

To the Graduate Council:

I am submitting herewith a dissertation written by Jonathan Wilson Grimes entitled "The Relationship of Parents' Parenting Style to the Television Viewing Amounts of Their Children." I have examined the final copy of this dissertation for form and content and recommend that it be accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy, with a major in Human Ecology.

Connie Steele
Connie Steele, Major Professor

We have read this dissertation
and recommend its acceptance:

Donald J. Perkins
Vern Mack
Jim Allen

Accepted for the Council:

Lee Minkal
Associate Vice Chancellor and
Dean of the Graduate School

THE RELATIONSHIP OF PARENTS' PARENTING
STYLE TO THE TELEVISION VIEWING AMOUNTS
OF THEIR CHILDREN

A Dissertation
Presented for the
Doctor of Philosophy
Degree
The University of Tennessee, Knoxville

Jonathan Wilson Grimes
August 1998

Copyright © Jonathan Wilson Grimes, 1998

All rights reserved

DEDICATION

This dissertation is dedicated to those who
have turned limited ability and unlimited potential into
something meaningful to others. This is my testament
to perseverance while maintaining grace.

“ . . . and if that bell rings, and I’m still standing there,
then I’m gonna know, for the first time in my life,
ya see, that I weren’t just another bum
from the neighborhood.” - Rocky Balboa

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

There are several people who were instrumental in my educational process. I would like to thank my Dissertation Committee Members, Connie Steele, Mick Nordquist, Jan Allen, and Donald Dickinson, for their time and attention to my educational pursuit. I would also like to thank all of the people involved with the Department of Child and Family Studies at The University of Tennessee, Knoxville. They taught me even when they didn't think they were teaching.

I would also like to thank the Department of Child and Family Studies, Department of Human Resource Development, and College of Human Ecology for providing me with assistantships enabling me to continue my studies.

Lastly, my family and friends have been a source of support through this process. My parents, David and Suzanne Grimes, have offered their encouragement and support from the start of this venture. My sister, Jane, for holding me to heights I wasn't always sure that I could reach. To Doug and Denise, who pushed my will by setting examples. To Penny and Zack, whose unconditional love reminded me during uncertain times. To my friends, who never treated me in any other way than the person I was when we met.

ABSTRACT

In this study, an attempt was made to relate the television viewing amounts of children and the parenting style of their parents. Parents of 23 children at a southeastern university reported on the household behaviors of their children and their own parenting style. Findings indicated that parenting style and viewing behaviors were not related in this group. A second function of the study was to validate further a parenting instrument using non-parents. Demographic variables held little influence in the parent sample and student sample. A discussion of the implications of the current findings calls to question the validity of the instruments and notion of parenting behavior.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER		PAGE
I.	INTRODUCTION	1
	Why Study Children's Viewing of Television?	1
II	REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	
	Theoretical perspective	8
	Children's Behavior in the Household	10
	The Displacement Hypothesis	12
	Measurement of Time Spent Viewing Television	13
	Previous Methodologies	13
	Television and Parenting Style	15
	Parenting Style	16
	Parental Control	18
	Age and Gender Differences	18
	Cultural Differences	18
	Ethnic Differences	19
	Measurement of Parenting Style	19
	Baumrind's Parenting Style Typology	21
	Criticism of Baumrind's Typology	23
	Ethnicity and Baumrind's Typology	23
	Gender and Baumrind's Typology	25
	Buri's Parental Authority Questionnaire	25
	Summary	29
	Research Questions	30
	Construct Definitions	30
III.	METHODS	
	Recruitment of Participants	32
	Instructor Contact	32
	Classroom Visits	33
	Measures	33
	Demographic Survey	33
	The Parental Authority Questionnaire	34
	Household Report of Time	35

IV.	RESULTS	
	Demographic Information	37
	The Parent Data	38
	Findings	38
	The Non-parent data	40
	Differences in Parenting Styles of Mothers and Fathers as Perceived by Non-Parent Students	42
	Differences in Reporting Between Males and Females	42
	Relationship of Parenting Style to Sample Characteristics	42
V.	DISCUSSION AND IMPLICATIONS	
	Conclusions	44
	Parent Issues	44
	Non-Parent Issues	50
	Implications	53
	Future Directions	54
	REFERENCES	59
	APPENDICES	69
	Appendix A (Tables)	70
	Appendix B (Instruments)	76
	VITA	86

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE		PAGE
1.	Demographic Characteristics of Parent and Non-parent Groups	71
2.	Correlations Between Parenting Style Scores and Children's TV Viewing Amounts (levels of significance in parentheses)	72
3.	Mean Amounts of Viewing and Levels of Significance for Boys and Girls	73
4.	Re-coded Variable Names and Amounts	73
5.	Relationship of Demographic Variables to Parenting Style and Children's Television Viewing Amounts	74
6.	Comparison of Means Using the Grimes and Steele (1998) Archival and Current Data of Parental Authority Questionnaire Non-parent Responses	74
7.	T-test Comparisons of Sample Scores Using Grimes and Steele's Findings and the Findings of Buri	75
8.	Relationship of Demographic Characteristics to Parenting Styles	75

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Television has taken a primary role in the socialization and education of children. Research continues to show that children watch in excess of 20 hours of television per week (Department of Education, 1994). Interestingly, parent roles have been limited to attempts to mediate, monitor, and reduce the amount of viewing by children (Abelman, 1986; Desmond, Hirsch, Singer, & Singer 1987; Eron, 1986; Jason, 1983; Jason & Klich, 1982; Weaver & Barbour, 1992).

Does a parent's parenting style relate to the amount of time their children spend viewing television? This question has only been peripherally addressed, even though much has been written regarding children and their television behaviors at home. The amount of children's television viewing and a parent's parenting style was investigated in this study to determine whether or not an association exists.

Why Study Children's Viewing of Television?

Several social changes make the study of television an important topic to examine. First, the presence of television in the home has become almost universal in our culture. According to 1996 statistics, 98 percent of the households in this country, roughly over 97 million homes, own at least one television (Farmagetti, 1998). Seventy percent of homes own two televisions, and one-third of all homes own three sets (Chen, 1994). Nielsen research (Farmagetti, 1998) found that 99% of the homes surveyed owned a color television set. However, only 38% of the homes owned a second television, in contrast with Chen's (1994) findings. Second, in the last 10 years, the amount of

television viewed per week has remained in excess of 20 hours for children and teens (Department of Education, 1994). According to recent Nielsen reports, children, ages 2-11 years, watch an average of almost 3 ½ hours per day. These amounts do not include the viewing of videotapes or video game play, although Nielsen reports found that 82% of the families surveyed owned a video cassette recorder (Farmagetti, 1998). Wartella, Heintz, Aidman, and Mazzearella (1990) in a study using participants from a small midwestern town found that nearly half of the homes containing a child between 6- and 12-years of age owned a video game system. Further information from the surveys found that the average home owned almost 28 videocassettes. Brown, Childers, Bauman and Koch (1990) in a study comparing media usage between gender and ethnic groups found that Black adolescents watched more television per day than White adolescents, and boys watched more per day than girls. White girls averaged the least amount of time with television (5.5 hours/day), while Black boys averaged the most (8 hours/day). Teens (ages 12-17) in a 1995 Nielsen report (Farmagetti, 1994), although not divided by race or gender in the findings, reported watching an average of 2.75 hours of television per day. More recent Nielsen reports suggested that teens are watching slightly less than two hours of television per day. However, these numbers may be misleading due to omissions in the Nielsen reporting of weekly viewing. For example, viewing behaviors on Saturday afternoons, Sundays before 8 pm, and weekdays before 10 am are not typically reported by Nielsen statisticians (Farmagetti, 1998). Men and women over the age of 18 watch an average of 3 hours 45 minutes and 4 hours 25 minutes per day, respectively (Monush, 1995), although the groups were not divided by ethnicity or further age subdivisions. St.

Peters, Fitch, Huston, Wright, and Eakins (1991), in a two-year, longitudinal study of families with 3- or 5-year-old children, found that parents set time restrictions on the amount of television viewed by their children about 25% of the time. Therefore, children might be watching as much or as little television as they desire. Despite the disparities in the exact number of hours, which is a major methodological hurdle in reporting accuracy, children and adolescents spend a large portion of their waking hours viewing television, and parents do not report extensive restriction of viewing.

Actual attention to the programs has been a topic worthy of consideration. The argument exists that children are not paying attention to programs when involved in other activities. If this is true, then actual viewing amounts may not reflect the attentional questions regarding time spent viewing. Anderson, Lorch, Field, Collins, and Nathan (1986) used a time-lapse recording method on a sample of 99 families, all of whom had young children. Findings suggested that children spent the largest amount of attention to television of all family members. Attention increased through the preschool years and leveled off in school-aged children, and then declined into the adulthood years.

The emergence of cable television has been another social phenomenon that demands the study of television effects. Two trends exemplify this change: the number of channels available and the number of subscribers. When cable television was first available about 20 years ago, there were about 25 channels available after subscription, and about 15% of families in the United States subscribed to cable services. Current data suggest that about two-thirds of all homes have cable subscriptions, with companies offering 60-100+ channels (Farmagetti, 1998). Another telling sign has been the fact that

the percentage of homes subscribing to cable services has increased every year since 1977 (Farmagetti, 1998). Therefore, cable television is becoming a common service in American culture.

Children may develop addictions to certain types of programming. Gathercoal (1995) linked the biological processes of endorphin activity with the exposure to media. Program content and viewing amounts influence neural pathways in the brain, which are developed to aid in the absorption of material that viewers find repetitive. Therefore, a child who watches several murders on television will have a neural pathway that allows that material to speed through the brain. One of the results of this phenomenon has been the "desensitization theory," which states that children are numbed to the effects of repeated violence (sexual content, etc.) on television (Silverblatt, 1995). Children are also able to experience events vicariously, which in an excited state after viewing provocative programming, might make typical daily routines seem boring or ordinary. Vicarious experience also offers new solutions to behavior that might not have been available prior to the viewed event. The implication of this argument was that children "learn" from the television viewing to behave violently, lie, steal, deceive, and commit other socially unacceptable behaviors. However, in fairness, Gathercoal's argument also supports the notion that children can learn acceptable behaviors if presented repetitive opportunities. Therefore, viewing material of any sort has the ability to shape brain pathways and create a physically addictive cycle through endorphin release, according to Gathercoal (1995).

Another moderating influence evident in society has been the change in family

structure and employment demands. Single mothers had an employment rate of almost 72% in 1996 (Department of Labor, 1998). Children are much more likely in today's culture to experience considerable time alone or without adult presence in a single-parent household, which deprives them of needed supervision from the working parent. Two-parent homes are now characterized by two working parents. Labor force statistics suggest that about nine out of ten fathers and seven out of ten mothers are in the labor force. Sixty-three percent of mothers in the labor force had a child under the age of two years according to the World Wide Web statistics from the Department of Labor (1998). Similar findings have shown this to be a trend. In the earlier part of this decade, almost 60% of working, married women had a child under the age of six (Gilbert, 1993; Lerner, 1994). As children grow older and no longer require direct supervision while a parent is away, children's viewing diets are not restricted in a way that would keep children from viewing inappropriate material. Brown et al. (1990) surveyed over 2,000 adolescents from ten different standard metropolitan statistical areas regarding their media usage. Mothers of those adolescents completed a questionnaire inquiring about their education, employment and rules regarding TV viewing. Maternal employment was not related to the amount of time that children spent watching television, but employed mothers had more difficulty keeping children from watching material that mothers found objectionable, such as crime shows, scary movies, and shows with sexual content. In the Brown et al. (1990) study, father presence in the home was positively related to increased rules regarding restriction of content and negatively related to the amount of television watched by adolescents.

Employment conditions may affect possible exposure to television. Crouter, MacDermid, McHale, and Perry-Jenkins (1990) studied 152 families with different employment conditions (two full-time parents, one FT and one PT, and single-earner). Parents reported on variables such as school competence, social competence, and learning problems of children. Parental monitoring ability was measured by combining information from child interviews, mother interviews of the importance of supervision, interviewer impressions, and comparisons of parent and child reports of child activities. Results suggested that less well-monitored boys, regardless of earner status, had significantly lower grades than well-monitored boys or girls, and less well-monitored girls. A plausible possibility suggested in this study is that children who are not monitored as closely may spend more time watching television than completing schoolwork.

Television influences on children, therefore, should be studied for five important reasons. First, children have access to more programming than ever before, with some cable companies exposing children to hundreds of channels. Second, children are unsupervised by parents for much of their viewing time (Lawrence & Wozniak, 1989; St. Peters et al., 1991). Third, children spend a great deal of time watching television, and devote more attention to the material than other family members devote to television viewing. Viewing has become children's most time-intensive leisure activity and occupies more time than formal schooling for some children (Department of Education, 1994; Silver, Florence, Rourke, & Lorimor, 1994). Parents have responded that they would wish their children watched less television (Miller, O'Connor, & Sirignano, 1995).

Fourth, biological processes offer evidence that humans can become physically addicted to material, and repetition of material has been hypothesized as leading to the "desensitization" of children to material viewed. Lastly, children may be more vulnerable to modeling effects from television especially when parental figures are absent.

This chapter has summarized the importance of television as a social force in our society. Research supports the notion that children have access to television, watch a consistent amount of television, and are able to learn and construct information from television. Evidence was also presented that suggested children lack parental supervision in many of their television experiences. How television may influence the thinking and behavior of children is founded on social learning theory– to be addressed in Chapter II.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Theoretical Perspective

Theoretically, the study of television viewing together with other behaviors of children in the home achieves added significance when viewed from a social learning perspective. Bandura (1969) pioneered studies that offered evidence demonstrating how subjects routinely learn by observation. Behavioral theorists, such as B. F. Skinner, were strong supporters of the notion that behaviors could only be learned through actual practice. However, Bandura's findings that people could vicariously learn have provided a valuable rationale to the importance of an observation-based medium. Imitation of models becomes the central issue in the debate over television viewing, especially when considering violent and sexually explicit programming (Federal Communications Commission, 1995). Bandura suggested that children are more likely to imitate behavior of models who are regarded as: 1) prestigious, 2) similar to themselves, and 3) rewarded for their behavior. Children are also likely to imitate behavior of models of the same gender (Thomas, 1992).

Several research studies have relied on a social learning perspective in their investigation of the influence of television on children. Eron (1982) used a social learning perspective when suggesting a cyclical relationship between intellectual functioning, aggression, and television viewing. Eron found, in a 10-year longitudinal study following third graders through adolescence, that low academic competence, as measured by scores on the California Test of Mental Maturity and the Wide Range

Achievement Test, was related to both television viewing and aggression, but could not account completely for the relationship. Children with low academic achievement were found to identify more strongly with aggressive characters on TV and were more apt to believe that the violence portrayed on television was real. Huesmann and Eron (1984) found that children who were doing poorly in school watched more television; boys were especially vulnerable to this cycle.

Several other studies have used a social learning perspective to address the question of the effects of television on behavior. Works dating back over twenty years have offered the observation that watching violence leads to violence in children (Kniveton, 1974). Hodapp (1977) found evidence that children (ages 5.5-6.5) were able to imitate problem-solving strategies viewed on television. Thomas and Drabman (1978), using a sample of 88 3rd and 5th graders, showed that children who viewed a violent film clip chose more violent ways subsequently to solve problems than children who viewed a non-violent program. Singer and Singer (1981) noted that cartoons seemed tied to more aggressive behavior in children and more violent play styles, especially with young children. Much of the Singers' subsequent work offered support for the prediction that children's violent behaviors would increase after watching violent programs. Huesmann and Eron (1984) continued to offer support to the television-violence connection with a three-year longitudinal study of 800 primary school children. They reported that children who watched violent programming and identified with violent characters were more likely to fantasize about violence, and boys were especially vulnerable to these behaviors. Later work by Eron and Huesmann (1987) concluded that violence viewed at age eight

was correlated with aggression at age 19. Evidence seems to support the social learning link between violent television and subsequent aggression.

Television content has remained a much-argued issue. Lazar (1994) eloquently stated, "Whether children watch primarily for education or entertainment they are always actively engaged in a process of learning and making sense of what they see by using their social experience to interpret television images" (p. 9). Although a review of the effects of television content (i.e., violence) is not within the scope or purpose of this paper, Singer and Singer's (1983) review of television effects proclaims the need for monitoring of television programming for young children. Gunter (1994), Felson (1996), and Silverblatt (1995) have also written clear reviews to help the reader decipher the plethora of research on the impact of media violence on children's behavioral responses to viewing television.

Children's Behavior in the Household

Measuring the time a child spends in total household activities including television viewing will be important if we are to get a clear idea of the varied influences upon viewing behavior. In-home activities can be conceptualized in this study as leisure activities or maintenance activities. Maintenance activities involve behaviors that are self-care or home-care oriented. For example, sleeping, bathing, eating, and household chores would qualify as maintenance activities. Leisure activities are related to areas of interest for the child. The different types of play, music and social activity, and media behavior would be examples of leisure activities.

Home maintenance by children has been a topic studied by other researchers.

Lawrence and Wozniak (1987) gathered information from more than 1000 parents regarding the household activities of their children. Children were selected from 10 different states, ranged between 6-17 years of age, and came from two-parent homes. Parents completed retrospective reports using an interview process and a time chart of their child's activities in the household. Girls spent a significantly greater amount of time involved in housework than did boys. Older children spent significantly more time completing housework than did younger children. Duckett, Raffaelli, and Richards (1989) also found that girls spent a significantly greater amount of time doing housework than did boys. Age trends were similar to Lawrence and Wozniak's study (1987). A similar finding from both studies saw housework amounts increase during the summer months. The Duckett et al. (1989) study used an experiential sampling technique in which respondents were given an electronic pager and instructed to write down their current activity when they were paged.

Leisure activities have also received attention in the literature, with a clear finding being the prevalence of television as a major leisure activity. Watching television was the activity reported with the greatest frequency in a study investigating correlations between viewing and reading ability (Neuman, 1988). Miller et al. (1995) conducted family interviews with 180 families of diverse ethnicity. Parents reported that television was the most frequent way that children spent their leisure time. Ironically, the only behavior that parents indicated their wish for their children to engage in less frequently was television viewing. Mauldin and Meeks (1990) found that the leisure activities of the 410 children (ages 3-17) in their study occupied an average of six hours per day for males and 5.25

hours per day for females during the weekdays. On weekends, males spent almost 10 hours per day engaged in leisure activities while females spent slightly more than eight hours per day. Television viewing was the major activity of leisure time for both males and females. Males and females watched similar amounts during the week, but the amount of television viewing of males on the weekend exceeded the amount of viewing for females. DuRant, Baranowski, Johnson, and Thompson (1994) found that television watching in 3- and 4-year-olds was weakly negatively correlated with physical activity levels. Consistent evidence has identified television as a major influence on children's use of their time.

The Displacement Hypothesis

A belief has been held that time spent watching television subtracts from the time a person could spend doing other more creative or educational activities. This argument has been referred to as the displacement hypothesis. One of the critical pieces of research was conducted by Neuman (1988) who studied the academic progress and television behavior of children from nine different states across the country. Correlational information showed that children who spent between 2-4 hours per day watching television had no significant drop-offs in reading scores. Children who watched for more than four hours per day showed a correlational trend in a negative direction, which increasingly worsened as the student spent more time with television.

Other perspectives refute the importance of the displacement hypothesis. Mutz, Roberts, and van Vuuren (1993) suggested that assumptions about the attention spent on television while engaged in other activities rendered the displacement perspective

innocuous. Other criticisms of the assumptions regarding the displacement hypothesis call to question the value of that perspective. For example, one of the main suggestions for the relatively benign effect of television as a displacement factor cited the ability of humans, as they mature, to handle simultaneously the requirements of more than one activity that requires attention. Therefore, the displacement hypothesis has value as a concept, but several assumptions that are made about displacement cannot be ignored in the discussion of a displacement perspective.

Measurement of Time Spent Viewing Television

Previous Methodologies

Much of the television research has depended on parental reports of children's television viewing behaviors. Many studies have relied on parent interviews (Crouter et al., 1990; Miller et al., 1995), parent viewing logs (Jason, Johnson, & Jurs, 1993; Singer, Singer, Desmond, Hirsch, & Nicol, 1988; Singer, Singer, & Rapaczynski, 1984; St. Peters et al., 1991; and Zuckerman, Singer, & Singer, 1980), parent reports of child behavior (Jason, 1983; Wartella et al., 1990), or combinations of the methods (Desmond et al., 1987). A different study (DuRant et al., 1994) used the observation of trained home researchers to measure the amount of time children spent with television. Few studies have used children as reporters of their own behavior (Mauldin & Meeks, 1990; Signorelli & Lears, 1992). Parents have usually been the main source of information regarding their children's television habits.

A major methodological concern has been the contention that parents are not reliable reporters of children's viewing behavior. Research findings support this

assertion. Lawrence and Wozniak (1989) found that parents co-view television about 50% of the time with their children. St. Peters et al. (1991) reviewed studies that suggested parents co-viewed 50-70% of the child's viewing time. However, Field (as cited in St. Peters et al., 1991) found that while children co-viewed programs 85% of the viewing time, 62% of the co-viewing was done with an older sibling and not a parent. McLeod, Fitzpatrick, Glynn, and Fallis (as cited in St. Peters et al., 1991) suggested that parents overestimated the amount of time they co-viewed with children. The St. Peters et al. (1991) study found that children were watching adult programming, such as news programs, comedies, dramas, action programs, and variety/game shows, when co-viewing with a parent or older sibling. The amount of time spent viewing alone and co-viewing varied across type of program. This finding was important because it supported the idea that children watch adult programs when they were with adults, but tended to watch children's programming when viewing alone. However, this does not mean that children will not watch adult programs when viewing alone. This evidence suggests that children view less children's programming when co-viewing with a sibling or parent. What we gather from this information is that parents may have limited information regarding children's viewing diets, unless the child watches with the parent. Parent reports, despite the concerns that surround the method, may still be the most accurate measures to report children's viewing of television until children are able to answer accurately regarding the amount of time spent watching specific television programs.

In recent years, a relatively popular consideration in the efforts to evaluate television has been the consideration of monitoring. Crouter et al., (1990) offered a

definition of monitoring as "conscientious supervision of the child, an index of parental interest, and a relationship." Other definitions of monitoring seem to center around the notion of parental knowledge of child behaviors. The arena of television behavior could be argued to fall within this realm. Varied methods to assess television monitoring (i.e., knowledge regarding child's behavior) have been used in the studies mentioned previously, including parent reports, child reports, videotaped observation, and metering (using an electronic device to track the hours of time where the television was in use).

Television and Parenting Style

Very few studies considering the construct of parenting style as a mediating factor in children's television behavior have been conducted. Abelman (1986) studied the connection between parental disciplinary style and child viewing behaviors (awareness of pro-social portrayals on TV) with a group of 286 mothers and their school-aged children (4th-5th graders). Disciplinary styles were coded based on parent responses to hypothetical situations. For example, a positive situation would include the question posed to the parent: "Suppose (name of child) does something really nice for you to show you that he/she loves you. What would you do?" A negative situation would have a question posed in this way: "Suppose (name of child) lies to you and you find out. What would you do?" Abelman found that parents using harsh methods, such as physical punishment, loss of privileges or objects, or coercive behavior (defined as "sensitizing" in his work) had children who were less affected by pro-social television, and more affected by anti-social portrayals on programs. Abelman (1991) replicated these findings with a sample of 969 fourth-graders with different educational abilities (gifted, learning

disabled, and emotionally disturbed).

Desmond et al., (1987) studied disciplinary styles, mediation attempts and child aggression with 66 children between the ages of five and eight years. Disciplinary style consisted of constructs called "power assertion" and "love withdrawal" and were derived from parent reports of typical disciplinary responses to situations. Mediation attempts polarized parent communication into two types: discussion and prescription. The characteristic of the discussion pole was tapped when parents used explanation with the child or pointed out corrective behavior. Prescriptive examples included moral judgements about the child and physical attempts at discipline. Therefore, style referred to the way the parent supposed they would have handled an incident. Findings suggested that power assertiveness was more related to aggression than love withdrawal in both boys and girls. Love withdrawal was a more common occurrence with girls but not correlated with aggression. However, love withdrawal was correlated with aggression in boys. Therefore, evidence does exist to suggest that the way in which parents socialize their children has an effect on the child's behavior (Seydlitz, 1991). It is this relationship of "parenting style" to children's behavior(s) in viewing television that is a focus of this study.

Parenting Style

Parenting style has been described as a process that combines parental control and support to socialize the child (Peterson & Rollins, 1987). According to Baumrind (1978), "socialization is an adult-oriented process by which the young person through education, training, and imitation acquires his culture as well as the habits and values congruent with

adaptation to that culture" (p. 239). This unidirectional viewpoint places the responsibility on the parents as socializers of children. Children are the recipients of socialization, whether or not parents intentionally model for children or model through inaction. Later work by Baumrind (1994) offered a more bidirectional view of interaction between parent and child. Parenting style was not only thought to affect the way the parent interacted to the parent, but also the way the child interacted with the parent. Baumrind posited that the parenting a child received was also likely to be passed on to generations afterward. Darling and Steinberg (1993) also viewed this relationship as mutualistic, but they referred to parenting style as a method by which the parent handles situations and not as the socialization between parent and child.

After reviewing literature regarding parenting style, some of the current thinking would suggest that parents use different styles as a reaction to different situations (Darling & Steinberg, 1993; Smetana, 1994; Smith, 1988). Parents may use a combination of several styles in their overall approach to parenting. This conceptualization creates a different construct to the original parenting style thinking. Parents may, therefore, use aspects of parenting considered authoritative and authoritarian, for example, in their parenting repertoire.

Parental authority has been thought to be a major component of the socialization process of children. Parenting styles differ in two important ways: the amount of nurturance in child-rearing interactions and the amount of parental control over the child's activities and behavior (Moore, 1992). Parental control acts as a key point in the discussion of children and viewing amounts. The central question becomes: Are parents

exerting any influence over how much television their children watch?

Parental Control

“Parental control” has been a phrase that has suffered from multiple meanings in the literature (Stice & Barrera, 1995). Unfortunately, results are often reported without specifically defining what the authors are calling “parental control.” Definitions of parental control have relied on actual child compliance behavior (McLaughlin, 1983). Other authors have used “control” to refer to discipline (Smith & Krohn, 1995; Lee, 1984). Attempts to influence child behavior have been classified as control methods (deMan, Labreche-Gauthier, & LeDuc, 1991; Ellis & Petersen, 1992; Rollins & Thomas, 1979; Rothschild & Morgan, 1987). These definitions have helped to make the concept of parental control a difficult one to use across situations.

Age and Gender Differences

The effects of control are varied across age and gender. Seydlitz (1991) found that parental control was more effective in delinquency prevention for mid-adolescent males (ages 13-16), while control for females was a better deterrent during later adolescence (ages 15-17). Control, along with other qualities, helps the child develop self-esteem, responsibility, scholastic competence, and social competence. As children enter adolescence, however, that same amount of control can have a negative influence on those outcomes.

Cultural Differences

Control also varies by culture. Ellis and Peterson (1992) examined control in a cross-cultural context. They found that people who live in cultures where conformity has

a high value tended to use more control, both coercive and non-coercive. Cultures that valued self-reliance and autonomy tended to avoid severe and frequent discipline of any kind.

Ethnic Differences

Smith and Krohn (1995) studied delinquency across racially diverse (African-American, Hispanic, Caucasian) groups in New York public schools. Their sample was heavily weighted with high-risk males. Lack of parental control was a significant factor in delinquency for both African-American and Caucasian adolescents, but was not a significant factor in the delinquency of Hispanic adolescents.

What we can gather from this research is that no singular definition of parental control dominates the literature. However, for the purposes of conceptualization, the definition of parental control forwarded by Amato (1989) offers some assistance in grasping the concept. Amato suggested that control was "reflected in the number of decisions parents make, the amount of supervision they exercise, and the number of rules they hold for their children." Therefore, control does not refer to child compliance (although child compliance may be a measurable outcome), nor does it refer to strict discipline (since not all discipline must be strict to be effective). Control refers to the attempts by the parents to set up guidelines for a child's behavior.

Measurement of Parenting Style

Parental control has been measured by different reporters and different methods. Adolescents have been the sole reporters of parental control in several studies (Barber, Olsen, & Shagle, 1994; deMan, 1987; deMan, 1990; deMan et al., 1991; deMan, Leduc,

& Labreche-Gauthier, 1992; Kelly & Goodwin, 1983; Lau & Cheung, 1987; Lee, 1984; Parish & McCluskey, 1992; Rothschild & Morgan, 1987; Stice & Barrera, 1995; Taylor, Casten, & Flickenger, 1993). The combination of parent and child reports has been less prevalent (Amato, 1989; Smetana, 1995; Smith & Krohn, 1995). One possible explanation for this trend could be the ease of information gathering. For example, administering surveys in a school setting allows the researcher to increase the probability that instructions were standardized. Administration of materials in a home setting adds the possibility of nonrandom error to the data. School settings also allow researchers to assume that students will respond more honestly, instead of the possible pressure participants might feel when completing a survey in the home setting. Adolescents seem to be the main reporters on the amount of control exercised by parents, and survey methodology seems to be the method of choice to gather information on behavior.

Different methods of data collection have been used with subjects.

Questionnaires and surveys were the only measures given to adolescents in several of the reviewed studies (Barber et al., 1994; deMan, 1987; deMan, 1990; deMan et al., 1991; deMan et al., 1992; Kelly & Goodwin, 1983; Lau & Cheung, 1987; Parish & McCluskey, 1992; Rothschild & Morgan, 1987; Stice & Barrera, 1995; Taylor et al., 1993). A combination of adolescent surveys and interviews was another method of gathering information (Lee, 1984). Combinations of parent and adolescent report included surveys and interview methods (Amato, 1989). Psychological assessment was used as the sole method in one of the studies (Hightower, 1990), and criminal activity was used as a sole method in another of the studies (Seydlitz, 1991). Videotaped interaction between parent

and child was the method in one study (McLaughlin, 1983).

Baumrind's Parenting Style Typology

Several studies, which are discussed below, have used the phrase "parenting style" in the literature. However, it may be argued that the most well-known conceptualization of parenting style may belong to Diana Baumrind and her use of the authoritarian, authoritative, and permissive parenting styles. Three central reasons exist for using Baumrind's typology in this study. First, Baumrind's work has historical significance. Her typologies (Baumrind, 1970; Baumrind, 1971) have been in existence for nearly thirty years. Second, research continues to show that her typologies have significance in several areas of child outcomes, such as self-esteem, social competence, and scholastic competence. Baumrind's work also has range, meaning that her styles are useful with children and adolescents. Lastly, Baumrind's paradigm shares a commonality with many other typologies of "parenting style." Many conceptions of parenting style have used the combination of nurturance and control, although the concepts may be referred to in a different manner. For example, Bordin (1992) used a matrix of autonomy-control and hostility-love to distinguish between the types of parenting. Kelly and Goodwin (1983) defined the terms "autocratic, democratic, and permissive" to distinguish between styles of parental control. Rollins and Thomas (Burr, Hill, Nye & Reiss, 1979), in their chapter of theories about the family, reviewed many of the parent socialization theories. Symond's (1939) theory, as cited in the Rollins and Thomas chapter, suggested that parenting involves an interaction of variables termed acceptance-rejection and dominance-submission. Schaefer's (1965) work used the variables acceptance-rejection,

firm control-lax control, and psychological autonomy-psychological control to describe parents. Baumrind's work (1971) used the concepts of nurturance and control to differentiate the socialization styles of parents. Control and warmth (acceptance) were used as the primary variables of parenting style in the Miller, Cowan, Cowan, Hetherington, and Clingempeel (1993) study. Therefore, Baumrind's construct has endured scientific study for several years and includes the basic components present in others' conceptualizations of parenting style.

Measurement of parenting style has frequently been by use of Baumrind's methodology of extensive child observation and parent interviewing. Baumrind determined parenting style by a three-month observation of the child in natural and laboratory settings, home observations, and in-depth interviews with the parent (Baumrind, 1970). Children who demonstrated specific behavioral characteristics had parents who expressed certain characteristics. After using a correlational technique, Baumrind developed the terms "authoritarian," "authoritative," and "permissive" to describe these parenting styles. Baumrind (1978) asserted that authoritarian parents "value obedience as a virtue and favor punitive, forceful measures to curb self-will at points where the child's actions or beliefs conflict with what the parent believes is the right conduct" (p. 244). Authoritative parents are thought to be more democratic in nature. Parents allow children to express their objections and concerns and are willing to make changes within reason. Parents temper their decisions with fairness without giving the child complete control. Permissive parenting is characterized by a lack of restrictions on the child. The child may make many of the household decisions, while the parents use

a non-directive style of discipline. The combination of parental support and control, known as parenting style, has been shown to affect the social competence, scholastic competence, at-risk behavior, and self-esteem of children and adolescents (Baumrind, 1978, 1991; Buri, 1989; Buri, Louiselle, Misukanis, & Mueller, 1988; Dornbush, Ritter, Leiderman, Roberts, & Fraleigh, 1987; Johnson, Shulman, & Collins, 1991; Moore, 1992; Pardeck & Pardeck, 1990; Vacha & McLaughlin, 1992).

Criticisms of Baumrind's Typology

An accurate picture of Baumrind's parenting style typology would not be complete without addressing the criticisms and shortcomings of the construct. Smith (1988) and Smetana (1994) both suggested that parents use different control in different situations arguing against the singularity of the construct. For example, a parent might use a strict, authoritarian style in issues of safety. Conversely, the same parent might use a lax, permissive style for television rules.

Ethnicity and Baumrind's Typology

Another one of the major criticisms cited in the research refers to ethnicity. It has been argued that the parenting style typology has been an ethnocentric measure of parenting style. Chao (1994), in a study comparing child-rearing responses from 50 mothers from Taiwan and 50 European-American mothers, argued that one of the best predictors of school achievement for Asian children was authoritarian parenting. Chao contended that "authoritarianism" was not synonymous with "controlling" as it was in the American sample used by Baumrind. Rather, authoritarian parents see their purpose in parenting as "training" their child, and strict discipline and control are perceived as

integral parts of that training (Lin & Fu, 1990). In fact, many Asian students when faced with American standards tended to rate their parents low on authoritativeness, which has been found to be the only style positively correlated with school performance in studies of American children. Ross (1984) investigated the fit of Baumrind's classifications to Australian parents by surveying 411 respondents in an Australian town. Parents responded to hypothetical situations that varied by age of child, gender of child, gender of parent, behavior intensity, and parental response. These variables were found to discriminate between parenting styles in previous research cited by Ross. However, these variables showed no discriminating power in Ross' (1984) study. Findings suggested that Australian parenting styles were slightly different from American styles and could not be considered similar using Baumrind's typology.

Although the Dornbush et al. (1987) study showed similarity among ethnic groups for parenting styles, other research has shown the parenting style typology of Baumrind to be ethnocentric. Baumrind (1972) completed an observational study of Black children and White children in a nursery school. Although limited by a small number of subjects (N=9), Baumrind found that parents of Black children tended to be more authoritarian, while parents of White children were more authoritative. She contended that Black parents did not encourage individuality and independence, instead encouraging conformity. McAdoo (1986) studied Black fathers and found support for Baumrind's earlier conclusions. However, despite an authoritarian parenting style, Black girls tended to develop an independence and comfort in novel situations. It seems that social norms play a role in the development of Black children, not necessarily dependent on or related

to parenting style.

Gender and Baumrind's Typology

Gender differences continue to be an interesting topic in critiques of Baumrind's work. The concern exists that parenting styles seem to affect boys and girls differently. For example, authoritarian parenting seems more detrimental to the decision-making ability of girls than of boys (Ferrari & Olivette, 1993). Girls from authoritarian homes had much more difficulty making decisions and were more likely to engage in procrastination. Hein and Lewko (1994) found that girls from authoritative homes were more scholastically encouraged than boys from authoritative homes. According to the authors, girls benefit from the gains in self-esteem, while boys may benefit from the more strict concern with achievement that is usually found in more authoritarian households.

Despite these challenges and criticisms of Baumrind's conclusions, her conceptualization of parenting styles as relating to children's behaviors has continued in the literature. Her work has persevered across time.

Buri's Parental Authority Questionnaire (PAQ)

In 1987, Dornbush et al. developed an interview measure for use with adolescents, which was remarkable because child reports had not been typically considered as a method to measure parenting style. However, this measure was criticized by Buri (1991) because each parent was not considered as a separate measurement, the reliability of measurements was poor, and the report was based on academic content.

In order to create an instrument that could measure various characteristics of parenting style, Buri (1991) developed the Parenting Authority Questionnaire (PAQ).

The PAQ is a 30-item, Likert-style questionnaire based on Baumrind's definitions of various parenting types (Buri, 1989). One of the unique strengths of Buri's (1991) Parental Authority Questionnaire appeared to be the conceptualization of individual parents as using varied amounts of the three major parenting styles defined by Baumrind. Responses are made on a five-point scale, and scores for each parent can range from 10-50 on each construct of authoritativeness, authoritarianism, and permissiveness. Higher scores mean greater trait presence. Individual items were drawn by Buri (1991) from a larger pool of items derived from descriptions of authoritarian, authoritative, and permissive parenting prototypes proposed by Baumrind, and subjected to a Q-sort inclusion criteria with 95% inter-rater agreement. Twenty-one raters (professionals in the fields of psychology, education, sociology, and social work) were used to categorize the Buri PAQ items. A sample item reads, "As I was growing up, my mother allowed me to decide most things for myself without a lot of direction from her." The PAQ has three different forms (self-report, report of spouse, and parent report). Items differ only by referent. For example, the item mentioned above would read "my father allowed me to decide . . ." for the child report of father's parenting style.

Reliability and validity checks were conducted for the Parental Authority Questionnaire. Test-retest reliability was conducted using the PAQ scores of 61 undergraduate, psychology students over a two-week period, so that the stability of the measure and vulnerability to the bias of maturity could be determined. The lowest test-retest correlation over the two-week period was .77 for father's permissiveness. Buri (1991) had 185 introductory, psychology students complete the PAQ to test internal

consistency. Internal consistency reliability measurements addressed the question of how each item related to the PAQ's total score. Cronbach alpha values were obtained for each subscale by the responding parent. Fathers' permissiveness was again the lowest score with a Cronbach's alpha of .74. The test-retest and internal consistency reliability scores provided evidence that the effects of random error were not enough to bias significantly the results (Carmines & Zeller, 1979).

Buri (1991) responded to concerns of validity for the PAQ by distributing the PAQ to 127 undergraduate, psychology students. Discriminant-related validity addresses the issue of items distinguishing people as different. The scores for items that assessed authoritarianism were inversely related to authoritativeness and permissiveness for both mothers and fathers. Grimes and Steele (1998) replicated these findings in their validation study of the PAQ. Permissiveness and authoritativeness were inversely related to authoritarianism for both mothers or fathers. Ferrari and Olivette (1994) used the PAQ in a study of 81 female, undergraduate students in a study of procrastination, and replicated the findings of Buri (1991) regarding the parenting typology directions.

Smetana (1995), in a study of 6th, 8th, and 10th graders and their parents, used the adolescent and parent versions of Buri's PAQ. However, Smetana used a method of categorization of PAQ scores to determine parenting style. Her methodology involved determining z-scores for the styles, and then requiring a z-score to be positive in number and at least 0.5 above the next closest score. She was able to categorize 84% of her sample with this methodology. Correlations showed that parent scores of permissiveness were negatively correlated with authoritarianism and authoritativeness at the .001 alpha

level. Adolescent reports of parenting showed negative correlations between permissiveness and authoritarianism ($\alpha=.001$), and permissiveness and authoritativeness ($\alpha=.01$). Authoritarianism was negatively correlated to authoritativeness ($\alpha=.001$). Furthermore, parent and adolescent reports of each style were correlated. Parent and adolescent reports of permissiveness were positively correlated ($\alpha=.01$), as were their reports of authoritativeness ($\alpha=.01$) and authoritarianism ($\alpha=.001$). Therefore, the PAQ has been supported as measuring three distinct constructs modeled after Baumrind's authoritarian, permissive, and authoritative parenting styles. Multiple informants are reporting similar findings regarding parenting style constructs, providing evidence of the PAQ's construct validity.

Although the constructs measuring the different parenting styles show validity, samples may respond differently. In a comparison between the findings of Grimes and Steele (1998), Brassington (1994), and Buri (1991), it was found that the means for the PAQ scales were significantly different across studies (Grimes & Steele, 1998). Response biases were measured using the Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale in the Buri (1991) study. High correlations between the Marlowe-Crowne Scale and the PAQ might suggest that subjects were intentionally answering in a way considered by the respondent to be most "socially desirable" and not necessarily an accurate description of one's experiences. However, no statistically significant relationships existed between social desirability and the PAQ subscales in the Buri (1991) study, which leads to the assumption that the PAQ was not vulnerable to social-desirability biases.

Other studies have used the PAQ to measure parenting style, although without as

much explanation of rationale as previously mentioned studies. Brassington (1994) used the PAQ in a study of insomnia, where sleep habits of college students were correlated with adolescent reports of parenting style using the PAQ. Flett, Hewitt, and Singer (1995) correlated perfectionism with 100 undergraduate, adolescent reports of parenting style using the PAQ. Although these studies do not explore the rationale for using the PAQ, one can assume that the authors believed that the PAQ would successfully discern the different parenting styles.

Summary

From the review of the literature mentioned in this chapter, we can draw some conclusions for the direction of this study. First, parenting style has been shown to have an important role in the growth and development of children. Second, parenting style seems to be culturally based. Findings summarized above suggest that Asian and Australian parents use styles that would be considered culturally different from the American context. Third, no studies were found that suggest that parental control of their child's television behaviors relates to their parenting style. Therefore, this research may bridge a gap between these two constructs. Fourth, although Baumrind's typology provides the specific guideline, most conceptualizations of parental style involve a combination of degrees of support and control. Finally, much of the measurement of parenting style has been done using adolescents as reporters of parent behavior. Although these reports have a valid place in information gathering, the construction and validation of Buri's Parental Authority Questionnaire provides opportunity for analysis of varied family members' perceptions of parenting behaviors by use of Buri's Parental Authority

Questionnaire.

Research Questions

This study explored four questions:

Question #1. Our main research question investigated the relationship between television and parenting style. The following null hypothesis was investigated with the sample: Parents' parenting styles have no relationship to their children's television viewing. Using the null hypothesis allowed us to reduce the probability of the Type II error, which suggests that factors are not related when they really are (Huck & Cormier, 1996).

Question #2. If there is no relationship between parenting style and amounts of children's television viewing, are demographics of the sample influencing this investigation?

Question #3. How do the findings of our non-parent group compare with the findings from previously published studies that used the Parental Authority Questionnaire?

Question #4. Do demographic factors of the non-parent sample influence findings using the PAQ?

Question #5. How was our sample altered when a categorization of parenting style used by Smetana (1995) was explored?

Construct Definitions

The constructs of children and television are specifically defined for this study:

Television usage refers to the viewing of commercial television programming and videotapes. Children may use the television for other purposes (for example, video

games), but time spent viewing commercial television is the variable of interest for this study.

Children are defined as subjects between the ages of 4 to 16 years. However, only parents of children within a convenience sample at a university were used for this study.

Parents are defined as those participants who chose to fill out the parent questionnaires indicating that the information regarded a child of at least four years of age.

Non-parents are defined as students who filled out the non-parent questionnaires indicating that they did not have a child or that their only child was under four years of age.

Parenting style, as mentioned above, refers to the socialization style of the responding parent. Baumrind developed the authoritarian, authoritative, and permissive typology that was used in this study, but several forms of Buri's Parental Authority Questionnaire (1991) assessed the use of parenting styles by parents and non-parents in the convenience sample.

CHAPTER III

METHODS

The goals for the study were to gather information on the parenting styles used by parents and the parents' perception of how children spend their time in the household. Non-parent perceptions of the parenting they received were also studied. Demographic information about the samples could also help clarify the parent and child characteristics that might affect the variables of interest.

Recruitment of Participants

All participants were recruited from undergraduate and graduate classes in the day and evening sections at a university in the southeastern United States.

Instructor Contact

Instructors were contacted by phone or electronic mail and asked if the principal investigator could visit their classes to recruit participants from each class. Initial information about class times and instructors was taken from the class schedule books published by the university every semester. Instructors from several departments such as English, Sociology, Child and Family Studies, Religious Studies, Social Work, Sociology, Health and Leisure Sciences, Business, Statistics, Mathematics, and Human Resource Development were telephoned by the principal investigator describing the purpose of the project and the requirements of students. Some instructors were sent electronic mail in lieu of telephone contact. Twenty-eight instructors were contacted and 23 agreed to allow the principal investigator access to their classrooms. Four of those 23 classes were not visited due to scheduling difficulties. Three instructors denied access to

their classes, and two instructors required departmental review in their college so those classes were not visited. Nineteen instructors provided access to 25 classes (as some instructors allowed access to more than one of the classes they taught).

Classroom Visits

When consent from instructors was received, classrooms were visited by the principal investigator. Packets were distributed to all students present in the class after a brief explanation of the study. Parent and non-parent versions of the questionnaires were given to students in one packet. Students decided which packet to complete, if they agreed to participate. They were instructed to fill out the questionnaires anonymously and to return the packet to the primary researcher using either the campus mail system or regular mail. Respondents were members of either non-parent/student or parent/student groups. Table 1* includes all respondents' demographics.

Measures

The packet of materials contained a consent letter that described the purpose of the study, instructions to students for choice of questionnaires, and method for return of the questionnaires.

Demographic Survey

All participants (parent or non-parent) were asked to complete a demographic questionnaire. The only difference in the parent and non-parent versions was that the parent version requested that a parent report the gender and age of his/her child, while the non-parent version asked the respondent to provide a report of the age and gender of the

*All tables may be found in Appendix A.

respondent's parent who had been more involved in the respondent's upbringing. The demographic questionnaire was constructed with attention to previous findings regarding parenting style.

We were also interested in family structure to see if children from different structures received different parenting as was found in the Kurdek and Fine (1993) study. We inquired about family income in response to McLeod, Kruttschnitt, and Dornfeld's (1994) study that indicated how income might relate to parenting. Other variables such as the number of children in the family (parent version) and the religious affiliation of the family (both versions) were included to begin to investigate these factors.

The Parental Authority Questionnaire

Buri's (1989) Parental Authority Questionnaire, based on Baumrind's definitions of various parenting types, conceptualizes parents as having varied amounts of the three major parenting styles defined by Baumrind. Thirty statements (10 for each parenting style) regard parenting behaviors rated on a five-point, Likert-style scale. PAQ scores range from 10-50 on each construct of authoritativeness, authoritarianism, and permissiveness as adapted from Baumrind's theoretical typology (1970). Higher scores mean greater trait presence. Individual items were drawn by Buri (1991) from a larger pool of items derived from descriptions of authoritarian, authoritative, and permissive parenting, and subjected to a Q-sort inclusion criteria of 95% inter-rater agreement. Twenty-one raters (professionals in the fields of psychology, education, sociology, and social work) were used to categorize the Buri PAQ items. The PAQ was selected for this study to measure each parenting style in a continuous format.

Three versions of the Parental Authority Questionnaire were employed for this study. Parents filled out an adapted version of the Parental Authority Questionnaire (PAQ) designed to assess their own perspective on parenting using the Baumrind typology of parenting. The modification made to the PAQ for parents regarded the time perspective in the opening phrase. For example, we replaced the phrase "while my child was growing up" in Buri's (1991) original version since many parents are still rearing their children. The phrase originally read, "As my child was growing up, I got very upset if any of my children disagreed with me." We eliminated the phrase leaving the original statement. An example of the modified version was "I get very upset if any of my children try to disagree with me." Therefore, we attempted to make the statements more active and current than the original version. Non-parent students were asked to determine which parent was more involved in their upbringing and to fill out a Parental Authority Questionnaire (report of mother or father) regarding that parent's rearing practices.**

Household Report of Time

Parents were asked to determine which parent had more knowledge of their child's daily activities, and then asked to complete an assessment of the time spent by the child in the home engaged in varied household activities. Television viewing behaviors were masked within a list of household activities to increase the likelihood that parents would respond honestly and not only as might seem to be socially desirable, a characteristic often found in parent reports.

Therefore, our primary interests were obtaining reports from parents about their

**See Appendix B for copies of instruments.

parenting style and about the behaviors of their children. However, non-parent participants were included in the study's design in order to include all members of a class if they desired to participate. It was also our intention to validate further the Buri instrument after obtaining results (Grimes & Steele, 1998) that included significantly different means from non-parents than Buri's (1991) sample of non-parents.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

Demographic Information

The demographic characteristics of the parent sample are summarized in Table 1. Means of demographic frequencies were used for the continuous data, and modes of demographic frequencies were used for the categorical data. Parent respondents were predominantly White, Baptist, and reared in a first-marriage, two-parent home with an income of less than \$50,000. An equal number of parents in the sample were high school or college educated. The average age of parents responding was 34.69 years of age, and the average age of the child they described was 9.94 years of age.

The demographic characteristics of the non-parent sample are also summarized in Table 1, with means reported for the continuous data and modes listed for the categorical data. Non-parent were White, Baptist, and reared in a two-parent home with an income of more than \$50,000. The modal categorization for non-parents' parents was a high-school education. The average age of non-parent respondents was 24.45 years of age and the average age of the parent on which they reported was 50.84 years of age. This non-parent sample considered mothers as having more influence on the child's upbringing than the father.

There were three criteria for responses that could be, in this study's design, included in the parent data. First, the child on which the parent reported must have been between the ages of 4 and 16 years of age. The second criterion was a completed Parental Authority Questionnaire for the responding parent. Third, the parent was required to fill

out the survey assessing how the target child spent his/her time in the home.

Forty-four reports were received from parents: 23 were retained for statistical analysis. Fifteen reports were excluded due to age cutoffs because the child on which they reported was over 16 years of age. No reports were submitted on children less than four years of age. Five reports were excluded because the responding parent did not complete the PAQ or household time survey. Of the 23 usable parent reports, 12 were completed for daughters and 11 were completed for sons. Responses from 156 students were used in the report of parenting style by non-parents.

The Parent Data

Findings

Question #1: *Parents' parenting styles have no relationship to their children's television viewing.* A bivariate correlation procedure including the parenting and television viewing variables was used to test this study's null hypothesis that predicted that children's television and video viewing amounts would not be related to any of the parenting styles assessed by the PAQ. The null hypothesis was not rejected, as no significant correlations, as determined by a Pearson r , were found between parenting style scores assessing the authoritarian, authoritative, and permissive parental behaviors and the amount of viewing done by the parents' children either on weekdays or weekends using television or video tapes (See Table 2). However, media behaviors were significantly related to other media behaviors. Specifically, the average amount of television viewed per day was positively correlated with the average amount of television viewed on the weekend (.450, $p < .031$), and the average amount of time spent watching

video tapes per day was positively correlated with the amount of time children spent watching video tapes on the weekend (.709, $p < .000$). Pearson correlations were used to find that scores on the authoritarian scale were not related to scores on the permissive scale (.051, $p < .816$), nor were they negatively related to scores on the authoritative scale (-.230, $p < .290$). A negative correlation was found between the scores for the authoritative parenting amounts and the permissive amounts (-.363, $p < .088$), although not at the .05 level of significance, which was used to assess significance in this study. None of the relationships reached a significant level, differing from some of the findings by Smetana (1995), whose study reported a negative correlation between authoritarianism and permissiveness (-.42, $p < .001$) and authoritativeness and permissiveness (-.28, $p < .01$). Parents had mean scores of 26.61 (SD=6.58) on the authoritarian scale, 20.74 (SD=4.00) on the authoritative scale, and 41.00 (SD=4.72) on the permissive scale.

Question #2: *If there is no relationship between parenting style and amounts of children's television viewing, are demographics of the sample influencing this investigation?* Children did not significantly differ in their media behaviors by their gender. A general linear model (GLM) using gender and the several types of media behaviors was constructed. The advantage of using the GLM rests in the reduction of the likelihood of a Type I error (assuming that a difference exists between groups when it really does not) instead of the repeated use of t-tests. Boys did watch more television per week than girls, but boys did not have a significantly greater amount of viewing (including video tapes and television) than did girls (Table 3). General linear models were also used with the demographic variables measuring the education of the mother,

education of the father, family structure, number of children, family income, and ethnicity. Ethnicity, however, was eventually excluded due to the small number (N=4) of non-white respondents in the sample. All of the variables with several levels were re-coded into variables with two or three levels (Table 4). Variables with two levels (such as gender) were not altered. Table 5 lists the significant findings from the demographic information. The number of children in a family was the only variable related to parenting style ($p < .012$). Families with two children had a parent who rated their parenting as more permissive than families with more or fewer children. The only demographic significantly related to amounts of children's TV viewing was family income. Children from middle income families (25-50K per year) spent more time watching video tapes on weekends than children from other income groups ($p < .026$).

The Non-Parent Data

Question #3: *How do the findings of our non-parent group compare with the findings from previously published studies that used the Parental Authority*

Questionnaire? Respondents who selected the questionnaires that identified themselves as without children or with their only children under the age of four years old completed a demographic questionnaire and the PAQ that described behaviors of the parent who was more involved in the respondent's upbringing. Non-parents completed PAQ's on 59 parents at the dissertation stage. These data were combined with the archival data used during pre-doctoral research conducted by the principal investigators, consisting of responses from 87 non-parent students. There were two reasons to combine the data. First, the correlations from the dissertation data of the 55 mothers and the direction of the

correlations were similar to both Buri's (1991) and Grimes and Steele's (1998) findings. Comparison of father correlations were not made due to the small number of responses (N=4). In fact, the correlation directions gathered during this second collection were more similar to Buri's original findings than those from the 87 non-parent respondents previously used by Grimes and Steele (1998). One-sample t-tests were also conducted to determine whether or not the data gathered during the second collection and the archival data were different. Means from the two collections were compared on the authoritarian, authoritative, and permissive subscales. Scores were combined for mothers and fathers without testing for differences in reports about fathering due to the low number of father responses by non-parent students during the second data collection (N=4). Table 6 compares the means between the groups and the two-tailed significance levels. Since the groups did not differ significantly, the responses from the archival data and the current data were combined for subsequent data analyses.

PAQ scores of the non-parent sample showed significant differences from the means reported by Buri (1991), but showed similar correlational trends. T-tests were used to compare the means of the styles for mothers and fathers to the means found in the Buri (1991) study. Table 7 lists the means compared and standard deviations from the samples. The mean scores for mothers and fathers on the three different PAQ scales were all significantly different from the Buri (1991) sample at the 0.001 significance level. Therefore, we are very confident that our respondents are rating their parents differently from the respondents in the Buri study. Our findings are similar with previous findings (Grimes & Steele, 1998), where we had correlations that followed a similar trend to

Buri's (1991) findings, but had means that were significantly different from Buri's results for the parent groups.

Question #4: *Do demographic factors of the non-parent sample influence findings using the PAQ?* Demographic findings were examined to investigate any differences between groups on PAQ scores.

Differences in Parenting Styles of Mothers and Fathers as Perceived by Non-Parent Students

Respondents more often identified the mother as the parent with the greater influence on the student's upbringing. A general linear model using gender of the parent and the different parenting styles was constructed to examine the differences between mothers (N=115) and fathers (N=30) and their scores on the scales of the PAQ. Findings showed that fathers were rated as higher on the authoritarian scale than were mothers (35.70, 29.54, $p<.000$), mothers were rated higher on the authoritative scale than fathers (22.62, 18.67, $p<.001$), and mothers were rated as being more permissive than fathers (36.45, 30.60, $p<.000$).

Differences in Reporting Between Males and Females

In order to see if any differences existed between gender of reporter in the study, a general linear model was constructed using the PAQ scales and the gender of the non-parent respondent. No significant difference (at the .05 level) was obtained between the responses of males and females and their reports of parenting.

Relationship of Parenting Style to Sample Characteristics

The demographic information was analyzed to determine if any relationship

existed between the demographic variables and the parenting style amounts reported by respondents. Mother education, father education, ethnicity, family income, family structure, gender of respondent, and student education were all factors re-coded and examined in general linear models. Findings are summarized in Table 8. White mothers (N=114) were rated as more authoritative in their parenting than non-white mothers (N=23) ($p<.017$). Mothers from 1st marriages (N=86) were rated as more permissive than other mothers (N=57) ($p<.015$). Respondents not possessing a college degree (N=82) rated their mothers as more permissive and authoritative than did respondents with a college degree (N=60) ($p<.002$, $p<.025$).

Question #5: *How was our sample altered when we used a categorization of parenting style used by Smetana (1995)?* The style scores for each respondent (both parent and non-parent) were subjected to the categorization method outlined by Smetana (1995). In the parent group, the distribution of style found seven authoritarian, six authoritative, and five permissive parents. However, five parents (22%) did not meet Smetana's criteria for categorization.

The non-parent group was subjected to the same categorization methodology with slightly different results. The distribution of styles resulted in categorizing 38 authoritarian, 31 authoritative, and 26 permissive parents. However, the non-parent group had 53 parents (36%) who were not classifiable according to Smetana's method.

CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION/IMPLICATIONS

Conclusions

Parent Issues

Previous literature regarding the relationship of parenting style to child behaviors were not replicated in this study. Question #1 found evidence that suggested that parenting styles do not seem to play a significant role in the amount of television viewing by children, contrary to this study's expectations. None of the parenting styles derived by Baumrind (1971) and measured by Buri (1991) was related to television or video tape viewing on weekdays or weekends. Media behaviors were significantly, positively correlated with each other, which may support the assumption that children who choose to view television or videos use that as a common activity. PAQ scores of the parent group were not significantly related positively or negatively, which alerts us to question the usefulness of the PAQ with a parent population. It might be expected that a parenting style such as authoritarianism, which implies firm control and low nurturance, might be inversely related to the authoritative or permissive style, but this finding did not appear at a significant level.

We may conclude from the findings regarding parenting style and television viewing amounts that no real relationship exists. It may be just as our numbers indicate. However, this would seem to refute some of the previously held ideas about the relationship of parenting style to children's behaviors. Evidence indicated that parenting style affects the social competence, scholastic competence, at-risk behavior, and self-

esteem of children (Baumrind, 1970, 1978, 1991; Buri, 1989; Buri et al., 1988; Dornbush et al., 1987; Johnson et al., 1991; Moore, 1992; Pardeck & Pardeck, 1990; Vacha & McLaughlin, 1992). Therefore, this study was based on the assumption that behavioral characteristics of the parents would have an influence, or at least be related to, how their children spend their time (Bordin, 1992), with particular attention to the report of their children's television viewing behavior. Previous evidence indicated that parenting style would have an effect on how children interact socially. It would also seem logical since parents exert an influence on their children's scholastic behavior (Dornbush et al., 1987), that their influence might be reflected in the amount of time children spend in leisure activities. Basically, it is difficult to believe that parenting style can have such an impact on so many aspects of a child's development, but not on their usual household routine.

The finding that parents' perceptions of male and female children did not differ significantly in reporting the amount of television or video tape viewing on weekdays or weekends was unexpected due to research that has suggested that boys watch a great deal more television than girls (Brown et al., 1990; Mauldin & Meeks, 1990). According to our findings, boys did watch an average of 1.5 hours more of television per week than did girls, but the amounts were not significantly different, and, therefore, replicated previous findings by Mauldin & Meeks (1990), but contradicted other findings that stated boys watch a greater amount of television than girls (Signorielli & Lears, 1992). Children of both genders were reported as watching less than 20 hours per week, which was less than other published reports of viewing even when we included the viewing of video tapes (Department of Education, 1994; Farmagetti, 1998). Boys tended to watch more

television on weekdays and weekends and watch more video tapes on the weekend. However, parents in this study reported that girls watched more hours of video tape during the week. It was not a part of this study, but we cannot be sure as to whether or not this finding might have been due to the number of video tapes that might be thought of as more "androgynous" or to the lack of television programming directed toward a female audience during the week.

Question #2 was based on the expectation that demographic characteristics would pertain to the amount of television viewing done by children, but that supposition was not supported in this study. For example, it could be argued that parents who have a higher income might be more likely to have more media devices in the home, and, therefore, give children more access to viewing. It may also be argued that parents with higher incomes might be more likely to be absent (e.g. they may work outside the home for longer hours) from the child's daily behaviors, which might contribute to more viewing. However, no clear rationale exists for the finding that the only difference found was that children from middle income families (25-50K) did more video tape viewing on weekends than children from other incomes. We also expected the number of children in a home to affect viewing amounts. Homes with several children were thought to have environments where television might be an activity in use more often. For example, a child might be engaged in some non-TV activity but a sibling may begin viewing and draw a child away from the other activity. However, these suppositions were not supported by the data. When the findings of this study are combined with the findings of a previous study which suggested that maternal employment was not related to the

amount of television that children watch (Brown et al., 1990), we must question whether television viewing is a variable susceptible to demographic influences.

Reports of household time that parents completed might also be questioned. It may be that, in this study, parents were not accurate reporters of their children's household behaviors; this would be a finding consistent with the literature (Lawrence & Wozniak, 1989; St. Peters et al., 1991), whether through lack of knowledge or lack of interest in reporting. It is also possible that parents might have been accurate reporters, even if marginally, but were not interested, or did not understand the items presented in this study. The question is also raised in this regard from viewing some of the parental reports that had to be excluded due to glaring errors in parent reports that were not included in this study. For example, some parent reports of the children's household behavior contained what can only be construed as sums of daily behaviors for the week instead of averages for the day which was requested. Some reports of household behavior listed over forty hours of activity per day, obviously demonstrating confusion in calculating daily household behaviors which in no case would be more than 24 hours.

We must also consider the Parental Authority Questionnaire and the usefulness of that measure. An assumption was made that the PAQ had been sufficiently validated through Buri's (1991), Brassington's (1994), Ferrari and Olivette's (1994), Flett et al.'s (1995), and Grimes and Steele's (1998) work to have been an understandable and, therefore, reliable and valid measure. Each sample in those studies consisted of college students as were members of this sample. That assumption could be called into question by the lack of relationship between the scores on the PAQ. The results from our use of

the PAQ with the parent and non-parent groups must also include the possibility that the PAQ does not adequately measure parenting style. The PAQ data received in the parent study add to this confusion. Scores on the PAQ scales defied our expectations regarding direction and correlation with the parent sample. There were no studies found that published mean scores from parents for use in comparison, although correlations between parent and adolescent reports were used in a study published by Smetana (1995). We must question whether or not parents are accurate reporters of their own parental behaviors, which has certainly been an issue of debate when considering parent reports on children's behavior. We made the assumption that the instrument would be valid with parents who are college students and have been parented, as the measure appeared to be valid with students who are not yet parents but have been parented (Smetana, 1995), particularly due to the strong, significant findings between parent and adolescent reports of permissiveness, authoritarianism and authoritativeness of parents.

It is also possible that the PAQ does indeed tap into the different patterns of perceived parenting used at different times in the life cycle. Parents may be able to recall examples of parenting that would be assessed by the instrument. Therefore, we might not see expected correlations of authoritarianism, authoritativeness, and permissiveness because a parent may recall instances of parenting meeting all three styles, which would elevate their scores and may interfere with expected correlations. This evidence would support the argument that parents use all three styles (Buri, 1991; Darling & Steinberg, 1993; Smetana, 1994).

The issue of social desirability in responses from parents with regard to the

expenditure of household time of their children should be noted. Although the Buri (1991) instrument had been validated with the Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale for adolescent reports, no measurement assessing social desirability responses from parents was conducted in this study. The Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale has received criticism for the lack of sensitivity of items and the appropriateness of the scoring scheme (Ballard, Crino, & Rubenfeld, 1988).

Furthermore, the parent report of household time used in this study was not piloted with another population. We were interested in receiving estimates of time and believed in the straightforward nature of the instrument to report children's household activities. However, there might have been confusion about the items. For example, we asked parents to estimate the average amount of time spent on various activities on both weekdays and weekends. We made the assumption that parents would be able to recognize and calculate an average number, and to understand that we were interested in estimates at two different times (weekday and weekend). A possibility exists that parents miscalculated or misunderstood what was requested on the survey.

Other limitations of this study may explain the findings. First, the small number of usable parent reports (N=23) may not be sufficient to compare adequately the constructs of parenting style as they may relate to children's behaviors. Unfortunately, several responses from parents whose children were older than the study's group of children (aged 4 to 16 years) were excluded due to age cutoffs. Parent reports were also excluded when they did not complete the questionnaires as requested.

Non-parent Issues

Question #3 required the examination of PAQ scores from students in the non-parent sample to attempt to add validity for the use of the measure to perceive the parenting styles experienced by older children. Parents of student reporters were perceived as having parenting styles that showed the expected relationships between the constructs of specific styles. For example, scores of authoritarianism would be expected to relate negatively to scores of permissiveness since the constructs are thought of as opposites; that was found in this study. However, there were striking differences in the specific styles upon which non-parents reported. Non-parent reporters in the Buri sample reported differently when regarding both parents on all styles when compared to the current sample. We can only assume that some characteristic of parenting must be different with the population used by Buri.

Question #4 attempted to investigate how demographic factors influence reports of parents' parenting style by adult children, but very few patterns emerged. White mothers were rated as more authoritative than non-white mothers. These findings add confirmation to the work of Chao (1994) and Baumrind (1972), respectively, who suggested that Asian and Black parents exerted more of an authoritarian influence on their children. Mothers experiencing their first marriage were rated as more permissive than mothers in other family structures such as reconstituted, single-parent, divorced, widowed, and never-married mothers. A possible explanation for this finding comes from the information given about the roles that respondents saw their parents occupying. If taken in the classical context of parenting behaviors, there is support for the notion that

fathers are seen as the stricter, controlling parent, while mothers are seen as the firmer, fairer parent bordering on indulgent parenting, according to definitions of the different styles used by Baumrind (1970). Adult children perceived their mothers as taking a more permissive approach to parenting and fathers using a more authoritarian style. Mothers in their first marriage may experience the support from the other parent and may be able to grow into that permissive role, whereas a single mother (whether through divorce or widowhood) may have to occupy several parenting roles. Reconstituted families may still contain mothers who occupy a more versatile role until the re-marriage. Therefore, the strain of single parenting may have been the factor that discriminates the permissive scores in this sample. A third finding from the demographic information was that students who did not have a college degree at the time of the study rated their mothers as more permissive and authoritative than students who did have a college degree. It may have been that the experience of college has shown students how much control their parents may have exerted on their lives. This control may have seemed "authoritarian" in retrospect. Another possibility remains that having more education has offered students time to reflect and learn about the parenting they received, therefore coming to describe it differently from students not having the educational opportunities.

An unexpected finding was that there were no demographic factors that related to the parenting style scores of the father. Interpretation of this finding could vary. One might argue that this finding shows that fathers do not really exert much of an effect on their children. This finding may also suggest that fathers may parent in a way that is separate from their ethnicity, income, or other factors. In other words, fathers may be

getting the same “training” from their models and are behaving as fathers in a way that resists demographic influence.

Another limitation may have been the limited range of demographic questions. It could be that the Buri responses were influenced in some way by some other variable about which was not reported in the published literature. Since parenting style and demographic data were not directly studied in the original publication by Buri, we suggest that some unknown variable, other than the ones for which we accounted, might be influencing student reports. In our study, non-parent reports of parenting style scores were marginally related to some of the demographic variables such as ethnicity of the mother, family structure of the mother, and the educational degree of the respondent when considering mothers. None of the demographic variables seemed to influence perceptions of fathers’ parenting.

Question #5 was investigated to determine whether or not a categorization technique developed by Smetana (1995) would be useful for classifying parenting style. Parent and non-parent respondents were affected somewhat differently. The parent group showed a fairly even distribution of the typologies while not allowing 22% of the respondents to be categorized. The parent sample, however, may be limited by the small number of respondents so generalization of the technique to this sample is suspect. However, the non-parent sample was more skewed by category and required that 36% of the respondents be categorized as having “no clear category.” Since the non-parent group was much larger than the parent sample, we can be more confident when generalizing. In this study, since categorization of the non-parent typologies reduces the sample to less

than two-thirds of those who responded, the categorization method is not useful for this study.

Implications

We must also examine our finding in a broader sense when considering the television behaviors of children and parenting style. The study was largely dependent upon the validity of the instruments. The PAQ may be influenced by time and cultural period. Possible explanations for this phenomenon could include the difference in serial time and social climate being experienced by the populations questioned. For example, students completing the PAQ for the Buri study published in 1991 may have experienced different parenting a decade ago. It could be possible that parents in that era were more authoritative and less authoritarian and permissive than parents today. Children in the late 1980's may have received parenting from a larger percentage of two-parent families or families that were more intact. Therefore, the differences in perceived parenting might reflect a difference that children actually received and not necessarily through fault of the instrument.

The most critical question, however, may be whether or not children's television viewing is, in reality, an activity that is related to parenting style. Media behaviors might be so ingrained, or habitual, for our children that parenting style might be "helpless" to influence it. It is possible that media behaviors have become so common in our culture that parenting style exerts no real effect on how much time children spend with television. One of the arguments made citing the need for this study suggested that

television was an extremely common device and one which is usually not subject to restriction (St. Peters et al., 1991). It may be that television viewing may be immune to requests or direction from the parents wanting children to do otherwise. In other words, it may be so much a part of our daily culture that we no longer consider it as different from eating and sleeping. We must revisit the work of Gathercoal (1995) who suggested that children may develop a biological addiction to television viewing. In the context of biology, none of the other factors such as parenting or demographics may have a strong influence on children's viewing behavior.

Future Directions

This study adds four new pieces of information to the literature. First, we have examined a relationship between parenting style and the television viewing of children. This relationship has not been previously studied according to searches conducted by the author. Second, we have added to the usefulness of the PAQ for parents by publishing raw scores from a parent sample. Subsequent studies may be able to use these data in analyses for validation purposes. Third and fourth, we have examined the relationship between demographic variables and PAQ scores for both parents and non-parents in our sample. Previous studies had not published any results on the possible demographic influences on the perception of parenting styles. Therefore, this research has helped to contribute to the body of knowledge on parenting style.

There are several directions in which further work regarding parenting style and the television viewing of children may proceed. First, future researchers may decide to employ a different sample from what was used in this work. A convenience sample was

used herein consisting of university students with the expectation that parents who had children in an age range useful for our study would be willing to participate . However, the difficulty obtaining respondents who were parents with children between the target age ranges (4 to 16 years old) was a surprise. It may be useful to recruit from other sources such as schools, churches, and community groups in subsequent studies.

Investigators researching a connection between parenting style and media behavior may consider using different measures. The Parental Authority Questionnaire was employed with the expectation that it would be a useful and defensible measure. Admittedly, no published studies were found in which parents rated their own parenting using the PAQ. Instead, results obtained from adolescent reports were considered as validating the measure, and the assumption made that the PAQ could be used with parents. Therefore, a portion of this study should be seen as exploratory and an opportunity for validation for future studies. Other researchers may decide on a different measure to report household behavior. Some parents had difficulty with the units of measurement to be reported (for example, on one report of the time average time per weekday their child spent sleeping, a parent answered "40 hours"). Other researchers may decide to use a survey that requires the respondent to choose appropriate categories of behavior (for example, children may sleep less than 6 hours, 6-8 hours, 8-10 hours, or more than 10 hours per day); the instrument could require the responding parent to total to 24 hours the child's behaviors. Program content of television and video tapes should continue to be an area of concern, especially when considering young children and the possibility that they are being exposed to programs that are designed for adults during co-

viewing opportunities (St. Peters et al., 1991). Future studies may also wish to employ a more detailed demographic survey.

Subsequent studies may also want to employ a different methodology. For example, researchers interested in using the PAQ in future studies may want to gain perspectives on a parent from more than one source as Smetana (1995) did in her study of parental authority. Future studies may also want to use the child's report of their own behavior or some sort of composite amount when considering children's behavior. For example, a researcher may decide to conduct an interview or ask parents to agree on amounts of time spent in the household by the child. Respondents to this study were asked to respond anonymously. Other research may want to consider whether to require basic information (such as a name and telephone number) so some method of follow-up observation may be employed. Incentives may also be a way to increase response.

It would be advantageous to develop a measure of parenting style that can also tap into the style outlined by Baumrind called *disengaged/rejecting* (Baumrind, 1984). Parents who exhibit disengaged parenting are usually unaware or unconcerned about the behaviors of their child. Therefore, we could legitimately question the usefulness of information gathered from this parent. The distinction between disengaged and permissive may also take some of the stigma from permissive parenting and allow for a clearer understanding of those parenting characteristics.

One more note about future research may be useful. A common question about using Baumrind's parental style prototypes questions the consideration of the style as unidirectional (i.e., a parent's influence on a child). A great deal of time and research has

shown that children affect parents as much as parents affect children (Bell, 1979; Belsky, 1990; Belsky, Taylor, & Rovine, 1984).

The question of directionality deserves elaboration. It would be naive to believe that any socialization process, not just parenting, remains a one-sided issue. However, the point of directionality was not argued within this research. The determination of a parenting style seems to involve a bidirectional process. The question was not, "Do your children determine your parenting style?" or "What have your children done to shape you as a parent?" Therefore, in what ways can a researcher use a typology that seems to be well-refuted? Simply put, the conceptualization of parenting style in this study requires a cognitive shift from Baumrind's original work. For example, a parent was originally thought to have one style as a dominant characteristic. However, Baumrind's later work and the work of others has led researchers to perceive parenting style as a pattern of behaviors, and not necessarily a single definition of a parent's behaviors. So, the idea of patterns of parental authority requires one to think differently from what was previously considered. A second concern has been addressed by the methodology involved in the use of the Parental Authority Questionnaire. The PAQ, by design, offers measures of the three Baumrind parenting types as demonstrated by each individual parent instead of the categorization of each parent as principally demonstrating one of the typologies. Therefore, parenting style has evolved into a different construct from what has previously been considered.

Although these are interesting questions, this study sought to tap into the perceptions of the parent about the television behaviors of their child and their parenting.

The argument of "who determined your style" was moot in this context. Our concern was to get a grasp on style, as the parent sees it, and not on the origin of that style. Therefore, the argument has little to do with who determined the parenting style and more to do with measurement of that style as it may or may not be related to the television viewing of one's children.

Parenting style seems to be an important variable in the lives of children. For example, harsh discipline may be a trademark of authoritarian parenting, yet authoritarian parenting may be important in the reduction of at-risk behavior, as Smither (1993) has suggested. Similarly, authoritative parenting may be helpful until children have the extent of freedom that allows them to engage in problem behaviors. The construct of parenting style will be a variable worth studying well into the next millennium.

REFERENCES

REFERENCES

- Abelman, R. (1986). Children's awareness of television's prosocial fare: Parental discipline as an antecedent. Journal of Family Issues, 7(1), 51-66.
- Abelman, R. (1991). Parental communication style and its influence on exceptional children's television viewing. Roeper Review, 14(1), 23-27.
- Amato, P. R. (1989). Family processes and the competence of adolescents and primary school children. Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 18(1), 39-53.
- Anderson, D. R., Lorch, E. P., Field, D. E., Collins, P. A., & Nathan, J. G. (1986). Television viewing at home: Age trends in visual attention and time with TV. Child Development, 57(4), 1024-1033.
- Ballard, R. Crino, M. D., & Rubenfeld, S. (1988). Social desirability response bias and the Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale. Psychological Reports, 63(1), 227-237.
- Bandura, A. (1969). Principles of behavior modification. New York, NY; Holt, Reinhart, and Wilson.
- Barber, B. K., Olsen, J. E., & Shagle, S. C. (1994). Associations between parental psychological and behavioral control and youth internalized and externalized behaviors. Child Development, 65(4), 1120-1136.
- Baumrind, D. (1970). Socialization and instrumental competence in young children. Young Children, 26(2), 104-119.
- Baumrind, D. (1971). Current patterns of parental authority. Developmental Psychology Monographs, 4(2, Pt. 2), 1-103.
- Baumrind, D. (1972). An exploratory study of socialization effects on black children: Some black-white comparisons. Child Development, 43, 261-267.
- Baumrind, D. (1978). Parental disciplinary patterns and social competence in children. Youth and Society, 9, 239-275.
- Baumrind, D. (1991). The influence of parenting style on adolescent competence and substance abuse. Journal of Early Adolescence, 11(1), 56-95.
- Baumrind, D. (1994). The social context of child maltreatment. Family Relations, 43, 360-368.

Bell, R. Q. (1979). Parent, child, and reciprocal influences. American Psychologist, 34(10), 821-826.

Belsky, J. (1990). Parental and nonparental child care and children's socioemotional development: A decade in review. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 52, 885-903.

Belsky, J., Taylor, D. G., & Rovine, M. (1984). The Pennsylvania infant and family development project, II: The development of reciprocal interaction in the mother-infant dyad. Child Development, 55, 706-717.

Blair, S. L. (1992) The sex-typing of children's household labor: Parental influence on daughters' and sons' housework. Youth and Society, 24(2), 178-203.

Bordin, J. A. (1992). The reciprocal phenomena of parenting style and family assumptions about household tasks. Dissertation Abstracts International, 53(11-A), 4097.

Brassington, G. S. (1994). Insomnia and styles of parental authority in college students. Psychological Reports, 74(3, pt. 1), 712-714.

Brown, J. D., Childers, K. W., Bauman, K. E., & Koch, G. G. (1990). The influence of new media and family structure on young adolescents' television and radio use. Communication Research, 17(1), 65-82.

Buri, J. R., Louiselle, P. A., Misukanis, T. M., & Mueller, R. A. (1988). Effects of parental authoritarianism and authoritativeness on self-esteem. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 14(2), 271-282.

Buri, J. R. (1989). Self-esteem and appraisals of parental behavior. Journal of Adolescent Research, 4(1), 33-49.

Buri, J. R. (1991). Parental Authority Questionnaire. Journal of Personality Assessment, 57(1), 110-119.

Carmines, E. G., & Zeller, R. A. (1979). Reliability and validity assessment. Sage; Newbury Park.

Chao, R. K. (1994). Beyond parental control and authoritarian parenting style: Understanding Chinese parenting through the cultural notion of training. Child Development, 65(4), 1111-1119.

Chen, M. (1994). The smart parent's guide to kids' TV. San Francisco, CA: KQED Publications.

Crouter, A. C., MacDermid, S. M., McHale, S. M., & Perry-Jenkins, M. (1990). Parental monitoring and perceptions of children's school performance and conduct in dual- and single-earner families. Developmental Psychology, 26(4), 649-657.

Darling, N., & Steinberg, L. (1993). Parenting style as context: An integrative model. Psychological Bulletin, 113(3), 487-496.

deMan, A. F. (1987). Parental control in child-rearing and adjustment in young adults. Perceptual and Motor Skills, 65(3), 917-918.

deMan, A. F. (1990). Parental control and conservatism revisited. Psychological Reports, 66(1), 25-26.

deMan, A. F., Labreche-Gauthier, L., & Leduc, C. P. (1991). Parental control and anomie in French-Canadian adolescents. Psychological Reports, 69(1), 199-200.

deMan, A. F., Leduc, C. P., & Labreche-Gauthier, L. (1992). Parental control in child rearing and multidimensional locus of control. Psychological Reports, 70(1), 320-322.

Department of Education Newsletter. (Oct. 1994). TV viewing and parental guidance.

Department of Labor. (1998). Web site statistics. Accessed 4/98.

Desmond, R. J., Hirsch, B., Singer, D. G., & Singer, J. L. (1987). Gender differences, mediation, and disciplinary styles in children's responses to television. Sex Roles, 16(7-8), 375-389.

Dornbush, S. M., Ritter, P. L., Leiderman, P. H., Roberts, D. F., & Fraleigh, M. J. (1987). The relation of parenting style to adolescent school performance. Special issue: Schools and development. Child Development, 58(5), 1244-1257.

Duckett, E., Raffaelli, M., & Richards, Maryse, H. (1989). "Taking care": Maintaining the self and the home in early adolescence. Special issue: The changing life space of early adolescence. Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 18(6), 549-565

DuRant, R. H., Baranowski, T., Johnson, M., & Thompson, W. O. (1994). The relationship among television watching, physical activity, and body composition of young children. Pediatrics, 94(4), 449-455.

Ellis, G. J., & Petersen, L. R. (1992). Socialization values and parental control techniques: A cross-cultural analysis of child-rearing. Journal of Comparative Family

Studies, 23(1), 39-54.

Eron, L. D. (1982) Parent-child interaction, TV violence, and aggression of children. American Psychologist, 37(2), 197-211.

Eron, L. D. (1986). Interventions to mitigate the psychological effects of media violence on aggressive behavior. Journal of Social Issues, 42(3), 155-169.

Eron, L. D., & Huesmann, L. R. (1987). Television as a source of maltreatment of children. School Psychology Review, 16(2), 195-202.

Farmagetti, R. (Ed.). (1998). The world almanac and book of facts. New Jersey: Funk & Wagnalls.

Federal Communications Commission. (1995). Policies and rules concerning children's television programming: Revision of programming policies for television broadcast stations (FCC 95-143). Washington, DC.

Felson, R. B. (1996). Mass media effects on violent behavior. Annual Review of Sociology, 22, 103-128.

Ferrari, J. R., & Olivette, M. J. (1993). Perceptions of parental control and the development of indecision among late adolescent females. Adolescence, 28(112), 963-970.

Ferrari, J. R., & Olivette, M. J. (1994). Parental authority and the development of female dysfunctional procrastination. Journal of Research in Personality, 28(1), 87-100.

Flett, G. L., Hewitt, P. L., & Singer, P. (1995). Perfectionism and parental authority styles. Individual Psychology, 51(1), 50-60.

Gathercoal, P. (1995). Brain research and media messages: On constructing a physical addiction to media messages. (Unpublished manuscript)

Gilbert, L. A. (1993). Societal changes and realities: An introduction to the dual-career family. In Two careers/One family (pp. 3-20). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Grimes, J. W., & Steele, C. (1998). Conceptualization of parenting style: Issues in validity using the Parental Authority Questionnaire. (Unpublished)

Gunter, B. (1994). The question of media violence. In J. Bryant & D. Zillman (eds.) Media effects: Advances in theory and research. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates; Hillsdale, NJ.

Hein, C., & Lewko, J. H. (1994). Gender differences in factors related to parenting style: A study of high performing science students. Special issue: Canadian research on adolescence. Journal of Adolescent Research, 9(2), 262-281.

Hightower, E. (1990). Adolescent interpersonal and familial precursors of positive mental health at midlife. Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 19(3), 257-275.

Hodapp, T. V. (1977). Children's ability to learn problem-solving strategies from television. Alberta Journal of Educational Research, 23(3), 171-177.

Huck, S. W., & Cormier, W. H. (1996). Reading statistics research. (pp. 149-168), New York: NY, Harper Collins.

Huesmann, L. R., & Eron, L. D. (1984). Cognitive processes and the persistence of aggressive behavior. Aggressive Behavior, 10(3), 243-251.

Jason, L. A. (1983). Self-monitoring in reducing children's excessive television viewing. Psychological Reports, 53(3, Pt 2), 1280.

Jason, L. A., Johnson, S. Z., & Jurs, A. (1993). Reducing children's television viewing with an inexpensive lock. Child and Family Behavior Therapy, 15(3), 45-54.

Jason, L. A., & Klich, M. M. (1982). Use of feedback in reducing television watching. Psychological Reports, 51(3, Pt 1), 812-814.

Johnson, B. M., Shulman, S., & Collins, W. A. (1991). Systematic patterns of parenting as reported by adolescents; Developmental differences and implications for psychosocial outcomes. Journal of Adolescent Research, 6(2), 235-252.

Kelly, C., & Goodwin, G. C. (1983). Adolescents' perception of three styles of parental control. Adolescence, 18(71), 567-571.

Kniveton, B. H. (1974). The very young and television violence. Journal of Psychosomatic Research, 18(4), 233-237.

Kurdek, L. A., & Fine, M. A. (1993). The relationship between family structure and young adolescents' appraisals of family climate and parenting behavior. Journal of Family Issues, 14(2), 279-290.

Lau, S., & Cheung, P. (1987). Relations between Chinese adolescents' perception of parental control and organization and their perception of parental warmth. Developmental Psychology, 23(5), 726-729.

Lawrence, F. C., & Wozniak, P. H. (1987). Rural children's time in household activities. Psychological Reports, 61(3), 927-937.

Lawrence, F. C., & Wozniak, P. H. (1989). Children's television viewing with family members. Psychological Reports, 65(2), 395-400.

Lazar, B. A. (1994). Why social work should care: Television violence and children. Child and Adolescent Social Work Journal, 11(1), 3-19.

Lee, C. C. (1984). An investigation of psychosocial variables related to academic success for rural Black adolescents. Journal of Negro Education, 53(4), 424-434.

Lerner, J. V. (1994). Working women and their families. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Lin, C. C., & Fu, V. R. (1990). A comparison of child-rearing practices among Chinese, immigrant Chinese, and Caucasian-American parents. Special Issue: Minority children. Child Development, 61(2), 429-433.

Mauldin, T., & Meeks, C. B. (1990). Sex differences in children's time use. Sex Roles, 22(9-10), 537-554.

McAdoo, J. L. (1986). A Black perspective on the father's role in child development. Marriage and Family Review, 9(3-4), 117-133.

McLaughlin, B. (1983). Child compliance to parental control techniques. Developmental Psychology, 19(5), 667-673.

McLeod, J. D., Kruttschnitt, C., & Dornfeld, M. (1994). Does parenting style explain the effects of structural conditions on children's antisocial behavior? A comparison of Blacks and Whites. Social Forces, 73(2), 575-604.

Miller, N. B., Cowan, P. A., Cowan, C. P., Hetherington, E. M., & Clingempeel, W. G. (1993). Externalizing in preschoolers and early adolescents: A cross-study replication of a family model. Developmental Psychology, 29(1), 3-18.

Miller, B. M., O'Connor, S., & Sirignano, S. W. (1995). Out-of-school time: A study of children in three low-income neighborhoods. Special issue: Child day care. Child Welfare, 74(6), 1249-1280.

Monush, B. (Ed.). (1995). International television & video almanac. New York: Quigley Publishing Company, Inc.

Moore, S. G. (1992). The role of parents in the development of peer group competence. (From ERIC: Clearinghouse, 1992, Abstract No. 88-062012).

Mutz, D. C., Roberts, D. F., & van Vuuren, D. P. (1993). Reconsidering the displacement hypothesis: Television's influence on children's time use. Communication Research, 20(1), 51-75.

Neuman, S. B. (1988). The displacement effect: Assessing the relation between television viewing and reading performance. Reading Research Quarterly, 23(4), 414-440.

Pardeck, J. A., & Pardeck, J. T. (1990). Family factors related to adolescent autonomy. Adolescence, 25(98), 311-319.

Parish, T. S., & McCluskey, J. J. (1992). The relationship between parenting styles and young adults' self-concepts and evaluations of parents. Adolescence, 27(108), 915-918.

Peterson, G. W., & Rollins, B. C. (1987). Parent-child socialization (pp. 471-507). In M. B. Suseman & S. K. Steinmetz (Eds.) Handbook of marriage and family. New York: Plenum Press.

Rollins, B. C., & Thomas, D. L. (1979). Parental support, power, and control techniques in the socialization of children. (pp. 317-364). In W. R. Burr, R. Hill, F. I. Nye, & I. L. Reiss (eds.) Contemporary Theories of The Family. McMillan; New York.

Ross, G. F. (1984). Styles of discipline: Reported to a variety of child behaviours. Australian Journal of Sex, Marriage, and Family, 5(4), 215-220.

Rothschild, N., & Morgan, M. (1987). Cohesion and control: Adolescents' relationships with parents as mediators of television. Special Issue: Television and the popular media in the world of the early adolescent. Journal of Early Adolescence, 7(3), 299-314.

Schaefer, E. S. (1965). A configurational analysis of children's report of parent behavior. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 29(6), 552-557.

Seydlitz, R. (1991). The effects of age and gender on parental control and delinquency. Youth and Society, 23(2), 175-201.

Signorielli, N., & Lears, M. (1992). Children, television, and conceptions about chores: Attitudes and behaviors. Sex Roles, 27(3-4), 157-170.

Silver, A., Florence, B. T., Rourke, D. L., & Lorimor, R. J. (1994). How children spend their time: A sample survey for use in exposure and risk assessments. Risk Analysis, 14(6), 931-944.

Silverblatt, A. (1995). Issues in media communication. In Silverblatt; Media literacy: Ways to interpret media messages. Praeger Publishers, Westport, CT.

Singer, D. G., & Singer, J. L. (1981). Television and the developing imagination of the child. Journal of Broadcasting, 25(4), 373-387.

Singer, J. L., & Singer, D. G. (1983). Psychologists look at television: Cognitive, developmental, personality, and social policy implications. American Psychologist, 38(7), 826-834.

Singer, J. L., Singer, D. G., Desmond, R., Hirsch, B., & Nicol, A. (1988). Family mediation and children's cognition, aggression, and comprehension of television: A longitudinal study. Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology, 9(3), 329-347.

Singer, J. L., Singer, D. G., & Rapaczynski, W. S. (1984). Family patterns and television viewing as predictors of children's beliefs and aggression. Journal of Communication, 34(2), 73-89.

Smetana, J. G. (1994). Parenting styles and beliefs about parental authority. Beliefs about parenting. Origins and developmental implications. San Francisco: New Directions for Child Development; Jossey Bass, 21-36.

Smetana, J. G. (1995). Parenting styles and conceptions of parental authority during adolescence. Child Development, 66(2), 299-316.

Smith, C., & Krohn, M. D. (1995). Delinquency and family life among male adolescents: The role of ethnicity. Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 24(1), 69-93.

Smith, T. E. (1988). Parental control techniques. Journal of Family Issues, 9(2), 155-176.

Smither, R. D. (1993). Authoritarianism, dominance, and social behavior: A perspective from evolutionary personality psychology. Human Relations, 46(1), 23-43.

Stice, E., & Barrera, M. (1995). A longitudinal examination of the reciprocal relations between perceived parenting and adolescents' substance abuse and externalizing behaviors. Developmental Psychology, 31(2), 322-334.

St. Peters, M., Fitch, M., Huston, A. C., Wright, J. C., & Eakins, D. J. (1991). Television and families: What do young children watch with their parents? Child Development, 62(6), 1409-1423.

Taylor, R. D., Casten, R., & Flickenger, S. M. (1993). Influence of kinship social support on the parenting experiences and psychosocial adjustment of African-American adolescents. Developmental Psychology, 29(2), 382-388.

Thomas, R. M. (1992). Social learning theory and contextualism. In Comparing theories of child development, (pp. 231-259). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Thomas, M. H., & Drabman, R. S. (1978). Effects of television violence on expectations of other's aggression. Personality and Social Psychology, 4(1), 73-76.

Vacha, E. F., & McLaughlin, T. F. (1992). The social structural, family, school, and personal characteristics of at-risk students: Policy recommendations for school personnel. Journal of Education, 174(3), 9-25.

Wartella, E., Heintz, K. E., Aidman, A. J., & Mazzarella, S. R. (1990). Television and beyond: Children's video media in the community. Communication Research, 17(1), 45-64.

Weaver, B., & Barbour, N. (1992). Mediation of children's televiewing. The Journal of Contemporary Human Services, 73(4), 236-242.

Zuckerman, D. M., Singer, D. G., & Singer, J. L. (1980). Children's television viewing, racial and sex-role attitudes. Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 10(4), 281-294.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

TABLES

Table 1: Demographic Characteristics of Parent and Non-parent Groups

Site/Demograph	Parents (N=23)	Non-parents (N=146)
Age of respondent (yrs.)	34.69	24.45
Age of child (months)	119.29	N/A
Age of parent	N/A	50.84
Number of children	1.92	N/A
Ethnicity	White 83% Hispanic 9% Black 4% Native Amer. 4%	White 81% Black 10% Native Amer. 6% Hispanic 3%
Family structure	1 st Marriage 63% Reconstituted 17% Separated 4% Divorced 4% Widowed 4% Never married 4%	1 st Marriage 53% Reconstituted 22% Divorced 13% Separated 3% Widowed 3% Never married 3%
Respondent educ.	N/A	High School (mode)
Mother education	High School 41% AA Degree 27% Other 18% College 9% Master's 5%	High School 33% Other 23% AA Degree 20% College 17% Master's 7%
Father education	High School 42% College 21% Other 21% AA Degree 8% DNF High School 4%	High School 36% Other 20% College 30% AA Degree 7% DNF High School 3%
Religious affiliation	Baptist 50% Other 16% None 8% Catholic 8%	Baptist 41% Other 16% Catholic 9% None 9%
Family income	50K+ 48% 25-50K 26% 10-25K 26%	50K+ 48% 25-50K 29% 10-25K 20% Under 10K 3%

Table 2: Correlations Between Parenting Style Scores and Children's TV Viewing Amounts (levels of significance in parentheses)

Corr. (sig.)	A-tarian	A-tative	Permiss.	TV/day	TV/day/ weekend	Video tape/day	Video tape/end
A-tarian		-.230 (.290)	.051 (.816)	.068 (.764)	.081 (.720)	.385 (.077)	.326 (.139)
A-tative	-.230 (.290)		-.363 (.088)	.184 (.412)	.160 (.478)	.126 (.575)	.133 (.554)
Permiss.	.051 (.816)	-.363 (.088)		.009 (.412)	.101 (.656)	.086 (.705)	.159 (.479)
TV/day	.068 (.764)	.184 (.412)	.009 (.412)		.450 (.031)*	.331 (.123)	.021 (.924)
TV/day/ weeken d	.081 (.720)	.160 (.478)	.101 (.656)	.450 (.031)*		.340 (.113)	.273 (.208)
Video tape/day	.385 (.077)	.126 (.575)	.086 (.705)	.331 (.123)	.340 (.113)		.709 (.000)**
Video tape/end	.326 (.139)	.133 (.554)	.159 (.479)	.021 (.924)	.273 (.208)	.709 (.000)**	

**Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

*Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (1-tailed).

Table 3: Mean Amounts of Viewing and Levels of Significance for Boys and Girls

Means and significance values	TV/day	TV/day/week end	Video/day	Video/day/weekend	Total viewing per week (hours)
Girls (N=12)	1.646	2.917	.458	.938	18.23
Boys (N=11)	1.705	2.364	.727	1.364	19.616
Sig. value	.788	.414	.674	.945	

Table 4: Re-coded Variable Names and Amounts

Variable name (levels)	New variable coding scheme
education of mother (11)	High school and below/college and above
education of father	High school and below/college and above
education of respondent	High school and below/college and above
number of children (continuous)	1 child/ 2 children/ 3 or more
family income (4)	Under 50K/ over 50K
ethnicity (7)	White/ non-white
family structure (7)	1 st marriage/ other structures

Table 5: Relationship of Demographic Variables to Parenting Style and Children's Television Viewing Amounts

Demographic variable	Parenting style	TV amounts
Education of mother	ns	ns
Education of father	ns	ns
Family structure	ns	ns
Number of children	Parents with two children rated themselves as more permissive ($p < .012$)	ns
Family income	ns	Children from middle income (25-50K) watched more video on weekends than other children (.026)
Ethnicity	nc	nc

ns "no significant relations"; nc "not calculated" (due to small N); na "not asked on forms"

Table 6: Comparison of Means Using the Grimes and Steele (1998) Archival and Current Data of Parental Authority Questionnaire Non-parent Responses.

Scale	Archival data (1997) (N=87)	1998 data (N=59)	Significance value (two-tailed)
Authoritarian	30.79	30.61	.856
Authoritative	21.99	21.47	.470
Permissive	35.41	35.20	.842

Table 7: T-test Comparisons of Sample Scores Using Grimes and Steele's Findings and the Findings of Buri

Means and standard deviations	Grimes and Steele (1998)		Buri (1991)	
	Mothers (N=116)	Fathers (N=32)	Mothers (N=171)	Fathers (N=171)
Authoritarian	29.59 (7.73)***	35.06 (7.84)***	26.97 (7.12)	28.74 (7.90)
Authoritative	22.55 (5.89)***	19.09 (6.00)***	37.34 (5.60)	35.56 (6.57)
Permissive	36.49 (7.51)***	31.34 (9.21)***	25.43 (5.73)	25.12 (5.39)

*** One-sample T-test significant at the 0.001 level

Table 8: Influence of Demographic Variables on Parenting Styles

Demographic variable	Mothers	Fathers
Education of Father	na	ns
Education of Mother	ns	na
Ethnicity	White mothers were rated as more authoritative than non-white mothers (p<.017)	nc
Family income	ns	ns
Family structure	Mothers from 1 st marriages were rated as more permissive than other mothers (p<.015)	ns
Gender of respondent	ns	ns
Student education	Students not having a college degree rated their mothers as more permissive and authoritative than students with a college degree (p<.002, p<.025)	ns

ns "no significant relations"; nc "not calculated"(due to small N); na "not asked on forms"

APPENDIX B
INSTRUMENTS

Demographic Questionnaire

Please place an "X" next to the correct response.

1. Gender of responding student ☐ Male ☐ Female
 Gender of child ☐ Male ☐ Female
2. Your age (in years)
 Your child's age (in months)
3. What is your primary race/ethnicity? (choose one)
 ☐ African-American
 ☐ Asian (Chinese, Japanese)
 ☐ European-American
 ☐ Hispanic-American
 ☐ Native American
 ☐ Other (please specify)
4. How many children do you have living with you (include anyone using your
 address as a mailing address, such as college students)?

 (indicate number of children)
5. What is your current family structure?
 ☐ Married (both parents living with child)
 ☐ Reconstituted (one biological/adoptive parent and one step-parent)
 ☐ Separated (one parent living with child)
 ☐ Divorced
 ☐ Widowed
 ☐ Single (never married)
 ☐ Other (please specify)
6. What is the highest educational degree you have attained ?
 What is the highest educational degree attained by your spouse (if applicable) ?

 (M.D., Ph.D., M.S., M.A., B.S., B.A., High School, G.E.D., Did not finish
 high school)
7. Please place an "X" next to your family income for the last year
 ☐ Under \$10,000 ☐ \$10,000-25,000
 ☐ \$25,001-50,000 ☐ Over \$50,000
8. Religious affiliation or preference (please write)

Household Time Survey

Consider the last 30 days and estimate the average number of hours per day that your child spends in the following activities at home. (Please provide an average for weekdays and weekends). Use increments of 1/4 hours when necessary (e.g., the child spends 2 1/4 hours per day...)

<u>Maintenance</u>	<u>Average hrs/day on weekdays</u>	<u>Average hrs/day on weekends</u>
Eating meals (breakfast, lunch, dinner, snacks)	—	—
Sleeping (at home only)	—	—
Bathing	—	—
Chores (cleaning room, picking up toys, yardwork, etc.)	—	—
 <u>Leisure</u>		
Reading/being read to	—	—
Artwork (drawing, coloring, painting)	—	—
Socializing (with friends, family)	—	—
Television watching	—	—
Watching videos	—	—
Athletic play (running, jumping, sports)	—	—
Listening to music (tapes, CD's, records)	—	—
Playing video games	—	—
Non-athletic play (board games, card games)	—	—
Pretend play (imaginary games/activities/other)	—	—

On average, how many hours/day does your child spend at school? ____

For each of the following statements, please circle the number on a 5-point scale that best indicates how that statement applies to you and your approach to parenting. Try to read and think about each statement as it pertains to the way you parent your children as they are growing up at home. Again, your responses are totally anonymous. There are no right or wrong answers, so please be as honest and accurate as you can. Also, try not to spend a lot of time on any one item--I am simply looking for your overall impression regarding each statement. Please be sure not to omit any items. Circle the number that most closely represents your response. Thank you again for your participation.

- | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|--|----------|----------|-----------|-------|----------|
| | Strongly | Disagree | Undecided | Agree | Strongly |
| | Disagree | | | | Agree |
| 1. I feel that in a well-run home the children should have their way in the family as often as the parents do. | 1) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 5 |
| 2. Even if my children don't agree with me, I feel that it is for their own good if they are forced to conform to what I think is right. | 2) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 5 |
| 3. Whenever I tell my children to do something I expect them to do it immediately without asking any questions. | 3) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 5 |
| 4. Once family policy has been established I discuss the reasoning behind the policy with the children in the family. | 4) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 5 |
| 5. I encourage verbal give-and-take whenever one of my children feels that family rules and restrictions are unreasonable. | 5) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 5 |
| 6. I have always felt that what children need is to be free to make up their own minds and to do what they want to do, even if this does not agree with what their parents might want. | 6) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 5 |
| 7. I do not allow my children to question any decision that I have made. | 7) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 5 |
| 8. I have directed my children's activities and decisions through reasoning and discipline. | 8) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 5 |
| 9. I feel that more force should be used by parents in order to get their children to behave the way they are supposed to. | 9) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 5 |
| 10. I do <u>not</u> feel that my children need to obey rules and regulations of behavior simply because someone in authority has established them. | 10) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 5 |
| 11. My children know what I expect of them in the family but they also feel free to discuss those expectations with me when they feel that they are unreasonable. | 11) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 5 |
| 12. I feel that wise parents should teach their children early just who is boss in the family. | 12) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 5 |
| 13. I seldom give my children expectations and guidelines for their behavior. | 13) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 5 |
| 14. Most of the time, I do what the children want when making family decisions. | 14) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 5 |
| 15. I consistently give my children direction and guidance in rational and objective ways. | 15) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 5 |
| 16. I get very upset if any of my children try to disagree with me. | 16) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 5 |
| 17. I feel that most problems in society would be solved if parents would <u>not</u> restrict their children's activities, decisions, and desires as they are growing up. | 17) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 5 |
| 18. I let my children know what behaviors I expect of them, and if they don't meet those expectations, I punish them. | 18) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 5 |

	1	2	3	4	5
	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly Agree
19. I allow my children to decide most things for themselves without a lot of direction from me.	19)	1	2	3	4 5
20. I take my children's opinions into consideration when making family decisions, but I would not decide for something simply because the children want it.	20)	1	2	3	4 5
21. I do <u>not</u> view myself as responsible for directing and guiding the behavior of my children as they are growing up.	21)	1	2	3	4 5
22. I have clear standards of behavior for the children in our home as they are growing up, but I am willing to adjust those standards to the needs of each of the individual children in the family.	22)	1	2	3	4 5
23. I give direction for my children's behavior and activities and I expect them to follow my direction, but I am always willing to listen to their concerns and to discuss that direction with them.	23)	1	2	3	4 5
24. I allow my children to form their own point of view on family matters, and I generally allow them to decide for themselves what they are going to do.	24)	1	2	3	4 5
25. I have always felt that most problems in society would be solved if we could get parents to strictly and forcibly deal with their children when they don't do what they are supposed to.	25)	1	2	3	4 5
26. I often tell my children exactly what I want them to do and how I expect them to do it.	26)	1	2	3	4 5
27. I give my children clear direction for their behaviors and activities, but I am also understanding when they disagree with me.	27)	1	2	3	4 5
28. I do not direct my children's behaviors, activities, and desires.	28)	1	2	3	4 5
29. My children know what I expect of them in the family, and I insist that they conform to those expectations simply out of respect for my authority.	29)	1	2	3	4 5
30. If I make a decision in the family that hurts one of the children, I am willing to discuss that decision with that child and to admit if I have made a mistake.	30)	1	2	3	4 5

Adapted from Buri's Parental Authority Questionnaire (1991)

Demographic Questionnaire

Please place an "X" next to the correct response.

1. Gender of responding student ☐ Male ☐ Female
Gender of parent on which you reported ☐ Male ☐ Female
2. Your age (in years)
Your parent's age (in years)
3. What is your primary race/ethnicity? (choose one)
☐ African-American
☐ Asian (Chinese, Japanese)
☐ European-American
☐ Hispanic-American
☐ Native American
☐ Other (please specify) _____
4. What is your parents' current family structure?
☐ Married (both parents living with child)
☐ Reconstituted (one biological/adoptive parent and one step-parent)
☐ Separated (one parent living with child)
☐ Divorced
☐ Widowed
☐ Single (never married)
☐ Other (please specify) _____
5. What is the highest educational degree you have attained _____?
The highest educational degree attained by the parent on which you reported ____ ?

(M.D., Ph.D., M.S., M.A., B.S., B.A., High School, G.E.D., Did not finish high school)
7. Check the approximate family income of your parent(s) for the past year
☐ Under \$10,000 ☐ \$10,000-25,000
☐ \$25,001-50,000 ☐ Over \$50,000
8. Religious affiliation/preference (please write) _____

For each of the following statements, circle the number on the 5-point scale (1 = strongly disagree, 5 = strongly agree) that best describes how that statement applies to you and your mother. Try to read and think about each statement as it applies to you and your mother during your years growing up at home. There are no right or wrong answers, so don't spend a lot of time on any one item. We are looking for your overall impression regarding each statement. Be sure not to omit any items.

- | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | |
|---|----------|----------|-----------|-------|----------|---|
| | Strongly | Disagree | Undecided | Agree | Strongly | |
| | Disagree | | | | Agree | |
| 1. While I was growing up my mother felt that in a well-run home the children should have their way as often as the parents do. | 1) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 2. Even if her children didn't agree with her, my mother felt that it was for our own good if we were forced to conform to what she thought was right. | 2) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 3. Whenever my mother told me to do something as I was growing up, she expected me to do it immediately without asking any questions. | 3) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 4. As I was growing up, once family policy had been established, my mother discussed the reasoning behind the policy with the children in the family. | 4) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 5. My mother has always encouraged verbal give-and-take whenever I have felt that family rules and restrictions were unreasonable. | 5) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 6. My mother has always felt that what children need is to be free to make up their own minds and to do what they want to do, even if this does not agree with what their parents might want. | 6) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 7. As I was growing up my mother did not allow me to question any decision she had made. | 7) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 8. As I was growing up my mother directed the activities and decisions of the children in the family through reasoning and discipline. | 8) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 9. My mother has always felt that more force should be used by parents in order to get their children to behave the way they are supposed to. | 9) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 10. As I was growing up my mother did <i>not</i> feel that I needed to obey rules and regulations of behavior simply because someone in authority had established them. | 10) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 11. As I was growing up I knew what my mother expected of me in the family, but I also felt free to discuss those expectations with my mother when I felt that they were unreasonable. | 11) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 12. My mother felt that wise parents should teach their children early just who is the boss in the family. | 12) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 13. As I was growing up, my mother seldom gave me expectations and guidelines for my behavior. | 13) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 14. Most of the time when I was growing up my mother did what the children in the family wanted when making family decisions. | 14) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 15. As the children in my family were growing up, my mother consistently gave us direction and guidance in rational and objective ways. | 15) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 16. As I was growing up my mother would get very upset if I tried to disagree with her. | 16) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 17. My mother feels that most problems in society would be solved if parents would <i>not</i> restrict their children's activities, decisions, and desires as they are growing up. | 17) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

	1	2	3	4	5
	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly Agree
18. As I was growing up my mother let me know what behavior she expected of me, and if I didn't meet those expectations, she punished me.	18)	1	2	3	4 5
19. As I was growing up my mother allowed me to decide most things for myself without a lot of direction from her.	19)	1	2	3	4 5
20. As I was growing up my mother took the children's opinions into consideration when making family decisions, but she would not decide for something simply because the children wanted it.	20)	1	2	3	4 5
21. My mother did not view herself as responsible for directing and guiding my behavior as I was growing up.	21)	1	2	3	4 5
22. My mother had clear standards of behavior for the children in our home as I was growing up, but she was willing to adjust those standards to the needs of each of the individual children in the family.	22)	1	2	3	4 5
23. My mother gave me direction for my behavior and activities as I was growing up and she expected me to follow her direction, but she was always willing to listen to my concerns and to discuss that direction with me.	23)	1	2	3	4 5
24. As I was growing up my mother allowed me to form my own point of view on family matters and she generally allowed me to decide for myself what I was going to do.	24)	1	2	3	4 5
25. My mother has always felt that most problems in society would be solved if we could get parents to strictly and forcibly deal with their children when they don't do what they are supposed to as they are growing up.	25)	1	2	3	4 5
26. As I was growing up my mother often told me exactly what she wanted me to do and how she expected me to do it.	26)	1	2	3	4 5
27. As I was growing up my mother gave me clear direction for my behaviors and activities, but she was also understanding when I disagreed with her.	27)	1	2	3	4 5
28. As I was growing up my mother did not direct the behaviors, activities, and desires of the children in the family.	28)	1	2	3	4 5
29. As I was growing up I knew what my mother expected of me in the family and she insisted that I conform to those expectations simply out of respect for her authority.	29)	1	2	3	4 5
30. As I was growing up, if my mother made a decision in the family that hurt me, she was willing to discuss that decision with me and to admit it if she had made a mistake.	30)	1	2	3	4 5

For each of the following statements, circle the number on the 5-point scale (1 = strongly disagree, 5 = strongly agree) that best describes how that statement applies to you and your father. Try to read and think about each statement as it applies to you and your father during your years growing up at home. There are no right or wrong answers, so don't spend a lot of time on any one item. We are looking for your overall impression regarding each statement. Be sure not to omit any items.

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly
Disagree				Agree

- | | | | | | | | |
|-----|--|-----|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. | While I was growing up my father felt that in a well-run home the children should have their way as often as the parents do. | 1) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 2. | Even if her children didn't agree with him, my father felt that it was for our own good if we were forced to conform to what he thought was right. | 2) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 3. | Whenever my father told me to do something as I was growing up, he expected me to do it immediately without asking any questions. | 3) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 4. | As I was growing up, once family policy had been established, my father discussed the reasoning behind the policy with the children in the family. | 4) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 5. | My father has always encouraged verbal give-and-take whenever I have felt that family rules and restrictions were unreasonable. | 5) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 6. | My father has always felt that what children need is to be free to make up their own minds and to do what they want to do, even if this does not agree with what their parents might want. | 6) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 7. | As I was growing up my father did not allow me to question any decision he had made. | 7) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 8. | As I was growing up my father directed the activities and decisions of the children in the family through reasoning and discipline. | 8) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 9. | My father has always felt that more force should be used by parents in order to get their children to behave the way they are supposed to. | 9) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 10. | As I was growing up my father did <i>not</i> feel that I needed to obey rules and regulations of behavior simply because someone in authority had established them. | 10) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 11. | As I was growing up I knew what my father expected of me in the family, but I also felt free to discuss those expectations with my father when I felt that they were unreasonable. | 11) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 12. | My father felt that wise parents should teach their children early just who is the boss in the family. | 12) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 13. | As I was growing up, my father seldom gave me expectations and guidelines for my behavior. | 13) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 14. | Most of the time when I was growing up my father did what the children in the family wanted when making family decisions. | 14) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 15. | As the children in my family were growing up, my father consistently gave us direction and guidance in rational and objective ways. | 15) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 16. | As I was growing up my father would get very upset if I tried to disagree with him. | 16) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 17. | My father feels that most problems in society would be solved if parents would <i>not</i> restrict their children's activities, decisions, and desires as they are growing up. | 17) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

			1	2	3	4	5
			Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly Agree
18.	As I was growing up my father let me know what behavior he expected of me, and if I didn't meet those expectations, he punished me.	18)	1	2	3	4	5
19.	As I was growing up my father allowed me to decide most things for myself without a lot of direction from him.	19)	1	2	3	4	5
20.	As I was growing up my father took the children's opinions into consideration when making family decisions, but he would not decide for something simply because the children wanted it.	20)	1	2	3	4	5
21.	My father did not view himself as responsible for directing and guiding my behavior as I was growing up.	21)	1	2	3	4	5
22.	My father had clear standards of behavior for the children in our home as I was growing up, but he was willing to adjust those standards to the needs of each of the individual children in the family.	22)	1	2	3	4	5
23.	My father gave me direction for my behavior and activities as I was growing up and he expected me to follow his direction, but he was always willing to listen to my concerns and to discuss that direction with me.	23)	1	2	3	4	5
24.	As I was growing up my father allowed me to form my own point of view on family matters and he generally allowed me to decide for myself what I was going to do.	24)	1	2	3	4	5
25.	My father has always felt that most problems in society would be solved if we could get parents to strictly and forcibly deal with their children when they don't do what they are supposed to as they are growing up.	25)	1	2	3	4	5
26.	As I was growing up my father often told me exactly what he wanted me to do and how he expected me to do it.	26)	1	2	3	4	5
27.	As I was growing up my father gave me clear direction for my behaviors and activities, but he was also understanding when I disagreed with him.	27)	1	2	3	4	5
28.	As I was growing up my father did not direct the behaviors, activities, and desires of the children in the family.	28)	1	2	3	4	5
29.	As I was growing up I knew what my father expected of me in the family and he insisted that I conform to those expectations simply out of respect for his authority.	29)	1	2	3	4	5
30.	As I was growing up, if my father made a decision in the family that hurt me, he was willing to discuss that decision with me and to admit it if he had made a mistake.	30)	1	2	3	4	5

VITA

Jonathan Grimes was born in Washington, D. C. on February 8, 1967. He attended public schools and graduated with his high school diploma in June of 1985. In the winter of 1989, he received his Bachelor of Arts degree in Psychology from Salisbury State University in Salisbury, Maryland. After taking a year off to work with patients experiencing mental illnesses, he began a graduate program at Towson State University in Towson, Maryland. While working toward his degree, he was employed full-time at Johns Hopkins University on a project studying the families of children with autism or Down syndrome. After working and going to school for two-and-a-half years, he received his Master of Arts Degree in Clinical Psychology in May of 1993. In August of 1993, he started a Ph. D. program in the College of Human Ecology at The University of Tennessee in Knoxville, Tennessee. While at Tennessee, he has spent time working in a preschool setting at the university, and has taught classes within the Department of Child and Family Studies and Human Resource Development, while pursuing his degree specialty in Child Development. He was awarded the doctoral degree in August, 1998.