

**I** *Patterns of change in parental support, behavioral control, and psychological control were examined longitudinally across adolescence.*

## Patterns of Parenting Across Adolescence

*Brian K. Barber, Suzanne L. Maughan, Joseph A. Olsen*

The parent-adolescent relationship has received considerable attention throughout the twentieth century because of developmental changes that occur in both children and parents during this period. Different renditions of the nature of the parent-adolescent relationship have been offered. These range from the classic storm and stress characterizations to the currently popular, more modest estimates of “transformations” (Baumrind, 1991)—but all posit change.

Some research on change has assessed the quality of the relationship between parents and adolescents (for example, the level of closeness or conflict), grounding the work in psychoanalytic, sociobiological, or cognitive-developmental theories (Blos, 1979; Laursen and Collins, 1988; Smetana, 1988; Steinberg, 1989). Empirical evidence is mixed, depending in part on whether the focal aspects of the relationship are time spent together, types of conflicts, or levels of closeness. Conger and Ge (1999) suggest that much of this inconsistency is due to methodological problems in the mix of studies, and they offer their own findings of gradual increases in conflict/hostility and decrease in cohesion/warmth/supportiveness.

An approach to examine change in the parent-child relationship during adolescence that has received less consistent attention has been the

---

This study was supported by a FIRST Award grant from the National Institute of Mental Health (R29-MH47067-03) to Brian K. Barber. Appreciation is expressed to the administrators, teachers, and families of the Ogden Utah City School District for participating in this study.

investigation of the degree to which actual parenting behavior (for example, behavioral practices or styles parents use in interaction with their children) changes during adolescence. Although parents' behavior toward their adolescent children certainly is a factor in the overall quality of the relationship between parents and adolescents, it is not synonymous with it.

### **Parental Support, Behavioral Control, and Psychological Control**

One recent trend in the study of parenting behaviors has been to revive and refine a tripartite classification of child- and parent-reported parenting behavior (Steinberg, Dornbusch, and Brown, 1992) first popularized by Schaefer (1965): acceptance/rejection, psychological control/psychological autonomy, and firm control/lax control. This tripartite organization of key parenting behaviors is also consistent with the basic components of classic parenting typologies (Baumrind, 1971, 1991; Steinberg and others, 1994).

Although some studies have assessed these parenting dimensions at multiple time points, most have focused on differential prediction of child and adolescent functioning over time and have not attempted a systematic assessment of the stability or change in these parenting dimensions across the developmental markers of adolescence. Other studies have assessed parenting behaviors quite similar to those included in Schaefer's model, but have been limited to the study of preadolescents or by small sample sizes. The purpose of the study described in this chapter was to provide an initial assessment of the three parenting dimensions across adolescence. It did so by testing mother, father, and adolescent reports of the three parenting dimensions in two cohorts (each approximately 350 families), each assessed over four consecutive years that cover the developmental markers of puberty and school transitions (cohort 1: ages eleven to thirteen; cohort 2: ages fourteen to seventeen). To further specify and validate change patterns, we analyzed both linear and nonlinear trends and also conducted trend interactions with sample characteristics of age of youth, sex of youth, social class, family structure, ethnicity, and religious affiliation.

As others have done, we use somewhat different labels for these parenting dimensions than did Schaefer (1965). We use the label *parental support* because Schaefer's acceptance construct appears to be just one of several parallel conceptualizations (for example, nurturance, warmth, affection) of a broader construct of perceived parental behaviors that, individually and collectively, support child and adolescent psychosocial development (Rollins and Thomas, 1979). We use *parental behavioral control* and *psychological control* because these labels better communicate the meaningful distinction between parent control of child or adolescent behavior and parental control of the child's or adolescent's psychological world apparent in Schaefer's original work (1965) and in more recent work (Barber, 1996, 2002; Gray and Steinberg, 1999). Parental behavioral control refers to parental behaviors that

are intended to regulate children's behaviors to accord with prevailing family or social norms (Barber, 1996). Parental psychological control refers to parental behaviors that are nonresponsive to the emotional and psychological needs of children and stifle independent expression and autonomy (Barber, 2002; Schaefer, 1965).

For this study, we included two additional measures. Physical affection expressed by parents to their adolescents was included as an assessment of parental support (in addition to parental acceptance) in order to facilitate a direct comparison to past studies that have assessed change over time in this aspect of support. Limit setting was employed as an assessment of behavioral control (in addition to parental knowledge/monitoring) because of the recent concern raised about the adequacy of the common measure of parental monitoring as an indicator of parental control (Stattin and Kerr, 2000).

Despite variations in methodology, some studies set a relevant foundation for this study, given their focus on indexes of specific parenting behaviors similar to those used here. We have drawn on these studies to outline some tentative expectations as to stability or change in parental support, behavioral control, and psychological control.

Specifically, in studying parental support, Roberts and others (1984) and McNally and others (1991) found evidence that support a tentative expectation of declining levels of physical affection expressed by parents across adolescence. For items reflecting nonphysical supportive behavior, however, findings were mixed among stability, increases, and decreases for both mothers' and fathers' behaviors. Thus, there is not a solid basis to guide any clear expectations about change in nonphysical support.

In examining behavioral control, both McNally, Eisenberg, and Harris (1991) and Roberts, Block, and Block (1984) found no change over time in a single item assessing parental knowledge of their children's behavior, while in a study focused explicitly on the parental knowledge/monitoring construct, Laird, Pettit, Bates, and Dodge (2003) found that males reported decreases across adolescence. As for the setting of rules, Roberts and others (1984) found no change in a single item on rules, while McNally, Eisenberg, and Harris (1991), using the same item but aggregated as part of a larger control construct, found a linear increase across adolescence. It appears that there is some reason to expect that parental knowledge of their children's behavior might decrease across adolescence, but there is not enough evidence to advance any hypotheses about changes in rules or limits that parents set.

As for items representing parental psychological control, both Roberts, Block, and Block (1984) and McNally, Eisenberg, and Harris (1991) found patterns of either stability or increases in psychological control, but not decreases, across time. These findings, coupled with assertions that parental psychological control is driven by complexities in the lives of parents (such as their own parenting history, beliefs about parental authority, or their own psychological deficits; Barber, Bean, and Erickson, 2002), lead us to expect no declines in psychological control across adolescence.

In sum, although there have been some findings of change, the literatures that have investigated specific parental behaviors (with items conceptually similar to those used in this study) show either mixed patterns of change or little, if any, change. Indeed, both McNally, Eisenberg, and Harris (1991) and Roberts, Block, and Block (1984) concluded that the degree of continuity and stability over time was strong enough to imply that instead of altering their parenting practices in response to developmental changes, parents may behave toward children according to personal orientations toward child rearing that are based in beliefs, values, and philosophies that remain relatively stable across the development of the child and even despite significant changes in family formations (such as parental marital intactness). Consistent with this interpretation, Pettit and Laird (2002) have suggested that parenting behavior toward adolescents (specifically, psychological and behavioral control) is variously affected by parenting philosophy (as well as by parent personality, parents' own child rearing, and individual characteristics of children that are stable through adolescence). These notions of stable orientations toward child rearing are consonant with a social relations theoretical model that would predict more continuity than change in parent-child relations over time, resulting from the inherent stability of close relationships (and presumably the behaviors that reflect them) (Conger and Ge, 1999; Laursen and Collins, 1988).

## Sample

Data came from the Ogden Youth and Family Project, a longitudinal study of families with adolescents in Ogden, Utah. The baseline sample was a random sample of fifth- and eighth-grade classrooms in the Ogden City School District in 1994. It consisted of 933 families with adolescent children. The sample was split equally between male and female students and grade, and was 71 percent white (16 percent Hispanic), 84 percent middle income, and 46 percent Mormon. In the first year, an extensive self-report survey of family interaction, personality, youth behavior, and peer, school, and neighborhood experiences was administered to the students in classrooms. Subsequent waves of the survey were done by multiple mailings to the students' homes. Both fifth- and eighth-grade cohorts were followed for four subsequent years, until 1997. The younger cohort was surveyed an additional time in 1998. The participation rate in the first year (in-class assessment) was over 90 percent. No follow-up was done of absentees. Multiple mailings following standard mail survey methodology (Dillman, 1978) were employed to maximize response rates in the subsequent years of data collection. Response rates were high: 78 to 80 percent for the different assessments. Details on sample sizes and composition in all years can be found in Barber, Stolz, Olsen, and Maughan (forthcoming). Analyses revealed that respondents and nonrespondents differed significantly only by way of a higher percentage of Mormons represented among the respondents.

## Measures

This study employed multiple measures of the three relevant parenting dimensions: parental support, parental behavioral control, and parental psychological control.

**Parental Support.** Two forms of parental support were assessed in this study: acceptance and physical affection.

*Acceptance.* Parental acceptance was measured using the ten-item acceptance subscale from the thirty-item version of the Child Report of Parent Behavior Index (CRPBI) (Schaefer, 1965; E. Schludermann and S. Schludermann, personal communication, March 1988). Adolescents responded on a three-point Likert-type scale from 1 (*not like her or him*) to 3 (*a lot like her or him*) as to how well items described their mothers and fathers. Sample items are:

My mother or father is a person who:

1. Makes me feel better after talking over my worries with her/him.
2. Smiles at me very often.
3. Enjoys doing things with me.

Parents responded to the equivalent items with appropriate changes made to each question. An equivalent three-point response scale also paralleled the youth response scale. Acceptable reliability was obtained for all measures.

*Physical Affection.* Physical affection was measured using two items: “My Mother/Father is a person who hugs me often” and “My Mother/Father is a person who kisses me often” (Barber and Thomas, 1986). The same three-point response scale as used for parental acceptance was used here. The parent versions of these same questions and response scales were employed to assess mother and father perspectives of their parent-child physical affection. Acceptable internal consistencies were obtained for both adolescents’ ratings of mothers and fathers and parents’ ratings of their own behavior.

**Parental Behavioral Control.** Two forms of parental behavioral control were assessed in this study: knowledge/monitoring and limit setting.

*Parental Knowledge/Monitoring of Child Activities.* Parental knowledge/monitoring was assessed with a five-item scale often used in research assessing self-reports of the parent-adolescent relationship (Brown, Mounts, Lamborn, and Steinberg, 1993). Scales using items such as these have been found to be particularly reliable and powerful indexes of family management and regulation (Patterson and Stouthamer-Loeber, 1984). The shift in the traditional label, monitoring, to include parental knowledge made here is in response to recent, valid criticisms that the measure is better described as parental awareness or knowledge of adolescent activities rather than the actual monitoring of those activities by parents such knowledge is presumed, in part, to be derived from (Stattin and Kerr, 2000). Students were asked the following questions separately for their father and mother:

How much does your father or mother *really* know about:

1. Where you go at night
2. Where you are most afternoons after school
3. How you spend your money
4. What you do with your free time
5. Who your friends are

Responses ranged from 1 (*doesn't know*) to 3 (*knows a lot*). The measures showed acceptable internal consistencies across the period of the study.

**Parental Limit Setting.** Parental limit setting was assessed with four items that measured adolescent reports of their parents' limit setting in the school context. Items were not differentiated by sex of parent. Adolescents responded on a four-point scale from 1 (*never*) to 4 (*often*) as to how often their parents performed these limit-setting behaviors during the past thirty days. Items were:

1. Restrict the amount of time you could watch television.
2. Check to see whether your homework was done.
3. Go over homework with you.
4. Check papers you brought home that a teacher had graded.

Equivalent questions and response scales for limit setting were answered by mothers and fathers. The measures showed acceptable internal consistencies across the period of the study.

**Parental Psychological Control.** Parental psychological control was measured by the eight-item Psychological Control Scale–Youth Self-Report (Barber, 1996). Participants responded on a three-point Likert-type scale from 1 (*not like her or him*) to 3 (*a lot like her or him*) as to how well items described their mothers and fathers. Sample items are:

My mother or father is a person who:

1. Is always trying to change how I feel or think about things.
2. Changes the subject whenever I have something to say.
3. Will avoid looking at me when I have disappointed her/him.

Mothers and fathers responded to the same (reworded) eight items according to the same (reworded response scale). The measures showed acceptable internal consistencies across the period of the study.

## Plan of Analysis

The analysis plan consisted of repeated-measures analyses of variance with time (year of assessment) as the one within-subjects factor. Six between-subject factors representing the major demographic breaks in the sample were also considered. Specifically, we assessed within-subject interactions

with time for each of the between-subjects variables: cohort (younger versus older), sex (male versus female), socioeconomic status (poor versus not poor), race (white versus nonwhite), religious affiliation (Mormon versus non-Mormon), and family structure (intact versus nonintact). Socioeconomic status was measured with one item: "Compared to other kids your age, how well-off do you think your family is?" (Pearlin, Lieberman, Meneghan, and Mullan, 1981). Responses ranged from 1 (*We are a lot poorer than most*) to 5 (*We are a lot richer than most*). This scale was dichotomized, with responses of 1 and 2 coded 1 (*poor*) and all other responses coded 2 (*not poor*). This produced a percentage of poor (13 percent) that matches the percentage of families that live under the poverty line in Ogden, Utah, based on census information from 1989 (Slater and Hall, 1996; U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1996).

## Results

Following are the results for the analyses of all measures of parental support, behavioral control, and psychological control.

**Parental Support.** Two measures of parental support were analyzed: parental acceptance and parental physical affection.

*Parental Acceptance.* Generally parental acceptance remained stable across time. This was true for youth reports of their mothers' acceptance and for fathers' reports of their own acceptance, for both of which no significant change was detected. Although there was a significant quadratic change effect for mothers' reports of their own acceptance, the drop in mean level from 1994 to 1995 (2.60 to 2.55) was recovered by 1997 (2.61) to reach the 1994 level; thus, over the full span of the study, mothers' reported acceptance stayed relatively constant as well. These patterns held regardless of sex, age, economic well-being, family structure, and religious affiliation of the adolescent. These findings of general stability of parental acceptance are consistent with those of McNally, Eisenberg, and Harris (1991).

Youth reported a significant decline in acceptance from their fathers. The effect was linear, although constant from year 3 to year 4 (yearly means: 2.33, 2.29, 2.25, 2.25). There was also a significant interaction between time and economic well-being, whereby poorer youth reported an initial increase and subsequent decrease of father acceptance. The reverse pattern, an initial decrease followed by some increase in father acceptance, was reported by less poor youth.

*Parental Physical Affection.* There was a clear pattern of decreased physical affection linearly across the four years of the study. This was the case for youth reports of both parents (yearly means for mothers: 2.31, 2.28, 2.24, 2.20; yearly means for fathers: 2.08, 1.94, 1.87, 1.84) and father reports of their own physical affection toward their adolescents (yearly means: 2.27, 2.08, NA, 1.95). Although not statistically significant, yearly means also declined linearly for mother reports of their own physical affection (2.50,

2.41, NA, 2.38). These patterns held regardless of sex, age, economic well-being, family structure, and religious affiliation of the adolescent. This pattern of decline is consistent with both Roberts, Block, and Block (1984) and McNally, Eisenberg, and Harris (1991).

**Parental Behavioral Control.** Two measures of parental behavioral control were analyzed: parental knowledge/monitoring and parental limit setting.

*Knowledge/Monitoring.* There was a reporter-based difference in patterns of change in parental knowledge/monitoring of their adolescents' activities. Youth reported stability in monitoring from both parents, although youth reports of mothers' knowledge/monitoring did increase in the second year and then returned to the first-year level for the following two assessments (year means: 2.53, 2.57, 2.54, 2.53). This pattern was constant regardless of sex, age, economic well-being, family structure, and religious affiliation of the adolescent. Both parents, however, reported linear declines over the course of the study in their knowledge/monitoring of their adolescents' activities (yearly means for mothers: 2.84, 2.81, NA, 2.73; yearly means for fathers: 2.72, 2.68, NA, 2.56). The decline in father-reported knowledge/monitoring was also qualified by race, whereby fathers of white youth reported steady knowledge/monitoring through year 2 followed by a linear decline. Fathers of nonwhite youth reported a steeper decline between the first two assessments, followed by a slower decline thereafter.

*Limit Setting.* There was a consistent linear decline in reports of parental limit setting. This pattern held for youth reports of parents (yearly means: NA, 2.64, 2.54, 2.43) and parent reports (yearly means for mothers: 3.24, 3.04, NA, 2.43; yearly means for fathers: 2.99, 2.73, NA, 2.54). This pattern of decline did not vary by demographic characteristics, with the one exception that mothers of youth from nonintact families reported a steeper decline in limit setting than did mothers of youth from intact families.

This finding of decreased control in the form of rules for schoolwork is consistent with theoretical positions positing declining parental control during adolescence, but it is not supportive of Roberts, Block, and Block's finding (1984) of stability in a single item measuring rules or McNally, Eisenberg, and Harris's finding (1991) of an increase in an aggregated control construct that included the same item on rules.

**Parental Psychological Control.** There was a consistent pattern of change in reports of psychological control, whereby decreased psychological control was reported in the second year, followed by a rise over the third year (fourth year for parent reports). This was true for reports by mothers (yearly means: 1.49, 1.28, NA, 1.36), by fathers (yearly means: 1.51, 1.29, NA, 1.37), and for youth reports of fathers (yearly means: 1.49, 1.45, 1.50, 1.51). Although there was no significant change in youth reports of mothers' psychological control, the annual means did accord with this same pattern (1.49, 1.44, 1.45, 1.50). One qualification of the general quadratic pattern is that youth reports of psychological control of both parents in the



final year of the study returned to or exceeded the first-year levels, whereas parental reports were lower in the last year compared to the first year. These patterns also held regardless of sex, age, economic well-being, family structure, and religious affiliation of the adolescent.

## Discussion

Although changes in the relations between parents and their children during adolescence have been a frequent topic of interest to lay, professional, and academic circles, the actual empirical evidence for change has not been particularly strong or consistent. Whereas most studies have focused on change in the general quality of the relationship (how much conflict or closeness is felt between the parties), this study emphasized parenting behavioral practices, focusing on three central dimensions of parenting behavior that have been studied systematically, both historically and currently.

The study was limited by using a regional sample (Rocky Mountain) and by exclusive reliance on self-reported parenting. It will be important to validate the findings of this study using other samples and different methods for assessing parental behaviors. Nevertheless, the study tested carefully for variations within the sample to assess how generalizable patterns of findings were for gender, age, social class, ethnic, family structure, and religious groups represented in the sample. Having multiple individuals from the same family reporting on the same indexes of parenting also helped to validate the findings. A further advantage of the study is that it included four annual assessments (three for parent reports) of perceived parenting practices among two cohorts, whose experiences during that four-year period included pubertal development and the transition to middle school and high school.

Depending on the parenting variable in question, the findings of this study revealed both stability and change. Before discussing these findings, it is noteworthy that there was substantial consistency in the observed patterns across reporter and sample subgroup, a consistency that helps validate the findings. Thus, for example, with one exception (parental knowledge/monitoring), the same patterns of change or stability were generally found regardless of whether youth-, mother-, or father-reported data were analyzed. Also, patterns of stability or change did not vary across most of the sample subgroups; patterns were the same for males and females, younger and older adolescents, Mormons and non-Mormons, and adolescents from single- and dual-parent families. There were only two cases in which sample subgroups had varied patterns, and both were for fathers. That nonwhite adolescents reported a steeper decline in father knowledge/monitoring than did white adolescents and that poorer adolescents reported a reversed pattern of increased and then decreased father acceptance than did adolescents who were less poor are interesting findings. However, they are unique enough in these analyses to require validation

with other data sets with better distributions and measures of ethnicity and social class before they could be adequately interpreted.

The clearest patterns of change in the findings of this study occurred for the two most behaviorally specific measures, physical affection and limit setting: both were reported to have declined significantly across adolescence. The decline in physically expressed parental support is sensible given that in the United States, notions of physical intimacy and gender socialization typically reserve hugging and kissing for younger children. Contrary to this pattern (except for youth reports of their fathers), there was relative stability across adolescence in reported parental acceptance. This pattern is also not surprising when considering that by adolescence, parents have likely already established a pattern or behavioral style of basic support to their children that should not be expected to fluctuate substantially during adolescence. This is particularly so given the rather macro-level format of the assessment, that is, yearly reports of the degree to which a set of behaviors describes parents.

As for behavioral control, the decline in limit setting is sensible given the tendency of parents to begin to reduce, or at least alter, some of the specific limits they set as they attempt to grant legitimate autonomy to their adolescents. That only parents reported declines in the less behaviorally specific form of behavioral control (knowledge/monitoring) raises interesting questions that should be investigated thoroughly in data sets (unlike our own) in which better determinations of the source of parental knowledge can be made (Stattin and Kerr, 2000). To the extent that this commonly used measure is a legitimate assessment of parental control (monitoring behaviors are responsible, at least in part, for the knowledge), then the discrepancy between parent-reported decline and adolescent-reported stability in control is quite interesting. Perhaps some adolescents, overly sensitive to any control, might not adequately note the decreases in the control that parents report. To the extent that parental knowledge stems not primarily from monitoring behaviors but from adolescent disclosure to parents of their activities, the discrepancy is again interesting. Perhaps, given increasing exercise of autonomy in some realms, parents fear that their adolescents are not telling them all, or as much as they did when younger.

Finally, as anticipated, there was no pattern of decline in parental use of psychological control. Instead, there was either stability or fluctuation across the four-year span of the study, with increases consistently following an initial decline in reported psychological control. Much less is known about the nature of parental psychological control than is of support or behavioral control, and thus we hesitate to interpret too much from this pattern. The initial decline is interesting, especially since both cohorts of adolescents underwent a school change in the second year. One speculation would be that parents noted the particular stress of this transition and relaxed their intrusive control, at least temporarily. Replication and more finely grained analyses would be necessary to confirm this or other speculations. But at least it can be concluded that in

this sample, this particular type of control functioned quite differently from the two measures of behavioral control, for both of which there was complete or partial evidence for declining control across adolescence.

In sum, this test of more behaviorally oriented assessments of parenting showed no consistent evidence for the often theorized decline in relational functioning between parents and their adolescent children. Instead we found differences in change patterns depending on the specific dimensions of parenting in question, with general stability for nonphysical supportive behaviors, decline in physical affection, general decline for behavioral control (particularly for explicit rules), and a fluctuating pattern for psychological control.

## References

- Barber, B. K. "Parental Psychological Control: Revisiting a Neglected Construct." *Child Development*, 1996, 67, 3296–3319.
- Barber, B. K. (ed.). *Intrusive Parenting: How Psychological Control Affects Children and Adolescents*. Washington, D.C.: American Psychological Association Press, 2002.
- Barber, B. K., Bean, R. L., and Erickson, L. D. "Expanding the Study and Understanding of Psychological Control." In B. K. Barber (ed.), *Intrusive Parenting: How Psychological Control Affects Children and Adolescents*. Washington, D.C.: American Psychological Association Press, 2002.
- Barber, B. K., Stolz, H. E., Olsen, J. A., and Maughan, S. L. "Parental Support, Psychological Control, and Behavioral Control: Assessing Relevance Across Time, Method, and Culture." Forthcoming.
- Barber, B. K., and Thomas, D. L. "Dimensions of Fathers' and Mothers' Supportive Behavior: The Case for Physical Affection." *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 1986, 48, 783–794.
- Baumrind, D. "Current Patterns of Parental Authority." *Developmental Psychology Monographs*, 1971, 4(1, part 2), 1–102.
- Baumrind, D. "The Influence of Parenting Style on Adolescent Competence and Substance Use." *Journal of Early Adolescence*, 1991, 11, 56–95.
- Blos, P. *The Adolescent Passage*. Guilford, Conn.: International Universities Press, 1979.
- Brown, B. B., Mounts, N., Lamborn, S. D., and Steinberg, L. "Parenting Practices and Peer Group Affiliation in Adolescence." *Child Development*, 1993, 63, 391–400.
- Conger, R. D., and Ge, X. "Conflict and Cohesion in Parent-Adolescent Relations: Changes in Emotional Expression from Early to Mid Adolescence." In M. J. Cox and J. Brooks-Gunn (eds.), *Conflict and Cohesion in Families: Causes and Consequences*. Mahwah, N.J.: Erlbaum, 1999.
- Dillman, D. A. *Mail and Telephone Surveys: The Total Design Method*. New York: Wiley, 1978.
- Gray, M. R., and Steinberg, L. "Unpacking Authoritative Parenting: Reassessing a Multidimensional Construct." *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 1999, 61, 574–587.
- Laird, R. D., Pettit, G. S., Bates, J. E., and Dodge, K. A. "Parents' Monitoring-Relevant Knowledge and Adolescents' Delinquent Behavior: Evidence of Correlated Developmental Changes and Reciprocal Influences." *Child Development*, 2003, 74(3), 752–768.
- Laursen, B., and Collins, W. A. "Conceptual Changes During Adolescence and Effects upon Parent-Child Relationships." *Journal of Adolescent Research*, 1988, 3, 119–139.
- McNally, S., Eisenberg, N., and Harris, J. D. "Consistency and Change in Maternal Child-Rearing Practices: A Longitudinal Study." *Child Development*, 1991, 62, 190–198.

- Patterson, G. R., and Stouthamer-Loeber, M. "The Correlation of Family Management Practices and Delinquency." *Child Development*, 1984, 55, 1299–1307.
- Pearlin, L. I., Lieberman, M. A., Meneghan, E. G., and Mullan, J. T. "The Stress Process." *Journal of Health and Social Behavior*, 1981, 22, 337–356.
- Pettit, G. S., and Laird, R. "Psychological Control and Monitoring in Early Adolescence: The Role of Parental Involvement and Earlier Child Adjustment." In B. K. Barber (ed.), *Intrusive Parenting: How Psychological Control Affects Children and Adolescents*. Washington, D.C.: American Psychological Association, 2002.
- Roberts, G. C., Block, J. H., and Block, J. "Continuity and Change in Parents' Child-Rearing Practices." *Child Development*, 1984, 55, 586–597.
- Rollins, B. C., and Thomas, D. L. "Parental Support, Power, and Control Techniques in the Socialization of Children." In W. R. Burr, R. Hill, F. I. Nye, and I. L. Reiss (eds.), *Contemporary Theories About the Family*. Vol. 1: *Research Based Theories*. New York: Free Press, 1979.
- Schaefer, E. W. "Children's Reports of Parental Behavior: An Inventory." *Child Development*, 1965, 36, 413–424.
- Silverberg, S. B., and Steinberg, L. "Adolescent Autonomy, Parent-Adolescent Conflict, and Parental Well-Being." *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 1987, 16, 293–312.
- Slater, C. M., and Hall, G. E. (eds.). *County and City Extra Annual Metro City and County Data Book*. Lanham, Md.: Bernan, 1996.
- Smetana, J. G. "Adolescents' and Parents' Conceptions of Parental Authority." *Child Development*, 1988, 59, 321–335.
- Stattin, H., and Kerr, M. "Parental Monitoring: A Reinterpretation." *Child Development*, 2000, 71, 1072–1085.
- Steinberg, L. "Pubertal Maturation and Parent-Adolescent Distance: An Evolutionary Perspective." In G. R. Adams, R. Montemayor, and T. P. Gulotta (eds.), *Biology of Adolescent Behavior and Development*. Thousand Oaks, Calif.: Sage, 1989.
- Steinberg, L., Dornbusch, S. M., and Brown, B. B. "Ethnic Differences in Adolescent Achievement." *American Psychologist*, 1992, 47, 723–729.
- Steinberg, L., and others. "Over-Time Changes in Adjustment and Competence Among Adolescents from Authoritative, Authoritarian, Indulgent, and Neglectful Families." *Child Development*, 1994, 65, 754–770.
- U.S. Bureau of the Census. *County and City Data Books*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1996.

BRIAN K. BARBER is professor of child and family studies at the University of Tennessee at Knoxville.

SUZANNE L. MAUGHAN is assistant professor of sociology at the University of Nebraska at Kearney.

JOSEPH A. OLSEN is associate professor of sociology at Brigham Young University in Provo, Utah.