Masciadrelli, 2004; Lewis & Lamb, 2003).

The patterns of parental involvement have been studied less in adolescence. Research indicates that both mothers and fathers spend less time with their children as they transition into adolescence and adulthood (Larson, 2001; Larson, Richards, Moneta, Holmbeck & Duckett, 1996; Pleck & Masciadrelli, 2004). Despite these changing trends, there is some support that discrepancies in maternal and paternal involvement and responsibilities with adolescents are similar to those found during infancy and childhood (Lamb, 1997; Parke, 2000; Phares, Fields, & Kamboukos, 2005).

Given this division of parental roles, research has focused on maternal influences and parenting on child development. There is an extensive literature supporting the benefits of maternal involvement, support, parenting and closeness in adolescent functioning (e.g., Bennett, Bendersky, & Lewis, 2002; Brody, Dorsey, Forehand, &

Armistead, 2002; Laible & Carlo, 2004; Levitt, Guacci, & Weber, 1992; Miller, DiOrio, & Dudley, 2002; Patterson, Cohn, & Kao, 1989; Querido, Warner, & Eyberg, 2002; Repinski & Shonk, 2002; Webster-Stratton & Eyberg, 1982). However, despite their more limited role in parenting compared to mothers, fathers impact their children's well-being through several avenues, such as through the provision of material resources, attitudes, level of involvement, and emotional support (King, 1994; Pleck & Masciadrelli, 2004).

One of the most widely researched construct in fatherhood is involvement. Lamb and colleagues (Lamb, Frodi, Hwang, & Frodi, 1982) proposed that paternal involvement can be conceptualized as: *paternal engagement* (direct interaction with children through shared activities; e.g., playing a board game), *accessibility* (availability for interaction, but not interacting directly; e.g., father and adolescent are in separate rooms in the house), and *responsibility* (making sure that the child and adolescent's needs are taken care of and resources are arranged; e.g., making a doctor's appointment). Direct interaction or paternal engagement has been the most studied and researchers often refer to direct interaction or engagement when describing paternal involvement (Pleck & Masciadrelli, 2004).

Research on paternal involvement has primarily focused on the role of the nonresident father and the extent to which fathers are absent or directly involved in their children's lives (Amato & Sobolewski, 2004). The research findings are mixed regarding the impact of contact with nonresidential fathers. Specifically, in a review of 32 studies of divorced families in which fathers maintained contact with their children, 15 studies found positive outcomes related to contact, seven found that paternal contact was related

to increased difficulties in children, and ten studies found no significant effects (Amato, 1993). Further investigation into the literature indicates that there are two opposing viewpoints on the importance of paternal physical and emotional involvement with children and adolescents (Amato, 1994).

On the one side, paternal nurturance and involvement are related to cognitive development, academic performance and positive attitudes towards school, especially when fathers exhibit high academic expectations for their children, and show interest in, assist with, and participate in children's school-based activities (Cooksey & Fondell, 1996; Flouri, Buchanan, & Bream, 2002; Grolnick & Slowiaczek, 1994; Hwang & Lamb, 1997; Jones, Forehand, & Beach, 2000; Nord, Brimhall, & West, 1997; Radin, 1981; Yongman, Kindlon & Earls, 1995). Paternal involvement and close father-adolescent relationships are also related to lower externalizing problems, delinquency and substance use problems, better psychological and social adjustment, and higher levels of competence in adolescents (Amato, 1987; Baker & Heller, 1996; Barnes, 1984; Coombs & Landsverk, 1988; Forehand & Nousiainen, 1993; Harris & Marmer, 1996; Jones et al., 2000; Knafo, 2003; Pleck, 1997; Pleck & Masciadrelli, 2004; Simons et al., 1994; Veneziano & Rohner, 1998). Paternal non-involvement has been linked to academic difficulties, lower cognitive ability, and higher dropout rates from school (Astone & McLanahan, 1991; Keith & Finlay, 1988; Mulkey, Crain & Harrington, 1992). There is also some evidence that the relationships between parental involvement and positive adolescent outcomes exist with step-fathers and non-residential fathers (Amato & Rivera, 1999; White & Gilbreth, 2001).

In contrast to the aforementioned studies, other researchers report no effects of paternal involvement once financial contribution and socioeconomic status are controlled statistically (Crockett, Eggebeen, & Hawkins, 1993; Harris & Marmer, 1996; Svanum, Bringle, & McLaughlin, 1982). Thus, increased academic, behavioral, and emotional difficulties can be attributed to factors other than paternal physical absence or presence, such as limited financial resources, inadequate monitoring, interparental conflict, and stress of single parenting (Biller & Solomon, 1986; Downey, 1994; Doherty et al., 1998; Duncan, Brooks-Gunn, & Klebanov, 1994; Hetherington, Bridges, & Insabella, 1998; McLoyd, 1998; Pettit, Bates, Dodge, & Meece, 1999; Simons et al., 1994; Snyder, Dishion, & Patterson, 1986). For instance, a study on paternal presence in a national sample of infants found no unique paternal effects on children's adjustment over a three year period after controlling for family financial resources (Crockett et al., 1993). Similar results were found in a longitudinal study of poor and non-poor two-parent families, in which paternal, relative to maternal, involvement in impoverished families did not serve a protective role for adolescents' well-being (Harris & Marmer, 1996).

In general, the literature on the role of fathers' financial contribution and socioeconomic status on paternal involvement is mixed (Pleck & Masciadrelli, 2004). There remains a body of research that supports the importance of paternal presence and involvement in children's lives even when economic factors are controlled statistically (Amato, 1993; Flouri et al., 2003). Yet, in a review of the literature, Pleck (1997) found inconsistent relationships between paternal involvement and socioeconomic status (determined based on parental educational level and occupation; Hollingshead, 1975). Large-scale longitudinal representative studies indicate that fathers' education and

income are not related to direct paternal involvement with offspring (Aldous, Mulligan, & Bjarnason, 1998; Toth & Xu, 1999; see Pleck & Masciadrelli, 2004 for a review).

However, a recent investigation of fathers' interactions with and accessibility to children under the age of 13 reported that higher educated fathers were more involved with their offspring (Yeung et al., 2001).

There is an additional dimension that emerges when examining paternal involvement in children's and adolescents' lives. Researchers in the field posit that the quality, rather than the quantity, of time that fathers spend with their children appears to play a seminal role in development (Amato & Gilbreth, 1999; Lamb, 1997; Palkovitz, 2002; Pleck, 1997; Simons et al., 1994; Wenk, Hardesty, Morgan, & Blair, 1995). Instead of investigating the length of visitation, Amato and Gilbreth (1999) suggest that the focus should be shifted to the magnitude of the emotional relationship and the level of closeness that adolescents have with their fathers, as well as the extent to which fathers employ authoritative parenting styles (i.e., high levels of warmth with high levels of age-appropriate parental control). For instance, the impact of nonresidential fathers' involvement may be better explained by the emotional connection fathers have with their children rather than their financial contribution per se. Specifically, non residential fathers who visit their children and have an emotional connection with them are more likely to pay child support (Seltzer, 1991; Amato & Gilbreth, 1999; Amato & Sobolewski, 2004). This highlights that the quality of the relationship may be more important. Additionally, Young, Miller, Norton and Hill (1995) found that fathers' authoritative parenting style of showing trust and encouragement to their children, and not activities such as going out, were related to children's life satisfaction.

Fathers' Parenting Practices

It is widely accepted that authoritative parenting is related to positive outcomes in children and adolescents (Baumrind, 1991; Maccoby & Martin, 1983). Authoritativeness is a combination of non-coercive parental control and responsiveness (Paulson & Sputa, 1996). Authoritative parents provide warmth, support, encouragement and assistance, while also setting appropriate rules, monitoring their adolescent's activities, providing autonomy, and engaging in open communication with their children (Amato & Golbreth, 1999; Darling & Steinberg, 1993). Consequently, adolescents develop a sense of trust, competence and self-worth, and learn about norms and self-regulation of behavior (Amato & Golbreth, 1999).

The extensive research in the area of parenting indicates that dimensions of authoritative parenting, such as warmth, acceptance and support, are related to positive behavioral adjustment (Baumrind, 1991; Dornbusch, Ritter, Leiderman, Roberts, & Fraleigh, 1997; Grolnick, Ryan, & Deci, 1991; Steinberg, Mounts, Lamborn, & Dornbusch, 1991; Wolfradt, Hempel, & Miles, 2003), decreased externalizing behaviors and substance use (Barber & Olsen, 1997; Ge, Best, Conger, & Simons, 1996; Lamborn, Mounts, Steinberg, & Dornbusch, 1991; Stice & Barrera, 1995), less emotional difficulties during times of stress (Johnson, Shulman, & Collins, 1991; Wagner, Cohen & Brook, 1996), increased competence and self-esteem (Baumrind, 1991; Johnson et al., 1991; Laible & Carlo, 2004; Lamborn et al., 1991) and educational success (Barber & Olsen, 1997; Gonzales, Cauce, Friedman, & Mason, 1996; Repinski & Shonk, 2002; Steinberg, Elmen, & Mounts, 1989). In contrast, parental control, hostility, and harsh discipline have been linked to increased behavioral difficulties and anxiety in children

and adolescents (Bennet et al., 2002; Frick, 1994; Ge et al., 1996; Johnson et al., 1991; Knafo, 2003; Melby & Conger, 1996; Murriss & Merckelbach, 1998; Rapee, 1997; Wagner et al., 1996; Wolfradt et al., 2003). Similarly, limited supervision and monitoring are related to poor adjustment and increased behavioral and academic difficulties (Carlo, Roesch, & Melby, 1998; Capaldi & Patterson, 1991; Krishnakumar & Buehler, 2000; Loeber, 1990; Patterson, Reid, & Dishion, 1992).

Given the different roles mothers and fathers take, it is important to investigate the specific patterns of parenting in mothers and fathers separately (Amato, 1994; Forehand & Nousiainen, 1993; Wentzel, Feldman, & Weinberger, 1991). The aforementioned studies on the benefits of warm and supportive parenting apply to both mothers and fathers (e.g., Barber & Olsen, 1997; Conger, Conger, & Scaramella, 1997; Gonzales et al., 1996; Melby & Conger, 1996). Other studies have investigated only the relationship between fathers' parenting behaviors and adolescent functioning. In a meta-analysis of 63 studies of divorced fathers, Amato and Gilbreth (1999) concluded that paternal authoritative parenting was related to increased academic achievement and less externalizing and internalizing problems in offspring.

Other studies, however, have found maternal and paternal differences in explaining academic and behavioral outcomes in children and adolescents. For example, increased frequency of maternal, rather than paternal, warmth and support was related to academic functioning and competence in children (Jones et al., 2000; Laible & Carlo, 2004; Repinski & Shonk, 2002) and fathers' behaviors towards their children were more strongly related to behavioral difficulties (e.g., Feldman & Weinberger, 1994; Knafo, 2003; Loeber, 1990). In addition, maternal, rather than paternal, intrusive control was

related to internalizing difficulties, including anxiety and depression (Bennett et al., 2002).

Differences by parental gender have also been found in the frequency of parenting behaviors. Mothers are reportedly the main disciplinarians at home (Milkie, Bianchi, Mattingly, & Robinson, 2002) and are rated as more intrusive in adolescents' lives compared to fathers (Cubis, Lewin, & Davies, 1989). Mothers also report that they engage in higher levels of acceptance, open communication, discipline, and control with their children compared to fathers (Forehand & Nousiainen, 1993; Milkie et al., 2002; Noller & Callan, 1990). In addition, mothers report more conflict and less positive relationships with adolescents than fathers (Almeida & Galambos, 1991; Collins & Russell, 1991; Wierson, Armistead, Forehand, Thomas, & Fauber, 1990), which appears to be a reflection of mothers' primary role in parenting.

Despite support for parental gender differences in parenting, the unique contribution of paternal parenting practices once maternal contributions are accounted for remains a question in the field. Based on their review of 68 studies on the relations between paternal behavior and child functioning in dual-parent families, Amato and Rivera (1999) concluded that only 9 studies (13%) controlled for maternal characteristics, such as the quality of the mother-child relationship, maternal involvement, and maternal expectations for children. Of these studies, about half (5 studies) produced significant results. Similar conclusions were drawn when examining the influence of paternal characteristics in young adults (Amato, 1994).

The few studies that have controlled for maternal contributions have produced mixed results. For instance, studies on young adults have found that a positive and close

relationship with their father is uniquely related to lower levels of psychological difficulties and higher levels of life satisfaction and happiness (Amato, 1994; Barnett, Marshall, & Pleck, 1992). Similarly, when controlling for the mother-child relationship, the quality of the father-child relationship and paternal involvement were linked to children's good grades and fewer behavioral problems (Amato & Rivera, 1999; Flouri et al., 2003; Forehand, Long, Brody, & Fauber, 1986). On the other hand, Umberson (1992) found that only the quality of the mother-child relationship, and not the father-child relationship, predicted lower levels of depression in adult offspring. Likewise, Forehand and Nousiainen (1993) found that paternal acceptance contributed to social competence and decreased conduct problems in school only when maternal acceptance was high.

Additionally, studies have discussed the interaction effects of mothers' and fathers' influences on adolescents. For instance, Laible and Carlo (2003) found that high paternal support was related to higher levels of sympathy, competence, and self-worth in adolescents, regardless of maternal levels of support. However, maternal support played an important protective role if paternal support was low. On the other hand, paternal control and acceptance of adolescents was not directly related to positive outcomes over time; rather, paternal factors interacted with maternal levels of control to predict romantic relationships and delinquency rates in young adults (Jones et al., 2000). Additionally, maternal, and not paternal, involvement has been found to have buffering effects for children and adolescents from impoverished backgrounds (Harris & Marmer, 1996). In short, research studies that have investigated fathers and mothers separately have

produced mixed findings. This point highlights the importance of further examining the role of fathers and their unique contribution in adolescent outcomes.

Importance of Adolescent's Gender

In order to fully understand family relationships, it is important to consider the gender of the adolescent as well as that of the parent (Collins & Russell, 1991; Russell & Saebel, 1997). Adolescent relationships with mothers and fathers differ depending on the gender of the adolescent (Larson & Richards, 1994). Father-daughter relationships have been described as the most distant whereas father-son relationships are closer and friendlier than father-daughter relationships, although still emotionally distant. Mother-son relationships are reportedly honest and loving and mother-daughter relationships are described as a combination of conflict and closeness (Laible & Carlo, 2004). Following this pattern of findings, a meta-analysis on parental treatment of, and attitudes toward, boys and girls indicated that fathers differentiate between their sons and daughters more so than do mothers (Lytton & Romney, 1991).

The majority of research on gender differences in parent-child relationships has focused on maternal and paternal differences in interactions with their children and different socialization patterns of boys and girls (Russel & Saebel, 1997). In terms of parental gender differences, mothers appear to emphasize interpersonal relationships whereas fathers emphasize achievements (Richards, Gitelson, Petersen, & Hurtig, 1991). According to gender role development theory, girls develop a sense of self-worth from social interactions and support, whereas boys develop their self-worth from achievement in activities (Wenk et al., 1994). Following this theory and given the differences in

mothers' and fathers' emphasis for development, girls and boys may identify with and seek out approval from their same-sexed parent.

Regarding socialization, although the relationship with mothers may be more influential for girls, the effects of their relationships with both their mothers and fathers play an equal part in outcomes (Barnett, Kibria, Baruch, & Pleck, 1991). For example, positive and close relationships with both mothers and fathers predict girls' self-esteem (Baruch & Barnett, 1975; Openshaw, Thomas, & Rollins, 1984; Richards, Gitelson, Petersen, & Hurtig, 1991). For boys, the relationship with fathers appears more important than with mothers (Barnett, Marshall, & Pleck, 1992; Noller & Callan, 1990; Montemayor, 1982). Despite an emotional distance in the relationship (Greene & Grimsley, 1990), fathers play an important role in their sons' development (Harris, Fursternberg, & Marmer, 1998). For instance, although the presence of adolescent gender differences in behavioral, emotional and academic difficulties in response to paternal departure from the home following divorce is equivocal (Allison, & Fursternberg, 1989, Demo & Acock, 1988; Fursternberg, 1990; Garbarino, Sebes, & Schellenbach, 1984; Hetherington, 1973), Mott and colleagues (Mott, Kowaleski-Jones, & Menaghan, 1997) suggest that boys have more difficulty adjusting to their father leaving the home than do girls.

The bulk of the research on gender and parent-child relationships has focused on the mother-daughter dyad, while studies on mother-son relationships can be found in reference to the effects of divorce and single parenting households (Russell & Saebel, 1997). Comparatively, the literature on the father-daughter and father-son relationships is limited (Hosley & Montemayor, 1997; Hetherington & Stanley-Hagan, 1997). Both

boys and girls report higher levels of satisfaction when involved in activities with their fathers than their mothers (Montemayor & Brownlee, 1987). This finding reflects adolescents' distribution of time with their parents; they spend more time in leisure and recreational activities with their father and engage in schoolwork and household activities with their mother.

In terms of gender differences, fathers report more interest in their son's activities and spend more time with their sons than their daughters (Pleck, 1997; Starells, 1994). Further, adolescent boys spend more time alone with their fathers than they do with their mothers, and sons spend more time with fathers than daughters do (Montemayor, 1982). However, it should be noted that the bulk of this research on paternal involvement was conducted over 20 years ago. More recent studies have suggested that adolescent gender may play less of an important role in paternal involvement than previously reported (Houssain & Roopnarine, 1993; Lytton & Romney, 1991; Pleck & Masciadrelli, 2004; Sanderson & Sanders-Thompson, 2002).

Gender differences have also been found in the quality of the parent-adolescent relationship and specific parenting practices. In communication, adolescent boys and girls report more closeness and intimacy with their mothers than their fathers (Bezirgianian & Cohen, 1992; Le Croy, 1988; Paulson & Sputa, 1991; Youniss & Smollar, 1985). In particular, adolescent girls report that they disclose less to their fathers and talk more openly with their mothers (Noller & Callan, 1990; Youniss & Smollar, 1985). Adolescent boys, on the other hand, are more likely to disclose equally to mothers and fathers, but disclose more to fathers than do girls (Noller & Callan, 1990). In comparison to adolescent females, adolescent boys also feel that their fathers know

them better (Youniss & Ketterlinus, 1987). In addition, boys reported higher levels of positive affect toward their fathers compared to girls (Phares, Renk, & Duhig, 2003). However, fathers and sons display less affection than mothers and daughters (Eberly, Montemayor, & Flannery, 1993).

Since adolescents spend more time with, and report greater intimacy and closeness with, mothers, it is suggested that adolescent adjustment is more impacted by mothers and the mother-adolescent relationship (Hosley & Montemayor, 1997).

Although there is evidence that mothers contribute to adolescent outcomes, the influence of fathers is clear in areas such as discipline. Effective paternal and maternal monitoring and discipline practices are related to less externalizing problems whereas negativity and psychological control are related to increased behavioral problems and lower self-esteem in both boys and girls (Conger et al., 1997; Hosley & Montemayor, 1997; Kim, Hetherington, & Reiss, 1999; Simons et al., 1994). Yet, fathers', rather than mothers', disciplinary practices appear to have a stronger impact on sons' behaviors (Patterson & Dishion, 1985) and paternal negativity has been found to be more strongly related to association with deviant peers and behavioral difficulties for boys than girls (Kim et al., 1999).

With the exception of studies focusing on monitoring and discipline, gender differences in behavioral, emotional and academic outcomes related to maternal and paternal parenting styles are not always consistently found in the literature (Forehand & Nousiainen, 1993; Flouri et al., 2003; Paulson, Hill, & Holmbeck, 1991; Smetana, 1995; Wenk et al., 1994). In terms of parenting style, even if mothers and fathers parent sons and daughters in similar ways, the same parental treatment may impact boys and girls

differently (Lytton & Romney, 1991). For example, Baumrind (1989) reported that abrasiveness in parents may be more beneficial to girls', rather than, boys' outcomes. Additionally, Bezirgianian and Cohen (1992) found that paternal warmth and responsiveness was related to girls', but not boys' sense of self, whereas this pattern was found between mothers and sons only.

Given the differences found in boys' and girls' development during adolescence, gender is an important factor to consider when studying parent-adolescent relationships. For example, although both boys' and girls' involvement with parents decreases during adolescence, boys in middle school tend to spend more time alone whereas girls tend to spend time alone and with peers (Larson & Richards, 1991). In addition, girls tend to talk more to mothers during early adolescence compared to boys (Larson et al., 1996; Raffaelli & Duckett, 1989). Further, girls reach puberty faster than boys, develop closer and more intimate friendships, have higher levels of body image disturbance, and lower self-esteem than boys (Dornbusch et al., 1987; Petersen, Tobin-Richards, & Boxer, 1983). Girls also show significantly higher rates of depression than boys, whereas there is a rise in externalizing problems in boys during adolescence (Ge et al., 1994; McGuire, Dunn, & Plomin, 1995; Nolen-Hoeksema & Girgus, 1994; Wade, Cairney, & Pevalin, 2002). Given these differences, there is support that adolescent girls are more vulnerable to family risk factors compared to boys (Cummings & Davies, 1994). In short, considering both the gender of the parent and the adolescent in family-based research is essential.

Adolescents' Perceptions of Parents and Parenting Practices

Although the quality of the parent-adolescent relationship and specific parenting practices are important in understanding adolescent outcomes, recent research has suggested that adolescents' perceptions of their parents are an important piece of the puzzle as well (Grych, Seid, & Fincham, 1992; Harold, Osborn, & Conger, 1997; Phares & Renk, 1998). The research on parent-adolescent agreement on adolescent well-being, parenting and family functioning supports the need for inclusion of adolescent reports in family research. Specifically, cross-informant research reveals that parent-adolescent agreement on reports of problem behaviors is only .25 (Achenbach, McConaughy, & Howell, 1987; Verhulst & Van der Ende, 1992). In fact, parental ratings of adolescent internalizing difficulties are generally low and tend to under-represent adolescents' emotional functioning (Collins & Russell, 1991; Repinski & Shonk, 2002). Adolescents tend to report more externalizing and internalizing problems than parents as well (Achenbach, 1991; Seiffge-Krenke & Kollmar, 1998; Stanger & Lewis, 1993; Verhulst & Van der Ende, 1992).

Differences have also been found in parent and adolescent reports of parent-adolescent conflict, parenting style and family functioning (Ohannessian, Lerner, Lerner, & von Eye, 1995; Paulson & Sputa, 1996; Smith & Forehand, 1996). For instance, adolescents have a more negative view of the family and report more conflict and less cohesion with their parents (Noller & Callan, 1986; Ohannessian et al., 1995). Parents, on the other hand, tend to rate themselves as more involved in parenting than their adolescents view them (Schwartz, Barton-Henry, & Pruzinsky, 1985), and report more

authoritative parenting practices while adolescents view them as permissive and authoritarian (Smetana, 1995).

Differences have also been found in maternal versus paternal reports of involvement and specific parenting practices. For example, mothers rated fathers as less motivated than fathers rated themselves in the parenting role and mothers reported that they were the primary caregivers at home, whereas fathers believed that the responsibilities were shared (Milkie et al., 2002). Further, reports of parental perceptions of adolescents differ by parental gender. For instance, in a recent investigation of gender differences in perceptions among family members, mothers endorsed higher levels of positive affect toward their sons compared to fathers (Phares, Renk, Duhig, Fields, & Sly, 2005).

In addition to parental perceptions, adolescents' feelings about their parents may be more important than the physical presence of parents in determining how adolescents feel about themselves (Wenk et al., 1994). Adolescents' perceptions of support and involvement from their parents are stronger predictors of behavioral and academic functioning than family structure (Buri, 1989; Paulson, 1994). When considering adolescents' perceptions of parents, it is also important to note that even if adolescents do not have contact with a parent, they continue to have thoughts and feelings about the parent (Phares & Renk, 1998).

The majority of studies on adolescents' perceptions of parents have focused on older adolescents and young adults, with a focus on observable parental behavior, such as marital conflict and specific parenting practices (Harold et al., 1997; Phares & Renk, 1998). For instance, adolescents' perceptions of high inter-parental conflict have been

related to increased behavioral difficulties (Davis, Hops, Alperly, & Sheeber, 1998; Jouriles, Bourg, & Farris, 1991; Harold et al., 1997). In addition, adolescents' perceptions of parental *psychological* control, such as guilt, possessiveness and criticism, are related to increased depression and delinquency, whereas perceptions of parental *behavioral* control are linked to increased externalizing problems (Barber, 1996).

When examining adolescents' perceptions of mothers compared to fathers, research has shown that mothers are viewed as more demanding, responsive and intimate (Forehand & Nousiainen, 1993; Noller & Callan, 1990; Paulson & Sputa, 1996; Pipp, Shaver, Jennings, Lamborn, & Fischer, 1985). Adolescents also perceive their mothers as more involved than fathers in their everyday activities and school-related functions (Paulson & Sputa, 1996). Further, Phares and Renk (1998) found that adolescent-reported maternal control in parenting was related to adolescents' negative feelings towards mothers, but the opposite was true for fathers. However, for both mothers and fathers, higher levels of parental acceptance were related to higher levels of positive affect and lower negative affect. These studies support the importance of investigating perceptions of maternal and paternal parenting behaviors separately.

There is less known about adolescents' cognitions and feelings about their parents in general (Phares & Renk, 1998), as opposed to perceptions about specific behaviors. In addition, the area of parental perceptions of adolescents has been rarely researched. Investigations in affective responses to parents indicate that adolescents' feelings and thoughts about their mothers and fathers influence their emotional and behavioral functioning (King, 1994; Phares & Renk, 1998). In fact, positive affect towards both parents was related to lower total behavioral and externalizing problems, whereas

negative affect towards parents was related to total, externalizing, and internalizing difficulties (Phares & Renk, 1998). Less is known about whether young adolescents' positive and negative perceptions of fathers and paternal parenting practices contribute to functioning, over and above the feelings towards mothers.

Rationale and Purpose of Study

Although there has been a growing awareness of the importance of fathers in adolescents' development (Lamb, 1997; Phares, 1999), the majority of research conducted on parental effects in adolescent development has focused on mothers rather than fathers (Phares, 1992; Phares & Compas, 1992). When the impact of fathers and mothers on adolescents' development has been investigated, the unique contributions of paternal factors are rarely assessed (Amato, 1994; Amato & Rivera, 1999; Hosley & Montemayor, 1997). Yet, both the quality of the father-adolescent relationship and paternal parenting styles are considered important factors in conducting research on paternal influences in adolescent outcomes (Amato & Gilbreth, 1999). Thus, both general affect and feelings toward parents and specific overt parenting behaviors should be included in parent-adolescent research (Phares & Renk, 1998).

Further, although there is some evidence that fathers' parenting practices and involvement with adolescents differ by gender of the child (Kim et al., 1999; Patterson & Dishion, 1985), the findings regarding gender are not consistent across all studies (e.g., Flouri et al., 2003; Paulson & Sputa, 1996; Wenk et al., 1994). Further investigation of paternal interaction patterns by gender is therefore needed (Hosely & Montemayor, 1997). Additionally, when investigating parent-adolescent relationships, adolescents' perceptions of parents and parenting are important as these feelings influence

adolescents' emotional and behavioral functioning (Grych et al., 1992; Harold et al., 1997; Phares & Renk, 1998). Similarly, parents' perceptions play an integral part in family relationships (Crouter, Bumpus, Maguire, & McHale, 1999; Seiffge-Krenge, 1999). Given that less is known about the direct correspondence between parental perceptions of their adolescents and the adolescents' outcomes (Phares et al., 2003; Phares et al., 2005), the investigation of parental feelings towards their children is an important factor to consider in family-based research.

Given these findings, the purpose of the current study is to examine the unique contribution of fathers in adolescents' emotional and behavioral functioning. Specifically, the study will investigate the relationships among adolescents' perceptions of both their mothers and fathers, adolescents' ratings of their mother's and father's parenting behaviors, perceptions of parents about their adolescents, and adolescents' functioning. The role of adolescent gender in these relationships will also be examined. Given the equivocal findings regarding the effects of non-resident paternal involvement and socioeconomic status, especially paternal education, on adolescents' outcomes (Crockett et al., 1993; Svanum et al., 1982), paternal involvement and socioeconomic status will be controlled statistically in the current study.

The current study will address the three following sets of hypotheses:

Hypothesis 1

Fathers spend more time with their adolescent sons and adolescent boys feel that their fathers know them better do adolescent girls (Pleck, 1997; Starells, 1994). There is also some evidence that boys have higher positive affect towards their fathers than do girls (Phares et al., 2003). It is therefore hypothesized that adolescent boys will report higher

levels of positive feelings and lower levels of negative affect towards their fathers than will adolescent girls. However, given that both boys and girls report similar levels of self-disclosure, closeness and conflict with mothers (e.g., Eberly et al., 1993; Paulson et al., 1991; Youniss & Smollar, 1985), no gender differences are expected for positive and negative affect towards mothers.

Hypothesis 2

Following suggestions that adolescent boys are more impacted by fathers than are adolescent girls (e.g., Barnett et al., 1992; Mott et al., 1997; Noller & Callan, 1990), it is expected that the relationship between paternal factors and emotional/behavioral functioning in adolescents will be stronger for boys than for girls. Since maternal factors are related to similar outcomes in boys and girls (e.g., Conger et al., 1997; Hosley & Montemayor, 1997), no differences are expected in the magnitude of the correlations for boys' and girls' reports of their mothers and their emotional/behavioral functioning.

Hypothesis 3

There is some support that fathers play an important role in adolescent psychological and educational outcomes even when maternal factors, such as involvement and support, are considered (Amato, 1994; Amato & Rivera, 1999; Barnett et al., 1992; Flouri et al., 2003). It is therefore expected that adolescents' perceptions of fathers, adolescents' ratings of paternal parenting practices, and fathers' perceptions of adolescents will be related to emotional and behavioral functioning, over and above the contribution of maternal factors. Given the limited amount of research on the unique contributions of fathers in boys versus girls, no specific hypotheses were made for the unique effects of fathers by adolescent gender.

Method

Participants

Adolescents from three public middle schools in West Central Florida participated in the study¹. Students were recruited from Bay Point Middle ($N = 1445$) and Largo Middle schools ($N = 1698$) in Pinellas County, and Terrace Community School ($N = 160$), a charter school in Hillsborough County. Despite the large number of students in the two Pinellas County Schools, not all students were provided with letters of invitation and consent forms.² It is estimated that about 960 consent forms were distributed across the three schools. Parents were asked to actively agree to or decline participation. In total, 136 parents signed consent and 164 parents declined participation in writing. The overall participation rate in relation to the estimated number of consent forms distributed was 14.2%. However, the participation rate based on the number of returned letters was 45.3%. Significant differences in response rates were found across the three schools in which TCS had a relatively higher response rate based on the estimate number of distributed consents ($\chi^2 (2) = 23.46, p < .001$) and Largo had a higher response rate based on the number of returned letters ($\chi^2 (2) = 25.31, p < .001$). Table 1 depicts the response rates per school.

¹ Two out of 22 middle schools in Pinellas County agreed to assist with the study, whereas 20 principals declined to have the study run at their school. Despite several attempts to access other sites for recruitment [two community centers/ YMCAs in the Tampa Bay area, four schools in the New York/New Jersey area (contacts were made through a principal, middle school teacher, guidance counselor and head of the parent association, respectively) and a school district in Queens, NY (through a violence prevention project)], access to these additional sites was not possible.

² Given that the Pinellas County School District requested that students' anonymity be maintained, researchers were not able to distribute consent forms in person. Thus, teachers were asked for their assistance. Not all teachers participated and not all teachers provided information on the number of consents that they distributed. As a result, only estimates of the number of consent forms that were distributed are available. At Bay Point Middle, only 12 out of 54 teachers (about 240 students) agreed to distribute consent forms in their home rooms. At Largo Middle, although more than 1000 consent forms were provided, it is estimated that 20 teachers (about 600 students) distributed consent forms to their home room classrooms, over two data collection periods. All six teachers at Terrace Community School agreed to assist with distribution of consents (120 students).

Table 1
Participation response rates by school

	Consents distributed (estimate)	Provided consent	Declined participation	Response rate based on returned letters	Response rate based on distributed consents
	N	N	N	%	%
Bay Point	240	25	61	29.07	10.42
Largo	600	77	47	62.10	12.83
TCS	120	34	56	37.78	28.33

Note: TCS = Terrace Community School

A total of 100 students were surveyed in person. Attempts to obtain surveys from the 36 students who were not surveyed in school (due to scheduling conflicts, absences or the school's request to discontinue data collection³) were made by mail. As a result, additional surveys for nine students were obtained by mail. Despite multiple attempts, 27 adolescents, whose parents provided signed consent, did not complete surveys. The final sample consisted of 109 adolescents aged 12-15 ($M = 12.73$, $SD = .93$). Based on a power analysis expecting a large effect size ($\alpha = .05$, power = .80; Cohen, 1992), a minimum of 100 participants was required for an adequate test of the hypotheses.

Adolescents in the study attended the 6th to 8th grades, and the distribution of the students across the grades was equivalent (33.9% in 6th grade, 32.1% in 7th grade, and 33% in 8th grade). There was approximately an equal number of girls ($N = 62$; 56.9%)

³ Distribution and collection of consents, as well as subsequent data collection, was abruptly ended after the tragic death of a student at Largo Middle School. Following requests from school personnel, students were not surveyed in school and parents and students were not contacted for a period of time. Attempts to obtain surveys were made by mail several months after the tragedy.

and boys (N = 47; 43.1%). The sample was ethnically diverse (64.2% Caucasian, 13.8% African-American, 11.0% Latino/Latina, 2.8% Asian, 1.8% Native American, and 6.4% Multiracial).

In addition to the adolescents, 55 mothers/mother figures (40.4% response rate) and 41 fathers/father figures (31.1% response rate) completed parent surveys by mail. The majority of the parents who completed surveys were biological mothers (93.0%) and biological fathers (84.6%). The rest of the respondents were step-parents (1.8% step-mothers; 12.8% step-fathers), adoptive parents (3.4% adoptive mothers; 2.6% adoptive fathers) and grandmothers (1.8%).⁴ Mothers reported a mean age of 42.18 (SD = 6.74, Range = 29-59) and fathers' mean age was 44.97 (SD = 7.38, Range = 30-65). On average, the sample fell in the middle to upper middle socioeconomic status on the Hollingshead (Range: 14-66, M = 43.46, SD = 11.29). Fathers reported working an average of 45.03 hours per week (Range: 0 – 70; SD = 16.67) and mothers worked an average of 33.73 hours a week (Range: 0-90, SD = 19.16).

According to adolescent report, about two-thirds of the sample consisted of parents in intact marriages (62.5%), about one-fifth of the parents were divorced (15.6%) or separated (5.5%), and 12.8% of parents had never been married. Finally, 1.8% of adolescents reported that their father was dead and 1.8% indicated that they did not know or have contact with their biological father and thus were unable to report parental marital status.

Adolescents also reported on their family constellation at home. Almost all of the adolescents reported living with their biological mother or maternal figure (97.2%) and

⁴ The terms “mothers” will be used to refer to mothers and mother figures and “fathers” to refer to fathers and father figures for ease of reading throughout the paper.

about three-quarters of the participants lived with their fathers or father figures (71.6%). Specifically, over half of the sample lived with their biological mothers and fathers (23.9% lived with mothers and fathers; 34.9% lived with mothers, fathers, and siblings). In terms of single-parent families, 11.9% of the participants lived with their mothers only, 2.8% lived with their mothers and siblings, and 1.8% lived with their fathers and siblings. A total of 14.7% of the sample was comprised of families with a step-parent (7.3%: mother and step-fathers; 6.4%: mother, step-father, and siblings; 1.0%: father, step-mother and siblings). Only 2.7% of the adolescents lived with their grandparents and 1.0% lived with foster parents. The rest of the participants lived with their parents and siblings and other extended family members, such as a grandparent (3.6%), and cousins or nephews (2.7%).

There were no significant differences across the three schools on demographic variables. Specifically, no differences were found for gender ($\chi^2 (2) = 1.66, p > .05$), adolescents' age ($F (2) = 1.02, p > .05$), adolescents' ethnicity/race ($\chi^2 (10) = 13.13, p > .05$), parents' marital status ($\chi^2 (10) = 14.18, p > .05$), and who the adolescent resided with ($\chi^2 (32) = 30.04, p > .05$). Although there was an initial significant difference across the three schools for grade attended by the adolescents, this difference did not remain significant after the correction for error ($\chi^2 (6) = 12.65, p < .05$). The only significant difference across the three school settings was for socioeconomic status (SES; $F (2, 92) = 6.55, p < .002$). Specifically, after controlling for error, results revealed that adolescents from Terrace Community School reported significantly higher SES scores ($M = 49.18, SD = 11.26$) than those in Largo Middle School ($M = 39.88, SD = 9.08$). This difference in SES across the three settings suggests recruitment from a diverse range of

middle schools. Since the only significant difference in demographic variables across the three schools was found in SES scores, and SES was controlled for in the regression analyses, data from all three schools were combined for the analyses.

Measures

Parents and their adolescents completed paper-and-pencil questionnaires. All selected measures are psychometrically sound and have been used extensively in research. Specifically, mothers and fathers completed a short demographic form, a measure on perceptions of their children, and a measure on their adolescent's emotional and behavioral functioning. Adolescents completed a short demographic information form, two measures on their perceptions of their parents and parenting practices, and one measure on their emotional and behavioral functioning.

Parent Surveys

Demographic Information Form. Parents completed a short demographic form that was developed for the purposes of the current study. The form requested information on family demographics, family constellation, parental occupation and education, and amount of time spent at home and at work. Mothers and fathers who lived with their adolescents were also asked how much time they spent with their adolescent during waking hours on an average weekday and on an average weekend day for two categories: *Direct interaction* (engagement, such as talking and playing a game) and *Accessibility* (without direct interaction, such as time when parents were accessible but not involved in direct interaction; e.g., watching television without talking or being in the house in separate rooms and involved in separate activities). These items were based on the conceptualization of Lamb and colleagues (Lamb, Frodi, Hwang, & Frodi, 1982).

Parents who did not live with their teenagers were asked to estimate how much time they spent on average within a month in direct interaction and accessibility with their teenagers. See Appendix A for the parent Demographic Information Form⁵.

Perceptions of Parents – Parent Form. Both mothers and fathers completed the parent-version of the *Perception of Parents* (POP-P; Phares & Renk, 1998), a 15-item measure that provides information on parents' feelings toward their adolescent. Parents who had limited or no contact with their adolescent could also complete the measure. Parents were asked to respond on a six point scale, ranging from “not at all or never” to “extremely or always”, to items such as: “How much do you feel love towards your child?”, “How much do you feel confused by your child?”, “How much do you feel anger towards your child?”, and “How much do you feel proud of your child?”.

The POP-P has two factors: *Positive Affect* and *Negative Affect*. Higher scores reflect greater positive affect and negative affect toward the adolescent. The psychometrics for the measure are strong, with internal consistencies ranging from .75 to .95 (Phares et al., 2003). In the current sample, internal consistency was generally strong with the exception of paternal reported negative affect (alpha for positive affect/mother report = .87; alpha for positive affect/father report = .92; alpha for negative affect/mother report = .70; alpha for negative affect/father report = .47). See Appendix B for a copy of the measure.

Child Behavior Checklist. Parents also completed the *Child Behavior Checklist* (CBCL; Achenbach & Rescorla, 2001), a widely used parent-reported measure of emotional and behavioral problems in children and adolescents. Respondents were

⁵ Please note that the documents presented in the Appendix have been modified from their original format and presentation.

provided with a list of items and asked to rate their adolescents' behaviors on a three-point scale, ranging from "not true" to "very true or often true". Sample items include: "Disobedient at home", "Can't sit still, restless or hyperactive", and "Shy or timid". Psychometric properties, including 7-day test-retest reliability (.89), internal consistency ($\alpha = .95$), and construct validity (.82), for the CBCL are excellent. The two broad band factors, *Internalizing* and *Externalizing Problems*, of the CBCL were used for the purposes of the current study. Higher T scores on the factors reflect greater parent-reported emotional and behavioral problems in adolescents.

Adolescent Surveys

My Mom and Dad. Adolescents were asked to list the names of their mother and father figures on the *My Mom and Dad* form. This information was used to match adolescent and parent surveys in order to ensure that the parents for which adolescents provided ratings were in fact the mothers and fathers who completed the surveys. In addition, adolescents were asked to provide their date of birth in order to facilitate scoring of the Child Behavior Checklist and Youth Self-Report measures. This form was separated from the surveys following data collection. See Appendix C for the measure.

Demographic Information Form – Adolescent. Adolescents completed a short demographic form that was developed for the purposes of the current study. This adolescent-version of the parental Demographic Information Form provides information on adolescents' gender, ethnic background and family constellation. Adolescents were also asked to provide information on their parents' education and occupation, which was used to determine the family's socio-economic status (SES; Hollingshead, 1975).

Similarly to the parental demographic form, adolescents were asked to report on

the amount of time their parents spent with them during waking hours in *Direct Interaction* (e.g., talking, playing a game) and *Accessibility* (e.g., time when parents are accessible but not involved in direct interaction with their children, such as watching television without talking or partaking in separate activities). Adolescents who lived with their parents reported on the amount of time their parents spent with them in direct interaction and accessibility on an average weekday and weekend day. Adolescents who did not live with a parent were asked to report on the average time monthly that they spent in direct interaction and accessibility with their non-residential parent.

Based on the work of Lamb and colleagues (1982), adolescent reports of parental direct interaction and accessibility were used for the purpose of this study. Parental report of direct interaction and accessibility was substituted only if adolescent reports of involvement were missing. Reported weekday and weekend involvement hours for direct interaction and accessibility were *each* converted into an overall average monthly amount of time.⁶ For direct interaction and accessibility separately, the newly computed average weekday and weekend hours per month were then added to provide an overall monthly average of involvement in each of the two domains. Thus, the final data did not separate hours by weekday and weekend for direct interactions and accessibility. This procedure was done to include ratings of involvement with non residential parents' participation (since adolescents with non residential parents reported only on the average amount of time parents spent with them in a month and not per weekday and weekend day). Once the hours of involvement were aggregated into overall monthly direct interaction and monthly accessibility rates, a daily average of these two domains was computed for ease

⁶ For both direct interaction and accessibility, the reported weekday hours were multiplied by 22 (average number of weekdays in a month) and the reported weekend hours were multiplied by 8 (average number of weekend days in a month).

of interpretation.⁷

Thus, the current study used the number of hours per day, on average, in which parents interacted directly with and were accessible to their adolescents. These procedures are consistent with previous research (Lamb et al., 1982). Specifically, adolescent reports of *paternal* direct interaction and accessibility were used as control variables in the current study. See Appendix D for the Demographic Information Form – Adolescent Version.

Perceptions of Parents (POP). Adolescents also completed the POP measure (Phares & Renk, 1998), which is the adolescent-version of the POP-P. The POP is a 15-item measure that assesses adolescents' cognitions and emotions related to their father and mother. Respondents were asked to report their feelings and opinions on their mother and father separately. Adolescents could complete the measure even if they had no contact with their mother or father. Respondents were asked to respond to items on a six-point scale, ranging from "not at all or never" to "extremely or always", on questions such as "How much do you feel respect toward your mother/father?", "How much do you feel anger toward your mother/father?", "How much do you feel confused by your mother/father?" and "How much do you feel closeness to your mother/father?".

The POP produces two factors: *Positive Affect* and *Negative Affect*. Higher scores on the POP reflect greater levels of positive affect and negative affect toward mothers and fathers. Psychometric properties for the measure are strong, with good one-week test-retest reliability (ranging from .70 to .97), internal consistency (alphas ranging from .73 and .93) and construct validity (ranging from .59 to .71). In the current sample, internal

⁷ The monthly total of hours in direct interaction and in direct accessibility was divided by 30 (average number of days in a month). This was done separately for direct interaction and for accessibility.

consistency was strong (alpha for positive affect toward mother = .85; alpha for positive affect toward father = .95; alpha for negative affect toward mother = .67; alpha for negative affect toward father = .79). See Appendix E for the POP.

Children's Report of Parental Behavior Inventory – Revised (CRPBI-R).

Adolescents completed four subscales of the CRPBI-R (Schludermann & Schludermann, 1970). The 27-item measure assesses adolescents' perceptions of their mother's and father's parenting behaviors. Specifically, adolescents rated their parents on four subscales, using a three point scale, with options "Not Like My Mother/Father", "Somewhat Like My Mother/Father" and "Like My Mother/Father". The four subscales were: *Acceptance* (8 items; e.g., "Smiles at me often" and "Almost always speaks to me with a warm and friendly voice"), *Discipline* (9 items, some of which were reverse scored; e.g., "Soon forgets a rule s/he has made" and "Does not insist I obey if I complain or protest"), *Control* (5 items; e.g., "Insists that I must do exactly as I am told" and "Believes in having a lot of rules and sticking to them") and *Monitoring* (5 items; e.g., "Wants to know exactly where I am and what I am doing" and "Is always checking on what I have been doing at school or play").

Higher scores on the CRPBI-R reflect greater levels of adolescent-rated acceptance, discipline, control, and monitoring in their mothers and fathers. Internal consistency ranges from .74 to .87, and the measure has good convergent and discriminant validity (Schwartz et al., 1985). In the current sample, internal consistencies were generally strong (alpha of maternal acceptance = .83; alpha of paternal acceptance = .89; alpha of maternal discipline = .71; alpha of paternal discipline = .73; alpha of

maternal control = .64; alpha of paternal control = .74; alpha of maternal monitoring = .76; alpha of paternal monitoring = .80). See Appendix F for a copy of the measure.

Youth Self-Report (YSR). Adolescents completed the YSR (Achenbach & Rescorla, 2001), a widely used measure of adolescent-reported emotional and behavioral problems. This measure is the adolescent version of the parent-rated CBCL mentioned above. Adolescents were asked to rate each item (e.g., “I get in many fights” and “I am too shy or timid”) on a three-point scale: “not true”, “sometimes or sometimes true” or “very true or often true”. Psychometric properties, including 7-day test-retest reliability (.72), internal consistency (alphas are .95 and above) and construct validity (.82 and above) for the YSR are excellent. The two broad-band factors of the YSR, *Internalizing* and *Externalizing Problems* were used for the purposes of the current study. Higher T scores reflect greater self-reported emotional and behavioral problems.

Procedure

Families were recruited from three middle schools in two school districts in West Central Florida. Homeroom teachers in 6th to 8th grades from the participating schools were asked to distribute letters of invitation and consent forms to their students (see Appendix G for copies of the invitation letters and consent form). Teachers were provided with a script describing the study and instructions for distribution and collection of the consent forms (see Appendix H for the instructions and script). Teachers were asked to read the script to the students verbatim. In the instructions, students were asked to take the letters of invitation and consent forms home, and return them to their homeroom teacher within a given time period.

The letters and consent forms sent home provided parents with a written description of the study, the measures collected, benefits and risks to the study, and information about confidentiality. Parents were assured that information on individual students' and parents' responses would not be shared with the school, district, students, or parents. They were also informed that their decision to participate or not participate in the study would in no way influence their adolescent's progress or services in the school. Parents were asked to indicate whether they wished to participate in the study or not, by checking off "Yes, I am interested" or "No, I am not interested" on the invitational form. At the request of the School District, if parents checked off that they were not interested, they were not asked to provide any additional identifying information. Parents who agreed to participate were instructed to sign the last page of the consent form, and provide their child's name, grade, and their contact information.

Depending on the school, drop off locations for the consent forms varied. Teachers collected consent forms on pre-determined dates and forwarded them to the mailroom (where drop boxes were available) or the principal's office. Following receipt of parental written consent, students were surveyed in small groups of 3-15 in the school setting. Students were provided with a verbal description of the study based on the assent form (see Appendix I). They were given assurances that no information would be shared with family members or school officials (except where required by state law for reporting potential suicidality, homicidality, or child abuse). Following data collection, the two suicidality items on the adolescent-reported Youth Self-Report (YSR) were reviewed (Item 18: "I deliberately try to hurt or kill myself" and item 91: "I think about killing myself"). Adolescents who responded a "1" or "2" on these two items were interviewed

separately and a suicide risk assessment was conducted. Six adolescents endorsed a “1” on the items. Following the clinical assessment, it was determined that these adolescents had no active suicidal intent, attempts, or plans.

Students gave written assent to participation prior to completing the questionnaires. Students were initially asked to complete the “My Mom and Dad” form, which was read to them verbatim. They were asked to identify the names of their mother and father, or the individuals who hold the role of maternal and paternal figures in their lives. If adolescents indicated that they had more than one maternal or paternal figure in their lives, they completed questionnaires on each of the figures. These questionnaires were then matched with the returned maternal or paternal surveys and/or compared with the names provided by the parents on the consent forms. Following these procedures, the current study included only one adolescent-reported survey on each parent (one maternal and one paternal figure). Thus, the adolescents decided on who were their maternal and paternal figures in their lives.

No identifying information was requested on the questionnaires, and the assent forms and identifying information (e.g., My Mom and Dad form) were separated from the questionnaires immediately following data collection. If students were absent on the assigned data collection and follow-up collection dates, a follow-up data collection date was scheduled. If students were absent on the follow-up date, surveys were mailed home for completion.

Following data collection in the school setting, parents were mailed the parent surveys to complete and return by self-addressed business reply envelopes. All forms were assigned a study identification code to ensure confidentiality of responses. The

preparation of parent packets followed recommendations in a recent article providing guideline for mail survey research (Weathers, Furlong, & Zolorzano, 1993). Specifically, cover letters were personalized, included the researchers' signature in ink, and packets were mailed in a personally addressed envelope. Additionally, following the recommendations by Weathers and her colleagues (1993), no cut-off dates were provided in the letters for responding to the questionnaires in order to provide the impression of a continued temporary relationship with the researcher. Finally, the potential of a tangible reward for participation was offered. Following recommendations (Weathers et al., 1993), two follow-up mailings of packets were made to parents who did not respond to the initial mailing. Parents were also provided with e-mail reminders to mail back the surveys.

Parents and adolescents who participated in the study were entered into a drawing for six gift certificates. There were four certificates for \$25 each and two for \$50 each. Parents or adolescents who signed consent but did not complete surveys were still entered into the drawing. In addition, teachers from each school who assisted with the distribution and collection of consent forms were entered into a drawing for a gift certificate of \$50 for their assistance. Finally, schools were offered in-service training in appreciation of their assistance in data collection.

Design and Data Analyses

The research design was cross-sectional. Preliminary analyses revealed that there were no significant differences, after controlling for error, on the independent/predictor and dependent/outcome variables across the three schools. Thus, the schools were combined in all analyses. Prior to examining the hypotheses, descriptive statistics were

run on the control variables (SES, paternal direct interaction, paternal accessibility), independent/predictor variables (adolescent positive and negative affect toward parents, maternal and paternal positive and negative affect toward adolescents, and adolescent ratings of parenting practices, including acceptance, control, discipline, and monitoring), and dependent variables (adolescent-, mother-, and father-reported internalizing and externalizing problems)⁸. Preliminary analyses were also run to explain involvement rates by mothers and fathers on the whole group and by adolescent gender.

To examine gender differences in adolescents' positive and negative affect toward mothers and fathers separately (Hypothesis 1), one-way analyses of variance were conducted. Correlation analyses were then conducted between the independent and dependent variables for boys and girls combined and separately by gender. In order to test Hypothesis 2, Fisher r to z transformations were computed to explore the magnitude of adolescent gender differences in the correlations. Finally, three sets of regression analyses (adolescent-only reports as predictors, adolescent- and parent-reports as predictor variables, and regressions by gender, where applicable) were conducted to test the final hypothesis. Given the large number of analyses, Bonferroni adjustments were used throughout the analyses to control for Type I error (Larzalere & Mulaik, 1977).

⁸ The independent variables will be referred to as "predictors" and the dependent variables will be referred to as "outcomes" in the current study for ease of reading. However, it should be noted that the use of these terms does not imply causation between the independent and dependent variables.

Results

The results section is reported in five major sections. The first section provides details on how missing data were handled. The second section provides descriptive statistics for the control variables, adolescent-reported predictors, parental predictors, and outcome variables. Results on gender differences in the predictor variables are reported in the third section. The fourth section provides inter-correlations between the predictor and outcome variables for the whole group and by gender. This section also includes results of the *r* to *z* transformations, which were conducted to examine the magnitude of gender differences in the correlations. The final section consists of the hierarchical multiple regressions for the whole group and by gender, where applicable.

Missing Data

As is the case in most studies, there were a small amount of missing data in this study. In keeping with standard procedures, missing data on the Perception of Parents (Phares & Renk, 1998) and CRPBI-R (Schludermann & Schludermann, 1970) measures were substituted with the individual's average rating on the subscale of the measure. On the adolescent-rated POP measure, there were only 8 (out of 825) mother-rated and 12 (out of 615) father-rated items missing, whereas on the CRPBI, adolescents did not provide responses on 13 (out of 2943) mother-rated and 15 (out of 2835) father-rated items. Only one adolescent did not complete the Youth Self-Report.

For the purposes of the current study, adolescent report of maternal and paternal involvement was used. If adolescents reported that they spent "24 or more hours" with their parents in direct interaction and/or accessibility, a predetermined formula was used

to clean the data. Specifically, on weekdays, 24 hours was changed to 8 hours (with the assumption of 8 hours in school and 8 hours of sleep in the day) and on weekends, 24 hours was changed to 16 hours (accounting for 8 hours of sleep). This process was used for six adolescents.

Further, when the combined total of direct interaction and accessibility added up to or more than 24 hours, in addition to the aforementioned predetermined formula, another conversion formula, based on the proportions of times reported, was used to clean the data. This was done to ensure that the combined amount of time in direct interactions and accessibility did not exceed 24 hours. For example, if adolescents reported that their parents spent 24 hours in direct interaction and 12 hours in accessibility, a 2:1 ratio was used to calculate the proportional amounts of time that parents spent in direct interaction and accessibility. This process was used for 20 adolescents' reports of maternal involvement and 13 adolescent reports of paternal involvement.

When the adolescents did not provide hours of involvement, maternal or paternal data was substituted. This occurred in 4 cases for maternal involvement and 3 cases for paternal involvement. No paternal involvement data were provided for 6 fathers and 4 mothers. Similarly, adolescent report of SES was used in the current study. However, in 24 cases, adolescents did not provide their parents' educational or occupational status in order to calculate SES. In these cases, parental report of SES was used.

Descriptive Statistics

Control Variables

As noted in the Methods section, adolescent ratings of their family’s SES indicate that participating families fell in the middle to upper middle classes (M = 43.46, SD = 11.29). Descriptive statistics for maternal and paternal average daily direct interactions and accessibility to their adolescents are presented in Table 2. Recall that weekdays and weekends were combined to create this average day estimate. Additionally, recall that *paternal* involvement was used as a control variable, following suggestions that paternal influence in adolescents’ lives can be accounted for by the amount of contact that fathers have with adolescents (Amato, 1994).

Table 2
Adolescents’ reports of parental involvement: Overall and by adolescent gender

	Mothers			Fathers		
	N	M	SD	N	M	SD
Direct Interaction *** (Hours on Average Day)	104	5.85	3.55	103	4.10	3.52
<i>Males</i>	47	5.22	3.59	45	4.80	4.08
<i>Females</i> ***	58	6.31	3.46	58	3.56	2.94
Accessibility * (Hours on Average Day)	103	4.31	2.97	103	3.46	3.17
<i>Males</i>	46	4.52	2.94	45	4.05	3.20
<i>Females</i> *	58	4.14	2.98	58	3.00	3.10

Note: For overall sample: N for direct interaction = 102 and N for accessibility = 101;
For males: N for direct interaction = 45 and N for accessibility = 44;
For females: N for direct interaction and N for accessibility = 57.

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

Exploratory analyses on adolescent reports of parental involvement rates were conducted to understand the nature of mothers' and fathers' involvement in the current sample. Separate paired t-tests were performed on the two involvement variables (direct interactions and accessibility) for the overall group and separately by adolescent gender to determine group differences in these control variables. A Bonferroni-adjusted alpha level (obtained by dividing the per comparison alpha level by the two involvement variables, $\alpha = .025$) was used in the analyses.

Results revealed that adolescents reported spending significantly more time in daily direct interactions with their mothers than with their fathers ($t(101) = 4.89, p < .001$). In fact, adolescents reported that they spent almost two hours more in direct interactions with their mothers than with their fathers on an average day. Similar results were found for maternal versus paternal accessibility ($t(100) = 2.56, p < .012$); adolescents reported that, compared to their fathers, their mothers were accessible to them for about an hour more each day. When examining involvement separately by adolescent gender, no significant differences were found between maternal and paternal involvement for adolescent boys. However, girls reported that mothers spent significantly more time in direct interactions with them compared to fathers ($t(56) = -2.54, p < .014$) and mothers were more accessible than fathers ($t(56) = -5.84, p < .001$). Girls reported that their mothers spent almost double the amount of time in direct interactions with them and were accessible about an hour more each day compared to their fathers (see Table 2).

Predictor Variables

Descriptive statistics for the predictor variables are presented in Table 3. Recall that ratings on the Perception of Parents (POP) measures ranged from 1 to 6, with higher scores reflecting high levels of positive affect and negative affect. On the POP, adolescent ratings of positive affect toward parents were very high, indicating that adolescents endorsed feelings that were “very much or very often” positive toward their mothers and fathers. Conversely, adolescent ratings of negative affect toward parents were low, indicating that adolescents “rarely” had negative feelings toward their mothers and fathers. On the POP-Parent Form, parents’ feelings about their children yielded similar results, in which both mothers and fathers endorsed high levels of positive affect and low levels of negative affect toward their adolescents. These numbers are consistent with other community samples (Phares & Renk, 1998).

Recall that the CRBPI-R measure used a three-point scale, in which higher scores indicated that the behaviors endorsed were reflective of mothers’ and fathers’ specific parenting practices. Adolescents reported, that on average, their mothers and fathers displayed moderate levels of acceptance, control, discipline, and monitoring in their overt parenting behaviors. These means are consistent with other community samples (Phares & Renk, 1998).

Table 3
Means and Standard Deviations for Predictor Variables (POP, POP-P, and CRPBI-R)

	N	M	SD
<i>POP (Adolescent Report)</i>			
Adolescent positive affect toward mother	109	5.47	.56
Adolescent negative affect toward mother	109	2.13	.88
Adolescent positive affect toward father	109	5.08	1.09
Adolescent negative affect toward father	109	2.37	1.12
<i>POP-P (Parent Report)</i>			
Maternal positive affect toward adolescent	56	5.64	.42
Maternal negative affect toward adolescent	56	2.19	.64
Paternal positive affect toward adolescent	42	5.45	.57
Paternal negative affect toward adolescent	42	2.20	.55
<i>CRPBI-R (Adolescent Report)</i>			
Maternal acceptance	109	2.70	.36
Maternal control	109	2.47	.39
Maternal discipline	109	2.20	.42
Maternal monitoring	109	2.28	.52
Paternal acceptance	105	2.53	.49
Paternal control	105	2.39	.47
Paternal discipline	105	2.24	.43
Paternal monitoring	105	2.08	.57

Note: POP = Perception of Parents; POP-P = Perception of Parents – Parent Version; CRPBI-R = Children’s Report of Parental Behavior Inventory – Revised

Outcome Variables

Table 4 presents the descriptive statistics and frequencies of the cut off scores for the Child Behavior Checklist (CBCL; mother and father report) and the adolescent-reported Youth Self-Report Form (YSR). On the CBCL, both mothers and fathers rated that, on average, their adolescents displayed non-clinical levels of internalizing and externalizing problems. In terms of clinical cut-off scores on the CBCL, mothers rated that 16.1% of adolescents exhibited borderline and clinical levels of internalizing problems, compared to 9.5% of adolescents according to fathers. When examining clinical levels of externalizing problems, both parents reported similar ratings of borderline and clinical scores (Mothers: 12.5%; Fathers: 11.9%).

Similar to the findings on the CBCL, adolescent reports on the YSR fell, on average, in the non-clinical range for internalizing and externalizing problems. These patterns are consistent with other community samples. However, somewhat more adolescents than parents reported higher clinical and borderline levels. Specifically, 23.1% and 25.9% of adolescents endorsed clinical and borderline levels of internalizing and externalizing problems, respectively. These percentages are higher than the average of 2% of adolescents from community samples. However, results from the current study are similar to those reported in the standardization of the CBCL and YSR (27% and 26%, respectively; Achenbach, 1991a, 1991b).

Table 4
Means and Standard Deviations for Outcome Variables (CBCL and YSR)

	N	Range	M	SD	% Borderline Range	% Clinical Range
<i>CBCL – Mother report</i>						
Internalizing problems	56	33 - 70	51.04	9.40	5.4%	10.7%
Externalizing problems	56	34 - 69	46.86	9.23	7.1%	5.4%
<i>CBCL – Father report</i>						
Internalizing problems	41	33 - 70	46.39	9.23	2.4%	7.1%
Externalizing problems	41	34 - 70	46.32	9.28	2.4%	9.5%
<i>YSR – Adolescent report</i>						
Internalizing problems	108	30 - 75	52.58	10.02	7.4%	15.7%
Externalizing problems	108	29 - 76	52.20	10.53	8.3%	17.6%

Note: CBCL = Child Behavior Checklist; YSR = Youth Self Report

Gender Differences in Perception of Parents and Parenting Practices

Overview

A series of one-way analyses of variance were conducted to investigate gender differences on adolescent perceptions of their mothers and fathers (positive and negative affect, based on the POP) to test the first hypothesis. Separate univariate F tests were performed on each of the four perception variables using a Bonferroni adjusted alpha level (that is, dividing the per comparison alpha level by the four comparisons, $\alpha = .0125$).

Although not originally hypothesized, one-way analyses of variance were also conducted to examine adolescent gender differences in adolescents' ratings of their mothers' and fathers' specific parenting practices in four domains (acceptance, control, discipline, and monitoring). Additionally, the study explored whether adolescent reports differed by gender of their parent. Specifically, paired t-tests, conducted separately for boys and girls, examined differences in adolescents' reported affect (positive and negative) toward their mothers versus their fathers, as well as adolescents' ratings of mothers' versus fathers' specific parenting practices in four domains (acceptance, control, discipline, and monitoring). Bonferroni adjusted alpha levels were set at .025 for the POP comparisons (predetermined alpha divided by 2) and .0125 for the CRPBI-R comparisons (the predetermined alpha level was divided by 4).

Adolescent Gender Differences on the POP

As can be seen in Table 5, significant adolescent gender differences were found in respect to negative affect toward mothers and fathers. Specifically, compared to girls, boys reported significantly lower levels of negative affect toward their mothers ($F(1, 107) = 8.18, p < .005$) and fathers ($F(1, 107) = 8.31, p < .005$). No significant adolescent gender differences were found with respect to positive affect toward mothers ($F(1, 107) = .71, ns$) and fathers ($F(1, 107) = 2.52, ns$). These results are somewhat consistent with the first hypothesis, in relation to adolescent gender differences in negative affect toward fathers and no adolescent gender differences in positive affect toward mothers. However, findings did not support expectations of adolescent gender differences in positive affect toward fathers and of no adolescent gender differences in negative affect toward mothers.

Exploratory analyses of adolescent boys' and girls' affect toward mothers versus fathers were also conducted (see Table 5). Significant differences in affect by gender of the parent were found for girls only. Specifically, girls endorsed significantly higher positive affect and lower negative affect toward their mothers than their fathers ($t(61) = -3.53, p < .001$ and $t(61) = 2.60, p < .012$, respectively).

Adolescent Gender Differences on the CRPBI-R

Additional exploratory analyses were conducted regarding adolescents' reports of parenting practices. As can be seen in Table 5, no significant adolescent gender differences were found on ratings of maternal or paternal acceptance, control, discipline, and monitoring (p 's $> .05$). Paired t-tests to explore ratings of mothers' versus fathers' specific parenting behaviors revealed that both boys and girls rated their mothers as exhibiting significantly higher levels of monitoring ($t(46) = -3.87, p < .001$ and $t(57) = -2.87, p < .006$, respectively) and acceptance behaviors ($t(46) = -2.69, p < .010$ and $t(57) = -3.37, p < .001$, respectively) compared to their fathers. However, the significant difference between maternal and paternal acceptance levels for boys was not considered significant after controlling for error.

Table 5
Adolescent-reported predictor variables (POP and CRPBI-R) by adolescent gender

	Boys			Girls		
	N	M	SD	N	M	SD
<i>POP</i>						
Positive affect toward mother	47	5.42	.56	62	5.51	.56
Negative affect toward mother **	47	1.86	.89	62	2.33	.82
Positive affect toward father	47	5.23	.75	62	4.93	1.28
Negative affect toward father **	47	2.03	.99	62	2.63	1.14
<i>CRPBI-R</i>						
Maternal acceptance	47	2.69	.39	62	2.72	.34
Maternal control	47	2.45	.36	62	2.47	.42
Maternal discipline	47	2.18	.43	62	2.21	.41
Maternal monitoring	47	2.23	.53	62	2.32	.52
Paternal acceptance	47	2.51	.55	58	2.55	.44
Paternal control	47	2.35	.47	58	2.41	.47
Paternal discipline	47	2.23	.49	58	2.26	.38
Paternal monitoring	47	2.00	.58	58	2.15	.56

Note: POP = Perception of Parents; CRPBI-R = Children's Report of Parental Behavior Inventory – Revised

** $p < .005$

Correlational Analyses

Overview

Before exploring adolescent gender differences for Hypothesis 2, correlations were run for the entire sample to determine the magnitude of the relationships among adolescent-reported parental factors (perception of parents and parenting practices), maternal and paternal perceptions of their adolescents, and adolescent-, mother-, and father- reported emotional/behavioral functioning in adolescents. These sets of correlations were also conducted separately by gender in order to test the second hypothesis. Specifically, Fisher r to z transformations were conducted to investigate the magnitude of adolescent gender differences in the relationships between the predictor and outcome variables. To control for Type 1 error, the Bonferroni adjusted alpha level was set to .004 for the POP measures and .002 for the CRPBI-R.⁹

Recall that on the POP scale, higher ratings reflect higher levels of positive and negative affect. Similarly, on the CRPBI-R parenting practices subscales, higher scores reflect higher levels of parental acceptance, consistent and firm disciplinary practices, control, and monitoring. Additionally, higher T scores of CBCL and YSR externalizing and internalizing problems reflect higher levels of emotional and behavioral difficulties in adolescents.

Correlations for Boys and Girls Combined

POP and Adolescent Outcomes. As can be seen in Table 6, the strongest findings emerged between adolescent-reported negative affect toward both parents and

⁹ The predetermined alpha level was divided by the number of correlations in each set. The sets were: adolescent-reported POP toward mothers and fathers (4 factors), maternal- and paternal-reported POP (4 factors), and adolescent-reported parenting practices for mothers and fathers (8 factors). Each set was correlated on each of the outcome variables: internalizing (3 raters) and externalizing (3 raters) problems. Thus, the number of comparisons for the POP measure were 12 (4 factors * 3 raters) and for the CRPBI-R were 24 (8 factors * 3 raters).

externalizing problems, in which negative affect toward mothers and fathers was positively related to externalizing problems across all three informants, with coefficients ranging from .24 to .46 (p 's < .05). However, negative affect toward mothers and adolescent- and father-rated externalizing problems did not remain significant after controlling for error. The relationships between negative affect toward fathers and adolescent- and maternal-rated externalizing problems were strong, while the association with paternal-rated externalizing problems did not remain significant after controlling for error. Results were not as strong for negative affect and internalizing problems, and for positive affect and internalizing and externalizing problems. Although some significant relationships between these variables emerged (see Table 6), these associations did not remain significant after the Bonferroni adjustment.

Similar to findings on the adolescent POP, results examining the relationships between parental affect and adolescent outcomes revealed that parental affect was related to externalizing, but not internalizing, outcomes (see Table 6). Three relationships remained as significant after controlling for error. Specifically, higher maternal and paternal negative affect was related to higher levels of adolescent- and paternal-reported externalizing problems, respectively, and higher levels of maternal positive affect were associated with lower levels of maternal-rated externalizing problems (p 's < .001). No other correlations were significant after controlling for error.

Table 6

Pearson correlations of perception of parents (POP) and adolescent functioning across three informants: Overall group

	Externalizing Problems			Internalizing Problems		
	Adolescent- -Report	Mother- Report	Father- Report	Adolescent- Report	Mother- Report	Father- Report
Adolescent-Report on POP						
Positive affect toward mother	-.24 * ^a	-.22	-.15	-.03	-.02	.02
Negative affect toward mother	.24 * ^a	.38 **	.38 * ^a	.21 * ^a	.24	.17
Positive affect toward father	-.27 ** ^a	-.16	-.25	-.14	-.03	-.08
Negative affect toward father	.31 ***	.46 ***	.44 ** ^a	.23 * ^a	.30 * ^a	.19
Parent-Report on POP						
Maternal positive affect toward adolescent	-.37 ** ^a	-.41 ***	-.22	-.17	-.20	-.04
Maternal negative affect toward adolescent	.57 ***	.35 ** ^a	.36 * ^a	.25	-.03	.10
Paternal positive affect toward adolescent	-.28	-.19	-.24	.07	-.12	-.15
Paternal negative affect toward adolescent	.15	.25	.52 ***	.02	-.02	.30

Note: POP = Perceptions of Parents; CBCL = Child Behavior Checklist; YSR = Youth Self-Report
 N for YSR = 108; N for maternal-reported CBCL = 56; N for paternal-reported CBCL = 41

* $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$; ^a Considered significant by chance (α set at .002).

Table 7

Pearson correlations of parenting practices (CRPBI-R) and adolescent functioning across three informants: Overall group

	Externalizing Problems			Internalizing Problems		
	Adolescent- -Report	Mother- Report	Father- Report	Adolescent- Report	Mother- Report	Father- Report
Adolescent-Report on Mother						
Acceptance	-.32 ***	-.26	-.28	-.26 ** ^a	-.09	.25
Control	-.01	-.11	.05	.09	-.09	.06
Discipline	-.23 * ^a	-.21	-.07	-.20 * ^a	-.28 * ^a	.01
Monitoring	.05	-.05	.06	.19 * ^a	-.09	.06
Adolescent-Report on Father						
Acceptance	-.45 ***	-.26	-.33*	-.21 * ^a	-.11	-.21
Control	-.07	.06	-.02	.11	-.03	-.14
Discipline	-.22 * ^a	-.28 * ^a	-.15	.09	-.30 * ^a	-.05
Monitoring	-.08	.13	.15	.13	.05	.06

Note: CRPBI-R = Children's Report of Parental Behavior Inventory-Revised; CBCL = Child Behavior Checklist; YSR = Youth Self-Report; N for YSR = 108 with mother variables and N for 104 with father variables; N for maternal-reported CBCL = 56; N for paternal-reported CBCL = 41

* $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$; *** $p < .001$; ^a considered significant by chance

CRPBI-R and Adolescent Outcomes. Results from the correlational analyses between the CRPBI-R and adolescent outcomes can be seen in Table 7. Maternal and paternal acceptance was significantly inversely related to adolescent externalizing outcomes ($p < .001$). Specifically, higher adolescent ratings of mothers' and fathers' acceptance were related to lower self-reported externalizing difficulties. Although a few other relationships emerged initially, no other analyses remained significant after the Bonferroni adjustments.

Adolescent Gender Differences in Correlation Analyses

POP and Adolescent Outcomes by Adolescent Gender. Adolescent gender differences on the associations between the POP subscales and adolescent outcomes were conducted to examine the second hypothesis. As can be seen in Table 8, few significant adolescent gender differences were found via Fisher r to z transformations between adolescent- and parent-reported perceptions of parents and adolescent outcomes.

One significant adolescent gender difference was found between adolescent-reported negative affect toward mothers and maternal-rated internalizing problems. This result was stronger for boys than for girls ($z = 1.98, p < .05$), in that, for boys, higher levels of negative affect toward mothers were related to higher maternal ratings of their sons' internalizing problems. This finding did not remain significant however after controlling for error. Several adolescent gender differences in the relationships between adolescent affect toward parents and adolescent emotional/behavioral functioning that approached significance were found (see Table 8). In general, the patterns of results suggest stronger relationships between maternal affect and adolescent outcomes for boys than for girls, and stronger relationships between paternal affect and internalizing

problems in girls compared to boys. These adolescent gender differences, however, were not significant after Bonferroni corrections.

CRPBI-R and Adolescent Outcomes by Adolescent Gender. Adolescent gender differences were also explored in the relationships between adolescent ratings of parenting practices (acceptance, control, discipline, and monitoring) and adolescent behavioral and emotional functioning to test the second hypothesis. Similar to findings on the POP, few adolescent gender differences were found in the relationships between parenting practices and adolescent functioning (see Table 9).

The patterns of results, however, suggest that the strongest relationships were between maternal factors, especially acceptance and monitoring, and adolescent outcomes. As can be seen in Table 9, the relationships between maternal acceptance and mother-reported externalizing problems and mother- and father-reported internalizing problems were stronger for boys than for girls ($z = -2.86, p < .004$, $z = 2.26, p < .02$, $z = 1.71, p < .09$, respectively). This pattern suggests that increased maternal acceptance was related to lower emotional and behavioral difficulties in boys. In contrast, maternal monitoring and self-reported internalizing problems were stronger for girls than for boys ($z = -2.64, p < .008$), which suggests a positive relationship between maternal monitoring and internalizing problems. Paternal acceptance was inversely related to self-reported internalizing problems. This finding was stronger for girls than for boys ($z = 1.62, p < .10$). Yet, none of these differences remained significant after controlling for error.

Table 8

Correlations of perception of parents (POP) and adolescent functioning across three informants: By adolescent gender

		Externalizing Problems			Internalizing Problems		
		Adolescent	Mother	Father	Adolescent	Mother	Father
N		M = 47 F = 61	M = 25 F = 31	M = 19 F = 22	M = 47 F = 61	M = 25 F = 31	M = 19 F = 22
Adolescent-Report on POP							
Positive affect toward mother	M	-.11	-.23	-.35	-.08	-.14	-.24
	F	-.33 **	-.25	-.08	.02	.08	.17
Negative affect toward mother	M	.24	.57 ** ^b	.30	.19	.48 * ^a	.30
	F	.29 *	.17	.44 *	.27 *	-.04	.04
Positive affect toward father	M	-.24	-.10	-.46 *	.10	-.06	-.32
	F	-.32 *	-.20	-.16	-.27 * ^b	.01	.05
Negative affect toward father	M	.28	.58 **	.42	.07	.48 *	.31
	F	.39 **	.33	.42	.38 ** ^b	.18	.09
Parent-Report on POP							
Maternal positive affect toward adolescent	M	-.29	-.66 ** ^b	-.35	-.09	-.44 * ^b	-.40
	F	-.50 **	-.27	-.23	-.22	.06	.27
Maternal negative affect toward adolescent	M	.55 **	.24	.41	-.00	.17	.37
	F	.62 **	.40 *	.32	.44 * ^b	-.17	-.04
Paternal positive affect toward adolescent	M	-.43	-.39	-.33	-.05	-.03	-.03
	F	-.14	-.10	-.24	.14	-.20	-.28
Paternal negative affect toward adolescent	M	.13	.24	.44	.17	.01	.17
	F	.06	.24	.55 ***	-.06	.35	.35

Note: POP = Perceptions of Parents; M = Males; F = Females

* $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$; *** $p < .001$; Italicized results - Fisher r to z transformations: ^a $p < .05$; ^b $p < .10$ before Bonferroni adjustments. The magnitude of gender differences did not remain significant after controlling for error.

Table 9

Correlations of parenting practices (CRPBI-R) and adolescent functioning across three informants: By adolescent gender

		Externalizing Problems			Internalizing Problems		
		Adolescent	Mother	Father	Adolescent	Mother	Father
	N	M = 47 F = 61	M = 25 F = 31	M = 19 F = 22	M = 47 F = 61	M = 25 F = 31	M = 19 F = 22
Adolescent-Report on Mother							
Acceptance	M	-.30 *	<i>-.60 **^b</i>	-.58 **	-.34 *	<i>-.43 *^a</i>	<i>-.53 *^c</i>
	F	-.33 **	.05	-.15	-.19	.34	.00
Control	M	-.28	-.30	-.27	-.07	-.04	-.24
	F	.17	-.01	.32	.21 *	-.13	.27
Discipline	M	-.28	-.25	-.27	-.09	-.31	-.23
	F	-.19	-.26	-.05	-.27 *	-.24	.12
Monitoring	M	.22	.48 **	-.36	-.08	-.15	-.05
	F	.26 *	.21	.24	<i>.42 **^a</i>	-.04	.10
Adolescent-Report on Father							
Acceptance	M	-.39 **	-.38	-.62 **	-.06	-.19	-.34
	F	-.51 **	-.23	-.21	<i>-.37 **^c</i>	.02	.12
Control	M	-.37 *	-.17	-.21	-.10	-.00	-.30
	F	.18	.19	.04	.31*	-.06	-.06
Discipline	M	-.18	-.36	-.31	-.09	-.38	-.27
	F	-.26	-.23	-.14	-.28 *	-.24	.07
Monitoring	M	-.27	-.25	-.14	.05	-.02	.11
	F	.10	.31	.25	-.22	.12	-.03

Note: CRPBI-R: Children's Report of Parental Behavioral Inventory – Revised; M = Males; F = Females

* $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$; $p < .001$; Italicized results - Fisher r to z transformations: ^a $p < .01$; ^b $p < .05$; ; ^c $p < .10$ before Bonferroni adjustments. The magnitude of gender differences did not remain significant after controlling for error.

Summary of Adolescent Gender Differences in Correlations. The directions of adolescent gender differences on the POP and CRPBI-R partially supported the second hypothesis. Given no significant adolescent gender differences were found after controlling for error, the hypothesized lack of gender differences in the relationships between maternal factors and adolescent outcomes was supported. It should be noted, however, that on the CPRBI-R, the pattern of results suggests that maternal factors played a more important role in outcomes for boys rather than girls. Contrary to the hypothesis, results did not confirm a stronger relationship between the paternal predictors (affect toward fathers, paternal perceptions of adolescents, paternal parenting practices) and emotional and behavioral functioning in boys compared to girls.

Regression Analyses

Overview

Prior to conducting the regression analyses to test the third hypothesis, diagnostics were run on each regression model in order to assess the assumptions of linearity, normality, independence and variability, and to investigate the effect of outliers and influential cases on the regressions. Three sets of hierarchical regression analyses were then conducted to determine predictors of behavioral and emotional functioning in adolescents, and to ascertain whether paternal factors contributed to adolescent functioning, over and above maternal factors (Hypothesis 3).

The first set of regressions focused only on adolescent-reported predictor variables (in order to explore adolescents' perceptions alone and to maximize the sample size given the return rate of parental surveys). The second set of regressions included adolescent-, mother-, and father-reported predictors. Finally, the third set of regression

analyses explored adolescent gender differences, as applicable. Given the large number of analyses, Bonferroni adjustments were used to control for Type I error (Larzalere & Mulaik, 1977). Specifically, the alpha level was set at .008 (that is, the predetermined alpha level was divided by the total number of tests: 3 raters for internalizing and 3 raters for externalizing problems) within each set.

In all regression models, the average daily rate of *paternal* involvement (direct interaction and accessibility as reported by the adolescent) and socioeconomic status (SES) were controlled for and entered into the first step. Recall that these control variables were selected following equivocal findings regarding the effects of non-resident paternal involvement and SES on adolescent functioning (Crockett et al., 1993; Svanum et al., 1982). The variables entered into the second and third steps differed, depending on whether adolescent-only or adolescent and parent variables were included in the models.

For the models with adolescent-only predictors, adolescents' perceptions of their mother (positive and negative affect) and adolescent ratings of maternal parenting practices (acceptance, discipline, control, and monitoring) were entered into the second step. The third and final step included adolescents' perceptions of their father (positive and negative affect) and adolescent ratings of paternal parenting practices (acceptance, discipline, control, and monitoring). For the models with adolescent and parent predictors, adolescents' perceptions of their mother (positive and negative affect), adolescents' ratings of maternal parenting (acceptance, discipline, control, and monitoring) and maternal perceptions of adolescents (positive and negative affect) were entered into the second step of the regressions. Adolescents' ratings of their fathers (positive and negative affect, acceptance, discipline, control and monitoring) and paternal

perceptions of adolescents (positive and negative affect) were entered into the third step. In both sets of regressions, the predictor variables were regressed onto the following criterion variables: adolescent-, mother-, and father-reported internalizing and externalizing problems.

Decisions on which regression models to run separately by adolescent gender were determined by the magnitude of gender differences in the correlations (presented in the previous section). No significant gender differences were found after controlling for error. However, given that adolescent gender differences were suggested in some relationships between adolescent-reported predictors and outcomes across the three informants prior to controlling for error, regression analyses with only the adolescent-reported predictors were conducted for exploratory purposes.

Diagnostics

In order to assess the assumption of a linear relationship between the predictor and outcome variables, plots of standardized residuals against predicted values and each independent variable were examined. These plots were also used to assess the assumption of homogeneity of the variance (homoscedasticity). In all models, the assumptions of linearity and homoscedasticity were not violated. Normal P-P plot of the regression standardized residuals, which were obtained to assess whether the assumption of normality was violated, revealed that the residuals were normally distributed.

Given the number of predictor variables in the current study, tests for collinearity and multicollinearity were also conducted. Tolerance and variance inflation factor measures were used to assess both pairwise and multiple variable collinearities. Condition indices and the proportions of variance for each regression coefficient in each

model were referred to for additional examinations of collinearity. Collinearity diagnostics revealed that there were problems of multicollinearity. This issue of multicollinearity is common in family research and is seen as one of the limitations in this type of research (Brandt, 1984; Mason & Perreault, 1991).

Finally, diagnostics for outliers and influential cases were performed. Studentized residuals were used for flagging potential outliers and leverages and Cook's distances were used for flagging influential cases. All regression analyses were performed with and without outliers and influential cases. On the basis of outlier and influence diagnostics, observations corresponding to suspected outliers in the residuals were deleted. The regression models were performed with and without the outliers. Results revealed that, overall, reports differed without the outliers. Thus, the reported results are based on the data set with the removed outliers.

Regressions for Boys and Girls Combined

Predicting Internalizing Problems in Adolescents. As can be seen in Table 10, the models predicting from adolescent-reported predictors to mother- and father-reported internalizing problems approached significance ($p < .09$ and $p < .06$, respectively). Similarly, the models that included both adolescent- and parent-reported predictors in explaining internalizing problems across all three raters were not significant (see Table 11). Thus, the only model that emerged as significant in explaining internalizing problems involved adolescent-reported predictors and self-reported internalizing problems ($p < .001$; see first three series of columns in Table 10).

Table 10

Hierarchical multiple regressions of adolescent-reported factors predicting internalizing problems across three informants: Boys and girls combined

Internalizing Problems									
	Adolescent-Report YSR			Mother-Reported CBCL			Father-Reported CBCL		
	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
F	3.16 * ^a	3.22**	4.12***	.83	1.25	1.76 ⁺	1.93	1.62	2.13 ⁺
df(F)	3,80	9,74	15,68	3,45	9,39	15,33	3,33	9,27	15,21
Adj. R ²	.07	.19	.36	-.01	.05	.19	.07	.13	.32 ⁺
ΔR ²		.18	.20		.17	.22		.20	.25 ⁺
ΔF		3.01** ^a	4.22***		1.44	2.18 ⁺		1.39	2.24 ⁺
df(ΔF)		6,74	6,68		6,39	6,33		6,27	6,21

Note: YSR = Youth Self-Report; CBCL = Child Behavior Checklist; Adj. R² = Adjusted R²;

df = degrees of freedom; ΔR² = Change in R²; ΔF = F Change

Steps are explained in the text (page 61)

⁺ p < .10, * p < .05, ** p < .01, *** p < .001

^a Not significant after correction for error (α < .008)

The control variables and adolescent-reported maternal and paternal predictor variables accounted for 36% of the variance in explaining self-reported internalizing problems ($p < .001$; see step 3 under adolescent-report YSR in Table 10). When examining the unique contribution of the variables entered in each step of the regression model, the addition of adolescent maternal ratings did not account for a statistically significant amount of variance, after controlling for error, beyond that explained by SES and paternal involvement. However, the inclusion of adolescents' positive and negative affect toward fathers and adolescent reports of fathers' specific parenting behaviors added a significant 20.0% of the variance in explaining self-reported internalizing problems, above and beyond the control and maternal variables ($p < .001$).

Table 12 presents the beta values and individual contribution of the predictors in the model explaining adolescent-reported internalizing problems (see first column). Increased accessibility to fathers and higher maternal acceptance were each significantly related to lower self-reported internalizing problems in adolescents. Results revealed differential effects by mothers and fathers on adolescent ratings of control. Specifically, higher maternal, but lower paternal, control was related to lower adolescent-reported internalizing problems.

Although the models predicting from adolescent- and parent-reported predictors to internalizing problems across the three informants was not significant (see Table 11), Table 13 depicts the beta weights and individual contribution of the predictors in the models. Similar to the aforementioned adolescent-reported model, maternal acceptance was inversely related to adolescent-reported internalizing problems. No other significant

Table 11

Hierarchical multiple regressions of adolescent- and parent-reported factors predicting internalizing problems across three informants: Boys and girls combined

Internalizing Problems									
	Adolescent-Report YSR			Mother-Reported CBCL			Father-Reported CBCL		
	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
F	.08	1.34	2.20 ⁺	.35	1.59	1.17	1.32	1.21	2.15 ⁺
df(F)	3,30	11,22	19,14	3,31	11,23	19,15	3,28	11,20	19,12
Adj. R ²	-.09	.10	.41	-.06	.16	.09	.03	.07	.41 ⁺
ΔR^2		.39	.35		.40	.17		.28	.37
ΔF		1.81	2.43 ⁺		2.02 ⁺	.77		1.14	2.27 ⁺
df(ΔF)		8,22	8,14		8,23	8,15		8,20	8,12

Note: YSR = Youth Self-Report; CBCL = Child Behavior Checklist; Adj. R² = Adjusted R²;

df = degrees of freedom; ΔR^2 = Change in R²; ΔF = F Change

Steps are explained in the text (page 61)

⁺ p < .10

Table 12

Individual contribution (beta weights) of adolescent-reported predictors to internalizing problems across three informants: Boys and girls combined

Adolescent-Reported Predictors	Internalizing Problems (β weights)		
	YSR	CBCL Mother	CBCL Father
<i>Control Variables</i>			
SES	-.47	.19	-.10
Paternal Accessibility	-.49***	-.09	.37 ⁺
Paternal Direct Interaction	-.19	-.47* ^a	-.46 ⁺
<i>Maternal Predictors</i>			
Positive Affect for Mother	.03	-.17	.52
Negative Affect for Mother	.07	.23	.21
Maternal Acceptance	-.52***	.43	-.29
Maternal Control	-.51***	-.11	.84* ^a
Maternal Discipline	.01	-.22	-1.02 ⁺
Maternal Monitoring	.25	-.63* ^a	-.33
<i>Paternal Predictors</i>			
Positive Affect for Father	.22	.22	-.20
Negative Affect for Father	-.11	-.05	.34
Paternal Acceptance	.21	-.47 ⁺	-.11
Paternal Control	.60***	.02	-.84* ^a
Paternal Discipline	-.19	-.06	1.32* ^a
Paternal Monitoring	-.10	.78**	.66

Note: YSR = Youth Self-Report; CBCL = Child Behavior Checklist

+ $p < .10$, * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$; ^a Not significant after correction for error

Table 13

Individual contribution (beta weights) of adolescent- and parent-reported predictors to internalizing problems across three informants: Boys and girls combined

Adolescent- and Parent-Reported Predictors	Internalizing Problems (β weights)		
	YSR	CBCL Mother	CBCL Father
<i>Control Variables</i>			
SES	-.61* ^a	.38	.79* ^a
Paternal Accessibility	-.08	-.19	.38
Paternal Direct Interaction	.37	-.20	-.19
<i>Maternal Predictors</i>			
Positive Affect for Mother	1.30	.10	2.17* ^a
Negative Affect for Mother	-.10	.28	1.64* ^a
Maternal Acceptance	-1.66**	.01	.32
Maternal Control	-.22	.26	.20
Maternal Discipline	.34	.79	-.85
Maternal Monitoring	.61	-.16	.47
Maternal Positive Affect to Adolescent	.01	-.08	-.31
Maternal Negative Affect to Adolescent	.17	-.21	-.19
<i>Paternal Predictors</i>			
Positive Affect for Father	-.22	.52	-1.19
Negative Affect for Father	-.17	.24	-1.38 ⁺
Paternal Acceptance	.22	-.85	-.08
Paternal Control	.78	-.28	-.25
Paternal Discipline	.30	-.78	1.19 ⁺
Paternal Monitoring	-.62	.29	-.21
Paternal Positive Affect to Adolescent	-.76* ^a	.05	-.25
Paternal Negative Affect to Adolescent	-.59* ^a	-.41	-.13

Note: YSR = Youth Self-Report; CBCL = Child Behavior Checklist

+ $p < .10$, * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$; ^a Not significant after correction for error

relationships were found between adolescent- and parent-reported predictors and adolescent internalizing problems after controlling for error.

Predicting Externalizing Problems in Adolescents. In explaining externalizing problems from adolescent-reported maternal and paternal predictors, only the models for adolescent- and *maternal*-reported externalizing problems remained significant after controlling for error ($p < .001$ for both models; see Table 14). Conversely, as depicted in Table 15, significant models predicting from both adolescent- and parent-reported predictors to adolescent- and *paternal*-reported externalizing problems were found ($p < .004$ and $p < .008$, respectively).

The model that included *both* adolescent- and parent-reported predictors in explaining adolescent-reported externalizing problems (see Table 15) was stronger than the one with only adolescent-reported predictors (see Table 14). Specifically, the control variables, adolescent-reported maternal and paternal predictors, and maternal and paternal perceptions of their adolescents contributed explained 68.3% of the variance in predicting self-reported externalizing problems ($p < .004$; see third column under adolescent-report YSR in Table 15), compared to 38.0% ($p < .001$) for the control and adolescent-reported predictors (see third column under YSR in Table 14).

In examining the incremental variance accounted for by the maternal variables in the two significant models explaining adolescent-reported externalizing problems, results revealed that in the model with only adolescent-reported variables, maternal predictors uniquely explained 26.1% of the variance, over and above the contribution of SES and paternal involvement ($p < .001$; see step 2 under adolescent-report YSR in Table 14).

Table 14

Hierarchical multiple regressions of adolescent-reported factors predicting externalizing problems across three informants: Boys and girls combined

Externalizing Problems									
	Adolescent-Report YSR			Mother-Reported CBCL			Father-Reported CBCL		
	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
F	2.72 * ^a	4.38***	4.20***	.23	2.05 ⁺	4.02***	.35	.96	2.81* ^a
df(F)	3,77	9,71	15,65	3,40	9,34	15,28	3,32	9,26	15,20
Adj. R ²	.06	.28	.38	-.06	.18	.51	-.06	-.01	.44
ΔR^2		.26	.19		.34	.31		.22	.43
ΔF		4.80***	2.88* ^a		2.93* ^a	4.87**		1.26	4.44**
df(ΔF)		6,71	6,65		6,34	6,28		6,26	6,20

Note: YSR = Youth Self-Report; CBCL = Child Behavior Checklist; Adj. R² = Adjusted R²;

df = degrees of freedom; ΔR^2 = Change in R²; ΔF = F Change

Steps explained in the text (page 61)

+ p < .10, * p < .05, ** p < .01, *** p < .001

^a Not significant after correction for error ($\alpha < .008$)

Table 15

Hierarchical multiple regressions of adolescent- and parent-reported factors predicting externalizing problems across three informants: Boys and girls combined

Externalizing Problems									
	Adolescent-Report YSR			Mother-Reported CBCL			Father-Reported CBCL		
	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
F	1.31 * ^a	2.93* ^a	4.63**	.49	1.20	1.65	.55	.70	3.86**
df(F)	3,29	11,21	19,13	3,30	11,22	19,14	3,29	11,21	19,13
Adj. R ²	.03	.40	.68	-.05	.06	.27	-.04	-.12	.63
ΔR^2		.47	.27		.33	.32		.22	.58
ΔF		3.24* ^a	3.35* ^a		1.44	1.79		.77	6.28**
df(ΔF)		8,21	8,13		8,22	8,14		8,21	8,13

Note: YSR = Youth Self-Report; CBCL = Child Behavior Checklist; Adj. R² = Adjusted R²;

df = degrees of freedom; ΔR^2 = Change in R²; ΔF = F Change

Steps explained in the text (page 61)

+ p < .10, * p < .05, ** p < .01, *** p < .001

^a Not significant after correction for error ($\alpha < .008$)

Conversely, in the model with both adolescent- and parent-reported predictors, the addition of maternal factors did not add significant incremental variance, after controlling for error, in explaining self-reported externalizing problems ($p < .015$; see step 2 under adolescent-report YSR in Table 15). For both models, although the addition of paternal predictors appeared to account for unique variance in explaining adolescent-reported externalizing problems, results did not remain significant after controlling for error (see steps 3 under adolescent-report YSR in Tables 14 and 15).

In terms of the independent contribution of the predictors in the two significant models explaining self-reported externalizing problems, three significant relationships were found after controlling for error (see beta weights in Tables 16 and 17). Increased paternal discipline was related to lower self-reported externalizing problems in adolescents in the model with the adolescent-only reported factors ($p < .006$; see first column in Table 16). In the model that included both adolescent- and parental-reported factors, decreased paternal accessibility and lower maternal positive affect toward adolescents were related to increased adolescent-reported externalizing difficulties ($p < .007$ and $p < .003$, respectively; see first column in Table 17).

In relation to parent ratings of externalizing problems, the model with only adolescent-reported predictors was significant in explaining *maternal*-reported externalizing problems (see middle sets of columns in Table 14), whereas the model with *both* adolescent- and parental-reported predictors significantly explained *paternal*-reported externalizing difficulties (see last sets of columns in Table 15). As can be seen in Table 14, the control variables and adolescent-reported maternal and paternal variables accounted for 51.3% of the variance in *maternal*-reported externalizing problems ($p <$

.001). When examining the incremental variance accounted for by the adolescent-reported maternal and paternal variables in the models, the inclusion of maternal variables did not account for a statistically significant amount of the variance after controlling for error ($p < .02$; see step 2 under mother-reported CBCL in Table 14).

However, the addition of adolescent-reported paternal factors accounted for a significant 31.0% of the variance in explaining *maternal*-reported externalizing problems, above and beyond the control and maternal variables ($p < .002$; see step 3 under Mother-reported CBCL in Table 14). Table 16 depicts the beta weights and independent contribution of the predictors in the model. Only one relationship remained significant after controlling for error (see Table 16, middle column). Specifically, higher levels of adolescent-rated paternal acceptance were related to lower rates of externalizing problems as rated by mothers ($p < .002$).

Table 16

Individual contribution (beta weights) of adolescent-reported predictors to externalizing problems across three informants: Boys and girls combined

Adolescent-Reported Predictors	Externalizing Problems (β weights)		
	YSR	CBCL Mother	CBCL Father
<i>Control Variables</i>			
SES	-.17 ⁺	-.01	.48**
Paternal Accessibility	-.13	-.05	-.04
Paternal Direct Interaction	.19 ⁺	-.12	-.05
<i>Maternal Predictors</i>			
Positive Affect for Mother	.12	-.87* ^a	.97
Negative Affect for Mother	.27	-.30	.27
Maternal Acceptance	-.12	.46 ⁺	.20
Maternal Control	-.15	.35	.51
Maternal Discipline	.38* ^a	.06	-.15
Maternal Monitoring	-.11	-.52* ^a	-.63
<i>Paternal Predictors</i>			
Positive Affect for Father	-.06	.78 ⁺	-.83
Negative Affect for Father	-.04	.65* ^a	-.01
Paternal Acceptance	-.41* ^a	-.85**	-.88** ^a
Paternal Control	.17	-.34	-.28
Paternal Discipline	-.47**	-.25	.29
Paternal Monitoring	.12	.55* ^a	.70

Note: YSR = Youth Self-Report; CBCL = Child Behavior Checklist

+ $p < .10$, * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$; ^a Not significant after correction for error

Table 17
Individual contribution (beta weights) of adolescent- and parent-reported predictors to externalizing problems across three informants: Boys and girls combined

Adolescent- and Parent-Reported Predictors	Externalizing		
	YSR	CBCL Mother	CBCL Father
<i>Control Variables</i>			
SES	-.55* ^a	-.25	.05
Paternal Accessibility	-.73**	.01	.59**
Paternal Direct Interaction	.16	-.11	-.17
<i>Maternal Predictors</i>			
Positive Affect for Mother	.52	1.19	-.87
Negative Affect for Mother	.40	.55	-.12
Maternal Acceptance	-.39	.58	.58
Maternal Control	-.63	.53	1.02**
Maternal Discipline	-.59	-.37	-.65
Maternal Monitoring	1.09* ^a	.03	.05
Maternal Positive Affect to Adolescent	-.68**	-.63* ^a	-.65**
Maternal Negative Affect to Adolescent	-.24	-.43	-.16
<i>Paternal Predictors</i>			
Positive Affect for Father	-.68	-1.06	1.01
Negative Affect for Father	.74	.10	.71* ^a
Paternal Acceptance	.29	-.72	-.56* ^a
Paternal Control	-.67	-.33	-1.41**
Paternal Discipline	.30	.21	1.33* ^a
Paternal Monitoring	-.68	-.14	.43
Paternal Positive Affect to Adolescent	-.28 ⁺	.37	-.06
Paternal Negative Affect to Adolescent	.44	.54	.72**

Note: YSR = Youth Self-Report; CBCL = Child Behavior Checklist

+ $p < .10$, * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$

^a Not significant after correction for error ($\alpha = .008$)

The control variables, and adolescent- and parent-reported predictor variables accounted for 63.0% of the variance in explaining *paternal*-reported externalizing problems ($p < .008$; see Table 15; last series of columns). Similar to the model for maternal-reported externalizing problems, the addition of the adolescent-reported maternal variables and maternal-reported predictors was not significant in the model (see step 2 under father-reported CBCL in Table 15). However, the inclusion of adolescent-reported paternal factors and fathers' perceptions of adolescents contributed 58.1% unique variance in explaining father-reported externalizing problems, above and beyond the control and maternal predictors ($p < .002$; see step 3 under father-reported CBCL in Table 15).

As can be seen in the last column of Table 17, several independent relationships emerged between predictor and outcome variables for father-reported externalizing problems. Increased paternal accessibility ($p < .006$), higher paternal negative affect toward adolescents ($p < .006$) and lower paternal control ($p < .008$) were significantly related to higher paternal-reported externalizing problems. With regard to maternal predictors, contrary to results for fathers, higher maternal control ($p < .005$) was related to higher father-reported externalizing problems. In addition, maternal positive affect toward adolescents was inversely related to externalizing problems as rated by fathers ($p < .002$).

Summary of Regressions for Boys and Girls Combined. In general, results revealed that the control variables (SES and paternal direct interactions and accessibility), and maternal and paternal factors meaningfully accounted for adolescent outcomes in five of the 12 models. The patterns of results differed depending on whether the

predictors included adolescent-only or adolescent and parent-reported predictors, and depending on the informant of externalizing and internalizing problems. After controlling for error, the amount of variance accounted for by the significant models ranged from 36% (adolescent-reported internalizing problems) to 68.3% (adolescent-reported externalizing problems).

After controlling for error, the amount of incremental significant variance accounted for by the addition of father variables in explaining adolescent outcomes ranged from 20% (adolescent-reported internalizing problems) to 58.1% (paternal-reported externalizing problems). The third hypothesis exploring the unique contribution of paternal factors in adolescent emotional and behavioral functioning was supported in three of the five significant models. For the models with adolescent-reported predictors, paternal factors explained self-reported internalizing problems and maternal-reported externalizing difficulties, above and beyond the effects of the control variables and maternal variables. The strongest contribution of fathers was found in the model with both adolescent- and parent-reported factors predicting to father-reported externalizing problems.

In further examining the independent contribution of the predictors in the three *significant* models that supported the unique contribution of fathers, patterns differed depending on the informant. Although the predictors and outcomes for adolescent-reported internalizing problems were based only on one informant, results for externalizing problems highlighted relationships among adolescent, mother, and father reports. In general, across the three significant models, adolescent ratings of paternal accessibility and maternal and paternal control were each independently related to both

internalizing and externalizing difficulties. Higher levels of maternal control and lower levels of paternal control were related to lower internalizing problems in adolescents. In contrast, higher levels of maternal control and lower levels of paternal control were related to increased externalizing problems. While maternal acceptance was found to be inversely related to internalizing problems, adolescent reports of paternal acceptance were inversely associated only with externalizing difficulties. Higher levels of maternal positive affect toward adolescents and lower levels of paternal negative affect toward adolescents were related to lower externalizing problems. Surprisingly, adolescent affect toward parents and parenting practices such as discipline and monitoring were not significantly related to emotional or behavioral difficulties in adolescents in the three significant models.

Adolescent Gender Differences in Regressions

Regression models with adolescent-reported predictors were run separately by adolescent gender. Only the models predicting to adolescent-reported internalizing and externalizing problems emerged as significant when conducted separately for boys and girls. As can be seen in Table 18, results revealed differential effects by adolescent gender.

Table 18

Hierarchical regressions predicting to adolescent-reported internalizing and externalizing problems from adolescent-reported predictors: By adolescent gender

	Adolescent-reported internalizing problems						Adolescent-reported externalizing problems					
	Step 1		Step 2		Step 3		Step 1		Step 2		Step 3	
	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F
F	2.64 ⁺	1.36	1.50	2.03 ⁺	3.57**	2.41* ^a	.42	2.31 ⁺	2.28* ^a	4.53***	1.37	3.91**
df(F)	3,35	3,42	9,29	9,36	15,23	15,30	3,35	3,42	9,29	9,36	14,24	14,31
Adj. R ²	.12	.03	.11	.17	.50	.32	-.05	.08	.23	.41	.12	.48
ΔR ²			.13	.25	.38	.21			.38	.39	.03	.11
ΔF			.94	2.24 ⁺	4.87**	2.32 ⁺			3.13* ^a	4.99***	.26	1.84
df(ΔF)			6,29	6,36	6,23	6,30			6,29	6,36	5,24	5,31

Note: Adj. R² = Adjusted R²; df = degrees of freedom; ΔR² = Change in R²; ΔF = F Change

+ $p < .10$, * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$

Steps explained in text (page 61)

^a Not significant after correction for error ($\alpha < .008$)

The model explaining adolescent-reported internalizing problems was significant for boys whereas the one accounting for externalizing problems was significant for girls. The control variables and maternal and paternal predictors accounted for 50.3% ($p < .002$) of the variance in explaining self-reported *internalizing* problems for boys, compared to 32.0% for girls ($p < .05$; see step 3 under adolescent-reported internalizing problems in Table 18). Only the model for boys was significant after controlling for error. Conversely, when examining self-reported *externalizing* problems, the combination of control variables and maternal and paternal predictors accounted for 48.0% of the variance for girls ($p < .001$) and a nonsignificant 12.0% for boys ($p > .05$; see step 2 under adolescent-reported externalizing problems on far right column in Table 18).

When examining the unique contribution of the maternal and paternal factors, results indicated that the inclusion of the maternal variables did not account for significant variance in explaining self-reported internalizing problems for both boys and girls (see step 2 under adolescent-reported internalizing problems in Table 18). However, maternal factors accounted for a significant 39.0% of the variance in explaining self-reported externalizing problems in girls ($p < .001$; see step 2 under adolescent-reported externalizing problems in Table 18), above and beyond the contribution of the control factors.

In terms of fathers' unique contributions in explaining internalizing and externalizing problems by gender, significant results were found only for boys' self-reported internalizing problems. Specifically, the addition of paternal variables added 38.2% of the variance in explaining internalizing difficulties in boys, beyond the

contribution of the control variables and maternal factors ($p < .002$; see step 3 under adolescent-reported internalizing problems in Table 18). No other significant patterns were found for the unique contribution of fathers for both girls and boys.

As can be seen in Table 19, different patterns of results also emerged when examining the beta weights of the individual factors in the models by adolescent gender. For boys, increased paternal accessibility was significantly related to lower self-reported internalizing problems ($p < .001$). Interestingly, the role of parental control differed by gender of the parent for boys. Specifically, higher maternal control and lower paternal control were significantly related to lower self-reported internalizing problems ($p < .001$ and $p < .001$, respectively). For girls, higher levels of paternal acceptance were related to lower self-reported internalizing ($p < .006$) and externalizing problems ($p < .001$). Additionally, higher levels of paternal discipline were associated with lower self-reported externalizing problems ($p < .002$).

Summary of Adolescent Gender Differences in Regressions. When examining the regression models by gender, only the models explaining adolescent-reported outcomes were significant. Differential patterns were found by gender in that the model explaining internalizing problems was significant for boys whereas the one explaining externalizing problems was significant for girls. Significant unique effects of fathers were found only in the model explaining internalizing problems in boys.

Table 19
Individual Contribution (beta weights) of Adolescent-Reported Predictors to Self-Reported Internalizing and Externalizing Problems: By Adolescent Gender

Adolescent-Reported Predictors	Internalizing Problems (Youth Self-Report)		Externalizing Problems (Youth Self-Report)	
	Boys	Girls	Boys	Girls
<i>Control Variables</i>				
SES	.08	.08	.09	-.20
Paternal Accessibility	-.75***	-.17	-.14	.08
Paternal Direct Interaction	-.25+	-.23	.09	.08
<i>Maternal Predictors</i>				
Positive Affect for Mother	-.89*	.26	.11	-.03
Negative Affect for Mother	-.01	.30	.36	.29
Maternal Acceptance	-.33	.22	-.35	.15
Maternal Control	-1.2**	-.22	-.22	.18
Maternal Discipline	-.03	.21	-.46	.42* ^a
Maternal Monitoring	-.31	.04	-.21	-.11
<i>Paternal Predictors</i>				
Positive Affect for Father	.97	.32	.05	-.07
Negative Affect for Father	.32	-.21	-.05	-.17
Paternal Acceptance	.16	-.85**	.06	-.85***
Paternal Control	1.23***	.29	-.03	-.07
Paternal Discipline	-.37	-.23	.47	-.51**
Paternal Monitoring	.29	.18	-.09	.40

+ $p < .10$, * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$; ^a Not significant after correction for error

Discussion

The current study focused on the unique contribution of fathers in adolescence by examining the associations among adolescents' perceptions of their mothers and fathers, mothers' and fathers' perceptions of their adolescents, and adolescents' emotional and behavioral functioning. The role of adolescent gender in these relationships was also examined.

Parental Involvement

Research suggests discrepancies in the patterns of maternal and paternal involvement from infancy to early childhood (Parke, 2000; Pleck & Masciadrelli, 2004). Although less researched, these divergent patterns of involvement are consistent throughout the adolescent years. In support of prior research (e.g., Lamb, 1997; Montemayor & Brownlee, 1987; Parke, 2000), adolescents in the current study reported that, compared to their fathers, their mothers spent significantly more time in direct interactions with them and were more accessible to them on a daily basis.

Although the specific factors contributing to discrepant rates of parental involvement could not be addressed in this study, results can be explained within the context of family-based research and developmental theory. Despite sharing the workforce with fathers and increased paternal assistance at home over the past few decades, mothers continue to be primarily responsible for household duties and daily caretaking of their children (Bianchi, 2000; Milkie et al., 2002; Parke, 2000; Pleck, 1997). In contrast, fathers' roles are more prominently reflected in increased leisure activities with their children as they transition into adolescence (Lewis & Lamb, 2003).

During this time, however, adolescents seek independence from parents and increase their involvement in friendships and structured activities outside the family unit (Larson et al., 1996; Henderson & Champlin, 1998; Pleck & Masciadrelli, 2004). It therefore stands that paternal, rather than maternal, involvement would be more impacted by this developmental trend. Specifically, the maternal caregiving role ensures mother-adolescent involvement during adolescence, regardless of adolescents' increased desire for independence. Yet, since fathers compete with external activities and peers for adolescents' free time, their time with their children would be compromised.

Interestingly, adolescent gender differences were found in maternal versus paternal involvement rates. Although boys reported comparable involvement between their mothers and fathers, girls indicated that their mothers were significantly more involved in their lives compared to their fathers. The lack of differences in boys' reports are somewhat surprising given prior research that mothers spend more time with both their sons and daughters compared to fathers (Hosley & Montemayor, 1997). However, the majority of research on paternal involvement has been conducted in the childhood years and the patterns in early adolescence are not as thoroughly researched. Additionally, results for boys appear to be consistent with recent studies indicating that child gender may have less of an influence in parental involvement rates than it did two decades ago (Hossain & Roopnarine, 1993; Lytton & Romney, 1991; Pleck & Masciadrelli, 2004; Sanderson & Sanders-Thompson, 2002).

Yet, these recent findings do not support the patterns of parental involvement reported by girls. Results could be explained within the context of the quality of parent-adolescent relationships and socialization theory. There is evidence that even if parents

do not differentiate in their treatment and involvement of their sons and daughters, boys and girls can be impacted differently by their parents (Lytton & Romney, 1991). In fact, although child gender may not be related to parental involvement rates per se, the nature of adolescent relationships with their mothers and fathers differ depending on the gender of the adolescent (Larson & Richards, 1994). Specifically, although both boys' and girls' relationships with their fathers are described as emotionally distant, father-son relationships are depicted as closer and friendlier than father-daughter relationships. Since reports of paternal involvement were subjective in the current study, adolescents may have been impacted by their perceptions of the nature of their relationships with their parents (Forehand & Nouaisiainen, 1993). Thus, given reports of increased distance in father-daughter relationships, girls may view their fathers less favorably than do boys and consequently may seek out their fathers less than do boys. Additionally, following socialization patterns, girls generally connect more with, and have closer relationships with their mothers than their fathers (Lytton & Romney, 1991). These factors therefore offer an explanation for lower reported rates of paternal versus maternal involvement with girls.

Interestingly, contrary to past research (Amato, 1987; Coley, 2001; Flouri et al., 2002; Simons et al., 1994), no significant relationships were found between mothers' and fathers' involvement and adolescents' emotional and behavioral functioning. The lack of significant results points to the possibility that the quality, rather than the quantity, of parental involvement plays a more salient role in understanding adolescent outcomes (Grossman, Pollack, & Golding, 1988; Palkovitz, 2002; Parke, 1996; Pleck, 1997). For example, research has found that authoritative parenting practices and open

communication between parents and adolescents are associated with positive academic, emotional, behavioral and social adolescent outcomes (Baumrind, 1991; Dornbusch et al., 1987; Hosley & Montemayor, 1997; Steinberg, Lamborn, Darling, & Mounts, 1989). The impact of parenting practices in the current study will be discussed in the sections that follow.

Perceptions of Parents

In general, adolescents, mothers and fathers provided high endorsements of positive affect and low ratings of negative affect in familial relationships. These results are consistent with prior studies on affective environments within families (Phares & Renk, 1998; Phares et al., 2005). Results provide support for generally positive and connected parent-adolescent relationships (Collins, 1990; Stemmler & Petersen, 1999) despite the developmental trend for independence (Greene & Grimsley, 1990; Larson et al., 1996; Noller & Callan, 1986; Ohannessian et al., 1995). In fact, a longitudinal investigation on adolescents' leisure time concluded that decreased adolescent involvement with family members was due to external interests rather than parent-adolescent conflict, affect or family issues (Larson et al., 1996).

In the current study, significant adolescent gender differences were found in ratings of negative affect toward mothers and fathers. Results partially confirmed the first hypothesis that boys would report lower levels of negative affect toward their fathers compared to girls. This finding supports prior research (Phares et al., 2003) and highlights reports of closer father-son than father-daughter relationships (Noller & Callan, 1990; Pleck, 1997; Starells, 1994). Results provide a first step in understanding the complexities of father-daughter relationships. Since adolescents' perceptions impact

their functioning and interactions with others (King, 1994; Phares & Renk, 1999), negative affectivity may impair the quality of the father-daughter relationship. Although the directionality of these effects could not be addressed within the context of the present study, results provide for the possibility that negative emotions would adversely affect girls' relationships with their fathers. On the one hand, girls' negative emotions could be in response to lower actual or perceived paternal involvement in their lives, especially when compared to the amount of time fathers spend with sons. On the other hand, the extent of paternal involvement and motivation in parenting daughters may be influenced by girls' negative affect toward them. Prospective research will be needed to explore the directionality of these results.

Surprisingly, contrary to the first hypothesis, girls reported significantly higher ratings of negative affect toward mothers compared to boys. Results were not consistent with prior studies that suggest a lack of gender differences in affect toward mothers (Phares et al., 2005). Additionally, since boys and girls report similar levels of self-disclosure, closeness and conflict with mothers (Paulson et al., 1991), no differences were expected in boys' and girls' feelings toward their mothers. Results could be explained within the context of gender differences in emotional development. Higher ratings of negative affect toward parents are reflective of the marked increase of internalizing and emotional difficulties in girls compared to boys during adolescence (Nolen-Hoeksema & Girgus, 1994; Koenig, Issacs, & Schwartz, 1994). Results also highlight that adolescent girls generally express emotions more than boys. Furthermore, although research suggests that both boys and girls exhibit increased levels of negative affect as they enter early adolescence, negative affectivity lasts longer for girls than for boys (Larson et al.,

1996). Larson and colleagues (1996) found that boys' affect improved as they transitioned out of middle school. Although not directly investigated in the current study, the patterns of results could be reflective of gender by age interactions.

Increased negative affectivity in girls compared to boys could also be explained within the context of developmental theory. Girls generally mature and enter into puberty faster than boys. Puberty is marked by an increased quest for independence from parents and increased interest in relationships outside the family unit (Henderson & Champlin, 1998). Additionally, during early adolescence, boys are more likely to withdraw to themselves whereas girls spend time alone and with friends (Larson & Richards, 1991). Girls' negative affect toward both mothers and fathers could be reflective of increased conflict (Laible & Carlo, 2004) as girls negotiate their desire for increased independence and freedom from their parents.

Contrary to the first hypothesis, no gender differences were found in positive affect toward fathers. This finding was not consistent with prior reports of boys' higher positive affect toward fathers (Phares et al., 2003). That study included a wider age range of adolescents (11-18 years old) so there may be developmental differences that were not able to be explored in the current study given the constricted age range of adolescents. As expected, boys and girls did not differ in their ratings of positive feelings toward their mothers. This finding is consistent with prior studies (Bezirgianian & Cohen, 1992; Paulson et al., 1991). This pattern of results may be reflective of a community sample which is more well-adjusted. In addition, the limited variability in ratings of positive affect for both boys and girls may account for lack of gender differences (Stemmler & Petersen, 1999).

When exploring girls' and boys' affective responses toward mothers versus fathers, results revealed that girls reported significantly higher levels of positive and negative affect toward their mothers compared to their feelings for their fathers. Results are consistent with our understanding of mother-daughter relationships. Extensive research on these relationships reveals that girls have closer relationships with, and confide more in, their mothers than their fathers (Paulson & Sputa, 1991; Youniss & Smollar, 1985). These studies support the higher ratings of girls' positive affect toward mothers. However, Larson and colleagues (1996) found that increased verbal interactions in adolescence were related to decreased positive relationships between mothers and daughters. In fact, girls' affective ratings toward mothers are reflective of the combined close and conflictual relationship highlighted by a combination of authority and equality in the mother-daughter relationship during adolescence (Laible & Carlo, 2004). Surprisingly, boys reported similar levels of negative and positive affect toward mothers and fathers. However, the lack of significant differences for boys is reflective of reports that boys have close relationships with both their mothers and fathers (Laible & Carlo, 2004; Paulson & Sputa, 1991; Youniss & Ketterlinus, 1987).

Perceptions of Parents and Adolescent Outcomes

Results revealed significant relationships between negative affect in adolescents, mothers, and fathers and externalizing problems in adolescents. Findings support the few studies that have been conducted on the association between adolescents' cognitions and feelings and adolescent functioning (Phares & Renk, 1998; Sanders, Dadds, Johnston, & Cash, 1992). Given the cross-sectional nature of the current study however, it is important not to infer causality between negative affect and externalizing problems.

Specifically, although affect may impact behavioral functioning directly (Sanders et al., 1992), it is possible that externalizing difficulties in children contribute to increased negative emotions and perceptions within family members (Simons et al., 1990; Patterson, 1986). Additionally, although beyond the scope of the current study, it is possible that negative affect serves as a mediator for factors, such as temperament, parental psychopathology, marital conflict, harsh discipline, aggression and rejection, which have been linked extensively to externalizing problems (e.g., Dadds, Sanders, Morrison, & Rebjetz, 1992; Dodge, 1990; Farrington & Loeber, 2000; Frick, 1994; Patterson et al., 1992).

Only maternal positive affect toward adolescents was related to decreased maternal-reported externalizing problems. Given that the role of positive affectivity on favorable parental ratings is not extensively researched, the potential that results may be confounded by common method variance (e.g., same-rater bias) should be considered. The majority of work in this area has focused on the impact of parental psychopathology, such as depression and anxiety, on ratings of adolescent functioning (Renk, Oliveros, Roddenberry, Klein, Sieger, Roberts, & Phares, 2005; Moretti, Fine, Haley, & Marriage, 1985). Findings suggest that parental reports may be more affected by depressive symptoms rather than general distress or negative affectivity (e.g., Briggs-Gowan, Carter, & Schwab-Stone 1996; Moretti et al., 1985). The current study cannot shed light to this discussion given that information on parental psychological functioning was not obtained. Further studies could consider the contribution of parental positive affect on ratings of adolescent emotional and behavioral problems.

It is of interest that adolescent-, maternal-, and paternal-reported negative affect were each related to externalizing outcomes in the correlations. This pattern highlights the importance of obtaining reports on mothers and fathers separately and including both mothers and fathers in research (Lamb, 2004; Larson & Richards, 1994; Phares, 1996). Results also revealed different associations depending on the informant of adolescent functioning. For example, in the correlational analyses, *maternal* negative affect toward adolescents was related to adolescent-reported externalizing problems whereas *paternal* negative affect was associated with paternal reports of externalizing problems. This pattern points to the importance of using multiple informants, suggesting that each informant contributes unique perspectives on parent-adolescent relationships and adolescent functioning (Rowe & Kandel, 1997).

Contrary to prior research, no significant relationships were found between affect and internalizing problems. The lack of results involving maternal- and paternal-ratings of internalizing outcomes may have been impacted by parents' tendencies to under-represent emotional difficulties in their children (Collins & Russell, 1991; Duhig, Renk, Epstein, & Phares, 2000; Repinski & Shonk, 2002). Additionally, negative affectivity appears to be more closely related to externalizing, rather than internalizing, problems (Sanders et al., 1992). This finding is consistent with the understanding that adolescent negative affect may be manifested overtly and behaviorally toward parents rather than internalized.

In general however, a complete understanding of the processes explaining internalizing problems in adolescence is not available. In sharp contrast to the extensive literature on externalizing problems, research has not consistently identified risk factors

or theoretical models for the development and persistence of internalizing problems (Shaw, Keenan, Vondra, Delliquadri, & Giovannelli, 1997). It is possible that the lack of significant relationships in the current study is reflective of a non-direct relationship between affect and internalizing problems. For example, negative affect may directly impact parenting practices, resulting in overprotective and controlling behaviors, which in turn are strong predictors of internalizing problems in adolescents (Bosco, Renk, Dinger, Epstein, & Phares, 2003). In addition, the relationships between negative affect and internalizing problems may be moderated by other factors, such levels of fearfulness in adolescence (Gilliom & Shaw, 2004).

Parenting Practices and Adolescent Outcomes

Results of the inverse relationship between maternal and paternal acceptance and adolescent externalizing problems are supportive of prior research (Barber & Olsen, 1997; Steinberg et al., 1991; Ge et al., 1996; Wolfradt et al., 2003). Additionally, the individual contributions of the predictors in the regression analyses revealed significant inverse associations between paternal acceptance and externalizing problems and maternal acceptance and internalizing problems. The differential connections between maternal and paternal acceptance and adolescent outcomes are of interest. Although consistent with prior studies (Jones et al., 2000; Laible & Carlo, 2004), the relationship between acceptance and internalizing difficulties is as consistently found as that between acceptance and externalizing difficulties.

Despite the lack of significant relationships between parental control and adolescent outcomes in the correlation analyses, maternal and paternal control emerged as independent contributors to both internalizing and externalizing problems in the

regression analyses. Results differed based on parental gender, however. The relationships between lower maternal control and decreased externalizing difficulties are consistent with prior research (Gilliom & Shaw, 2004; Jones et al., 2000; Laible & Carlo, 2004). High levels of control would impact the parent-adolescent relationship (Barber, 1996) and contribute to increased conflict, negative affect, and potential acting-out in the adolescent. The adolescent's lack of control in his/her life at a time when independence is very important could contribute to increased adolescent behavioral difficulties (Barber, 1996), especially with the primary caregiver and disciplinarian in the family.

Surprisingly, lower levels of paternal control were related to *increased* externalizing problems in problems. This could be explained by further investigating the nature of the relationship between paternal involvement and paternal control. The inverse associations between control and adolescent behavioral behaviors may be similar to those between paternal involvement and adolescent functioning (see Pleck & Masciadrelli, 2004 for a review). This could be better understood by future studies examining the moderating and mediating relationships between paternal involvement and control on adolescent externalizing problems. Nevertheless, results point to the possibility that despite similar parenting practices by mothers and fathers, differential outcomes are found in adolescents (Lytton & Romney, 1991).

Higher paternal, but lower maternal, control was related to higher levels of adolescent internalizing problems. Increased parental control and related emotional difficulties in adolescents support prior research that children and adolescents of firm, rigid, and over-controlling parents are at higher risk for emotional difficulties (Jones et al., 2000; Krohne & Hocke, 1991; Murriss & Murkelbach, 1988; Rapee, 1997). Yet, when

investigating maternal and paternal control, studies have more consistently indicated that maternal, rather than paternal, control is uniquely related to adolescent functioning (Jones et al., 2000; Laible & Carlo, 2004).

The results regarding maternal control are surprising. Given that mothers hold the primary caregiving role and mother-adolescent relationships are marked with increased conflict during early adolescence (Collins & Russell, 1991), it would have been expected that maternal control would be positively related to emotional difficulties in the current study. Results for the inverse relationship between maternal control and internalizing problems are contrary to those found for externalizing problems, in which lower levels of maternal control were related to decreased behavioral outcomes in adolescents. Results on the possible beneficial aspects of maternal control on emotional functioning in adolescence suggest that although adolescents need independence from their primary caregivers, they also continue to require consistent supervision, guidance and support for healthy development (Laible & Carlo, 2004). Given the cross-sectional nature of the current study, however, additional research in this area needs to be conducted to determine the beneficial effects of maternal control on emotional functioning in adolescents.

Surprisingly, the dimensions of monitoring and discipline examined in the current study were not significantly related to adolescent outcomes. This finding is contrary to previous research (e.g., Capaldi & Patterson, 1991; Patterson et al., 1992; Ge et al., 1996; Wagner et al., 1996). However, the majority of research conducted in this area has been with high-risk or targeted samples. For example, research on the effects of discipline have been found in boys from low-SES backgrounds and disorganized family

environments (e.g., Stouthamer-Loeber & Loeber, 1986; Patterson et al., 1992). Further, aversive parenting practices appear to be more consistent in families marked by parental psychopathology, including depression, anxiety and antisocial personality disorders (Phares, 1996; Rapee, 1997; Rhule, McMahon, & Spieker, 2004). Differential patterns in monitoring and discipline have also been suggested when comparing intact versus divorced families (Freeman & Newland, 2002; Hetherington, 1993; Laible & Carlo, 2004) and across ethnic and cultural groups (Harrison, Wilson, Pine, Chan, & Buriel, 1990). Finally, there is a suggestion that the effect of parenting practices may be impacted by moderating effects between mothers and fathers or the moderating relationship with another parenting factor. For instance, low levels of discipline have been found to act as a moderator between parental acceptance in predicting increased emotional and behavioral difficulties in adolescents (Laible & Carlo, 2004)

Adolescent Gender Differences

In general, adolescent gender differences were not found in the relationships between affect and adolescent functioning or in ratings of parenting practices and adolescent emotional and behavioral functioning. Results partly confirm the second hypothesis in that differences were not expected in relation to maternal factors and adolescent outcomes. However, findings are contrary to expectations, based on socialization theory, that paternal individual factors would play a more significant role in boys', rather than girls', functioning. Nevertheless, findings partially support the notion that fathers play a unique role in boys', compared to girls', functioning.

Although not significant, the patterns of results from the correlational analyses suggest that affect toward mothers and ratings of maternal acceptance may be more

strongly related to emotional and behavioral functioning for boys rather than girls. This finding is somewhat consistent with a recent study in which boys exhibited higher externalizing difficulties in relation to lower levels of parental acceptance (Bosco et al., 2003). Additionally, the regression analyses revealed that the relationships between parental control and internalizing problems discussed in the previous section were significant for boys only. Maternal control was inversely related to internalizing difficulties in boys, whereas paternal control was positively related to emotional functioning. Results on the possible detrimental relationship between high levels of paternal control and emotional functioning support prior research (Jones et al., 2003; Rapee, 1997). However, findings regarding maternal control are somewhat surprising, in that maternal control has been positively related to externalizing, rather than internalizing, problems in boys (Bosco et al., 2003). The patterns of results could be explained by examining the nature of boys' interactions with their mothers and fathers. As previously mentioned, boys may benefit from increased supervision and control by the primary caregiver at a time of many developmental and social changes (Laible & Carlo, 2004). The relationships between paternal control and internalizing difficulties are reflective of the unique father-son relationship. Specifically, given that fathers primarily engaged in leisure activities with adolescents, and their sons in particular (Pleck, 1997), lower levels of control may be conducive to a positive relationship and subsequent positive adolescent functioning. Conversely, higher levels of control would impact the quality of the father-son relationship (Barber, 1996) and potentially lead to negative feelings that are internalized by the son.

Contrary to expectations, results suggest that paternal parenting factors play a more significant role for girls', rather than boys', outcomes. Specifically, higher levels of paternal acceptance were related to lower reports of internalizing and externalizing problems in girls, but not boys. Results are somewhat consistent with prior research in which girls' reports of both maternal and paternal acceptance were related to emotional and behavioral functioning (Bosco et al., 2003). In addition, higher levels of paternal disciplinary practices were related to decreased externalizing difficulties in girls. Results are consistent with prior research on the negative outcomes of inconsistent discipline (Farrington & Loeber, 2000; Dodge, 1990). Although most of the studies on the effects of discipline were conducted with high-risk boys (e.g., Loeber & Dishion, 1983), it points to the importance of consistent discipline by parents in potentially preventing acting-out behaviors in adolescents. It is surprising though that parental discipline was not related to adolescent males' emotional or behavioral functioning given prior studies in this area (e.g., Loeber & Dishion, 1983).

The patterns of associations between parental factors and adolescent outcomes emphasize the differential effects by parent and adolescent gender in parent-adolescent relationships (Lytton & Romney, 1991). Although individual paternal factors were related to outcomes in girls, there was no support for the unique contribution of fathers in adolescent girls' development. The effects of paternal factors could have been diminished by the inclusion of maternal characteristics in the model for girls (Larson & Richards, 1994). Conversely, a unique contribution of paternal factors in explaining boys' internalizing problems was found. These results point to the important role that fathers play in their sons' lives (Harns et al., 1998) and suggest that the father-son

relationship may be qualitatively different and distinct from the mother-son relationship (Noller & Callan, 1990).

The Unique Role of Fathers

Regression analyses with both males and females revealed that paternal factors add unique variance in explaining emotional and behavioral problems in adolescents. Findings are consistent with prior research highlighting the distinct contribution of fathers in adolescents' lives (Forehand & Nousianen, 1993; Lamb, 1997; Lamb & Tamis-Lemonda, 2004; Phares & Compas, 1992). Results validate recommendations to consider maternal and paternal factors separately and not combine data across both parents (Lamb, 1997; Phares, 1996).

The strongest regression models in the current study included adolescent-only predictors and adolescent-reported internalizing and externalizing problems, and adolescent- and parental-predictors and maternal externalizing problems. While considering the common method variance in two of the three significant models, results point to the potential impact of adolescents' perceptions of their parents in the development of emotional and behavioral problems (Bosco et al., 2003; Forehand & Nousiainen, 1993). Given that one model supporting the unique contribution of fathers included both adolescent and parent reports, the extent of the findings in the current study cannot be attributed only to single-reporter bias.

Not all models investigated in the current study pointed to the unique contribution of fathers in adolescents' emotional and behavioral functioning. The patterns of results reflect the inconsistencies in the field regarding fathers' contributions to adolescent development, above and beyond maternal factors (Amato, 1994; Amato & Rivera, 1999,

Forehand & Nousianen, 1993; Umberson, 1992). Prior researchers have suggested that the lack of unique paternal effects could be attributed to the amount of time that fathers and adolescents spend together (Blair & Hardesty, 1994; Larson & Richards, 1994). However, paternal involvement was controlled for in the current study. Rather, the relatively small sample size and the large number of factors included in the regressions could explain the patterns of nonsignificant results.

Implications

Overall, the present study provided support for gender differences in parent-adolescent relationships and the role of fathers in adolescents' functioning. The current study responded to the call for research on fathers (Lamb, 1975, 1987) and for examining the unique impact of fathers in adolescents' lives (Phares, 1996; Phares & Compas, 1992). Results highlight the importance of considering mothers and fathers separately in research. As was evident in the current study, differential patterns of associations can be found when investigating mothers and fathers separately (Duhig et al., 2000; Jones et al., 2000; Larson & Richards, 1994; Lamb, 1997; Paley, Conger, & Harold, 2000).

The nature of family associations in the current study differed based on whether reports were obtained by adolescents, mothers, or fathers, which highlights the importance of multiple informants in family-based research. By incorporating both adolescents' and parents' perceptions, the current study provided a better understanding of the complex connections between adolescents' views of their parents, parents' feelings toward their adolescents, and adolescents' psychological well-being. The inclusion of adolescent perceptions was important given evidence of their connection to adolescent functioning (Harold et al., 1997; Phares & Renk, 1998). Importantly, the current study's

investigation of parental perceptions contributes to the scarce amount of research in this area (Phares et al., 2003). Overall, although including multiple informants of predictors and outcomes leads to a more complicated pattern of results, it better represents the multifaceted aspects of family-adolescent relationships and the multiple factors that contribute to understanding adolescents' psychological well-being.

The current study indicated stronger connections between adolescents' perceptions of negative affect than positive affect toward parents and externalizing difficulties. For parents, maternal and paternal negative affect, and maternal positive affect, toward adolescents was related to behavioral functioning. The differential results on valence of feelings toward parents highlight the importance in assessing both positive and negative affect within families (Phares et al., 2003). Additionally, results indicate that adolescent reports of maternal and paternal control and acceptance play a vital role in adolescents' emotional and behavioral functioning.

Results regarding borderline and clinical levels of internalizing and externalizing problems in adolescents are of interest. The percentage of adolescents falling in the borderline and clinical ranges in the current study appeared significantly higher than those reported, on average, in community samples. Yet, when examining prevalence rates of psychopathology in children and adolescents, it becomes apparent that the rates vary widely across studies, case ascertainment and case definition. Specifically, in a review of studies conducted since 1980 that focused on the overall prevalence of child and adolescent psychiatric disorders, Roberts, Attkisson, and Rosenblatt (1998) found that prevalence rates ranged from 1% to 51%, with rates in adolescent samples averaging 16.5%. According to this review, the prevalence rates for the CBCL and YSR, when

using the Achenbach classification for clinical cutoffs, ranged from 7.8% to 21 %. These rates are similar to those found in the current study.

These high prevalence rates raise the question about whether adolescents in the community are underserved in mental health services. In fact, only one in five children and adolescents in need of psychological and psychiatric services are accommodated through traditional mental health services (Surgeon General Report, 1999). This pattern may be explained by a combination of factors, such as limited access to mental health screening and services and underreporting of difficulties. Clinicians, researchers, and school professionals would benefit from recognizing the large proportion of adolescents who are reporting psychological difficulties. Results point to the importance of screening children and adolescents for the identification of emotional and behavioral problems. This is especially salient during early adolescence, which is marked by changes, such as puberty, interest in peer groups, and transitions into middle and high schools.

Results may assist clinicians when treating youth and families who are experiencing difficulties. Findings could contribute to the development of prevention programs or targeted interventions with adolescents with behavioral and emotional problems. Clinicians and researchers could benefit from assessing adolescent-, maternal- and paternal perceptions of family members, interactions and functioning, as well as adolescent well-being prior to developing treatment plans or intervention programs. Assessment using a multi-informant and multi-method approach would assist clinicians and interventions to identify specific dimensions for treatment and intervention (Achenbach et al., 1987; Lochman & The Conduct Problems Prevention Research Group, 1995; Parke, 2000). For example, following the current study, a clinician may assess for,

and target, negative affectivity within family dyads for adolescents who are exhibiting behavioral difficulties.

Importantly, results point to the importance of considering the unique nature of mothers' and fathers' relationships with sons and daughters separately in assessment and intervention work (Bosco et al., Larson & Richards, 1994; Phares et al., 2005). For instance, interventions may incorporate different targets for parental control for adolescent boys, given results of differential connections between maternal versus paternal control and internalizing problems. Additionally, given gender differences in the unique contribution of fathers, clinicians and researchers may consider developing different programs for dyads in the family (e.g., mother-son, father-daughter).

Limitations

The results of this research are qualified somewhat by several limitations. Recruitment and the distribution and collection of the consent forms were largely dependent on each school's level of participation and commitment to the study. Although detailed instructions were provided, variability across the classrooms and sites could not be controlled. Further, given that the school district would not allow collection of demographic data from parents who refused participation or did not return consent forms, information on these groups was not available for comparisons to the responders.

Based on general estimates, only one out of seven distributed consents was returned. This response rate appears low compared to the 25% expected return rates for parent consents (Grady, Gersick, & Boratynski, 1999). However, the number of parents who agreed to participate, based on the number of consents returned, was within the range found in family-based research. In their article on response rates of parental

consent forms, Fletcher and Hunter (2003) reported return rates ranging from 40% to 95% across several studies. Thus, although on the lower end, the response rate of the current study (45.3%) fell within the same range of previous research. However, the exact response rate in the current study may be under represented given the reliance on teachers and students to distribute and return consents. Based on prior research, it is expected that response rates would have been higher if the school district had allowed direct mailings to parents (MacGregor & McNamara, 1995) or had approved passive consent procedures (Ellickson & Hawes, 1989; Range, Embry & McLeod, 2001).

The current study was limited by the cross-sectional nature and reliance on adolescents', mothers' and fathers' reports. For instance, the study relied only on adolescent report of parenting practices, which explain the few associations found between parenting practices and adolescent outcomes. In fact, much of the research on the impact of parenting has focused on either observational studies or parental-report (e.g., Baumrind, 1991; Dadds & Sanders, 1992). Similarly, the reliance on adolescent report of paternal involvement is another potential limitation to the study. Although this method is widely used in family-based research (Pleck & Masciadrelli, 2004), other more objective methods, such as the use of a pager or diary to more precisely document parent-adolescent interactions (Larson & Richards, 1994), may have provided a more direct measurement of involvement.

It is acknowledged that results may be biased by each family member's perceptions of, and interactions with, one another. Yet, these reports are valid indicators of each family member's experiences within the family unit. Further, the inclusion of adolescents' perceptions and reports is essential given that the way they view their world

can impact their functioning and the quality of parent-adolescent relationships (Paulson, 1994; Wenk et al., 1994). Nevertheless, the inclusion of school reports would have further contributed to our understanding of adolescents' functioning outside the home setting. For instance, teachers could provide vital information on academic performance, which was not investigated in the current study, but has been shown to be affected by the quality of the parent-adolescent relationship (Dornbusch et al., 1987; Forehand & Nousainen, 1993; Steinberg, Lamborn, Darling, & Mounts, 1994). However, the inclusion of teacher reports should not replace adolescent or parental reports, since research indicates that although teachers provide valid reports of adolescents' externalizing behaviors, they under-represent the extent of internalizing problems (Durlak, Stein, & Mannarino, 1980; Gillespie & Durlak, 1995; Green, Beck, Forehand, & Vosk, 1980).

The cross sectional nature of the current study does not allow for interpretations of causation. Thus, results could be interpreted bidirectionally. The effect of collinearity on the results is another potential limitation in the current study. High associations among predictors could have resulted in decreased effects between predictors and adolescents' emotional/behavioral functioning. The relationships among variables in the study, however, were not surprising given prior research (Phares & Renk, 1998). In fact, the reality of family-based research is that many factors are inter-related, representing the quality and complexity of family relationships.

Finally, results may be limited in their generalizability. Although the sample was ethnically diverse, the majority of the participants were Caucasian from a small urban area in West Central Florida. In addition, most of the adolescents were from intact

families, limiting the possibility to explore the impact of parent-adolescent relationships across different types of family configurations (e.g., divorced, step-families, same-gender parents). Additionally, the majority of the participants were from a middle socioeconomic background. The current study was not able to investigate the effect of demographic variables, such as socioeconomic status, ethnic background and/or residence (inner-city urban, small urban, or rural environments) on parent-adolescent relationships. Yet, some research suggests that these variables play an important role in fully understanding the impact of maternal and paternal factors on adolescents' functioning (e.g., Gjerde & Onishi, 2000; Harrison et al., 1990).

Future Directions

Despite the limitations of the current study, results contribute to the understanding of parent-adolescent relationships. The study demonstrates the importance of including both mothers and fathers in family-based research and highlights the importance of investigating the similarities and differences in maternal and paternal factors in parent-adolescent relationships. Adolescents' gender should also be considered when investigating parent-adolescent relationships. Longitudinal and prospective studies are recommended to better explain the causal role of maternal and paternal factors in the development of adolescents' emotional and behavioral functioning.

The current study can be expanded on by targeting some of its limitations. Specifically, a replication of the current study with a larger sample size is recommended. Additionally, the inclusion of a more objective measure of parental involvement and parenting practices may improve the validity of the results. Although cumbersome, the inclusion of adolescent, mother, and father reports in the current study was a strength.

The addition of teacher and peer (e.g., Coie & Dodge, 1988; Hatzichristou & Hopf, 1996; Lochman et al., 1995) reports would provide additional information on adolescents' functioning outside the home environment. In addition, given that maternal and paternal factors have been related to academic outcomes (Steinberg et al., 1989), a measure of functioning in school should be included in future studies.

Although perceptions of family members and parenting practices are important factors to consider in family research, future studies should expand variables that may be accounting for relationships in the current study. The direct and indirect effects of family-based variables such as parent psychopathology (e.g., Cummings & Davies, 1994; Phares, 1996; Phares & Compas, 1992; Rhule et al., 2004; Weissman, Leckman, Merikangas, Gammon, & Prusoff, 1984), parental efficacy (Coleman & Hilderbrandt Karraker, 2000), familial support (Freeman & Newland, 2002), parental satisfaction (Phares et al., 2005) and marital conflict (Margolin, Gordis, & John, 2001) should be considered. Additionally, environmental factors, such as stressors (Cohen & Brook, 1987; Compas, Howell, Phares, Williams, & Guinta, 1989), peer influences (Armsden & Greenberg, 1987), school environment and work-family conflict should be considered. The examination of different patterns of results by subgroups, such as marital status, residence (urban or rural), ethnicity, age and gender (Parke, 1996) should also be considered. Research examining the mediating and moderating effects of these factors is also warranted given the complexities of parent-adolescent relationships.

Given that results in the current study may have been limited in their generalizability, further research needs to be conducted to investigate fathers in ethnically diverse groups, families in large urban settings and families from low and high

socioeconomic backgrounds. The research on ethnicity and culture on parent-adolescent relationships have been equivocal. For instance, although some researchers reported no differences in parenting dimensions such as supervision, acceptance, control and monitoring (Barnes, Farrell, & Banerjee, 1994; Buehler & Gerard, 2002; Landarine, Richardson, Klonoff, & Flay, 1994; McKenry, 1994), others reported differences across ethnic groups (Hampton, Gelles, & Harrop, 1989; Hofferth, 2003; McLeod, Kruttschnitt, & Dornfeld, 1994; Paschall, Ennett, & Flewelling, 1996; Peoples & Loeber, 1994).

In addition, when differences by ethnic groups are found, the patterns of results are not necessarily similar. For example, McLeod and colleagues (1994) found that African-American parents had higher levels of supervision than Caucasian parents, whereas Peoples and Loeber (1994) reported opposite patterns of results. Some researchers have also suggested that less gender distinctions are found in parent-adolescent research among minorities (Gibbs, 1989). The pathways of relationships across ethnic groups need to be examined further to better understand the similarities and differences across ethnic and cultural groups (Gjerde & Onishi, 2000). Further, given the potential confound of socioeconomic status (Harrison et al., 1990), SES should be incorporated into investigations involving ethnicity.

Future research also needs to consider family constellations. Research on the effects of divorce on adolescents (Amato & Sobolewski, 2004; Hetherington, 1993; Laible & Carlo, 2004; Wallerstein & Lewis, 1998) suggests differential outcomes in adolescents from intact, single-parent, and step-families. In addition, the impact of parent-adolescent relationships on adolescent outcomes in non-traditional families, including same-sex unions and grandparents as primary care givers, needs to be

considered. Further, given that participants were recruited from a school, it would be interesting to determine if there would be stronger connections between factors in the current study, such as negative affect, control, and monitoring, and adolescent outcomes within a clinical sample.

Studies should be multifaceted and should target multiple factors, while considering different developmental levels, gender, and other subgroups (Masten, 1999; Parke, 1996). Research would also benefit from investigating the impact of interactions between an adolescent and his/her environment over time (Masten & Coatsworth, 1998). Further, the distinct interactions and effects between family dyads (e.g., father-daughter, father-son, mother-daughter, mother-son, and mother-father) play an important role in development (Parke, 1996). Thus, future studies should be expanded to incorporate the multiple systems that influence adolescents, such as schools, peers, and community. The integration of such transactional models (Masten, 1999; Parke, 2000) would extend our current knowledge in the field and would help disentangle the particular effects of fathers in adolescents' development.

Despite its limitations and recommendations for future research, the current study has provided important information on the complex relationships between parents and adolescents at a time when relationships with parents are very important in development (Walker, 1999). Although interesting findings on the association between mothers and boys and girls were provided, the core of the current study was to highlight the importance of, and unique contribution of, fathers in adolescent development. By providing a greater focus on fathers, and the patterns of father-son and father-daughter relationships, the present study has extended the field of paternal research. Findings

provide support for the distinct nature of mother-adolescent and father-adolescent relationships. In short, the answer to the question: “Do dads make a difference”, is “yes”.

References

- Achenbach, T. M. (1991a). *Manual for Child Behavior Checklist and 1991 Profile*.
Burlington, VT: University of Vermont Department of Psychiatry.
- Achenbach, T. M. (1991b). *Manual for Youth Self Report and 1991 Profile*.
Burlington, VT: University of Vermont Department of Psychiatry.
- Achenbach, T. M., McConaughy, S. H., & Howell, C. T. (1987). Child/adolescent behavioral and emotional problems: Implications of cross-informant correlations for situational specificity. *Psychological Bulletin*, *101*, 213-232.
- Achenbach, T. M., & Rescorla, L. A. (2001). *Manual for the ASEBA school-age forms and profiles*. Burlington, VT: University of Vermont, Research Center for Children, Youth, and Families.
- Aldous, J., Mulligan, G. M., & Bjarnason, T. (1998). Fathering over time: What makes the difference? *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, *60*, 809-820.
- Allison, P. D. & Furtsenberg, F. F. (1989). How marital dissolution affects children. *Developmental Psychology*, *25*, 540-549.
- Almeida, D. M., & Galambos, N. L. (1991). Examining father involvement and the quality of father-adolescent relations. *Journal of Research on Adolescence*, *1*, 155-172.
- Amato, P. R. (1987). Family processes in one-parent, stepparent, and intact families: The child's point of view. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, *49*, 327-337.
- Amato, P. R. (1993). Children's adjustment to divorce: Theories, hypotheses and empirical support. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, *55*, 23-38.

- Amato, P. R. (1994). Father-child relations, mother-child relations, and offspring psychological well-being in early adulthood. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, *56*, 1031-1042.
- Amato, P. R., & Gilbreth, J. G. (1999). Nonresident fathers and children's well-being: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, *61*, 557-573.
- Amato, P. R., & Rivera, F. (1999). Paternal involvement and children's behavior problems. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, *61*, 375-384.
- Amato, P. R., & Sobolewski, J. M. (2004). The effects of divorce on fathers and children: Nonresidential fathers and stepfathers. In M. E. Lamb (Ed.), *The role of the father in child development* (pp. 341-367). New York: Wiley.
- Armsden, G.C., & Greenberg, M.T. (1987). The Inventory of Parent and Peer Attachment: Individual differences and their relationship to psychological well-being in adolescence. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, *16*, 427-455.
- Astone, N. M., & McLanahan, S. S. (1991). Family structure, parenting practices, and high school completion. *American Sociological Review*, *56*, 309-320.
- Baker, B. L., & Heller, T. L. (1996). Preschool children with externalizing behaviors: Experience of fathers and mothers. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology*, *24*, 513-532.
- Barber, B. K. (1996). Parental psychological control: Revisiting a neglected construct. *Child Development*, *67*, 3296-3319.
- Barber, B. K. & Olsen, J. A. (1997). Socialization in context: Connection, regulation, and autonomy in the family, school and neighborhood, and with peers. *Journal of Adolescent Research*, *12*, 287-315.

- Barnes, G. M. (1984). Adolescent alcohol abuse and other problem behaviors: Their relationships and common parental influences. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 13*, 329-348.
- Barnes, G. M., Farrell, M. P., & Banerjee, S. (1994). Family influences on alcohol abuse and other problem behaviors among Black and White adolescences in a general population sample. *Journal of Research on Adolescence, 4*, 183-201.
- Barnett, R. C., Kibria, N., Baruch, G. K., & Pleck, J. H. (1991). Adult daughter-parent relationships and their associations with daughter's psychological distress. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 53*, 29-43.
- Barnett, R. C., Marshall, N. L., & Pleck, J. H. (1992). Adult son-parent relationships and their associations with sons' psychological distress. *Journal of Family Issues, 13*, 505-525.
- Bartkowski, J. P. & Xu, X. (2000). Distant patriarchs or expressive dads? The discourse and practice of fathering in conservative Protestant families. *Sociological Quarterly, 41*, 465-485.
- Baruch, G. K., & Barnett, R. C. (1975). Implications and applications of recent research on feminine development. *Psychiatry, 38*, 318-327.
- Baumrind, D. (1989). Rearing competent children. In W. Damon (Ed.), *Child development today and tomorrow. The Jossey-Bass social and behavioral science series* (pp. 349-378). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Baumrind, D. (1991). The influence of parenting style on adolescent competence and substance use. *Journal of Early Adolescence, 11*, 56-95.

- Bennett, D. S., Bendersky, M., & Lewis, M. (2002). Children's intellectual and emotional-behavioral adjustment at 4 years as a function of cocaine exposure, maternal characteristics, and environmental risk. *Developmental Psychology, 38*, 648-658.
- Bezirgianian, S., & Cohen, P. (1992). Sex differences in the interaction between temperament and parenting. *Journal of the American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry, 31*, 790-801.
- Bianchi, S. M. (2000). Maternal employment and time with children: Dramatic change or surprising continuity? *Demography, 37*, 401-414.
- Biller, H. B., & Solomon, R. S. (1986). *Child maltreatment and paternal deprivation: A manifesto for research, prevention and treatment*. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.
- Blair, S. L., & Hardesty, C. (1994). Paternal involvement and the well-being of fathers and mothers of young children. *Journal of Men's Studies, 3*, 49-68.
- Briggs-Gowan, M. J., Carter, A. S., & Schwab-Stone, M. (1996). Discrepancies among mother, child and teacher reports: Examining the contributions of maternal depression and anxiety. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology, 24*, 749-765.
- Bosco, G. L., Renk, K., Dinger, T. M., Epstein, M. E., & Phares, V. (2003). The connections between adolescents' perceptions of parents, parental psychological symptoms, and adolescent functioning. *Applied Developmental Psychology, 24*, 179-200.
- Brandt, P. A. (1984). Stress-buffering effects of social support on maternal discipline. *Nursing Research, 33*, 229-234.

- Brody, G. H., Dorsey, S., Forehand, R., & Armistead, L. (2002). Unique and protective contributions of parenting and classroom processes to the adjustment of African American children living in single parent families. *Child Development, 73*, 274-286.
- Buehler, C., & Gerard, J. M. (2002). Marital conflict, ineffective parenting, and children's and adolescents' maladjustment. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 64*, 78-92.
- Buri, J. R. (1989). Self-esteem and appraisals of parental behavior. *Journal of Adolescent Research, 4*, 33-49.
- Cabrera, N. J., Tamis-LeMonda, C. S., Bradley, R. H., Hofferth, S., & Lamb, M. E. (2000). Fatherhood in the twenty-first century. *Child Development, 71*, 127-136.
- Carlo, G., Roesch, S. C., & Melby, J. (1998). The multiplicative relations of parenting and temperament to prosocial and antisocial behaviors in adolescence. *Journal of Early Adolescence, 18*, 266-290.
- Capaldi, D. M., & Patterson, G. R. (1991). Relation of parental transitions to boys' adjustment problems: I. A linear hypothesis. II: Mothers at risk for transitions and unskilled parenting. *Developmental Psychology, 27*, 489-504.
- Cohen, J. (1992). A power primer. *Psychological Bulletin, 112*, 115-159.
- Cohen, P., & Brook, J. (1987). Family factors related to the persistence of psychopathology in childhood and adolescence. *Psychiatry: Journal for the Study of Interpersonal Processes, 50*, 332-345.

- Coie, J. D., & Dodge, K. A. (1988). Multiple sources of data on social behavior and social status in the school: A cross-age comparison. *Child Development, 59*, 815-829.
- Coley, R. L. (2001). (In)visible men: Emerging research on low-income, unmarried and minority fathers. *American Psychologist, 56*, 743-753.
- Coleman, P. K., & Hilderbrandt Karraker, K. (2000). Parenting self-efficacy among mothers of school-age children: Conceptualization, measurement, and correlates. *Family Relations: Interdisciplinary Journal of Applied Family Studies, 49*, 13-24.
- Collins, W. A., & Russell, G. (1991). Mother-child and father-child relationships in middle childhood and adolescence: A developmental analysis. *Developmental Review, 11*, 99-136.
- Compas, B. E., Howell, D. C., Phares, V., Williams, R. A., & Guinta, C. T. (1989). Risk factors for emotional/behavioral problems in young adolescents: A prospective analysis of adolescent and parental stress and symptoms. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 57*, 732-740.
- Conger, K. J., Conger, R. D., & Scaramella, L. V. (1997). Parents, siblings, psychological control, and adolescent adjustment. *Journal of Adolescent Research, 12*, 113-138.
- Cooksey, E. C., & Fondell, M. M. (1996). Spending time with his kids: Effects of family structure on fathers' and children's' lives. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 58*, 693-707.
- Coombs, R. H., & Landsverk, J. (1988). Parenting styles and substance use during childhood and adolescence. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 50*, 473-482.

- Crockett, L. J., Eggebeen, D. J. & Hawkins, A. J. (1993). Fathers' presence and young children's behavioral and cognitive adjustment. *Journal of Family Issues, 14*, 355-377.
- Crouter, A. C., McHale, S. M., Bartko, W. T. (1993). Gender as an organizing feature in parent-child relationships. *Journal of Social Issues, 49*, 161-174.
- Cubis, J., Lewin, T., & Dawes, F. (1989). Australian adolescents' perceptions of their parents. *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Psychiatry, 23*, 35-47.
- Cummings, E. M., & Davies, P. T. (1994). Maternal depression and child development. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry, 35*, 73-112.
- Dadds, M. R., & Sanders, M. R. (1992). Family interaction and child psychopathology: A comparison of two observation strategies. *Journal of Child and Family Studies, 1*, 371-391.
- Dadds, M. R., Sanders, M. R., Morrison, M., & Rebgetz, M. (1992). Childhood depression and conduct disorder: II. An analysis of family interaction patterns in the home. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 101*, 505-513.
- Danziger, S. K., & Radin, N. (1990). Absent does not equal uninvolved: Predictors of fathers in teen mother families. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 52*, 636-642.
- Darling, N., & Steinberg, L. (1993). Parenting style as context: An integrative model. *Psychological Bulletin, 113*, 487-496.
- Davis, B. T., Hops, H., Alpert, A., & Sheeber, L. (1998). Child responses to parental conflict and their effect on adjustment: A study of triadic relations. *Journal of Family Psychology, 12*, 163-177.

- Demo, D. H., & Acock, A. C. (1988). The impact of divorce on children. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 50, 619-648.
- Dodge, K. A. (1990). Developmental psychopathology in children of depressed mothers. *Developmental Psychology*, 26, 3-6.
- Doherty, W. J., Kouneski, E. F., & Erickson, M. F. (1998). Responsible fathering: An overview and conceptual framework. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 60, 277-292.
- Dornbusch, S. M., Ritter, P. L., Leiderman, P. O., Roberts, D. F., & Fraleigh, M. J. (1987). The relation of parenting style to adolescent school performance. *Child Development*, 58, 1244-1257.
- Downey, D. B. (1994). The school performance of children from single-mother and single-father families: Economic or interpersonal deprivation? *Journal of Family Issues*, 15, 129-147.
- Duhig, A. M., Renk, K., Epstein, M. E., & Phares, V. (2000). Interparental agreement on internalizing, externalizing, and total behavior problems: A meta-analysis. *Clinical Psychology: Science and Practice*, 7, 435-453.
- Duncan, G. J., Brooks-Gunn, J., & Klebanov, P. K. (1994). Economic deprivation and early childhood development. *Child Development*, 65, 296-318.
- Durlak, J. A., Stein, M. A., & Mannarino, A. P. (1980). Behavioral validity of a brief teacher rating scale (the AML) in identifying high-risk acting-out school children. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 8, 101-115.

- Eberly, M. B., Montemayor, R., & Flannery, D. J. (1993). Variation in adolescent helpfulness toward parents in a family context. *Journal of Early Adolescence, 13*, 228-244.
- Ellickson, P. L., & Hawes, J. A. (1989). An assessment of active versus passive methods for obtaining parental consent. *Evaluation Review, 13*, 45-55.
- Fagot, B. I., & Hagan, R. (1991). Observations of parent reactions to sex-stereotyped behaviors: Age and sex effects. *Child Development, 62*, 617-628.
- Farrington, D. P., & Loeber, R. (2000). Epidemiology of juvenile violence. *Child and Adolescent Psychiatric Clinics of North America, 9*, 733-748.
- Feldman, S. S., & Weinberger, D. A. (1994). Self-restraint as a mediator of family influences on boys' delinquent behavior: A longitudinal study. *Child Development, 65*, 195-211.
- Fields, J. & Casper, L. M. (2001). America's families and living arrangements: March 2000. *Current population reports, P20-537*. Washington, DC: U. S. Census Bureau. <http://www.census.gov/prod/2001pubs/p20-537.pdf>
- Fish, L. S., New, R. S., Van Cleave, N. J. (1992). Shared parenting in dual-income families. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 62*, 83-92.
- Fletcher, A. C. & Hunter, A. G. (2003). Strategies for obtaining parental consent to participate in research. *Family Relations: Interdisciplinary Journal of Applied Family Studies, 52*, 216-221.
- Flouri, E., Buchanan, A., & Bream, V. (2002). Adolescents' perceptions of their fathers' involvement: Significance to school attitudes. *Psychology in the Schools, 39*, 575-582.

- Forehand, R., Long, N., Brody, G. H., Fauber, R. (1986). Home predictors of young adolescents' school behavior and academic performance. *Child Development, 57*, 1528-1533.
- Forehand, R., & Nousiainen, S. (1993). Maternal and paternal parenting: Critical dimensions in adolescent functioning. *Journal of Family Psychology, 7*, 213-221.
- Freeman, H. S., & Newland, L. A. Family transitions during the adolescent transition: Implications for parenting. *Adolescence, 37*, 457-475.
- Frick, P. J. (1994). Family dysfunction and the disruptive behavior disorders: A review of recent empirical findings. *Advances in Clinical Child Psychology, 16*, 203-226.
- Furstenberg, F. F. (1990). Divorce and the American family. *Annual Review of Sociology, 16*, 379-403.
- Garbarino, J., Sebes, J., & Schellenbach, C. (1984). Families at risk for destructive parent-child relations in adolescence. *Child Development, 55*, 174-183.
- Ge, X., Best, K. M., Conger, R. D., & Simons, R. L. (1996). Parenting behaviors and the occurrence and co-occurrence of adolescent depressive symptoms and conduct problems. *Developmental Psychology, 32*, 717-731.
- Gibbs, J. T. (1989). Black American adolescents. In J. T. Gibbs & L. N. Huang (Eds.), *Children of color: Psychological interventions with minority youth* (pp. 179-223). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Gillespie, J. F., & Durlak, J. A. (1995). Screening children at risk for school maladjustment: Further evidence for the value of the AML. *Journal of Community Psychology, 23*, 18-27.

- Gilliom, M., & Shaw, D. S. (2004). Codevelopment of externalizing and internalizing problems in early childhood. *Development and Psychopathology, 16*, 313-333.
- Gjerde, P. F., & Onishi, M. (2000). In search of theory: The study of “ethnic groups” in developmental psychology. *Journal of Research on Adolescence, 10*, 289-298.
- Gonzales, N. A., Cauce, A. M., Friedman, R. J., & Mason, C. A. (1996). Family, peer and neighborhood influences on academic achievement among African-American adolescents: One-year prospective effects. *American Journal of Community Psychology, 24*, 365-387.
- Grady, K., Gersick, K. E., & Boratynski, M. (1985). Preparing parents for teenagers: A step in the prevention of adolescent substance abuse. *Family Relations: Journal of Applied and Family Studies, 34*, 541-549.
- Green, K. D., Beck, S. J., Forehand, R., & Vosk, B. (1980). Validity of teacher nominations of child behavior problems. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology, 8*, 397-404.
- Greene, A. L., & Grimsley, M. D. (1990). Age and gender differences in adolescents’ preferences for parental advice: Mum’s the word. *Journal of Adolescent Research, 5*, 396-413.
- Grolnick, W. S., Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (1991). Inner resources for school achievement: Motivational mediators of children’s perceptions of their parents. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 83*, 508-517.
- Grolnick, W. S. & Slowiaczek, M. L. (1994). Parents’ involvement in children’s schooling: A multidimensional conceptualization and motivational model. *Child Development, 65*, 237-252.

- Grossman, F. K., Pollack, W. S., & Golding, E. (1988). Fathers and children: Predicting the quality and quantity of fathering. *Developmental Psychology, 24*, 82-91.
- Grych, J. H., Seid, M., & Fincham, F. D. (1992). Assessing marital conflict from the child's perspective: The Children's Perception of Interparental Conflict Scale. *Child Development, 63*, 558-572.
- Hatzichristou, C. & Hopf, D. (1996). A multiperspective comparison of peer sociometric status groups in childhood and adolescence. *Child Development, 67*, 1085-1102.
- Hampton, R. I., Gelles, R. J., & Harrop, J. W. (1989). Is violence in Black families increasing: A comparison of 1975 and 1985 National Survey Rates. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 51*, 969-980.
- Harris, K. H., Furstenberg, F. F., & Marmer, J. K. (1998). Paternal involvement with adolescents in intact families: The influence of fathers over the life course. *Demography, 35*, 201-216.
- Harris, K. M. & Marmer, J. K. (1996). Poverty, paternal involvement, and adolescent well-being. *Journal of Family Issues, 17*, 614-640.
- Harrison, A. O., Wilson, M. N., Pine, C. Q., Chan, S. J., & Buriel, R. (1990). Family ecologies of ethnic minority children. *Child Development, 61*, 347-362.
- Harold, G. T., Osborne, L. N., & Conger, R. D. (1997). Mom and Dad are at it again: Adolescent perceptions of marital conflict and adolescent psychological distress. *Developmental Psychology, 33*, 333-350.
- Hetherington, M. E. (1973). Effects of father absence in personality development of adolescent girls. *Developmental Psychology, 73*, 313-326.

- Hetherington, M. E. (1993). An overview of the Virginia Longitudinal Study of Divorce and Remarriage with a focus on early adolescence. *Journal of Family Psychology, 7*, 39-56
- Hetherington, M. E., Bridges, M., & Insabella, G. M. (1998). What matters? What does not? Five perspectives on the association between marital transitions and children's adjustment. *American Psychologist, 53*, 167-184.
- Hetherington, M. E., & Stanley-Hagan, M. M. (1997). The effects of divorce on fathers and their children. In M. E. Lamb, *The role of the father in child development*, 3rd edition (pp. 191-211). New York, NY: Wiley.
- Henderson, A., & Champlin, S. (1989). *Promoting teen health*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Hofferth, S. L. (2003). Race/ethnic differences in father involvement in two-parent families: Culture, context, or economy? *Journal of Family Issues, 24*, 185-216.
- Hollingshead, A. B. (1975). *Four factor index of social status*. Unpublished manuscript, Yale University, Department of Sociology, New Haven, Conn.
- Hosley, C. A., & Montemayor, R. (1997). Fathers and adolescents. In M. E. Lamb (Ed.), *The role of the father in child development* (3rd ed.), pp. 162-178. New York, NY: John Wiley & Sons.
- Houssain, Z., & Roopnarine, J. L. (1993). African American fathers involvement with infants: Relationship to their functioning style, support, education, and income. *Infant Behavior and Development, 17*, 175-184.
- Howard, A. (1995). A framework for work change. In A. Howard (Ed.), *The changing nature of work*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

- Hwang, C. P., & Lamb, M. E. (1997). Father involvement in Sweden: A longitudinal study of its stability and correlates. *International Journal of Behavioral Development, 21*, 621-632.
- Johnson, B. M., Shulman, S., & Collins, W. A. (1991). Systemic patterns of parenting as reported by adolescents: Developmental differences and implications for psychosocial outcomes. *Journal of Adolescent Research, 16*, 235-252.
- Jones, D. J., Forehand, R., & Beach, S. R. H. (2000). Maternal and paternal parenting during adolescence: Forecasting early adult psychosocial adjustment. *Adolescence, 35*, 513-530.
- Jouriles, E. N., Bourg, W. J., & Farris, A. M. (1991). Marital adjustment and child conduct problems: A comparison of the correlation across subsamples. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 59*, 354-357.
- Keith, V. M., & Finlay, R. (1988). The impact of parental divorce on children's educational attainment, marital timing, and likelihood of divorce. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 50*, 797-809.
- Kim, J. E., Hetherington, E. M., & Reiss, D. (1999). Associations among family relationships, antisocial peers, and adolescents' externalizing behaviors: Gender and family type differences. *Child Development, 70*, 1209-1230.
- King, V. (1994). Nonresident father involvement in child well-being: Can dads make a difference? *Journal of Family Issues, 15*, 78-95.
- Knafo, A. (2003). Authoritarians, the next generation: Values and bullying among adolescent children of authoritarian fathers. *Analyses of Social Issues & Public Policy, 3*, 199-204.

- Koenig, L. J., Issacs, A. M., & Schwartz, J. A. J. (1994). Sex differences in adolescent depression and loneliness: Why are boys lonelier if girls are more depressed? *Journal of Research in Personality, 28*, 27-43.
- Krishnakumar, A., & Buehler, C. (2000). Interparental conflict and parenting behaviors: A meta-analytic review. *Family Relations: Interdisciplinary Journal of Applied Family Studies, 49*, 5-44.
- Krohne, H. W., & Hock, M. (1991). Relationships between restrictive mother-child interactions and anxiety of the child. *Anxiety Research, 4*, 109-124.
- Laible, D. J., & Carlo, G. (2004). The differential relations of maternal and paternal support and control to adolescent social-competence, self-worth and sympathy. *Journal of Adolescent Research, 19*, 759-782.
- Lamb, M. E. (1975). Fathers: Forgotten contributors to child development. *Human Development, 18*, 245-266.
- Lamb, M. E. (Ed.). (1997). *The role of the father in child development* (3rd ed.). New York NY: Wiley.
- Lamb, M. E. (Ed.). (2004). *The role of the father in child development* (4th ed.). New York, NY: Wiley.
- Lamb, M. E., Frodi, A. M., Hwang, C. P., & Frodi, M. (1982). Varying degrees of paternal involvement in infant care: Attitudinal and behavioral correlates. In M. E. Lamb (Ed.), *Nontraditional families: Parenting and child development* (pp. 117-138). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

- Lamb, M. E., & Tamis-LeMonda, C. S. (2004). The role of the father: An introduction. In M. E. Lamb (Ed.), *The role of the father in child development*, 4th ed (pp. 1-31). New York, NY: Wiley.
- Lamborn, S. D., Mounts, N. S., Steinberg, L., & Dornbusch, S. M. (1991). Pattern of competence and adjustment among adolescents from authoritative, authoritarian, indulgent and neglectful families. *Child Development*, *62*, 1049-1065.
- Landarine, H., Richardson, J. L., Klonoff, E. A., & Flay, B. (1994). Cultural diversity in the predictors of adolescent cigarette smoking: The relative influence of peers. *Journal of Behavioral Medicine*, *17*, 331-346.
- Larson, R. W. (2001). How U.S. children and adolescents spent time: What it does (and doesn't) tell us about their development. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, *10*, 160-164.
- Larson, R., & Richards, M. H. (1991). Daily companionship in late childhood and early adolescence: Changing developmental contexts. *Child Development*, *62*, 284-300.
- Larson, R., & Richards, M. H. (1994). *Divergent realities: The emotional lives of mothers, fathers, and adolescents*. New York, NY: Basic Books.
- Larson, R. W., Richards, M. H., Moneta, G., Holmbeck, G., & Duckett, E (1996). Changes in adolescents' daily interactions with their families from age 10 to 18: Disengagement and transformation. *Developmental Psychology*, *32*, 744-754.
- Le Crocy, C. W. (1988). Parent-adolescent intimacy: Impact on adolescent functioning. *Adolescence*, *23*, 137-147.

- Levitt, M. J., Guacci, N., & Weber, R. A. (1992). Intergenerational support, relationship quality, and well-being: A bicultural analysis. *Journal of Family Issues, 13*, 465-481.
- Lewis, C., & Lamb, M. E. (2003). Fathers' influences on children's development: The evidence from two-parent families. *European Journal of Psychology of Education, 18*, 211-228.
- Lochman, J. E., & The Conduct Problems Prevention Research Group (1995). Screening of child behavior problems for prevention programs at school entry. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 63*, 549-559.
- Loeber, R. (1990). Development and risk factors of juvenile antisocial behavior and delinquency. *Clinical Psychology Review, 10*, 1-41.
- Loeber, R. & Dishion, T. (1983). Early predictors of male delinquency: A review. *Psychological Bulletin, 94*, 68-99.
- Lytton, H., & Romney, D. M. (1991). Parents' differential socialization of boys and girls: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin, 109*, 267-296.
- Maccoby, E. E., & Martin, J. A. (1983). Socialization in the context of the family: Parent-child interactions. In P. H. Mussen (Ed.), *Handbook of child psychology*, Vol. 4. (pp. 1 – 101). New York, NY: Wiley.
- Margolin, G., Gordis, E. B., & John. R. S. (2001). Coparenting: A link between marital conflict and parenting in two-parent families. *Journal of Family Psychology, 15*, 3-21.
- Marsiglio, W. (1991). Paternal engagement activities with minor children. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 53*, 973-986.

- Mason, C. H., & Perreault, W. D. (1991). Collinearity, power, and interpretation of multiple regression analysis. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 28, 268-280.
- Masten, A. S. (1999). Commentary: The promise and perils of resilience research as a guide to preventive interventions. In M. D. Glantz and J. L. Johnson (Eds.), *Resilience and development: Positive life adaptations. Longitudinal research in the social and behavioral sciences* (pp. 281-296). New York, NY: Kluwer Academic/Plenum Publishers.
- Masten, A. S., & Coatsworth, J. D. (1998). The development of competence in favorable and unfavorable environments: Lessons from research on successful children. *American Psychologist*, 53, 205-220.
- Melby, J. N., & Conger, R. D. (1996). Parental behaviors and adolescent academic performance: A longitudinal analysis. *Journal of Research on Adolescence*, 6, 113-137.
- MacGregor, E., & McNamara, J. R. (1995). Comparison of return procedures involving mailed versus student-delivered parental consent forms. *Psychological Reports*, 77, 1113-1114.
- McGuire, S., Dunn, J., & Plomin, R. (1995). Maternal differential treatment of siblings and children's behavioral problems: A longitudinal study. *Development and Psychopathology*, 7, 515-528.
- McLeod, J. D., Kruttschnitt, C., & Dornfeld, M. (1994). Does parenting explain the effects of structural conditions on children's antisocial behavior? A comparison of Blacks and Whites. *Social Forces*, 73, 575-604.

- McLoyd, V. C. (1998). Socioeconomic disadvantage and child development. *American Psychologist, 53*, 185-204.
- Melby, J. N., & Conger, R. D. (1996). Parental behaviors and adolescent academic performance: A longitudinal analysis. *Journal of Research on Adolescence, 6*, 113-137.
- Miller, J. M., DiOrio, C., & Dudley, W. (2002). Parenting style and adolescent's reaction to conflict: Is there a relationship. *Journal of Adolescent Health, 31*, 463-468.
- Milkie, M. A., Bianchi, S. M., Mattingly, M. J., & Robinson, J. P. (2002). Gendered division of child rearing: Ideals, realities, and the relationship to parental well-being. *Sex Roles, 47*, 21-38.
- Moretti, M. M., Fine, S., Haley, G., & Marriage, K. (1985). Childhood and adolescent depression: Child-report versus parent-report information. *Journal of the American Academy of Child Psychiatry, 24*, 298-203.
- Montemayor, R. (1982). The relationship between parent-adolescent conflict and the amount of time adolescents spend alone and with parents and peers. *Child Development, 53*, 1512-1519.
- Montemayor, R., & Brownlee, J. (1987). Fathers, mothers, and adolescents: Gender-based differences in parental roles during adolescence. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 16*, 281-291.
- Mott, F. L., Kowaleski-Jones, L., & Mehaghan, E. G. (1997). Paternal absence and child behavior: Does a child's gender make a difference? *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 59*, 103-118.

- Mulkey, L. M., Crain, R. L., & Harrington, A. J. C. (1992). One-parent households and achievement: Economic and behavioral explanations of a small effect. *Sociology and Education, 65*, 48-65.
- Murris, P., & Merckelbach, H. (1998). Perceived parental rearing behaviour and anxiety disorders symptoms in normal children. *Personality and Individual Differences, 25*, 1199-1206.
- Noller, P., & Callan, V. J. (1986). Adolescent and parent perception of family cohesion and adaptability. *Journal of Adolescence, 9*, 97-106.
- Nolen-Hoeksema, S., & Girgus, J. S. (1994). The emergence of gender differences in depression during adolescence. *Psychological Bulletin, 115*, 424-443.
- Nord, C. W., Brinmhall, D., & West, J., (1997). Fathers' involvement in their children's schools, NCEs-98-091. Washington, DC: National Center for Educational Statistics, U.S. Department of Education. <http://nces.ed.gov/pubs98/fathers/>
- Ohannessian, C. M., Lerner, R. M., Lerner, J. V., von Eye, A. (1995). Discrepancies in adolescents' and parents' perceptions of family function and adolescent emotional adjustment. *Journal of Early Adolescence, 15*, 490-516.
- Openshaw, D. K., Thomas, D. L., & Rollins, B. C. (1984). Parental influences of adolescent self-esteem. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 4*, 259-274.
- Paley, B., Conger, R., & Harold, G. T. (2000). Parents' affect, adolescent cognitive representations, and adolescent social development. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 62*, 761-776.

- Palkovitz, R. (2002). Involved fathering and child development: Advancing our understanding of good fathering. In C. S. Tamis-LeMonda & N. Cabrera (Eds.), *Handbook of father involvement: Multidisciplinary perspectives* (pp. 119-140). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Parke, R. D. (1996). *Fatherhood*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Parke, R. D. (2000). Father involvement: A developmental psychological perspective. *Marriage and Family Review, 29*, 43-58.
- Paschall, M. J., Ennett, S. T., & Flewelling, R. L. (1996). Relationships among family characteristics and violent behavior by black and white male adolescents. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 25*, 177-197.
- Patterson, G. R. (1986). Performance models for antisocial boys. *American Psychologist, 41*, 432-444.
- Patterson, C. J., Cohn, D. A., & Kao, B. T. (1989). Maternal warmth as a protective factors against risks associated with peer rejection among children. *Development and Psychopathology, 1*, 21-38.
- Patterson, G. R., Reid, J. B., & Dishion, T. J. (1992). *Antisocial boys*. Eugene, OR: Castalia.
- Patterson, G. R. & Dishion, T. J. (1985). Contributions of families and peers to delinquency. *Criminology, 23*, 63-79.
- Paulson, S. E. (1994). Relations of parenting style and parental involvement with ninth grade students' achievement. *Journal of Early Adolescence, 14*, 250-267.

- Paulson, S. E., Hill, J. P., & Holmbeck, G. N. (1991). Distinguishing between perceived closeness and parental warmth in families with seventh-grade boys and girls. *Journal of Early Adolescence, 11*, 276-293.
- Paulson, S. E., & Sputa, C. L. (1996). Patterns of parenting during adolescence: Perceptions of adolescents and parents. *Adolescence, 31*, 369-381.
- Peoples, F., & Loeber, R. (1994). Do individual factors and neighborhood context explain ethnic differences in juvenile delinquency? *Journal of Quantitative Criminology, 10*, 141-157.
- Petersen, A. C., Tobin-Richards, M., & Boxer, A. M. (1983). Puberty: Its measurement and its meaning. *Journal of Early Adolescence, 3*, 47-62.
- Pettit, G. S., Bates, J. E., Dodge, K. A., & Meece, D. W. (1999). The impact of after-school peer contact on early adolescent externalizing problems is moderated by parental monitoring, perceived neighborhood safety, and prior adjustment. *Child Development, 70*, 768-778.
- Phares, V. (1992). Where's Poppa? The relative lack of attention to the role of fathers in child and adolescent psychopathology. *American Psychologist, 47*, 656-664.
- Phares, V. (1996). Conducting nonsexist research, prevention, and treatment with fathers and mothers: A Call for a Change. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 20*, 55-77.
- Phares, V. (1999). Poppa psychology: The role of fathers in children's mental well-being. Westport, CT: Praeger.
- Phares, V., & Compas, B. E. (1992). The role of fathers in child and adolescent psychopathology: Make room for daddy. *Psychological Bulletin, 111*, 387-412.

- Phares, V., Fields, S., & Kamboukos, D. (2005). Fathers' and mothers' involvement with their adolescents. Manuscript submitted for publication.
- Phares, V., Fields, S., Kamboukos, D., & Lopez, L. (2005). Still looking for Poppa: The continued lack of attention to the role of fathers in developmental psychopathology. Manuscript submitted for publication.
- Phares, V., Lopez, E., Fields, S., Kamboukos, D., & Duhig, A. M. (In press). Are fathers involved in pediatric psychology research and treatment? *Journal of Pediatric Psychology*.
- Phares, V., & Renk, K. (1998). Perceptions of Parents: A measure of adolescents' feelings about their parents. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 60, 646-659.
- Phares, V., Renk, K., & Duhig, A. (2003). Positive and negative feelings between adolescents and their fathers and mothers. Poster to be presented at the bi-annual conference of the Society for Research on Child Development, Tampa, FL.
- Phares, V., Renk, K., Duhig, A. M., Fields, S., & Sly, J. (2005). Gender differences in positive and negative feelings between adolescents and their fathers and mothers. Manuscript submitted for publication.
- Pipp, S., Shaver, P., Jennings, S., Lamborn, S., & Fischer, K. W. (1985). Adolescents' theories about the development of their relationships with parents. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 48, 991-1001.
- Pleck, J. (1985). *Working wives, working husbands*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.

- Pleck, J. H. (1997). Paternal involvement: Levels, sources, and consequences. In M. E. Lamb, (Ed.), *The role of the father in child development* (3rd ed). New York: Wiley and Sons.
- Pleck, J. H., & Masciadrelli, B. P. (2004). Paternal involvement by U.S. residential fathers: Levels, sources, and consequences. In M. E. Lamb (Ed.), *The role of the father in child development* (4th ed.) (pp. 222-271). New York: Wiley.
- Querido, J. G., Warner, T. D., & Eyberg, S. M. (2002). Parenting styles and child behavior in African American families of preschool children. *Journal of Clinical Child and Adolescent Psychology*, 31, 272-277.
- Radin, N. (1981). The role of the father in cognitive, academic, and intellectual development. In M. E. Lamb (Ed.), *The role of the father in child development* (pp. 379-427). New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Raffaeli, M. & Duckett, E. (1989). "We were just talking...". Conversations in early adolescence. *Journal of Youth & Adolescence*, 18, 567-582.
- Range, L. M., Embry, T., & MacLeod, R. (2001). Active and passive consent: A comparison of actual research with children. *Ethical Human Sciences & Services*, 3, 23-31.
- Rapee, R. M. (1997). Perceived threat and perceived control as predictors of the degree of fear in physical and social situations. *Journal of Anxiety Disorders*, 11, 455-461.
- Renk, K., Oliveros, A., Roddenberry, A., Klein, J., Sieger, K., Roberts, R., & Phares, V. (2005). The relationship of parental psychological symptoms and ratings of adolescent functioning. Manuscript submitted for publication.

- Repinski, D. J., & Shonk, S. M. (2002). Mothers' and fathers' behavior, adolescents' self-representations and adolescents' adjustment: A mediational model. *Journal of Early Adolescence, 22*, 357-383.
- Rhule, D. M., McMahon, R. J., & Spieker, S. J. (2004). Relation of adolescent mothers' history of antisocial behavior to child conduct problems and social competence. *Journal of Clinical Child & Adolescent Psychology, 33*, 524-535.
- Richards, M. H., Gitelson, I. B., Petersen, A. C., & Hurtig, A. L. (1991). Adolescent personality in girls and boys. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 15*, 65-81.
- Roberts, R. E., Attkisson, C. C., & Rosenblatt, A. (1998). Prevalence of psychopathology among children and adolescents. *American Journal of Psychiatry, 155*, 715-725.
- Rowe, D. C., Kandel, D. (1997). In the eye of the beholder? Parental ratings of externalizing and internalizing symptoms. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology, 25*, 265-275.
- Russell, A., & Saebel, J. (1997). Mother-son, mother-daughter, father-son, and father-daughter. Are they distinct relationships? *Developmental Review, 17*, 111-147.
- Sanders, M. R., Dadds, M. R., Johnston, B. M., & Cash, R. (1992). Childhood depression and conduct disorder: I. Behavioral, affective, and cognitive aspects of family problem-solving interactions. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 101*, 495-504.
- Sanderson, S., & Sanders-Thompson, V. L. T. (2002). Factors associated with perceived paternal involvement in childrearing. *Sex Roles, 46*, 99-111.

- Schludermann, E., & Schludermann, S. (1970). Replicability of factors in the Children's Report of Parental Behavior Inventory (CRPBI). *Journal of Psychology, 96*, 15-23.
- 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.
- Seiffge-Krenke, I. (1999). Families with daughters, families with sons: Different challenges for family relationships and marital satisfaction? *Journal of Youth & Adolescence, 28*, 325-342.
- Seiffge-Krenke, I. & Kollmar, F. (1998). Discrepancies between mothers' and fathers' perceptions of sons' and daughters' problem behaviour: A longitudinal analysis of parent-adolescent agreement of internalising and externalising problem behaviour. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry and Allied Disciplines, 39*, 687-697.
- Seltzer, J. A. (1991). Relationships between fathers and children who live apart: The father's role after separation. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 53*, 79-101.
- Seltzer, J. A., & Brandreth, Y. (1994). What fathers say about involvement with children after separation. *Journal of Family Issues, 15*, 49-77.
- Shaw, D. S., Keenan, K., Vondra, J. I., Delliquadri, E., & Giovannelli, J. (1997). Antecedents of preschool children's internalizing problems: A longitudinal study of low-income families. *Journal of the American Academy of Child & Adolescent Psychiatry, 36*, 1760-1767.

- Silverstein, L.B., & Phares, V. (1996). Expanding the parenting paradigm: An examination of dissertation research 1986-1994. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 20, 39-53.
- Simons, R. L., Whitbeck, L. B., Beaman, J., & Conger, R. (1994). The impact of mothers' parenting, involvement by nonresidential fathers, and parental conflict on the adjustment of adolescent children. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 56, 356-374.
- Smetana, J. G. (1995). Parenting styles and conceptions of parental authority during adolescence. *Child Development*, 66, 299-316.
- Smith, K. (2002). Whose minding the kids? Child care arrangements: Spring 1997. *Current Population Reports, P70-86*. Washington, DC: U.S. Census Bureau. <http://www.census.gov/prod/2002pubs/p70-86.pdf>
- Smith, K. A., & Forehand, R. (1996). Parent-adolescent conflict: Comparisons and prediction of the perception of mothers, fathers and daughters. *Journal of Early Adolescence*, 6, 353-367.
- Snyder, J., Dishion, T. J., & Patterson, G. R. (1986). Determinants and consequences of associating with deviant peers during preadolescence and adolescence. *Journal of Early Adolescence*, 6, 29-43.
- Starrels, M. E. (1994). Gender differences in parent-child relations. *Journal of Family Issues*, 15, 148-165.
- Stanger, C., & Lewis, M. (1993). Agreement among parents, teachers and children on internalizing and externalizing behavior problems. *Journal of Clinical Child Psychology*, 22, 107-115.

- Steinberg, L., Elmen, J., & Mounts, N. (1989). Authoritative parenting, psychosocial maturity, and academic success among adolescents. *Child Development, 60*, 1424-1436.
- Steinberg, L., Lamborn, S. D., Darling, N., & Mounts, N. S. (1994). Over-time changes in adjustment and competence among adolescents from authoritative, authoritarian, indulgent, and neglectful families. *Child Development, 65*, 754-770.
- Steinberg, L., Mounts, N. S., Lamborn, S. D., & Dornbusch, S. M. (1991). Authoritative parenting and adolescent adjustment across varied ecological niches. *Journal of Research on Adolescence, 1*, 19-36.
- Stemmler, M., & Petersen, A. C. (1999). Reciprocity and change within the affective family environment in early adolescence. *International Journal of Behavioral Development, 185-198*.
- Stice, E., & Barrera, M. (1995). A longitudinal examination of the reciprocal relations between perceived parenting and adolescents' substance use and externalizing behaviors. *Developmental Psychology, 31*, 322-334.
- Stouthamer-Loeber, M., & Loeber, R. (1986). Boys who lie. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology, 14*, 551-564.
- Surgeon General Report (1999). *Mental health: A report of the surgeon general* [Online]. Available: www.surgeongeneral.gov/library/mentalhealth
- Svanum, S., Bringle, R. G., & McLaughlin, J. E. (1982). Father absence and cognitive performance in a large sample of six-to-eleven-year-old children. *Child Development, 53*, 136-143.

- Toth, J. F., & Xu, X. (1999). Ethnic and cultural diversity in fathers' involvement: A racial/ethnic comparison of African American, Hispanic, and White fathers. *Youth & Society, 31*, 76-99.
- Umberson, D. (1992). Relationships between adult children and their parents: Psychological consequences for both generations. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 54*, 664-674.
- U. S. Census Bureau (2000). Household and families 2000. Washington, DC: U. S. Census Bureau. www.census.gov
- Veneziano, R. A., & Rohner, R. P. (1998). Perceived paternal acceptance, paternal involvement, and youths' psychological adjustment in a rural, biracial southern community. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 60*, 335-343.
- Verhulst, F. C. & Van Der Ende, J. (1992). Six-year developmental course of internalizing and externalizing problem behaviors. *Journal of the American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry, 31*, 924-931.
- Wade, T. J., Cairney, J., & Pevalin, D. J. (2002). Emergence of gender differences in depression during adolescence: National panel results from three countries. *Journal of the American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry, 41*, 190-198.
- Wagner, B. M., Cohen, P., & Brook, J. S. (1996). Parent/adolescent relationships: Moderators of the effect of stressful life events. *Journal of Adolescent Research, 11*, 347-374.

- Walker, A. J. (1999). Gender and family relationships. In M. Sussman, S. K., Steinmetz, & G. W. Peterson (Eds.), *Handbook of marriage and the family* (2nd ed.) (pp. 439-474). New York: Plenum Press.
- Wallerstein, J. S., & Lewis, J. (1998). The long term impact of divorce on children: A first report from a 25-year study. *Family and Conciliation Courts Review*, 34, 368-383.
- Weathers, P. L., Furlong, M. J., & Solorzano, D. (1993). Mail survey research in counseling psychology: Current practice and suggested guidelines. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 40, 238-244.
- Webster-Stratton, C., & Eyberg, S. (1982). Child temperament: Relationships with child behavior problems and parent-child interactions. *Journal of Clinical Child Psychology*, 11, 123-129.
- Weissman, M. M., Leckman, J. F., Merikangas, K. R., Gammon, G. D., & Prusoff, B. A. (1984). Depression and anxiety disorders in parents and children. *Archives of General Psychiatry*, 41, 845-852.
- Wenk, D., Hardesty, C. L., Morgan, C. S., & Blair, S. L. (1994). The influence of parental involvement on the well-being of sons and daughters. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 56, 229-234.
- Wentzel, K. R., Feldman, S. S., & Weinberger, D. A. (1991). Parental child rearing and academic achievement in boys: The mediational role of social-emotional adjustment. *Journal of Early Adolescence*, 11, 321-339.

- White, L. K., & Gilbreth, J. G. (2001). When children have two fathers: Effects of relationships with stepfathers and noncustodial fathers on adolescent outcomes. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 63*, 155-167.
- Wierson, M., Armistead, L., Forehand, R., Thomas, A. M., & Fauber, R. (1990). Parent-adolescent conflict and stress as a parent: Are there differences between being a mother and a father? *Journal of Family Violence, 5*, 187-197.
- Wolfradt, U., Hempel, S., & Miles, J. N. V. (2003). Perceived parenting styles, depersonalization, anxiety and coping behaviour in adolescents. *Personality and Individual Differences, 34*, 521-532.
- Yeung, W. J., Sandberg, J. F., Davis-Kean, P. E., & Hofferth, S. L. (2001). Children's time with fathers in intact families. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 63*, 136-154.
- Yongman, M. W., Kindlon, D., & Earls, F. (1995). Father involvement and cognitive/behavioral outcomes of preterm infants. *Journal of the American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry, 34*, 58-66.
- Young, M. H., Miller, B. C., Norton, M. C., & Hill, E. J. (1995). The effect of parental supportive behaviors on life satisfaction of adolescent offspring. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 57*, 813-822.
- Youniss, J., & Ketterlinus, R. D. (1987). Communication and connectedness in mother- and father-adolescent relationships. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 16*, 265-280.
- Youniss, J., & Smollar, J. (1985). *Adolescent relations with mothers, fathers, and friends*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Appendices

APPENDIX A

FAMILY INFORMATION FORM – PARENT

Please complete the following:

1. This form is being completed by (please check one):

- Mother Stepmother Adoptive mother
 Grandmother Father Stepfather
 Adoptive father Grandfather Guardian
 Other (please specify: _____)

2. How old are you? _____

3. What is your race/ethnicity (please check one)?

- Caucasian African-American
 Latino/Latina Native American
 Asian Multiracial (specify: _____)
 Other (please specify: _____)

4. How many children (biological, stepchildren, and other children) are *presently living* in your home? _____

5. List the ages of all children who are presently living in your home:

6. In all, how many children (biological, stepchildren, and others) do you have? _____

7. Are you:

- Married Separated Divorced
 Single, not living with partner Single, living with a partner
 Widowed Other (please specify: _____)

8. Your employment status.

(Please completed for both mother/female guardian and father/male guardian):

Mother or Female Guardian

Father or Male Guardian

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Employed as: _____ | <input type="checkbox"/> Employed as: _____ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Unemployed | <input type="checkbox"/> Unemployed |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Retired | <input type="checkbox"/> Retired |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ | <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

9. Number of years of education (including school, college and university):

Mother/Female Guardian: _____

Father/Male Guardian: _____

APPENDIX A (Continued)

10. Highest educational level completed.

(Please complete for both mother/female guardian and father/male guardian):

Mother or Female Guardian:

Some High School (Highest grade: ____)

Graduated High School/G.E.D.

Some college

Associates Degree

Bachelors Degree

Masters Degree

Doctorate Degree

Father or Male Guardian:

Some High School
(Highest grade: ____)

Graduated High School/G.E.D.

Some college

Associates Degree

Bachelors Degree

Masters Degree

Doctorate Degree:

11. Total household income per year (Optional): _____

12. Average hours *per week* you spend at work and/or school, including commuting time? ____

13. Please select one of the following:

I live with my teenager (*please go to question 14*)

I do not live with my teenager (*please skip question 14 and go to question 15*)

14. If you currently live with your teenager or have daily contact with your teenager, please estimate how much time you spend with your teenager. Think of a typical day during the workweek *and* a typical day during the weekend. Please do not include time during the night when you are both sleeping.

a. *Direct interaction with teenager* (e.g., talking, playing a game, doing homework together)

◆ AVERAGE WEEKDAY TIME: _____(hours) ____ (min)

◆ AVERAGE WEEKEND DAY TIME: _____ (hours) ____ (min)

b. *Accessibility to teenager* (i.e., when you are in the same room as your teenager, but you are not actively engaged in conversation or any other type of interaction. For example, when you watch T.V. together without talking, when you are in the house together but involved in different activities)

◆ AVERAGE WEEKDAY TIME: _____(hours) ____ (min)

◆ AVERAGE WEEKEND DAY TIME: _____ (hours) ____ (min)

APPENDIX A (Continued)

14. If you do not currently live with your teenager or do not have daily contact with your teenager, please answer the following questions by estimating the amount of time per month you spend with your teenager. Please do not include time during the night when you are both sleeping.

- a. *Direct interaction with teenager* (e.g., talking, playing a game, doing homework together)

◆ AVERAGE TIME PER MONTH: _____(hours) ____ (min)

- b. *Accessibility to teenager* (i.e., when you are in the same room as your teenager, but you are not actively engaged in conversation or any other type of interaction. For example, when you watch T.V. together without talking, when you are in the house together but involved in different activities)

◆ AVERAGE TIME PER MONTH: _____(hours) ____ (min)

APPENDIX B

PERCEPTIONS OF PARENTS – Parent Version

Children, teenagers, and young adults often have many different feelings toward their mother and father. Similarly, mothers and fathers often have many different feelings toward their children. Even if they do not have contact with their children anymore, mothers and fathers may still have feelings or opinions about them. *Please think about your own teenager in this study and answer the following questions for how you currently feel.* If you cannot answer a question regarding your child, write "N/A".

1 = Not at all or Never	2 = Not much or Rarely	3 = Somewhat or Sometimes	4 = Pretty Much or Pretty Often	5 = Very much or Very Often	6 = Extremely or Always
----------------------------	---------------------------	------------------------------	---------------------------------------	-----------------------------------	----------------------------

WITH REGARD TO HOW YOU FEEL ABOUT YOUR CHILD,
HOW MUCH DO YOU FEEL:

1. Respect toward your child:	1	2	3	4	5	6
<hr/>						
2. Anger toward your child:	1	2	3	4	5	6
<hr/>						
3. Happy when you think about your child:	1	2	3	4	5	6
<hr/>						
4. Love toward your child:	1	2	3	4	5	6
<hr/>						
5. Grateful for your child:	1	2	3	4	5	6
<hr/>						
6. Proud of your child:	1	2	3	4	5	6
<hr/>						
7. Caring toward your child:	1	2	3	4	5	6
<hr/>						
8. Confused or puzzled by your child:	1	2	3	4	5	6
<hr/>						
9. Disappointed or let down by your child:	1	2	3	4	5	6
<hr/>						
10. Comforted thinking about your child:	1	2	3	4	5	6
<hr/>						
11. Anxious/nervous about your child:	1	2	3	4	5	6
<hr/>						
12. Closeness toward your child:	1	2	3	4	5	6
<hr/>						
13. Upset when you think about your child:	1	2	3	4	5	6
<hr/>						
14. Appreciative of (thankful for) your child:	1	2	3	4	5	6
<hr/>						
15. Positive feelings toward your child:	1	2	3	4	5	6
<hr/>						

APPENDIX C

MY MOM AND DAD

This form will be removed from the rest of your surveys!!

There will be no names on the rest of the surveys.

Please complete all 4 questions:

1. What is your first and last name? _____

2. Date of Birth? ____ / ____ / ____ (month/day/year)

3. **MY MOM.** We are interested in the person who you think is your mother or who takes on a mother's role in your life. This person may or may not be your biological parent. Also, you do not have to actually live with the person you consider your mother. *If you feel that you do not have someone in your life who is your mom or mother figure, you can leave this blank.*

a. What is your mother's first and last name? _____

b. Is this person your:

___ Biological Mother ___ Stepmother ___ Adoptive Mother

___ Aunt ___ Grandmother ___ Sister

___ Cousin ___ Other (please specify: _____)

4. **MY DAD.** We are interested in the person who you think is your father or who takes on a father's role in your life. This person may or may not be your biological parent. Also, you do not have to actually live with the person you consider your father. *If you feel that you do not have someone in your life who is your dad or father figure, you can leave this blank.*

a. What is your father's first and last name? _____

b. This person is your:

___ Biological Father ___ Stepfather ___ Adoptive Father

___ Uncle ___ Grandfather ___ Brother

___ Cousin ___ Other (please specify: _____)

In the rest of the survey, when you are asked about your "mother" or "father" please consider the people on this form when you are answering the questions. Thanks.

APPENDIX D

FAMILY INFORMATION FORM – ADOLESCENT

Please complete the following:

1. How old are you? _____

2. What grade are you in? _____

3. Are you a: Boy (Male) Girl (Female)

4. What is your racial/ethnic background?

___ White ___ African-American ___ Latino/Latina ___ Native American
___ Asian ___ Multi-racial (Specify: _____)
___ Other: (Specify: _____)

5. Are your biological mother and father:

___ Married/Living together ___ Separated ___ Divorced
___ Remarried ___ Never married
___ Other: _____

6. How often do you see your *mother*? Please select only *one* response.

___ Every day ___ A few times a week ___ Once a month
___ A few times a month ___ Every few months ___ Every few years
___ Never ___ Other: _____

7. How often do you see your *father*? Please select only *one* response.

___ Every day ___ A few times a week ___ Once a month
___ A few times a month ___ Every few months ___ Every few years
___ Never ___ Other: _____

8. Who do you current live with? Please list (e.g., mom, data, step dad, sister etc).

9. What is your *mother's* educational level:

___ Never completed High School ___ Graduated High School
___ Some college ___ Graduate from college
___ Some graduate school ___ Completed a Master's or Doctorate
___ I don't know ___ Other: _____

APPENDIX D (Continued)

10. What is your *father's* educational level:

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Never completed High School | <input type="checkbox"/> Graduated High School |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Some college | <input type="checkbox"/> Graduate from college |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Some graduate school | <input type="checkbox"/> Completed a Masters or Doctorate |
| <input type="checkbox"/> I don't know | <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

11. What is your *mother's* job (if any)? _____

12. What is your *father's* job (if any)? _____

13. Do you live with your mother or have daily contact with your mother?

Yes (go to question 14)

No (go to question 15)

14. *If you live with your mother or have daily contact with your mother:*

Please estimate how much time you spend with your mother. Think of a typical day during the school week and a typical day during the weekend. Please do *not* include time during the night when you are both sleeping.

(If you do not live with your mother or do not have daily contact with your mother, please skip this question and go to question 15).

a. *Direct interaction with your mother* (e.g., talking, playing a game, doing homework together)

◆ AVERAGE WEEKDAY TIME: _____(hours) ____ (min)

◆ AVERAGE WEEKEND DAY TIME: ____ (hours) ____ (min)

b. *Accessibility to your mother* (i.e., when you are in the same room as your mother, but you are not actively engaged in conversation or any other type of interaction. For example, when you watch T.V. together without talking, when you are in the house together but involved in different activities)

◆ AVERAGE WEEKDAY TIME: _____(hours) ____ (min)

◆ AVERAGE WEEKEND DAY TIME: ____ (hours) ____ (min)

PLEASE GO TO QUESTION 16 IF YOU ANSWERED QUESTION 14

APPENDIX D (Continued)

15. *If you do not currently live with your mother or do not have daily contact with your mother:* Please answer the following questions by estimating the amount of time per month you spend with your mother. Please do *not* include time during the night when you are both sleeping.

(If you responded to question 14, skip this Question and go to question 16).

- a. *Direct interaction with your mother* (e.g., talking, playing a game, doing homework together)

◆ AVERAGE TIME PER MONTH: _____(hours) ____ (min)

- b. *Accessibility to your mother* (i.e., when you are in the same room as your mother, but you are not actively engaged in conversation or any other type of interaction. For example, when you watch T.V. together without talking, when you are in the house together but involved in different activities)

◆ AVERAGE TIME PER MONTH: _____(hours) ____ (min)

16. Do you live with your father or have daily contact with your father?

Yes (go to question 17)

No (go to question 18)

17. *If you live with your father or have daily contact with your father:* Please estimate how much time you spend with your father. Think of a typical day during the school week and a typical day during the weekend. Please do *not* include time during the night when you are both sleeping.

(If you do not live with your father or do not have daily contact with your father, please skip this question and go to question 18).

- a. *Direct interaction with your father* (e.g., talking, playing a game, doing homework together)

◆ AVERAGE WEEKDAY TIME: _____(hours) ____ (min)

◆ AVERAGE WEEKEND DAY TIME: ____ (hours) ____ (min)

- b. *Accessibility to your father* (i.e., when you are in the same room as your father, but you are not actively engaged in conversation or any other type of interaction. For example, when you watch T.V. together without talking, when you are in the house together but involved in different activities)

◆ AVERAGE WEEKDAY TIME: _____(hours) ____ (min)

◆ AVERAGE WEEKEND DAY TIME: ____ (hours) ____ (min)

APPENDIX D (Continued)

18. *If you do not currently live with your father or do not have daily contact with your father:* Please answer the following questions by estimating the amount of time per month you spend with your father. Please do *not* include time during the night when you are both sleeping.

(If you responded to question 17, skip this question and go to the next page).

- a. *Direct interaction with your father* (e.g., talking, playing a game, doing homework together)

◆ AVERAGE TIME PER MONTH: _____(hours) _____ (min)

- b. *Accessibility to your father* (i.e., when you are in the same room as your father, but you are not actively engaged in conversation or any other type of interaction. For example, when you watch T.V. together without talking, when you are in the house together but involved in different activities)

◆ AVERAGE TIME PER MONTH: _____(hours) _____ (min)

APPENDIX E

PERCEPTIONS OF PARENTS (POP) – Adolescent

Children, teenagers and young adults often have many different feelings toward their mother and father. Even if they do not have contact with their mother or father anymore, they may still have feelings or opinions about them. Please think about your own mother and father currently and answer the following questions. If you no longer have contact with one or both of your parents, please try to answer the questions based on how you remember them. Please do not spend too much time on any one answer.

1 = Not at all or Never	2 = Not much or Rarely	3 = Somewhat or Sometimes	4 = Pretty Much or Pretty Often	5 = Very much or Very Often	6 = Extremely or Always
----------------------------	---------------------------	------------------------------	---------------------------------------	-----------------------------------	-------------------------------

WITH REGARD TO HOW YOU FEEL ABOUT YOUR PARENTS,
HOW MUCH DO YOU FEEL:

	MOTHER						FATHER					
1. Respect toward your:	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6
2. Anger toward your:	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6
3. Happy when you think about your:	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6
4. Love toward your:	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6
5. Grateful for your:	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6
6. Proud of your:	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6
7. Caring toward your:	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6
8. Confused or puzzled by your:	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6
9. Disappointed or let down by your:	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6
10. Comforted thinking about your:	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6
11. Anxious/nervous about your:	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6
12. Closeness toward your:	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6
13. Upset when you think about your:	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6
14. Appreciative of (thankful for) your:	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6
15. Positive feelings toward your:	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6

APPENDIX F

CHILDREN’S REPORT of PARENTAL BEHAVIOR INVENTORY-REVISED

As children grow up to be teenagers and young adults, they learn more and more about their parents and how their parents are bringing up their sons and daughters. We would like you to describe some of the different experiences. Please read each statement on the following pages and indicate your answer on the right side of the page that most closely describes the way each of your parents act towards you. You will answer first for your mother and then for your father.

If you think the statement is *NOT LIKE* your mother/father, record a “1”

If you think the statement is *SOMEWHAT LIKE* your mother/father, record a “2”

If you think the statement is *LIKE* your mother/father, record a “3”

	MOTHER	FATHER
1. Make me feel better after talking over my worries with her/him	1 2 3	1 2 3
2. Almost always speaks to me with a warm and friendly voice	1 2 3	1 2 3
3. Smiles at me often	1 2 3	1 2 3
4. Is able to make me feel better when I am upset	1 2 3	1 2 3
5. Enjoys doing things with me	1 2 3	1 2 3
6. Cheers me up when I am sad	1 2 3	1 2 3
7. Often speaks of the good things I do	1 2 3	1 2 3
8. Seems proud of the things I do	1 2 3	1 2 3
9. Sees to it that I know exactly what I may or may not do	1 2 3	1 2 3
10. Believes in having a lot of rules and sticking to them	1 2 3	1 2 3
11. Believes that all my bad behavior should be punished in some way	1 2 3	1 2 3
12. Insists that I must do exactly as I am told	1 2 3	1 2 3
13. I had certain jobs to do and was not allowed to do anything else until they were done	1 2 3	1 2 3
14. Soon forgets a rule he/she has made	1 2 3	1 2 3

APPENDIX F (Continued)

If you think the statement is *NOT LIKE* your mother/father, record a “1”

If you think the statement is *SOMEWHAT LIKE* your mother/father, record a “2”

If you think the statement is *LIKE* your mother/father, record a “3”

	MOTHER	FATHER
15. Is easy with me	1 2 3	1 2 3
16. Punishes me for doing something one day but ignores it the next	1 2 3	1 2 3
17. Lets me off easy when I do something wrong	1 2 3	1 2 3
18. Depends on her/his mood whether a rule is enforced or not	1 2 3	1 2 3
19. Excuses my bad conduct	1 2 3	1 2 3
20. Only keeps rules when it suits him/her	1 2 3	1 2 3
21. Does not insist I obey if I complain or protest	1 2 3	1 2 3
22. Changes his/her mind to make things easier for him/herself	1 2 3	1 2 3
23. Wants to know exactly where I am and what I am doing	1 2 3	1 2 3
24. Is always checking on what I have been doing at school or play	1 2 3	1 2 3
25. Asks to me tell everything that happens when I am away from home	1 2 3	1 2 3
26. Keeps a careful check on me to make sure that I have the right kind of friends	1 2 3	1 2 3
27. Asks other people what I do away from home	1 2 3	1 2 3

APPENDIX G

LETTER OF INVITATION AND CONSENT FORM

Dear Parent or Guardian:

Have you ever noticed how different girls and boys can be? I would like to figure out why these differences happen. My name is Demy Kamboukos and I am working on my Ph.D. in Clinical Psychology at the University of South Florida (USF). I am currently completing my internship in Clinical Child Psychology at North Shore-Long Island Jewish Medical Center. While at USF, I conducted research in Pasco County Schools, worked for the Pinellas County School Board, and worked as a therapist in Hillsborough County Schools.

Enclosed you will find a consent form/permission slip that explains a survey that I would like to invite you and your child to take part in. Participation is voluntary. If you choose to participate, you and your child will be entered into a drawing for six gift certificates (whether or not you end up completing the surveys). By taking part, you and your child will help us understand gender differences in parent-adolescent relationships. All surveys and responses will be kept confidential.

Please read the enclosed consent form/permission slip and let us know if you have any questions. If you decide to take part in the survey, please complete the information below and sign and complete the last page of the consent form enclosed. A copy of the consent form for your records will be mailed to you with the parent surveys in the next few weeks. If you choose not to participate in the study, please complete the information below by checking off the option that you do not wish to participate.

Please return this letter and your signed consent to your child's school by _____. We kindly request that you return these materials whether you decide to participate or not participate in our study. We greatly appreciate your time.

We hope that you will agree to take part in our project. We will be very happy to answer any questions that you may have. I can be reached at 813-974-9222 or 813-416-4716, or by email (dkambouk@luna.cas.usf.edu). My major professor, Vicky Phares, can be reached at 813-974-0493. Thank you very much.

Sincerely

Demy Kamboukos, M.A.
Doctoral Candidate
Clinical Psychology

Vicky Phares, Ph.D.
Associate Professor and
Director of Clinical Training Program

PLEASE CHECK ONE OF THE OPTIONS BELOW

Yes, my child and I are interested in participating in your study (Please read and sign enclosed last page of consent form; return letter and consents by deadline noted above)

No, my child and I are not interested in participating in your study at this time (Please return the letter by deadline noted above).

APPENDIX G (Continued)

Social Sciences/Behavioral
Parents Informed Consent
University of South Florida

Information for Parents of Children Who Take Part in Research Studies

The following information is being presented to help you decide whether or not you want to allow your child to be a part of a minimal risk research study. Please read carefully. If you do not understand anything, ask the Person in Charge of the Study.

Title of Study: Adolescents and their families
Principal Investigator: Dimitra Kamboukos, M.A. & Vicky Phares, Ph.D.
Study Location(s): Middle Schools in Tampa Bay

Your child is being asked to participate because we are interested in learning more about how middle school students perceive their families and themselves.

General Information about the Research Study

The purpose of this research study is to learn about gender differences in adolescents' feelings of their mothers and fathers. The study will also investigate the relationship between adolescents' feelings and their emotional and behavioral functioning.

We are asking you and your child to take part in this study because we are interested in learning more about middle school students' feelings. The current study will include 6th, 7th and 8th grade students from public and private schools in the Tampa Bay area. We expect that no more than 1420 adolescents and their parents will take part in this study.

Your child was *randomly selected* for participation from all enrolled middle school students your child's school. We are requesting consent for participation of both your child and yourself. After reading the description of the study below, you are free to consent to participation for both yourself and your child. You are also free to decline participation or withdraw from the study at any time.

Plan of Study

If you decide to take part in this study, you will have to sign the consent form/permission slip and return it in the envelope provided to your child's school. You may ask your child to return the forms for you. After we receive your consent form, you will be asked to complete and mail three short surveys. In addition, once we receive your signed consent form, your child will be asked to complete four surveys within his/her school. If you consent to participate in this study, we will also obtain records data on your child from your child's school.

APPENDIX G (Continued)

PARENT

You will be asked to complete four short surveys. It should take about 30 minutes for you to fill out these surveys. You will be provided with a stamped self-addressed envelope to return the surveys to the researchers. The three measures ask questions regarding your family background, your perceptions about your child, your work and family roles, and your child's functioning. The Family Information form requests information on family make-up, marital status, parental occupation and education, and the amount of time you spend at work and at home. The Perceptions of Parents survey provides information on your feelings about your child. You will be asked to rate your feelings regarding a list of statements (e.g., "How much do you feel proud of your child" and "How much do you feel closeness towards your child") on a 6-point scale ("not at all" to "extremely"). The Child Behavior Checklist is a scale on your child's emotional and behavioral functioning. You will be asked to rate each item (e.g., "Disobedient at home", "Can't sit still, restless, hyperactive" and "Shy or timid") on a three-point scale ranging from "not true" to "very often or often true".

ADOLESCENT

Following your written consent, your child will be escorted by Demy Kamboukos and/or designated staff to an area approved by the principal of your child's school. The study will be explained to your child and he/she will be asked if he/she is willing to take part in the study. Your child will be told that you have provided written consent for the study. If your child agrees to participate in the study, he/she will sign a brief simplified version of this form. An authorized staff member and a witness will also sign the form. If your child agrees to participate, he/she will be asked to complete four measures of family background, perceptions of their parents, parental behavior, and emotional/ behavioral functioning. The survey requires 30-40 minutes of your child's time.

The Family Information form requests information on your child's gender and ethnic background, family make-up, and parental education and occupation. The Perceptions of Parents survey reports how adolescents feel about their mothers and fathers. Your child will be asked to rate each item (e.g., "How much do you feel happy when you think of your mother/father?" and "How much do you feel closeness for your mother/father") on a 6-point scale ("not at all" to "extremely").

The Children's Report of Parental Behavior Inventory-Revised provides information on adolescents' perceptions of their parents' behaviors at home. Your child will be asked to rate the degree to which each item is like his/her mother and father (e.g., "Often speaks of the good things that I do" and "Believes in having a lot of rules and sticking with them"). The Youth Self-Report is a scale of behavioral and emotional functioning. Your child will be asked to rate each item (e.g., "I get in many fights" and "I am willing to help others when they need help") on a three-point scale: "not true", "somewhat or sometimes true" or "very true or often true".

Payment for Participation

You and your child will not be paid for your participation in this study. You will be entered into a drawing for six gift certificates to restaurants or stores. There will be two (2) gift certificates for the amount of \$50 and four (4) certificates for \$25. If you or your child wish to withdraw from the study after you have provided consent, you will still be entered into the drawing after the study is completed.

APPENDIX G (Continued)

Benefits of Being a Part of this Research Study

By taking part in this research study, you and your child will assist in increasing our overall understanding of gender differences in parent-adolescent functioning. The information will assist in developing targeted interventions for middle school students and their families.

Risks of Being a Part of this Research Study

The risks involved in being a part of this study are minimal. Most children enjoy completing the selected surveys. Very rarely, an adolescent may become nervous when answering some questions. If your child should appear nervous in any way, we will discontinue the survey immediately and ensure that your child is not upset in any way. If you have questions about any of the surveys, you are encouraged to contact the investigators of the study at the numbers on the next page. Parents are free to call the persons in charge of the study at any time for additional information or clarification.

Your child's performance or experiences in school will not be affected by participation, or lack of participation, in the current study.

Confidentiality of Your and Your Child's Records

Your and your child's privacy and research records will be kept confidential to the extent of the law. Authorized research personnel, employees of the Department of Health and Human Services and the USF Institutional Review Board may inspect the records from this research project.

The results of this study may be published. However, the data obtained from you and your child will be combined with data from other children in the publication. The published results will not include your or your child's name or any other information that would personally identify you or your child in any way.

Each parent and adolescent in the study will receive a study code number so that *no names of any child or parent appear on any survey or database*. Your child's school will provide us with the records data mentioned above. The information will be provided using the study code number and your child's name and identifying information will not be connected to the records information we obtain. The surveys will be kept in a locked cabinet in Dr. Vicky Phares' research laboratory in the Department of Psychology at the University of South Florida. The study database and records data will not include names or identifying information. Only members of the research team will have access to the surveys and database. Your and your child's individual responses will not be shared with your child's school or school district, or your child's school principal, teachers or staff. In addition, your responses will not be shared with your child or other family members, and your child's responses will not be shared with you or other family members. The only exception to confidentiality is if your child indicates in the surveys that he/she is in danger or will hurt him/herself. In addition, confidentiality will be broken if your child indicates that someone else is in danger. In these situations, your child will be spoken to privately. You and the school principal will be informed in order to ensure your child's or other children's safety.

APPENDIX G (Continued)

Volunteering to Be Part of this Research Study

Your decision to allow your child to participate in this research study is completely voluntary. You are free to have yourself and your child participate in this research study or withdraw at any time. If you choose not to participate in this study, or if you or your child withdraw from the study, there will not be any penalty. You and your child’s decision to participate or not participate in the study, or to withdraw from the study, will in no way affect your child’s grades or status as a student at school. If you or your child choose to withdraw from the study after you have provided written consent, you will still be entered into the drawing for one of the 6 gift certificates.

Questions and Contacts

If you or your child have any questions about this research study, contact Demy Kamboukos at 813-974-9222 or Dr. Vicky Phares at 813-974-0493.

If you or your child have questions about your child’s rights as a person who is taking part in a research study, you or your child may contact a member of the Division of Research Compliance of the University of South Florida at (813) 974-5638.

Your Consent—By signing this form I agree that:

- I have fully read or have had read and explained to me this informed consent form describing a research project
- I have had the opportunity to question one of the persons in charge of this research and have received satisfactory answers
- I understand that I am being asked to allow my child to participate in research. I understand the risks and benefits and I freely give my consent to allow my child to participate in the research project outlined in this form, under the conditions dictated in it.

Signature of Parent of Participant	Printed Name of Parent	Date
•		
•		
•		
•		

Signature of Parent of Participant	Printed Name of Parent	Date

APPENDIX G (Continued)

PARENT/GUARDIAN: PLEASE COMPLETE THE FOLLOWING:

_____ Student's Name	_____ Student's Grade
<u>Information on Mother/Female Guardian:</u>	<u>Information on Father/Male Guardian:</u>
Name: _____	Name: _____
_____	_____
_____	_____
Street Address	Street Address
_____	_____
City, State, Zip	City, State, Zip
Home Phone Number: (_____)_____	Home Phone Number:(_____)_____
Email address: _____	Email address: _____

Investigator Statement

I have carefully explained to the subject the nature of the above protocol.
I hereby certify that to the best of my knowledge the subject signing this consent form understands the nature, demands, risks and benefits involved in participating in this study.

Signature of Investigator

Printed Name of Investigator

APPENDIX H

INSTRUCTIONS FOR TEACHERS AND DISTRIBUTION OF CONSENTS

LETTER AND INSTRUCTIONS TO TEACHERS

Dear _____:

My name is Demy Kamboukos and I am a graduate student in Clinical Psychology at the University of South Florida. I have received approval to conduct a study in Pinellas County middle schools from both the Pinellas County Schools' Research and Accountability Department and the University of South Florida Institutional Review Board (IRB).

I am hoping to collect surveys from students in your school for my dissertation research. The purpose of my dissertation study is to examine gender differences in the relationships among adolescents' perceptions of their mothers and fathers, parents' perceptions about their children, and adolescents' emotional/behavioral functioning.

Your principal has graciously provided me with permission to collect surveys from your students in the next few weeks. *I would greatly appreciate your support and assistance in distributing parental letters of invitation/permission slips to your students.* You will *not* be asked to assist with distribution and collection of the surveys.

What does your assistance involve? I am attaching a short announcement for you to read to your students when you distribute the permission slips. Please ask your students to take the permission slips home and return them to you by _____. Please return all permission slips to the principal in the attached envelope.

Your assistance is *voluntary*. Should you choose to assist with the distribution and collection of the permission slips, you will be entered into a drawing for a \$50 gift certificate.

Thank you so much for your time and assistance. If you would like additional information on the study, please contact me directly. Please do not hesitate to contact me at (813) 416-4716 or at dkambouk@luna.cas.usf.edu should have any questions or concerns. Thanks again

Sincerely,

Demy Kamboukos, M.A.
Doctoral Candidate in Clinical Psychology
University of South Florida

APPENDIX H (Continued)

ANNOUNCEMENT FOR TEACHERS WHEN DISTRIBUTING CONSENTS

We are handing out some permission slips for you to take home to your parents. These permission slips will ask your parents if you can take part in a survey on your feelings about your family and yourself. If you and your parents agree to take part, you will complete the surveys in school. Your name will not be on the surveys and no one will learn your individual answers. If you and your family agree to take part in the study, you will be entered in a drawing for one of 6 gift certificates.

Please return the completed permission slip by this Friday.

Any questions?

Thank you.

APPENDIX I
ADOLESCENT ASSENT

This project is a study on your views and feelings about your parents and your beliefs about yourself. We are asking you to spend about 45 minutes with us. We will ask you to fill out four short surveys. The first survey asks you to tell us a little about yourself and your family background. The second survey asks you to tell us how you feel about your mom and your dad, or legal guardians. The third survey asks you to tell us how you view your parents' behaviors. The last survey asks you to tell us about your feelings and behaviors.

This is not a test! You will not get a grade on it. All you need to do is tell us about your opinions and feelings. Your parents already know about this study and they have given us written permission for you to take part. Before we ask you to complete the surveys, we would like to get your written permission too.

If you participate in this study, you and your parents will be entered into a drawing to win 1 of 6 gift certificates to restaurants or stores. There will be two (2) \$50 gift certificates and four (4) \$25 gift certificates in the drawing.

Your name will not be on your survey and answer sheets. Your teachers, parents, and the other students will not learn your answers unless your responses tell us that you or someone else might get hurt. If that happens, we will talk with you privately and possibly speak to your parents or principal.

If you do not want to participate, you do not have to.
Do you understand what I am asking you to do?
Can you please tell me in your own words what we would like you to do?
Do you have any questions?
If you would like to participate, I need you to sign below

Mr./Ms. _____ has explained the survey called
"Adolescents and their Families" to me. I have had all my questions answered.
I would like to participate.

_____ Printed Name of Student	_____ Student Signature	_____ Date
_____ Printed Name of Investigator Authorized Personnel	_____ Signature of Investigator or Authorized Personnel	_____ Date
_____ Name of Witness	_____ Signature of Witness	_____ Date

About the Author

Dimitra Kamboukos received Bachelors of Science Degrees in Psychology and Sociology from the University of La Verne, Greece in 1992 and a Masters of Arts in Developmental Psychology from Teachers College, Columbia University in 1995. Prior to entering the Ph.D. program in Clinical Psychology at the University of South Florida in 1998, Dr. Kamboukos worked on several research projects in developmental psychopathology at the New York State Psychiatric Institute/Columbia University.

While in the Ph.D. program at the University of South Florida, Dr. Kamboukos provided clinical services to children and families both in the Psychology Department's Psychological Services Center and community settings. Additionally, she was actively involved in research projects conducted at the university and in school settings. She has presented her research in national conferences and co-authored several publications. Dr. Kamboukos completed a one-year internship in child psychology at North Shore/Long Island Jewish Medical Center in New York in 2003.