

INTERPERSONAL FUNCTIONAL FLEXIBILITY:
AN ANTECEDENT OF AUTHORITATIVE PARENTING?

By

MARGARET ANN VAN OEVEREN

B.A., The University of British Columbia, 1979

A THESIS SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF
THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF
MASTER OF ARTS

in

THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES

Division of Family Sciences

School of Family and Nutritional Sciences

We accept this thesis as conforming
to the required standard

THE UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA

July, 1988

© Margaret Ann Van Oeveren, 1988

In presenting this thesis in partial fulfilment of the requirements for an advanced degree at the University of British Columbia, I agree that the Library shall make it freely available for reference and study. I further agree that permission for extensive copying of this thesis for scholarly purposes may be granted by the head of my department or by his or her representatives. It is understood that copying or publication of this thesis for financial gain shall not be allowed without my written permission.

Department of Family Studies

The University of British Columbia
Vancouver, Canada

Date September 28, 1988

Abstract

It has been asserted that androgynous individuals are both competent and flexible and that, as such, they should be most likely to be authoritative parents (highly demanding/highly responsive)(Spence & Helmreich, 1978). However, studies examining the association between psychological androgyny and this optimal parenting strategy (Baumrind, 1982; Spence & Helmreich, 1978) have reached conflicting conclusions. The position taken in this study is that there is a logical association between androgyny and authoritative parenting at the construct level, but that the component of androgyny critical to this link is functional flexibility (the ability to appropriately deploy both masculine and feminine attributes across multi-interpersonal domains) rather than the simple possession of both masculine and feminine traits per se. In view of this argument, earlier studies share a significant limitation. Their operational definitions of androgyny fail to reflect the functional flexibility aspect of the construct definition, thus allowing individuals who possess both masculine and feminine traits but who are not functionally flexible to be classified as androgynous. This study had two objectives. The first was to retest Spence and Helmreich's (1978) hypothesis

that androgyny is positively related to authoritative parenting using a measure which would assess functional flexibility. The second objective was to demonstrate that authoritative parenting requires flexibility with respect to a whole range of interpersonal abilities rather than simply masculine and feminine attributes. A sample of 96 mothers with children between the ages of 7 and 12 were asked to complete a battery of questionnaires which included Bem's (1974) Sex Role Inventory (BSRI), Paulhus and Martin's (1987) Battery of Interpersonal Capabilities (BIC), and the Block (1965) Childrearing Practices Report: Q-Sort (CRPR). Contrary to what was expected, neither androgyny nor flexibility with respect to the whole range of interpersonal attributes was positively associated with authoritative parenting. Certain problems with the content of the parenting measure may have contributed to the lack of association. To minimize some of the problems with its content the method of using the parenting Q-sort was revised. The new analyses involved categorizing mothers according to warmth and demandingness--a method similar to that used in earlier studies. In these further analyses few significant differences in parenting style were found between androgynous mothers and other mothers. The most notable difference arose

when the sex of the child was considered. Although, overall, androgynous mothers were not more likely to be bad parents, they were more likely than other mothers to be permissive with their sons.

Table of Contents

| | Page |
|---|------|
| Abstract | ii |
| Table of Contents | v |
| List of Tables | vii |
| Acknowledgements | ix |
| Introduction | 1 |
| Androgyny and Authoritative Parenting | 4 |
| Functional Flexibility and Authoritative Parenting | 7 |
| The Measurement of Interpersonal Functional Flexibility | 13 |
| The Problem | 14 |
| Method | 16 |
| Subjects | 16 |
| Procedure | 16 |
| Measures | 17 |
| Personal history and demographic data | 17 |
| The BSRI | 18 |
| The BIC | 22 |
| The CRPR | 26 |
| Results and Discussion | 29 |
| Sample Characteristics | 29 |
| Functional Flexibility and Authoritative Parenting | 31 |

| | |
|--|----|
| The Independent Measures | 35 |
| The Dependent Measure | 38 |
| Factor Analysis of the Parenting Q-Sort | 41 |
| Correlations Between the Parenting Factor Indexes and the Independent Variables | 43 |
| Androgyny as a Predictor of Authoritative Parenting Using Baumrind's Parenting Style Categories | 47 |
| The BSRI index of androgyny and authoritative parenting | 49 |
| The capabilities index of androgyny and authoritative parenting | 52 |
| Comparison of the three sets of results | 54 |
| Socioeconomic Status and Authoritative Parenting | 56 |
| Conclusion | 57 |
| Footnotes | 62 |
| References | 64 |
| Tables | 68 |
| Appendixes | 89 |

List of Tables

| | Page |
|---|------|
| Table 1. Demographic Correlates of Authoritative Parenting | 68 |
| Table 2. Regression Coefficients for Model 1 | 69 |
| Table 3. Regression Coefficients for Model 2 | 70 |
| Table 4. Regression Coefficients for Model 3 | 71 |
| Table 5. Regression Coefficients for Model 4 | 72 |
| Table 6. Regression Coefficients for Model 5 | 73 |
| Table 7. Items for Factor 1 with Factor Loadings. Responsiveness..... | 74 |
| Table 8. Items for Factor 2 with Factor Loadings. Neuroticism..... | 76 |
| Table 9. Items for Factor 3 with Factor Loadings. Demandingness..... | 78 |
| Table 10. Correlations Between the Independent Variables (Masculinity, Femininity, Dominance and Warmth) and the Parenting Factor Indexes for the Total Sample | 79 |
| Table 11. Correlations Between the Independent Variables (Masculinity, Femininity, Dominance and Warmth) and the Parenting Factor Indexes for Mothers of Girls | 80 |
| Table 12. Correlations Between the Independent Variables (Masculinity, Femininity, Dominance and Warmth) and the Parenting Factor Indexes for Mothers of Boys | 81 |
| Table 13. Frequencies for Parenting Categories by BSRI Types for the Total Sample | 82 |

| | | |
|-----------|---|----|
| Table 14. | Frequencies for Parenting Categories by BSRI Types for Mothers of Girls | 83 |
| Table 15. | Frequencies for Parenting Categories by BSRI Types for Mothers of Boys | 84 |
| Table 16. | Frequencies for Parenting Categories by Capabilities Classifications for the Total Sample | 85 |
| Table 17. | Frequencies for Parenting Categories by Capabilities Classifications for Mothers of Girls | 86 |
| Table 18. | Frequencies for Parenting Categories by Capabilities Classifications for Mothers of Boys | 87 |
| Table 19. | Correlations Between the Demographic Variables and the Parenting Factor Indexes | 88 |

Acknowledgement

I would like to express my sincere appreciation to the members of my thesis committee, Dr. Carol Martin, Dr. Roy Rodgers, Dr. Jim White, and Dr. Jerry Wiggins for their guidance throughout the completion of this thesis.

Parenting style has been cited as a major contributing factor in children's attainment of social competency (Baumrind, 1966). Children's social behavior varies primarily along two dimensions: 1) their propensity for responsible versus socially disruptive behavior, and 2) their tendency towards active versus passive behavior. Furthermore, these two dimensions are independent of one another. Within the context of North American culture, the competent child is generally defined as one who is socially responsible (accommodating towards social institutions) and yet active (self assertive and individualistic) (Baumrind, 1971).

Baumrind (1967) has argued that parenting styles differ on four dimensions: (a) parental control, (b) maturity demands, (c) parent-child communication, and (d) nurturance; and tend to cluster into or near three typical patterns which are termed: authoritarian, authoritative, and permissive. Of course no parent fits a given pattern all of the time. The categories simply reflect dominant patterns.

Parents who fit the authoritarian classification are likely to attempt to shape, control, and evaluate the behavior and attitudes of their children in accordance with a set standard of conduct. They favor punitive, forceful measures to curb their

children's self will and believe in keeping their children in their place, thus restricting their autonomy. They value obedience, work, and the preservation of order and traditional structure. They discourage verbal give and take and are sometimes unresponsive to the point of rejecting their children (Baumrind, 1966).

Parents who fit the classification of authoritative attempt to direct their children in a rational, issue-oriented manner. They encourage verbal give and take, share with their children the reasoning behind their policies, and solicit their objections when they refuse to conform. They value autonomous self will and disciplined conformity. Firm control is exercised at points of parent-child divergence but their children are not hemmed in by restrictions. They expect their children to conform to adult requirements but also to be independent and self directing (Baumrind, 1966).

Permissive parents are likely to behave in a nonpunitive, acceptant, and affirmative manner towards their children. They make few demands for household responsibility and orderly behavior, and allow their children to regulate their own activities as much as possible. They avoid the exercise of control and do not encourage their children to obey externally defined standards. They view themselves as a resource for their

children to use as they wish rather than as a controlling agent responsible for shaping their present or future behavior (Baumrind, 1966).

The children of authoritarian and permissive parents exhibit less social competency than children of authoritative parents (Baumrind, 1966). Despite their very different approaches to parenting, both authoritarian and permissive parents shield the child from the "opportunity to engage in vigorous interaction with people. Demands which cannot be met or no demands, suppression of conflict or sidestepping of conflict, refusal to help or too much help, unrealistically high or low standards, all may curb or understimulate the child so that he fails to achieve the knowledge and experience which could realistically reduce his dependence upon the outside world..." (Baumrind, 1966, p.904). To learn how to express dissension and/or aggression in a self serving but prosocial manner, children require a strongly held position from which they are allowed to diverge when it is socially appropriate to do so (Baumrind, 1966).

It is authoritative parents who appear to have the most socially competent children. They balance high levels of warmth with high levels of control, and high levels of demandingness with clear communication about what is required of the child and

why. They exercise firm control over the actions of their children, yet engage in independence training and do not reward dependency (Baumrind, 1966, 1971, 1982). Baumrind argues that through their tempering of control with warmth and communication, and their capability for compromising standards when situationally appropriate, these parents foster within their children both a sense of social responsibility and independence.

Androgyny and Authoritative Parenting

Given existing support for the position that authoritative parenting is most facilitative of social competency in children, the question arises: What, then, are the antecedents of this optimal parenting strategy? In a study designed to assess the association between parental characteristics and the socialization techniques employed by parents, Spence and Helmreich (1978) proposed, and found support for, a positive association between androgyny and authoritative parenting. Androgyny, as operationally defined, is the equally high endorsement of both masculine and feminine personality characteristics (Bem, 1981). Consistent with this, Spence and Helmreich claim that androgynous parents are likely to be warmer and more accepting of their child than those who are relatively

lacking in feminine, expressive attributes; but that at the same time they are likely to impose relatively high demands on their child, expecting him (or her) both to develop the same level of instrumental competence that they exhibit and to defer to them, the parent, as an autonomous, powerful adult.

In support of their argument Spence and Helmreich (1978) found that couples in which both partners were androgynous or in which one member was androgynous and the other feminine tended to be authoritative parents. Masculine-androgynous and masculine-feminine couples displayed behavior ranging between authoritative and authoritarian.

Baumrind (1982), using data from her family socialization and developmental competence project, retested the hypothesis that androgyny is positively associated with authoritative parenting. Her suspicion was that androgynous individuals would fail to enact the flexibility which they claim to possess. Indeed, she found that androgynous parents failed to be agentic (firm) even though they endorsed agentic as well as communal values. It was sex-typed parents who more closely matched the authoritative pattern.

Baumrind found that androgynous couples were "childcentered" rather than authoritative. They tended to be either democratic (high responsive, medium demanding) or

permissive (high responsive, low demanding). In contrast, sex-typed couples fell under the classifications of authoritative (high responsive, high demanding), demanding (medium responsive, high demanding), and traditional (structured role differentiation between mothers and fathers: mothers responsive but undemanding, fathers demanding but unresponsive). Sex-typed mothers and fathers tend to assume parenting roles which are complementary to one another (fathers being firm, mothers being warm) (Baumrind, 1982).

In addressing the discrepancy between her results and those of Spence and Helmreich, Baumrind concluded that Spence and Helmreich's primary reliance upon adolescent's perceptions of their parent's attributes and parenting style, rather than upon behavior observations and parental self reports, renders their results unreliable. It is interesting to note, however, that if Spence and Helmreich's subjects did err in their perceptions, their distortions were in the direction of the stereotypic (sex-typed characteristics) rather than its opposite (androgyny). "Students tended to perceive their same sex parent as possessing stereotypic characteristics of their sex to a greater degree than themselves" (Spence & Helmreich, 1978, p.218). It would seem that a bias in this direction would be more likely to diminish a positive association between androgyny and

authoritative parenting than to inflate it.

Functional Flexibility and Authoritative Parenting

The position taken here is that there is a logical association between androgyny and authoritative parenting at the construct level. Spence and Helmreich's proposal that the unique attributes of the androgynous individual predispose them to the highly demanding/highly responsive style characteristic of the authoritative parent makes intuitive sense. However, the component central to the proposed link between androgyny and authoritative parenting is not the possession of both masculine and feminine traits per se, it is the possession of functional flexibility. Bem, herself, defines the "construct" of androgyny as the ability "to remain sensitive to the changing constraints of the situation and [to] engage in whatever behavior seems most effective at the moment, regardless of its stereotype as appropriate for one sex or the other" (1975, p.635). Certainly, masculine and feminine attributes are the relevant characteristics, but the focus of the construct of androgyny is clearly on the capability for appropriately deploying these abilities across all interpersonal domains.

In view of the argument that it is functional flexibility which links androgyny to authoritative parenting, certain

limitations of the earlier mentioned studies emerge. The first issues concern measurement. Operational definitions of androgyny based upon such measures as Bem's Sex Role Inventory (BSRI, Bem, 1974) and The Personal Attributes Questionnaire (PAQ, Spence & Helmreich, 1978) assume that equally high levels of endorsement of desirable masculine and feminine traits naturally presupposes the appropriate usage of these attributes across all domains. However, as pointed out by Kaplan (1979) "while [the essential parameters of situational appropriateness, flexibility, effectiveness, and integration] may be likely outcomes of an equal balance between masculinity and femininity, they are not necessary outcomes" (p.224). Indeed, Kaplan acquired clinical support for the argument that an individual could possess an equal balance of masculine and feminine characteristics, and yet utilize them in ways which could only be described as rigid and/or dysfunctional. In other words, a person might be capable of both masculine and feminine behavior but only within specific domains (e.g., assertive within an occupational role, warm within an intimate relationship) or only in a dysfunctional sense (e.g., inappropriate deployment of aggression when the situation calls for submission). Clearly, in equating the simple possession of masculine and feminine traits with androgyny, existing measures fail to reflect the construct

definition.

Both Spence and Helmreich (1978), who used the PAQ, and Baumrind (1982), who used the BSRI, categorized individuals as androgynous using measures which likely included within the classification a more or less substantial portion of individuals who, although in possession of masculine and feminine attributes, were not truly androgynous. Since there is no reason to assume a relationship between dysfunctional flexibility (inappropriate or ineffectual usage of attributes) or rigid androgyny (domain specific usage of masculine and feminine attributes) and authoritative parenting, it is likely that the rate of inclusion of such individuals would have affected the strength of the association. In sum, the discrepancy between the results of the Spence and Helmreich study (1978) and the Baumrind study (1982) may in part be due to the inadequacy of the measures used for accurately assessing the concept of androgyny.

Furthermore, as the BSRI and the PAQ essentially only measure the orthogonal traits of instrumentality/dominance and expressivity/nurturance (Spence & Helmreich, 1980; Wiggins & Holzmuller, 1981) they only assess androgyny to the extent that these attributes are major components of masculinity and femininity. Neither index measures flexibility with respect to

the range of characteristics which Bem's labelling of her scales with the terms "masculine" and "feminine" would suggest.

The final issue concerns the choice of androgyny as the independent variable. If androgyny has simply been used to represent functional flexibility, the effect has been to restrict the association between functional flexibility and authoritative parenting to the logical relationship between desirable masculine/feminine attributes and the control/warmth dimensions of parenting style. (In view of the earlier discussion of rigid androgyny and dysfunctional flexibility, even this association is tenuous.) There is certainly no reason to assume that a parent who is both dominant and nurturant (flexible with respect to masculine and feminine behavior) will also rate highly on the other two dimensions of parenting style: parent child communication and maturity demands. Parental control may be devoid of maturity demands and nurturance may come unaccompanied by communication. Spence and Helmreich's (1978) suggestion that androgynous individuals encourage their children to attain the same level of instrumental competence that they themselves possess (maturity demands) may be true in a number of instances, but it is a motivational link which assumes the ability to encourage autonomous self will by restraining control; an ability not synonymous with instrumentality or

expressivity. It is likely that functional flexibility with respect to a whole range of positive and negative interpersonal abilities is the requirement for authoritative parenting.

In contrast to authoritarian and permissive parents who are essentially rigid in their style of interaction with their children, the behavior of the authoritative parent reflects situational sensitivity and response flexibility. Parental control and warmth are exercised when warranted by the child's behavior. Furthermore, the type of parental control implemented is likely to be dependent upon the nature and severity of the child's transgression. Reasoning and rational guidance are favored for first time and understandable offenses with more punitive measures reserved for repeated or incomprehensible disobedience. Importantly, parental control is balanced with suitable displays of acceptance and affirmation, and with situationally appropriate elicitation of autonomous self will and independence.

Clearly, authoritative parenting requires the abilities for dominance and nurturance (positive masculine and feminine attributes), however it also necessitates flexibility with respect to abilities which facilitate communication and maturity demands and the ability to restrain control or nurturance when it is necessary to exercise what have traditionally been thought

of as the "negative" antitheses of these: submissiveness and coldness. The elicitation of a sense of social responsibility in a child requires the exercise of parental control in conjunction with effective communication. Encouragement of a sense of independence in a child requires affirmation towards the child accompanied by a certain restraint of control. The authoritative parent must be capable of dominance when exercising control and must be capable of submissiveness when encouraging independence. They must have the ability to compromise their view or their control when the situation or the child's position warrant it. Effective communication often requires the capability for argument and tenacity as well as openness and frankness. The enforcement of disciplinary measures often necessitates the temporary withdrawal of warmth, and achievement demands made upon the child require some degree of parental ambition. It may even be necessary, at times, for a parent to be cold towards their child in order to induce the guilt required as an impetus for mature behavior; or to be lazy in order to encourage self help activity. Although certainly major contributors, capabilities for dominance and nurturance are only a part of the behavioral repertoire required for authoritative parenting.

The Measurement of Interpersonal Functional Flexibility

Paulhus and Martin (1986) have recently developed a new approach to the measurement of interpersonal flexibility. They argue that functional flexibility involves the appropriate deployment of a large repertoire of capabilities rather than traits. Whereas trait ratings assess average or typical behavior, capability ratings measure the potential for performing the behavior (Wallace, 1966; Willerman, Turner, & Peterson, 1976). Because trait measures require respondents to fix themselves at some point along a rating scale, respondents cannot claim certain combinations of abilities (e.g., dominance & submissiveness) without contradicting themselves. In contrast, it is reasonable for a respondent to claim both the capability for dominance and submissiveness (Martin & Paulhus, 1984). The individual's functional flexibility rating is derived from their responses to the Battery of Interpersonal Capabilities (BIC, Paulhus & Martin, 1987). The battery is composed of four questions about the individual's ability to enact each of a series of interpersonal behaviors:

For each attribute, subjects [are] asked a direct capability question, for example, "How capable are you of being dominant when the situation requires it?" Three additional questions [are] asked to assess (a) the difficulty of performing each behavior, (b) anxiety when performing each behavior, and (c) the tendency to avoid situations demanding such behavior. Responses to all

questions [are] rated on 7 point Likert scales anchored by "very much" (=7) and "not at all" (=1) (Paulhus & Martin, 1986, p.12).

Unlike androgyny measures, the BIC measures a broad domain of characteristics. To measure the full range of interpersonal behaviors, the 16 interpersonal variables (dominance, warmth, introversion, etc.) which form the interpersonal circumplex (Wiggins & Holzmueller, 1978, 1980) are used (Paulhus & Martin, 1986). These items include both socially desirable attributes (e.g., dominance) and socially undesirable attributes (e.g., submissiveness).

The Problem

This study had two objectives. The first was to retest the hypothesis that androgyny (functional flexibility with respect to instrumentality and expressivity) is positively related to authoritative parenting. By focusing on the individual's ability to appropriately deploy these attributes across all interpersonal domains, the BIC provides a measure of these abilities which more closely approximates the "construct" definition of androgyny than do the BSRI and the PAQ. Where the BSRI and the PAQ have operationalized androgyny in terms of traits (typical behaviors), and with no regard for dysfunctional deployment or domain specificity, the BIC allows for

operationalization of androgyny in terms of functional, multi-domain capabilities (Martin & Van Oeveren, 1986).

The second goal was to demonstrate that the association between functional flexibility and authoritative parenting is more powerful when the measurement of flexibility is extended to include a whole range of positive and negative interpersonal capabilities rather than simply the socially desirable traits of instrumentality and expressivity. Paulhus and Martin's (1987) Battery of Interpersonal Capabilities facilitates assessment of both the range and the composition of the individual's behavioral repertoire. The latter allows for assessment of the individual's ability to integrate what have traditionally been thought of as polar opposites (e.g., dominance & submissiveness).

In order to test the above predictions, a sample of mothers were administered questionnaires containing: Bem's (1974) Sex Role Inventory, Paulhus and Martin's (1987) Battery of Interpersonal Capabilities, and The Childrearing Practices Report: A Set of Q-Items for the Description of Parental Socialization Attitudes and Values (Block, 1965). It was hypothesized that androgyny, operationalized as the capability for appropriately deploying desirable masculine and desirable feminine attributes, would exhibit a significantly more positive

association with authoritative parenting than would androgyny, as operationalized by the BSRI. The second hypothesis was that there would be a stronger positive relationship between interpersonal functional flexibility (the individual's flexibility score with respect to all 16 interpersonal variables measured by the BIC) and authoritative parenting than between androgyny (the individual's flexibility simply with respect to the masculine and feminine interpersonal variables of instrumentality and expressivity) and authoritative parenting.

Method

Subjects

Women volunteers who had at least one child between the ages of 7 and 12 and who resided in the lower mainland area were solicited to participate in the study. The age range of 7 to 12 years was selected so as to allow for comparison with Baumrind's (1982) results (her subjects' children ranged in age from 8 to 10 years) while also facilitating the attainment of an adequately sized sample of mothers.

Procedure

In order to recruit mothers, contact letters requesting volunteers (see Appendix A) were distributed through after

school daycares and private schools. The letter included an outline of the objectives of the study, the participant criteria, a space for the individual to indicate whether or not she was interested in participating in the study, and instructions for the indication of willingness to participate to be returned to the daycare or school. Packages containing a battery of four questionnaires (see Appendix B) were distributed through the daycares and schools to subsequent volunteers. Mothers were asked to return their completed questionnaires to these same centers for the researcher to collect. The questionnaires required approximately one hour of the mothers' time. Once the questionnaire data had been obtained, all records containing the names and telephone numbers of the mothers were destroyed.

Measures

Personal history and demographic data. The first questionnaire contained questions concerning the mothers' personal history and demographic variables. The background information was obtained because mothers' age, educational level, profession, religious background, and number of children, may influence the results of the study.

The second, third, and fourth questionnaires were, as

mentioned earlier, Bem's (1974) Sex Role Inventory, Paulhus and Martin's (1987) Battery of Interpersonal Capabilities, and The Childrearing Practices Report: A Set of Q-Items for the Description of Parental Socialization Attitudes and Values (Block, 1965). The order of the latter three questionnaires was counterbalanced.

The BSRI. The BSRI (Bem, 1974) is designed to assess psychological androgyny. It consists of 60 personality characteristics. Twenty of these attributes are stereotypically feminine (e.g., gentle, understanding, affectionate, sensitive to the needs of others) and 20 are stereotypically masculine (e.g., independent, self reliant, ambitious, assertive). There are also 20 items that function as filler items (e.g., happy, conceited, truthful). A person filling out the BSRI is asked to indicate on a 7-point Likert scale the self-descriptiveness of each of the 60 characteristics. The scale is labelled at each point and ranges from 1 (never or almost never true) to 7 (always or almost always true) (Bem, 1981).

Femininity and masculinity were treated as two independent dimensions rather than as two ends of a single dimension. A person who is high (above the median) on both dimensions is classified as androgynous. A person who is low (below the median) on both dimensions is classified as undifferentiated

and a person who is high on one dimension but low on the other is termed either masculine or feminine (Bem, 1981).

The logical independence of masculinity and femininity has been empirically demonstrated by low, non-significant correlations between the two scales. In two studies reviewed by Bem (1981) the correlations between femininity and masculinity were $-.14$ for a sample of 279 women and $.11$ for a sample of 444 men in the first study, and $.00$ for 340 women and $-.05$ for 476 men in the second study.

Lubinski, Tellegen, and Butcher (1981, 1983) have recently questioned the fact that Bem's median split typology is an essentially additive index. Bem (cited in Lubinski et al., 1981) has suggested that masculinity and femininity temper each other so that negative manifestations of one tend to cancel out those of the other. In response to this Lubinski et al. proposed that androgyny be measured as an interactive concept and suggested a multiple regression model designed to include the interaction of the BSRI's masculinity and femininity scales as indexed by their product. They argued that "for [androgyny] inventories ... to have predictive utility, $M \times F$ must display a significant interaction in the prediction of relevant psychological criteria. If not, it will be enough to interpret findings as correlates of M and F without recourse to such

interactive concepts as androgynous and undifferentiated" (1981, p.729). Given the logical superiority of this method of indexing androgyny it was the one used for the present research.

Psychometric analyses indicate that the BSRI has high internal consistency and test-retest reliability. When computed separately for men and women across two samples, coefficient alphas for the femininity score, the masculinity score, and the femininity minus masculinity difference score ranged from .75 to .87. Product moment correlations computed between the first and second administrations proved all three scores to be highly reliable, with the lowest test-retest reliability coefficient being .76. Furthermore, an empirical check on the relation between social desirability response set and an individual's scores on the BSRI indicated that BSRI scores were not measuring a general tendency to describe oneself in a socially desirable manner (Bem, 1981).

The BSRI has also been tested for construct validity. A study designed to assess the correspondence between an individual's score on the BSRI and their behavioral adaptability (Bem, 1975) revealed that androgynous subjects were more likely than non-androgynous subjects to engage in whatever behavior seemed appropriate at the time, regardless of the sex-typing of the behavior. "Androgynous subjects of both sexes displayed a

high level of masculine independence when under pressure to conform, and they displayed a high level of feminine playfulness when given the opportunity to interact with a tiny kitten" (p.642). The results for the non-androgynous subjects showed an almost, but not entirely, complementary pattern. As expected, masculine males displayed independence but not playfulness, and feminine males displayed playfulness but not independence. Females, however, exhibited a different pattern. Masculine females displayed the anticipated independence, but also a moderate amount of playfulness. Feminine females, as expected, failed to display independence. However, contrary to predictions, they also failed to display playfulness. Bem and Lenney (1976) have also demonstrated that sex-typed individuals are significantly more likely than androgynous individuals to select gender appropriate activities and to reject gender inappropriate activities, even when many of the external constraints on gender inappropriate activity have been removed and the choice of a gender appropriate activity will cost them money. Moreover, sex-typed subjects reported feeling more nervous and peculiar after performing a gender inappropriate activity than did androgynous or cross sex-typed subjects.

The BIC. The BIC (Paulhus & Martin, 1987) is composed of four questions about perceived capabilities on each of the 16 characteristics that form the interpersonal circumplex (gregarious, unassuming, aloof, arrogant, ambitious, warm, lazy, cold, extraverted, trusting, introverted, calculating, dominant, agreeable, submissive, and hostile). For each attribute subjects are asked to rate their general capability for performing the behavior, the difficulty they experience in performing the behavior, the anxiety they experience in performing the behavior, and their tendency to avoid situations requiring such behavior. (In this study, an exploratory question assessing the subject's motivation to perform the behavior was also included for each attribute.) Functional flexibility is calculated as the sum around the circumplex of the respondent's 16 capability ratings. (Similar indexes can be computed for the anxiety, avoidance, and difficulty ratings; and an index of intradimensional flexibility is computed by considering the eight bipolar dimensions of the circumplex one at a time and giving the respondent a "1" for each capability with a score above 4 on both bipolar opposites.) (Paulhus & Martin, 1986).

It has recently been suggested that the characteristics "ambitious" and "lazy" may not belong in the interpersonal realm and that the circumplex variables represented by the labels

"ambitious-dominant" and "lazy-submissive" are more accurately represented by the labels "assured-dominant" and "unassured-submissive" (Wiggins, 1987, personal communication). In that the inclusion of potentially non-interpersonal characteristics may affect the predictive power of the BIC (as an index of interpersonal flexibility), analyses were done with two versions of the measure--one in which these two characteristics are retained and one in which they are replaced with "assured" and "unassured".

Following Lubinski, Tellegen, and Butcher's (1981) argument concerning the scoring of the BSRI, the "capabilities" conception of androgyny was calculated as the product of the respondent's capability ratings for dominance and warmth. It should be noted, however, that no such claim regarding interaction between components has been put forth concerning capabilities. The proposed superiority of a capabilities index over a trait index of androgyny in predicting authoritative parenting derives from the functional flexibility argument. Thus, proof of the hypothesis does not necessitate that this product index explain variance beyond that accounted for by its components (the sum of the individual's capability ratings on dominance and warmth).

Given that the two critical components of flexibility are a

wide behavioral repertoire and the ability to adjust to situational demands, Paulhus and Martin's (1986) operationalization of this construct has inherent face validity. In addition, this index of interpersonal flexibility has demonstrated both convergent and discriminant validity. In a factor analysis of 10 measures of interpersonal flexibility, Paulhus and Martin (1986) found that the four indexes derived from the BIC (sum of capabilities ratings, sum of anxiety ratings, sum of avoidance ratings, and sum of difficulty ratings) clustered together; while the other available measures, which fail to assess either the breadth of the behavioral repertoire or the ability to adjust to situational demands, clearly separated.

Three factors showed eigenvalues above unity and together explained 58% of the variance (Paulhus and Martin, 1986). The four capability related composites of flexibility loaded on the first factor, labelled Functional Flexibility. Two indexes derived from Bem's concept of androgyny¹ and a measure of the variance of an individual's trait scores around the circumplex² marked the second factor, labelled Androgyny. A situationality index based on Goldberg's (1981) trait rating categories and Snyder's (1974) self monitoring scale loaded on a third factor, labelled Situationality. The intradimensional

index derived from the BIC was not included in the factor analysis because it correlated .88 with the sum of capabilities index.

Paulhus and Martin (1986) suggest that the two androgyny measures may have loaded on a separate factor because they are trait-based rather than capability-based and because they focus only on the dominance/nurturance quadrant of the circumplex (Wiggins & Holzmueller, 1981), thus tapping only a small domain of socially desirable characteristics. The fact that the situationality index, which assesses the number of "it depends" responses (Goldberg, 1981) emerged as distinct even from the trait-based measures is not surprising if one considers that the situational individual is claiming a lack of traits (Paulhus & Martin, 1986).

In a second study (Paulhus & Martin, 1986) a battery of adjustment measures were administered along with the nine flexibility measures. According to Leary (1957) individuals who are able to change their behavior to suit situational demands should report higher self esteem than people who are more rigid in their interpersonal interactions. Interestingly, only the four capability-related composites correlated significantly with self esteem (all were close to .30). "Neither the difference index of androgyny nor the circumplex variance index showed even

a trend" (p.21), and the product index of androgyny, after its product components were entered into a regression equation, showed no predictive power above and beyond its components. The situationality index showed a highly significant negative correlation with self esteem, and the self monitoring scale a negative but nonsignificant correlation. Clearly, these other available measures of flexibility are tapping something quite different from "functional" flexibility. Administration of the Marlowe Crowne (1960) Social Desirability Scale along with the capability composites ruled out the possibility of their being contaminated with socially desirable responding.

The CRPR. The Childrearing Practices Report (CRPR, Block, 1965) consists of 91 socialization-relevant statements that are administered in a Q-sort format with a forced-choice, seven-step distribution. The instructions advise the parent to focus on a specified child in the family (in this case, one between the ages of 7 and 12) while responding to the Q-items. To obtain more precise descriptions of childrearing attitudes and values, the items are phrased in the active voice (e.g., I do, I ask, I emphasize, I believe) and emphasize a behavioral orientation. The Q-sort format minimizes response sets such as social desirability, acquiescence, and differential use of hyperbole; and, through the use of items which have been stated

in relatively neutral terms, it minimizes defensiveness (Block, 1965).

The test-retest reliability of the CRPR has been assessed twice. In the first study, 90 psychology students were asked to describe their childrearing philosophies, using the CRPR, at the beginning of a course, and then again eight months later. The average correlation between the two tests was .707 (range = .38 to .85; $\sigma = .10$). In the second study 66 peace corps volunteers were asked to use the CRPR to describe the childrearing practices of their parents. Three years later, upon completion of their peace corps duty, they repeated the process. The average correlation between the two tests was .64 for descriptions of mothers and .65 for descriptions of fathers (the ranges were respectively .04 to .85 & .13 to .85; σ s = .26 & .23). In that the time intervals for both of these studies were considerable (1 and 3 years) it is likely that the correlations obtained represent the lower limit of test-retest reliability (Block, 1965). Furthermore, while "test-retest data have not been obtained from samples of parents, it is expected that their self descriptions would show even greater stability over time" (Block, 1965, p.6).

The CRPR also exhibits construct validity. A study designed to assess the relation between self reports, as indexed by the

CRPR responses, and actual maternal behaviors toward children, as indexed by observer-provided Q-sort data, found appreciable coherence in the results derived from the two sources (Block, 1965).

In that the CRPR assesses a person's general philosophy towards parenting, numerous approaches may be taken to scoring the data obtained (Block, 1965). For the purpose of this study, the scoring procedure had to measure just how closely the person approximated the authoritative style, as described by Baumrind (1966). To accomplish this, 3 parenting experts independently Q-sorted the CRPR items so as to express this style of parenting. Baumrind's description of the authoritative parent was used by each as a guideline. The average correlation between these three profile sorts was .76. These Q-sorts were then averaged item by item to obtain a single, consensual profile of this pattern of parenting. The actual CRPR Q-sorts of the mothers being studied were then each correlated with this profile item by item. The higher the correlation the more that individual's responses approximated the authoritative parenting style. The correlation coefficient thus served as the mother's score on authoritative parenting.

The averaging process used in forming the consensual profile resulted in a number of items being given values that

were not whole numbers, so adjustments had to be made to regain the forced-choice pattern of 13 items given each value on the 7 point rating scale. Beginning at the upper end of the scale, items with values a fraction below 7 were rounded up until 13 items had been given a value of 7. Next, the 13 items with the highest values, not already assigned a value of 7, were given a value of 6. The 13 items with the highest values, not already assigned a value of 6, were given a value of 5, and so forth down to the value 1. See Appendix C for the number of items given each value and the range of values assigned to each of the 7 rating points. In cases where the criteria of 13 items per each of the 7 rating points necessitated placing items with the same fraction at different points, the distribution of the individual expert ratings was taken into consideration. In two instances where similar distributions made two or more items comparable choices, the placement decision was based on face validity.

Results and Discussion

Sample characteristics

The questionnaire was returned by 96 mothers. Of these mothers, 89 followed the forced-choice procedure for the parenting Q-sort. The 7 mothers that did not follow the Q-sort

instructions and an additional number that failed to complete either the BSRI (4 mothers) or the BIC (3 mothers) were not included in analyses involving these measures.

Although the mothers were not randomly selected, there was wide variation on most demographic characteristics. Ages ranged from 26 to 48 years ($M=37.8$). Educational levels ranged from completion of grades 11 or 12 to graduate level degrees ($M = 2$ to 4 years of post-secondary education). Ethnic backgrounds, while predominantly white anglo saxon, included a wide spectrum of different races and cultures. The range for family socioeconomic status was also fairly inclusive varying from self-supporting single parent mothers in low status occupations to married women in dual, high status, career families.

One target child was selected for each family. The children's ages ranged from 7 to 12 years ($M = 8.9$ years). The numbers of male versus female children were roughly equivalent; 38 mothers responding in regard to female children and 50 responding in regard to male children. Birth order rankings for the target child were also representative; there were approximately the same number of youngest, oldest, and only children. Middle children were the least represented category.

Preliminary analyses revealed significant associations between a number of the demographic measures and authoritative

parenting as assessed using the profile technique (see Table 1). Mother's education, father's education, income, and socioeconomic status were all positively correlated with the mother's use of the authoritative parenting style. (See Appendix D, Table 1 for correlations among the demographic measures, and Appendix D, Table 2 for correlations between the demographic measures and the independent variables.)

Functional Flexibility and Authoritative Parenting

Multiple linear regression was used to compare the variance in authoritative parenting accounted for by the BSRI, the capabilities index of androgyny, and the Functional Flexibility Index. The first regression equation tested the hypothesis that the "capabilities" conception of androgyny would predict a significant portion of variance in authoritative parenting after controlling for the variance accounted for by the BSRI. Following Lubinski, Tellegen, and Butcher's (1981) argument concerning androgyny as being an inherently interactive concept, the equation (labelled Model 1) took the following form:

$$\hat{Y} = B_1M + B_2F + B_3(M \times F) + B_4CD + B_5CW + B_6(CD \times CW) + A.$$

where \hat{Y} is the predicted value of authoritative parenting, M and

F represent Bem's masculinity and femininity scales, (MxF) represents the interaction between masculinity and femininity, CD and CW represent Paulhus and Martin's measures of capabilities for dominance and warmth, (CDxCW) represents the interaction between these capabilities, B_1 through B_6 represent the respective regression coefficients, and A is the constant.

The variables were entered into the equation step-by-step in order to identify how much each of them improved the equation's predictive power. The order of the entry reflected the conceptual assumption that the capabilities conception of androgyny would demonstrate superior predictive power. It was expected that, once the variance accounted for by the BSRI had been removed, the capabilities conception of androgyny would account for a significant portion of the remaining variance in authoritative parenting. As stated earlier, proof of the hypothesis did not necessitate that the product of CD and CW explain variance beyond that accounted for by the sum of its components.

Contrary to what was expected, none of the variables in the regression equation accounted for a significant portion of the variance in parenting (see Table 2). To try to diminish the discrepancy between the number of items contributing to the BSRI indexes (20 items each) and the number of items contributing to

the capability indexes (1 item each), two variations of this equation were also tried. The first variation of the equation (labelled Model 2) simply replaced the long versions of the masculinity and femininity scales with the short versions (10 items each). The second variation of the equation (labelled Model 3) also altered the capability indexes. Instead of including only the questions that assess the likelihood of performing the response, the indexes were extended to include the questions assessing the difficulty, anxiety, avoidance, and motivation associated with the performance. In both variations the variables in the regression equation still failed to account for a significant portion of the variance in parenting (see Tables 3 & 4). It should be noted that even in these variations there were still more BSRI items than capabilities items.

Bivariate correlations and scatterplots for each of the independent variables with the dependent variable were then examined. Both the correlations and the scatterplots indicated a lack of linear association between any of the independent measures and the dependent measure.

The second regression equation tested the hypothesis that functional flexibility (all 16 interpersonal capabilities) would predict a significant amount of variance in authoritative parenting above that which is accounted for by the sum of

capabilities for dominance and warmth. This equation (labelled Model 4) took the form:

$$\hat{Y} = B_1CD + B_2CW + B_3FF + A.$$

where \hat{Y} is the predicted value of authoritative parenting, CD and CW represent the capabilities for dominance and warmth, FF represents functional flexibility with respect to the remaining 14 capabilities indexed by the BIC, B_1 through B_3 represent the respective regression coefficients, and A is the constant. Capability ratings for dominance and warmth were excluded from the overall functional flexibility index to avoid unnecessary multicollinearity between the independent measures in the regression equation (see Appendix D, Table 3 for correlations among the independent variables). Again the order of entry reflected presumed predictive power. Once the variance accounted for by capabilities for dominance and warmth had been removed, functional flexibility was expected to account for a significant portion of the remaining variance in authoritative parenting.

As expected from the results of the first regression analysis, there was no linear association between either the capability for dominance or the capability for warmth and authoritative parenting. A significant association between

functional flexibility (the sum of the 14 remaining interpersonal capabilities) and authoritative parenting did emerge but it was the inverse of what was predicted (see Table 5). In contrast to the expected positive association, the regression of functional flexibility on authoritative parenting revealed a negative linear association. Substitution of the BIC items "ambitious" and "lazy" with the items "assured" and "unassured" as suggested by Wiggins (1987, personal communication) (labelled Model 5) produced a similar, although non-significant, result (see Table 6).

The Independent Measures

In an attempt to understand why the BSRI scales for masculinity and femininity and the capability indexes for dominance and warmth all failed to predict authoritative parenting, the independent variables were examined for possible irregularities. Mothers' scores on the masculinity and femininity scales of the BSRI proved to be consistent with the norms (for females) reported by Bem (1981). The mean (5.13) and the standard deviation (.48) for the femininity scale were similar to those found for the females in Bem's sample ($M=5.05$, $SD=.53$). For the masculinity scale the mean (4.87) and the standard deviation (.72) were also similar to the results found

by Bem ($M=4.79$, $SD=.66$).

Mothers' scores on the BIC capability questions did not prove to be uniformly consistent with earlier findings. A comparison with Paulhus and Martin's (1987) results yielded relative consistency between samples on mean scores for items that are socially desirable (e.g., dominant, warm, gregarious, ambitious, trusting, etc.). In contrast, for socially undesirable items (e.g., submissive, cold, aloof, lazy, calculating, etc.), the present sample demonstrated consistently lower mean scores. This finding indicates that these mothers were less likely than the university students (used in Paulhus & Martin, 1987) to endorse these capabilities. The mean across these items was 3.93, whereas for Paulhus and Martin's sample it was 4.85. This finding indicates a comparatively higher rate of socially desirable responding than was evident with the former university student sample. The higher rate of socially desirable responding by the mothers in this sample may help to explain the inverse association between the FFI (the sum of all 14 capabilities) and authoritative parenting. The mothers who were willing to endorse the more negative capabilities and thus have high scores on functional flexibility may not perceive these interpersonal responses as being as socially undesirable as do the other mothers. This may result in their perceiving

more situations as eliciting these responses, and thus, their engaging in parenting strategies that, by external standards, use these more negative capabilities more than is appropriate.

Structurally, mothers' responses to the capability questions were consistent with earlier findings. A principal factors analysis with varimax rotation produced the same distinctive positive manifold pattern reported by Paulhus and Martin (1987). In contrast to the typical circular structure of traits (Wiggins, 1979) the interpersonal capabilities all collapsed into the first quadrant indicating positive correlations among the capabilities. In the trait circumplex the horizontal axes are marked by the dimensions of warmth and hostility indicating that these traits are negatively correlated. In the capability manifold the dimensions of warmth and hostility emerged as orthogonal factors. As predicted by Paulhus and Martin, capabilities for warmth and hostility can reasonably be claimed by a respondent whereas this is not the case when subjects report on their typical or traitlike behavior. The one finding not replicated was the presence of the capability for dominance at the center of the manifold. In the present analysis, the capability for dominance appeared along the horizontal axis (marked by hostility). While not critical to determining the structure of capabilities, this finding

raises some doubt concerning Paulhus and Martin's (1987) suggestion that the capability for dominance may be fundamental to all other capabilities. In summary, the structure of the mothers' scores on the capability questions generally replicated earlier studies of the structure of capabilities (Broughton & Paulhus, 1984; Paulhus & Martin, 1987) and provided additional support for the finding that capabilities have a different underlying structure than do traits.

To summarize what was found regarding the independent measures, the BSRI scales for masculinity and femininity demonstrated no irregularities. The means and the standard deviations were comparable to those reported for Bem's (1981) normative sample. The structural analysis of the BIC items replicated the positive manifold pattern of capabilities reported by Paulhus and Martin (1987). There was only one finding inconsistent with earlier work. The mothers in this sample tended to respond in a more socially desirable manner than did the university students in Paulhus and Martin's sample.

The Dependent Measure

Earlier studies (eg. Baumrind, 1982; Spence & Helmreich, 1978) have found an association between masculinity and

femininity and authoritative parenting. It is possible that the failure to replicate earlier results might be due to properties of the dependent measure, so the parenting Q-sort profile was examined for possible deficiencies. A comparison of the Q-sort profile used in the present study with the type of items and the method used by Baumrind (1982)³ raised three potential problems with the parenting profile. The first problem is that the Block Q-sort, which purportedly includes some index of parental control, does not contain a full range of questions concerning control. For instance, it does not contain items that assess the parent's use of firm enforcement (e.g., whether the parent forces confrontation when the child disobeys, whether the parent exercises enforcement after initial noncompliance, and whether the parent can be coerced by the child). Items that assess only the parent's belief in parental directiveness or their initial response to disobedience from the child do not measure the ongoing process of parental control. The subsequent reaction from the child (whether they comply or continue to disobey) and the parent's response to this are important to consider in distinguishing between parents who have the ability to maintain their stand regardless of the child's response to their directive, and those that do not.

The second and third potential problems, which are related,

concern the relative contribution of certain dimensions of parenting to the Q-sort profile. It appears that there are (a) many more items that assess responsiveness than those that assess control and (b) that the Q-sort contains too many items unrelated to authoritative parenting. No attempt was made to balance responsiveness and control or to eliminate irrelevant items in the profile. All Q-sort items were included in the profile so as to maintain the forced-choice properties of a common mean and standard deviation for all mothers. Correlational analysis is not sensitive to differences in elevation or dispersion. If the forced choice were eliminated by dropping irrelevant items it would be unclear what the correlation coefficient between each mother's Q-sort and the profile of authoritative parenting meant. Baumrind used a very different technique. She classified parents according to their scores on the dimensions of responsiveness and demandingness. This procedure helps to maintain balance between responsiveness and demandingness.

In sum, the Block Q-sort is not an ideal way to assess parental control because it lacks items that measure firm enforcement. Furthermore, the profile technique, although potentially a viable method, can be biased by an imbalance in the items used as a basis for computing correlations.

Factor Analysis of the Parenting Q-Sort

To explore the content of the Q-sort and to identify some empirical dimensions with which to try to replicate the methodology of the earlier studies (Baumrind, 1982; Spence & Helmreich, 1978) mothers' responses to the Q-sort were factor analyzed. Such analysis of the Block Q-sort typically identifies between 28 and 33 factors (Block, 1965) (31 were identified with this sample); certainly far too large a number for the present purpose. Using Rickel and Biasatti's (1982) choice of a two factor solution (which they labeled "Restrictiveness" and "Nurturance") as an estimate of the most interpretable number of factors, varimax rotations were applied in which two, three, and four factor solutions were considered. Upon examination, the three factor solution was selected as most interpretable for this sample. Together, these three factors accounted for 19% of the variance in the unrotated solution. The items with factor loadings of .35 and above or -.35 and below were retained for each factor. Table 7 shows the 19 items retained for Factor 1 with their factor loadings, Table 8 shows the 14 items retained for Factor 2 with their factor loadings, and Table 9 shows the 9 items retained for Factor 3 with their loadings. A summary score was obtained for each mother on each factor by adding the individual items that were retained for each factor (see

Appendix D, Table 4 for correlations among the factor indexes). Before summing the items for each factor index the rating scale was reversed for items with negative loadings.

The items in Factor 1 represent the nurturant aspects of parenting, for instance, warmth, communication, and enjoyment of the parental role. A high score also includes a willingness to employ childrearing practices that encourage independence in the child. As indicated from their negative loadings, authoritarian childrearing practices and strategies used to induce the child's compliance through anxiety represent the opposite of these characteristics. Factor 1 was labeled "Responsiveness".

The items in Factor 2 represent more neurotic tendencies such as over-involvement with the child, worry concerning the child's health, and encouragement of emotional dependency on the part of the child. A high score on this factor also includes some degree of restrictiveness, however, it is a form of restraint accompanied by a reluctance to punish the child. Factor 2 was labelled "Neuroticism".

The items in Factor 3 represent a form of parental control. They include the endorsement of childrearing practices that encourage reasonably mature behavior and achievement on the part of the child. The items also reflect parental consistency and use of parental authority. This factor was labelled

"Demandingness".

Correlations Between the Parenting Factor Indexes and the Independent Variables

Correlations were calculated for each of these three factor-derived indexes with the independent variables (masculinity, femininity, dominance, and warmth) (see Table 10). (The capability for trust was combined with the capability for warmth to try to compensate for the restrictive effect that socially desirable responding had on the distribution of responses for this capability.) Based on the prediction that androgynous parents would be more authoritative parents, the Responsiveness index was expected to be positively correlated with the BSRI femininity scale and the capability index for warmth (& trust); and the Demandingness index was expected to be positively correlated with the BSRI masculinity scale and the capability index for dominance. The masculinity scale and the capability index for dominance were not expected to be related to Responsiveness. Likewise the femininity scale and the capability index for warmth (& trust) were not expected to be related to Demandingness. The correlations between Neuroticism and each of these independent variables was performed for exploratory purposes.

The results provided partial support for the predictions (see Table 10). As expected, the Responsiveness index was significantly correlated with both the femininity scale ($r=.27$, $p=.006$) and the capability index for warmth ($r=.19$, $p=.04$). However, in contrast to what was expected, there was no significant association between Demandingness and either the masculinity scale or the capability index for dominance. Furthermore, there were significant negative correlations between Demandingness and both the femininity scale ($r=-.24$, $p=.01$) and the capability index for warmth ($r=-.17$, $p=.05$).

When these analyses were done controlling for the sex of the child (see Tables 11 & 12), an interesting pattern emerged. The expected association between Demandingness and the masculinity scale emerged as significant for mothers of girls ($r=.29$, $p=.04$). The association between the Demandingness index and the capability for dominance was also positive ($r=.25$, $p=.07$). For mothers of boys, the association between the index for Demandingness and the capability for dominance became inverse ($r=-.23$, $p=.05$). There was no association between the index for Demandingness and the masculinity scale for mothers of boys. Correlations computed for Demandingness with each of the items that form the masculinity scale revealed varied degrees and directions of associations. While there were no

significant positive associations, there were significant negative associations between Demandingness and the item "defending one's beliefs" ($r = -.40$, $p = .002$) and the item "taking a stand" ($r = -.26$, $p = .04$).

Why the predicted association between masculinity and Demandingness occurred for mothers of girls and not for mothers of boys is unclear. One possible explanation is that the index for Demandingness is weighted heavily on items pertaining to achievement (an expectation traditionally held for boys) rather than other kinds of directiveness. Mothers low on masculine traits may hold more stereotypic beliefs concerning sex roles (Frable, in press), and thus, make fewer such demands on girls. In contrast, mothers high on masculine traits may hold less stereotypic beliefs (Frable, in press), and thus make more achievement demands on girls.

The negative association between the capability for dominance and Demandingness indicates that mothers who score high on the capability for dominance are less demanding of boys than mothers that score low. If mothers' scores on the capability for dominance also reflect how stereotypic their beliefs about sex roles are, it would make sense that mothers low on this capability would encourage boys, more than girls, to achieve. Mothers who score high on the capability for dominance

may feel there are enough social directives emphasizing male achievement and thus deemphasize parental demands.

Because of the prediction that androgyny (which combines a high level of masculinity/dominance with a high level of femininity/warmth) would be associated with authoritative parenting (which combines a high level of demandingness with a high level of responsiveness) the negative correlations between Demandingness and both the femininity scale and the capability index for warmth (& trust) were unexpected. However, a scatterplot of the association between Demandingness and femininity revealed a somewhat curvilinear pattern indicating that mothers who were both demanding and feminine (as would be the case if androgynous mothers were authoritative parents) tended to be moderately high rather than extremely high on femininity--a finding not incompatible with the above prediction.

A scatterplot of the association between Demandingness and the capability index for warmth (& trust) revealed that there was still a problem with the range of responses on the index for warmth. The ratings for this capability bore little association with the ratings for Demandingness, but were located predominantly at the upper end of the scale (indicating a high level of warmth & trust). The negative correlation arose from

the tendency of the relatively small number of mothers that rated themselves lower on the capability for warmth (& trust) to rate themselves in the moderately high range on the items contributing to the index for Demandingness.

In the exploratory analysis the Neuroticism index (Factor 2) was positively correlated with both the femininity scale ($r=.26$, $p=.008$) and the capability index for warmth ($r=.28$, $p=.004$), and negatively correlated with the masculinity scale ($r=-.20$, $p=.03$). This finding is of interest because there is no association between the Responsiveness index and the masculinity scale. While both Responsiveness and Neuroticism may represent more traditionally feminine parenting characteristics, items comprised by the latter appear to be more incompatible with the possession of masculine personality traits.

Androgyny as a Predictor of Authoritative Parenting Using Baumrind's Parenting Style Categories

Because the three factor solution for the parenting Q-sort included dimensions representing responsiveness and a form of demandingness, category classifications, approximating those used by Baumrind (1982), could be constructed so as to retest the hypothesis that androgynous mothers are significantly more likely than other mothers to be authoritative parents. The use

of category classifications based on mothers' scores on the indexes for Responsiveness and Demandingness eliminated the possibility that an association between androgyny and authoritative parenting was being lost due to an unequal balance between these two dimensions or to the intrusive effect of items which did not load significantly on either of them.

Based on Baumrind's (1982) procedure, mothers' scores on the indexes for Responsiveness and Demandingness were collapsed to form trichotomies of high, medium, and low scores for each dimension. Mothers were then classified according to their combination of scores on the two dimensions. By using a trichotomous categorization, patterns can be differentiated not only by the degree of responsiveness and demandingness but by the degree of imbalance between them (Baumrind, 1982). The nine possible combinations were: authoritative (high demanding, high responsive), demanding (high demanding, medium responsive), authoritarian (high demanding, low responsive), undifferentiated (medium demanding, medium responsive), democratic (medium demanding, high responsive), permissive (low demanding, high responsive), nondirective (low demanding, medium responsive), rejecting/neglecting (low demanding, low responsive), and undifferentiated/nondirective (medium demanding, low responsive). Baumrind recategorized the latter subjects as

either undifferentiated or nondirective depending on the individual's scores. For this study the category was left as is. Baumrind included a tenth category, labelled traditional, that represented families in which the father was demanding and the mother was responsive. This category was not included in the following analyses because fathers' parenting was not assessed.

The BSRI index of androgyny and authoritative parenting. In an attempt to replicate the method of analyses used in earlier studies (Baumrind, 1982; Spence & Helmreich, 1978), a median-split procedure was used to identify mothers' sex-typing. Mothers high on both masculinity and femininity were classified as androgynous. Mothers high on masculinity and low on femininity were classified as masculine. Mothers high on femininity and low on masculinity were classified as feminine. Mothers low on both masculinity and femininity were classified as undifferentiated. To compensate for any bias created by an all female sample, the medians from Bem's (1981) normative sample were used in place of the present sample medians.

Chi square analyses⁴ were used to test the significance of predicted congruence between BSRI sex-typing classifications and parenting style types. In Table 13 the number of mothers in each parenting type by each sex-type are presented. The results are based solely on mothers' scores and so are not directly

comparable to results based on couple data; nevertheless, the pattern which emerged bore closer resemblance to Baumrind's (1982) results than to those reported by Spence and Helmreich (1978).

Spence and Helmreich (1978) found that couples in which both partners were androgynous or in which one member was androgynous and the other feminine tended to be authoritative parents. Masculine-androgynous and masculine feminine couples displayed behavior that ranged between authoritative and authoritarian. In contrast, Baumrind (1982) found that androgynous couples (couples in which one or both members were androgynous) were not significantly more likely than other couple types to be authoritative-democratic (the "best" parents).⁵ They were significantly more likely than other parents to be democratic-permissive (childcentered) and they were significantly less likely to be authoritative-demanding (controlling but fair).⁶ When the comparison was limited to androgynous and sex-typed couples (couples in which the father was masculine and the mother was feminine), sex-typed parents were significantly more likely than androgynous parents to be represented in what traditionalists would term "good" parenting styles (authoritative, demanding, and traditional) and androgynous parents were significantly more likely than sex-

typed parents to be represented in what traditionalists would term "bad" parenting styles (permissive, rejecting/neglecting, nondirective and authoritarian).⁷

The present findings run counter to Spence and Helmreich's (1978) claim that androgynous parents are more likely to be authoritative parents. Similar to Baumrind's findings for couples, androgynous mothers were significantly more likely than others to be democratic-permissive ($\chi^2[1, N=85]=6.8, p<.01$) and were not significantly more likely than others to be authoritative-democratic. This latter result is surprising because the androgynous mothers in Baumrind's sample differed from her other mothers only in their use of guilt induction--a characteristic not used to classify parenting styles. It was the androgynous fathers who were comparatively lacking on firmness. In contrast to Baumrind's findings for couples, but as would be expected from her results for mothers alone, androgynous mothers were not significantly less likely than others to be authoritative-demanding.

When the present analysis was limited to only androgynous and sex-typed mothers, no significant differences were found between their respective representations in either the "good" or the "bad" parenting style categories. There was, however, a difference in which of the "bad" categories each was

represented. Exploratory analyses revealed that androgynous mothers were significantly more likely than other mothers to be permissive ($\chi^2[1, N=85]=7.12, p<.01$), whereas feminine mothers (sex-typed) were significantly more likely than others to be rejecting/neglecting ($\chi^2[1, N=85]=4.33, p<.05$). When these analyses were run controlling for the sex of the child in question, androgynous mothers were only significantly more likely than others to be permissive with male children ($\chi^2[1, N=48]=9.69, p<.01$), while feminine mothers were only more likely than others to be rejecting/neglecting with female children ($\chi^2[1, N=36]=3.48, p<.07$).⁸ Frequencies for parenting categories by BSRI types are reported separately for mothers of girls and mothers of boys in Tables 14 and 15.

To summarize the results obtained using the BSRI, androgynous mothers differed from other mothers in their tendency to be permissive with boys. Feminine mothers differed from other mothers in their tendency to be rejecting/neglecting with girls.

The capabilities index of androgyny and authoritative parenting. A second set of analyses were done to determine whether these results would be replicated using the capabilities index of androgyny (capabilities for dominance and warmth). A median-split scoring method was used to remain consistent with

the treatment of the BSRI in the former analyses. Because it was impossible to achieve a true median split on the single item capability indexes for dominance and warmth, the capability for warmth was combined with the capability for trust and the capability for dominance was combined with the capability for being ambitious, and their joint medians used to distinguish among mothers. Trusting and ambitious were chosen because of their proximity to warmth and dominance in the structure of capabilities. In Table 16 the number of mothers in each parenting type by each capabilities classification are presented.

Similar to the results achieved using the BSRI classifications, mothers possessing capabilities for both dominance and warmth were not significantly more likely than others to be authoritative-democratic; nor were they significantly less likely than others to be classified as authoritative-demanding. In contrast to the findings obtained using the BSRI index of androgyny, these mothers were not significantly more likely than others to be democratic-permissive.

When compared only with mothers who scored high on warmth and low on dominance (feminine mothers), neither the androgynous mothers nor the feminine mothers were significantly more or less

represented, than the other, in the traditionally "good" categories (authoritative & demanding) or the traditionally "bad" categories (permissive, rejecting/neglecting, nondirective, & authoritarian). When the sex of the child was controlled for, androgynous mothers were more likely than other mothers to be permissive with boys ($\chi^2[1, N=49]=3.70, p<.06$)⁸ but not with girls. Feminine mothers, while not underrepresented in the combined "bad" categories, were not overrepresented in any single "bad" category. Frequencies for parenting categories by capabilities classifications are reported separately for mothers of girls and mothers of boys in Tables 17 and 18.

To summarize the results obtained using the capabilities index of androgyny, androgynous mothers and feminine mothers were equally likely to be represented in both the "good" and the "bad" categories. However, whereas feminine mothers classified as "bad" parents were fairly evenly represented across the categories of permissive, rejecting/neglecting, nondirective, and authoritarian, androgynous mothers classified as "bad" parents were labelled such because of their overrepresentation in the permissive category.

Comparison of the three sets of results. Androgynous mothers, whether classified as such using the BSRI or using the

capability indexes for dominance and warmth, were more likely than other mothers to be permissive with boys. While this result is partially consistent with Baumrind's finding that androgynous couples were more likely than other couples to be democratic-permissive, it likely occurred for a different reason. Baumrind's androgynous parents differed from her sex-typed parents on only one relevant characteristic--the androgynous fathers' comparative lack of firmness. The association between androgyny and permissive parenting in this sample of mothers likely arose from the lack of a positive association between masculinity or the capability for dominance and Demandingness. Had the index for Demandingness been weighted less in the direction of items pertaining to achievement and more in the direction of general directiveness, androgynous mothers might not have been more permissive than other mothers.

The tendency for mothers classified as feminine on the BSRI to be more rejecting/neglecting of girls than other mothers was a somewhat unexpected variation from Baumrind's results. Because demandingness (for mothers of girls) involves having masculine characteristics, it is not surprising that feminine mothers lacked demandingness. However, why the feminine mothers of girls were more likely than other mothers to be low on responsiveness is unclear. It may be that feminine mothers and female children

both have comparatively low activity levels and so interact less than other mother/child combinations. The fact that this pattern was not replicated using the capabilities index (feminine = mothers high on the capability for warmth/trust and low on the capability for dominance/ambitiousness) suggests that this tendency towards low responsiveness may somehow be related to the less socially desirable dimensions of femininity.

Socioeconomic Status and Authoritative Parenting

Although the focus of this research has been on psychological factors related to parenting, the significant correlations between a number of the demographic measures and authoritative parenting must be addressed and the heuristic value of a more sociological model needs to be considered. There were positive correlations between the socioeconomic variables (mother's education, father's education, income and socioeconomic status) and the mothers' scores on authoritative parenting (see Table 1). However, further analyses using the factor indexes derived from the parenting Q-sort in place of the correlations with the profile of authoritative parenting revealed that only the mothers' scores on the Demandingness index were significantly associated with these socioeconomic measures (see Table 19). Given the composition of the

Demandingness index, this result likely reflects the well-documented association between social class and achievement expectations (Gecas, 1979).

Although a number of studies (Hess & Shipman, 1968; McKinley, 1964; Rosen, 1964; Zunich, 1962) have reported a positive association between social class and parental affection and involvement, there was not a significant association between the socioeconomic measures and the mothers' scores on the Responsiveness index. It may be that the sex of the parent is an important factor in this association (Gecas, 1979). Findings from a number of studies (Bowerman & Elder, 1964; Kohn, 1969; Rosen, 1964; Rosenberg, 1965; Thomas, Gecas, Weigert, & Rooney, 1974) indicate that there is a greater class difference in fathers' support and involvement.

In sum, the present data suggest that social class is a strong determinant of one aspect of authoritative parenting--achievement expectations. However, at least with respect to mothers, socioeconomic status does not appear to be a predictor of the broader grouping of behaviors labelled as authoritative parenting.

Conclusion

In summary, the results of the multiple regression analysis

failed to support the prediction that androgyny is positively associated with authoritative parenting. Neither the BSRI nor the capabilities index of androgyny accounted for a significant amount of the variance in the authoritative parenting profile. While this may reflect a true lack of linear association between these variables, an examination of the parenting profile revealed certain problems with its use. The Block Q-sort proved to be a less than ideal measure of parental control because it lacks items that assess firm enforcement. In addition, the profile technique, although potentially viable, is sensitive to biases caused by an imbalance in the items used as a basis for the correlations.

The results obtained with the second regression equation revealed a negative association between functional flexibility and authoritative parenting. In contrast to the expected positive association, this result indicates that mothers who were willing to endorse both the socially desirable and the socially undesirable capabilities were less likely, than those who did not, to match the profile of authoritative parenting. It was suggested that the mothers who were willing to endorse the more negative capabilities may perceive them as less socially undesirable than do the other mothers. This may result in their perceiving more situations as eliciting these responses, and

thus, their engaging in parenting behaviors that, by external standards, inappropriately deploy these capabilities. This problem might be overcome, in future research, by emphasizing to the subjects that the BIC questions concern situationally "appropriate" capabilities rather than typical responses and by objectifying what is considered appropriate.

The results of the analyses, using the BSRI and Baumrind's parenting categories also failed to support Spence and Helmreich's (1978) claim that androgynous individuals are more likely than others to be authoritative parents. However, in contrast to the view of traditional gender identity theorists (e.g., Barry, Bacon, & Child, 1975; Benedek, 1956; Blos, 1962; Klein, 1948; Parsons, 1951; Rossi, 1977) there was also no indication that the development of cross-sex qualities in women (e.g., agency) interferes with the development of sex appropriate traits (e.g., communion). Androgynous mothers were not more likely than sex-typed mothers to be bad parents. In fact, it could be argued that the androgynous mothers' tendency towards permissive parenting (where the fault lies only in low demandingness) is more acceptable than the feminine mothers' tendency to be rejecting/neglecting (where the fault lies in the absence of both demandingness and responsiveness).

The emergence of parenting differences associated with the

sex of the child suggests that mothers' responses vary according to the child's sex and, thus, that this is an important factor to be considered in future research. These variations may be attributable to gender-identity related differences in mothers' responses to general temperament and activity level differences between boys and girls. There is also some suggestion, specifically in the findings concerning mothers' levels of Demandingness, that sex role attitudes and beliefs may play an intermediary role by motivating different expectations and, thus, different responses to boys versus girls.

The results of the analyses using the capabilities index of androgyny and Baumrind's parenting categories were essentially the same as those based on the BSRI. The one significant difference was the failure to replicate the finding that feminine mothers were more likely than other mothers to be rejecting/neglecting with girls. This result may reflect the fact that the BSRI femininity scale includes some less positive attributes in addition to warmth. It may also reflect the fact that the capability index assesses "appropriate" warmth.

With regard to the argument that the capabilities index of androgyny is a truer measure of functional flexibility than the BSRI and thus should be a better predictor of the flexible style of the authoritative parent, the results are inconclusive. If

beliefs and values do play a larger role in parenting than do interpersonal abilities, then a simple association between androgyny and authoritative parenting may not exist. If the association does exist, problems with the capabilities index may have attenuated the relationship. The use of a single item for assessing each capability was problematic in that it allowed the tendency towards socially desirable responding to have a fairly restrictive effect on the variance of the individual capabilities, and, thus, on their predictive utility. One way of overcoming this problem would be to use more items to assess each capability. The comparatively high rate of socially desirable responding was also a problem in that it worked against the assessment of "functional" flexibility. However, this is a measurement issue which could, in future research, be eliminated by stressing that the questions concern appropriate behavior and by objectifying what this means. It does not undermine the concept of capabilities or the conceptualization of functional flexibility in terms of capabilities. In sum, while the results of this study did provide support for Baumrind's (1982) findings rather than those of Spence and Helmreich (1978), the conceptual strengths underlying the capabilities index of androgyny may not have been adequately tested.

Footnotes

1

These were Bem's (1974) difference score, the absolute value of femininity minus masculinity; and the interaction of masculinity and femininity scales indexed by their product (Lubinski, Tellegen, & Butcher, 1981, 1983).

2

A measure similar to the variance index used by Wiggins and Holzmüller (1981).

3

The comparison was made with Baumrind's parenting measure rather than with Spence and Helmreich's measure because they equate their "best" parents with her "authoritative" parents and draw conclusions concerning the attributes of this style from her research.

4

Yates correction was used when the expected frequency in any cell was less than 5.

5

Although Spence and Helmreich (1978) claim that their "best" parents possess the high demandingness and high responsiveness characteristic of Baumrind's "authoritative" parents, Baumrind argues that their best parents more resemble her "democratic" parents (medium demanding, high responsive). To give Spence and Helmreich the benefit of the doubt, Baumrind combined these two categories when testing the correspondence between BSRI and best parent types.

6

Baumrind's reasons for collapsing the democratic and permissive categories and the authoritative and demanding categories are not clear. The latter combination is probably intended to represent the parenting styles that traditionalists would term "good". Traditionalists term "good", parenting styles that combine a high level of demandingness with a medium or high level of responsiveness.

7

Traditionalists term "bad", parenting styles that lack demandingness (permissive, rejecting/neglecting, and nondirective) or in which hostility undermines demandingness (authoritarian).

8

These results were included because they were significant at $p < .05$ when Yates correction was not used.

References

- Barry, H., Bacon, M. K., & Child, I. L. (1957). A cross-cultural survey of some sex differences in socialization. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 55, 327-332.
- Baumrind, D. (1966). Effects of authoritative parental control on child behavior. Child Development, 37, 887-907.
- Baumrind, D. (1967). Childcare practices anteceding three patterns of preschool behavior. Genetic Psychology Monographs, 75, 43-88.
- Baumrind, D. (1971). Current patterns of parental authority. Developmental Psychology Monographs, 4 (1, pt. 2).
- Baumrind, D. (1982). Are androgynous individuals more effective persons and parents? Child Development, 53, 44-75.
- Bem, S. L. (1974). The measurement of psychological androgyny. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 42, 155-162.
- Bem, S. L. (1975). Sex role adaptability: One consequence of psychological androgyny. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 31, 634-643.
- Bem, S. L. (1981). Bem Sex Role Inventory: Professional manual. Palo Alto, California: Consulting Psychologists Press, Inc.
- Bem, S. L., & Lenny, E. (1976). Sextyping and the avoidance of cross-sex behavior. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 33, 48-54.
- Benedek, T. (1956). Psychobiological aspects of mothering. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 26, 272-278.
- Blishen, B. R., Carroll, W. K., & Moore, C. (1987). The 1981 socioeconomic index for occupations in Canada. Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology, 24, 465-488.
- Block, J. H. (1965). The Childrearing Practices Report: A set of Q-items for the description of parental socialization attitudes and values. Berkeley: University of California, Institute of Human Development.

- Blos, P. (1962). On adolescence: A psychoanalytic interpretation. New York: Free Press.
- Bowerman, C. E. & Elder, G. H. (1964). Variations in adolescent perception of family power structure. American Sociological Review, 29, 551-567.
- Broughton, R., & Paulhus, D. L. (1984, June). Maximal versus typical measures of interpersonal traits. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Canadian Psychological Association, Ottawa, Ontario, Canada.
- Crowne, D. P., & Marlowe, D. (1960). A new scale of desirability independent of psychopathology. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 24, 349-354.
- Frable, D.E. (in press). Sex-typing and gender ideology: Two facets of the individual's gender psychology that go together Journal of Personality and Social Psychology.
- Gecas, V. (1979). The influence of social class on socialization. In W. R. Burr, R. Hill, F. I. Nye, & I. L. Reiss (Eds.), Contemporary theories about the family (Vol. 1, pp. 365-404). New York: The Free Press.
- Goldberg, L. R. (1981). Unconfounding situational attributions from uncertain, neutral, and ambiguous ones: A psychometric analysis of descriptions of oneself and others. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 41, 517-552.
- Hess, R. D. & Shipman, V. (1968). Maternal attitudes toward the school and the role of the pupil: Some social class comparisons. In A. H. Passow (Ed.), Developing programs for the educationally disadvantaged. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Kaplan, A. G. (1979). Clarifying the concept of androgyny: Implications for therapy. Psychology of Women Quarterly, 3, 223-230.
- Klein, M. (1948). Contributions to psychoanalysis, 1945. London: Hogarth.
- Kohn, M. L. (1969). Class conformity: A study in values. Homewood, Ill.: Dorsey Press.

- Leary, T. (1957). Interpersonal diagnosis of personality. New York: Ronald Press.
- Lubinski, D., Tellegen, A., & Butcher, J. N. (1981). The relationship between androgyny and subjective indicators of emotional well being. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 40, 722-730.
- Lubinski, D., Tellegen, A., & Butcher, J. N. (1983). Masculinity, femininity, and androgyny viewed and assessed as distinct concepts. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 44, 428-439.
- Martin, C. L., & Paulhus, D. L. (1984, August) A new approach to assessing interpersonal flexibility: Functional flexibility. Paper presented at the meeting of The American Psychological Association, Toronto, Ontario.
- Martin, C. L., & Van Oeveren, M. A. (1986) Reconceiving androgyny in terms of capabilities. Unpublished manuscript, University of British Columbia.
- McKinley, D. G. (1964). Social class and family life. New York: Collier-Macmillan.
- Parsons, T. (1951). The social system. New York: Free Press of Glencoe.
- Paulhus, D. L., & Martin, C. L. (1988). Functional flexibility: A new conception of interpersonal flexibility. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 55, 88-101.
- Paulhus, D. L., & Martin, C. L. (1987). The structure of personality capabilities. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 52, 354-365.
- Rosen, B. C. (1964). Social class and the child's perception of the parent. Child Development, 35, 1147-1154.
- Rosenberg, M. (1965). Society and the adolescent self image. Princeton, N. J.: Princeton University Press.
- Rossi, A. (1977). A biosocial perspective on parenting. Daedalus, 106, 1-31.

- Rickel, A.U., & Biasatti, L.L. (1982). Modification of the Block Child Rearing Practices Report. Journal of Clinical Psychology, 38, 120-134.
- Snyder, M. (1974). Self monitoring of expressive behavior. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 11, 526-537.
- Spence, J. T., & Helmreich, R. L. (1978). Masculinity and femininity: Their psychological dimensions, correlates, and antecedents. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Spence, J. T., & Helmreich, R. L. (1980). Masculine instrumentality and feminine expressiveness: Their relationships with sex-role attitudes and behaviors. Psychology of Women Quarterly, 5, 147-163.
- Thomas, D. L., Gecas, V., Weigert, A., & Rooney, E. (1974). Family socialization and the adolescent. Lexington, Mass.: Heath.
- Wallace, J. (1966). An abilities conception of personality: Some implications for personality measurement. American Psychologist, 21, 132-138.
- Wiggins, J. S., & Holzmuller, A. (1978). Psychological androgyny and interpersonal behavior. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 46, 40-52.
- Wiggins, J. S. (1979). A psychological taxonomy of trait descriptive terms: The interpersonal domain. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 37, 395-412.
- Wiggins, J. S., & Holzmuller, A. (1981). Further evidence on androgyny and interpersonal flexibility. Journal of Research in Personality, 15, 67-80.
- Willerman, L., Turner, R. G., & Peterson, M. (1976). A comparison of the predictive validity of typical and maximal personality measures. Journal of Research in Personality, 10, 482-492.
- Zunich, M. (1962). Relationship between maternal behavior and attitudes toward children. Journal of Genetic Psychology, 100, 155-165.

Table 1

Demographic Correlates of Authoritative Parenting.

| Demographic measures | Mother's use of authoritative parenting style |
|-------------------------------|---|
| Mother's | |
| Age | .03 ** |
| Education | .37 a |
| Religious upbringing | .21 |
| Present religious affiliation | a .03 |
| Ethnic background | a .24 |
| Marital status | a .12 |
| Number of children | .05 |
| Father's | ** |
| Education | .31 ** |
| Income | .26 |
| Socioeconomic status | ** .30 |
| Child's | |
| Age | -.11 |
| Sex | -.05 a |
| Birthorder | .14 |

Note. ^a An MCA multiple r is being reported because of the level of measurement. Socioeconomic status was assessed using Blishen's socioeconomic index (1987).

** $p < .01$

Table 2

Regression Coefficients for Model 1.

| Independent variables | Beta | T | Significance of T |
|-----------------------|------|------|-------------------|
| Traits | | | |
| Masculinity | .11 | .80 | .42 |
| Femininity | .03 | .23 | .82 |
| Masc. x Fem. | - | - | - |
| Capabilities | | | |
| Dominance | -.07 | -.52 | .61 |
| Warmth | -.05 | -.42 | .67 |
| Dom. x Warm. | - | - | - |

Note. Betas are for independent effects.
 The interaction variables were not entered into the equation because of tolerance levels less than .01.
 None of the above results were statistically significant.

Table 3

Regression Coefficients for Model 2.

| Independent variables | Beta | T | Significance of T |
|-----------------------|------|------|-------------------|
| Traits | | | |
| Masculinity | .09 | .63 | .53 |
| Femininity | .10 | .84 | .40 |
| Masc. x Fem. | - | - | - |
| Capabilities | | | |
| Dominance | -.09 | -.64 | .52 |
| Warmth | -.08 | -.70 | .49 |
| Dom. x Warm. | - | - | - |

Note. Betas are for independent effects.

The interaction variables were not entered into the equation because of tolerance levels less than .01.

None of the above results were statistically significant.

Table 4

Regression Coefficients for Model 3.

| Independent variables | Beta | T | Significance of T |
|-----------------------|------|-------|-------------------|
| Traits | | | |
| Masculinity | .15 | .07 | .28 |
| Femininity | -.00 | -.01 | .99 |
| Masc. x Fem. | - | - | - |
| Capabilities | | | |
| Dominance | -.21 | -1.43 | .15 |
| Warmth | .13 | 1.03 | .31 |
| Dom. x Warm. | - | - | - |

Note. Betas are for independent effects.

The interaction variables were not entered into the equation because of tolerance levels less than .01.

None of the above results were statistically significant.

Table 5

Regression Coefficients for Model 4.

| Independent variables | Beta | T | Significance of T |
|-----------------------|------|-------|-------------------|
| Capabilities | | | |
| Dominance | .03 | .24 | .81 |
| Warmth | -.06 | -.56 | .58 [*] |
| Flexibility | -.22 | -1.95 | .05 |

Note. Betas are for independent effects.

^{*} $p < .05$

Table 6

Regression Coefficients for Model 5.

| Independent variables | Beta | T | Significance of T |
|-----------------------|------|-------|-------------------|
| Capabilities | | | |
| Dominance | .01 | .12 | .91 |
| Warmth | -.08 | -.69 | .49 |
| Flexibility | -.21 | -1.80 | .07 |

Note. Betas are for independent effects.
None of the above results were statistically significant.

Table 7

Items for Factor 1 With Factor Loadings. Responsiveness.

| Factor loadings | Item | Item list |
|-----------------|------|--|
| .49 | 1 | I respect my child's opinions and encourage him/her to express them. |
| -.40 | 5 | I often feel angry with my child. |
| -.49 | 15 | I believe that a child should be seen and not heard. |
| .44 | 19 | I find some of my greatest satisfactions in my child. |
| .40 | 21 | I encourage my child to wonder and think about life. |
| .74 | 26 | I let my child make many decisions for himself/herself. |
| -.41 | 32 | I feel my child is a bit of a dissappointment to me. |
| .64 | 34 | I am easy going and relaxed with my child. |
| .38 | 38 | I talk it over and reason with my child when he/she misbehaves. |
| .55 | 40 | I joke and play with my child. |
| .42 | 41 | I give my child a good many duties and family responsibilities. |
| .50 | 42 | My child and I have warm intimate times together. |

| | | |
|------|----|--|
| .57 | 45 | I encourage my child to be curious, to explore and question things. |
| -.49 | 58 | When I am angry with my child I let him/her know it. |
| .49 | 62 | I enjoy having the house full of children. |
| -.38 | 69 | There is a good deal of conflict between my child and me. |
| -.57 | 73 | I let my child know how ashamed and dissappointed I am when he/she misbehaves. |
| .69 | 77 | I find it interesting and educational to be with my child for long periods. |
| -.42 | 83 | I control my child by warning him/her about the bad things that can happen to him/her. |

Table 8

Items for Factor 2 With Factor Loadings. Neuroticism.

| Factor loadings | Item | Item list |
|-----------------|------|---|
| -.52 | 5 | I often feel angry with my child. |
| -.51 | 7 | I punish my child by putting him/her off somewhere by himself/herself for awhile. |
| -.45 | 24 | I feel a child should have time to think, daydream, and even loaf sometimes. |
| -.45 | 32 | I feel my child is a bit of a dissappointment to me. |
| .38 | 44 | I think one has to let a child take many chances as he/she grows up and tries new things. |
| .57 | 54 | I believe that children should not have secrets from their parents. |
| -.52 | 60 | I punish my child by taking away a privilege he/she otherwise would have had. |
| .40 | 68 | I worry about the health of my child. |
| -.46 | 69 | There is a good deal of conflict between my child and me. |
| -.60 | 72 | I like to have some time for myself, away from my child. |
| -.46 | 75 | I encourage my child to be independent of me. |

- | | | |
|-----|----|--|
| .37 | 78 | I think a child should be weaned from the breast or bottle as soon as possible. |
| .48 | 80 | I don't go out if I have to leave my child with a stranger. |
| .46 | 86 | I don't think children should be given sexual information before they can understand everything. |

Table 9

Items for Factor 3 With Factor Loadings. Demandingness.

| Factor loadings | Item | Item list |
|-----------------|------|---|
| .55 | 2 | I encourage my child always to do his or her best. |
| -.44 | 7 | I punish my child by putting him/her off somewhere by himself/herself for awhile. |
| -.42 | 16 | I sometimes forget the promises I have made to my child. |
| -.37 | 25 | I find it difficult to punish my child. |
| .55 | 33 | I expect a great deal of my child. |
| .48 | 47 | I expect my child to be grateful and appreciate all the advantages he/she has. |
| .51 | 55 | I teach my child to keep control of of his/her feelings at all times. |
| .40 | 59 | I think a child should be encouraged to do things better than others. |
| .41 | 74 | I want my child to make a good impression on others. |

Table 10

Correlations Between the Independent Variables (Masculinity, Femininity, Dominance and Warmth) and the Parenting Factor Indexes for the Total Sample (N = 85).

| Independent variables | Factor indexes | | |
|---------------------------|----------------|-------------|---------------|
| | Responsiveness | Neuroticism | Demandingness |
| Traits | | | |
| Masculinity | .09 ** | -.20 ** | .08 ** |
| Femininity | .27 | .26 | -.24 |
| Capabilities | | | |
| Dominance | .06 * | -.07 ** | -.01 * |
| Warmth (& Trust) | .19 | .28 | -.17 |
| Flexibility (16 caps.) | .02 | .02 | -.07 |

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

Table 11

Correlations Between the Independent Variables (Masculinity, Femininity, Dominance and Warmth) and the Parenting Factor Indexes for Mothers of Girls (N = 36).

| Independent variables | Factor indexes | | |
|---------------------------|----------------|-------------|---------------|
| | Responsiveness | Neuroticism | Demandingness |
| Traits | | | |
| Masculinity | .16 | -.25 | .29* |
| Femininity | .33* | .15 | -.32* |
| Capabilities | | | |
| Dominance | .13 | .07 | .25 |
| Warmth (& Trust) | .22 | .23 | -.21 |
| Flexibility (16 caps.) | .16 | -.19 | .11 |

Note. * $p < .05$

Table 12

Correlations Between the Independent Variables (Masculinity, Femininity, Dominance and Warmth) and the Parenting Factor Indexes for Mothers of Boys (N = 48).

| Independent variables | Factor indexes | | |
|---------------------------|----------------|-------------|---------------|
| | Responsiveness | Neuroticism | Demandingness |
| Traits | | | |
| Masculinity | .05* | -.16** | -.07 |
| Femininity | .23 | .34 | -.18 |
| Capabilities | | | |
| Dominance | .00 | -.20** | -.23* |
| Warmth (& Trust) | .18 | .32 | -.17 |
| Flexibility (16 caps.) | -.08 | .15 | -.19 |

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

Table 13

Frequencies for Parenting Categories by BSRI Types for the Total Sample.

| Parenting types | BSRI types | | | | Row totals |
|------------------|------------|------|-------|--------|------------|
| | Undiff. | Fem. | Masc. | Andro. | |
| Authoritative | - | 3 | 2 | 4 | 9 |
| Undifferentiated | - | 5 | 1 | 3 | 9 |
| Reject./neglect. | 1 | 6 | 1 | - | 8 |
| Demanding | 4 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 10 |
| Authoritarian | 3 | 2 | 5 | 3 | 13 |
| Democratic | 2 | 5 | 1 | 5 | 13 |
| Undif./nondir. | 1 | 3 | - | 1 | 5 |
| Permissive | - | 1 | 2 | 8 | 11 |
| Nondirective | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 7 |
| Column totals | 13 | 30 | 14 | 28 | 85 |

Table 14

Frequencies for Parenting Categories by BSRI Types for the Mothers of Girls.

| Parenting types | BSRI types | | | | Row totals |
|------------------|------------|------|-------|--------|------------|
| | Undiff. | Fem. | Masc. | Andro. | |
| Authoritative | - | 1 | 2 | 2 | 5 |
| Undifferentiated | - | 1 | - | 1 | 2 |
| Reject./neglect. | 1 | 4 | - | - | 5 |
| Demanding | 2 | - | - | 1 | 3 |
| Authoritarian | 1 | - | 1 | 2 | 4 |
| Democratic | 1 | 2 | - | 4 | 7 |
| Undif./nondir. | 1 | 2 | - | - | 3 |
| Permissive | - | 1 | 1 | 2 | 4 |
| Nondirective | 1 | 1 | - | 1 | 3 |
| Column totals | 7 | 12 | 4 | 13 | 36 |

Table 15

Frequencies for Parenting Categories by BSRI Types for the Mothers of Boys.

| Parenting types | BSRI types | | | | Row totals |
|------------------|------------|------|-------|--------|------------|
| | Undiff. | Fem. | Masc. | Andro. | |
| Authoritative | - | 2 | - | 2 | 4 |
| Undifferentiated | - | 4 | 1 | 1 | 6 |
| Reject./neglect. | - | 2 | 1 | - | 3 |
| Demanding | 2 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 7 |
| Authoritarian | 2 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 9 |
| Democratic | 1 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 6 |
| Undif./nondir. | - | 1 | - | 1 | 2 |
| Permissive | - | - | 1 | 6 | 7 |
| Nondirective | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4 |
| Column totals | 6 | 18 | 10 | 14 | 48 |

Table 16

Frequencies for Parenting Categories by Capabilities
Classifications for the Total Sample.

| Parenting types | Capabilities classifications | | | | Row totals |
|------------------|------------------------------|------|-------|--------|------------|
| | Undiff. | Fem. | Masc. | Andro. | |
| Authoritative | 2 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 8 |
| Undifferentiated | 1 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 8 |
| Reject./neglect. | 1 | 4 | 1 | 3 | 9 |
| Demanding | 1 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 10 |
| Authoritarian | 2 | 3 | 8 | 1 | 14 |
| Democratic | 3 | 5 | 1 | 4 | 13 |
| Undif./nondir. | 2 | 2 | - | 1 | 5 |
| Permissive | 3 | 1 | 1 | 6 | 11 |
| Nondirective | 1 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 8 |
| Column totals | 16 | 26 | 20 | 24 | 86 |

Table 17

Frequencies for Parenting Categories by Capabilities
Classifications for the Mothers of Girls.

| Parenting types | Capabilities classifications | | | | Row totals |
|------------------|------------------------------|------|-------|--------|------------|
| | Undiff. | Fem. | Masc. | Andro. | |
| Authoritative | - | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 |
| Undifferentiated | 1 | 1 | - | - | 2 |
| Reject./neglect. | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 5 |
| Demanding | - | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 |
| Authoritarian | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 5 |
| Democratic | 1 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 7 |
| Undif./nondir. | 2 | 1 | - | - | 3 |
| Permissive | 2 | 1 | - | 1 | 4 |
| Nondirective | - | 1 | 2 | 1 | 4 |
| Column totals | 8 | 12 | 8 | 8 | 36 |

Table 18

Frequencies for Parenting Categories by Capabilities
Classifications for the Mothers of Boys.

| Parenting types | Capabilities classifications | | | | Row totals |
|------------------|------------------------------|------|-------|--------|------------|
| | Undiff. | Fem. | Masc. | Andro. | |
| Authoritative | 2 | - | 2 | 1 | 5 |
| Undifferentiated | - | 1 | 2 | 2 | 5 |
| Reject./neglect. | - | 2 | - | 2 | 4 |
| Demanding | 1 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 7 |
| Authoritarian | 1 | 2 | 6 | - | 9 |
| Democratic | 2 | 2 | - | 2 | 6 |
| Undif./nondir. | - | 1 | - | 1 | 2 |
| Permissive | 1 | - | 1 | 5 | 7 |
| Nondirective | 1 | 2 | - | 1 | 4 |
| Column totals | 8 | 13 | 12 | 16 | 49 |

Table 19

Correlations Between The Demographic Variables and the Parenting Indexes.

| Demographic variables | Factor indexes | | |
|-------------------------------|----------------|-------------|---------------|
| | Responsiveness | Neuroticism | Demandingness |
| Mother's education | .13 | -.23 ** | .36 ** |
| Father's education | .07 | -.05 | .37 ** |
| Father's income | .06 | -.15 | .30 ** |
| Father's socioeconomic status | .02 | -.27 ** | .31 ** |

Note. Socioeconomic status was assessed using Blishen's socioeconomic index (1987).

** $p < .01$

Section One

Mark an 'X' next to the single best answer for each question. Please indicate only one answer per question. For some questions you are asked to write an answer. For these please print.

1. Age _____

2. How many years of schooling did you complete?

_____ (1) 10 years or less

_____ (2) 11 - 12 years

_____ (3) 13 years

_____ (4) 14 - 16 years

_____ (5) more than 16 years

3. What is your present occupation? (Please be as specific as possible) _____

4. Which of the following categories is closest to your total income per year?

_____ (1) 0 - \$5,000

_____ (2) \$5,001 - \$10,000

_____ (3) \$10,001 - \$20,000

_____ (4) \$20,001 - \$30,000

_____ (5) \$30,001 - \$40,000

_____ (6) \$40,001 - \$50,000

_____ (7) more than \$50,000

5. In which religious group were you raised?

- _____ (1) none
- _____ (2) Roman Catholic
- _____ (3) Jewish
- _____ (4) Protestant
- _____ (5) other, please specify _____

6. Do you presently feel a part of some religious group?

- _____ (1) no _____ (2) yes

7. What is your ethnic background? (Please be as specific as possible) _____

8. What is your present marital status?

- _____ (1) married
- _____ (2) common law
- _____ (3) single
- _____ (4) divorced
- _____ (5) widowed
- _____ (6) separated
- _____ (7) cohabiting

9. How many children of your own do you have? (Include adopted children) _____

10. Are you actively raising (a primary caretaker for) any step children?

- _____ (1) no _____ (2) yes

11. Are you actively raising any foster children?

_____ (1) no _____ (2) yes

12. Please list the ages of all children you are actively raising, specifying which, if any, are step or foster children, and the sex of each child.

13. If you answered 'no' to questions 10 and/or 11, but have, in the past, been a primary caretaker for any step or foster children, please list the ages of these children when you last cared for them on a permanent basis.

14. Two of the questionnaires you will be answering concern parenting. You will be asked to focus on one child (between the ages 7 and 12) while answering these questions. What is the age of this child? _____

15. What is the sex of this child? _____ (1) female
_____ (2) male

Important Note

Please refer to your behavior with this child only when answering all subsequent questions concerning your parenting practices.

16. Which of the following categories best reflects you and your spouse/partner's division of parenting responsibilities?

If you are separated or divorced from your child's father and presently cohabiting with or remarried to another man, please refer to which ever man spends more time interacting with the child, when answering this question.

- _____ (1) mother is totally responsible
- _____ (2) mother is mainly responsible but father is somewhat active
- _____ (3) mother and father share the responsibility equally
- _____ (4) father is mainly responsible but mother is somewhat active
- _____ (5) father is totally responsible

If you are currently residing with or receiving support from a spouse/partner please complete questions 17 through 19.

17. How many years of schooling did your spouse/partner complete?

- _____ (1) 10 years or less
- _____ (2) 11 - 12 years
- _____ (3) 13 years
- _____ (4) 14 - 16 years
- _____ (5) more than 16 years

18. What is your spouse/partner's present occupation? (Please be as specific as possible) _____

19. Which of the following categories is closest to your spouse/partner's total income per year?

- _____ (1) 0 - \$5,000
- _____ (2) \$5,001 - \$10,000
- _____ (3) \$10,001 - \$20,000
- _____ (4) \$20,001 - \$30,000
- _____ (5) \$30,001 - \$40,000
- _____ (6) \$40,001 - \$50,000
- _____ (7) more than \$50,000

FFI Inventory

Complete all questions by writing the most appropriate number to the left of the statement. Use the scale at the top of the page as a guide.

| | | | | | | |
|------------|---|---|---|---|---|------|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| Not at all | | | | | | Very |

GREGARIOUS (friendly, neighbourly, approachable)

1. ___ How likely is it that you could be gregarious if the situation requires it?
2. ___ How difficult is it for you to be gregarious if the situation requires it?
3. ___ How anxious would you feel being gregarious in a situation that requires it?
4. ___ How often do you avoid situations where you need to be gregarious?
5. ___ Would you like to be gregarious in situations that require it?

UNASSUMING (humble, modest, not vain)

1. ___ How likely is it that you could be unassuming if the situation requires it?
2. ___ How difficult is it for you to be unassuming if the situation requires it?
3. ___ How anxious would you feel being unassuming in a situation that requires it?
4. ___ How often do you avoid situations where you need to be unassuming?
5. ___ Would you like to be unassuming in situations that require it?

| | | | | | | |
|------------|---|---|---|---|---|------|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| Not at all | | | | | | Very |

ALOOF (impersonal, unsociable, distant)

1. ___ How likely is it that you could be aloof if the situation requires it?
2. ___ How difficult is it for you to be aloof if the situation requires it?
3. ___ How anxious would you feel being aloof in a situation that requires it?
4. ___ How often do you avoid situations where you need to be aloof?
5. ___ Would you like to be aloof in situations that require it?

ARROGANT (conceited, boastful, cocky)

1. ___ How likely is it that you could be arrogant if the situation requires it?
2. ___ How difficult is it for you to be arrogant if the situation requires it?
3. ___ How anxious would you feel being arrogant in a situation that requires it?
4. ___ How often do you avoid situations where you need to be arrogant?
5. ___ Would you like to be arrogant in situations that require it?

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
|------------|---|---|---|---|---|------|
| Not at all | | | | | | Very |

AMBITIOUS (success-oriented, industrious, persistent)

1. ___ How likely is it that you could be ambitious if the situation requires it?
2. ___ How difficult is it for you to be ambitious if the situation requires it?
3. ___ How anxious would you feel being ambitious in a situation that requires it?
4. ___ How often do you avoid situations where you need to be ambitious?
5. ___ Would you like to be ambitious in situations that require it?

WARM (tender, kind, sympathetic)

1. — How likely is it that you could be warm if the situation requires it?
2. — How difficult is it for you to be warm if the situation requires it?
3. — How anxious would you feel being warm in a situation that requires it?
4. — How often do you avoid situations where you need to be warm?
5. — Would you like to be warm in situations that require it?

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
|------------|---|---|---|---|---|------|
| Not at all | | | | | | Very |

Very

EXTRAVERTED (outgoing, vivacious, enthusiastic)

1. — How likely is it that you could be extraverted if the situation requires it?
2. — How difficult is it for you to be extraverted if the situation requires it?
3. — How anxious would you feel being extraverted in a situation that requires it?
4. — How often do you avoid situations where you need to be extraverted?
5. — Would you like to be extraverted in situations that require it?

TRUSTING (naive, gullible, not crafty)

1. — How likely is it that you could be trusting if the situation requires it?
2. — How difficult is it for you to be trusting if the situation requires it?
3. — How anxious would you feel being trusting in a situation that requires it?
4. — How often do you avoid situations where you need to be trusting?
5. — Would you like to be trusting in situations that require it?

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
|------------|---|---|---|---|---|------|
| Not at all | | | | | | Very |

INTROVERTED (withdrawn, shy, unsparkling)

1. ___ How likely is it that you could be introverted if the situation requires it?
2. ___ How difficult is it for you to be introverted if the situation requires it?
3. ___ How anxious would you feel being introverted in a situation that requires it?
4. ___ How often do you avoid situations where you need to be introverted?
5. ___ Would you like to be introverted in situations that require it?

CALCULATING (cunning, sly, crafty)

1. — How likely is it that you could be calculating if the situation requires it?
2. — How difficult is it for you to be calculating if the situation requires it?
3. — How anxious would you feel being calculating in a situation that requires it?
4. — How often do you avoid situations where you need to be calculating?
5. — Would you like to be calculating in situations that require it?

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
|------------|---|---|---|---|---|------|
| Not at all | | | | | | Very |

DOMINANT (assertive, forceful, firm)

1. — How likely is it that you could be dominant if the situation requires it?
2. — How difficult is it for you to be dominant if the situation requires it?
3. — How anxious would you feel being dominant in a situation that requires it?
4. — How often do you avoid situations where you need to be dominant?
5. — Would you like to be dominant in situations that require it?

AGREEABLE (forgiving, well-mannered, cooperative)

1. — How likely is it that you could be agreeable if the situation requires it?
2. — How difficult is it for you to be agreeable if the situation requires it?
3. — How anxious would you feel being agreeable in a situation that requires it?
4. — How often do you avoid situations where you need to be agreeable?
5. — Would you like to be agreeable in situations that require it?

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
|------------|---|---|---|---|---|------|
| Not at all | | | | | | Very |

SUBMISSIVE (timid, meek, unaggressive)

1. ___ How likely is it that you could be submissive if the situation requires it?
2. ___ How difficult is it for you to be submissive if the situation requires it?
3. ___ How anxious would you feel being submissive in a situation that requires it?
4. ___ How often do you avoid situations where you need to be submissive?
5. ___ Would you like to be submissive in situations that require it?

HOSTILE (quarrelsome, impolite, uncooperative)

1. — How likely is it that you could be hostile if the situation requires it?
2. — How difficult is it for you to be hostile if the situation requires it?
3. — How anxious would you feel being hostile in a situation that requires it?
4. — How often do you avoid situations where you need to be hostile?
5. — Would you like to be hostile in situations that require it?

[illegible]

ASSURED (confident, composed, self-confident)

1. — How likely is it that you could be assured if the situation requires it?
2. — How difficult is it for you to be assured if the situation requires it?
3. — How anxious would you feel being assured in a situation that requires it?
4. — How often do you avoid situations where you need to be assured?
5. — Would you like to be assured in situations that require it?

UNASSURED (insecure, unsure, unself-reliant)

1. ___ How likely is it that you could be unassured if the situation requires it?
2. ___ How difficult is it for you to be unassured if the situation requires it?
3. ___ How anxious would you feel being unassured in a situation that requires it?
4. ___ How often do you avoid situations where you need to be unassured?
5. ___ Would you like to be unassured in situations that require it?

Please indicate how characteristic of you each of the following statements is by circling the appropriate number. 1 = not at all characteristic. 7 = very characteristic.

Some of the statements below refer to your beliefs about parenting and some refer to your actual behavior with your child. Often times, circumstances cause people to act in ways that do not exactly reflect their beliefs, so do not be concerned if there is some discrepancy between the two.

When rating statements concerning your parenting behavior please refer to your interaction with your child who is between 7 and 12 years of age.

- (1) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 I believe that parents should exercise a lot of control over their children.
- (2) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 I exercise a lot of control over my child.
- (3) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 I believe that parent-child communication is an important part of parenting.
- (4) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 My child and I communicate well with one another.
- (5) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 I believe that parents should always expect reasonably mature behavior from their children.
- (6) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 I always expect reasonably mature behavior from my child.
- (7) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 I believe that nurturance is an important part of parenting.
- (8) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 I am very nurturant toward my child.

Now indicate how characteristic of your spouse/partner each of these statements is. 1 = not at all characteristic. 7 = very characteristic.

Again, if you are separated or divorced from your child's father and presently cohabiting with or remarried to another man, please refer to which ever man spends the most time interacting with the child, when rating these statements.

When rating statements concerning your spouse/partner's parenting behavior please refer to his interaction with your child who is between 7 and 12 years of age.

- (1) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 My partner believes that parents should exercise a lot of control over their children.
- (2) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 My partner exercises a lot of control over our child.
- (3) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 My partner believes that parent-child communication is an important part of parenting.
- (4) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 My partner and our child communicate well with one another.
- (5) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 My partner believes that parents should always expect reasonably mature behavior from their children.
- (6) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 My partner always expects reasonably mature behavior from our child.
- (7) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 My partner believes that nurturance is an important part of parenting.
- (8) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 My partner is very nurturant toward our child.

B S R I

On the following page, you will be shown a large number of personality characteristics. I would like you to use those characteristics in order to describe yourself. That is, I would like you to indicate on a scale of 1 to 7 how true of you these various characteristics are. Please do not leave any characteristics unmarked.

EXAMPLE: SLY

Mark a 1 if it is NEVER OR ALMOST NEVER TRUE that you are sly.

Mark a 2 if it is USUALLY NOT TRUE that you are sly.

Mark a 3 if it is SOMETIMES BUT INFREQUENTLY TRUE that you are sly.

Mark a 4 if it is OCCASIONALLY TRUE that you are sly.

Mark a 5 if it is OFTEN TRUE that you are sly.

Mark a 6 if it is USUALLY TRUE that you are sly.

Mark a 7 if it is ALWAYS OR ALMOST ALWAYS TRUE that you are sly.

Thus, if you feel it is sometimes but infrequently true that you are "sly", never or almost never true that you are "malicious", always or almost always true that you are "irresponsible", and often true that you are "carefree", then you would rate these characteristics as follows:

SLY _____

IRRESPONSIBLE _____

MALICIOUS _____

CAREFREE _____

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
|--|---------------------|---|------------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------|--|
| NEVER OR ALMOST NEVER TRUE | USUALLY NOT TRUE | SOMETIMES BUT INFREQ- UENTLY TRUE | OCCASION- ALLY TRUE | OFTEN TRUE | USUALLY TRUE | ALWAYS OR ALMOST ALWAYS TRUE |
| self-reliant | _____ | analytical | _____ | warm | _____ | |
| yielding | _____ | sympathetic | _____ | solemn | _____ | |
| helpful | _____ | jealous | _____ | willing to take a stand | _____ | |
| defends own beliefs | _____ | has leader- ship abilities | _____ | tender | _____ | |
| cheerful | _____ | sensitive to the needs of others | _____ | friendly | _____ | |
| moody | _____ | truthful | _____ | aggressive | _____ | |
| independent | _____ | willing to take risks | _____ | insuffic- ient | _____ | |
| shy | _____ | understanding | _____ | acts as a leader | _____ | |
| conscientious | _____ | secretive | _____ | childlike | _____ | |
| athletic | _____ | makes decisions easily | _____ | adaptable | _____ | |
| feminine | _____ | compassionate | _____ | individ- ualistic | _____ | |
| theatrical | _____ | sincere | _____ | does not use harsh language | _____ | |

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
|--|---------------------|---|------------------------|---------------|-----------------|--|
| NEVER OR ALMOST NEVER TRUE | USUALLY NOT TRUE | SOMETIMES BUT INFREQ- UENTLY TRUE | OCCASION- ALLY TRUE | OFTEN TRUE | USUALLY TRUE | ALWAYS OR ALMOST ALWAYS TRUE |

| | | | | | |
|-----------------------|-------|-------------------------------------|-------|-------------------|-------|
| assertive | _____ | self- sufficient | _____ | unsystem- atic | _____ |
| flatterable | _____ | eager to soothe hurt feelings | _____ | competitive | _____ |
| happy | _____ | conceited | _____ | loves children | _____ |
| strong personality | _____ | dominant | _____ | tactful | _____ |
| loyal | _____ | soft-spoken | _____ | ambitious | _____ |
| unpredict- able | _____ | likable | _____ | gentle | _____ |
| forceful | _____ | masculine | _____ | convent- ional | _____ |
| affection- ate | _____ | reliable | _____ | | |

Instructions for the Q-Sort Cards

In trying to gain more understanding of parenting styles, I would like to know what is important to you as a parent and what kinds of methods you use in raising your child--in particular, your child who is now between 7 and 12 years of age. You are asked to indicate your opinions by sorting through a special set of cards that contain statements about bringing up children.

The Cards and Envelopes

The set contains 91 cards. Each card contains a sentence having to do with childrearing. Some of these statements will be true or descriptive of your attitudes and behavior in relation to your child. Some sentences will be untrue or undescriptive of your feelings and behavior toward this child. By sorting these cards according to the instructions below, you will be able to show how descriptive or undescriptive each of these sentences is for you. Together with the cards you have received 7 envelopes, with the following labels:

7. These cards are most descriptive
6. These cards are quite descriptive
5. These cards are fairly descriptive
4. These cards are neither descriptive nor undescriptive
3. These cards are fairly undescriptive
2. These cards are quite undescriptive
1. These cards are most undescriptive

Your task is to choose 13 cards that fit into each of these categories and to put them into their proper envelopes.

How to Sort the Cards (You may wish to check off each step as completed)

- ___ 1. Shuffle the cards.
- ___ 2. Spread out the envelopes in a row, going from 7 to 1 (Most descriptive to most undescriptive):

7 6 5 4 3 2 1

- ___ 3. Now take the shuffled deck of cards, and read each sentence carefully. Then make three piles of cards: one pile containing cards that are generally true or descriptive of you; one pile that you are not certain about, and one pile of cards that are generally not true or descriptive.

It doesn't make any difference how many cards you put in each of the three piles at this time, since you will probably have to do some switching around later. But you may find it helpful if each pile contains about the same number of cards.

Now your cards and envelopes look like this:

| | | | | | | |
|------------------------|---|---------------------|---|--------------------------|---|---|
| 7 | 6 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| "Descriptive" Cards | | "Not Sure" Cards | | "Undescriptive" Cards | | |

- ___ 4. Now take the pile of "descriptive" cards and pick out the 13 cards that are the most descriptive of your behavior with your child. Put these cards on top of envelope #7. Don't put them inside yet, because you might want to shift some of them later.
- ___ 5. Next, from the cards that remain, pick out 13 cards that you think are quite descriptive of your behavior and put these on top of envelope #6. (If you run out of cards from your "descriptive" pile, you'll have to add some of the more descriptive cards from your "not sure" pile.)
- ___ 6. Now, begin at the other end. Take the pile of "undescriptive" cards and pick out the 13 cards that are the most undescriptive of you. Put these on top of envelope #1.
- ___ 7. Then pick out the 13 cards which are quite undescriptive and put them on envelope #2. (Again, you may have to "borrow" from your "not sure" pile to make the necessary 13 cards for envelope #2.)

- 8. You should now have 39 cards left over. These are now to be sorted into three new piles with 13 cards in each: 13 cards that are fairly descriptive of you (to be put on envelope #5); 13 cards that are neither descriptive nor undescriptive (to be put on envelope #4); and 13 cards that are fairly undescriptive (to be put on envelope #3).

You may find it hard, as others have, to put the same number of cards in each pile but I must ask you to follow these directions exactly, even if you feel limited by them.

- 9. Now, as a last step, look over your sort to see if there are any changes you want to make. When the cards seem to belong where you have put them, double check to make sure you have 13 cards in each pile. Then put each pile in the proper envelope and tuck in the flaps. The small envelopes go into the large envelope for return.

Item List for the CRPR Q-Sort

1. I respect my child's opinions and encourage him/her to express them.
2. I encourage my child always to do his/her best.
3. I put the wishes of my mate before the wishes of my child.
4. I help my child when he/she is being teased by his/her friends.
5. I often feel angry with my child.
6. If my child gets into trouble, I expect him/her to handle the problem mostly by himself/herself.
7. I punish my child by putting him/her off somewhere by himself/herself for awhile.
8. I watch closely what my child eats and when he/she eats.
9. I don't think young children of different sexes should be allowed to see each other naked.
10. I wish my spouse were more interested in our children.
11. I feel that a child should be given comfort and understanding when he/she is scared or upset.
12. I try to keep my child away from children of families who have different ideas or values from our own.
13. I try to stop my child from playing rough games or doing things where he/she might get hurt.
14. I believe physical punishment to be the best way of disciplining.
15. I believe that a child should be seen and not heard.
16. I sometimes forget the promises I have made to my child.
17. I think it is good practice for a child to perform in front of others.

18. I express affection by hugging, kissing, and holding my child.
19. I find some of my greatest satisfactions in my child.
20. I prefer that my child not try things if there is a chance that he/she will fail.
21. I encourage my child to wonder and think about life.
22. I usually take into account my child's preferences in making plans for the family.
23. I wish my child did not have to grow up so fast.
24. I feel that a child should have time to think, daydream, and even loaf sometimes.
25. I find it difficult to punish my child.
26. I let my child make many decisions for himself/herself.
27. I do not allow my child to say bad things about his/her teacher.
28. I worry about the bad and sad things that can happen to a child as he/she grows up.
29. I teach my child that in one way or another punishment will find him/her when he/she is bad.
30. I do not blame my child for whatever happens if others ask for trouble.
31. I do not allow my child to get angry with me.
32. I feel my child is a bit of a disappointment to me.
33. I expect a great deal of my child.
34. I am easy going and relaxed with my child.
35. I give up some of my own interests because of my child.
36. I tend to spoil my child.

37. I have never caught my child lying.
38. I talk it over and reason with my child when he/she misbehaves.
39. I trust my child to behave as he/she should, even when I am not with him/her.
40. I joke and play with my child.
41. I give my child a good many duties and family responsibilities.
42. My child and I have warm, intimate times together.
43. I have strict, well-established rules for my child.
44. I think one has to let a child take many chances as he/she grows up and tries new things.
45. I encourage my child to be curious, to explore, and question things.
46. I sometimes talk about supernatural forces and beings in explaining things to my child.
47. I expect my child to be grateful and appreciate all the advantages that he/she has.
48. I sometimes feel that I am too involved with my child.
49. I believe in toilet training a child as soon as possible.
50. I threaten punishment more often than I actually give it.
51. I believe in praising a child when he/she is good and think it gets better results than punishing him/her when he/she is bad.
52. I make sure that my child knows that I appreciate what he/she tries or accomplishes.
53. I encourage my child to talk about his/her troubles.
54. I believe that children should not have secrets from their parents.

55. I teach my child to keep control of his/her feelings at all times.
56. I try to keep my child from fighting.
57. I dread answering my child's questions about sex.
58. When I am angry with my child, I let him/her know it.
59. I think a child should be encouraged to do things better than others.
60. I punish my child by taking away a privilege he/she otherwise would have had.
61. I give my child extra privileges when he/she behaves well.
62. I enjoy having the house full of children.
63. I believe that too much affection and tenderness can harm or weaken a child.
64. I believe that scolding and criticism makes my child improve.
65. I believe that my child should be aware of how much I sacrifice for him/her.
66. I sometimes tease and make fun of my child.
67. I teach my child that he/she is responsible for what happens to him/her.
68. I worry about the health of my child.
69. There is a good deal of conflict between my child and me.
70. I do not allow my child to question my decisions.
71. I feel that it is good for a child to play competitive games
72. I like to have some time for myself, away from my child.
73. I let my child know how ashamed and dissappointed I am when he/she misbehaves.

74. I want my child to make a good impression on others.
75. I encourage my child to be independent of me.
76. I make sure I know where my child is and what he/she is doing.
77. I find it interesting and educational to be with my child for long periods.
78. I think a child should be weaned from the breast or bottle as soon as possible.
79. I instruct my child not to get dirty while he/she is playing
80. I don't go out if I have to leave my child with a stranger.
81. I think jealousy and quarreling between brothers and sisters should be punished.
82. I think children must learn early not to cry.
83. I control my child by warning him/her about the bad things that can happen to him/her.
84. I think it is best if the mother, rather than the father, is the one with the most authority over the children.
85. I don't want my child to be looked upon as different from others.
86. I don't think children should be given sexual information before they can understand everything.
87. I believe it is very important for a child to play outside and get plenty of fresh air.
88. I get pleasure from seeing my child eating well and enjoying his/her food.
89. I don't allow my child to tease or play tricks on others.
90. I think it is wrong to insist that young boys and girls have different kinds of toys and play different sorts of games.

91. I believe it is unwise to let children play alot by themselves without supervision from grown-ups.

Final Instructions

When you have completed the questionnaire, please place it and the small envelopes containing your Q-sort cards in the large envelope and return it to your child's teacher/daycare director.

Once again, thank you for your assistance.

Appendix C
Parenting Profile Adjustments

| Average value | Number of items | Assigned value |
|---------------|-----------------|----------------|
| 7.0 | 5 | 7 |
| 6.7 | 7 | 7 |
| 6.3 | 1 | 7 |
| 6.3 | 3 | 6 |
| 6.0 | 6 | 6 |
| 5.7 | 3 | 6 |
| 5.3 | | |
| 5.0 | 7 | 5 |
| 4.7 | 4 | 5 |
| 4.3 | 2 | 5 |
| 4.3 | 2 | 4 |
| 4.0 | 6 | 4 |
| 3.7 | 5 | 4 |
| 3.3 | 1 | 3 |
| 3.0 | 9 | 3 |
| 2.7 | 3 | 3 |
| 2.7 | 4 | 2 |
| 2.3 | 5 | 2 |
| 2.0 | 4 | 2 |
| 1.7 | 5 | 1 |
| 1.3 | 3 | 1 |
| 1.0 | 5 | 1 |

Appendix D

Table 1

Correlations Among the Demographic Variables.

| Variables | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
|-------------------------|------|------|-----|------|------|-----|-----|---|
| Mother's | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Age | - | | | | | | | |
| | ** | | | | | | | |
| 2. Education | .33 | - | | | | | | |
| Father's | | | | | | | | |
| | | ** | | | | | | |
| 3. Education | .17 | .54 | - | | | | | |
| | ** | ** | ** | | | | | |
| 4. Income | .43 | .44 | .39 | - | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| 5. Socioeconomic status | * | ** | ** | ** | ** | | | |
| | .25 | .47 | .55 | .67 | - | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| 6. Number of children | ** | | * | ** | ** | ** | | |
| | .37 | .16 | .23 | .27 | .32 | - | | |
| | ** | | | | | ** | | |
| 7. Child's age | .48 | -.01 | .10 | .10 | .04 | .30 | - | |
| | | | | | | | * | |
| 8. Child's sex | -.07 | -.09 | .00 | -.07 | -.07 | .09 | .22 | - |

Note. Socioeconomic status was assessed using Blishen's socioeconomic index (1987).

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

Appendix D

Table 2

Correlations Between the Demographic and the Independent Variables.

| Demographic variables | Independent variables | | |
|-----------------------|-----------------------|------------|--------------|
| | Mother's | | |
| | Masculinity | Femininity | Masc. x Fem. |
| Mother's | | | |
| Age | .11 | .19* | .22* |
| Education | .11 | -.11 | .06 |
| Father's | | | |
| Education | -.08 | -.01 | -.09 |
| Income | .01 | .16 | .11 |
| Socioeconomic status | -.03 | .11 | .04 |
| Number of children | .05 | -.07 | .01 |
| Child's age | -.07 | .11 | -.02 |
| Child's sex | .09 | -.03 | .02 |

Note. Socioeconomic status was assessed using Blishen's socioeconomic index (1987).

* $p < .05$

Appendix D

Table 2 Continued.

Correlations Between the Demographic and the Independent Variables.

| Demographic variables | Independent variables | | |
|-----------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------|--------------|
| | Mother's | | |
| | Capability for dominance | Capability for warmth | Dom. x Warm. |
| Mother's | | | |
| Age | .17 | -.08 | .11 |
| Education | -.01 | -.07 | -.05 |
| Father's | | | |
| Education | -.23 * | -.11 | -.28 ** |
| Income | -.08 | .02 | -.07 |
| Socioeconomic status | -.08 | -.24 * | -.19 |
| Number of children | -.01 | -.10 | -.06 |
| Child's age | .13 | -.03 | .10 |
| Child's sex | .05 | .05 | .05 |

Note. Socioeconomic status was assessed using Blishen's socioeconomic index (1987).

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

Appendix D

Table 2 Continued.

Correlations Between the Demographic and the Independent Variables.

| Demographic variables | Independent variables | |
|-----------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|
| | Mother's | |
| | Flexibility (14 caps.) | Flexibility (16 caps.) |
| Mother's | | |
| Age | .17 | .18 * |
| Education | -.12 | -.12 |
| Father's | | |
| Education | -.10 | -.14 |
| Income | .12 | .11 |
| Socioeconomic status | -.20 * | -.22 * |
| Number of children | -.11 | -.12 |
| Child's age | -.03 | -.01 |
| Child's sex | -.01 | .00 |

Note. Socioeconomic status was assessed using Blishen's socioeconomic index (1987).

* $p < .05$

Appendix D

Table 3

Correlations Among the Independent Variables.

| Variables | Traits | | | Caps. | | | Flex. | |
|---------------------|--------|------|-----|-------|-----|-----|-------|---|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| Traits | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Masculinity | - | | | | | | | |
| 2. Femininity | -.02 | - | | | | | | |
| | ** | ** | | | | | | |
| 3. Masc. x Fem. | .86 | .48 | - | | | | | |
| Capabilities | | | | | | | | |
| 4. Dominance | .56 | -.05 | .47 | - | | | | |
| | ** | ** | | | | | | |
| 5. Warmth | -.01 | .28 | .14 | .12 | - | | | |
| | ** | | ** | ** | ** | | | |
| 6. Dom. x Warm. | .49 | .07 | .47 | .91 | .52 | - | | |
| Flexibility | | | | | | | | |
| 7. 14 caps. | .10 | .13 | .15 | .21 | .04 | .20 | - | |
| | | | | ** | | ** | ** | |
| 8. 16 caps. | .16 | .13 | .21 | .33 | .11 | .33 | .99 | - |

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

Appendix D

Table 4

Correlations Among the Factor Indexes Derived from the Parenting Q-Sort.

| Variables | 1 | 2 | 3 |
|-------------------|------|------|---|
| Factor indexes | | | |
| 1. Responsiveness | - | | |
| | * | | |
| 2. Neuroticism | .21 | - | |
| | * | | |
| 3. Demandingness | -.18 | -.15 | - |

Note. * $p < .05$