**Book Description**

**Parenting: Cultural Influences and Impact on Childhood Health and Well-Being**

This book presented abundant emergent research works of European and Latin American countries, cultural contexts where the results of research are seriously questioning the most popular ideas about the theory of parenting style that proposed Diana Baumrind. Following traditional parenting research approach, that examines how parents treat their children and how these children fit into society, the fourteen chapters of this book have travelled by countries of America (United States, Brazil and Peru) and Europe (Sweden, United Kingdom, Spain, Portugal, Slovenia, and the Czech Republic), and have sampled from various backgrounds (adolescent in contexts at psychosocial risk, or elderly people), for wondering about which is the best parenting style. The book authors consider different measures of parental behavior for define the parenting style (authoritative, indulgent, authoritarian, or neglectful) and a varied set of criteria to determine the adjustment of their children. Childhood health and well-being outcomes were as varied as academic achievement, self-esteem, drug use, internalization of values, forgiveness, adolescents' scholar adjustment, child-to-parent violence and teen dating violence. The contributors of the book conclude one and another time that indulgent parenting style is equal or even better than the authoritative parenting style, highlights the importance of considering cultural influences when the relationships between parenting and its impact on health and well-being of children are analyzed.
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INTRODUCTION

Fernando García
Department of Methodology of Behavioral Sciences, University of Valencia, Spain

ABSTRACT

[Parenting: Cultural Influences and Impact on Childhood Health and Well-Being] Evidence from emergent research in South European and Latin American countries indicates that adolescents from indulgent families scored equal or even better than those from authoritative families in many key indicators of psychosocial adjustment, and that indulgent parenting appears as the optimum parenting style in these samples. In addition, recently research also sees that it is valid for many European countries include United Kingdom and Sweden, and Asian countries as Iran and Filipinas. This research suggests that authoritative parenting is not always associated with optimum developmental outcomes and those relationships between parenting styles and developmental outcomes also depend on the ethnic, cultural and cultural-variations context where the socialization process takes place. The contributors to the book analyzed emergent research where the indulgent parenting style is equal or even better than the authoritative parenting style. Explaining the hypothesis of cultural influences and analyzing the specific relationships between the traditional two-dimensional model of parental socialization and the parenting practices in Spain. Analyzing the parenting styles in Portugal, Brazil and Peru, and their relation to the adolescents' personal competence and internalization of values. Studying in Spain parental socialization styles between different generations and several adolescents' outcomes, as internalization of values, Human Rights, forgiveness, adolescents' scholar adjustment and violence (antisocial behaviour, bullying, child-to-parent violence, and teen dating violence). Analyzing evidence indicate that indulgent model is that work best in European countries for adolescents' personal competence, substance use and in personal disorders. The contributors to the book collectively clarify how indulgent families impact more positively on childhood health and well-being.

* Corresponding Author address: Rebecca H. Foster, Ph.D., Department of Psychology, St. Louis Children’s Hospital, St. Louis, USA, Phone: 314-454-6069, Fax: 314-454-4013
Email: rebecca.foster@bjc.org
Parenting: Cultural Influences and Impact on Childhood Health and Well-Being consists of 14 chapters. In the first chapter, María C. Fuentes has reviewed empirical evidence which currently debate the traditional assumption that the authoritative style is always the best parenting style. She highlights the importance of considering cultural influences when the relationships between parenting and its impact on health and well-being of children are analyzed. She focused main attention on emergent research in South European and Latin American countries where indulgent parenting (characterized by warmth but not strictness) appears as the optimum parenting style.

Continuing the discussion of cultural influences, Fernando García, Leonor Fernández-Doménech, Feliciano H. Veiga, Roser Bono, Emilia Serra and Gonzalo Musitu have analyzed the relations between parenting practices and styles with a sample of Spanish adolescents. The authors have found major discrepancies with results obtained with American Anglo-Saxon samples. Concretely, in Spain, psychological autonomy granting is unrelated to the behaviour control parenting practice, and in the opposite end of psychological control and rejection parental practices. This Spanish results shows that adolescents from indulgent families (characterized by warmth but not strictness) are strongly related to the psychological autonomy granting.

In the third chapter, with Brazilian samples, Isabel Martínez, Leoncio Camino, Cleonice Camino and Ignacio Madrid have reviewed and discussed the conceptualization of family socialization process. They analyze the influence of parenting styles into personal competence and internalization of values in Brazil. The results of reviewed showed that children raised by indulgent have equal or higher self-esteem score than adolescents from authoritative parents. The lowest self esteem was for adolescents raised by neglectful and authoritarian parents. In the case of internalization of values there is no difference between children from authoritative and indulgent homes in any of the five types of values analysed.

In the fourth chapter, but now with a Portuguese sample, Yara Rodrigues, María C. Fuentes and Feliciano H. Veiga analyze the influence of parenting styles into personal competence and internalization of values in Portugal. In this South European country, those authors found very similar results to Brasil.

In the fifth chapter, now with a Peruvian sample, Antoni Albertí, Sonia Gabaldón and Dolores Frias-Navarro, analyze the relation between parenting styles with adolescents' personal competence and internalization of values. The authors replicate the results of two previous studies (Brazil and Portugal) with this new sample of Peruvian adolescent.

In the sixth chapter researchers returned to Spain. Bárbara Lorence, M. Victoria Hidalgo and Susana Menéndez have explored the associations between parenting styles with internalizing and externalizing problems. Sample was of 445 adolescents, half of them of families at psychosocial risk. The authors conclude that indulgent style (based on affection and dialogue but not on parental coercion) was the most favorable pattern of parental socialization (for preventing externalizing problems) for at-risk and not-at-risk families.

In the next chapter, Pablo Queiroz, Cleonice Camino, Oscar García and Juan J. Zacarés analyze in Spain the relationship between parenting styles with offspring's psychological and psychosocial adjustment between different generations. In this chapter Spanish parenting is examined retrospectively founding that both the adolescent of indulgent homes and the elderly people of indulgent homes were associated with the best levels of self-concept and self-esteem. On the other hand, also in line with previous results in Brazil, Portugal and Peru,
the indulgent and authoritative styles exert best, but similar, effects in the internalization of values of their offspring.

Maite Garaigordobil, Vanesa Martínez and Aida Fernández start with the first chapter, the ninth of the book, which analyzes the connections between parenting styles with offspring's violence. As the authors claimed, violence is a social pathology that has always been a part of human experience. The study comprises an ample sample of 3,026 participants from the Basque Country (Spain), measure antisocial-delinquent behaviors, and behavioral disorders. The authors conclude that the authoritarian and neglectful styles were the most harmful regarding antisocial behavior. Conversely, the indulgent style (high acceptance-involvement and low coercion-imposition) was the most positive because participants who had indulgent parents displayed significantly lower levels of antisocial behavior.

María C. Fuentes, Isabel Martínez and Fidel Navarro analyze, in the ninth chapter, the relationships between Spanish parenting styles and adolescence bullying with a minor sample of 1,114 adolescents from middle-class backgrounds of a large metropolitan area. They measured in adolescents: antisocial behavior, disruptive or undisciplined behavior, academic indifference, perception of violence from teachers, academic self-esteem, family self-esteem and social self-esteem. Conclusion was that both indulgent and authoritative styles of socialization also act as prevention factors from bullying, and other behaviors related as school maladjustment and antisocial behavior.

In chapter number ten, Cristian Suárez-Relinque, Gonzalo del-Moral-Arroyo, Belén Martínez-Ferrer and Gonzalo Musitu, from a different perspective, analyze school and child-to-parent violence. The study comprises a large sample of 3,399 Spanish adolescents. The authors' conclusion was that, in the same line that previous chapters with large samples, the Indulgent style was found as the most functional parental socialization style, followed by the authoritative one.

The chapter eleven is the last where is analyzed the violence. Amapola Povedano, María-Carmen Monreal, Pepa Cuesta, María Muñiz, David Moreno and Gonzalo Musitu studied parenting styles and teen dating violence with a sample of 2,399 Spanish adolescents. Results indicated that indulgent parenting style, on the part of the father and mother, has the weakest relationship with teen dating violence. On the opposite hand, teenagers from families that apply authoritarian parenting styles are most likely to get involved in violent teen dating relationships, followed by the neglectful style.

In the twelfth chapter, Amador Calafat, Montse Juan, Elisardo Becoña and Oscar García analyzed the most recent evidence on the protective factor of the parenting styles on drug use in the European context. The study comprises a large sample of 7,718 European adolescents from Sweden, Slovenia, Czech Republic, UK, Spain, and Portugal. The authors conclude that indulgent families performs as well as the authoritative one on substance use (and personal disturbances), but the indulgent parenting style performs even better than for authoritative parenting style on self-esteem and school performance, including in those conclusions two countries from Northern Europe (i.e., UK and Sweden).
In the thirteenth chapter, Júlio Rique and Thayanne Lima da Silva propose an approach for explaining how parenting socialization for promoting forgiveness in childhood may contribute to fostering adolescents’ socio-moral competence. Authors studied indulgent parental practices of induction, focusing on the consequences that the child’s behavior have for others, attributing responsibility to the child, but without the use of an “moralizing” rule. Indulgent parents may induce other-oriented empathy and feelings of guilt.

Finally, in the fourteenth chapter, Rebecca H. Foster and Amanda M. Brouwer present a review of healthy families America. The authors proposed a home visiting program designed to promote positive parenting, enhance child health and development, and prevent child maltreatment. Positive parenting practices are key to promote child health and development.
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Chapter 1 — Which is the best parenting style?

**WHICH IS THE BEST PARENTING STYLE?**
**EXPLAINING THE DISCREPANCIES ACROSS CULTURAL INFLUENCES**

*María C. Fuentes*
Department of Methodology of Behavioral Sciences, University of Valencia, Spain

**ABSTRACT**

Considering the classical theoretical model of parental socialization of two main dimensions (responsiveness and demandingness; also called acceptance/involvement and strictness/imposition) and four typologies (authoritative, indulgent, authoritarian and neglectful), scientific research in this area has mainly focused on analyzing which parenting style is related to the optimum health and well-being in children. Far from the existence of a consensus, different conclusions are obtained especially when the cultural and social context in which this relationship is studied varies. So, there is an important debate that challenges the traditional result obtained fundamentally in samples from the US regarding the authoritative style like the best parenting style. In this sense, empirical evidence obtained in samples from different ethnic and cultural backgrounds, even considering the socioeconomic status of families, and some emerging empirical studies has shown that high acceptance/involvement and high strictness/imposition is not always the best parental strategy. Thus, this chapter highlights the importance of considering cultural influences when the relationships between parenting and its impact on health and well-being of children are analyzed.

**Keywords:** Parental Socialization Styles, Children’s Health and Well-being, Cultural Influences, Cross-Cultural Variation

**INTRODUCTION**

An optimum health and well-being in children are among the most important constructs in different research disciplines. Due to the significant negative impact that an inadequate health and psychological well-being could have during this developmental stage and also into adulthood, several studies have focused on the analysis of the different personal, social and contextual factors that are related to an optimal adjustment in childhood and adolescence, as

* Corresponding Author address: María C. Fuentes, Department of Methodology of Behavioral Sciences, University of Valencia, Avda. Blasco Ibáñez 21, 46010 Valencia, Spain, Phone: +34–96–38–64514, Fax: +34–96–38–64697
Email: m.castillo.fuentes@uv.es
well as the risk factors that could lead to the involvement in maladjusted behaviors such as delinquency or drug use (Bornstein, Hahn, & Haynes, 2010; Brenner, Zimmerman, Bauermeister, & Caldwell, 2013; Calafat, García, Juan, Becoña, Fernández-Hermida, 2014; Fuentes, García, Gracia, & Lila, 2011a, 2011b).

Among these factors, family has received an important attention among researchers. Actually, family is the first social context in children’s development and, therefore, the main socialization agent in the transmission of values, rules and beliefs that will influence on the adjustment of children in the family context as well as in the society (Berns, 2011; Espino, 2013; Gavazzi, 2011, 2013). So, over the last decades, researchers from different disciplines have focused on analyzing this influence, since empirical research has repeatedly shown that the different parental behavior in the socialization process have different implications for their children’s health and well-being (Baumrind, 1967, 1971; Becoña, Martínez, Calafat, Juan, Fernández-Hermida, & Secades-Villa, 2012; García & Gracia, 2014; Lamborn, Mounts, Steinberg, & Dornbusch, 1991).

Research on parental socialization has traditionally been based on the classical two-dimensional theoretical model (Maccoby & Martin, 1983), in which the dimensions of responsiveness and demandingness, also called acceptance/involvement and strictness/imposition (Lamborn et al. 1991; Steinberg, Lamborn, Darling, Mounts, & Dornbusch, 1994), were theoretically orthogonal (Darling & Steinberg, 1993; Maccoby & Martin, 1983). Although theoretical models have changed over time, they all point out two main dimensions on which the different parenting practices in children’s socialization process are organized. For example, first research conducted in this field of study labeled the dimensions of acceptance, warmth or love and, hostility, control or inflexibility (Becker, 1964; Schaefer, 1959; Sears, Maccoby, & Levin, 1957; Symonds, 1939). All these labels used with similar implications to the dimensions of acceptance/involvement and strictness/imposition (Steinberg, 2005). On the one hand, the acceptance/involvement dimension refers to the degree in which parents show warmth, affection and support to their children and use the dialogue and reasoning with them in order to modify their maladjusted behavior. On the other hand, the strictness/imposition dimension is referred to the degree in which parents impose their authority in order to set limits in their children’s behavior. These dimensions are theoretically independent since, given the maladjusted behavior of children, parents could use parenting practices characteristic from both dimensions; that is to say, parents could use dialogue and also high control and supervision. So, it is necessary to combine both dimensions in order to represent all the distinctions offered by the classical model, giving rise to four parenting styles (Lamborn et al., 1991; Steinberg et al., 1994). Each one of them represents a consistent and particular pattern of parenting behavior in their children’s socialization: Authoritative style, characterized by high acceptance/involvement and high strictness/imposition; indulgent style, characterized by high acceptance/involvement and low strictness/imposition; authoritarian style, characterized by low acceptance/involvement and high strictness/imposition and; neglectful style, characterized by low acceptance/involvement and low strictness/imposition (see Figure 1).

Empirical research is consistent in concluding that the relationships between the four parenting styles and different adjustment and maladjustment criteria do not vary depending on the sex and age of children or parents; that is to say, the parenting style which is related to the best results in children’s adjustment is not different from sons or daughters nor different from fathers or mothers (Amato & Fowler, 2002; Baumrind, 1993; García & Gracia, 2010;
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Kazemi, Ardabili, & Solokian, 2010; Martínez, García, Musitu, & Yubero, 2012; Rodrigues, Veiga, Fuentes, & García, 2013). Nevertheless, there are important discrepancies in the scientific literature regarding the best parenting style, especially when the cultural and social context in which this relationship is studied varies (Becofa et al., 2012; Berks, 2011; Espino, 2013; García & Gracia, 2014; Gavazzi, 2013; White & Schnurr, 2012).

Thus, one of the most traditional results obtained mainly in Anglo-Saxon cultural contexts is that the authoritative style, characterized by high parental affection together with high parental imposition (high acceptance/involvement and high strictness/imposition), is the best parenting strategy. On the contrary, the neglectful style, characterized by low parental affection together with low parental imposition (low acceptance/involvement and low strictness/imposition), is related to the worst results in children’s psychosocial adjustment. Finally, children from indulgent and authoritarian families are in an intermediate position between the best adjustment offered by the authoritative style and the worst adjustment offered by the neglectful style, showing a mixture of positive and negative results (Baumrind, 1971, 1991; Lamborn et al., 1991; Steinberg et al., 1994). Nowadays, research continues supporting this perspective. For instance, children from authoritative families show a better academic achievement (Klein & Ballantine, 2001; Garg, Levin, Urajnik, & Kauppi, 2005; Im-Bolter, Zadeh, & Ling, 2013), are more resilient (Kritzas & Glober, 2005), do a better use of adaptive strategies (Aunola, Stattin, & Nurmi, 2000), and are less likely to have problems with drug use and antisocial behavior (Bahr & Hoffman, 2010; Montgomery, Fisk, & Craig, 2008) in comparison to children from authoritarian, indulgent and neglectful families.

In this point, it is important to highlight that most of the studies that analyze this relationship between parenting styles and children’s adjustment have been conducted in samples from the US (White & Schnurr, 2012), fact that undoubtedly contributed to the generalization of this result regarding the best influence of the authoritative parenting style. However, as it will be seen below, a growing number of studies suggest that this result is not always related to the best adjustment of children.

Explaining the Discrepancies

Scientific research carried out in samples from different ethnic and cultural backgrounds, even considering the socioeconomic status of families, and the emerging empirical research, show empirical evidence that question the suitability of using high acceptance/involvement together with high strictness/imposition, the authoritative style, in children’s socialization process.

Thereby, results from different studies conducted in the US with ethnic minority groups (Chao, 1994; Steinberg, Dornbusch, & Brown, 1992), in Asian and Middle Eastern societies (Dwairy & Achoui, 2006; Dwairy & Menshar, 2006), and also results obtained in studies developed with poor families (Hoff, Laursen, & Tardif, 2002) have suggested that low parental affection together with high parental imposition (low acceptance/involvement and high strictness/imposition), the authoritarian style, is an adequate parenting strategy. For example, Baumrind (1972) concluded that Afro-American children from authoritarian families showed better results in independence and assertiveness in comparison to children from authoritative, indulgent and neglectful families. In the same line, Pittman and Chase-Lansdale (2001) also concluded that Afro-American children from authoritarian families obtained the best results in academic achievement. The same results were obtained by Chao
(2001) in a study conducted with Chinese-American children. Finally, different studies carried out by Dwairy and colleagues (Dwairy, 2008; Dwairy, Achoui, Abouserfe, & Farah, 2006a, 2006b, 2006c) showed that the authoritarian parenting style did not harm the mental health of children in Arab societies.

Another set of studies conducted in different cultural backgrounds, mainly in different Southern European and Latin American countries, also question the idea that the authoritative style is always the best parenting strategy. The results obtained in these studies suggest that high parental affection together with low parental imposition (high acceptance/involvement and low strictness/imposition), the indulgent parenting style, is related to the best results in the psychological and social adjustment of children or, that it offers, at least, the same results in children’s adjustment than the authoritative style (Brazil: Martínez, Camino, Camino, & Cruise, 2014; Martínez, García, & Yubero, 2007; Germany: Wolfradt, Hempel, & Miles, 2003; Mexico: Villalobos, Cruz, & Sánchez, 2004). For instance, Rodrigues et al. (2013) concluded that Portuguese children from indulgent families showed the same results or even better than those from authoritative families in different dimensions of self-esteem. Similar results were obtained by Martínez and García (2008) in Brazilian children from indulgent families who showed equal or even higher self-esteem (as in the case of the family dimension of self-esteem) than those from authoritative families. In addition, no significant differences were found in the internalization of self-transcendence and conservation values between children from authoritative and indulgent families. In a study conducted with Italian children, Di Maggio and Zappulla (2014) concluded that children from authoritative and indulgent families showed lower internalizing and externalizing behavior problems (such as anxiety disorders and antisocial behavior) and higher life satisfaction than children from authoritarian and neglectful families.

A wide group of studies conducted into this research area in Spain have also concluded that the parenting style characterized fundamentally by parental affection but not by parental imposition (high acceptance/involvement and low strictness/imposition), the indulgent style, is the best parenting strategy. This conclusion is derived from empirical evidence in which children from indulgent families also obtained the same or better scores in different adjustment and maladjustment criteria in comparison to those from authoritative families (Alonso-Geta, 2012; Cerezo, Casanova, de la Torre, & Carpio, 2011; García & Gracia, 2009, 2010, 2014; Linares, Rusillo, Cruz, Fernández, & Arias, 2011). For example, Gracia, Fuentes, Garcia, and Lila (2012) found that children from indulgent and authoritative families showed higher academic achievement and lower behavior problems in comparison to children from authoritarian and neglectful families. Similar results were obtained by Martínez, Fuentes, Garcia and Madrid (2013) who analyzed the parenting style as a protective or risk factor against drug use and other behavior problems. These authors concluded that the indulgent parenting style was a protective factor against drug use, whereas the authoritarian style was identified as a risk factor. With respect to other behavior problems, both the indulgent and the authoritative style were identified as protective factors against delinquency and school misconduct, while the authoritarian style was also identified as a risk factor. Garaigordobil and Aliri (2012) analyzed whether there were differences in the level of sexism of the adolescents as a function of the parental socialization style, concluding that parents characterized by an indulgent parenting promote less sexist attitudes in their children. Specifically, these authors found that indulgent parents stimulated a lower level of hostile sexism, ambivalent sexism and neosexism in their adolescent children than authoritative,
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authoritarian and neglectful parents. Other most recent studies continue adding empirical evidence about the suitability of the indulgent parenting style for the optimum health and well-being of children in Spain. Thus, children whose parents are characterized by an indulgent parenting style showed: (1) better school adjustment, obtaining the best results in academic achievement and academic self-concept than children from authoritative, authoritarian and neglectful families and, the lowest scores in school misconduct in comparison to children who have been raised in authoritarian and neglectful homes (Fuentes, Alarcón, Gracia, & García, in press) (see Figure 2); (2) lower likelihood of getting involved in substance use, obtaining the lowest scores in the consumption of alcohol, tobacco, cannabis and other illegal drugs than children from authoritative, authoritarian and neglectful families (Fuentes, Alarcón, Garcia, & Gracia, in press) (see Figure 3) and; (3) better psychological adjustment, obtaining the best scores in the dimensions of self-concept assessed (academic, social, emotional, family and physical; García, Gracia, & Zeleznova, 2013; García & Musitu, 1999; Fuentes et al., 2011a, 2011b) and the lowest scores in the dimensions of psychological maladjustment evaluated (hostility/aggression, negative self-esteem, negative self-efficacy, emotional instability, emotional unresponsiveness and negative worldview; Rohner, 1990) (Fuentes, García, Gracia, & Alarcón, in press) (see Figure 4 and Figure 5).

In addition, some incipient research carried out in Spain have tested whether the relationships between parenting styles and children’s psychological and social adjustment varied depending on the level of the perceived risk in the neighborhood, issue that had not been studied yet in this cultural context. Although empirical research conducted in different cultural contexts have concluded that high parental imposition is essential for the adequate adjustment of children who perceive high risk in their neighborhood (Brody & Flor, 1998; Lamborn, Dornbusch, & Steinberg, 1996; Leventhal & Brooks-Gunn, 2000; Schonberg & Shaw, 2007; Steinberg et al., 1992), results obtained in the different studies conducted do not support this conclusion, showing that both variables (parenting styles and the perceived risk in the neighborhood) independently influence on the psychosocial adjustment of children. On the one hand, the indulgent parenting style was related to the best psychosocial adjustment of children or it offers, at least, the same results than the authoritative style. On the contrary, the authoritarian and neglectful parenting styles were related to the worst health and well-being of children. On the other hand, children who perceive high-risk in their neighborhoods were those who showed the worst adjustment regardless of the parental style used by parents (Gracia et al., 2012; Fuentes, Alarcón, Garcia et al., in press).

Finally, it is important to highlight a number of emerging empirical studies conducted in different cultural and social backgrounds, where the relationships between parenting styles and psychosocial adjustment of children have been widely studied in scientific literature. These incipient studies show inconsistent results with those obtained previously in these cultural contexts. For instance, in Asian and Middle Eastern societies where previous empirical research have concluded that the parenting style characterized fundamentally by parental imposition but not by parental affection (low acceptance/involvement and high strictness/imposition), the authoritative style, was the adequate parenting strategy (Dwairy, 2008; Dwairy et al., 2006a, 2006b, 2006c; Dwairy & Menshar, 2006), Kazemi et al. (2010) in a study using a sample of Iranian girls found that the indulgent style, characterized fundamentally by parental affection but not by parental imposition, and the authoritative style, characterized by high parental affection together with high parental imposition, was related to the best results in social competence. In another most recent study carried out in different
samples from six European countries (Sweden, UK, Spain, Portugal, Slovenia and Czech Republic), where in some of them previous empirical research have widely concluded that the authoritative style was related to the best psychosocial adjustment of children (e.g., Sweden: Aunola et al., 2000; UK: Montgomery et al., 2008); Calafat et al. (2014) have found that the indulgent parenting style seems to be the best parenting strategy in the European context since children who have been raised in indulgent homes obtained, on the one hand, the same results than children from authoritative families, showing the lowest problems of substance use and personal disturbances and, on the other hand, the best results in self-esteem and school performance in comparison to children whose parents were characterized by an authoritative parenting style.

**CONCLUSION**

All this empirical evidence exposed highlights the necessity of taking into account the important influence of the different forms of parental behavior in the socialization process on the optimal health and well-being of their children.

Furthermore, this variety of results with respect to the best parenting style suggests that the relationship between parenting styles and children’s psychological and social adjustment depends on the cultural context in which these relationships are developed. Therefore, an only optimal parenting style does not exist, but it is rather determined by the values implicit in each cultural and social context (Berns, 2011; Espino, 2013; García & Gracia, 2014; Gavazzi, 2011, 2013; White & Schnurr, 2012). So, some authors have explained this variety in the optimal parenting style according to the constructs of individualism and vertical or horizontal collectivism (García & Gracia, 2009, 2014; Martínez et al., 2014; Martínez & García, 2008; Rudy & Grusec, 2001). Thereby, in individualistic cultures, mainly in Anglo-Saxon contexts, where independence and autonomy are the main values to be transmitted in the socialization process (Greenfield & Suzuki, 1998; White & Schnurr, 2012), the parenting practices pertaining to the strictness/imposition dimension, like strict control and discipline, are perceived as necessary together with the parenting practices pertaining to the acceptance/involvement dimension, like warmth and affection, in order to raise responsible, mature and self-sufficient children (Baumrind, 2012; Bahr & Hoffman, 2010; Kritzas & Glober, 2005; Lamborn et al., 1991; Steinberg et al., 1994). In collectivistic cultures where the individual self is perceived as part of the family self and moreover, it is expected that the relationships between parents and children are hierarchical, like in Asian and Middle Eastern societies (White & Schnurr, 2012), the high use of the parenting practices pertaining to the strictness/imposition dimension together with the low use of the parenting practices pertaining to the acceptance/involvement dimension, are associated with parental concern, caring and involvement in the socialization process of their children (Chao, 1994, 2001; Dwairy, 2008; Dwairy & Achoui, 2006; Dwairy & Menshar, 2006). In other collectivist cultures like in Southern European and Latin American countries, where family relationships are more egalitarian rather than hierarchical (García & Gracia, 2014; White & Schnurr, 2012), the high use of the parenting practices pertaining to the acceptance/involvement dimension together with the low use of parenting practices pertaining to the strictness/imposition dimension, is related to the optimum psychological and social adjustment of children (Di
Maggio & Zappulla, 2014; Fuentes et al., in press; Martínez et al., 2014; Rodrigues et al., 2013; García & Gracia, 2010; Gracia et al., 2012), whereas the high use of the parenting practices pertaining to the strictness/imposition dimension seems to be perceived as unnecessary, since children from authoritative families showed, at most, the same adjustment than children from indulgent families, or even harmful if they are not used together with high parental affection, because children from authoritarian families showed the worst adjustment together with children from neglectful families, where parental care and concern for children’s health and well-being is non-existent.

Despite this, it is important to highlight, as it is suggested in the emerging empirical research, that significant cultural and socioeconomic changes could happen in some societies that could lead to a change in this relationship between the best parenting style and the optimum health and well-being of children, as it has widely concluded the scientific literature for decades. In this sense, results from these studies show an important change in the optimum parenting style. On the one hand, in cultural societies where previous empirical research has concluded that the authoritarian style was an adequate parenting strategy (Dwairy, 2008; Dwairy et al., 2006a, 2006b, 2006c); a new empirical evidence shows that, due to meaningful cultural changes during the past century, the indulgent style is the optimum parenting style (Kazemi et al., 2010). It should be noted the important change from the suitability of the parenting style characterized fundamentally by parental imposition but not by parental affection, to the parenting style characterized fundamentally by parental affection but not by parental imposition. On the other hand, in cultural contexts where the authoritative parenting style was well established as the best parenting style, according to the conclusions obtained in the extensive previous empirical research conducted mainly in Anglo-Saxon cultures (Aunola et al., 2000; Baumrind, 1971, 2012; Im-Bolter et al., 2013; Lamborn et al., 1991; Steinberg et al., 1994; Montgomery et al., 2008); the results from current studies carried out in some of these cultural contexts show that the indulgent parenting style provides, at least, the same or even a better adjustment than the authoritative style (Calafat et al., 2014). In this case, the best parenting style has changed from the style characterized by high parental affection together with high parental imposition, to the parenting style characterized by high parental affection together with low parental imposition.

All these results emphasize the progressive importance that the high use of parenting practices like parental warmth, affection, support and involvement, dialogue and reasoning are gaining over the high use of parental control, imposition and strict discipline to raise healthy children, even in cultural and social contexts where the parental imposition was perceived as important or more important than parental affection. Therefore, these new results open a new perspective in research on parenting styles and children’s psychosocial adjustment that questions the generalization of the results obtained in previous studies and highlight the necessity of considering cultural influences when the relationships between parenting socialization and its impact on health and well-being of children are analyzed.
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ABSTRACT

This chapter analyzes current evidence between parenting styles and parenting practices for the Spanish context. As opposed to traditional results obtained in Anglo-Saxon contexts with European-American samples, evidence from emergent research from Spain (a South European country) shows that adolescents from indulgent families (characterized by warmth but not strictness) are strongly related to the psychological autonomy granting parenting practice. Interestingly, psychological autonomy granting is positively related to warmth, but negatively related to strictness, just in the opposite end of the rejection and psychological control, that are both strong related to the authoritarian parenting style (characterized by strictness but not warmth). However, in line with traditional results obtained in samples from Anglo-Saxon contexts, behavioural control parenting practices are positively related with the authoritative parenting style (warmth and strictness) and negatively related with the neglectful parenting style (characterized by neither warmth nor strictness). In Spain, psychological autonomy granting is unrelated (i.e, orthogonal) to the behavioural control parenting practice, and in the opposite end of psychological control and rejection parental practices. Psychological control and psychological autonomy granting are distinct constructs, not are the opposite ends of a continuum construct.
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The Bidimensional Model of Parenting Style

Over several decades, the bidimensional model of parenting style, with four-typologies, has served as a background for a large body of research on family socialization practices during infancy and adolescence. This common framework provides consistent concepts which can establish consistent relations between long-term parenting practices and the children's adjustment. According to Darling and Steinberg (1993), the term "parenting style" is used to denote "the constellation of attitudes towards the child that are communicated to the child and create an emotional climate in which the parents' behaviors are expressed" (p.493). The model distinguishes between two consistent patterns of parenting behavior in the socialization process (Darling & Steinberg, 1993; García et al., 1994; Maccoby & Martin, 1983; Musitu & Allatt, 1994; Musitu & García, 2001, 2004). Scholars have stressed the importance of combining the two major dimensions of this parental socialization model in order to analyze accurately their relationships to children's psychosocial adjustment (see Lamborn, Mounts, Steinberg, & Dornbusch, 1991; Maccoby & Martin, 1983; Steinberg, Lamborn, Darling, Mounts, & Dornbusch, 1994). Both dimensions are not-correlated, and both are necessary for accurately conceptualizing the parents' actuations. For example, Tunis (Tunisia) has exactly the same longitude as Oslo (Norway), yet its temperature is very different. Despite the many historical labels that have been used to denominate each dimension, as other two-dimensional systems that scientists used, this cartesian model has been used to congruently organize many information (Darling & Steinberg, 1993).

Actually, responsiveness and demandingness, also commonly titled as acceptance/involvement and strictness/imposition, have received different labels. Earlier scholars used other labels such as acceptance (Symonds, 1939), assurance (Baldwin, 1955), warmth (Becker, 1964; Sears, Maccoby & Levin, 1957) or love (Schaefer, 1959), that have similar meanings to acceptance/involvement. Labels such as domination (Symonds, 1939), hostility (Baldwin, 1955), inflexibility (Sears et al., 1957), control (Schaefer, 1959) or restriction (Becker, 1964), were also used in past with parallel meanings to strictness/imposition. As Steinberg noted: "responsiveness was often operationalized using measures of parental warmth and acceptance, while demandingness came to be defined with respect to parental firmness" (Steinberg, 2005, p. 71). From the confluence of these two cartesian dimensions, four parenting styles can be characterized: authoritative (warmth and strictness), indulgent (warmth but not strictness), authoritarian (strictness but not warmth) and neglectful (neither warmth nor strictness).

Labels with similar meanings may not become a serious problem, however three axis in a cartesian plane, can be a more serious conceptual problem. The last revision of the four-typology model emerged from the theorist work of Maccoby and Martin (1983), in which these researchers critically reviewed the initial tripartite model (authoritative, authoritarian, and permissive) of Diana Baumrind’s (1967, 1971). Maccoby and Martin (1983) proposed a new more consistent and coherent two-dimensional framework from parental socialization in which the dimensions, responsiveness and demandingness, were theoretically orthogonal (Darling & Steinberg, 1993, pp. 491-492; Smetana, 1995, p. 299; Steinberg, 2005, p. 71). The
empirical validation of four-typology model emerged from the study of Lamborn and colleagues (1991) with a diverse sample of approximately 10,000 high school students in the USA. Lamborn and colleagues (1991) criticized seriously that “most discussions and empirical tests of Baumrind’s model … ignore variations in warmth among families characterized by low levels of control, grouping these families together into a single category labeled “permissive”” (p. 1050). Those researchers looked explicitly whether within the permissive category of the three-typology model which parents were so cold with their children like the authoritarian (i.e., “neglectful permissiveness”), or on the contrary, were so emotionally involved like the authoritative parents (i.e., “indulgent permissiveness”) implies different outcomes for the children. From the four-typology model they confirmed distinct relations between each parenting style with several sets of outcomes (Lamborn et al., 1991), they also found that these relations persisted, or even increased, after a year (Steinberg et al., 1994).

Another studies also demonstrated that opposed parenting styles, authoritative-neglectful, also differ equally on different criteria: depressive symptoms, smoking, academic grades (Radziszewska, Richardson, Dent, & Flay, 1996), school integration, psychological well-being (Shucksmith, Hendry, & Glendinning, 1995), adaptive achievement strategies, self-enhancing attributions (Aunola, Stattin, & Nurmi, 2000), drug use (Adalbjarnardottir & Hafsteinsson, 1991), and accuracy in perceiving parental values (Knafo & Schwartz, 2003). On the other hand, the authoritarian and indulgent parenting styles, end up in intermediate position regard to the same criteria. All previous research works have the same convergent point out, four-typology model reinforce the idea that the combination of higher warmth – shared by the authoritative and indulgent– together with higher strictness –shared by the authoritative and authoritarian– corresponds with the optimal prototype of parental socialization: authoritative parenting style.

**IS ALWAYS OPTIMUM THE AUTHORITATIVE PARENTING STYLE?**

In Euro-American samples, authoritative parenting is generally the best style of parenting; the optimum authoritative parenting has been consistently associated with a wide range of adjustment criterias for adolescents. The effective balance between high levels of strictness/imposition and acceptance/involvement (Lamborn et al., 1991; Steinberg et al., 1994; Steinberg, 2005) is the distinctive characteristic of authoritative parenting. While authoritative and authoritarian parents share the same strictness, only an authoritative parenting style may exercise their authority in a rational and flexible manner, this parent can communicate and negotiate with their children, and clearly explain their decisions. Only an authoritative parent might set clear limits while showing warmth and involvement to their children, because authoritarian parents are emotionally distant and cold in their parenting role. Authoritarian parents tend to shape and control the behavior of their children every time that it is possible, with direct and strict approaches, but they not show warmth, affection and bidirectional communication with their children. On the other hand, indulgent parent, as the authoritative ones, fosters an environment of acceptance, dialogue and affection; but when children disobey, the indulgent families do not impose strict rules since they believe that children can regulate their own behaviour through dialogue and reflection (Espino, 2013;

Transgressions of children (specific boundaries of what is not acceptable in their family and their society) may differ in the level of seriousness, in the level of defiance to parental authority or the level of anger or frustration they arouse in parents, and, conversely, compliance with social norms (within boundaries of what is acceptable in their family and their society) may differ in level of sincerity, level of compliance to parental authority or the level of calm or satisfaction that they arouse in their parents. Comparative studies have consistently shown that the Chinese typically emphasize and adopt stricter parenting practices to achieve the culturally valued goal of child obedience than North-American parents (Chiu, 1987; Dornbusch, Ritter, Leiderman, Roberts, & Fraleigh, 1987; Ho, 1986; Hsu, 1985; Leung, Lau, & Lam, 1998). Also, several studies have indicated that high strictness, has either neutral or beneficial consequences for African American children (Brody & Flor, 1998; Spieker, Larson, Lewis, Keller, & Gilchrist, 1999). In Arab societies, Dwairy and Achoui (2006) also found that authoritarian parenting did not harm adolescents’ mental health (Dwairy & Menshar, 2006).

However, when research analyzes normal patterning of parental practices on child development, in general, two main sets of parental practices are distinguished: Those contingent for transform a situation of child misbehaviour (e.g., withdrawing privileges, yelling, scolding, spanking, or reasoning; see Critchley & Sanson, 2006; Deater-Deckard, 2000) and those contingent to maintain a situation of non-misbehaviour (to feeling proud, praising, or giving a toy; see Critchley & Sanson, 2006; Musitu & García, 2001). The situation where the parents applied a practice is important because establish the tolerable limits of child behavior, it’s well known also the detrimental consequences of pathological practices (e.g., inconsistent discipline) of the abusive parents (e.g., Baumrind, 1994; Watson, 1971). Certainly, the practices can be more complex (e.g., attending school functions) and include more variations (e.g., social-class, culture, ethnic-group), the above examples of parental practices represents basic reactions to situations that do not foster adoption of parental standards, or contrarily, situations that foster adoption of their parental standards (Musitu & García, 2001). Parenting socialization, from a psychological perspective, is a universal process that involves teaching to children boundaries of what is acceptable and what is not acceptable, and it makes them aware of the values and actions that are acceptable in their family and their society (Baumrind, 1983; Lewis, 1981). The dimensions of parenting model (i.e., acceptance/involvement and strictness/imposition) and the different parenting practices related to this two main dimensions should maintain the same conceptual meaning (invariances) over different measures of parenting practices and styles (De La Iglesia, Ongarato, & Liporace, 2012; Martinez, García, Camino, & Camino, 2011; Martinez, García, Musitu, & Yubero, 2012).

Empirical research has repeatedly demonstrated that cultural and ethnic differences systematically challenge the optimum parenting style. Literature comparing the relations between the styles of parenting socialization and variables related to the psychological and psychosocial adjustment of children have found different pattern of results between different cultural context. On the one hand, studies carried out in USA with minority ethnic groups and in different countries seriously questioned the idea that the authoritative parenting style was always associated with the best adolescent psychosocial adjustment, suggesting that the authoritarian style (characterized by low levels of acceptance/involvement and high levels of
strictness/imposition) was also an adequate parenting style (Darling & Steinberg, 1993; Steinberg, Lamborn, Dornbusch, & Darling, 1992). For example, Chao (2001) found that Chinese American adolescents from authoritarian families obtained better scores in academic achievement than adolescents from authoritative families. In the same line, Dwairy and Achoui (2006) found that the authoritarian style was not associated with mental health problems in Arab societies. Research with Chinese American samples also showed that children of authoritative parents obtained better academic results than children of authoritarian parents (Chao, 1994, 1995, 2001). Additionally, results from studies with poor families also questioned the idea that the authoritative style of parenting was always associated with optimum outcomes among adolescents (Hoflf, Laursen, & Tardif, 2002). For example, Leung, Lau, and Lam (1998) found differences in the relationship between authoritarian parenting and adolescent academic achievement with parents of little education, but showed no relationship with authoritative parenting.

On the other hand, other main set of continuously growing studies suggested that adolescents who characterize their parents as indulgent obtain equal, or even higher, scores on different outcomes than adolescents who describe their parents as authoritative. For example, seminal studies in Spain, taking several multidimensional measures of adolescent self-esteem and value priorities, indicated that indulgent children obtain equal, or even higher, scores on the adolescent outcomes examined (Musitu & García, 2001, 2004). In another seminal study with German adolescents, those children who perceived their parents as indulgent-permissive "seemed to show a distinctive better psychosocial adjustment by scoring lowest on depersonalization and anxiety and showing high levels of active coping" (Wolfradt, Hempel, & Miles, 2003, p. 529). Researchers in South European countries such as Spain (Martinez & García, 2007; Musitu & García, 2001, 2004), Turkey (Turkel & Tezer, 2008), and Italy (Marchetti, 1997), or in South American countries such as Mexico (Villalobos, Cruz, & Sanchez, 2004), and Brazil (Martinez & García, 2008; Martinez, Garcia, & Yubero, 2007; Martinez, Musitu, Garcia, & Camino, 2003), also found that children and adolescents of indulgent parents did perform equally, or even better, in several youth outcomes. For example, Martinez et al. (2007) showed that Brazilian adolescents from indulgent families scored equally or even higher on several self-esteem dimensions than did the adolescents from authoritative families. Spanish children raised from indulgent families also showed better results on some dimensions of self-esteem than children from authoritative families (Martinez & García, 2007; Martinez, Camino, Camino, & Cruise, 2014; Musitu & García, 2001, 2004). García and Gracia (2009, 2010) noted that Spanish adolescents whose parents were indulgent, systematically, obtained the better scores in some key indicators of psychological adjustment, such as emotional stability and positive worldview, than those from authoritative families. Indulgent parenting style (warmth but not strictness: high levels of acceptance/involvement but low levels of strictness/imposition) has proven effective mainly in South European and Latin American countries (Alonso-Geta, 2012; Calafat, García, Juan, Becoña, & Fernández-Hermida, 2014; DiMaggio & Zappulla, 2014; García & Gracia, 2009, 2010; Gracia et al., 2012; Kazemi et al., 2010; López-Romero et al., 2012; Turkel & Tezer, 2008; Wolfradt et al., 2003). Indulgent Spanish families were found to be as effective as authoritative parenting or, sometimes, even better in all matters concerning self-esteem, psychological maladjustment, personal competence, and a broad-spectrum of problem behaviours (García & Gracia, 2009, 2010).
This chapter aims to examine the structural relation between the two major parenting dimensions of the socialization model (acceptance/involvement and strictness/imposition) and the related parenting practices: psychological control, psychological autonomy granting, behavioral control, (Over)-Protection and Rejection (Arrindell et al., 1999; Baumrind, 2005; Perris, Jacobsson, Lindstrom, von Knorring, & Perris, 1980; Silk, Morris, Kanaya, & Steinberg, 2003) in the Spanish culture (Cebrián, 2012; Fernández-Domenech, 2014; García-Perales, 2011; García, Gracia, Fuentes, Lila, & Pascual, 2010; García & Gracia, 2014).

METHODS

Participants and procedure

Frame for the research work of this chapter have comprised a complete list of secondary schools (students ranging between 12 and 17 years of age) from one Autonomous Community of Spain. An a priori power analysis was performed in order to determine the minimum sample size required in each city to detect with a power of .95 ($\alpha = .05$, $1 - \beta = .95$) a medium-small effect size ($f = .13$, estimated from ANOVAs of Lamborn and colleagues (Lamborn et al., 1991) (pp. 1057-1060) in an univariate $F$-test between the four parenting style groups (Faul, Erdfelder, Buchner, & Lang, 2009; García, Pascual, Frías, Van Kruikens, & Murgui, 2008; Pérez, Navarro, & Llobell, 1999), requiring a minimum sample size of 1020 observations. A total of 16 random sampled schools participated. The procedure for obtaining consent from participants was according to national and regional legality and complete confidentiality was assured. Data were collected using a paper-and-pencil self administered questionnaire, which was applied collectively to the whole class during a regular class period. At the end of the sampling process, there were 1107 Spanish adolescents included in the final analysis. Ranged in age from 12 to 17 ($M = 14.72$ years, $SD = 1.6$ years), with 495 men (45%) and 606 women. Finally, a sensitivity power analysis with the study sample size ($N = 1107$, $\alpha = \beta = .05$) indicated that main effects between four parenting styles can detect even a small effect size ($f = .124$).

Measures

Three instruments were applied. One questionnaire for measure acceptance/involvement, psychological autonomy granting, and behavioral control, other for measured psychological control, and another for measure emotional warmth, [over]-protection, and rejection.

The Authoritative Parenting Measure (APM, Lamborn et al., 1991; Steinberg et al., 1992) is an instrument that measures three parenting dimensions: acceptance/involvement, psychological autonomy granting, and behavioral control. These scales reflect the three major dimensions of authoritative parenting, similar to those proposed by Baumrind (1991), and have been applied in different studies to form the two-dimensional model (e.g., Chao, 2001; Lamborn et al., 1991; Steinberg et al., 1994). The involvement/acceptance scale contains nine items and looks at the degree to which adolescents perceive their parents as responsive, caring, and involved (e.g. “I can count on my parents to help me out if I have some kind of problem”). The psychological autonomy granting scale contains nine items which assess the
degree to which parents use non-coercive and democratic discipline, allowing for an adolescent’s expression of their individuality (e.g., reverse scored, “My parents say that you shouldn’t argue with adults”). These scales were coded on a 4-point scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 4 (strongly agree). The strictness/supervision scale contains six items and measures the degree to which parents regulate and monitor adolescent behavior and whereabouts (e.g., “How much do your parents try to know where you go out at night or where you are most afternoons after school?”). The responses are rated on a 3-point scale, ranging from 1 (don’t try) to 3 (try a lot). Another two items, coded on a 7-point scale, indicated how late the teenager was allowed out on school nights and Friday/Saturday nights, the answers being 1 (I am not allowed out), 2 (before 8:00), 3 (8:00 to 8:59), to 6 (11:00 or later), and 7 (as late as I want). Cronbach’s alpha for each subscale: acceptance/involvement, $\alpha = .802$; behavioral control, $\alpha = .707$; and, psychological autonomy granting, $\alpha = .679$.

The Psychological Control Scale – Youth Self-Report (PCS-YSR), adapted by Barber (1996) from the Schaefer (1965) original Child’s Report of Parental Behavior Inventory (CRPBI) measured psychological control. This scale was constructed to measure parental controlling behavior that intrudes into the psychological and emotional development of the child through use of parenting practices such as guilt induction, withdrawal of love, or shaming (Barber, 1996). The questionnaire consisted of 8 items (e.g., father version, “My father always tries to change my feelings and thoughts”; mother version, “My mother often interrupts me”). Adolescents responded on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (not at all true) to 5 (very true). Cronbach’s alpha, $\alpha = .828$.

The S(hort)-EMBU. The S(hort)-EMBU is a 23-item reliable and factorial valid equivalent of the original 81-item EMBU (Arrindell et al., 1999; Perris et al., 1980) with a 5-point scale ranging from 1 (no, never) to 5 (yes, always). It measures Rejection (“My parents criticized me and told me how lazy and useless I was in front of others”), Emotional Warmth (“I felt that warmth and tenderness existed between me and my parents”), and (Over)-Protection (“When I came home, I then had to account for what I had been doing, to my parents”). The short version of the EMBU has been demonstrated to be valid and reliable in several countries and languages (Spanish version: Arrindell et al., 2005). Cronbach’s alpha for each subscale: emotional warmth, $\alpha = .744$; rejection, $\alpha = .741$; behavioral control, $\alpha = .707$; and, (over)-protection, $\alpha = .669$.

**RESULTS**

Table 1 shows the correlations between the variables of this chapter. Positive relationships were observed between emotional warmth and emotional warmth. Psychological autonomy granting correlated positively with both warmth measures but negatively with psychological control and rejection.

Table 2 shows show as the parental practices are structured (their pattern in a bidimensional model), a principal axis factoring with a rotation of 30 grades was carried out on the seven socialization practices analyzed.
CONCLUSION

In this chapter we have analyzed the relationships with a sample from Spanish adolescent between the parenting dimensions measured by the above parenting questionnaires: Authoritative Parenting Measure, S(hort)-EMBU, and Psychological Control Scale (Figure 1). The relations between the parenting dimensions of these three questionnaires indicated a positive relationship between the two measures of warmth (the acceptance/involvement dimension from the the APM, and the emotional warmth dimension of S-EMBU). The behavioral/control scale of the APM is a parenting practice associated to the authoritative style (a positive relation with strictness and warmth), and does not appear to be a distinct measure of parenting strictness. The over-protection dimension of the S-EMBU is also related to the strictness dimension. Psychological control and Rejection are both similar measures, both related with low levels of acceptance/involvement and high levels of strictness, which are characteristic of the authoritarian parenting style. Interestingly, psychological autonomy granting is positively related to warmth (acceptance/involvement), but negatively related to strictness, just in the opposite end of the rejection and psychological control. This is a clear difference when compared to other results reported in research conducted with American-samples (see Silk et al., 2003, p. 122), and this relationship indicates that in Spain high psychological autonomy granting is clearly positively related to the domain of indulgent parenting.
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Table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Acceptance/Involvement [APM]</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Psychological Autonomy Granting [APM]</td>
<td>.300***</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Behavioral Control [APM]</td>
<td>.303***</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Psychological Control [BAR]</td>
<td>-.477***</td>
<td>-.523***</td>
<td>-.132***</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Rejection [s-EMBU]</td>
<td>-.482***</td>
<td>-.515***</td>
<td>-.131***</td>
<td>.647***</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Emotional Warmth [s-EMBU]</td>
<td>-.666***</td>
<td>.285***</td>
<td>.241***</td>
<td>-.396***</td>
<td>-.514***</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. (Over)-Protection [s-EMBU]</td>
<td>-.112***</td>
<td>-.457***</td>
<td>.244***</td>
<td>.389***</td>
<td>.397***</td>
<td>-.063*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scales Correlation Coefficients between APM, BAR and s-EMBU Questionnaires


* p < .05; ** p < .01; *** p < .001.
### Table 2.

*Factor Loadings (F1, F2) and Rotated Factor Loadings (F1r, F2r)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>F1</th>
<th>F2</th>
<th>F1r</th>
<th>F2r</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acceptance/Involvement [APM]</td>
<td>0.703</td>
<td>0.398</td>
<td>0.808</td>
<td>-0.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological Autonomy Granting [APM]</td>
<td>0.620</td>
<td>-0.297</td>
<td>0.388</td>
<td>-0.567</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavioral Control [APM]</td>
<td>0.187</td>
<td>0.440</td>
<td>0.382</td>
<td>0.288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological Control [BAR]</td>
<td>-0.755</td>
<td>0.123</td>
<td>-0.592</td>
<td>0.484</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rejection [s-EMBU]</td>
<td>-0.801</td>
<td>0.082</td>
<td>-0.653</td>
<td>0.472</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Warmth [s-EMBU]</td>
<td>0.658</td>
<td>0.384</td>
<td>0.762</td>
<td>0.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Over)-Protection [s-EMBU]</td>
<td>-0.444</td>
<td>0.615</td>
<td>-0.077</td>
<td>0.755</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Eigenvalues**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2.755</th>
<th>0.988</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Percent of variance explained**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>39.358</th>
<th>14.110</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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ABSTRACT

In this chapter the conceptualization of socialization and family socialization process are discussed and studies that analyze family socialization styles in Brazil are reviewed. Next, the relation between family socialization styles and child adjustment is considered, with particular focus on studies analyzing the influence of parenting styles into personal competence and internalization of values in Brazil. Those studies shown that Brazilian adolescents raised by authoritative and indulgent parents show higher psychological well-being and internalization of values that adolescents raised by authoritarian and neglectful parents. The importance of acceptance an involvement practices in those results is discussed as well as other studies carried out in Brazil that supported the use of reasoning with children. Finally the role of the cultural context in family socialization and in Brazil in particular is analyzed.
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THE PROCESS OF FAMILY SOCIALIZATION

Socialization has been defined as a learning and internalization process whereby the culture of one generation is transmitted to the next (Whiting 1970). Through this process, individuals acquire the cultural values, habits and norms necessary for adaptation to a determined society (Baumrind 1966). Therefore, the objective of the study of socialization process has been to understand the way in which individuals acquire and internalize the social habits, beliefs, values and norms that define a culture (Maccoby 1994; Zigler & Child 1969).
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From this stance, adaptation to a society or social group constitutes the main objective of socialization processes, although without forgetting the dynamic aspects that intervene in the socialization process and the development of the children (Piaget, 1975).

Thus, through the socialization process, children and adolescents will begin to recognize their interests through their active insertion in diverse groups in society. In this way groups will construct their identities through intergroup relations and individuals will be socialized in this process (Camino, 1996). In the interaction with other groups, individuals will construct values, norms and representations of themselves and of the groups they make up, defining their social identity. In this way, will participate in the construction of the norms and social identity of the groups to which they belong (Camino, 1996). However, groups do not develop in a social vacuum, but inside social, economic and political formations with specific ideologies. And it is in each specific context that must be analyzed the influences of the family and other socialization agents.

Hence, the ways in which the socialization process develops are multiple and complex. Notwithstanding, the study of the family as a socializing agent is fundamental. As much as norms and socialization processes vary depending on different social economic and political contexts, the role of parents continues to be to evaluate if the child’s behavior is in line with, or not, the norms of the social context in which both parents and child are found. This is due to society’s assigning of responsibility to parents as socializing agents, which is constant and transcends the diversity of cultural norms (Darling & Steinberg, 1993).

Research on family socialization strives to respond, on one hand, how parents socialize their children, that is, what practices, systems or strategies do parents use to achieve internalization of behaviors that are normative within a determined society, and, on the other hand, the repercussions that different forms of parental socialization have on their children, or how does parental behavior relate to the personal and social adjustment of their children. Upon studying the role of parents in the process of children’ socialization, the influence that the cultural context must be considered (Chapman, 1979; Schaffer, 1984).

In order to define or classify parents’ behavior towards their children certain consistency is necessary in parental actions regarding the child’s behavior. According to Musitu and García (2001), this consistency in parental conduct is what would define a socialization style. In this way, socialization styles are patterns of persistent behavior that parents adopt in response to different behaviors on the part of the child in everyday life. However, a socialization style is not only the consistent employment of a set of socialization techniques or practices, defined as a response to a specific act on the part of the child. Parents use these practices by combining and orienting them toward an objective, which gives meaning to the use of the practices themselves.

In this way, socialization styles allow for the classification of a great part of the relationship established between parents and children. Initially, Baumrind (1967, 1971) distinguished between three parental socialization styles—authoritative, authoritarian, and permissive—based on the type of authority and control exercised by parents. Later, Maccoby and Martin (1983) proposed measuring socialization styles with a quadripartite typology model via two dimension of parental conduct that are theoretically independent: demandingness and responsiveness (Darling & Steinberg, 1993; Smetana, 1995). Parental demandingness refers to parental attitudes and behaviors that try to control the behavior of the child in some way, imposing limits and establishing rules. Responsiveness, on the other hand, refers to attitudes which favor autonomy development and self-affirmation of the child.
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through communication and emotional support. From these dimensions four socialization styles can be derived: authoritative—characterized by the use of high demandingness and high responsiveness; neglectful—characterized by low demandingness and low responsiveness; indulgent—characterized by low demandingness and high responsiveness; and authoritarian—characterized by the employment of high demandingness and low responsiveness.

**FAMILY SOCIALIZATION STYLES IN BRAZIL**

In Brazil, Costa, Teixeira and Gomes (2000) found that the dimensions of demandingness and responsiveness were appropriate for measuring socialization between the Brazilian parents translating the scale used by Lamborn, Mounts, Steinberg and Dornbusch (1991) into Portuguese. The distribution of the styles that the authors observed, in a sample from Porto Alegre, in the state of Rio Grande del Sur (Costa et al., 2000), does not present significant differences with the distribution found in the United States by Lamborn, Mounts, Steinberg and Dornbusch (1991), using the same scoring system. The authoritative and neglectful styles are the most frequent, while the styles least used by Brazilian parents are the indulgent and authoritarian. This distribution is similar to that observed by Weber, Prado, Viezzer and Brandenburg (2004), using the same scales, with a sample of children from the Curitiba region, in the south of Brazil, though here highlights the high number of neglectful families observed.

Furthermore, Martínez, García, Camino and Camino (2011) and Martínez, García, Yubero and Musitu (2012) also confirmed the existence of two dimensions equivalent to demandingness and responsiveness upon validating the ESPA29 family socialization scale, originally developed in Spain, with a sample of over 2,000 adolescents in the Northeast of Brazil. This scale measures parental socialization styles (authoritative, indulgent, authoritarian and neglectful) using a contextual (Darling & Steinberg 1993) and situational perspective (Oliveira, Marin, Pires, Frizzo, Ravanello & Rossato 2002; Smetana 1995). The two independent dimensions, called acceptance/involvement and strictness/imposition in the scale, are configured by considering the level of employment that parents make of various concrete practices of socialization. The socialization practices considered are: affection, indifference, dialogue, detachment, scolding, physical punishment and revoking privileges.

Regarding the degree to which Brazilian parents use the socialization practices measured by the scale, it was observed that the practices of affection and dialogue are employed to a similar degree by both parents (Martínez, 2005). However, there are differences in the use of the strictness/imposition practices on the part of both mothers and fathers. Both use scolding to a higher degree, followed by revoking privileges, while physical punishment is the technique least employed (Martínez & Madrid, 2008).

**FAMILY SOCIALIZATION STYLES AND CHILD ADJUSTMENT**

The way in which the socialization style that parent employs relates to the behavior of children and their social and psychological adjustment is a phenomenon widely studied in
family socialization literature. Baumrind (1966) proposed that authoritative parental control was the most effective to socialize and raise children over the authoritarian and neglectful types of control in her pioneering work carried out in this line of research (Baumrind, 1967, 1971). In these studies, she argued that an authoritative parenting style, which combines firm control with dialogue, would better transmit social norms and values and would result in more mature, autonomous and responsible children (Baumrind, 1967, 1971; Maccoby & Martin, 1983).

Otherwise, considering the quadripartite model, originating from the demandingness and responsiveness dimensions (Maccoby & Martin, 1983), research carried out in an Anglo-Saxon context, with samples of middle-class European-American adolescents, has supported the idea that the use of the authoritative style achieves more optimum results in child and adolescent development (Baumrind, 1967, 1971; Dornbusch, Ritter, Leiderman, Roberts, & Fraleigh 1987; Gray & Steinberg, 1999; Johnson, Shulman, & Collins, 1991; Lamborn et al., 1991; Noller & Callan, 1991; Radziszew ska, Richardson, Dent, & Flay, 1996; Steinberg, Blatt-Eisengart, & Cauff man, 2006; Steinberg, Elmen, & Mounts 1989; Steinberg, Mounts, Lamborn & Dornbusch, 1991; Steinberg et al., 1991, 1992, 1994). In general, in this context, children from authoritarian and indulgent families displayed intermediate profiles of social and psychological adjustment, while children from neglectful families tended to present the lowest levels of adjustment.

However, studies recently carried out in other cultural contexts have found that it is not always the authoritative style that is related to the best outcomes in child adjustment. For example, a number of studies carried out in the United States with Asian minorities show that the use of an authoritarian style by parents is associated with positive adjustment in children, especially in academic results (Chao, 1994, 1996, 2001; Reglin & Adams, 1990). In this same way, the authoritarian style was not found to be damaging to adolescent mental health in Arabic societies (Dwairy, Achoui, Abouserie, & Farah, 2006). Finally, in other cultural contexts, it seems that the indulgent style is associated with the best outcomes of adolescent adjustment or as equally as good as the results associated with the authoritative style. Among the studies that show positive outcomes in adolescents raised under the indulgent style are those carried out in the Philippines by Hindin (2005), as well as in countries in southern Europe such as Turkey (Türkel & Tezer, 2008), Spain (Musitu & García, 2004; Martínez, Fuentes, García, & Madrid, 2013) and Italy (Marchetti, 1997). This has also been found in Latin American countries, such as Mexico (Villalobos, Cruz, & Sánchez, 2004) and, as will be discussed in more detail below, Brazil (Martínez, Camino, Camino, & Cruise, 2014; Martínez & García, 2008; Martínez, García, & Yúbero, 2007).

Influence of Parenting Styles into Personal Competence and Internalization of Values in Brazil

In order to analyze the influence of parenting styles, into Brazilian adolescents' personal competence and internalization of values two studies were carried out on two samples of 1,198 and 1,239 adolescents from the northeast of Brazil (Martínez et al., 2007; Martínez & García, 2008). In those studies the relationship between the four parental socialization styles (authoritative, authoritarian, neglectful and indulgent) and adolescent self-esteem and
internalization of self-transcendence and conservation Schwartz values (Schwartz, 1992; Schwartz & Bilsky, 1987, 1990) was analyzed. Self-esteem was appraised with five dimensions – Academic, Social, Emotional, Family, and Physical – (Byrne & Shavelson, 1996; Shavelson, Hubner, & Stanton, 1976) using the AF5 scale (García & Musitu, 1999). Self-transcendence and conservation values were measured with the Schwartz (1992) value inventory. Self-transcendence values include the values of universalism and benevolence and conservation values include values of security, conformity, and tradition.

Both, internalization of social values and the development of the child's self-esteem are central objectives of parental socialization (see Grusec & Goodnow, 1994). Self-esteem has been one of the traditional measures of adolescent adjustment in parenting studies (e.g., Amato & Fowler, 2002; Barber, 1990; Barber, Chadwick, & Oerter, 1992; Coopersmith, 1967; Felson & Zielinsky, 1989; Gecas & Schwalbe, 1986; Rudy & Grusec, 2006). On the other side, the importance of the internalization of values as a variable of children adjustment have been stressed by several authors (Grusec & Goodnow, 1994; Grusec, Goodnow, & Kuczynski, 2000; Rudy & Grusec, 2001), although, with few exceptions (e.g., Aluja, del Barrio, & Garcia, 2005), it has not been purposely analysed. Internalization is referring "to taking over the values and attitudes of society as one's own so that socially acceptable behaviour is motivated not by anticipation of external consequences but by intrinsic or internal factors" (Grusec & Goodnow, 1994) and has been pointed out as the key of well-developed children (Baumrind, 1966, 1983; Lewis, 1981). Grusec and Goodnow (1994) suggested that children internalization of values should be measured in terms of prosocial behavior including consideration for the feelings or needs of others and of moral standards. Furthermore, these authors also recommend to take into account variables of psychological adjustment, like self-esteem, that are required for the internalization of values, because low levels of self-esteem can be an impediment to the internalization of values. As they pointed "low self-esteem could lead to a reduction on the child's part in standards for acceptable behaviour and interfere with internalization" (Grusec & Goodnow, 1994, p.17).

Self-transcendence and Conservation Schwartz values (Schwartz, 1992; Schwartz & Bilsky, 1987, 1990) are centered on consideration for others and acceptance of social norms. Self-transcendence values emphasize concern for the welfare and interests of others; they include Universalism values – referred to understanding, appreciation, tolerance, and protection for the welfare of all people and for nature – and Benevolence values – referred to preserving and enhancing the welfare of those with whom one is in frequent personal contact. Conservation values emphasize order, harmony, self-restriction, and non-threatening relations; they include Security – referred to safety, harmony, and stability of society, of relationships, and of self –, Conformity – referred to restraint of actions, inclinations, and impulses likely to upset or harm others and violate social expectations or norms –, and Tradition – referred to respect, commitment, and acceptance of the customs and ideas that traditional culture or religion provide the self – (Sagiv & Schwartz, 2000; Saiz, Alvaro & Martínez, 2011; Schwartz, 1994; Schwartz, 2005; Schwartz & Bilsky, 1987, 1990).

As it can be seen in Figure 1, the results of those studies in Brazil (Martínez et al., 2007; Martínez & García, 2008), showed that children raised by indulgent and authoritative parents have higher self-esteem than children raised by indulgent and neglectful parents. This results can be appreciate in four of the five self-esteem dimension - academic, social, family, and physical - that were analysed in those samples of adolescents, and consequently when global self-esteem is considered. But in addition, adolescents from indulgent parents show equal or
higher self-esteem scores than adolescents from authoritative parents. Those results differ from the research conducted in Anglo-Saxon contexts with European-American samples that traditionally identified authoritative parents as the optimal parenting style.

Additionally, regarding value internalization which has been pointed out as the key of well-developed children (Baumrind, 1966), as is showed in Figure 2, Brazilian adolescents from authoritative and indulgent families give higher priority to self-transcendence – universalism and benevolence – and conservation – tradition, conformity and security – values than adolescents raised in authoritarian and neglectful homes, who are the ones who least internalize these values. Furthermore, in the case of internalization of values there are no differences between children from authoritative and indulgent homes in any of the five types of values analysed. Again the results are different from the classical results of the studies carried out in the Anglo-Saxon context.

All those results suggest that the parents’ use of practices of reasoning and warmth is related with the highest adolescents’ adjustment: adolescents from authoritative and indulgent households – both characterized by high acceptance/involvement – present higher self-esteem and internalization of values; whereas adolescents from authoritarian and neglectful parents – both characterized by low acceptance/involvement – generally have the lowest self-esteem and internalization of values. In addition, it must be taken into consideration, that authoritative parenting is also characterized by high levels of strictness and imposition while indulgent parenting is characterized by low levels of strictness and imposition. In consequence it seems that the use of these coercive practices do not achieve improvement in adolescents’ personal competence or value internalization in Brazil, but it would be primarily defined by the degree of acceptance and involvement practices utilized by the parents.

Other studies relating specific practices that parent’s use with their children in Brazil have also supported the use of practices of acceptance and involvement. Moraes, Camino, Costa, Camino and Cruz (2007) analysed the relationship between the employment of the practices of acceptance, coercion and detachment on the part of the parents with the values displayed by their adolescent children. Through the practices of acceptance, parents reason with and show affection to their children, while the practices of coercion are based on the use of punitive strategies, and the practices of detachment are based on indifference in response to the child’s behaviour. The results of this study showed that the employment of the practices of reasoning and affection are positively related to the internalization of values, including materialist, post-materialist and religious values. However, the practices of punishment and indifference overall were related negatively to the internalization of these values between Brazilian adolescents. Another example of the positive outcomes that can be rendered by the use of the reasoning practices on children in Brazil is outlined in the study carried out by Camino and colleagues (2003) in the Northeast of the country with families from low socio-economic levels. The authors found that reasoning was the parental control technique associated with the highest moral development as it promotes internal behavioral control compared to external control techniques, such as promise of reward, threat of real or supernatural punishment and threat of affection withdrawal. Finally Camino, Camino & Moraes (2003), in a study exploring the use of a number of concrete parental control techniques characteristic of the rural environment of the Northeast of Brazil, identified the technique of explanation of the consequences of the child’s conduct as the unique internal control technique that reflects an attitude of control that emphasizes the intrinsic consequences that the child’s behavior would have.
THE ROLE OF CULTURAL CONTEXT

In short, the studies developed in Brazil measuring the influence of parenting styles, into Brazilian adolescents’ personal competence and internalization of values show that the association between authoritative parenting and optimum outcomes in adolescents reported in studies on European American families in the United States, is not confirmed on Brazilian adolescents for either when self-esteem or interiorization of self-trancendence and conservation values are assessed. On the contrary, the results support studies that question the generalization of the association between authoritative parenting and optimum adjustment to any ethnic or cultural context (Dornbusch et al., 1987; Chao, 2001; Kim & Rhoner, 2002; Steinberg et al., 1991), particularly, those studies reinforce research in Spain (Musitu & García, 2004; Martínez & García, 2008) and some countries such as Italy (Marchetti, 1997) or Mexico (Villalobos et al., 2004), which have found that in these cultures indulgent parenting is associated with the same or better adolescent outcomes than authoritative parenting.

The discrepancies in studies on the relationship between socialization practices employed by parents and child adjustment among different countries and cultures in which the socialization process develops suggest that the ideal parental socialization style depends on the cultural environment (Chao 1994; Ho, 1989). It has been argued that some parenting practices can have different meanings depending on the characteristics of the culture (Chao, 2001) and can be associated with different parenting objectives (Grusec, Rudy & Martini 1997; Rao, McHale, & Pearson, 2003).

Therefore, the impact of parenting styles in offspring can vary in different cultures. In this way, it seems that coercive socialization practices will only achieve positive outcomes in children in cultures where hierarchical relationships and respect for authority are positively valued. This would explain the use of coercion by parents to obtain positive outcomes in cultures in Asia and the United States, where hierarchical relationships are emphasized and encouraged (Triandis, 1995, 2001). Authoritarian parenting have a positive impact on Asiatic cultures because in those contexts strict discipline is understood as beneficial for the children (Grusec et al., 1997) and because both parents and children view authoritarian practices as an organizational strategy that fosters harmony within the family and try to ensure children’s moral (Chao 1994; Ho, 1989).

However, these practices would not have such a positive effect in countries like Brazil where parent-child relationships have a more horizontal nature (Gouveia, Guerra, Martínez & Paterna, 2004), given that Brazil has been identified as a collectivist-horizontal culture (Gouveia, Albuquerque, Clemente & Espinosa, 2002; Gouveia, Clemente, & Espinosa, 2003). Horizontal rather than hierarchical social and familial relationships are emphasized in collectivist-horizontal cultures. Hence, in Brazil, reasoning would be a more effective socialization practice to establish guidelines and limits on the child’s conduct (Camino, Camino, & Moraes 2003; Martínez & García, 2007, 2008; Martínez et al. 2007), while affection would be the parental practice that provides emotional support to children. In Brazil and other south American or Mediterranean countries such as Mexico, Spain or Italy, it seems that more emphasis is placed on the use of affection, acceptance, and involvement in children socialization (Musitu & García, 2004; Villalobos et al., 2004; Marchetti, 1997). As Rudy and
Grusec (2001) pointed out, strictness practices seem to be perceived in a negative way in cultures that are not based on hierarchical relationships. As a result, strictness practices, which involve a hierarchical parent-child relationship, seem to not have a positive influence on the socialization of offspring in Brazil, whereas practices like affection, reasoning, acceptance, and involvement are positively related with adolescents’ outcomes. Therefore, the relationship between parenting styles and adolescent adjustment must be examined having in consideration the meaning of parenting styles in each cultural context.
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ABSTRACT

This chapter analyzes current evidence between parenting styles and adolescent outcomes for the Portuguese context. Parenting styles and adolescent outcomes were analyzed in a sample of 517 Portuguese adolescents aged 11 to 19 years old, of whom 214 (41.4%) were males. The adolescents were classified into 1 of 4 groups (authoritative, authoritarian, indulgent, and neglectful) on the basis of self reported ratings of their parents on two dimensions: Acceptance/involvement and strictness/imposition. Adolescents were contrasted along two different set of outcomes: (1) priority given to Schwartz's values (self-direction, universalism, benevolence, tradition, conformity, security and realization) and (2) level of Self-esteem (appraised in five domains: academic, social, emotional, family, and physical). Regarding the consequences of using a particular parenting style on the personal and social adjustment of children, studies from Anglo-Saxon literature suggest that the children from authoritative families display a better adaptation that children socialized with other parenting styles. Results with Portuguese adolescents suggest that adolescents from indulgent families score the same, and even better than those of authoritative families, in some indicators of psychosocial adjustment. The study refers to the need for further research, taking into account new contexts and new cultures.

Keywords: Parenting, Self-esteem, Priority Given to Values, Portuguese Adolescents

INTRODUCTION

The family institution is often referred to as the first social group of which the individuals are part, and therefore it is considered as the initial and primary cell of the society in most of the western world (Biasoli-Alves, 2004). Despite the multiple agents to be considered, it is to
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the family, specifically to the parents, to whom the role of the socialization of the child is assigned. In this regard, it is the role of the family to lay down rules and limits for the established relations between the new and the old generations, favoring the adaptation of the individuals to the demands of the society. Even though during adolescence new inquietudes and new relationships become very important, the family continues being a genuine and determining reference in the life of the adolescents (Veiga, 1996, 2009, 2013). It is important to point out, that family relationships do not happen in a social vacuum, but rather they exist in a concrete society and culture; in this sense it is important to consider some of the social, economic and political aspects of Portugal (Taborda-Simões, Vale-Dias, Formosinho, & Fonseca, 2007).

Officially the Portuguese Republic, located in the Southwest of Europe, whose territory is situated in the western part of the Iberian Peninsula and archipelagos in the North Atlantic. Portugal, is the most western nation of the European continent. It has a population of approximately ten millions, with a distribution showing important differences between the south and the north and between the interior and the coast. The north and the coast have remarkably higher population densities than the rest of the country. In Portugal, the fundamental law is the Constitution, dated in 1976, and all other laws are bound by it. Since 1985, the country entered a process of modernization in a quite stable environment (from 1985 to the present day) and joined the European Union in 1986. The successive governments made several reforms, privatized many state-controlled firms and liberalized key areas of the economy including telecommunications and the financial sector. The Portuguese society experienced in the last decades, major changes, not only regarding to socioeconomic aspects, but also with respect to the relationships and the roles established within the new family units (Morgado, Dias, & Paixão, 2013). These new models suggest that the family has passed, and continues passing by major changes in its organization, either in its composition or in relation to the forms of socialization that are born inside it (Romanelli, 2002). However, despite these changes, the family continues being a recognized and highly valued institution, because it continues exercising the basic functions for the development of its members (Taborda-Simões et al., 2007).

Parenting Styles

As much as the norms and the socialization processes vary according to the different social, economic and political contexts, the family keeps being the factor who influences more systematically the developmental trajectories of the children (Veiga, 1996, 2001). Currently, one of the methods for empirical research on parenting is the study of the parental styles, considered one of the most traditional and relevant perspectives in the study of the parent-child relationships (Maccoby & Martin, 1983). Research during the past decades shows the influence of the parenting socialization on the personal and social adjustment of their children (Garcia & Gracia, 2010). The relationships between parental styles and children’s adjustment have been studied following a two-dimensional framework of parental socialization (Maccoby & Martin, 1983), in which the dimensions responsiveness and demandingness, also denominated acceptance/involvedness and strictness/imposition (Lamborn, Mounts, Steinberg, & Dornbusch, 1991; Steinberg, Lamborn, Darling, & Dornbusch, 1994), were theoretically orthogonal (Darling & Steinberg, 1993). These dimensions reflect two main persistent patterns of parenting behavior in the socialization
process (Darling & Steinberg, 1993). The acceptance/involvement dimension refers to the extent to which parents show warmth and affection to their children, giving them support and communicating with them by reasoning; as a form of showing the respect that parents have for the individuality of their children. The strictness/imposition dimension refers to the extent to which parents use parental firmness strategies to keep an assertive position of authority with their children and require of them maturity, so as to help the parents to set clear limits in their children's conduct.

In order to analyze appropriately the relationship between the model and the personal and social adjustment of adolescents, it is essential to combine the two main dimensions of the parental socialization model (Lamborn et al., 1991; Steinberg et al., 1994). Crossing these two orthogonal dimensions, have been defined four parenting styles: Authoritative, characterized by acceptance/involvement and strictness/imposition; indulgent, characterized by acceptance/involvement but not strictness/imposition; authoritarian, characterized by strictness/imposition but not acceptance/involvement; and neglectful, characterized by neither acceptance/involvement nor strictness/imposition (Steinberg, 2005). Both authoritative and authoritarian parents are defined by strictness/imposition; however, only the authoritative parenting style can exercise authority in a rational and flexible manner, encouraging communication and negotiation with children, and explaining their decisions to children. Thus, the authoritative parents set clear limits but also showing warmth and affection to their children. Indulgent parents, like the authoritative ones, also foster an environment of acceptance, dialogue and affection. But when children transgress the family norms they are not impositive, because they believe that children can regulate their own behavior through dialogue and reflection. On the other hand, authoritarian parents tend to shape and control the behavior of their children whenever possible, using direct and imposing approaches, and not showing warmth and affection to their children. They are parents little responsive to the emotional needs of their children. Whereas neglectful parents tend to limit the time that they spend in their parenting tasks, and they are often focused on their own interests. The neglectful parents, like the authoritarian parents, are little responsive to the emotional needs of their children (García & Gracia, 2014; Musitu & García, 2001, 2004; Steinberg et al., 1994).

Parenting styles and the psychosocial adaptation of adolescents

Adolescence is a period of development that comprises important changes, and it is in this period where adolescents build their individual and social identity. In the studies of parenting styles, the self-esteem is one of the most frequently used indicators for the assessment of the psychosocial adjustment (Berns, 2011; Wen & Danhua, 2012). With regard to the social function of the family, one of its biggest assignments is to equip young people for the exercise of citizenship. Therefore, it is from the socialization process that the individuals elaborates their identity and subjectivity (Romanelli, 1997), acquiring, within the family, the values, norms, beliefs, ideas, models and behaviors required for their role in society (Drummond & Drummond, 1998). It should be noted that the standards and values that we introject within the family remain with us throughout life, acting as a basis for the decisions and attitudes we assume during adulthood.
Whereas the self-concept is an indicator of the personal adaptation of the adolescent, for Rokeach (1973), values are an indicative of the social adjustment, as they condition in a particular way the whole system of beliefs and the social behavior of the individual.

In the literature on parent adolescent relationships, one the most robust findings reported, since the early studies carried out by Baumrind (1967, 1971) with middle-class American families, is that young people who have been raised in authoritative households have better psychosocial adjustment. Numerous empirical studies have been published in which adolescents from authoritative families, characterized by acceptance/involvement and strictness/imposition would perform better in all youth outcomes examined, while adolescents from neglectful families, characterized by neither acceptance/involvement nor strictness/imposition, would perform worse in all youth outcomes examined (Steinberg et al., 1994).

On the one hand, the results obtained by different studies carried out in the US with minority ethnic groups as well as with cultures different of the Anglo-Saxon ones, questioned the idea that the authoritative parenting style was always associated with the best psychosocial adjustment of the children. Baumrind (1972) found that authoritarian parenting was associated with independence and assertiveness among African-American girls in the US. In Arab societies, Dwairy and Achoui (2006) also found that authoritarian parenting did not harm adolescents’ mental health (Dwairy & Menshar, 2006).

On the other hand, emergent research in diverse cultural contexts (mainly South European and Latin American countries) supported the idea that the authoritative style was not always associated with the best results in children and adolescents, suggesting that the indulgent parenting style, characterized by acceptance/involvement but not strictness/imposition, was related to better psychosocial adjustment of adolescents or, at least indistinguishable from authoritative style. Other studies realized in Spain (Fuentes, García, Gracia, & Alarcón, 2015; García & Gracia, 2009, 2010, 2014; Gracia, Fuentes, García, & Lila, 2012), Italy (DiMaggio & Zappulla, 2014), Turkey (Turkel & Tezer, 2008), Germany (Wolfradt, Hempel, & Miles, 2003), Mexico (Villalobos, Cruz, & Sánchez, 2004), Brazil (Martínez & García, 2008), Iran (Kazemi, Ardabili, & Solokian, 2010) and Philippines (Hindin, 2005), reported similar findings.

PORTUGUESE PARENTING, ADOLESCENTS’ PERSONAL COMPETENCE AND INTERNALIZATION OF VALUES

Objective

This chapter analyzes current evidence of the relationship between the parenting styles and the adolescents’ personal competence and internalization of values for the Portuguese context (Rodrigues, 2011; Rodrigues, Veiga, Fuentes, & García, 2013). Rodrigues and colleagues (2014) have analyzed which parenting style (characterized by acceptance/involvement and strictness/imposition) is optimum in a Portuguese context. We could start hypothesize, drawing from the literature review, that indulgent parenting style should be the optimum, or even find results similar to that of the authoritative parenting style.
Portuguese adolescents raised with these parental styles would show higher self-esteem and more internalization values than other parenting styles.

METHODS

Participants and procedure

Participants in this study were 514 adolescents, 211 boys (41.1%) and 303 girls (58.9%), aged 11 to 18 years (M = 14.26 years old, SD = 1.85 years old) from three public schools selected by simple cluster sampling from all educational centers in the city of Lisbon (Kalton, 1983). After contacting the headmaster of each school (all agreed to participate) and obtaining parental permissions (there were only 3% of non-permissions), students were assured of complete confidentiality and chose to participate voluntarily, obtaining a final response rate of 93%. Analysis conducted a posteriori showed that, with this sample size, it could be detected medium-small effect sizes (f = .18, Cohen, 1977) in univariate F tests between the four parenting styles (Lamborn et al., 1991; Steinberg et al., 1994) with a statistical power of .95 (Faul, Erdfelder, Buchner, & Lang, 2009; García, Pascual, Frías, Van Krunckelsven, & Murgui, 2008).

Measures

Parenting styles were measured using the Parental Socialization Scale (ESPA29) of Musitu and García (2001). This instrument is based on the two-dimensional and four-typology classical theoretical model (Darling & Steinberg, 1993; Maccoby & Martin, 1983). Consists of 212 items where adolescents had to rate the frequency with which their parents use several parenting practices (response scale ranged from 1: never, to 4: always) in twenty-nine representative situations in western culture. 13 of them refer to compliance situations with the family rules (e.g., "If I behave appropriately at home and do not interrupt") where adolescents indicate the frequency with which their parents show them affection ("he/she shows me affection") and indifference ("he/she seems indifferent") and, 16 non-compliance situations (e.g., "If they find out that I have lied") where adolescents indicate the frequency with which their parents use dialogue ("he/she talks to me"), detachment ("it is the same to him/her"), verbal scolding ("he/she scolds me"), physical punishment ("he/she spanks me"), and revoking privileges ("he/she takes something away from me"). The acceptance/involvement score was obtained by averaging the responses in affection, indifference, dialogue and detachment (indifference and detachment scores were inverted because of their inverse relationship with the dimension). The strictness/imposition score was obtained by averaging the responses in verbal scolding, physical punishment and revoking privileges (Lamborn et al., 1991; Steinberg et al., 1994). Its factorial structure and invariance of demographic variables sex and age has been confirmed in different studies (Martínez, Garcia, Camino, & Camino, 2011; Martínez, García, Musitu, & Yubero, 2012), as well as the orthogonality of the two major dimensions (Lim & Lim, 2003). Cronbach alpha obtained in the two main dimensions were .98 in acceptance/involvement and .96 in strictness/imposition. For the subscales: .96 in affection, .95 in indifference, .95 in dialogue, .92 in detachment, .94 in verbal scolding, .94 in physical punishment, and .95 in revoking privileges.
Self-esteem, as one of the most traditional indicators of personal competence (Berns, 2011; Wen & Danhua, 2012), was measured using the Multidimensional Self-Esteem Scale (AF5) of García and Musitu (1999). This instrument consists of 30 items that assess five self-esteem dimensions, 6 items by dimension, with a response scale ranging from 1 (totally disagree) to 99 (totally agree): Academic self-esteem (e.g., “I do my homework well”), social self-esteem (e.g., “I make friends easily”), emotional self-esteem (e.g., reverse item, “I am afraid of some things”), family self-esteem (e.g., “My family would help me with any type of problem”) and, physical self-esteem (e.g., “I take good care of my physical health”). Empirical research has repeatedly showed that multidimensional measures of self-esteem offer more detailed and specific information about different areas of human behavior than the general information offered by one-dimensional measures (Fuentes, García, Gracia, & Lila, 2011a, 2011b; Rodríguez-Fernández, Droguett, & Revuelta, 2012). The factorial structure of this instrument has been confirmed in several studies conducted in different countries like Portugal (García, Musitu, & Veiga, 2006), Spain (Murgui, García, García, & García, 2012), Chile (García, Musitu, Riquelme, & Riquelme, 2011) and US (García, Gracia, & Zeleznova, 2013); as well as its factorial invariance of the variables sex and age (Fuentes et al., 2011a, 2011b). Cronbach alpha obtained in each dimension was: .83 in academic self-esteem, .70 in social self-esteem, .77 in emotional self-esteem, .80 in family self-esteem and .79 in physical self-esteem.

Finally, internalization of values was assessed using the Schwartz Value Inventory of Schwartz and colleagues (Schwartz, 1992; Schwartz & Bilsky, 1990). We applied a 46-items version for measuring the following values: Self-direction (6 items; e.g., “Independence”), universalism (9 items; e.g., “A world at peace”), benevolence (9 items; e.g., “Faithful”), tradition (6 items; e.g., “Respect for tradition”), conformity (4 items; e.g., “Obedient”), security (7 items; e.g., “Social order”) and realization (5 items; e.g., “Triumphant, with success”). Adolescents had to rate the importance of each value as a guiding principle in their life using a 99-point response scale ranging from 1 (opposed to my values) to 99 (of supreme importance). Cronbach alpha obtained in the dimensions assessing each value were: .58 in self-direction, .75 in universalism, .65 in benevolence, .55 in tradition, .55 in conformity, .62 in security and .63 in realization. These coefficients are similar to, or even superior to those obtained in other studies (Schwartz, 1992; Schwartz & Bilsky, 1990).

**Typologies of parenting styles**

Families were classified into one of the four parenting styles (authoritative, indulgent, authoritarian or neglectful) using the median split procedure considering the scores in the two main parental socialization dimensions simultaneously (acceptance/involvement and strictness/imposition) and after controlling for sex and age (Musitu & García, 2001). So, authoritative families scored over the median on both dimensions, indulgent families scored over the median on acceptance/involvement and under it on strictness/imposition, authoritarian families scored under the median on acceptance/involvement and over it on strictness/imposition and, finally, neglectful families scored under the median on both dimensions (Lamborn et al., 1991; Steinberg et al., 1994).
RESULTS

Two factorial multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was conducted with each set of psychosocial adjustment criteria. Results showed significant main effects for parenting styles both in personal competence as in internalization of values.

Personal competence (self-esteem)

Results of the univariate $F$ test (ANOVA) showed that adolescents from indulgent families obtained better scores in academic self-esteem than adolescents from authoritarian and neglectful families. In the social and emotional dimensions, adolescents whose parents were characterized as indulgent scored better than adolescents with authoritarian parents. Finally, adolescents who have been raised in indulgent homes showed better family self-esteem in comparison to adolescents from authoritative, authoritarian and neglectful families (see Figure 1).

Internalization of values

With respect to internalization of values, the ANOVA showed that adolescents who have been raised in indulgent and authoritative homes obtained better scores in comparison to adolescents whose parents were characterized by the authoritarian and neglectful parenting styles in all the values assessed (self-direction, universalism, benevolence, tradition, conformity, security and realization) (see Figure 2).

CONCLUSION

The main objective of this chapter was to analyze the relationship between parenting styles and personal competence and internalization of values of Portuguese adolescents (Rodrigues, 2011; Rodrigues et al., 2013).

In the Portuguese cultural context, the adolescents who defined their parents as indulgent (characterized by acceptance/involvement but without the component of strictness/imposition) scored highest on four of the five self-esteem dimensions evaluated: academic, social, emotional and family. No statistically significant differences were found for the physical self-esteem between the four parenting styles (Rodrigues et al., 2013).

These results suggest that the self-esteem is positively related with parental affection, communication and acceptance, components shared by the two styles - authoritative and indulgent - though, relates negatively to strictness and imposition, components shared by the authoritative and authoritarian styles. These results contradict the Anglo-Saxon studies, which indicate that the best personal adaptation is associated with the authoritative style of parenting (Bahr & Hoffman, 2010; Baumrind, 2012; Im-Bolter, Zadeh, & Ling, 2013; Lamborn et al., 1991; Steinberg et al., 1994). However, this result does not solely characterize Portugal culture, given that similar results have been found in studies carried out in other countries (Brazil: Martínez, Camino, Camino, & Cruise, 2014; Martínez & García, 2008; Martínez, García, & Yubero, 2007; Germany: Wolfradt et al., 2003; Italy: DiMaggio & Zappulla, 2014;
Spain: Garaigordobil & Aliri, 2102; Gracia et al., 2012; Martínez, Fuentes, García, & Madrid, 2013). For example, as affirmed by García and Gracia (2009, 2010), Spanish children that defined their parents as indulgent scored higher on the self-esteem dimensions than those who defined them as authoritarian or neglectful. The children of indulgent parents also matched the children from authoritative parents in the dimensions of academic, social and physical self-esteem, and even exceeded them in the emotional and family self-esteem. The cross-cultural study between the United States and Germany, made by Barber, Chadwick, & Oerter (1992) suggests that in the German society a greater academic self-esteem is not related to the utilization of the authoritative style, but with the display of affection by the parents.

With respect to internalization of values, it is in the family context where parents transmit to their children the values, norms, beliefs, models and patterns of behavior required for their actuation in society. The parents, in this sense, have a central role in this process, since they present to their children the rules and norms of how to behave socially.

Current evidence show that Portuguese adolescents raised within families that employ an indulgent or authoritative educational style showed greater orientation towards the values of Universalism and Benevolence (Rodrigues, 2011; Rodrigues et al., 2013).

It can be suggested, therefore, that the effect of the acceptance/involvement by the parents leads children to adopt more values related to understanding, appreciation, tolerance and protection towards the welfare of all people and nature. It is understood, thus, that adolescents raised with much affection and acceptance may be more motivated to transcend selfish attitudes and promote the welfare of others and of nature than those raised with little affection and acceptance. These results coincide with those found by Martínez and García (2007), and Musitu and García (2001), which revealed that Spanish adolescents from homes where there is a high acceptance get higher scores than those from homes with predominantly low acceptance, in relation to the values of Universalism and Benevolence. In another study, Martínez and García (2008) also found that Brazilian adolescents whose parents were characterized by a parenting style based on high acceptance/involvement scored higher on both values in comparison with those adolescents whose parents were characterized by low acceptance/involvement.

The same trend is observed in relation to the values of tradition, conformity and security, where Portuguese adolescents raised by authoritative and indulgent parents, attributed greater importance to these values than those created by authoritarian and neglectful parents. These results are also consistent with those obtained in other studies that have analyzed the relationship between parenting styles and the internalization of these values (Brazil: Martínez & García, 2008; Spain: Martínez & García, 2007; Musitu & García, 2001). It can be suggested that an educational style high in acceptance/involvement –indulgent and authoritative– predisposes adolescents to appreciate and accept more the customs and ideas of their culture, limiting the actions, inclinations and impulses that may harm others or violate social expectations or norms.

Regarding the values of self-direction and realization, Portuguese children of authoritative and indulgent parents had higher scores on these values than children from authoritarian and neglectful parents. One may suggest that the consequences of the use of affection, dialogue, and acceptance by their parents helps children to feel more motivated to adopt values related to independence of thought, creativity and decision making and also with the values related to personal success, being more hardworking and more competent.
It can be said, thus, that the greater the emotional involvement, the bidirectional communication, and the affective demonstration of parents, the higher the self-concept of their children, with a positive impact on the internalization of values. In contrast, the greater the strictness, the use of firm discipline, imposition and control of parents towards their children, the lower the personal and social adjustment.

One possible explanation may be due to the fact that Portuguese culture, considered as collectivist horizontal, although children are very connected to their families, the relationship between the different generations is expected to be more egalitarian than in collectivist vertical cultures (such as Asian or Arabic) or the individualistic cultures (like the US). In this sense, the use of severity, punishment, imposition and control, in the Portuguese culture is perceived by the children as an intrusive and coercive parental practice and not as a component of the care and responsibility of the parents for their children (Fuentes et al. 2015; García & Gracia, 2009, 2010, 2014; Martínez & García, 2007, 2008; Martínez et al., 2012, 2013, 2014; Musitu & García, 2004; Rodrigues et al., 2013; White & Schnurr, 2012).
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ABSTRACT

In this chapter the relation between parenting styles and adolescent outcomes were analyzed in a sample of 601 Peruvian adolescents aged 11 to 18 years old, of whom 67.2% were females. The adolescents were classified into 1 of 4 groups (authoritative, authoritarian, indulgent, and neglectful) on the basis of self reported ratings of their parents on two dimensions: Acceptance/involvement and strictness/imposition. Adolescents were contrasted along two different set of outcomes: (1) priority given to Schwartz’s values (universalism, benevolence, tradition, conformity, security, self-direction, stimulation/hedonism, achievement and power) and (2) level of Self-esteem (appraised in five domains: academic, social, emotional, family, and physical). Results showed that authoritative and indulgent parenting are associated with the highest internalization of values of teenagers, whereas authoritarian and neglectful parenting are associated with the lowest. On the other hand, adolescents with indulgent parents have equal or higher levels of self-esteem than adolescents with authoritative parents, while adolescents raised in authoritarian or neglectful homes have the lowest scores in self-esteem. In conclusion, the parenting styles which frequently show affection by the parents, obtained higher scores in several self-esteem dimensions.
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INTRODUCTION

This chapter compares different parental styles that parents use to educate and socialize their children in a sample of Peruvian adolescents, and the influences of these parental styles on their social adjustment within the Peruvian culture. Classical literature of parenting poses three main questions: (1) How do parents socialize their kids? (2) Is there an optimally efficient parenting style to obtain the best psychosocial adjustment of children? And (3) do cultural factors determine a parental style optimum to socialize children of a determinate culture? From the confluence of cardinal two dimensions of parenting—acceptance/involvement and strictness/imposition—, four main parenting styles have been defined: authoritative, high levels of acceptance/involvement and strictness/imposition; indulgent, high levels of acceptance/involvement but low levels of strictness/imposition; authoritarian, low levels of acceptance/involvement but high levels of strictness/imposition; and neglectful, low levels of acceptance/involvement and strictness/imposition (Lamborn, Mounts, Steinberg, & Dornbusch, 1991; Maccoby & Martin, 1983; Steinberg; Lamborn, Darling, Mounts, & Dornbusch, 1994; Steinberg, 2005). Research analyzes the repercussions of using each one of the parenting styles to the personal and social well being of the children. Literature concludes that cultural factors determine for each culture an optimal parenting style different.

Studies in Anglo-Saxons cultures tends to conclude that the authoritative parenting style has the most positive relation with the psycho-social adjustment of children in comparison to the other three styles (Dornbusch, Ritter, Leiderman, Roberts, & Fraleigh, 1987; Maccoby & Martin, 1983; Steinberg, Elmen, & Mounts, 1989; Mounts, Lamborn, & Dornbusch, 1991; Steinberg, Lamborn, Dornbusch, & Darling, 1992). Although these studies show the advantages of the authoritative style, other research has found that the indulgent parenting style is on par, or even better, in regards to the psychosocial well being of children. These studies mainly drew their samples from Southern Europe and Latin America (Llinares, 1998; Marchetti, 1997; Martinez & García, 2007; Musitu & García, 2001, 2004; Hindin, 2005, Rodrigues, Veiga, Fuentes, & García, 2013; Fuentes, 2014). As well, results from studies in the US with ethnic minority groups such as African Americans (Baumrind, 1972; Deater-Deckard, Dodge, Bates, & Pettit, 1996) or multi-ethnic Americans (Steinberg, Dornbusch, & Brown, 1992) renowned that authoritarian parenting was highly related to adolescent engagement. In a same line, research with Chinese American samples showed that children of authoritarian parents obtained better academic results than children of authoritative parents (Chao, 1994, 1996, 2001). Additionally, results from studies with poor families also indicated that for low-educated parents in the United States and Australia, authoritarian parenting was positively related to academic achievement (Hoff, Laursen, & Tardif, 2002). Moreover, some research in Middle Eastern and Asian societies suggested that authoritarian parenting was also an adequate parenting strategy (Dwairy, Achoui, Abouserie, & Farah, 2006; Quoss & Zhao, 1995).

In this chapter, we study the associations of parenting styles with adolescents’ self-esteem and internalization of values in a sample of Peruvian adolescents. Both, internalization of social values and the development of the child’s self-esteem, are fundamental goals of parental socialization (Grusec & Goodnow, 1994; Martínez & García, 2007, 2008).
Since the end of the 20th century the importance that self-esteem plays in personal and social well-being has been repeatedly underpinned from diverse areas of psychology (Garaigordobil, Cruz, & Pérez, 2003; Stevens, 1996). Clinical psychologists, educational psychologists as well as social psychologists, all defend the importance of this construct in explaining human behaviour (Asendorpf, Banse, & Mücke, 2002; Tafarodi, Marshall, & Milne, 2003). On the other side, the attention that cognitive psychology has paid to this issue contributed to grant the self-concept a key position in the complex framework of psychosocial processes in humans (Bracken, 1996; Del Barrio, Frías, & Mestre, 1994). One of the most important psychological functions attributed to the family is the formation of the self-concept or identity of the children (Lila, 1995; Musitu & Allatt, 1994; Noller & Callen, 1991). The family reinforces the formation of the self-concept by means of different socialisation techniques used by the parents (Felson & Zielinski, 1989), the degree of communication between parents and children (Burkitt, 1991; Musitu, Herrero, & Lila, 1993) and the familiar climate (Noller & Callen, 1991). All of these factors contribute to the content of self-concept, as well as to its evaluative component of self-esteem. This is critical: The family constitutes the first socialisation context of the child as well as the first environment where their identity starts developing (Lila, 1995). Different studies have observed the existence of a connection between the way a child feels he is perceived by his parents, and his own self-evaluation (Cook & Douglas, 1998; Cuneo & Schiaffino, 2002) as well as his adjustment in school (Larose & Boivin, 1998; Shumow, Vandell, & Posner, 1998). Therefore, one of the most important psychological functions attributed to the family is its contribution to the development of the self-concept of the child (García & Musitu, 1999; Musitu & Allatt, 1994).

Self-esteem is a traditional indicator of psychological adjustment in parenting studies (Barber, 1990; Barber, Chadwick, & Oerter, 1992; Calafat, García, Juan, Becoña, & Fernández-Hermida, 2014; Felson & Zielinsky, 1989; Gecas & Schwalbe, 1986; Martínez, García, & Yubero, 2007).

Several authors have suggested that the same parenting practices can be associated with different objectives of socialization (Rao, McHale, & Pearson, 2003) and that the meaning of the socialization practices can be different according to culture (Grusec, Rudy, & Martini, 1997; Kim & Rohner, 2002). It seems that in a horizontal collectivistic in culturally similar countries to Peru (Gouveia, Alburquerque, Clemente, & Espinosa, 2002; Gouveia, Clemente, & Espinosa, 2003), where emphasis is placed on egalitarian relations (Triandis, 2001), instead of those that are hierarchical as in the United States—characterized by vertical individualism—or Asian cultures-characterized by vertical collectivism—parents' use of strictness and imposition is not necessary to obtain greater internalization of self-transcendence and conservation values as well as optimal self-esteem in adolescents.

From all of this, assimilating behavioural patterns requires the children to identify themselves with their parents. At the beginning this appears as an imitation of the model's behaviour but later on the mutual perception between the interacting members, through communication mechanisms underlying education, allows the effective internalisation of the norms (Ibarra, 1995). Internalization of social norms is referring "to taking over the values and attitudes of society as one's own so that socially acceptable behaviour is motivated not by anticipation of external consequences but by intrinsic or internal factors" (Grusec & Goodnow, 1994) and has been traditionally pointed out as one key of well-developed children (Baumrind, 1993; Martínez & García, 2007, 2008). Martínez and García (2007, 2008) suggested that children’s internalization of values should be measured in terms of prosocial
behavior including consideration for the feelings or needs of others and of moral standards. Several authors recommend to take into account variables of psychological adjustment, like self-esteem, that are required for the internalization of values, because low levels of self-esteem can be an impediment to the internalization of values (Grusec & Goodnow, 1994; Martinez & Garcia, 2007, 2008).

This chapter aims to examine what sort of parenting style (characterized by acceptance/involvement and strictness/imposition) is optimum in a Peruvian context. We could hypothesize, drawing from the literature review, that indulgent parenting style should be the optimum, or even find results similar to that of the authoritative parenting style. Peruvian adolescents would show higher self-esteem and more internalization values that other parenting styles.

**METHODS**

Participants and procedure

Participants in this study were 601 adolescents: 404 girls (67.2%) and 197 boys (32.8%) aged 11 to 18 years ($M = 14.62$ years old, $SD = 1.71$ years old). Data were obtained from four public schools in the city of Lima selected by simple cluster sampling from all education centers. If clusters (i.e., schools) are selected randomly, then the elements within the clusters (i.e., students) are similar to those randomly selected (Kalton, 1983). The headmaster at each school was contacted (all agreed to participate) and parental permissions were obtained (there were only 3% of non-permissions). Students freely chose to participate and they were assured of complete confidentiality. Data were collected using a paper-and-pencil self-administered questionnaire, which was applied collectively to the whole class during a regular class period. The final response rate was 93%.

Measures

Three instruments were applied. Parental socialization Scale (ESPA29) of Musitu & Garcia (2001), Multidimensional Self-esteem Scale (AF5) of Garcia and Musitu (1999) and the Schwartz value questionnaire of Schwartz and colleagues (Schwartz, 1992; Schwartz & Bilsky, 1990).

The parental socialization Scale (ESPA29) of Musitu & Garcia (2001) is based on a two-dimensional theoretical model of parental socialization (Darling & Steinberg, 1993; Maccoby & Martin, 1983). It consists of 212 items that assess the frequency of several parental practices (father’s and mother’s practices were asked about separately), with a 4-point Likert response scale (ranging from “never” to “always”), in 29 different significant situations in Western culture: 13 of them are referred to adolescents’ compliance situations (e.g., “If I behave appropriately at home and don’t interrupt”) and 16 referred to adolescents’ non-compliance situations (e.g., “If I leave home to go somewhere without asking anyone for permission”). For each of the 13 compliance situations, adolescents had to rate the frequency of parental practices of affection (“he/she shows affection”) and indifference (“he/she seems indifferent”). For each of the 16 non-compliance situations, adolescents had to rate the frequency of parental practices of reasoning (“he/she talks to me”), detachment (“it’s the
same to him/her”), verbal scolding (“he/she scolds me”), physical punishment (“he/she spanks me”), and revoking privileges (“he/she takes something away from me”). The family score for acceptance/involvement dimension was obtained by averaging the responses on the practices of affection, reasoning, indifference, and detachment (in the last two practices, the scores were inverted because they are negatively related to the dimension) of both parents. The factor structure of this scale has been previously confirmed in several studies with different samples of Spain and Brazil (Martinez et al., 2011; Martínez et al., 2012; Martínez, Musitu, García, & Camino, 2003; Musitu & García, 2001). In addition, the implicit assumption that the structure of the instrument was invariant across age and sex was also tested (Martínez et al., 2012), showing how the variations in these variables did not change the relationships assumed by the model (Maccoby & Martin, 1983). Furthermore, this instrument had the advantage of having the two main dimensions being relatively orthogonal (Lim & Lim, 2003, p.21). For the two major dimensions the Cronbach’s alphas were: Acceptance/Involvement, 0.952; Strictness/Imposition, 0.971.

The Multidimensional Self-esteem Scale (AF5) of García & Musitu (1999) is based on the Shavelson’s hierarchical and multidimensional theoretical model (Shavelson, Hubner, & Stanton, 1976). This considers self-esteem to have different, but related aspects, which may be differentially related to various areas of human behaviour. It consists of 30 items with a 99-point response scale (ranging from “complete disagreement” to “complete agreement”), designed to measure five self-esteem dimensions: Academic (e.g., “My teachers think that I am a hard worker”), social (e.g. “I am a friendly person”), emotional (e.g., reversed item, “Many things make me nervous”), family (e.g., “I feel that my parents love me”) and physical (e.g., “I like the way I look”). Higher scores represent a great sense of self-esteem in each of its dimensions. The factor structure of this instrument has been previously confirmed in several studies using exploratory factor analysis with samples of Spain (Cerrato, Sallent, Aznar, Pérez & Carrasco, 2011; García & Musitu, 1999; López-Jáuregui & Oliden, 2009), Brazil (Martínez et al., 2003), and Italy (Marchetti, 1997), and confirmatory factor analysis with samples of Spain (Elosua & Muñiz, 2010; Fuentes et al., 2011a, 2011b; Murgui, García, García, & García, 2012; Tomás & Oliver, 2004), Portugal (García, Musitu, & Veiga, 2006) and Chile (García, Musitu, & Riquelme, 2011).

The Schwartz value questionnaire, CVS, (Menezes & Campos, 1997; Schwartz 1992; Schwartz & Bilsky, 1987, 1990) which Molpeceres (1994) adapted a Spanish version. This questionnaire contains 56 items which measure ten types of different human values based on Schwartz' theory. The scale is formed by a list of phrases which make reference to human values and the importance that each of them has on every value grading them from 1 to 99 (1 being not important in life up to 99 being essential in life). The values measured by the questionnaire are power (e.g., social power, control on others), achievements (e.g., fortune, material possessions), hedonism (e.g., pleasure, desire satisfaction), stimulation (e.g., a varied life full of challenges), universalism (e.g., union with nature), benevolence (e.g., tolerant with other people's ideas), tradition (e.g., respect for tradition, preserve culture), self direction (e.g., independent, self sufficiency), conformity (e.g., humbleness, try to be unnoticed) and security (e.g., family security, security in loved people). At times, these ten values can be grouped into four dimensions: (1) Openness to change: Stimulation, self-direction and some hedonism. (2) Self-enhancement: Achievement, power and some hedonism. (3) Conservation: Security, tradition and conformity. (4) Self-transcendence: Universalism and benevolence. Viewing values as organized along two bipolar dimensions lets us summarize the oppositions
between competing values. One dimension contrasts ‘openness to change’ and ‘conservation’ values. This dimension captures the conflict between values that emphasize independence of thought, action, and feelings and readiness for change (self-direction, stimulation) and values that emphasize order, self-restriction, preservation of the past, and resistance to change (security, conformity, tradition). The second dimension contrasts ‘self-enhancement’ and ‘self-transcendence’ values. This dimension captures the conflict between values that emphasize concern for the welfare and interests of others (universalism, benevolence) and values that emphasize pursuit of one’s own interests and relative success and dominance over others (power, achievement). Hedonism shares elements of both openness to change and self-enhancement.

Their use of specific parental discipline techniques, educational techniques, breeding or socializing, called, parenting styles. The types of interactions between parents and their children differentially affect the internalization of the values of the latter. Such parenting styles affect other aspects of their socialization, ie the process of becoming competent persons and emotional skills and personal criteria that allow them to guide their own actions and contribute to the social community (Grusec & Goodnow, 1994; Grusec, Goodnow, & Kuczynski, 2000).

**Parenting Styles**

The four parenting styles (authoritative, indulgent, authoritarian, and neglectful) were defined by dichotomizing the sample using the median split procedure on the two major dimensions of parenting (acceptance/involvement and strictness/imposition), considering these two variables simultaneously (Lamborn et al., 1991; Steinberg et al., 1994) and controlling for sex and age (Musitu & Garcia, 2001). Authoritative families were those who scored above 50th percentile on both dimensions, indulgent families were those who scored above 50th percentile on acceptance/involvement and below it on strictness/imposition, authoritarian families were below 50th percentile on acceptance/involvement and above it on strictness/imposition, and, finally, neglectful families were below 50th percentile on both dimensions. The independent variable was assigned once the subjects were classified based on the parenting styles' study. This allows us to study the influence of the parenting styles on the self esteem and the internalization of values by the adolescents. The participants’ distribution based on parenting styles were: neglectful, 109 (18.1%); indulgent, 175 (29.1%); authoritarian, 175 (29.1%); and authoritative 116 (19.3%).

**RESULTS**

Two preliminary multivariates analyses of variances were applied with parenting style (indulgent, authoritative, authoritarian and neglectful) as independent variable. One for the five dimensions of the multidimensional measure of self-esteem and another with variables of the internalization of values. The values measured by the questionnaire were that best defines the psychosocial adjustments: Conservation (security -e.g., family security, security in loved people-, tradition -e.g., respect for tradition, preserve culture- and conformity -e.g., humbleness, try to be unnoticed-) and Self-transcendence (universalism -e.g., union with
nature- and benevolence -e.g., tolerant with other people's ideas-). The MANOVA results yielded significant main effects on five self-esteem measures and six variables of the internalization of values (α = .05). Hence, the univariate effects were examined.

Regarding the effects of parenting style on self-esteem (see Table 1), self-esteem had statistically significant effect of parenting style in social, \( F(3, 574) = 5.162, p < .05 \), emotional \( F(3, 574) = 6.416, p < .001 \), and family, \( F(3, 574) = 23.955, p < .001 \), but had not statistically significant effect of parenting style in academic, \( F(3, 574) = 2.064, p = .104 \), and physical, \( F(3, 574) = 1.344, p = .259 \).

Adolescents who characterized their parents as indulgents \((M = 7.12, SD = 1.52)\), authoritarian \((M = 6.93, SD = 1.65)\) or authoritative \((M = 6.98, SD = 1.51)\) obtained higher scores in social self-esteem than adolescents from neglectful families \((M = 6.55, SD = 1.49)\), whereas adolescents from indulgent families scored higher in this self-esteem dimension than the others homes. With respect to emotional dimension of self-esteem, adolescents from neglectful \((M = 5.01, SD = 2.31)\), indulgent \((M = 5.69, SD = 2.09)\) or authoritative families \((M = 5.27, SD = 1.94)\) scored higher than those adolescents who defined their parents as authoritarian \((M = 4.71, SD = 2.18)\), whereas adolescents from indulgent families scored higher in emotional self-esteem than the other homes. Finally, for family self-esteem the same results as for emotional self-esteem were obtained adolescents from neglectful \((M = 6.79, SD = 1.90)\), indulgent \((M = 7.81, SD = 1.98)\) or authoritative families \((M = 7.44, SD = 1.76)\), scored higher than those adolescents who defined their parents as authoritarian \((M = 6.32, SD = 1.82)\), whereas adolescents from indulgent families scored higher in emotional self-esteem than the others homes.

Regarding the main effects of parental socialization and internalization values (see Table 2), the results show that there are effects of parenting styles, these are: Achievement \( F(3, 574) = 3.698, p < .05 \), universalism, \( F(3, 574) = 2.586, p < .01 \), benevolence, \( F(3, 574) = 5.542, p < .001 \), tradition, \( F(3, 574) = 2.835, p < .05 \), conformity, \( F(3, 574) = 3.922, p < .01 \), self-directions \( F(3, 574) = 3.698, p < .05 \), and security, \( F(3, 574) = 4.572, p < .01 \). The rest of the dimensions: Achievement, \( F(3, 574) = 2.586, p > .05 \), power, \( F(3, 574) = 0.058, p > .05 \), and stimulation/hedonism, \( F(3, 574) = 1.750, p > .05 \) did not reach statistical significance.

With respect to self-transcendence values, as shown in Table 2, adolescents from authoritative \((M = 7.17, SD = 1.88)\) and neglectful homes \((M = 7.07, SD = 1.78)\) gave higher priority to universalism values than adolescents from authoritarian homes \((M = 6.74, SD = 1.85)\); whereas adolescents from indulgent families \((M = 7.40, SD = 1.77)\) scored higher in these values than the other homes. The same results obtained with benevolence, adolescents from authoritative \((M = 7.54, SD = 1.84)\) and neglectful homes \((M = 7.32, SD = 1.83)\) gave higher priority to universalism values than adolescents from authoritative homes \((M = 7.01, SD = 1.90)\); whereas adolescents from indulgent families \((M = 7.78, SD = 1.60)\) scored higher in these values than the other homes.

With regard to conservation values, the results had a similar tendency to that of self-transcendence values. First, adolescents from authoritative \((M = 7.42, SD = 1.87)\) and neglectful homes \((M = 7.07, SD = 1.88)\) gave higher priority to conformity values than adolescents from authoritarian homes \((M = 7.05, SD = 1.94)\); whereas adolescents from indulgent families \((M = 7.73, SD = 1.75)\) scored higher in these values than the other homes. Second, adolescents from authoritative \((M = 6.66, SD = 1.91)\) and neglectful families \((M = 6.70, SD = 1.78)\) gave higher priority to tradition values than those from authoritative families \((M = 6.47, SD = 1.83)\); whereas adolescents from indulgent families \((M = 7.03, SD = 1.77)\)
assigned higher priority to tradition scored higher in these values than the others homes. Finally, adolescents from authoritative ($M = 7.38, SD = 1.60$) and neglectful parents ($M = 7.14, SD = 1.70$) gave higher priority to security values than adolescents from authoritarian families ($M = 6.83, SD = 1.95$), whereas adolescents from indulgent families ($M = 7.48, SD = 1.66$) scored higher in security values.

Therefore, in general, indulgent, authoritative, and neglectful parenting was associated with higher adolescents’ priority to self-transcendence and conservation values than authoritarian parenting.

**CONCLUSION**

This study analyzed the relationships between parenting styles and the psychosocial adjustment of Peruvian adolescents, using the two-dimensional four-typology framework of parental socialization (Maccoby & Martin, 1983). The central hypothesis of this research was that the indulgent styles, characterized by acceptance/involvement but not strictness/imposition, was related to better psychosocial adjustment than the authoritarian and neglectful style and even better, or at the least indistinguishable, from the authoritative parenting style. Hence, the current findings add to a growing body of empirical research that questioned the idea that the authoritative style is always related to the best psychosocial adjustment of adolescents (Lamborn et al., 1991; Maccoby & Martin, 1983; Steinberg et al., 1989). The indulgent and authoritative parental socialization styles are both characterized by acceptance/involvement. However, the current findings add to research that supported the importance of using practices such as parental warmth and bidirectional communication for the optimal psychosocial adjustment of adolescents (Garcia & Gracia, 2009, 2010; Torre et al., 2011). A possible explanation may be due to the fact that in the Peruvian culture, considered as horizontal collectivist, even if the children are very connected with their families, the relationship among different generations is expected to be more egalitarian than in vertical collectivist cultures (such as the Asiatic or Arabic ones) or individualistic (e.g., American). In this sense, the use of strictness, punishment, imposition and control in Peruvian culture, is perceived by children as an intrusive and coercive parenting practice, and not as a component of mind and responsibility from parents for their children (Dwairy et al., 2006; Garcia & Gracia, 2009, 2010, 2014; Martinez & Garcia, 2007, 2008; White & Schnurr, 2012). In the Peruvian culture, considering the four parental styles, adolescents from indulgent families, characterized by acceptance/involvement but not strictness/imposition, had better outcomes than adolescents from authoritative families. One could say that parental strictness is not related to better adjustment of adolescents in the Peruvian culture.
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Table 1.

Means and (Standards Deviations), Univariate Analysis of Variance between a Multidimensional Measure of Self Esteem with Parenting Style

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Neglectful</th>
<th>Indulgent</th>
<th>Authoritarian</th>
<th>Authoritative</th>
<th>F(3, 574)</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic</td>
<td>6.17 (1.94)</td>
<td>6.67 (1.96)</td>
<td>6.24 (2.02)</td>
<td>6.31 (1.73)</td>
<td>2.064</td>
<td>.104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>6.55 (1.49)</td>
<td>7.12 (1.52)</td>
<td>6.93 (1.65)</td>
<td>6.98 (1.51)</td>
<td>3.162</td>
<td>.024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional</td>
<td>5.01 (2.31)</td>
<td>5.69 (2.09)</td>
<td>4.71 (2.18)</td>
<td>5.27 (1.94)</td>
<td>6.416</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td>6.79 (1.90)</td>
<td>7.81 (1.58)</td>
<td>6.32 (1.82)</td>
<td>7.44 (1.76)</td>
<td>23.955</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical</td>
<td>6.16 (1.90)</td>
<td>6.59 (1.80)</td>
<td>6.43 (1.80)</td>
<td>6.34 (1.75)</td>
<td>1.344</td>
<td>.259</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Bonferroni’s Test post-hoc ($\alpha = .05$): 1 > 2.
Table 2.

Means and (Standards Deviations), Univariate Analysis of Variance between a Multidimensional Measure of Self Esteem with Parenting Style

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Neglectful</th>
<th>Indulgent</th>
<th>Authoritarian</th>
<th>Authoritative</th>
<th>F(3, 573)</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self-direction</td>
<td>7.07 (1.73)(^1)</td>
<td>7.35 (1.77)(^1)</td>
<td>6.74 (1.85)(^2)</td>
<td>7.22 (1.74)(^2)</td>
<td>3.698</td>
<td>.012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement</td>
<td>6.58 (1.71)</td>
<td>6.78 (1.90)</td>
<td>6.22 (1.98)</td>
<td>6.52 (1.94)</td>
<td>2.586</td>
<td>.052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universalism</td>
<td>7.07 (1.78)(^1)</td>
<td>7.40 (1.77)(^1)</td>
<td>6.74 (1.85)(^2)</td>
<td>7.17 (1.88)(^2)</td>
<td>3.988</td>
<td>.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benevolence</td>
<td>7.32 (1.83)(^1)</td>
<td>7.78 (1.60)(^1)</td>
<td>7.01 (1.90)(^2)</td>
<td>7.54 (1.84)(^1)</td>
<td>5.542</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tradition</td>
<td>6.70 (1.78)(^1)</td>
<td>7.03 (1.77)(^1)</td>
<td>6.47 (1.83)(^2)</td>
<td>6.66 (1.91)(^1)</td>
<td>2.835</td>
<td>.038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conformity</td>
<td>7.07 (1.88)(^1)</td>
<td>7.73 (1.75)(^1)</td>
<td>7.05 (1.94)(^2)</td>
<td>7.42 (1.87)(^1)</td>
<td>3.922</td>
<td>.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security</td>
<td>7.14 (1.70)(^1)</td>
<td>7.48 (1.66)(^1)</td>
<td>6.83 (1.95)(^2)</td>
<td>7.38 (1.60)(^1)</td>
<td>4.572</td>
<td>.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power</td>
<td>5.65 (2.02)</td>
<td>5.69 (2.00)</td>
<td>5.73 (1.91)</td>
<td>5.75 (2.00)</td>
<td>0.058</td>
<td>.982</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stim./Hedonism</td>
<td>5.33 (2.72)</td>
<td>5.20 (2.86)</td>
<td>5.70 (2.83)</td>
<td>5.00 (2.57)</td>
<td>1.750</td>
<td>.156</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Bonferroni's Test post-hoc (\(\alpha = .05\)): 1 > 2.
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ABSTRACT

The study of parental socialization during adolescence and its effects on adolescent’s adjustment has been a common topic of research in family studies, but these relationships have been less examined in at-risk families. These families are characterized by a great heterogeneity, but most of them usually face an extensive diversity of difficulties (including economic pressure, accumulation of stressful life events, lack of personal empowerment…) that undermine parenting practices, which, in turn, threaten children and adolescent adjustment. The purpose of this chapter is to explore the associations between parenting styles and internalizing and externalizing problems in a sample of 445 adolescents, half of them living in families at psychosocial risk recipients of psychosocial interventions for family preservation in Social and Community Services in Spain. A series of bivariate and multivariate analyses were computed in order to explore the associations between adolescents’ maladjustment and parenting styles in the at-risk and not-at-risk samples, taking into account sex and age of the adolescent. Results obtained show that parenting styles are significantly related to adolescents’ adjustment, especially for externalizing problems, in both samples. Data analyses also suggest that indulgent style (based on affection and dialogue but not on parental coercion) emerge as the most favorable pattern of parental socialization, since seems to work as a protective factor for externalizing problems in both at-risk and not-at-risk families.
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INTRODUCTION

Parenting has historically been one of the focuses of developmental psychology. The study of parental socialization and developmental outcomes is currently understood from ecological, transactional, and systemic perspectives. Hence, the influence of parenting on child and adolescent adjustment is the reflection of a reciprocal process unfolding over time, which cannot be reduced to parents’ actions performed in a specific situation. Furthermore, these interactions are considered within a complex and multivariate process of functioning in which other intrapersonal, interpersonal, and contextual factors are present. In the case of adolescence, empirical evidence supports the primacy of parental socialization on psychosocial adjustment, without underestimating the existence of other relevant development contexts, such as peers (Steinberg & Silk, 2002). Many professionals have shown interest in the study of parental socialization during adolescence for two reasons: (1) at this period, parents tend to change their way of parenting in order to adjust to the teenagers’ and their own new needs and interests (Collins & Steinberg, 2006; Shek, 2000); (2) parenting continues to protect the course of positive development years after infancy (Grant et al., 2006). Although several investigations have associated parental socialization with adjustment problems in adolescence, few studies have analyzed this relationship in at-risk families, and fewer still in the Spanish context.

Parenting and Psychosocial Adjustment in Adolescence

In contrast to the classic approaches attempting to identify the consequences of parenting styles on children's development as a one-directional process, socialization practices are currently understood as dynamic and bidirectional interactions that are influenced by personal, interaction, and circumstantial factors (Rodrigo, Byrne & Rodriguez, 2014). Accordingly, there is empirical evidence of differences in educational style as a function of the parents' specific characteristics (such as age, personality, or educational level), the children's characteristics (such as age and sex), and contextual variables (such as the sociocultural context in which the children are socialized) (Belsky & Jafee, 2006).

In accordance with current models, Musitu and Garcia (2001) have developed a theoretical model of parental socialization with two general dimensions (acceptance/involvement and strictness/imposition) the confluence of which allows distinguishing among four qualitatively different types of parenting styles in adolescence: authoritative (acceptance/involvement and strictness/imposition), indulgent (acceptance/involvement but low level of strictness/imposition), authoritarian (strictness/imposition but low level of acceptance/involvement), and neglectful (low levels of acceptance/involvement and strictness/imposition). These authors propose an instrument — The Parental Socialization Scale for Adolescents (ESPA29)— for the assessment of parental socialization in adolescence, using 29 situations representative of everyday family life: 13 compliance situations (e.g., “A teacher calls your mother and tells her that you are behaving well in class”) and 16 non-compliance situations (e.g., “you arrive home late”). In each of the compliance situations, the adolescent has to rate the parenting practices of Affection (“my mother shows affection”) and Indifference (“my mother seems indifferent”), and in each of the non-compliance situations, they rate the parenting practices of Dialogue (“my mother
talks to me”), Detachment (“my mother doesn’t tell me anything”), Verbal Scolding (“my mother scolds me”), Physical Punishment (“my mother spanks me”), and Revoking Privileges (“my mother takes something away from me”). This scale consists of 116 items rated on a response scale ranging from 1 (never) to 4 (always). The instrument provides scores on the two general parenting dimensions and the four parenting styles described previously. Adequate psychometric properties of the ESPA29 have been found in several studies in European countries (López-Jáuregui & Elosua, 2009; Nunes, Luis, Lemos, & Musitu, 2015) and Brazil (Martinez, García, & Yubero, 2012).

The relation between parental socialization and adolescent adjustment from a typological perspective is highly supported empirically. Previous studies suggest that authoritative parenting is the most beneficial style for adolescents’ psychosocial adjustment, whereas neglectful parenting is potentially the most harmful (Rodrigo et al., 2014; Steinberg, Lamborn, Darling, Mounts, & Dornbusch, 1994). Many studies have confirmed these results, but studies conducted in Spain with the ESPA29 maintain that the parenting style characterized by high levels of acceptance/involvemnt and low levels of strictness/imposition—that is, the indulgent style— is related to better youth outcomes or, at least, indistinguishable outcomes from the authoritative model (García & Gracia, 2009; Musitu & García, 2005). A cross-cultural perspective may explain the discrepancies found between countries. Thus, an indulgent style could obtain scores on different outcomes equal to or higher than the authoritative style in collectivist cultures like some southern European and South American countries because these cultures emphasize cooperativeness and egalitarian relations, in contrast to predominantly individualistic cultures (García & Gracia, 2014). However, these differences could also be explained by the different measuring instruments used to assess parenting styles and adolescent adjustment. In this regard, more research is needed to clarify the findings of this relationship, controlling for the culture and assessment measures used.

Parenting and Adolescent Adjustment in Families at Psychosocial Risk

According to current risk and protective models, family functioning is considered complex and multilevel. The label “at-risk families” can undoubtedly cover a wide variety of family situations, and we concur with Rodrigo, Máiquez, Martín, and Byrne (2008) in defining these families as: “Those in which the persons responsible for the care and education of the minor, due to personal and relational circumstances, are neglectful of their parental functions or use them inappropriately, compromising or prejudicing the minor’s personal and social development, but without the situation attaining a degree of severity that would justify a foster care order whereby it would be appropriate to separate the minor from his or her family.” (p. 42). It is well known that members of these families are embedded in trajectories of risk where the available resources are barely able to deal with the difficulties. These complications are present not only in adults but also in children and adolescents who grow up in these adverse contexts.

Most teenagers who grow up in at-risk families undergo prolonged stress, which could have a negative influence on their functioning. Psychosocial stress, related to cumulative stressful life events, has been proposed as a risk factor for adolescent maladjustment (Kim, Conger, Elder, & Lorenz, 2003). Adolescents in general are more vulnerable to psychosocial stress, but this might be especially true for adolescents living in adverse family
circumstances. These youths are exposed to a variety of stressful life events over time which weaken their personal coping strategies (Cowan, Cowan, & Schultz, 1996; Osofsky & Thompson, 2000). These trajectories of risk and lack of available resources could explain the emergence of behavior problems in adolescents (McLoyd, 1998; Rodrigo et al., 2004). For example, several studies have reported a strong association between adolescents’ accumulation of stressful life events and internalizing and externalizing problems in at-risk families (Costello, Keeler, & Angold, 2001; Fergusson, Horwood, & Lynskey, 1997).

Many elements act as protective factors against the negative effects of stressful circumstances (Cumming, Davies, & Campbell, 2000). Thus, some studies reveal the normal or even higher than normal development of males and females living in the most adverse settings (Grant et al., 2006; Luthar, 2006). During adolescence, parental socialization is considered an important protective factor for adolescent development (López & Brennan, 2000).

There are still some gaps in the study of adolescents growing up in at-risk families. According to the available data, at-risk families are characterized by inadequate parenting practices (Rodrigo et al., 2008). Usually, these families use harsh and punitive parental practices in the relationship with their children (McLoyd, Jayaratne, Ceballo, & Borquez, 1994; Pinderhughes, Dodge, Bates, Pettit, & Zelli, 2000; Rodrigo et al., 2008). Some authors argue that this type of parental behavior pattern is due to family distress suffered by parents in these contexts (Conger et al., 1992, 1993; DeGarmo, Forgatch, & Martínez, 1999; Luthar, 1999). Taking into account other studies conducted with non-adverse families, these educational practices could be related to negative adjustment indicators. However, the available empirical evidence is limited or produces contradictory results in this regard.

There has been some speculation about whether the authoritarian style is adaptive and beneficial for adolescents’ well-being in specific social contexts, for example, dangerous neighborhoods (Baumrind, 1991). In an at-risk context, parenting practices based on strictness and coercion could guarantee the safety of children and adolescents. On the basis of this assumption, some studies have shown that low levels of autonomy-granting, high parental restriction and punitive parenting are beneficial practices for adolescents living in high-risk communities as compared with those growing up in low-risk communities, especially regarding externalizing problems (e.g., Baldwin, Baldwin, & Cole, 1990). The cultural differences in terms of childrearing goals and socialization practices may reflect parents’ specific adaptive solutions to problems posed by the demands of a particular environment. However, some authors have found no differences in the association between parenting styles and developmental outcomes when comparing adolescents of violent neighborhoods and other teenagers (Gracia, Fuentes, García, & Lila, 2012).

Available results suggest that there is no unique parenting style that is suitable for all adolescents and every family. It is therefore necessary to explore specific relationships between parenting styles and problem behaviors in different contexts, without generalizing the results found in not-at-risk families to at-risk families. This is the purpose of this chapter and, in the next section, we present data from a research conducted in Spain that will hopefully lead to further study of adolescents growing up in at-risk families.
Objective

The aim of this study is to analyze the moderating role of family risk in the relationship between parenting styles and adolescents' psychosocial maladjustment.

METHODS

Participants

A total of 445 adolescents (ages 11 to 17 years old) from Seville (Spain) who grew up in a variety of family situations participated in this research. Participation was voluntary, confidentiality was guaranteed, and the participants signed an informed consent form. Participants were divided into two groups, similar in age, \( F(1, 443) = 0.072, p = .789 \), and sex, \( \chi^2(1, N = 445) = 0.41, p = .393 \), depending on whether or not their families were recipients of intervention for family preservation.

At-risk sample (R): 225 adolescents, 99 females and 121 males, with a mean age of 13.63 years (SD = 1.83), living in families declared at-risk and receiving psychosocial intervention for Family Preservation Services. The mothers’ mean age was 41.27 years (SD = 7.57), 71.3% had completed primary school (low), 23.1% had finished secondary school (medium), and 4.7% had university education (high). The women’s percentage of employment was 61.51%. There was an average of 2.32 (SD = 0.97) children under 18 in these homes, and 50.23% were single-mother families.

Not-at-risk sample (NR): 220 adolescents, 111 females and 114 males, living in families that were not recipients of intervention from Social and Community Services. These participants were recruited from public schools of Seville (Spain), and had a mean age of 13.68 years (SD = 1.97). The adolescents’ mothers mean age was 43.02 years (SD = 5.99) and their educational level was 35% low, 38% medium, and 27% high. The percentage of mothers’ employment was 63.51%. An average of 1.91 children (under 18 years) lived in these homes, and the percentage of single-mother families was 9.78%.

Measures

The main instruments used for this research were the Parental Socialization Scale for Adolescents (ESPA29, Musitu & García, 2001) to assess the mothers’ parenting style, and the Youth Self-Report (YSR, Achenbach, 1991) to assess psychosocial maladjustment in adolescence. The ESPA29 is described above, and the YSR consists of 112 items with response options ranging from 0 (not true) to 2 (very true), which measure eight behavior problems: Withdrawn (e.g., “I would rather be alone than with others”), Somatic complaints (e.g., “I feel dizzy or lightheaded”), Anxiety and depression (e.g., “I cry a lot), Social problems (e.g., “I’m too dependent on adults”), Thought problems (e.g., “I see things that other people think aren’t there”), Attention problems (e.g., “I feel confused or in a fog”), Aggressive behavior (e.g., “I destroy things belonging to others”), and Rule-breaking behaviors (e.g., “I steal from places other than home”). The first three subscales correspond to Internalizing problems, whereas the last two correspond to Externalizing problems.
RESULTS

Previous Analyses

A short version of a self-report designed by Oliva, Jiménez, Parra, and Sánchez-Queija (2008) was used to assess the presence of 15 stressful life events faced in the last five years. Results obtained show that, similar to previous studies (Evans & English, 2002; Guerra, Huesmann, Tolan, Van Acker, & Eron, 1995; Wadsby, Svedin, & Sydsjö, 2007), adolescents growing up in at-risk families experience many difficulties and negative life events. There was statistically significant difference, $F(1, 440) = 30.71, p < .001$, between the number of stressful live events experienced by the at-risk adolescents ($M_R = 4.81, SD_R = 2.66$) and the not-at-risk sample ($M_{NR} = 3.54, SD_{NR} = 2.14$). Thus, results showed higher percentages for stressful events in the at-risk group, such as parents’ divorce ($R = 7.59\%$, $NR = 36.24\%$), parent’s new partner ($R = 5.80\%$, $NR = 24.31\%$), moving ($R = 21.87\%$, $NR = 43.58\%$), financial problems ($R = 21.43\%$, $NR = 37.61\%$), family member leaving home ($R = 20.98\%$, $NR = 38.53\%$), addiction suffered by a close relative ($R = 13.84\%$, $NR = 26.60\%$), and serious illness or accident ($R = 10.71\%$, $NR = 17.89\%$).

Before comparing the association between adolescents’ maladjustment and parenting styles in at-risk and not-at-risk samples, differences on both dimensions were examined separately. With respect to parental socialization, four parenting styles (authoritative, indulgent, authoritarian, and neglectful) were defined by dichotomizing, with the median split procedure, the two major parenting dimensions (acceptance/involvement and strictness/imposition) considering these two variables simultaneously, and controlling for sex, age, and sample of adolescents. Both dimensions were relatively correlated in at-risk, $r(220) = .294, p < .001$, and not at-risk adolescents, $r(225) = .199, p = .003$. The distribution of the families across the four parenting styles was homogeneous for each sample. No associations were found when crossing mothers’ parenting style with sex, $\chi^2(3, N = 445) = 1.88, p = .597$, age, $F(3, 441) = 0.017, p = .997$, and sample, $\chi^2(3, N = 445) = 0.25, p = .969$. Table 1 shows the means obtained for the two parental dimensions in each of the four parenting styles. Statistically significant differences were found between the two samples (at-risk and not-at-risk) on acceptance/involvement for the neglectful, $F(1, 126) = 5.37, p = .022$, and authoritarian styles, $F(1, 94) = 7.32, p = .008$. Thus, both neglectful and authoritarian mothers of at-risk families showed lower warmth, affection, and communication towards their teenagers in comparison to mothers of not-at-risk families. It is noteworthy that these differences were related to the two parenting styles associated with worse outcomes, and particularly regarding the parental dimension acceptance/involvement, which has proven to be especially critical for psychosocial adjustment regardless of characteristics of the child and of the sociocultural context (García & Gracia, 2014; Rodrigo et al., 2014).

Regarding psychosocial maladjustment, at-risk adolescents had higher scores both for internalizing, $F(1,440) = 13.38, p < .001$, and externalizing behavior problems, $F(1,437) = 27.88, p < .001$, than the not-at-risk group. Consistent with previous studies (Hoffman, Powlsisha & White, 2004; Moffitt, Caspi, Rutter & Silva, 2001), both outcome measures were significantly correlated, $r(439) = .382, p < .001$, indicating that internalizing and externalizing problems co-occur. Moreover, bivariate correlations were computed in order to explore the associations between age and psychosocial maladjustment. Results showed a significant
relation between age and externalizing problems, \( r(439) = .200, p < .001 \), but not with internalizing problems, \( r(442) = .089, p = .060 \).

**4 × 2 × 2 factorial MANCOVA**

Some empirical evidence suggests that the consequences of parenting styles tend to be different depending on the context and circumstances in which the relationships between parents and adolescents take place (Baumrind, 1991). Some researchers suggest that these differences in styles might be due to parenting linked to cultural and social characteristics. The relationship between parenting and adolescent outcomes in at-risk families in Spain has not received enough attention. To explore the relationships between different parenting styles and developmental outcomes, a MANCOVA was computed with internalizing and externalizing problems as dependent variables and parenting styles (neglectful, indulgent, authoritarian and authoritative), group (at-risk vs. not-at-risk) and sex (female vs. male) as independent variables, and age as covariate. Follow-up univariate F-tests were conducted with the outcome variables that revealed significant global multivariate differences and significant results on the univariate tests were followed with Bonferroni’s comparisons between all possible pairs of means. Results of these analyses yielded three main effects and one significant interaction effect (see Table 2).

**Main effects of parenting styles.** Inter-subject contrasts showed significant main effect of maternal parenting styles for externalizing problems, \( F(3, 439) = 6.26, p < .001, \eta^2_{\text{partial}} = .043 \), but not for internalizing problems. With respect to the former, adolescents who described their mothers as indulgent (\( M = 10.42, SD = 7.73 \)) reported significantly lower scores than did adolescents of authoritarian (\( M = 13.74, SD = 8.64 \)) and neglectful mothers (\( M = 4.64, SD = 9.10 \)), but such differences were not found in authoritative mothers (\( M = 12.50, SD = 6.74 \)).

These results are in line with the general view of European and Latin American countries, in which authoritative and indulgent styles tend to be related to adolescents’ better psychosocial adjustment in comparison authoritarian and neglectful styles (i.e., Alonso-Geta, 2012; De la Torre, Casanova, García, Carpio & Cerezo, 2011; Wolfradt, Hempel, & Miles, 2003). Nevertheless, these differences were not observed for internalizing problems. Several arguments could explain the lack of this association: (a) internalizing problems refer to a private dimension influenced by multilevel interactive factors (biological and social) during adolescence (Gray & Steinberg, 1999; Oliva, Parra, & Reina, 2014); (b) in contrast to externalizing problems, internalizing behaviors are not easily identified by others and thus, parents may not recognize adolescents’ internalizing problems and may fail to react to them (Lorence, Hidalgo, & Dekovic, 2013); (c) some studies have found that the prediction of internalizing problems varies when controlling for their covariance with externalizing behaviors (Callahan, Scaramella, Laird, & Shor-Preston, 2011; Lorence et al., 2013).

**Main effects of sample.** At-risk adolescents obtained higher scores both in externalizing, \( F(1, 439) = 30.51, p < .001, \eta^2_{\text{partial}} = .067 \), and internalizing problems, \( F(1, 439) = 16.32, p < .001, \eta^2_{\text{partial}} = .037 \), than adolescents from not-at-risk families. These results coincide with other studies in at-risk population reporting that adolescents who grow up in adverse circumstances show worse psychosocial adjustment than their peers (Appleyard, Egeland, Van Dulmen, & Sroufe, 2005; Costello, Keeler, & Angold, 2002; Deater-Deackard, Dodge, 2003).
Bates, & Pettit, 1998; Sameroff, 2000). These adolescents’ vulnerability for behavior problems could be explained by the psychosocial stress they frequently face and by the lack of psychological and cognitive maturity necessary to successfully cope with it (Aneshensel & Gore, 1991; Casullo, 1998).

**Main effects of sex.** Females scored higher in internalizing problems than males, $F(1, 439) = 17.15, p < .001, \eta^2_{\text{partial}} = .039$, but there were no differences for externalizing problems. Consistent with the literature, internalizing problems were more present in females than in males (Aalsma & Lapsely, 2001; Bonger, Koot, Van der Ende & Verhulst, 2003; Hankin, Abramson, Moffitt, Silva, McGee et al., 1998; Reitz, Dekovic & Meijer, 2005). Regarding externalizing problems, no sex differences were found, which is not consistent with previous studies highlighting the prevalence of this type of problems in males versus females (Achenbach 1991; Sandoval, Lemos, & Vallejo, 2006; Zubeidat, Fernández-Parra, Ortega, Vallejo, & Sierra, 2009). However, some studies also reported no sex differences (Reitz et al., 2005; Yakin & McMahon, 2003). Some authors indicate that the similar levels of external adjustment in both sexes could be due to the females’ tendency to resemble the males in all developmental areas (Sánchez-Queija, 2007), whereas other researchers point to a methodological problem in the assessment of external maladjustment, which includes a large variety of maladaptive behaviors rather than a behavioral change in adolescents (Jiménez, 2009).

**Interaction effect between parenting style, sample, and sex.** Univariate $F$-tests showed a significant Parenting style $\times$ Sample $\times$ Sex interaction effect for externalizing problems, $F(3, 439) = 4.33, p = .005, \eta^2_{\text{partial}} = .030$, but not for internalizing ones. Subsequently, diverse analyses were performed taking into account the levels of the three interaction variables. No sex differences were found in either sample comparing the externalizing scores regarding different parenting styles. The most interesting results were those comparing externalizing scores of the four parenting styles between samples, distinguishing females and males. The means for the different levels of the three variables (parenting style, sample, and sex) are represented as figures (Figure 1 and 2) to facilitate the interpretation of the interaction.

Subsequent ANOVAs were computed to compare parenting styles between at-risk and not-at-risk adolescents, with differential analyses for males and females (a total of 16 ANOVAs). Bonferroni’s comparison indicated that at-risk females who perceived their mothers as neglectful, $F(1,56) = 10.35, p = .002$, presented more externalizing problems in comparison with the other groups of females. Males with authoritarian, $F(1,46) = 14.03, p < .001$, and authoritative mothers, $F(1,67) = 7.43, p = .008$, obtained higher scores in external maladjustment in the at-risk sample than in the not-at-risk group. In all cases, these differences were detriment for external adjustment of at-risk adolescents.

Differences in externalizing scores between at-risk and not-at-risk adolescents by sex were found for neglectful, authoritarian, and authoritative styles, but not for the indulgent style. Results showed that adolescents of indulgent mothers presented similar external adjustment in both samples, independently of sex. In others words, the existence of risk in the family context did not moderate the relationship between indulgent style and psychosocial adjustment for males or females, unlike the relationship found in the other styles.
CONCLUSION

Considering all the above data, this research supports the association of parenting with adolescent adjustment, specifically with externalizing problems. From a typological perspective, the authoritative and indulgent styles emerge as the most favorable in relation to external adjustment, whereas the neglectful and authoritarian styles are related to high scores on externalizing problems. Further, the indulgent style, based on affection and dialogue but not on parental coercion, could be considered a protective factor for females and males of Spanish families, both at risk and not at risk. That is, the indulgent style is associated with better outcomes regardless of the sex of adolescents and of family circumstances. The results with at-risk Spanish families revealed in this chapter not only strengthen the previous findings with other families, but also serve as an important guide for the design of interventions to prevent or reduce problem behaviors in adolescents growing up in at-risk contexts. The strengthening of indulgent and authoritative parenting, especially the former, is a key challenge for promoting psychosocial adjustment, independently of the level of adversity of the family in which they are growing up. In this sense, family preservation interventions that are currently carried out with at-risk families should include among their goals the promotion of educational practices based on affection and non coercive control, as this is the best way to optimize the psychological adjustment of adolescents growing up in these family contexts.
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Table 1.

Descriptive Statistics of Parenting Styles of Mothers of At-risk and Not-at-risk Families

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N (%)</th>
<th>Acceptance/involvement M (SD)</th>
<th>Strictness/Imposition M (SD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Neglectful</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>66 (29.33)</td>
<td>2.43 (0.45)</td>
<td>1.67 (0.27)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NR</td>
<td>62 (28.18)</td>
<td>2.60 (0.39)</td>
<td>1.71 (0.23)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indulgent</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>48 (21.33)</td>
<td>3.28 (0.39)</td>
<td>1.68 (0.26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NR</td>
<td>49 (22.27)</td>
<td>3.38 (0.29)</td>
<td>1.71 (0.25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Authoritarian</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>47 (20.89)</td>
<td>2.49 (0.37)</td>
<td>2.28 (0.37)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NR</td>
<td>49 (22.27)</td>
<td>2.68 (0.31)</td>
<td>2.35 (0.33)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Authoritative</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>64 (28.44)</td>
<td>3.37 (0.36)</td>
<td>2.31 (0.32)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NR</td>
<td>60 (27.27)</td>
<td>3.28 (0.26)</td>
<td>2.00 (0.41)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* (R) At-risk sample, (NR) Not-at-risk sample
Table 2.

**Multivariate Analysis of Covariance**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pillai’s Trace</th>
<th>$F$</th>
<th>$p$</th>
<th>$\eta^2_{\text{partial}}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.054</td>
<td>$F(2, 421) = 11.92$</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>.054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A) Parenting Style</td>
<td>.057</td>
<td>$F(6, 844) = 4.14$</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>.029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(B) Sample</td>
<td>.077</td>
<td>$F(2, 421) = 17.63$</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>.077</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(C) Sex</td>
<td>.054</td>
<td>$F(2, 421) = 11.91$</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>.054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A $\times$ B</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>$F(6, 844) = 0.64$</td>
<td>.696</td>
<td>.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A $\times$ C</td>
<td>.017</td>
<td>$F(6, 844) = 1.21$</td>
<td>.301</td>
<td>.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B $\times$ C</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>$F(2, 421) = 2.76$</td>
<td>.065</td>
<td>.013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A $\times$ B $\times$ C</td>
<td>.031</td>
<td>$F(6, 844) = 2.24$</td>
<td>.038</td>
<td>.016</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* (A) $a_1$, neglectful; $a_2$, indulgent; $a_3$, authoritarian; $a_4$, authoritative. (B) $b_1$, not-at-risk; $b_2$, at-risk. (C) $c_1$, female; $c_2$, male.
**FIGURE CAPTIONS**

*Parenting Styles and Externalizing Problems: Females*

*Parenting Styles and Externalizing Problems: Males*
This chapter analyzes the relationship between parenting styles and offspring’s psychological adjustment between different generations. Psychological adjustment was assessed by self-concept and self-esteem, and psychosocial adjustment was assessed by offspring’s priority by values and commitment to human rights. Five hundred twenty-six Spanish participants were divided in two groups: 309 adolescents (12-17 years old, $M = 14.36$ years, $SD = 1.69$), and 217 elderly (60-75 years old, $M = 63.38$ years, $SD = 3.45$ years). Psychological adjustment results indicated that offspring from indulgent families scored higher than offspring from other parenting styles, and elderly scored higher than adolescents in academic self-concept and self-esteem. Psychosocial adjustment results indicated that offspring from indulgent and authoritative families scored higher than offspring from neglectful families in priority by benevolence and conformity values. Offspring from authoritative families scored higher than offspring from authoritarian and neglectful families in tradition values. Offspring from authoritative families scored higher than offspring from neglectful families in security values; and elderly scored higher than adolescents in priority by universalism, benevolence and conformity values. Human rights results indicated that offspring from neglectful families scored lower than offspring from other parenting styles in commitment to human rights; and finally, elderly scored higher than adolescents in commitment to human rights.

**Keywords:** Parenting styles, Psychological Adjustment, Psychosocial Adjustment, Values, Human Rights
INTRODUCTION

Socialization processes have been a theme of utmost interest to psychology. As through them individuals acquire notions about social regulation, which allows them to adapt to the culture pertaining them. Besides playing an important role in psychosocial adjustment, socialization is present in the vast psychology literature, which indicates a meaningful connection between socialization and psychological adjustment. In the first socialization individuals get in touch with, probably the principal ones related to the internalization of social norms and patterns, occur within the family, and parents are the main agents of socialization. This socialization extends throughout adolescence and its effects will be present in the behavioral repertoire of each individual in the course of his lifetime (Baumrind, 1971, 1983; Hoffman, 1975ab; Lewis, 1981).

Traditionally, studies about parenting socialization have first analyzed how parents teach their children and then the effect that this socialization generates in the various aspects of their lives of children. Overall, in the history of the studies on this theme, scholars have identified the existence of two main dimensions: Acceptance/Involvement and Severity/Imposition (Barber, Chadwick, & Oerter, 1992; Barnes & Farrell, 1992; Foxcroft & Lowe, 1991; Lamborn, Mounts, Steinberg, & Dornbusch, 1991; Shucksmith, Hendry, & Gendening, 1995; Smetana, 1995). However, many other labels were associated with these dimensions: Symonds (1939) labeled them as Acceptance/Dominance; Baldwin (1955), Involvement/Hostility; Becker (1964), Affection/Restriction; Sears, Maccoby and Levin (1957), Affection/Strictness; and, Schaefer (1959), Love/Control.

One can better understand these dimensions when considered according to a Cartesian coordinates where the $X$-axis represents the acceptance/involvement dimension related to those parenting practices connected with the use of warmth, dialogue and understanding of the behavior of the children. The positive aspect of this axis relates to the more frequent use of this kind of practice and the negative one to the less frequent. The axis of the ordinates, on its turn, represents the Strictness/Imposition dimension, characterized by the use of coercive practices used in the control of the behavior of children, i.e., parents who resort to verbal and physical punishment to control the behavior of their children. In connection with this dimension, the positive aspect of the axis of the ordinates – $Y$-axis – is related to the repeated use of this sort of practice by parents and the negative one to the rare or no use at all of them. The combination of different degrees of intensity in the use of the practices of parenting socialization proper to each one of these dimensions allows classification of parenting styles under four main styles of socialization. Authoritative, characterized by high levels of acceptance/involvement and high levels of strictness/imposition; indulgent, characterized by high levels of acceptance/involvement and low levels of strictness/imposition; neglectful, characterized by low levels of acceptance/involvement and low levels of strictness/imposition; and authoritarian, characterized by high levels of acceptance/involvement and high levels of strictness/imposition (García & Gracia, 2014; Lamborn, Mounts, Steinberg, & Dornbusch, 1991; Maccoby & Martin, 1983; Martínez, Camino, Camino, & Cruise, 2014; Steinberg, Lamborn, Darling, Mounts, & Dornbusch, 1994).
Literature comparing the relations between the styles of parenting socialization and variables related to the psychological and psychosocial adjustment of children have found different pattern of results between different cultural context. The traditional studies carried out with Anglo-Saxon cultures indicate that children of authoritative parents show better psychological and psychosocial adjustment than children whose parents resort to other styles (Baumrind, 1991; Chao, 2001; Christian, 2002; Dornbusch, Ritter, Liederman, Roberts & Fraleigh, 1987; Maccoby & Martin, 1983; Steinberg, Mounts, Lamborn, & Dornbusch, 1991; Steinberg, Lamborn, Dornbusch, & Darling, 1992). This result, however, does not cover other cultural contexts such as American families of Asian or African origins (Dornbusch et al., 1987; Steinberg et al., 1991). Furthermore, the studies carried out within Spanish and Italian cultural contexts concluded that the use of an indulgent style of socialization promoted a better psychological and psychosocial adjustment of the children than the use of an authoritative style (DiMaggio & Zappulla, 2014; Fuentes, García, Gracia, & Alarcón, 2015; Marchetti, 1997; Musitu & García, 2004; Llinares, 1998).

This chapter aims to examine what parenting style (characterized by acceptance/involvement and strictness/imposition) is optimum in a Spanish context. We could hypothesize, drawing from the literature, that indulgent parenting style should be the optimum, or find results similar to that of the authoritative parenting style. Adolescents and elderly people from indulgent homes would show the higher levels of self concept and self-esteem, more internalization values, and more commitment to human-rights than offspring of other parenting styles.

**METHODS**

**Participants and procedure**

Sample in this chapter were 526 participants: 309 adolescents (12-17 years old, $M = 14.36$ years, $SD = 1.69$), and 217 elderly (60-75 years old, $M = 63.38$ years, $SD = 3.45$ years). A priori power analysis determined a sample size of 280 observations to detect with a power of .95 ($\alpha = .050$, $1 – \beta = .95$) a medium size ($f = .25$; Bono y Armau, 1995; Cohen, 1977; García, Pascual, Frias, Van Kruncckelsven, & Murgui, 2008) in a univariate $F$-test among four parenting style groups (Faul, Erdfelder, Buchner, & Lang, 2009). We over-sampled to nearest double the initial sample size ($N = 526$) in order to increase the power. With end sample size of 526 participants, we can detect ($\alpha = .050$, $1 – \beta = .95$) a medium-small effect size ($f = .181$, Cohen, 1977) in univariate $F$-tests between the four parenting styles. Data of adolescent were obtained from nine schools from an autonomous community in Spain selected by simple cluster sampling from all education centers. If clusters (i.e., schools) are selected randomly, then the elements within the clusters (i.e., students) are similar to those randomly selected (Kalton, 1983). The headmaster at each school was contacted (all agreed to participate) and parental permissions were obtained. Data of elderly people were obtained in the same way from schools seniors from the same autonomous community at Spain. They were educated elders, students of university courses adapted to middle aged people or engaged in formative activities aimed at aged people in parishes. Students (adolescents and elderly people) freely chose to participate and they were assured of complete confidentiality (the final response rate...
was 95%). Data were collected using a paper-and-pencil self-administered questionnaire, which was applied collectively to the whole class during a regular class period.

**Measures**

Six instruments were applied: Two scales for measure parenting styles, warmth/affection and strictness/imposition; other two for measure the offspring's psychological adjustment, self-concept and self-esteem; and another two for measure the offspring's psychosocial adjustment, internalization of values and commitment to human rights.

**Acceptance/Involvement** was measured with the WAS (Warmth/Affection Scale, Rohner, Saavedra, & Granum, 1978) from the questionnaire PAQ/C (Parenting Acceptance-Rejection/Control Questionnaire, Rohner, 1990). The WAS has been used in approximately 500 studies within the United States and internationally in the past five decades (García & Gracia, 2009, 2010; Khaleque & Rohner, 2012; Lila, García, & Gracia, 2007; Rohner & Khaleque, 2003). The WAS scale is a reliable measure of the extent to which offsprings perceive his or her parents as loving, responsive, and involved (sample items: "They help me when I am scared or sad" and "We talk about our plans and they always take my opinion into account"). Cronbach alpha for this 20-item scale was .94.

**Strictness/Imposition** was measured with the PCS scale from the questionnaire PAQ/C (Parenting Acceptance-Rejection/Control Questionnaire, Rohner, 1990), which assesses the extent to which the offspring perceives strict parental control of his/her behavior (sample items: "When I go out they always tell the time I must come back home" and "They assign me tasks and never let me do anything else before I finish them"). Cronbach alpha for this 13-item scale was .67.

**Self-concept** was evaluated with the AF5 Five-Factor Self-Concept Questionnaire (Garcia & Musitu, 1999; García, Gracia, & Zeleznova, 2013). The AF5 questionnaire with 30 items appraises self-esteem in five different domains of self-concept: Academic, feelings of self-appraisal that the subject has on the quality of performance in the student role, e.g., "I do my homework well"; Social, perception of the subject's own performance in social relationships, e.g., "I make friends easily"; Emotional, perception of the subject's emotional state and responses to specific situations, with a certain commitment and involvement in everyday life, general perception of emotional state and in specific situations, (reverse scored), e.g., "Many things make me nervous"; Familiar, Family perception that the subject has on involvement, participation, and integration in the family unit, e.g., "I feel that my parents love me"; and Physical, perception that the subject has on physical appearance and physical state, e.g., "I take good care of my physical health". Factorial structure of AF5 was confirmed with both exploratory (Garcia & Musitu, 1999) and confirmatory (Fuentes, García, Gracia, & Lila, 2011a, 2011b; García, Gracia, & Zeleznova, 2013; García, Musitu, & Veiga, 2006; Murgui, García, Gracia, & García, 2012) factor analyses, and no method effect appears to be associated with negatively worded items (García, Musitu, Riquelme, & Riquelme, 2011; Tomás & Oliver, 2004). Cronbach’s alphas were: academic, .83; social, .71; emotional, .74; familiar, .78; and physical, .79.

**Self-esteem** was measured by the scale developed by Rosenberg (1965), a 10-item self-report measure of global self-esteem. It consists of 10 statements related to overall feelings of self-worth or self-acceptance (e.g., ‘I feel that I’m a person of worth, at least on an equal plane with others’). Cronbach’s alpha value for this scale was .84.
Priority given by offspring to self-transcendence (universalism and benevolence) and conservation (tradition, conformity, and security) values were measured with the Schwartz (1992) Value Inventory, adapted from Struch, Schwartz, and van der Kloot, (2002). Schwartz’s Values Inventory was designed to analysis the Theory of Human Values (Schwartz & Bilsky, 1987) in more than 200 samples from over 60 countries (Schwartz, 1992; Schwartz & Sagiv, 1995). Each of the 27 items, measuring self-transcendence and conservation values, consists of one single value accompanied by a short descriptive phrase. Both variables have been indicators of psychosocial adjustment, internalization of social values, in parenting literature (Martínez, Camino, Camino, & Cruise, 2014; Martínez & García, 2007, 2008). Cronbach’s alphas were: universalism, \( \alpha = .76 \); benevolence, \( \alpha = .74 \); conformity, \( \alpha = .65 \); tradition, \( \alpha = .45 \); and security, \( \alpha = .57 \). These reliabilities were within the range of variation commonly observed in these subscales (e.g., Roccas, Sagiv, Schwartz, & Knafo, 2002).

The commitment of offspring to Human Right was measured with the Commitment with Human Rights Scale (CHRS), developed by Camino (2012). CHRS was developed for measures the commitment with human rights. The basis for the development of this instrument was the theoretical perspective of the generations of rights proposed by Bobbio (2004) and Lafer (2009). This instrument is composed of 20 items with a scale from 1 (Nothing) to 5 (Very Much), which five items for measure each generation of rights. The generations of rights assessed by the instrument are: first generation, composed by rights to freedom (e.g., “We must be free to go anywhere we wish”); second generation, composed by social rights (e.g., “We have the right to have a job”); third generation, composed by the rights of the minorities (e.g., “One must respect the lifestyle of ethnic minorities such as gypsies, blacks and others”); and, the fourth generation, composed by the rights related to the environment (e.g., “Nature cannot be poisoned”). The alpha coefficients in this study were: Freedom, .79; social, .80; minorities, .77; and, environment, .81.

Parenting Styles

Parenting styles were defined followed median split procedures, controlling for gender and age (García & Gracia, 2009, 2010, 2014). Authoritative families were those who scored above the median on both acceptance/involvement and strictness/imposition, whereas neglectful families were below the median on both variables. Authoritarian families were below the median on acceptance/involvement but above the median on strictness/imposition. Indulgent families were above the median on acceptance/involvement but below the median on strictness/imposition.

Design and data analysis

We used a Multivariate Factorial Analysis of Variance (MANOVA, \( 4 \times 2 \times 2 \)) for each one of the criteria of psychological (self-concept and self-esteem) and psychosocial (values and commitment with Human Rights) adjustment of offspring. Factors were parenting styles (indulgent, authoritative, authoritarian and neglectful), offspring’s sex (male vs. female) and two generations (adolescents vs. elderly people). Univariate \( F \) follow-up tests were conducted within the set of outcomes that had multivariate significant overall differences, and significant
results on the univariate tests were followed with Bonferroni’s comparisons between all possible pairs of means.

RESULTS

Self-concept dimensions and self-esteem

The relation between parenting socialization styles and self-concept and self-esteem suggest that the indulgent style is better related to all aspects of self-concept and self-esteem than other parenting styles, including the authoritative style (Figure 1). These results corroborate previous studies (Alonso-Geta, 2012; de la Torre, Casanova, Garcia, Carpio, & Cerezo, 2011; Martinez & Garcia, 2007; Garcia & Gracia, 2009, 2010; Garaigordobil & Aliri, 2012) and differ from that obtained in the North-American culture (Baumrind, 1991; Chao, 2001; Chistian, 2002; Dornbusch, Ritter, Liederman, Roberts & Fraleigh, 1987; Maccoby & Martin, 1983; Steinberg, 2001; Steinberg, Lamborn, Dornbusch & Darling, 1992; Steinberg, Mounts, Lamborn, & Dornbusch, 1991) in which the authoritative style best relates with the psychological adjustment of the children.

In relation to the variable sex, the participants of the male sex present levels of physical and emotional self-concept higher than those of the female sex, which may denote higher cultural demand concerning female beauty. Those results are in full line with other previous studies (Alonso-Geta, 2012; Calafat, García, Juan, Becoña, & Fernández-Hermida, 2014; Garaigordobil, Durá, & Pérez, 2005; García & Musitu, 1999; Martinez & Garcia, 2007).

Differences concerning the two generations studied were also noticed: the older ones presented higher levels of academic self-concept and self-esteem than the younger ones who participated in the study. It is understood that the differences found in relation to academic self-concept may be related to the fact that the older ones had more time than the younger ones to become more solid in their jobs and study areas and then, they are more self-assured about their knowledge. In relation to the differences connected with self-esteem, we presumed that it is caused by stronger feelings of personal fulfillment, due to a greater number of experiences they have lived in different areas of their lives (Gutiérrez, Serra, & Zacarés, 2006; Zacarés & Serra, 1991, 1996, 1998).

Interestingly, both the adolescent of indulgent homes and the elderly people of indulgent homes were associated with the best levels of self-concept and self-esteem (we neither found a significant interaction effect, α = .05). The indulgent as optimum parenting style in Spanish context seem applied not only to the younger generations of Spanish, but also to previous elderly generations of 60-75 years old. On the opposite hand, other studies suggest that new social situations explain why the indulgent parenting may become an excelent parenting (e.g., Calafat, García, Juan, Becoña, & Fernández-Hermida, 2014; Kazemi, Ardabili, & Solokian, 2010). Analizing other studies conducted in countries with a diversity of cultural values led Steinberg (2001) to claim that the benefits of authoritative parenting transcended the boundaries of ethnicity, socioeconomic status, and household composition, in retrospect and prospect, for contemporary industrialized societies.
Priority by values of self-transcendence and conservation

The results concerning the relationship between parenting styles and values indicated that the indulgent and authoritative styles are more related with values of self-transcendence (benevolence) than the neglectful one (Figure 2). Values of conservation, concerning the values of conformity, they are also more related to the styles indulgent and authoritative than to the style neglectful. The values of tradition are more related to authoritative parenting style than to the neglectful and authoritarian styles. Finally, the values of security are more related to the authoritative style than to the neglectful one. Generally, results of this chapter are in line with another sample of Spanish adolescent (Martinez & Garcia, 2007). Excepting that in the study of Martinez and Garcia (2007), they also found differences in universalism (the other measure of self-transcendence values) and for three measures of conservation values (conformity, tradition and security) they found more clear differences between indulgent and authoritative parenting vs. authoritarian and neglectful parenting. However, the sample size of Martinez and Garcia (2007) was more major, of 1456 adolescent (Garcia, Pascual, Frias, Van Kunckelsven, & Murgui, 2008; Pérez, Navarro, & Llobell, 1999). These results corroborate previous studies in different cultural backgrounds (Marchetti, 1997; Martinez & Garcia, 2007, 2008; Musitu & Garcia, 2001) and differ from that obtained in the North-American culture (Baumrind, 1971, 1983; Darling & Steinberg, 1993; Lewis, 1981; Steinberg, 2001) in which the authoritative style best relates with the psychosocial adjustment of the children.

Differences related to sex with values of self-transcendence (universalism and benevolence) were identified. Women presented clear higher levels of priority with these values than men. This result appears to reflect the influence of the values in a positive discrimination of the gender roles for women. In western culture, women are often trained to look after the welfare of the whole family and then, besides developing the capacity of looking after themselves, they are also supposed to look after other members of the family, woman generally are less self-centered and egoistic than men (Martínez & García, 2007, 2008; Musitu & García, 2001). For example, Mestre and colleagues (Mestre, Samper, Frias, & Tur, 2009) confirm a greater empathic response in females than in males (Hoffman, 1977; Mestre et al., 2009).

Additionally, differences were observed in different generations: the elders presented higher levels of self-transcendence (universalism and benevolence) than adolescents. Universalism, a domain value that is part of the dimension of self-transcendence, is developed by experiences acquired throughout life. In this sense, it is believed that the fact that elders present higher levels of the dimension self-transcendence is related to the greater variety of experiences they have lived because of the number of years they have lived. Elders also achieved higher priority levels in the values of tradition (conformity) than adolescents. Elders, have been exposed to more traditional values, and have used these values more than adolescents and, therefore, these values are more consolidated within them than with adolescents (Martínez & García, 2007, 2008; Musitu & García, 2001).

In sum, women and elder people are more centered on consideration for others and acceptance of social norms (Baumrind, 1983; Lewis, 1981; Martinez & Garcia, 2007, 2008; Schwartz, 1992; Schwartz & Bilsky, 1987, 1990).
Commitment to human-rights

The relationship between parenting styles and the commitment of children with human rights indicate that the commitment of children with those rights related to freedoms is more associated to indulgent families, authoritative and authoritarian ones than to neglectful families (Figure 3). The commitment of the children of authoritative families with social rights is higher than that of the children of neglectful families. The commitment with the rights of minorities is stronger among children of authoritative and authoritarian families than among children of neglectful families. In all results the neglectful style is the one showing the lowest commitment of the children with human rights. It is supposed that these results are related to the fact that human rights are social norms and indulgent, authoritative and authoritarian families are more strongly committed with the transmission of these norms than neglectful families, which favor a deeper internalization of the norms concerning human rights by the children of non-neglectful families.

Finally, it was observed that elders present higher levels of commitment with human rights than adolescents. This result relates to the fact that elders’ people, as women, enjoy higher levels of self-transcendence —i.e., more concern with others—, and this dimension is fundamental for a commitment with the cause of implementation of human rights.

Conclusion

Self-concept and self-esteem, indicators of psychological adjustment, are generally more benefited by the indulgent style of socialization than by any other style. The results show that Spanish adolescents from indulgent households have the same or better outcomes than adolescents from authoritative homes. This result can be explained by the high level of warmth and explanations and by the low level of oppression that characterizes this style (Alonso-Geta, 2012; Calafat, García, Juan, Becoña, & Fernández-Hermida, 2014; Fuentes et al. 2015; García & Gracia, 2009, 2010, 2014; White & Schnurr, 2012). Additionally, both the adolescent of indulgent homes and the elderly people of indulgent homes were associated with the best levels of self-concept and self-esteem. This predominance of the indulgent style over other styles is not observed in relation to the values and the commitment with human rights, indicators of psychosocial adjustment. In concordance with previous studies (Marchetti, 1997; Martínez & García, 2007, 2008; Musitu & García, 2001), there were no differences between the priority given by adolescents of authoritative and indulgent parents to any of the self-transcendence and conservation values, whereas adolescents of authoritarian and neglectful parents, in general, assign the lowest priority to all of these values. Broadly speaking, in relation to values, the indulgent and authoritative styles exert similar effects. On the other hand, as to human rights, with the exception of the rights of the first generation (freedom), it is the authoritative style that seems to be more related to the fact that human rights are norms, and the use of some degree of coercion makes this norm more evident when it is violated in some way. To commitment with other human rights (social, minorities and environment), warmth and explanations are not a key.
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ABSTRACT

The purpose of the study was to explore the connections of antisocial behavior with the degree of parents' acceptance-involvement and coercion-imposition, as well as the different parenting styles (authoritative, authoritarian, neglectful, and indulgent). The sample comprised 3,026 participants from the Basque Country (Spain), aged between 12 and 18 years (48.5% males, 51.5% females). Three assessment instruments were administered: Antisocial-Delinquent Behaviors Questionnaire (Seisdedos, 1988/1995), Behavioral Problems Scale (Navarro et al., 1993) and Parental Socialization Scale for Adolescence (Musitu & García, 2001). The results confirm that a high level of acceptance-involvement and a low level of coercion-imposition of both parents are significantly associated with a low level of adolescents’ antisocial behavior. The parents' degree of acceptance-involvement was an educational variable with considerable influence on the inhibition of the adolescents’ antisocial behavior, and it had a greater weight than the degree of coercion-imposition used by the parents. The indulgent style (high acceptance-involvement and low coercion-imposition) was the most positive because participants who had indulgent parents displayed significantly lower levels of antisocial behavior. The authoritarian parenting style (low acceptance-involvement and high coercion-imposition) was the one that promoted the most antisocial behavior in the adolescents. The authoritarian and neglectful styles were the most harmful regarding antisocial behavior. Participants with authoritative parents (high acceptance-involvement and high coercion-imposition) showed lower levels of antisocial behavior than those with authoritarian parents, but no significant differences were found with the neglectful style. The results suggest the importance of programs targeting the parents to foster positive parental attitudes that inhibit antisocial behavior.

Keywords: Parenting Styles, Antisocial Behavior, Adolescence

INTRODUCTION

Throughout history, it can be observed that humans have frequently carried out harmful actions, violent acts against others that have caused intense and lasting pain and suffering. The World Health Organization (WHO, 2003) defines violence as "the intentional use of physical force or power, threatened or actual, against oneself, another
person, or against a group or community, that either results in or has a high likelihood of resulting in injury, death, psychological harm, maldevelopment, or deprivation. Based on this definition, one could state that violence has always been a part of human experience. Its effects can be seen, in various forms, all over the world. Each year, almost 2 million people lose their lives, and many more suffer nonfatal injuries as a result of self-inflicted, interpersonal, or collective violence.

Human violence is expressed in many ways and in diverse settings: family (couple violence, parents' violence against children, children's violence against parents, violence against older people...), politics (wars, terrorism...), sexist (violence against women, homophobia...), racist (violence against individuals of other races), religious (religious integrism), school (peer violence, teachers' violence against students, students' violence against teachers...), structural violence (poverty...). Therefore, the antisocial behavior of adolescents and youth analyzed in this study must be contextualized within the framework of the expression of human violence occurring worldwide and in different settings. This study stems from our concern about the current increase of violence (bullying, racism, sexism...) during childhood, adolescence, and youth.

Antisocial behavior is defined as any behavior reflecting a breach of social rules and/or an action against others. In this study, to assess antisocial behavior, we used self-reports (Seisdedos, 1988/1995) with which we explored antisocial behaviors associated with hooliganism and behaviors of breaching social rules with regard to age, such as destroying other people's property, breaking objects in public places (on the street, in public gardens...), hitting, fighting with, or attacking other people, intentional tardiness at school, copying in an exam, littering the streets and sidewalks, breaking bottles or overturning garbage cans, pestering strangers or performing vandalistic acts in public places, practical jokes (pushing someone into a puddle, taking away their chair when they are about to sit down...), swearing or using vulgar language, stealing fruit from someone's garden, answering back to someone, refusing to perform assigned tasks... In addition, the antisocial behaviors explored in this study by means of a scale of behavior problems completed by the parents (Navarro, Peiró, Llácer, & Silva, 1993) are very similar to those assessed by the self-report. Specifically, we analyze a series of activities such as breaking objects, hitting, smoking, drinking, forging notes, truancy, attacking other people...

In order to diagnose a “behavioral disorder”, the last update of the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders, fifth edition (DSM-5, American Psychiatric Association, 2014) suggests having carried out in the past 12 months at least three of the following behaviors: 1) aggression towards people or animals: bullying, intimidation, threats, fights, physical cruelty, rape...; 2) deliberate destruction of others' property; 3) cheating or theft: lying, cheating, stealing...; 4) severe breach of rules: forging notes, truancy, going out at night without permission.

Studies assessing the consequences of antisocial behavior conclude that a large percentage of boys and girls displaying this type of behavior in childhood and adolescence will have some kind of maladjustment in adult life (Garaigordobil & Ofederrera, 2010). The fact that antisocial behavior in early years is a predictor of subsequent antisocial behavior and delinquency is a strong argument to concentrate our prevention efforts on young people's development. As adults, half of the minors with this type of externalizing symptomatology present what is considered antisocial personality at these ages (López-López & López-Soler, 2008). Therefore, it can be stated that antisocial behavior is a very relevant object of study, and it is necessary to identify factors that enable us to prevent this type of behaviors.

Parents, relevant socialization agents, represent culture, explicitly or implicitly transmitting social values to their sons and daughters. The family context has considerable influence on the development of social behavior, and there is much empirical evidence confirming if parents: 1) provide a safe feeling of attachment, 2) strongly insist that their children should not harm others, 3) make them repair the harm when they have hurt and/or attacked others, 4) are altruistic models in their relations with
others, 5) reinforce through social approval their children's spontaneous acts of sharing, helping, or cooperating, and 6) adopt a style of inductive discipline from which they discuss the rules, this increases the probability of the emergence of prosocial behavior in their children (see Garaigordobil, 2003a, 2008).

The family is the main socializing agent and has therefore received much attention by researchers. The influence of variables such as the family structure, cohesion, the presence of conflicts, parenting styles…was explored with regard to the psychological, social, and emotional adjustment of the children. In the same vein, the present study analyzes the connections between antisocial behavior and family contextual variables such as parents' level of acceptance-involvement and coercion-imposition, as well as the educational or socialization styles used by the mothers and fathers with their sons and daughters. Therefore, firstly, we reviewed the studies that have recently (2003-2014) analyzed the relations between antisocial behavior and family context, the results of which are presented in Table 1.

Table 1. Antisocial behavior and family contextual variables: A review of studies from 2003 to 2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors and year</th>
<th>Sample and Country of origin</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rodríguez &amp; Torrente (2003)</td>
<td>N = 374 adjusted n = 200 adjusted n = 174, maladapted. 11-17 years. Spain (Murcia)</td>
<td>7 variables (age, minor's academic level, family cohesion and conflict, family's emphasis on social-recreational and/or moral-religious activities and authoritarian mother) correctly classified 77.2% of the participants.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romano, Tremblay, Boulerice, &amp; Swisher (2005)</td>
<td>N = 2,745 (1,982 families). 2 to 11 years. Canada</td>
<td>Predictors of high physical aggression and low prosocial behavior: Mother's hostility and punitive parenting style.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Torrente &amp; Ruiz (2005)</td>
<td>N = 660. 11-18 years. Spain (Murcia)</td>
<td>Use of verbal scolding emerges as a predictor of antisocial behavior in different types of families (intact and destructured).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kemp, Overbeek, Wied, Engels, &amp; Scholte (2007)</td>
<td>N = 823. 11-14 years. Holland</td>
<td>Gender moderates the relation between parental support and aggressive behavior and future delinquency. In the case of girls, high levels of parental support are related to lower levels of antisocial behavior.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quiroz et al. (2007)</td>
<td>N = 3,603. Students of secondary high school and technical and commercial schools. Mexico</td>
<td>Predictors of antisocial behavior: greater presence of hostility and rejection, less children's communication, less support to children, and higher presence of severe negative discipline. Negative family environment and maltreatment were associated with antisocial behavior.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authors and year</td>
<td>Sample and Country of origin</td>
<td>Results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pelegrín &amp; García (2009)</td>
<td>$N = 1,800$. 11-16 years. Spain (Murcia)</td>
<td>Children whose parents used a less personalized-permissive and more restrictive parenting style have a higher risk of aggressive, antisocial, and delinquent behaviors in adolescence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schaffer, Clark, &amp; Jeglic (2009)</td>
<td>$N = 244$. University students. USA</td>
<td>Permissive maternal style contributes directly and indirectly to antisocial behavior.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antolín, Oliva, &amp; Arranz (2009)</td>
<td>$N = 214$ families as normalized contexts with children from 3 to 10 years. Spain (Basque Country and Andalusia)</td>
<td>The type of family structure (normalized, unmarried, reconstituted, or combined unions, homoparental, adoptive, monoparental families…) should not be considered a priori as a risk factor for children's antisocial behavior.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abdi, Jalali, &amp; Mirmehdy (2010)</td>
<td>$N = 60$ parents of adolescents between 12-18 years and 60 parents of non-delinquents. Iran</td>
<td>Parents with high levels of neuroticism and authoritarian and permissive parenting styles are associated with higher levels of adolescent antisocial behavior.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lansford et al. (2011)</td>
<td>2 longitudinal studies. E1: $N = 562$ families with children assessed at 6-9 years. E2: $N = 290$ families with male children assessed at 10-15 years. USA</td>
<td>High levels of physical discipline during one year predict high levels of externalizing behaviors the following year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wang, Dishion, Stormshak, &amp; Willett (2011)</td>
<td>$N = 1,000$. Longitudinal study, various assessments at 11-15 years. USA</td>
<td>Reciprocal associations between parenting practices and adolescent antisocial behavior. Adolescents were less likely to engage in antisocial behaviors when they perceived their parents’ greater knowledge, more rules, and more affection.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>López &amp; Rodríguez-Arias (2012)</td>
<td>$N = 2,440$. 12-18 years. Spain (Galicia)</td>
<td>Protector factors against antisocial behavior: the family has relevant weight through family reward reflected in positive involvement and family attachment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barton &amp; Kirtley (2012)</td>
<td>$N = 290$. 18-21 years. USA</td>
<td>Girls may be more susceptible to the influence of maternal socialization style.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Varela, Avila, &amp; Martínez (2013)</td>
<td>$N = 1,723$. 12-18 years. Spain (Andalusia)</td>
<td>Adolescents displaying high school violence obtained higher scores in offensive and avoidant communication with the mother and father, family conflict, and attitude towards transgression.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wang, Feng, &amp; Zhang (2013)</td>
<td>$N = 567$. Adolescents. China</td>
<td>Psychological parental control was positively associated with behavior problems, whereas behavioral parental control did not correlate with behavior problems, either externalizing or internalizing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authors and year</td>
<td>Sample and Country of origin</td>
<td>Results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martínez, Fuentes, García, &amp; Madrid (2013)</td>
<td>N = 673. 14-17 years. Spain (Castilla la Mancha)</td>
<td>Authoritarian socialization parenting style was associated with delinquent behaviors and disruptive school behavior, whereas the indulgent style was a protector factor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>van der Voort, Linting, Juffer, Bakermans-Kranenburg, &amp; van IJzendoorn (2013)</td>
<td>N = 160 adopted children Longitudinal: childhood-adolescence. Germany, Sri Lanka, South Korea and Colombia</td>
<td>Low level of control in childhood was a predictor of aggressive and delinquent behaviors in adolescence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franco, Pérez, &amp; de Dios (2014)</td>
<td>N = 30 mothers and 23 fathers of children from 3 to 6 years. Spain (Madrid and Toledo)</td>
<td>Parents who granted low levels of discipline, affection-emotional support, and commitment to childrearing perceived more aggressiveness and withdrawal, and fewer social skills in their sons and daughters.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DiMaggio &amp; Zappulla (2014)</td>
<td>N = 213. 14-16 years. Italy</td>
<td>The neglectful style was more closely linked to behavior problems. The indulgent style was more favorable for diverse dimensions of psychological adjustment and life satisfaction. Stricter and demanding maternal and paternal attitudes are related to externalizing and internalizing behavior problems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wang &amp; Kenny (2014a)</td>
<td>N = 862. Fathers and mothers and their children. USA</td>
<td>Mothers' and fathers' physical punishment between 12 and 14 years predicted behavior problems between ages 14 to 16 years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wang &amp; Kenny (2014b)</td>
<td>N = 976. Fathers and mothers and their children. USA</td>
<td>Severe verbal discipline of parents at 13 years predicted an increase in adolescents' behavior problems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LeRoy, Mahoney, Boxer, Gullan, &amp; Fang (2014)</td>
<td>N = 239. Clinical sample. 11-18 years. USA</td>
<td>51% of the adolescents had experienced severe physical aggression and/or verbal aggression by one or both parents. When the mother exerted severe physical aggression against the adolescent, verbal aggression was associated with greater behavior problems, whereas when there was no severe physical aggression, the correlations between aggressive problems and verbal behavior were nonsignificant. However, an increase in the father's verbal aggression against the adolescent was linked to behavior problems beyond the influence of severe physical aggression.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fuentes, García, Gracia, &amp; Alarcón (in press, 2015)</td>
<td>N = 772. 12-17 years. Spain (Balearic Islands)</td>
<td>The indulgent style, based mainly on affection and not on parental imposition, is related to the best results in the assessed criteria. Therefore, we underline the importance of parents' affective involvement in their children's socialization for adequate psychological and emotional adjustment.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As can be seen in Table 1, in general, the results of the studies reveal that authoritarian behavior, high use of severe physical and verbal discipline, negative family environment, hostility, rejection, maltreatment by parents..., and also a high degree of permisiveness are related to antisocial behaviors in children, adolescents, and youth. In contrast, a high level of family support, high acceptance by parents, high level of affection and involvement in the sons' and daughters' lives is related to lower levels of aggressive and antisocial behavior in the children.

Objectives and Hypotheses

Taking as reference the review carried out (see Table 1), the purpose of the study was to explore the connections between antisocial behavior (self-assessed and assessed by parents) with the degree of parents' acceptance-involvement and coercion-imposition, as well as with different parenting styles (authoritative, authoritarian, neglectful, and indulgent). With this goal three hypothesis were posited: 1) Adolescents and youth with high scores in antisocial behavior will have parents with low levels acceptance-involvement and high levels of coercion-imposition; 2) The mothers' and/or fathers' authoritarian and neglectful parenting styles will promote a high level of antisocial behavior in the adolescents; and 3) The indulgent style will promote low levels of antisocial behavior in the adolescents.

METHOD

Participants

The sample comprised 3,026 participants from the Basque Country (northern Spain), aged between 12 and 18 years, 1,469 (48.5%) males and 1,557 (51.5%) females. The participants studied Compulsory Secondary Education (75.4%) and High School (24.6%), and were enrolled in various public (45.6%) and private (54.4%) schools of the Basque Country. The distribution of the sample by sex and age is presented in Table 2. To obtain the representative sample of the Basque Country, the latest population survey presented by the Basque Statistical Institute was consulted, confirming a population of students of Compulsory Secondary Education and High School of 101,757. With a .99% confidence level, a sample error of .024, for a population variance of .50, the representative sample comprises 2,802 students. To select a representative sample of students from the Basque Country, we used a stratified, proportional, and randomized sampling technique, taking into account the proportionality of the schools in each province and balancing the diverse conditions (socio-economic-cultural level, type of network: public-private, urban-rural, secular-religious...).

Table 2. Description of the sample: frequency and percentage of males and females in the three age groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>12-13 years</th>
<th>14-15 years</th>
<th>16-18 years</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n (%)</td>
<td>n (%)</td>
<td>n (%)</td>
<td>n (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>543 (51.2%)</td>
<td>536 (49%)</td>
<td>390 (44.8%)</td>
<td>1,469 (48.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>518 (48.8%)</td>
<td>558 (51%)</td>
<td>481 (55.2%)</td>
<td>1,557 (51.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,061 (100%)</td>
<td>1,094 (100%)</td>
<td>871 (100%)</td>
<td>3,026 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Measures

With the aim of measuring the dependent variables, we applied three assessment instruments with adequate psychometric guarantees of reliability and validity, two self-reports, and a questionnaire completed by the parents.

Antisocial behavior was measured with Antisocial-Delinquent Behaviors Questionnaire [in Spanish, Cuestionario de conducta antisocial-delictiva] (AD. Seisdedos, 1988/1995). This instrument comprises 40 sentences referring to different types of antisocial and delinquent behavior. It assesses two aspects of deviant behavior, antisocial (entering a prohibited place, writing graffiti, breaking or throwing other people’s things on the ground, fighting, punching, or insulting, and so on) and delinquent (taking drugs, stealing, obtaining money by threats, belonging to a gang that gets into fights or causes disturbances, etc.). Respondents’ task consists of reading the sentences and indicating whether they have performed the behaviors in question. When scoring, one point was assigned for each affirmative phrase. In this study, we only used the antisocial behavior scale (20 items). Reliability is adequate (Spearman-Brown = .86 in both scales). Studies of criterion validity confirm higher scores in 95 adolescents with behavior problems, compared to 99 control adolescents, and analyses of variance indicate significant differences between the two groups on the scales of antisocial behavior, $F(1, 192) = 4.70, p < .01$, and delinquent behavior, $F(1, 192) = 2.90, p < .01$. Reliability analysis with the sample of this study yielded satisfactory internal consistency (Cronbach’s $\alpha = .89$).

Behavioral disorders were measured with Behavioral Problems Scale [in Spanish, Escala de Problemas de Conducta] (EPC. Navarro, Peiró, Llácer, & Silva, 1993). This is a 99-item scale assessing behavioral problems, which is completed by the parents. The items are grouped in 7 scales: Academic problems (related to low academic performance), Antisocial behavior (behaviors that may be classified as aggressive, and other behaviors that are not aggressive but might impair social relationships), Shyness and timidity (tendency to solitude and susceptibility in social relationships), Psychopathological problems (serious problems that have, in general, a depressive component), Psychosomatic problems (idiopathic physical disorders), and a positive scale of Social adjustment (adjustment to social rules). In this study, we only administered the Antisocial Behavior Scale (EPC-CA). Parents report whether or not their children engage in these behaviors (breaking objects, hitting, smoking, drinking, forging notes, truancy, attacking other people...). As regards the reliability of the scale, information about the internal consistency of the entire EPC has been gathered ($\alpha = .88$). At the same time, the EPC was applied on two occasions with a temporal interval of 9 months, resulting in an alpha coefficient between .71 and .88 in different scales. To test the criterion validity, the EPC was applied to different samples of children and adolescents (referred to the school psychologist due to problems at school, referred to a clinical psychologist, and inmates in prison due to criminal problems), and multiple regression analysis showed that belonging to different criterion groups was the variable that presented the highest level of relations with the EPC scores. Reliability analysis with the sample of this study yielded satisfactory internal consistency (EPC-CA Cronbach’s $\alpha = .89$).

Parenting styles were measured with Parental Socialization Scale for Adolescence [in Spanish, Escala de Socialización Parental en la Adolescencia] (ESPA-29. Musitu & García, 2001). This scale assesses the parents’ socialization styles, that is, the parenting styles of the father and mother towards their children. The adolescent rates the father’s and mother’s action independently in 29 relevant situations. Of the 29 situations proposed, 16 are negative (“If I am dirty and poorly dressed,” “If one of my teachers tells him/her that I behave badly in class,” “If I am disobedient”), and 13 are positive (“If I take care of my things and am clean and properly dressed,” “If I do not skip classes and arrive punctually every day,” “If I pick up and take care of things at home”). The respondent reports the way his or her parents act when the situations described in the questionnaire
occur. The questionnaire allows identifying 4 parenting styles of the father and mother along the acceptance/involvement-coercion/imposition continuum: authoritative, indulgent, authoritarian, and neglectful. **Authoritative parents** (high acceptance/involvement and high coercion/imposition): They make an effort to guide the activities of their son/daughter rationally, sharing the rationale underlying their policy, they affirm their children's qualities, but they also set limits and the course of future behavior, resorting both to reasoning and to power to achieve their goals. **Indulgent parents** (high acceptance/ involvement and low coercion/imposition): They attempt to behave affectionately, they accept their children's impulses, desires, and actions, and allow them to regulate their own activities as much as possible, they offer explanations and rationale, but they avoid the use of dominant or coercive control. **Authoritarian parents** (low acceptance/involvement and high coercion/imposition): They frequently do not offer any rationale when they give orders and are very reluctant to modify their positions in the face of their children's arguments. They are generally indifferent to their children's demands for support and attention and they are less likely to use positive reinforcement, acting indifferently towards their children's appropriate behaviors. **Neglectful parents** (low acceptance/involvement and low coercion/imposition): They have severe difficulties to relate to and interact with their children, and to set limits for them, and they express little affection. Psychometric studies of the scale reveal high internal consistency. The results of factor analysis confirmed the theoretical structure of the bidimensional model satisfactorily. In the present study, the internal consistency coefficients were high (mother $\alpha = .91$, father $\alpha = .93$).

**Design and Procedure**

We used a descriptive, comparative, correlational, and cross-sectional design. With regard to the procedure, the following phases were established: 1) A letter was sent to the directors of the randomly selected schools from the list of educational centers in Basque Country, explaining the project and requesting their collaboration; 2) Communication with the directors: we performed an interview with those who agreed to collaborate in order to present the project and hand out the informed consent forms for the parents of the participants in the study; if the director of the selected center refused to collaborate, the procedure was repeated with the next center on the list, taking into account the type (public-private) and/or the socio-economic-cultural level of the center that declined to participate; 3) After receiving the parents’ consent, the research team (Psychology graduates and Ph.D. students) administered two assessment instruments (AD and ESPA-29). The administration was carried out in two 45-minute assessment sessions. The participants were handed an envelope containing an instrument to assess behavior problems (EPC-CA) for their parents to complete anonymously. The study respected the ethical values required in research with humans (informed consent and the right to the information, protection of personal data and guarantees of confidentiality, non-discrimination, gratuity, and the possibility to leave the study at any phase), and received the favorable report of the University Research and Teaching Ethics Committee of the University of the Basque Country (CEISH/112/2012).

**RESULTS**

**Antisocial behavior and parents' acceptance/involvement and coercion/imposition**

In order to explore the relations between antisocial behavior (self-reported and assessed by parents) and family contextual variables such as degree
acceptance/involvement and coercion/imposition of the father and mother, and taking into account the effect of sex and age, we calculated partial correlations of antisocial behavior (AD, self-report; EPC-CA, parents' assessment) with the degree of parents' acceptance/involvement and coercion/imposition (ESPA-29). The coefficients obtained are shown in Table 3.

Table 3. Partial correlations taking into account the effect of sex and age, between antisocial behavior and parents' degree of acceptance/involvement - coercion/imposition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AD</th>
<th>EPC-CA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mother's acceptance/involvement</td>
<td>-.14***</td>
<td>-10**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother's coercion/imposition</td>
<td>.09***</td>
<td>.22***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father's acceptance/involvement</td>
<td>-.13***</td>
<td>-11***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father's coercion/imposition</td>
<td>.06**</td>
<td>.21***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: AD = antisocial behavior self-assessed, EPC-CA = antisocial behavior assessed by parents. **p < .01; ***p < .001.

As can be observed in Table 3, we found significant negative correlations between acceptance/involvement of both parents and antisocial behavior, and positive correlations with coercion/imposition. The results suggest that the participants of both sexes with high scores in antisocial behavior (self-assessed and assessed by parents) characterized their parents as displaying significantly: 1) lower levels of acceptance and a lower level of involvement in their education and lives, and 2) higher levels of coercion and severe discipline.

Antisocial behavior and parenting styles

In order to explore whether the participants with different scores in antisocial behavior (AD) differed by parenting style (authoritative, authoritarian, neglectful, indulgent), with the data obtained in the AD and the ESPA29, we performed descriptive analyses (means and standard deviations), analysis of variance, analysis of the effect size (eta squared), and post-hoc (Bonferroni) tests, the results of which are presented in Table 4.

Table 4. Means, standard deviations in antisocial behavior in each parenting style, and results of the analysis of variance by parenting style, effect size (Eta squared), and post-hoc tests (Bonferroni)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>M (SD)</th>
<th>F(2, 3023)</th>
<th>Eta</th>
<th>Post-Hoc</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mother</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Neglectful</td>
<td>8.30 (5.30)</td>
<td>11.14 ***</td>
<td>.018</td>
<td>1&gt;3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Authoritarian</td>
<td>9.36 (5.06)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2&gt;3, 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Indulgent</td>
<td>7.16 (5.02)</td>
<td>3&lt;1,2, 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Authoritative</td>
<td>8.24 (5.15)</td>
<td></td>
<td>4&lt;3-2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Neglectful</td>
<td>8.42 (4.97)</td>
<td>8.83 ***</td>
<td>.016</td>
<td>1&gt;3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Authoritarian</td>
<td>9.08 (4.85)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2&gt;3, 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Indulgent</td>
<td>7.20 (5.23)</td>
<td>3&lt;1,2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Authoritative</td>
<td>7.78 (5.22)</td>
<td></td>
<td>4&lt;2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: ***p < .001.

The results obtained (see Table 4) confirm statistically significant differences in antisocial behavior as a function of parenting style. Adolescents and youths from
authoritarian homes (low acceptance/involvement and high coercion/imposition) showed significantly more antisocial behaviors than adolescents with indulgent and authoritative parents. However, participants from indulgent homes (high acceptance/involvement and low coercion/imposition) displayed significantly lower levels of antisocial behavior than participants with authoritarian or neglectful parents (or those with authoritative mothers). Participants from authoritative homes (high acceptance/involvement and high coercion/imposition) had a lower level of antisocial behavior than those from authoritarian homes. Although antisocial behavior was lower in adolescents from authoritative homes when compared to the neglectful style, the differences were not statistically significant. The authoritarian and neglectful styles were the most harmful for antisocial behavior.

CONCLUSION

The purpose of the study was to analyze the connections between antisocial behavior and parenting practices during the process of education and socialization of the children. The results confirm the relations between the paternal/maternal parenting styles and adolescents' and youths' antisocial behavior.

Firstly, the correlation coefficients have shown that adolescents and youths of both sexes with high scores in antisocial behavior reported significantly lower levels of parental acceptance and of parental involvement in their education and lives. We also confirmed that the parents of adolescents with many antisocial behaviors used more coercion, discipline, and punishment as a parenting method. Therefore, the results obtained ratify Hypothesis 1, stating that adolescents and youths with high scores in antisocial behavior would have parents with low levels of acceptance and high levels of coercion. These results also confirm those obtained in other studies finding that high levels of family support and parental acceptance (Franco et al., 2014; Kemp et al., 2007; Quiroz et al., 2007; López et al., 2012; Wang et al., 2011) are related to less aggressive and antisocial behavior in the children, and in studies showing that a punitive parenting style (Romano et al., 2005), with high levels of verbal scolding (Torrente & Ruiz, 2005), offensive communication (Varela et al., 2013), frequent physical punishment (Leroy et al., 2014), severe physical and verbal aggression (Wang & Kenny, 2014a), physical (Lansford et al., 2011) and verbal discipline (Wang & Kenny, 2014b) negatively affects antisocial behavior.

Secondly, the results of the analyses of variance and the Bonferroni tests confirm that adolescents and youths from homes where both parents were authoritarian (low acceptance/involvement and high coercion/imposition) obtained significantly higher scores in antisocial behavior compared to individuals with indulgent and authoritative parents. These findings confirm those of other studies showing that the authoritarian parenting style stimulates a higher level of antisocial behavior in the children (Abdi et al., 2010; Martínez et al., 2013; Rodríguez & Torrente, 2003). The results allow us to partially confirm Hypothesis 2 because, although the authoritarian style was the one that most promotes antisocial behavior, only the neglectful style was significantly worse than the indulgent style. Although antisocial behavior was lower in adolescents from authoritative homes when compared to adolescents from neglectful homes, the differences were not statistically significant. This result does not confirm the findings of DiMaggio and Zapulla (2014), who did find that the neglectful style was significantly more associated with behavior problems. These discrepant results may be explained by the lower age range of the sample and the assessment methodology of behavior problems in the Italian study. Nevertheless, the results of the present study reveal that the authoritarian and neglectful styles are the ones that most foment antisocial behavior.

Thirdly, the results have confirmed that the indulgent style is more positive because it promotes significantly less antisocial behavior in the children. Participants with indulgent parents (high acceptance/involvement and low coercion/imposition) showed
significantly lower levels of antisocial behavior than individuals with authoritarian or neglectful parents (or those with authoritative mothers). These results confirm Hypothesis 3, pointing in the same direction as recent studies that also found that the indulgent style was more favorable for diverse dimensions of psychological adjustment (DiMaggio & Zapulla, 2014), for children's psychological and emotional adjustment (Fuentes et al., in press 2015), and it was a protector factor against antisocial behavior (Martínez et al., 2013).

On the basis of these data, it can be concluded that: 1) a high level of both parents' acceptance/involvement in their children's lives is a very influential educational variable for the inhibition of antisocial behavior. In fact, it has more weight than the degree of parents' coercion/imposition, because the indulgent style (high acceptance/involvement and low coercion/imposition) generates low levels of antisocial behavior in the children; and 2) the authoritarian parenting style (low acceptance/involvement and high coercion/imposition) is the one that most fosters antisocial behavior in the children.

The investigation contributes to the identification of family variables that influence antisocial behavior, suggesting the need to establish family education programs (for example, via parents' schools) that lead to changes in the way parents educate their children, their disciplinary practices, and their degree of attention, involvement, and affection towards their children. From the results of the study, it can be inferred that high doses of affection, involvement in the children's lives, and reasonable levels of discipline will favor child-juvenile development, inhibiting aggressive and antisocial behavior. Along the same lines as Fuentes et al. (in press, 2015), the results of the present study underline the relevance of parental actions based mainly on signs of affection and love, support and parental involvement, as well as communication and reasoning with the children during the socialization process, as factors that inhibit antisocial behavior.

Nevertheless, despite the great influence of the family on the children's social behavior, the diverse explanatory theories of social behavior (both prosocial and antisocial) have shown that social behavior is complex and determined by multiple factors. Antisocial behavior requires comprehension and holistic or global intervention, because diverse studies have revealed the influence of multiple factors in the onset of these behaviors, for example, family factors such as aggressive interactions between parents and children, social factors such as peer friendships, situational factors such as observation of violence in the mass media... As emphasized by Muñoz, Navas, and Graña (2005), any preventive approach to and/or intervention in these behaviors should be grounded in the identification and assessment of the risk factors that are responsible for their onset and maintenance, and it should integrate the different factors involved, both environmental and individual (psychological and socialization factors in the family social, and school contexts).

A review of the protection factors allows us to note that an intervention to inhibit antisocial behavior should be carried out at the social, family, and school levels. At the social level, we underline that in order to reduce antisocial behavior, we must: 1) implement social norms that inhibit the use of weapons and drugs use among youth, 2) provide access to resources (housing, health, training, work...), 3) provide a support network and social links, and 4) involve youth in community services. At the school level, in order to inhibit antisocial behavior, we must: 1) foster a good school environment and a high level of knowledge, 2) promote prosocial development, 3) stimulate students' active participation, 4) promote socio-emotional development and cooperative learning, 5) involve the parents, and 6) provide alternative activities to alcohol/drug use. In this sense, the proposals of psychoeducational interventions to promote prosocial behavior and empathy during childhood and adolescence (Garaigordobil, 2003b, 2004, 2005, 2007, 2008) would be a protector factor against aggressive and antisocial behavior. At the family level, some protection factors are: 1) developing affective bonds with the children, 2) caring for and protecting the children, 3) fostering self-esteem, 4) sharing time with the children, 5) using a parenting style...
characterized by high doses of affection and low levels of criticism, 6) setting clear and appropriate expectations according to the children's age and characteristics, and 7) sharing family responsibilities.
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**ABSTRACT**

In this chapter family socialization and its influence on bullying in the school context is discussed, considering parenting styles as a possible protective factor from aggressive behavior among peers. Next, a study analyzing the influence of parenting on bullying in a sample of Spanish adolescents is discussed. Recent research has confirmed that, in Spain, adolescents raised by indulgent parents have similar adjustment than adolescents raised by authoritative parents. In this work, the role of indulgent and authoritative parenting, both characterized by acceptance/involvement, as protective factors against bullying is confirmed. Furthermore, both styles of socialization –indulgent and authoritative- also act as prevention factors from other behaviors related with bullying denoting school maladjustment as antisocial behavior, disruptive or undisciplined behavior, academic indifference, perception of violence from teachers, academic self-esteem, family self-esteem and social self-esteem.

**Keywords:** Parenting, Bullying, School maladjustment, Antisocial behavior, Disruptive behavior, Academic indifference, Perception of violence from teachers

**FAMILY SOCIALIZATION STYLES AS PROTECTIVE OR RISK FACTORS FOR BULLYING**

Over the last decades, school violence has greatly increased its social impact due to the negative consequences it has for the agents involved in the aggressive situation, especially important physical and psychological consequences in both aggressors and victims and negative consequences for the educational system as well as for the society.
Bullying or aggressive behavior among peers is one of the most important school violence problems. A wide body of research has analyzed different personal, social and contextual factors related to the involvement in these maladjusted behaviors in order to develop effective prevention and intervention programs aimed at avoiding or reducing the high incidence of this problem. For example, with respect to personal factors, on the one hand, there are demographic variables like sex and age or the academic year where empirical research coincides in pointing that adolescents boys are more likely to get involved in these aggressive behaviors (Carlyle & Steinman, 2007; Liang, Flisher, & Lombard, 2007; Wang, Iannotti, & Luk, 2012). On the other hand, different studies have concluded that other personal risk factors are the high impulsiveness and, consequently, the difficulty of self-control, a low frustration tolerance, poor social and coping skills, low self-concept and some emotional disorders such as depression and anxiety (Carlyle & Steinman, 2007; Shetgiri, Lin, Avila, & Flores, 2012; Wang, Nansel, & Iannotti, 2011). Other risk factors considered in the scientific research are those related to the social context where children are raised. For example, living in conflictive and violent neighborhoods which could be characterized, among other things, by the presence of violent gangs and drug dealing increase the likelihood of developing aggressive behaviors (Gracia, Fuentes, García, & Lila, 2012; Jansen et al., 2012; Shetgiri et al., 2012). School factors like the school resources available, school climate and cohesion, the problem-solving strategies, the teacher competence and the relationships both between teachers and between teachers and students are also considered as important factors (Debnam, Johnson, & Bradshaw, 2014; Eliot, Cornella, Gregorya, & Fan, 2010; Waasdorp, Pasc, O'Brennand, & Bradshaw, 2011).

Despite the relevance of all these factors, empirical research highlights the necessity of considering the family context as the first social context in children’s development and as the main socialization agent that will influence on the adjustment of children in the different developmental contexts as well as in the society (Berns, 2011; Espino, 2013; Gavazzi, 2011, 2013). Thus, different variables like the socioeconomic status, family structure and cohesion, the perceived quality of parent-child relationships, parental drug use or the presence of conflicts at home both between parents and between parents and children, have been widely studied in relation to the development of children’s aggressive behavior. For example, a low socioeconomic status, low family cohesion, living in a broken home and the presence of parental violent behavior at home have been identified as risk factors (Espelage, Low, Rao, Hong, & Little, 2013; Jansen et al., 2012); while living with both biological parents, family cohesion, perceiving a good relationship both between parents and between parents and children and parental support and involvement have been identified as protective factors against children’s violent behavior (Melander, Hartshorn, & Whitbeck, 2013; Spriggs, Iannotti, Nansel, & Haynie, 2007; García & Gracia, 2009, 2010; Gracia et al., 2012).

Another important family variable in empirical research is parental socialization and its relationship with the development of adjusted and maladjusted behaviors of children. In this sense, most studies emphasize that the values, beliefs and attitudes towards school and education that parents transmit to their children in the socialization process will influence significantly on their school adjustment (Fuentes, Alarcón, Gracia, & García, in press; Pears, Kim, Capaldi, Kerr, & Fisher, 2013; Steinberg, Lamborn, Dornbusch, & Darling, 1992a). Traditionally, the study of parental socialization and its influence on children’s adjustment has based on the classical theoretical model that consists of two orthogonal dimensions (acceptance/involveinment and strictness/imposition) and four typologies (Darling & Steinberg,
1993; Maccoby & Martin, 1983); each of them representing a particular pattern of parental behavior in their children’s socialization: Authoritative style (high acceptance/involvement and high strictness/imposition), indulgent style (high acceptance/involvement and low strictness/imposition), authoritarian style (low acceptance/involvement and high strictness/imposition) and, neglectful style (low acceptance/involvement and low strictness/imposition) (Lamborn, Mounts, Steinberg, & Dornbusch, 1991; Steinberg, Lamborn, Darling, Mounts, & Dornbusch, 1994; Maccoby & Martin, 1983).

Despite the agreement in scientific literature about the importance of considering parental socialization as a significant factor that influences on the adequate psychosocial adjustment of children, there are important inconsistencies with respect to the parenting style which would act as a protective or as a risk factor for the development of maladjusted behaviors like children’s aggressive behavior, mainly when it is considered the cultural and social background where this relationship is developed (García & Gracia, 2014; White & Schnurr, 2012).

So, in studies carried out fundamentally in Anglo-Saxon cultures, the authoritative style, characterized by high acceptance/involvement together with high strictness/imposition, is considered as a protective factor, followed by the authoritarian style, characterized by low acceptance/involvement together with high strictness/imposition. On the contrary, the neglectful style, which is characterized by the lack of both parental affection and parental imposition (low acceptance/involvement and low strictness/imposition), even the indulgent parenting style, characterized by high acceptance/involvement together with low strictness/imposition, have been identified as risk factors (Baumrind, 1991, 2012; Lamborn et al., 1991; Steinberg et al., 1992a, 1994). Similar results have been obtained regarding psychosocial adjustment: Children from authoritative families showed better psychological adjustment (e.g., higher self-esteem, higher resilience, and better use of adaptive strategies), higher school achievement (e.g., better academic competence, higher grade point average) and lower probabilities to have behavior problems (e.g., lower drug use and delinquency); children from neglectful families obtained the worst results; while children from authoritarian and indulgent families showed mixed results (Aunola, Stattin, & Nurmi, 2000; Bahr & Hoffman, 2010; Garg, Levin, Urajnik, & Kauppi, 2005; Im-Bolter, Zadeh, & Ling, 2013; Kritzas & Glober, 2005; Montgomery, Fisk, & Craig, 2008).

Another set of studies conducted with ethnic minor groups from the US (Afro-American: Baumrind, 1972; Pittman & Chase-Lansdale, 2001; Asian-American: Steinberg, Dornbusch, & Brown, 1992b; Chinese-American: Chao, 1994, 2001); in Asian and Middle Eastern societies (Dwairy, 2008; Dwairy & Achoui, 2006; Dwairy & Menshar, 2006) and, studies with families with low socioeconomic status (Hoff, Laursen, & Tardif, 2002) have identified the authoritarian style as a protective factor as well as an adequate parenting style for the optimal psychosocial adjustment since children from authoritarian families showed, for example, an adequate mental health and the best academic achievement.

Finally, in a wide group of studies carried out in different Southern European and Latin-American countries, even in some cultural backgrounds where previous studies have broadly concluded about the suitability of another parenting style (Iran: Kazemi, Ardabili, & Solokian, 2010; Sweden and UK: Calafat, García, Juan, Becoña, & Fernández-Hermida, 2014), the indulgent style, characterized fundamentally by parental affection but not by parental imposition (high acceptance/involvement and low strictness/imposition) has been identified as a protective factor against children’s aggressive behavior, followed by the
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authoritative style (high acceptance/involvement and high strictness/imposition). On the contrary, the authoritarian style (low acceptance/involvement and high strictness/imposition) and the neglectful one (low acceptance/involvement and low strictness/imposition) are considered as risk factors. With respect to psychosocial adjustment, children from indulgent families showed better psychological adjustment (e.g., higher self-concept, lower emotional instability, and lower emotional unresponsiveness), higher school achievement (e.g., higher grade point average, and a better use of self-regulated learning strategies) and lower probability to have behavior problems (e.g., lower drug use and delinquency) or, at least, the same results than children from authoritative families; while children from authoritarian and neglectful families showed the worst psychosocial adjustment (Brazil: Martínez, Camino, Camino, & Cruise, 2014; Martínez & García, 2008; Martínez, García, & Yubero, 2007; Germany: Wolfhadt, Hempel, & Miles, 2003; Italy: DiMaggio & Zappulla, 2014; Portugal: Rodrigues, Veiga, Fuentes, & García, 2013; Turkey: Erden & Uredi, 2008; Turkel & Tezer, 2008). These results are consistent with those obtained in Spain: The indulgent style is identified as a protective factor against aggressive behavior of children as well as the parenting style related to the best results (or, at least, to the same results than the authoritative style) in children’s psychosocial adjustment (better psychological adjustment, better school adjustment and lower behavior problems), whereas the authoritarian and the neglectful styles are identified as risk factors for the development of aggressive behavior and also as the parenting styles related to the worst psychosocial adjustment (Alonso-Geta, 2012; Cerezo, Casanova, de la Torre, & Carpio, 2011; Fuentes, Alarcón, García, & Gracia, in press; Fuentes, García, Gracia, & Alarcón, in press; Garaigordobil & Aliri, 2012; Gracia et al., 2012; Martínez, Fuentes, García, & Madrid, 2013).

Considering this cross-cultural variation regarding the parenting style which is related to the best psychosocial adjustment of children, there is not enough empirical evidence about its relationship with bullying or aggressive behavior among peers at school in the Spanish cultural context. So, the main objective of this chapter is to analyze which parenting style would act as a protective factor and which as a risk factor for the development of this maladjusted behavior among Spanish children. According to the results obtained in previous research conducted in Spain, as well as in related cultural contexts, it was expected that the indulgent style was identified (alone or together with the authoritative style) as a protective factor, while the authoritarian and the neglectful style were identified as risk factors.

STUDYING THE INFLUENCE OF PARENTING STYLES ON BULLYING

To analyze the influence of parenting on bullying between adolescents was utilized a sample of 1114 Spanish adolescents (49.9% females and 50.1% males) from middle-class backgrounds of a large metropolitan area in Spain with over one million inhabitants. In addition to bullying, other variables related with it, some of them denoting school maladjustment, were also considered as outcome variables. These variables were: antisocial behavior, disruptive or undisciplined behavior, academic indifference, perception of violence from teachers, academic self-esteem, family self-esteem and social self-esteem.

Parenting styles were assessed using the ESPA29 Parental Socialization Scale (Musitu & García, 2001). In this scale adolescents report the frequency of several parental practices (father’s and mother’s practices were asked about separately) in different situations with
significant impact on the parent-child relationship in Western culture using a contextual (Darling & Steinberg, 1993) and situational (Smetana, 1995) perspective, where a total of 232 questions were asked, 116 for each parent. Twenty-nine situations were sampled, 13 teenagers’ compliance situations (e.g., ”If somebody comes over to visit and I behave nicely”) and 16 teenagers’ noncompliance situations (e.g., ”If I break or ruin something at home”) to assess parental practices with a 4-point scale (1 = never, 4 = always). In each of the 13 compliance situations, offsprings had to rate the parenting practices of warmth ("he/she shows warmth") and indifference ("he/she seems indifferent"). In each of the 16 noncompliance situations, offspring had to rate the parenting practices of reasoning ("he/she talks to me”), detachment ("it’s the same to him/her”), verbal scolding ("he/she scolds me”), physical punishment ("he/she spansk me”), and revoking privileges ("he/she takes something away from me"). The family score for the acceptance/involvement dimension was obtained by averaging the responses on warmth, reasoning, indifference, and detachment practices of both father and mother (in the last two practices the scores were inverted because they are inversely related to the dimension). The family score for the strictness/imposition dimension was obtained by averaging the responses on verbal scolding, physical punishment and revoking privileges practices of both the father and the mother. Hence, two dimensions measured family parental styles (see Lamborn et al., 1991; Steinberg et al., 1994) so that higher scores represent a greater sense of acceptance/involvement and strictness/imposition (highest score on the two scales = 4). The factorial structure of the instrument was also confirmed in different studies (Martínez, Garcia, Camino & Camino, 2011; Martínez, Garcia, Musitu, & Yubero, 2012; Martínez, Musitu, Garcia, & Camino, 2003).

The four parenting styles –authoritative, indulgent, authoritarian, and neglectful– were defined, after controlling the differences for sex and age, by dichotomizing the family scores on the acceptance/involvement and strictness/imposition dimensions using the median split (50th percentile). In this way, authoritative families were those who scored above the median on both dimensions, indulgent families scored above the median on acceptance/involvement and below it on strictness/imposition, authoritarian families scored below the median on acceptance/involvement and above it on strictness/imposition and, neglectful families scored below the median on both dimensions (Lamborn et al., 1991; Steinberg et al., 1994).

Bullying was assessed with the Questionnaire on School Maladjustment Problems, QSMP (Peralta, Sánchez, de la Fuente, & Trianes, 2007). This questionnaire was also used to evaluate other variables related with bullying and denoting school maladjustment as antisocial behavior, disruptive or undisciplined behavior, academic indifference and perception of violence from teachers. The QSMP has two versions, one for students and one for teachers. In this study, the students’ versions was used. The original version of the QSMP includes 66 items, that are scored on a scale from 1 (never) to 4 (always)

Finally, the academic, social and family dimensions of self-esteem of adolescents were evaluated with the Multidimensional Self-Esteem Scale AF5 (García & Musitu, 1999). In this instrument, self-esteem is understood as multidimensional, hierarchically ordered, and increasingly differentiated with age based on the Shavelson and colleagues’ theoretical model (Byrne & Shavelson, 1996; Shavelson, Hubner, & Stanton, 1976). This scale, with 30 items, assesses self-esteem in five domains: Academic (e.g., ”I do my homework well”), social (e.g., ”I make friends easily”), emotional (e.g., reverse scored, ”Many things make me nervous”), family (e.g., ”I feel that my parents love me”), and physical (e.g., ”I take good care of my physical health”). Each domain is measured using 6 items (99-point scale). Its factorial
structure was confirmed with both exploratory (García & Musitu, 1999, Martínez, 2003) and confirmatory (Fuentes, García, Gracia, & Lila, 2011a, 2011b; García, Gracia, & Zeleznova, 2013; García, Musitu, & Veiga, 2006; García, Musitu, Riquelme, & Riquelme, 2011; Murgui, García, García, & García, 2012) factor analyses, and no method effect appears to be associated with negatively worded items (Tomás & Oliver, 2004).

RESULTS OF THE STUDY

The analysis of variance of the relation between parenting styles and bullying or aggressive behavior among peers show that adolescents from indulgent and authoritative parents tend to participate less in these behaviors than adolescents from authoritarian and neglectful homes. The same result was replicated in the other behavior analyzed that reflects school maladjustment problems (antisocial behavior, disruptive or undisciplined behavior, academic indifference and perception of violence from teachers). No differences were found between adolescents from indulgent and authoritative homes in any of those behaviors (see Figure 1), showing that both styles of socialization –indulgent and authoritative- can act as prevention factors of bullying and the other related behaviors analyzed.

With respect to self-esteem, adolescents raised in indulgent and authoritative homes show higher academic, social and family self-esteem than adolescents raised in authoritarian and neglectful homes (see Figure 2). In line with other results analyzing the relation of parenting and self-esteem in Spanish adolescents, indulgent parenting have similar or better results than authoritative parenting when children self-esteem is considered (e.g., Fuentes et al., in press; Martínez & García, 2007).

CONCLUSION

The results of previous research studying the different personal, social and contextual prevention and risk factors for the development of school violence, especially bullying or aggressive behaviors among peers, are exposed in this chapter. Among these factors, the family context as the first developmental context of children as well as the main socialization agent are highlighted. In this sense, empirical research has repeatedly shown the important influence that the different parental behaviors in the socialization process have in the optimal psychosocial adjustment of children (Baumrind, 2012; Becoña et al., 2012; García & Gracia, 2014; Lamborn et al., 1991; Steinberg et al., 1994). Different studies have concluded that the values, beliefs and attitudes towards school and education that parents transmit to their children will influence significantly on their school adjustment (Fuentes, Alarcón, Gracia et al., in press; Pears et al., 2013; Steinberg et al., 1992a). So, the main aim of this chapter was to analyze the relationships between parental socialization styles (authoritative, indulgent, authoritarian and neglectful) and aggressive behavior among peers at school and other related variables (antisocial behavior, disruptive behavior, academic indifference, perception of violence from teachers, and the academic, family and social dimensions of self-esteem) in order to examine which parenting style would act as a protective factor and which one would act as a risk factor in the Spanish context. According to the results obtained in previous empirical research with respect to children’s psychosocial adjustment, it was expected that the indulgent style, characterized fundamentally by parental affection but not by parental
imposition (high acceptance/involvement and low strictness/imposition), was identified (alone or together with the authoritative style, characterized by high acceptance/involvement and high strictness/imposition), as a protective factor. On the contrary, it was expected that the authoritarian style (low acceptance/involvement and high strictness/imposition) and the neglectful style (low acceptance/involvement and low strictness/imposition) were identified as risk factors.

The results obtained were in line with those previously expected: both the indulgent and the authoritative style were identified as protective factors against bullying since children from indulgent and authoritative families showed the lowest likelihood of getting involved in aggressive behaviors among peers. The authoritarian and the neglectful styles were identified as risk factors because children raised in these homes showed the highest likelihood of behaving aggressively toward their peers at school. Similar results were obtained from the other variables analyzed. On the one hand, children from indulgent and authoritative families obtained the lowest scores in the other school maladjustment criteria and the highest scores in the academic, social and family dimensions of self-esteem. On the other hand, children from authoritarian and neglectful families scored higher in the different school maladjustment criteria and scored lower in the self-esteem dimensions assessed.

These findings are consistent with previous research conducted in the Spanish cultural context (Alonso-Geta, 2012; Cerezo et al., 2011; Garaigordobil & Aliri, 2012; Fuentes, Alarcón, Garcia et al., in press; Fuentes et al., in press; García & Gracia, 2009, 2010; Martínez et al., 2013), as well as in related cultural contexts (DiMaggio & Zapulla, 2014; Martínez et al., 2014; Martínez et al., 2007; Martínez & García, 2008; Rodrigues et al., 2013). These studies have concluded that the indulgent parenting style is associated with the best psychosocial adjustment of the adolescents or that it offers, at least, the same results in children’s adjustment than the authoritative style.

Both parenting styles, the indulgent and authoritative, are characterized by high parental affection in the socialization process (high acceptance/involvement). However, only the authoritative style is also characterized by high parental imposition (high strictness/imposition). Children from indulgent families obtained, at least, the same scores in all adjustment and maladjustment criteria assessed as children whose parents are characterized by the authoritative parenting style. This result suggests that the high use of the parenting practices pertaining to the acceptance/involvement dimension such as parental warmth and affection, parental support and involvement in children’s socialization, as well as the use of dialogue and reasoning with children, are essential for the optimal psychological and social adjustment of Spanish children. On the contrary the high use of the parenting practices pertaining to the strictness/imposition dimension such as parental control, supervision or firm discipline are, at least, unnecessary, or even harmful if they are not used along with parental affection since the authoritarian style was identified as a risk factor for the development of bullying as well as the parenting style related to the worst results in the other criteria analyzed.

Therefore, it is necessary to highlight the importance of considering the family context in the different prevention and intervention programs aimed at avoiding or reducing school violence problems, specially bullying, working the educational strategies of parents in the socialization process and encouraging the adequate use of those parenting practices related to the optimal psychological and social adjustment of children.
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ABSTRACT

Socialization is an interactive process through which cultural contents are transmitted and incorporated into the personality of human beings in the form of behaviors and beliefs. It can also be defined as a not formalized and largely unaware learning process by which, through a complex system of interactions, people assimilate the knowledge, attitudes, values, customs, needs, feelings and other cultural patterns that will configure their adaptation styles to environment. In this chapter, four styles of parental socialization (authoritative, indulgent, neglectful and authoritarian) are analyzed from two orthogonal axes (control/imposition and acceptance/involvement). In addition, the relationships between these four styles of socialization and the different types of violence in adolescence are explored: parental socialization style and overt and relational school violence (pure, reactive and instrumental); parental socialization style and child-to-parent violence (physical and verbal violence towards the father or the mother). These relationships are based on the correlations and MANOVAs resulting from a recent study with a sample of 2,399 Spanish adolescents. Indulgent style was found as the most functional parental socialization style, followed by the authoritative one.
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INTRODUCTION

Socialization is a process by which humans acquire the values, beliefs, norms and forms of proper behaviour of the culture they belong (Musitu & Cava, 2001). The main goal of this process is for the person to take the socially valued objectives as guiding principles of his own conduct, ie, get him take as his own a set of internally consistent values that will become a filter for evaluating the acceptability of his behavior (Musitu, 2013). Therefore, the periods of childhood and adolescence are critical in this process and, consequently, family has been
considered a particularly privileged place for the transmission of these cultural categories. In fact, social scientists have given special attention to the family socialization over the past few decades. An essential aspect in the study of family socialization process has been its effect on personality and adjustment of children and adolescents. We must not forget that child socialization is the primary responsibility in most societies. Thus, within the processes of family interaction, those that aim to socialize the child in a certain system of values, norms and beliefs occupy a major part. These socialization processes are undoubtedly one of the most widely recognized family functions; in fact, it's around socialization where the family roles are distributed and the expectations and parent-child behaviors are delimited. In this sense, we can say that socialization is perhaps the cornerstone of family life.

**The Family as a Context for Socialization**

Family is itself a process of socialization, and in it, socialization develops as psychological function, as interaction function of its members and as basic function of social organization. Family is also a set of relations, a way of living together and of satisfying emotional needs through the interaction of its members which, along with love, hate, fun and violence, builds an emotional environment in which each person learns the skills that will determine his interaction with others in the world around him: the skills for learning in the educational system and for working at the workplace; feelings of self-worth and concern for others; process of decision making and skills to deal with difficult situations such as job loss, infidelity, the incorporation of new members into home, the shortage of funds and abuse of alcohol and drugs by some of its members; managing emotions such as anger and love; compliance or violation of the law; the basis of human interaction, consideration for others and responsibility for one's actions (Badir, 1993).

Family is therefore an environment of privacy where attitudes, ideas and values are learned and exchanged. It is both a reflection of society, a social microsystem, a world of relationships, negotiations, contradictions, operating as a search of approaching and desire for autonomy, need for dialogue and demand for privacy, words and silences, actions and reactions, domains and submissions, satisfactions and sufferings. Likewise, family is an specialized institution on satisfying the psychological needs of child and adult such as understanding, affection, self-acceptance, personal growth, emotional peace, serenity and love. Family is, in short, and although not always, the best institution known on providing their members a "permanent availability to affection, intimacy, companionship and unconditional acceptance" (Pastor, 1988; Musitu, Román & Gracia, 1988; Musitu & Allatt, 1994).

**Socialization within the family: Agency and bidirectionality**

Traditionally, family socialization has emerged as a one-way process: from parent to children. It is clear that parents are better able to influence their children because, as adults, they have a cognitive, social and emotional development which is not present yet in the child and the adolescent. Now this greater influence of parents does not mean that children have a
passive role in socialization. In fact, family relationships are determined not only by parents, but by all family members that contribute to its development.

At the start, all parents begin their difficult task of educating and inculcate certain values and norms of behavior in children with a number of preconceived ideas, in a more or less conscious way, about how children should be (obedient, independent, cheerful, selfish, suspicious, rebellious, mischievous...) and how they must be educated (lovingly, firmly, respectfully, patiently, intransigently...). However, when the child is born, parents can face two realities: their beliefs and expectations are met or they must be modified. A key reason to change these initial beliefs and expectations is that most children are not usually what their parents wish. In addition, parents learn from experience that there are not two children alike: some of them are more sociable, others are more nervous and certainly some have a harder character. Thus, children, although they born helpless and ignorant of social norms, exert from the beginning a level of influence on the specific way in which their socialization process will unfold.

And also children can influence parents' values. The birth of a child can make their parents rethink all their value system and even that they get involved in ways of life different from those held so far. A child can be an important motivator for parents to leave, for example, unhealthy lifestyle habits such as consumption of alcohol and tobacco, or in some extreme cases, the use of illegal substances. Children, in any case, also influence parents through the elements assimilated from other socialization agents. Thus, through children, some values of the school, the media, the fashion and the internet world are inserted often into the family. Therefore, it should be noted that the socialization process is, at least a two-way process and, of course, much more dynamic and complex than is usually suggested. Furthermore, this process is likely to be, in a sense, circular and increasingly accented as children grow.

Inside these processes, an aspect considered important is that, regardless of their directionality, the quality of exchanges between the parent and the child is the key to the setting and quality of the life of its members. This chapter aims to analyze the relations between parental socialization styles and two aspects closely related to the adjustment of children: scholar violence and child-to-parents violence.

**Parental Socialization Styles and Violence in Adolescence**

One of the most currently accepted definition of violence is provided by the World Health Organization (WHO) (1996), that defines it as the intentional use of physical force or power, threatened or actual, against oneself, another person, or against a group or community, which either results in or has a high likelihood of resulting in injury, death, psychological harm, maldevelopment, or deprivation. Other authors agree that the violence term indicates conduct that involves the use of coercive means to do harm to others and / or satisfy the interests of the individual himself (Krug, Mercy, Dahlberg & Zwi, 2002; Leyton & Toledo, 2014). In this respect, Baron, Branscombe and Byrne (2008) suggest a broad and inclusive definition, considering violence as any form of harm inflicted intentionally to others.
Given this diversity of definitions, we have chosen to highlight the most relevant features shared by researchers about violent conducts, helping to differentiate it from other types of behavior. Cava and Martinez (2013) emphasize that the most used classification about types of violent behavior distinguishes between behavioral dimension (direct hostile violence to cause harm) and intentional dimension (violence as a tool to get something and meet own interests). However, as Del Moral (2014) states, these criteria have also been criticized: the criterion of intentionality shows a main limitation in the fact that intent has to be determined by an external observer or be self-ascribed by the own subject; but when the limits of the behavioral dimension are analyzed, it is observed that there are attacks that are intentional but don't end in injury to the victim.

Despite these limitations, there is a broad agreement on highlighting the following dimensions as the ones that set the borders of violent behavior: intention, desire to cause harm (clear item in the behavioral dimension) and, more recently, it's been included the dimension of "domain and power", considering that violent behavior intends to impose the interests of aggressor against the resistance of others (Eibl-Eibesfeldt, 1993).

**Parental socialization styles and school violence**

At school, adolescents not only acquire new contents, values and standards that prepare them for adulthood, but also they create new relationships with peers and establish relations of friendship and companionship (Cava & Musitu, 2002; Martínez, 2013). Additionally, the school is the first formal contact with authority figures. In this scenario, one of the problems that concerns most of the teachers, as well as families and professional intervention, is school violence.

School violence is defined as any type of violent behavior that occurs in the school, including those actions aimed at doing harm to students, teachers, or school material and that can be prompt and occasional or persistent and systematic (Serrano & Iborra, 2005). Indeed, aggressive acts in schools can be of different types: vandalism, physical and verbal abuse, discipline problems in class, emotional abuse (blackmail) and sexual abuse (Benbenishty & Astor, 2005; Skiba, Morrison, Furlongy & Cornell, 2013).

Generally speaking we can say, therefore, that the violent behavior at school has the characteristics of any violent behavior, with two special features: these behaviors occur in schools and colleges and the actors are children and teenagers, who stay together much of the day and may even share classroom and school for several years. Moreover, these behaviors represent a breach of social and school norms regulating social exchanges in this scenario.

According to literature, it seems that the authoritarian style based on punitive measures and phisic punishment, in family environments characterized by the absence of emotional and affective proximity, increases the likelihood of aggressive behavior towards peers (Baldry & Farrington, 1998; Schwartz, Dodge, Pettit & Bates, 2000). However, although the authoritarian style has often been associated with all types of violence, some authors believe that this style of socialization (provided that is not accompanied by physic aggression), may be effective in preventing antisocial behavior of the child against the parent (Cottrell & Monk, 2004; Ulman & Straus, 2003). In cases of school victimization, according to Schwartz and colleagues (2000), harsh and punitive educational practices increase the likelihood of becoming a victim of bullying, as these aggressive models would cause high rates of aggressive reaction and anger, peer rejection and the occurrence of aggressive victim's traits.
Other studies have found that the adolescent aggressor has family contexts that do not facilitate social adjustment, where seem to prevail too permissive or indulgent parenting styles which can tolerate violent behaviors and promote and reinforce aggression (Cerezo & Ato, 2010; Ibabe, Jaureguizar & Diaz, 2007; Stevens, De Bordeaudhuij & Van Oost, 2002). In previous research it has been observed that the indulgent style, characterized by the low level of demand and parental control, and show difficulty in setting standards and respecting the limits (Lamborn, Mounts, Steinberg & Dornbusch, 1991). In cases of school violence, Díaz-Aguado (2005) notes that parents of bullies often combine the indulgence towards antisocial behavior and the frequent use of authoritarian coercion methods, often using physical punishment at the expense of more democratic practices. Thus, not only the severe or indulgent educational practices can be a risk factor for violent behavior, but also the incoherent, inconsistent or inappropriate ones (Smith, 2004). Neglectful style has also been associated with violent behavior in adolescence. Empirical evidence suggests that many of the offenders have little supervision and parental control, and show difficulty in setting standards and respecting the limits (Díaz-Aguado, 2005). Although there are no unique family models of socialization, parents and teachers, experts and youth are agree in indicate the prevalence of neglectful and authoritarian parental styles in the case of aggressors.

In a recent study conducted by Musitu, Suarez & Del Moral (2015) with a sample of 2,399 adolescents, it was observed that, usually, styles of socialization more related to school violence and its different dimensions were, in the positive direction, authoritarian and neglectful. Inversely, the authoritative and indulgent ones, being the indulgent style the one with the highest correlation coefficient (see Table 1).

Table 2 shows the results of the study related to differences in the expressions of school violence discussed above, depending on the styles of parental socialization.

Regarding school violence, as shown in Table 2, adolescents with indulgent style are those expressing lower levels of school violence in all its forms, as compared to the other styles of socialization. By contrast, adolescents from families with an authoritative style reported greater involvement in all forms of peer violence than those who came from families with neglectful, indulgent and authoritative styles. We believe interesting to note that adolescents from authoritative style indicated a similar involvement level to adolescents from authoritarian style in the following dimensions: overt reactive violence, reactive relational violence and instrumental relational violence.

Parental socialization styles and child-to-parent violence

In recent years, along with traditional forms of domestic violence, a new type of abuse and bullying has emerged and grown; child-to-parent violence. Harbin and Madden (1979) were the first to define a new form of violence that they called "battered parent syndrome". More recently, several authors (Cottrell, 2001; Kennair & Mellor, 2007; Pereira, 2006) have identified child-to-parent violence (hereinafter CPV) as a crime of assault against one parent or both, done intentionally to cause physical, psychological or financial harm, in order to achieve power and control with respect to parental figures. Eckstein (2004) found that abuse against one parent often begins with verbal abusive episodes that progress over time increasing in frequency and intensity to the point that verbal abuse is subsumed in the emotional and psychological abuse, mainly when the effects intended by the child are not achieved.
As for the actual prevalence of such violence, parents show a strong tendency to deny the seriousness of the attacks of their children in order to preserve the myth of family harmony. This secrecy of the troubled family situation is, in many cases, a tool through which parents want to protect their self-image as parents and as a family (Pagani, Larocque, Vitaro & Tremblay, 2003). The shame that many of these parents feel for their inability to control the violence, along with the fear of being singled out as the culprits of the problem in open court about their lack of abilities as educators, are other factors that contribute to keep in secret the abuse (Agnew & Huguley, 1989; Bobic, 2004). All these aspects make complicated the calculation of the true incidence of parental abuse.

That said, it is interesting to collect the available data which offer figures that vary depending on the social context analyzed. In early studies, results relative to CPV reflected a low level of incidence, around 7-8% (Peek, Fisher & Kidwell, 1985). However, in subsequent research conducted in different countries (United States, Canada, France) incidence data are shown ranging from 10 to 18% in families with both parents and reach 29% in single-parent families (households composed by mother and one or more children). This figure may reach 50% in samples of violent adolescents in other areas outside family (Kethineni, 2004).

In a Canadian study conducted by Pagani and colleagues (2004) was found that 64% of teens surveyed (both boys and girls, in a random sample of more than 2000 participants), usually assaulted their mothers verbally; 13.8% of them also committed physical assaults. Among the latter, 73.5% pushed their mothers, 24.1% hit them, 12.3% admitted to have thrown objects, 44.4% threaten with physical violence and 4.3% even attacked their mother with a weapon.

In Spain, according to the General Attorney, the total number of such complaints has doubled in the past five years, from just under 2,500 to more than 5,000 cases in 2010. Ibabe and Jaureguizar (2010) provide data from the Basque Country that set the CPV's percentages between 13% and 25%, and, in a later study (Ibabe & Jaureguizar, 2011), they found that 21% of boys and girls participating had used physical violence against their parents, another 21% had used psychological violence (verbal) and half of them (46%) had used emotional violence (blackmail).

However, even though this problem is becoming more serious and its prevalence is getting higher, the study of CPV has not attracted the same interest as other types of violent behavior in adolescents, although it is a recognized and penalized act (Ibabe & Jaureguizar, 2011; Routt & Anderson, 2011). Furthermore, although in previous research CPV has been linked to families with authoritarian style, that have a lot of control over the children and even make frequent use of corporal punishment as physical discipline strategy (Calvete, Orue, Gámez-Guadix, 2012; Gallagher, 2004a; Garrido, 2005), in most of the studies, indulgent and neglectful styles are shown as the most likely to physical and verbal abuse from children and adolescents toward parents.

As it was stated earlier in this chapter, previous research have found that the aggressor adolescent has family contexts that don't facilitate social adjustment, where seem to prevail permissive or indulgent parenting styles that can tolerate violent behaviors and promote and reinforce aggression (Cerezo & Ato, 2010; Ibabe et al., 2007; Stevens et al., 2002). On the other hand, it is important to note that sometimes it was observed that indulgent style of socialization is used by parents when they fear violence in children, as a way to avoid it (Routt & Anderson, 2011).
In the same vein, there are theoretical arguments that relate the CPV with problems in establishing an adequate family hierarchy, a typical feature of neglectful style (Cottrell, 2001; Gámex-Guadix, Jaureguizar, Almonds & Carrobles, 2012). In these cases, the children use violence as an attempt to impose themselves on others in the family or to reject the role in which he is located. As Gámez-Guadix (2010) points out, a child who has lacked of attention, supervision and sufficient control is more likely to be involved in maladaptive coping strategies and shown an aggressive pattern of interaction, even towards his parents. Thus, the neglectful style has been associated with an increased likelihood of physical and verbal aggression against parents, and this educational style is more practiced by fathers, while the permissive or indulgent one is more used by mothers (Ibabe et al., 2007; Romero et al., 2007; Sempere et al., 2005).

At this point, as before, it is interesting to refer to the data provided by the study of Musitu and colleagues (2015). Regarding CPV, it is observed a similar trend to which was found with school violence. As Table 3 shows, adolescents coming from familiar contexts with indulgent style are the least likely to engage in behaviors of physical violence against mother and verbal violence towards father and mother. By contrast, adolescents from families with an authoritarian style reported more physical violence towards mother and verbal towards father and mother.

In addition, an interaction between age and parental socialization styles in verbal violence (mother) and verbal violence (father) was observed. Table 4 collects the average scores obtained, depending on the interaction between the above variables.

As Table 4 shows, adolescents from families with an authoritarian style are more involved in behaviors of verbal violence against the father and mother than rest of adolescents in the period of the middle adolescence (15-16 years). In the remaining socialization styles (neglectful, indulgent and authoritative), the greater level of involvement in acts of verbal violence towards the mother and father occurs mainly in late adolescence (17-18 years). Finally, the adolescents from families with an indulgent style of socialization are the least likely to be involved in violent behavior towards parents, in all age ranges.

**CONCLUSION**

In this chapter we analyzed, first, the fundamental role of the family as a context for socialization, a privileged place for the transmission of the values, norms, beliefs and behaviors of the culture to which the individual belongs. In this sense, we have highlighted, not only the significant impact that the family socialization process has on personality and social adjustment of child and adolescent, but also the active role played by the children and the bidirectional nature of that process. The latter aspect is particularly relevant since, traditionally in the literature, the socialization process in the family has been raised as a one-way path, emphasizing the influence of the parents in the thinking and acting of the children. However, it is necessary to take into account the changes in the value system and the parents’ lifestyles that occur as a result of the interaction with their kids. In other words, socialization in the family should be seen as a bidirectional process, much more dynamic and complex than is usually suggested in the literature, and wherein the mutual influence is accentuated as the children grow and introduce in the family the elements they assimilate from other agents of socialization.
Secondly, we analyzed the relationship between style of parental socialization and violence in adolescence, a crucial aspect related to the adjustment of children. In this sense, in previous research, the authoritarian style has often been associated with all types of violence (Baldry & Farrington, 1998; Schwartz, Dodge, Pettit & Bates, 2000). But also, we can find studies in which violent behavior in the adolescent is related with other parental socialization styles: the indulgent style (Cerezo & Ato, 2010; Ibabe et al., 2007; Stevens et al., 2002) and the neglectful style (Díaz-Aguado, 2005). In the specific case of school violence, the literature shows that not only the authoritarian or indulgent educational practices, but also the incoherent, inconsistent or inappropriate ones (neglectful style) can be a risk factor for violent behavior (Smith, 2004). Furthermore, according to Schwartz and colleagues (2000), the harsh and punitive educational practices can increase the likelihood of being violent against peers, but also of becoming a victim of bullying. Overall, as seen in the recent study by Musitu and colleagues (2015), the styles of socialization more related to school violence and its various dimensions would be, in a positive sense, the authoritarian and neglectful ones, and negatively, the authoritative and indulgent styles, the latter being the one that would show a lesser degree of relationship with school violence in all its forms, compared with other styles of socialization.

On the other hand, regarding the relationship between styles of socialization developed by parents and CPV, some research works link this kind of violence to those families with a very authoritarian style (Calvete et al., 2012; Gallagher, 2004a), but most studies support the idea of indulgent style (Calvete et al., 2012; Cerezo & Ato, 2010; Stevens et al., 2002) and neglectful style (Gámez-Guadix, Jaureguizar, Almendros, & Carrobles, 2012; Cottrell, 2001), as the most likely ones in the cases of physical and verbal abuse toward parents. So, the neglectful style has been associated with an increased likelihood of physical and verbal aggression against both parents, being this educational style more usually exerted by fathers, while the permissive or indulgent ones are more used by mothers (Ibabe et al., 2007; Romero et al., 2007; Sempere et al., 2005). In this regard, in the recent study by Musitu and colleagues (2015), is observed a similar trend in CPV to the one they found in peer violence in the same research. That is, again, adolescents coming from families with an indulgent style of socialization were the least involved in violent behavior towards parents, and in all age ranges. By contrast, adolescents from families with an authoritarian style showed, for example, more cases of physical violence towards the mother and verbal violence to the father and mother. In this study, it is also observed that adolescents from families with an authoritarian style, were more involved in episodes of verbal violence against the father and mother than the rest of the adolescents in the period of middle adolescence (15-16 years). Finally, in indulgent and neglectful authoritative styles, the greatest degree of involvement in acts of verbal violence against the mother and the father was focused mainly in late adolescence (17-18).
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Table 1.

Pearson Correlation between Parental Socialization Styles and School Violence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Socialization Style</th>
<th>Neglectful</th>
<th>Authoritarian</th>
<th>Indulgent</th>
<th>Authoritative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pure overt violence</td>
<td>.190**</td>
<td>.101*</td>
<td>-.130**</td>
<td>-.048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overt reactive violence</td>
<td>.055**</td>
<td>.050*</td>
<td>-.158**</td>
<td>.036 n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overt instrumental violence</td>
<td>.090*</td>
<td>.110**</td>
<td>-.105**</td>
<td>-.030 n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pure relational violence</td>
<td>.078**</td>
<td>.085**</td>
<td>-.114**</td>
<td>-.058**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reactive relational violence</td>
<td>.019 n.s.</td>
<td>.078**</td>
<td>-.112**</td>
<td>.008 n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrumental relational violence</td>
<td>.020 n.s.</td>
<td>.056**</td>
<td>-.099**</td>
<td>.015 n.s.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. n.s. not significant, * significant at .05, **significant at .01.
Table 2.

*Means, Standard Deviations and F Value between Styles of Socialization and School Violence*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Socialization Style</th>
<th>Pure overt violence</th>
<th>Overt reactive violence</th>
<th>Overt instrumental violence</th>
<th>Pure relational violence</th>
<th>Reactive relational violence</th>
<th>Instrumental relational violence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Neglectful</td>
<td>1.39 (.34)</td>
<td>1.62 (.55)</td>
<td>1.15 (.26)</td>
<td>1.37 (.32)</td>
<td>1.79 (.45)</td>
<td>1.20 (.30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authoritarian</td>
<td>1.42 (.32)</td>
<td>1.63 (.52)</td>
<td>1.17 (.26)</td>
<td>1.38 (.33)</td>
<td>1.85 (.44)</td>
<td>1.22 (.31)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indulgent</td>
<td>1.28 (.27)</td>
<td>1.49 (.45)</td>
<td>1.08 (.20)</td>
<td>1.25 (.28)</td>
<td>1.67 (.49)</td>
<td>1.13 (.25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authoritative</td>
<td>1.34 (.30)</td>
<td>1.61 (.57)</td>
<td>1.12 (.23)</td>
<td>1.30 (.32)</td>
<td>1.78 (.48)</td>
<td>1.20 (.32)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F(3, 2395)</td>
<td>18.28 &lt;.001</td>
<td>20.04 &lt;.001</td>
<td>12.66 &lt;.001</td>
<td>14.25 &lt;.001</td>
<td>7.70 &lt;.001</td>
<td>6.68 &lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3.

Means, Standard Deviations and F Value between Styles of Socialization and Child-To-Parent Violence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Socialization Style</th>
<th>Neglectful</th>
<th>Authoritarian</th>
<th>Indulgent</th>
<th>Authoritative</th>
<th>F(3, 2395)</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Physical violence (mother)</td>
<td>.05 (.25)</td>
<td>.07 (.21)</td>
<td>.01 (.05)</td>
<td>.04 (.18)</td>
<td>6.48</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal violence (mother)</td>
<td>.97 (.75)</td>
<td>1.09 (.74)</td>
<td>.63 (.61)</td>
<td>.85 (.75)</td>
<td>23.80</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal violence (father)</td>
<td>.71 (.64)</td>
<td>.83 (.72)</td>
<td>.50 (.53)</td>
<td>.64 (.66)</td>
<td>16.19</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 4.

**Means, Standard Deviations and F Value between Styles of Socialization, Age and Child-To-Parent Violence**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Socialization Style</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>F(11, 2387)</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Neglectful</td>
<td>Authoritarian</td>
<td>Indulgent</td>
<td>Authoritative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal violence (mother)</td>
<td>12-14</td>
<td>.91 (.69)</td>
<td>.90 (.72)</td>
<td>.46 (.53)</td>
<td>.69 (.72)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15-16</td>
<td>.98 (.80)</td>
<td>1.35 (.78)</td>
<td>.77 (.62)</td>
<td>1.01 (.80)</td>
<td>20.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17-18</td>
<td>1.09 (.82)</td>
<td>1.06 (.58)</td>
<td>.87 (.67)</td>
<td>.96 (.61)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal violence (father)</td>
<td>12-14</td>
<td>.70 (.63)</td>
<td>.71 (.68)</td>
<td>.36 (.47)</td>
<td>.52 (.61)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15-16</td>
<td>.66 (.59)</td>
<td>.99 (.80)</td>
<td>.59 (.52)</td>
<td>.76 (.72)</td>
<td>13.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17-18</td>
<td>.81 (.72)</td>
<td>.83 (.58)</td>
<td>.69 (.61)</td>
<td>.72 (.55)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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ABSTRACT

Musitu and García (2001) propose a Spanish perspective on parenting socialisation styles with a view to incorporating contributions from previous studies: authoritative, authoritarian, permissive and negligent. Numerous studies have related certain parenting styles with the psychosocial adjustment of children. However, scant research has examined the relationships between parenting socialisation styles and teen dating violence, which is the purpose of this paper. The sample comprises 2,399 teenagers (50% female). Multivariate analyses of variance (MANOVAs) are used to evaluate the relationships between the four parenting styles and teen dating violence. The findings indicate significant associations between the three types of dating violence studied (physical, verbal-emotional, and relational) and the relationship with the mother, and in the case of the father, with the verbal-emotional dimension only. Indulgent parenting style, on the part of the father and mother, has the weakest relationship with teen dating violence. Teenagers from families that apply authoritarian parenting styles are most likely to get involved in violent teen dating relationships, followed by the negligent style. Finally, the results obtained are discussed along with the limitations of the study.

Keywords: Parenting Styles, Adolescence, Dating Violence, Gender

INTRODUCTION

The family is the most important socialising agent in the life of a person, as the first environment where identity develops and from which the individual relates to others, and also as the first nexus between the individual and the society in which he or she lives. Socialisation is defined as the process whereby people acquire their values, norms and appropriate forms of behaviour in the society to which they belong. To understand processes of family socialisation it is practically essential to draw a distinction between socialisation goals, the practices used by parents to help their children achieve these goals, and their
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parenting style (Darling & Steinberg, 1993). Hence, parenting style can, according to these authors, be defined as a constellation of attitudes held by parents towards children that, when considered together, create an “emotional climate” in which the behaviours of parents are expressed. These behaviours include those aimed at achieving a socialisation goal, parental practices, as well as behaviours that are not aimed at achieving a socialisation goal.

Socialisation goals include the acquisition of specific abilities and behaviours by the child (social abilities, academic abilities, etc.) as well as the development of more global qualities (curiosity, independence, critical thinking, etc.). Logically, these aspects of family socialisation are not universal; rather they are closely related with the cultural context into which the family is integrated. Behaviours not aimed at the achievement of a socialisation goal, on the other hand, include gestures, tone of voice, body language and the spontaneous expression of emotions.

Most research highlights two dimensions or basic factors that explain most variability in the disciplinary conduct of parents, and although each author uses different terms, the similarity between the dimensions proposed is notable; hence they can be unified in terms of parental support (affection and warmth vs. hostility) and parent control (permissiveness vs. rigidity). Depending on these two factors, different types of disciplinary styles have been described as a foundation for analysing the antecedents and consequences of different forms of socialisation on children.

One of the classic studies on parenting styles was conducted by Diana Baumrind in the late 70s. According to Baumrind (1978), the key element of the parental role is to socialise children so that they accept the demands of others whilst maintaining a sense of personal integrity. The author distinguishes between three types of parenting styles according to the parental control dimension: (1) authoritarian style, when parents value obedience and restrict the autonomy of their child; (2) permissive style, when they exercise practically no kind of control over their children and give them as much autonomy as possible, as long as this does not endanger the child’s physical survival; and (3) authoritative style, which is somewhere in between: the parents endeavour to control the behaviour of their children on the basis of reason rather than through imposition.

One of the major contributions to this debate in the 80s came from Maccoby and Martin (1983), who presented a categorisation of parental styles in accordance with the dimensions (a) responsiveness: the degree to which parents respond to the demands of their children; and (b) demandingness: the degree to which parents make demands of their children. The combination of these two dimensions gives rise to the following four parental styles: (1) authoritative or democratic style, according to which parents maintain a responsive disposition to the demands of their children but at the same time expect their children to respond to their parental demands; (2) authoritarian style, where the behaviour of the parents is characterised by the assertion of power and the establishment of rigid norms, emphasising the obedience of rules and respect for authority; 3) permissive style, according to which parents are reasonably responsive but they avoid regulating the behaviour of their children; and 4) negligent or indifferent style, where parents are only concerned with their own problems, providing little support or affection, and setting few boundaries to the behaviour of their children.

Within the Spanish context, Musitu and García (2001) proposed a new classification of parental socialisation styles that aimed to incorporate the contributions of previous studies. This categorisation was established on the basis of two dimensions: (a) involvement and
imposition. Parents with high levels of (a) involvement show affection and warmth towards their children when they behave appropriately, and when their behaviour is inappropriate, they try to talk and reason with them about how and why such behaviour is inappropriate. Parents with low levels of involvement usually show indifference to the appropriate behaviour of their children, and when behaviour is inappropriate, they do not reason with their children, nor do they express opinions or judgements; these parents, therefore, do not get particularly involved in the behaviour of their children, regardless of whether it is appropriate or not. It is also likely that some of these uninvolved parents might use coercive techniques with their children when they behave inappropriately.

In fact, the second dimension considered, (b) imposition, is not linked with the level of parental involvement. A parent can show involvement and acceptance of their child and at the same time use coercive or non-coercive methods (Martínez, Fuentes, García, & Madrid, 2013). Hence, parents with high levels of imposition, when their child does not behave as they would like, regardless of whether they reason with the child or not, try to coerce him or her so that the child does not repeat such behaviour. Coercion can be physical, verbal, or can entail depriving the child of something he or she normally has access to. On the basis of these two dimensions, involvement and imposition, these authors develop the following two-dimensional model that gives rise to four parenting styles.

The essential traits of these four socialisation styles are as follows: (1) the authoritative style is characterised by high involvement and high imposition; (2) the authoritarian style is characterised by low involvement and high imposition; (3) the permissive style is characterised by high involvement and low imposition; (4) the negligent style is characterised by low involvement and low imposition of rules. It is, therefore, a style defined by a lack of affection and boundaries.

It is interesting to note also that all families and all parents share some of the features of the parenting styles described, although there might be shifts from one style to another within the same family depending on the circumstances, needs, parental mood, and the child’s stage of development. However, with the caveat that there might be variations, that any categorisation is a simplification, and that “prototype” or “pure type” families do not exist, it is nonetheless certain that observing regularities in the behaviours and norms of each family, they can be situated closer to one style than to another. Furthermore, consistency and coherence have been found in parenting styles over time (Molpeceres, 1991; Musitu & Lila, 1993; García & Gracia, 2010). Finally, it is worth highlighting that in spite of the different terms used to describe parenting styles, all the dimensions and categorisations set out in the scientific literature have a great deal in common with one another, which indicates that the disciplinary dimensions might contain a considerable component of transcultural generality (Musitu, Román, & Gracia, 1988; Musitu & García, 2001).

This process of family socialisation also encompasses aspects related with gender. Specifically, the socialisation of gender refers to the process whereby people begin to feel, think and act differently depending on whether they are male or female, which develops from early childhood (Povedano, 2013). During adolescence, the family plays an even more important role than at other developmental stages in the socialisation of gender, through the assimilation and reproduction of behaviours, attitudes and roles associated with gender. In this respect, the type of affective bond that parents establish between them provides the first model of relationship that children will have. If this type of relationship is conflictive and violent, it is highly likely that teenagers will tend to get involved in dysfunctional dating
relationships. These initial experiences of learning through observation are extremely important, since teenagers from families with low levels of communication and affection could become involved in controlling and unhealthy dating relationships. However, a parental style that establishes clear boundaries for young people, shaped by closeness, affection and open and positive communication seems to exert a protective function during adolescence against violence in dating relationships (Vézina & Hérbert, 2007).

Partner violence can be defined as the abusive behaviour displayed repeatedly by a man against a woman with whom he currently has or has had a sentimental relationship in order to exercise control and dominance over the woman and the relationship (Povedano, 2013). To achieve his goal, the man might use subtle methods such as isolation, control, and belittling, or other more evident methods such as shouting, insults, humiliation, accusations, threats, emotional abuse, sexual abuse, or any other effective strategy of violence to achieve his purpose. The main objective of the aggressor is to dominate the victim. Hence, when physical violence presents itself, normally the abuser has already established a previous pattern of verbal, psychological, or sexual abuse. Physical violence is “only” used if the other forms of violence are not effective.

The first partner or dating relationships are normally established during adolescence and can mark patterns of behaviour in future adult relationships (Povedano, Jiménez, & Valdivieso, 2013). These first relationships can be occasional and fortuitous encounters that are exploratory behaviours of intimate and sexual encounters typical of adolescence, and that, normally, remain a secret from parents or teachers, or they can be more profound relationships, in which the bond is stronger, and significant adult figures in the teenager’s life are normally informed about them. However, in spite of the specificity of the first dating relationships that occur in adolescence (exploratory behaviours and not cohabitation), the mechanisms of violent action against the partner (cycle and process) are very similar to those found in adulthood (Povedano, 2014).

Women who regularly suffer gender violence are not constantly being assaulted. Normally, in the relationship, moments of tension and violence are alternated with other moments of calm and even affection. This alternation becomes a cycle of gender violence, which generates a high level of mutual dependence and in which three clearly differentiated stages can be identified: (1) the build-up of tension is characterised by unexpected mood swings, rage provoked by unimportant matters, and irascibility in the man towards an external element, which triggers the next stage; (2) violent explosion where the tension built up in the previous stage is unleashed with an acute episode of relational or physical violence. The main intent of the abuser is not so much to damage the victim as to dominate her. The acute incident comes to an end when the abuser feels that the victim has “learned her lesson”; in the last stage, (3) the so-called honeymoon or remorse phase, the tension and violence subside until they disappear. The aggressor usually acknowledges his guilt, asks for forgiveness, and promises to change and not to be violent again, and might even agree to get counselling. The victimisation of the woman becomes even more profound at this point since the relationship of dependency between victim and aggressor becomes closer (as she thinks that he is not such a monster since he can at times be a wonderful man). However, promises to change never come to anything, and the cycle begins again in the first stage of tension build-up.

Furthermore, the abuser creates the conditions required to dominate and control the victim so that the woman, through his manipulation, takes herself further into the process of violence. The first step in the process of gender violence is to create and consolidate a system
of dominance over the woman based on three basic tools: (1) through isolation, the abuser will try any way he can to isolate the victim from her network of family and friends, which is a prior step to the next stage; (2) control begins in relation to aspects that might appear unimportant, such as the woman’s clothing or make-up. However, gradually and progressively control will be established over more important aspects of the woman’s life, such as her relationships, schedules, activities, etc. Initially, the aggressor will use subtle behaviours, such as getting angry or giving her the silent treatment, until more forceful and direct acts are brought into play, such as insults or punishments; finally (3) by belittling her, the aggressor materialises the androcentric belief that man is superior to woman. These are behaviours that, systematically, endeavour to deride the capacities, opinions, emotions and actions of the woman. The process closes when the system of dominance is consolidated; in other words, when the aggressor regularly uses tools of isolation, control and belittling (Povedano, 2014).

Table 1 provides some examples of behaviours that teenage boys use to create and consolidate the system of dominance over girls. Particularly close attention should be paid to detecting these behaviours among teenagers to prevent fundamentally girls from entering into a process of gender violence and perpetuating a system of partner abuse that will in all likelihood continue into their adult life.

For many teenagers and adolescents, gender violence is perceived as a private aspect in amorous relationships or justifiable in some circumstances, as indicated in the study carried out by Díaz-Aguado and Carvajal (2010) with a Spanish teenage population, in which, for example, 35% of the teenage boys who participated in the study did not consider one form of behaviour to be abuse (such as “controlling everything my partner does”) in contrast to 26.2% of the girls interviewed. One of the many interesting discoveries made by this study is that boys justify partner violence to a greater extent than girls. However, partner violence is not a justifiable and private problem that affects just the person who is suffering from it; it is an attack on the victim’s human rights and health, and, therefore, a public matter.

There are two risk conditions that are particularly relevant in teen dating violence: the tendency to justify and reproduce the sexist and violent models with which they have lived during childhood and adolescence; and the imbalance of power between men and women, on the basis of which the stereotypes linked gender are perpetuated and transmitted, fundamentally through the family socialisation processes. Gender socialisation is the process whereby people learn which values, beliefs, emotions or behaviours are considered socially acceptable for men and for women (Estévez, Povedano, Jiménez, & Musitu, 2012). This process of socialisation is subject to the socio-cultural characteristics of each specific context in which the person learns to participate in the logic of the society to which they belong, discovering the cultural reality and their relationship with it through the development of their own identity. Gender socialisation takes place fundamentally within the context of the family, with parents being the universal agents of socialisation, in terms of their direct influence and also because they constitute a filter for the experience of their children in other important contexts in their development.

Gender, therefore, is socialised and learned just as violence is. Hence, it has been identified that the greater involvement of boys in forms of physical aggression could be attributed to learning “gender differentiated patterns of violence” (White, 2002). Furthermore, there are also family-related risk factors that are linked to dating abuse, including: parental punitive practices, the lack of affective cohesion, frequent conflicts, inadequate patterns of
family communication, violent marital relations, and physical or sexual abuse of children by their parents.

Regarding the socialisation of violence, a great deal of research has focused on studying the association between a certain parenting style and the consequences or effect produced on the psycho-social adjustment of the child. In the classic studies carried out by Baumrind (1971, 1977, 1978), the conclusion is drawn that there are certain characteristics in children that correlate with the three types proposed by the author. Hence, authoritarian parents usually have conflictive, irritable, unhappy and distrustful children; permissive parents usually have impulsive and aggressive children; and democratic parents usually have energetic, friendly children with high levels of self-confidence, self-esteem, and great capacity for self-control. In short, the idea gleaned from the studies conducted by Baumrind is that both total authoritarianism and total permissiveness produce undesirable effects and that these effects are enhanced when accompanied by distance and coldness in the affective relationships between parents and children.

However, scant research has analysed the relationships that exist between parental socialisation styles and teen dating violence, which is the fundamental aim of this chapter.

METHODS

Participants

A sample of 2,399 adolescents from 9 schools (state and grant-aided) in Spain took part in this study (50% female). Rural and urban secondary schools were selected. The sample is representative of the Spanish educational community which numbered 2,446,715 secondary students in the 2013-2014 academic year. A sample error of ± 2.5%, a level of trust of 95% and a population variance of 0.50 were assumed. The size of the sample required was 1,528 students. The selection of participants was carried out using a multi-staged stratified random sample (Santos, Muñoz, Juez, & Cortiñas, 2003). The sample units were rural and city state and grant-aided schools in Andalusia. The strata were established by province and ownership.

Procedure

After obtaining the relevant institutional (School Administration) and parental permits (written documents signed by the parents giving their consent), trained researchers carried out the survey in the classroom during regular class times. It was made clear to the adolescents that participation in the research was voluntary, anonymous and required prior parental consent. The study met the ethical values required for research on human beings, respecting the basic principles included in the Helsinki Declaration (informed consent and a right to information, protection of personal data and guarantees of confidentiality, non-discrimination, gratuity and the option of abandoning the study in any of its phases).

Measures
Parenting socialisation styles were measured with Parental Socialization Scale for Adolescence (ESPA29; Musitu & García, 2001). This scale assesses the parents’ socialization styles, that is, the educational styles of the father and mother with their children. The adolescent rates the father’s and mother’s action independently in 29 relevant situations. Of the 29 situations proposed, 16 are negative (e.g., “If I am dirty and poorly dressed”) and 13 are positive (e.g., “If I take care of my things and am clean and properly dressed”). The questionnaire allows identifying 4 educational styles of the father and mother along the involvement/acceptance-coercion/imposition continuum: authoritative (high involvement/acceptance and high coercion/imposition), indulgent (high involvement/acceptance and low coercion/imposition), authoritarian (low involvement/acceptance and high coercion/imposition), and neglectful (low involvement/acceptance and low coercion/imposition). Psychometric studies of the scale reveal high internal consistency (Musitu & García, 2001). In the present study, the internal consistency coefficients were acceptable (ESPA mother $\alpha = .89$ and ESPA father $\alpha = .85$).

Teen dating violence was measured with Conflict in Adolescent Dating Relationships Inventory (CADRI; Spanish version of Fernández-Fuertes, Fuertes, & Pulido, 2006). Instead of using the full instrument—34 items, grouped into 5 subscales (physical abuse, sexual abuse, verbal-emotional abuse, threatening behavior, and relational aggression)—17 items from the Spanish version were used. The response format is a rank scale with 4 options from 1 (never) to 4 (often). Ten of the items measure verbal-emotional aggression, both reports of perpetration (e.g., “I insulted her/him with put-downs”) and victimization (e.g., “S/he insulted me with put-downs”); 3 items measure relational aggression, both reports of perpetration (e.g., “I spread false rumors about him/her.”) and victimization (e.g., “S/he spread false rumors about me.”); and 4 items measure physical aggression, both reports of perpetration (e.g., “I kicked, hit or punched her/him”) and victimization (e.g., “S/he kicked, hit or punched me”). Internal consistency (Cronbach’s Alpha) of these 6 factors was acceptable ($\alpha = .82$, $\alpha = .85$, $\alpha = .65$, $\alpha = .70$, $\alpha = .76$, and $\alpha = .80$, respectively).

RESULTS

Table 2 shows the correlations between the variables of this research project: the dimensions involvement and imposition of the mother and father, and relational, verbal-emotional and physical violence in adolescence. Negative relationships were observed between the involvement of the mother and relational and verbal violence, whereas the involvement of the father was only linked with verbal-emotional violence. Regarding imposition, correlations were observed between the imposition of the mother and relational and physical violence, and this was also the case with the father.

Table 3 and Figure 1 show the results of the MANOVA for the socialisation styles of the mother and the three dimensions of teen dating violence (relational, verbal-emotional, and physical).

Regarding relational violence, as reflected in Table 3 and Figure 1, teenagers whose mothers use a permissive style are less likely to express relational violence in their dating relations, in comparison with the other styles of socialisation. On the contrary, teenagers whose mother uses an authoritarian style reported higher levels of relational violence in
partner relationships than teenagers socialised through negligent, permissive and authoritative styles.

In relation to verbal-emotional violence, as reflected in Table 4 and Figure 2, teenagers whose fathers use a permissive style, as is the case with mothers in relation to relational violence, are less likely to report verbal-emotional violence in their dating relationships. In contrast, teenagers whose father uses an authoritarian style reported higher levels of this type of violence in their dating relationships than teenagers socialised through negligent, permissive and authoritative styles.

CONCLUSION

The findings of this research indicate that there are differences in the relationships between the socialisation styles of the father and mother, and the different expressions of teen dating violence. In relation to the mother, significant relationships have been observed with the three types of violence studied: physical, verbal-emotional and relational, whereas in the case of the father, differences are only observed in the dimension of verbal-emotional violence.

It is interesting to highlight that, relating to the mother and the father, teenagers whose families have a permissive socialisation style express the lowest levels of dating violence, in comparison with the negligent, authoritarian and authoritative styles. However, teenagers from families with authoritarian styles are mostly likely to become involved in violent teen dating relationships, followed by teenagers from families with a negligent style. In short, the styles of socialisation characterised by affection, understanding and support are the most favourable when it comes to building healthy teen dating relationship, in particular in the case of the mother.

This study has analysed the relationships between styles of family socialisation and teen dating violence, finding that positive socialisation styles characterised by high levels of affection act as protective factors in teenage sentimental relationships. However, there are other scenarios in which processes of socialisation occur that also have profound implications on teen dating dynamics, such as school, peers, the media, and information and communication technologies. Future research in this sphere might wish to examine the relationship between such contexts and teen dating violence.
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Table 1. Examples of Behaviours Used by Teenage Boys to Create and Consolidate a System of Dominance over Their Partners (Povedano, 2013)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Isolation</th>
<th>Control</th>
<th>Belittling</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Jealousy and criticism, direct or indirect, of friends and family.</td>
<td>1. Controlling what she does, who she sees, who she talks to, what she reads, what friends she has on social media, where she goes.</td>
<td>1. Making her feel inferior, stupid, bad, silly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Provoking uncomfortable, humiliating or awkward situations on social occasions.</td>
<td>2. Deciding about her clothes, make-up, relationships, leisure activities.</td>
<td>2. Making her feel guilty for all their problems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Restricting her use of the mobile, computer, etc.</td>
<td>3. Watching her and even following her to know where she goes.</td>
<td>3. Laughing at her feelings, actions or thoughts in private or in public.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Convincing her that no one will believe her because of her lack of credibility owing to her reputation as being crazy, weird, or unfaithful.</td>
<td>4. Overseeing everything the girl has to do, as if he were the master in the relationship.</td>
<td>4. Ignoring her, not speaking to her, or not answering her.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Banning her from having contact with her friends.</td>
<td>5. Trying to convince her not to continue studying, or to give up a job that earns her money.</td>
<td>5. Coming onto other girls in her presence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6. Discrediting her ironically in front of family and friends.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7. Revealing personal or intimate information about her in front of other people.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2.

_Correlations between Dating Violence Dimensions and Parental Socialization Styles_

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Relational violence</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Verbal-emotional violence</td>
<td>.530**</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Physical violence</td>
<td>.478**</td>
<td>.443**</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Involvement Mother</td>
<td>-.134**</td>
<td>-.107**</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Imposition Mother</td>
<td>.126**</td>
<td>.035</td>
<td>.049*</td>
<td>.179**</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Involvement Father</td>
<td>-.041</td>
<td>-.118**</td>
<td>-.023</td>
<td>.769**</td>
<td>.171**</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Imposition Father</td>
<td>.141**</td>
<td>.035</td>
<td>.116**</td>
<td>.211**</td>
<td>.770**</td>
<td>.235**</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. * significant at .05, **significant at .01.
Table 2.

Means, Standard Deviations and F Value between Mother Socialization Styles and Dating Violence Dimensions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Socialization Style Mother</th>
<th>Neglectful</th>
<th>Authoritarian</th>
<th>Indulgent</th>
<th>Authoritative</th>
<th>F(3, 1707)</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relational violence</td>
<td>1.15 (.30)</td>
<td>1.19 (.35)</td>
<td>1.11 (.25)</td>
<td>1.15 (.27)</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal-emotional violence</td>
<td>1.44 (.43)</td>
<td>1.51 (.45)</td>
<td>1.38 (.38)</td>
<td>1.43 (.43)</td>
<td>7.40</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical violence</td>
<td>1.10 (.25)</td>
<td>1.11 (.28)</td>
<td>1.06 (.21)</td>
<td>1.10 (.28)</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>&lt;.020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3.

*Means, Standard Deviations and F Value between Father Socialization Styles and Dating Violence Dimensions*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Socialization Style Father</th>
<th>Relational Violence</th>
<th>Verbal-emotional Violence</th>
<th>Physical Violence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Neglectful</td>
<td>1.16 (.31)</td>
<td>1.47 (.44)</td>
<td>1.11 (.30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authoritarian</td>
<td>1.18 (.34)</td>
<td>1.51 (.46)</td>
<td>1.12 (.33)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indulgent</td>
<td>1.12 (.26)</td>
<td>1.38 (.38)</td>
<td>1.10 (.24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authoritative</td>
<td>1.15 (.30)</td>
<td>1.41 (.42)</td>
<td>1.10 (.28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F(3, 1707)</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>7.10</td>
<td>2.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p</td>
<td>.109</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>&lt;.074</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Abstract

This chapter analyzes current evidence between parenting styles and adolescent substance use for the European context. As opposed to traditional results obtained in Anglo-Saxon contexts with European-American samples, evidence from emergent research from European countries (Sweden, United Kingdom, Spain, Portugal, Slovenia, and the Czech Republic) shows that adolescents from indulgent families perform as well as the authoritative one on substance use (and personal disturbances). Furthermore, in the European context, the indulgent parenting style performs even better than for authoritative parenting style on self-esteem and school performance. The indulgent parenting appears as the optimum parenting style in these European samples of six countries, including two from Northern Europe (e.g., UK and Sweden). This currently evidence give support to the possibility of implementing similar strategies in family prevention, given that same parenting styles seem to be working on the same direction in very different European back-grounds, moreover if participants as in this research had different levels of substance use and presence of parenting practices. Programs designed to promote family drug prevention in Europe based on established currently real risk factors is an urgent need, because most of them do not address identified risk or protective factors.
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INTRODUCTION

Epidemiology data from the United States and Europe claim a high, but also growing, prevalence of substance use by adolescents (Conway et al., 2013; European Monitoring Centre for Drugs and Drug Addiction, 2012). Although efforts against substance use have existed for quite some time, drug abuse is a major public health problem that impacts society on multiple levels. However, substance abuse has even a major impact on adolescent health, since risky substance use patterns expose adolescents, the future adults, to harsh long-term health problems (Thompson et al., 2013). Parental socialization has been especially critical for adolescent substance use, and literature widely recognize that parental influences can promote or discourage adolescent substance use.

The parenting styles have been characterized by dimensions of parental responsiveness and demandingness (Baumrind, 1991; Maccoby & Martin, 1983). The combination responsiveness (warmth, acceptance, involvement) and demandingness (strictness, imposition, parental firmness) (Adalbjarnardottir & Hafsteinsson, 2001; Cano, Solanas, Mari-Klose, & Mari-Klose, 2012; Darling & Steinberg, 1993; Lamborn, Mounts, Steinberg, & Dornbusch, 1991; Steinberg, 2005; Steinberg, Lamborn, Darling, Mounts, & Dornbusch, 1994; Turkel & Tezer, 2008), both theoretically orthogonal dimensions (Darling and Steinberg, 1993; Lamborn et al., 1991; Maccoby & Martin, 1983; Steinberg, 2005; Steinberg et al., 1994), defines four types of parenting styles: Authoritative (warmth and strictness), authoritarian (strictness but not warmth), indulgent (warmth but not strictness), and neglectful (neither warmth nor strictness) (Darling & Cumsille, 2003; Steinberg, Blatt-Eisengart, & Cauffman, 2006).

Research conducted mainly in Anglo-Saxon contexts with European-American samples has consistently recognized authoritative parents (i.e., harmonious, warm and responsive parents that exert concurrently firm control and maturity demands) as the optimal parenting style since it is regularly associated with optimum outcomes on children and adolescents (i.e., adolescents from authoritative homes are linked to the less level of drug use). By example, in a survey to nearly 5,000 North American adolescents between the ages of 12 and 19 years old (Bahr & Hoffmann, 2010), it noted that teens least prone to heavy drinking had a family characterized by both strictness and warmth: an authoritative family. Indulgent parents, those low on strictness and high on warmth, had nearly tripled the risk of their youngster participating in heavy drinking. In an intermediate position, authoritarian parents (high on strictness and low on warmth) had more than doubled than their youngster’s risk of heavy drinking. In another USA sample of 5,419 adolescents from the National Longitudinal Study of Youth, those whose parents were authoritative were less likely to drink heavily than adolescents who experienced neglectful or indulgent parenting styles (Hoffmann & Bahr, 2014). Not only the positive influence of an authoritative parenting style is related to the use of substances, the same sort of influence is found, by example, in academic performance (Cohen & Rice, 1997; Im-Bolter et al., 2013), psychological competence (Lamborn et al., 1991), or behaviour problems (Lamborn et al., 1991; Steinberg et al., 1994).

On the other hand, evidence from emergent research from South European and Latin American countries shows that adolescents from indulgent families performs as well as the authoritative one on substance use. By example, in a study which 1416 Spanish adolescents between the ages of 12 and 17 years old (García & Gracia, 2009), those whose parents were
Authoritative or indulgent were less likely to drug use (alcohol, tobacco and illicit drugs use) than adolescents who experienced neglectful or indulgent parenting styles. The same pattern of results also emerged in another four Spanish studies (Fuentes, Alarcón, García, & Gracia, in press; García & Gracia, 2010; Gracia, Fuentes, García, & Lila, 2012; Martinez, Fuentes, García, & Madrid, 2013). Teens raised by indulgent or authoritative parents were not only less likely to use drugs but also had fewer personal disorders (García & Gracia, 2009, 2010; Martinez et al., 2013). Still further, in Spanish recent studies, the so-called indulgent parenting style performs even better than for authoritative parenting style on several outcomes as self esteem (Fuentes, García, Gracia, & Alarcón, in press; Martínez & García, 2007) and school performance (Fuentes, Alarcón, Gracia, & García, in press). In fact, researchers in South European countries such as Spain (Alonso-Geta, 2012; Martínez & García, 2007; Musitu & García, 2001, 2004), Portugal (Rodrigues, Veiga, Fuentes, & García, 2013), Turkey (Turkel & Tezer, 2008), and Italy (DiMaggio & Zappulla, 2014), or in South American countries such as Mexico (Villalobos, Cruz, & Sanchez, 2004), and Brazil (Martinez & García, 2008; Martínez, Garcia, & Yubero, 2007; Martínez, Musitu, Garcia, & Camino, 2003), also found that children and adolescents of indulgent parents did perform equally, or even better, in several youth outcomes (Burns, 2011; Cobb, 2010; Scheier & Hansen, 2014; Weiten, Dunn, & Hammer, 2012).

**Parenting and Adolescent Substance Use in The European Context**

**Objective**

This chapter analyzes current evidence between parenting styles and adolescent substance use for the European context (Calafat, García, Juan, Becoña, & Fernández-Hermida, 2014). Calafat and colleagues (2014) have analyzed at the risk of adolescent using alcohol, tobacco and illegal drugs use in multicountry samples from Sweden, the United Kingdom, Spain, Portugal, Slovenia and the Czech Republic. Study aims to examine what sort of parenting style (characterized by warmth and strictness) is more protective against adolescent substance use in different European countries. Study start hypothesize, drawing from the previous literature review, that authoritative parenting style should be the most protective against adolescent substance use in Europe, and adolescents from authoritative families would show higher self-esteem, better school performance and less personal disturbances; with the exception of the Southern European countries, where the most protective parenting style should be the indulgent one (characterized by warmth but not strictness). Additionally, three traditionally adolescent outcomes (self-esteem, school performance and personal disturbances) frequently associated with the use of substances (García & Gracia, 2009; Lamborn et al., 1991; Steinberg et al., 1994) were also measured.
METHODS

Participants

A total of 7,718 European adolescents (ages 11 to 19 years old) from six European regions participated in this research. The locations were chosen trying to cover different cultural sensibilities, attitudes and legal frameworks towards alcohol and other drugs, including populations from Northern (Stockholm, Sweden), Central (Ljubljana, Slovenia; Prague, Czech Republic,), Western (Liverpool, UK) and Southern (Palma de Mallorca, Spain; Coimbra, Portugal) of Europe. Sample were of 1,778 Spanish (23.0%), 1,868 Portuguese (24.2%), 827 British (10.7%), 1,216 (15.8%) Czechs, 1,014 Slovenian (13.1%), and 1,015 Swedish (13.2%); ranged in age from 11 to 19 (M = 14.63 years, SD = 1.9 years), 2,364 (30.6%) were 13 years-old or younger, 2,610 (33.8%) were 14–15 years-old, and 2,744 (35.6%) were 16 years-old or older; including 3,774 men (48.9%) and 3,944 women (51.1%).

Participants’ anonymity and confidentiality were guaranteed, and institutional ethical research approval, licenses and authorizations in each country to undertake the survey were obtained. Three ethical approvals were obtained from three University Committees (Liverpool John Moores University, Univerzita Karlova V from Prague and Karolinska Institutet from Stockholm).

Measures

The main instruments used for this research were a 15-items scale (García & Gracia, 2009; Lamborn et al., 1991) to assess frequency of adolescents’ involvement with alcohol, cigarettes, marijuana, and other illegal drugs, and the Warmth/Affection Scale (Rohner, Saavedra, & Granum, 1978) and the Parental Control Scale – PCS (Rohner, 2005; Rohner & Khaleque, 2003) to assess the parenting style. Additionally, three sets of outcome variables were also assessed: self-esteem, school performance, and personal disturbances (García & Gracia, 2009; Lamborn et al., 1991; Rosenberg, 1965).

Substance use was measured with a 15-items scale that tapped the frequency of adolescents’ involvement with alcohol, cigarettes, marijuana, and other illegal drugs; obtaining scores for three specific factors: alcohol use, cigarettes use, and illegal drugs use (García & Gracia, 2009; Lamborn et al., 1991). Adolescents were asked about their alcohol use (never, once a month or less, weekly, and daily) and drunken episodes last month; and tobacco and illegal drugs use with 8-items exploring different frequencies. Cronbach’s alpha value was .77.

Parenting styles were measured with WAS and PCS scales. Adolescents responded to the two versions of the WAS (Warmth/Affection Scale), one assessing perceptions of their fathers (or primary male caregivers), and one assessing perceptions of their mothers (or primary female caregivers). The WAS has been used in approximately 500 studies within the United States and internationally in the past five decades (García & Gracia, 2009, 2010; Khaleque & Rohner, 2012; Lila, Garcia, & Gracia, 2007; Rohner & Khaleque, 2003). The WAS scale is a reliable measure of the extent to which adolescents perceive his or her parents as loving, responsive, and involved (sample items: "Tries to help me when I am scared or upset," and "Talks to me about our plans and listens to what I have to say"). Cronbach alpha for this 8-item scale was .91 for the mother version, and .93 for the father version (correlation
between both versions, $r = .57, p < .001$). The PCS scale assesses the extent to which the adolescent perceives strict parental control of his/her behavior (sample items: "Tells me exactly what time to be home when I go out," and "Gives me certain jobs to do and I will not let me do anything else until they are done"). Cronbach alpha for this 13-item scale was .76 for the mother version, and .80 for the father version (correlation between both versions, $r = .64, p < .001$).

Self-esteem was measured with the scale of Rosenberg (Rosenberg, 1965), a 10-item self-report measure of global self-esteem. It consists of 10 statements related to overall feelings of self-worth or self-acceptance (e.g., ‘I feel that I’m a person of worth, at least on an equal plane with others’). Cronbach’s alpha value for this scale was .85. School performance was measured with a 13-items self-report scale (e.g., ‘I don’t go to school some times because I don’t want to’). Cronbach’s alpha value for this scale was .88. Personal disturbances were measured with a 10-items self-report scale (e.g., ‘Been in trouble with the police’), being the Cronbach’s alpha value for this scale .66.

### Four parenting styles

Following the example of Steinberg and colleagues (Lamborn et al., 1991, p. 1053; Steinberg et al., 1994, p. 758) the four parenting styles (authoritative, indulgent, authoritarian, and neglectful) were defined with a median split (50th percentile) on each family parenting dimension (warmth and strictness) and examined the two variables simultaneously. Mothers’ and fathers’ scores of warmth and strictness were averaged in two-parent households to obtain each family’s parenting dimension. Authoritative families were those who scored above median on both warmth and strictness, whereas neglectful families were below median on both variables. Authoritarian families were above median on strictness but below median on warmth. Indulgent families were above median on warmth but below median on strictness. Following García and Gracia (2009, 2010, 2014), we split the sample by country, sex and age groups.

### RESULTS

#### Drugs use

Were obtained different levels of drugs use between the six European countries (Figure 1). For example, in Czech Republic, alcohol, tobacco and illegal drugs use were the higher. In the other hand, in Slovenia, alcohol use and illegal drugs use were the lower, and in the UK, tobacco use was the lower.

However, despite significant differences in drug use across the six European countries, it is interesting that both adolescents who characterized their parents as authoritative or those who characterized them as indulgent scored more positively than did adolescents from authoritarian and neglectful families in all the variables that measured drug use (use of alcohol, tobacco and illegal drugs) (see Figure 2).
The other set of outcomes

Were obtained different levels of self-esteem, school performance and personal disturbances between the six European countries (Figure 3). In the same line that drugs use, adolescent from indulgent and authoritative homes always showed lower personal disturbances than male and female adolescents from authoritarian and neglectful homes. However, in these two outcomes, the self-esteem and the school performance of adolescents from indulgent families were higher than adolescent from authoritative homes (Figure 4).

CONCLUSION

This chapter analyzes the relationships between parenting styles and adolescent substance use using a two-dimension four-typology model of parenting styles with an ample sample of European adolescents. Interestingly, both the authoritative –warmth and strictness– parenting style and the indulgent –warmth but not strictness– were associated with lower levels of substance use than authoritarian and neglectful parenting styles, performing similarly in Southern European countries (Spain and Portugal) as well as in the other European countries assessed (Sweden, United Kingdom, Slovenia, and the Czech Republic). While, the neglectful parenting style –neither warmth nor strictness– and the authoritarian parenting style –strictness but not warmth– were associated to the highest level of tobacco and illegal drug use, being alcohol use even higher for neglectful than authoritarian parenting style (Calafat et al., 2014).

These results confirm previous research in some South European (DiMaggio, R., & Zappulla; Musitu & Garcia, 2004) and South American countries (Martinez & Garcia, 2008; Villalobos, Cruz, & Sánchez, 2004), as well as in other cultural contexts (Hindin, 2005; Wolfradt, Hempel, & Miles, 2003; Kazemi, Ardabili, & Solokian, 2010), suggesting that adolescents from indulgent families do perform equally (i.e., use of alcohol, tobacco and illegal drugs, and personal disturbances) or even better (i.e., self-esteem and school performance) than adolescents from authoritative homes. Is more, adolescents from authoritative families performed equally with adolescents from indulgent families, but never better.

Clearly, these results differ from those obtained in other cultural contexts. For example, in USA, Bahr and Hoffmann (2010), noted that Indulgent parents, low on strictness and high on warmth, had nearly tripled the risk of their youngster participating in heavy drinking (Hoffmann & Bahr, 2014). Although a certain number of studies, conducted mainly in Anglo-Saxon contexts with European-American samples, continually suggest that the authoritative parenting style or even, for certain minorities, the authoritarian parenting style, both sharing strictness as a characteristic, have the best positive effect in the area of drug use prevention (Bahr & Hoffman, 2010; Hoffmann & Bahr, 2014; Lamborn et al., 1991; Montgomery, Fisk, & Craig, 2008; Steinberg et al., 1994), stressing that parental firm control, or strictness, may act as a prevention to deviance (Lamborn et al., 1991; Maccoby & Martin, 1983; Steinberg et al., 1994); our finding on indulgent parenting style show it to be as protective as the authoritative style on adolescent substance use in the European context.
Taking into consideration that the level of drug use for the different substances differs among explored countries, and that the presence of the diverse parenting styles is not distributed in the same way, these findings are still more interesting. Because this could imply that parenting styles relationship with the variables considered is the same independently of the country considered.

Hence, from the global perspective of personal health, our findings support the idea that the indulgent style performs as the optimum parenting style in the European context, or at least as well as the authoritative style. These results confirm previous emergent research carried out in several cultural contexts (Hindin, 2005; Kazemi et al., 2010; Wolfradt et al., 2003), mainly in Southern European and Latin American countries (Alonso-Geta, 2012; Garaigordobil & Aliri, 2011, 2012; Garcia & Gracia, 2009, 2010; López-Romero et al., 2012; Rorigues et al., 2013; Villalobos et al., 2004) in which adolescents from indulgent families obtained equal or even better scores, for the different indicators of psychosocial adjustment, than adolescents from authoritative families. Thus, current findings add knowledge to a growing body of empirical research questioning the idea of the authoritative style being always related to the best psychosocial adjustment for adolescents (Lamborn et al., 1991; Maccoby & Martin, 1983; Steinberg et al., 1989), while supporting the importance of using practices such as parental warmth and bidirectional communication for the optimal psychosocial adjustment on adolescents and the prevention of deviances (Garcia & Gracia, 2009, 2010; Kerr & Stattin, 2000; Martinez & Garcia, 2008; Martinez et al., 2007; Stattin & Kerr, 2000; de la Torre et al., 2011; White & Schnurr, 2012).

In sum, this growing body of empirical research indicates that warmth and communication are key items when characterizing optimum parenting. The combination of high levels of parental warmth and involvement with low levels of strictness appears in this study to be the best parenting strategy in the European context. These results are consistent with previous studies in Southern European countries (Spain and Portugal). In these cultures, strictness and impositions in the socialization practices seem to be perceived in a negative way (Garcia & Gracia, 2009, 2010, 2014; Martinez & Garcia, 2008; Rudy & Grusec, 2001; White & Schnurr, 2012). As Sorkhabi (2005) points out, more research is needed before conclusions can be drawn on the extent to which culture constructs, such as individualism and collectivism, explain the effects on child development. In fact, the optimal parenting style will depend on the cultural backgrounds where parent-child relationships takes place (Becoña Martinez, Calafat, Juan, Fernández-Hermida, & Secades-Villa, 2012; Garcia & Gracia, 2009; White and Schnurr, 2012), on the parenting socioeconomic status (Leung, Lau, & Lam, 1998) and even in the new social situations (Kazemi et al., 2010).

At the same time, this study gives support to the possibility of implementing similar strategies in family prevention, given that same parenting styles seem to be working in the same direction in different European backgrounds, even though participant areas in this research had different levels of substance use and presence of parenting styles had different frequencies around participant countries. The use of family prevention programs in Europe based on established risk factors is an urgent need, because most of them do not address identified risk or protective factors (Juan, Calafat, Duch, & Becoña, 2014; Lloret, Espada, Cabrera, & Burkhart, 2013; Vermeulen-Smit, Verdurmen, Engels, & Vollebergh, 2014).
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Chapter 13 — Parenting and Forgiveness for Sociomoral Competence

PARENTING STYLES AND FORGIVENESS FOR CHILD DEVELOPMENT AND ADOLESCENTS' SOCIOMORAL COMPETENCE
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ABSTRACT

This chapter proposes an approach for explain as the parenting socialization for promoting forgiveness in childhood may contribute to foster adolescents’ sociomoral competence. The main argument is that the internalization of values occurs in disciplinary family encounters. Parental practices for the internalization of justice principles during childhood can foster forgiveness in a context that promote the sociomoral (e.g., concern for others, prosocial behaviors, reconciliation) and personal (e.g., emotional regulation, self-concept, accurate self-assessment) competences along adolescence. Literature shows as after moral transgressions, indulgent parental practices of induction, focusing on the consequences that the child’s behavior have for others, attributing responsibility to the child, but without the use of an “moralizing” rule, parents may inducing other-oriented empathy and feelings of guilt. After the guilt, parents can lead actions for children to take their responsibility and seek reparation; help children to overcome shame and, finally, forgiveness. In conclusion, the chapter is setting the stage for testing a model of parenting practices based on to develop personal responsibility to seek reparation and forgiveness in childhood for the promotion of sociomoral development in adolescence.
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INTRODUCTION

Why is forgiveness relevant for child development? Possibly, Clark (1997) responded that question better than anyone:
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Try to imagine a society without sympathy. Suppose unsympathetic fathers and mothers look impassively at their children’s scraped knees and bruised feelings. Friends yawn with boredom when they hear of each other’s misfortunes and upsets. No one says ‘I’m so sorry’ or ‘that’s too bad.’ Community members offer no condolences to the bereaved. Without mercy or consideration of extenuating circumstances, judges, bosses, and teachers hold people accountable for every action they take or fail to take [emphasis added]. Imagine yourself a member of this group, never giving sympathy or getting any. (p. 3).

Clark’s description of a society without mercy addresses sociomoral development regarding how children grow to become adults capable of judging with fairness and compassion. The psychological literature indicates that the internalization of values, particularly justice, begins in contexts of parent-child interactions. The practice of induction enforces discipline without much resistance from the child to create affective-cognitive schemas that will be assimilated via modeling (i.e., social learning) and/or inner conflicts (i.e., cognitive-constructivism). These schemas are developmental and organized as normative scales of values. Theoretically, the child will practice values solving interpersonal problems in the family, conserve the schemas spontaneously transferring them to (or activating them in) relationships with friends to carry on in the life span.

The psychological literature also indicates that justice is the primary value under scientific scrutiny, and that empathy, sympathy, compassion and social perspective taking are the psychological means for a person to develop with fairness and compassion in adulthood.

This chapter introduces forgiveness as part of the normative scale of values promoted in childhood. Forgiveness has three dimensions: forgiving, receiving forgiveness and self-forgiving (Enright et al., 1996). The theme of forgiveness is no news in: (a) moral psychology, where forgiveness is intrinsic to the development of justice reasoning by cognitive-constructivism or (b) prosocial development, where forgiveness is defined as altruism. Clinical intervention studies (Enright & Fitzgibbons, 2000; Worthington Jr, 2005) have accumulated evidences from forgiving. Discussions from findings obtained through clinical interventions relate forgiving to unsolved interpersonal problems in a person’s life apart from parenting and processes of how forgiveness apply to solve those problems since childhood. For that, theory should focus, firstly, on the side of the offender and his or her motivation for seeking forgiveness and receiving forgiveness; secondly, on the side of victim for forgiving and reconciliation. How can parents foster these dimensions of forgiveness in their children? To address this question, the chapter follows with a short presentation of each area of study that will substantiate the arguments for parenting and forgiveness in childhood.

**Parenting Styles**

Parenting is a pattern of most frequently used behaviors from mothers and/or fathers toward their children. A review of studies in psychology outlines two dimensions of parenting: firmness/control and warmth/responsiveness. It also reveals four parenting styles: authoritative, indulgent, authoritarian and neglectful.
The empirical literature shows that authoritative and indulgent parenting styles produce the most positive developmental outcomes in children. These parenting styles are child-centered and cause less resistance from or negative impact on children to impose limits in their behavior, and are also democratic allowing, via induction, some degree of child participation in family matters and rule making. Despite these commonalities, authoritative and indulgent styles differ in the degree of control of child’s behavior and personal choices. Authoritative parenting style is highly structured, firm, and maintains respect for the rules of the family and ascendency of parents in relation to their children; indulgent parenting style is more lassie-affair situating parents and children more equally across situations. Yet, indulgent parents tend to attribute personal responsibility for children’s behaviors letting them learn by consequences.

Authoritarian parenting is characteristically high on behavioral and psychological control and low in warmth toward the child. Parents set the rules to their child and obedience is the form of showing respect. Neglectful parenting means that parents are low in firmness/control and warmth/responsiveness toward the child. This style is negative for child development for providing a sense of abandonment, and, as consequence, children develop no sense of security or trust in the world.

**DISCIPLINARY PRACTICES**

Authors agree that disciplinary practices are patterns of aggregated behaviors frequently applied by parents in their daily routine with children, yet influenced by personality, age, ethnicity, culture and/or socioeconomic conditions. The frequency of parent-child conflict increases from infancy to adolescence regarding the legitimacy of parental authority requiring parents to adjust their parenting style with disciplinary practices that vary according to multifaceted situations. Experienced parents use several means to enforce the rules of discipline and foster inner conflicts in their children for the internalization of values. Parents know how, when and to what child a particular practice will function for the better.

Disciplinary practices are: (1) **Power assertion**: parents make predominant use of commands and imperatives, for example, “You will do it because I said so!” and physical punishment to make children comply with the rules; (2) **Love withdrawal**: Parents use feelings to send verbal or implicit messages of disapproval to their children (e.g., “I do not like you when you behave like this”; or parents show faces of anger). Parents also ignore the child, threaten to leave the child alone etc.; (3) **Induction**: parents explain the rules, listen to children and acknowledge their feelings. For example, parents say: “You need to go to bed early, how do you feel about saying good night and going now?” This shows respect for the child’s feelings, which is very appropriate and desirable in many circumstances to get children’s compliance to the rules. Yet, parents can use (4) **Positive reinforcement** of desirable behaviors by praising the child when he or she complies with the rules spontaneously. For example, parents might praise the child for waking up on time, for making their bed, for doing their homework etc. Parents might ignore negative behaviors, concentrating on the positive or use (5) **time out**: parents remove the child from a problem situation, let the child express their feelings of frustration but put no emphasis on what the child did wrong. Or, (6) **cushion**: after a child’s moral transgression (e.g., when children harm
others), parents reduce the power of authoritarian practices (i.e., power-assertion or love-withdrawal) by following their expression of anger and frustration from child’s behavior with explanation. They justify their anger toward the child but also listen to the child’s feelings for being disciplined, and then allow a closure for the problem. For example, parents may look firm at the child and say: “Go to your room now (authority). You hurt your brother and it made me really angry. Go to your room and wait for me there because we may need to talk about your behavior (inductive discipline). Then, when we decide that it is time, you may come back to the living room to play with your brother as you most often do well (positive reinforcement).”

Parental practices also do not happen in a vacuum. So, it is important to focus on the contents of the situation.

**Socio-moral Domains, Child Transgressions and the Legitimacy of Parental Authority**

Turiel (2005) argues that parenting and parental practices occur in four specific domains involved in parent-child interactions: (1) **The Moral**, where parents enforce discipline via prescriptive actions for behaviors that affect the rights and the welfare of others. (2) **The Conventional**, where parents enforce discipline for behaviors consensually agreed as valuable for the family and cultural traditions. (3) **The Personal**, when the boundaries of parents and children’s authority are blurred and multifaceted, and parents have to carefully consider the legitimacy of their children’s demands in areas of personal choices (e.g., choice of friends). Finally, (4) **Prudential concerns**, which relate to areas of child protection, safety, health, education, comfort etc.

The degree of legitimacy and efficacy of parental authority depends on age and parents’ and children’s perception of domain-specific issues. Early in infancy, parents justifiably use authoritarian discipline to protect their children for prudential concerns and to advice children against moral transgressions, which is quite common in childhood. Hoffman’s (2000) theory of internalization of values provides a good account of the importance of sociomoral development of justice and care in childhood. The focus of moral socialization in the early years is to inhibit children’s negative behaviors and tendencies to harm others. In adolescence, the nature of conflicts changes and most frequently parents and adolescents disagree about the moral, conventional, personal or prudential nature of the issue. Nevertheless, if the problem behavior escalates to unjustly wound parents or children, values like justice and/or forgiveness apply to the solution of the problem despite the nature of the conflict.

The arguments will focus on child’s moral transgressions because they are non-negotiable behaviors, where the child lacks respect to others, harm others physically or verbally and violate principles of fairness and concern for the well-being of others. Those are certainly situations where parents can foster the development of justice and forgiveness.

**Sociomoral Competence**
Walker and Taylor (1991) studied parents’ style of communication with their children in two different types of moral dilemmas: a hypothetical and a real life moral dilemma, in a 2-year experimental design. It was verified that child’s moral development was better predicted when parents used Socratic dialogue with supportive verbal interactions where parents could match their children’s level of reasoning and, at the same time, raise their communication to higher levels.

Leman (2005) predicted two possible explanations for the effective influence of authoritative parenting on children’s moral development that happens consistently through adolescence. One is what they called “discursive atmosphere”, which means that authoritative parents may indicate the connections between moral rules and justifications of any kind to the child. Thus, the “developmental benefits are from reason in its broadest sense and the discursive positive atmosphere in parent-child relations” (p. 266). The other possibility was called “specific justifications” where authoritative parenting presents the child with justifications from a particular kind of reason or ethic to apply to judgments of moral issues. Both possibilities are connected because a positive atmosphere may be used to promote parents’ particular ethic, but there is a distinction in the quality of the developmental outcome. A “discursive atmosphere” allows children to construe their own grasp of the rational nature of rules and “specific justifications” imply “the internalization of means for legitimizing rules for social conduct” (p. 266). To investigate these two possibilities, he examined how children perceived adults’ justifications in moral transgression situations. He interviewed 100 children with a mean age of 10 years and seven months. Leman used a measure for parenting style groups and for justification of parental authority, he used five illustrated short stories depicting moral transgressions. In the illustration, a parent says to the child: “you should not do this”, and a child asks, Why?.” Children would them fill in the blank with what they think that the adult would reply to the child. Children were also asked to explain why adults would have said that rule. Leman verified that when children attributed an explanation to the adults’ rule, children of authoritative parenting tended to use equality more often than children of authoritarian parenting. However, the surprise result was that, when looking for the extent to which children used the categories proposed from adults’ explanation equality, it was only marginally significant. A significant effect was found for consequences for others category given by children of indulgent parents. What Leman is saying is that indulgent parents are fostering children’s own sensibility to conclude that the behavior is not permissible. In this way, parents do not “moralize” their explanation for ruling. They use induction to raise perspective taking, empathy, compassion and that helps children to conclude they should comply with moral principles. Therefore, the internalization of moral principles requires not only understanding the necessity of the moral rule, but also acknowledging the consequence of one’s action for others.

Bolivar et al. (2008) studied 131 Spanish adolescents aged from 12 to 14 to compare parenting styles with prosocial attitudes in adolescence. Findings showed that children from indulgent parents followed by authoritative parents had significantly more prosocial attitudes than adolescents from authoritarian or neglectful parents. Patrick and Gibbs (2012) also found that “other-oriented induction” induce empathy-based guilt in children and it is significantly related to moral identity in adolescence.

Santos (2014) examined the frequency of agreement with conceptions of forgiveness in relation to parenting styles in 186 Brazilian boys and girls, 15-year old average age. Conceptions of forgiveness vary in complexity and categories were created from folk
conceptions, empirical studies in psychology and philosophical expert definitions. In general, statements that imply forgiveness as a change of negative feelings into positive feelings like “forgiveness is the return of trust and love for the person who offended,” are more complex because they consider the level of difficulty to act in accordance with the rule. Her findings showed that adolescents from authoritative parents tended to choose complex statements significantly more than adolescents from the other parenting style groups. However, one should observe here that Santos was assessing adolescents’ understanding of what forgiving is and, therefore, her hypothesis is congruent with predictions that a discursive atmosphere in parent-child interaction may lead to better comprehension of values. If her participants were also asked to agree with statements that would justify a person to seek for forgiveness, perhaps participants raised by indulgent parenting would show higher frequency to statements indicating the consequences of moral transgressions onto others. Well, if children from authoritative and indulgent parenting will differ in more or less conscience for the consequences of behavior and awareness of their social responsibility for amendments after moral transgressions is an open empirical question for further replication of Santos’s study.

Therefore, the literature has accumulated evidences in favor of authoritative style and induction practices for the internalization of moral principles. What is news is that indulgent parenting style use of induction, in association with concern for others with no moralizing of the rules, can also foster the internalization of justice and forgiveness.

Hoffman (2000) calls situations in the family that parents combine induction with other practices to cause guilt and inner conflict in the child after moral transgressions as “discipline encounters”. His model for the internalization of justice and care is interpreted as: Child’s transgression → Parental induction for punishment → Child’s guilt → inner conflict → the internalization of moral principles. Hoffman alleges that: “When children process and understand an induction message, this can produce in them an empathic response to the victim’s distress, an awareness of their action’s being the cause of that distress, and a feeling of empathy-based transgression guilt.” (p. 144).

Hoffman’s approach principles of justice and care within the same model. Forgiveness follows the same principles, but it requires an expanded model. Children’s empathic response to the victim’s distress should mean that they feel guilt and acknowledge their responsibility for what they caused to others and, therefore, children might seek reparation (i.e., compensation, restitution etc.). However, if guilt, which is specific to child’s behavior in a particular event, is motivational to repentance, parents can anticipate that children will feel shame in seeking reparation. Shame involves the realization of public social judgments indicating that the child is “bad” for acting wrong. Parents should use induction to help their children to overcome this part of the process. Perhaps, considering seeking for forgiveness as a way to overcome shame. Enright, Santos and Al-Mabuk’s (1989) socio-cognitive model of forgiveness reasoning shows that early adolescents are influenced by public acknowledgments and positive reinforcements for using values of the family and/or friends. Therefore, Hoffman’s model can be expanded to include forgiveness as follows: Child’s transgression → Parental induction for punishment → Child’s guilt → Child’s inner conflict → Parental induction for responsibility → Child acknowledging the hurt → Parental induction for reparation → Child’s shame → Parents’ induction for forgiveness. If the conflict involves members of the family, let’s say between siblings, parents can use children’s level of understanding to communicate means for reconciliation. This will help the one who was offended to understand the importance of forgiving the other who is asking for
forgiveness. To have children understanding at their own level the consequences of what happens in the family when people do not consider forgiveness may help. Then, parents stress that forgiveness is a conscious and voluntary process letting children decide in their own time. Nevertheless, the process of forgiveness and reconciliation should be overt. Implicit or symbolic gestures for forgiveness will leave the window of resentment open to reappear in further conflicts. So, a child has to ask for forgiveness and the other has to express overtly whether he or she has forgiven or not.

Enright’s et al (1996) defined forgiveness as a moral attitude and defends that forgiveness depends on a person sense of justice and the quality of the relationship between victims and offenders. Enright theory includes a process model for each dimension of the forgiveness triad that is helpful to advise parents. The model includes (a) acknowledgment of the hurt, where victims or offenders assess the consequences caused or inflicted on the other; (b) a decision for asking for forgiveness and forgiving, where victims an offenders look for understanding what is forgiveness; (c) to take the perspective of the other as motivation for forgiveness and, finally, (d) victims and offenders look for a meaning to the suffering caused by injustice, seek acceptance and new purposes for their relationship. At this point, reconciliation with each other or with the self is a possibility.

Riek (2010) examining situational factors that would lead offenders to seek for forgiveness, built a model of association considering rumination (or constant rehearsal of the offense), responsibility (or acknowledging the hurt), severity of the hurt, anger and closeness of the relationship. Fouty-eight college students from a Christian institution responded to self report measures of the variables of interest and were asked to recall an incident where they hurt someone unjustly. Results showed a negative correlation between anger and responsibility indicating that the more a person perceived responsibility the less anger he or she felt towards the victim; perception of responsibility had no significant unique effect on guilt and closeness of the relationship had direct association to seeking forgiveness. Authors of this chapter have no knowledge of further studies proposing models from the offender’s side other than Riek’s that brings partial support for the one that is proposed here.

Finally, what does a review of the literature on forgiveness in psychology indicate for forgiveness in the family and in friendship contexts?

FORGIVENESS IN FAMILY CONTEXT

In parent-child relationship, feelings of injustice occur after frustrated expectations regarding the actions or attitudes of one and another. Lee and Enright (2009) examined the intergenerational consequences of anger from injustices in the family. Their review of the literature indicated that because of gender identification, modeling parenting quality in father-son and mother-daughter interactions have long term consequences. Particularly, injustices and harsh discipline from fathers are positively correlated with aggressive behaviors in sons; verbal and physical abuse from fathers toward their sons predicted anger and aggression when they were college students; forgiveness mediates psychological process that can release anger reminiscent from injustices in the family; also, that when adolescent sons forgive their fathers, conflict in father-son relationship decreased significantly. Enright and Lee investigated whether forgiveness would mediate fathers’ perceived unfair treatment from a
family member in their past and anger toward their own sons in the present. They found that “fathers who were hurt by their fathers and were still struggling to forgive may relate this more strongly toward their sons in terms of anger, whereas those who were hurt by their fathers but have forgiven may relate this experience less to their sons.” (p. 28).

Furthermore, a study by Lawler-Row, Hyatt-Edwards, Wuensch and Karremans (2011) suggests that psychological stress caused by lack of forgiveness in relationships as close as family can lead to physiological indices of malaise, feeling of loneliness and stress. Some studies indicate that the relationship between mother and child has the most influence in the attitude of forgiving. A longitudinal study by Mao et al. (2008) with 114 families showed that when mothers apologize for her mistakes, children tend to forgive them the most, while the same was not true for fathers. They also found that children who are forgiven by their parents show stronger feelings of closeness in relation to them. Apparently, the attitude of forgiveness can strengthen the emotional bonds between parents and children, promoting better relationships. Richaud de Minzi, Lemos and Rubilar (2014) found, in the cultural context of middle class families in Argentina, that boys and girls are more likely to forgive their mothers’ faults than their fathers’. Finally, a longitudinal study by Christensen et al. (2011) with 334 families found that although the relationship with both parents influence children, the mother’s relationship with the child played a central role in son’s attitude to forgiving both father and mother during adolescence. Furthermore, the results showed that the more mothers forgave the children during infancy, the more children tended to forgive others in adolescence.

Parents’ relationship with each other is of fundamental importance in the behavior of children, influencing their lives in various degrees, and may even result in aggressive behavior and/or anxiety in the child (Grych & Fincham, 1990). When fathers and mothers forgive each other, the child tends to be more forgiving as well, especially toward fathers (Christensen et al., 2011). Thus, forgiveness between parents can be an effective way to positively influence their children’s behavior, and improve the quality of the marriage itself, since it also shows that forgiveness is related to marital satisfaction (Finkel et al., 2002).

**FORGIVENESS IN ADOLESCENCE - PEERS CONTEXT**

Park and Enright (1997) believe that forgiveness is often associated with seeking reconciliation from friends. To forgive a friend is a conscious decision, influenced by factors such as time since the injustice happened, the perception of the intensity of the hurt caused and the quality of friendship. The lack of forgiveness between friends can affect not only the offended person, but also the self-esteem of the one who offended, especially women (Hodgins, Liebeskind, & Schwartz, 1996).

Two studies conducted by Tabak et al. (2012) showed that offenders who apologized, tried to make amends with victims or tried to compensate them somehow, as acknowledging the error, were seen by them as more likable. Moreover, these gestures indicated increased forgiveness and the feeling of friendship for the fact of making the person look nicer.

Finally, Peets, Hodges and Salmivalli (2013) say that forgiveness among teenagers strongly depends on the relationship between the victim and the offender. In her study, teens offended by peers who are not close tended to forgive less and adopt negative behaviors such
as avoidance or revenge. In contrast, when offended by friends who are close friends teenagers tended to forgive completely and even after acknowledging feelings of anger or avoidance toward the friend, the victims kept positive affect for their offenders.

CONCLUSION

This chapter examined theories and studies on parenting socialization and parental practices for the internalization of moral principles (Hoffman, 2000) to suggest that parents can expand the education of their children to include responsibility to seek reparation and forgiveness after child’s moral transgressions. The focus is on the offender’s side and processes of seeking forgiveness and receiving forgiveness after transgressions. Also, from the victims’ side for forgiving. Psychological components of the process are: affective-cognitive schemas for justice and forgiveness as interrelated values, guilt and shame as moral sentiments, empathy and social perspective taking as motivational abilities. The educational practice is induction followed by attribution of responsibility to children pointing to the consequences of injustices on others. The goal is reconciliation in the family. Later, in adolescence, children can have the capacity to seek for forgiveness, receive forgiveness and forgive, and reconcile with friends.

Integrating personal responsibility and forgiveness in the model of transgressions and punishment can further research on parenting and forgiveness in childhood. Researchers should examine the process of seeking forgiveness that may be different from receiving forgiveness. Also, to examine authoritative and indulgent styles forms of communication and consistency of values through adolescence. Findings are indicating that indulgent style raises sociomoral competence without stressing the morality of the rules, which is more characteristic when parents are viewed as role models. Also, results from studies examining forgiveness in the family have found that mothers are significant agents for values more than fathers. While it may be the result of gender biases, the role of same-sex dyads in the process is important to be examined in childhood because of gender identification modeling. Finally, the review of studies on forgiveness in the family and in adolescents’ peers context is supportive of the assumption that treating forgiveness as part of moral education in the family strengthen personal competences in adolescence.
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ABSTRACT

As an in-home visiting program designed to promote positive parenting, enhance child health and development, and prevent child maltreatment, evaluations of the degree to which the Healthy Families America (HFA) model has met its objectives are multifarious. Research suggests some support for positive parenting and child health and development (e.g., positive effects for parent-child interactions, higher birth weights, and increased use of community-based resources). Yet there seems to be a lack of support for positive effects on domestic violence, substance use, and the prevention of child maltreatment. Some have argued that the disparities in results are expected given that HFA was designed as a flexible model that can be tailored to specific community-based needs. As such, research and evaluation of HFA must continue and evolve to better understand how to shape continued HFA successes now and in the future. Broader models of success (e.g., ones that embrace the ecological model) may need to be considered for better evaluation of this translational program. Importantly, HFA has worked to implement effective changes based on research results and ever-changing societal needs. New Best Practice Standards and future considerations will be discussed.
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HISTORY OF HEALTHY FAMILIES AMERICA

Approximately 686,000 substantiated cases of child maltreatment occur each year in the United States (U.S.), with 1590 annual deaths due to abuse or neglect (USDHHS, 2012). Although advocacy efforts against maltreatment have existed for quite some time, a
foundational epidemiological study by Felitti and colleagues (1998) initiated an amplification of these efforts when they published data suggesting that a history of adverse childhood experiences, including abuse and neglect, was linked to poorer health outcomes in all 10 of the leading causes of morbidity and mortality in the U.S. Home visit psychosocial interventions aimed at preventing child abuse and generalized maltreatment, defined as “any act or series of acts of commission or omission by a parent or other caregiver that results in harm, potential for harm, or threat of harm to a child” (Leeb et al., 2007, p. 11), evolved as one such model for preventing harm to children. Such programs have been found to be efficacious but with varied effect sizes (Ammerman et al., 2006; Gomby et al., 1999; Karoly, 1998; Kendrick et al., 2000). Researchers have found that home visit programs can decrease childhood injuries and accidental ingestions (Olds et al., 1998) and promote positive parent-child interactions (Armstrong et al., 1999). Outcomes are typically dependent on the length of time families engage in the program and number of visits included (Wagner & Clayton, 1999). Success also appears to be dependent on the mothers’ level of motivation and time management skills, amount of privacy within the home that is available to discuss concerns, and whether or not other family members will allow home visitors into the home. Moreover, rapport with home visitors has been found to be very important, with staff turnover negatively affecting program efficacy (Ammerman et al., 2006).

There had been thousands of privately and publically funded home visit programs (Gomby et al., 1999). Healthy Families America (HFA) is a home-based child maltreatment prevention program for new and expectant at-risk parents that seeks to follow children and families through the first 3 to 5 years of life, until the child either enters Head Start or kindergarten (Dumont et al., 2008; Leeb et al., 2007). HFA was established in 1992 by the national Committee to Prevent Child Abuse (now Prevent Child Abuse America) in collaboration with the Hawaii Family Stress Center (Daro & Harding, 1999) in an effort to provide services to the most vulnerable families (Daro, 1998). Additional initial support also came from the Ronald McDonald House Charities (Daro, 1998). HFA has now been established in over 450 sites in 38 U.S. states (Falconer, 2011; Galano, 2007; Leeb et al., 2007). This growth was due, in part, to additional governmental funding efforts in the late 1990s and early 2000s (Galano, 2007). Currently, federal funding is provided to help support staffing and support services, including the quality assurance process. Beyond this, sites are typically responsible for procuring their own funding unless they are part of a statewide HFA initiative providing state funding (e.g., Arizona and New York). Please refer to Table 1 for additional information on HFA’s historical time line.

Primary HFA program goals are to 1) promote positive parenting, 2) enhance child health and development, and 3) prevent maltreatment. The HFA model focuses on specific populations, targets for change, mechanisms for change, and designated outcomes (Daro, 1998). HFA was not designed as a strict replication model, meaning that the program provides a structured framework and then expects that each community/agency will tailor the program to meet its own needs (Galano, 2007). In general, three principles guide the development of individualized HFA community programs: 1) provide communities an empirically supported foundation to develop their own programs, 2) ensure the availability of extensive services for the families most in need nested within the bigger project, and 3) identify methods of supporting individual and systemic change for health and social service institutions (Daro, 1998). Although a strict replication structure is not required between all sites, Friedman and Schriber (2007) identified and discussed 10 centralized components that
The components include administration/governance, strategic planning, training and technical assistance, community planning/site development, continuous quality improvement/credentialing, public relations/media, public/advocacy, collaboration, public education/awareness/outreach, and communication. Friedman and Schreiber (2007) indicated that as of 2003, 17 out of the 34 states that responded to state systems surveys were categorized as more developed (i.e., were able to demonstrate having at least 8 out of 10 centralized components). The highly developed states were more likely to have a greater number of sites, a greater number of families served, and more funding.

Since its inception, HFA has promoted the concept that the best prevention efforts need to be orderly with a strong foundation starting before birth or shortly thereafter (Daro, 2000). HFA is based on Bowlby’s (1982) attachment theory, Bronfenbrenner’s (1979) ecological system’s theory, and Watzalwick’s (1990) constructivist views of child maltreatment. The premise is that strong secure attachments between a child and primary caregiver are crucial in developing healthy social and emotional development, strong social relationships are necessary in facilitating this, and people create their own realities to shape their perspectives of the world. Utilizing these foundational models can then support families in revising their understanding of attachment to provide a strong foundation for their children. To help establish this strong foundation, families are often referred to HFA by medical or other community resources or child welfare agencies based on risk factors assessed either prenatally or shortly after birth (Harding et al., 2007). HFA does not require that families are offered enrollment prenatally, but several programs have found benefits to doing so (Harding et al., 2007).

Initially, HFA worked to accomplish their prevention efforts by developing a strong foundation via three elements (i.e., service initiation, content, and training) that have since grown and changed based on research findings (reviewed later) and societal needs (Daro & Harding, 1999). Today, the three elements that initially established HFA’s foundation have grown into best practice standards. HFA programs now require 12 Best Practice Standards (previously called 12 Critical Elements) that must be implemented before an HFA program can be accredited (Frankel et al., 2000; HFA Best Practice Standards, 2014). As part of the quality assurance process, HFA programs undergo site self-assessments in conjunction with peer review site visits to obtain and maintain certification (Falconer, 2009), thereby demonstrating adherence and commitment to the 12 Best Practice Standards (HFA Best Practice Standards, 2014). This ongoing program development is a testament to HFA’s dedication to providing quality care to families most in need. Please refer to Table 2 for an overview of the 12 Best Practice Standards.

A research network has been composed of over 50 academic and public administrators, all with the common purpose of exploring HFA efficacy and determining changes that need to be made to HFA Best Practice Standards (Daro, 2000; HFA Best Practice Standards, 2014). This research network has worked to establish formal comparison groups, a range of outcome measures, multiple methods of data collection, integration of data collection system, multiple post-intake assessments, and clear documentation. The most common outcome measures have included tracking of reports to Child Protective Services, maternal and child health, parent-child interactions, capacity to care for children, use of formal and informal supports, and maternal life course choices (education, employment, having more children, welfare).
OVERVIEW OF HEALTHY FAMILIES AMERICA RESEARCH RESULTS

HFA research has demonstrated mixed results with little evidence of reduced substantiated reports of child maltreatment or abuse. The earliest systematic review of HFA was conducted by Daro and colleagues (1999), who evaluated 17 HFA programs with results suggesting positive impacts on parent-child interactions and parenting capacity. This initial evaluation was followed by a study of 816 participants from 17 HFA programs nationwide (Daro et al., 2003). Daro and colleagues’ (2003) investigation demonstrated that annual budgets for HFA ranged from $202,000 for 60 families with 5 home visitors to $2.8 million for 1101 families with 65 home visitors. Home visitor caseloads ranged from 9.8 to 21.6 families per worker. Programs varied widely in the education level of home visitors (i.e., from 0% with a bachelor’s degree to 100% with bachelor’s degree). Study findings showed that older participants, unemployed participants, and those who enrolled earlier in their pregnancy were more likely to stay in the program and complete more home visits. African American and Hispanic participants were more likely to remain in the program with African Americans and Hispanic Americans participating in the greatest number of home visits. Those enrolled in school more likely to stay in program, and younger home visitors seemed to obtain better results. Programs that were able to match participants and providers on parenting status and race/ethnicity had stronger enrollment, as did those with smaller caseloads.

Harding and colleagues (2007) offered a more comprehensive review of HFA programs. The evaluation included 33 HFA studies; 15 of the 33 included a control or comparison group. The included studies had an average of 110 participants per program with as few as 10 participants to more than 1000. The researchers concluded that HFA programs were demonstrating consistently positive effects on higher birth weights and breastfeeding, with 43% of programs enrolling parents prenatally. Improvements in positive parenting practices and attitudes were also demonstrated in multiple studies (Harding et al., 2007). Similar findings were reported by Mitchell-Herzfeld and colleagues (2005) and Whipple and Nathans (2005), who were not included in the Harding and colleagues’ 2007 analysis. These researchers reported lower rates of maternal depression, greater positive parenting attitudes, higher birth weights, improved maternal employment rates, and greater material supports for HFA families (Mitchell-Herzfeld et al., 2005; Whipple & Nathans, 2005). They also found that families completing the program were more likely to receive additional community-based resources (Mitchell-Herzfeld et al., 2005). Additional evidence of positive HFA outcomes came from Daro and colleagues (2007), who published evidence that HFA was successful at involving families in service planning, training home visitors, building good rapport with workers, and engaging high-risk populations.

Although positive outcomes have been identified, several researchers have reported inconclusive findings for some program outcomes. Harding and colleagues’ (2007) comprehensive review noted that there were mixed results with respect to attending recommended well-visits, moderate effects on maternal depression, and no overall evidence of benefits to immunization rates or creating a medical home as compared to community and national norms. Results of the review also indicated minimal to no support for better economic self-sufficiency, social support, reducing domestic violence, or decreasing substance abuse (Harding et al., 2007), which prompted additional specific home visitor training that is now mandatory in the HFA Best Practice Standards (HFA Best Practice...
Standards, 2014). According to Harding and colleagues (2007) there were also no positive effects overall on child social or cognitive development, parent-child interactions, parenting stress, or reduced subsequent births. Additionally, Whipple and Nathans (2005) found that the HFA program they evaluated was ineffective at improving attachment or attitudes toward parenting practices. There were also no changes in child development. Moreover, only one randomly controlled trial found reduced child maltreatment. Duggan and colleagues (2004) also found weak or no effects on all major program outcomes with little evidence that the program was preventing maltreatment within a Hawaiain HFA program. Of note, it was suggested that site implementation disparities may have contributed to the lack of findings; some data from this study were also likely obtained prior to quality assurance practices that were later implemented. One of very few HFA programs to find positive outcomes specific to reduced child maltreatment was reported by Dumont and colleagues (2006), who found fewer acts of abuse in the first two years of life with fewer positive impacts after the first two years of life.

Some caveats to these findings should be discussed. In Harding and colleagues’ (2007) review, only 4 out of 33 studies discussed breastfeeding at all; one of these reported higher rates of breastfeeding among mothers enrolled prenatally, a second reported longer rates of breastfeeding, and a third found higher rates of teen mothers breast feeding. With respect to a medical home, high rates were reported (74-100% of families reported having a medical home), but they were not significantly higher than control groups. On average, 14% of HFA families reported domestic violence with 10% of sites reporting rates of 33% or more (Harding et al., 2007); U.S. national norms suggest that approximately 1 in 4 women experience domestic violence in their lifetimes (National Coalition Against Domestic Violence, 2007). Thirteen percent of HFA families reported substance abuse with 10% of sites reporting rates of 40% or more. This is substantially higher than 2012 U.S. norms, which indicated 9.2% of individuals using illicit substances or abusing psychotropic medications in the last month (National Institute of Drug Abuse, 2012).

In addition to exploring overall program outcomes, a number of studies have explored program retention/engagement and the impact of retention/engagement on outcomes. In 2000, Daro published an article indicating that 20-30% of families referred to HFA fail to engage in the program. Ammerman and colleagues (2006) explored engagement in HFA within the first year of services by exploring the duration the families were involved in the program, the quantity of visits, and the consistency of the services provided. Results indicated that 31.8% of families disengaged within the first month of services. Although more than two thirds of families remained in the program, most had fewer than the recommended number of visits with 89.4% of families experiencing a visit gap of one month. Only 16.4% of families had a visit gap of two months or more. Families were more likely to remain in the program if they identified as being Caucasian and had greater parenting risk factors such as a history of mental health and/or alcohol and other drug abuse, reduced social support, or greater stress. The authors suggested that increased adversity may increase likelihood of participating in home visitations.

Following Harding and colleagues’ (2007) review, at least two additional studies have found positive outcomes concerning child abuse and neglect. Dumont and colleagues (2008) reported that HFA families committed less very significant abuse, less minor physical aggression, less psychological aggression, and less frequent harsh punishment during the child’s first year of life. The only analysis that continued to be significant at age 2 was
reduced serious physical abuse. It should also be noted that although this article provides many percentage comparisons suggesting significant results, most differences did not reach statistical significance. In 2011, Falconer and colleagues evaluated child abuse and neglect within a HFA completers group (i.e., families who reached Level 4 status – the lowest level of care - for at least three months) and a high fidelity group (i.e., families who were “active in or graduated from the program at end of the 3rd year, had >75% of expected home visits over the full period of enrollment, and were on Level X for <3 months total,” p. 68) to a no service group (i.e., never engaged in HFA following the initial referral) and a low service group (i.e., less than 3 months in HFA). A large number of covariates were explored, including young maternal age, higher number of children or siblings, being unmarried, having less than a high school education, obtaining inadequate prenatal care, and smoking during pregnancy. Other significant factors included parental substance abuse, mental health diagnoses or depression, social isolation, a history of domestic violence, and being the caregiver of a child with a significant disability. Reports of child abuse and neglect were confirmed via the state wide reporting system. Results indicated that the treatment groups were less likely to have reports of abuse or neglect. It is unknown whether these results were maintained over time.

Outside of assessing child abuse and neglect outcomes, additional studies published after the Harding and colleagues’ (2007) publication seem to report more positive findings, which contradict some of the findings from previous publications. Cullens and colleagues (2011) explored social and emotional competence of children among HFA families in the rural south east. Those completing the program were more likely to demonstrate positive parenting attitudes and changes based on the Adult-Adolescent Parenting Inventory Revised (Bavolek & Keene, 1999). Families completing the HFA program were also more likely to perform higher on measures of social and emotional competence based on parent self-reports from the Social/Emotional module of the Ages and Stages Questionnaire (ASQ-SE; Squires et al., 2003). Similar findings were reported by Whipple and Whyte (2010), who indicated positive health and child development related outcomes with children meeting their developmental milestones. They also reported that home workers were excellent at creating strong rapport with families and helping families provide a positive home environment. In addition to positive child development findings, Ownbey and Ownbey (2011) found reduced rates of rapid repeat births (RRBs) and teen repeat births (TRBs). Although this is not a primary HFA goal, this is important because research suggests that closer placed births are associated with higher risk of childhood injury. There are also more pre-natal health difficulties associated with shorter intervals between births including congenital malformations, neural tube defects, low birth weight, and prematurity, all of which can add to parenting stressors, potentially leading to abuse.

Home visitors for the HFA program have participated in research as well. LeCroy and Whitaker (2005) conducted focus groups with home visitors and then developed a list of 77 situations that the visitors commonly encounter. Home visitors reported that the most difficult situations encountered include limited resources for families, families with significant mental health concerns, families with significant substance abuse concerns, and families who seem to be unmotivated. The visitors also reported that five primary factors limiting their success included lack of clinical skill, lack of knowledge/ability to address family difficulties, lack of knowledge/training to address parenting difficulties, lack of knowledge/training to resolve parents’ personal challenges, and lack of experience in being a home visitor. Additional challenges reported by home visitors included having to work in homes during the summer
heat and witnessing or hearing about potentially dangerous activities occurring within families, such as abuse, neglect, and domestic violence. With the numerous challenges faced by HFA home visitors, job satisfaction and risk for burnout have also been explored (Mena & Bailey, 2007). Rapport with HFA supervisors was significantly related to job satisfaction. Although there was no association between rapport with supervisors and burnout, better rapport was associated with reduced emotional exhaustion and depersonalization.

**PROGRAM CHALLENGES**

The efficacy of HFA in meeting its stated aims has varied somewhat widely across sites. HFA has often been criticized most heavily as not having met its goal to prevent maltreatment (Holton & Harding, 2007). Specifically, in 1999, seven years after HFA formally began, the Packard Foundation’s *The Future of Children* (1999) highlighted these concerns. Then, in 2003, the Task Force for the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention published an equally discouraging report for HFA, which found home visit programs to be effective in general but that HFA was not producing beneficial results (Holton & Harding, 2007). Howard and colleagues (2009) reported similar findings for HFA but, in contrast to Holton and Harding (2007), reported that eight other home visiting programs from the U.S., Australia, and the Netherlands had also failed to prevent abuse. Additional criticism came when the Coalition for Evidence-Based Policy (2009), a nonpartisan, nonprofit research and advocacy organization, argued that HFA has been overly positive about claims of evidence-based effectiveness (Coalition of Evidence-Based Policy, 2009). The Coalition further argued that HFA was selectively reporting and overselling a small quantity of positive findings, discussing non-statistically significant effects as if they were significant, and had little to no evidence that the genuinely significant results would be maintained over time. Despite strong negative reviews of HFA and mixed research results that have not demonstrated a reduction in child abuse or neglect, HFA has continued to grow.

Proponents of HFA have offered many rationales for mixed research findings. Several HFA researchers have indicated that mixed research findings are not surprising and that it has been challenging to meet all of the primary HFA goals (Cullens et al., 2010). This may be because HFA was never intended to be a strict replicable model. Cullens and colleagues (2010) stated, quite simply but eloquently, that differences in service intensity, target population, and curriculum content led to differences in program quality. Additionally, many sites from early HFA studies may not have gone through formal credentialing processes. This means that they may not have had standardized guidelines and expectations in place, resulting in greater likelihood of varied outcomes and research findings. It is possible that these concerns may have now been addressed with additional quality assurance practices and Best Practice Standards (HFA Best Practice Standards, 2014). Differences in family risk level also exist across sites (Cullens et al., 2010). All of these factors play roles in accounting for HFA outcome variations. In a rebuttal to some of the negative comments made about HFA program design and research findings, Daro (2005) challenged all researchers and program evaluators to reconsider how clinical trials may not be the most effective means of demonstrating program effectiveness, especially considering the unique diversity of each family and community:
For researchers, this means that the standard toolbox of research techniques and principles may not be sufficient to get the job done. We will not be able to always rely on randomized trials as our “gold standard.” We may not always have neat little tables, with clear statistics to guide our decision-making. We are going to have to integrate new standards of evidence into our traditional thinking. Rather than being hierarchical, where one method is always considered superior, we will need to be more democratic, more participatory (p. 239).

HFA acknowledges that challenges exist and will likely continue to exist. HFA is a time intensive program that requires substantial system-level funding (Friedman & Schreiber, 2007). Excellence in training and leadership must be maintained, especially in times of program transitions. There are ongoing challenges with maintaining connectedness to individual families and communities as well. As this report and others have demonstrated, despite some very promising program outcomes, additional time and attention must be paid to how to meet the original program goals that are as of now not being systematically met (Friedman & Schreiber, 2007; McCurdy, 2000). This includes determining methods of improving developmental outcomes as well as considering alternative methods of assessing developmental markers. Efforts must be made to assist families in building strong social support networks outside of HFA and to develop means of better engaging at-risk families. Finally, there have not yet been any large scale efforts to determine HFA program cost effectiveness.

PROGRAM SUCCESSES

Important HFA successes should not be overlooked. Families participating in HFA have demonstrated improved birth outcomes and attendance at well-child check-ups (McCurdy, 2000). With few exceptions, research has consistently demonstrated improvements in parenting attitudes as well. While critics of HFA do exist, in 2003, the Administration for Children and Families recognized an HFA program in Arizona as a “noteworthy” model (Friedman & Schreiber, 2007). HFA staff members were commended for taking leadership roles within the Western Regional Resource Center and for collaborating with Department of Economic Security and Prevent Child Abuse Arizona. Friedman and Schreiber (2007) also described the benefits of HFA successfully collaborating with local universities to ensure accurate data analyses and interpretation of results; a Virginia HFA program’s collaborations with the College of William and Mary were discussed as an example of successful community connections. Of importance, HFA is one of multiple home visiting programs that has been widely successful in procuring and sustaining millions of dollars in private, state, and federal funding annually.

HFA has also been described as beneficial to state systems (Friedman & Schreiber, 2007). HFA is able to facilitate partnerships and information sharing with local agencies to help provide necessary supports to families. This relationship is mutually beneficial, as HFA is then also able to capitalize on state and local expertise in domains outside the scope of HFA. HFA has been successful in advocating for local program. States have seen first-hand
the positive impact of high quality home visiting efforts. HFA also has the ability to facilitate the development of learning laboratories that may drive knowledge of how to build home visit programs elsewhere and create a vision for the future.

MOVING FORWARD

HFA is one of the largest home visiting models in the U.S. and is unlike any other prevention program ever developed (Gomby, 2007; Holton & Harding, 2007). The program has been described as a “work in progress” (Oshana, 2005, p. 220) with many important lessons learned during its 20+ year history (Gomby, 2007; Holton & Harding, 2007). HFA has repeatedly demonstrated the importance of being inclusive of all families and being patient with what can often be a stressful process to not only build rapport with families but to create a program that will be uniquely successful in each community (Friedman & Schreiber, 2007). The program has also reiterated the importance of developing and utilizing a strategic plan, community connectedness, maintaining positive media coverage, building local programs of great quality, and continually advocating for funding. The importance of cultivating strong community connections also cannot be understated, and HFA has been a leader in demonstrating how to build these lasting connections (Oshana, 2005). For example, 97% of HFA programs are partnering with mental health providers, 96% are partnering with domestic violence agencies, and 89% are partnering with alcohol and drug abuse prevention agencies.

HFA emphasizes that program content must drive program results; “HFA is a general service strategy, not a specific intervention” (Gromby, 2007, p. 794), and the importance of how content in delivered is key. All content must be closely aligned with program goals, and relationships between families and home visitors are critical. Home visitors must be thoroughly and continually trained in core HFA content; they must also be capable and confident in responding to crises. In considering the future of HFA and the newest HFA Best Practice Standards (HFA Best Practice Standards, 2014), it appears that HFA has been mindful of the needs that Gromby (2007) discussed. For example, HFA now emphasizes advanced “wraparound” training to include additional skills in how to identify and response to maternal depression, domestic violence, and substance abuse, as these are areas that home visitors have described as being challenging points of intervention. Reflective supervision processes also provide home visitors with better emotional supports. Providing the necessary supports to home workers is highly important, especially given that as of 2007, the national turnover rate for home visitors was 3 years with individual programs reporting 30-35% turnover in 1 year to 70% over 18-36 months; low wages are often a reason for departure (Gomby, 2007).

Supporters of HFA accept that specific communities and families will shape program content and that this will ultimately limit generalizability of the program (Gomby, 2007). With this in mind, program goals will need to continue to align with family goals for the program to work. Both federal and state policy and funding will also dictate how far HFA’s mission will extend. Evaluations of HFA must also be strengthened in an effort to better determine risk factors for maltreatment and how to meet HFA’s primary program goal: to prevent child maltreatment. Although this program supports individualization of sites with a
flexible framework, standardizing assessment tools, which continue to vary somewhat across sites, would reduce the number of potential confounds when attempting to interpret variations in research results across sites (Holton & Harding, 2007; Oshana, 2005). Overall, HFA’s research base must be continued for learning, implementation, and execution purposes. The methodological limitations are challenging, but as Oshana (2005) argues, “Health Families America does not exist in a vacuum and it cannot entirely ameliorate all that ails families and children” (p. 226). The public and private systems (e.g., relationships, schools, work environments, etc.) in which families and children live are important to consider and assess when meeting the objectives of preventing child maltreatment. As such, considering the strengths of how to approach research and evaluation of HFA from an ecological systems model may be one method of continuing to demonstrate empirical support for HFA in the future (Oshana, 2005).

CONCLUSION

As a program designed to promote positive parenting, enhance child health and development, and prevent maltreatment, evaluations of the degree to which the HFA model has met its objectives are multifarious. Reviews find some support for positive parenting and child health and development (e.g., positive effects for parent-child interactions, higher birth weights, and increased use of community-based resources). Yet there seems to be a lack of support for needed changes in domestic violence, substance use, and the prevention of child maltreatment. Some have argued that the disparities in results can be expected given the model of HFA (i.e., clinical trials may not be the best measure of success). As such, research and evaluation of HFA must continue and evolve. Substantial efforts have been made to utilize research outcomes to implement updated Best Practice Standards.
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Table 1.

**Healthy Families America Program Development Time Line**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1974</td>
<td>Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act (CAPTA) created by U.S. congress; Funding from CAPTA created the national Center on Child Abuse and Neglect (NCCAN – now the Office on Child Abuse and Neglect – OCAN)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975-1976</td>
<td>Healthy Start begins in Hawaii, based on home visit structure developed by C. Henry Kempe, a pediatrician, in the 1960s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980s</td>
<td>Prenatal/Early Intervention Project began in NY to promote smoking cessation, also brought need for scientific evidence of home visits to the forefront</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>Prevent Child Abuse America (PCA) replicates the Hawaii program on the US mainland beginning with 25 sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>Carnegie Corporation helps fund HFA research network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>HFA grows quickly with support from the Freddie Mac Foundation and PCA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>Discussion occurs regarding how to provide more structure to the HFA model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997-1998</td>
<td>The existing HFA program expands its existing structure to nationalize the program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Regional Resource Centers launched by PCA – nearly all states with more than one HFA have some sort of state support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>HFA 12 Best Practice Standards are implemented</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note:* Information in this time line is based on Friedman and Schreiber, 2007, Holton and Harding, 2007, HFA Best Practice Standards, 2014
### 12 Healthy Families America Best Practice Standards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Best Practice Standard</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Beginning Services Prenatally or at Birth</td>
<td>Provide evidence that programs have well-developed process for identifying families that may benefit from HFA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Utilization of Standardized Screening and Assessments</td>
<td>Implement standardized screening and assessment techniques to identify at-risk families. Also need to assess for maltreatment risks and other adverse child experiences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Voluntary Participation</td>
<td>Support voluntary participation from families and build trust via positive community outreach.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Intensive Long Term Intervention</td>
<td>Provide intensive in-home services (weekly) after birth and continue interventions for a minimum of 3 years but up to 5 years. Measureable mechanisms must be in place to determine the level of care each family needs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) Cultural Sensitivity and Competent Care</td>
<td>Offer culturally sensitive and competent services that acknowledge and respects cultural similarities and differences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) Positive Parenting and Child Growth and Development</td>
<td>Emphasize a reduction in parental stress, increase in positive parent-child interactions via family-centered, support techniques, and stimulate child development in social, cognitive, and motor domains.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7) Health Care and Community Resources</td>
<td>Connect families to appropriate health care providers and other community resources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8) Individualized Attention</td>
<td>Limit home visitor caseloads to provide the individualized attention families require to address needs and help set future goals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9) Selection of Home Service Providers</td>
<td>Select home visitors based on personal characteristics, openness to cultural diversity, and skill set.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10) Extensive Home Visitor Training</td>
<td>Provide home visitors with the necessary training to work well with complex, culturally diverse family needs. HFA Core training by a certified HFA Core Trainer is required within the first 6 months of hire that includes 6 training topics.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11) Home Visitor Program-Specific Training for At-Risk Families</td>
<td>Provide home visitors with the necessary training to offer qualified family assessments and home visits, develop individualized support plans, build excellent rapport with families, assist families in engaging in preventative health services and home safety, meet mental health and substance abuse needs, make accurate behavioral observations, and intervene in crisis situations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12) Home Visitor Supervision</td>
<td>Implement appropriate, ongoing supervision for home visitors by qualified staff. Supervision must be in three core areas: 1) administrative duties, 2) clinical care, and 3) reflective processes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Information in this table is based on Frankel et al., 2000 and HFA Best Practice Standards, 2014.