

Development and Validation of Parenting Style Scale

Syeda S. Batool and Afia N. Mumtaz

Government College University

The study aimed to develop and validate the parent's version of indigenous Parenting Style Scale. A mixed method approach was used to develop the scale. Eight children (9 to 15 years) and eight parents (30 to 65 years) were selected for interviews to generate items. A sample of 300 parents (31 to 60 years) was used to validate the scale. Data were collected by using convenient sampling strategy. Varimax Rotation method through Principal Component Analysis was used to evaluate the factor structure of the scale. Exploratory factor analysis yielded six factors (Controlling, Compassionate, Conventional, Supportive, Avoidant, and Aggressive Parenting) that accounted for 47% of the variance. The Cronbach alpha coefficients for factors ranged from .62 to .77. The final scale comprised of 48 items. Convergent validity of the scale was established by computing the correlations between the scores on the indigenous scale and subscales of Parenting Styles and Dimensions Questionnaire (Robinson, Mandelco, Olsen, & Hart, 1995). Results revealed that the indigenously developed Parenting Style Scale is a promising indigenous measurement tool.

Keywords. Indigenous, parenting style, mixed method, varimax rotation, convergent validity

The term *parenting* is generally used to explain how a child's behavior and development is influenced by parents (Bornstein, 2002). Darling and Steinberg (1993) defined parenting style as a global climate involving family functioning and entailing the process of child-rearing. What children learn and how they react in certain situation is affected by their relationships with parents and parenting styles and behavior (Collins & Laursen, 1999).

Syeda S. Batool and Afia N. Mumtaz, Department of Psychology, Government College University, Lahore, Pakistan.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Syeda S. Batool, Department of Psychology, Government College University, Lahore, Pakistan. E-mail: shahidaphd@yahoo.com

Adolescence has been reported as a critical stage for children to adjust with the biological changes and assigned social roles. There is also a change in the attitude and behavior of parents when children enter into adolescence period. The expectations of adolescents from their parents and parents' expectations from adolescent children usually clash with each other (Batool, 2013). Hence, parents' role is critical for adolescents to reach their full potential (Youniss & Ruth, 2002), which entails the measurement of parenting styles of parents via valid and reliable measurement tools. A substantial body of literature demonstrates that dimensions of positive or adequate and negative or inadequate (viz., authoritative, authoritarian, permissive or neglecting) parenting are differentially associated with the prosocial and antisocial behavior of children and adolescents (see Batool, 2013).

Studies have reported gender differences in the style of parenting practiced by parents (see e.g., Stephens, 2009). Mothers on average, spend more time taking care of children than fathers and are often perceived to use nurturing parenting approaches (Craig, 2006). Pohl, Bender, and Lachmann (2005) found men to be more assertive than women. Mothers tend to show more empathy than fathers; are more caring, over-protective, and supportive in parenting a child; and fathers as more punishing and spend lesser time with their children (Stephens, 2009).

Ferguson, Hagaman, Maurer, Mathews, and Peng (2013) raised the notion that parenting is shaped by the personal experiences of a parent and the society where he/she lives. Culture plays a central role in the parenting styles in a particular society for instance; Asians understand social life and its diverse aspects through a different lens as compared to Western Caucasians (Harrington & Liu, 2002). Cultural values such as the emphasis on interdependence and family cohesion may influence the type of parenting style that parents usually prefer to assume in Asian societies (Chang, 2007). Asian society emphasizes interdependence, group harmony, social hierarchy, and modesty; whereas, American society encourages independence and promotes self-expression, individuality, and self-reliance (Wang & Leichtman, 2000).

Despite the fact that in the decade of 1990, there had been an increased sensitivity regarding application of the tools of psychology across cultures (e.g., Gergen, Gulerce, Lock, & Misra, 1996). Stewart et al. (1999) claimed that there was very little information existed in the international psychology literature on parenting practices in Islamic countries, as till that period, much of what was known in psychology was based on studies in the Western societies. Some

central ideas reverberated by several investigators had the significance of ecologically valid frameworks that guided the research and its interpretation (Adair, Puhan, & Vohra, 1993), and of equivalence of measures across cultures (Berry, Poortinga, Segall, & Dasen, 1992). At the same time, the challenge to develop a universal psychology was emphasized. Gergen et al. (1996) emphasized on the importance to maintain relationship between indigenous constructs and universal ones for the progress to be made towards this goal.

Regardless of the fact that parenting styles are indigenously determined, culturally knitted phenomenon, and the diversity exist in Western and Asian cultures; the cultural context has not been emphasized as much as is required in the development of psychological measures of parenting. Most of the extant measures of parenting styles have been developed in Western societies: Parental Authority Questionnaire (Buri, 1991), Measure of Parental Styles (Parker et al., 1997), Parenting Styles Dimension Questionnaire (Robinson, Mandelco, Olsen, & Hart, 2001), Parenting Practices Questionnaire (Robinson, Mandelco, Olsen, & Hart, 1995), Parenting Styles Scale (Lamborn, Mounts, Steinberg, & Dornbush, 1991), Parenting Style Inventory-II (Darling & Toyokawa, 1997), and The Alabama Parenting Questionnaire (Elgar, Waschbusch, Dadds, & Sigvaldason, 2007). However, Malik (2002) developed Paternal Authoritarianism Scale in Pakistan, which measures single dimension of fathers' parenting.

Undoubtedly, Western models of parenting are sound and highly developed and a logical place to start in studies with the nonWestern groups. However, the issue of functional equivalence is particularly important in designing such studies. By using exclusively Western constructs and items, we as researchers take the risk of imposing a frame that might miss the key relationships in nonWestern cultures. Functional equivalence is reached by ensuring that the items used to assess constructs are valid in the culture of the participants to be assessed. For example, not all cultural groups may express parental warmth through verbal communications, or support through involvement with homework (Stewart et al., 1999). The specific items that compose functional parenting may differ from culture to culture. The relative weight of different components in the functional parenting typology may differ to the point that they influence the primary goals of socialization in that culture. Assertion for social cohesion is evident in the cultural demands of Asian parents. For example, Asian parents' focus on an interdependent view of the self is to ensure that their children develop a sense of relatedness with their families (Wang & Leichtman, 2000). Contrary to American parents,

Asian parents ignore personal autonomy as they place a strong emphasis on obedience, dependability, proper behavior, and social commitment. In order to preserve harmony within the family unit, children are expected to develop self-control, a characteristic of a good child. Asian parents often remind children of past misdemeanor and build moral standards and social norms. For example, children are expected to obey and respect elders, get along with others, and learn good moral character (Rothbaum, Morelli, Pott, & Liu-Constant, 2000).

Some attempts have been made to develop culturally valid frameworks for the study of parenting in nonWestern cultures. For instance, Chao (1994) questioned the applicability of the constructs of authoritarian and authoritative parenting developed in Western culture to Chinese cultures. Such as, Chao (1994) proclaimed that the authoritarian construct, with its implication of parental domination to the Western child, is not relevant to Chinese culture. By drawing on indigenous prescriptions for child rearing, Chao (1994) described Chinese parenting as being guided by the concepts of *Chiao Shun* [Teaching] and *Guan* [a term meaning both to love and to govern]. She suggested that strictness interpreted negatively by the Western child, may be equated with parental concern, caring, and involvement by the Chinese child (Setwart et al., 1999).

Hence, the terms of training and supervision are the unique feature of Asian culture (Setwart et al., 1999). The Urdu word *tarbiat* in Pakistan is comparable to the Chinese *Chiao Chun*. It carries many of the same connotations of guidance in raising children. The endpoint of cooperation with others is also emphasized in Pakistani cultures, and obedience or acceptance of the authority of elders is expected from children. Respect for parents is an imperative facet of Islamic teachings (Obeidas cited in Setwart et al., 1999). Levels of parental control, therefore, are likely to be higher and better tolerated in Pakistani culture (Kagitecibasi, 1996). Asian families associate control with caring instead of dominating restriction. There are some distinctive aspects of Pakistani culture that do not appear to be shared even in other Asian cultures. Religion plays a very important role in Pakistan. The individuals' responsibilities to God are emphasized in many aspects of daily life (Setwart et al., 1999). Nelsen and Rizvi (1984) stated that religion is woven through family and other social life, so that one cannot easily delineate that which is specifically religious. Honor as a central value appears to be shared by other Islamic societies, for example, Arab culture (Feghali, 1997). Maintaining family *Izzat* [pride, honour, and self-respect] is an

important determinant and motivator of child training and education in Pakistan.

Hence, the measurement of parenting across cultures is a critical issue. The concerns which are associated with the phenomena of parenting mainly involve conceptual and contextual issues. Baranowski et al. (2013) addressed these issues and discussed the problems present in the existing scales of parenting style (e.g., lack of qualitative and observational researches, ignorance of inconsistencies in findings, inadequate use of latest theories, state-of-the-art, and cutting-edge approaches) and highlighted the need of advancement in the extant measures. Provided that most of the parenting styles scales were constructed by the Western authors and represent their own cultural ideals and norms of child rearing; for instance, manipulation of contextual factors (e.g., training, education, obedience, family relatedness, religion, etc.) has not been addressed in extant measures that were developed in the West. These scales do not represent the norms adhered by the parents in Pakistan. Pakistan is a collectivistic society, whereas, Western societies are highly individualistic in which personal goals and needs are preferred over the concern for others and emphasis is mostly laid on *me* (Oyserman & Lee, 2008). In addition to cultural disparities, the scales developed by the Western authors are mostly in English language. The translation of these questionnaires is also a taxing task and high expertise is required in it. Researchers translate the existing scales of measurement in their local languages, which leads to change in the real meaning of the items (Baranowski et al., 2013).

Given that the knowledge in Psychology if applied to members of other cultures, they must be directly examined with an understanding of their assumptions, which may not always match with those of Western culture (Gergen et al., 1996), the development of indigenous tool of parenting has its implications. Bearing in mind the various conceptual and contextual issues supportive in parenting (e.g., religion, deep-rooted traditions, training, modesty, group cohesion, interdependent view of self, and social hierarchy); disparities in Eastern and Western cultures, paucity of indigenous work on the measurement of parenting styles; and problem in existing scale of parenting as raised by Baranowski et al. (2013); the present research was designed to develop a multidimensional, valid, and reliable indigenous parenting style scale. The development of Parenting Style Scale (PPS; Parent's version) comprised of three phases. In Phase 1, items were generated. In Phase 2, the factorial validity of the scale was determined, and in Phase 3 convergent validity of the scale was

established. A mixed method approach (qualitative and quantitative) was used for data collection and analyses.

Method

Phase 1: Item Generation for Parenting Style Scale (PSS)

Sample. Convenient sampling technique was used to approach the sample consisted of children and parents. It included 8 children (4 boys and 4 girls) with age range 9 to 15 years ($M = 13.12$, $SD = 2.64$) from government and private schools in Lahore. Eight parents (4 fathers and 4 mothers) with age range 30 to 65 years ($M = 46.00$, $SD = 8.83$) were also part of our sample. They were not the parents of children who participated in the study. Single parents (e.g., divorced, separated, widow/widower) and children living with single parents were not included in the study.

Measures. A semi-structured interview schedule was constructed for the item generation for the measure. The interview protocol was finalized with the consultation of four teaching psychologists (1 MS in Clinical Psychology, 2 M.Phil, and 1 Ph.D) in order to ensure that questions covered the broader areas of parenting from an indigenous perspective (e.g., parent-child relationships, disciplinary techniques practiced by parents, shared activities, reciprocated expression of emotions, decision making, child autonomy, religion and parenting, and parents' involvement in child's education).

Procedure. Permission from the school administration and parents of children who participated in the study along written consent from parents (both of children and participants) was taken before data collection. Participants were ensured of their anonymity and they had a right to withdraw information at any stage of interview.

The participants were interviewed individually using a semi-structured interview schedule. The researcher started the interview after building rapport with the participants. Prompts and probes were used during the interview. A demographic form was also used to gather basic information from participants, both parents and children (viz., age, gender, educational level, family system, and monthly income). Confidentiality of the information provided was assured and the participants were asked to use initials of their names or any pseudo-name. All the interviews were tape-recorded with the permission and were transcribed afterwards.

Themes generation. Before item generation, major themes were drawn from the interviews by using thematic analysis. According to Braun and Clarke (2006), thematic analysis is a qualitative analytic method for identifying, analyzing, and reporting patterns within the data. It minimally organizes and describes data set in detail. However, frequently it goes further than this, and help in interpreting various aspects of the research topic. The interviews were analyzed in-depth, and themes were generated by interacting with the data by the first and second author.

Table 1
List of Themes in the Item Generation Process

S. No.	Themes
1.	Parent-child relationship types
2.	Reciprocal emotions (parent/child)
3.	Child's autonomy in personal affairs (e.g., dressing, selection of friends, hobbies, use of internet, mobile)
4.	Parents' preferences vs. children's preferences
5.	Decision making
6.	Religion and parenting
7.	Parents' expectations
8.	Parents' expression of emotions
9.	Disciplining a child
10.	Parents' involvement in child's activities
11.	Modern or traditional parenting practices
12.	Children perception of ideal parents
13.	Parents' perception of ideal children
14.	Parent-child communication
15.	Parents' future plans for children
16.	Use of threats and reprimands
17.	Parenting control
18.	Punitive strategies
19.	Gender biases in parenting
20.	Responsibilities of parents and children
21.	Training and socialization

Item generation. The items were empirically generated in the areas under major themes. The total number of initially generated items in Urdu was 246. All the initial items were reviewed repeatedly by the first and second authors. A pool of 150 items was finalized after the elimination of redundant, complex, ambiguous, and unnecessary items. The initial pool of 150 items was reviewed by the committee of five experts including 3 assistant professors and 2 Ph.D

scholars in the Department of Psychology, Government College University, Lahore, by focusing on (a) precision of the items, (b) transparency, (c) repetition, and (d) understandability. After taking experts' opinion, a pool of 120 items was finalized. This pool of 120 items was then reviewed for language fidelity by two experts (university teachers) in Urdu language. Afterwards a pool of 120 initial items was finalized for the try out. A 5-point Likert type scale where 1 = *never*, 2 = *sometimes*, 3 = *do not know*, 4 = *often*, and 5 = *always* was used.

Phase 2: Dimensionality of Parenting Style Scale (PSS)

Phase 2 comprised of two steps. In Step I, a try out was carried out to ensure the comprehensibility of items. In Step II, the factorial validity of the scale was analyzed.

Step I: Try out. The basic aim was to pretest the measure to find out the level of difficulty, comprehensibility of items, elimination of redundant items, and replacement of confusing items as suggested by the participants in the study.

Sample. The sample of 40 parents (20 fathers and 20 mothers) was conveniently recruited from Lahore city. The age range of the parents selected was 30-65 years ($M = 48.17$, $SD = 9.86$). Those parents whose children were of 12-25 years were selected belonging to varied socioeconomic status and having varied educational level.

Procedure. Initially, 50 parents were requested to complete the 120 items in initial form of the scale. The final number of participants who completed the questionnaire was 40. The participants recruited for the pre-testing phase were approached personally at their homes. The confidentiality of the data was also ensured. The feedback from the participants helped in identifying redundant, confused, ambiguous, and complex statements. The overall understandability of the questionnaire was also investigated with the participants. The participants were asked to express their positive and negative views on the items of the scale. The qualitative analysis of the feedback of the participants helped in the refinement of the initially developed indigenous scale. Consequently, some of items were excluded and a few were modified. Many items were excluded due to nonnormality determined by the values of skewness and kurtosis. The items with values beyond the acceptable ranges of skewness and kurtosis for normality were excluded. The value of skewness for the selected items was not less than 8 and the value of kurtosis for the selected items was not greater than 3 (Coakes & Steed, 2003). Finally, 46 items were

excluded and the final scale used for exploratory factor analysis (EFA) consisted of 74 items.

Step II: Exploratory factor analysis, internal consistency, and intrascale correlations. Factorial validity of the scale was determined using EFA. While, Cronbach alpha were computed to determine the internal consistency of the subscales and intrascale correlations were tabulated to establish the construct validity of the PSS.

Sample. The sample for factor analysis comprised of 300 parents (150 mothers and 150 fathers) recruited from 8 cities of Punjab province [Lahore = 70 (23%); Rawalpindi = 50 (16%); Gujranwala = 40(13%); Sargodha = 25(8%); Faisalabad = 35(11%); Sahiwal = 20(6%); Multan = 40(13%); and Bahawalpur = 20 (6%)] by using a convenience sampling technique to give representation to the people living in different areas of the province. The age of the participants ranged between 31 and 60 years ($M = 46.99$, $SD = 9.19$). The sample had diverse socioeconomic status and varied education levels. Two hundred (about 66%) participants were living in nuclear families and 100 (about 33%) were living in joint families. Parents who were having at least one school-going child between 15 and 25 years of age were included in the study, as some of the items of the scale were related to studies of the child and their friendship. Single parents (e.g., divorced, separated, widow/widower) were not included in the study.

Measure. The final 74 items that were selected after the try out were used in this phase.

Procedure. The research project was approved by the Board of Studies of the Department of Psychology, Government College University, Lahore. Written informed consent was taken from the participants that contained the purpose of the data collection, ensuring their anonymity, and confidentiality of the data and their right to withdraw information at any stage of data collection. The rationale of the study was explained to all the participants. A sample of 350 parents was approached personally by the second author at their homes and work places. Finally, 300 participants completed the scale in full.

Results. The suitability of the data was determined by testing the criteria and fulfilling the various assumptions, for example, sample size, normality (skewness and Kurtosis), and missing data for factor analysis (Field, 2005). The values of KMO = .89 and Bartlett's test of Sphercity, $\chi^2 = 92555$, $p = .000$, supported to run EFA. The EFA was run by using Varimax rotation method on the data obtained from 300 participants. The factor solution converged in 50 iterations and six factors solution was obtained.

Table 2

Final Factors with Item Loadings (N = 300)

S. No.	Item No.	Factors					
		I	II	III	IV	V	VI
1.	1	-.52	.22	-.32	.23	.01	.36
2.	2	.39	.13	.21	.17	.11	.23
3.	6	-.32	.04	.15	.12	.23	.07
4.	9	.46	.12	.33	.21	.18	.05
5.	10	.49	.18	.23	.16	.04	.10
6.	12	.48	-.22	.34	-.17	.05	.05
7.	13	.38	.04	.19	-.21	.18	.16
8.	16	.38	-.16	.16	-.21	.14	.03
9.	19	-.39	.23	-.12	.12	.18	.00
10.	20	.56	.10	.26	.17	.14	.05
11.	22	-.54	.20	-.10	.28	.23	.13
12.	28	.39	.02	.04	-.21	.17	.21
13.	40	.43	-.22	.24	-.21	-.21	.34
14.	14	-.15	.52	-.21	.36	.23	-.22
15.	59	.23	.62	.12	.16	.25	.26
16.	60	-.12	.48	.13	.21	.17	-.28
17.	63	.16	.41	-.21	.19	.04	.28
18.	64	.16	.67	-.21	.44	.25	-.25
19.	65	.00	.48	.16	.21	.21	-.12
20.	67	-.13	.41	.18	.15	.12	-.38
21.	69	-.16	.50	-.34	.26	.04	-.27
22.	70	.21	.49	.22	.23	-.18	.23
23.	74	.14	.33	.02	.19	-.26	.26
24.	25	.35	-.20	-.48	-.21	-.28	.09
25.	31	.21	.22	.31	-.21	.17	.16
26.	48	.41	.28	.61	-.27	.23	.31
27.	49	.00	-.23	.44	-.17	.05	.12
28.	50	.21	.03	.32	.15	.00	.16
29.	52	.03	-.26	.68	.16	.21	.33
30.	53	.11	-.28	.65	-.18	.04	.30
31.	57	.24	-.28	.50	-.23	.22	.12
32.	30	.19	.18	-.23	.48	.21	.26
33.	33	.17	.12	.28	.65	.17	.15
34.	35	.21	.28	-.11	.46	.18	.12
35.	37	.18	.18	.23	.43	.19	.21
36.	38	-.33	.17	.06	.59	.17	-.34
37.	47	.12	.21	.29	.39	.07	.13
38.	62	.18	.16	.26	.54	-.33	.14
39.	41	.29	.15	-.22	-.23	.38	.25
40.	42	-.38	.23	.00	-.34	.68	-.33
41.	44	.23	.18	-.34	-.28	.45	.13
42.	45	.29	-.27	-.28	-.40	.60	.19

Continued...

S. No.	Item No.	Factors					
		I	II	III	IV	V	VI
43.	73	.23	.12	.28	-.17	-.47	.00
44.	8	.23	.16	.27	.23	.23	.41
45.	11	.22	-.23	.26	.27	.12	.42
46.	17	.33	-.26	.18	.28	-.17	.51
47.	24	.27	-.22	.26	.18	.11	.52
48.	27	.33	-.34	.27	.18	-.33	.63
Variance		13.91%	7.16%	4.31%	3.53%	3.22%	2.81%
Eigen Values		19.01	4.55	3.13	2.87	2.27	1.66

Note. Factor I = Controlling Parents; Factor II = Compassionate Parents; Factor III = Conventional /Orthodox Parents; Factor IV = Supportive-Involved Parents; Factor V = Avoidant Parents; Factor VI = Aggressive Parents. Factor loadings > .30 are boldfaced. Boldface loadings show the retained items under the relevant factor. Loadings with minus sign show that the item has contradictory connotation (reverse item) to the relevant factor or other items loaded under that particular factor.

Six comprehensive and interpretable factors out of 8 factors in total are chosen on the basis of Eigen values > 1.0, scree plot, and theoretical relevance. The inclusion criteria for retaining items are based either on the higher loadings or the theoretical relevance of the items to a particular factor. Total 26 items, which are excluded, have loadings < .30 or they are scattered throughout the factor structure. A thorough evaluation of the 6 meaningful factors depict that they are reasonably important and distinctive parenting styles practiced by parents in Pakistan. The amount of variance accounted for by retained factors is 47%. The content of the items loaded on the 6 factors is interpreted in the light of available literature on parenting practices. Out of the final 48 items, six items (1, 3, 9, 11, 24, and 43) need reverse coding.

The internal consistency of subscales of PSS, item-total correlations for each item with respective subscales was computed through Pearson Product Moment Correlation. All the items showed significant correlations with their respective factors and correlations ranged from .36 to .64 for Controlling; .33, to .63 for Compassionate; .38 to .68 for Conventional; .33 to .62 for Supportive; .43 to .68 for Avoidant; and .36 to .68 for Aggressive Parents.

The first factor was labeled as *Controlling Parents* since items (Items no. 1-13) loaded on this factor covered lack of autonomy in mobility and decision making; strict monitoring of child's academic activities, use of mobile, TV and internet; undermining child's opinion, imposing decision on child; not allowing the child to argue; and exercising authority to control the child's behavior. Example item: "I do not allow my child to do anything without bringing it into my

notice". The second factor *Compassionate Parents* included items (Items no. 14-23) of those parents who prefer child's likes and dislikes; keep the child aware of parental expectations; discipline their child with love and care; give positive feedback; show encouraging attitude; understands children's problem from their perspectives; give space to the child to express his/her views; and resolve conflict harmoniously. Example item: "I make efforts to relax my child, when s/he is upset".

The third factor was labeled as *Conventional/Orthodox Parent* since the items (Items no. 24-31) loaded on this factor pertained to demand from children to be submissive, compliant, and respectful; using conventional child rearing practices; use past and religious precedents for child rearing; and observe cultural values in all sphere of a child's life. Example item: "I strictly deal with my child, if s/he does not follow Islamic codes of life".

The fourth factor contained items (Items no. 32-38) depicting *Supportive/Involved Parents*, for example, encourage child to share their failures and achievements; engage children in their future plans and decisions; empathize with children during turmoil; give them presents on important occasions; stay in touch when child is away; share jokes; accompany the child in recreational activities; provide coaching to the child amicably; compliment child for good deeds; support the child in resolving academic and social issues. Example item: "I prefer my child's choice in his/her academic affairs".

The fifth factor *Avoidant Parents* (Items no. 39-43) reflect those parents who remain silent on child's misbehavior and mistakes; show withdrawal behavior (e.g., leave home when child show aggressive behavior; and ignores child's demands, misconduct, and mischievous behavior). Example item: "I keep quiet on the mistakes of my child". Final factor of PSS characterized as *Aggressive Parents* (Items no. 44-48) are marked as those who use physical punishment to discipline a child; abuse the child verbally; reprimand the child on little mistakes; and insult their child in public. Example item: "I punish my child physically on undesirable actions".

Table 3 shows that in order to determine the internal consistency ($N = 300$) on the retained subscales of the PSS, Cronbach's alpha coefficients are computed that ranged from .62 to .77 for Avoidant Parents to Compassionate Parents, respectively. All the subscales show internal consistency, and with the exception of Avoidant Parents and Aggressive Parents, are significantly correlated with all other subscales and the correlations ranged from .15 to .68. The highest correlation appeared between Supportive Parents and Compassionate

Parents indicating that in Pakistani society, parents show high level of involvement in their children which is an expression of their love, care, and empathy towards children.

Table 3

Cronbach Alpha and Correlation among Subscales of PSS (N = 300)

Variables	No. of Items	α	1	2	3	4	5	6
1. Controlling	13	.76	-	-.40**	.27**	.15*	-.42**	.47**
2. Compassionate	10	.77		-	.45**	.68**	-.31**	-.22*
3. Conventional	8	.74			-	.52**	-.23*	.38**
4. Supportive	7	.66				-	-.31**	.27**
5. Avoidant	5	.62					-	-.04
6. Aggressive	5	.69						-

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.

As the direction of correlations concerns, Controlling Parents appears to be significantly negatively correlated with Compassionate and Avoidant Parents, which shows that parents who hold strict control over the activities of their children, take lesser care of children's likes and dislikes; they show lesser empathy and encouraging attitude towards children; and give lesser space to the children to express their views. These parents hardly remain silent on the misbehavior, mistakes, and other issues related to their children. Similarly, Compassionate Parents show significant negative correlations with Avoidant and Aggressive Parents, which show that parents who prefer child's likes and dislikes, discipline their child with love and care, and give space to the child to express his/her views; they occasionally ignore the issues related to their children and do not use punitive strategies to discipline their child.

Negative correlation between Conventional and Avoidant Parents shows that parents who demand more from children to be submissive, compliant, and respectful; and use conventional child rearing practices, they rarely remain silent on the misbehavior of children; and do not ignore misconduct and mischievous behavior of children. Again negative correlation between Supportive and Avoidant Parents show that parents who score higher on the dimensions like, coaching children in amicable way; sharing their problems and participate in children's recreational activities; they score lower on ignoring child's demands and seldom compromise on child's misconduct.

In order to determine the construct validity of the PSS, group differences attributable to gender on parenting styles were examined by computing independent sample *t*-test.

Table 4

Gender Differences among Parents on Parenting Styles (N= 300)

Factors	Fathers (<i>n</i> = 150)	Mothers (<i>n</i> = 150)	<i>t</i> (298)	Cohen's	
	<i>M</i> (<i>SD</i>)	<i>M</i> (<i>SD</i>)		<i>p</i>	<i>d</i>
Controlling	47.66(8.96)	49.66(8.39)	1.84	.06	.23
Compassionate	37.06(7.00)	39.49(6.42)	3.04	.00	.36
Conventional	37.11(6.88)	38.80(6.17)	2.17	.03	.31
Supportive	42.25(7.73)	45.35(6.06)	3.69	.00	.39
Avoidant	14.28(4.09)	13.61(3.06)	1.53	.12	.18
Aggressive	21.02(5.60)	21.19(4.93)	.26	.79	.03

Significant differences appear only on three parenting styles (Supportive, Conventional, and Compassionate), where mothers show significantly higher mean values as compared to fathers. The values of Cohen's *d* show medium effect size.

Phase 3: Convergent Validity of Parenting Style Scale

In order to determine the convergent validity of the scale, scores on PSS were compared with subscales of Parenting Styles and Dimension Questionnaire (PSDQ; Robinson et al., 1995).

Sample. It comprised 100 parents living in Lahore (60 mothers and 40 fathers). Age of the sample ranged between 42 and 58 years ($M = 47.50$, $SD = 6.18$). Participants of the study belonged to middle socioeconomic status and their education ranged between matric to postgraduate level. Convenient sampling technique was used to recruit the sample. Parents who had adolescent children were included in the study, since this age group is vulnerable and parents are usually most concerned regarding moral and social development of their children at this stage.

Measures. Following measures were used.

Parenting Style Scale (PSS). The indigenously developed 48 items PSS was used. Respondents rated on 5-point Likert options (1 = *never*, 2 = *sometimes*, 3 = *do not know*, 4 = *often*, and 5 = *always*) with six subscales (viz., Controlling, Compassionate, Conventional/Orthodox, Supportive, Avoidant, and Aggressive).

Parenting Styles and Dimensions Questionnaire (Robinson et al., 1995). The Urdu version (Batool, 2013) of the 32 item PSDQ was used in the study. Each item of the scale was evaluated using the 6-point Likert type options (*Never* = 1 to 6 = *Always*). The Authoritative subscale (for example, *I take into account child's preferences in making plans for the family*) consisted of 13 items. The Authoritarian subscale (for example, *I punish by taking privileges away from child with little if any explanations*) consisted of 13 items. The Permissive subscales (for example, *I ignore my child's bad behavior*) consisted of 4 items. Validity of the scale has been supported in number of studies (e.g., Onder & Gulay, 2009; Robinson et al., 1995). The alpha values of the Authoritarian, Authoritative, and Permissive parenting were found to be .72, .65, and .62, respectively, in the present study.

Procedure. Parents were approached personally and were requested to complete the PSS and PSDQ after the interval of 30 minutes to control the effect of first questionnaire on the next one. Initially, 120 parents were contacted and 100 of them gave their consent and completed the study scale on all dimensions. Fifty parents were given PSS first and PSDQ afterward and the sequence of scales was reversed for the rest 50 parents.

Results. In order to determine the convergent validity of the scale, correlations among subscales of PSS and subscales of PSDQ (Robinson et al., 1995) were computed through Pearson Product Moment Correlation.

Table 5
Correlations among Subscales of the PSS and PSDQ (N = 100)

Subscales of PSS	Subscales of PSDQ		
	Authoritative	Authoritarian	Permissive
Controlling	-.41**	.47**	-.64**
Compassionate	.52**	-.33**	.22*
Conventional	-.28*	.44**	-.54**
Supportive	.43**	-.22*	-.33**
Avoidant	-.34**	-.52**	.36**
Aggressive	-.28**	.46**	.09

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.

All the correlations in Table 5 exclusive of correlation between Aggressive and Permissive parents are significant. Significant inverse correlations with the complementary scales (showing opposite content) and positive correlations with comparable scales (showing similar content) support the convergent validity of the indigenous

measure. Authoritative parenting shows significant negative correlations with Controlling, Conventional, Avoidant, and Aggressive Parents; but significant positive correlations with Compassionate and Supportive parents. It shows that Authoritative parents in the Western scale (Robinson et al., 1995): offer warmth, love, understanding, and empathy to a child; parenting style that is child-centered, these parents closely interact with their children, while maintaining high expectations for behavior and performance is opposite to Controlling, Conventional, Avoidant, and Aggressive Parents in our scale, and is comparable to Compassionate and Supportive parents in the indigenous scale (see the description of the indigenous scale under Table 2).

Authoritarian parenting shows significant positive correlations with Controlling, Conventional, and Aggressive Parents; but significant negative correlations with Supportive, Compassionate, and Avoidant parents. It shows that Authoritarian parenting in the Western scale (Robinson et al., 1995) is self-indulgent and value obedience to their authority; and do not value the will of children and exert control through power and coercion; it has some how features that are similar to Controlling, Conventional, and Aggressive Parents in the indigenous scale (see the description of the indigenous scale under Table 2).

Permissive parenting in Robinson et al. (1995) scale shows significant negative correlations with Controlling, Conventional, and Supportive parents and significant positive correlations with Avoidant Parents. It shows that parents who are nontraditional and lenient, do not require mature behavior; allow considerable self-regulation; and avoid confrontation with children; parents who have low expectations for self-control and maturity; and rarely discipline their children in the Western scale (Robinson et al., 1995) has some similar feature that Avoidant Parents contain; and opposite to Controlling, Conventional, and Supportive parents in the indigenous scale (see the description of the indigenous scale under Table 2).

Discussion

The indigenous scale to measure parenting styles practiced by Pakistani parents was developed and validated in three phases. The items for the scale were generated empirically and the factorial validity of the scale was analyzed through EFA. Six interpretable and distinct factors emerged as a result of Varimax rotation method, which drew on the notion that the Varimax rotation method is the simplest

method that helps in the prediction of the precision and clear interpretation of each factor (Kaiser, 1974). The alpha coefficients of all the 6 subscales of the PSS showed internal consistency and significantly correlated with each other (see Table 3).

The extant parenting scales largely measure four basic parenting styles as proposed by Baumrind (1991); whereas, PSS appeared as a multidimensional measure and the subscales of PSS revealed six distinct parenting styles prevalent in Pakistani society. The subscales of the PSS comprised of Controlling Parents, which partially reminds us of authoritarian parenting that exerts power on their children to get control over their lives (Baumrind 1991). Compassionate Parents receive support from the work of Halbert (2014). It is the type of democratic parenting, in which the level of communication is increased to an even higher degree. Supportive Parents, which is partially equivalent to helicopter parents that is a parent who takes an over-protective or excessive interest in the life of their child or children; are over focused on their children; and typically take too much responsibility for their children's experiences, specifically, their successes or failures (O'Donnell, 2014). Avoidant Parents look like unsupportive parents; whereas, Conventional/Orthodox parents have not been markedly revealed in the extant literature. Aggressive Parents in our scale are to some extent comparable to authoritarian parenting (Baumrind, 1991).

The first domain of controlling parents defines those parents who consider themselves perfectionists and do not allow their children to live their lives independently. They show domineering attitude towards their children. The results of the present research indicate a significant correlation between controlling parents and conventional parents (see Table 3). It shows that controlling parents usually use conventional parenting styles, which are conservative in nature and set down strict and rigid standards for their children. Traditional parenting in Pakistan does not appear to be harsh, however, demanding to greater extent, but do not suppress the liberty of the child at the same time. Some of the items cover the training, education, obedience, family relatedness component of parenting, which is missing in existing measures. Some of the items in controlling parents are comparable to authoritarian parenting (Baumrind, 1966), where parents score high on the control dimension and low on acceptance. In authoritarian parenting style, parents often use a system of punishment to enforce their control and communication is top (parent)-down (to the child) oriented.

The second subscale Compassionate Parents is a mixture of various positive characteristics (e.g., care, love, sensitivity, empathy,

tenderness, concern for child's welfare, etc.). Compassionate parents show significant negative correlations with Controlling, Avoidant, and Aggressive parents (see Table 3). This shows that parents who are empathetic towards child, they do not show commanding, authoritarian, detached and aggressive attitude towards child. Compassionate parenting provides a secure emotional foundation for children to explore and interact with their environments in a safe manner. At the same time, parents develop the protective, nurturing, and compassionate skills that empower them in child rearing. We simply function at our best when we have emotional connections with our children that are strong, flexible, and enjoyable. Compassion most definitely does not mean that parents should go along with whatever children want, nor does it mean entire nobility. Compassionate Parents empower children to control their own behavior by teaching them to regulate their motivations (Halbert, 2014).

For Conventional/Orthodox Parents (third Subscale), religious parenting is a core aspect. The correlation matrix (see Table 3) indicates that conventional parents in Pakistan are compassionate and concerned at the same time. They seem to be controlling, due to the fact that they are caring and thoughtful of child's well-being. Conventional Parents consider parenting a God-appointed, sanctified, and important mission. Conventional couples struggle to raise their children within a conventional religious frame of values. This factor is supported by the vision (e.g., Nelsen & Rizvi, 1984; Setwart et al., 1999) that religion and socialization of a child are intertwined, and religion is dominant in parenting a child in Pakistan. Petrovich (2014) disapproves conventional Christian parents, believing that it is increasingly difficult to isolate our children completely from the outside world and its influence, primarily in this fast-paced digital age.

Supportive/Involved Parents (fourth subscale) are labeled as those who are highly supportive in every domain of child's life. High level of parental warmth and nurturance is a unique characteristic of Supportive Parents. Parents deal with the child in a reassuring, warming, and caring way. They provide their children a sense of security. Significant positive correlations appeared among Supportive and Compassionate Parents; whereas, Supportive Parents inversely correlated with Avoidant Parents. The high correlation between Supportive Parents and Compassionate Parents (see Table 3) shows that parents who are concerned, they are kind hearted, sympathetic, empathetic, and considerate of child's issues. Supportive Parents in Pakistani context appeared in positive perspective, whereas, in Western societies supportive parents are considered as helicopter parents as a group of parents who take on in the practice of over-

parenting; obsessed with their children's education, safety, extracurricular activities, and other aspects of their children's lives; and fail to infuse them with a sense of independence (O'Donnell, 2014).

Fifth parenting category is Avoidant Parents, who treat their children on superficial level by concealing their actual emotions and feeling towards children. This parenting style is somehow comparable to neglectful parenting given by Maccoby and Martin (as cited in Rodriguez, Donovan, & Crowley, 2009). Intercorrelation among subscales showed significant negative correlations with Supportive, Controlling, Compassionate, and Conventional parents (see Table 3), which illustrate that parents who use avoidant style of parenting, do not control their children's routine; take least interest in child's affairs; and do not use conventional religious frame of values in the upbringing of their children. The final subscale of Aggressive Parents use verbal and physical aggression frequently to deal with their children. Significant positive correlations with Controlling, Conventional, and Supportive parents and significant negative correlation with Compassionate Parents (see Table 3) illustrate that these parents use strict strategies to control their children in helping them for resolving their problems. They are orthodox parents, who have profound bonding with their culture and traditions, and show least love and care in parenting their children. They show low nurturance, low communication, high expectations, and high control.

Significant gender differences appeared on three parenting styles (e.g. Supportive, Conventional, and Compassionate) that support the construct validity of our scale (see Table 4). The plausible reason of mother's higher involvement, conventional parenting, and compassion towards their children may be that mothers are the primary care takers of the children. Furthermore, mothers are inherently characterized with care, love, and affection which play an important role in developing a strong bond between them and children.

Pakistani mothers spend a lot of time with their children at home and get an adequate period for understanding them. However, fathers do not find enough time to be with their children. Mothers appeared to be more conventional in child rearing as compared to fathers. The reason for this finding may be that most mothers in our society are house-wives and consequently have less social exposure, so they are less able to understand the demands of modern age and rear child in a conventional way. Fathers in Pakistani society are more avoidant towards their children as compared to mothers. The reason for this may be that traditional Pakistani fathers often miss the chance to play a role in the child rearing. A father spends most of his time outside the

home as he is a bread-winner (Craig, 2006). This is one aspect that negatively affects father-child relationship. Mothers usually spend more time with children, speak more to them, and take care of the child as compared to fathers. Parenting role is defined by gender (Craig, 2006; Slavkin & Stright, 2000). Man in most of the societies is a bread winner and woman is the home-maker. Male partner is defined as masculine, independent, aggressive, and assertive (Eagly & Steffen, 1984). Whereas, female partner is defined as feminine, being nurturing, and emotionally warm (Slavkin & Stright, 2000), and this affect their roles as parents. Results of our study are also supported by Webb and Toussaint (2005) that women are inclined to express more empathy than men, and men are likely to be more forceful and aggressive than their women (Helgeson, 2012).

Results also support the convergent validity of the scale. Our results are in line with the literature on parenting, for example, authoritative parenting is believed to support a balanced use of warmth and control; whereas, authoritarian parenting style exerts too much control; permissive and neglectful-uninvolved parenting lack warmth or they lack control yet with excessive warmth, or they lack both warmth and control, as with the neglectful-uninvolved style (Baumrind, 1966). Parents who practice authoritative parenting are warm and nurturant toward adolescent; they are high in control and high in responsiveness. The authoritarian parents appeared to place firm limits and control on adolescents and allow little verbal exchange. Permissive parents, who are low in control and high in responsiveness on one hand; and on the other, these parents are warm and caring.

Limitations and Suggestions

The following limitations of the study should be addressed in future. Firstly, the sample of the current work was not large enough and was drawn only from Punjab province, so it was not the representative of all provinces of Pakistan. It is suggested to include cities from other provinces to get larger and more representative sample of Pakistani parents in future validation studies. Secondly, convenient sampling technique was used to collect data, in future, sample representation be based on quota sampling technique. Thirdly, the scale was developed keeping in view the parenting of adolescents. Some of the items of the scale may not be applied to parents of young children. Further, scales should include items that address parents of children of all age groups. Finally, this study requires further

validation against larger population. The scale needs to be used in cross-cultural studies, so that differences in parenting across different cultures may be examined. A comparative analysis of parenting styles in rural and urban areas will also give directions for future researches.

Implications

This research has wide ranging implications, specifically for family counselors, as it will help them develop a proper insight to parenting styles in Pakistani context. The family therapists may also foster strong and meaningful relationships between parents and children, once parenting style has been identified. The scale can be used in educational domains, particularly helping the educationist to study the role of parenting styles in educational difficulties and achievements of students in Pakistani context. Parents may also obtain benefit from the study by evaluating their own parenting style and being open to change. The study provides the most prevalent styles of parenting in indigenous perspective

Conclusion

The present study provides firm evidence that parenting styles are determined by culture, via attaining original culturally grounded parenting concerns and practices. The six distinct valid and reliable subscales of the PSS facilitate in measuring parenting styles in Pakistani context.

References

- Adair, J. G., Puhan, B. N., & Vohra, N. (1993). Indigenization of psychology: Empirical assessment of progress in Indian research. *International Journal of Psychology*, 28, 149-169.
- Baranowski, T., O'Connor, T., Hughes, S., Sleddens, E., Beltran, A., & Baranowski, J. (2013). Houston...We have a problem! Measurement of parenting. *Childhood obesity*. Retrieved from <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/23837847>
- Batool, S. S. (2013). Lack of adequate parenting: A potential risk factor for aggression among adolescents. *Pakistan Journal of Psychological Research*, 28(2), 217-238.
- Baumrind, D. (1966). Effects of authoritative parental control on child behavior. *Child Development*, 37(4), 887-907.

- Baumrind, D. (1991). Effective parenting during early adolescent transition. In P. A. Cowan & E. M. Hetherington (Eds.), *Advances in family research* (pp. 111-163). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Inc.
- Berry, J. W., Poortinga, Y. H., Segall, M. H., & Dasen, P. R. (1992). *Cross-cultural psychology: Research and applications*. UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Bornstein, M. H. (2002). *Handbook of parenting*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3, 77-101.
- Buri, J. (1991). Parental Authority Questionnaire. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 57(1), 110-119.
- Chang, M. (2007). *Cultural differences in parenting styles and their effects on teens' self-esteem, perceived parental relationship satisfaction, and self-satisfaction*. (Unpublished honors thesis). Dietrich College of Humanities and Social Sciences, Carnegie Mellon University, Australia.
- Chao, R. K. (1994). Beyond parental control and authoritarian parenting style: Understanding Chinese parenting through the cultural notion of training. *Child Development*, 65, 1111-1119.
- Collins, W. A., & Laursen, B. (1999). *The Minnesota symposia on child psychology: Relationships as developmental contexts*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Craig, L. (2006). Does father care mean fathers share? A comparison of how mothers and fathers in intact families spend time with children. *Gender and Society*, 20(2), 259-282.
- Darling, N., & Steinberg, L. (1993). Parenting style as context: An integrative model. *Psychological Bulletin*, 113, 487-496.
- Darling, N., & Toyokawa, T. (1997). *Construction and validation of the Parenting Style Inventory II*. The Pennsylvania State University: Internal Publication.
- Eagly, A. H., & Steffen, V. J. (1984). Gender stereotypes stem from the distribution of women and men into social roles. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 46(4), 735-754.
- Elgar, F. J., Waschbusch, D. A., Dadds, M. R., & Sigvaldason, N. (2007). Development and validation of a short form of the Alabama Parenting Questionnaire. *Journal of Child and Family Studies*, 16(2), 243-259. DOI: 10.1007/s10826-006-9082-5
- Feghali, E. (1997). Arab cultural communication patterns. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 21, 345-378.
- Ferguson, E. D., Hagaman, J. A., Maurer, S. B., Mathews, P. & Peng, K. (2013). Asian culture in transition: Is it related to reported parenting styles and transitivity of simple choices. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 43, 730-740. doi: 10.1111/jasp.12001

- Field, A. (2005). *Discovering statistics using SPSS* (2nd ed.). London: Sage Publications.
- Gergen, K. J., Gulerce, A., Lock, A., & Misra, G. (1996). Psychological science in a cultural context. *American Psychologist*, 51, 496-503.
- Halbert, B. (2014). *Coaching for parents who are ready and committed to building relationships of deeper connection with their children*. Retrieved from <http://www.compassionateparenting.com/>
- Harrington, L., & Liu, J. H. (2002). Self-enhancement and attitudes toward high achievers: A bicultural view of the independent and interdependent self. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 33(1), 37-55.
- Helgeson, V. (2012). *Psychology of gender*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson.
- Kagitcibasi, C. (1996). *Family and human development across cultures*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Kaiser, H. F. (1974). An index of factorial simplicity. *Psychometrika*, 39, 31-36.
- Lamborn, S. D., Mounts, N. S., Steinberg, L., & Dornbusch, S. M. (1991). Patterns of competence and adjustment among adolescents from authoritative, authoritarian, indulgent, and neglectful families. *Journal of Child Development*, 62, 1049-1065.
- Malik F. (2002). *Paternal authoritarianism, parental acceptance-rejection, and family environment* (Unpublished Ph.D Dissertation). National Institute of Psychology, Quaid-i-Azam University, Islamabad.
- Nelsen, H. M., & Rizvi, A. (1984). Gender and religious socialization: Comparisons from Pakistan and the United States. *Journal of Comparative Family Studies*, 15, 281-290.
- O'Donnell, J. (2014). *What are helicopter parents?* Retrieved from <http://tweenparenting.about.com/od/physicalemotionalgrowth/g/helicopterparents.htm>
- Onder, A., & Gulay, H. (2009). Reliability and validity of Parenting Styles and Dimension Questionnaire. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 1(1), 508-514.
- Oyserman, D., & Lee, S. (2008). Does culture influence what and how we think? Effects of priming individualism and collectivism. *Psychological Bulletin*, 134, 311-342.
- Parker, G., Roussos, J., Pavlovic, H. D., Mitchell, P., Wilhelm, K., & Austin, M. P. (1997). The development of a refined measure of dysfunctional parenting and assessment of its relevance in patients with affective disorders. *Psychological Medicine*, 27(5), 1193-1203.
- Pohl, R., Bender, M., & Lachmann, G. (2005). Autobiographical memory and social skills of men and women. *Applied Cognitive Psychology*, 19(6), 745-759.

- Robinson, C. C., Mandelco, B., Olsen, S. F., & Hart, C. H. (1995). Authoritative, authoritarian, and permissive parenting practices: Development of a new measure. *Psychological Reports*, 77, 819-830.
- Robinson, C. C., Mandelco, B., Olsen, S. F., & Hart, C. H. (2001). The Parenting Styles and Dimensions Questionnaire. In B. F. Perlmutter, J. Touliatos, & G. W. Holden (Eds.), *Handbook of family measurement techniques: Instruments and index* (pp. 319-321). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Rodriguez, M. M. D., Donovanick, M., & Crowley, S. (2009). Parenting styles in a cultural context: Observations of protective parenting in first-generation Latinos. *Family Process*, 48, 195-210.
- Rothbaum, F., Morelli, G., Pott, M., & Liu-Constant, Y. (2000). Immigrant-Chinese and Euro-American parents' physical closeness with young children: Themes of family relatedness. *Journal of Family Psychology*, 14, 334-348.
- Slavkin, M., & Stright, A. (2000). Gender role differences in college students from one and two parent families. *Sex Roles*, 42(1/2), 23-37.
- Stephens, M. A. (2009). *Gender differences in parenting styles and effects on the parent child relationship*. (BS Honor Thesis). Department of Psychology, Texas State University, San Marcos, USA.
- Stewart, S. M., Bond, M. H., Zaman, R. M., Rao, C., McBride-Chang, N., & Ho, T. (1999). Functional parenting in Pakistan. *International Journal of Behavioral Development*, 23, 747-770.
- Wang, W., & Leichtman, M. D. (2000). Same beginnings, different stories: A comparison of American and Chinese children's narratives. *Child Development*, 71, 1329-1346.
- Webb, J., & Toussaint, L. (2005). Gender differences in relationship between empathy and forgiveness. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 145(6), 673-686.
- Youniss, J., & Ruth, A. J. (2002). Approaching policy for adolescent development in the 21st century. In J. J. Mortimer & R. W. Larson (Eds.), *The changing adolescent experience, societal trends, and the transition to adulthood* (pp. 250-271). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Received December 31st, 2014

Revision received December 3rd, 2015